UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 103—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1957, TO FEBRUARY 1, 1957
(PAGES 1 TO 1420)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1957

J
11
.R
V.103
pt.1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1957

The 3d of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the 1st session of the 85th Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, lifting our hearts to Thee for this hallowed moment at this altar of prayer our fathers reared, we come reverently thanking Thee for new years and for new days, for new thoughts of Thee and for new hopes for a redeemed and cleansed earth.

Facing the tangled tragedy in which all human relationships are caught, we beseech Thee, empower Thy servants in this forum of freedom, upon which are the eyes of a fear-haunted world, that rising above all that is base and small they may work together in glad and eager harmony, deeper than any division, for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of the peoples of this stricken earth who will unite in mutual good will determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind.

On this significant day of beginnings, like the sound of a great amen may there ascend from the Members of this body as each stands on a pedestal of privilege and power the solemn petition "So help me God." Save those who here serve the Nation's cause from all compromise which crucifies principle, from all shoddy workmanship which betrays the possible best, and from cowardly expediency which is treason to the highest integrity. Above all sectional and party shibboleths and interests, may there be lifted at the very beginning of this session the fervent prayer which makes us one—"God bless America."

Desiring nothing for ourselves that we do not desire for all men, help us to be good stewards of Thy bounty, to practice a beneficent cooperation with depressed areas everywhere, to be beacons of freedom, and to proclaim and protect the dignity of peoples and individuals, remembering as we come to the first session of the 85th Congress that we are the spiritual heirs of those who at the first session of the first Congress stirred the world with a gospel of startling change. Help us not to betray the Founding Fathers by allowing a passion for security, a morbid fear of change, or of cringing timidity at the threats of dictators, in so stormy an era, to crush out the spirit which launched this dear country of our hopes and prayers. And, above all and in all, undergird our faith with the conquering assurance that—

Under the shadow of Thy throne
Still may we dwell secure.
Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
And our defense is sure.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

RESIGNATION FROM THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] enclosing a copy of a letter to the Governor of Texas, tendering his resignation as a Senator, effective as of January 15, 1957. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD and placed on file.

The letter is ordered to be printed in the RECORD and placed on file, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1956.

Hon. ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Acting under the provisions of section 4 of article 4.09 of the Texas Election Code, I hereby resign the office of United States Senator effective January 15, 1957, or at such earlier date as my successor has been elected and qualified.

From this date forward I shall not draw any salary, but I shall continue my services in completing pending matters in my Senate committees and shall be available in the event of a special session, thereby assuring that Texas has the full representation of two United States Senators while my successor is being elected.

Although the date of the election, within the time limits specified in section 1 of article 4.09, is a matter within your discretion, please permit me to express the hope that it will be held in time for my successor to take office not later than January 3, the first day of the next Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE DANIEL.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of CHAPMAN REVERCOMB and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, elected Senators on November 6, 1956, from the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, respectively, for unexpired terms. They are regular in form, and, without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD and ordered to be placed on file.

The certificates of election ordered to be printed in the RECORD and placed on file are as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, CHAPMAN REVERCOMB was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore ending the 3d day of January, 1959.

Witness: His excellency Gov. William C. Marland, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, W. Va., this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM C. MARLAND,
Governor.

[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, November 26, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, the Honorable JOHN SHERMAN COOPER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 4 years.

Witness: His excellency our Gov. Albert Benjamin Chandler, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
Governor.

[SEAL] THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

The VICE PRESIDENT. With reference to the election of a Senator from the State of South Carolina for the unexpired term ending January 3, 1961, at noon, the Chair lays before the Senate a letter of resignation from the Senate, addressed to the Governor of South Carolina by Thomas A. Wofford; a communication from the Governor of said State, enclosing a certificate, dated November 7, 1956, purporting to appoint STROM THURMOND, "effective as of the effective date of his acceptance, a Senator from said State to succeed Thomas A. Wofford, resigned, until the vacancy therein is filled as provided by law"; and a certificate, signed by the Governor and secretary of state, dated November 27, 1956, of the election on November 6, 1956, of STROM THURMOND as a Senator from said State "for the term of 4 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957."

The clerk will read the documents.

The letter, communication, and certificate of election were read by the legislative clerk, Edward E. Mansur, Jr., as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
October 29, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor of South Carolina, the State House, Columbia, S. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR TIMMERMAN: At the time of my appointment to the United States Senate, I stated that I would submit my resignation when my successor was elected.

In compliance with this promise, I herewith submit to you my resignation from the Senate and respectfully request you to accept it effective as of November 7, 1956.

It has been a great honor for me to serve the people of South Carolina in this high office. I wish to express my deep appreciation to you for the trust you reposed in me by choosing me to serve in the Senate.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. WOFFORD.

(Copy to President of the Senate, Secretary of the Senate, Senator STROM THURMOND.)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Columbia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Carolina, I, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint J. STROM THURMOND, effective as of the effective date of his acceptance, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States to succeed Thomas A. Wofford, resigned, until the vacancy therein is filled as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, as of the 7th day of November, the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor.

[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, STROM THURMOND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 4 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor.

[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter, communication, and certificate of election will be placed on file.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a resolution, which I shall shortly send to the desk, on behalf of myself and the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. After the clerk has stated the resolution for the information of the Senate, I should like to make a brief statement before action is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 1), as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 36 (49 Stat. 22), and under the precedents of the Senate, the term of service of Thomas A. Wofford, appointed a Senator by the Governor of the State of South Carolina, to fill the vacancy in the term ending January 2, 1961, caused by the resignation of STROM THURMOND, expired on election day, November 6, 1956; and be it further

Resolved, That the term of service of STROM THURMOND, duly elected a Senator on said day to fill the vacancy in the said unexpired term ending January 2, 1961, commenced, under said statute and precedents, on November 7, 1956, the day following the election.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader, and he has joined me in this resolution, which is presented because, in the opinion of the Parliamentarian, it is necessary to adopt such a resolution in order to maintain the precedents of the Senate, and to comply with Federal statutes now on the books.

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who was elected Senator from that State for the 6-year term beginning January 3, 1955, resigned on April 4, 1956; and Thomas A. Wofford was appointed by the Governor, effective April 5, 1956, to fill the vacancy.

On October 29, 1956, Senator Wofford resigned, effective November 7, 1956. Former Senator THURMOND was elected without opposition on November 6, 1956, for the unexpired term, which will end on January 3, 1961, at noon; and, under authority of title 2, United States Code section 36, the Senate being in sine die adjournment, the Secretary of the Senate placed Mr. THURMOND's name upon the payroll of the Senate.

I am informed that the Governor contends that, under the law of that State, the interim appointment of Mr. Wofford would not expire until noon on January 3, 1957; and that, by reason of Senator Wofford's resignation, a vacancy arose, which he was required by law to fill until that date. He therefore, on November 7, 1956, tendered an appointment to Senator-elect THURMOND, effective upon his acceptance, "to succeed Thomas A. Wofford, resigned, until the vacancy therein is filled as provided by law." Senator THURMOND, on November 13, 1956, accepted the appointment effective as of November 7, 1956.

The Governor, on November 27, 1956, transmitted to the President of the Senate a certificate, signed by himself and the secretary of state, that on November 6, 1956, "STROM THURMOND was duly chosen a Senator from said State for the term of 4 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957."

The Federal law governing the salaries of Senators elected to fill unexpired terms is contained in title 2, United States Code, section 36 (49 Stat. 22), approved February 13, 1935, the pertinent part of which is as follows:

SEC. 36. Salaries of Senators.

Provided, That when Senators have been elected during a sine die adjournment of the Senate to succeed appointees, the salaries of Senators so elected shall commence on the day following the election.

The Senate since the adoption of this act has uniformly followed its provisions, and there have been two instances when the question was raised by the appointee when another person was elected to fill the unexpired term.

On November 8, 1938, Tom Stewart was elected a Senator from the State of Tennessee to fill an unexpired term ending January 2, 1943, which had been previously filled by an appointment of one George L. Berry. Mr. Stewart was serving as a district attorney in that State, and did not qualify as Senator until January 16, 1939. Mr. Berry contended he was entitled to draw pay until Mr. Stewart took the oath; but the Senate, on February 2, 1939, adopted a resolution that Mr. Berry's term expired on the day on which Mr. Stewart was elected, and that Mr. Berry was not entitled to receive compensation or emoluments of the office after election day.

On November 5, 1945, Kingsley A. Taft was elected Senator from the State of Ohio for the unexpired term ending January 2, 1947, to succeed James W. Huffman, who had been appointed by the Governor to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Burton.

The financial clerk of the Senate, under authority of the Federal law, dropped Mr. Huffman's name from the payroll as of election day, and placed Mr. Taft's name thereon as of November 6. Senator Huffman questioned this action, and brought the matter to the attention of the President pro tempore of the Senate, Hon. Kenneth D. McKellar, who concurred in the decision of the financial clerk.

In another instance, in 1936, under an identical situation, the appointee continued to maintain an office and clerical force, at his own expense, after another person had been elected to fill the remainder of the unexpired term. In the next Congress a resolution was submitted in the Senate to reimburse him and his employees for their expenses, which was referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses, where it died at the end of the Congress without any action thereon.

Numerous cases have arisen since the adoption of the law in 1935 where persons were elected to succeed appointees while the Senate was in sine die adjournment, and the above rule has been uniformly followed by the financial clerk. In only the two cases above cited has a question been raised by the appointee as to his right to draw compensation after election day.

Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished Parliamentarian and his assistant, the distinguished Secretary of the Senate, and the distinguished minority leader, and after giving the Senate all the facts with regard to the precedents, the majority leader is hopeful that this resolution will be adopted unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificates of election for 32 Senators for 6-year terms commencing at noon on January 3. The certificates are in the form provided by law. If there is no objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without being read and will be placed on file.

The certificates of election were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 GEORGE D. AIKEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Joseph B. Johnson, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier this 20th day of November in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
Governor.

[SEAL] HOWARD B. ARMSTRONG,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, WALLACE F. BENNETT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, J. Bracken Lee, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor.

[SEAL] LAMONT F. TORONTO,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 6th day of November, 1956, ALAN BIBLE was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the secretary of State at Carson City, Nev.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of State to be affixed at Carson City, this 12th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.

[SEAL] JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, PRESCOTT BUSH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Abraham Ribicoff, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Governor.

[SEAL] MILDRED P. ALLEN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, and our seal hereto affixed at Annapolis, this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor.

[SEAL] BLANCHARD RANDALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, Ind.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, HOMER E. CAPEHART was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, George N. Craig, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

GEORGE N. CRAIG,
Governor.

[SEAL] CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, FRANK CARLSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Fred Hall, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

FRED HALL,
Governor.

[SEAL] PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, JOHN A. CARROLL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Ed C. Johnson, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, this 30th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

ED C. JOHNSON,
Governor.

[SEAL] GEO. J. BAKER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, FRANCIS CASE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Joe Foss, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, S. Dak., this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

By the Governor:

JOE FOSS,
Governor.

[SEAL] GERALDINE OSTROOT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Whereas, the State Board of Canvassers of the State of Idaho, in obedience to the provisions of section 34–1304 of the Idaho Code, has found, certified and declared that a canvass of the abstract of votes cast at the general election held in the State of Idaho on the 6th day of November 1956 shows that FRANK CHURCH, of Boise, has received the greatest number of legal votes cast for the office of United States Senator.

Now, therefore, I, Jas. H. Young, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby declare and certify that said FRANK CHURCH, of Boise, has been duly and regularly elected to the office of United States Senator, for the term beginning January 3, 1957, and is entitled to all the rights, honors, and privileges pertaining thereto.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1956, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 181st.

[SEAL] JAS. H. YOUNG,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, George M. Leader, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Harrisburg, Pa., this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1956.

GEORGE M. LEADER,
Governor.

[SEAL] HENRY E. HARNER,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 NORRIS COTTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Lane Dwinell, and our seal hereto affixed at Concord, this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1956.

LANE DWINELL,
Governor.

By the Governor, with advice of the council.

[SEAL] ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, William G. Stratton, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, December 4, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, SAM J. ERVIN, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Luther H. Hodges, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol in the city of Raleigh, this 4th day of December in the year of our Lord 1956 and in the 181st year of our American independence.

By the Governor:

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Governor.

[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Little Rock.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, J. W. FULBRIGHT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Orval E. Faubus, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this 23d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

[SEAL] C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Arizona, ss:

I, Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State, State of Arizona, do hereby certify that, at a general election held in said State of Arizona on the 6th day of November, A. D., 1956, CARL HAYDEN was duly elected to the office of United States Senator in and for said State of Arizona, as appears by the official State canvass or certifications on file in my office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 28th day of November, A. D. 1956.

[SEAL] WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City.

To Hon. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I, Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of the State of Missouri, hereby certify that at a general election held in the State of Missouri on the 6th day of November, 1956, as provided by law, the following-named person was elected to the office named, as shown by the returns of the election certified to me by Hon. Walter H. Toberman, Secretary of State of the State of Missouri:

Senator in Congress: THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., 220 North Kingshighway, St. Louis, Mo.

In witness whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and cause the great seal of the State of Missouri to be affixed at the city of Jefferson, State of Missouri, this 21st day of December, A. D., 1956.

PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor.

[SEAL] WALTER H. TOBERMAN,
Attest:
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Leo A. Hoegh, and our seal hereto affixed at Des Moines, Iowa, this 14th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

LEO A. HOEGH, *Governor.*

[SEAL] MELVIN D. SYNHORST,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Montgomery, November 26, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 LISTER HILL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama as a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, James E. Folsom, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

JAMES E. FOLSOM, *Governor.*

[SEAL] MARY TEXAS HURT GARNER,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 JACOB K. JAVITS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New York a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Averell Harriman, and our seal hereto affixed at Albany, this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Governor.

Attested by:

[SEAL] CARMINE G. DE SAPIO,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 OLIN D. JOHNSTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, JR.,
Governor.

[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, THOMAS H. KUCHEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Goodwin J. Knight, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 14th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

Attest:

[SEAL] FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF OHIO.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION, UNITED STATES SENATOR

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, FRANK J. LAUSCHE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

[SEAL] TED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, RUSSELL B. LONG was duly

chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

EARL K. LONG, *Governor.*

[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, WARREN G. MAGNUSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Washington a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Washington to be affixed at Olympia this 6th day of December A. D. 1956.

EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
Acting Governor of Washington.

[SEAL] EARL COE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, 1956, MIKE MONRONEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, begining on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Raymond Gary, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

RAYMOND GARY,
Governor.

[SEAL] ANDY ANDERSON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the regular general election held within and for the State of Oregon, on Tuesday, the 6th day of November, A. D. 1956, that WAYNE MORSE, of Lane County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator at said election;

Now therefore, I, Elmo Smith, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue and in pursuance of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said WAYNE MORSE, of Lane County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator for the State of Oregon, for a term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January, 1957.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereto affixed. Done at the Capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 4th day of December, A. D. 1956.

By the Governor:

ELMO SMITH,
Governor.

[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, November 26, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956, the Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Albert Benjamin Chandler, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1956.

ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
Governor.

[SEAL] THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November, A. D., 1956, GEORGE A. SMATHERS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 16th day of November, A. D., 1956.

By the Governor, attest:

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

[SEAL] R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

NOTICE OF ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATOR

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 HERMAN E. TALMADGE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d of January 1957.

Witness His Excellency our Governor Marvin Griffin, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1956.

MARVIN GRIFFIN,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 ALEXANDER WILEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, commencing on the 3d day of January 1957.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1956.

WALTER J. KOHLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] MRS. GLENN M. WISE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Bismarck.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of November 1956 MILTON R. YOUNG, of Berlin, N. Dak., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1957.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Brunsdale, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 10th day of December in the year of our Lord 1956.

NORMAN BRUNSDALE,
Governor.

[SEAL] BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

WELCOME TO HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to announce to the Senate that one of America's most distinguished citizens and one of our great Democrats, Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois, and the most recent nominee of our party for President, is seated in the Diplomatic Gallery. I should like to ask him to stand in order that Members of the Senate may extend to him a welcome.

[Mr. Stevenson rose, and was greeted by prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries, Members rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Texas that in view of the response both in the galleries and on the floor, we would enjoy hearing Mr. Stevenson speak; but, because the privilege of the floor is reserved only for Senators and certain other persons, that opportunity must be denied him upon this occasion. Certainly we are most happy to join in welcoming this distinguished guest, and to have him with us, even though we are unable to enjoy the eloquence for which he is well famed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the administration of the oath. The clerk will proceed to call the names in alphabetical order, in groups of four.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. BUSH.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. PURTELL, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. CARROLL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BEALL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. ALLOTT, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. COOPER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MUNDT, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of our guests in the galleries, the Chair points out that the signing of the oath book is more than a mere ritual. Until the Members sign the book their pay does not begin.

The Clerk will call the next four names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MCCLELLAN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HILL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. SPARKMAN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The Clerk will call the next four names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. JAVITS, who was absent, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. LONG.

These Senators, other than Mr. JAVITS, escorted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. ELLENDER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the next four names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MORTON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. COOPER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next four names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TALMADGE, and Mr. THURMOND.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the last two names on the list.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. WILEY and Mr. YOUNG.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. LANGER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and John A. Carroll.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and William A. Purtell.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear, Jr.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Frank Church.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Thos. E. Martin.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—John S. Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne.

Maryland.—John M. Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Charles E. Potter and Pat McNamara.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and Stuart Symington.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—George W. Malone and Alan Bible.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Clifford P. Case.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Jacob K. Javits.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and W. Kerr Scott.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—John W. Bricker and Frank J. Lausche.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Edward Martin and Joseph S. Clark, Jr.

Rhode Island.—Theodore F. Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Lyndon B. Johnson and Price Daniel.

Utah.—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Matthew M. Neely and Chapman Revercomb.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Frank A. Barrett and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Gore	Morton
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Revercomb
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lausche	Stennis
Daniel	Long	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Douglas	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	McNamara	

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2) which

was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Under the foregoing resolution, the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 5) which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890, on the subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to the resolution of the Senator from Texas I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and on which I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the name "CARL HAYDEN," and in lieu thereof to insert the name "STYLES BRIDGES, Senator from the State of New Hampshire."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk [Emery L. Frazier] called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Capehart	Flanders
Allott	Carlson	Goldwater
Barrett	Case, N. J.	Hickenlooper
Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Hruska
Bennett	Cooper	Ives
Bricker	Cotton	Jenner
Bridges	Curtis	Knowland
Bush	Dirksen	Kuchel
Butler	Dworshak	Langer
Malone	Potter	Thye
Martin, Iowa	Purtell	Watkins
Martin, Pa.	Revercomb	Wiley
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Williams
Morton	Schoeppel	Young
Mundt	Smith, Maine	
Payne	Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hill	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Carroll	Humphrey	Neuberger
Chavez	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clark	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Daniel	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kennedy	Scott
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Lausche	Sparkman
Ervin	Long	Stennis
Frear	Magnuson	Symington
Fulbright	Mansfield	Talmadge
Gore	McClellan	Thurmond
Green	McNamara	
Hayden	Monroney	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the administration of the oath to the newly elected President pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as a committee of one to escort the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the chair.

Mr. HAYDEN, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to him by the Vice President.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE PRO TEMPORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the election of the President of the Senate pro tempore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE PRO TEMPORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTE—ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution which provides for the counting on January 7, 1957, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States. I ask that the resolution be read.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 7th day of January 1957, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter "A", and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MURRAY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. CLARK I submit a motion which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MURRAY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MORTON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CLARK) makes the following motion:

"In accordance with article 1, section 5 of the Constitution which declares that * * * each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * * I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before a motion is made to lay on

the table the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico, for himself and other Senators, I should like to read for the information of the Senate a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which will be submitted to the Senate. The proposed agreement has been arrived at after numerous conferences of many Members of the Senate. It will be submitted on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and myself.

The proposed agreement reads as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That debate be in order on the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to lay on the table the motion of Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and others) to take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules of the Senate for the 85th Congress; that on Friday, January 4, 1957, at the hour of 6 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote on said motion without further debate; and that during the intervening period the time devoted to the consideration of the said motion shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and Mr. ANDERSON, or someone designated by them, provided, however, that parliamentary inquiries may be in order during this period.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that the time required for any parliamentary inquiries which may be made will be charged against the side making such inquiries.

I desire to say further that if the proposed agreement shall be entered into, it is the plan of the leadership, subject to the approval of the Senate, to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow and to stay in session for 6 hours before proceeding to a vote.

Those 6 hours would be divided equally between the 2 sides.

It is the intention of the leadership, if this agreement shall be entered into, to move that the Senate recess early today, so that Members who have guests here will be able to spend some time with them this afternoon.

Mr. President, I move to lay the motion of the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Illinois first, and then I shall yield to my friend from South Carolina, before I enter my motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to raise certain inquiries based on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas. The first inquiry is this: If the President of the United States shall address a joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress tomorrow, is it understood that the Senate will still vote at 6 o'clock in the evening, regardless of how much time may be spent in recessing for the address and reconvening?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the opinion of the majority leader, that would be true. I should be very glad to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow if it should be determined that the President desired to address the Congress at 12:30. That determination has not been made. It is my opinion that if the proposed unanimous-consent agreement shall be entered into, the Senate will proceed to discuss the question of the rules for as long as may be desired, up to 6 o'clock. The Senate could meet at 10 o'clock and the President could deliver his message subsequent to the matter being taken up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, I may say that I think at least 6 hours of discussion is needed, 3 hours for each side. I should like to have the unanimous-consent request framed in such broad terms that if the President of the United States shall address a joint meeting tomorrow the full 6 hours of debate will be permitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has my assurance that the full 6 hours will be permitted, conditioned only on the consent of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a second inquiry. Did the majority leader say that parliamentary inquiries would be permitted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The unanimous-consent request states, and I read to the Senator from Illinois and all other Senators who may be interested:

However, that parliamentary inquiries may be in order during this period.

That means at any time during the period of discussion any Senator on either side may raise a parliamentary question, and the side yielding the time will be charged with the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Against which side would the time taken for the opinion of the Presiding Officer on parliamentary inquiries be charged?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would say the side which originally yielded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would object. I think, at the least, the time should be equally charged to both sides.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader has no disposition to quibble about that, and is willing to modify the unanimous-consent request to that effect, so that the record may show that any time the distinguished Presiding Officer may use will be charged to both sides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the following is a better suggestion: That the time consumed in any ruling by the Presiding Officer shall not be taken from the time allotted for debate, and that the time used for that purpose shall instead be added to the 6 hours otherwise permitted for debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader will be glad to consent to that suggestion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can it be assumed that, because of the possibility of an address by the President tomorrow, the situation can be taken care of by the Senate's convening at 10 a. m. tomorrow? Can it be assumed that, regardless of how much time may be consumed, a vote will not be taken until 6 o'clock? I hope that Senators will find it possible to be present in the Chamber all the time. On the other hand, it might be that some Senators would look forward to having a vote at 6 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader is of the opinion that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement makes it abundantly clear that the time of the voting will be at the hour of 6 o'clock. It is the opinion of the majority leader that, if the agreement shall be entered into, the President will deliver his message after 6 o'clock tomorrow, possibly on Saturday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it understood, then, that any time consumed by possible rulings from the Chair, and any time which may be taken by a recess to enable the Senate to attend the joint meeting to be addressed by the President, will be in addition to the 6 hours which is implicitly recognized in the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader so understands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is one final question I should like to ask. I notice the unanimous-consent request states that parliamentary inquiries will be in order. Will points of order be in order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the opinion of the majority leader, they will not be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I propound a parliamentary inquiry, and request the Chair to give a ruling as to the difference between a point of order and a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There can be an appeal from a decision of the Chair on a point of order. There can be no appeal as to any pronouncement by the Chair regarding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does an opinion by the Chair on a parliamentary inquiry constitute a dictum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A response by the Chair to a parliamentary inquiry is an opinion. A ruling on a point of order is a decision and is subject to appeal to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it dictum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is using a legal phrase. The Chair believes that would be a proper description of an opinion expressed by the Chair in response to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The majority leader said a moment ago he would now move to lay the motion on the table. We, of course, recognize that debate must cease when such a motion is made. Will he tell us that the unanimous-consent agreement will permit debate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the purpose of the request. It is necessary to ask unanimous consent to propose such an agreement, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes that to be the proper procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I ask unanimous consent that, following my intended motion to lay on the table, it may be in order to propose such a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question, based on the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Texas and the comment of the Chair as to the difference between a parliamentary inquiry and a point of order. Am I to understand that the effect of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is that a Senator would not be privileged under that agreement to raise a point of order as to whether or not the proposed motion of the Senator from New Mexico is in order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; I think so.

Mr. MORSE. That means, then, that again in this session of Congress the Senate will not face up to the question directly as to whether or not a new session of the Senate has the parliamentary obligation of adopting new rules. The only way this question can be determined, and I think American history is entitled to have the Senate determine it, is for the Senate itself to face this issue squarely and directly. The Senate should take the following parliamentary steps in facing up to this problem. First entertain a motion such as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] proposes to make to the effect that the Senate proceed to adopt Senate rules binding upon the 85th Congress. Second, the Senate and the Presiding Officer should then consider a point of order raised by some Senator asking for a determination as to whether or not the motion calling for the adoption of new rules is in fact in order. Third, the Senate should then consider an appeal from the decision of the Chair on the point of order.

If we will follow the parliamentary steps I have just outlined we should then, and only then, meet the issue directly, and not by the parliamentary diversionary tactic of a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is a very able parliamentarian; no Member of this body understands better than does he the effects of motions. He is experienced in this respect.

It is the opinion of the majority leader that we shall meet the issue when we act on the motion to lay on the table. Every Member of the Senate realizes that if the motion to lay on the table shall be adopted, that will end the matter. We reached a similar situation in 1953; we did not then have a unanimous-consent agreement, but we had a gentleman's agreement calling for substantially the same procedure as that which we now propose.

The very able Senator from Oregon is aware of the problems which confront the Senate and of the messages which are to come before it. We have just attempted to work out with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators representing their viewpoint, an arrangement which would serve notice on each Member of the Senate that there would be adequate time in which to discuss this subject both pro and con; that we would fix a definite time for voting on it; and that we would try to set that time in accordance with the views and wishes of all the Members of the Senate.

After conferring until late in the night—until 11 o'clock last night—and all this morning, it seems that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement more nearly represents the views of all the Members of the Senate than anything else at which we could arrive.

It is the opinion of the majority leader that if the motion shall be agreed to, and if the unanimous-consent proposal to be offered by the Senator from New Mexico, the minority leader, and myself, shall be agreed to, the question will be thoroughly discussed; opportunity to make parliamentary inquiries will be afforded; the time required for making them will be charged to the side making them, although the time required for the answers to such inquiries will not be charged to either side; and the Senate will vote at 6 o'clock tomorrow, at which time Senators will be at liberty to vote either to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators, or not to lay it on the table, according to the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas. I wish to say that I shall support the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. However, I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear in regard to what we are doing when we support the unanimous-consent agreement. Frequently we are heard to say on the political platforms that the legislative process is a compromise process. So I think the RECORD should be made clear regarding this parliamentary compromise, and that both the Senate and the public should know that when any Senator votes on the motion to lay on the table, he really is voting on the question of whether new rules for the Senate should be adopted at the beginning of the 85th Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I look forward to hearing the Senator from Oregon speak on that subject during the afternoon or on tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, I shall not be able to speak at my customary length. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to note first that the statement of the Senator from Oregon has so clarified the situation that I think there is no need for further discussion in regard to what this is all about.

We are assuming that under the unanimous-consent agreement, the motion will be in order; otherwise the agreement would not have been acceptable. So the motion will be in order, and will be debated and settled. That means that we shall reach a decision as to whether we shall adopt new rules for the Senate. That question will be settled by the vote which will begin at 6 o'clock on tomorrow, Friday, if the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is propounded and agreed to.

I should like to ask the majority leader a question, to see whether we can arrive at a slight modification of the proposed procedure. The majority leader said he would accommodate the wishes of Senators regarding the time available for the debate, if the President should wish to address a joint meeting of the two Houses, and it should be necsary for the Senate to take a recess for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader has expressed the hope that the President's message will come to us subsequent to the taking of the vote on this question, and the majority leader can assure the Senator from Minnesota that that will be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I so understand.

The majority leader said that the time required for any statements by the Presiding Officer would not be charged to the time available to either side. However, there is a little conflict here. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] seeks to have 6 hours of debate. Because of these uncertainties, will not the majority leader consider setting the time of meeting on tomorrow at 10 a. m., so there will be no doubt that at least 6 hours will be available for the debate, and so we shall not have to be uncertain as to that situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am amenable to the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota, who always is very persuasive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be laid on the table.

Mr. President, I submit the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which I ask to be read by the clerk, and then to be acted on. The proposed agreement is offered on behalf of the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That debate be in order on the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to lay on the table the motion of Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and others) to take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules of the Senate for the 85th Congress; that on Friday, January 4, 1957, at the hour of 6 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote on said motion without further debate; and that during the intervening period the time devoted to the consideration of

the said motion shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion, and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and Mr. ANDERSON, or someone designated by them: *Provided, however,* That parliamentary inquiries may be in order during this period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the proposed unanimous-consent request. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senate, and I appreciate the cooperation of my colleagues. I hope that the harmony which prevails here today will extend throughout the session.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator of Texas has the floor.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., when called to order by the President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND advanced in the center aisle; and

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said: Mr. President, I should like to announce that the committee to communicate with the President, to which the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader were appointed, has informed the President that Congress has assembled and is ready to receive messages from him. The President has told us he plans to deliver a message personally on Saturday at 12:30 p. m. at a joint meeting.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) providing for the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President on January 7, 1957.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses meet in a joint session on Saturday, January 5, 1957; and

H. Con Res. 2. Concurrent resolution making the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES ON SATURDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the desk a concurrent resolution concerning a joint meeting, on which the House has acted. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 1), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, January 5, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate another concurrent resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1957, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, of the 84th Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, of the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

RULES OF THE SENATE—PROCEDURE UNDER UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier in the day in response to an inquiry from my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the majority leader said that in order to have 6 hours' time for debate tomorrow on the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, if it would be necessary for the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock, the Senate would do so. Since that time it has been determined that the President will address a joint meeting on Saturday, at 12:30. So we shall have all day tomorrow to debate the pending motion.

I have consulted the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and he has consulted some of his associates in the matter. It is our opinion that it would be better procedure, and it would suit the convenience of more Senators, if the staffs would arrange to notify all Senators to be on hand promptly at 11 a. m., tomorrow. Immediately after the prayer, we shall have a quorum call. Senators will have advance notice of it. We believe that a quorum can be obtained very promptly. If not, we shall withdraw the request for a quorum, and shall proceed to discuss the pending motion.

We shall then have assurance that ample time will be left to allow the 6 hours' debate we have promised, with the understanding that every Senator will be put on notice by the RECORD and by the staffs of the respective leaderships to be here at 11 a. m., because as soon as a quorum is obtained—or, if one cannot be obtained, as soon as the quorum call is withdrawn—we shall proceed with the debate on this question; and thereafter we shall have a quorum call, preceding the vote, so that every Senator will be notified of the desire for his presence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that this proposal is perfectly agreeable to me.

I should like to add that I discussed this matter with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is one of the sponsors of the unanimous-consent agreement. I also took the liberty of calling my friend and colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS] on this matter regarding the rules of the Senate. Our main concern is, and was, that 6 hours of debate be afforded. That is assured now that the time of the delivery of the President's

message has been settled. So I see no reason to object; in fact, I feel that we should cooperate and should proceed as outlined by the majority leader.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum I have prepared, dealing with the question of majority rule in the United States Senate, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD; also that a memorandum I have prepared, concerning the "continuing body" argument, be inserted in the RECORD; that a third memorandum, on House and Senate action on civil-rights bills which have passed the House since World War I, be inserted in the body of the RECORD; also that a list of Senate votes on invoking the cloture rule from 1919 on be inserted in the body of the RECORD; that an article by Irving Brant, published in the Washington Post of January 2, 1957, be inserted in the body of the RECORD; also an editorial from the New York Times of December 27, 1956; an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of December 17; a letter which I addressed to the St. Louis Post Dispatch, and the accompanying editorial which it published on December 20, 1956; an editorial from the Washington Post of November 24, 1956; an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of November 24, 1956; an editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of December 17, 1956; an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, published in the New York Herald Tribune on December 24, 1956; an editorial from the Denver Post of December 19; an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 2; an editorial entitled "Both THYE and HUMPHREY," from the Minneapolis Tribune of December 17; an editorial from the Pittsburgh Courier of December 29, 1956; an editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of November 25; an editorial from the Des Moines Register of November 28; an editorial from the Christian Century of December 26; an editorial from the New Republic of December 31; an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of November 26; another editorial from the Denver Post of November 30; an editorial from the Pittsburgh Courier of December 15, 1956; an editorial from the Denver Post of November 25; an editorial from the New York Post of January 2; an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of December 31; an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 30; and finally, Mr. President, a brief which I have had prepared in my office, and which has been submitted to the Vice President, in support of the proposition that a motion to take up the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress is in order and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the several matters referred to by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the President pro tempore and the majority leader.

The matters submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS are as follows:

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM CONCERNING MAJORITY RULE IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

THE ISSUES AT STAKE ON JANUARY 3, 1957

(1) The success or failure of the efforts that will be made on the opening day of the 85th Congress to end the filibuster and bring majority rule to the Senate may very well determine the outcome of much of the important legislation that will be presented to the new Congress.

For rule 22 is not only the "gravedigger" of civil-rights legislation, it is also the threat under which other vital legislation has been compromised to meet the views of the minority.

It would not be too much to say that what is at stake in the fight for majority rule to be made at the opening of the new Congress is nothing more nor less than the dignity of the Senate and its ability to function as a democratic legislative body.

THE IMPOSSIBLE HURDLE OF 64 VOTES

(2) The existing rule 22 permits the closing of debate only if two-thirds of the total Senate (not two-thirds of those present and voting) vote affirmatively to close debate. In other words, 64 Senators must be on the floor and must affirmatively vote for closing debate or a filibuster can continue forever. It has never been possible in the past to obtain such a 64-Senator vote to close debate on any civil-rights bill, and there is no reason to believe it will ever be possible in the future.

HOW RULE 22 IS DESIGNED TO PERPETUATE ITSELF

(3) Furthermore, even this theoretical possibility of closing debate by 64 Senators present and voting, academic though it is, does not apply to a motion to consider a change in the rule itself. Subsection 3 of Senate rule 22 expressly states that the cloture rule (64 votes) "shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate." Thus, even 90 Senators present and voting cannot close debate on a motion to consider a proposed change in rule 22.

NO ESCAPE FROM FILIBUSTER RULE AFTER RULE 22 IS ACCEPTED

(4) Thus, once the Senate of the 85th Congress meeting this January accepts rule 22 by acquiescing in the full body of existing rules of the Senate, there is no practical way of changing rule 22 later on in the session. The possibility of breaking a filibuster against an attempt to bring up a rule change without any applicable cloture provision whatsoever, and then changing rule 22, is and has proved to be over the years, wholly academic and illusory.

ONLY TIME TO CHANGE THE RULE IS AT THE START OF A NEW CONGRESS

(5) There is one moment and one moment only when this matter can be resolved, and that is the moment at which the Senate of the 85th Congress opens on January 3, 1957. At that point, the Senate can proceed under general principles of parliamentary law, including those set forth in Jefferson's Manual, on the basis that it has no other set rules, and a majority of its members can adopt any rules of procedure that they deem proper to govern the business of the Senate. Then only, under general parliamentary law, by moving the previous question, can we hope to close debate and reach a vote on a change in the rules free from the shackles which rule 22 places on the amending process itself.

THE SENATE'S RULEMAKING POWER IS UNDIMINISHED

(6) In the past, it has been the practice of the Senate of a new Congress simply to acquiesce in the old rules and thereby make them the rules of the new Senate. If past practice (other than 1917 and 1953) were followed, nothing would be said about the rules at the opening of the 85th Congress and the old Senate rules would, by acquiescence, govern the conduct of business of the new Senate.

But the question whether to acquiesce in the old rules is up to the Senators sitting on January 3, 1957; there is no requirement that they acquiesce in the old rules and all the limitations of those rules on the rulemaking power itself when the new Senate opens. The Senate that meets on January 3, 1957, will have the same right to adopt its own rules as the first Senate had to adopt its rules when it met in 1789.

THE POWER IS IN THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF

(7) Article I, section 5, of the Constitution, declares that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," and there can be no doubt that the Senate of the 85th Congress has this constitutional right just as did the Senate of the 1st Congress in 1789. The House adopts its rules at the start of each new Congress and does so without any interference with the expeditious handling of its business. The Senate of the 85th Congress, therefore, will clearly have the right to adopt its own rules on January 3, 1957.

FRESH START IS MADE BY SENATE IN EACH NEW CONGRESS

(8) In every major activity, the Senate recognizes the constitutional right of the Senate of each new Congress to determine both legislative and executive business anew.

All consideration of bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations starts at the beginning of each Congress without reference to or continuation of what has taken place in the past. The slate is wiped clean; the proceedings begin again.

The fact that two-thirds of the Senate membership regularly hold office over from one Congress to the next does not limit the express constitutional grant of power over rules, and it does not eliminate the necessity of starting all business anew in a new Congress. There is no possible reason for any differentiation in the matter of rules.

"CONTINUOUS BODY" THEORY, CONTRADICTED BY SENATE PRACTICE, CANNOT PERPETUATE OLD RULES

(9) The argument will be made that the Senate is a "continuous" body, and, therefore, the rules automatically carry over from Congress to Congress. But the Senate does not act as a continuous body for bills, resolutions, treaties, nominations, etc.; indeed, it does not act as a continuous body for any known purpose.

The proponents of the "continuous body" theory are actually arguing completely in a circle; they say that the Senate is a continuous body because the rules carry over from Senate to Senate, and then turn around and argue that the rules should carry over from Senate to Senate because it is a continuous body.

NEW SENATORS MUST HAVE SHARE IN MAKING THE RULES

(10) Furthermore, even if the Senate could be deemed a "continuous" body for some unstated purpose, this could not deprive new Senators of the right to participate in making the rules under which they must operate.

Every Senator elected since the adoption of the present rule 22 must have restored to him his right to help make the rules to govern his actions.

It becomes an absurdity to argue that rules adopted years or even generations earlier can bind new Senators who are elected on pledges to particular programs which the old rules make impossible. As Thomas Jefferson said:

"Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not.

The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. * * * A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing, then, is unchangeable but the inherent unalienable rights of man."

ISSUE RAISED TWICE, IN 1917 AND 1953

(11) The question of new rules for the Senate of a new Congress has been raised twice in recent history—once at the opening of the 65th Congress in 1917, and the other time at the opening of the 83d Congress in 1953.

SENATOR WALSH SUCCEEDED IN 1917

(12) At the opening of the 65th Congress in March 1917, Senators Owen, of Oklahoma, and Walsh, of Montana, raised the question whether the rules of the preceding Senate were binding upon the new body.

Senator Owen, on the first business day, March 6, 1917, refused to permit a bill to be referred to committee on the ground that committees were not in existence at the beginning of this new Congress, and Senator Walsh supported Owen's contention.

On March 7, Senator Walsh presented a resolution squarely raising the issue whether the rules carried over from Senate to Senate and presented his famous argument against the old rules being applied to the new Senate. Said the Senator: "A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them."

On the evening of March 7, after Senator Walsh's resolution and speech, caucuses of both parties voted to approve a change in rule 22 to provide for cloture by a two-thirds vote. The resolution was debated by unanimous consent without ever being referred to committee, and was adopted on March 8, 1917 (76 yeas, 3 nays). Senator Walsh, who had accomplished his purpose of obtaining the cloture rule he sought, dropped his resolution.

The full story of this incident is included in a brief inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Lehman on January 7, 1953. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, p. 181.)

IN 1953 OPPONENTS AVOIDED HEAD-ON DEBATE

(13) The other attempt to deal with the problem of rule 22 at the opening of a session of Congress was on January 3, 1953, the 1st day of the 83d Congress. On the opening day, Senator ANDERSON, on behalf of himself and Senators Ives, Lehman, Tobey, Green, Humphrey, Hendrickson, Neely, Duff, Pastore, Kilgore, Murray, Mansfield, Magnuson, Jackson, Douglas, Kennedy, Morse, and Hunt moved as follows: "In accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution which declares that 'each House may determine the rules of its proceedings,' I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 83d Congress."

Proponents of this motion set forth their arguments in support of the right of the new Senate under the Constitution to adopt its own rules.

Opponents of the resolution refused to meet these arguments head on; their primary contention was the purely negative one that the Senate had not in the past undertaken to establish new rules at the beginning of each new Congress and, therefore, should not do so now.

The group which opposed the motion to take up consideration of new rules for the new Senate did not raise a point of order against it, a maneuver which would have been the proper one if the group had been sure of the soundness of its position. Vice President Barkley was reported (Newsweek, January 19, 1953) to have been prepared to rule that the Senate could then adopt new rules, like the House. No opposing Senator, however, made any move to get a direct vote on the issue.

Instead, the then majority leader, Senator Taft, avoided such a vote by moving to lay the resolution on the table. As was subsequently pointed out by Senator Lehman, this was an implicit recognition of the fact that the resolution had been in order. The motion to table was passed by a vote of 70 to 21 (this included 18 of those who cosponsored the motion (all except Senator MAGNUSON who was absent) plus Senators Hennings, Kilgore, and Symington).

NO RULE CHANGE WAS ATTEMPTED IN 83D AND 84TH CONGRESSES

(14) During the course of the debate at the opening of the new Congress in 1953, the leaders of the opposition to the motion to consider new rules assured the Senate that this question of rule 22 would be considered in due course. Senator JENNER, chairman of the Rules Committee, told the Senate that he had already prepared a resolution to amend the cloture rule which would be offered at the first opportunity. Despite these assurances, nothing effective was ever done to try to change rule 22 in the 83d Congress or in the 84th. Now, 4 years later, the only possibility lies in taking the matter up on January 3, 1957.

A MAJORITY CAN CHANGE RULE 22 IF IT HAS THE WILL TO DO SO

(15) The actual mechanics of obtaining majority rule will be simple if the majority of the Senators of the new Congress meeting on January 3, 1957, wills it that way.

On January 3, 1957, a motion, modeled on the 1953 motion, will be made to take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

Those supporting the filibuster and opposing new rules will then have two alternatives. They can either (a) raise a point of order against the motion, or; (b) move to table it, as Senator Taft did in 1953, after allowing debate on the motion.

If the latter course is followed again, it is presumed that reasonable debate will be had before the motion to table is made and voted upon (a motion to table is undebatable).

VICE PRESIDENT MAY BE ASKED TO RULE ON MOTION

(16) If a point of order is raised, Vice President NIXON would be called upon to rule whether the motion to take up the new rules is in order. A thorough legal brief is being prepared to present to the Vice President if he is called upon to rule on this point.

Should Mr. NIXON rule against the point of order, the opponents of the motion could appeal the ruling of the Chair. Although such an appeal is subject to debate, after allowing reasonable time for such debate on the appeal, a motion could be made by the proponents of the motion to table the appeal. If a majority favored the tabling motion, the ruling would stand and consideration of the motion would continue under general parliamentary procedures, including the right to close debate by calling the previous question.

IF VICE PRESIDENT RULES AGAINST THE MOTION, ENSUING FILIBUSTER MUST BE BROKEN

(17) On the other hand, should the Vice President support the point of order on the "continuous body" or some other theory, an appeal from his decision would be made by the proponents of new rules.

In this event, however, the appeal would be subject to the old rules of the Senate and the possibility of a filibuster. But it should be noted that since this would occur within a few days of the opening of Congress, it is the best possible time for a filibuster to take place. There are no bills on the calendar and no reason why, if a filibuster has to come, it should not come right then and there.

CAN DECIDE ON NEW RULE 22 LATER

(18) It is not necessary to decide at this stage what the new rule 22 should be. If the motion to take up the rules of the Senate is adopted, then a motion would be made to adopt the old rules with a new rule 22.

The new rule 22 might provide for a limitation on debate if, after 2 days' notice, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting supported cloture or if, after 15 days' notice, a majority of the Senators present and voting supported cloture. This proposal would permit prompt action on emergency measures supported by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, while, at the same time, it would assure no less than 2 weeks of debate on legislation before a majority of Senators present and voting could obtain cloture.

An alternative would be to allow cloture after 15 days only upon a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate (that is, 49 Senators).

Some of those who will support the motion to take up the new rules will favor one proposal for a new rule 22 and some the other. But this matter can be worked out after the principle has been established that the new Senate has a right to determine its own rules. Certainly, those who believe in the dignity and effective operation of the Senate under majority rule should combine to bring this about.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IS ESSENTIAL

(19) If the motion to take up new rules is to be successful, it must have bipartisan support. This memorandum is, therefore, being sent to Senators on both sides of the aisle in the hope that such support can be obtained.

REPUBLICAN SENATORS IVES AND KUCHEL FAVORED CHANGE IN 1953

(20) As far as the Republican side is concerned, Senators IVES and KUCHEL both supported the motion to take up new rules in 1953, and it is hoped that they will obtain support from many of their colleagues.

The promptness and forthrightness with which Senators IVES, KUCHEL, and CASE of New Jersey have already publicly announced their full participation in this effort on January 3, 1957, to restore majority rule and to put a curb on filibusters are encouraging signs of growing Republican support.

DEMOCRATS ARE PLEDGED TO RULE CHANGE AT THE BEGINNING

(21) As far as the Democratic side is concerned, the 1956 Democratic platform pledges action "at the beginning of the 85th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House."

There is a strong nucleus of Democratic Senators from the 1953 effort who supported the motion to take up new rules (including Senator MANSFIELD, the proposed whip, who cosponsored the motion and voted against its tabling, as well as other distinguished Senators).

Over and above this nucleus from 1953, Senators MCNAMARA and NEUBERGER and Senator-elect CLARK have indicated their intention to support this rule change motion in 1957.

RULE CHANGE HAS SIGNIFICANT EDITORIAL BACKING

(22) The bipartisan character of the support building up for this drive to restore majority rule in the Senate is reflected in favorable editorials in such newspapers as the New York Herald Tribune (November 24, 1956): "* * * to permit a bloc of Senators to use an antiquated rule to circumvent the democratic principle of the rule of the majority, is an entirely different question. Rule 22

should certainly be revised so as to permit each Senator to have his full say on the issue up for a vote but to prevent the use of filibustering tactics to thwart the will of the majority."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch (November 25, 1956): "* * * this time there is every prospect that the Democrats can enlarge their last vote against the filibuster. They could even win the battle if President Eisenhower would give them a hand."

And the Washington Post (November 24, 1956): "It is more than time, we think, for the Senate of the United States to get control over itself. The way to do this is to establish majority rule in its proceedings."

SUCCESS IS POSSIBLE

(23) Only if this effort can be made a bipartisan move can it be successful. But, equally clearly, if this effort is made a bipartisan move, it can be successful.

DECEMBER 1, 1956.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE "CONTINUING BODY" ARGUMENT

PROPOSAL TO ADOPT SENATE RULES

A number of Democratic and Republican Senators have announced that on January 3, 1957, they will move to proceed to adopt rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Senate shall "determine the rules of its proceedings." It is under this specific constitutional provision that we shall move to adopt new rules at the beginning of the session.

The purpose of this move is to change existing rule 22—the filibuster rule—which now requires 64 positive votes to limit debate on a measure or motion in the Senate, and provides that there shall be no limitation of any kind on a motion to change the rules—and especially rule 22.

OPPONENTS AVOID ISSUES

This proposal is simple and straightforward. But the opponents of the move do not reply with simple or straightforward arguments.

All we hear and all we read is that the Senate is a continuing body, and for that reason and that reason alone it cannot adopt new rules at the opening of a new session, as does the House of Representatives and most all other legislative bodies in the world—continuous or discontinuous.

Our opponents do not answer the charge that the filibuster rule thwarts the will of the majority of the Senate—and many times the overwhelming majority—of the Senate.

Our opponents do not answer the charge that the filibuster rule thwarts the will of the majority—and often the overwhelming majority—of the American people.

Our opponents do not answer the charge that the filibuster rule affects the dignity and competence of the Senate of the United States.

Our opponents do not answer the charge that this proposal is the only method of changing the filibuster rule.

All that is ever said is—"continuous body, continuous body, continuous body." It is a phrase which, constantly repeated, appears to take on some special significance and intelligence—just as many people saw some deeper meaning in Gertrude Stein's reassertion of "a rose is a rose is a rose is a rose."

"CONTINUOUS BODY" QUESTION IS ACADEMIC

The question whether the Senate is a continuous body may have importance in academic circles; it has no particular significance here. The term "continuous" is simply an adjective used to describe the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate carry over from Congress to Congress. It is an adjective resulting from this one aspect of the Senate; it is not a cause of anything. As far as is known, this is the first time in American history that an adjective has been made more important than the will of the majority of the Senate.

THE SENATE ACTS AS A DISCONTINUOUS BODY

Even academically the adjective "continuous" seems misplaced. All consideration of bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations starts completely fresh at the beginning of each new Congress. Furthermore, while many Senators have used the word "continuous," every time the issue has arisen in concrete form the Senate has voted "discontinuous." Thus in 1841 the Senate voted to dismiss the printer chosen by a previous Senate over the arguments of those who contended that the continuing-body theory prevented the change. In 1876, the Senate treated their joint rules with the House as no longer in effect despite arguments as to the continuity of the Senate and acquiescence in these rules for the better part of a century. And in 1917, when Senator Walsh raised the same point that we are now making, the Senate immediately agreed to the cloture rule he was seeking rather than face the issue. Again in 1953, the supporters of the filibuster rule refused to raise the issue of continuity squarely by point of order and instead moved to table the proposal to take up the rules. It is perfectly clear that, while Senators have talked continuity, every time the issue has been raised, a majority of the Senate has acted the other way.

WHETHER THE SENATE IS OR IS NOT A CONTINUOUS BODY DOES NOT AFFECT ITS RIGHT TO ADOPT ITS RULES

Some Senators believe the Senate is a continuous body. Others believe it is not, that in fact it acts as a discontinuous body. Both have the right to their opinions. But when a descriptive term resulting from nothing more than the carryover of two-thirds of the Senators is used as a reason for preventing the majority of the body from determining the Senate's actions, then they are confusing an adjective with a reason and effect with cause. They are, in a word, allowing a myth to conquer the Senate of the United States.

As Senator ANDERSON said in 1953, whether the Senate "is or is not a continuing body does not in the slightest change the possibility that the Senate in the first few days of a new Congress can adopt rules for its guidance." Whether or not the word "continuous" is the proper adjective to describe the Senate of the United States, the majority of the body meeting for the first time in the new Congress has the power to adopt its own rules. Our case does not depend upon proving that the adjective "continuous" is wrong.

NEW AND REELECTED SENATORS SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADOPT THE RULES UNDER WHICH THEY SERVE

The Constitution gives the Senate the right to "determine the rules of its proceedings" and the Senate of one Congress cannot deprive the Senate of a later Congress of this right. The argument that the body that meets on January 3, 1957, cannot set up its own rules free of obstacles created by the Senate in years past, is the antithesis of democracy. It means that a majority of the Senate in 1949 can bind a radically different majority of the Senate in 1957. Furthermore, it means that a majority of the Senate in 1949 can bind the Senate in 1980 when there may be not a single Senator left in the body who was there in 1949. A Constitution that was intended to endure through the ages cannot tolerate such a result.

ANTI-CIVIL-RIGHTS PROVISION MASQUERADES AS PROCEDURE

What we have here is substance masquerading as procedure. Rule XXII, the cloture rule, is not a procedural means of getting business done; it is a substantive means of preventing business from being done. It is a means of keeping the majority of the Senate and of the people from determining vital substantive issues. If the Senate in 1949, instead of passing the present cloture rule, had adopted a rule that no civil rights legislation could be considered for 25 years, no one would even dream of arguing that this rule would bind the Senate of the incoming 85th Congress. As a matter of practical fact, however, that is exactly what the Senate did do in 1949. It tried to bind the future; but it cannot be allowed to succeed. No legislative body, if it is to be responsive to the will of the people, is or can be bound by the action of a previous body.

HOUSE AND SENATE ACTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS WHICH HAVE PASSED THE HOUSE SINCE WORLD WAR I

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILLS

Seventy-seventh Congress

H. R. 1024. Passed House October 13, 1942.

Amends the act preventing pernicious political activities (Public, No. 252, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) so as to forbid the local requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at a Federal election. Makes it unlawful for any person to require such payment.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 254.
Nays: 84.
Answered present: 3.
Not voting: 86.

Reported in Senate October 15, 1942. (88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Motion to consider, pages 8814, 8838, 8861, 8925, 8949–9033.

Agreed to, page 9033. Debated, pages 9043–9059, 9060.

Vote on motion to close debate:
Yeas: 37.
Nays: 41.

Seventy-eighth Congress

H. R. 7. Passed by House May 25, 1943.

Makes it unlawful for any individual, State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a Federal election.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 265.
Nays: 110.
Not voting: 54.
Answered present: 3.

Reported in Senate November 12, 1943. (90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Debated, pages 4172–4189, 4244–4264, 4300–4322, 4385–4405, 4405–4425, 4425–4429, 4473–4477. Motion to conclude debate rejected, page 4470.

Vote on motion to close the debate:
Yeas: 36.
Nays: 44.

Seventy-ninth Congress

H. R. 7. Passed by House June 12, 1945.

Makes it unlawful for any individual, State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a Federal election.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 251.
Nays: 105.
Not voting: 75.
Answered present: 1.

Reported in Senate October 5, 1945. (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Debated, pages 3971, 10383–10387, 10511, 10536.

Vote on motion to close debate:
Yeas: 39.
Nays: 33.

Eightieth Congress

H. R. 29. Passed by House July 21, 1947.

Makes it unlawful for any individual, State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at a Federal election.

Vote on motion to suspend rules and passage:
Yeas: 290.
Nays: 112.
Not voting: 28.
Reported in Senate April 30, 1948.
(94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:) Debated, pages 9480, 9488, 9499, 9504, 9554, 9577, 9597, 9627, 9659, 9665, 9696, 9710.

Vote of Wherry motion to adjourn until the following day (during discussion of the poll tax bill):
Yeas: 69.
Nays: 16.

Eighty-first Congress

H. R. 3199. Passed by House July 26, 1949.

Federal Anti-Poll Tax Act: Makes it unlawful for any individual, State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a Federal election.

For the purposes of this act the requirement of a poll tax shall be construed to include any charge of any kind upon the right to vote or to register for voting, and any form of evidence of liability to a poll tax.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 273.
Nays: 116.
Answered "present": 2.
Not voting: 41.
No debate in Senate.

ANTILYNCHING

Sixty-seventh Congress

H. R. 13. Passed by House January 26, 1922.

Provides for 5 years' imprisonment and/or $5,000 fine for any State or municipal officer convicted of failing to prevent a lynching or apprehening or prosecuting any person participating in a lynching. Provides that any State or municipal officer having custody of a prisoner who conspires to put such prisoner to death without authority of law or who conspires to have the prisoner taken from his custody or control for the purpose of being put to death without authority of law shall upon conviction thereof be imprisoned for life or for not less than 5 years. Grants jurisdiction of the proposed crime to the Federal district court of the judicial district wherein a person is put to death by a mob when there has been a failure of the State court to prosecute the crime. Provides that any county in which a person is put to death by mob or riotous assemblage shall forfeit $10,000, which may be recovered by an action in the name of the United States against such county for the use of the family of the victim, dependent parents, or the United States, respectively.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 231.
Nays: 119.
Answered "present": 4.
Not voting: 74.
Reported in Senate July 28, 1922.
(62 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:) Debated, pages 13082, 13129, September 21 and 22, 1922. Session adjourned September 22, 1922.

Seventy-fifth Congress

H. R. 1507. Passed by House April 18, 1937.

Declares that a State or governmental subdivision which fails (1) to provide protection to any individual against a "mob or riotous assemblage" (i. e., an assemblage of three or more persons acting in concert, without authority of law, for killing or injuring any person in the custody of any peace officer, with the intention or result of depriving such person of due process or equal protection of the laws), or (2) to punish mob action, shall be deemed to have denied to such person due process or equal protection, wherefore the following provisions are enacted:

1. Any State officer with authority or power to protect an individual from injury by any mob who fails to make all diligent efforts to protect such individual, or any officer charged with the duty of apprehending and punishing participants who fails to make all diligent efforts to punish such persons, shall be guilty of a felony, punishable by a $5,000 fine and/or 5 years' imprisonment.

2. Any State officer who conspires with any member of a mob (a) to injure a prisoner in his control, or (b) to allow a prisoner to be taken from his control, shall, with his conspirators, be punished by imprisonment (5 to 25 years).

3. Federal district courts shall have jurisdiction to punish members of mobs, in accordance with State laws, when it is shown (a) that the responsible local officers have failed to prosecute (delay of 30 days being prima facie evidence of such failure); or (b) that the jurors obtainable for the proper State court are so biased that there is probability that the guilty persons will not be punished in such court.

4. Any county in which a person is injured or killed by mob action shall be liable in damages (from $2,000 to $10,000) recoverable in a civil action for the injured person or his representatives by the United States district attorney, judgment enforceable by execution upon county property, by mandamus and by contempt proceedings against State officers. Should the mob seize a person in one county and kill him in another, both counties shall be jointly and severally liable for such forfeiture.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 277.
Nays: 120.
Answered present: 1.
Not voting: 33.
Reported June 22, 1937.
(81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Debated, pages 8694, 8737.
(82 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Motion to consider, pages 38, 60, 61, 69, 106, 116, 155, 171, 205.

Motion withdrawn, page 266. Laid before the Senate, page 1769.
(83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Debate continued in Senate, pages 77, 85, 137–161, 216, 252, 275, 305–318, 362, 429–443, 447, 493, 571, 610, 682, 751, 772, 813, 872, 939, 964, 1033, 1067, 1098, 1130, 1139, 1161, 1168, 1174, 1197, 1339, 1385, 1443, 1490, 1502, 1533, 1623, 1683, 1887, 1888, 1925, 2002, 2090, 2201, 2265.
Back to the calendar.

Seventy-sixth Congress

H. R. 801. Passed by House January 10, 1940.

Provides that the violence of three or more persons, attempting to prevent the apprehension, trial, or punishment of any person which results in his death or maiming, is deemed to be a lynching. A State or local officer failing through neglect, etc., to prevent a lynching, or to apprehend or prosecute any member of a lynching mob is punishable by a $5,000 fine and/or 5 years imprisonment.

Any governmental subdivision failing through neglect, etc., to prevent a lynching, or a seizure and abduction followed elsewhere by a lynching, shall be liable for $2,000 to $10,000 in damages, recoverable in a civil action by the claimant or by the United States in his behalf. In such civil cases the showing: (a) That an officer of the defendant, after notice failed to provide protection; (b) that apprehension of danger of mob violence was general within the community; or (c) of any circumstance from which a reasonable conclusion might be drawn that the governmental subdivision failed to use all diligence to protect the person lynched, shall be prima facie evidence of liability.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 252.
Nays: 131.
Not voting: 40.
Reported in Senate April 8, 1940.
No debate.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

Eighty-first Congress

H. R. 4453. Passed by House February 23, 1950.

Fair Employment Practices Act: Declares it is the policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, political affiliation, or color in employment relations. Establishes a Fair Employment Practices Commission of five members, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, with the duty of formulating plans, publishing reports, and conferring with others for the purpose of eliminating discrimination. It shall investigate complaints charging discrimination and make specific recommendations to the interested parties of means for the elimination of such discrimination. It shall investigate discrimination in employment by the Federal Government and recommend a plan to the Congress for its elimination.

Vote on passage:
Yeas: 240.
Nays: 177.
Not voting: 14.
Place on Senate calendar February 23, 1950.
(96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): Objected to, pages 5332, 11962, 16596.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Eightieth Congress

H. J. Res. 334. Passed by House May 4, 1948.

Gives consent of Congress to the compact on regional education between the Southern States.

Vote on passage:
Yeas, 236.
Nays, 45.
Answered present, 1.
Not voting, 149.
Referred to the Senate Calendar May 5, 1948.
Volume 94, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Debated, pages 5411, 5484, 5502, 5560, 5658, 5667, 5758.

Vote on Morse motion to recommit:
Yeas, 38.
Nays, 37.

Eighty-fourth Congress

H. R. 627: Passed by House July 23, 1956.

1. Creates a six-man temporary bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government with subpena power. Gives the Commission the duty to (a) investigate allegations in writing that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote or that certain persons in the United States are voting illegally or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures by reason of their sex, color, race, religion, or national origin; (b) study and collect information concerning economic, social, and legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and (c) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

2. Requires the Commission to submit reports to the President of its findings. Gives the Commission power to constitute such advisory committees and to consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

3. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, the appropriate district court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to order compliance with such subpena, etc. Authorizes necessary appropriations. Sets

out the rules of procedure for such Commission.

4. Provides for the creation of an additional Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice in charge of a new Civil Rights Division. Grants the Attorney General the right to bring a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief to prevent or redress acts or practices which would give rise to a cause of action under such section which pertains to conspiracies to deprive of certain civil rights.

5. Provides for a civil remedy brought by the Attorney General to protect the right to vote. Declares that the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to such remedy and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

Vote on passage:
Yeas, 279.
Nays, 126.
Answered present, 1.
Not voting, 26.
No debate in Senate.

Senate votes on invoking cloture rule [1]

Congress and session	Date	Subject	Senator offering motion	Yeas	Nays	Congressional Record		Cloture
						Volume	Page	
66th, 1st	Nov. 15, 1919	Treaty of Versailles	Lodge	78	16	58	8555–8556	Yes.
66th, 3d	Feb. 2, 1921	Emergency tariff	Penrose	36	35	60	2432	No.
67th, 2d	July 7, 1922	Fordney-McCumber tariff	McCumber	45	35	62	10040	No.
69th, 1st	Jan. 25, 1926	World Court	Lenroot	68	26	67	2678–2679	Yes.
	June 1, 1926	Migratory-bird refuges	Norbeck	46	33	67	10392	No.
69th, 2d	Feb. 15, 1927	Branch banking	Pepper	65	18	68	3824	Yes.
	Feb. 26, 1927	Retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War	Tyson	51	36	68	4901	No.
	do	Colorado River development	Johnson	32	59	68	4900	No.
	Feb. 28, 1927	Public buildings in the District of Columbia	Lenroot	52	31	68	4985	No.
	do	Creation of Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition	Jones (of Washington).	55	27	68	4986	Yes.
72d, 2d	Jan. 19, 1933	Banking Act	Robinson	58	30	76	2077	No.
75th, 3d	Jan. 27, 1938	Antilynching	Neely	37	51	83	1166	No.
	Feb. 16, 1938	do	Wagner	42	46	83	2007	No.
77th, 2d	Nov. 23, 1942	Antipoll tax	Barkley	37	41	88	9065	No.
78th, 2d	May 15, 1944	do	do	36	44	90	2550–2551	No.
79th, 2d	Feb. 9, 1946	FEPC	do	48	36	92	1219	No.
	May 7, 1946	British loan	Ball	41	41	92	4539	No.
	May 25, 1946	Labor disputes	Knowland	3	77	92	5714	No.
	July 31, 1946	Antipoll tax	Barkley	39	33	92	10512	No.
81st, 2d	May 19, 1950	FEPC	Lucas	52	32	96	7300	No.
	July 12, 1950	do	do	55	33	96	9982	No.
83d, 2d	July 26, 1954	Atomic Energy Act	Knowland	44	42	100	11942	No.

[1] Many cloture petitions have also been withdrawn or held out of order since 1917.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 2, 1957]

ABSURDITIES AND CONFLICTS IN SENATE RULES ARE OUTLINED

(By Irving Brant)

When the Senate convenes on Thursday, it will plunge at once into a fight over rule 22, which was adopted in 1917 as an antifilibuster rule and was converted in 1949 into a device for protecting filibusters through all eternity. Here is a nutshell history of Senate rules on debate:

From 1789 to 1806, debate on a bill could be ended instantly by a majority of Senators present, through adoption of an undebatable motion calling for the previous question.

From 1806 to 1917 there was no limitation on debate.

In 1917, to check filibusters, a cloture rule was adopted. On the written motion of 16 Senators, debate could be brought to a close by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

In 1949, this was changed to require the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the entire Senate—64 out of 96—and a clause was added declaring that there should be no limitation of debate on a motion to change the rules.

As a result of this alteration, the absence of any Senator has the same effect as a vote against cloture, and offsets two votes in favor of it. The effect is enormously heightened by the higher majority required. For example, under the 1917 rule, with 20 Senators absent, an affirmative vote of 51 to 25 would put a limit on debate. Under the 1949 rule, a vote of 63 to 13 against the filibuster would not be enough to stop it.

The present rule gives the balance of power to sympathizers with the filibuster who would not venture to vote openly in its defense, but who can achieve the same results by avoiding the rollcall. To protect this ingenious device, the 1949 amenders added the clause which forbids limitation of debate on a motion to change the rules. Thus the filibusterers were given a license to filibuster forever against any attempt to get rid of the rule protecting them.

Forever is a long time, however, and the Senate on Thursday will consider just how long it is. Here is the legal question at issue:

Is the Senate of the new 85th Congress necessarily bound by the Standing Rules of the Senate of the expired 84th Congress, without a specific adoption of them? Has the Senate in one Congress the power to bind the Senate in a succeeding Congress, against the will of a majority of its Members?

To bring this question to an issue, it is merely necessary that as soon as the Senate convenes, a Member shall move the adoption of past Senate rules, with Rule 22 altered. A defender of the filibuster will then make a point of order that the old rules are still in effect. If Vice President NIXON overrules the point of order, an appeal will be taken from his decision. If the Senate, by a simple majority, sustains the Vice President, the majority can proceed to rewrite the rules and do what it pleases about the limitation of debate.

Against this course a constitutional objection is raised. The Senate, it is said, is a continuing body. With its Members elected for 6 years, one-third of them every 2 years, it can always produce a quorum of holdover Senators. Therefore, it is contended, it does not come to an end as the House of Representatives does, whenever a Congress expires. On the other hand, all unfinished legislative and executive business of the Senate lapses into nothing at the expiration of a Congress, and all its committees are elected anew whenever a new Congress convenes.

Supporting the continuing body theory is the fact that the Senate rules, by acquiescence, have always held over from Congress to Congress without formal readoption. The present rules, except for later amendments, were adopted on January 11, 1884, in the middle of a congressional term. Also, since 1890, the President pro tempore of the Senate has been elected for an indefinite period, regardless of the 2-year life of Congress.

The real question is whether the Senate is constitutionally a continuing body. If it is, it can perform its legislative and executive functions without regard to the termination of a Congress. However, if the Constitution does not make the Senate a continuing body in both its legislative and executive functions it cannot be subject to the mandatory application of past rules subordinate to those functions.

When this test is applied to the Senate's chief business—legislation—the "continuing body" theory breaks down in a multitude of absurdities.

Rule 37 provides that in the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, treaties submitted by the President shall be resumed at the same stage in which they were left at the close of the previous session. "But," the rule goes on, "all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon."

That may be construed in either of two ways. It may be regarded as an acknowledgment that the Senate is not a continuing body as to treaties, save for recognition that the submission of a treaty by the President is not nullified by the transition from one Senate to the next. Or, it may be held to imply that the Senate has power to go on with the treaty in the new Congress, but chooses not to exercise that power.

The latter would be true if, by constitutional mandate, the Senate actually is a continuing body. But observe what this leads to.

Suppose that, in the final session of a Congress, the Senate adopts a rule that treaties shall be resumed in a new Congress at the same stage they reached in the previous one. It then adopts some highly controversial reservations to a pending treaty, comparable to those that killed the League of Nations, but adjourns without final action on the treaty. November comes. The voters elect one-third of the whole Senate and defeat every Senator who voted for the reservations. In January, the incoming Senators discover that they are helpless. The Senate, they are told, is a continuing body. Its new Members are bound by the decisions taken in

the previous Congress, with no chance to change the decisions because the right to filibuster is protected by a rule constitutionally binding on the new Senate without its consent. Thus the "continuing body" theory would subvert the Senate's constitutional function as to treaties.

Next, what happens to the legislative function if the Senate is constitutionally a continuing body? Senate Rule 32 says that "at the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place."

That treats legislative business as if the Senate was understood to die with the Congress. If not, if the Senate is constitutionally a continuing body, it must have power to apply this unfinished business rule to the opening session of a Congress, as readily as to the second session.

And what then? Among the undetermined business of the Senate, at the end of a Congress, is the disposition of bills originating in and already passed by the House of Representatives. If the Senate is constitutionally a continuing body, it has just as much power to pass those bills in the next Congress as in the last one. Then come the absurdities.

Can the Senate hold a conference on such a bill, with the conference committee of a House which has passed out of existence? If House and Senate texts are identical, and no conference is needed, can the Senate obtain the signature of a past Speaker of the House who may be dead or defeated? Or if he has been reelected, will he sign retroactively as Speaker of a dead House?

The crowning absurdity is reached if such a bill is sent to the President and vetoed—as it certainly would be—as unconstitutional. The President would not even be able to send it back, as the Constitution requires, to the House in which it shall have originated. That House would have ceased to exist. It could only be conjured into being by assuming that the House of Representatives is also a continuing body. Thus the chain of incongruities leads to an inescapable conclusion. Either each House is a continuing body, or neither one is.

There is in fact not a vestige of support in history, law, or logic either for the theory that the Senate has the constitutional powers of a continuing body, or that the automatic continuation of its rules has anything mandatory about it.

The very words of the Constitution contradict this claim. It says:

"Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

If somebody should propose a rule reading "The rules of the Senate shall not be changed," it would be recognized instantly as a violation of the Constitution. But that is substantially what has been engrafted on the Senate, by a rule making changes in rules subject to a perpetual filibuster, and by denying the inherent power of the present body to make its own rules.

To sustain the power of the Senate to free itself from the dead hand of the past, its Members only need go to the words of the Constitution: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

Those who would have the Senate divest itself of this constitutional power can best appeal to the precedent of the ancient Chinese, who handed their sovereignty over to their deceased grandfathers.

[From the New York Times of December 27, 1956]

THE ATTACK ON RULE 22

The Constitution of the United States says, in article I, section 5, that "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings." There is one rule, however, that a little band of willful men has decided that a majority of the new Senate shall not determine for itself. That is rule 22, the rule that requires a positive vote of 64 Senators to shut off debate on any business before the Senate. It is also the rule that permits no closure whatsoever on any motion to take up a proposed change in the rules—a built-in filibuster machine, expressly designed for the purpose.

A week from today, when the 85th Congress convenes in Washington, a new effort will be made to achieve a modification of rule 22. Though similar efforts have failed before this—the last occasion being in 1953—the interests of democratic government require that it be made again, and again, and again, until at last it succeeds as it eventually will. In this effort Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and their associated group of liberal Democrats and Republicans (including IVES, of New York, CASE of New Jersey, and CLARK, of Pennsylvania) ought to have the strong support and effective backing of Americans concerned with the viability of our constitutional processes. For, in essence, what these men will be doing next week when this subject comes up will be fighting to make democratic government work, fighting against the power of a determined group of die-hards to block legislation by means of that negation of the democratic process: the filibuster.

It is a travesty to wrap the mantle of free speech around the filibuster. That is exactly what the filibuster is not. On the contrary, it is a method by which a small but resolute group can physically prevent the enactment of legislation desired by the majority—often, as Senator DOUGLAS points out, the overwhelming majority. One of the great blessings of our kind of government is that it protects the minority against the rash or impulsive actions of a majority. But the filibuster does not contribute to such protection. The filibuster is the antithesis of free and open debate, the considered action, the balanced evaluation of pros and cons, the careful evaluation of minority rights as against majority desires, that go to make up the kind of democracy we like to think we have.

This is true for no matter what purpose the filibuster is employed; but it is most obviously and unmistakably true when the filibuster is used as a weapon against proposals to protect minority rights. And that is precisely the purpose that many of those who defend rule 22 and the filibuster have in mind. So long as rule 22 stands as it is on the books of the Senate, civil rights legislation of any sort will be virtually impossible. Even a motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion to change the rules will be subject to unlimited debate. This is not free speech. It is blatant obstructionism of the kind that could kill a democracy.

No one wants arbitrarily to shut off debate. What is needed is the opportunity to set a reasonable limitation on the length of debate. Yet neither the majority leader of the Senate nor the minority leader has seen fit to recognize the manifest justice of this demand. We think, however, that eventually the American people will.

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of December 17, 1956]

TIME TO KILL THE FILIBUSTER

The six Democratic Senators who are spearheading the attack on the filibuster are earnestly enlisting Republican support, and that's a wise move.

It's time that Senate rule 22 was changed. It's the rule that permits the minority to kill civil rights legislation and force compromises on other measures.

The parliamentary maneuvering needed to change the rule requires bipartisan backing. It won't help the cause any to have it tagged simply as a liberal Democratic battle.

So far, four GOP Senators have publicly joined the battle being planned by Democrats PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois; HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; and PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan. The Republicans openly supporting the rule change are CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan; IRVING M. IVES, of New York; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California; and CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey.

It is to be hoped that the policy meeting the Republicans have scheduled before Congress convenes January 3 will produce at least a tacit approval of the antifilibuster fight.

The effort to change rule 22 will also need the help of Vice President NIXON in the parliamentary maneuvering. As Presiding Officer of the Senate, he can make the ruling that will protect the antifilibuster move from a filibuster.

Strongest weapon the opponents of a rule change have is the illogical and constitutionally unsound tradition that the Senate is a continuing body, since two-thirds of its membership is held over from session to session. Because of this, they argue, its rules are held over from session to session without change.

So the antifilibuster forces will start with a move to hold up adoption of rules until rule 22 is changed. In the absence of its own rules, the Senate would proceed under ordinary parliamentary rules in which a simple majority governs.

Should a point of order be raised against changing rule 22, the Vice President could rule against it, thereby permitting the antifilibuster forces to beat down any appeal, using the majority which they are certain they can muster from both sides of the Senate.

This accomplished, they could then formulate a new rule 22, which will provide that debate on any topic can be shut off by a majority vote instead of the two-thirds vote of the full Senate now required. The new rule would also get rid of the section which perpetuates the filibuster by providing that debate on amending the rules cannot be shut off at all.

Leaders of the antifilibuster fight are amenable to some sort of compromise on what it would take to shut off debate, if that is necessary. But whatever the compromise, it still would outlaw the filibuster. And that would be a commendable accomplishment.

It is obvious that the move will not succeed unless there is strong bipartisan support. And conversely, as Senator DOUGLAS logically points out, it will succeed if there is strong bipartisan support.

The alternative, of course, if the Vice President should rule that no change can be made, is a filibuster. The only good thing about that is that it would come at the start of the session when no legislation is at stake.

As far as the southern Democratic Senators go, it would seem much smarter for them not to worry too much if the rule is changed. It is a seriously divisive issue, and if the filibuster could be outlawed the Democratic Party could close ranks on other issues.

Civil rights are here to stay. The Supreme Court has seen to that. So the filibuster might just as well be outlawed as an undemocratic weapon to thwart the will of the majority in any and all areas of legislation.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 20, 1956]

CONGRESS SHACKLED

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

The chances for enactment of any substantial civil-rights legislation by Congress may well be determined by the outcome of the

drive for new rules which some of us will make in the United States Senate on January 3.

From long and bitter experience, we have learned that Senate filibusters, prolonged talk to prevent a vote, are the big obstacle to congressional action for human rights.

Over the recent years the House has passed numerous civil-rights bills. All have died in the Senate.

While the courts and the Executive have acted, Congress has been shackled.

Meanwhile, discriminations and coercions continue. They deny to many of our people equality of opportunity in voting, in education, in employment, in transportation, and in housing. They damage our Nation's position in the world struggle.

The problem is national, not sectional. The need to free the Senate to act is obvious and compelling.

The real gravedigger for such legislation and for other worthy measures is Senate Rule XXII. Under it debate can be brought to a close only by the vote of 64 Senators.

It has been impossible to secure 64 such votes to limit debate on a civil-rights bill. Rule XXII further provides that no limitation of debate at all is permissible on a motion to bring up a rule change.

The filibuster is thus locked into the old rules, and the key is thrown away.

A bipartisan group of Senators of which I am one, therefore intends to move for the adoption of new Senate rules to curb the filibuster at the start of the 85th Congress. (Those who have publicly announced their support include Republican Senators IVES, CASE of New Jersey, KUCHEL and POTTER, and Democrats HUMPHREY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, CLARK, and CHAVEZ.)

Under the constitutional provision that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, we are convinced that the new Senate may adopt new rules, just as in each new Congress the House adopts its rules anew, and the Senate starts fresh on all bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations.

Indeed, this is the only time, before rule XXII's handcuffs are again effective, when we can hope to escape from the filibuster. Senator Walsh in 1917 and a number of us in 1953 fully outlined the legal basis for making this drive at the opening of Congress.

The success of this effort largely depends upon public understanding that behind the complex conflict over Senate procedures lies the fate of vital civil rights.

A new rule to permit a limitation of debate after a reasonable opportunity for full discussion is essential.

Only by thus restoring majority rule and removing the filibuster roadblock can the civil-rights promises of both parties be redeemed.

With strong bipartisan backing, we can succeed.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senator from Illinois.

FLIMFLAM IN THE SENATE

When the Senate meets next January 3, it will start considering bills, resolutions, nominations, and other business with a clean slate, on the assumption that the Senate is not a continuous body. Then it will turn around and adopt the rules of the last session on the asumption that the Senate is a continuing body.

This flimflam, part of the intricate parliamentary machinery that keeps the power of filibuster alive, has been challenged by a bipartisan group of Senators, one of whom—Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois—discusses the question in our letters column today.

Senator DOUGLAS and his colleagues deserve every bit of bipartisan help they can get. For they are attacking a basic weakness in our democratic processes which is wrong, not only because it prevents fair consideration and a vote on civil rights legislation, but because it gives a minority power to obstruct the business of the Senate by essentially physical means.

A filibuster works, not by debate or reason or parliamentary procedure or any other proper democratic method, but by physically exhausting the majority. It is a blackjacking operation, by which a minority refuses to let the Senate function unless the Senate agrees not to take up a certain piece of legislation. The effect is the same as if a dictator surrounded Congress with troops until it agreed to take the action he wished it to take.

The filibuster is built into present Senate rules, as Senator DOUGLAS says, and the only practical way to attack it is to write new rules the way the House and any other democratic body would write them—by majority vote. This is what the antifilibuster Senators will try to do on the opening day of the session. They can do it if they are supported by an understanding public and by enough Senators in both parties.

The adoption of a new rule permitting limitation of debate need not represent any real curtailment of the full and fair discussion which lies at the heart of democratic procedure. All that need be done is to permit debate to be closed by a reasonable number of votes after full opportunity has been given for debate. Thus in 1953 the foes of the filibuster proposed that after a certain number of hours, debate could be ended by a petition signed by 49 Senators. Getting that many Senators to agree on a cloture motion would never be easy. But it would be possible—which can scarcely be said of the present requirement of 64 Senators.

Although the Republican floor leader, Senator KNOWLAND, has regrettably declared against a rules change, four important Republican Senators have joined the fight on the other side. Senator CASE of New Jersey was one of the first to declare himself. Then IVES, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, and POTTER, of Michigan—all significantly representing the larger States—came out against the filibuster rule.

In 1953, only five Republicans joined the liberal Democrats on the final vote against filibusters. In 1957, many more GOP votes will be needed, and many more could be obtained if President Eisenhower in his role of party leader would unequivocally support the cause of democratic procedure. Cannot Senators CASE of New Jersey, KUCHEL, IVES, and POTTER find a way to convince him that he should do so?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 24, 1956]

CLOTURE IN THE SENATE

Six Democratic Senators have announced that they will move on the opening day of Congress, January 3, to change the rules of the Senate so that debate on any question may be limited by a simple majority vote. The motion will revive an old and bitter controversy. The Senate has a tradition of unlimited debate which has been used on many an occasion by small minorities to delay or to frustrate Senate action through the technique of the filibuster. Limitation of debate has been governed since 1917 by rule 22 which provides that cloture may be applied only by a vote of 64 Senators and that it may not be applied at all in connection with a motion to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

The first question which the Senate will have to decide in regard to the proposed motion of the six Democrats is whether rule 22 is in force when the Senate of the 85th Congress convenes. It has been persuasively argued that even if the Senate be considered a continuing body, the rules which it adopted in one Congress cannot be carried over to another and that the Senate in each new Congress is free to adopt rules by majority vote in accordance with the constitutional provision that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Under any other interpretation, newly elected Senators would be denied a full voice in determining the rules under which they must serve.

The Vice President, as President of the Senate, will therefore be called upon on January 3 to decide whether rule 22 is operative on that date. If he decides in the negative and is not overridden by the Senate itself, Senators will then be able to vote on the new rule to be proposed by the six Democrats. If he decides in the affirmative, Senators opposed to any change in the rules will be able to filibuster as long as their lungs last. Rule 22 has been kept operative until now by a combination of southern Democrats and northern Republicans. But that alliance may be dissolved in the light of current political realities.

It is said that it would be undesirable to precipitate a filibuster at this time when the world is in a state of crisis. A filibuster is undesirable at any time. But we do not believe that the fear of one should prevent the Senate from freeing itself from the filibuster threat in the event of a decision that rule 22 is in force. Long ago this newspaper published a Herblock cartoon which showed a besotted, disheveled figure representing the Senate sprawled in an armchair in a disordered room with an empty bottle labeled "Old Filibuster" in his hand. The caption on the cartoon was, "I Got No Control Over Myself." It is more than time, we think, for the Senate of the United States to get control over itself. The way to do this is to establish majority rule in its proceedings.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 24, 1956]

SHALL FILIBUSTERS GO?

Six Democratic Senators have asked their colleagues to support a move on January 3, when the 85th Congress convenes, to enact a substitute for Senate Rule 22, which requires the votes of 64 Senators to apply cloture and halt debate on a measure; in other words, to end a filibuster. Instead of the requirement for a two-thirds vote of the Senate membership, they would substitute a rule necessitating only a majority.

If this Senate rule cannot be changed at the opening session of the new Congress, it will stand for another 2 years. It has often been called the bulwark of southern Senators in their efforts to block civil-rights bills, either by filibuster or by the threat of one. But individual Senators have adopted the tactic in the past when they were vehemently opposed to certain proposals, using up hour after hour by reading books, giving recipes for shrimp creole and sazarac cocktails, or talking on other subjects which had no conceivable relation to the bill under discussion.

An individual Senator usually can delay passage of a bill just so long by filibustering if he does not have support of his colleagues. There is certainly no reason why Members of the Senate should not be allowed time to state in full their reasons for opposing or supporting any particular measure. But to talk on endlessly on unrelated subjects in an effort to wear down the opposition, to permit a bloc of Senators to use an antiquated rule to circumvent the democratic principle of the rule of the majority, is an entirely different question. Rule 22 should certainly be revised so as to permit each Senator to have his full say on the issue up for a vote but to prevent the use of filibustering tactics to thwart the will of the majority.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 17, 1956]

PROTECTION BY FILIBUSTER

The filibuster is the South's only protection against unwanted legislation repugnant

to its traditions. And besides, even those Senators who now seek to curb the power of unlimited debate never have hesitated to use filibustering tactics when it served their purposes to do so.

So runs the familiar argument of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram against any change in the Senate filibuster rule. It is of course true that the tactics of extended debate have been used by northerners and westerners as well as by southerners. But the objective sought by such tactics varies widely in different cases.

In some cases, as with fairly recent filibusters by Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois, the purpose has been not to prevent discussion or action on a particular bill, but to attract public attention to the issue and stall for time, in the hope that public opinion would rally to their side.

Almost always, in the case of an organized southern filibuster against civil-rights legislation, the purpose is quite different—actually to prevent the Senate from even considering the legislation in question, to talk so long and so irrelevantly that eventually the Senate, out of sheer physical exhaustion, will give up the effort to bring a civil-rights bill to a vote.

There have been cases in history when a northerner or westerner used the filibuster in its true sense just as southerners have used it. The late Senator Norris, of Nebraska, did so in an effort to prevent the arming of merchant ships in the First World War. But the fact that Senators from all sections have taken advantage of a bad rule does not make the rule any better.

Whoever uses the privilege of unlimited debate for the purpose of imposing a physical barrier to the consideration of or voting on a piece of legislation is abusing parliamentary forms. Whoever uses debate not to discuss but to prevent the discussion of an issue is perverting the democratic process.

This is why we think the Senate should adopt a rule permitting a reasonable limitation of debate. That does not mean gagging anybody. It means permitting a fair majority of Senators, after a certain period of debating time has elapsed, and after due notice to vote for an orderly termination of debate so that a vote can be had. Southerners, northerners, easterners, and westerners alike need the protection of such a rule—for what it protects is the democratic principle itself.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 24, 1956]

HOW WILL MR. NIXON RULE?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When the Senate convenes on January 3 the first order of business will be for the Senate to decide how it is going to conduct its business—whether by majority rule or by recurring minority veto by filibuster.

The right of filibuster is deeply imbedded in the traditions and rules of the United States Senate. It is not going to be uprooted or even mildly circumscribed without sharp controversy and conflict. We are now headed for just this kind of controversy on the opening day of the new Congress—which is a good time to have it.

What is the controlling rule of filibuster? It is this: There can be unlimited, unstoppable debate on every piece of legislation and on any amendment to any piece of legislation except under one condition: If 64 Senators are physically present in the Senate and vote to end debate. That provision is designed to be read in the fine print, rarely used.

Furthermore, there is one issue on which debate is completely unlimitable. So long as one Senator wants to talk on and on, it is not within the power of even 95 Senators to bring to a vote any proposed change in the rules.

What kind of change in the rules is being sought? Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and HUBERT HUMPHREY, for a group of Democrats, and Senators CLIFFORD CASE, IRVING IVES, and THOMAS KUCHEL, for a number of Republicans, seem agreed on this proposal: That after 2 days of debate, a vote of two-thirds of the Senate, present and voting (that is, two-thirds of any quorum), can end debate, and that after 15 days of debate, a majority vote can end debate.

The present Senate rule, which requires an almost impossible 64 Senators to bring legislation to vote against a filibuster, has been in force for the past 40 years. A change in the rule can be achieved only under two circumstances:

If there is strong bipartisan backing for the Douglas-Case proposal and a willingness to let a filibuster run its course at the very opening of the Senate. (A filibuster has the least prospects of success when time is not pressing.)

If Vice President NIXON, as Presiding Officer of the Senate, were to determine that rules of the preceding Senate were not binding on the new session, this would mean that rule XXII would not be binding and that under parliamentary procedure the Senate would be free to adopt new rules by a straight majority vote.

It seems to me that it would be highly unconventional and highly reasonable for Mr. NIXON to rule that the Senate has the right to adopt new rules at the beginning of a new session—the same as the House of Representatives.

There is a difference, of course, between the two Houses. The Senate puts a great premium on the fact that since two-thirds of the Senate always holds over from the previous session, the Senate is a "continuing body" and therefore its rules are continuing, not expired. Other presiding officers of the Senate have ruled this way and this is why it would be unconventional for Mr. NIXON to upset the setup.

This doesn't mean it wouldn't be logical and just to do so. The late Senator Walsh of Montana put it this way when he was advocating such a ruling in 1917: "A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them."

I can't escape the feeling that there is a way for the Vice President to help the Senate break through the ice jam which has blocked even a moderate change of the rules.

Obviously the Senators could not abide a rule which premised that the Senate is not a "continuing body." But couldn't Mr. NIXON rationally and fairly rule that despite the fact that the Senate is a continuing body, its rules expire at the end of each session—as does all legislation—and must be readopted, with or without change, so that the newly elected one-third of the Senators has the same right to vote on rules governing them as the Senators previously elected?

[From the Denver Post of December 19, 1956]

SENATE SHACKLES

Is the Senate of the United States a continuing body or does a new Senate come into existence every 2 years when a new Congress convenes?

This sounds like an exercise in semantics which can be of concern only to those persons who like to argue legal and grammatical technicalities. But it is more important than that.

If the Senate meeting on January 3 is a new Senate, it can adopt parliamentary rules under which a filibuster would be impossible, thereby clearing the way for the adoption in 1957 of civil rights legislation as advocated by President Eisenhower and others.

But if the Senate which meets January 3 is merely a continuation of the Senate which has been meeting regularly since 1789, it automatically inherits moss-covered Senate rules, including rule No. 22, adopted in 1917, which requires the vote of 64 Senators to put an end to a filibuster.

Never in Senate history has it been possible to get 64 votes to end a filibuster on civil rights legislation and if rule No. 22 remains in effect the chances for the passage of any new civil rights legislation in 1957 will be exactly nil.

That is why foes and advocates of civil rights are looking forward to January 3 as the fateful day when the Senate itself will be asked to decide whether it is a continuing body or a new body.

Everyone admits the House of Representatives is not a continuing body. All Members of the House are elected for 2 years. A new House convenes every time there is a new Congress. Each new House adopts the rules which will govern its proceedings.

However, only one-third of the Senators are elected every 2 years. When a new Congress convenes, two-thirds of the Senators are holdovers. Tradition is on the side of those who contend that the Senate is a continuing body. Rules of the Senate have carried over from one Congress to another, usually without challenge. Only twice in recent years, in 1917 and again in 1953, has the continuing body theory been questioned on the opening day of a new Congress.

Those who oppose the theory of continuation point out that every 2 years the Senate starts its deliberations with a clean slate. Bills, resolutions, nominations, treaties, and other matters which were hanging fire when the last Congress adjourned, have to be introduced anew if they are to be considered.

They have another argument which is most compelling. It rests on that part of the Constitution which says, "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." If newly elected Senators find themselves bound by filibuster rules which were adopted 40 years ago, the authority given each House to determine its own rules becomes meaningless.

Meaningless, also, is the authority given Congress in the Constitution to pass legislation by majority vote in both Houses.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, says the "dignity of the Senate and its ability to function as a democratic legislative body" is at stake in the issue over Senate rules—particularly rule No. 22. Viewed in that light, the Senate tussle scheduled for January 3, its opening day, becomes a matter of major concern for every American.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 2, 1956]

SENATE VERSUS SENATE RULES

Vice President NIXON may get a chance, when the next Congress opens, to show whether he is as friendly to a curb on Senate filibusters as was his predecessor, the late Alben W. Barkley.

Northern and western Democrats are planning another effort to change the filibuster rule, on the day the Senate convenes.

They will argue that the Senate has no rules until it adopts them, and that the adoption of rules is therefore subject to general parliamentary law, which permits closing of debate by a simple majority vote. Thus they hope to gain consideration of a new filibuster rule without first being required to break a filibuster, as the Senate rules themselves provide.

Whether this strategy will work or not depends upon the attitude of a majority of Senators toward the question of whether the Senate is a continuing body. If it is, then one can argue that its rules automatically carry over from one session to the next in the absence of action to the contrary. And under those rules, action to the contrary cannot be taken so long as any Senator chooses to exercise his right of unlimited debate—that is, his right of filibuster.

The likeliest way in which the issue could come to a head is through a ruling by the Vice President, as presiding officer, on whether or not the Senate is a continuing body. His judgment would then be subject to ratification or reversal by the Senate.

Vice President Barkley faced a similar situation in 1949 when called upon to decide whether a motion to consider a change in the rules was subject to a limitation of debate. He held that it was, thus casting his lot with Senators who seek a reasonable curb on filibusters, but the Senate overruled him. By a deal with the Republicans, the southern Democrats then put through what they consider an iron-clad protection of the filibuster power. This is the rule now in force, which provides for unlimited debate unless 64 Senators agree to a limitation—and also provides that no limitation at all can be invoked in the case of a move to change the rules.

If this seems like an absurd and legalistic way for a great parliamentary body to tie itself in procedural knots, it is. But can the Senate unravel the tangle? That will depend, in large measure, upon how much cooperation the Republicans give the northern and western Democrats who are trying to do something about it.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of December 17, 1956]

BOTH THYE AND HUMPHREY

Minnesotans should be pleased that both their Senators have alined themselves against the Senate rule which has long blocked civil-rights legislation. This is rule 22 requiring a two-thirds vote to limit debate. It is at the very heart of the power to filibuster.

Both Senator THYE and Senator HUMPHREY want to see this power curbed. Both are convinced that the effort to curb it cannot succeed without bipartisan support.

Such support is already taking shape. A group of 10 Senators (6 Democrats and 4 Republicans) is expected to move against rule 22 on the opening day of Congress. These Senators will contend that the Upper House is not a continuing body and that the adoption of new rules is therefore in order. They will argue that the new Senate is at liberty to adopt its own rules by a majority vote, unhampered by rule 22. It will be up to Vice President NIXON to make a decision here.

Senator HUMPHREY is a member of this group of 10. Senator THYE is not. But THYE, like HUMPHREY, favors an all-out attack on rule 22. If the continuing body concept of the Senate prevails, success will not be easy. Yet if there is a strong coalition of Republicans and Democrats determined to curb the filibuster, success might follow a long and stubborn fight.

We are glad that THYE and HUMPHREY are prepared to stand against the filibuster. Until rule 22 is changed, the outlook for civil-rights legislation will be utterly forlorn.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of December 29, 1956]

THE WAR ON RULE 22

Eleven United States Senators have declared war on Senate Rule 22 which requires an affirmative vote of 64 Senators before debate can be brought to a close and which, moreover, permits no limitation of debate at all on a motion to bring up a rule change.

This is based on the hoary fiction that the Senate is a continuing body, even though each session is numbered as if it were, the coming Senate being the 85th.

Since it is most difficult to get 64 out of 96 Senators to agree on anything, let alone civil rights, the prospects for change are admittedly not bright, especially since all southern Senators and a few northern ones are openly against it.

We can see no sound reason why the 47 Republican Senators should not vote against rule 22, nor why northern and western Democratic Senators should not join them.

It is true that such an alliance would split the Democratic Party, spur the 2-party system in the South, and eventually eliminate the advantage Dixie derives from a 1-party dictatorship, and for this very reason nonsouthern Senators may not go along.

If they will not vote to end filibustering, we believe that a combined Negro-liberal-labor vote will divorce them from political life in 1958.

The time has passed when politicians can talk liberal and vote reactionary, and expect the voters to forget it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 25, 1956]

TO BEAT THE FILIBUSTER

The six Democratic Senators who promise a fight to revise the Senate filibuster rule when Congress opens may seem to be embracing a lost cause. Win or lose, the fight ought, of course, to be made. But this time there is every prospect that the Democrats can enlarge their last vote against the filibuster. They could even win the battle if President Eisenhower would give them a hand.

Four years ago President Eisenhower left the whole question of Republican policy on the issue to Senator Taft, the majority leader. And Senator Taft entered into a bold combination with the southern Democrats to sustain the filibuster rule, the result being that 41 Republicans voted for it and only 5 against. Democrats voted for it 29 to 15.

This time there is less excuse for the President to stand aloof from the battle. He is no longer a political novice and he should be well aware that, if Congress is ever to consider fairly any moderate civil rights legislation, the power of extremists to talk such bills to death must be curtailed. If the President would make it administration policy to oppose the unlimited right of filibuster in the Senate, and stand firm on this line, the victory could be won.

But whether that happens or not, the six Democrats who have resolved to take the initiative deserve a vote of thanks. They are Senators HUMPHREY of Minnesota, DOUGLAS of Illinois, MORSE and NEUBERGER of Oregon, MURRAY of Montana, and MCNAMARA of Michigan.

[From the Des Moines Register of November 28, 1956]

MOVE TO LIMIT FILIBUSTERS

The fate of the Federal civil rights legislation for the next 2 years could be decided as early as January 3, when the Senate meets for the opening session of the 85th Congress.

This is the date a group of Democrats, headed by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, hope to push through a revision of Senate rules on filibustering. The move is taking on a bipartisan complexion with avowals of support so far from two Republicans—Senator IRVING IVES, of New York, and CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey.

The plan is to revive the attempt first made in 1953 to get the Senate to agree that it is not a continuing body. If it does agree, it then would proceed to adopt rules for the session, rather than follow past practice of carrying over rules from Congress to Congress.

The great advantage in adopting new rules, from the point of view of antifilibustering Senators, is that debate on these new rules would not be subject to filibuster. It could be shut off by simple majority vote. The key rules change they hope to put through is one to make it easier to close off filibusters during regular session.

As the rules stand now it is virtually impossible to curb a filibuster. It takes a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate membership—64 votes—to limit debate. Any attempt to ease this requirement during the session is itself subject to unlimited debate.

Changing the filibuster rule at the start of the session is clearly the only practical method of curbing filibusters. There is a sticky technical argument, however, over its propriety. The House adopts new rules at the start of each Congress because all terms expire every 2 years, so the House clearly is not a continuing body. Can the same be said of the Senate, which holds over two-thirds of its Members at each election?

The question was debated 3 days at the start of the 1953 session and was resolved by a 70 to 21 vote in favor of tabling motion by Majority Leader Robert Taft. Forty-one Republicans and 29 Democrats, mostly from the South, voted to table, against 15 Democrats, 5 Republicans, and 1 Independent.

If the liberal Democratic group expects to win the argument this time, it obviously will have to make inroads on the Republican side of the aisle. The two G. O. P. Senators lined up thus far indicate the Democrats have a long way to go to achieve a bipartisan answer to the filibuster.

The Eisenhower administration has an excellent record on civil rights, and this paid off in the 1956 election among Negroes, both in the South and northern cities. Attorney General Brownell has announced vigorous efforts to enforce the civil-rights laws. It would be consistent with this attitude of the Republican administration for Republican Senators to support the move toward ending the throttlehold on civil-rights legislation of the southern minority in the Senate.

[From the Christian Century of December 26, 1956]

MOVE GROWS TO END SENATE FILIBUSTER

For a short time at the opening of each new Congress the opportunity exists to abolish the filibuster and so end domination of the Senate by a southern Democratic minority. The Senate is not a continuing body, but must adopt a new set of rules at the start of each new Congress. A bipartisan group of liberal Senators have announced that they intend to use the time before adoption of rules for the 85th Congress to argue against inclusion of the famous rule 22. This provision says that cloture, or limitation of debate, may be applied to a bill only when 64 Senators vote for it. Once rule 22 is incorporated in the rules of the Senate, a minority can block any action by endless talk. In practice, the filibuster is employed mainly against civil-rights legislation, and mainly by southerners. This year six Democrats started the move to drop rule 22. They have been joined by four Republicans—Senators CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan; IRVING M. IVES, of New York; CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey; and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California—all from States where the Negro vote makes a difference. The originators of the current move, which deserves to succeed, and will succeed if it receives sufficient public support, are Democrats HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon; JAMES MURRAY, of Montana; and PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan. With the exceptions of DOUGLAS and MCNAMARA, these Senators are not immediately and personally concerned about Negro votes in their States. But they are concerned about the failure of the Senate to produce adequate laws to protect the civil rights of citizens of minority races. They see in this failure a threat to the Democratic Party and, more important, to American democracy. Senators of both parties rightly seek to return to rule by the majority. If this move succeeds, they will discover that most Americans seek the same thing and are prepared to abide by the majority's decisions.

LIBERATING THE SENATE

[From the New Republic of December 31, 1956]

On the day, February 3, 1917, that President Wilson asked Congress to authorize the arming of merchant ships, the House of Representatives approved his request, 403 to 14. A month later, the Senate was still debating the matter. An 11-Senator filibuster, led by "Fighting Bob" La Follette, had the floor. "The Senate of the United States," Wilson angrily charged, "is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action. A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible. * * * The only remedy is that the rules of the Senate shall be so altered that it can act."

The imperative of public opinion was on the President's side, and suddenly, after only 3 short days of argument, the Senate took itself in hand and adopted a rule permitting two-thirds of those present and voting to limit debate by invoking cloture. It had taken 20 years for the Senate to discipline itself even that much. Yet although "the alacrity of the Senate in adopting cloture shows what results are possible under the pressure of a militant public opinion," observed the New Republic in its March 17, 1917, issue, "it should be the aim of progressives not to let that militancy die after expending itself for a crumpet."

In 1917 the rule on cloture was no crumpet. It was a loaf of stone that has now lain on the stomach of the Senate for 40 years. Cloture has been invoked 22 times, unsuccessfully except on 4 occasions, and none of these 4 involved civil rights. The mere threat of a talkathon has usually been enough to prevent civil rights legislation from coming to a vote.

But even the children of Israel (who had provoked the displeasure of One mightier than all the Southern Democrats who ever were) were granted a reprieve after 40 years. Is the Senate to suffer forever from a rule of its own making? We shall have a partial answer on January 3 when a Senator rises to move the adoption of the Senate rules. Hidden in that simple motion is the heart of the civil rights fight, and the future of the filibuster. To understand the complicated, parliamentary maneuvering that will take place once that motion is made on the opening day of the 85th Congress, we must begin at the beginning.

The 1917 rule permitted two-thirds of the Senators voting to limit debate not merely on a final, substantive motion, but on a motion to proceed with the debate on a substantive motion. But in 1948, the acting chairman of the Senate, Arthur Vandenberg, ruled that cloture could not be invoked on procedural matters; debate on those was unlimited. The following year, this ruling was reversed by Vice President Barkley; but Mr. Barkley's decision was challenged, and he was overriden by a vote of 46 to 41. Twenty-three Republicans and 23 Southern Democrats united in support of no limitation on procedural debate.

At this point, Senator Kenneth Wherry (Republican, Nebraska) offered a compromise amendment to rule 22, one which Southern Democrats might have written themselves. For the Wherry compromise (which passed) provided that two-thirds of those sworn in (rather than present and voting) were required for cloture—that is, 64 votes. Even more pleasing to the South, the compromise provided that cloture could not be invoked on a motion to change the rules. From that time on, an anticivil rights minority has enjoyed absolute security against the will of the majority.

In the opinion of those like Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) there is only one easy way to free the Senate from the stranglehold of rule 22, and that is to insist on the opening day of Congress that as of that moment the Senate has no rules. That is what he will insist on January 3. It was tried before, in 1953, when Senator CLINTON ANDERSON (Democrat, New Mexico) moved for the adoption of the rules, but his motion was tabled, 70–21. Its opponents then, and now, claim that the Senate is a continuing body, and that its rules carry over from one session to another.

This argument seems to us fatuous, for the Constitution itself provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," and in fact, the Senate does not act as a continuing body where legislation is concerned; action on bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations dies at the end of each Congress.

Whether Senator DOUGLAS' opening-day tactic works this time depends entirely on the Republicans, and they will be torn by conflicting impulses. Some who favor civil rights legislation honestly share the late Senator Robert Taft's conviction that the Senate is a continuing body, and that the Douglas motion would be out of order. On the other hand, the Republican Party since then has made substantial gains among Negro voters, and for many civil rights advocates the Douglas motion will be viewed as a test of Republican sincerity.

It is predicted that some of the Republicans will decide that their political self-interest lies in defeating the Douglas motion, so as to increase the probability of a filibuster on civil rights later in the year. From their point of view, nothing could be more satisfactory than the spectacle of a nasty, knockdown, dragout fight between Northern and Southern Democrats—with Republicans on the sidelines and no action on civil rights.

We do not know how Vice President NIXON will rule on the admissibility of a motion for the adoption of the rules, or whether a majority of the Senate will approve or reject the basic Douglas thesis that the Senate is not a continuing body. But we are reasonably confident of one thing: a majority of Americans approve of further Federal action in defense of civil rights; they support the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions; they oppose racial restrictions on voting and employment. These aims are not partisan as far as the country is concerned. But will the Senate too accept them as national imperatives? If so, a new coalition may come into being, a coalition of constructive purpose and not, as in the past, simply an alliance of convenience between Southern Democrats and the more reactionary Republicans.

[From the Sacramento Bee of November 26, 1956]

DICTATOR FILIBUSTER

Still another attempt will be made to abolish rule 22 of the United States Senate procedural system and for the good of the country success should crown the efforts.

This rule makes it necessary to obtain a two-thirds majority to shut off senatorial debate and there is no chance short of unanimity to halt talkathons when the issue is a change in the Senate rules.

Rule 22 is the means by which Southern Senators have throttled and talked to death civil-rights legislation. Its defenders hold it aloft as supremely democratic since it permits unlimited debate.

Actually it is supremely undemocratic. It establishes the dictatorship of the filibuster. Democracy never was conceived as a stalemate. It never was meant to permit the dominance of the minority but merely to provide reasonable safeguards for it.

If unanimity generally were required for action in democracy it would be a system in which one man could be supreme. That is dictatorship. Yet usually at least once every session of Congress the American people are mistreated to the spectacle of majority rule being talked into a farce.

Six Northern and liberal Democrats are taking the lead in attempting to change rule 22. Unless it is done the Nation will continue to see democratic procedure reduced to a travesty and the Democratic Party tainted with the stigma of extreme reaction.

[From the Denver Post of November 30, 1956]

SIX MEN AGAINST A LONG TRADITION

Rules of the United States Senate can be changed at any time by majority vote. Seemingly, the six "liberal" Democratic Senators who have announced they will try to change the rule which requires a two-thirds vote to stop a filibuster should not have too much trouble putting their plan across.

Don't be deceived. The filibuster as an institution is protected by a set of parliamentary gimmicks as well as more than 100 years of Senate tradition.

Some pretty influential men, including the late Woodrow Wilson, have tried to put limits on interminable debates. None has succeeded so far.

The filibuster, as a device to enable a minority to keep a majority from passing legislation, first came into general use during the 1840's when Democrats used it against the Whigs. In those days there was no way to impose a gag rule to end debate—by a two-thirds vote or any other vote.

In 1917 certain Senators used the filibuster in an effort to defeat President Wilson's proposal to arm merchant ships. Wilson referred to them as a "little group of willful men" and declared, "The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action."

As a result of Wilson's fuming, the Senate adopted rule XXII, which is still in force and permits cloture, or a gag on debate, to be imposed by two-thirds vote.

How difficult it is to obtain a two-thirds vote to end debate is indicated by the fact that efforts to impose cloture have failed many times and have been successful only four times in nearly 40 years. The last time cloture was used successfully was in 1927.

Filibusters were used by southern Senators in 1922 and 1938 against antilynching bills. In 1942, 1944 and 1946, filibusters were used to prevent anti-poll-tax bills from passing. In 1946 an attempt to use the gag to pass a fair employment practices act was defeated.

The last serious attack on the filibuster came in 1948 and 1949. A motion to take up an anti-poll-tax bill in the Senate ran into a filibuster in the summer of 1948. An effort was made to impose the gag by the two-thirds rule.

The late Senator Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, who was presiding as President of the Senate pro tempore, held that under rule 22 cloture could be used to end debate upon a pending measure but not to end debate on a motion to take up and consider a measure.

Early in 1949, Vice President Barkley, in an effort to clear the way for President Truman's civil-rights program, ruled that Vandenberg's interpretation was wrong and that cloture could be used to stop any debate—whether on a pending measure or not.

The Senate, by a vote of 46 to 41, promptly upheld Vandenberg's interpretation and overthrew Barkley's. As a result, there is now no way to stop debate on motions preliminary to the actual consideration of a proposal.

If the "liberal" six make a motion to change rule 22 to permit a majority to impose cloture, protectors of the present rule can filibuster as long as they like—or as long as their strength holds out. If that filibuster should come to an end, a two-thirds vote would be necessary to approve the motion to take up the proposed rule change.

If there should be another filibuster on the rule change itself, a two-thirds vote

would be required to stop that debate. If the advocates of the rule change should survive two filibusters and should succeed in mustering two votes of two-thirds each for their side, then and only then could rule 22 be changed by a simple majority vote.

Incidentally, a good number of conservative Republicans are just as opposed as southern Democrats are to any abolition of the two-thirds rule. They take pride in calling the Senate the greatest deliberative body in the world. They believe in unlimited debate, even though it may be crippling at times.

That's why we say, don't be deluded about the task which the "liberal" six have set for themselves. We wish them luck. They will need it.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of December 15, 1956]

QUO VADIS REPUBLICANS?

Whether the Republican Party will be in the saddle after 1958 depends upon what Republican Senators do when the 85th Congress convenes on January 3, 1957.

If the 47 GOP Senators vote as a solid bloc against filibustering rule 22, they can pick up enough nonsouthern Democrat votes to reorganize the Senate as a non-continuing body and to enforce closure of debate on civil rights legislation.

If the GOP follows its previous course of splitting between those who represent large Negro constituencies going for civil rights and those from areas where there are few or no Negro votes allying themselves with the Eastland-Talmadge axis, then the Republicans will lose both in 1958 and 1960.

Because of its more forthright attitude toward civil rights, the Republican Party won the November election with most of the southern Negro vote and a significant shift of nonsouthern Negro voters to the GOP column.

This striking gain in Negro support indicated not only approval but expectation that the good times would continue to roll in the direction of civil rights.

Negroes will be watching very closely the events following the opening of the Senate on January 3, 1957, and if the Republican bloc is found to be up to its old divisive tricks, then it can kiss the Negro vote goodbye.

The blunt truth is that the Republicans from now on will not be able to stay in power unless they dramatically and wholeheartedly back civil rights without evasion or equivocation; so the choice before them in January is success or suicide.

[From the Denver Post of November 25, 1956]

WILL THEY DO IT?

More than a month before the new Congress convenes with its majority of Democrats, it may seem rude to rub Democratic noses in the 1956 Democratic platform and remind them of promises made in Chicago convention days. The Democrats had such a struggle with certain portions of their platform that more than ever they would probably choose to forget the thing, as usual, now that the election is over. It was one of the longest ever written—nearly 10,000 words—but there is one short paragraph it would be for their own good to remember:

"Improving congressional procedures: In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 85th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House."

In the 85th Congress where the Democrats so happily establish themselves as a majority, there are bound to be hot disagreements within their own party between northern liberals and southern segregationists. The southerners have habitually used the old filibuster technique on such occasion to enforce their minority opinions upon the Congress and upon those American people the Democrats wooed in August.

Filibuster is the antithesis of reasonable debate. It blackmails constitutional law and democratic government. Its elimination as a congressional practice should indeed be undertaken, as the Democrats at Chicago urged, at the beginning of the new Congress.

Failure to act on this would be the first and most noticeable Democratic default to the people on the party's platform promises. Fulfillment of this promise would be as much in the interest of harmony within the Democratic Party as it would be in the national interest.

Having gone through all the stress and strain of producing that enormous statement of principles in the heat of Chicago last August, the Democrats represented there will certainly expect the Congress they elected to bear its aims at least subconsciously in mind. And "at the beginning" will be interpreted to mean January or February—not at some indefinite point of the 85th congressional future.

Six Democratic Senators (HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, MORSE, MURRAY, MCNAMARA, and NEUBERGER) Thursday signed a 16-point declaration of a liberal legislative program that commits them to move on January 3, 1957, toward a cloture rule permitting a majority of Senators to close debate after an opportunity for full and thorough discussion. But it is still questionable whether such liberal Senators are in a majority, even among the Democrats. They may merely be setting off a bitter civil-rights fight.

[From the New York Post of January 2, 1957]

THE BATTLE OF THE SENATE

Once again a fateful battle for democracy is about to be fought on the floor of the United States Senate.

Technically the conflict centers on the effort of a group of liberals in both parties to revise the rule of the Senate which safeguards the filibuster.

Fundamentally the issue is whether a small band of willful southern diehards will be forever allowed to strangle the democratic process.

There is no question of suppressing reasonable debate. Every proposal for curbing the filibuster protects full debate. What is solely at stake is the right of a few men to permanently paralyze the Senate by resort to unlimited oratory long after the will of the majority is plain.

The test is a clear challenge to both parties. Both are pledged to civil-rights legislation; yet it has long been evident that no effective legislation in this realm will pass as long as the southern extremists retain the filibuster power.

On the eve of this historic clash it is deceptive and dishonorable irrelevancy for the President and his congressional deputies to talk grandiosely of their civil-rights program without taking a stand on the filibuster. The southern battalions have heard such gaudy announcements before; they know it is empty rhetoric as long as they retain the sanction to talk democracy to death.

The majority leaders of both parties—LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND—appear alined in support of the filibuster. Probably a clear word from the President could alter KNOWLAND'S stand; at the very least it could insure enough Republican votes to swing the result. Will the word come? Where will Vice President NIXON stand? Surely it is absurd for the White House to use the pretext that it cannot interfere in a procedural matter when the procedure goes to the very heart of the business of democracy.

As the showdown nears we are again told the filibuster has intrinsic democratic virtues. We are reminded that other men and other groups may someday find it indispensable to their protection, as they have before; that the Dixiecrat cause today may be the liberal's salvation tomorrow.

We say again that those who earnestly take this view reject the democratic idea. That idea is premised on the calculated risk that legislative bodies can and will make errors. The danger is real. But the risk is the essence of democracy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 31, 1956]

SENATE'S FROZEN RULES

The United States Senate is facing a real showdown on the old question of filibustering. When Congress opens this week a bipartisan group led by Senators DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, IVES, and CLARK will make a bold bid to change the Senate rules. They are aiming especially at an interpretation of the rules which in effect requires unanimous consent to change them. But their ultimate objective is to curb filibusters and clear a path for civil-rights legislation.

It would be well if the civil-rights controversy were not allowed to confuse the issue over filibusters. For this issue concerns the larger and continuing question as to whether a small minority should be able to veto indefinitely congressional action on any subject. Opinions may differ as to the purposes for which filibusters have been used; many who have opposed their use at one time have favored it at another.

The best arguments for it are that it provides a last-ditch safeguard of the rights of a minority and that on some questions the intensity of minority feeling should be given extra weight. There may be wisdom in such reasoning. But the civil-rights issue raises a further question, for here the filibuster has been used to deny the rights of a minority within a minority.

Theoretically and historically the filibuster looks like a poor adjunct of effective representative government. It is not really a safeguard of free speech, but rather an abuse of speech. Often it is a doling of words which makes speech meaningless and frustrates democratic action. History attributes most of the weakness which permitted the repeated partitioning of Poland to rules that blocked action by its Parliament. The Senate's cloture rule—requiring 64 affirmative votes—is not so stringent, but the provision barring any closing of debate on a change or rules does permit a veto by 1 Member.

If the filibuster were generally used, it would not be tolerated. If it were frequently used against those who favor it most, they would lose their taste for it. We do not recommend a resort to such extreme measures. But those who defend the filibuster should think twice about the extremes to which they may be tempted. At the very least they ought to concede that the Senate rules should not be frozen until unanimous consent is obtained to amend them.

The Senators proposing a change will make their move in the first minutes of the 85th Congress. They contend that at that moment the Senate, like the House, can adopt a new set of rules by a simple majority vote. Their opponents argue that the Senate is a "continuing body" because two-thirds of its Members carry over.

The advocates of change declare the legislation and appointments before the Senate expire with each congressional session and have to be renewed. They point out also that new Members should have some effective voice in the rules that govern them. Indeed, they contend that even if the Senate be considered a continuing body, that does not deprive it of the right granted by the Constitution to "determine the rules of its proceedings."

Let us recognize that checks on impulsive majority action may be wise and useful. But nothing in the American constitutional system favors a perpetual frustration of the established purpose of the people. Sooner or later procedures which permit such frustrations must be modified.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of December 30, 1956]

OUTLAW THE FILIBUSTER

The question before the Senate when it reconvenes Thursday will be this: "Is majority rule to prevail?"

Senate rule 22 allows a minority to paralyze majority action by use of the filibuster (unlimited debate). A group of Democrats and Republicans led by PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, will move to change rule 22 and end the power to paralyze.

Two hurdles face the DOUGLAS forces. They must first beat down the argument that the Senate is a continuous body and therefore cannot adopt new rules at the opening of a session. Next they must win a change in rule 22 so that cloture (closing of debate) can be voted by something less than 64 votes, a practically impossible margin.

Logic and justice are on the DOUGLAS side. The filibuster violates Democratic concepts by thwarting the will of the Senate majority and, frequently, of a majority of the American people. No issue of freedom of speech or debate is involved. The issue is the setting of a reasonable limitation on the length of debate so that a Senate majority can act and the Senate machinery can operate.

There's no predicting how the DOUGLAS motion will make out. The Senate is ever reluctant to change. Four years ago a Republican-southern Democrat coalition tabled a like motion by a 70 to 21 vote.

However, no such lopsided result is expected this time. The liberal Democrats have been strengthened by a plank against the filibuster in the party platform. Liberal Republicans have increased in number since 1953. Members of both parties outside of the South are anxious to pass some civil rights legislation after canvassing results of the recent election. And there will be no significant civil rights legislation out of the 85th Congress if rule 22 remains as is.

Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY of Wisconsin voted to table the rule changes proposals of 4 years ago. There seems some hope that one or both will vote the other way this time. Such a reversal, we believe, would meet with approval by a majority of their constituents, who certainly support the fundamental American principle of majority rule.

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

BEFORE THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (ACTING AS PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES)—IN THE MATTER OF THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON MOTION TO TAKE UP RULES—BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION THAT MOTION TO TAKE UP RULES OF SENATE OF 85TH CONGRESS IS IN ORDER AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the motion to be presented by certain Senators on January 3, 1957, to take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress, is in order?

2. Whether the Constitution, and particularly article I, section 5 thereof, authorizes the Senate of each new Congress to determine its own rules?

3. Whether action by the Senate of an earlier Congress can prevent the Senate of the 85th Congress from adopting the rules which the majority of the duly-elected Senators of the 85th Congress believe will best facilitate the business of the Senate and the implementation of the mandate of the electorate?

(The question is not whether the Senate is a continuing or continuous body. As we shall show in this brief, the terms "continuing" and "continuous" are simply adjectives used to convey the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate carry over from Congress to Congress. They are adjectives resulting from this one aspect of the Senate; they are not a cause of anything. The question is not whether the words "continuing" and "continuous" are appropriate adjectives to describe the Senate of the United States, but whether the majority of Senators meeting for the first time in the new Congress have the power to adopt their own rules free from obstructions laid down many years earlier. While we are confident that this brief successfully disproves the general applicability of these adjectives to the Senate,[1] our case does not depend upon proving, as an academic exercise, that those who take comfort in references to the Senate as a continuing or continuous body have used the wrong adjectives. In sum, the question is not whether the Senate is a continuing or continuous body, but whether the majority of the Senate of the 85th Congress may adopt its own rules free of the fetters of earlier senatorial actions and rules.)

SIGNIFICANCE OF RULING

The decision of the Vice President upon the motion to take up the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress may well prove to be the most significant ruling ever made by a Presiding Officer of the Senate. For the Vice President's ruling may determine whether the Senate of the United States will, in the critical years ahead, be in a position to reflect the views of the majority of its members and of the people who elected them, or will be chained to inaction by the veto power of an unyielding minority representing special and sectional interests. What is at stake is far more than civil rights legislation, important as that is; what is at stake is the ability of the Senate to function as a democratic legislative body in the interests of justice and peace.

The question that will be placed before the Vice President by the motion to take up rules has never been placed squarely before the presiding officer of the Senate. No doubt it was because Vice President Barkley was prepared to rule the Anderson motion in order in 1953 (see e. g. Newsweek, January 19, 1953) [2] that no point of order was made against the motion and no opportunity was given him to make the ruling in question here. However that may be, no direct precedent is presently available to guide the Vice President in reaching his historic decision. He must therefore be guided by the letter and spirit of the Constitution and by the precedents on related issues; so guided he can only reach the decision which accords with the fundamental principle that the living shall determine the destinies of the living and that a democracy rests upon the majority will of the governed.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Senate of the 85th Congress will convene at 12 o'clock meridian on January 3, 1957. Immediately after the prayer, the formalities of administering the oath to new members, and the election of officers, the following motion will be made:

"In accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution which declares that '* * * Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * *,' I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress."

Consideration has been given to presenting the motion to take up rules before the election of officers. Indeed, strict logic might appear to demand such action since officers are customarily elected under rules which have already been adopted. We have, nevertheless, deemed it appropriate to withhold the motion to take up the rules until the officers have been elected. This order of proceeding would appear to be in the interest of the organization and expeditious operation of the Senate. It has been the order of proceeding generally in the House of Representatives. It is also the procedure that was followed in 1953. Furthermore, at that time Vice President Barkley, after the election of officers had been completed, answered a query as to the rules governing the election with the statement that "the organization of the Senate is an inherent right of the Senate, as it is of any sovereign body, and all that has taken place up to date has been under that inherent right" (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10). In the same vein, Senator Taft stated that "it is fair to say that none of the matters that have been acted on today have been taken up under the provisions of any particular rules" (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10). In light of these considerations, we do not believe that proceeding to the election of officers by unanimous consent could possibly constitute an acquiescence in the rules of the Senate of the 84th Congress or a waiver of the right to move to take up the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress. If the Vice President should not agree with this analysis and the proposed timing of the motion to take up rules, it is requested that he indicate such disagreement before January 3. Otherwise the motion will be made as set forth above.

Once the motion to take up rules has been made, those supporting the filibuster and opposing new rules may either:

(a) raise a point of order against the motion; or

(b) move to table it, first allowing reasonable debate as Senator Taft did in 1953.[3]

If those opposing the motion raise a point of order against the motion on the ground that the Senate of the 85th Congress already has rules (carried over from the Senate of

---

[1] Upon request the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared two briefs (one on each side) on the question "Is the Senate a Continuing Body?" While the briefs are helpful on this academic issue, they are not directed at the real questions before the Vice President.

[2] Vice President Barkley was undoubtedly influenced by the brief of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights which was made available to him prior to the opening of Congress in 1953. This brief is the most complete study ever made of the power of the Senate of a new Congress to adopt its own rules unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. We urge the Vice President to give careful consideration to this brief and to facilitate his review of the brief we are appending the full debates in 1953 which include the leadership conference brief (see 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 181–201). We have also borrowed liberally from that document in the preparation of this brief.

[3] Senator Taft made his motion to table after substantial debate on the motion to take up rules had been permitted. Presumably this same courtesy would be shown this time despite reports circulating in the press to the contrary. Certainly those who defend the principle of unlimited debate would hardly want to be in the position of preventing their opponents from even making a full statement of their position on the floor of the Senate.

the previous Congress), the Vice President will be called upon to make a ruling upon the question whether the old rules carry over to the Senate of the 85th Congress.[4] Actually, such a point of order rather than a motion to table would appear to be the appropriate method of determining whether the old rules carry over to the Senate of the 85th Congress. For, if the old rules do not carry over and the motion to take up rules is in order, as we believe it to be, the motion ought not be tabled as tabling would leave the Senate without permanent rules for the 85th Congress and would actually not even settle the question whether the rules carry over.[5]

If the motion to take up rules is held in order and is then adopted by the Senate, a motion will be made to adopt, as the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress, the old rules with a revised rule XXII. The new rule XXII might provide for a limitation on debate if, after 2 days' notice, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting supported cloture or if, after 15 days' notice, a majority of the Senators present and voting supported cloture. This proposal would permit prompt action on emergency measures supported by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, while, at the same time, it would assure no less than 2 weeks of debate on legislation before a majority of Senators present and voting could obtain cloture. An alternative would be to allow cloture after 15 days only upon a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate (that is, 49 Senators). Other alternatives the Senate will likely have presented to it are to allow cloture only by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting or to retain the existing rule XXII or even to do away with cloture entirely (i. e., recognize the practicalities of the existing situation). All the proposals for a new rule XXII that have been made allow full debate before cloture can be applied and all Senators supporting the motion to take up rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress are strongly committed to the proposition that cloture should only be applied after full debate.

But the question as to which cloture rule will ultimately be adopted is irrelevant to the question whether the motion to take up rules is in order. What is at issue here is the power of a majority of the Senators of the 85th Congress to make the decision on the rules that will bind them in their work in that Congress. The existence of that power is clear. It resides in the Constitution itself.

[4] Although it would be technically possible for the Vice President to avoid a ruling by placing the point of order before the Senate for a vote without rendering a decision upon the point of order himself, it is not believed that the Vice President, acting in his constitutional role as President of the Senate, would deprive the body of guidance from its presiding officer on so vital and significant an issue.

[5] If the motion to take up rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress is tabled, it will still be open to Senators to raise the question whether the rules of the earlier Congresses carry over to the Senate of the 85th Congress. After tabling, a Senator might arise and ask the Vice President to state under what rules the Senate was proceeding; one side or the other could then appeal from the Vice President's ruling. Another method of accomplishing the same result would be for a Senator to make a point of order against a particular action of the Senate under the old rules on the ground that they did not carry over and then either side could appeal from a ruling on that point of order.

ARGUMENT

I. The majority of the Senate in each Congress has a constitutional right to adopt rules of proceedings for the Senate of that Congress unfettered by action or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Although there are no directly relevant judicial or legislative precedents interpreting this provision of the Constitution, it seems quite clear from the language and context that "each House" means not only the separate branches of the Congress—that is, the House and the Senate—but also the separate branches of each succeeding Congress. No reason has been or can be adduced to interpret this constitutional provision as a grant of rulemaking authority to the Members of the House and Senate meeting for the first time in 1789 and a withholding of this same authority from the Members of the House and the Senate of later Congresses. Both language and logic lead to the conclusion that the constitutional authority to make rules is granted to each House of each Congress.

It is significant that article I, section 5, is an identical grant of rulemaking authority to each House of Congress. It is not disputed that the House of Representatives of each new Congress has the power to, and does, adopt new rules at the opening of each Congress (see point V). The identical constitutional provision cannot reasonably be given a different interpretation as applied to the Senate, a coordinate branch of the "Congress of the United States" (art. I, sec. 1). For, not only do the two bodies act as a team in the Congress, but the rulemaking authority of the House can be rendered meaningless if the Senate is not also in a position to adopt rules that will make possible the expression of the majority will of the Senate and thus of the Congress.

Every principle of constitutional construction supports the interpretation of article I, section 5, which gives the majority of the Senate present on January 3, 1957, the right to "determine the rules of its proceedings" unfettered by action or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. The Constitution of the United States should be interpreted in the light of the intention of its framers to build a democratic government reflecting the will of the governed not only for the day but for an enduring future. What Chief Justice Marshall said in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 415) of the congressional power to pass necessary and proper legislation, is equally applicable to its power to make its own rules without the impediments of the past:

"The subject is the execution of those great powers on which the welfare of a nation essentially depends. It must have been the intention of those who gave these powers, to insure, as far as human prudence could insure, their beneficial execution. This could not be done by confiding the choice of means to such narrow limits as not to leave it in the power of Congress to adopt any which might be appropriate, and which were conducive to the end. This provision is made in a Constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs. To have prescribed the means by which Government should, in all future time, execute its powers, would have been to change, entirely, the character of the instrument, and give it the properties of a legal code. It would have been an unwise attempt to provide, by immutable rules, for exigencies which, if foreseen at all, must have been seen dimly, and which can be best provided for as they occur. To have declared that the best means shall not be used, but those alone without which the power given would be nugatory, would have been to deprive the Legislature of the capacity to avail itself of experience, to exercise its reason, and to accommodate its legislation to circumstances."

The suggestion that rules enacted by men long since dead or retired from public life should prevent the majority of the Senate of the 85th Congress from adopting its own rules is contrary to the very spirit of democracy upon which the Constitution is predicated. There is no more basic principle of democracy than that the living shall determine their own destinies unhampered by the dead hand of the past. It becomes an absurdity to argue that rules adopted years or even generations earlier can bind new Senators who are elected on pledges to particular programs which the old rules make impossible.

We cannot state this proposition as well as Thomas Jefferson did many years ago:

"Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. * * * A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing, then, is unchangeable but the inherent unalienable rights of man." (The Jefferson Cyclopedia, vol. VII, pp. 377, 378.)

As one generation cannot bind another, so one legislature cannot bind its successor. This fundamental principle of the independence and full authority of each new legislature, recognized by all authorities, has been well stated by Judge Cooley (Constitutional Limitations, 6th ed., 1890, pp. 146–147):

"To say that the legislature may pass irrepealable laws is to say that it may alter the very Constitution from which it derives its authority, since, insofar as one legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two Houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual."

The inherent right of legislative bodies to be unfettered by previous assemblies has been forcefully recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in cases dating back over a long period. This right, as analyzed by the Supreme Court, does not arise from any particular phraseology in Federal and State constitutions; it arises from the very nature of successive legislatures in a democratic society.

In one of the leading cases dealing with this problem, the Supreme Court stated:

"Every succeeding legislature possesses the same jurisdiction and power with respect to them as its predecessors. The latter have the same power of repeal and modification which the former had of enactment, neither more nor less. All occupy, in this respect, a footing of perfect equality. This must necessarily be so in the nature of things. It is vital to the public welfare that each one should be able at all times to do whatever the varying circumstances and present exigencies touching the subject involved may require. A different result would be fraught with evil." (*Newton* v. *Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio* (100 U. S. 548, 559).)

Again, in response to the argument that Congress could not change the use of certain

public lands, Mr. Justice (later Chief Justice) Stone said:

"By dedicating the lands thus acquired to a particular public use, Congress declared a public policy, but did not purport to deprive itself of the power to change that policy by devoting the lands to other uses. The dedication expressed no more than the will of a particular Congress which does not impose itself upon those to follow in succeeding years. (See *Newton* v. *Mahoning County Commissioners* (100 U. S. 548, 559); *Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.* v. *Spratley* (172 U. S. 602, 621).)" (*Reichelderfer* v. *Quinn* (287 U.S. 315, 318).)

This principle, that no legislature can act so as to fetter its successors in expressing public policy and public will, has been repeatedly expressed. See *Town of East Hartford* v. *Hartford Bridge Co.* (10 How. 511, 533); *Ohio Life Insurance and Trust Co.* v. *Debolt* (16 How 416, 431); *Connecticut Mutual Life Ins. Co.* v. *Spratley* (172 U. S. 602, 621); *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 393 (n. 19)).

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution, empowering each House to determine the rules of its proceedings, must be interpreted in the light of these fundamental democratic principles upon which the Constitution is based; so interpreted, it can only be read to give each branch of each succeeding Congress the same power of making its own rules that the branches of the first Congress had when they met in 1789. Any other interpretation would lead to the antidemocratic formulation that one legislature, whose members were long since dead and gone, could prevent action by the duly-elected and existing representatives of the people. This, as we have seen, cannot be done.

What we have here is a clear illustration of the evils inherent in the members of a legislative body seeking to bind their successors. What we have here is not simply a rule of the past whose incidental effect is to bind the present and the future; what we have here is a purposeful effort to restrict the authority of future Congresses by preventing changes in the rules. Clause 3 of the Hayden-Wherry resolution of 1949, which amended rule XXII, provides that there shall be no cloture whatever on any proposal to change the rules of the Senate. The Senate of the 81st Congress thus attempted to fasten its will on the Senate of all future Congresses; it attempted to perpetuate the present rule XXII for all time. This was not a simple effort by the Senate of the 81st Congress to provide rules for its own governance, but was rather a deliberate attempt to foist those rules upon the Senate of all future Congresses. As Senator RUSSELL so aptly said of clause 3, "the rules of the Senate hereafter are not subject to cloture on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the standing rules * * * it [clause 3] permits Senators who have the courage to do so to protect the parliamentary integrity of this body from assaults that will come in the days that lie ahead." 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2722. See also 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2230, 2415, 2582–2584, 2673–2675. Clause 3 was, in a word, a deliberate effort boldly stated to flout the basic principle that the members of one Congress cannot bind their successors. It cannot be that such a strategem has effectively given a minority of Senators a perpetual veto power over the national legislative process.

It might be helpful and clarifying to consider some other possible courses that the Senate of the 81st Congress might have followed to perpetuate rule XXII. Suppose that, instead of adopting clause 3 of rule XXII, the Hayden-Wherry resolution had provided that rules of the Senate "may be amended hereafter only by unanimous consent." Certainly no one would contend that the Senators meeting on January 3, 1957, would be bound by any such rule and yet this is exactly the purpose and effect of clause 3 of rule XXII. As long as there is one Senator on his feet and ready to talk, there can be no change in the rules of the Senate.

Or let us take a second case. Suppose the Senate in 1949 instead of enacting clause 3 of rule XXII had adopted a rule that no civil rights legislation could be considered for 25 years or some other term of years. Again no one would dream of arguing that this rule would bind a majority of the Senate of the incoming 85th Congress. Yet, again as a practical matter, that is exactly the purpose and effect of the action of the Senate of 1949.

The Senate of 1949, by clause 3 of rule XXII, tried to bind the future just as much as if it had required unanimous consent to any change in the rules or had provided that the Senate of no future Congress could take up civil rights legislation. Its efforts to prevent the Senate from responding to the will of the people cannot succeed under the authorities cited and principles outlined above.

Rule XXII is substance masquerading as procedure. Rules are generally intended to make business possible, not to prevent its consummation. The purpose of rules is to facilitate and provide, by orderly procedures, what a legislative body desires to do; a rule which defeats the purpose for which rules are established is hostile to democratic processes.

Rule XXII is not a procedural means of getting business done; it is a substantive means of preventing business from being done.

It is a means of the Senate of one Congress seeking to bind its successors to its own rules and its own inaction.

It is a means of keeping the majority of the Senate and of the people from determining vital substantive issues.

The answer to this attempt to bind the future lies in article I, section 5, which gives the majority of the Senate of the 85th Congress, meeting for the first time on January 3, 1957, the power and the duty to make its own rules, unfettered by efforts of the Senate of an earlier Congress to deprive this majority of its constitutional power and responsibility. Manmade rules cannot prejudice the explicit constitutional authority in article I, section 5.

II. The three closest precedents in the history of the Senate all support the proposition that a majority of the Senate of a new Congress can act to adopt its own rules without the obstruction of actions and rules of the Senate of an earlier Congress

A. Precedent 1—The Dismissal of the Senate Printer in 1841

A joint resolution of 1819 authorized each House of Congress to choose the printer for the next succeeding House; it provided the method, rights of pay, and other matters of detail. Pursuant to this joint resolution, the Democratic Senate in 1840 chose as printer for the Senate of the following Congress (the 27th Cong.) the firm of Blair & Rives. Mr. Blair was editor of the Washington Globe, an intensely partisan newspaper which supported the Democratic administration. The Whigs had given notice during the last days of the second session of the 26th Congress that they did not consider that the Democrats had any constitutional or moral right to choose a printer for the next Congress. Despite these warnings, the Democratic Senate awarded the contract for the printing for the next Senate to Blair & Rives.

Immediately upon the opening of a special session of the Whig-controlled 27th Congress, Senator Mangum of North Carolina introduced a resolution that Blair and Rives be dismissed as printer to the Senate (9 Cong. Globe, p. 236). The resolution was heatedly opposed, largely on the authority of the established usage under the joint resolution of 1819. The opponents argued that a printer had been elected 10 times under the authority of the resolution and that now, on the occasion of the 11th election, the unconstitutionality of the authorizing resolution was claimed too late. Senator Allen of Ohio, in a statement quoted several times during the 1953 Senate debates, summed up the position of those contending for the binding effect of the action of the previous Senate in these words:

"And, as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. * * * There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate."

Senator Buchanan and others supported Senator Allen, arguing for the theory of the Senate as a permanent and continuous body bound by the actions of the Senate of an earlier Congress.

Rejecting the appeals of Senators Allen, Buchanan and the other Democrats, those in favor of the dismissal of the printer designated the resolution of 1819 as a nullity because it attempted to bind the actions of future Houses of Congress. The argument that the Senate of one Congress could not bind its successors prevailed; the resolution to dismiss the printer was adopted 26 to 18.

In a word, the Senate of 1841 rejected the theory that the action of the Senate of one Congress could bind the Senate of a later Congress. The Senate rejected this theory in the face of the same arguments of permanence and continuity that are now being made by the supporters of rule XXII. Indeed, it is significant that Senator Taft, leading the battle against the Anderson motion in 1953, relied heavily upon the quotation from Senator Allen in the 1841 debate, despite the fact that Senator Allen's statement and his theory had been repudiated by a majority of the Senate when it voted to dismiss the printer. In other words, those who relied upon the statements of Senators Allen, Buchanan, and their colleagues were relying upon the arguments of the defeated side; it was as though, in arguing to a court, a lawyer had relied upon a decision that had been overruled.

B. Precedent 2—Abrogation of the Joint Rules in 1876

The story of the abrogation of the joint rules and their relevance to the present issue was well stated in the Leadership Conference Brief (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 187), and we quote that statement in full:

"In the First Congress the Senate and House adopted joint rules to govern the relationship and necessary business between them. Annals of Congress, 57–58, 987. Thereafter these joint rules of the two Houses were treated as in force and revised and amended, although the Senate and House did not adopt them at the beginning of each Congress.

"In 1865 rule XXII of the joint rules was adopted in an attempt to settle the long-standing controversy on the method of counting electoral votes. In 1869 there was a violent quarrel between the two Houses of Congress over the effect of this particular joint rule. This led to a determination by a portion of the Senate to rescind that rule in anticipation of any problems over the counting of electoral votes which might arise from the 1876 Presidential election. Haynes, op. cit. supra, page 245 et seq. The desire of the Senate to eliminate joint rule XXII led to the end of acquiescence of each new Senate in the continuation of the joint rules and the

Senate in the 1st session of the 41st Congress, after 87 years of unbroken historical usage, demonstrated its right to adopt new joint rules at the beginning of each new Congress.

"On December 15 Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, introduced a resolution to adopt the joint rules in force at the close of the last session of Congress. Senator Bayard, of Delaware, asked whether this was necessary, and Senator Edmunds answered:

" 'That, as a celebrated Englishman said, is past finding out. The object of this resolution is to ascertain from the proper Committee on Rules (which had jurisdiction over the joint rules as well as the Standing Rules of the Senate) whether the joint rules that were in force at the last session of Congress are in force now without any vote; and if so, upon what principle of law or joint proceeding; and if not, of course, to take some steps to have some joint rules between the two Houses.' (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 220.)

"The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules, which reported it back favorably with a technical amendment making it a concurrent resolution. Senator Hamlin argued that the joint rules operated only by acquiescence (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 309). Considerable heated discussion ensued, in which widely different theories as to the effect and validity of the joint rules were stated. The one point receiving constant reiteration was that the joint rules had operated acquiescence and must be subject to change. Senator Hamlin, as he gave the committee report, stated it as follows:

" 'It is only by acquiescence in long years that they have been treated and regarded as rules, and not by an affirmative vote either of the House or of the Senate.' (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 309.)

"Recognition that common consent or acquiescence could give validity to that which was otherwise doubtful only so long as the acquiescence continued was voiced by Senator Merrimon, who said in the course of this debate (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 431–432):

" 'It seems, as the venerable Senator from Maine [Mr. Hamlin] stated on a former occasion, that this matter has passed uniformly from the beginning of the Government down to this time without question. The question is now raised, and if today some action of Congress should be required under the joint rules, and a Senator should rise and say "I object," there would be the end of it. It is only by common consent that the practice to which I have referred has prevailed.'

"Despite the appeals to history, long-standing practice, and the venerability of the joint rules, the Senate voted to reject a substitute resolution which would have treated the rules as in force and provided for an amendment of those rules, and accepted the initial resolution which was framed on the theory that no joint rules existed at the opening of the new Congress. (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 519.)

"Thus, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution adopting the joint rules anew for the 44th Congress. The House never passed this resolution. The Senate, at various times since then has made an effort to have joint rules passed but they never have succeeded. (Gilfrey, Precedents, 1914, p. P–441; Hinds, secs. 6782–6787.) In most respects the House and Senate now operate in the same manner as they did under the joint rules on some theory of usage.

"The decision, by vote of the Senate, that the joint rules were not in effect demonstrated that the joint rules had existed only by acquiescence and that the acquiescence of even 87 years was in no way binding when a majority manifested its will to the contrary. It also showed conclusively that the method by which the majority in such a situation manifests its will is by the adoption of new rules and not by amendment of the old ones."

C. Precedent 3—Senator Walsh's Resolution and Arguments in 1917

At the opening of the 65th Congress in March 1917, Senators Owen of Oklahoma and Walsh of Montana raised the question whether the rules of the preceding Senate were binding upon the new body.

Senator Owen, on the first business day of the Senate of the new Congress, March 6, 1917, refused to permit a bill to be referred to committee on the ground that committees were not in existence at the beginning of this new Congress, and Senator Walsh supported Senator Owen's contention.

On March 7, Senator Walsh presented a resolution squarely raising the issue whether the rules carried over from Senate to Senate and presented his now famous argument against the old rules being applied to the Senate of the new Congress. Said the Senator: "A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them."

On the evening of March 7, after Senator Walsh's resolution and speech, caucuses of both parties voted to approve a change in rule XXII to provide for cloture by a two-thirds vote. The resolution was debated by unanimous consent without ever being referred to committee and was adoptd on March 8, 1917 (76 yeas, 3 nays). Senator Walsh, who had accomplished his purpose of obtaining the cloture rule he sought, dropped his resolution.

* * * * *

Thus, in the three closest precedents, the Senate, while some of its Members talked continuous body and others talked in a contrary vein, each time decided against being bound by the dead hand of the past. The printer was dismissed despite the argument that this could not be done in the face of the action of the Senate of the earlier Congress; new joint rules were adopted despite the action and acquiescence of the Senate of the earlier Congresses; and a new cloture rule was adopted by overwhelming agreement once the argument was made that the old rules did not carry over.

The action of the Senate in 1953, while admittedly not free from ambiguity, would also appear to be a favorable precedent. On January 3, 1953, Senator ANDERSON on behalf of himself and 18 other Senators moved that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 83d Congress. If, in fact, the rules of the Senate of the earlier Congress had automatically carried over, this motion was out of order. Yet not a single member of the majority opposing the motion to take up the rules raised a point of order against the motion despite the fact that this would have been the proper parliamentary procedure if the group had cared to test out the question whether the old rules carried over. Instead of a point of order, the then majority leader, Senator Taft, moved to lay the motion on the table, an implicit recognition of the fact that the motion had been in order. Many Senators undoubtedly voted for the tabling motion because they sought to avoid any direct issue on the rules at that time, even though they would have supported a ruling by the Vice President that the resolution was in order.[6] Indeed, one such Senator, Senator POTTER, has stated recently that he voted to table because he did not want anything to interfere with the organization of the new administration and the confirmation of the new cabinet. New York Times, December 12, 1956, page 31. No such issue is presently before the Senate.

The effect of the motion to table was well stated by Senator Lehman at the conclusion of the debate in 1953:

"The adoption of the motion to table the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico is implicit recognition of the fact that our main contention that each Senate has the constitutional right to adopt its own rules is sound.[7] No point of order was raised against the Anderson motion. A majority of the Senate has laid that motion on the table. I believe the opposition did not dare to raise a point of order because of the fear that such a point against the Anderson motion would have been overruled. * * * I believe it to be an incontrovertible fact that the Senate has the constitutional right—even the obligation—to adopt its own rules at the beginning of a new Congress. It is incontrovertible because the right to do so is expressly set forth in the Constitution. It is, moreover, basically inherent in the nature of a democratic parliamentary body." (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 232.)

III. The Senate of each new Congress makes a fresh start on all activities; it has a right to make a fresh start on its rules

In every major activity the Senate recognizes a constitutional right of the Senate of each new Congress to determine both legislative and executive business anew. All consideration of bills,[8] resolutions, treaties, and nominations starts at the beginning of each Congress without reference to or continuation of what has taken place in the past; new officers and committee members are elected in the Senate of each new Congress; when

[6] It is generally believed that such a ruling would have been forthcoming had a point of order been raised and the Vice President given the opportunity to rule. Actually Vice President Barkley made a partial ruling to this effect when he stated, in connection with the election of officers, that "the organization of the Senate is an inherent right of the Senate, as it is of any sovereign body, and all that has taken place up to date has been under that inherent right." 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10. Had the rules actually carried over from the previous Congress, the election of officers would have taken place under these rules, not under inherent right.

[7] Senator Lehman's interpretation of the action of the Senate in 1953 appears to be more accurate than that contained in the Watkins committee report in 1954. Furthermore, the entire discussion of the question of continuing body in the Watkins report was irrelevant to its conclusion that a Senator can properly be censured for actions occurring during a prior term as Senator. The Senate's power to censure arises from the necessity of maintaining the dignity and good repute of the Senate and, therefore, the authority to censure exists as long as a Senator is a Member of the Senate and exists by virtue of his presence in the Senate. Indeed, the same rule that past conduct may be considered for censure and expulsion purposes applies in the House (2 Hinds, Precedents, sec. 1286; House Report No. 570, 63d Cong., 2d sess., 1914), whose rules do not carry over from Congress to Congress.

[8] As was well said in the brief of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in referring to the fact that no action in connection with bills carries over from the Senate of one Congress to the Senate of the next Congress: "This necessary practice is not grounded upon a rule only but upon article I, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States which vests all legislative power in the Congress. As the legislative business of one Congress cannot carry over to a subsequent Congress, a fortiori, the legislative business of one part of the Congress cannot carry over to that part of a subsequent Congress."

the Senate adjourns, it adjourns sine die. The slate is wiped clean, the proceedings begin again.

For convenience, we present the following analysis of the operations of the United States Senate in tabular form:

Analysis of the operations of the United States Senate

Activity	Senate acts anew in each Congress	Senate carries over from Senate of preceding Congress	Comment
1. Introduction of bills	X		See Senate Rule XXXII.
2. Committee consideration of bills.	X		Do.
3. Debate on bills	X		Do.
4. Voting on bills	X		Do.
5. Election of officers	X		While the old officers carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carryover. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.[1]
6. Consideration of validity of senatorial elections.	X		Although credentials of a Senator-elect are often presented to the Senate prior to the beginning of his term, the validity of the credentials can only be considered by the Senate to which he was elected and not before.
7. Consideration of treaties	X		See Senate Rule XXXVII (2).
8. Submission and consideration of nominations.	X		See Senate Rule XXXVIII (6).
9. Election of committee members.	X		See Rule XXV. While old committees carry over until new ones are elected, the carryover does not prove rules carry over. It is a mere convenience. Even in the House, the Clerk carries over until the new one is elected. Obviously this does not prove that House rules carry over; they do not.
10. Adjournment	X		Adjourns sine die. When Congress ends at noon of a particular day, and a special session of the Senate of the new Congress is called, the Senate adjourns at noon, and 1 minute afterwards opens the new session.
11. Rules		X	Practice of Senate on rules can be explained as acquiescence, which can be ended at the opening of each Congress by vote of the majority. In order to give some logic and rationale to the procedures of the greatest deliberative assembly in the world, practice on rules should be explained as acquiescence which can be refused at opening of the Senate of any new Congress by the adoption of new rules.

[1] Similarly, the fact that the President pro tempore carries over until there is a change of party control of the Senate is no evidence of rules carryover. On the contrary, the fact that an election of a president pro tempore automatically follows a shift in party control (see 99 Congressional Record 9, Jan. 3, 1953) is evidence that the Senate of each new Congress responds to the will of the majority of the Senate of that Congress.

The thing that stands out in the above analysis is that everything starts afresh except the rules.[9] And these, too, can start afresh the moment a majority of the Senators at the opening of the Senate of a new Congress so wills it and so votes. All that has happened over the past years is that there has been acquiescence in the carryover of rules of the Senate from Congress to Congress.[10] Carryover of the rules based on acquiescence is certainly no precedent for carryover in the absence of acquiescence. Absent acquiescence, the rules do not carry over and the Senate of the new Congress must adopt new rules or readopt the old. The acquiescence will be ruptured and will end by the motion to take up new rules on January 3, 1957.

IV. The talk about the Senate being a continuing body is both misleading and irrelevant; whether or not the Senate is properly termed a continuous body as an academic matter does not determine whether a majority of the Senate of the 85th Congress may adopt its own rules unobstructed by the actions and rules of the Senate of earlier Congresses

As we have seen in points II and III, the Senate has not in the past acted as a continuous body.

It did not act as a continuous body in 1841 when it dismissed the printer chosen by the Senate of the earlier Congress; it did not act as a continuous body in 1876 when it adopted new joint rules; and it did not act as a continuous body in 1917 when it yielded to the contrary arguments of Senator Walsh and adopted the cloture rule he demanded (point II).

It does not today act as a continuous body; it wipes the slate clean on bills, resolutions, treaties, and nominations at the beginning of each new Congress (point III).

It would be circular reasoning indeed to argue that, despite these actions, the Senate is a continuous body because it has acquiesced in the carryover of rules in the past and is now bound to continue to acquiesce in the carryover of rules because it is a continuous body.

No one would deny that many Senators have talked in terms of a continuous body and that textbook writers have accepted this talk in their academic works. But the talk has been largely by those who tried to use the phrase to prevent Senate action departing from that of the Senate of an earlier Congress and who have failed in their efforts.[11] Success has crowned the efforts of those who argued against the use of the academic term "continuous body."

The essence of the matter, of course, is that the term "continuous" is an adjective resulting from the two-thirds carryover of Senators, not a cause of anything. Also, being an adjective, it can be appropriate when considering one aspect of the Senate and inappropriate when considering another. The adjective may, for example, be well used when it is simply meant to convey the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate carry over to the succeeding Congress, but, equally clear, the adjective "continuing" is inappropriate when it is intended to convey the idea of a body which wipes the slate clean in regard to bills, treaties, nominations, etc. (See point III.) But whether or not the term "continuing" is a good or a bad adjective,[12] it has not been a successful adjective when utilized against concrete proposed action. It cannot prevail over article I, section 5 of the Constitution empowering each House "to determine the rules of its proceedings" nor sanction a device by which the Senate of a previous Congress attempted to fasten its will upon the future. Whether the Senate be continuous or not for other purposes, its bylaws (rules) are void where they conflict with its charter (Constitution). If, by saying that the Senate is a continuous body, it is intended to assert that the rules of yesterday can bind the Senate of the Congress of today, the simple answer is that the first obligation of the Senate is not to its rules but to the people and the Constitution from whence its power derives. There cannot be a constitutional obligation of this House to observe rules whose purpose and effect is to deprive it of its constitutional right to make its own rules.

Actually, parliamentary bodies generally have both continuous and discontinuous aspects. The House of Representatives, as we shall show in point V, has continuous aspects and yet no one refers to it as a continuous body and no one disputes its right to adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress. By the same token, the Senate has both continuous and discontinuous aspects; its limited continuous aspects do not support the proposition that its rules carry over to the Senate of a new Congress if a majority of the Senators desire to adopt new rules.

[9] It has been suggested that the very fact that the Senate rules referred to in the above analysis provide that Senate bills, resolutions, treaties, nominations, etc., start afresh is evidence that, in the absence of these rules, Senate activities and business would not start afresh. There are several answers to this suggestion: (i) The rules codified rather than reversed existing practice. (ii) At least with respect to legislative business, starting afresh is a constitutional necessity. See note 8, supra. (iii) Senate rule XXXII provides for the continuation of legislative business from session to session of the same Congress; the existence of this rule hardly proves that the opposite would be true in the absence of rule XXXII. No more does the existence of the various rules providing that Senate business and activities start afresh in a new Congress prove that the opposite would be true in the absence of these rules.

[10] Except, of course, in 1917, when Senators Walsh and Owen refused to acquiesce until the Senate adopted the cloture rule they sought.

[11] We have already seen (point II, A) how Senator Taft and others quoted Senator Allen and his colleagues who were on the losing side in the 1841 debate over the dismissal of the printer.

[12] The passing reference to the Senate as a continuing body in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135) is much discussed and little analyzed. That case involved an investigation into the malfeasance of Attorney General Daugherty, which was begun in the 68th Congress, and the validity of a subpena to the Attorney General's brother which had been issued during the life of that Congress. Before the Supreme Court handed down its decision, the 68th Congress had expired. In considering whether the case had become moot as a result of this fact, the Supreme Court pointed out that the Senate could now revive the committee "by a motion to that effect" and therefore there was a potential need for the information sought from Daugherty. All the Court held was that the Senate had power to revive a committee started in one Congress by action taken by the Senate in the next Congress. This decision did not involve the determination that the Senate was a continuing body, since a truly continuing body would not require a new motion to continue the work of the committee. In a word, the Court disproved its own dictum.

The relevant difference between the House and the Senate, which causes the latter to be described in the textbooks as a continuous body, is the fact that two-thirds of the Senators carry over from Congress to Congress. But the fact that two-thirds of the Senators carry over to the new Congress is not relevant to the question whether the rules of the Senate of one Congress bind the Senate of the next Congress. What is relevant is the fact that one-third of the Senators do not carry over and that, in the course of a very few years, a majority of the Senators do not carry over; and in the course of a little more than a generation, no Senator carries over.

The argument for the carryover of the rules seems to come down to this: Because two-thirds of the Senators carry over, the Senate is a continuous body; because the Senate is a continuous body, the rules carry over. Striking the words "continuous body" out of this formula,[13] the argument comes down to this: Since two-thirds of the Senators carry over, the rules carry over. But this is a patent nonsequitur. It assumes that the carryover of two-thirds of the Senate always carries over a majority in favor of the rules. The infusion of one-third newly elected Senators may very well change the majority view on rules and it is this majority view that is determinative under our constitutional democracy, not who carries over. That the new one-third may change the majority on any matter is well illustrated by the shifting of the Senate from party to party over the years. The argument that the two-thirds carryover prevents the new majority from acting on the rules disenfranchises not only the newly elected one-third, but the new majority who are prevented from exercising their powers and duties to make the rules for their own work and laws for the people.

Furthermore, the initial two-thirds which carry over to the next succeeding Congress will be dissipated in later Congresses until the initial two-thirds is less than a majority and finally is gone entirely. The chain does not last forever. To say that the Senate of the 85th Congress in 1957 is the same as the Senate of the 1st Congress in 1789 because two-thirds of its members carried over to the Senate of the 2d Congress is to prefer romantic form to rational substance and dubious academic theory to practical reality.

Some Senators genuinely believe the Senate is a continuous body. Others genuinely believe that it is not, that it acts as a discontinuous body. Both have the right to their opinions. But when a descriptive term resulting from nothing more than the carryover of two-thirds of the Senators is used as a reason for preventing the majority of the body from determining the Senate's actions, then they are confusing an adjective with a reason and an effect with a cause. They are, in a word, allowing a myth to conquer and rule the Senate of the United States.[14] The Vice President should not lend his great office to that myth, harmless enough as an abstraction, but stultifying and destructive of the power of the Senate and of the entire Congress when used to trap the present in the parliamentary deadfall dug by the Senate of a dead Congress.

V. The practice of the House of Representatives in readopting its rules in each new Congress is a relevant precedent for the Senate

As we have noted many times in this brief, article I, section 5 of the Constitution provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Article I, section 1 provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The Constitution contains reference after reference to the Congress of which the Senate is a coordinate part. Where any differences in the conduct or authority of the two Houses are intended, they are set forth in express terms in the Constitution and no difference is expressed in relation to the determination of rules. We believe, therefore, that the Vice President, in arriving at his decision, can properly consider the history and practice of the House of Representatives in the adoption of its rules.

A. Brief History of House Practice on Adoption of the Rules

The House in the first Congress, as one of its first acts, adopted rules of procedure, based on those used in the Continental Congress (Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (1946), p. 13; Annals of Congress, p. 121). The House of the second Congress instituted the system, now in use, of adopting the rules of the prior House at the beginning of the session (vol. 3, Annals of Congress, p. 143). This practice apparently continued until 1860. However, for the 30-year period from 1860 to 1890, the House operated under a system of acquiescence in past rules, without necessarily formally adopting new rules at the beginning of each Congress. During this period the House operated under a resolution providing that the 1860 rules of the House should be the rules "of the present and subsequent Congresses unless otherwise ordered." This rule remained in existence until 1890 and operated as the source of authority for the rules of the House.

In 1890, there occurred perhaps the most famous example of a change in basic legislative procedure in our country. Speaker Reed ruled that at the beginning of each new Congress the House operates under general parliamentary law until new rules are adopted. By so ruling, he made it possible for the majority of the House to adopt new rules which were designed to promote effective majority exercise of legislative functions and to prevent minority obstructionism (vol. 21, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1347; vol. 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 188, 189). Since 1890, House rules have been adopted anew by each incoming Congress. The 1890 episode demonstrates that acquiescence in the carryover of rules does not prevent the majority from acting when they no longer deem such acquiescence in the public interest.

B. Current House Practice on Adoption of the Rules

Very early in the first sesion of each new Congress, on the first or second day, the ranking Member of the (old) Committee on Rules offers a resolution adopting rules for the new Congress (Galloway, Legislative Procedure in Congress (1955), p. 15). The resolution often is phrased in terms of reference to the rules of the preceding Congress, although the rules are sometimes set out in full (see vol. 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 15–24). Unless a major change is proposed, debate is nonexistent or perfunctory and the rules are adopted within a few minutes. Even when a controversial change has been proposed, the debate does not run on unduly (see adoption of new rules for the 81st and 82d Congresses at vol. 95, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10; vol. 97, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9). During the period preliminary to the adoption of the rules, the House operates under general parliamentary procedure (vol. 21, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 740–749; vol. 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 24) and under general parliamentary procedure, debate on the rules can always be effectively closed by a call for the previous question (vol. 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 24). The experience of the House within the last 50 years in adopting rules has proved conclusively that the necessity for periodic adoption every 2 years at the opening of each new Congress does not delay either the organization of the legislative body or the prompt consideration of legislative business.

C. Carryover of House Clerk

Perhaps the most striking example of a House procedure which at first glance is inconsistent with the House's views of itself as a discontinuous body is the carryover of the Clerk of the old House for the purpose of opening the new session of Congress in the new House. This procedure is described at volume 100, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 188 (see also Cannon's Procedure in House of Representatives, sec. 175). It is now authorized by statute, although, of course, that statute, like the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, is subject to change by the House in the exercise of its constitutional right to make its own rules. That statute, moreover, merely codifies a long-standing custom and House rule under which the House operated prior to the statute. The carryover procedure is not limited solely to the Clerk, for in case the Clerk is absent the duty falls upon the Sergeant at Arms and next on the Doorkeeper (Hinds' Precedents, sec. 15). This well-known and unquestioned procedure offers a further convincing demonstration that necessary procedural carryovers, acquiesced in over a long period of time, do not change the nature of a legislative body and cannot obliterate nor diminish the constitutional and moral right of a majority of an American legislative body to make its own rules.

The House also carries over certain other functions. These are listed in sections 6748–6754 of Hinds' Precedents. Hinds, in summarizing these carryover procedures, points out that, although the House becomes "functus officio" at the end of its term, in practice certain rules extend into the new Congress. But the carryover of the Clerk and of other items by acquiescence does not deprive the House of its right to make new rules at the opening of a new Congress; no more does past acquiescence of the Senate in rules carryover deprive it of the right to make new rules at the opening of a new Congress when a majority of the Senators then elected and present so decide.

* * * * *

These practices and procedures of the House of Representatives are relevant to the debate concerning the adoption of new rules by the Senate. Because the House and the Senate operate as a team in a 2-year Congress, the Senate in each Congress starts anew with respect to legislative business. So does the House. (The Senate also starts anew in each new Congress the business relating to its special functions in connection with nominations and treatymaking.) Both organize their activities on a 2-year basis.

The sole significant difference between the two legislative bodies in our Congress is the duration of the individual Senators' terms and the rotation of one-third of the number

---

[13] Here is the argument for the carryover stated as a mathematical equation: Two-thirds carryover equals continuous body, continuous body equals rules carryover, two-thirds carryover equals rules carryover.

[14] Senator O'MAHONEY summed up the argument well on December 2, 1956: "I think that the present rule which makes it impossible to apply cloture to a debate upon a rule is just absurd. The Wherry amendment, which requires a two-thirds vote of all the Members of the Senate was passed long before any Member of the Senate had the opportunity last to go before the people. Senator HAYDEN, now the dean of the Senate, was elected in 1956 and the Wherry amendment was adopted, as I recall, in 1949. So there is not a sitting Member of the Senate who has not been before the people for election since the rule was passed, and I don't believe the Senate is bound by the rule—it's not the law of the Medes and the Persians—it can be changed."

of Senators every 2 years. The historical materials demonstrate that the longer term for Senators was established in order to provide a moderating force in Congress, a body which would have stability and the opportunity via its longer term to acquire specialized knowledge in the field of foreign affairs and some independence from the pressures of politics. See Prescott, Drafting the Federal Constitution, pages 247–260. It is equally clear from the debates in the Constitutional Convention that there was a firm desire to avoid the establishment of a permanent upper House similar to the House of Lords. Thus, the Convention dismissed without even a vote a suggestion made that tenure might be for life. It rejected the proposal of a 9-year term in favor of the shorter 6-year term. The fact that the Founding Fathers desired to give a measure of stability to one branch of the Congress cannot support any artificial theories abrogating the right of new Senators in each new Congress to have an equal voice in establishing the rules of its proceedings. If the rules cannot as a matter of actual fact be changed at the will of the majority, as in the House, the Senate will have been converted into that permanent, undemocratic, and irresponsive body which it was the particular intention of the drafters of the Constitution to prevent.

VI. Majority rule is the basic principle of legislative action prescribed by the Constitution of the United States: The ruling of the Vice President should be made in the light of the fact that his decision may well determine whether constitutional majority rule is to be regained in the Senate of the United States

Majority rule has not existed in the Senate of the United States for many years. The filibuster and the threat of filibuster have prevented the majority from carrying out its will in the Senate and thus in the Congress. This is in direct opposition to the letter and spirit of the Constitution which established majority rule as the basic principle of our Government, and the basis of the enacting power of the Houses of Congress. The Supreme Court has aptly described the principle of majority rule as one "sanctioned by our governmental practices, by business procedure, and by the whole philosophy of democratic institutions." (*N. L. R. B.* v. *A. J. Tower Co.*, 329 U. S. 324, 331.)

The pervasive need for majority rule was recognized at the Constitutional Convention. Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist, No. XXII, strongly emphasized this need as follows: "To give a minority a negative upon a majority (which is always the case where more than a majority is requisite to a decision) is, in its tendency, to subject the sense of the greater number to that of the lesser. * * * If a pertinacious minority can control the opinion of a majority, respecting the best mode of conducting it, the majority, in order that something may be done, must conform to the views of the minority; and thus the sense of the smaller number will overrule that of the greater, and give a tone to national proceedings."

The authors of the Constitution prescribed majority rule as the rule for congressional action by expressly enumerating all the instances in which more than a majority vote was to be required. These special cases were limited to five. There are two-thirds requirements in connection with (1) the power of Congress to override the veto, (2) senatorial ratification of treaties, (3) the initiation by Congress of proposals to amend the Constitution, (4) the impeachment power, and (5) the expulsion of Members of Congress. In these rare instances, where it was felt necessary to make exceptions to majority rule, the Constitution expressly said so (art. I, sec. 7; art. II, sec. 2; art. V; art. I, sec. 3; art. I, sec. 5).

This detailed specification of the two-thirds requirement in connection with particular powers demonstrates that, when Congress was to operate other than by majority rule, it was so instructed by definite language in the Constitution. When a document, as carefully drafted and considered as was the Constitution, enumerates particular exceptions to a general rule, it must be concluded that no other exceptions were intended to be made. As the Supreme Court said in *Addison* v. *Holly Hill Co.* (322 U. S. 607 at 617): "Exemptions made in such detail preclude their enlargement by implication."

The framers of the Constitution gave further evidence of their intent that the majority rule should govern in all except the five specified instances by the great care with which they limited the two-thirds requirement. At least two separate instances are recorded in which the Convention rejected efforts to impose a two-thirds requirement on legislation:

1. On August 29, a motion to limit the national power over interstate and foreign commerce by a two-thirds provision was made and rejected. Mr. Sherman, in arguing against the motion, stated that, "To require more than a majority to decide a question was always embarrassing, as had been experienced in cases requiring the votes of nine States in Congress" (referring to the Congress under the Articles of Confederation).

2. On September 15 another attempt to fetter Congress' control over navigation by a two-thirds limitation was unsuccessful. (Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention of 1787.)

In addition to the rejected attempts that were made to limit the majority principle in connection with substantive powers, the motion in the Constitutional Convention to raise the quorum provision (art. I, sec. 5) from a majority to two-thirds was overwhelmingly put down. Some members of the Convention even feared that a majority was too large a number. George Morris pointed out that "the secession of a small number" might "in the national councils * * * be fatal," and this fear of his was concurred in by a number of others who spoke on the subject (Prescott, Drafting the Federal Constitution, p. 425 et seq.). Accordingly, the Congress was given power to compel the attendance of absent members so that a majority could be gathered together and the business of the Congress dispatched.

Majority rule is the constitutional measure for legislative action. As Senator Thomas, of Colorado, pointed out in debating the cloture rule in 1917, "majority rule is an essential principle in American Government" (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 33). Yet this fundamental constitutional principle can only be reestablished in the United States Senate through the route of a motion to take up rules at the opening of the Senate of a new Congress. If this route is blocked by a ruling of the Vice President or otherwise, there will be no way to carry out this basic principle of the Constitution and to implement the Supreme Court's statement that a House of Congress "may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints" (*United States* v. *Ballin*, 144 U. S. 1, 5).

VII. Conclusion

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution gives the Senate of each succeeding Congress, just as it gives the House of each succeeding Congress, the power to make its own rules and this power exists without regard to anything that the Senate of an earlier Congress may have done (point I). We have seen how the fundamental principles of democratic government require that the majority of the Senators of each new Congress have the right to act unfettered by an earlier majority (point I). We have seen how the Senate has refused to be bound by the action of the Senate of earlier Congresses whenever its own majority desired to take action (point II). We have seen how the Senate wipes the slate clean at the opening of each new Congress (point III). We have seen how the Senate has talked continuity and acted discontinuously (point IV). We have seen that the history and practice of the House of Representatives is a relevant precedent in favor of a ruling that the motion to take up rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress is in order (point V.) Finally, we have seen that this is the only method to restore the constitutional principle of majority rule to the Senate of the United States (point VI).

For all these reasons we urge the Vice President, acting as President of the Senate, to hold the motion to take up rules in order and thus to make possible a return to the constitutional principle of majority rule.

Respectfully submitted by Senators joining in motion to take up rules.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the information contained in Senate Document No. 4, under the heading "Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RULES AND THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

I

The right or privilege of extended debate in the United States Senate has been a subject of recurring controversy. Almost from the Senate's beginnings the numerous efforts to impose limitations have not been to effective.[1] The most recent positive action to curb debate which was taken in 1949 permitted, for the first time,[2] the invocation of cloture in all cases except that of a motion to take up a change in the Senate rules.[3]

Critics of this 1949 amendment attack it on the grounds that (1) it may be invoked only by affirmative vote of not less than 64 Senators; and (2) that the rules themselves remain subject to amendment by simple majority vote of those present and voting, while a motion to take up an amendment to the rules can be filibustered indefinitely.[4]

Many supporters of civil-rights measures, such as FEPC, antilynch bills, anti-poll-tax bills, claim that such measures never can be

[1] For a detailed study of the subject, see Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate, by Dr. George B. Galloway, Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64, Library of Congress. This was incorporated in the Hearings on Limitation of Debate in the Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration, October 1951, pp. 46–54; see also, Haynes, The Senate of the United States, pp. 394 et seq.

[2] The 1917 amendment to rule XXII provided for cloture in the case of any pending measure. There has been much support for the claim that this was intended to be unlimited in scope and to include, for example, a motion to take up a matter. But this contention has not had majority support in the Senate since it first was challenged in the Senate in 1919. See debates in the Senate, March 1949, preceding the overruling by the Senate of Vice President Barkley on this issue; also Haynes, The Senate of the United States, pp. 409–415.

[3] This amendment has been referred to as the Wherry-Hayden amendment. For the complete text of rule XXII in its present form see appendix I, annexed hereto.

[4] See sec. 3, rule XXII.

passed in the Senate so long as rule XXII remains in its present form, because of the opportunities the rule still affords for filibuster by a minority.[5] There have also been many other measures which have been successfully blocked, by extended debate of a minority, during the course of the Senate's history.[6]

During the hearings in October 1951 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, various proposals were considered relative to limitation of debate in the Senate beyond that now provided in Senate Rule XXII. These included proposals to achieve cloture by vote of a constitutional majority of the Senate (S. Res. 52, by Ives and Lodge); by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting (S. Res. 203, by Wherry); by majority vote of those present and voting (S. Res. 41, by MORSE and HUMPHREY); by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to limit debate in 48 hours in case of "grave national emergency," and in 15 days "on any question whatsoever," by vote of a majority of the Senators present and voting (S. Res. 105, by Lehman, Murray, Magnuson, Neely, Douglas, Humphrey, Green, Benton, Pastore, McMahon, and Kilgore).[7]

A novel angle on changing Senate rules

At these hearings where many witnesses, including a number of Senators, testified, an interesting and somewhat different approach was suggested by Walter Reuther.

"It is our contention," he told the committee, "that the Senate is not a continuing body and therefore the 82d, the Senate that sits as part of the 82d Congress cannot adopt a set of rules which binds future Senate bodies, because if the 82d session of the Senate can adopt a set of rules that go on in perpetuity, it means that they are exercising an authority which they deny to a future Senate; and they can't do that."[8] He further stated: "Now, when the Senate meets in January 1953, a Senator can stand up and say, 'Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the following set of rules for adoption to govern the work and the proceedings of this body.'"[9]

In a supplemental written statement,[10] Mr. Reuther spelled out his suggestion in detail, as follows:

"Proposal No. 1: When the new Senate of the 83d Congress convenes January 3, 1953, the following procedure can be adopted:

"(1) After the credentials have been submitted and accepted, a Senator can rise and move the adoption of the Rules of the Senate of the 83d Congress which he will then submit to the body. These rules may include a new rule XXII providing for limitation of debate by majority vote. He may state, in making his submission, that there are no existing rules of the Senate because the rules of one Senate cannot bind a succeeding Senate. Also, he may point out that, until adoption of rules, there is no committee to which his motion can be referred.

"(2) It can be expected that a point of order will be made that the motion is out of order since, it will be contended, there are existing rules which can only be amended as provided through the present rules.

"(3) The President of the Senate must rule on this point of order.

"(4) His ruling, if he rejects the point of order,[1] is subject to an appeal. Under general parliamentary rules, which would be in effect during the period prior to the adoption of specific rules, the appeal can be debated, although most parliamentary authorities limit the debate to one speech by each person.

"[1] If the Vice President should support the point of order, thereby declaring rule XXII adopted by the 81st Senate binding upon the 83d Senate, there would be the possibility of unlimited debate on the appeal, as Senator MONRONEY pointed out in the hearings October 3. Such a ruling, together with a filibuster, could prevent the majority from expressing its will. For practical purposes, the 83d Senate would be deprived of the rulemaking power assigned to it by art. I, sec. 5 of the Constitution. (See pp. 19–20 of our brief.)

"Should the minority group attempt to turn the debate on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair into a filibuster, the debate can be cut off either by a motion to lay on the table or by moving the previous question. A majority vote in favor of the motion to table would operate to affirm the Chair's ruling. A majority vote in favor of the call for the previous question would permit an immediate vote on the appeal.

"(5) If the ruling of the Chair is sustained by a majority vote, the Senate will be able to adopt rules for the Senate of the 83d Congress by regular parliamentary procedure of majority vote. If a filibuster should be attempted at this point, it can again be dealt with by the parliamentary device of moving the previous question outlined in step 4 above. It is significant that the Speaker of the House, at the time of an attempt to prevent the adoption of rules by repeated dilatory motions, ruled that he would refuse to recognize Members attempting these delaying tactics as they were interfering with the constitutional right of the House to determine its rules" (Cannon, Precedents, vol. 5, secs. 5706, 5707).

Mr. Reuther also submitted a brief in support of his claims that the Senate is not a continuing body; that its rules are not continuing, and therefore new rules may be adopted (or old rules amended, rule XXII to the contrary notwithstanding) by a simple majority vote of the Senate.[11]

Statements made by Senators Benton, Lehman, and Humphrey during the course of the hearings appear to be in agreement with these claims.[12] In the Senate report to Senate Resolution 203 [13] are found the views of Senator Benton and Senator GREEN, as follows:

"Subsection 3 of rule XXII should not be allowed to bind this Senate and all future Senates by perpetuating the right to filibuster against any motion to change any rule of the Senate. Such a right, written into the rules only in 1949 and in spite of the warning and protest of Vice President Barkley, violates the great tradition which the Senate has always followed. We deny the right of any past Senate so to tie the hands of this or any future Senate. The Senate by acquiescence accepts the rules of each previous Senate as the rules of the current Senate, but nowhere in such a procedure can there be found any excuse for the gag rule which subsection 3 imposes.

"Many compelling arguments were presented to the committee in support of majority cloture at any and all times. The hearings have been printed and we recommend their study to our colleagues in the Senate."

Various newspaper stories and articles have appeared in recent weeks stating the possibility that when the 83d Congress assembles in January 1953, some Senator will rise on the Senate floor "almost as soon as the Chamber is convened and move adoption of all the rules that governed the Senate of the preceding Congress except rule XXII."[14]

This discussion deals with a consideration of the possibilities suggested from the foregoing that may thus be presented shortly after the Senate convenes in January. Could it mean, for example, an end to filibustering in the Senate by a simple majority vote, by vote of 25 Senators present and voting?[15]

The issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body, or whether its rules are continuing, obviously is subject to being strongly colored by the issues involved in any consideration of the pros and cons of extended debate and efforts to curb it—the civil rights issue, the individual prerogatives of Senators, and the like. So far as practicable, however, this discussion will be limited to the constitutional and policy questions directed to the continuity of the Senate and of its rules, from Congress to Congress. These questions will be considered within the framework of the following issues:

I. Was the Senate established as or intended to be a continuing body? What does the Constitution provide? What did the Founding Fathers say?

II. Even if issue I is answered in the affirmative can the Senate, notwithstanding, determine it is not to have continuing rules?

III. Should the Senate so determine?

Preliminarily, this much can be stated: That precedent overwhelmingly is against the propositions (a) that the Senate is not a continuing body and (b) that its rules are not continuing.[16]

II. WAS THE SENATE ESTABLISHED AS OR INTENDED TO BE A CONTINUING BODY?

(a) *Constitutional provisions*

Article I, section 3, provides for rotation of one-third of the Senate every 2 years.[17]

---

[5] Webster defines one who filibusters as follows: "A member of a legislative or deliberative body who, in opposition to the proposed action of the majority, obstructs or prevents action by the extreme use of dilatory tactics, such as speaking merely to consume time."

[6] For an incomplete list of these measures, see hearings, op. cit. supra, note 1, at p. 60.

[7] Both the Morse and the Lehman proposals provided also for repeal of the present sec. 3, rule XXII, which would thereby make the rule itself subject to cloture.

[8] Hearings, p. 130.

[9] Hearings, p. 138.

[10] Hearings, pp. 282–285. This was entitled, "Supplemental Written Statement Setting Forth Two Proposals for Breaking Filibusters by a Simple Majority Vote."

[11] Hearings, pp. 147–160.

[12] Hearings, pp. 15, 19, 29, 264, 269.

[13] S. Rept. No. 1256, 82d Cong., p. 13. The Wherry resolution, S. Res. 203, providing for cloture by vote of two-thirds of the Senate Members present and voting, was reported from committee on March 5, 1952, but died on the Senate Calendar.

[14] Quoted from an article entitled "Battle of Filibuster: New Round Opens," New York Times magazine, September 14, 1952; see also New York Times news stories and articles dated July 16, August 12, August 14, September 3, 1952, on the same subject matter.

[15] Under art. I, sec. 5 of the Constitution, a majority of the Senate constitutes a quorum to do business.

[16] Mr. Reuther expressly conceded the precedent, which is more fully discussed hereinafter, when he stated in the hearings, op. cit. supra, note 1, at p. 131: "Now you may choose to follow precedent, but there is a fundamental difference between your willingness to follow precedent and the constitutional compulsion. We are not raising your right to choose to follow precedent. We are raising the question of constitutionality. Are you compelled? According to our research, you are not."

[17] The pertinent language is as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of 2 Senators from each State [chosen by the legislature] thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have 1 vote.*

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every

This provision has been compared with the requirement in the Constitution for biennial election of all House Members. Unlike the case of the House of Representatives, the plan of rotation every 2 years has resulted, ever since the Senate organized for the first time in 1789, in there always being more than a majority of sitting Senators. The Senate has thus always been able "to do business," since it always has had a quorum as required by the Constitution.[18]

Other provisions of the Constitution cited to establish that the Senate is an always organized body include (a) those dealing with the office of the Vice President and the President pro tempore;[19] (b) those establishing the Senate's executive functions, as distinguished from its legislative functions;[20] (c) the power of the President "on extraordinary occasions, [to] convene both Houses, or either of them * * *";[21] (d) the limiting proviso in article V (which deals with amending the Constitution), as follows: "* * * no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."[22]

---

second year; [and if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies].**"

*The part included in heavy brackets was changed by clause 1 of the 17th amendment to the Constitution, providing for popular election of Senators.

**The part included in heavy brackets was changed by clause 2 of the 17th amendment to the Constitution.

[18] Art. I, sec. 5, provides, "* * * a majority of each [House] shall constitute a quorum to do business." See Cushing, Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies, p. 272.

[19] The fourth and fifth clauses of art. I, sec. 3, are as follows:

"The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, * * *.

"The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of the President of the United States." See appendix III, attached hereto, pp. 5–10.

[20] These provisions are to be found in art. II, sec. 2, clause 2, which reads as follows: "He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments."

[21] Art. II, sec. 3. The Congressional Directory for January 1952, p. 270, lists 46 special sessions of the Senate, between 1791 and 1933. See Haynes, II, 1021–1022, op. cit. supra, note 1, for his comments, "What the Senate Can Do Alone."

[22] "The most conspicuous, and what was at one time deemed the most important feature of the Senate, is that it represents the several States of the Union as separate commonwealths, and is thus an essential part of the Federal scheme. Every State, be it as great as New York or as small as Delaware, sends two Senators, no more and no less. This arrangement was long resisted by the delegates of the larger States in the Convention of 1787, and ultimately adopted because nothing less would reassure the smaller States, who feared to be overborne by the larger. It is now the provision of the Constitution most difficult to change, for no State 'can be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent,' a consent most unlikely to be given." Bryce, The American Commonwealth, 2d edition (1891), pp. 93–94.

(B) The Intent of the Founding Fathers

The Constitutional Convention of 1787 had before it various alternatives with respect to the powers, duties, and composition of the Senate, as well as the manner of selection and tenure of office of its Members. The agreements which were finally reached on these alternatives appear in varying degrees to have a general bearing on the subject of this discussion. These details were expanded upon at length by the authors of The Federalist, Messrs. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. Typical of their comments are the following:

In The Federalist, No. 62, James Madison (or Alexander Hamilton) wrote:

"The necessity of a Senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies, to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factions leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions. Examples on this subject might be cited without number; and from proceedings within the United States, as well as from the history of other nations. But a position that will not be contradicted, need not be proved. All that need be remarked, is, that a body which is to correct this infirmity, ought itself to be free from it, and consequently ought to be less numerous. It ought, moreover, to possess great firmness, and consequently ought to hold its authority by a tenure of considerable duration. * * *

"The mutability in the public councils, arising from a rapid succession of new members, however qualified they may be, points out, in the strongest manner, the necessity of some stable institution in the Government. Every new election in the States, is found to change one-half of the Representatives. From this change of men must proceed a change of opinions; and from a change of opinions, a change of measures. But a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence, and every prospect of success. The remark is verified in private life, and becomes more just, as well as more important in national transactions. * * *

"To trace the mischievous effects of a mutable government, would fill a volume. I will hint a few only, each of which will be perceived to be a source of innumerable others.

"In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. * * * The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessings of liberty itself."

Also in the Federalist, No. 63, Madison or Hamilton wrote as follows:

"Yet however requisite a sense of national character may be, it is evident that it can never be sufficiently possessed by a numerous and changeable body. It can only be found in a number so small that a sensible degree of the praise and blame of public measures may be the portion of each individual; or in an assembly so durably invested with public trust, that the pride and consequence of its members may be sensibly incorporated with the reputation and prosperity of the community. The half-yearly Representatives of Rhode Island, would probably have been little affected in their deliberations on the iniquitous measures of that State, by arguments drawn from the light in which such measures would be viewed by foreign nations, or even by the sister States; whilst it can scarcely be doubted that if the concurrence of a selected and stable body had been necessary, a regard to national character alone would have prevented the calamities under which that misguided people is now laboring.

"I add, as a sixth defect, the want in some important cases of a due responsibility in the Government to the people, arising from that frequency of elections, which in other cases produces this responsibility. The remark will, perhaps, appear not only new, but paradoxical. It must nevertheless be acknowledged, when explained, to be as undeniable as it is important.

"Responsibility, in order to be reasonable, must be limited to objects within the power of the responsible party; and in order to be effectual, must relate to operations of that power, of which a ready and proper judgment can be formed by the constituents. The objects of government may be divided into two general classes: the one depending on measures which have singly an immediate and sensible operation; the other depending on a succession of well-chosen and well-connected measures, which have a gradual and perhaps unobserved operation. The importance of the latter description to the collective and permanent welfare of every country, needs no explanation. And yet it is evident, that an assembly elected for so short a term as to be unable to provide more than one or two links in a chain of measures, on which the general welfare may essentially depend, ought not to be answerable for the final result any more than a steward or tenant, engaged for one year, could be justly made to answer for plans or improvements which could not be accomplished in less than half a dozen years. Nor is it possible for the people to estimate the share of influence which their annual assemblies may respectively have on events resulting from the mixed transactions of several years. It is sufficiently difficult, to preserve a personal responsibility in the members of a numerous body, for such acts of the body as have an immediate, detached, and palpable operation on its constituents.

"The proper remedy for this defect must be an additional body in the legislative department, which having sufficient permanency to provide for such objects as require a continued attention, and a train of measures, may be justly and effectually answerable for the attainment of those objects.

The Federalist, No. 64, by John Jay, concerns itself with the Senate and treaty-making. The following, on the permanency of the Senate, is quoted from that paper:

"Although the absolute necessity of system, in the conduct of any business, is universally known and acknowledged, yet the high importance of it in national affairs, has not yet become sufficiently impressed on the public mind. They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly, composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession, seem not to recollect, that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects, which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances and which can only be approached and achieved by measures, which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise therefore, in convention to provide, not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political information, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence, in providing for the frequent elections of Senators in such a way, as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men: for by leaving a considerable residue

of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved."

In The Federalist, No. 59, Alexander Hamilton commented on the regulation of elections of both Senators and Representatives. He stated:

"It may be easily discerned also, that the National Government would run a much greater risk, from a power in the State legislatures over the elections of its house of representatives, than from their power of appointing the members of its senate. The Senators are to be chosen for the period of 6 years; there is to be a rotation, by which the seats of a third part of them are to be vacated, and replenished every 2 years; and no State is to be entitled to more than 2 Senators; a quorum of the body is to consist of 16 Members. The joint result of these circumstances would be, that a temporary combination of a few States, to intermit the appointment of Senators, could neither annul the existence, nor impair the activity of the body; and it is not from a general and permanent combination of the States, that we can have anything to fear. The first might proceed from sinister designs in the leading members of a few of the State legislatures; the last would suppose a fixed and rooted disaffection in the great body of the people; which will either never exist at all or will, in all probability, proceed from an experience of the inaptitude of the General Government to the advancement of their happiness in which event no good citizen could desire its continuance.

"But with regard to the Federal House of Representatives, there is intended to be a general election of Members once in 2 years. If the State legislatures were to be invested with an exclusive power of regulating these elections, every period of making them would be a delicate crisis in the national situation, which might issue in a dissolution of the Union, if the leaders of a few of the most important States should have entered into a previous conspiracy to prevent an election."

Attention is also directed to a compilation of early source material related to the division of Senators into classes. This compilation, which is annexed hereto as appendix II, was prepared by the Library of Congress and contains extracts from Elliot's Debates and other contemporaneous sources.

III. CAN THE SENATE DETERMINE IT IS NOT TO HAVE CONTINUING RULES?

(a) *The rules of the Senate*

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution provides: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. * * *" Thus, the Senate is the sole judge of its own rules,[23] and a majority at any time can change its rules or adopt new ones, whether at the beginning of a session of Congress or at any other time when it is sitting. But what about the minority's power to block a vote on this issue?

In his book, the Senate of the United States, Haynes commented on the rules of the House and the Senate, as follows:

"Since in each Congress the House is newly elected, it has been held that the rules of the House in the preceding Congress cannot without specific adoption be held binding on the new House, inasmuch as such restraint would impair the constitutional right of this House to 'determine the rules of its proceedings.' Hence at the opening of each Congress the House faces the task of adopting the rules by which it is to be governed. This may be disposed of—as it usually is—by the perfunctory adoption of the rules effective during the preceding Congress. On the other hand, this biennially recurring task may start a long and bitter struggle. Thus, at the opening of the 68th Congress (December 1923), a group of insurgents blocked the organization of the House until they had extorted a pledge that the question of radical change of certain rules should promptly be brought to open debate and decisive vote; and several changes of moment were their temporary gain from this contest."

"The Senate, on the other hand, is a continuing body.[1] It first effected its organization April 6, 1789, and there never since has been a time when the Senate as an organized body has not been available, at the President's summons or in accordance with the terms of its own adjournment, for the transaction of public business. The first rules, adopted only 10 days after the Senate came into being, have continued in force without reaffirmation until amended or abolished by the Senate. In contrast with notable revisions of the House rules,[2] the few Senate revisions have been significant of no urgent spirit of revolt or reform; they have been authorized when the accumulation of changes through a long series of years made a new codification desirable.[3] Thus, by the revision of March 26, 1806, the list grew from the 20 of 1789 to 40, the more important additions dealing with the regulation of Senate action upon nominations and treaties. The 1820 revision brought the number up to 45, but most of the new rules were of trifling importance, the changes being mostly for the purpose of more systematic arrangement and combination of the substance of the old rules. The most significant addition was rule XXX, formally bringing into the code of rules the provisions as to the choice of standing committees which had been adopted 4 years earlier. In 1868, the revision not only gathered up the modifications in the rules that had been accumulating for nearly half a century, but it embodied some provisions that evidenced the strain of the war and of the Reconstruction problems. The number of rules increased to 53, the maximum reached in any general revision. Among the more important changes were those intended to prevent general legislation under the guise of amendments to general appropriation bills (XXX); to regulate special orders (XXXI); and to provide for more careful handling of nominations (XLIII). There is an echo of the passions of the day in the elaborate provisions for calling to order any Senator who in speaking or otherwise should transgress the rules of the Senate. The last of the rules set forth the formalities attending the suspension, modification, or amendment of the rules. The revision of 1884 has met the Senate's wishes so well that in more than twoscore years no general revision of the rules has been found necessary (pp. 340–342)."[24]

(a) *The proposal to "adopt" Senate rules for the Eighty-third Congress*

The Reuther proposal contemplates that after acceptance of credentials of new Senators on January 3, 1953, a motion will be made to adopt Senate rules for the 83d Congress, such rules to "include a new rule XXII providing for limitation of debate by majority vote."

A point of order could be anticipated, on the ground that the motion is out of order, since there are existing rules governing procedure in the Senate. The Vice President must then rule on the point of order.

If he overrules the point of order, an appeal from that ruling, it is contended, would be under general parliamentary rules. These "would be in effect during the period prior to the adoption of specific rules." Moreover, while the appeal "can be debated * * * most parliamentary authorities limit the debate to one speech by each person." The "parliamentary authorities" are not cited, however.[25]

If the Vice President sustains the point of order, an appeal could be taken by proponents of the Reuther proposal. Whether under present Senate rules or under general parliamentary rules, such an appeal would be debatable.

It is possible that a secondary issue might be raised at this point, viz, the issue over whether the appeal itself is debatable under general parliamentary rules or under the Senate rules. If the Vice President sustains the point of order on the main question, he can be expected to rule on the secondary issue that the Senate rules apply while the main question is being debated. Under both Senate rule XX[26] and general parliamentary rules,[27] his ruling on the secondary issue

---

[23] There is no known judicial precedent invalidating a rule of either Senate or House. In at least one case which reached the Supreme Court the validity of a House rule (concerning quorums) was challenged, but the rule was upheld (*U. S.* v. *Ballin*, 144 U. S. 1 (1892)). The following dictum in that case, by Mr. Justice Brewer, may be of some interest, however: "[Neither House may] by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights and there must be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained."

[1] Walsh (Montana) has argued that the Senate rules are equally evanescent with those of the House. See resolution and speech of March 7, 1917. Root strongly set forth the Senate 'as a continuing body' February 15, 1915, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3793.

[2] De Alva S. Alexander, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives, chs. IX, X, and XI.

[3] Codification of Senate rules:

Date	Reference	Number of rules	Senate membership
Apr. 16–18, 1789	Senate Journal	20	20
Mar. 26, 1806	Ibid., pp. 65–66	40	34
Jan. 3, 1820	Ibid., pp. 61–69	45	46
Mar. 25, 1868	Ibid., pp. 340–47	53	68
Jan. 11, 1884	Ibid., pp. 145–60	40	76

To the original list of April 16, 1789, 2 days later by vote there was 'subjoined to the standing orders of the Senate' a twentieth rule. Senate Journal 16."

[24] The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made no change in parliamentary as distinguished from organizational, rules of either the House or the Senate, due to lack of authority of the joint committee which considered the general subject to make recommendations for such rule changes.

Although there have been six impeachment trials (for a complete list see Congressional Directory) since that of President Andrew Johnson in 1868, the Senate rules on impeachment have undergone no change since that trial. See Haynes, II, 847, op. cit., supra, note 1. With respect to joint Senate-House rules, see appendix III, document entitled, "The Senate as a Continuing Body," pp. 10–12.

[25] Hearings, p. 283.

[26] Senate rule XX reads as follows: "1. A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer. 2. The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate."

[27] Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), sec. 21, p. 78.

would not be debatable and an appeal therefrom could be voted upon and decided immediately by majority vote.

If the Vice President is sustained by the Senate as to the secondary issue, the main question would be subject to limitation of debate under Senate rule XXII only. If the Senate does not sustain the Vice President's ruling on the secondary issue, debate on the main question would proceed under general parliamentary rules.

It should be pointed out that the same secondary issue could be raised, if the Vice President overrules a point of order directed to the main question. This is true, notwithstanding the claim that parliamentary rules would automatically govern in such an event. It is doubtful that the secondary issue would be raised by opponents of the Reuther proposal for they may be expected to avoid such a showdown vote, especially since that vote would be reached without debate.

With respect to the main question, it is claimed that if debate thereon is under general parliamentary rules a filibuster "can be cut off either by a motion to lay on the table or by moving the previous question. A majority in favor of the motion to table would operate to affirm the Chair's ruling. A majority in favor of the call for the previous question would permit an immediate vote on the appeal." [28]

The conclusion is then reached that the adoption of rules "for the Senate of the 83d Congress" would then be in order, under "regular parliamentary procedure by majority vote."

Under the rules of the Senate a motion to lay on the table has the effect of shutting off debate and reaching a vote by a simple majority,[29] but under general parliamentary rules this motion does not have the same effect. On the contrary, such a motion will, if adopted, result only in postponing a matter temporarily.[30] Obviously, an appeal from a ruling of the Chair that is adverse to the Reuther proposal would not be made the subject of a motion to lay on the table, since the effect of that ruling would be to make the Senate rules (including rule XXII) continuing rules.

If, as a result of a ruling of the Chair that is favorable to the Reuther proposal, the Senate rules are held not to apply, a motion to lay on the table an appeal from that ruling would not have the effect of killing debate, since it would be made under general parliamentary rules. It would result not only in postponing the appeal, but the main question as well.[31] It is not likely, therefore, that such a motion would be resorted to, despite the suggestion in the supplemental written statement of Mr. Reuther, above referred to, of its possible use.

On the question of limitation of debate under general parliamentary rules, authorities seem to agree that a two-thirds, rather than a majority vote is required. Thus, Sturgis, in Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), pages 47–48, says:

"It is unwise to make a practice of cutting off or preventing debate and deliberation on debatable questions. This is true whether debate is cut off by recognized motions or by arbitrarily bringing questions to vote without adequate opportunity for discussion. * * * Since full discussion of all proposals is a fundamental right of Members, a motion which restricts or sets aside this right by closing or limiting debate requires a two-thirds vote."

Additional parliamentary authorities stating that a two-thirds vote is needed in order to limit debate are the following:

(1) Palmer, A New Parliamentary Manual (1901), section 241:

"The general principles of parliamentary law require that the assembly should reach its decisions on matters that come before it (1) in the order prescribed for their introduction, (2) after full debate, (3) in accordance with its established rules. And these requirements are of such importance that a bare majority should not be permitted to disregard or alter them. They should be observed unless the reasons for proceeding contrary to them are so obvious that a two-thirds majority desire to so proceed."

The author then cites six instances, including limitation or closing debate, as requiring "a two-thirds vote because they are in opposition to one or another of these three requirements."

(2) Rice's Rules of Order (1921), section 41, footnote 17, page 146:

"The two-thirds vote * * * is the rule for ordinary societies, while in the United States House of Representatives it requires only a majority vote, and in the Senate the motion is not allowed at all. But there is a growing sentiment throughout the country that the Senate should adopt a cloture rule."

(3) Plummer, Practical Lessons in Parliamentary Procedure (1921), page 50.

(4) Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), section 29, page 112.

With respect to the "previous question" rule, there are some who refer to rule VIII of the original Senate rules, adopted in 1789. That rule was invoked some four times between 1789 and 1806, when the Senate rules were revised and mention of "the previous question" was dropped from rule VIII. It has never since been in the Senate rules. There is some question whether this rule provided for cloture, however, in the way the previous question rule now operates in the House of Representatives.[32] Indeed, the House rule "was not turned into an instrument for closing debate until 1811, although it, also, adopted a rule for the previous question in 1789." [33]

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in an article appearing in the North American Review of November 1893, entitled, "Obstruction in the Senate," wrote:

"The rules of the Senate are practically unchanged from what they were at the beginning. They are the same now to all intents and purposes as when they were first adopted more than a hundred years ago. There never has been in the Senate any rule which enabled the majority to close debate or compel a vote. The previous question, which existed in the earliest years, and was abandoned in 1806, was the previous question of England and not that with which everyone is familiar today in our House of Representatives. It was not in practice a form of cloture and it is therefore correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate." [34]

IV. SHOULD THE SENATE DETERMINE ITS RULES ARE NOT CONTINUING FROM ONE CONGRESS TO ANOTHER?

(a) *Arguments pro*

Any decision the Senate might make on this question will also contemplate its effect on rule XXII and a possible end to unlimited debate in the Senate by a majority cloture rule. This would follow from the fact that if the Senate in each new Congress could determine its own rules by majority vote, rule XXII would no longer be a bar, either in its requirement of a minimum of 64 affirmative votes to end debate on all matters save a change in the rules themselves, or in its application to prevent cloture of any kind on an attempted rule change.

Another collateral but equally important consideration in the thinking of many will be the effect of the Senate's decision upon the civil-rights issue.

The pros and cons of these two issues will not be detailed here, except as they are related directly to the main question.[35]

Whether or not the Senate rejects all precedent in this instance, an examination of that precedent is indicated.

Of equal or even greater significance are the remoter consequences either assured or conjectural, of a determination that its rules are not continuing.

The brief in support of Walter Reuther's claim asserts that majority rule is the basic principle of our Constitution; and that rule XXII is violative of that principle, not only in that it fastens a requirement of a constitutional two-thirds vote to invoke cloture but also in that "in its efforts to bind future Congresses to its own standards of inaction, the Senate of the 81st Congress compounded the unconstitutionality of the rule it was adopting." [36]

The result has been "a constitutional crisis of senatorial inaction in time of national emergency * * *. Talk has been substituted for action; the duty to legislate has been frustrated * * *. It was just such a crisis of inaction that the Founding Fathers had seen in the Articles of Confederation and had

---

[28] Attention is directed to the Manual of Rules of the House of Representatives, in which is found the following statement: "The power of each House of Representatives to make its own rules may not be impaired or controlled by the rules of a preceding House. * * * Before the adoption of rules the House is governed by general parliamentary law, but the Speakers have been inclined to give weight to the precedents of the House in modifying the usual constructions of that law" (H. Doc. No. 739, 81st Cong., pp. 22–23). If similar weight were to be given to precedents of the Senate, it would by no means be certain, therefore, even if general parliamentary rules were held controlling, that the Senate rules, especially Senate rule XXII, would be disregarded, in the circumstances under discussion.

[29] See Senate rule XXII, sec. 1 (appendix I, attached hereto).

[30] See Sturgis, Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), pp. 202–204; Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), sec. 28, pp. 104–111.

[31] See Sturgis, Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), p. 204; Robert's Rules of Order, p. 110.

[32] Rule XVII of the House provides: "There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered * * *."

[33] See Manual of Rules of House of Representatives, footnote concerning House rule XVII.

[34] Quotation as cited in 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. IV, p. 3736 (Feb. 13, 1915). The conclusion that the early Senate rule concerning the "previous question," did not provide cloture was repeatedly asserted without challenge on the Senate floor during the 1949 debates which preceded adoption of the Wherry-Hayden amendment to Senate rule XXII. See, e. g., statement of Senator HOLLAND, 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. II, pp. 1784–1785; also, colloquy between Senator George and Senator MORSE, p. 2144.

[35] Many of these pros and cons are comprehensively set forth, generally, in the hearings, op. cit., supra, note 1. Some of the arguments favoring such a determination have already been stated in pt. 1, supra.

[36] Hearings, pp. 147–157. Note that Mr. Reuther testified, "Unfortunately, you can't get this kind of thing to the Supreme Court. Otherwise, there would have been a test" (p. 146).

sought to prevent in the Constitution of the United States * * *.[37]

"But rule XXII has a second fatal flaw which would demonstrate its unconstitutionality even if one were to close his eyes to the clearly expressed intent of the Constitutional Convention in favor of majority rule and the other constitutional history set forth in this brief.

"Clause 3 of rule XXII provides that cloture cannot apply to any motion to consider a change in any of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The Senate of the 81st Congress has attempted to fasten its will on all future Senates; it has attempted to perpetuate the present rule XXII for all time.

"By clause 3, a future Senate no longer can 'determine the rules of its proceedings.' The rule adopted by the 1949 Senate sought to determine them once and for all. A virtually unanamious vote is now required for any succeeding Senate to adopt its own rules, for clause 3 makes it possible for any one or two stubborn Senators to prevent a change in the rules. Rule XXII thus clearly deprives each succeeding Senate of the constitutional right to make its own procedural rules.

"The principle is well established that one Congress cannot bind future Congresses. This principle finds expression, for example, in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 6th edition, 1890, pages 146–147:

"'* * * To say that the Legislature may pass irrepealable laws is to say that it may alter the very Constitution from which it derives its authority; since, insofar as one Legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two Houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual.'

"This quotation almost seems to have been addressed to rule XXII. That rule, by allowing a small minority to prevent changes in the rule and to prevent action by the Senate under the rule, actually operates to exclude subjects of legislation from the control of the Senate. Civil-rights legislation, desired by the overwhelming majority of the Senate, cannot be acted upon by the present Senate, not because of anything the present Senate did or can do, but because of rule XXII passed by the Senate of an earlier Congress. The dead hand of the Senate of the 81st Congress excludes vital subjects of legislation from the control of all future Senates.

"Strangely enough, although the principle that one Congress cannot bind a subsequent Congress is generally accepted, the statement that the Senate is a continuing body is used to defend the perpetuation of its rules. This continuing body theory seems to be predicated upon the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate continue their terms at the expiration of each Congress; it certainly has no other or constitutional basis.

"Yet the Senate itself recognizes that it is not truly continuing. Bills must be reintroduced and repassed in the Senate of each new Congress. The Senate, even when acting in executive capacity, does not treat itself as continuing; consideration of the ratification of treaties begins de novo in each new Congress (rule XXXVII, clause 3). The Senate adjourns sine die at the end of each Congress.

"The reintroduction of bills into the Senate of each new Congress is made necessary, of course, because a majority in favor or against a given bill may be changed by the election of new Senators to some or all of the one-third of the seats whose terms expire. A bill passed by an earlier Senate could not, therefore, be considered the will of the later Senate unless a new vote were taken. But certainly the new Senate must be able to express its will on the rules of the Senate as well as concerning legislation proposed for adoption. And this is particularly true of rule XXII, which, because it determines the course of all legislation in the Senate, is far more important than any single piece of substantive legislation that the Senate might consider.

"It will be argued that the uniform practice from the time of the organization of the Second Senate until the present time has been to treat the rules of the Senate as continuing in force from Congress to Congress. But this practice would be more persuasive if it had been challenged and voted upon. Until Senator Walsh, of Montana, on March 7, 1917, argued that the rules were not in force as the Senate was not and could not legally be a continuing body, the question does not seem ever to have been directly raised (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9). Senator Walsh urged that, since there were no Senate rules in effect at the beginning of the session of Congress which was then starting, it should be possible to adopt a cloture rule directly rather than by the process of amending the rules. The Senate did not vote on Senator Walsh's proposal.[14] Certainly, general acquiescence in the practice of continuing rules from Congress to Congress is no binding precedent upon a Senate no longer prepared to acquiesce in that practice.

"[14] However, the cloture resolution which was adopted was phrased in terms of an amendment of rule XXII. Recently the Senate has recognized that it could not bind future Congresses. In section 101 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) it was provided that certain rules set out were to be the Standing Rules of the Senate and House, respectively, 'with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules.' "

"The generally admitted principle that one Congress cannot bind its successors is especially applicable to rule XXII. The suggestion that the Senate is a continuing body has neither the logical nor historical force to prevent a new Senate from exercising its constitutional right to 'determine the rules of its proceedings.' "[38]

(b) *Precedents on the continuity question*

(1) Senate Precedents

No direct precedent has been found in the form of a Senate ruling either on the question (1) whether the Senate is a continuing body, or (2) whether its rules are continuing. It is evident, however, that the overwhelming body of opinion and comment, both in the Senate and elsewhere, negatives the Reuther thesis. In the portion of the brief which he submitted and which is quoted above, the challenge to Senate continuity is shown not to be a new one.

The continuity of the Senate as a body was questioned on the Senate floor by Senator James, of Kentucky, on February 15, 1915, during a filibuster on a shipping bill. He stated:

"These rules have not been adopted by the Senate. These [sic] are merely the inheritance of a hundred years behind us, with the gathered cobwebs and dust that have come down through the centuries. It is to say that it must be done by some new change and that we cannot by ourselves submit to the majority the right to transact business."

This was challenged by Senator Root (New York), who asked: "Does anybody dispute that the Senate is a continuous body?" To which the following reply was made by Senator Thomas (Colorado):

"I dispute it, and [that it will be tested out at the beginning of the next Congress].[39] The Senate is a continuous body in the sense that two-thirds of it hold over with every Congress. We appoint new committees and assign the new Members; but there is no more reason why the rules of the Senate should continue from Congress to Congress than that our committees should continue from Congress to Congress. I do not know what others may think, but one of the efforts I shall make will be to secure a change of the rules when the new Senate shall organize."[40]

On Tuesday, March 6, 1917—the day after the convening of the 65th Congress in special session—Senator Owen obtained recognition on the Senate floor and the following colloquy ensued:

"Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish, before any action is taken that will recognize the Senate as being bound by the rules of the preceding Congress, to make the observation that while the Senate is a continuing body as an executive body it is not a continuing body as a legislative body. All the bills on the calendar died with the 64th Congress. We have no calendar. We have no legislative committees. I wish to make the point that those rules are not binding on the new Members who come into this body, who have had no opportunity to participate in the making of the rules by which they are to be bound, and that they are not bound in the legislative functions of the Senate by the rules of any preceding Congress.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a point of order?

"Mr. OWEN. I make that observation for the RECORD so that any proceedings we take here shall be by unanimous consent.

"Mr. LODGE. I wish to call attention to the fact that the committees of the Senate were continued by resolution, as usual, and those committees can only exist under the rules. The question whether the rules continue or not is a rather large one, which I have no desire to discuss at this time. I call attention to the action of the last session of Congress."[41]

On Wednesday, March 7, 1917, Senator Walsh, of Montana, submitted Senate Resolution 5, as follows:

"Resolved, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the close of the 64th Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

"Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII."[42]

On Thursday, March 8, 1917, Senator Martin, of Virginia, submitted a resolution (thereafter identified as S. Res. 5) and asked for its immediate consideration. It passed the Senate, 76–3, and became rule XXII in the form in which it remained until the Wherry-Hayden amendment thereto was adopted.[43]

---

[37] While the quoted language refers both to the Constitution and to the Founding Fathers, it is believed that the arguments here used have a more direct bearing on the issue whether the Senate should alter the precedent of the continuity of its rules than on whether the Constitution and the Founding Fathers intended to provide for such continuity. Hence, the inclusion of the material at this point rather than in an earlier part of this discussion.

[38] Hearings, pp. 156–157.

[39] Matter in brackets added.

[40] 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, p. 3792.

[41] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 3.

[42] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 9.

[43] Senator Walsh did not vote, being "necessarily absent from the city," when the Martin resolution was passed on the same day that it was submitted. Moreover, there is no record of any subsequent action on S. Res. 5 by Senator Walsh.

During the following year Senator Thomas stated to the Senate:

"I recall that in one instance I was referred * * * for information regarding the continuous character of the Senate. I availed myself of that suggestion to investigate the subject, and found the references were correct." [44]

It is altogether probable that the source material to which Senator Thomas thus referred was contained in a 1917 document "printed for the use of the Secretary of the Senate," which was entitled "The Senate as a Continuing Body," containing extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE and other information.[45] A copy is annexed hereto as appendix III.

(2) Judicial Precedents

The question whether the Senate is a continuing body and, in that respect, is unlike the House of Representatives, which cannot continue beyond the period of a single Congress, was considered by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135 (1926)).

The question before the court in that case was whether the Attorney General's brother was within his legal rights when he refused to appear, although subpenaed, as a witness before a Senate investigating committee.

The following is quoted from the unanimous decision of the Court in that case (pp. 180–182):

"* * * We conclude that the investigation was ordered for a legitimate object; that the witness wrongfully refused to appear and testify before the committee and was lawfully attached; that the Senate is entitled to have him give testimony pertinent to the inquiry, either at its bar or before the committee; and that the district court erred in discharging him from custody under the attachment.

"Another question has arisen which should be noticed. It is whether the case has become moot. The investigation was ordered and the committee appointed during the Sixty-eighth Congress. That Congress expired March 4, 1925. The resolution ordering the investigation in terms limited the committee's authority to the period of the Sixty-eighth Congress; but this apparently was changed by a later and amendatory resolution authorizing the committee to sit at such times and places as it might deem advisable or necessary.[21] It is said in Jefferson's Manual: [22] "Neither House can continue any portion of itself in any parliamentary function beyond the end of the session without the consent of the other two branches. When done, it is by a bill constituting them commissioners for the particular purpose." But the context shows that the reference is to the two houses of Parliament when adjourned by prorogation or dissolution by the King. The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives whose members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it cannot well be the same with the Senate, which is a continuing body whose members are elected for a term of six years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation."

"[21] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Congress, 1st session, p. 4126.

"[22] Senate Rules and Manual, 1925, p. 303."

"Mr. Hinds in his collection of precedents says: 'The Senate, as a continuing body, may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of a Congress'; [23] and, after quoting the above statement from Jefferson's Manual, he says: 'The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of a Congress.' [24] So far as we are advised the select committee having this investigation in charge has neither made a final report nor been discharged; nor has it been continued by an affirmative order. Apprently its activities have been suspended pending the decision of this case. But, be this as it may, it is certain that the committee may be continued or revived now by motion to that effect, and, if continued or revived, will have all its original powers.[25] This being so, and the Senate being a continuing body, the case cannot be said to have become moot in the ordinary sense. * * *" [46]

"[23] Vol. 4, sec. 4544.

"[24] Vol. 4, sec. 4545.

"[25] Hines' Precedents, Vol. 4, secs. 4396, 4400, 4404, 4405."

The following is quoted from *Robertson* v. *State* (109 Indiana 79, 10 N. E. 582 (1887)):

"In response to much that has been said upon the subject in argument, I feel quite assured that the senate of this State is not, like the Senate of the United States, a continuous body. In the Senate of the United States a majority constitutes a quorum and as there is always more than a quorum of qualified Senators holding seats in that body, its organized existence is necessarily continuous. But in the senate of this State two-thirds of its members are necessary to make a quorum. As one-half of its members go out of office at the end of each legislative term of two years—that is to say, on the day after each general and biennial election—it becomes, at the end of each such legislative term a disorganized body; and, as the officers of the senate comprise an essential part of its organization, it necessarily results that the terms of such officers expire when the body becomes disorganized for want of a quorum.[47]

(c) *Senate officers and continuity* [48]

Because the Senate has been held to be a continuing body, its officers have no stated term of office, but serve until their successors are selected. On March 24, 1879, while the Senate was in process of replacing some of its officers with others, along purely political lines, Senator Anthony observed:

"Unlike the House of Representatives, which expires every two years and is renewable fresh from the people, the Senate never dies. The same which it was when it met, in 1789, it is now, and has held continuous and unbroken existence ever since. Its officers have naturally partaken of its permanent character. Its elective officers are chosen, not for a definite period, but during the pleasure of the Senate.[49]

(d) *Senate committees and continuity*

Hitherto the House of Representatives has been at a distinct disadvantage over the Senate because its committees end with each Congress. The Senate can and does order investigations, interim reports, final report and recommendations by its committees, without reference to the ending of one Congress or the beginning of another. This procedure is not affected even where there is some change in the composition of the committee membership.

Under Senate rule XXV, all standing committees continue until their successors are appointed.[50] The duration of select committees in the Senate depends on the terms of the resolutions under which their power is derived.

"In the first 40 years after the adoption of the Constitution, the House conducted 7 or 8 times as many investigations as did the Senate. In fact, down to the last quarter of the 19th century most of the investigations of large consequence were instituted by the House. But increasingly, beginning with the last quarter of the 19th century, the House has seemed to be relinquishing such activities, while the Senate has been greatly expanding its exercise of the investigative function, in the number, variety, and importance of its inquiries. The explanation of this remarkable shift is to be found in the contrast between the rules and procedure of the House and of the Senate. * * * For the future, the decision in McGrain v. Daugherty has materially broadened the scope of congressional inquiries and the grand-jury investigative function is likely to be increasingly used by the Senate, particularly as to the Executive and the 'Independent Agencies.'" [51]

Obviously, what Haynes wrote in 1938 is equally applicable today. To destroy Senate continuity would, in effect, reverse the precedent in McGrain v. Daugherty, of continuity as it applies to Senate committees.

(e) *The Senate as an executive body*

The constitutional prerogatives of the Senate in treatymaking and in giving or withholding advice and consent to certain Presidential appointments have already been referred to. Indeed, the many special sessions of the Senate, as distinguished from special sessions of the Congress heretofore convened, were for executive, rather than legislative purposes.[52]

The Senate "does not change all at once, as do bodies created by a single popular election, but undergoes an increasing process of gradual change and renewal, like a lake into which streams bring fresh water to replace that which the issuing river carries out. This provision was designed to give the Senate that permanency of composition which might qualify it to conduct or control the foreign policy of the Nation." [53]

Woodrow Wilson wrote: "* * * The continuity of the Government lies in the keeping of the Senate more than in the keeping of the Executive, even in respect of matters which are the especial prerogative of the Presidential office." [54]

Attention is directed to Senate Rule XXXVII, section 2, as follows:

"Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or subsequent session of the

[44] 57 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 437, December 14, 1918.

[45] This document was prepared by the Legislative Reference Division, Library of Congress, and printed as a Senate print, 65th Cong., special session.

[46] See also, discussion of the Senate as a permanent body, in a leading article entitled, "The Smith-Vare Case and Its Relation to Senate Procedure," by Charles C. Tansill, National University Law Review, May 1928, pp. 29–38.

[47] See also, *State* v. *Rogers* (56 N. J. Law 480, 622) (1894).

[48] For discussion of applicable constitutional provisions, see supra, pt. II (a).

[49] 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 147. See, to the same effect, This Country of Ours, p. 51, by Benjamin Harrison, former United States President and United States Senator; Haynes, op. cit. supra, note 1, p. 261; appendix III, attached hereto.

[50] Compare House Rule X on standing committees. It has no comparable provision, and all committees expire with each Congress.

[51] Haynes, op. cit. supra, note 1, pp. 551–553.

[52] See footnote 21 of this discussion. These special Senate sessions were all held prior to enactment in 1933 of the 20th amendment to the Constitution which, among other things, abolished the so-called lame-duck sessions of the Congress and which advanced the commencement of the Presidential term of office from March 4 to January 20.

[53] The American Commonwealth, by James Bryce (1891 edition), p. 101. At this point Bryce cited The Federalist, No. 61, and Alexander Hamilton's argument in the New York State Convention (Elliot's Debates, vol. II, p. 307).

[54] Constitutional Government in the United States, p. 127.

same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon."

Note that even under this rule, unless it is withdrawn by the President or fails from lapse of time, a treaty continues to be live matter and, as such, pending in the Senate. It need not be resubmitted with commencement of a new Congress.[55] On the other hand, nominations not disposed of in the Senate die with the Congress in which they are submitted.[56]

APPENDIX I

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE XXII

Precedence of motions

1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

To take a recess.

To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

To lay on the table.

To postpone indefinitely.

To postpone to a day certain.

To commit.

To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate (Jefferson's Manual, Sec. XXXII).

2.[1] Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

APPENDIX II

SOURCE MATERIAL RELATED TO THE DIVISION OF SENATORS INTO CLASSES[1]

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION (1777)

Art. 5. For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each state shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each state, to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

No state shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor by more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit, receives any salary, fees, or emolument of any kind (Elliot, Debates on the Federal Constitution, 2d edition, Philadelphia, 1907, vol. 1, p. 80. Hereafter cited as Elliot).

MR. CHARLES PINCKNEY'S DRAFT OF A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

"• • •

"Art. IV. The Senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates, which house, immediately after their meeting, shall choose by ballot ____ senators from among the citizens and residents of New Hampshire; ____ from among those of Massachusetts; ____ from among those of Rhode Island; ____ from among those of Connecticut; ____ from among those of New York; ____ from among those of New Jersey; ____ from among those of Pennsylvania; ____ from among those of Delaware; ____ from among those of Maryland; ____ from among those of Virginia; ____ from among those of North Carolina; ____ from among those of South Carolina; and ____ from among those of Georgia. The senators chosen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, shall form one class; those from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, one class; and those from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, one class. The House of Delegates shall number these classes one, two, and three, and fix the times of their service by lot. The first class shall serve for ____ years, the second for ____ years, and the third for ____ years. As their times of service expire, the House of Delegates shall fill them up by elections for ____ years, and they shall fill all vacancies that arise from death, or resignation, for the time of service remaining of the members so dying or resigning. Each senator shall be ____ years of age, at least; shall have been a citizen of the United States four years before his election; and shall be a resident of the state he is chosen from. The Senate shall choose its own officers" (1 Elliot 145–146).

Monday, June 25, 1787.

It was moved and seconded to add, after the words "seven years," in the 4th resolution, the words "to go out in fixed proportions."

It was moved and seconded to insert the word "six," instead of "seven."

It was moved and seconded to amend the clause so as to read, "for four years, one-fourth to go out annually."

No determination being taken on the three last motions, it was moved and seconded to erase the word "seven" from the 3d clause of the 4th resolution; which passed in the affirmative (1 Elliot 188).

Tuesday, June 26, 1787.

It was moved and seconded to amend the 3d clause of the 4th resolution, reported from the committee, so as to read as follows, namely, "for nine years, one-third to go out triennially"; which passed in the negative.

Yeas: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, 3. Nays: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, 8.

It was then moved and seconded to amend the 3d clause of the 4th resolution so as to read, "for six years, one-third to go out biennially."

On the question to agree to the amendment, it passed in the affirmative.

Yeas: Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, 7. Nays: New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, 4.

(1 Elliot 189.)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVENTION

(Referred, on the twenty-third and twenty-sixth of July 1787, to a committee of detail (Messrs. Rutledge, Randolph, Gorham, Ellsworth, and Wilson), for the purpose of reporting a constitution)

Journals, June 25:

"IV. *Resolved,* That the members of the second branch of the legislature of the United States ought to be chosen by the individual legislatures; to be of the age of thirty years at least; to hold their offices for six years, one-third to go out biennially; to receive a compensation for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to, and incapable of holding, any office under the authority of the United States (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second branch), during the term for which they are elected, and for one year thereafter. • • •"

(1 Elliot 221).

DRAFT OF A CONSTITUTION

(Reported by the Committee of Five, August 6, 1787)

(One copy of this printed draft is among the papers deposited by President Washington in the Department of State; another copy is among the papers of Mr. Brearly, furnished by General Bloomfield.)

"Art. V. Sec. 2. The senators shall be chosen for six years; but immediately after the first election, they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be, numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that a third part of the members may be chosen every second year" (1 Elliot 225).

REVISED DRAFT OF THE CONSTITUTION

(Reported September 12, 1787, by the Committee on Revision)

"• • •

"Art. I. Sec. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years and each senator shall have one vote.

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided, as equally as may be, into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the

---

[55] For an extreme illustration, consider the Isle of Pines Treaty. It was continuously before the Senate from March 3, 1904, until its ratification on March 13, 1925. See Haynes, op. cit., supra, note 1, p. 626.

[56] Senate Rule XXXVIII, sec. 6.

[1] As amended, Senate Journal 173, 81st Cong., 1st sess., March 17, 1949.

[1] Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, November 17, 1952.

expiration of the fourth year; and the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that one-third may be chosen every second year. And if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any state, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature * * *" (1 Elliot 298).

THE NOTES OF THE SECRET DEBATES OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787

(Taken by the Late Honorable Robert Yates, Chief Justice of the State of New York, and one of the delegates from that state to the said convention)

(Copied from the original manuscript of Chief Justice Yates, by John Lansing, Jun., and certified to be a true copy)

Saturday, June 2, 1787.

* * * * *

The Convention went into committee of the whole.

Mr. Wilson moved that the states should be divided into districts, consisting of one or more states, and each district to elect a number of senators to form the second branch of the national legislature—the senators be elected, and a certain proportion to be annually dismissed—avowedly on the plan of the New York Senate. Question put—rejected. * * * (1 Elliot 393).

Monday, June 25, 1787.

Mr. Gorham proposed that the senators be classed, and to remain four years in office; otherwise great inconveniences may arise, if a dissolution should take place at once.

Governor RANDOLPH. This body must act with firmness. They may possibly always sit—perhaps to aid the executive. The state governments will always attempt to counteract the general government. They ought to go out in classes. Therefore I move that they go out of office in fixed proportions of time, instead of the words "seven years."

Question on Governor Randolph's motion—7 ayes, 3 noes, 1 divided.

Do. for five years—5 ayes, 5 noes, 1 divided.

The question for four years was not put; and the Convention adjourned till tomorrow morning.

Tuesday, June 26, 1787.

Met pursuant to adjournment. Present, eleven states.

Mr. GORHAM. My motion for four years' continuance was not put yesterday. I am still of opinion that classes will be necessary, but I would alter the time. I therefore move that the senators be elected for six years, and that the rotation be triennial.

* * * * *

Mr. Read moved that the term of "nine years" be inserted, in triennial rotation.

* * * * *

Mr. SHERMAN. The two objects of this body are permanency, and safety to those who are to be governed. A bad government is the worse for being long. Frequent elections give security, and even permanency. In Connecticut we have existed one hundred and thirty-two years under an annual government; and as long as a man behaves himself well, he is never turned out of office. Four years to the Senate is quite sufficient, when you add to it the rotation proposed.

* * * * *

Mr. WILSON. The motion is now for nine years, and a triennial rotation. Every nation attends to its foreign intercourse; to support its commerce; to prevent foreign contempt; and to make war and peace. Our Senate will be possessed of these powers, and therefore ought to be dignified and permanent. What is the reason that Great Britain does not enter into a commercial treaty with us? Because Congress has not the power to enforce its observance. But give them those powers, and give them the stability proposed by the motion, and they will have more permanency than a monarchial government. The great objection of many is, that this duration would give birth to views inconsistent with the interests of the Union. This can have no weight, if the triennial rotation is adopted; and this plan may possibly tend to conciliate the minds of the members of the Convention on this subject, which have varied more than on any other question.

The question was then put on Mr. Read's motion, and lost—8 noes, 3 ayes.

The question on five years, and a biennial rotation, was carried—7 ayes, 4 noes. New York in the minority (1 Elliot 447–451).

DEBATES IN THE FEDERAL CONVENTION

Tuesday, May 29, 1787.

Mr. Charles Pinckney laid before the House the draft of a Federal Government which he had prepared, to be agreed upon between the free and independent States of America:

Plan of a Federal Constitution

Art. IV: The senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates; which House, immediately after their meeting, shall choose by ballot ____ senators from among the citizens and residents of New Hampshire; ____ from among those of Massachusetts; ____ from among those of Rhode Island; ____ from among those of Connecticut; ____ from among those of New York; ____ from among those of New Jersey; ____ from among those of Pennsylvania; ____ from among those of Delaware; ____ from among those of Maryland; ____ from among those of Virginia; ____ from among those of North Carolina; ____ from among those of South Carolina; and ____ from among those of Georgia. The senators chosen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, shall form one class; those from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, one class; and those from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, one class. The House of Delegates shall number these classes, 1, 2, and 3; and fix the times of their service by lot. The first class shall serve for ____ years; the second for ____ years; and the third for ____ years. As their times of service expire, the House of Delegates shall fill them up by elections for ____ years; and they shall fill all vacancies that arise from death or resignation, for the time of service remaining of the Members so dying or resigning. Each senator shall be ____ years of age at least; and shall have been a citizen of the United States for four years before his election; and shall be a resident of the state he is chosen from. The Senate shall choose its own officers (5 Elliot 129).

Monday, June 25, 1787.

The clause, that the second branch hold their offices for a term of "seven years," being considered—

Mr. Gorham suggests a term of "four years," one-fourth to be elected every year.

Mr. Randolph supported the idea of rotation, as favorable to the wisdom and stability of the corps; which might possibly be always sitting, and aiding the executive, and moves, after "seven years," to add, "to go out in fixed proportion;" which was agreed to.

Mr. Williamson suggests "six years," as more convenient for rotation than seven years.

Mr. Sherman seconds him.

Mr. Read proposed that they should hold their offices "during good behavior." Mr. R. Morris seconds him.

General Pinckney proposed "four years." A longer time would fix them at the seat of Government. They would acquire an interest there, perhaps transfer their property, and lose sight of the states they represent. Under these circumstances, the distant states would labor under great disadvantages.

Mr. Sherman moved to strike out "seven years," in order to take questions on the several propositions.

On the question to strike out "seven,"—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, ay, 7; Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, no, 3; Maryland, divided.

On the question to insert "six years," which failed, five states being, ay; five, no; and one, divided—

Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, ay, 5; Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

On motion to adjourn, the votes were, five for, five against it; and one divided—

Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, ay, 5; Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

On the question for "five years," it was lost—

Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, ay 5; Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

Adjourned (5 Elliot 241).

Tuesday, June 26, 1787.

In Convention: The duration of the second branch being under consideration—

Mr. Gorham moved to fill the blank with "six years," one third of the members to go out every second year.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

General Pinckney opposed six years, in favor of four years. The states, he said, had different interests. Those of the Southern, and of South Carolina in particular, were different from the Northern. If the senators should be appointed for a long term, they would settle in the state where they exercised their functions, and would in a little time be rather the representative of that, than of the state appointing them.

Mr. Read moved that the term be 9 years. This would admit of a very convenient rotation, one-third going out triennially. He would still prefer "during good behavior;" but being little supported in that idea, he was willing to take the longest term that could be obtained.

Mr. Broom seconded the motion.

Mr. MADISON. In order to judge of the form to be given to this institution, it will be proper to take a view of the ends to be served by it. These were—first, to protect the people against their rulers; secondly, to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led. A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plant of government most likely to secure their happiness, would first be aware, that those charged with the public happiness might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be, to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. In this they would be governed by the same prudence which has prevailed in organizing the subordinate departments of government, where all business liable to abuses is made to pass through separate hands, the one being a check on the other. It would next occur to such a people, that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want of information as to their true interest; and that men chosen for a short term, and employed but a small portion of that in public affairs, might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest, that the government be so constituted as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests (5 Elliot 242).

Mr. WILSON. * * * The true reason why Great Britain has not yet listened to a commercial treaty with us has been, because she had no confidence in the stability or efficacy of our Government. Nine years, with a rotation, will provide these desirable qualities; and give our Government an advantage in this respect over monarchy itself. In a monarchy, much must always depend on the

temper of the man. In such a body, the personal character will be lost in the political. He would add another observation. The popular objection against appointing any public body for a long term, was, that it might, by gradual encroachments, prolong itself, first into a body for life, and finally become a hereditary one. It would be a satisfactory answer to this objection, that, as one-third would go out triennially, there would be always three divisions holding their places from unequal times, and consequently acting under the influence of different views and different impulses.

On the question for nine years, one-third to go out triennially—

Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, ay, 3; Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 8.

On the question for six years, one-third to go out biennally,—

Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, ay, 7; New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 4 (5 Elliot 245).

Monday, July 2, 1787.

Mr. Pinckney thought an equality of votes in the second branch inadmissible * * * Congress have failed in almost every effort for an amendment of the federal system. Nothing has prevented a dissolution of it but the appointment of this Convention; and he could not express his alarms for the consequence of such an event. He read his motion to form the states into classes, with an apportionment of Senators among them. (See article 4 of his plan, ante, p. 129.)

Mr. Gouverneur Morris thought a committee advisable, as the Convention had been equally divided. He had a stronger reason also. The mode of appointing the second branch tended, he was sure, to defeat the object of it. What is this object? To check the precipitation, changeableness, and excesses, of the first branch. Every man of observation had seen in the democratic branches of the state legislatures, precipitation—in Congress, changeableness—in every department, excesses against personal liberty, private property, and personal safety. What qualities are necessary to constitute a check in this case? Abilities and virtue are equally necessary in both branches. Something more, then, is now wanted. In the first place the checking branch must have a personal interest in checking the other branch. One interest must be opposed to another interest. Vices, as they exist, must be turned against each other * * * In the fourth place, an independence for life involves the necessary permanency. If we change our measures, nobody will trust us; and how avoid a change of measures, but by avoiding a change of men? (5 Elliot 270–271).

Thursday, July 26, 1787.

* * * * *

The proceedings since Monday last were unanimously referred to the committee of detail; and the Convention then unanimously adjourned till Monday, August 6th, that the committee of detail might have time to prepare and report the Constitution. The whole resolutions, as referred, are as follows:

* * * * *

4. *Resolved*, That the members of the second branch of the Legislature of the United States ought to be chosen by the individual legislatures; to be of the age of thirty years at least; to hold their offices for six years, one-third to go out biennially; to receive a compensation for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to, and incapable of holding, any office under the authority of the United States (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second branch) during the term for which they are elected, and for one year thereafter (5 Elliot 374–375).

Monday, August 6, 1787.

Mr. Rutledge delivered in the report of the committee of detail as follows—a printed copy being at the same time furnished to each member—

* * * * *

Art. V, Sec. 1. The Senate of the United States shall be chosen by legislatures of the several States. Each legislature shall choose two members. Vacancies may be supplied by the executive until the next meeting of the legislature. Each member shall have one vote.

Art. V, sec. 2. The Senators shall be chosen for six years; but immediately after the first election they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that a third part of the members may be chosen every second year (5 Elliot 376–377).

DEBATES OF THE CONVENTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Tuesday, June 24, 1788.

Convention assembled; and being resolved into a committee, the 1st paragraph of the 3d section of the 1st article was read; when Mr. G. Livingston rose and addressed the Chair.

* * * I therefore move that the committee adopt the following resolution, as an amendment to this clause:

"*Resolved*, That no person shall be eligible as a Senator for more than six years in any term of twelve years, and that it shall be in the power of the legislatures of the several States to recall their Senators, or either of them, and to elect others in their stead, to serve for the remainder of the time for which such Senator or Senators, so recalled, were appointed."

Hon. Mr. LANSING. * * * Now, if it was the design of the plan to make the Senate a kind of bulwark to the independence of the States, and a check to the encroachments of the General Government, certainly the Members of this body ought to be peculiarly under the control, and in strict subordination to the State who delegated them. In proportion to their want of dependence, they will lose their respect for the power from whom they receive their existence, and, consequently, will disregard the great object for which they are instituted. The idea of rotation has been taken from the articles of the old Confederation. It has thus far, in my opinion, operated with great advantage. The power of recall, too, has been an excellent check, though it has, in fact, never been exercised. The thing is of so delicate a nature, that few men will step forward to move a recall, unless there is some strong ground for it (2 Elliot 286, 289).

Mr. R. R. LIVINGSTON. The amendment appears to have in view two objects—that a rotation shall be established in the Senate, and that its Members shall be subject to recall by the State legislatures. It is not contended that six years are too long a time for the Senators to remain in office. Indeed, this cannot be objected to, when the purposes for which this body is instituted are considered. They are to form treaties with foreign nations. This requires a comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics, and an extensive acquaintance with characters, whom, in this capacity, they have to negotiate with, together with such an intimate conception of our best interests, relative to foreign powers, as can only be derived from much experience in this business. What singular policy, to cut off the hand which has just qualified itself for action. But, says the gentleman, as they are the representatives of the States, those States have a control. Will this principle hold good? The Members of the lower House are the representatives of the people. Have the people any power to recall them? What would be the tendency of the power contended for? Clearly this: The State legislatures, being frequently subject to factitious and irregular passions, may be unjustly disaffected and discontented with their delegates; and a Senator may be appointed one day and recalled the next. This would be a source of endless confusion. The Senators are indeed designed to represent the State governments; but they are also the representatives of the United States, and are not to consult the interest of any one State alone, but that of the Union.

* * * * *

But to return: The people are the best judges who ought to represent them. To dictate and control them, to tell them whom they shall not elect, is to abridge their natural rights. This rotation is an absurd species of ostracism—a mode of proscribing eminent merit, and banishing from stations of trust those who have filled them with the greatest faithfulness. Besides, it takes away the strongest stimulus to public virtue—the hope of honors and rewards. The acquisition of abilities is hardly worth the trouble, unless one is to enjoy the satisfaction of employing them for the good of one's country. We all know that experience is indispensably necessary to good government. Shall we, then, drive experience into obscurity? I repeat that this is an absolute abridgment of the people's rights.

As to the Senate's rendering themselves perpetual, or establishing such a power as to prevent their being removed, it appears to me chimerical. Can they make interest with their legislatures, who are themselves varying every year, sufficient for such a purpose? Can we suppose two senators will be able to corrupt the whole legislature of this state? The idea, I say, is chimerical. The thing is impossible.

Hon. Mr. LANSING. The objects of this amendment are, first, to place the senators in such a situation of dependence on their several state legislatures, as will induce them to pay a constant regard to the good of their constituents; secondly, to oblige them to return, at certain periods, to their fellow-citizens, that, by mingling with the people, they may recover that knowledge of their interests, and revive that sympathy with their feelings, which power and an exalted station are too apt to efface from the minds of rulers.

It has been urged that the senators should be acquainted with the interests of the states in relation to each other, and to foreign powers, and that they should remain in office, in order to acquire extensive political information. If these were the only objects, the argument would extend to the rendering their dignity perpetual—an idea which probably none of the gentlemen will consent to; but, if one third of the senators go out every two years, cannot those who succeed them acquire information from the remaining members; with respect to the relative interests of the states? It is to be presumed that the Senate will be composed of the best informed men, and that no such men will be incapable of comprehending the interests of the states either singly or collectively. If it be the design of representation that the sense and spirit of the people's interests and feelings should be carried into the government, it is obvious that this design can be accomplished in no way so perfectly as by obliging our rulers, at certain periods, to relinquish their offices and rank. The people cannot be represented by men who are perpetually separated from them (2 Elliot 291–294).

Hon. Mr. Hamilton. * * * The zeal for liberty became predominant and excessive. In forming our Confederation, this passion alone seemed to actuate us, and we appear to have had no other view than to secure ourselves from despotism. The object certainly was a valuable one, and deserved our

utmost attention; but, sir, there is another object, equally important, and which our enthusiasm rendered us little capable of regarding: I mean a principle of strength and stability in the organization of our government, and vigor in its operations. This purpose could never be accomplished but by the establishment of some select body, formed particularly upon this principle. There are few positions more demonstrable than that there should be, in every republic, some permanent body to correct the prejudices, check the intemperate passions, and regulate the fluctuations, of a popular assembly. It is evident that a body instituted for these purposes must be so formed as to exclude, as much as possible, from its own character, those infirmities, and that mutability, which it is designed to remedy. It is, therefore, necessary that it should be small, that it should hold its authority during a considerable period, and that it should have such an independence in the exercise of its powers, as will divest it, as much as possible, of local prejudices. It should be so formed as to be the centre of political knowledge, to pursue always a steady line of conduct, and to reduce every irregular propensity to system. Without this establishment, we may make experiments without end, but shall never have an efficient government.

* * * * *

Sir, the main design of the Convention, in forming the Senate, was to prevent fluctuations and cabals. With this view, they made that body small, and to exist for a considerable period. Have they executed this design too far? The senators are to serve six years. This is only two years longer than the senators of this state hold their places. One third of the members are to go out every two years; and in six, the whole body will be changed. Prior to the revolution, the representatives in the several colonies were elected for different periods—for three years, for seven years, &c. Were those bodies ever considered as incapable of representing the people, or as too independent of them? There is one circumstance which will have a tendency to increase the dependence of the senators on the states, in proportion to the duration of their appointments. As the state legislatures are in continual fluctuation, the senator will have more attachments to form, and consequently a greater difficulty of maintaining his place, than one of shorter duration. He will, therefore, be more cautious and industrious to suit his conduct to the wishes of his constituents (2 Elliot 300–306).

The Hon. Mr. HAMILTON. If the Members of Congress are too dependent on the State legislatures, they will be eternally forming secret combinations from local views. This is reasoning from the plainest principles. Their interest is interwoven with their dependence, and they will necessarily yield to the impression of their situation. Those who have been in Congress have seen these operations. The first question has been, How will such a measure affect my constituents, and consequently, how will the part I take affect my reelection? This consideration may be in some degree proper; but to be dependent from day to day, and to have the idea perpetually present, would be the source of numerous evils. Six years, sir, is a period short enough for a proper degree of dependence. Let us consider the peculiar state of this body, and see under what impressions they will act. One-third of them are to go out at the end of two years, two-thirds at four years, and the whole at six years. When one year is elapsed, there is a number who are to hold their places for one year, others for three, and others for five years. Thus there will not only be a constant and frequent change of Members, but there will be some whose office is near the point of expiration, and who, from this circumstance, will have a lively sense of their dependence. The biennial change of Members is an excellent invention for increasing the difficulty of combination. Any scheme of usurpation will lose, every two years a number of its oldest advocates, and their places will be supplied by an equal number of new, unaccommodating, and virtuous men. When two principles are equally important, we ought, if possible, to reconcile them, and sacrifice neither. We think that safety and permanency in this government are completely reconcilable. The State governments will have, from the causes I have described, a sufficient influence over the Senate, without the check for which the gentlemen contend (2 Elliot 318–319).

LUTHER MARTIN'S LETTER ON THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787

"The Senate, sir, is so constituted that they are not only to compose one branch of the legislature, but, by the second section of the second article, they are to compose a privy council for the President. Hence, it will be necessary that they should be, in a great measure, a permanent body, constantly residing at the seat of government. Seventy years are esteemed for the life of a man; it can hardly be supposed that a Senator, especially from the States remote from the seat of empire, will accept of an appointment which must estrange him for six years from his State, without giving up to a great degree, his prospects in his own State. If he has a family, he will take his family with him to the place where the Government shall be fixed; that will become his home; and there is every reason to expect that his future views and prospects will centre in the favors and emoluments of the general government, or of the government of that State where the seat of empire is established. In either case, he is lost to his own State" (1 Elliot 361).

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXII

Thirdly. Another defect to be supplied by a senate lies in a want of due acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation. It is not possible that an assembly of men called for the most part from pursuits of a private nature, continued in appointment for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs, and the comprehensive interests of their country, should, if left wholly to themselves, escape a variety of important errors in the exercise of their legislative trust. It may be affirmed, on the best grounds, that no small share of the present embarrassments of America is to be charged on the blunders of our governments; and that these have proceeded from the heads rather than the hearts of most of the authors of them. What indeed are all the repealing, explaining, and amending laws, which fill and disgrace our voluminous codes, but so many monuments of deficient wisdom; so many impeachments exhibited by each succeeding against each preceding session; so many admonitions to the people, of the value of those aids which may be expected from a well-constituted senate?

A good government implies two things; first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be best attained. Some governments are deficient in both these qualities; most governments are deficient in the first. I scruple not to assert, that in American governments too little attention has been paid to the last. The federal Constitution avoids this error; and what merits particular notice, it provides for the last in a mode which increases the security for the first.

Fourthly. The mutability in the public councils arising from a rapid succession of new members, however qualified they may be, points out, in the strongest manner, the necessity of some stable institution in the government. Every new election in the States is found to change one-half of the representatives. From this change of men must proceed a change of opinions; and from a change of opinions, a change of measures. But a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence and every prospect of success. The remark is verified in private life, and becomes more just, as well as more important, in national transactions.

To trace the mischievous effects of a mutable government, would fill a volume. I will hint a few only, each of which will be perceived to be a source of innumerable others.

In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. An individual who is observed to be inconstant to his plans, or perhaps to carry on his affairs without any plan at all, is marked at once, by all prudent people, as a speedy victim to his own unsteadiness and folly. His more friendly neighbors may pity him, but all will decline to connect their fortunes with his; and not a few will seize the opportunity of making their fortunes out of his. One nation is to another what one individual is to another; with this melancholy distinction perhaps, that the former, with fewer of the benevolent emotions than the latter, are under fewer restraints also from taking undue advantage from the indiscretions of each other. Every nation, consequently, whose affairs betray a want of wisdom and stability, may calculate on every loss which can be sustained from the more systematic policy of their wiser neighbors. But the best instruction on this subject is unhappily conveyed to America by the example of her own situation. She finds that she is held in no respect by her friends; that she is the derision of her enemies; and that she is a prey to every nation which has an interest in speculating on her fluctuating councils and embarrassed affairs.

The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessing of liberty itself. It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed? (The Federalist. Lodge, editor. New York, 1908, pp. 388–391.)

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXIII

I add, as a sixth defect, the want, in some important cases, of a due responsibility in the government to the people, arising from that frequency of elections which in other cases produces this responsibility. This remark will, perhaps, appear not only new, but paradoxical. It must nevertheless be acknowledged, when explained, to be as undeniable as it is important.

Responsibility, in order to be reasonable, must be limited to objects within the power of the responsible party, and in order to be effectual, must relate to operations of that power, of which a ready and proper judgment can be formed by the constituents. The objects of government may be divided into two general classes: the one depending on measures which have singly an immediate and sensible operation; the other depending on a succession of well-chosen and well-connected measures, which have a gradual and perhaps unobserved operation. The importance of the latter description to the collective and permanent welfare of every country, needs no explanation. And yet it is evident that an assembly elected for so short a term as to be unable to provide more than one or two links in a chain of measures, on which the general welfare may essentially depend, ought not to be answerable for the

final result, any more than a steward or tenant, engaged for one year, could be justly made to answer for places or improvements which could not be accomplished in less than half a dozen years. Nor is it possible for the people to estimate the share of influence which their annual assemblies may respectively have on events resulting from the mixed transactions of several years. It is sufficiently difficult to preserve a personal responsibility in the members of a numerous body, for such acts of the body as have an immediate, detached, and palpable operation on its constituents.

The proper remedy for this defect must be an additional body in the legislative department, which, having sufficient permanency to provide for such objects as require a continued attention, and a train of measures, may be justly and effectually answerable for the attainment of those objects (The Federalist, pp. 392–393).

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXIV

* * * * *

They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly, composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession, seem not to recollect that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects, which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances, and which can only be approached and achieved by measures which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise, therefore, in the convention to provide, not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political information, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence in providing for the frequent elections of Senators in such a way as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men; for by leaving a considerable residue of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved (The Federalist, p. 402).

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXXVII

It has been mentioned as one of the advantages to be expected from the cooperation of the Senate, in the business of appointments, that it would contribute to the stability of the administration. The consent of that body would be necessary to displace as well as to appoint. A change of the Chief Magistrate, therefore, would not occasion so violent or so general a revolution in the officers of the government as might be expected, if he were the sole disposer of offices. Where a man in any station has given satisfactory evidence of his fitness for it, a new President would be restrained from attempting a change in favor of a person more agreeable to him, by the apprehension that a discountenance of the Senate might frustrate the attempt, and bring some degree of discredit upon himself. Those who can best estimate the value of a steady administration, will be most disposed to prize a provision which connects the official existence of public men with the approbation or disapprobation of that body which, from the greater permanency of its own composition, will in all probability be less subject to inconstancy than any other member of the government (The Federalist, pp. 476–477).

APPENDIX III

[Senate Print, 65th Cong., special session]

THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

EXTRACTS FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE RELATING TO DEBATES IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE QUESTION OF THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

(Prepared by the Legislative Reference Division, Library of Congress)

(Printed for the use of the Secretary of the Senate)

1. Controversy over the Senate Printers in 1841

A joint resolution of March 3, 1819, had provided that "as soon as this resolution shall have been approved by the President of the United States, each House shall proceed to ballot for a Printer, to execute its work during the next Congress." (The resolution is reprinted in Congressional Globe, 26th Cong., 2d sess., v. 9, p. 238.)

An amendatory joint resolution adopted in 1829 provided that "within thirty days before the adjournment of every Congress, each House shall proceed to vote for a Printer to execute its work for and during the succeeding Congress." (Reprinted ibid., p. 189.) Accordingly, on February 20, 1841, during the 2d session of the 26th Congress, the Senate elected Blair and Rives as its Printers for the 27th Congress. (Ibid., p. 197.)

On March 4, 1841, the political complexion of the Senate changed. (Ibid., p. 186.) The Senate organized by reelecting its President pro tem. (ibid., p. 231), and sat in special session until March 14. The House of Representatives duly adjourned sine die, and was not in session after March 4.

On March 4, 1841, a resolution was introduced "That Blair and Rives be dismissed as Printers of the Senate for the 27th Congress." (Ibid., p. 236.) On March 5 a motion to take up this resolution for consideration was debated at length. In February at the time of the election of the Printers it had been urged that the "next Senate" should be allowed to elect its own printers. (Ibid., p. 186.)

Mr. Allen, of Ohio:

"And as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. The argument so much relied on in this discussion and on which so much logic and reasoning had been wasted in opposition to the election of these Printers was untrue. There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate. There was a new House of Representatives because the entire House expired at the expiration of the second year and because the 4th of March terminated the life of that body. But not so the Senate. The Constitution replenishes that body every two years by the election of a class of Senators, and thereby gives eternity to the duration of the body. There was no new, nor was there any old, Senate. The same Senate, therefore, which elected Blair and Rives now without charge or allegation proposes to rescind the act, but he would not go into that." (Ibid., p. 236.)

Mr. Wright, of New York (as the Senate was in special session and the House of Representatives was not sitting, the Senate could properly consider no other business than nominations and treaties):

"He had never heard it pretended that the rules of the Senate are not perpetual from Congress to Congress, unless they were changed by the body. The rules were not now changed; and what, then, were they doing? Why, they were debating this matter in violation of their rules, and by their action were assuming to exercise legislative powers." (Ibid., p. 236.)

Mr. Henry Clay, of Kentucky:

"It was contended on one side that the Senate was a continuous, never-dying body, and on the other side it was said there was no House of Representatives. But in the true contemplation of the Constitution, the Senate, and the House, too, were supposed to be in existence; for if the States had discharged their duties by the election of Members, they were ready to form a House. The Senate and the House were, in the contemplation of the Constitution, continuous bodies; they were not identical in the Members that composed them, but he hoped that, though theoretically always in existence, the acts and measures of the Senate would depend on the component Members that constitute the body. By the Constitution the Senate had power, exclusively of the House, of the President, or any other authority, to elect its own officers. They said that their Printer was an officer; but he should not go over the arguments which had been urged with so much ability by his friend from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] and which stood unanswered to that day, that these Printers were officers." (Ibid., p. 237.)

"Mr. WRIGHT. He had before referred to the rules of the Senate, and he had stated what he supposed would not be controverted, that those rules were as perfectly binding on that body as they were on the body which occupied those seats a week ago. Now, one of those rules was, that 'When acting on confidential or executive business the Senate shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Principal or the Executive Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, and the Assistant Doorkeeper.' Well, then, under their rules they must assume to be acting legislatively, a position which he undertook to show they did not occupy after their organization for executive purposes." (Ibid., p. 237.)

The Senate voted to take up for consideration the resolution to dismiss the Printers. (Ibid., p. 238.) On March 8 the debate proceeded. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, contended that the Printers were not officers of the Senate, but were entitled under a binding contract to do the Senate printing. But what if they were officers?

"Senators had contended that one Senate or one Congress had no right to elect officers for their successors; and that, therefore, the joint resolution violated the Constitution, because it gave the election of a Printer for the next Senate to that which had expired on the 3d of March. This was as strange a position as any which had been assumed throughout the argument. An old Senate and a new Senate.

"There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting in 1789. It has existed without any intermission from that day until the present moment, and would continue to exist as long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body. Its rules were permanent and were not adopted from Congress to Congress like those of the House of Representatives. For many years after the commencement of the Government its Secretary was a permanent officer, though our rules now require that he should be elected at stated intervals. The Senate always had a President, and there were always two-thirds of its actual Members in existence, and generally a much greater number. It would be useless to labor this question. Every writer, without exception, who had treated on the subject had declared the Senate to be a permanent body. It never dies; and it was the sheet anchor of the Constitution on account of its permanency. Senators were thus deprived of the poor apology that one Senate had no right to bind its successors." (Ibid., p. 240.)

On March 9 the discussion was continued. A resolution that it was not competent for the Senate to annul the election and divest the printers of their rights was voted down. (Ibid., p. 246.) On March 10 the resolution

to dismiss was again taken up. Mr. Sevier, of Arkansas:

"It had been very properly said that this was a permanent body, and that the election, whether before the 4th of March or after, was good and valid. It had been acquiesced in before, as he found on looking at the ayes and noes." (Ibid., p. 250.)

Mr. Woodbury, of New Hampshire:

"He was summoned here to a session of the Senate without the House of Representatives; and, of course, a session for the transaction of executive business merely. This body was a permanent one; and hence it was supposed that no new officers were to be elected if no vacancies already existed." (Ibid., p. 251.)

The resolution to dismiss Blair and Rives as Printers of the Senate to the 27th Congress was adopted by a vote of 26 to 18, on March 11, 1841. (Ibid., p. 256.) This action tended to support the view that the Senate was a discontinuous body.

But a vote to dismiss its printers was not necessarily a vote that the Senate was discontinuous. One of the Senators who advocated and voted for the dismissal, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, agreed with the opposition that the Senate was everlasting. (See above.) And if the proponents of the discontinuity view were, in fact, more numerous than its opponents, the reports in the Congressional Globe (of which Blair and Rives were editors and publishers) wholly fail to indicate itself.

2. Office of President pro tempore

Senator Collamer introduced in the Senate, August 5, 1861 (Congressional Globe, 37th Cong., 1st sess., p. 436), the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the President pro tempore of the Senate, elected in the absence of the Vice President, holds his office, while a Member of the Senate, until another is elected, and executes the duties thereof whenever the Vice President is absent."

He declared:

"The object of this resolution is to declare what I have understood to be really the law. * * * It seems to me that, if any election be made to last only while the Vice President is at that time absent, the election to the office must cease with the session. It is an absurdity to talk about the absence of the Vice President when the Senate is not sitting. * * *

"The law which provides, in accordance with the Constitution, who shall perform the duties of President of the United States, in case of the death or resignation of both the President and Vice President, declares that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall officiate, or, if there be no President pro tempore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is very observable that that law necessarily implies that the Congress which passed it understood the place of President pro tempore to be a continuing office; that when elected, he remained in until another was elected. True, it might fall out that he might die; and so provision was made for the Speaker of the House of Representatives; but the necessary implication from the law is that the office of President pro tempore of the Senate is a continuing office."

Senator Bayard opposed the resolution, saying (ibid., p. 437):

"If the Vice President does not return, the occupant of the chair remains President pro tempore of the Senate, session or no session; because that is the natural inference from the duration of the office. He is not elected President pro tempore during the session of the Senate; he is elected President pro tempore during the absence of the Vice President, and you can not assume the Vice President will return until he again appears in the chair as President of the Senate."

No vote was taken on Senator Collamer's resolution, and there was no discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore could continue over into a new Congress.

On December 17, 1875, after the death of the Vice President, Senator Edmunds introduced a resolution to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore on the 7th of January (Misc. Doc. 21, 44th Cong., 1st sess.).

January 10, 1876, Senator Morton, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, introduced four resolutions relating to the office of President pro tempore (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 311). In the report of the committee (S. Rept. 3, 44th Cong., 1st sess.) it is stated (p. 2):

"The custom of the Vice President to vacate the chair before the close of a session to enable the Senate to choose a President pro tempore, did not begin until after the passage of the act of March 1, 1792, and was obviously instituted to meet the contingency contemplated in the act, by providing a President pro tempore of the Senate during the vacations of that body. The Senate in contemplation of law, is a perpetual body, and the officers of the Senate are as much its officers during its vacations as during its sessions."

The report also cites 4 cases where the office of President pro tempore ceased "at the meeting of the Senate after the first recess," and 49 where it did not.

The first resolution proposed was (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 311):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of office of President pro tempore of the Senate elected at one session does not expire at the meeting of Congress after the first recess, the Vice President not having appeared to take the chair."

Senator Merrimon, discussing this resolution, said:

"I entertain the opinion that when the Senate elects a President pro tempore the Senator so elected may rightfully continue to hold his office, unless his term as Senator shall sooner terminate or he shall be removed for cause, until the Vice President shall return to preside over the Senate, and in case he shall fail to so return because of death or other cause, then until a new Vice President shall be elected and qualified. * * * The Senate is a perpetual body; it is created, its powers are conferred, defined, and limited, by the Constitution."

The resolution was unanimously adopted (ibid., p. 316). Senator Sherman then remarked:

"I want to emphasize the matter. This resolution is adopted unanimously. It is a resolution that affects the organization of the body for all time to come and establishes a precedent."

January 12, 1876 (ibid., pp. 360–373), the Senate adopted this resolution:

"That the office of President pro tempore is held at the pleasure of the Senate."

October 10, 1881, Senator Garland, objecting to the admission of new Senators until a President pro tempore should be elected (the Vice President having become President of the United States during the recess of the Senate), said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 12, p. 507);

"The Senate is a continuing body. It has Members enough whenever it may meet, in legal contemplation, to transact its business."

June 23, 1882, while Senator Morgan was addressing the Senate on the powers of the presiding officer, Senator Maxey interjected the remark (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 13, p. 5263): "The Senate is a perpetual body." Thereupon Senator Morgan continued:

"The Senate being a perpetual body, if the Journals show that we have a Presiding Officer selected under the Constitution, the Journals cannot show that any other person can convene the Senate and call it to order and organize it as a legislative body except that person, until we supply another man under the Constitution and furnish him with the constitutional and record authority also to preside in this body * * *. Whenever the Senate of the United States is not together in pursuance, if you please, of an adjournment from yesterday or an adjournment from the last term and we do not find the gentleman present who fills the office which the Journals of this body show that he is entitled to fill, our duty then, and it is our first constitutional and unavoidable duty, is to supply that record and supply the man to fill the place."

March 20, 1889, Senator Butler introduced the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, v. 21, p. 37):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of the President pro tempore does not expire at the meeting of Congress after a recess, the Vice President having appeared to take the chair."

In discussing this resolution, Senator Reagan said (ibid., p. 46):

"A great many of the precedents show that the President pro tempore at the expiration of a Congress takes his seat at the commencement of a new Congress. It is convenient for the Senate to allow him to do so for the purpose of organization; but it seems to me as a rule to be unjust and improper for the reason I shall state. I know it is done upon the supposition that the Senate is a continuing body. So it is a continuing body with installments added every 2 years, if I may use such an expression. At the end of each Congress it is presumed that one-third of the Senate are new to their position. It ought not to be that that one-third of the Senate shall have no choice in the selection of a President pro tempore."

The resolution was not acted upon.

February 10, 1890, Senator Evarts, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 1154):

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore, who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof when the Vice President is absent."

In discussing this resolution Senator Evarts (ibid., p. 1717) referred to Senator Collamer's resolution of 1861, and also to the Morton report of 1876, which he said raised the question—"whether a President pro tempore chosen at one session of the Senate should vacate that place, that post, that office, at the opening of the next session or after the first recess of the Senate. This committee were entirely of opinion, and there is now, I suppose, no difference in the Senate on that point, that that did not terminate the office of President pro tempore. * * * It appears now that there is left for consideration only this: Whether as a matter of constitutional obligation it is essential that the Senate should confine the existence and authority of a President pro tempore to the immediate occasion of the particular absence of the Vice President on which he is elected. * * * No Senator can see more clearly than I do the very great inconvenience of being dependent, entirely without a presiding officer, when a merely casual, unexpected, and unannounced, and yet necessary absence of the Vice President may require that there should be someone to take the chair."

Senator Hoar supported the resolution, but Senator George maintained that it was contrary to "the uniform, unbroken practice of the Senate of the United States for a hundred years, and the uniform and unbroken practice of the House of Commons in England for five hundred years."

March 12, 1890, Senator George (ibid., p. 2144) stated:

"At all times, and in every conceivable way in which the question could be raised, it was uniformly decided until 1861, without dissent on the part of anyone, that the Presi-

dent pro tempore of the Senate held his office, as the words themselves mean, during that particular absence of the Vice President for which he was elected. * * * Down to the present time the practice of the Senate has conformed to the original interpretation placed upon the Constitution, as I have stated it to be."

Senator George then reviewed the various elections of a President pro tempore from 1789 to 1869, and concluded (p. 2145):

"At the expense of frequent elections, at the expense of changing the occupant of the chair as frequently as 10 or 12 days apart, with one uniform consensus of opinion, with a uniformity of practice which is without a single break for a hundred years, the judgment of the Senate has been that the President pro tempore elected in the absence of the Vice President vacates his office upon the return of that officer."

Senator Turpie (ibid., p. 2150) introduced an amendment to change the resolution to the following form:

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof during all future absences of the Vice President until the Senate shall otherwise order."

In reply to Senator George he said:

"I think the unbroken practice or custom which he speaks of is owing to the fact that the question has not been discussed, and there has been no determinative or affirmative decision on the construction of the National Constitution herein."

The resolution was adopted as amended by Senator Turpie without division March 12, 1870 (ibid., p. 2153). Nothing was said in the discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore under the resolution would expire with the Congress during which he was elected.

March 2, 1891, Senator Charles F. Manderson was elected President pro tempore to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of March 12, 1890 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 22, p. 3637), with the intention, apparently, that his office would continue over into the following Congress. Subsequent Presidents pro tempore have regularly been elected with reference to this same resolution.

In Gilfry's compilation "President of the Senate Pro Tempore" numerous instances are cited of Presidents pro tempore holding over from one Congress to the next:

John Gaillard, 13th–14th Congress (p. 14).

William P. Mangum, 27th–28th Congress (p. 22).

William R. King, 31st–32nd Congress (p. 36).

Jesse D. Bright, 33rd–34th Congress (p. 39).

Benjamin F. Wade, 39th–40th Congress (p. 49).

John J. Ingalls, 49th–50th Congress (p. 175).

Charles F. Manderson, 51st–53rd Congress (p. 213).

William P. Frye, 54th–56th Congress (p. 215–217).

William P. Frye, 57th–59th Congress (p. 218–220).

William P. Frye, 60th–62nd Congress (p. 221–223).

On the other hand, the same compilation cites cases of reelection of Presidents pro tempore at a special March 4 session of the Senate, as follows:

William R. King, March 4, 1841 (p. 21).

David R. Atchison, March 4, 1853 (p. 37).

James M. Mason, March 4, 1857 (p. 42).

Solomon Fort, March 4, 1863 (p. 47).

William P. Frye, March 7, 1901 (p. 217).

William P. Frye, December 5, 1907 (p. 220).

3. *Debate concerning joint rules of Senate and House*

January 10, 1876, Senator Hamlin, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 309):

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives in force at the close of the last session of Congress be, and the same are hereby, adopted as the joint rules of the two Houses for the present session."

Senator Hamlin, in supporting the resolutions, said:

"The Senate has its rules. The Senate is an existing body, and its rules exist with the body. The House of Representatives is a body which expires once in two years, and its rules expire, of course, with each expiring Congress."

Senator Bayard, speaking on the same resolution January 17, 1876, said (ibid., p. 431):

"The question comes at once whether a joint rule adopted by the two Houses falls and becomes void by the expiration of the Congress in which that rule was adopted. So far as the Senate is concerned, it will not, I think, be suggested, because this is a continuing body: there is always and at all times a quorum continuing from one Congress to another. It is not so with the House of Representatives, the termination of whose legal existence is at the end of every two years. * * * So far as the Senate is concerned, we all know that the Senate's rules continue, but the question is what effect the different constitution of the other House of Congress has upon a joint rule."

Senator Merrimon stated:

"The long experience of our Chief Clerk, embracing about 38 years, knows of no exception; and, as far as he has been able to learn on examination, there has been no exception to the practice that the joint rules continue from Congress to Congress on the part of the Senate. But when the matter was brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules we could not see how any rule, whether joint or otherwise, of one Congress could be binding upon a subsequent Congress, for the Congress as a Congress lasts but two years. As a legal proposition, if a joint rule is not binding upon the House, how could it be binding upon the Senate?"

Senator Thurman said (ibid., p. 432):

"The resolution now before the Senate rests upon the assumption that the joint rules of the two Houses fall at the end of what is called every Congress, and that they must necessarily do so upon the theory that the House of Representatives expires at the end of every Congress, while it is said that the Senate is a perpetual body. Why is it said that the Senate is a perpetual body? I know of no reason except one, and that is that only one-third of its Members go out every two years, so that there is always a sufficient number of Senators in office to constitute a quorum of the Senate. * * * The Senate is said to be a perpetual body, because it can be convened at any instant.

"I say, in reply to the Senator from Maine, that the Congress of the United States can be convened at any moment. In the contemplation of our Constitution there is never one moment of time when there is not a Congress of the United States which can be convened upon the call of the President, and in point of fact it is so. * * * The theory of our Government is that all the departments of the Government—executive, judicial, legislative—are in existence at every moment of time. * * * The Senate is said to be a continuing body. Cannot we change our rules whenever we please? The House can change its rules, no matter whether the rules of the last House continue in force until altered or not. * * * I think this idea that there is a dead House of Representatives every two years is all a mistake. I think the House of Representatives is as permanent a body as the Senate. The fact that we hold our office for six years and they for only two makes no manner of difference between the two Houses as to the permanent nature of the body."

Senator Sherman said (ibid., p. 433):

"The rules of the House of Representatives, I believe it is conceded on all hands, expire with the Congress. There can be no doubt about that, because that has been the universal practice of the Government, I believe, from the beginning. While I was a Member of the House there were two or three important occasions when, before the House was organized, it was held that there were no rules. By the established practice of the Government from the beginning to this hour it has been held that the rules of the House of Representatives expire with the Congress, and that no law can operate to extend the rules from one Congress to another, because that would be to violate the Constitution itself. In this respect the rules of each House are precisely alike.

"The rules of the Senate are no more operative than the rules of the House of Representatives. We have the power to change them at any moment. It is said that this body is a continuous body; but these rules need not be written out in the form of rules prescribed in set phrases. I have come, therefore, to the conclusion that it is not necessary, so far as the joint rules or the rules of the Senate are concerned, to take any action at the beginning of each Congress, simply because the joint rules expire by the expiration of Congress. It is not necessary for us to continue any of our rules, to adopt the usual resolution of the House at the beginning of every Congress. I believe the joint rules will be continued without any such action. The Senate itself is a permanent body, and all the rules which affect the Senate continue until changed by the action of the Senate."

Senator Kelly said (ibid., p. 434):

"The Senate has never considered it necessary to adopt the rules of a previous Congress, probably for the reason which has been stated, that it is always an organized body; that is, it always has a quorum to do business. Being an organized body it has never since 1789 adopted the rules of a previous Congress."

Senator Morton said (ibid., p. 435):

"I have always understood the theory of the two Houses to be this: First, that the Senate is a continuing body. That results from the nature of its organization and also because it is a part of the executive department of the Government. * * * When the Senate adjourns from one session to another it is nothing more than a recess of the Senate. I believe I have never before heard it said that the House of Representatives was a continuing body. * * * We have a President pro tempore, a Sergeant at Arms, and a Secretary, and they continue until the Senate itself makes a change. Therefore the organization of the body is not lost, and every adjournment of the Senate is simply in the nature of a recess."

Senator Maxey said (ibid., p. 438):

"It is said that the House of Representatives is a continuous body; and that reason is assigned by a Senator for whose legal judgment I have great respect; but I do not concur in it; I do not think it is true. I believe that there is a cessation of the organization of the House of Representatives every two years. The very fact that this body requires the President of the Senate (whoever that may be) to call the Senate together, that it is a perpetual body, that it never ceases to exist, that while one-third goes out every second year one-third comes in at the same time, makes it a perpetual body. * * *

"There never has been a time since the organization of this Government that two-thirds of the Senate were not in existence. It is, therefore, a perpetual body, so laid down in all the works on the subject. The House is not so. It is true of the House of Lords; it is not true of the House of Commons. Precisely what is true of the House of Lords is true of the Senate; precisely what is

true of the House of Commons is true of the House of Representatives. (Edgerton, Apr. 30, 1915; McClenon, Nov. 22, 1915.)"

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that shortly I shall move that the Senate take a recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

On tomorrow, after the Senate convenes, we shall have a quorum call. I hope we may be able to obtain a quorum quickly. If not, I shall ask unanimous consent to withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that discussion of the pending motion may proceed immediately. We shall also have a quorum call preceding the vote at 6 p. m.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Saturday at 12:30 p. m., there will be a joint meeting with the House of Representatives; but the Senate will convene at 12 o'clock.

On Monday, we shall have a joint session with the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes.

I make these announcements so that all Senators may be on notice of the schedule.

It is customary not to transact business or to have bills introduced until after we receive the President's message on the state of the Union, unless that message is delayed and some several days intervene from the time when the session begins. In view of the fact that the President does not expect to have his state of the Union message ready until January 10, next Thursday, it is the plan of the leadership to ask Senators to withhold until Monday next the introduction of bills or the transaction of any other business not already agreed upon. After Monday, however, it will be agreeable to have bills introduced; and all Senators will be on notice so they may make the necessary preparations.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 4, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1957

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, on this 1st day of the 85th Congress, we are earnestly beseeching Thee that we may always be humble in spirit as we daily approach Thee with prayers and petitions for strength and wisdom and our many needed blessings.

Inspire us with this same spirit of humility, not only in our approach unto Thee, but in every appraisal that we make of ourselves and our resources to discharge faithfully the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation.

We pray that in the sphere of human relationships and all our associations, as colleagues and comrades in a grand and glorious mission, we may manifest a spirit that is gracious and generous in its appreciations, magnanimous and sympathetic in its attitudes, considerate and charitable in its judgments.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, our chosen Representatives, and all Government employees may be the humble and obedient servants of Thy divine will in the great adventure of mediating to mankind the principles of democracy and the spirit of peace and brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the meek and lowly man of Galilee who hath taught us to say:

Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For *Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.*

The CLERK. Representatives-elect to the 85th Congress, this is the day fixed by the Constitution of the United States for the meeting of the 85th Congress.

As the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the 85th Congress have been received and are now on file with the Clerk of the 84th Congress. The names of those persons whose credentials show they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of their several States and of the United States will be called, and as the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will answer to their names to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The reading clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA		
Boykin	Roberts	Elliott
Grant	Rains	Jones
Andrews	Selden	Huddleston
ARIZONA		
	Rhodes	
ARKANSAS		
Gathings	Trimble	Hays
Mills	Harris	Norrell
CALIFORNIA		
Scudder	McFall	Holt
Engle	Sisk	Doyle
Moss	Teague	Lipscomb
Mailliard	Hagen	Hillings
Shelley	McDonough	Roosevelt
Baldwin	Jackson	Sheppard
Allen	Hosmer	Utt
Miller	Holifield	Saund
Younger	Smith	Wilson
Gubser	Hiestand	
COLORADO		
Rogers	Chenoweth	Aspinall
Hill		
CONNECTICUT		
May	Cretella	Patterson
Seely-Brown	Morano	Sadlak
DELAWARE		
	Haskell	
FLORIDA		
Cramer	Fascell	Haley
Bennett	Herlong	Matthews
Sikes	Rogers	
GEORGIA		
Preston	Davis	Landrum
Pilcher	Vinson	Brown
Forrester	Lanham	
Flynt	Blitch	
IDAHO		
	Pfost	Budge
ILLINOIS		
Dawson	Collier	Michel
O'Hara	Sheehan	Chiperfield
Byrne	Boyle	Simpson
McVey	Church	Mack
Kluczynski	Keeney	Springer
O'Brien	Mason	Vursell
Gordon	Allen	Price
Yates	Arends	Gray
INDIANA		
Madden	Beamer	Wilson
Halleck	Harden	Harvey
Nimtz	Bray	Brownson
Adair	Denton	
IOWA		
Schwengel	LeCompte	Jensen
Talle	Cunningham	Hoeven
Gross	Coad	
KANSAS		
Avery	George	Breeding
Scrivner	Rees	Smith
KENTUCKY		
Gregory	Chelf	Perkins
Natcher	Spence	Siler
Robsion	Watts	
LOUISIANA		
Hébert	Brooks	Long
Boggs	Morrison	
Willis	Thompson	
MAINE		
Hale	Coffin	McIntire
MARYLAND		
Miller	Fallon	Friedel
Devereux	Lankford	
Garmatz	Hyde	
MASSACHUSETTS		
Heselton	Bates	O'Neill
Boland	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Macdonald	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Nicholson	Martin
Rogers	Curtis	
MICHIGAN		
Machrowicz	McIntosh	Diggs
Meader	Bentley	Rabaut
Johansen	Griffin	Dingell
Hoffman	Cederberg	Lesinski
Ford	Knox	Griffiths
Chamberlain	Bennett	Broomfield
MINNESOTA		
Andresen, August H.	McCarthy	Andersen, H. Carl
O'Hara	Judd	Blatnik
Wier	Marshall	Knutson
MISSISSIPPI		
Abernethy	Smith	Winstead
Whitten	Williams	Colmer
MISSOURI		
Karsten	Bolling	Cannon
Curtis	Hull	Jones
Sullivan	Brown	Moulder
Christopher	Carnahan	

MONTANA

Metcalf Anderson

NEBRASKA

Weaver Harrison Miller
Cunningham

NEVADA

Baring

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow Bass

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton Widnall Kean
Auchincloss Canfield Sieminski
Thompson Osmers Dellay
Frelinghuysen Rodino
Dwyer Addonizio

NEW MEXICO

Dempsey

NEW YORK

Wainwright Powell Taylor
Derounian Coudert Kearney
Becker Santangelo Kilburn
Latham Farbstein Williams
Bosch Teller Riehlman
Holtzman Zelenko Taber
Delaney Healey Cole
Anfuso Dollinger Keating
Keogh Buckley Ostertag
Kelly Fino Miller
Celler Dooley Radwan
Dorn Gwinn Pillion
Multer St. George Reed
Rooney Wharton
Ray O'Brien

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner Scott Alexander
Fountain Durham Jonas
Barden Lennon Whitener
Cooley Kitchin Shuford

NORTH DAKOTA

Burdick Krueger

OHIO

Scherer Ashley McGregor
Hess Jenkins Hays
Schenck Dennison Kirwan
McCulloch Vorys Feighan
Clevenger Baumhart Vanik
Polk Ayres Bolton
Brown Henderson Minshall
Betts Bow

OKLAHOMA

Belcher Albert Jarman
Edmondson Steed Morris

OREGON

Norblad Green Porter
Ullman

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett Flood Kelley
Granahan Fenton Saylor
Byrne McConnell Gavin
Chudoff Rhodes Kearns
Green Walter Clark
Scott Mumma Morgan
James Bush Fulton
Curtin Simpson Eberharter
Dague Stauffer Corbett
Carrigg Van Zandt Holland

RHODE ISLAND

Forand Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers Dorn Hemphill
Riley Ashmore McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

McGovern Berry

TENNESSEE

Reece Evins Cooper
Baker Loser Davis
Frazier Bass

TEXAS

Patman Thompson Burleson
Brooks Thornberry Rogers
Beckworth Poage Mahon
Rayburn Wright Kilday
Alger Ikard Fisher
Teague Young Dies
Dowdy Kilgore
Thomas Rutherford

UTAH

Dixon Dawson

VERMONT

Prouty

VIRGINIA

Robeson Tuck Jennings
Hardy Poff Broyhill
Gary Harrison
Abbitt Smith

WASHINGTON

Pelly Holmes Magnuson
Westland Horan
Mack Tollefson

WEST VIRGINIA

Moore Bailey Kee
Staggers Neal Byrd

WISCONSIN

Smith Reuss Johnson
Tewes Van Pelt O'Konski
Withrow Laird
Zablocki Byrnes

WYOMING

Thomson

The CLERK. Four hundred and twenty-eight Members-elect have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. The Clerk will state that credentials have been received showing that the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT has been elected a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska; that the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS has been elected a Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii; and that the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN has been elected a Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Clerk will state that since the last election of Representatives to the 85th Congress, there have been two changes as a result of which there are now two vacancies; one At Large in the State of New Mexico occasioned by the death of the late Honorable Antonio M. Fernandez, and the other in the Second Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, occasioned by the death of the late Honorable T. Millet Hand.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Clerk of the House.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Clerk, as Chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress the name of Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Clerk of the House.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Clerk, by authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican Conference, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the 85th Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the following to act as tellers: The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON; the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LECOMPTE; the gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. GREEN; and the gentlewoman from Indiana, Mrs. HARDEN.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice. The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—227

Abbitt Forand Moss
Abernethy Forrester Moulder
Addonizio Fountain Multer
Albert Frazier Natcher
Alexander Friedel Norrell
Anderson, Mont. Garmatz O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews Gary O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso Gathings O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley Gordon O'Neill
Ashmore Granahan Patman
Aspinall Grant Perkins
Bailey Gray Pfost
Barden Green, Oreg. Philbin
Baring Green, Pa. Pilcher
Barrett Gregory Poage
Bass, Tenn. Griffiths Polk
Beckworth Hagen Porter
Bennett, Fla. Haley Powell
Blatnik Hardy Preston
Blitch Harris Price
Boggs Harrison, Va. Radaut
Boland Hays, Ark. Rains
Bolling Hays, Ohio Reuss
Bonner Healey Rhodes, Pa.
Boykin Hébert Riley
Boyle Hemphill Rivers
Breeding Herlong Roberts
Brooks, La. Holifield Robeson, Va.
Brooks, Tex. Holland Rodino
Brown, Ga. Holtzman Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Mo. Huddleston Rogers, Fla.
Buckley Hull Rogers, Tex.
Burleson Ikard Rooney
Byrd Jarman Roosevelt
Byrne, Pa. Jennings Rutherford
Cannon Johnson Santangelo
Carnahan Jones, Ala. Saund
Celler Jones, Mo. Scott, N. C.
Chelf Karsten Selden
Christopher Kee Shelley
Chudoff Kelley, Pa. Sheppard
Clark Kelly, N. Y. Shuford
Coad Keogh Sieminski
Coffin Kilday Sikes
Colmer Kilgore Sisk
Cooley Kirwan Smith, Miss.
Cooper Kitchin Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga. Kluczynski Spence
Davis, Tenn. Knutson Staggers
Dawson, Ill. Landrum Steed
Delaney Lane Sullivan
Dempsey Lanham Teague, Tex.
Denton Lankford Teller
Dies Lennon Thomas
Diggs Lesinski Thompson, La.
Dingell Long Thompson, N. J.
Dollinger Loser Thompson, Tex.
Donohue McCarthy Thornberry
Dorn, S. C. McCormack Trimble
Dowdy McFall Tuck
Doyle McGovern Ullman
Durham McMillan Vanik
Eberharter Macdonald Vinson
Edmondson Machrowicz Walter
Elliott Mack, Ill. Watts
Engle Madden Whitener
Evins Magnuson Whitten
Fallon Mahon Wier
Farbstein Marshall Williams, Miss.
Fascell Matthews Willis
Feighan Metcalf Winstead
Fisher Miller, Calif. Wright
Flood Mills Yates
Flynt Morgan Young
Fogarty Morris Zablocki
Morrison Zelenko

MARTIN—199

Adair	Fenton	Morano
Alger	Fino	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Neal
Allen, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	Nimtz
	Gavin	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	George	O'Hara, Minn.
	Griffin	O'Konski
Arends	Gross	Osmers
Auchincloss	Gubser	Ostertag
Avery	Gwinn	Patterson
Ayres	Hale	Pelly
Baker	Halleck	Pillion
Baldwin	Harden	Poff
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Bates	Harvey	Radwan
Baumhart	Haskell	Ray
Beamer	Henderson	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Heselton	Reed
Belcher	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bentley	Hill	Riehlman
Berry	Hillings	Robsion, Ky.
Betts	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Hoffman	Sadlak
Bosch	Holmes	St. George
Bow	Holt	Saylor
Bray	Horan	Schenck
Broomfield	Hosmer	Scherer
Brown, Ohio	Hyde	Schwengel
Brownson	Jackson	Scott, Pa.
Broyhill	James	Scrivner
Budge	Jenkins	Scudder
Burdick	Jensen	Seely-Brown
Bush	Johansen	Sheehan
Byrne, Ill.	Jonas	Siler
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Canfield	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Carrigg	Kearney	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Chamberlain	Keating	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Keeney	Springer
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Stauffer
Church	Knox	Taber
Clevenger	Krueger	Talle
Cole	Laird	Taylor
Collier	Latham	Teague, Calif.
Corbett	LeCompte	Tewes
Coudert	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wyo.
Cramer	McConnell	Tollefson
Cretella	McCulloch	Utt
Cunningham, Iowa	McDonough	Van Pelt
	McGregor	Van Zandt
Cunningham, Nebr.	McIntire	Vorys
	McIntosh	Vursell
Curtin	McVey	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass.	Mack, Wash.	Weaver
Curtis, Mo.	Mailliard	Westland
Dague	Mason	Wharton
Dawson, Utah	May	Widnall
Dellay	Meader	Wigglesworth
Dennison	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	Michel	Wilson, Calif.
Devereux	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Dixon	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Dooley	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Dorn, N. Y.	Minshall	Younger
Dwyer	Moore	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Martin Rayburn

NOT VOTING—5

Bowler	Murray	Udall
King	Passman	

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 428, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, received 227, and the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, received 199. Two voted "present."

Therefore, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is the duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 85th Congress, having received a majority of all the votes cast.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair:

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON; the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON; and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK.

(The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.)

Mr. MARTIN. My colleagues, for 20 years the Speaker of the House and I have been rivals across the aisle. In such a long period of time one comes to know a man most intimately and so it is a great privilege and a pleasure for me today, as long as we must have a Democrat, to be able to present to you the man who is to be our next Speaker. He is a man of the highest character and of the finest integrity. He is a just man. He is a man with a fierce determination to uphold the fine traditions of this great legislative body. He has demonstrated in the past that his main objective is not only to dispense judgment impartially, but to keep this great deliberative body in the high position it occupies today. I can truthfully say that in all the period of time I have been a Member of this House, from Speaker Longworth to the present, we have never had a man who was not desirous of sustaining our finest tradition.

Today I am very happy to present to you the new Speaker, one worthy in every way to be our Presiding Officer. He is your Speaker, my Speaker, and my friend, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. My respected colleague, JOE MARTIN, and my fellow Members of the House of Representatives:

This is the eighth time that you have done me the high honor of electing me to this high post and from a grateful heart I thank you.

It has been a pleasure to work with all the Members of the House throughout these years. Especially has it been a pleasure to work with the leadership on the other side of the aisle, and especially a man of the high type of character, fairness, and intelligence of your leader, JOE MARTIN.

I come to this place again with no enemies to punish, but with a fervent desire that our leadership may be such that we can bring forth a program that will not only appeal to the people of our common country but will be of great and enduring service to all of our people. I am dedicated to that doctrine and I shall try to live up to it and to the highest expectations of the people who have been so partial to me during all the years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

It is a high honor to be a Member of the House of Representatives for even one term, because there is not a district in America, in my opinion, where there are not 1,000 men and women who covet this place, and who would seek it if they thought they had a good opportunity of attaining that position. To be reelected to this high forum is an added honor and there has never been a day since I came here many years ago when I have not felt the honor conferred upon me by my people, nor have I forgotten the high and serious responsibility that rests upon my shoulders and upon the shoulders of every other Member of this body.

This is the highest theater that anyone plays in upon this earth today. I must refer again to the tremendous and at times appalling responsibility that falls upon the shoulders of each and every one of us. We must so act in the days to come that we will merit the confidence and the faith not only of our own people but of the people of the whole world, because your country and mine has been challenged to take the leadership of the free world. If we do not with courage and judgment accept that leadership, then the world will be a place in which good men and women will be unhappy.

In my opinion, the Christian civilization that we know and love and which is ours without the asking stands in more mortal danger today than it has stood in at any time since the lowly Galilean walked those shores and preached peace and good will. We are challenged, therefore, so to conduct ourselves in our legislative capacity and in our executive capacity that we will hold the respect and the high regard of every human being upon the face of the earth who wants to look this way and yearns for the freedom and the liberty that you and I and all of our people enjoy.

This is no time for acrimony. This is a time of dedication for every human being that lives within the confines of the United States of America. Therefore, I look forward to a session that will be fruitful, that will be serviceable not only to us but to the other people of the earth.

In this feeling and in this belief I am now ready to shoulder the responsibility that you have placed upon my shoulders, and ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to administer the oath of office to me.

Mr. VINSON then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the custom which was established a number of years ago, the Chair will now ask all Members to rise and take the oath of office.

The Members, Delegates-elect, and Resident Commissioner-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that Conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been selected as the minority leader of the House.

ELECTION OF CLERK, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1) which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be and he is hereby chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., of the State of Tennessee, be and he is hereby chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be and he is hereby chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That H. H. Morris, of the State of Kentucky, be and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be and he is hereby chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a substitute to the resolution, but before offering the substitute I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

The question was taken; and that portion of the resolution referring to the election of the Chaplain was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute resolution offered by Mr. HOEVEN.

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, of the State of Illinois, be and he is hereby chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be and he is hereby chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Tom J. Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be and he is hereby chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Beecher Hess, of the State of Ohio, be and he is hereby chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to inform the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make to it, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF HON. SAM RAYBURN AS SPEAKER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES GOVERNING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 5) which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority leader, I offer the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 3, 1957, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Lyle O. Snader and William R. Bonsell, to receive gross compensation of $15,000 per annum, respectively; Tom J. Kennamer, to receive gross compensation of $12,500 per annum; Beecher Hess, to receive gross compensation of $11,000 per annum; James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk), to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum; and John W. McCabe, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION AS A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 12, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: By reason of the fact that I have been elected to the office of judge of the court of general sessions in the county of New York, which office is to take effect January 1, 1957, I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of the State of New York my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 20th District of New York, which said resignation is to take effect as of midnight, December 31, 1956.

With great respect, your obedient servant,

IRWIN D. DAVIDSON.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 10, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with a great deal of regret that I tender my resignation as a Member of Congress from the 19th District of New York, effective midnight December 31, 1956.

This is due to the fact that I have been elected to the supreme court of the State of New York, and will take office on January 1, 1957.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY MEMORIAL, WEXFORD, IRELAND

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 244, 84th Congress, and the order of the House of July 27, 1956, empowering him to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on September 8, 1956, appoint as a member of the joint committee to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received at the Clerk's office at 11:25 a. m. on September 24, 1956, and said to contain the 10th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

TENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 481)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States

I am transmitting herewith the 10th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual security program, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956.

The accomplishments during this 6-month period under this program of mutual effort have further advanced the security, the economic progress, and the well-being of the United States and our partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 20, 1956.*

ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 15, 1956.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides for a suspension of assistance to Yugoslavia as therein specified unless I find and report to the Congress with my reasons therefor: "(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

After careful study and examination of all the relevant facts available to me, I hereby find and report to the Congress affirmatively, with respect to the three matters above mentioned.

My reasons therefor are the following:

1. The policy of assisting Yugoslavia was begun by this Government in 1949. That policy was not based upon the approval of, or affinity with the internal policies of the Government of Yugoslavia. It was undertaken because, despite such internal policies, it was then deemed in the interests of the United States to support the independence of Yugoslavia against a major effort by the Soviet Union to dominate that country. The balance of available evidence leads me to find that Yugoslavia remains independent of control by the Soviet Union and desires to continue to be independent; that it is still subject to efforts by the Soviet Union to compromise that independence; and that some assistance from the United States continues to be required and is desired by the Government of Yugoslavia to assure the maintenance of its independence.

I am aware of the fact that the designs of the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia are more subtle than heretofore, and that perhaps those designs are not adequately appreciated, or defended against, by Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, there remain the basic factors, i. e., the independence of Yugoslavia; the dedication of Yugoslavia to its independence; and the Soviet endangering of that independence.

2. My finding that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for Communist conquest of the world is based upon the fact that the ideology and doctrine of the Yugoslav Communist Party appear to adhere to the concept that each nation should determine for itself which kind of a society it wishes and that there should be no interference by one nation in the internal affairs of another.

3. My reason for finding that it is in the interests of the national security of the United States to continue to furnish at least limited assistance to Yugoslavia is that otherwise, in my opinion, there is a danger that Yugoslavia will be unable to maintain its independence. I believe, moreover, that the United States policies inaugurated in 1949 to enable Yugoslavia to maintain its independence remain valid.

This determination on my part meets the statutory requirement in section 143 regarding the utilization of the public funds allotted to Yugoslavia under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and under prior mutual-security legislation. Its primary immediate effect will be to clear the way for conversations with appropriate Yugoslav officials to examine the various possibilities for bilateral cooperation in the economic field thus made feasible under our laws. In the military field, the various departments of the Government have, since the enactment of section 143 in July of this year, at my direction, followed a policy of permitting only small, routine, and long-planned deliveries of equipment. I intend that this attitude, which implies the nondelivery of jet planes and other items of heavy equipment, shall be maintained until the situation can be more accurately appraised during the days to come. I believe, however, that economic aid for the people of Yugoslavia, primarily in the form of foodstuffs, may now prudently and wisely be proceeded with. In any case, I shall not consider that my action herewith definitely settles the various questions pertaining to United States-Yugoslav relations. These problems will, on the contrary, remain under my constant review, and I have, in addition, directed that those officers who conduct our day-to-day relations with Yugoslavia vigilantly apply the very helpful criteria established by the Congress in section 143 to insure that the decision which I have now made remains justified in future circumstances. I have made it clear, furthermore, that my determination is not, even in economic matters, to be taken as a continuing directive necessitating the obligation or expenditure of the funds available for Yugoslavia, regardless of circumstances, but is one which restores discretion in this area to me and my subordinates to take such actions as accord with the applicable national policy relating to Yugoslavia and serve the national interest. Such an approach will, I am sure, serve the foreign policy interests of our country and, at the same time, afford adequate protection against the unwise expenditure of public funds.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Washington, D. C.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p. m., January 10, 1957, at a joint session of the two Houses.

MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 7

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means:

Jere Cooper (chairman), Tennessee; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; Hale Boggs, Louisiana; Eugene J.

Keogh, New York; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; Frank Ikard, Texas; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 8

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island, Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Prince H. Preston, Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; John F. Shelley, California; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Don Magnuson, Washington; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; George P. Miller, California; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Lester Holtzman, New York; Richard E. Lankford, Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Thomas S. Gordon (chairman), Illinois; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, Texas; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama; J. L. Pilcher, Georgia.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith (chairman), Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President on January 7, 1957.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 3

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 4

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

Senate Resolution 7

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Honorable CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

HOUR OF MEETING ON SATURDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, January 5, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 7th day of January 1957, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that 2 tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and 2 by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral votes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LECOMPTE.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE RECESS ON JANUARY 5 AND 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday, January 5, 1957, and on Monday, January 7, 1957, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. JAMES B. BOWLER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas JAMES B. BOWLER, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois, from the seventh district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him be and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said JAMES B. BOWLER.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to authority of H. Res. 10, 85th Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] to administer the oath of office to the Honorable JAMES B. BOWLER.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 11

Resolved, That during the 85th Congress the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 Members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 12

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the 85th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION OF COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 13

Resolved, That standing committees of the House shall have authority to approve the employment and compensation of committee employees from January 3, 1957, or such subsequent date as their service commenced.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1957, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, of the 84th Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS INTRODUCED TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all the bills that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so that Members of the House may understand.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

SALUTE TO AUSTRIA FOR HER VALOR TOWARD HUNGARY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, no part of the free world need ever hang its head in shame over the response of mankind to Hungary's magnificent liberty-or-death break for freedom from the Soviet Union.

The effect upon the history of our time is illimitable.

Here is the crack in the monolithic mass of tyranny that portends at long last what so many pray desperately is the beginning of the end.

In this most exciting international drama of the last decade there is a role played by one small nation which brings me to my feet in the House today with a resolution of commendation.

This is the role played so valiantly by recently liberated Austria. This little nation, indifferent to her own safety, jumped into the breach. She stood by Hungary as if she, too, as much as Hungary herself, were immediately and fully involved. Without treaty obligations, without any obligations, she alined herself with the Hungarian revolution in the form of aid for fleeing refugees, in a way that will stand for all time a symbol to men whose hearts go out to those seeking to be free.

Against this seemingly impossible resistance stood the glowering, wounded, massive Soviet enemy of a free mankind. She was injured to the quick by this glaring exposure of her dishonest propaganda protestations of friendship for the proletariat and for peace—the most gargantuan fraud of the 20th century.

I ask passage of this resolution in the Congress for the glory of Austria, of course, but as much for peoples everywhere who do honor to the human spirit. And I want the valiant conduct of Austria memorialized by this documentary recognition from the United States lest the big part this little nation played in the mighty spectacle be swallowed up in the huge world canvas against which the tragedy of Hungary is being enacted.

Austria's deed was done without knowing whether she, like the refugees she was helping, would have to go it alone against the full vengeance of the infuriated Soviet Union. Her response to the challenge was instantaneous, it was wholehearted, it was in the tradition of man's noblest conduct toward man. But it was, in addition, as a kind of overplus, a brilliant demonstration of such raw human courage as only legends are made of.

It was this, as much as any single act of the Hungarian revolution itself, that deepened and bloodied the wound in the side of the Soviet enemy. Here, out in the open for all the world to see, was a performance of the Soviet Union destroying much of the faith in communism she had succeeded in building up in the rising nations of Africa and Asia by her blinding and deceitful enlightenment. And what the world saw, too, was valor in the purest sense of the word, as Austria, opening her arms to the Hungarian fighters against the Soviet Union, stood helpless and undefended against any of the armored divisions the Kremlin might send into Austria to crush her. Russia has found easier pretexts for aggression before.

But this little nation, this fragment of the free world, taking the harried and the driven of Hungary to her bosom, stopped the Soviet Union dead in its tracks. What it did was, of course, to arouse the indignation of mankind to a valor of its own by the example of Austria toward the terror-driven masses she was taking inside her borders.

Perhaps, to some extent, even our own country was itself swept up into the stream of the effort for helping Hungarian refugees by the stout example Austria set for mankind. Here is a nation of a mere 7 million. At the very moment that we were talking of taking in some handful of thousands from bloodied Hungary, Austria opened herself wide to 120,000 of them—coming over in droves under threat of torture and murder. Yet Austria had already within its gates no less than 180,000 refugees of World War II and the cold war.

Now that we have, on the official level, grasped in all its fullness the enormity of this tragic situation, I ask the House of Representatives of the United States to offer a proud and respectful salute to the little nation of Austria. She was there and she did the right thing. The resolution will show her and the world that her courage, her fortitude, and her immense valor have not gone unnoticed.

This resolution can, of course, speak only in words. But we can take comfort that the sense of justice and the indignation of the American people have moved our Government to take heart from Austria's example. What we say in this resolution in words we implement in action by doing for the refugee Hungarian patriots what Austria did for them under the threat of Soviet tanks and at peril of her life and her freedom.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I am proud to offer this salute to the people of Austria:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense

of the Congress of the United States that the relief and good will extended by the people of Austria to refugees from strife-torn Hungary are in the finest traditions of humanity. The Congress, therefore, hereby expresses its admiration for the humanitarian conduct of the people of Austria and extends to them its best wishes for the future.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN HUNGARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by me on December 30, 1956.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. JUDD, Mr. BENTLEY, Mr. HILLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MACHROWICZ, and I have introduced identical resolutions to create a select committee to investigate the latest acts of Communist aggression in Hungary.

All the world was inspired by the heroism and patriotism of the Hungarians in their revolt against the Russian Communists. For a time it appeared the Hungarians had won their freedom and national independence. Then the Russians committed one of the cruelest and most inhuman acts of history. Without warning and contrary to promises given that they would evacuate their Red army from the Hungarian nation, all the military might of the Red army was turned against the young Hungarian government. The new Hungarian government, which had freed itself of Moscow control only a few days before, then had to stand alone against the fury of the Kremlin. With absolutely no effective assistance in any form from any of the western nations, it was not long before the Hungarian patriots were cut down by the Red army. Thousands of brave Hungarians died in this struggle. Still other thousands of patriotic Hungarians were deported from their homeland to the slave-labor camps of the Soviet Union. What the future holds for the Hungarian nation is indeed a very grave question in the minds of all of us.

I believe that the public interest would be served if Congress established a select committee to investigate all the facts of the Hungarian revolution against tyranny and the retaliatory acts of aggression committed by the Russian Communists. Such an inquiry would naturally concern itself with the causes of the revolution, how the revolution got started, and why the western nations were totally unprepared for such an event. It would also look into all other pertinent leads and information of this type.

I also believe such a select committee should look into other revolts against the Russians which have taken place in recent years, particularly those of the east Germans, the Georgians in the Soviet Union, and the Poles. By securing all the pertinent facts in connection with these revolutions and making them known here in the United States, I believe all of us will be better prepared to understand why such revolutions against tyranny will occur in the future. Moreover, we should be better prepared to do something about them. I also believe that now is the time for Congress to move on this question before information becomes cold and before memory is dimmed by the passage of time. In addition, I believe much documentation on these revolutions which would be available to Congress now might be lost sight of in the future.

Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I had the pleasure to address an International Freedom Rally in New York City. This affair was attended by approximately 5,000 people all of whom were concerned with the cause of the Hungarian nation and the ultimate freedom and independence of all the non-Russian nations enslaved by the Communists. In my address I analyzed recent world developments as I see them in light of our own national interest. I believe my remarks will be of interest to Members of this House and at the same time that they will provide additional information as to why the select committee will serve a necessary and useful purpose.

Under leave granted, I include my address delivered before the International Freedom Rally at Manhattan Center, New York City, December 30, 1956, and copy of the resolutions which have been introduced today:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL FREEDOM RALLY, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 30, 1956

Mr. Chairman, it is most appropriate that this international freedom rally is being held today and in this setting. The cause of human freedom has reached one of the most encouraging high-water marks of recent years. Tyranny, colonialism, and despotism have reached a point of low ebb in the eyes of thinking people the world over.

We owe an eternal debt of gratitude to the brave Hungarian patriots who rose up against the Russian Communist occupiers, and who today continue the fight for freedom despite the cold absence of any effective assistance from the nations of the free world. History will surely record the debt of all civilization to the Hungarian nation for creating this favorable atmosphere of freedom of which I speak.

For too long we here in America have been told that effective revolution against the Russian despots was impossible; that we must accept a status quo with the Russian tyrants and that there was a finality to the brutal Russian conquest and exploitation of the many non-Russian nations within the Communist empire. The seemingly endless pounding and repetition of these false and unsupportable beliefs have tended to dull our own national conscience and to bring on a spirit of defeatism in which we are encouraged to think only of our own comfort and immediate safety. Time alone can measure the extent of the damage to our national character as well as our prestige and respect among the nations of the world caused by the era of despair out of which we are just now passing. But of one thing we may now be certain. The decks must be cleared of these depressing and unfounded beliefs so that our Government can satisfy the ever increasing public demand that we measure up to our full stature in world affairs and develop a foreign policy consistent with the destiny of a great and free nation.

A series of revolutions against tyranny has set the stage for the development of future world trends. Among these revolts are those of the East Germans, the Georgians within the Soviet Union, the Poles, and now the Hungarians. These are the most dramatic explosions of human freedom and best known to the public. But there have been many other such events in the last 3 years, including uprisings in the slave-labor camps which are so characteristic of Russian communism. While each of these events are important within themselves, their real importance can only be measured when examined against their relationship to the other enslaved non-Russian nations of the Communist Empire and the fact that each succeeding revolution against Russian despotism increases in its intensity and violence. It seems that the more repressive the measures employed by the Kremlin to preserve the empire the more violent and certain the reaction of the enslaved nations. This trend can lead in only one direction. That direction is the complete disintegration of the modern-day Russian empire, an event which is long overdue, but equally certain to occur. The Hungarian patriots have rendered a great service to their beloved homeland. They have rendered, in my opinion, an even greater service to all of humanity. By their heroic uprising, by their unyielding fight against the Russian occupier with little or no military equipment, and by their determination to die rather than to surrender their cause to the Russians, they have taught us some important and inescapable lessons. Along the most self-evident of these lessons are the following:

1. Communism has failed in its effort to break the national will of the non-Russian nations it enslaves. The world will never forget the cry of the Hungarian fighters of "Russians go home" or "We demand our national independence." Armed with love of country and fortified by love of God, the Hungarian patriots have struck the greatest single blow for human freedom and decency since our own forefathers signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. Communism has strengthened the national will of the nations it occupies and has fanned the flame of national independence beyond the control of any human force.

2. The degrading programs of Russification long used by the leaders of world communism have not only failed miserably but have created a spirit of contempt among the enslaved non-Russian people for all things Russian. This reality in the long run presents a very real danger to the survival of the Russian nation itself. The long series of human abuses and national degradation which have been forced upon millions and millions of people behind the Iron Curtain has created a spirit of violence against the Russian oppressor which know few equals in recorded history.

3. The people living closest to the Russians, that is, the people subjugated and exploited by them, have less fear of them than do many people who live in the comfort and safety of the free world. The Hungarian patriots have exposed the cowardice of the Russians and their constant fear of what the people they oppress may one day do to them. Only a coward could shoot down unarmed men, women, and children who demand nothing more than the freedom and respect befitting the dignity of all men. Cowardice is a fundamental characteristic of communism which must be understood and properly evaluated by those who are responsible for the preservation and extension of freedom throughout the world.

4. That the Russians cannot promote an effective war against civilization because the non-Russians in the Red army, the armed forces of the so-called satellite nations as well as the entire populations of the enslaved non-Russian nations will rise up and fight against them. This would create a situation in which the Russians would be compelled to stand alone against the entire world which obviously would mean their total destruction in short order. No one understands this truism better than the Red reactionaries who now seek desperately to hold the Russian Communist Empire together. This obviously

does not mean that we can now relax our national defense programs and it does not lessen the need for eternal vigilance against a possible sneak attack by the Russian Communists. It does, however, mean that we must accord this truism its full political weight by giving immediate support to all those who fight for their freedom and national independence.

5. That the time has arrived for us to liberate ourselves from the false and strangling notion that to take any effective action against the Russians would mean war. This vicious piece of propaganda has been the secret weapon of the Russians for some time and they have used it with devastating effect throughout the free world. A desire to preserve the peace without a willingness to fight for those moral and political principles which form the foundation of peace is to flirt with disaster. Men of faint heart and timid action have never prevented war. The history of our own time tells us clearly that any effort to appease the dictator, to make accommodations with a dictator because of an overriding fear of war, can lead only to war.

This is not the time for harping or negative criticism. This is a time for realistic thinking and resolute action. Therefore, I hope that nothing I have said will be construed as criticism for criticism's sake. I have attempted to put into sharp focus those political realities which I sincerely believe have come out of the fight of the Hungarian people to regain their freedom and national independence. There are undoubtedly other lessons of importance which with time will appear out of the tragic events now taking place in Hungary.

The great opportunities for peace which have been provided us by the Hungarian revolution must now be seized upon and pursued with vigor. While we were totally unprepared for any kind of revolution behind the Iron Curtain and therefore appeared in the embarrassing posture of political paralysis, it is time we did something practical to support the brave Hungarian people who are this very day carrying on the fight against the Russian Communists.

To begin with we must eliminate the childish beliefs that political evolution is the answer to the hopes and aspirations of the people enslaved by communism. Revolt has always been man's answer to tyranny. This is a fact of history which knows no noteworthy exception. The brave Hungarians have been consistent with their own long history which is replete with heroic chapters of revolt against tyranny. It is time we faced up to this reality. Freedom like peace cannot be won the easy way.

The resettlement of Hungarian escapees and refugees will not restore freedom and independence to Hungary. The care and housing of these Hungarian refugees in this hour of crisis is absolutely necessary, but it will not contribute to the restoration of freedom and independence to the Hungarian nation. These things we must do and I remain as always a firm supporter of programs of this type, but we should come to grips with the real issue which is the continued Russian occupation of the Hungarian nation. I am convinced that if we can cause the Russians to get out of Hungary we will have resolved the major problems of the Hungarian escapees and refugees. With but few exceptions, these people want to return to a free and independent Hungary as soon as possible.

The United Nations some weeks ago, passed a resolution condemning Russian Communist aggression in Hungary and calling upon the Red army to get out of that tormented nation. Many weeks have passed during which the slaughter of the Hungarian patriots by the Russians has continued and yet the United Nations has failed to come to grips with the real issue. I regret to say that unless the United Nations does come to grips with the real issue it will lose the confidence of all thinking people and thus make even less effective the work it has been able to do to date. But it is not too late for the United Nations to take a firm stand in support of the principles of its own charter. This will require imagination and boldness. As a first step the United Nations should expell the Russians from membership unless they abide forthwith by the terms of Resolution A/424 passed December 12 by the General Assembly calling for, among other steps, the Red army to get out of Hungary.

In my considered judgment, if such an expulsion resolution were introduced in the General Assembly of the United Nations overwhelming world opinion would force its passage. The Russians would then have no other course but to withdraw their occupation forces from Hungary because they dare not expose themselves to the condemnation and isolation which would come with their expulsion from the United Nations.

The success of such an action would lead the way to the withdrawal of the Russian occupation forces from all the non-Russian nations of the Communist empire. It would take time to accomplish this task, but once it got started it could not be stopped. In the end such action would guarantee the presevation of the Russian nation itself—a consideration which merits the support of all thinking people.

I believe there are a number of things Congress can do in response to the great opportunities for peace presented by the Hungarian revolution. Congress can establish a select committee to investigate Communist aggression against Hungary, which would include Russian intervention in the internal affairs of the Hungarian nation and deportation of Hungarian patriots by the Russian secret police and Red army. Such a committee should be authorized to make inquiry into all facts surrounding the Hungarian revolution and similar revolutions within the Communist empire, particularly those which have occurred during the past 4 years. I intend to introduce a resolution to create such a select committee during the first days of the new Congress.

I am encouraged by the action taken by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in calling upon the parliamentary bodies of many countries of the free world, including the United States, to establish such a select committee. The amount of public good that can come out of such inquiries, which would include the sworn testimony of eye witnesses is incalculable. I hope all organizations gathered here today will give their vigorous support to the resolution I shall introduce in Congress.

I pledge my support, as a Member of Congress, to all programs which back up the fight of the enslaved nations for their freedom and national independence and all actions in the United Nations which will give the Russians the choice of either abiding by the Charter of the United Nations or being expelled from that body.

Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the latest acts of Communist aggression in Hungary

Whereas the people of the United States of America are shocked by the latest acts of Communist aggression visited upon the Hungarian people who heroically have fought for their freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has expressed the concern of the American people by protesting these acts of Communist aggression and by introducing and securing the passage of resolutions in the United Nations condemning such Communist aggression against the Hungarian nation and calling for the removal of the Red army from that nation; and

Whereas Congress can make a contribution to a better public understanding of the Hungarian revolution and the acts of Communist aggression and thus assist our country in being better prepared for such future revolts against tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 7 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the Hungarian freedom revolution and the acts of aggression committed during this revolution by the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, including the mistreatment of the civilian population, and other similar revolts against Communist tyranny.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such time and places within or outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

THE NEED FOR GREATER HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved over our Christmas holidays to read the constantly mounting toll of deaths caused by traffic accidents. The 1956 Christmas weekend highway deaths reached the terrifying total of 706 dead—the highest in the Nation's history. If these deaths had all occurred in one place due to an explosion or fire, Federal aid would be sought and it would be declared a major disaster. Yet, because the deaths are stretched out across

the Nation's highways, a few here and there, we tend to ignore the impact of this useless, bloody sacrifice of lives upon the altar of the automobile.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged in the last few months of the last session of the 84th Congress to be appointed chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Highway Safety. The subcommittee was to determine the causes of our highway deaths and to discover what could be done to save lives. Our subcommittee held hearings in July and August from which we gained much valuable information. The subcommittee, in accordance with the provisions of House Resolution 357, filed its report this morning. Unfortunately, however, there was not adequate time for the subcommittee to complete its entire task within a few months. I believe that the need for the continuation of this study is self-evident from the horrendous number of accidents we have just witnessed over the holidays. I hope that within the very near future this Congress will approve a continuation of the subcommittee so that we can stop this trend to a greater and greater death march every time the Nation celebrates a holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the members of this subcommittee and the staff, all of whom were acutely aware of the seriousness of this national problem now of epidemic proportion. The hard-working, diligent members of the subcommittee were: Representatives SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; WALTER ROGERS, of Texas; JOHN BEAMER, of Indiana; and PAUL SCHENCK, of Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BROYHILL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for 1 week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MASON, for 1 hour, on January 14 on the subject Our Present Supreme Court and Its Recent Decisions.

Mr. BENTLEY, for 1 hour, on Monday, January 7, 1957.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, on Saturday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in four instances.

Mr. BROYHILL (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. DOYLE and to include appropriate material.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in 4 instances.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on January 10, following the legislative program of the day and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 1 hour for the purpose of memorializing our departed colleague, Mr. HINSHAW.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE CARL HINSHAW, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 14) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE T. MILLET HAND, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, It becomes my sad duty to inform the membership of the House of the sudden demise of our esteemed and distinguished colleague, T. MILLET HAND. An opportunity will be asked at a later date in order that Members so desiring may pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 15) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. T. MILLET HAND, a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. PERCY PRIEST, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a unanimous consent request will be presented for a day and time certain to be fixed to pay eulogy to our late colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST. Therefore, at this time I offer a resolution (H. Res. 16) for the present consideration of the House.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE-AT-LARGE FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, at a later date and time, a unanimous consent request will be made to pay eulogy to Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, a deceased Member of the House of Representatives. I now offer a resolution (H. Res. 17) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Saturday, January 5, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 84th Congress, 2d session:

2085. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 657, 84th Cong.).

2086. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841), the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 657, 84th Cong.).

2087. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to Sixty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 92, and the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to H. Res. 657, 84th Cong.).

2088. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 13, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Salem Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 17, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with four illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

2089. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 26, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion-control study of the shore of Saco, Maine, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

2090. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 482); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 657, 84th Cong.).

2091. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 5, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 17, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

2092. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 10, 1953, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Cook Inlet and tributaries, Alaska. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of harbors and rivers in Alaska, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and related water uses, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 30, 1948. It is also submitted in final response to several other congressional authorizations listed in the report (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with nine illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 858, 80th Cong.).

2093. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 14, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Cannonball River at Mott, N. Dak., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted March 20, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustration (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

2094. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 1, 1956, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on waterhyacinth obstructions in the waters of the Gulf and South Atlantic States, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 6, 1945, and in partial response to the authority contained in the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, on Lake Okeechobee and its tributary streams, Florida, with a view to removing the water-hyacinth (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 17 illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

2095. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on San Juan Harbor, P. R., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted December 21, 1945, and March 30, 1955, respectively (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 1 illustration (pursuant to Public Law 641, 84th Cong.).

[*Submitted Jan. 3, 1957*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956, both inclusive, pursuant to provisions of paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

3. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the annual report of the Home Loan Bank Board covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to Public Law 345, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264) and the general provisions of section 114 of the act of September 12, 1950 (31 U. S. C. 66b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To suspend the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, during periods of war or national emergency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 16th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Alcrest unit, Mountain Home Division, Snake River project, Idaho, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting copy of the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19–20, 1956, pursuant with provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 38th annual convention (H. Doc. No. 43), pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "To amend the act of June 24, 1936, as amended (relating to the collection and publication of peanut statistics), to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradiction of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of June 1956, pusuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

13. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of July 1956, pursuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

14. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of August 1956, pursuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

15. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of September 1956, pursuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

16. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of October 1956, pursuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

17. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relating to the cooperative program of the United

States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease reporting no significant developments for the month of November 1956, pursuant to the reporting requirement of section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

18. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report with respect to the disposition of agricultural products by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

19. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior (Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission), transmitting the Report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, U. S. C., title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of obligations incurred in excess of amounts permitted by the Administrative Regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, and procedures of the Forest Service thereunder, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951; to the Committee on Appropriations.

21. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits," for the fiscal year 1957, has been reapportioned and indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation pursuant to subsection (e) (1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of State for "Salaries and expenses" for the fiscal year 1957, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection 3679 (e) of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

23. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Indian Claims Commission for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1957, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

24. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Annuities, Panama Canal Construction employees and Lighthouse Service Widows," for the fiscal year 1957, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

25. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the National Mediation Board for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1957, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

26. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report stating that certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the administrative expense authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

28. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the appropriation to the Railroad Retirement Board for "Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board," for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

29. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service," for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

30. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Administering the public debt, Bureau of the Public Debt," for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

32. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Treasurer," for the fiscal year 1957, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

33. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Tariff Commission for "Salaries and Expenses, 1957" has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

34. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service," for the fiscal year 1957, has been reapportioned and indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 1 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

35. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, relative to submitting 144 reports covering 225 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

36. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting supplemental certification from the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification as required by the 1954 appropriation act, North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

37. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a report of overobligations of allotments by three operational units within the Department for the period ending March 31, 1956, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

38. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a report of four overobligations of allotments by operational units within the Department for the quarter ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

39. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, relative to requesting that a lump-sum appropriation in the amount of $2,081,000 be made to the Post Office Department for crediting postal revenues for the fiscal year 1957, etc., pursuant to Public Law 286, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

40. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report of a violation by an employee of the Department of State under subsection (h), pursuant to subsection 1 (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

41. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of information concerning a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), which occurred in the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

42. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of violations of overobligation or overexpenditure of amounts permitted by the agency regulations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, subsection (1) (2), and subsections (h), (g); to the Committee on Appropriations.

43. A letter from the Director, Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting copy No. 2 of the Statistical Supplement Stockpile Report to the Congress for the period January–June 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

44. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

45. A letter from the Director, Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

46. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a special report for consideration in connection with the semiannual reports, respecting payment of claims based on corrections of military records, which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury are required to make to Congress pursuant to section 207

(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 191a (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

47. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force Flying Pay Report for the period from March 1 to August 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

48. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the quarterly report of officers assigned for the period ending September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

49. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

50. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

52. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

53. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for the period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

54. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the 10th semiannual report of payments for the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

55. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report on property acquisitions for the period ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

56. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

57. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 23d report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the period ending September 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

59. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of the helium production fund for the year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to Fiftieth United States Statutes at Large, page 855; title 50, United States Code, section 164; to the Committee on Armed Services.

60. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period January 1 to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 2 (c) (11) and (16) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

61. A letter from the Chairman, National Security Training Commission, transmitting the first annual report, pursuant to chapter 8, section 262 (e), of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

62. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the sixth annual report for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 10 (g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a list of contracts executed by negotiation for experimental, developmental, or research work, etc., for the period January 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

64. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1956, with a report of receipts and disbursements, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

65. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting the eighth semiannual report of contracts, in excess of $50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

66. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the Report on Borrowing Authority for the quarter ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

67. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which presents a preliminary study of the problems raised by Government-sponsored research and development programs in industry, as well as a continuing review of the current status of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established under section 708 (b), pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

68. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report discussing the tax amortization program on competition and small business participation in the nitrogen industry, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

69. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 36th quarterly report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

70. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 37th quarterly report, covering the 3d quarter 1956, as required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

71. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting an interim report regarding the special investigation and study of the production, allocation, distribution, and use of nickel, pursuant to section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (sec. 3, Public Law 632, 84th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

72. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, relative to submitting an interim report on a survey of iron and steel scrap available and potentially available, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 631, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

73. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, for the year 1955, pursuant to section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

74. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting two monthly reports for July 1956 on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large business for work in the United States, in compliance with Section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, amending section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

75. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the monthly reports of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with business firms for work in the United States in compliance with section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, amendng section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

76. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large business for work in the United States for the months of July and August, the first 2 months of fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

77. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large business for work in the United States, covering the first 3 months of fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

78. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington covering the period January-June 1956, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

79. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report of operations for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to the provisions of section 17 (a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

80. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, transmitting a report of the Federal Facilities Corporation on tin operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

81. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, covering the period from August 2, 1954 to March 31, 1956, pursuant to title VI of the Housing Act of 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

82. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the period January 1-June 30, 1956, in accordance with section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

83. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration covering operations from January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (Public Law 163); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

84. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a quarterly report of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to September 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

86. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report for the 12 months ending June 30, 1956, and projection of our plans for the next fiscal year, pursuant to section 15 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

87. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and letter concerning allowances for the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C., and his immediate staff; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

88. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

89. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the American National Red Cross for 1955, and a supplemental combined statement of income and expenditures of the national organization and the 3,718 chapters and their 3,990 branches for the year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to 67 Statutes 178 of July 17, 1953. Also enclosed the opinion of the Army Audit Agency with combined statement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

90. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the fourth semiannual report as of June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; 50 U. S. C. App. 2001-2016), as amended, and of section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U. S. C. App. 1621-1627), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

91. A letter from the Permanent Executive Secretary, Interparliamentary Union, transmitting the 1956 Report of the American Group—Interparliamentary Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

92. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting the sixth semiannual report covering the period from January 1 to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

93. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of operation and maintenance of navigation projects by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

94. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on an examination of the United States assistance program for Israel for fiscal years 1952 through 1955, pursuant to the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U. S. C. 1811) and pertinent prior legislation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

95. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Farmers' Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

96. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the first overall report on a review of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

97. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the activities of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the Missouri River Basin for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

98. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Information Agency for the period August 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

99. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

100. A letter from the Comptroller of the United States transmitting a report on the audit of the power generating and marketing and related activities of the Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the Columbia River Basin for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

101. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the audit of the power generating and marketing and related activities of the Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the southeastern area, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

102. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the power generating and marketing and related activities of the Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins, including the Whitney project, Texas, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

103. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the operation, maintenance, and administration of recreational activities at reservoir projects by the Corps of Engineers, January 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

104. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the administration of individual Indian moneys by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, as of November 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

105. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the administration of Indian lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, as of January 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

106. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting a separate report from each of the military departments relative to the disposal of foreign excess property, for the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

107. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, etc., for the period January 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

108. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to educational and public health institutions covering the calendar quarter, April 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 61, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

109. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to educational and public health institutions covering the calendar quarter, July 1 through September 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 61, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

110. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the fourth report of the Department of State on its activities, exclusive of those of the International Cooperation Administration, for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1955, pursuant to title IV, section 404 (d) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

111. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1956, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

112. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting

a copy of a resolution entered upon the minutes of the Commission, relative to the death of Hon. J. Percy Priest on October 12, 1956, who served with distinction as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

113. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of a resolution entered upon the minutes of the Commission, relative to the death of Hon. J. Percy Priest on October 12, 1956, who served with distinction as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

114. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting certificates of ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in each of the States on November 6, 1956, pursuant to the final clause of section 6 of title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

115. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the claim of *The Choctaw Nation, Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, docket No. 103, pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

116. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the San Luis unit, West San Joaquin division, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

117. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a preliminary report covering the activities and accomplishments of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, dated July 18, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 75, 84th Congress, approved June 16, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

118. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report on Synthetic Liquid Fuels for the Year 1955, Part 1—Oil From Coal, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

119. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Louis L. and Helen M. Perkins, to provide facilities and services at the La Push area of Olympic National Park, Wash., for a period of from approximately 5½ to 10½ years from May 15, 1956, together with financial summary of the operations of the prior concessioner for the period June 1, 1951, through December 31, 1953, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

120. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting structural analysis and report of the Ford's Theatre Building (Lincoln Museum), Washington, D. C., pursuant to Public Law 372, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

121. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the renewal of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 185, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

122. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report on the commissary and messing facilities activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, pursuant to Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the eighth interim report, covering causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances, pursuant to Public Law 657, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

124. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 22d annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

125. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

126. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

128. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

129. Letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting two publications for the information of the House of Representatives, entitled, "Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1956," and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1954;" to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

130. Letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a newly issued publication entitled, "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1955," for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

131. Letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting three sets of maps and publications, Nos. M–46, M–47, and S–123 for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

132. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting information relating to Irving Wayne, Ely Novich, and Adolfo Orive-Alba to be included with letter of September 14, 1956, which enclosed copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting information relating to Jozo Barich to be included with letter of August 6, 1956, which enclosed copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Agriculture for the period July 1, 1955, to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act as reenacted (28 U. S. C. 2671–2680); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1956, required by section 2673, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended and codified (28 U. S. C. 2671–2680); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of amounts paid for the fiscal year 1956, required by section 9805, pursuant to the Maritime Claims Act of October 20, 1951, as codified (10 U. S. C. 9801–9806); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended and codified (10 U. S. C. 2731–2735), required by section 2732f; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims settled and not settled arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 907, 84th Congress, approved August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 920); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

139. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal tort claims paid by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

140. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to provisions of section 1 (e), Public Law 439, 82d Congress, approved July 3, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

141. A letter from the Navy Cross Corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, Inc., transmitting a financial report for the period from July 21, 1956, to September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 14 (b), Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of Federal tort claims paid by the Canal Zone Government for the period June 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of Federal tort claims paid by the Central Intelligence Agency during fiscal year 1956, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid during the fiscal year 1956 under part 2, pursuant to provisions of section 404, Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C., 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "For the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "For the relief of Dr. Harold J. Heck"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendations concerning the claim of Ernest Hagler against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413, U. S. C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. A letter from Samuel D. McIlwain (former president), Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., transmitting annual report for the Conference of State So-

cieties for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 293, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a report on Federal tort claims paid during fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on Federal tort claims paid by General Services Administration during fiscal year 1956, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders authorizing admission were issued pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders authorizing admission were issued pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of Cheung Kam Yin, A–8931052, involving provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting that the case be withdrawn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) were exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to provisions of section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of William G. Yu-Ming Diao, 0300–460545, involving the provisions of section 6, Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting that the case be withdrawn due to the death of the applicant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

157. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a list with several names of aliens, which orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to provisions of section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

159. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in several cases of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

160. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in several cases of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

161. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in several cases of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States pursuant to provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of Mo Ling Hwang-Chen nee Hwang, A–6851705, involving the provisions of section 6, Refugee Relief Act of 1953, requesting the case be withdrawn as the applicant made permanent departure from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the cases of George J. Martinek, Eva Martinek, and Carolina or Karla Martinek, A–6877302, A–7138175, and A–7858833, involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

164. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of Ho Kee, alias Kee Ho, A–9770731, involving suspension of deportation, due to the death of the respondent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

165. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of Sing Chue, A–9700804, suspension of deportation, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

166. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the case of Fred Alexander Haddix, Jr., A–6063049, involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to act of 1952, section 241 (a) (1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

167. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1956, showing claims paid under authority of section 2673 (28 U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

168. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of the receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 470; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

169. A letter from the National Commandant, Marine Corps League, transmitting copies of the several reports of committees and officers at the National Convention, Miami Beach, Fla., pursuant to charter of 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

170. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the payment of claims settled for damage caused by vessels of the Navy and of claims for towage or for salvage services rendered to Navy vessels, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 8 of the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726; 46 U. S. C. 797); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

171. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the collection of claims settled for damage caused by a vessel or floating object to property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, pursuant to section 2 of the act of December 5, 1945 (34 U. S. C. 600b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all settlements made by the Department of the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, of personnel claims of $6,500 or less, pursuant to section 1 (e) of Public Law 439, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

173. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting report of the claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

174. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting copy of the Sixth Semiannual Report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, pursuant to Public Law 203, 83d Congress, 1st session, as amended by Public Law 751, 83d Congress, as required by the provisions of section 19 of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting correspondence showing the receipt of payment of a claim in a net amount exceeding $3,000 due the United States for damage to Government property and settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 647 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

176. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of payment of a claim by the Gulf Oil Corp. covering damage to the United States Coast Guard submarine cable by the steamship *Gulftrade* from Cape May, N. J., to Cape Henlopen, Del., July 6, 1956, pursuant to section 647 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

177. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a report listing the tort claims approved for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. A letter from the Acting General Manager, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the period from July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a report of the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1956, showing claims paid under authority of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the executive director, United States Olympic Association, Inc., transmitting the financial report, as of December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 12, Public Law 805, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

181. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the tort claims paid during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Congress (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

182. A letter from the Commissioners, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 20th semiannual report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

183. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report

of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions from April 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

184. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions from July 1 through September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

185. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

186. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of September 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

187. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report covering activities under the Federal aid in fish restoration program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to section II of act of Congress approved August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 16 U. S. C. 777); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

188. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 3, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Birnie Creek, Wash., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, United States Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 22, 1950, and August 16, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 3, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Siletz River bar and entrance and Drift Creek, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted May 20, 1946, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

190. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report together with accompanying papers on a letter report of Reclamation District No. 768, Humboldt County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

191. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on White River at and below Clarendon, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 12, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

192. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 2, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Siuslaw River, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 6, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

193. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Missouri River, vicinity of Watson, Mo., to vicinity of Leavenworth, Kans., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

194. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Middle Guadalupe Basin Soil Conservation District, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

195. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Kanab Creek, Utah and Arizona, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

196. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 29, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., small-boat channel at Bay Bridge, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

197. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 10, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on East River and Flushing Bay, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, adopted January 19, 1940; to the Committee on Public Works.

198. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 15, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Mahoning and Grand River Basins, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 6, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on New London Harbor (Bentleys Creek), Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 17, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

200. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Salinas River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

201. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Skagit River and tributaries, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Acts, approved June 13, 1934, June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

202. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Board, pursuant to section 12 (c), Public Law 831, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

203. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

204. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report stating that the appropriation to the Justice Department for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1957 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

205. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of an overobligation of an allotment of funds made to Dr. A. B. Beaumont, State conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service, for the period ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Satutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951; to the Committee on Appropriations.

206. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of GSA operations in the production of abaca during fiscal year 1956, pursuant to Public Law 683, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

207. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the number of officers in the Coast Guard above the rank of lieutenant commander who are authorized to receive flight pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of certain activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, in the Central Valley Basin, Calif., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

209. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U. S. C. 278a), and in the manner contemplated in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841); to the Committee on Government Operations.

210. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

212. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, and the annual certified public accountant's audit of the books of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

213. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Tai Look Wong, A–7985659, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, trans-

mitting a report relative to the establishment of certain positions, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

215. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 23d annual report covering the activities of the TVA during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

216. A letter from the Director, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the report of the National Capital Planning Commission for fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 13 of Public Law 592, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

217. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report on operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

218. A letter from the national adjutant, American Disabled Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of our national gathering, held in San Antonio, Tex., August 19 through 24, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

219. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Ill. and Ind. (Calumet-Sag navigation project), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 30, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

220. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

221. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

223. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

224. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active service under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

226. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy, to fix the compensation of civilian clergymen appointed as chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof, and for certain other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the supply and distribution of nickel and related matters, pursuant to section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (sec. 3, Public Law 632, 84th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

228. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States as authorized in section 415 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

229. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the disposition of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

230. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the desirability of a food-stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and local units of government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories and possessions, so as to prevent the accumulation of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

231. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to fix responsibility in the American Battle Monuments Commission for the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree Site in Santiago, Cuba"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

233. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States transmitting additional certificates of ascertainment received to date from the executives of the States named in the attached list, which supplements a list dated December 19, 1956, pursuant to the final clause of section 6, title 3, of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

234. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 22d annual report of the Commission covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and certain other laws covering same to date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of Indian irrigation or power project works to water users' associations or irrigation districts organized under State law, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to ratify and confirm conveyances of allotted land on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota by fullblood Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

239. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

240. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

241. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material"; to the Committee on Public Works.

242. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

243. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

244. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the United States Court of Claims for the year ended September 29, 1956, pursuant to section 791 (c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

245. A letter from the chairman, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

246. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

247. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1956, pursuant to Public Law 886, 80th Congress, amended by Public Law 116, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

248. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Tudorachi Sava, also known as Tony Sava, A–5562072, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports of committees on public bills and resolutions were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 84th Congress, 2d session:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Report No. 2945 (pt. 2). Report on Publications Management Pursuant to House Resolution 262 (84th Cong.); without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 84th Congress, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 105, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. Report pertaining to housing investigation pursuant to House Resolution 203, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report of Subcommittee No. 2 on Government procurement, disposal, and loan activities pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the portland-cement industry pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on regulatory agencies and commissions pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1956, pursuant to House Resolution 483, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on safety of life at sea duty pursuant to House Resolution 653, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on highway traffic safety pursuant to House Resolution 357, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on airspace use study pursuant to section 136, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress and House Resolution 105, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on newsprint study-newsprint outlook for 1957 pursuant to House Resolution 105, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on abandonment of Panama Railroad pursuant to House Resolution 118, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 5. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 8. A bill to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 9. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 11. A bill—

DECLARATION AND PURPOSE OF POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260, as amended) and the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, sec. 306) to require compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 13. A bill to amend sections 323, 331, 334, 335, 336, 337, 363, and 376 of, and to add a new section to, the Bankruptcy Act approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 14. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for price support for basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 15. A bill to authorize the payment of damages to the landowners of certain drainage districts in Missouri, arising from the construction and operation of navigation pools in the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 16. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 17. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 18. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 19. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 21. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment

Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 22. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages securing loans which are guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 23. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain expenditures for the acquisition or improvement of business property made in any taxable year, to the extent such expenditures do not exceed $50,000, to be deducted in the year paid or incurred or to be amortized over such longer period as may be selected by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 24. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 25. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act so as to provide that in issuing bonds under that act, preference shall be given to trust funds and other subscribers seeking to invest funds which represent real savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 26. A bill to increase to 12 the number of members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to provide that their terms of office shall be 6 years, and to abolish the Federal Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to such Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 27. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chainstores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 28. A bill to provide that owners of land acquired for public works projects shall in certain cases be entitled to reimbursement for resettlement costs resulting from such acquisition; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 29. A bill to repeal section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 30. A bill to make the Alaska Railroad subject to the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 31. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 32. A bill to provide for a Commission on Naval Vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 33. A bill to change the name of the Public Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 34. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 35. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by increasing the amount which is exempt from the surtax on corporate taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 36. A bill to encourage equity investments through tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 37. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 38. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of casein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 39. A bill to give relief in the case of transfers to United States charities which are subjected to State and foreign death taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 40. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 41. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 42. A bill to encourage the provision of housing for families of low and moderate income by means of special incentives relating to income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 43. A bill to assist individuals to provide financial security upon retirement and to make provisions for surviving members of their families by allowing an income-tax deduction for premiums paid on annuity and life-insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 44. A bill to establish a Commission on Programs for the Aging; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 45. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 46. A bill to provide for the collection of income tax at source on dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 47. A bill to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income-tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 48. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 51. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 52. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 53. A bill to consolidate into one act, and to simplify and make more uniform, the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, hospitalization, and burial benefits, and to consolidate into one act the laws pertaining to the administration of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 54. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 55. A bill to consolidate into one act the administrative, penal, and regulatory provisions of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 56. A bill to simplify and make more uniform the laws governing the payment of pension for age, service, or for non-service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 57. A bill to consolidate all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration which relate to furnishing hospital and domiciliary care and medical treatment to veterans, to the acquisition and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities, and to burial and funeral benefits for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 58. A bill to amend Public No. 2, 73d Congress, so as to impose additional requirements on certain veterans seeking hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 59. A bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend until July 25, 1958, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, to remove certain impediments to the processing of applications for direct loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 60. A bill to amend section 605 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that 20 percent of the national service life insurance fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans, and that the interest from such loans in excess of the average rate of interest on the portion of such fund invested in other obligations shall be used to pay the costs of administering such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 61. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 62. A bill to provide that pension for non-service-connected disability or death, or for age, shall not be paid under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any alien who is not a resident of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 63. A bill to prohibit the payment of pension, under applications hereafter filed, to aliens who are not residents in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 64. A bill relating to the payment of veterans' pension, compensation, and retirement pay during hospitalization or institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 65. A bill to provide certain allowances and benefits to personnel of the Veterans' Administration who are United States citizens and are assigned to the Veterans' Administration office in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 66. A bill to repeal the provisions of law which require that payments be made to Philippine pensioners on the basis of 1 Philippine peso for each American dollar; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 67. A bill to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 68. A bill to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 69. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 70. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who married the veteran before January 1, 1938, may be eligible for death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 71. A bill to prohibit the payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions for periods longer than 60 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 72. A bill to amend section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, to provide for the disposition of certain benefits which are unpaid at the death of the intended beneficiary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 73. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 74. A bill to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension, the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 75. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 76. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 77. A bill to provide a direct old-age pension of $75 a month for every citizen of the United States who is 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 78. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bagpipes, kilts, and sporrans on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 79. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make certain payments to the County of Mecklenburg, State of Virginia, from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va., and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 80. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make certain payments to the counties of Dinwiddie, Nottoway, and Brunswick, State of Virginia, based upon the proceeds of sales of timber located on land within Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 81. A bill to establish general policies for mobilization purposes governing industrial properties of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 82. A bill to terminate the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to educational institutions for housing construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 83. A bill to provide for a survey of the production of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 84. A bill providing for a survey by the Comptroller General of the United States of the operation by the Department of Defense of commissary stores and post exchanges; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 85. A bill to add a new title relating to real property management to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 86. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus Government property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 87. A bill to provide for effecting the disposition of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 88. A bill for the relief of Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 89. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 90. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 91. A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 92. A bill relating to the import tax on sugar used after June 30, 1955, as livestock feed or in the production of livestock feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 93. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 94. A bill authorizing the construction of the Littleville Reservoir project, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 95. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 96. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class parcel post; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 97. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 98. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 99. A bill to authorize remedial works and measures to prevent the silting of Sandy Slough in Lincoln County, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 100. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the discharge from the Armed Forces of men whose families reside on a farm and whose continued absence from home would seriously impair the successful operation of the farm; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 101. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 102. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deferment from training and service thereunder of men residing on a farm with their families when their induction would seriously impair the successful operation of the farm; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 103. A bill to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 104. A bill to prohibit wiretapping except by a court-authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of crimes against the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 105. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 106. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 107. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 108. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 109. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 110. A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 111. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 112. A bill to improve the United State Code by enacting into law title 26, entitled "Internal Revenue"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 113. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 114. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 115. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to allow compensation to counsel assigned by the court in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 116. A bill to prohibit insurance companies doing insurance business of an interstate character from issuing group health, hospitalization, and accident insurance which may be canceled after a period of 3 years for any reason other than nonpayment of premium; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 117. A bill to liberalize the basis for and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 118. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 119. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 120. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 121. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 122. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of

pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 123. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 124. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces in the Philippine Islands during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 125. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 126. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate for future construction the deductions for amortization of emergency facilities and grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 129. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of medical expenses without regard to the maximum limitations of existing law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 130. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a longer period for claiming refund or credit of income tax where the claim is based upon a judicial decision affecting tax liability in a similar case; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 131. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social-security benefits or subject to social-security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 132. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 133. A bill to exempt from tax assessments paid by club members for capital improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 134. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the annuities of certain retired employees who served in Alaska and on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 135. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 136. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 137. A bill to provide an equitable adjustment for retirement pay of naval and Marine Corps officers commissioned from the enlisted ranks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 138. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 so as to provide that in the absence of a designation of beneficiary thereunder by a person having national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance the designated beneficiary of such insurance shall also be the designated beneficiary of any indemnity payable under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 139. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 140. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 141. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 142. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 143. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 144. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 145. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 146. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, and to reenact all acts repealed or amended by the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 147. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 148. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 149. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 150. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amounts payable thereunder by the Federal Government to States having approved plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 151. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 152. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 153. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

H. R. 154. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 155. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for air carriers providing service by helicopter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 156. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 157. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 158. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 159. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 160. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to define mothers for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 161. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 162. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,500 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 164. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 165. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 166. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 167. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 168. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 169. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 170. A bill to provide for the modification of the Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 171. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 172. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that an employee who has received compensation for

total disability continuously for 20 years shall thereafter be paid compensation for total disability for the remainder of his life; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 173. A bill to amend section 12 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 174. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 175. A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 176. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 177. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 178. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 179. A bill to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 180. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 181. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 182. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight and other unlighted cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 183. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, so as to provide for import controls, and modify the provisions relating to export controls for the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 184. A bill to permit involuntarily separated postmasters, when post offices are discontinued, to acquire classified civil-service status through noncompetitive civil-service examinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 185. A bill to prohibit the importation of pork and other agricultural commodities and products from the Soviet Union, Poland, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 186. A bill to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 187. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 188. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent sudden and unreasonable decreases in the price of hogs and cattle which are sold at stockyards, or to packers subject to that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 189. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 190. A bill to extend the death benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the dependents of certain Reserve members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 191. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 192. A bill to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, may be removed for cause; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 193. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 194. A bill providing that no treaty now existing or hereafter to be created shall contain any provision abridging the sovereign power of the United States, nor of any State thereof, nor shall any treaty amend or abridge any law of the United States or of any State thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 195. A bill providing for a deduction of $1,200 on the income tax of parents for each dependent in college for each year of attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 196. A bill to provide for accrued servicemen's indemnity payments in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 197. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 198. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to compensate the city of Williston, N. Dak., for the acquisition and replacement of the municipal water supply and water-treatment facilities which will be damaged, impaired, or rendered inoperative by the construction and operation of Garrison Dam and Reservoir on the Missouri River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 199. A bill to protect the integrity and independence of national banks by strengthening the laws relating to ownership of stock in such banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 200. A bill to change the name of the reservoir above Garrison Dam, and known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, to Lake Sakakawea; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 201. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 202. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 203. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 204. A bill providing that in the interpretation of any treaty made between the United States and any other independent state, the Supreme Court of the United States shall be the sole judge thereof, notwithstanding the provision of any treaty now existing or hereafter to be made, to the contrary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 205. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 206. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 207. A bill limiting the power of the Security Council of the United Nations or any other agency created by treaty to call for troops of the United States to serve in foreign countries, without the consent of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 208. A bill making it a criminal offense for any officer of the Armed Forces or any member of the Armed Forces or any member of the Chiefs of Staff to take retaliatory measures against any officer or enlisted man in the Armed Forces of the United States for any testimony he gives or answers he makes under oath before any committee of the Congress, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 209. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 210. A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in agricultural extension work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 211. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 212. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 213. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 214. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and

report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Creek Indian Council House and the grounds which constitute its site as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 215. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 216. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 217. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended, relating to the retirement pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 218. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 219. A bill to amend section 4141 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of repealing the manufacturers excise tax on phonograph records; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 220. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for amortization deductions with respect to housing facilities for farmworkers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 222. A bill to provide that certain voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 223. A bill relating to the reporting for income-tax purposes of dues and fees received by nonprofit service corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 224. A bill to amend section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exemption of voluntary employees' beneficiary associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 225. A bill to amend section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exemption of voluntary employees' beneficiary associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 226. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that amounts earned by an individual in or after the month in which he attains age 72 shall not be counted as earnings for purposes of computing deductions from his benefits under the work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 227. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 228. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 229. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the Southern District of California, and to redesignate the present Southern District of California as the Middle District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 230. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the permissible methods of accounting to be used in computing taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 234. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the 30 percent withholding tax with respect to the income of certain nonresident aliens and foreign corporations shall not apply in the case of rentals derived from the exhibition of motion pictures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair (including painting and papering) of property used by him as his principal residence to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 236. A bill to allow certain expenses paid for the repair and maintenance of a personal residence as an income-tax deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 237. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the acquisition of real property by trade-in shall in certain cases constitute a nontaxable exchange for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 239. A bill to amend the provisions of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program relating to the investment of the assets of the trust fund, to consolidate the reporting of wages by employers for income tax withholding and old-age and survivors insurance purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 240. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 241. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 242. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to certain community organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 243. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 244. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be regarded as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to give men whose wives are institutionalized the advantages of the deduction provided for expenses for care of dependents in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 246. A bill to provide domestic and community sanitation facilities and services for Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 247. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service-retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 248. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 249. A bill to require persons who obtain commissions for rendering assistance in the obtaining of Government contracts to register with the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 250. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 252. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 253. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 254. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point-preference eligibles in the postal service, transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 256. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 257. A bill to revise the laws relating to the claims and services of former employees in matters affecting the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 258. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 259. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 260. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against

liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 261. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State, or of a Federal court, shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 262. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 263. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 264. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 265. A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 266. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 267. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Newark, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 268. A bill to provide that provisions of law governing the payment of office expenses for certain United States commissioners shall apply to United States commissioners in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 269. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 270. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, so as to provide for appellate review of sentences, on appeal by the defendant, in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 271. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 272. A bill to permit judicial review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 273. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 274. A bill to provide for the temporary free entry of religious sceneramas and other articles imported for exhibition by religious societies or institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 275. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the donation to the Bureau of Prisons of commodities acquired through price-support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 276. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 277. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 278. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 279. A bill to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 280. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 282. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the wiliful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 283. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 284. A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 285. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 286. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 287. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to provisions governing notice of copyright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 288. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to permit payment of the burial allowance where discharge requirements are or have been met through a change by competent authority; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 289. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide that the Veterans' Administration will transport the body of a veteran, who dies in a State home for disabled soldiers and sailors, to the place of burial within the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 290. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide for payment of not in excess of $75 to cover the cost of acquisition of a burial site for certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 291. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 292. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1935, as amended, to permit the disposal of lands and interests in lands by the Secretary of State to aliens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 293. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 294. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 295. A bill to provide that the transfer of certain trust property and of certain Federal responsibilities, in connection with the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe for Federal jurisdiction, shall be delayed until December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 297. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE.

H. R. 298. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 299. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 300. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 301. A bill to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 302. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age assistance otherwise payable to an individual thereunder shall not be reduced on account of certain increases in any insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 303. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 304. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 305. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 306. A bill to provide a program of grants and scholarships to encourage education and training in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 307. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 308. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 309. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston,

Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 310. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 311. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of worsted fabric in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the worsted-fabric industry, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 312. A bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 313. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and Local Governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 314. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 315. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 316. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 317. A bill to appropriate $10 million for certain flood-control projects on the Merrimack River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 318. A bill to authorize certain flood-control measures on the Merrimack River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 319. A bill appropriating money for the improvement of the Merrimack River from its mouth to Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 320. A bill to provide that courts administering estates of deceased persons may require that legacies payable to persons in certain Communist countries be paid in the form of necessaries of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 321. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits payable thereunder, to reduce the age at which such benefits become payable, to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deduction from such benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 322. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 323. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 324. A bill to provide that in determining income of beneficiaries, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not include the value of certain property acquired by bequest, devise, or inheritance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by increasing the amount which is exempt from the surtax on corporate taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 326. A bill to provide that in determining income of beneficiaries, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not include certain amounts which are not considered as income for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 327. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 328. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the income tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 329. A bill to amend Public Law 361, 77th Congress, to provide for admission of certain combat veterans to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities pending adjudication of service connection of the disabilities for which they need treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 330. A bill to provide that every combat veteran awarded the Purple Heart shall be deemed to be 10 percent disabled from service-connected causes in addition to any other disabilities from which he is suffering; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax amounts paid for admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 332. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired list of persons retired for disability after 30 years' service or more; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 333. A bill to amend section 23 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to tax treatment of certain casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 334. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop if fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish new corporate tax rates by reducing the normal tax on corporate income and placing such tax on a graduated basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 337. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 338. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 339. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 340. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 341. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the taxes on admissions, club dues, communications, and transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 343. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 345. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Illinois State Normal University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 346. A bill to amend section 723 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 347. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 348. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 349. A bill to amend section 608 of the National Housing Act to prevent the charging of excessive rents, resulting from unduly high estimates of costs, in the case of property covered by a mortgage insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 350. A bill to provide for Federal participation and cooperation with States and local interests in developing water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 351. A bill creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 352. A bill to amend section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 353. A bill to authorize the project for the improvement of Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 354. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a new program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 355. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 356. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 357. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 358. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 359. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 360. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 361. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 362. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 363. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 364. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, Minn., from mile 14.2 to its mouth; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 365. A bill to amend section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to place certain restrictions upon ownership or control of broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 366. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 367. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 368. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River for flood-control and allied purposes in the vicinity of Mankato and North Mankato, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 369. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U. S. C. 261–265); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 370. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for the transaction of business in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 371. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 372. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 373. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on the Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 374. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 375. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 376. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 377. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 378. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 379. A bill to establish dates for celebrating certain public legal holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY (by request):

H. R. 381. A bill to amend Public, No. 2, 73d Congress, to provide care for disabled veterans having neuropsychiatric ailments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 382. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means

H. R. 383. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 384. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which individuals may become entitled to benefits thereunder from 65 to 62 in the case of men and to 60 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 385. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 386. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 387. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 388. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 389. A bill to amend Public Law 361, 77th Congress, to provide for admission of certain combat veterans to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities pending adjudication of service connection of the disabilities for which they need treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 390. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 391. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 392. A bill to designate the building to be constructed as the principal office of the Atomic Energy Commission under the act of May 6, 1955, as the Enrico Fermi Building, to provide for the establishment therein of an appropriate memorial to Dr. Fermi, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 393. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 394. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 395. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 396. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 397. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 398. A bill to reaffim the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 399. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to, technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 400. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 401. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 402. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse), the exemption for a dependent, and

the additional exemption for old age or blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 403. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 404. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 405. A bill to prohibit the severence of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 406. A bill to increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 407. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 408. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 409. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 410. A bill to increase the rates of disability and death compensation and additional allowances for dependents payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 411. A bill to authorize a clothing allowance for certain veterans wearing or using prosthetic appliances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 412. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 413. A bill to provide a further period for presuming service connection in the case of veterans suffering from Hansen's disease (leprosy); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 414. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 415. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 416. A bill to exclude life-insurance payments from any source in the annual income computation for death-pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 417. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 418. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of emergency hospital care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 419. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 420. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that malignant tumors developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 421. A bill to authorize restoration of a remarried widow to the rolls upon termination of her remarried status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 422. A bill to amend the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, to mature United States Government life insurance when the insured becomes 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 423. A bill to regulate the membership of sections of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 424. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 425. A bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of producers of gasoline and other petroleum products, by enabling retail gasoline dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of producers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises and leases with their dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 426. A bill to eliminate certain practices in the marketing of gasoline and other petroleum products which tend to cause destructive and unfair methods of competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 427. A bill to amend section 4 of the Sherman Act to prescribe a procedure with respect to consent judgments, decrees, or orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 428. A bill to eliminate certain practices in the marketing of petroleum products which tend to cause destructive and unfair methods of competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 429. A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court-martial, or if not court-martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to provide for correction of records in the case of certain persons not given honorable discharges in the past; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 430. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 431. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 432. A bill to amend section 16 of the Clayton Act to provide for the payment of costs of the suit and attorneys' fees to private parties who proceed to enforce the antitrust laws in the public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 433. A bill establishing a commission to study certain aspects of the restrictions on political activities imposed under sections 9, 12, and 15 of the act commonly referred to as the Hatch Political Activities Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 434. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 435. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 436. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 437. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 438. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 439. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 440. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 441. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 442. A bill to provide that admissions to entertainment events conducted by certain civic and community membership associations shall be exempt from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 443. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 444. A bill to amend section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the definition of "nonbusiness debt"); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 445. A bill to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the classification and rate of duty on certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes paid or determined and customs duties paid on distilled spirits, wines, beer, tobacco products, and cigarette papers and tubes lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by authorized officials as a result of a major disaster; to provide for refund of internal revenue tax paid on beer lost or rendered unmarketable as result of floods of 1951; and to provide for refund or credit of taxes paid on distilled spirits and wines of Puerto Rican manufacture lost or rendered unmarketable or condemned by health authorities as result of hurricanes of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 447. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain losses arising from a major disaster may be carried back 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 448. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 449. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain handmade and moldmade paper on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 450. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Pemberton, Leflore County, Miss., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the validity of a lien for taxes as against a mechanic's lien; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 452. A bill to extend certain rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of service in the Armed Forces of the United States to certain citizens of the United States who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 453. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide education and training rights for persons who enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States during January 1955, but who were not on active duty on January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 454. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 455. A bill to provide that a manufacturer or producer of nonbeverage products containing distilled spirits shall not be required to pay the tax imposed on such spirits by section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code if he is appropriately licensed and bonded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 456. A bill to amend section 202 of the Social Security Act to permit certain beneficiaries of an insured individual to meet the applicable proof-of-support requirements even though such individual was unable by reason of illness or injury to provide such support during a period ending with his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 457. A bill to provide Federal assistance to business enterprises, communities, and individuals injured by tariff reductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 458. A bill to repeal the manufacturer's excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 459. A bill relating to information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for public inspection of information required from certain organizations and trusts exempted from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 461. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 462. A bill to establish certain qualifications for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and for judges of the United States courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 463. A bill to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 464. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be granted leave upon the critical illness or death of a close relative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 465. A bill to require that whenever an officer or member who is discharged from the Armed Forces is so mentally deranged or unstable as to be potentially dangerous, his family and certain other persons are to be placed on notice of such potential danger; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 466. A bill to provide that credit shall be given to Reserve officers for service performed by them with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 467. A bill to provide that certain officers of the uniformed services who have been retired for disability incurred in line of duty, and who hold civilian office or employment with the United States, may receive retired pay and civilian pay totaling $6,000; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 468. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to authorize the insurance of loans made to finance the installation of irrigation systems and facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 469. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 470. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 471. A bill relating to the retired pay of certain retired officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 472. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to establish an additional wages basis for computing compensation in cases of recurrence of disability and in cases of death occurring subsequent to such recurrence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 473. A bill to provide that 66⅔ percent of money rentals received by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from leasing for agricultural or grazing purposes lands located within school districts shall be paid to such school districts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 474. A bill to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 475. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 476. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 477. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 478. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 479. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the licensing of foreign freight forwarders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 480. A bill to amend section 16 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 481. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 482. A bill to establish the Federal Maritime Board as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 483. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 484. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 485. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for the taxpayer if he or his spouse is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 487. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 488. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 489. A bill to encourage the extension and improvement of voluntary health prepayment plans or policies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 491. A bill to provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for International Cultural Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 493. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an exclusion from gross income in the case of damages recovered under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 495. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 496. A bill to change the name of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Office of Rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 497. A bill to provide for the donation of certain cotton and cotton materials to States for use by needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 498. A bill to provide for an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, to increase certain allowances of and provide more adequate office space for such official, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 499. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a 2,477.43-acre tract of land, avigation, and sewer easements in Tarrant and Wise Counties, Tex., situated about 20 miles northwest of the city of Fort Worth, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 500. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation

Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 501. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 502. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 503. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 504. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 505. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 506. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 507. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 508. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 509. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 510. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 511. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 512. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court and to provide that persons who have held certain Federal and State offices shall be ineligible for appointment to any Federal judgeship within 5 years after leaving such offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 513. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 514. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 515. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 516. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 517. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 518. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to establish a procedure for making wage determinations under that act, and to provide for judicial review of such wage determinations, to the same extent as wage determinations are made and judicial review is provided under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 519. A bill to terminate certain functions of the Public Housing Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 520. A bill prohibiting a member of the Home Loan Bank Board from being a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 521. A bill relating to the transfer of funds by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 522. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations issued pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 523. A bill relating to the retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 524. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 525. A bill to authorize construction of a building in Winona, Minn., to house the Federal post office and Federal and county courtrooms and offices; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 526. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 527. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 528. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 529. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $250 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 530. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 531. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on Mississippi River (Frontenac), Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 532. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on the Iowa River, Iowa and Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 533. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 534. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 535. A bill to provide that rental income from farming, and amounts received under the soil-bank program, shall constitute net earnings from self-employment for purposes of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 536. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make certain benefits applicable to Canal Zone and other employees retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 537. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer casein from the dutiable list to the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 538. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 539. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 540. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people; to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 541. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees (and former employees) of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., for unpaid compensation for overtime services performed by them between June 1, 1945, and March 16, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 542. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 543. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation and other disposal of property to tax-supported public recreation agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 544. A bill to repeal the tax of 20 percent of all amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, or merchandise, at any roofgarden, cabaret, or other similar place; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 545. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 546. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 547. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide for the allocation of unused visas; to admit certain aliens afflicted with tuberculosis; and to provide relief to certain aliens under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 548. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 549. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 550. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 551. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 552. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 553. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 554. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 555. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 556. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.50; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 557. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to make acreage removed from production by quota programs eligible for the acreage reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 558. A bill to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 559. A bill to provide certain additional assistance to small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 560. A bill to establish programs to facilitate the procurement of scientists and technicians for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 561. A bill to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 562. A bill to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office for Senior Citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 563. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to prohibit approval of State laws unless they contain provisions for the payment of certain benefits during illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 564. A bill to facilitate the procurement of doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry for the Armed Forces by providing grants and scholarships for education in the medical and dental professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 565. A bill to provide for a survey of feasibility for water conservation in the Etonia Creek and Rice Creek Basin and vicinity; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 566. A bill to authorize a project for flood control and wildlife conservation in the Saginaw River Basin, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 567. A bill making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of vocational training for certain adult Indians; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 568. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Labor to make a study of wage differentials between men and women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 569. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit children adopted by United States citizens to be naturalized in certain cases without satisfying the residence and physical presence requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 570. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 571. A bill to provide a particular designation for the west highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 572. A bill to provide a particular designation for the east highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 573. A bill to prohibit the operation of budget planning services in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 574. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 575. A bill to provide that public lands of the United States shall not be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 576. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho and Wyo., the Narrows Federal reclamation project and a reregulating reservoir below the Palisades Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 577. A bill to require the leasing or disposition of at least 20,000 acres of the Hawaiian home lands in any calendar 5-year period; to provide for a Federal contribution to the Hawaiian home-loan fund; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 578. A bill to establish quotas on imports of crude petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 579. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which old-age and survivors insurance benefits become payable to 55 in the case of widows, and to 60 in the case of other individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 580. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 581. A bill to transfer certain land to the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 582. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 583. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 584. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 585. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to repeal the exemptions for retail and service establishments and for processors of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 586. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 587. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 588. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 589. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 590. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed each taxpayer, each dependent, and $1,800 for a dependent child (until said child reaches 21 years of age) while attending any accredited business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 591. A bill to create the office of Senate Delegate in the Senate of the United States for former Presidents of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 592. A bill amending chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the manufacture, use, and shipment of various and sundry types of cigar and cigarette tobaccos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 593. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control and other purposes on the Purgatoire River in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 594. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 595. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to the transfer of restricted data for military purposes, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 596. A bill to amend section 703 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for additional payments in lieu of taxes, for certain periods ending after December 31, 1954, with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R.597. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 598. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to give United States district courts jurisdiction of certain offenses committed by Americans outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 599. A bill to provide a new method for apportioning Representatives in Congress

among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 600. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 601. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 602. A bill authorizing surveys and studies bearing upon the possible use of atomic energy for utility service requirements of buildings and grounds under the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 603. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purpose of pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 604. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxability of the proceeds from stock sold by individuals in order that they may enter Government service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit organizations from the tax on bowling alleys, billiard tables, and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 606. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 607. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 608. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 609. A bill to amend the law in force with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 610. A bill to exempt churches from the excise tax on bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 611. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for making payments in lieu of taxes on certain real property of the United States Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 612. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 613. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 614. A bill to provide for programs of public-facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 615. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 616. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 617. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 618. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 619. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 620. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 621. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 623. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in certain Communist-controlled countries or produced from raw materials originating in such countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 624. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 625. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain the Sacramento River Channel in conjunction with operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 627. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 628. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 629. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 630. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose Oroville Dam proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 631. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 632. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 633. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to eliminate the provision by which United States citizens born in Puerto Rico are denied certain benefit rights assured under such act to other United States citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 634. A bill to extend the unemployment compensation program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 635. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be treated as one of the several States for purposes of determining the amount of the Federal payments to which it is entitled under those provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 636. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the existing limitation on the amount which may be paid to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in any fiscal year under the public-assistance programs contained in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 637. A bill to create an International Trade Commission to promote the establishment and improvement of international expositions, trade fairs, and trade marts in the United States and throughout the world; to the Committeee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 638. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 639. A bill to provide that Federal employees who are members of the National Guard shall not suffer loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating for periods of service pursuant to call by the Governor of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 640. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 641. A bill to prohibit sales from vending machines of postage stamps accompanied by matter bearing or containing advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to acquire space for off-street parking facilities in connection with United States post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 643. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 644. A bill to permit certain United States commissioners to represent claimants before the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 647. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 648. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 649. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 650. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by authorizing the Federal Government to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 651. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 652. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 653. A bill to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether the child is a dependent for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 654. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant nonprofit educational institutions exemptions from the excise taxes which are now applicable to public educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 656. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 657. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain State clubs and other nonprofit organizations from the requirement of filing an annual return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 660. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 661. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 662. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 663. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by deferring implementation requirements and requiring report by management specialists; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 664. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 665. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 666. A bill to grant natives of the Dependency of Malta unlimited access to the immigration quota for Great Britain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 667. A bill to increase from $50 to $75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 668. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 669. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 670. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I, and to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 671. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 672. A bill to amend the definition of the term "airport development" in the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 673. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code (relating to copyrights) to provide that reception of radio or television programs or the playing of phonographic records in hotels shall not constitute public performances for profit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 674. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 675. A bill modifying the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La., authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1946 in the interest of flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 676. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 678. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 680. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 681. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 682. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 683. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 684. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 686. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 687. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 688. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 689. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 690. A bill to authorize the donation and transfer of series E savings bonds to tax-exempt charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 691. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to authorize the optional purchase of additional amounts of group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance by individual employees in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 692. A bill to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 693. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 694. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with the development of the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 695. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of income which an individual may earn while receiving aid to the blind thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 696. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 697. A bill to amend section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income in certain cases of indebtedness discharged 20 years or more after the date on which it was incurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 699. A bill to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 700. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 701. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 2, 73d Congress, to establish a priority for combat and overseas war veterans in obtaining hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 702. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 703. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 704. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 705. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Amsterdam, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 706. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 707. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 708. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 709. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 710. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 711. A bill to provide a method of voting and to facilitate voting by members of the land, air, and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 713. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of expenses for the care of certain dependents); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 714. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 715. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 716. A bill to extend the time within which certain insane veterans may apply for insurance under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 717. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 718. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 719. A bill to amend the Air Force Academy Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 720. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 721. A bill to provide that certain caps shall be dutiable under paragraph 1504 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 722. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1914, commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act, to make it applicable to sales of commodities made to governmental agencies for resale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 724. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 725. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 726. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 727. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 728. A bill to establish the seniority status of employees in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 729. A bill to make the United States Merchant Marine Academy library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 730. A bill to prohibit the registration of trademarks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 731. A bill to give relief in the case of transfers to United States charities which are subjected to State and foreign death taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 732. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the interest received from certain loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 734. A bill relating to the definition of the term "bond" for purposes of determining amortizable bond premium under section 171 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 735. A bill to extend benefits under the civil service retirement system to certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 736. A bill to incorporate the State Guard Association of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 737. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of certain surplus property to State defense forces; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 738. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuitants may elect to have their annuities taxed in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 740. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 741. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 742. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the upper Fox River, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 743. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 744. A bill to establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital at 150 South Huntington Avenue, Boston, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 746. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 747. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 748. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to base the calculation on a new formula; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 749. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that a private annual study and report of the retirement fund be made; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 750. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 751. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide the proper annuities for wives of Federal employees covered by section 6 (C) who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 752. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman

Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill to provide health insurance for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 754. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 755. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI (by request):

H. R. 756. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 757. A bill to amend the Federal Records Act of 1950 to improve the microfilming services available to Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 758. A bill to provide that proposed appropriations shall be stated in the budget on an accrued expenditures basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of the payment and receipt of back alimony; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 760. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 761. A bill to recognize naval service performed in sweeping the North Sea of mines in 1919 as service in World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 762. A bill to requiire bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 763. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 764. A bill to amend section 170 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions to libraries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 766. A bill to grant rural mail service to all patrons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 767. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 768. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act with respect to its application to producers of flue-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 769. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, 1954, to require the sale abroad at world market prices of 150 million pounds of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 770. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 771. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 772. A bill to increase to $800 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 773. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 774. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 775. A bill to encourage private United States investment in foreign countries by reducing the incidence of double taxation on taxpayers with more than 80 percent of their gross income from sources without the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 776. A bill to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 777. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the board of education of the school district of the city of Hamtramck, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 778. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 779. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 780. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require manufacturers of farm machinery sold in interstate commerce to identify each such machine by a serial number; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 781. A bill to make the retirement benefits of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 available to certain persons who rendered active Federal service during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 782. A bill to reimburse the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, for expenses incurred in furnishing electric power for Hungry Horse project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 783. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources following spraying, and to provide basic data on the various chemical controls so that forests, croplands, and marshes can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 784. A bill to provide for effecting the disposition of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 785. A bill to give military status and grant discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps organized by the War Department under the authority of the President of the United States for service during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 786. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 787. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the United States of America and the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 788. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 789. A bill to authorize the regulation of the solicitation of proxies in respect of securities issued by certain banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 790. A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriations Act, 1955, with reference to official office expenses of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 791. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that clergymen who are naturalized citizens shall not lose their nationality by residence abroad, even though they are not representatives of American organizations, if they devote full time to their clerical duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 792. A bill to amend the War Risk Insurance Act so as to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from the forces of nature; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 793. A bill to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 794. A bill to provide for the regulation of motor vehicles on the highways of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 795. A bill to prohibit coercion by automobile manufacturers in the sale of parts, accessories, equipment, or tools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 796. A bill to amend title 15 of the United States Code with respect to the operation of speedometers on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 797. A bill to prevent the sale of automobiles with unauthorized equipment, parts, and accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 798. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements between manufacturers of motor vehicles and their franchised dealers, to permit the establishment of exclusive representation by dealers and to restrict franchised dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 799. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 800. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to be made to local taxing authorities with respect to Federal real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 801. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the interest on certain obligations issued by the States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 802. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 803. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the interest received from loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 805. A bill to provide that communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which disclose information concerning such taxpayer's income or tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require every seller of property, who collects from the purchaser any amount as a charge for the transportation of such property, to furnish such purchaser a statement showing the amount of transportation charges, if any, taxable under section 4271 (a) of such code, and the amount of tax imposed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 807. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 808. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase the deductions for personal exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 810. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require officers and directors of any issuer of registered securities to periodically report the extent to which, and the purposes for which, their holdings of such securities are pledged, hypothecated, or loaned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 811. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 812. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 813. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the employment of administrative assistants by Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 814. A bill to require the establishment of congressional election districts composed of contiguous and compact territories, and to require that the districts so established within any one State shall contain approximately the same number of inhabitants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 815. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 816. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 817. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 818. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 819. A bill to amend section 1963 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the registration of that portion of divorce decrees providing for the payment of money or the transfer of property which have been entered in certain district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 820. A bill relating to the practice of law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 821. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 822. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 823. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 824. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 825. A bill to authorize the President, under certain conditions, to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances for the purpose of protecting and preserving the health of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 826. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 827. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 828. A bill to remove inequalities between the compensation to which members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces are entitled for death or disability incurred in line of duty and that to which other members of the Armed Forces are entitled; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 829. A bill to promote certain prisoners of war in Korea upon their discharge from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 830. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 831. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 832. A bill to amend section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act so as to broaden judicial relief under that section pending review of administrative action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 833. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 834. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 835. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 836. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 837. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize longevity step-increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 15 of the general schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 838. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 769 of the 83d Congress, entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 839. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from 75 cents to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 840. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 841. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 842. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require United States obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 843. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 844. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 845. A bill to amend the provisions of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act relating to reserve balances of member banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 846. A bill to permit in certain cases minor children under 16 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 847. A bill to provide for a more comprehensive development and utilization of natural water resources in plans and construction of reservoir projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 848. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 849. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 850. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 851. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount

of outside earnings permitted without deductions from the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 852. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 853. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 854. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 855. A bill to designate the dam being constructed in connection with the Eagle Gorge Reservoir project on the Green River, Wash., as the Howard A. Hanson Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 856. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 857. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to prevent loss of annual leave by employees in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 858. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 859. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities urgently and immediately needed for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 860. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 861. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 862. A bill for the relief of sufferers of casualty losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 863. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, or of the Air Force of the United States, or of any component thereof, retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 864. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 865. A bill to provide that all gifts made to aid a disaster area shall be allowed as deductions for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 866. A bill authorizing the President to make permanent replacements of public facilities and public and private school buildings, damaged or destroyed in a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income from $25,000 to $50,000, and to permit a corporation with income-tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to elect to pay its tax in 4 equal installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 868. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 869. A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 870. A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 871. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 872. A bill to permit missionaries who are citizens of the United States to make purchases at certain commissaries operated abroad by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 873. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide immediate annuities to widows without dependent children of employees who die in the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 874. A bill relating to the import tax on sugar used after June 30, 1955, as livestock feed or in the production of livestock feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 875. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 876. A bill to amend section 2104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 877. A bill to protect the income of cotton producers, encourage the expansion of domestic and world cotton markets, and provide an equitable competitive position for the United States cotton textile industry, by establishing the support level of American upland cotton and providing for compliance payments to cooperators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 878. A bill to limit price supports on an individual crop on an individual farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 879. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 880. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 881. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 882. A bill to establish a national cemetery near Chillicothe, Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 883. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 884. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in September 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 885. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Camp Sherman Rifle Range to the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 886. A bill to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion, and simplification of farm ownership and operations credit programs by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and of August 31, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 887. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 888. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 889. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers by the construction of a dam at Chain of Rocks; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 890. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 891. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 892. A bill to amend section 93 (b) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 893. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 894. A bill to provide free barber services to all Armed Forces personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 895. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 896. A bill to provide for the performance of heraldic services for the United States by the Quartermaster General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 897. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 898. A bill to establish permanent firing squads for national cemeteries in which burials are conducted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 899. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 900. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that certain employees who terminate their railroad employment shall be entitled to a refund of the railroad-retirement taxes which they have paid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 901. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to

needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 902. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 903. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 904. A bill to provide that in determining income of World War I veterans and their widows for the purpose of ascertaining eligibility for pensions, payments under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be taken into account; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 906. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 907. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to extend for 6 additional months the period during which visas may be issued thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 908. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 909. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 910. A bill to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 33 percent surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 911. A bill to amend section 105 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 912. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 913. A bill to create an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 914. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 915. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 916. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 917. A bill to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 918. A bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 919. A bill to amend section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to alter the period for applying for insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 920. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 921. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 922. A bill to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased by $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 923. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 924. A bill to provide a 3-year presumptive period of service connection for multiple sclerosis, psychoses, and malignant tumors which develop within 3 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 925. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Middlesex County, Mass.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 926. A bill to provide that, notwithstanding the termination by Presidential proclamation of the period within which veterans of service subsequent to June 27, 1950, may accrue eligibility for wartime benefits, such period shall not terminate while individuals may be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 927. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 928. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 929. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide that psychoses or multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 930. A bill to provide for the payment of the cost of the transportation expenses of certain survivors of deceased servicemen to attend group burials in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 931. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 932. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 933. A bill to provide for closer supervision of the costs of constructing irrigation and reclamation projects, and projects in the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 934. A bill to permit the interment of the last survivor of the Union Army and the last survivor of the Confederate Army within the Gettysburg National Military Park and to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 935. A bill to preserve permanently as a national park an area of national significance in Colorado and Utah, such park to be known as the Dinosaur National Park, which shall supersede the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 936. A bill authorizing the construction of a project on the Eel River for local flood protection at Sandy Prairie in the vicinity of Fortuna, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 937. A bill to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission may determine toll charges over certain bridges and tunnels crossing State lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 938. A bill granting an exemption from income tax in the case of certain pensions and annuities of policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 939. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948 so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service may be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 940. A bill requesting that a report of the Army engineers regarding the Hackensack River, N. Y. and N. J., be reviewed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 941. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public-housing authorities for the admission of single persons in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 942. A bill to amend titles I and XIV of the Social Security Act to provide that where a State requires an individual to assign his life-insurance policies to the State agency as a condition of assistance thereunder, such requirement shall not apply to the first $1,000 of the proceeds of such policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 943. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 944. A bill to provide for the establishment of a policy of placing certain contracts in States having the lowest per capita income; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 945. A bill to allow the cost of meals and lodging to be taken into account as traveling expenses in computing the income-tax deduction for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 946. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 947. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 948. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of futures trading in coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 949. A bill to provide for the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 950. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 951. A bill to provide greater security for persons retired after service during the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of outpatient treatment by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 952. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 953. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to increase the maximum indebtedness which farmers may incur under such act for operating loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 954. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require the establishment of two grades of spotted cotton for the purpose of the cotton loan program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 955. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 956. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 957. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 958. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 959. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 960. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 961. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 962. A bill to provide additional Federal aid for highways to those States which do not levy a third structure highway-use tax; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of the city of Clarksville, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 964. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 965. A bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 966. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar, Leyte, and Luzon, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 967. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair (including painting and papering) of his home to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 969. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens who have been citizens 10 years or over, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 970. A bill to amend the act to prohibit State plan provisions requiring transfer to State of title or control of property or a lien or other encumbrance for purpose of recovery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 971. A bill to amend section 6 of the Safety Appliance Act of March 2, 1893, as amended, so as to increase the penalty for violations of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 972. A bill to establish a pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 973. A bill to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 974. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 975. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 977. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 978. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to allow the courts discretion in awarding damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 979. A bill to amend section 1861 of title 28, United States Code, in relating to the qualifications of jurors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 980. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 981. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment, and dismissal, of civilian officers and employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 982. A bill to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 983. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 984. A bill to create additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 985. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 986. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 988. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1933, to extend by 10 years the period prescribed for determining the rates of toll to be charged for use of the bridge across the Missouri River near Rulo, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 989. A bill authorizing modification of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin to provide for improvement of Salt Creek and its tributaries, Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 991. A bill to authorize the construction of a project for modification and improvement of Bellingham Harbor, Wash., for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 992. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 993. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land by the United States to the Cape Flattery School District in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 994. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Sammamish River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 995. A bill to authorize the construction of a project for improvement of Port Townsend Harbor, Wash., for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 996. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 997. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 998. A bill to provide an additional method for computing certain benefits payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to persons who continue their employment after sustaining injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 999. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1000. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1001. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water

control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1002. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1003. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1004. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1005. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1006. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1007. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1008. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1009. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1010. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1011. A bill to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 1012. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1013. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that, in the establishment of farm acreage allotments for cotton, producers will not be penalized by reason of their observation of soil conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1014. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General, subject to the civil-service laws and rules and regulations, of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, to prohibit prior approval or clearance on a political basis of appointments to positions in the classified (competitive) civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 1015. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER (by request):

H. R. 1016. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian claims fund to settle claims of certain United States nationals against Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1017. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1018. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1019. A bill to create a Department or Urbiculture, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1020. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1021. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1022. A bill relating to life insurance taken out to cover estimated liability for the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1023. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of San Gregorio Creek and tributaries, California, for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1024. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Redwood Creek, San Mateo County, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1025. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of streams at and in the vicinity of Burlingame, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1026. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Pescadero Creek, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1027. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1028. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of streams at and in the vicinity of South San Francisco, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1029. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1030. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to medical expenses); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1031. A bill to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances and complaints of all Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 1032. A bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts to provide increased safety for employees and travelers upon railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1033. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide that the annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States may be based on not to exceed 40 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1034. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1035. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1037. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to require the owners of civil aircraft to be financially responsible for damages arising out of the operation of such aircraft for which they are liable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1038. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits thereunder and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled while both were living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1039. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways ahd Means.

H. R. 1040. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1041. A bill to amend the War Risk Insurance Act so as to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from the forces of nature; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1042. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1043. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1044. A bill to amend the Federal Employers' Liability Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1045. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1046. A bill to amend section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Public Law 540, 84th Cong.); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1047. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1048. A bill to amend, with respect to basic commodities, the parity provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,

as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1049. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1050. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses which offer expanding markets for farm products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 1051. A bill to authorize certain beach-erosion control of the shore of the State of New York from Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1052. A bill to provide for studies by the United States Information Agency in order to increase the effectiveness of United States postage stamps in promoting understanding in other countries of America and its objectives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1053. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1054. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize the payment of travel allowances to individuals proceeding to and from the places where competitive examinations for admission to the respective service academies are given, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1055. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Medical Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1056. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1057. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the uniformed services during certain periods of combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1058. A bill to preserve the key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a National Key Deer Refuge in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1059. A bill to provide an additional judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1060. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association, exercising its special assistance functions with a special revolving fund of $200 million, to aid in providing adequate housing for minority groups which have not shared proportionately in increased housing construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1061. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1062. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that moving expenses paid by an employer for a new employee shall not be included in the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by provision of a deduction for expenditures for reconversion of structures in a slum clearance program or rehabilitation project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1066. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1067. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1068. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1069. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1070. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1071. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 68 the age beyond which deductions will not be made from benefits on account of outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 23-percent depletion rate for bauxite if from deposits in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1073. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1074. A bill to provide for the improvement of the waterway between Barataria Bay, La., and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1075. A bill to provide for the prevention of the erosion of the banks of the Bayou Barataria; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 1076. A bill to provide that coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed farmers and ranchers shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1077. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1078. A bill to establish a Commission on Air Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1079. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1080. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1081. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to modify the duty on the importation of veneers of wood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1082. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1083. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that a discharge in bankruptcy shall release a bankrupt from provable debts due as a tax levied by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1084. A bill to provide that when a proposed dam across any navigable waters and the pool to be caused by the dam will be located entirely within one State, a license or permit must be granted by the State for the construction of the dam; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers who are severely disabled to deduct certain transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1087. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1088. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1089. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1090. A bill to amend the War Risk Insurance Act so as to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from the forces of nature; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to reduce the rate of tax applicable to distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1092. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 1093. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1094. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the tax on certain cigars which do not contain reconstituted or processed tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1096. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Indiantown Gap Military Reservation in Dauphin and Lebanon Counties, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1097. A bill to provide protection of persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1098. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1099. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1100. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1101. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1102. A bill to amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit attempts to commit the offenses therein proscribed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 1103. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 1104. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1105. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1106. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1107. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school-construction needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1108. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1109. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1110. A bill to provide that measurement prior to planting of cotton-acreage allotments made at the request of farmers shall be without cost to them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1111. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1112. A bill to modify the period of service requirement governing the payment of pension to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1113. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1114. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general, medical, and surgical hospital of 500 beds at Russellville, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1115. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States, by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1116. A bill to eliminate in certain cases the performance by rural carriers of relay and parcel-post-delivery service on city and village delivery routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1117. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual aggrieved by the action of a State agency with respect to his claim for assistance shall be entitled to judicial review thereof in an appropriate State court; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1118. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1119. A bill to provide that permanently disabled individuals (including the blind) who are under 65 shall be entitled to the same tax treatment of their medical expenses as they would be entitled if they were 65, to grant permanently disabled individuals an additional tax exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1120. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1121. A bill relating to price support and acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1122. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the former capitol building of the Cherokee Indian Nation and the grounds which constitute its site, located in Tahlequah, Okla., as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 1124. A bill relating to the computation of the retirement income credit in the case of joint income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1125. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to certain cultural and trade centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1126. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that muzzle-loading pistols and revolvers shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1127. A bill to preserve the key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a national key deer refuge in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1128. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1129. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 1130. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1131. A bill to establish a Commission on Voter Participation in Federal Elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1132. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1133. A bill to amend section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to authorize the use of foreign currencies for certain activities authorized by section 201 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, and to provide assistance to refugees from political tyranny; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1134. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1135. A bill to establish a Commission on the Office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 1136. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1137. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1138. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 1139. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 1140. A bill to amend Public Law 314, 78th Congress, to provide that retired reservists may waive receipt of a portion of their retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 1141. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American farmer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1142. A bill to establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1143. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide that arthritis, psychoses, or multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1144. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 1145. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 1146. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir project located in the county of Denton, the State of Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 1147. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1148. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1149. A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1150. A bill to add a new section 274 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide revenue and eliminate unfair competition by denying a deduction for amounts paid by a private industrial or commercial organization to a State or local government for the use of property acquired or improved by the Government by issuing industrial-development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1151. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the civil rights statutes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1153. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 385, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1154. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1155. A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1156. A bill to remove inequities by imposing limitations on the period during which the United States may retain, without the payment of interest, overpayments under section 722 for taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1157. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the wage credit of $160 a month for military or naval service, granted to individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall also be granted to certain individuals who served in the armed forces of countries allied with the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1158. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1159. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals, to certain individuals who are employees of foreign governments and international organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1160. A bill to amend section 391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1161. A bill to provide deductions for payments on certain preferred stock to the United States or to any instrumentality thereof exempt from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1162. A bill to provide deductions for gifts to nonprofit voluntary health insurance plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1163. A bill relating to the computation of the invested capital credit for excess profits tax purposes in certain cases where property has been exchanged for stock and where the stock has been distributed as a taxable dividend; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1164. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 1165. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 1166. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "Aid to State or Territorial Homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 1167. A bill establishing a commission to study certain aspects of the restrictions on political activities imposed under sections 9, 12, and 15 of the act commonly referred to as the Hatch Political Activities Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1168. A bill to clarify the application of section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the preservation of the rates of basic compensation of certain officers or employees in cases involving downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 1169. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effectiev evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 1170. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1171. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1172. A bill to provide that every veteran of the Regular services who has been a prisoner of war in excess of 3 years be officially declared to be physically disabled to the extent that he receive his full retired pay based upon his rank and length of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1173. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 19, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

H. R. 1174. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1175. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, and certain other articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1177. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1178. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1179. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by the addition of a new section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1180. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of benefits thereunder to certain Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1181. A bill to provide for the extension and remodeling of the Terminal Annex Post Office at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1182. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to exemptions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1183. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1184. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1185. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American schoolteacher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a 3-year carryover for medical and dental expenses in excess of the maximum deduction allowable under section 23 (x); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1187. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law 662, 79th Congress, chapter 869, 2d session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1189. A bill to provide for awarding the Combat Infantryman Badge to certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States who fought in wars prior to World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1190. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1191. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income, certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums, and to provide more liberal income-tax treatment for amounts paid for hospitalization insurance and amounts paid under voluntary medical-care plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1193. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930,

as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1194. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of prevailing-wage-rate employees, to provide longevity compensation for such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1195. A bill to permit local taxation of the private interest in personal property and work in process, and inventories of material acquired by the Federal Government for military security and the national defense but in the possession of contractors with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1196. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1197. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased retirement benefits for certain officers and employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1198. A bill to repeal section 1701 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from tax admissions to certain events conducted for the benefit of religious, educational, and charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1199. A bill to prohibit the introduction of cigarettes into interstate commerce unless each package containing such cigarettes is labeled to indicate every substance or material contained in such cigarettes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 1200. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high-water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1201. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 1202. A bill to provide for the orderly termination and liquidation of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1203. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers or plaques commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 1204. A bill to provide that an appropriate memorial marker shall be furnished for each member of the Armed Forces dying in service whose body cannot be recovered; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of certain severance pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1206. A bill to permit any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1207. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to limit the deductions which would otherwise be made, on account of outside earnings, from benefits to which an individual is entitled in the year in which he retires or attains age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income-tax deduction for social-security taxes paid by an employer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 1209. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1210. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1211. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make loans to assist students in pursuing courses at colleges and universities in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 1212. A bill to authorize modification of existing project for the Siuslaw River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1213. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1214. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 1215. A bill relating to the status of certain organizations as tax-exempt organizations under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1216. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1217. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1218. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1219. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of their Federal tax liabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1221. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definitions of sale price and price readjustment for purposes of the manufacturer's and retailer's excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of dividends paid by regulated investment companies which hold the bulk of their assets in State and local securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1223. A bill to provide benefits under the Social Security Act for the survivors of certain individuals who died prior to 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1224. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1225. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a net operating loss for a taxable year shall be a net operating loss carryback for the 5 preceding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1227. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public-health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1228. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the United States courts of appeals and to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1229. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in Greece on March 5, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1230. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1231. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1232. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1233. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1234. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1235. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 1236. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1237. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1238. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1239. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1240. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1241. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1242. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1243. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1244. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1245. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1246. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1247. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1248. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1249. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1250. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1251. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1252. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1253. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1254. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1255. A bill to provide that the carrying of a deadly weapon on or about the person in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall be a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1256. A bill for the allowance of certain claims not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1257. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H R. 1258. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1259. A bill to clear the title to certain Indian land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1260. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 1261. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a) to establish an effective date of awards of pension in the case of certain veterans permanently and totally disabled from active pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1262. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept certain land in Buncombe County, N. C., for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1263. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain impediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1264. A bill to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 1265. A bill to authorize the project for the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1266. A bill to authorize a project for the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 1267. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Treasury to strike a gold medal of appropirate design to be awarded posthumously by the President to the mother of James Edward Sarran for an act of valor which caused his death; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1268. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 relative to nonrecognition of gain from involuntary conversion of certain real property used for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1270. A bill to amend section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 so as to make such act inapplicable to stockyards which engage exclusively in the sale of livestock on commission at public auction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1271. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public-health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1272. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1274. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1275. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1276. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1277. A bill to amend section 1341 of title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1278. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER (by request):

H. R. 1279. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Armies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the corporate tax rates applicable to corporations whose taxable income is less than $100,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1281. A bill—

DECLARATION AND PURPOSE OF POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1282. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River

Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to exercise existing authority to provide for acceptance of marketable obligations of the United States at par in payment of taxes imposed by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil and property rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a Just and Lasting Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to make Constitution Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of the Star Spangled Banner as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the people of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Congress shall have power to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the 178th anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to designate the 4th day of May as Teachers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Utilization of Manpower in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to establish a Northeastern United States Watershed Development and Flood Protection Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to designate April 30 of each year to be known as President's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing that each member of the Armed Forces sent overseas shall be notified of the fact that, because of certain international agreements, he may be subject to the criminal jurisdiction of a foreign country without the safeguards provided by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day in Sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the separate election of the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address

a joint session of Congress annually; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day 1957 as a day for a nationwide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber and for other reasons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution designating the month of June of each year as National Dairy Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide that the next transport-type vessel commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Paul Revere*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate the cost of living and the widening spread between retail prices and prices paid by farmers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to prohibitions upon the giving or lending of property of the United States to any foreign government or international governmental organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to designate payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed, and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and Territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration an executive department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the qualifications for the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to designate the musical composition by John Philip Sousa, known as The Stars and Stripes Forever, as the official national march of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution designating the period beginning August 10 and ending August 16 of each year as Orphans Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-in's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration an executive department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution designating the 3d day of February in each year as Dorchester Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection, and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to encourage the study of foreign languages by citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim Sunday, June 23, 1957, and the fourth Sunday in June of each year and thereafter, as a

day of prayer for the man and woman in white; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution regarding the revocation of certain reclamation projects for which construction funds have not been appropriated; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution designating the 7th day of December in each year as Pearl Harbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a nuclear power reactor in Japan; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate must concur in the making of any treaty by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to exempt State clubs and fraternal organizations from filing form 990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim May 11 of each year Colonel Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to change the name of the Argonne National Laboratory to the Enrico Fermi National Laboratory; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution for the relief of Joseph L. Barrow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con Res. 3. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution providing that the United States mission to the United Nations shall take such steps as might be necessary to have each day's session in the United Nations opened with a prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution proposing a Code of Ethics for Government Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the flagrant acts of aggression committed by Soviet Russia against the people of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution providing for the reading of the Declaration of Independence on the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint congressional committee on civil rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the closing of Indian hospitals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of the organization and operation of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the manner in which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has suppressed attempts by the peoples of certain satellite countries of the Soviet Union to achieve self-government or independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the month of February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution requesting the International Joint Commission to amend its order of approval of the St. Lawrence power project to specify the range of water levels to be maintained in Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution relating to the levels of Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution to provide protection for communities along the shores of the Great Lakes against damage from changes in water levels resulting from projects authorized and approved by the International Joint Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 450 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a Federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to promote through the United Nations an effective and enforceable system of worldwide disarmament and calling for a crusade for world peace and freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the humanitarian conduct of the people of Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the meetings of the United Nations Assembly, and similar world organizations of which the United States is a member, should be opened with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring about the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint congressional committee on civil rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in favor of the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution commending the valiant struggle of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, and other Soviet-dominated nations in their quest for freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 18. Resolution requesting a review of reports on the St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Res. 19. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 20. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 21. Resolution to continue in effect House Resolution 190 and House Resolution 386, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 23. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the printing of remarks of Members of the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 24. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 25. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 26. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the broadcasting of false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertisements by radio or television; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 27. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Res. 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to employ two additional employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 30. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 29; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to provide equal access for all news media before proceedings of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 32. Resolution to provide for the broadcasting by radio and television of committee hearings of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 35. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to continue the study and investigation begun under House Resolution 262 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 36. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of labor racketeering in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 37. Resolution authorizing investigation of damage claims resulting from sonic blasts; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 38. Resolution to create a select committee on pornographic materials; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 39. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to take action to carry out certain recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, contained in its report made at the close of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. Res. 40. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Benjamin Franklin television series should be included in the archives of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing inquiry into manner of selecting candidates for the United States Military and Naval Academies; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 42. Resolution to appoint a select committee regarding the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 43. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of hurricane and flood control and warning problems; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 44. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing and directing the study and investigation of the national boxing sport by the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 46. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study and investigation of the influence of professional gamblers on amateur and professional sports; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 47. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Service to investigate and study certain problems in connection with the operation of aircraft in the vicinity of certain military and naval air installations of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 48. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the more frequent display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 50. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to discharge of committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 51. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the Committee on Banking and Currency shall have jurisdiction over all consumer problems; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 54. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 55. Resolution providing for a committee to consider removal of the United States Capitol or providing a supplemental Capitol; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 56. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 57. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House in respect to investigative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 58. Resolution opposing all plans, programs, and proposals tending toward the development of any form of world government which would limit the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. Res. 59. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the publication and distribution of offensive and undesirable books; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 60. Resolution providing for a special series of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 62. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing for the commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski on October 11 of each calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 64. Resolution to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 65. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 66. Resolution to provide for the printing of a compilation of veterans' laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 67. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 68. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 67; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 69. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 70. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 71. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Res. 72. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 73. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. Res. 74.—Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 75. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Crowder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1284. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pietropinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1285. A bill for the relief of Charles Blasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Maria Ciccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1287. A bill for the relief of Marianne Harpeng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Ralph Landolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Losco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Maria Pucillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Carl Adolph Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Francisco Alvarez Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO (by request):

H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Felix E. Dayrit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Inge Wallaberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Ruth and Cecile May Dequine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Tseh An Chen and Cheh Chen Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Aberle and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Jesus Martinez Jiminez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Andrew DiMartino Cataline and Frances DiMartino Cataline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Antonio Salazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Francisco Ponce-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1306. A bill for the relief of Ilda dos Santos Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Felipe Tovar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Santiago S. Nazareta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1309. A bill for the relief of Francesco Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Florentina Laurente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Toha Bin Hadji Dulah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1312. A bill for the relief of Choi, Joon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Berta Reitberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Jose Anguiana Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Ralph N. Meeks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1320. A bill for the relief of Anita Soave; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1321. A bill for the relief of James Wanleung Mann and Mrs. Diana Biren Tung Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Traversa G. Usellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hsin Chuen Li Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha K. Martensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 1326. A bill for the relief of Eric L. Reid; to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Emily Elkas Batrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND (by request):

H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Ettore Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Massman-Patti-Tanner & Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Maraessa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Sadie Lobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1332. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 1,917,634 for 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Dr. Franklin Fu-Yen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Lauria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 1335. A bill for the relief of Nedeljka Begovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Michaline, Antonio, and Pancrazio Montesano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Moinuddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Arthur Lebovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of the Malowney Real Estate Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1340. A bill for the relief of Christa G. Friese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 1341. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorina A. Gensmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1343. A bill for the relief of Hanna Rezmovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of John William Forbes Petch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Peter Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of John J. Fedor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1350. A bill for the relief of Sister Emmanuel (Miss Margarete Fu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Chen Loong Mou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rena Carmi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haide E. Carmona de Duchoslav; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1354. A bill for the relief of Theodore Elil Hadjithomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Miss Susana Clara Magalona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of Esref Tomakan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Drake America Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Bertha Gabriel Y. Martinez Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho Rousseau); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Antonino Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1361. A bill for the relief of Concetta Pugliese Privitera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Clelia Cusano Puglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Franc Molka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1364. A bill for the relief of Estelle Carlson as guardian of Hulda Ahlberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Jen-Pu Cheng and Mrs. Chuan-huan Wu Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1367. A bill for the relief of Kwan-Ting Shen and Mrs. Nai-hsuan Chang Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1368. A bill for the relief of the beneficiaries of William Lee La May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1369. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roger W. Evans and Jamerson C. McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma and Mrs. Tsugie Azuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1371. A bill for the relief of Sara Reid (Maria Luise Brenten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 1372. A bill for the relief of Kathleen M. Rambo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1373. A bill for the relief of Antonio Frezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 1374. A bill for the relief of Beddo Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 1376. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Phipps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1377. A bill for the relief of Wickham Courtney Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1378. A bill for the relief of Felicia de Diamondstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1379. A bill for the relief of John Wilbert Wan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1380. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Chaia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1381. A bill for the relief of Alton Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1382. A bill for the relief of Aldo Lazzaroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1383. A bill for the relief of Keith Smith (also known as Keith Dryden and Keith James); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marina Coralia Castillo Wamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1385. A bill for the relief of Tomiko Abiru and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1386. A bill for the relief of Rosa Grunbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1387. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Schwartz and Vera Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1388. A bill for the relief of Erna H. Gleissner and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1389. A bill for the relief of Sarah Reiko Tochman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1391. A bill for the relief of Stanley Teitzel & F. M. Crawford Lumber, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Karl L. Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 1394. A bill to authorize the sale of certain keys in the State of Florida by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1395. A bill for the relief of Ladislav Marion Hudec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lore Anna Rominger Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1397. A bill for the relief of Wayne Edward Cottrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1398. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Matilde Barbara Picallo Queglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Gino G. Fabbian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Alvaro J. Barretto and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of Liesel Rynevicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Elsie Purvis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Emilia Rodrigues Padilha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Loutfie Noama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Albert Rieksts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Henrik Mannerfrid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Tak Wa Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Maria Febbrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Lee Sage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of George H. Meyer Sons, Brauer & Co., Joseph McSweeney & Sons, Inc., C. L. Tomlinson, Jr., and Richmond Livestock Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elise T. Kirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shunhsin Chou, Julia Wei-hsien Wu Chou, David Chou, and Teresa Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Nessim Negrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1415. A bill for the relief of Kenichi Sugahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of William R. Overton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Lienfu Lo, also known as Luke Lo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1418. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Dabrowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Eva Glockner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1422. A bill for the relief of Gunda B. MacDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Jeanne Marie-Louise Hoez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Ottila Tenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1425. A bill for the relief of Panayota Persamtzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Plutarco Pecina Sierra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 1427. A bill for the relief of Ciro Motti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Juan Pedro Garay-Muro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1429. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Navarro-Savala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Jesus Marie Ambriz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dudley Anthony Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Glancy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Brigitte Kendziorra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of John I. Strong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Lucienne Canicio Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1437. A bill for the relief of Leon Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Christos Mirtsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of E. R. Ensey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Tokiyo Nakajima and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Estela Marina Ries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Frank T. McCormick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Philip J. Denton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of J. Ross Reed, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Ludwig, Isabel, and Milly Model; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Joseph L. Searcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Vaccaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine M. Castle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Janis Lee Owen and Jacqueline F. Algorri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey Charles Medworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Ramon R. Mingares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Pilar A. Centeno, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Nikolaus Pazdernik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Jael Mercades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Jeanette Shbeeb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and her husband, Jack Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hayguhi (kedesyan) Kudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Erol Ozer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Simeon Krammer, also known as Sidney Krammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Fiorindo Francesco Nappo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Henry Aleong Gonzales, Perline Aleong Gonzales, and Annette Aleong Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Brenda Theresa Monaghan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Shee-go Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Kendall Leroy Simmonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Burawski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christa Ernst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Anna L. De Angelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Richardson Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John H. Wagenblass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Lillian Ida Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Gaetano DiChiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Henry Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Ragland Joseph Biggs (also known as Vincent Doig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Maria Angela La Faso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Maria Baricelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1483. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Jan Kryla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Aristotelis A. Karapanagiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Ciacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Adelaide F. M. Krasnapolsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Miguel Angel Guzman Nunez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Liesbeth Lohrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Gillous M. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Southwest Research Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Alfred Hanzal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Pasqualino E. Magno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannine Gallot Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Takehiko Kikuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thekla H. Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Beulah I. Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Homer Cazamias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Guillermina Peralta Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Rodrigo Eulalio Santa Ana-Alvarado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Tomas Reyes Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Cesar Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of Roger Eugene Caillaud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Hannah Cox Fransone (nee Garbutt) and her minor child, Heleene Garbutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Martinez de Rosenfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Limon de Serrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of O. Yung Ja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1512. A bill for the relief of Alfredo A. Guinitaran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of Cesar, Rosita, Baltazar, and Angelina Jabonillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusa Honbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Edward Martin Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsuma Ueda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Javier (formerly Maria Alvarado Salas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Basil Constantine Mavromichalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1519. A bill for the relief of Juan Ysais-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1521. A bill for the relief of Julio Carpiso Orca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Artemio N. Jangaon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1523. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Stein Whitsell Ille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. A bill for the relief of Godfrey Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Virendra K. Sondhi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1526. A bill for the relief of Gottfried Walter Stingl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1527. A bill for the relief of Georgia Ziavras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1528. A bill for the relief of Francesco Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1529. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Minassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1530. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Irrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1531. A bill for the relief of Biagio D'Agata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Virginia Casani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1533. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aboudi or Joe Abood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1534. A bill for the relief of David Piementel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Allison B. Clemens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Jacob Baronian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Maria Gianias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renee M. Silver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1540. A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Gerald Augustine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Casey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1543. A bill for the relief of M. Nell Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1544. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 1545. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Philip Sardelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1546. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Efriede Herpel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1547. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Hassan Dardari, alias Hassan Choukat Dardari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of Hossein Golji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nur Sami de Wejbe and Maria Sofia Wejbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1550. A bill for the relief of Leopold Danihel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1552. A bill for the relief of William H. Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Miriam Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1554. A bill for the relief of Tam Luen-Kwong (also known as Kwong Tam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Luigi Valas (also known as Louis Rick); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1556. A bill for the relief of Agnesa Rosa Modano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1557. A bill for the relief of Daniels Fomenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1558. A bill for the relief of Phillis Guyadeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1559. A bill for the relief of Nemesio Ramirez Moran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1560. A bill for the relief of Chieh-Chuan Li (also known as Leslie K. Lai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1561. A bill for the relief of Daniela R. P. Zei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1563. A bill for the relief of Basiliki Andre Spatharas, nee Giannoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1564. A bill for the relief of George V. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Pence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1566. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiyoko Kume; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1567. A bill for the relief of Louis Graves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1568. A bill for the relief of Tien S. Chan and Chan Li Wai-Sheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1569. A bill for the relief of Tam Chung Fay and Tam Fay Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1570. A bill for the relief of Jose Jesus Chacon-Raya, also known as Joe Chacon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1571. A bill for the relief of Jules Maurice Lotode, Mary Lotode, and Jeanne Lotode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margot Wartenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1573. A bill for the relief of Allan Armenag Abou Hayatian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1574. A bill for the relief of Albert Hyrapiet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Col. Adolph B. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1576. A bill for the relief of Teruko Shindo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1577. A bill for the relief of Clemencio Gumban Hechanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Vadasz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1579. A bill for the relief of King-Kay Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1580. A bill for the relief of Kuo Hsien Li, also known as Catherine Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1581. A bill for the relief of Otto Wiesner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1582. A bill for the relief of Miss Carolyn Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Concepcion Delgado Mendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Carolina Rosa Garcao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Don Ralph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Antone Franchehkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Kobayashi Takayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of George S. Zambrzycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1589. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1590. A bill for the relief of Antoni Klimowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Customs Brokerage Co., of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Purificacion de Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of Rahil Saad Ghosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Valdemars W. Kokins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Vanja Stipcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 1596. A bill for the relief of Bernhard and Gertrude Horowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Western Sales & Supply Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Dennis Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Sagrario Gonzalez Arrivillaga Yanguas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Lurline Jackson and Mrs. Mable D. Minott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Francisca M. Jegers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Lillian Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 1603. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lotte Gertrude Augusta Phelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Dr. James R. P. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1605. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all of the interest of the United States in certain lands, other than a certain easement and right-of-way to Ernest F. Hartwell; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsbe Hermine van Dam Hurst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1607. A bill for the relief of Marie-Luise H. Generali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Carlo Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Frances Pompa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Gildo Nicolio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Oscar Francis Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Nikolai, Gerda, and Annerose Korotkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1616. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalena Simonavicius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Christos Constantinou Liosis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1619. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liselotte Steffan McDonnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Kim Sung Il; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmena Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Edward Constantine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Rello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Angelina Burdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Noel Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Giuseppe Collura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Frouin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Andrew Frey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Antonio Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Wai Ling Vivian Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of John V. Saly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Gemma Scarfogliero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Jane Froman and Gypsy Markoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ranalletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Hubert Wellington Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of George D. LaMont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of James M. Ripley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Isidor Goldfracht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Helen Koutroumanis and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francine Corrigan de Jacomé; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Georgette Charalambo Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 1644. A bill for the relief of Vendelin Kalenda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norberta Cueto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Holdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of Anthony Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Rachel Nethery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Robert Nai-Hsin Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Po-ling Liu and minor son, George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Miss Lily Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1652. A bill for the relief of Rajka Markovic and Krunoslav Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Jose Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1654. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of Herman Wobbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1656. A bill to provide for the renewal of Patent No. 1,596,994 issued August 14, 1926, relating to shoe button-snaps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1657. A bill for the relief of Seu Shuit Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Nickolas Bodner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1659. A bill for the relief of Antonio LaSala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1660. A bill for the relief of Stavroula Nicholas Rupakias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Romilos Sarri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Ramon Gullon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1663. A bill for the relief of Dean E. Fosmoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Marina Josepina Maria Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Fouad Mikhail Zada; his wife, Sabat Zada (nee Leon or Laoun); and their minor child, Michel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Lisa El Aneed and Alfred El Aneed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Elio Rotondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Francesco Pizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Yrjo (George) Israel Erkinpoika Haapanen; Anna Esther Alfhild Haapanen, nee Talkari; Seppo Pellervo Haapanen; Timo Juhani Haapanen; and Eira Telervo Haapanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Ludwik Kwasniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Eleanora Fiorini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Hjalmar Johansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Orietta Giardino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Gilbert B. Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill to provide for the quitclaiming of the title of the United States to the real property known as the Barcelona Lighthouse Site, Portland, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Osmar Tonilo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Sonja Spieker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Moskot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Norman H. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of William Franklin Rollins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Nashat Saadi Zabalaoui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1686. A bill for the relief of Theobald Industries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1687. A bill for the relief of Katharina Richlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. McCullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Fred Gordon Ralph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Margherita Conca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margot M. Draughon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Albi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Yoe Chul Koo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1696. A bill for the relief of Mikiko Uemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Salamon Jakab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Melon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Western Instruments Associates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Abram van Heynigen Hartendorp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Dora Camalich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1703. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothea Brett Blok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of David Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1705. A bill for the relief of James J. Bach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1706. A bill for the relief of Paula Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodora Bourlotos (nee Hangepetros); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Maurice Delvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1709. A bill for the relief of Luis Gustavo Garcia-Oliva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Johann August Josefsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Moishe David Piotrkovski and his wife, Chana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Leonard Pignatello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sidney Nevil Milford and his wife, Danuta Maria Milford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Russo Roca Marsilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Leason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zyczynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of Max Trichter Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Peter Sposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1719. A bill for the relief of Michele Santoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Felix Rincon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Vito Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Sansone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1726. A bill for the relief of Herman Skiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Deeb Abu Gheida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Ralph Moschitta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1729. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vassiliki P. Theodorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Herminegilda Sanz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Mose Scotto di Santolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Maria and Grazia Guida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Brunetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Angelo (Arcangelo) Amendolara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Ka Tim Lee, Veng Tang Wong Lee, and William Cleveland Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Manuel Stephan Derahian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1739. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Chan-Caballero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Manfred Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Ikuko Morooka Mahoney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Gom Gor Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1743. A bill for the relief of Polytimi D. Alevizos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1744. A bill for the relief of Hideki Imaizumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Ryszard Sewer-Czerwinski and Elzbieta Sewer-Czerwinski, also known as Richard Severs and Elizabeth Severs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1746. A bill for the relief of Kam Man Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Ng Kwock Gee and Ng Kwock Jom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1748. A bill for the relief of George Quon Lok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Walterio Carrasco Mondaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Fernando Galvan-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw (John) Waz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Frank J. and Mae T. W. Burger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Charles Ang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Eleanor French Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Levi Isac Galperin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of Yun Yong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Sang Ho Lee, his wife, Hi Sook Lee, and minor child, Byung Yun (Louise) Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1760. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1761. A bill for the relief of Henrik Mannerfrid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1762. A bill for the relief of Moniek Cukier (also known as Zdzislaw Wasilewski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chu Suk Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1764. A bill for the relief of Peter Trbojevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1765. A bill for the relief of Ellen G. Marinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1766. A bill for the relief of Cecilia (Bongal) Pasion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1767. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Remaria Avearii a Marama Geronimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1768. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berna Lee Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Nechaeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1770. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Natividad Castro de Prada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary De Battista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1773. A bill for the relief of Fernando Quinonez-Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1774. A bill for the relief of Romeo (Casabuena) Celestial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1775. A bill for the relief of Jeanne May Sasaki, Pamela Joyce Suzuki, Dorothea Grace Itoh, Frank Louis Morita, and John Michael Takezawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 1776. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Stuart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1777. A bill for the relief of Antonie Hagenaars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1778. A bill for the relief of Saveria Velona Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of Raffaele D'Auria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of Gordon Sidney William Barson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Antonia DeMarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Maria Pas Singson Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Matuszczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of William and Helen Kobielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sau Fong Chang Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Mary Carmelita Ottolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Marian Anthony Rotnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Herbert Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Segundina Kirkby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Alexander Alcheff also known as A. V. Schaff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Dr. Royal W. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Edith Kaspersky and her minor child, Christine Kaspersky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Albert Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Alphonsus Ludovicus Rosalia Van Den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of W. P. Sweetman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Maria Sausa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Pera Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Low Hung-pong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mariana Valencia de Marmolejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hartmann H. Pauly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Charles O. Fairbank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1803. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1805. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1806. A bill for the relief of Jose Zavala-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1807. A bill for the relief of Filippo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1808. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ting Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1809. A bill for the relief of Grace Su (nee Ling Yu-Ying), wife of Dr. Ting Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1810. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Consuelo Medel de Saragosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1811. A bill for the relief of Amado Martinez-Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Magdaleno-Acosta (also known as Jose Guadalupe Magdaleno y Acosta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Pedro Diaz (Ramirez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Esther Reyes de Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chie Imaizumi Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Federico Ancheta(also known as Rodencio A. Cabotage); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of the Electronic Medical Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Helene Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1819. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos V. Palmos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1820. A bill for the relief of Kelsie A. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1821. A bill for the relief of the Little Lake Misere Land Co., Inc., and the North American Land Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Chalkley et al.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1823. A bill for the relief of Domenico Leonardi and his wife, Clara Corradi Leonardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 1824. A bill for the relief of Keriahos (Keriakos) Bekiarelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1825. A bill for the relief of Antonios (Anthony) G. Troulinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1826. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the United States in Wyoming to Bud E. Burnaugh; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 1827. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Gambini and Tomazo Gambini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Ishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1829. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Frank C. Gregg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Dan M. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1831. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 1832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Geordt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1833. A bill for the relief of Sofia Kavadias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Walter Schik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Aram Peltekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Elda Mondillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bruno Coletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Angus Learie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1840. A bill for the relief of Antonio Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Machie Yoshiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Rosina Gartling, Rosa Gartling, Gustav Gartling, and Adolph Gartling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Harry Vondas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of Rosario Nunez Basante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of James Walter or Wongo Alfonso Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Thomas K. Koutsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Rosario Nunez Basante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Dezrin Boswell Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Lynn Troutman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Licha Hanna Farah (also known as Hanna Licha); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franziska T. Gage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ern-Gret Birkholz Seim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of John C. Mation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of Dino Tassinari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of George C. Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of George W. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Maria Patsana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ilse Brauer-McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Yotsu Yusawa Heim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Daniel Adamson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Fung Chen Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Josefa Pidlaoan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lavinia Brancato Spoto and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Eosin, Linda, Walter, and Hsien King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Michele De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Liera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Rousos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Irena Wierzchowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May Chen Cheing Voo (Wu) and Ming-Ming Voo (Wu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Kujawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Kotar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kosarzycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Emmy B. Heinrichmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Benedict M. Kordus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Jack Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Edwin Matusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Naum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Isaias Antoine Elias Khoury, Mary (Marie) Khoury, Alexis Elias Khoury, and Matilde Gladis Khoury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of George C. Constantacopoulos, Helen G. Constantacopoulos, and Trisvengenia Constantacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Josip) Torbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Nachman and Estera Rosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of Adolf and Rosa Iliescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Maria Arocha y Delgado de Sande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Fuh Yu Yang (John F. Y. Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Gustawa Silber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Ellen Yuin-Shang Chung Au; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Alvise Pietro Naccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Clement Alphonso Kepple; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Giulia Bogino, Lidia Bogino, and Giorgio Bogino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Zias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1900. A bill for the relief of Joseph Juda Teuchberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Jansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of George Liberâtos (Lymperatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Manuel Sanchez Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Eleni Anastasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging the Congress of the United States to examine the United States postal regulations and Federal legislation concerning the transmitting of obscene material to members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and to make recommended changes necessary to curtail such practices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to interposing the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against encroachment upon the police powers reserved to this State by the United States Constitution, and appealing to her sister States to resolve a question of contested powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to setting aside a day each year to be known as Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemnation and protest against oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the several States of the Union and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Wisconsin Library Association, La-Crosse, Wis., expressing thanks to Congress for passing the Library Services Act, together with the appropriation for implementation, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2. Also petition of Catholic Laymen's League of Orange and Rockland Counties, Pearl River, N. Y., condemning the invasion of Hungary by Soviet Russia and the butchery and deportation of the Hungarian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3. Also petition of the commander, the American Legion, Department of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska, urging that the Battle Monuments Commission be instructed to inspect, design, and construct a monument or memorial in honor of those who died that we might live in peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. Also petition of the secretary, Club of the National Guard of Lithuania in Exile, Racine, Wis., relative to appealing to the Government of the United States for strong and decisive action on the part of our foreign policy, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5. Also, petition of the publicity director, the Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet Domination, Minneapolis, Minn., condemning the continuous and illegal enslavement of Eastern European peoples by Soviet Russia in pursuance of her aim to achieve world domination, and urging that all nations subscribing to the Charter of the United Nations deny recognition to the Hungarian puppet government, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6. Also, petition of the president, Jewish Community Council of Austin, Austin, Tex., protesting discrimination against the religious freedom of American citizens in the Middle East Arab countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., expressing sorrow relative to the death of the Honorable Carl Hinshaw, of Pasadena, Calif., and the loss to our country and our cause with the passing of this capable leader; to the Committee on House Administration.

8. Also, petition of Josue B. Pineda, legal adviser, Church of Jesus Christ "New Jerusalem," Manila, Philippines, appealing to the United States Government for consideration of their case by way of adjudicating the war damage claim of the Church of Jesus Christ "New Jerusalem"; to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9. Also, petition of Margie McConnell and others, Presbyterian Campus Christian Life, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., requesting that attention be given to Public Laws 450, 702, and 959, and that the interests of the American Indian be considered and protected; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

10. Also, petition of the mayor of Casa Grande, Ariz., relative to endorsing the Buttes Dam project on the Gila River in central Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

11. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, American Newspaper Guild, Washington, D. C., relative to the American Newspaper Guild, AFL–CIO, going on record as unanimously and earnestly favoring passage of legislation granting statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

12. Also, petition of the executive secretary, League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, urging action which would benefit the Territory of Alaska and its cities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

13. Also, petition of the executive director, National Society of Public Accountants, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record as strongly indorsing statehood for Hawaii, and urging Congress to pass legislation for that purpose at the next session of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

14. Also, petition of the president, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., relative to requesting economic aid regarding public works made necessary by destruction caused by hurricane Betsy in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

15. Also petition of Marie L. Mobley and others, North Hollywood, Calif., relative to transmitting copies of letters dealing with the danger of interracial marriage, Supreme Court decisions, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. Also, petition of the commander Bert S. Crossland Post No. 170, American Legion, Torrance, Calif., recommending an investigation of various complaints as to the treatment of United States military veterans on civil service and other employees working in it and also other matters affecting the efficiency in conducting the business in the United States post office at Torrance, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

17. Also, petition of the executive director, Minnesota Society of Architects, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing for historical reasons any changes which would alter in material or design the central portion of the United States Capitol Building in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

18. Also, petition of the secretary, Hawaii Postal Employees Association, Ninole, T. H., appealing to the United States Government to enact legislation extending exemption of Federal income tax on annuities received by employees under the Civil Service Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

19. Also, petition of the counselor, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., transmitting a message from the Association of Members of the National Assembly, Republic of China, expressing sincere appreciation and admiration to Members of the House of Representatives for unanimous adoption of the resolution opposing the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

20. Also, petition of Franco-Bulgarian Institute of Scientific Research, Paris, France, relative to their second number of the bulletin published by the Franco-Bulgarian Institute, which makes an effort to show the free world the difference between the official statements of the Communist leaders in the countries behind the Iron Curtain and sad reality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

21. Also, petition of the secretary, Headquarters, National Movement for the Retrocession of Okinawa, Okinawa, relative to price recommendations concerning Okinawa, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. Also, petition of the president, Japan Federation of Lawyers Associations, Tokyo, Japan, relative to price recommendations concerning Okinawa, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

23. Also, petition of the secretary, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass., with reference to 4 resolutions adopted by the association at its 131st annual meeting, held in Boston, Mass., dealing with immigration, brotherhood, increased support for education, and capital punishment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

24. Also, petition of C. S. Bowen, Greenville, S. C., relative to the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on behalf of petitioner, and for the benefit of, the good people of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, petition of the president, United Chinese Society, Honolulu, T. H., requesting the extension of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., requesting that legislation be introduced restoring full citizenship and rights under the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

27. Also, petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, stating a grievance relative to

charges against his name, etc., and requesting an investigation of the Rules Committee, HOWARD SMITH, chairman, and the Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman; to the Committee on Rules.

28. Also, petition of the chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York, N. Y., requesting the establishment of a special committee of inquiry for the purpose of investigating Soviet aggression against Hungary, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1956 were received after July 20, 1956, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, P. O. Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $337. E. (9) $840.38.

A. Charles J. Alexander, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $10.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $6,604.33.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,673.82. E. (9) $1,673.82.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $17,132.49. E. (9) $17,132.49.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,467.50.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $11,218.85.

A. The American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,980. E. (9) $304.99.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,020. E. (9) $4,158.06.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $7,480.52.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,153.16. E. (9) $2,090.38.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,268.72.

A. Anti-Tax Association of New York, 141 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $568.29. E. (9) $562.29.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $8.56.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,188.77.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,925.25.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,341.30. E. (9) $2,341.30.

A. Kenneth M. Birkhead, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.95. E. (9) $54.23.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,703.60. E. (9) $2,703.60.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $405. E. (9) $23.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wholesalers 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Boston and Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $91.38. E. (9) $62.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen e. V. Contrescarpe 46 Bremen, Germany.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $734.65.

A. William E. Boyle, Providence, R. I.
B. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold J. Buoy, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $466.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and Room 740, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $324.50. E. (9) $324.50.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Postoffice Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $3,396.10. E. (9) $3,975.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. Cliff D. Carpenter, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $280.30.

A. Ralph H. Case, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, Cheyenne Agency, South Dakota.
D. (6) $51,500.

A. Paul M. Castiglioni, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6). $449.96. E. (9) $757.50.

A. Chapman & Wolfsohn, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Balderas 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $666.32.

A. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $840.

A. Frankie Childers, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,365. E. (9) $1,202.

A. Herman Ciott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Suite 412, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $287.33.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $955. E. ($) $468.74.

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 104 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $663.82.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,031,937.12. E. (9) $5,044.90.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $605.77. E. (9) $13.85.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $19,823.18. E. (9) $22,375.03.

A. A. M. Crawford, 718 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $12.

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft, M. B. H. (American-German Coal Transport Co.), 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 812 Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans American Airlines, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Joffre David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $208.30. E. (9) $296.12.

A. S. P. Deans, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,874. E. (9) $3,625.91.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $105.35.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $43.11.

A. John W. Edelman, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,149.03. E. (9) $399.10.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. (9) $260.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $405. E. (9) $20.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Russell J. Fisher, Gordonsville, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $54.27. E. (9) $54.27.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $2,236.74. E. (9) $2,236.74.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $510.27.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $93.75.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $600.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $9,748.67.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,055. E. (9) $180.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1314 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Waverly, Va.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Trans American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $2,827.33.

A. William B. Henderson, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,334. E. (9) $3,192.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $75.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,551.37. E. (9) $1,551.37.

A. Housewives United, 3915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $33. E. (9) $42.49.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,796.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $536.59. E. (9) $1,095.61.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $2,257.80.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,026.26. E. (9) $3,026.26.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $135.35.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $2,150.

A. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $466. E. (9) $466.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $426.40. E. (9) $713.72.

A. J. P. Johnson, 17 Varick Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert I. Kabat, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.22.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, P. O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., P. O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $623.56. E. (9) $1,317.71.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875.01. E. (9) $251.20.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $149.80. E. (9) $60.92.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kreeger, Ragland and Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Alden Lown, receiver of the joint venture of Barrett & Hilp, McDonald and Rutherford, 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. D. B. Lasseter, P. O. Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, P. O. Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.

A. Legislative Council, National Anti-Dumping Committee, Inc., 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio.
B. Pennsylvania-Ohio-New York Committee on Low-Cost Niagara-St. Lawrence Power, Box 187, North Baltimore, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,205. E. (9) $3,336.31.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 North Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $129.01.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $557.50. E. (9) $255.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $580.16.

A. Harry B. Madsen, 1559 North McKinley Road, Lake Forest, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $1,040.20.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,796.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1822 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,248.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1822 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $130. E. (9) $241.47.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok Incorporated, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $6.04.

A. Fisher Muldrow, Post Office Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma, Inc., Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.
D. (6) $666.67. E. (9) $546.63.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $166.22.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $1,592.35. E. (9) $324.27.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $21,219.39. E. (9) $16,410.97.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $77,900.06. E. (9) $9,666.55.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $136.75. E. (9) $136.75.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards and its division of governmental affairs, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15,117.42.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $750.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House ,Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $25.750. E. (9) $22,269.33.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,500.

A. National Congress of American Indians, 226 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (99) $2,000.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 513 West 166th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,244.64. E. (9) $622.54.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,326. E. (9) $419.12.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $69.92. E. (9) $1,284.75.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,906.88. E. (9) $6,906.88.

A. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 412 5th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,046.53. E. (9) $2,022.68.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,297.06. E. (9) $1,729.77.

A. National Institute of Social Welfare, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $661.40. E. (9) $9,814.38.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $792.53.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $14,768.41.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,402.04. E. (9) $590.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $17,606. E. (9) $7,747.65.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,620. E. (9) $5,317.47.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,814.27. E. (9) $1,692.65.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,775.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $217.05.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $381.53. E. (9) $563.54.

A. L. M. Faramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $2,100.

A. Charles A. Parker, Room 714, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,152.50. E. (9) $1,126.44.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $15.25.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $142.19.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,999.99. E. (9) $377.97.

A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D. C.

A. Maurice G. Paul, Jr., 1922 Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Federal Excise Tax Council, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Helen L. Peterson, 226 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 226 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $100.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,557.66. E. (9) $1,576.37.

A. Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.
D. (6) $10,999.97. E. (9) $5,259.40.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $389.82.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $303.40.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Harry N. Rosenfield, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $26.16.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $128.91.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $79.59.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $48.10.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $96.75.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $945. E. (9) $9,203.52.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $159.85.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Ltd., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,949.17.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $4,230.55. E. (9) $5,144.20.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. William L. Breese, Longview, Accokeek, Md.
E. (9) $4.41.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Edward Martin Hinsberger, care of R. M. Franks, 55 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $2.70.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Josefa Kusiak, 4814 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $495.

A. Sterck, Rickards & Roots, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $217.61.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Volunteer Worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local 1, GCEOC, AFL–CIO, 1007 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $12.65.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $108.60.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Stein, Hall & Co., 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York 17, N. Y.
D. (6) $43. E. (9) $43.

A. Texas Committee of Correspondence, Box No. 912, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $834.25. E. (9) $607.74.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $204.04.

A. Hugh C. Tuttle, Dover, N. H.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
E. (9) $99.84.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,320.86.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Marion G. Ward, Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Arkansas Bus and Truck Association, Inc., Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $731.56.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $91.55.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $156.10.

A. Richard H. Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $22,634.12. E. (9) $55.57.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $237.93.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $833.34. E. (9) $15.17.

A. Joseph M. Wyatt, 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $348.08.

A. Howard Zahniser, 6222 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $250.

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1956:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register" place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER: 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "EMPLOYEE".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expand except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during the Quarter
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through_____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6"), and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $174.40. E. (9) $174.40.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $9.65.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,621.96. E. (9) $11,75.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,018.89. E. (9) $9,351.35.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,315.70. E. (9) $4,315.70.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Mo.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plaster Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $337.18.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $96.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $3,476.55. E. (9) $3,476.55.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,423. E. (9) $26,986.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $38,659.97.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $11,070.88.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $155,045.11.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $198.10. E. (9) $198.10.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $11,660.37.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $6,282.05.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $14,184.28. E. (9) $5,800.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $48,402.48. E. (9) $4,513.13.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $5,424.92.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525.06. E. (9) $525.06.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $11,654.53. E. (9) $1,277.22.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $12,200. E. (9) $13,483.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $40,868.37. E. (9) $984.41.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,787.09. E. (9) $1,787.09.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,299.88.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $10,259.53.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans, World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,467.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,460. E. (9) $2,545.01.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $27.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $37.15.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $433.33.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building. Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,197.88.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Simon & Schuster, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $11.72.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $28.44.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Retail Confectioners of the United States, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,117.50. E. (9) $2,497.83.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $23,594.30. E. (9) $23,594.30.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,878.93. E. (6) $1,878.93.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $590.60. E. (9) $590.60.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 186, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $15.60.

A. George P. Baker, 808 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John A. Baker, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $94.56.

A. H. M. Baldrige.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Hartman Barber, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,028.27. E. (9) $707.60.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $350.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $316.25.

A. Irvin L. Barney, room 303, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrel Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 26 O'Farrel Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $351.05.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A. Burton N. Behling, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Adm. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.30. E. (9) $50.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,627.79.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $380.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $346.

A. Walter J. Bierwagon, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 899 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $312.87.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $576.92. E. (9) $379.19.

A. Henry W. Blalock, Sr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo.; N. W. Electric Power Cooperative, Cameron, Mo.; Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anardako, Okla.
D. (6) $250.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,025. E. (9) $219.03.

A. Leo V. Bodine, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hyman H. Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $401.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $590.60.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $135.

A. Ray B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $63.25.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 400 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $484.62. E. (9) $45.99.

A. W. S. Bromley, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $200.

A. Brookhart, Becker, and Dorsey, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Agencia Industrial, C. por A., Post Office Box 199, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,094.38. E. (9) $7,094.38.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $25.35.

A. C. R. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,110.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $1,645.05.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Power Reactor Development Co., care The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $359.76.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $13.55.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Toby E. G. Brunner, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $650.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $168.75.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $15.72.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Life Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Retinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $995.67. E. (9) $624.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $262.80. E. (9) $262.80.

A. William J. Burns, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $150.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11.50. E. (9) $1.60.

A. Harold Burke.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $6,261.26.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $3.63.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 401 Third Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Cafrey, 1145, 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $21.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of The Cotton Industries, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis 12, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,346.13. E. (9) $234.61.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $214.35. E. (9) $16.97.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $452.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,645.67.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $28.80. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Benjamin F. Castle.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,665.11.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,260. E. (9) $261.04.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Colodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Frankie Childers, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $294.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,601.11. E. (9) $3,941.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $116.81.

A. Clark & Lanahan, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert W. Groves, John Morel, F. D. M. Strachan, Jr., and Thomas H. Adams, Savannah Bank and Trust Company Building, Savannah, Ga.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,230.78.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.
E. (9) $8.32.

A. Hermon Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287. E. (9) $260.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $57.50.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $905.16.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Browning Lines, Inc., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (6) $8,925. E. (9) $689.21.

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,925. E. (9) $26,813.80.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $115.46.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,293. E. (9) $747.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $9,604.27.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anne Arundel County and Prince Georges County, Maryland Citizens Group.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry Bulk Regulation, c/o Ames, Hill & Ames, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. J. Robert Conroy, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $15.25.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $168.27.

A. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,100.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $6,334.25.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $8,392.12.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $56.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $6.11.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $8.10.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50,000. E. (9) $62.83.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington and Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $5,382.62.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $675.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Arnold H. Dadian, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $28.56.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $39.04.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $675.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans American Airlines, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $660.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $821.86. E. (9) $96.14.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,635.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge and Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trustees Under the Will of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, care The Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
E. (9) $69.24.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $309.28.

A. Sherlock Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.22.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. R. T. DeVany.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $16.96.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,659.50. E. (9) $34.50.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, 741 North Fulton, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,444.34. E. (9) $44.34.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,980.78.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,865.58. E. (9) $16,880.24.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $16,905.03.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.51. E. (9) $8.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $219.24.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,613.99. E. (9) $15.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. James W. Douthat.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold R. Duffie, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald H. Dunham, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $232.50. E. (9) $31.07.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,731.26.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,288.82. E. (9) $4,288.82.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $103.28. E. (9) $4,161.24.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $5.75.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,276. E. (9) $458.35.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Bernard H. Ehlrich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,184.21.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $171.50.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,180.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,877.50. E. (9) $13.97.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $157.61.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $20.75.

A. Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. $3,179.88. E. (9) $936.32.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29,864.26. E. (9) $18,280.73.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; Okeelanta Surgar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $5,850.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $11.70.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Financial General Corp., formerly the Morris Plan Corp., 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $135.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King and Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $430.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,541.66. E. (9) $20.95.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $52.80.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,042.75.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,365.72.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $2,360.16.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $44.45.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $78.15.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $65. E. (9) $65.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $606. E. (9) $437.35.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $595.83. E. (9) $438.33.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $80.17.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,164.89. E. (9) $3,601.76.

A. George Milan Fuller.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $2.80.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $526.45.

A. Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd, 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,867.50. E. (9) $162.17.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $3.

A. John A. Gosnell, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Adhesives Manufacturers Association of America, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $625.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,889.57. E. (9) $5,601.14.

A. Government Relations Committee, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $23.08.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $19,082.80. E. (9) $11,392.61.

A. Robert A. Grant, 620–624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $436.32.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $15.65.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $4.25.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $459.91. E. (9) $459.91.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $490. E. (9) $250.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $576.79.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $315.65.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $104.35.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $408.05.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of America Railroads, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $107. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $8.65.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.96. E. (9) $699.91.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $1,089.90.

A. Eugene Hardy.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $35.30.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Edward Hart, 2531 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $57.34.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $305.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $25.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $63.55.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $18.95.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,032.22.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and N Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $157.78. E. (9) $157.78.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.50.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $245.20.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $196.83.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,451.67. E. (9) $201.67.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. AMVETS (American Veterans World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $75.

A. Charles Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $792.93. E. (9) $202.93.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $309.28.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $73.91.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,580.

A. Raymond R. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $277.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $23.33. E. (9) $86.64.

A. W. C. Hushing, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,302. E. (9) $390.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $971.41.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $16,635. E. (9) $8,530.08.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,714.55.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $2.40.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $58.92. E. (9) $58.92.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,875.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $11.61.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $126.35.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.
E. (9) $9.75.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $120.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $100.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Postoffice Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Postoffice Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,412.50. E. (9) $51.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participatione Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Herianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.

A. Joe Jenness, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $57.50.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $565. E. (9) $2,295.45.

A. Peter Dierks Joere, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,683.33.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. P. Johnson, 17 Varick Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,615.68. E. (9) $44.91.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. L. Don Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $7.03.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters' Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $483.83.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace M. Jopling, People's Hardware Building, Lake City, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $450.

A. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $792.93.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, N. Y.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $102.50.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $215.50.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $59.73.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1148 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $267.24. E. (9) $534.62.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $230.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $618.34. E. (9) $668.99.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois and Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $575.68.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1707 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. King, Noble & Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Bill Kirchner.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,475.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $55.87.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,038.44. E. (9) $83.95.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2649 North Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $100.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $2,467.30.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $54.54.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,551. E. (9) $4,551.15.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (7) $2,550.

A. La Roe, Winn and Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $3,823.39.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,816.75.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,666.66 E. (9) $69.28.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,749.98. E. (9) $5.87.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $22.50. E. (9) $0.82.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,903.80.

A. James R. Lee, 1426 G Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $103.25.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $418.67.

A. G. E. Leighty, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street, Washington, D. C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $6,936.63.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,515.65. E. (9) $6,515.65.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $42.95.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $123.75. E. (9) $42.08.

A. Walter J. Little, 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,135.44. E. (9) $623.02.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 4045 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,750. E. (9) $400.83.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.93. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Loan & Finance Corp., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,718.75. E. (9) $18.67.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $750.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $15.25.

A. John J. Lyons, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,962.35. E. (9) $1,514.39.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424, 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,312.50.

A. John A. McCart, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,712.28. E. (9) $31.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Ins., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $1,562.45.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McGaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,210. E. (9) $127.28.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,550.98. E. (9) $195.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., 425 Crocker Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $2.87.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 435 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1300 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportes Maritimos Mexicanos, S. A., Avenue Insurgentes No. 432, Mexico City, D. F.
E. (9) $2.87.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $260.42. E. (9) $463.56.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $200.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,918.46. E. (9) $507.92.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $476.81.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $13.48.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,325. E. (9) $52.71.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John G. Macfarlan, Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $226.77.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $975.50. E. (9) $410.90.

A. James Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $875.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $157.14.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Chuch, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, Post Office Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $375.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $28.41.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $642.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Public Utilities Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $28.90.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,375.02. E. (9) $408.40.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $40.80. E. (9) $3.80.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–13 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $2.49.

A. Mike Masaoka, 18th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $369.08.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $7.75.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $51.45.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $2,724.99.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Merchants National Bank and Trust Company of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $80.20.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $327.55.

A. James C. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $856.

A. Clarence R. Miles.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles C. Miller, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $655.21.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $322.86.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,226.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $311.02.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $8.40.

A. F. E. Mollin, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,450. E. (9) $198.50.

A. Donald Montgomery, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,913.58.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Maryland Railroad Association, care of E. H. Burgess, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $3.15.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $176.26.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
E. (9) $192.66.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Group Health Dental Insurance, Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $17.45.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $296.27.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $82.50.

A. Edwin B. Morris, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $15.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $70.39.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $655.90.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Fisher Muldrow, Post Office Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma, Inc., Box 983, Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Howard E. Munro, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,452.44. E. (9) $707.54.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Co-op, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,408.78. E. (9) $1,408.78.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $708. E. (9) $322.28.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $2,876.80. E. (9) $381.62.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,468.75. E. (9) $139.61.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,422.95. E. (9) $5,812.15.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,148.25. E. (9) $6,079.23.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,265.36. E. (9) $1,253.38.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,957.18. E. (9) $5,901.70.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,194.01. E. (9) $682.60.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $533.22. E. (9) $692.67.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26,834.49.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $230,565.54. E. (9) $2,992.93.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $265.90.

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,074.41.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, care Mr. D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,499.02. E. (9) $3,499.02.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,189. E. (9) $4,057.68.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $165.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $336.50. E. (9) $336.50.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,821.43. E. (9) $1,689.85.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $285.19. E. (9) $285.19.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $120,376.38. E. (9) $23,300.04.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,496.21. E. (9) $1,496.21.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20,976.71. E. (9) $20,057.60.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $305.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700.85. E. (9) $789.06.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,858.57. E. (9) $1,858.57.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $35,670.95. E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,157.32.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,427.50. E. (9) $4,902.82.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,549.91. E. (9) $15,549.91.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,400. E. (9) $4,304.03.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,281.40.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $33,900.18. E. (9) $1,765.83.

A. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $126.90. E. (9) $126.90.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,262.75. E. (9) $1,754.81.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $11,136.50. E. (9) $2,783.42.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,350. E. (9) $8,409.95.

A. William S. Neal.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.75.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499. E. (9) $6.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,440. E. (9) $4,304.03.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. George S. Newcomer, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $582. E. (9) $12.29.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $718.46.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $302.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,470.60.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $94.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $185.21.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $32.01.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $77.46.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $8.47.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $8.47.

A. Graeme O'Geran, 131 Orvilton Drive, Dewitt, New York, N. Y.
B. The Merchants National Bank & Trust Co. of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. A. N. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $23.06. E. (9) $2.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,311.66. E. (9) $383.

A. Clarence H. Olson, care of The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,370. E. (9) $15.24.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,966.83.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,631.40.

A. L. M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $2,233.36. E. (9) $2,233.36.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Shaeffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., and Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $322.50. E. (9) $56.17.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $2,813.73.

A. James G. Patton, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $292.15.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. N. R. Gains and Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $88.19.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty and Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Paul, Weise, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $120.22.

A. Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. Helen L. Peterson, 226 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 226 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $500.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $5.27.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $42.75.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.58.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., 8-10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
E. (9) $3.90.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $30.11.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $750.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $103.47.

A. Piper & Marbury, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $22.01.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Admiral Corp., 3800 Courtland Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $98.53.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,651.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers and Oregon Filbert Commission, Portland, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,677. E. (9) $22.59.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $190.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $14.60.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,662.72.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Thomas L. Preston, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Devalin Corp, 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.71.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Little & Christman, 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.33.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $217.63.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 9807 South Oakley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $425.60.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,925.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $44.60. E. (9) $65.21.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruits & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $81.95.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Reasoner & Davis, 505 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $19.68.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,892.50. E. (9) $2,892.50.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 10th and E Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $100.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $37,444.15.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $21,864.68. E. (9) $10,877.08.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $502.50.

A. Harry Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Siert M. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $173.22.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $360.50.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $145.91.

A. E. W. Rising, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, postoffice box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $365.67.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $104.41.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,975.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $177.32.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $94.59.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $264.90.

A. William H. Ryan, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,700.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.01. E. (9) $536.45.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $223. E. (9) $500.

A. Jesse T. Sanders, 227 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association for Retarded Children and the Yadkin Valley Association.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $659.38.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,100.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grier Cotton Co., Statesville, N. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $271.52.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N. J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $480.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $316.49.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Services (CCBS); 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $11.

A. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislation Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $5.27.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,044. E. (9) $137.27.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,033.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $319.32.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $131.25.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,426.47.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $7.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $149.76.

A. T. W. Smiley, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $146.41.

A. R. S. Smitehurst, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $161.55.

A. John A. Smith, Stapleton Air Field, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Stapleton Air Field, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $375.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,897.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Mutual Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward P. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,161.06. E. (9) $103.87.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $460.25.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $545.76.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $16,379. E. (9) $24,475.45.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $65. E. (9) $150.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,949.77.

A. Samuel Elliott Stavisky, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba, and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.

A. Mrs. Nell P. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Utility Trailer Rental Association, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Rental Trailer Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 1720 East Morris, Wichita, Kans.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,881.44. E. (9) $11,903.45.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 Wabash, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Erskine Stewart, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.34.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $297.44.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local 1, GCEOC, 1007 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $778.75.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $178.22.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,538.46.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Stein, Hall & Co., 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2.75.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $757.12.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence Talley, Route 1, Box 86, McLean, Va.
B. American Oil Co., 555 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Tax Reduction League of New York, 141 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $77.51. E. (9) $77.51.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ruth H. Tegtmeyer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Committee of Correspondence, Post Office Box 912, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,131.24. E. (9) $1,150.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $10,080. E. (9) $7,057.22.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $165.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $151.95.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,476.90.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,725.62. E. (9) $37.35.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $324.52. E. (9) $9.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $126.35.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $306.10. E. (9) $90.99.

A. Tomoka Land Co., 8-10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $153.93.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $192. E. (9) $195.84.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,156.25. E. (9) $58.50.
A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Hugh C. Tuttle, Dover, N. H.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William S. Tyson, 736 Bowen Building, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $46.85.

A. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $450.

A. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Citizens Association, Canal Zone, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,568. E. (9) $507.02.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $19,240.09.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.35.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14.25. E. (9) $14.25.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley W. Vogt, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,315.68. E. (9) $14.57.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $163.41. E. (9) $68.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Marion G. Ward, P. O. Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Arkansas Bus and Truck Association, Inc., P. O. Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Qualfe M. Ward, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $123.60. E. (9) $4.55.

A. William C. Warren, 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,527.22. E. (9) $1,574.01.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $331.25. E. (9) $14,202.49.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,207.52. E. (9) $1,292.48.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Lloyd W. Weaver, 841 West 33d Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $750.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,628.17. E. (9) $428.49.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,112.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2.56.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the USA, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $305.54.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $630.11.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,798.12. E. (9) $42.95.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $3.42.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $3.42.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $3.41.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.50.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $84.31.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,650.67. E. (9) $1,650.67.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $7.31.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $290.83.

A. Wilmer & Broun, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Bullard Co., Bridgeport, Conn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $118.48.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $15.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $450.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $273.18.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,000.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadcasting Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,000.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,253.07. E. (9) $964.70.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $773.67. E. (9) 499.54.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,222.80.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,437.50. E. (9) $83.72.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $585. E. (9) $100.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America.
E. (9) $2,422.12.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter of 1956:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3" and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	QUARTER				
		P	1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Rports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report disregard this item "C 4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Beauty and Barber Supply Institute, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Mary Hillyer Blanchard, 408 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, Ellsworth and Morewood, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. North German Lloyd, Bremen, Germany.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Cline House, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Francis J. McNamara, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

A. Marks and Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Public Utilities Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Admiral Corp., 3800 Courtland Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Francis W. Stover, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

A. H. William Tanaka, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Introduction of Bill To Increase Retirement Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the annuities of those Federal employees who had retired prior to October 1, 1956.

Last year, the 84th Congress enacted a major revision to the Civil Service Retirement Act, but the improved benefits accrued only to those who retired subsequent to the effective date of that law. No action was taken to improve the annuities of those already retired.

With costs of living continuing to spiral upward, the retired Federal workers are finding it difficult to make ends meet. In a 17-year period since 1939 the real income of the retired civil-service employees has gone down 13 percent, while the real income of practically every other group have increased, in one case up 107 percent.

In addition to providing an increase in annuities, my bill provides annuities for the so-called forgotten widows of 1948. These surviving spouses of employees who retired and died prior to April 1, 1948, were not included among the beneficiaries of Public Law 426 which provided survivorship annuities for widows of employees who retired on or after April 1, 1948. They are a dying class and their numbers are decimated each year. Actuarial standards show that the entire class will expire in about 6 more years. Consequently any small cost of providing them annuities at this time will only be for a 6-year period and will get smaller each year.

I believe enactment of this legislation is an obligation which we cannot overlook. These people served their Government well and deserve the means by which to keep pace with current day costs of living. I strongly urge that immediate action be taken on the proposal.

Economic Relief of Civil Service Retirees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress, January 3, I introduced H. R. 854, legislation designed for the economic relief of our civil service retirees. This group of our citizenry has suffered greatly due to rapidly rising prices in our Nation. The U. S. News & World Report of August 3, 1956, carried a very detailed and eye-opening account of this situation analyzing the inflation rates and showing the actual and realistic increases received by various groups in our economy after allowing for taxes and changes in the value of the dollar.

According to the report, on the basis of an analysis of 35 large groups representing approximately 95 percent of our population, it was found that these groups based on 1939 incomes were obtaining larger real income ranging all the way from 4 percent to 107 percent. Civil service retirees, on the other hand, were down 13 percent from the 1939 level.

Mr. Speaker, these figures speak for themselves. This group of loyal and dedicated retired employees of our Government are indeed the forgotten men and women of our times. It is imperative that the Congress of the United States take effective and affirmative action to relieve this situation. On the basis of this information and knowing these figures to be reliable, the legislation which I have introduced is designed to provide justice for this loyal group of retired Federal workers. The bill, I believe, is a practical and realistic one granting increases to our retirees of up to $800 per year.

It is my sincere hope that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will take prompt and favorable action on this measure, and that my distinguished colleagues and I will be given an opportunity to consider this vital legislation early in this session.

Religion in America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the rally day period conducted by the churches of Altoona, Pa., late in September 1956, I delivered the following address titled "Religion in America Today":

It is an honor to be invited to participate in this annual rally day service.

I regard it as a special privilege and one which I have accepted in a spirit of deepest reverence.

Rally day is a very important occasion on the church calendar.

It signifies the end of the summer season when warm weather and vacations adversely affect church attendance.

Rally day sounds the call to action, as we take inventory of our spiritual needs and prepare to care for them during the ensuing months by establishing regularity in our attendance at church.

Not only on rally day but in fact every day of the year we should thank God for

our churches for they are the Nation's first line of defense.

Through our churches we as a Nation have been able to maintain a standard of honesty and decency without which the Nation would not be worth saving nor would its citizenry care for any interest beyond their own selfish personal gratifications.

It is an accepted fact that a nation with strong moral convictions and a deep reverence for God is able through His divine grace to defend itself against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Did you ever stop to realize that should our churches fall into decay and ruin America would become overwhelmingly pagan in a few years.

That fact should make an indelible impression on our minds and hearts and urge all of us to appreciate more fully the church as a spiritual powerhouse whose beacon of light and goodness encompasses the entire globe.

If we have a fuller appreciation of the indispensable position the church plays in our everyday lives, then, as individuals and as a Nation, we will be better able to discharge our responsibility of actively supporting the church and all it is defending in the fields of moral and spiritual development.

Religious groups through the church are carrying the Gospel to the four corners of the earth and in so doing, creating an atmosphere of confidence and good will that is of more value than costly armaments or diplomatic maneuvering, which so often leads to meaningless peace pacts between the nations of the world.

Let us never forget America was built upon the church.

All of us are familiar with the picture depicting the Pilgrims on their way to church carrying both Bibles and rifles.

There were many reasons why the New England pioneers might have remained near their primitive homes and worshipped under the sheltering trees with one eye on the prowling Indians.

The well-known painting, however, shows them—men, women, and children—trudging along the snow-piled forest path on their way to the rudely constructed meetinghouse, their reverent hands had fashioned for divine worship.

The Pilgrims on their way to church remind us, as these spiritual ancestors of ours fought for their very lives, that Sunday morning for them was not a time to catch up in sleep, not an opportunity to clear more needed land or plant crops, not a time to indulge in sports and amusements.

In spite of the hazards and the hardship of it, Sunday morning was a time to go to church.

The Pilgrims went, and by so doing they contributed their physical presence as a witness to their faith in God and by which they lived.

It is a serious indictment against our generation, that for literally millions of Americans church attendance is ignored.

With 3 global wars engulfing our Nation in the short span of 33 years, it is little wonder that there has been the growing realization that the church is the bulwark and arsenal of all that makes our Nation great.

Even the radio and television stations across the land signify this truth, as they sandwich between commercials the devotional song called Let's Go to Church Next Sunday Morning.

We profess to be a Christian Nation, but deserted churches give the lie to the creed we claim to profess.

When we remain away from church, it does something to that fragile plant called reverence, which needs watering at least once a week.

Surely there can be no question that unless we give regular expression to an emotion or conviction, it will die or grow dim.

As we thank God for our churches, let us do it in church and not from some reclining place, as we deny our Creator 1 hour of worship on Sunday.

Rally day, therefore, is an opportune time to examine our own conscience, and at the same time to keep in mind that in the Communist world churches of every denomination are being ruthlessly persecuted in the diabolical effort to destroy man's belief in God.

It is encouraging to know that religion in America today is a mighty and increasing force.

Statistics may sometimes seem hard to understand, or inconclusive, or dull, but today's religious statistics are as clear an indication of the way the wind blows as a million straws, all blowing one way, as conclusive as the force of that wind, and exciting as its impact.

In 1850, 16 percent of the population of America were church members.

By 1900, the percentage had climbed, slowly and with setbacks, to 36 percent.

Through the first half of the 20th century the increase continued up to 57 percent, and the most recent figures, for 1955, released this month by the National Council of Churches, show that approximately 61 percent of all Americans are now church members.

In actual numbers the American church membership has now, for the first time, passed the 100 million mark.

In 1906, half a century ago, there were 209,266 churches of all denominations in the United States.

Though both the shift of population from the country to the city, and the increasing tendency to consolidate churches where possible, tended to reduce the total number of churches, that number, after sinking to 199,302 in 1936, rose to 300,056 for 1954.

The result is, that we now have both more members in each congregation, and more actual church buildings.

In 1955 5,393 new church buildings were reported and the money spent on new construction during that year is said by the national council to constitute a new record.

The total financial contribution of members to their churches continued an upward trend, per capita contributions rising 7 percent in 1955, to reach the sum of $48.81 annually.

If money talks they are surely good words that we hear from that money.

Both the increase in church membership and the growing concern for the education and moral training of our youth are reflected in a 3.4-percent increase in Sunday school enrollments.

Newspapers and magazines are full of discussions of the religious boom.

Book publishers find that the sales of religious books are large and steadily increasing.

Political actions reflecting both the popular feeling and the convictions of individuals in the Government, include the provision of the Prayer Room in the Capitol, the addition of the phrase "under God" to the pledge of allegiance, the issuance of a stamp bearing the words "In God We Trust," the provision by law that the same motto is to appear on all our coins designed in the future, and most recently the adoption of the statement "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States.

Besides the increase in church membership there is a remarkable increase in both the number of prayer groups and the number of members in established prayer groups.

In Government agencies, in business, in neighborhoods, it is becoming more and more the custom to meet occasionally to pray together, and to conduct programs of speaking, or reading, or discussion, on the subject of prayer.

In magazines and newspapers, and in the public transportation vehicles, we have grown familiar with the advertisements urging people to attend the churches of their choice, to take their families to church, to go to Sunday school with their children, to pray together as families.

I am not sure how much effect this sort of advertising has, but I feel sure the advertising is itself, the effect of an urge among all the American people, to deepen their religious experience and to give tangible evidence of the faith that is in them.

Ministers and other theological thinkers have published many articles criticizing the current popularity of religion as superficial and tainted with self-interest.

But the very fact that such critical articles are published in great numbers shows that a deep and honest interest must be somewhere in the American public.

Surely those who are indulging in superficial emotionalism do not welcome searching criticism of their motives, and it is farfetched to suppose that those who are dropping more money in the collection basket are doing it in the expectation of any financial or material return.

Some of the criticism, too, it must be remarked, is more superficial than any of the religious manifestations toward which it is directed.

Typical of the easy sneer with which some critics content themselves and may fool their readers is a sentence from a recent article on the religious views of our current presidential candidates:

"Many critics of the ground swell of religious manifestations in America today see in President Eisenhower a personification of this popular piety."

The very image this critic has chosen to avail himself of betrays the inconsistency of his attack.

Of course, there are superficial religious manifestations in America today. There always were such manifestations in this country and in every other country.

However, for perfectly practical reasons the superficial manifestations will become greater when it becomes more profitable for the hypocrites and self-servers to pretend to real religious feeling, and that is precisely when a real ground swell of religion is manifesting itself.

I am glad to believe that President Eisenhower's religion, and the religion of Adlai Stevenson likewise, is a part of this ground swell of religious feeling and conviction in the American people.

There is not cause for complacency, and there is no complacency, in the religion of America today.

We have the forward movement and the forward urge.

We are striving to bring our actions into closer accord with our professions of moral principle and to submit our individual good to the good of all.

There will always be those—who will rest content with the system of morality—expressed by the motto, "Honesty is the best policy."

But I believe that America today—and the world today—need a heroic virtue—reaching far beyond that feeble and petty sentiment.

We shall not hold our earth and sky together—nor each individual of us—keep his own soul and body together—unless we adopt that heroic virtue—expressed in the old saying—"Let justice be done though the heavens fall."

And we shall not save our individual souls if we consider it fashionable merely to be seen "going to church."

We need the rock-ribbed faith of our forefathers who founded this "Nation under God" and who never tired of constantly seeking his protection.

We should never forget—that the atomic-hydrogen age in which we live—had its birth when Almighty God—first entrusted the secrets of the atom to our Nation.

Therefore, we owe Him—not only our allegiance—but our constant prayers of thanksgiving—that this Nation was spared from the unhappy fate of Japan—which became the testing ground for the devastating atomic attack in World War II.

Let us on this rally day—resolve to make an earnest effort—to stimulate interest in church membership—and above all—regular church attendance.

Let us with our friends and loved ones—turn our thoughts more frequently to church—and by prayer and devotion—acknowledge our utter dependence—on the God who hath made and preserved us a Nation.

Thus we will be doing more—than thanking God for the church.

We will be conducting our spiritual lives—in such an edifying manner—that the church will thank God for our aid—in its mission to extend the Kingdom of God on earth.

Let us joyfully look forward to fulfilling our obligation to the church by regular attendance, and as we enter its portals may our hearts be attuned to the true Spirit of God, enabling us to say in all sincerity and from the innermost recesses of our hearts:

"Sweet hour of prayer! Sweet hour of prayer!
That calls us from a world of care.
And bids us, at our Father's throne
Make all our wants and wishes known.

"In seasons of distress and grief
Our souls have often found relief.
And oft escaped the tempter's snare,
By thy return, sweet hour of prayer."

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Introduction of Equality of Opportunity Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act. That act has been the main protection of small business against price discrimination, but it has been weakened by the action of the Supreme Court in 1951 when a precedent was set by the case of *Standard Oil Company* v. *The Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 321).

As each year passes, we note that more and more of the small businesses are folding and the larger concerns are growing even larger. In a statement last year, I pointed out as an example that in 1 year following the Supreme Court decision it had been estimated that about 60,000 small service-station operators failed in business. Price discrimination has been the chief factor contributing to the alarmingly high rate of turnover in the service-station field, as in other areas of small business.

My proposed amendment to the act provides a fair opportunity for all to purchase items under the same terms and conditions regardless of size of the purchasing company.

Our American economy was founded on the principle of individual enterprise. If we are to remain strong in this tradition, we must see that each individual has an opportunity to enter business and prosper. While the bill would help primarily the small-business man, I believe all segments of the business world would welcome it for it applies to all of them.

National Civil Service Week: January 13 Through 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the observance of National Civil Service Week, January 13 through 19, sponsored by the American Federation of Government Employees. This week can serve a valuable purpose in acquainting the American people with the services performed by our civil servants, and in familiarizing them with the manner by which Government employees are selected. It should also emphasize the fact that we must do all we can to reestablish the prestige of the civil service in the eyes of the American people so that able and dedicated young men and women will continue to be attracted to the public service.

Mr. Speaker, I think it well to point out that the 74-year-old Civil Service Act is the taxpayer's guarantee that the Nation's 2 million Government employees are hired and keep their jobs solely on the basis of ability. Even in the horse-and-buggy days America could ill afford the waste, inefficiency, and corruption of the spoils system, and in the critical times in which we live any departure from the principles of impartial selection of the best available men and women would be a national tragedy.

I also feel this is a very opportune time to caution my colleagues that the gains in good government achieved during the 74 years since the start of the merit system could be wiped out if the civil service is no longer able to attract qualified men and women. If we insist on paying mediocre salaries and fail to match other benefits received by workers in private industry, we can look forward only to mediocre standards of performance in future years. This, in the long run, would be far more costly to the taxpayer than the price of enabling Government employees to share in the rising American standard of living which they have helped to bring about.

Mr. Speaker, the observance of National Civil Service Week is of particular interest to the approximately 35,000 civil service employees and their families residing in my district, which includes the great Puget Sound naval shipyard in Bremerton, Wash. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to these employees, and to all our civil servants. The devotion to duty of these people is evidenced by the many employee on-the-job suggestions for greater efficiency and economy which saved the Government more than $100 million last year. It is my sincere hope that the civil service will be able to continue to attract such valuable members.

Some Information About H. R. 1108, a Bill To Provide that Military Boards of Correction Will Give Consideration to Satisfactory Evidence of Good Character and Conduct and Rehabilitation in Civilian Life; on Petition for Review by Person Having Received Less Than Honorable Type Discharge Not Less Than 3 Years Previous, as Introduced in the House of Representatives, January 3, 1957, by Hon. Clyde Doyle, of California, Member of House Armed Services Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having already had the privilege of speaking with a goodly number of the Members of this legislative body about the terms, conditions, and objectives of H. R. 1108, I will say that not a single one of the Members raised or stated any objection to me thereto. Furthermore, almost without exception, the Members, with worried expressions, told me of one or more cases in their respective congressional districts which they had personal knowledge of and which they believed could be meritoriously considered by the appropriate military review board, if H. R. 1108 should become the law and put into full force and effect by the military department.

I wish to again call attention to the fact that under the expressed terms of H. R. 1108 the appropriate military review board in our Defense Department remains the sole judge of whether or not an applicant for review of his record, having been in civilian life not less than 3 years, shall have that former discharge corrected and changed by the said military review board. In other words, the evidence of rehabilitation by applicant, who has been in civilian life not less than 3 years, must be "to the satisfaction of the board by oral or written evidence or both." Also, Mr. Speaker, my bill expressly provides that the military review boards for which the application for review and change of type of discharge is pending "may make independent investigation." And because it is manifestly reasonable that an applicant may fail in one application at a given

time, but may be able to naturally succeed years later, my bill expressly provides that "applications and reapplications for review of discharges or dismissals under this subsection may be filed at any time after 3 years."

And, Mr. Speaker, because I recognize that it would be manifestly reasonable to allow a boy who had received a discharge or dismissal under conditions other than honorable to come up to the high level of evidence of military service equal to the boys who had received honorable discharge on leaving the military service, H. R. 1108 expressly provides that "No benefits under any laws of the United States—including, but not limited to, pension, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guaranty, retired pay, and other benefits—shall be afforded any individual issued a new discharge or release under this subsection unless he would be entitled to such benefits without regard to the action of the board."

I am pleased to inform you that from many quarters and sources, there has come to my desk approving comments and communications about the worthy objectives and terms and conditions of H. R. 1108. I have heretofore invited any Member of this House, who desires so to do, to take H. R. 1108 and place his own name thereon and file it as evidence of his support thereof. I now again do so.

And, I am naturally pleased at the considerable number of military personnel, both active and retired, who have already communicated their support of H. R. 1108. Many of them say that such treatment of this dire problem has been needed for many years. Many Members of the House also have personally told me of their worries for civilians on this very subject matter and their lack of ability to seemingly find any way or manner to have it corrected.

Mr. Speaker, being cognizant as I believe I am, to the need of prompt, full consideration of this important subject matter which involves many thousands of American lads every year, I have conferred with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, to wit, Hon. CARL VINSON, and I am pleased to find that he also is very much concerned about the problem involved. I have not met a single Member of the House who has had anything but worried and concerned expression about the condition surrounding these thousands of teen-agers and American youth from year to year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Department of Defense itself is really concerned with the problem and its magnitude and its difficulties of satisfactory solution to date.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the exact terms and provisions of H. R. 1108 may not be those which should be approved just as they are. But, Mr. Speaker, I again declare and believe that the objectives of my bill and the provisions thereof make a substantial and meritorious plan by which and of which should come a plan of legislation which will help to correct present errors; which will help strengthen the morale of those involved in such discharges and dismissals past, present, and future; will not substantially interfere with necessary military discipline; will in fact, add to the plans and procedures whereby these thousands of teen-age or youthful offenders will primarily be able to be handled more nearly in accordance with their age and inexperience and their rehabilitated habits and attitudes acquired in civilian life and satisfactory evidence thereof to the military itself.

These then briefly stated are some of my reasons for studying the problem for over 2 years and then for drafting and submitting H. R. 1108. Same has been referred to House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member. I appreciate the able aid and assistance of the House Legislative Council, which has suggested one amendment which I will submit to the House Armed Services Committee in due time, and I appreciate also the cooperation of the Defense Department in materially aiding me in my study as will be revealed in their answers to my 23 questions, many of which have been set forth in this discussion. Knowing of the interest of all the Members of this legislative body in this subject, I am respectfully requesting that you make known your interest in it at an early date, if you have not already done so.

My bill has no purpose to interfere with military discipline nor to make it more difficult to administer. I recognize that military discipline is no cinch nor child's play. But, Mr. Speaker, if the objectives of H. R. 1108 are put into fair and practical application by the Military Establishment the increased morale will logically result. This will be true, because under the objectives of H. R. 1108 discharges and dismissals under less than honorable conditions will logically be treated substantially different than at present. Also, thousands of American homes each year will have reason in fact to bless the American military instead of to condemn it; because their sons have had a fair and just and equitable opportunity and chance to prove that their infractions of military rules and regulations were only minor; were not intended to be serious or felonious in intent or result; but they were then, while in the military, and still are patriotic, loyal, and law-abiding American citizens.

Even a brief observation of the numbers of American youth involved in the foregoing tables furnished me by our Defense Department will clearly show it is a annual matter of many thousands of American boys and youth as well as others. Therefore, it is a major problem which I am asking you to consider:

H. R. 1108

Bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the correction of military or naval records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", (2) by striking out "subsection" in the second proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) In the case of any individual heretofore or hereafter discharged or dismissed from any of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable (except by sentence of a general court martial), the appropriate board shall issue to such individual a discharge or release under honorable conditions, dated as of the date it is issued by the board, if it is established to the satisfaction of the board by oral or written evidence, or both, and by such independent investigation as the board may make, that such individual has rehabilitated himself, and that his character, conduct, activities, and habits since he was granted his original discharge (or since originally dismissed) have been good for a reasonable period of time, and in any event for not less than 3 years. In determining whether or not a period of time is a reasonable time, the board shall take into consideration in each case the reasons for the nature of the original discharge or dismissal, together with such other factors as the board may consider appropriate. Applications and reapplications for correction of records under this paragraph may be filed at any time. No benefits under any laws of the United States (including, but not limited to, pension, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guaranty, retired pay, and other benefits) shall be afforded any individual issued a new discharge or release under this paragraph unless he would be entitled to such benefits without regard to the action of the board."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 207 is amended by striking out "(a)" and inserting "(a) (1)."

SEC. 2. Section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 693h), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 301.", (2) by striking out "section" in the second proviso therein and inserting "subsection", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) In the case of any individual heretofore or hereafter discharged or dismissed from any of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable (except by sentence of a general court-martial), the appropriate board shall issue to such individual a discharge or release under honorable conditions, dated as of the date it is issued by the board, if it is established to the satisfaction of the board by oral or written evidence, or both, and by such independent investigation as the board may make, that such individual has rehabilitated himself, and that his character, conduct, activities, and habits since he was granted his original discharge (or since originally dismissed) have been good for a reasonable period of time, and in any event for not less than 3 years. In determining whether or not a period of time is a reasonable time, the board shall take into consideration in each case the reasons for the nature of the original discharge or dismissal, together with such other factors as the board may consider appropriate. Applications and reapplications for review of discharges or dismissals under this subsection may be filed at any time after 3 years. No benefits under any laws of the United States (including, but not limited to, pension, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guaranty, retired pay, and other benefits) shall be afforded any individual issued a new discharge or release under this subsection unless he would be entitled to such benefits without regard to the action of the board."

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1957.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: The purpose of this letter is to provide you with a summary of the provisions of H. R. 1108, 85th Congress, a bill providing that certain boards having jurisdiction to correct or amend military records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life in determining whether or not to issue new discharges or releases to men previously discharged or dismissed from the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable.

At present two boards in each of the military departments have jurisdiction to correct or amend discharges given to members of the Armed Forces. However, such boards have held that they are not authorized by the law creating them to issue discharges under honorable conditions to individuals on the ground of good character and conduct in civilian life.

H. R. 1108 amends the two provisions of law establishing these boards (sec. 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and sec. 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) so as to provide that each board shall issue to individuals discharged or dismissed from the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable (other than by sentence of a general court martial) a discharge under honorable conditions if the board finds, on the basis of satisfactory evidence, that the individual involved has rehabilitated himself and that his character, conduct, activities, and habits since his discharge or dismissal have been good for a period (not less than 3 years) commensurate with the grounds on which originally discharged or dismissed. Under H. R. 1108, the issuance of a new discharge by either board is not to provide benefits under any Federal law to any person issued such a new discharge.

There is, of course, an overlap in the jurisdiction proposed to be granted to the boards by H. R. 1108, since both the boards established pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the boards established pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 will be performing substantially the same functions under the bill. However, it is relevant to note that this overlap follows the pattern of existing law, since today each of such boards has jurisdiction to change the character of a discharge or dismissal.

For your convenience I am enclosing with this letter a copy of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) and a copy of the latest version of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES M. MENGER, Jr.,
Assistant Counsel.

1. It amends section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; also section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, so as to authorize the appropriate Military Review Boards to consider and take into account the good conduct, habits, character, activities and rehabilitation of an individual in civilian life who has been discharged or dismissed from any of the armed forces not less than 3 years previous, on any of the type of discharges other honorable—except by sentence of a general court martial.

NOTE.—The military authorities maintain that existing statutes do not now authorize such consideration and such rehabilitation in civilian life is not now recognized as legal or appropriate grounds by the military boards for correction of discharge or dismissals.

2. H. R. 1108 does not apply where there has been sentence by general court martial. It only applies to the minor offenses—such as would generally be minor or misdemeanors in civilian life.

3. The evidence and proof of rehabilitation accomplished in civilian life by applicant for review of his discharge or dismissal, must be found satisfactory by the Military Review Board; and in the judgment of the Military Review Board. Evidence can be written or oral.

4. Applications for review may be filed not less than 3 years from date of separation from the military; more than one may be filed.

5. The Military Review Board may make its own independent investigation of the pending application before making decision.

6. No benefits under any laws of the United States shall be afforded any individual whose type of dismissals may be changed under the provisions of H. R. 1108, by reason of H. R. 1108.

7. If the Military Review Board finds applicant has rehabilitated himself in civilian life, then the Board shall issue a corrected discharge to him under honorable conditions; dated as of the original discharge date.

8. In determining the merits of an application, the board shall take into consideration the reasons for the nature of the original discharge or dismissal together with other factors the Board may consider appropriate.

9. The clear purpose of H. R. 1108 is to give the thousands of lads who receive any type of discharge from the military, less than honorable a reasonable opportunity to—

(a) Erase the stigma which automatically attaches to him for a lifetime as a result of receiving such less than honorable discharge.

(b) In applying for work and employment to present a type of discharge which will not cause the employer to immediately say "No" because of the type of discharge presented.

It is believed that many thousands of discharges less than honorable are given to lads still in their teen-age years and a large number of them administratively and a great number of resignations by teen-agers when under great stress or strain and without due consideration of results.

10. H. R. 1108 is generally directed to types of military discharges and dismissals which are classified or known as follows:

(1) General, (2) under honorable conditions, (3) blue discharges, (4) undesirable (unfitness and misconduct), (5) unsuitable, (6) bad conduct.

In October 1955, when Congressman DOYLE directed 23 questions to the Defense Department and asked how many of each type of discharges had been issued in 1955, he was furnished the following table:

Fiscal year 1955	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Honorable	619,194	173,251	175,400	[1] 22,023
General	18,684	6,675	7,200	1,407
Honorable conditions	* *			
Discharge (blue)	* *			
Undesirable	14,566	3,529	6,200	1,901
Bad conduct	965	3,127	2,400	2,669
Dishonorable	2,546	76	1,000	[1] 127
Total	655,955	186,658	192,200	28,127

[1] H. R. 1108 does not apply.

Congressman DOYLE says that based upon the figures he has received from the Defense Department, the total discharges and dismissals during 1955 to which H. R. 1108 might apply is the total of all the discharges above shown (excepting those honorable and dishonorable) or 69,323 grand total.

Following are some of the questions asked the Defense Department by Congressman DOYLE in August 1955, and their answers thereto in December 1955:

Question: Under what public law does the Defense Department or any of the military establishments each establish their respective boards of review or correction? Or, if not under public law, then by what directive or order is such established?

Answer: The discharge review boards were established pursuant to section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, June 22, 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended. The Boards for Correction of Records were established pursuant to section 207, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.).

Question: How many discharges have been reviewed by each of the military services by the respective Boards of Review of Discharges and Dismissals? List each type of discharge or separation given during each of the last 5 years.

Answer: (a) The total number of discharges reviewed by the separate Discharge Review Boards for the 5-year period ending June 30, 1955, are as follows:

Army; 49,399; Navy 36,968; Air Force, 12,506.

Question: How many discharges have been changed by the Board for the Correction of Military Records or the Board for the Correction of Naval Records? List each type discharge having been changed during the last 5 years.

Answer: (a) During the 5-year period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955, 561 discharges have been changed.

Question: Have any discharges been changed as prayed for to the Board for the Correction of Military Records or the Board for the Correction of Naval Records?

Answer: Yes, 561 discharges or separations have been changed during the 5-year period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955.

Question. In considering the review of an adverse type of discharge upon the request of the dischargee, is any consideration given by the reviewers to exemplary behavior subsequent to the date of discharge on the part of the petitioner?

Answer. Generally speaking the answer is "No." However, in these borderline cases where the Board considers that the dischargee, on the basis of his record of service alone could have been properly and equitably discharged with a higher type discharge, the Board may be influenced in its decision to change or not to change the awarded discharge by his record since discharge.

Answering my question on the point, the Defense Department replied that for the 5-year period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955, the following were processed:

(1) Army: Processed 16,815 reviews of discharge; modified 235 without change in type of discharge; denied 14,646.

(2) Air Force: Reviewed 773 discharge cases; changed 48 discharges or separations; changed 18 undesirable discharges to better type discharges, or a total of 67 discharges and separations; denied 706 cases on review.

(3) Navy: Reviewed 3,946 discharge cases; changed 278 cases from dishonorable or bad conduct discharges to better type discharges; changed 25 undesirable discharges and resignations to better type; denied 3,643 cases on review.

The Navy Discharge Review Board action reported that during this 5-year period it reviewed a total of 9,478 appeals for review of discharge (including 1,725 for the Marines) and it changed 1,632 types of discharges to a better type.

(4) Marine Corps: Processed 11,683 petitions for review of discharges; changed 268 to better type discharge.

Following is a copy of original letter from the Defense Department with reference to discharges and dismissals:

MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND RESERVE

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: On September 1 my deputy wrote you that your inquiry of August 11 concerning service discharges and discharge policy was under study, and that it was unlikely that reply could be made before October 30.

The ad hoc committee appointed to prepare the service data requested has encountered certain administrative difficulties in assembling the information. Data for the Army and Air Force prior to 1948 were, in most instances, jointly recorded, so that they must now be separated for a usable presentation of statistics by service. In order to provide you with figures for comparable period of time some adjustment of control dates for several items was required. Solution of these problems is time consuming and has delayed the work of the committee beyond the completion date originally estimated.

Reply to your very thoughtful and perceptive questions relating to broad, general policies and their application among the services requires a reevaluation of certain operational aspects of the discharge system. This is being made as the statistical information is developed, and I hope that the final reply will be helpful to you in your further considerations of the entire matter of military discharges. The anticipated date for completion of the Department of Defense reply is December 15.

Thank you for your continuing interest in the welfare of the Armed Forces.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER BURGESS.

Mr. Speaker, answering my question as to the number of discharges reviewed and action taken from the period July 1, 1950 to June 30, 1955, the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force replied as follows:

MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your letter of August 11, proposing a series of questions relating to types of discharge, has been referred to this office for compilation of the information you requested.

As you recognized in your letter, the project will require extensive research in all branches of the service, which in turn results in considerable delay. The purpose of this letter is to advise you that our preliminary work indicates that full reply may not be completed prior to October 30, 1955.

This information is furnished in order that you and your associates may know well in advance that the material you desire cannot reach you as promptly as we would like, but that we are making every effort to obtain for you complete and detailed data for your further study.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. DUFLON,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Question: What are the names and official designations of the various boards in each of the military services which have jurisdiction over discharges and separations? What is the jurisdiction of each and what are the necessary steps to obtain a review of a discharge or separation before each of the said boards? About how long a waiting period is ordinarily necessary before the various review or correction boards can prepare for and consider the application filed before it?

A (1) (a) Army Discharge Review Board; (b) Navy Discharge Review Board; (c) Air Force Discharge Review Board.

(2) (a) Army Board for Correction of Military Records; (b) Board for Correction of Naval Records; (c) Air Force Board for the Correction of Military Records.

B (1) The Discharge Review Boards are authorized to review all discharges and separations, irrespective of the manner evidenced or brought about, except separations by reason of the sentence of a general court-martial. The only step necessary to obtain a review of discharge is to fill out form DD 293 and mail to the address shown on the reverse side of the form.

(2) The Board for the Correction of Records may review any type of discharge or separation including those resulting from the sentences of general courts-martial. However, as a general rule, these Boards do not initially review a discharge or separation which is within the jurisdiction of the Discharge Review Board, but may, on appeal, by the dischargee from an adverse decision by the Discharge Review Board, review such discharges or separations. The only step necessary to obtain a review of discharge before the Boards for Correction of Records is to fill out form DD 149 and mail to the address shown on the reverse side of the form.

C (1) The total time for processing an application for review of discharge by the Discharge Review Boards is shown in the following table (time in days is average elapsed time from date DD 293 is received by the Board until case is closed out as "finished"):

Type of review

Service	Documentary	Counsel present only	Applicant present or without counsel
Army	30	60	90
Navy	75	75	120
Air Force	30	60	60

Discharges reviewed by each of the separate discharge review boards over 5-year period ending June 30, 1955

Service	Appeals denied after review of discharge	Findings modified without change in type of discharge	Discharges changed after review from—					
			General to honorable	Blue/undesirable to—		Bad conduct to—		
				Honorable	General	Honorable	General	Undesirable
Army	14,646	235	447	428	1,043	5	11	----
Navy	7,753	265	555	62	556	31	424	4
Marine Corps	1,725	40	145	9	85	5	23	1
Air Force	8,886	282	138	94	366	3	5	2
Total	33,010	822	1,285	593	2,050	44	463	7

Total appeals processed by service

Army	16,815
Navy	9,650
Marine Corps	2,033
Air Force	9,776
Total	38,274

Department of the Army

Army Board for Correction of Military Records Action. Discharges reviewed and action taken during the period of July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955.

Discharge cases reviewed	3,423
Dishonorable, bad conduct discharges and dismissals changed to better type of discharges or separations under honorable conditions	171
Undesirable discharges (blue) and resignations changed to better type discharges or separations under honorable conditions	[1] 20
Total discharges or separations changed	191
Total discharges or separations denied	3,232

[1] An approximate figure.

Department of the Navy

Board for Correction of Naval Records Action. Discharges reviewed and action taken during the period 1 July 1950 to 30 June 1955.

Disharge cases reviewed	3,946
Dishonorable, bad conduct discharges and dismissals changed to better type discharges or separations under honorable conditions	278
Undesirable discharges and resignations changed to better type discharges or separations under honorable conditions	25
Total discharges or separations changed	303
Total discharges or separations denied	3,643

Department of the Air Force

Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records Action. Discharges reviewed and action taken during the period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955.

Discharge cases reviewed	773
Dishonorable, bad conduct discharges and dismissals changed to better type discharges or separations under honorable conditions	48
Undesirable discharges (blue) and resignations changed to better type discharges or separation and honorable conditions	19
Total discharges or separations changed	67
Total discharges or separations denied	706

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Introduction of Federal Employees Union Recognition Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to give official recognition to unions organized by Federal employees. This bill grants the right to officers or representatives of such organizations to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal.

This bill is no revolutionary concept. Its enactment would provide the postal and Federal employees with rights similar to those that the Congress has given to employees in private industry. However, the Federal Government would not lose any of the final authority it now has in employee-employer relationships. Nor would the Government be a party to collective bargaining. Federal employees would not be given any right to strike for settlement of grievances.

Need for this legislation has been recognized not only by the employees of the Federal Government but also by such outstanding organizations as the American Bar Association and the Commission on the Executive Branch of the Government.

I hope to see early and favorable action taken on this proposal.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the first legislation I introduced in this session of the 85th Congress was H. R. 374. This bill, which on January 3, 1957, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, provided for securing and protecting the civil rights of the people of this country. It provided for establishment of a commission to study civil rights problems, and also, in conformity with President Eisenhower's recommendation, it strengthened the Attorney General's power to intervene and prosecute violations of civil rights and in particular it sought to protect the right to vote.

H. R. 374 or a similar bill should have early consideration because it contains the basic minimum civil rights provisions which the administration requested last year and felt would meet with sufficient support to be enacted into law. It would seem that legislation of this kind would have much wider support under present conditions, and I certainly hope it will have prompt committee study because if the constitutional voting franchise of all citizens is protected, the greatest milestone for progress in civil rights will have been passed.

Today I have introduced another bill. This second civil rights bill would provide relief against discrimination in interstate transportation. Separation of the races in motor vehicles is outlawed, we know that. But full and equal enjoyment of accommodations in common carriers in interstate commerce in certain areas is not being observed and segregation based on race continues to exist.

My bill provides that any carrier or officer, agent, or employee thereof or any other person who unlawfully and wilfully segregates or attempts to segregate passengers on account of race, color, religion, or national origin shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense. Furthermore they shall be subject to suit by the injured person or by the Attorney General for the United States or for the benefit of the real party in interest.

During the 83d Congress when I was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I helped to report out favorably a bill similar to this one. However, it was subsequently tied up in the Rules Committee and never reached the floor. I hope this session we can get a committee hearing, because I know the testimony will clearly point to the need for legislation of this character to stop once and for all time segregation in interstate travel.

I recall an incident which points up the need for a penalty under the law for failure to comply with the Constitution of the United States. A colored soldier in the uniform of his country, an American GI, was traveling in a railroad car reserved exclusively for white passengers. Local law enforcement officials boarded the train and took the soldier off. He was tried under local law, fined and jailed before being sent on his way. Unless the Federal Government steps in and protects its citizens and enforces the law, situations of this kind will continue in interstate travel.

Tribute to a Team, Coaches, and a Great Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the sports highlight of the New Year, the State University of Iowa's 35–19 victory over Oregon State in the Rose Bowl football game at Pasadena, Calif., gives me cause to direct the attention of my colleagues to what most experts agree is one of the greatest team achievements in sports history. Given little recognition at the beginning of the season, and lightly regarded in the Big Ten Conference race, the Iowa Hawkeye team of 1956, with unusual spirit and great determination and unequaled team play, finished first in the toughest athletic conference in the United States, the Big Ten. In winning this conference championship, they also won the right to represent the Big Ten in the Rose Bowl and then in step with a crescendo of excellence which built up with each succeeding game, they went on to climax their efforts in the New Year's Day victory over a very worthy opponent and another fine group of Americans from one of the great West's State colleges.

It is fitting and proper to pay tribute to and call attention to the reward that comes with wonderful team play demonstrated game after game by this great group of young men, who under the direction of a fine, able, intelligent, and dedicated coaching staff of which Forest Evashevski, the head coach, is one of America's finest examples of athletic statesmanship.

At a college or university all of these virtues are not enough and so it is important to point out also that behind these coaches is also one of the most loyal student bodies in the entire United States, never for a moment letting up in their support, which has been characteristic and loyal throughout all history of our school, and with them, of course, a great faculty always boosting, always supporting without sacrificing the principles of our school—all of its programs and every phase of this great school whose supreme objective is to build a great and more effective citizen for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make and one that should be noted, is that we not only have a great football team, but behind it one of the greatest educational institutions in the world.

The State University of Iowa will mark its 110th anniversary this year. It was created by the first general assembly of the State on February 25, 1847, within 90 days after the State became a part of our Nation. This is significant because it indicates that our pioneers knew and understood that to grow we must have and support an educational system. During this more than a century of service, the university's work has touched and benefited every city, village, and home within the boundaries of Iowa. Consistently throughout her history, the university has maintained an educational program of the highest integrity as the base for all of her activities and the foundation upon which the superstructure of professional, semiprofessional, and graduate education has been erected, under one of the greatest, if not the greatest educational leader in America, President Virgil Hancher, who with the help of the board of regents and friends has built up at the university a great faculty with great ambitions to contribute not only in championships in sports, but also the champion of the great cause that is America by inspiring its student body, its friends, in cooperation with all other educational institutions and interests all across our great Nation toward higher goals.

From the days when she stood on Iowa's physical wilderness, the State University of Iowa has been on the world's educational frontier. She has pioneered and advanced with her State, and, with justifiable pride, points to her distinguished contributions to the advancement of knowledge and the well-being of the State of Iowa.

Iowa's football team and its Rose Bowl victory, symbolic of one of sportsdom's finest achievements, is the start of another year in which Americans in all walks of life and endeavor will be conscious of the leadership of the State University of Iowa.

Since the victory is nearest and dearest to the sweat, blood, and tears of the players and coaches, I ask that special recognition be given by herein listing Iowa's roster for the Rose Bowl game:

Head Coach Forest Evashevski and Assistant Coaches Bob Flora, Chalmers Elliott, Archie Kordos, Henry Piro, Jerry Burns, and Jerry Hilgenberg.

Players: Don Ahlgren, left end, senior; Frank Bloomquist, left guard, junior;

Don Bowen, right guard, junior; Russell Breedlove, center, sophomore; John Burroughs, left tackle, junior; Bob Commings, left guard, junior; Roy Coppotelli, quarterback, junior; Dick Deasy, cocaptain, right guard, senior; Don Dobrino, left halfback, senior; Hugh Drake, right guard, sophomore; Randy Duncan, quarterback, sophomore; Kevin Furlong, right halfback, sophomore; Jim Gibbons, left end, junior; Frank Gilliam, right end, senior; Bill Gravel, left halfback, sophomore; Gary Grouwinkel, right guard, sophomore; Collins Hagler, right halfback, junior; Bill Happel, right halfback, junior; Fred Harris, fullback, junior; Toni Hatch, right end, senior; Bob Haussman, right end, senior; Jon Janda, fullback, junior; Jerry Jenkinson, left end, junior; Alex Karras, left tackle, junior; Paul Karras, right guard, sophomore; Dick Klein, right tackle, sophomore; Delmar Kloewer, left halfback, junior; Melvin Knotts, right halfback, sophomore; George Kress, left tackle, senior; Jeff Langston, left end, sophomore; Charlie Lewis, right tackle, sophomore; John Nocera, fullback, sophomore; Orlando Pellegrino, right halfback, senior; Charlie Pierce, center, junior; Ken Ploen, quarterback, senior; Bob Prescott, right end, sophomore; Frank Rigney, right tackle, junior; Bill Scott, left tackle, sophomore; Bob Stifter, fullback, junior; Don Suchy, cocaptain, center, senior; Dick Theer, right guard, junior; Gene Veit, quarterback, junior; Marion Walker, fullback, senior; Jim Willett, right tackle, senior.

In making this tribute to the University of Iowa and the fine contribution in sports that it has made, I should like to point out that I mean in no way to belittle the programs and objectives of any institution, but rather to point out the great contributions of all institutions of learning all across every section of our country.

Size and Weight Limits on Parcel Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress is a vicious, highly discriminatory law that imposes a triple standard of availability on the use of the parcel-post service. That law says that if you are sending a parcel-post package from one first-class post-office town to another that package may measure only 72 inches, length and girth combined. If your package is traveling only in the 1st and 2d postal zones—a maximum of about 150 miles—it can weigh up to 40 pounds. If your package is going a greater distance, it may weigh only 20 pounds. However, if you send a parcel-post package to or from a 2d-, 3d-, or 4th-class post office, it is exempt from the provisions of Public Law 199, and it may weigh up to 70 pounds and measure up to 100 combined inches.

Public Law 199 is impossible to explain to the average postal patron. The Post Office Department says it is very difficult to administer and that this law causes the Department a loss of some $70 million a year. Public Law 199 imposes unnecessarily high parcel-post rates, even upon those postal patrons not subject to its size and weight limitations. It has seriously hampered the movement of small shipments and has created no end of ill will on the part of postal patrons.

The saddest thing about Public Law 199 is that it has helped no one, not even the Railway Express Agency, for whose exclusive benefit it was enacted. According to financial reports they are required to file with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Railway Express Agency is faring less well now than before they succeeded in getting this bad law on the statute books. They claim that their payments to their railroad owners are larger, but according to their own sworn statements, their net operating losses are greater than the amount these payments were increased.

When the House Committee on Post Office held hearings in 1951 on the bill that became Public Law 199, 20 witnesses protested the enactment of this law, while only 8 people supported it. Of those 8, 2 represented the Railway Express Agency and 1 represented the railroad owners of the agency.

In 1954, 8 days of hearings were held by a House subcommittee on the subject of parcel-post size and weight limitation. At that time, 94 people from all walks of America's economic life urged the Congress to repeal Public Law 199, while only 5 witnesses asked that it be retained. The Post Office Department presented most conclusive evidence of its dissatisfaction with Public Law 199, the problems with respect to its administration, and the very unfavorable effect this law has had on the postal deficit. But the Railway Express Agency held the political power necessary to block consideration of legislation to repeal their special-interest law.

It is my privilege today, as it has been twice before, to introduce legislation designed to remove this special-interest legislation from our statute books and restore to the American people equality in the use of the postal service. The bill I am introducing today will restore parcel-post size and weight limitations to the historic limits in effect for more than 20 years prior to January 1952.

I know that the supporters of Public Law 199 will again say that I seek to put the Post Office in the express business. Nothing could be further from the truth; I am only trying to get the Express Co. out of the parcel-post business, a business which experience proves them to be completely unqualified to operate.

My bill to repeal Public Law 199 will have the support of farm organizations, householders, manufacturers and retailers, and particularly will it have the support of the small-business man who cannot afford expensive traffic experts, or whose volume of shipment is too small for him to participate in joint shipping endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my bill will also have your support and the support of every Member of this body.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1 by Representative KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, and H. R. 3986 by Representative MCCONNELL, of Pennsylvania, are two examples of proposals recognizing the need for legislation to extend Federal aid to alleviate the classroom shortage. While these bills, along with dozens of others, recognize and acknowledge the need for some Federal assistance, they differ in the way in which they propose to distribute Federal funds to the States.

H. R. 1. would distribute the Federal aid on a per-capita basis. H. R. 3986, the proposal favored by the administration, sets up a formula which takes into consideration the per-capita income per State and distributes the assistance on a need basis as determined by such a formula.

The other day our colleague from Maine, the Honorable FRANK M. COFFIN, suggested a formula which he called an incentive-need-grant approach. His suggestion might prove to be a satisfactory compromise solution for the Congress to consider in finally deciding how school-construction funds are to be allocated.

Congressman COFFIN's testimony before the Education and Labor Committee sets forth his plan in detail and works out the application to some typical States. His testimony follows:

A NEW PLAN FOR AN INCENTIVE-NEED-GRANT FORMULA FOR FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK M. COFFIN, DEMOCRAT, MAINE, IN TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in submitting a new proposal to you I am, to modernize an old figure, carrying oil to Texas.

You have justified the hopes of millions of parents and children in tackling this crisis in classrooms with vigor and without delay. This 85th Congress is barely 6 weeks old, and you have already received the testimony of many responsible leaders and spokesmen.

It would be effrontery on my part to testify as an expert or analyze as a critic. What I wish to do is to focus on the critical point where any Federal school-construction program meshes with the several States and to make a simple suggestion.

The critical point is the formula for allocating funds to the States. The suggestion is a proposal for an incentive-need-grant approach.

Simply stated, my proposal is as follows:
Amount authorized: $600 million per year.
Period: 5 years.

Incentive grant: $300 million per year to be matched equally by States, available on the basis of school-age population.

Need grant: $300 million per year distributed to States on the basis of the ratio of the national average income per school-age child to each State's income per school-age child; conditioned on State's participation in the matching-fund program. If a State did not match the whole amount authorized under the "incentive grant" formula its "need grant" would be proportioned to its participation.

I am sure we are all agreed that the objectives of Federal aid for school construction are: (1) To provide the best possible opportunities for the largest number of children; (2) to make sure that the Federal Government's large appropriation contemplated under this proposal is used to the best possible advantage; and (3) to insure also that the Federal plan is an incentive to the States to maintain and increase their efforts toward school construction within the realistic limits of their other obligations, their income and the size and distribution of their population.

I think it may be helpful to test this proposal by measuring it against three standards: Fairness, realism, workability.

If it is to be fair it must not give young people less than the best in training for this modern complex world. We cannot afford to allow a child's educational opportunity to be circumscribed by accident of social or economic position or geographical location. The boy or girl in the poorest village is entitled to the same chance, as far as we are able to provide it, as the boy or girl from the wealthiest metropolitan area.

We know that each State has a different problem in terms of financial ability, population, geographical area, and climate. Wealthier States have more money available for governmental expenditures, but generally speaking their costs are higher and their demands are greater. States like my own have limited financial resources, a small population spread over a large area in a climate which compels higher construction costs.

Obviously we cannot hope to develop a formula which will include all the refinements necessary to reflect in detail all the factors of wealth, population, and costs of construction. I believe the incentive-need-grant formula comes as close as practicable to balancing the interests of different States.

The formula governing aid for school construction should be so devised as to leave a residue of resources in the States for the purpose of doing the rest of the educational job. It would indeed be merely a brick-and-mortar victory if we so exhausted our State's resources in building classrooms that we had no reserves which could be used to attract the teachers needed in those classrooms. And in my opinion there is a real danger of encouraging States to strain so in meeting matching fund requirements as to drain their reservoir of future effort. The incentive-need-grant proposal would reduce State matching fund erquirements to allow the States sufficient reserves to face the problem of teachers' salaries, teachers' colleges, State universities, community colleges, and other essential educational programs.

To be workable, the formula must be simple to apply and easy to understand. The incentive-need-grant proposal is based on objective, known, and easily accessible facts. Allocations under this formula are simple to compute and readily understandable.

Two appendixes are submitted herewith. One shows the method used in computing the proposed authorizations for the States. The other is a selected comparative table of the allocations proposed under the incentive-need-grant formula, H. R. 1, H. R. 3986.

In arriving at these conclusions I have consulted with the governor of my State, our State commissioner of education and others who have had experience in the planning of educational programs. I have followed the testimony and proposals before this subcommittee. I hope that the result will be helpful to you in your deliberations.

APPENDIX A

METHOD OF CALCULATING ALLOCATIONS UNDER THE INCENTIVE-NEED-GRANT FORMULA

I. Incentive grant (Federal authorization, $300 million):

The per pupil allocation is determined by dividing the total number of school-age (5–17) children in the United States and its Territories (36,844,000) into the total authorization ($300 million). This allocation is $8.14 per pupil.

To determine the authorization available to the individual State or Territory, multiply the per pupil allocation ($8.14) by the number of school-age children in the State or Territory.

II. Need grant (Federal authorization, $300 million):

The per pupil need grant is determined by: (1) Dividing the average income per school-age child in the State or Territory into the average income per school-age child for the Nation ($7,947); (2) multiplying the result of this computation by the incentive-grant allocation per pupil ($8.14).

The total authorization per State under the need-grant formula is determined by multiplying the per pupil need grant by the total number of school-age children in the State or Territory.

Illustration

MAINE: School-age population 207,000
income/school-age child $6,415

Incentive-grant..... 207,000×$8.14=$1,684,980 (matching funds required—$1,684,980)

Need-grant..... $\frac{7,947}{6,415}$=1.24×$8.14=$10.09

207,000×$10.09=$2,088,630

Total authorization available	$3,773,610
Matching funds required	1,684,980
Program total year	5,458,590

MAINE

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$3,367,000	$3,367,000	$6,734,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	1,932,000	1,311,000	3,243,000	9.33
Need-grant Program	3,773,000	1,684,980	5,458,590	18.23

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if Maine were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $7,140,610. Of this $1,682,020 could be used for general purpose education aid.

APPENDIX B

Comparative tables of amounts available under H. R. 1, H. R. 3986, and incentive-need-grant formula

ARIZONA

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$3,807,000	$3,807,000	$7,614,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	2,524,000	1,692,000	4,216,000	10.79
Need-grant program	4,319,640	1,904,760	6,224,400	18.46

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if Arizona were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $8,126,640. Of this, $1,902,240 could be used for general purpose education aid.

DELAWARE

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$1,253,000	$1,253,000	$2,506,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	381,000	762,000	1,143,000	4.95
Need-grant program	1,059,520	626,780	1,686,300	13.76

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if Delaware were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $2,312,520. Of this, $626,220 could be used for general purpose education aid.

MONTANA

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$2,391,000	$2,391,000	$4,782,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	1,405,000	1,242,000	2,647,000	9.56
Need-grant program	2,500,470	1,196,580	3,697,050	17.01

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if Montana were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total would be $4,891,470. Of this, $1,194,420 could be used for general purpose education aid.

NEW JERSEY

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$17,016,000	$17,016,000	$34,032,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	5,489,000	10,980,000	16,469,000	5.25
Need-grant program	14,560,320	8,514,440	23,074,760	13.91

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if New Jersey were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $31,576,320. Of this, $8,501,560 could be used for general purpose education aid.

NEW YORK

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$49,192,000	$49,192,000	$98,384,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	15,765,000	31,535,000	47,300,000	5.21
Need-grant program	41,852,216	24,615,360	66,467,576	13.84

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if New York were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $91,044,216. Of this, $24,576,640 could be used for general purpose education aid.

PENNSYLVANIA

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$37,659,000	$37,659,000	$75,318,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	18,803,000	22,898,000	41,701,000	8.12
Need-grant program	36,368,650	18,844,100	55,212,750	15.71

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if Pennsylvania were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $74,027,650. Of this, $18,814,900 could be used for general purpose education aid.

WEST VIRGINIA

Proposal	Comparative figures			Allocation per pupil (total)
	Authorization	State matching	Total	
H. R. 1	$8,622,000	$8,622,000	$17,244,000	$16.28
H. R. 3986	6,699,000	3,349,000	10,048,000	12.64
Need-grant program	11,734,200	4,314,200	16,048,400	22.14

NOTE.—Under the incentive-need-grant proposal, if West Virginia were to raise the equivalent of the matching funds required under H. R. 1, the total available for educational purposes would be $20,356,200. Of this, $4,307,800 could be used for general purpose education aid.

The Atomic-Nuclear Age Presents a Challenge to Educators To Provide the Professional and Technical Manpower Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1956, the following address was delivered by me before the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Secondary School Principals' Association at Harrisburg, Pa.:

I am particularly happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you a problem which I believe to be the most challenging, thought-provoking subject currently confronting educators and citizens throughout this Nation.

In order that we can think about this matter together, I propose the following question: "What can we do to provide the professional and technical manpower which is required for the atomic-nuclear age in which we are living today?"

This is not a lofty, philosophical question.

It can be answered by hard thinking, imagination, and practical action.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the last session of Congress, I participated in what I consider some of the most important and vital hearings held during the entire 84th Congress.[1]

The hearings were arranged to help the committee get an overview of the shortages of engineering and scientific manpower in the United States.

The resulting information—suggestions and recommendations provoked by these hearings—can be of priceless value to the Nation.

Sometimes congressional committee hearings—because of their specialized scope—are necessarily of limited value to the general public, but these joint committee hearings I commend to you for study and discussion.

There are many parts of the testimony which would provoke interesting discussion and debate in faculty meetings.

Members of local school boards also would find the information and ideas enunciated in these hearings very stimulating and thought-provoking on a policy level.

I do not presume to suggest that this information will be entirely new to you.

It represents, however, a combination of the thoughts and opinions of some of our most outstanding lay and professional specialists who have America's manpower problems under constant consideration.

America's future leadership in the free world is largely dependent upon our recognition of the serious problem of continued and increased development—of well-trained, creative manpower.

Science and technology have long been among the beacon lights of our American civilization.

Throughout the world our inventiveness and productive talents are known and respected.

To insure the continued growth of our technological development—to guarantee America's security and that of the free world—we must recognize and solve America's problem of specialized manpower.

By now the cold war—if not the hot one before it—has demonstrated that to survive and prosper a free society must develop—as fully as possible—its human resources including its best brains.

The fullest development of this vital resource is imperative.

We are capable of making a far more significant contribution than we have ever made before.

In this age of rapidly advancing scientific discoveries—increasing world population and decreasing supplies of raw materials, the coming of automation, the continued growth of our economy—we must reevaluate our educational system, in terms of its ability, to meet the demands of technological expansion as well as enrollment increases.

We are challenged by the problem of providing enough well-trained men and women to maintain the momentum of our rapidly expanding technical civilization.

Every new scientific development increases the fraction of our working population that must be more highly trained in specialized fields.

Specifically this is the problem which is of most concern to educators.

Some of the experts before our committee claim "our economic growth and military strength have come very rapidly to depend so much more directly on scientific and technological progress than was true 20 years ago, that the educational system has not been able to keep up with the changed situation."[2]

They dramatically declared that "the educational system—which is virtually the same in its general framework and nature as it has been for a long period—is, so far as modern progress is concerned, in the horse and buggy era."[3]

This lag in our educational system, "in an age of nuclear weapons—jet propulsion, radar, plastics, and electronic brains—means we are preparing students for college in elementary and secondary schools that have changed little in their basic policies during the few years that were required to bring those developments from the research laboratory to the positions they occupy today."[4]

Educators, school board members, legislators, and all our citizens must be made aware of this lag in our schools caused by the impact of the atomic-nuclear revolution.

Exactly what needs to be done in each State and community must be decided there.

First, the facts.

We must find a way to marshal the facts so that the public will be better informed about the amount of technology each child of the future is going to have to learn.

We should help more people to understand the increasing need for specialized personnel to expand America's growing economy.

The growing shortage of more highly trained persons in our society is increased because the talent of many thousands of our young people is not being developed to its fullest capacity.

Many parents do not appreciate how much potential their children really have.

We must do something about this.

There is a vast potential in the human brain of which, as a nation, we make far too little use.

Needless to say the problem of manpower shortages is not a simple one.

By its very nature it is a long-range problem which cannot be solved suddenly, quickly, or by some magic formula.

It is basically and fundamentally an educational problem.

More people must learn to understand the reasons for the manpower shortages.

They must understand also just how our schools are affected.

Our citizens must realize that the most serious threat to our long-run national welfare and security is not today's shortage of scientists so much as today's and tomorrow's shortage of talented teachers.

This, as one authority stated, is not to discount the high importance of achieving further rapid progress in the scientific field.

It is rather to emphasize that we cannot sustain such progress there or anywhere else unless our schools and colleges are well staffed to turn out a steadily expanding flow of specialized talent of every variety.[5]

In my opinion—based on the information brought out in the committee hearings—we are confronted with a manifold problem in the field of education.

We not only lack manpower, we lack enough adequately trained teachers, especially in the sciences, and we lack facilities in both our schools and institutions of higher education.

Perhaps a look at what the Soviet Union is accomplishing in answer to the demands of the technological 20th century will give you an insight into the very real challenge of what some have called a battle for brainpower between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Witnesses at our hearings declared:

"The Russians are training intensively about three times as many scientists as we are."

"Russian textbooks and curriculum are excellent."

"Some people may like to console themselves with the thought that the quality of Soviet scientific and technical education is inferior to ours.

"The curriculum of the Soviet 10-year school should explode that myth."

"By 1960 for every Russian child (in the Soviet 10-year school) this curriculum is to be compulsory:

"Five years of physics, 5 years of biology, 4 years of chemistry, 10 years of mathematics through trigonometry, and 1 year of astronomy."

In the words of Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission:

"Too many of us have fallen into the easy attitude of assuming that the Russians, because of what we have observed of the sinister purposes and slave methods of their political system and the compartmentalization of their research, could never match us in scientific initiative and progress.

"This is dangerous self-delusion.

"The emphasis which the Soviets are placing on science—and particularly on the training of new young scientists and engineers—presents a real and growing challenge to us and to the free world. * * *

[1] U. S. Congress. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Research and Development. Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower. 84th Cong., 2d sess., Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956, 487 p.

[2] Dael Wolfle, p. 242.

[3] Henry Chauncey, p. 324.

[4] Dael Wolfle, p. 242.

[5] Philip H. Coombs, p. 373.

"It is evident," Mr. Strauss emphasized further, "that we are rapidly falling behind Soviet Russia in the training of engineers and scientists.

"The level of our reservoir of trained brain power is dropping in relation to the demand.

"They, on the other hand, are striving to fill theirs to capacity as rapidly as they can."

Shortage of time precludes a more extensive mentioning of many important comparisons between the scientific manpower of the Soviet Union and the United States brought out during the committee's hearings on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower.

There is one significant aspect of this whole question, however, which should be highlighted.

The power of technology can change the balance of military power.

Technology's "impact on heavy industry can change the world balance of economic power."

But of far greater importance are the new Soviet tactics of competitive coexistence.

The "psychological power balance" can be upset by the rise of Soviet science and technology.

As one witness pointed out, the Soviet Union is exporting ideas for which they have displayed talent.

Today they are producing almost three times as many new engineers as we are, yet their own industrial capacity is only half the size of ours.

How this additional manpower is being used was described as the new propaganda of the Kremlin emphasizing economic, political, and ideological competition clearly reveals the long-range plan—a plan so potent as to make military maneuvering seem by comparison tactical and even diversionary.

Central to it is this schooling for export of scores of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters, and technicians of all kinds.

These are being trained to help convert the world to communism.

In Burma last December Khrushchev and Bulganin offered to build and staff a technological institute in Rangoon—"a gift to the people of Burma from the people of the Soviet Union," as they put it.

An advanced guard of technicians is now in India in connection with the steel mill the Soviets are building for India.

A technical institute has also been offered to India and enticing inducements have been advanced to Egypt, Afghanistan, and America.[6]

It is evident from this description that the production in the Soviet Union of scientific and engineering manpower is to them a political weapon as well as a means of increasing their own domestic production.

We must match this technique with improved quality in our educational system.

We cannot afford to be complacent about our educational efforts and system.

As a nation we must not waste our young talent in a world where other nations are determined to exploit theirs to the utmost.

We must not allow ourselves to fall behind the Russians.

If this ever happens we could easily "find ourselves outwitted, outmaneuvered, outthought, and outbuilt throughout the world." [7]

We should be challenged by these facts and the manifold warnings that manpower shortages in the United States can be the chief limiting factor in determining our continued growth and progress.

It seems obvious that unless we find our potential talent and develop it we may lose the contest which could mean the difference between our world leadership or leadership by another world power dedicated to totalitarianism.

Whether the United States maintains its world leadership for free enterprise and a hope for a peaceful world in the battle for brainpower depends upon how sincerely and effectively we understand the important role of our educational system.

The experts and authorities who appeared before our committee were in complete accord on one major note: Our schools are the key to America's future.

Our hearings established the fact that the shortage of scientific and engineering talent is only a part of a much larger national problem of identifying and developing our best young minds in this country so as to realize the maximum advantage from our potential intellectual resources.

It is the development of this brainpower and the upgrading of our educational system so as to make it more attuned to the needs of our economy which is at once the most challenging and most important job we have to do.

This, I am sure, will be greeted with applause by educators throughout the Nation as they consider the challenges of the atomic-nuclear age to our education system.

Many of the authorities who discussed the gravity of this situation before our committee outlined what they considered to be the major problems confronting educators.

I want you to hear some of their opinions.

One witness suggested that the problems of our school systems have been caused by a "combination of forces which threatens to force a deterioration in the quality of American education from kindergarten through graduate schools over the next 10 or 20 years." [8]

The most obvious of these forces, he contended, is the rapid rise in school and college enrollments caused by the increased birthrate and the continued trend toward more years of education for the average young American.

He concluded, however, that "the second force in combination with the first presents the difficulty, namely, the mounting shortage of good teachers, a shortage which promises to get progressively worse each year.

"This brings us back to the overall shortage of specialized talent, for it is this caliber of manpower that our schools and colleges need in ample supply if they are to raise the quality of education for all young people and if they are to help develop more fully the potential talents of the ablest." [9]

Let us consider the facts of the teacher shortage.

We now have approximately 1,200,000 schoolteachers in public and private schools in this country.

By 1965 we will need more than 1,600,000.

To increase our staff of schoolteachers by this amount and replace those who leave teaching each year we would be required to recruit approximately 1,900,000 new teachers over the next 10 years.

This is equivalent to 50 percent of all 4-year college graduates that can be expected to emerge from all of the Nation's institutions of higher learning during the same 10-year period.

This creates a severe and long-range problem during a period when school enrollments are greatly expanded and we need desperately to maintain and improve the quality of training.

A study of this problem, reported to the committee by a representative of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, concluded that this teacher shortage, "which is as much a problem of quality as quantity, cannot be solved on the present basis of recruitment, preparation, and utilization of teachers." [10]

The study emphasized further that the serious deterioration of the quality in education could be averted through improvements in curriculum in buildings and equipment, in guidance and counseling, and in other important aspects of the whole educational enterprise.

A statement made by the American Chemical Society summarized its opinion of education's dilemma when it stated that "problems of major proportions are being created by the great expansion in numbers of students the tendency to provide high-school education for all with the unavoidable trend toward mediocrity the high cost of education, the shortage of teachers, the shift of educational emphasis away from traditional academic subjects to vocationalism and other factors." [11]

The specific effects of the broadened high-school curriculum were emphasized also by Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, when he declared:

"During the past half century the secondary schools of the country have become a part of a nearly universal educational system.

"During the past half century the number of pupils attending high school has increased very greatly, but a smaller and smaller percentage went on to college.

"School officials quite naturally gave most of their attention to the courses the methods of instruction and the expected levels of performance appropriate to students who did not intend to enter college." [12]

Dr. Wolfle concluded that "there have been both good and bad aspects of this policy.

"One of the bad effects," he says, "has been a decreased emphasis on science and mathematics and a decreased insistence upon the kind of intellectual rigor that provides best preparation for high-level college work." [13]

A statement by Dr. Henry Chauncey, president of the educational testing service, supports this opinion.

Dr. Chauncey told the committee that "even the college preparatory program as carried on in most schools today does not provide adequate training for our best students.

"Most of them do not get the full measure of value from the time they spend in school.

"In some ways this is the fault of the curriculum itself. In some ways it is the fault of the teaching." [14]

Dr. Chauncey contended that the basic cause of our shortage of specialized manpower lies in our educational process today.

He believes four specific areas need attention in any long-range educational improvement program.

He listed them as follows:

1. "We do not have an adequate program for identifying our best minds early in their school careers so that we can give them the kind of training they should have."

2. "We are not equipped in most schools to give them the thorough training they should have."

3. "We do not do a good job of imbuing young people in general and even very capable young people with the desire to study hard and prepare themselves for highly specialized scientific careers."

And finally he stated:

4. "We do not supply the financial help that many students must have no matter how anxious and willing they may be if they are to complete the long and arduous course of study that is required." [15]

Another educator told the committee the inequality of educational opportunity was one major cause of a shortage of skilled manpower.

---

[6] William Benton, pp. 415–416.
[7] William Benton, p. 420.
[8] Philip H. Coombs, p. 368.
[9] Ibid.
[10] P. 371.
[11] P. 479.
[12] P. 242.
[13] Ibid.
[14] P. 322.
[15] P. 320.

He emphasized the inadequate programs of many of our rural high schools which enroll a third of our high school students.

Many of these schools do not have full-time science or mathematics teachers, and these schools are generally not able to maintain a fully equipped laboratory of the kind necessary for up-to-date courses in high school chemistry and physics.[16]

One witness stressed the need for widespread improvements throughout our school system recommending that "the best promise of solid improvement in science teaching is through solid improvement in support for education across the board in better salaries in school buildings, in budgets for supplies, and equipment, and through enhanced prestige for the entire profession." [17]

Still another perspective on the manifold problems concerning our school systems was offered to the committee in the suggestion that "the problem is the importance of training our young people and the importance of recognizing that this is a local community problem and a State problem and the problem then is to convince the taxpayers of the town or State that this is an important problem and they must give increased support to this in the future." [18]

Let us now consider some of the solutions and recommendations made during the committee hearings.

I have selected only those comments concerned with the long-range solution of the manpower shortage.

Some of these salient opinions proposed that without enough good teachers and efficient administration of them we cannot hope to relieve the overall shortage of talent.

School boards should be more aware of the problem and increase teachers' salaries as rapidly as possible.

Others suggested that ways and means ought to be found to break the inflexibility of salary schedules.

In fact, it was proposed that not only should the general level of teachers' salaries be raised, but the salary structure itself must be overhauled, to provide greater incentive and reward for outstanding teachers.

Ways must be found to make sure that our teachers receive the recognition and the prestige which is commensurate with their high responsibility of training our young people.

One witness suggested that certification rules ought to be made less rigid so that college graduates who had not taken education courses could be recruited to alleviate high-school teaching shortages.

Other recommendations called for bold and imaginative experimentation in our schools and colleges, aimed at raising the quality of education in the face of the shortage of good teachers.

It was stressed that we must learn how to relieve our well-qualified teachers of clerical and housekeeping duties and free them to teach full time.

As one witness suggested: What we need and need quickly is a long overdue technological revolution in our whole educational system." [19]

Throughout all of the recommendations related to a long-range solution of the manpower shortage in this country, one suggestion emerged in varying patterns—more thorough means of identification of talent and better guidance should be available to our young people.

Some said parents must be guided to more awareness of the potential talents possessed by their children and must be encouraged to assist them in desiring and obtaining a higher education.

Others commented that through the early identification of able students, followed up by sound guidance, encouragement, and help, would certainly inspire more students to continue their education.

More inclusive methods should be found to help counselors in assisting students to become more aware of their talents.

As much information about careers as possible should be available to students.

They must be guided but not directed.

Another proposal suggested a statewide testing program in each State, beginning in elementary school, which would include both achievement and aptitude tests which could be administered either to all students each year or to selected grades.

This program, it was suggested, could be administered in each State by the department of education and/or the State university.

It is obvious that your role in solving these problems, as they apply to Pennsylvania's schools, cannot be casual.

The challenges are vital and demand attention.

In our time when decades have shrunk to years, years to months, and months to moments, there is little time to debate and none to lose.

The job to be done for the next 20 years in public education alone is as exciting as the most eager pioneer among you can desire.

How will these challenges be met?

Will our schools give all of their students a good quality education?

Or will the increased enrollment coupled with the shortage of teachers force a steady deterioration of educational quality at a time when this Nation desperately needs the finest educational program possible?

Can we mobilize our efforts so that each of our youth gets the kind of education and training which will bring about his fullest development?

Congressional committees can hold hearings concerning education until doomsday.

Congressmen can be cautioned by legions of experts, but until the people across the country understand and strive for solutions to the Nation's educational problems very little can be achieved on a national level.

I submit that the entire burden of responsibility cannot be placed solely on the shoulders of educators.

The burden of responsibility for America's future is upon all of our citizens, educators, businessmen, scientists, laborers, and legislators.

We must find some way to alert the members of all of these groups to our school needs while there is still time for calm deliberation and imaginative planning.

We are in an era which challenges to the utmost the full measure of the American people to cope with the most serious problems of modern times.

We must lift ourselves to a new and higher plane of concern, of hard work, of expenditure, and of dedication to the increased development and undergirding of America's key to the future—our educational system.

[16] John L. Buford, president, National Education Association, p. 478.

[17] Dr. Robert H. Carleton, executive secretary National Science Teachers Association, p. 88.

[18] Dr. Harry C. Kelly, National Science Foundation, p. 60.

[19] Philip H. Coombs, p. 375.

Legislation Introduced To Improve Existing Federal Wage Board System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to improve the existing Federal wage board system. Enactment of this legislation will remove much of the inequity which exists for all of these so-called blue-collar workers. It will lessen the loss they now suffer when wage rates fail to keep pace with rising prices, by making the final increase retroactive to the date the survey is initiated.

I am sure that my colleagues, particularly those who represent districts with extensive Federal installations, will agree that the lapse of time between the authorization of the survey and the final determination as reflected in the employee's pay checks represents a substantial economic loss to the recipient. This time lapse in many instances involves a 4 to 6 months' period. The initiation of the survey is not authorized until preliminary spot checks and investigations of local conditions have established the need for a wage adjustment. The main purpose of the survey, therefore, is not to determine if an adjustment is warranted but rather the degree of adjustment required to bring the wage scale into line with private industry and cost-of-living indexes. It is, therefore, only fair and equitable that these adjustments be made retroactive to the authorization date. It is my sincere hope that the committee will take prompt and favorable action on this bill, and that the Congress will act swiftly to correct the inequity of the present system.

Bear in mind that the Federal blue-collar worker's pay scale is always behind the wage scale of private industrial employees for similar types of work. In some measure this legislation would rectify this discrepancy.

The Herculean Job of Harnessing Tornadoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, although Louisiana ranks 11th among the 48 States in the number of tornadoes recorded in the past 40 years, the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, has suffered greater damage from this destructive force of nature than any other part of the State.

But it is not the calm reading of records from the Climatology Division of the United States Weather Bureau that impelled me to become informed about tornadoes. Even time has not erased from my memory the horrible results of a tornado that struck the little town of Cotton Valley about 4:30 in the afternoon of December 31, 1947.

Within a few hours after getting a report of this disaster, and after a conference with the President, I flew to Shreveport, then went by automobile to the scene of destruction.

I did everything I could to relieve those suffering people, and while so doing

I made a promise to myself that I would work with the proper Government agencies in their efforts to discover scientific and practical means of giving warnings of approaching tornadoes.

Considering the great achievements of science in the forecasting of weather and particularly the development of ways and means by which a hurricane can be followed almost from the moment of its inception, a person is likely to put all storms in the same category and assume that tornadoes can also be discovered in early stages and followed in their course. That is an erroneous assumption.

Consequently, it seems important that we review a compilation of data concerning one of the most destructive of nature's forces, with the view of giving aid and encouragement to those scientists who are striving to provide the best possible protection to human life and proprty.

The tornado is the most violent storm nature produces. It strikes with instantaneous power. The sudden fury with which it strikes is terrifying.

The vortex cloud, which is the dynamo of the tornado, is funnel-shaped. Its unusual shape is the only thing about it that gives a few minutes' warning. It does not travel rapidly as a mass of destruction; in most cases not over 20 miles per hour. Its stupendous power comes from the whirling force within. Its pathway may not measure more than 200 or 300 yards in width.

Invariably it travels northeastward, which fact has taught amateur forecasters to look southwestward for the approach of funnel-shaped clouds.

The centrifugal force of whirling winds creates uprushing currents often capable of lifting an object that weighs several thousand pounds. Trucks and automobiles have been taken off the ground and whirled about as if they were feathers. The actual speed of these whirling winds has never been determined.

The dynamic force of these wind currents results in a partial vacuum at the center of the whirl which exerts an explosive effect, often accompanied by a whining sound that adds to the terrifying effect. Huge hailstones often fall from clouds that are drawn into the vortex, bearing out the impressions of a friend of mine who witnessed the catastrophe at Cotton Valley. "A tornado is nature gone berserk."

In airplanes, many courageous men have followed the eye of a hurricane and correctly reported its movements. Not so with a tornado. Only a few persons have ever looked into the interior of a tornado cloud and lived to tell of the experience.

Records kept through the past 40 years show that no State in the Union is immune from tornadoes, but most of them occur in the Midwest and Southwest. Their greatest frequency in occurrence has been in Iowa, northwestern Missouri, and eastern Kansas. Iowa has had more of them in proportion to its size than any other State, with Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Mississippi not far behind. However, more deaths have occurred in Illinois than in any other State. Total deaths from tornadoes in Iowa during the past 34 years were 911, whereas in Louisiana during that span of years we have had only 272 people killed.

For the 34-year period ending with 1949 there was more property damaged in Oklahoma than in any other State, totaling $52,116,557. Illinois followed with a total loss of $47,846,550.

From these figures we see that the problem is not a regional one, but concerns the entire country. They are more numerous and more destructive, however, between the 100th meridian and the Appalachian Mountains than in any other part of the world.

From this report you will also understand that the people of Cotton Valley, La., are not the only ones who have suffered from the devastating effects of tornadoes.

The tornado that struck this little town of 1,500 people, on December 31, 1947, destroyed most of the homes and business houses. In fact, only five structures within the town's limits escaped damage. Five hundred persons were left homeless. Eighteen people were killed and 69 hospitalized. More than 100 families required rehabilitation.

The situation that I found there is unpleasant to remember, but I found solace, faith, and gratitude from the response that I received in calling for aid to those unfortunate people.

Communication lines were down, utilities demolished, and no water available. Unusual in Louisiana, snow was falling, making conditions even more miserable.

Soon after the Babylonial cry, "Come over and help us," was broadcast, individuals, private organizations, and Government agencies nobly responded.

Barksdale Air Force Base sent men to help in various capacities and supplied a caravan of trucks to bring beds and blankets. The American Red Cross, as ever, was there with efficient and tender care for the injured, supported by a hundred thousand dollars immediately allocated to the task.

The United States Navy had surplus equipment and supplies at Fort Worth, Tex., all of which was made available to these suffering people and much of it moved to the disaster area.

The Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co. sent a special train of 20 boxcars loaded with materials and implements, two of which were tank cars that contained 18,000 gallons of water.

Plasma and whole blood came from different sources, a great deal of it supplied by Barksdale Air Force Base.

The National Guard from Minden moved to the area and accepted the opportunity to serve in many capacities. And a volunteer group of women from that town came to prepare and serve food. No doubt the people of Minden remembered a similar catastrophe that had befallen them 14 years earlier.

Perhaps it was fear of a recurrence of this destructive force of nature that impelled me to call on Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, as soon as I returned to Washington, or perhaps it was the humanitarian response to the plight of a suffering people that set the example and gave me inspiration to implement, if possible, some method of warning people of the approach of a tornado, a task that is by no means completed at this date.

All that is known about the gestation of a tornado is that after several hours of abnormally humid and oppressive weather the initial whirl or centrifugal force may be perceptible in the sky. One observer of the birth of a tornado reported that two ominous clouds collided, one moving from the northwest, the other from the southwest, and that a wild turmoil began as the clouds rolled about and against each other, setting up a wind. Then a funnel-shaped cloud formed near the center of the whirl and began to bore downward, twisting and writhing.

Until recent years the view was held that forecasting of tornadoes was so uncertain that warnings might cause unnecessary panic in a community where conditions indicated the possibility of a tornado. It was strongly argued that science had provided no certain means of detecting where a tornado might strike, and that, therefore, warnings might do more harm than good.

Even so, there were cases in which oldtimers who studied weather conditions had warned their neighbors in these general terms: "This is cyclone weather." These amateur forecasters, usually farmers, had learned to respect the forebodings of abnormally warm and humid atmosphere, calling it sticky or muggy. There are cases where neighbors accepted and responded to such warnings. Many of them built storm cellars, while others scoffed and joked about running into a hole in the ground every time thunder was heard.

As uncertain as forecasting of a tornado may be, the United States Weather Bureau realized that warnings of only a few minutes in advance of a tornado made it possible to guard against loss of life.

Another obstacle that was encountered a few years ago was the lack of communications through which to spread warnings. During World War II, the Weather Bureau, in cooperation with the military services, established networks of reporting stations. These reporters all served without compensation. Among them were telephone operators in small communities, flood control personnel, and in my State the police juries did valiant service, and throughout the Nation were gas station attendants, farmers, housewives, and merchants, all cooperating to form a network of reporters. Utility companies and State Police volunteered assistance. And of particular importance to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, Barksdale Air Force Base acted as a sort of clearinghouse for the dissemination of warnings. Arrangements were made whereby all such communications got priority over ordinary use of transmission lines.

Warnings made possible by these networks proved so valuable that they were eventually placed under the supervision of the Weather Bureau and materially expanded.

A striking example of the value of these networks proved so valuable that they were eventually placed under the supervision of the Weather Bureau and materially expanded.

A striking example of the value of these warnings comes from my district. On February 13, 1950 the town safety officials of Haynesville received a warning from the Shreveport Weather Bureau office, about 50 miles away, that a tornado had been reported in the Shreveport area and could be expected to hit Haynesville. The safety officials went to work immediately, getting people off the streets and into places of safety.

Within an hour after the warning was received the storm struck. Considerable property was damaged, but no lives were lost.

Today there is no definite way of spotting a tornado at the point of genesis, but several methods of determining the formation of a tornado are being tested. One of them requires observation of lightning.

It has been found that lightning generated from high-voltage sources is brighter, bluer, and more vicious in appearance than that from other storm clouds. Graphs from these lightning strokes that are registered on the oscilloscope show that they are of much greater amplitude than any others and that the top of the stroke is flat and rugged.

It is reassuring to the people of my district that today the United States Weather Bureau office in Shreveport maintains a network that covers 18 parishes in Louisiana, 7 counties in southwest Arkansas, and 2 in east Texas.

And to me it is reassuring that we have a man like Francis W. Reichelderfer as Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, who realizes the importance of determining tornadoes at their inception, and who understands the necessity of having the best possible system of warning in advance the approach of this destructive force of nature which strikes with such sudden and deadly power. I am grateful to him and his coworkers for their effort to evaluate and summarize the results of all research that deals in a comprehensive manner with the frequency and damage of tornadoes, their appearance and their causes, and that he seems determined to find the best method of forecasting them, thus saving human lives. He is also trying to determine the different types of buildings that are strong enough to resist the instantaneous power of tornadoes.

Much progress has been made by the Weather Bureau under the able management of Dr. Reichelderfer since the Cotton Valley disaster in 1947. Since I returned to Washington from that disaster and discussed with this quiet, sincere, but most capable, public servant the need of diagnosing and predicting the course of tornadoes, headquarters for this work has been placed in the State of Oklahoma for this area. Since that fateful time, the Weather Bureau has made much progress in this work and by this progress has saved thousands of lives of our people and hundreds of millions of dollars in loss of property. During the interim I have been able to interest the Congress in giving the Weather Bureau more money, a part of which was for this purpose. During this period of time I have always maintained an active interest in the tremendous job of diagnosing tornadoes and predicting their course. I am proud of the part I played in this work which is already a decade of conscientious and prayerful effort, and I am proud of the achievements that the Weather Bureau has contributed to a monumental fight to make America more safe from the ravages of nature's most violent forces.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Bill To Prevent Loss of Salary by Federal Employees Whose Positions Have Been Downgraded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 1957

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 594 which was designed to prevent loss of salary of those Federal employees who after having served in a position satisfactorily for a period of 2 years, through reclassification were placed in a lower grade.

The Civil Service Commission's regulations, based upon an interpretation of the law by the Comptroller General, were not as broad as had originally been intended by Congress. Many employees who felt they were covered by the law found that the statute did not apply to their cases.

In view of the confusion arising from the administration of Public Law 594, I am today introducing a bill to make explicit the intent of Congress in this matter. I shall attempt to have early and immediate action taken to have it processed.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years Thy goodness faileth never. Because we draw our inner strength from deep wells, in this confused day, save us from any panic of spirit. May the highest truth illumine the nearest duty, and holy aspirations transfigure the humblest task.

Enable with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might those who in these fearful times have been entrusted in this Chamber with the stewardship of the national life. Help us to fill swift hours with mighty deeds, to bear the fret of care, the sting of criticism, the drudgery of unapplauded toil; to think clearly, to act kindly, to play valiantly our part in the life of our time, to strike our blow for freedom; and, as swift to its close ebbs out life's little day, to keep the unbroken vigil of the inner light, and to leave the world the better for our sojourn in it. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 3, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, agreed to by both Houses, the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] as tellers on the part of the Senate, at the joint session of the two Houses on Monday next, to count the electoral votes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, the time required therefor to be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Morton
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hennings	Murray
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler	Hruska	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Revercomb
Carroll	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Church	Kennedy	Scott
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Daniel	Lausche	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dworshak	Malone	Thurmond
Eastland	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEGAL HOLIDAY ON INAUGURATION DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] may be recognized for a few moments, without the time being charged to either side, for the purpose of calling up a resolution concerning Inauguration Day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this year Inauguration Day occurs on Sunday, January 20. In order that there may be a legal holiday in the District of Columbia on Monday, January 21, it is necessary that a resolution be passed providing that January 21 be a holiday.

I introduce at this time a joint resolution to that effect, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) was read the first time by title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 20th day of January 1957 and the 20th day of January in every fourth year thereafter, known as Inauguration Day, is hereby made a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia employed in such area: *Provided, however*, That whenever the 20th day of January in any such year shall fall on a Sunday, the next succeeding day selected for the public observance of the inauguration of the President of the United States shall be considered a legal holiday as provided by this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is the same type of resolution as was submitted 4 years ago, and it has been customary to make Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia and the immediate vicinity. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That has been the past history. In the past Congress has set aside Inauguration Day as a legal holiday. The pending resolution does that. In addition, it provides that hereafter Inauguration Day shall be a legal holiday when that day occurs on a date other than January 20.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection, and I think the joint resolution should be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the unanimous-consent agreement, from now until 6 o'clock the time will be evenly divided between the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the majority leader. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The Senate is now operating under that agreement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

We are again facing the question of whether or not the Senate of the United States, round by round, shall determine its own rules, or whether it shall be bound by rules adopted a century ago.

Jointly, with some 30 other Senators, and in accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, we have moved that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

This motion, if agreed to, would not prejudge the nature of the rules which the Senate of the 85th Congress in its wisdom might adopt. It has been suggested to me that this is nothing but a majority cloture proposal. It is nothing of the kind. If a majority of the Senate should wish to adopt the old rules as the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress, the majority could do so.

My motion supports, but does not deny, the right of the Senate to determine the rules of its proceedings, but my motion declares, in effect, that the Senate of the 85th Congress is responsible for and must bear the responsibility for the rules under which the Senate will operate. That responsibility cannot be shifted back upon the Senate of past Congresses. No Congress, and no House of the Congress, can tie the hands of future Congresses or future Houses of the Congress. That principle is basic to our Constitution and to our democratic form of government. I hope that not only those who believe, with me, that the Senate should not continue rule 22 in its present form as a part of the rules of the Senate, but many of those of a contrary mind, will support this motion, so that, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, this body may determine the rules of the proceedings. Let us assume and not shirk or evade that responsibility.

That constitutional responsibility is very clear. Article I, section 5 of the Constitution declares that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. The language of the Constitution is very clear in its application to each House of the Congress.

It is not disputed that the House of Representatives of each new Congress has the power to adopt, and for many years has adopted, the rules of its proceedings at the opening of each Congress. For a period of time, from 1860 to 1890, the House operated much as the Senate has operated, under a system of acquiescence in past rules stemming from a resolution of the House that the 1860 rules should be the rules of the present and subsequent Houses unless otherwise provided. But in 1890 Speaker Reed ruled that at the beginning of each new Congress the House operates under general parliamentary law until new rules are adopted. Thereupon the House adopted new rules designed to permit efficient majority exercise of legislative functions, and to prevent minority obstructions. Since 1890 the House rules have been adopted anew by each incoming House.

I have heard recently—and I assume new Members of the Senate have been hearing recently—that if we fail to adopt rules we shall tie up the Senate for weeks to come. I only hope that each Member of the Senate will take time to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday and see what happened in the House of Representatives when it was ready to adopt rules. The chairman of the Rules Committee rose and moved that the rules be the same as those of the 84th Congress. There was not a word said on either side. The Speaker put the question on the motion, and within scarcely 30 seconds from the time the chairman of the Rules Committee had been recognized the House of Representatives had adopted its rules; and there is nothing in any record that would indicate that, after a preliminary skirmish, the Senate of the United States would not do the same thing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the Senator is discussing the House of Representatives, and not the Senate, all the way through.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not all the way through. I am discussing at the moment what the House of Representatives did yesterday.

For a long period of years the House of Representatives was tied in the same fashion, and by the same strings with which the Senate is now tied. The House was working on the assumption that the old rules applied all the way through unless some change was made.

In 1890 the Speaker of the House of Representatives banged down his gavel and stated that the Constitution of the United States provides that each House shall determine the rules of its proceedings, and that the House of Representatives would proceed immediately to adopt its rules.

If that had not been done, we would have the most unwieldy organization imaginable. I was formerly a Member of the House, as many other Senators

have been. No one can imagine the chaos which would result, with the complication of modern issues, if the 435 Members of the House were governed by the old rules. It was necessary to make it possible for the House of Representatives to act. That was what was done in 1890.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that since 1890 the House of Representatives has been acting under those rules?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it has been acting under those rules, with some exceptions. At one time, upon motion by a Representative from the State of Mississippi, there was added to the rules of the House the provision that the Committee on Un-American Activities should be a permanent committee. As a Member of the House I participated in long debates on the question of the Committee on Un-American Activities. When I entered the House of Representatives in 1941, the Dies Committee was about the hottest subject in the Congress. However, when the proposed rule came before the House, Representative Rankin was able to have it placed in the rules in a matter of seconds.

The rules have not remained the same. They have been changed as occasion required; and the changes have been made in accordance with the Constitution, and in accordance with proper legislative practice.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as filibusters are concerned, the rules have remained the same, have they not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from New Mexico will agree that in the case of a body consisting of 435 Members, the rules must be different from the rules governing a body of 96 Members.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think I can quite concede that. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I think the rules of the Senate might very well be different from the rules of the House. I have never said otherwise. That is why I said in the beginning that this is not merely a question of majority cloture. I do not favor majority cloture, but I emphasize the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides that the Senate of the United States may determine its own rules, and I refuse to be bound by the action of someone who is not now in the Senate, who has long since gone to his reward, but who ties my hands, and says to me, through his action, that I cannot participate in the deliberations of this body as fully as I should like because 2 generations or 4 generations ago he wrote a rule which I am required to follow.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Members of the House of Representatives are elected every 2 years, are they not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the Senate two-thirds of the membership carries over.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, there will be further discussion of this question throughout the entire day, and I shall perhaps participate in that discussion. When we went into this question 4 years ago, I made a motion that the Senate proceed in the fashion now proposed, and I was surprised to hear it said that this was a Walter Reuther proposal. I grant that Walter Reuther has advocated a similar course to that which I am now advocating. However, Mr. Reuther also advocates allegiance to the country and respect for the flag. If Mr. Reuther happens to say that we should respect the flag of the United States, I do not intend to be disrespectful to it because respect for the flag is a Reuther proposal. I did not get my proposal from Walter Reuther.

Senator James, of Kentucky, spoke on this subject in 1915. I will say to the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that the State of Kentucky has taken on increased interest since the last election. The President of the United States, when he was appearing on a television program after his overwhelming election last fall, said he was speaking about modern Republicanism. I realize that the Senator from Kentucky was one who participated, with many of us, in liberal and progressive fights. Therefore, I was glad to find that when this question was raised many years ago it was raised by Senator James, of Kentucky. On February 15, 1915, he felt impelled to say something about the shipping bill filibuster, which, as he saw it, was threatening the welfare of the country.

He questioned the continuity of the Senate as a body. He said:

> These rules have not been adopted by the Senate. They are merely the inheritance of hundreds of years behind us, with the gathered cobwebs and dust that have come down through the centuries.

I find that in the statement filed by the able minority leader yesterday afternoon, and I pick it up and commend it as good language for us to remember.

That statement was challenged by Senator Root of New York. He asked if anyone disputed that the Senate was a continuing body. Senator Thomas of Colorado got up and said, "I challenge it, and I intend to test it."

Senator Thomas proceeded to get ready to test it at the opening session of the next Congress. When he tried to test it, Walter Reuther was a boy of 9 years. Somehow I find it difficult to believe that Mr. Reuther had reached his 9-year-old hand all the way out to Colorado to influence Senator Thomas. Nor do I believe that he influenced me. I was in the Senate of the United States in 1949 when the present rule was adopted. I had lived through the long dreary hours, waiting for the filibuster then in progress to come to an end. I recognized that there were Senators who decided that it would be desirable to terminate that filibuster. They circulated a round robin throughout the corridors of the Senate and through the adjoining rooms, where gin rummy games were going on, and they said, "Let us have a chance to go home. Let us sign the round robin and get this over."

They said, "Our friends will consent to a wholly new version which will give us a wholly new rule. Let us sign up quickly and adopt it."

Let me say, Mr. President, that I did not accept that version, and I am glad today that I did not accept it. I say that because, while there was great assurance that the rule would effectively prevent filibusters, I questioned whether anyone really believed it would.

Mr. President, a great many Senators who were interested in this proposal were not influenced in the slightest by subsequent events, but determined that night, so long as they remained in the Senate, they would try to wipe out a cloture rule which seemed to run contrary to the Constitution of the United States and its sacred provisions.

Mr. President, the whole question of constitutionality must some day be raised. The Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its procedure.

When we look at rule 22, we find paragraph 3, which denies that the Senate may adopt its own rules. That provision reads:

> The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII * * * and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, we cannot move in the field of changing the standing rules of the Senate because this prohibition exists. We are told now that we cannot take it out of the rules by majority vote, because a previous Congress wrote that provision into the rules.

Mr. President, suppose that a previous Congress had said, instead, that the rule relating to cloture may never be changed except by unanimous consent.

On the night, in 1949, when this rule was adopted, there was so much sentiment in favor of ending the filibuster then going on that I am sure the Senators who signed that round robin would just as soon have signed one which provided that a filibuster could not be stopped except by unanimous consent.

They were ready, apparently, to sign anything that was presented to them, and they agreed that this rule should go into the Senate's rules. Let us suppose that a provision had been adopted in 1949 that the rule could not be changed except by unanimous consent. In that case, Mr. President, how many Senators today would be willing to accept such a restriction, if it had been put upon them in 1949? Therefore I say we should not accept this provision of the rules. The only chance we will ever have of ridding ourselves of this improper provision, as I see it, is by acting upon it in the early days of the session of Congress. Therefore, I say that this is a step that we must take.

I hope every Member of the Senate will write down in his copybook or in some other document these words:

> To say that the Senate in 1949 could pass an irrepealable rule on cloture is to say that it can alter the very Constitution from which it derives its power to meet and conduct its business.

Cooley's Constitutional Limitations as cited in the document filed by the able minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] uses almost this language and points out that this is true because insofar as one Senate could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could—and I am now quoting from the first column of page 33 of yesterday's RECORD—"in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two Houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual."

Mr. President, my quarrel has been largely with section 3. I do not like everything in the provisions regarding cloture, but I am outraged by section 3, which provides that I may do nothing about it. Unless the Senate moves in the particular way now proposed, at this particular time, Senators will never have a chance to change that provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say, first, that I believe the Senator has put his finger upon the vital point in this entire discussion. I have listened with keen interest to the Senator's dissertation on the rules of the Senate. I know his position is very clear. He is not arguing about any new form of cloture; he is arguing for the constitutional right of the Senate to adopt its own rules. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that when I received the letter written by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I replied that I was willing to go along with them on the question of the Senate having a right to adopt its own rules, but as to what the rules should be, I said, I may be diametrically opposed to them; but, nevertheless, I believe I have a right, as does the Senator from Minnesota, who entered the Senate on the same day on which I entered it, as did the Senator from Illinois, to have a part in the determination of the rules under which the Senate may operate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, the Senator does say that, although the Senate may adopt clause 3 of rule 22 for one Congress, as was done in 1949, this rule does continue applicable, without the acquiescence or overt consent of the Senate, to the 82d Congress, 83d Congress, 84th Congress, or 85th Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has stated it exactly correctly. I was a Member of the Congress which adopted the rule to which I object. During that time I raised no question about it, because the majority had overridden men. I do not believe we shall be overriden in the 85th Congress. The Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its procedure. It is not provided that a previous House may determine that the rules may never be changed except by unanimous consent, and that they may be shoved down the throat of every new Member coming into the Congress. Some day the objectionable parts of rule 22 will be taken out of the book. It may take time, but it will be eliminated. The proposal received 21 votes 4 years ago. There are 31 sponsors at this time, and that should tell the Members of the Senate what is going on; namely, that the hands of the Senate of the United States cannot forever be tied by rules adopted in 1949.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point has been made on other occasions that the fact that the Senate has not changed its rules since 1949 is conclusive evidence that the rules continue, and that, therefore, they are not subject to change through the process in which we are now engaged; namely, at the beginning of the session to file a motion providing for the adoption of the rules. The argument is that because we have not changed the rules, they are, therefore, not subject to change through the procedure in which we are now engaged.

However, merely because the Senate may not have exercised—and I use the words "may not have exercised" its right, that is no reason to say that the right does not exist.

I call to the Senator's attention the language of article I, section 5, of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers debated this language for a considerable period of time. The language is that "each House may determine the rules of its procedure." The word "may" is very important. They may, if they so desire, or they may not. It is not a mandate, but it is permissive.

The point which the Senator from New Mexico is now making is that he desires at this time to have the Senate act.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly correct. The Senate may do it. I believe the Senate should do it. Before we get through we shall be hearing that there is plenty of time to determine the question in an orderly fashion; that such action as is now proposed will get into the way of proposals relating to the freedom for Hungary, or some such thing as that. We always hear the story that there will be plenty of time for the question to be brought up in an orderly fashion. But there is no possibility of that happening. The Committee on Rules and Administration tried to incorporate in the rules a cloture provision in previous Congresses. The last proposal was passed over five consecutive times, even though we were trying all the time to get some action on it. Why was it said that it had to be passed over? Because some project dear to some Member of the Senate might be held up. Because we never have time late in the session to take up the calendar item that covers the change in the cloture rule. We get to the last days and the majority leader whether he is a Democrat or Republican, and no matter how conscientious he may be, comes sadly to the Members and says, "Oh, if we have this cloture change before the Senate, our southern friends will filibuster for 3 weeks. That means that the appropriation bills will not pass. That means that the great national proposals like the creation of Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park in Alabama or the Pea Ridge National Military Park in Arkansas would never get through the Senate and that we will not have a chance to have a vote on Hells Canyon Dam or the San Luis Dam in California.

We accumulate on the calendar enough of a backlog so that every Senator has a gift dangling on the Christmas tree and we are then told that the good fairies will take away the Christmas tree and that Santa Claus will not come down the chimney if we are bad boys and insist that a change in the cloture rule be brought before the Congress. There is one day, and only one day, that this matter can be considered in this Congress, and that is today. Any Senator who votes to table the motion, votes to end all possibility that the cloture rule of the Senate, unconstitutional though it may be, will be revised in the 85th Congress. I make that flat prediction without any fear that subsequent events may prove it to be untrue.

Then we hear the panic line that a rules proposal would get in the way of measures affecting the Suez situation and Hungary, and in the way of the fighters for freedom all over the world. We have been told not to get in the way of any of those things.

The House acted upon its rules promptly. It is ready to conduct business. The Middle East proposal which the President will announce before the Congress tomorrow can be taken up and considered by the House of Representatives. It is going to take some time, I believe, in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Anyone who is so naive as to believe that the proposal will be taken by that great body and rubberstamped and reported in an hour or two is misguessing the situation. It is said that there is no committee to which it can be referred if we do not adopt these rules. All this propaganda advanced on the floor of the Senate today is only panic propaganda, because the proposal can be referred and will be referred, no matter what we do with the rules.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for bringing to our attention again some of the cries of anguish, fear, and trepidation that have been raised regarding what will happen if we revise the rules. It has been stated that there would be no appropriate committee to

which any message of the President or any statement of the President could be referred, like the statement which will come to us tomorrow on the crucial problems in the Middle East.

I have in my hand Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, known as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That act supersedes the provisions which are found in the Senate Manual relating to Senate committees. The Senate committees are established now, not by rules of the Senate, but by statutory law. The Senator from New Mexico has pointed out that in the instance of Senate committees, they do not exist by mere sufferance of the rules of the Senate, but they exist by reason of the Reorganization Act.

I suggest, if it be agreeable to the Senator, that the portion of the Reorganization Act relating to Senate committees be included at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the portion of the Reorganization Act relating to Senate committees was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART 1—STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 102. Rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE 25

"Standing committees

"(1) The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economics and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 21 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(c) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

"4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

"6. Selective Service.

"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"9. Ammunition depots.

"10. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

"11. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.

"12. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"(d) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"(e) Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. The Federal civil service generally.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(f) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(g) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. The bonded debt of the United States.

"3. The deposit of public moneys.

"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"6. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"8. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

"9. National social security.

"10. Veterans' measures generally.

"11. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"12. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"13. Compensation of veterans.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Treaties.

"3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"5. Neutrality.

"6. International conferences and congresses.

"7. The American National Red Cross.

"8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"13. Foreign loans.

"(j) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipelines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics.
"5. Merchant marine generally.
"6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
"7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.
"8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
"9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
"10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
"11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
"12. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
"13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
"14. Weather Bureau.
"15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.
"16. Inland waterways.
"17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.
"18. Bureau of Standards including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.
"(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
"2. Constitutional amendments.
"3. Federal courts and judges.
"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
"6. National penitentiaries.
"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
"8. Holidays and celebrations.
"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
"12. Civil liberties.
"13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
"14. Patent Office.
"15. Immigration and naturalization.
"16. Apportionment of Representatives.
"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
"18. Interstate compacts generally.
"(l) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.
"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.
"3. Wages and hours of labor.
"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.
"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.
"6. Child labor.
"7. Labor statistics.
"8. Labor standards.
"9. School-lunch program.
"10. Vocational rehabilitation.
"11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.
"12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.
"13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.
"14. Public health and quarantine.
"15. Welfare of miners.
"16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.
"17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.
"18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.
"19. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.
"(m) Committee on Public Lands, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.
"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.
"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.
"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.
"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.
"10. Mining interests generally.
"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
"12. Geological survey.
"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
"14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.
"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.
"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.
"(n) The Committee on Public Works, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.
"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).
"3. Water power.
"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.
"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.
"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.
"7. Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.
"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.
"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.
"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads.
"(o) (1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.
"(B) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.
"(C) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.
"(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.
"(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Building and of the Senate Wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.
"(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate. Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate Wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.
"(3) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.
"(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.
"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more."

Appropriations

SEC. 103. Rule 16 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE 16

"Amendments to appropriation bills

"1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be

moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

"2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

"3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least 1 day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

"4. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; nor shall any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law be received if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate; and any such amendment or restriction to a general appropriation bill may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill.

"5. No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall be cited on the face of the amendment.

"6. (a) Three members of the following-named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

NAME OF COMMITTEE	PURPOSE OF APPROPRIATION
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.	For the Department of Agriculture.
Committee on Civil Service.	For the Post Office Department.
Committee on Armed Services.	For the Department of War; for the Department of the Navy.
Committee on the District of Columbia.	For the District of Columbia.
Committee on Public Works.	For Rivers and Harbors.
Committee on Foreign Relations.	For the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

"(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or their respective committees, shall be a member of any conference committee appointed to confer with the House upon the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the foregoing table opposite the name of his or their respective committee.

"7. When a point of order is made against any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriation bill on the ground that the restriction violates this rule, the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order."

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 121. (a) Rule 10 of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE 10

"Standing committees

"(a) There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

"1. Committee on Agriculture, to consist of 27 Members.

"2. Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 43 Members.

"3. Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 33 Members.

"4. Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 27 Members.

"5. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of 25 Members.

"6. Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 25 Members.

"7. Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 25 Members.

"8. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 25 Members.

"9. Committee on Foreign Affairs, to consist of 25 Members.

"10. Committee on House Administration, to consist of 25 Members.

"11. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 27 Members.

"12. Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 27 members.

"13. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of 25 members.

"14. Committee on Public Lands, to consist of 25 members.

"15. Committee on Public Works, to consist of 27 members.

"16. Committee on Rules, to consist of 12 members.

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"18. Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 27 members.

"19. Committee on Ways and Means, to consist of 25 members.

"(b) (1) The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

"(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman, the member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

"(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more."

(b) Rule 11 of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE 11

"Powers and duties of committees

"(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively: *Provided*, That, unless otherwise provided herein, any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of that committee or of the consolidated committee succeeding generally to the jurisdiction of that committee.

"(a) Committee on Agriculture.

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economics and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(b) Committee on Appropriations.

"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(c) Committee on Armed Services.

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

"4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

"6. Selective service.

"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"9. Ammunition depots.

"10. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.

"11. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"12. Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

"(d) Committee on Banking and Currency.

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.
"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.
"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.
"(e) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
"1. The Federal civil service generally.
"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.
"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.
"4. Postal-savings banks.
"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.
"6. The National Archives.
"(f) Committee on the District of Columbia.
"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—
"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.
"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.
"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.
"5. Taxes and tax sales.
"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.
"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.
"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.
"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.
"(g) Committee on Education and Labor.
"1. Measures relating to education or labor generally.
"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.
"3. Wages and hours of labor.
"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.
"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.
"6. Child labor.
"7. Labor statistics.
"8. Labor standards.
"9. School-lunch program.
"10. Vocational rehabilitation.
"11. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.
"12. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and Saint Elizabeths Hospital.
"13. Welfare of miners.
"(h) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.
"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.
"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—
"(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.
"(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.
"(C) Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.
"(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.
"(i) Committee on Foreign Affairs:
"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.
"2. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.
"3. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.
"4. Neutrality.
"5. International conferences and congresses.
"6. The American National Red Cross.
"7. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.
"8. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.
"9. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.
"10. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.
"11. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.
"12. Foreign loans.
"(j) (1) Committee on House Administration:
"(A) Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.
"(B) Expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.
"(C) The auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged to the contingent fund.
"(D) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.
"(E) Appropriations from the contingent fund.
"(F) Measures relating to services to the House, including the House restaurant and administration of the House Office Buildings and of the House wing of the Capitol.
"(G) Measures relating to the travel of Members of the House.
"(H) Measures relating to the assignment of office space for Members and committees.
"(I) Measures relating to the disposition of useless executive papers.
"(J) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the House Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.
"(K) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.
"(L) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
"(M) Measures relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; and Federal elections generally.
"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of—
"(A) Examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; and in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that they are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the House, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the House.
"(B) Reporting to the Sergeant at Arms of the House the travel of Members of the House.
"(C) Arranging a suitable program for each day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding period, and to arrange for the publication of the proceedings thereof.
"(k) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.
"2. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
"3. Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.
"4. Civil aeronautics.
"5. Weather Bureau.
"6. Interstate oil compacts; and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.
"7. Securities and exchanges.
"8. Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government waterpower projects.
"9. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.
"10. Public health and quarantine.
"11. Inland waterways.
"12. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.
"(l) Committee on the Judiciary.
"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
"2. Constitutional amendments.
"3. Federal courts and judges.
"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
"6. National penitentiaries.
"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
"8. Holidays and celebrations.
"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
"12. Civil liberties.
"13. Patents, copyrights, and trademarks.
"14. Patent Office.
"15. Immigration and naturalization.
"16. Apportionment of Representatives.
"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
"18. Interstate compacts generally.
"19. Presidential succession.
"(m) Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
"1. Merchant marine generally.
"2. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
"3. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.
"4. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
"5. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
"6. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water (except matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission) and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
"7. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
"8. United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
"9. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
"10. The Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone; and interoceanic canals generally.
"11. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.
"(n) Committee on Public Lands.
"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

"(o) Committee on Public Works.

"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"3. Water power.

"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

"7. Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads, other than appropriations therefor; but it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads to contain any provisions for any specific road, nor for any bill in relation to a specific road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific road.

"(p) Committee on Rules.

"1. The rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House.

"2. Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

"(r) Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"1. Veterans' measures generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.

"5. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"6. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"7. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"(s) Committee on Ways and Means.

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. The bonded debt of the United States.

"3. The deposit of public moneys.

"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"6. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"8. National social security.

"(2) (a) The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on House Administration—on the right of a Member to his seat, enrolled bills, on all matters referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House; the Committee on Ways and Means—on bills raising revenue; the Committee on Appropriations—on the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Public Works—on bills authorizing the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands—on bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers, and bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—on general pension bills.

"(b) It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last 3 days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of rule 24 shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule 16.

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within 3 legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within 7 legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

"(d) The Committee on House Administration shall make final report to the House in all contested-election cases not later than 6 months from the first day of the first regular session of the Congress to which the contestee is elected except in a contest from the Territory of Alaska, in which case the time shall not exceed 9 months.

"(e) A standing committee of the House (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall meet to consider any bill or resolution pending before it (A) on all regular meeting days selected by the committee; (B) upon the call of the chairman of the committee; (C) if the chairman of the committee, after 3 days' consideration, refuses or fails, upon the request of at least three members of the committee, to call a special meeting of the committee within 7 calendar days from the date of said request, then, upon the filing with the clerk of the committee of the written and signed request of a majority of the committee for a called special meeting of the committee, the committee shall meet on the day and hour specified in said written request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee to notify all members of the committee in the usual way of such called special meeting.

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees."

DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

SEC. 122. Rule 12 of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE 12

"Delegates and Resident Commissioner

"1. The Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, shall be elected to serve as additional members on the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, and Public Lands; and they shall possess in such committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider."

REFERENCE OF PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

SEC. 123. Paragraph 3 of rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary."

PART 3—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

PRIVATE BILLS BANNED

SEC. 131. No private bill or resolution (including so-called omnibus claims or pension bills), and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing (1) the payment of money for property damages, for personal injuries or death for which suit may be instituted under the Federal Tort Claims Act, or for a pension (other than to carry out a provision of law or treaty stipulation); (2) the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

SEC. 132. Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

SEC. 133. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (except the Committees on Appropriations) shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.

(b) Each such committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(d) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

(e) Each such standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

(f) All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

COMMITTEE POWERS

SEC. 134. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

(b) Every committee and subcommittee serving the Senate and House of Representatives shall report the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it, and shall make an accounting of funds appropriated to it and expended by it to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, at least once every 6 months, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is issued and as Senate and House documents, respectively, every 3 months.

(c) No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

CONFERENCE RULES ON AMENDMENTS IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE

SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

DECISIONS ON QUESTIONS OF COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

SEC. 137. In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $."

HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

SEC. 139. (a) No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least three calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

(b) The Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to develop a standard appropriation classification schedule which will clearly define in concise and uniform accounts the subtotals of appropriations asked for by agencies in the executive branch of the Government. That part of the printed hearings containing each such agency's request for appropriations shall be preceded by such a schedule.

(c) No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations; except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

(d) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses are authorized and directed to make a study of (1) existing permanent appropriations with a view to limiting the number of permanent appropriations and to recommend to their respective Houses what permanent appropriations, if any, should be discontinued; and (2) the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services by all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government with a view to recommending to their respective Houses a uniform system of control with respect to such funds.

RECORDS OF CONGRESS

SEC. 140. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to obtain at the close of each Congress all of the noncurrent records of the Congress and of each committee thereof and transfer them to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House, respectively.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to collect all of the noncurrent records of the House of Representatives from the 1st to the 76th Congress, inclusive, and transfer such records to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House respectively.

PRESERVATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 141. The Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to have bound at the end of each session of Congress the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress at the preceding session.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 142. This title shall take effect on January 2, 1947; except that this section and sections 140 and 141 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Minnesota, because when I heard the argument that if the President came before Congress to deliver a message on Saturday there would be absolutely no committee to which the message could be referred, I thought, "Is not that strange? Someone must have forgotten that Congress passed the Reorganization Act, and that act, which was passed by both Houses of Congress and was signed by the President, will be effective regardless of the operations of some of the rules some Senators worry about."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be interested to know that in Public Law 601 the following language appears, under title I, Changes in Rules of Senate and House:

SEC. 101. The following sections of this title are enacted by Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and—

The section goes on to say:

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the Reorganization Act of 1946, which is the law—it is not merely a Senate rule, but is the law, by which this body is bound until such time as the law may be changed by both Houses of Congress—subsection (b) of section 101 of title I provides:

With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

I would note that at least the preponderance of the evidence in that particular situation would indicate that Congress in 1946 recognized what the Senator from New Mexico is pointing out so well and so succinctly today; namely, the constitutional right of either House to change its rules, at its own discretion, and at its own will.

Mr. ANDERSON. And one of the authors of that law is now a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I expect, as the discussion proceeds, that we shall hear a great deal about whether the Senate is or is not a continuing body. I respectfully suggest to those who participate in that discussion that it has nothing whatsoever to do with this debate. The Senate may or may not be a continuing body; but the Constitution permits each House to determine the rules of its own procedure. Whether it is a continuing or a noncontinuing body, the obligation to determine its rules rests upon the Senate.

The 1890 episode in the House of Representatives demonstrates that the carryover of rules results not from the binding effect of any past action of any past Congress or House thereof, but from majority acquiescence. Each House is responsible for determining its rules of proceedings for each Congress. I hope the Senate will not try to shirk or hide this responsibility by silent acquiescence. It is our duty to take responsibility for the rules which will govern our procedures, and not to cast that responsibility upon the dead hands of past Congresses.

It is said by many that the Senate differs radically from the House; that the Senate is a continuing body and the House is not. I do not propose to burden the Senate at this time with a prolonged legal argument as to the meaning and effect of the phrase "continuing body" in relation to the Senate. The phrase "continuing body" does not appear in the Constitution, and no doctrine that envisages the Senate as a continuing body can obscure the fact that the Constitution gave to the Senate the same continuing authority and responsibility in respect to the determination of its rules of procedure that it gave to the House.

It may be appropriate to regard the Senate as a continuing body for some purposes but not for others. It may, for example, be useful to regard the Senate as a continuing body for giving effect to action of the Senate in one Congress in aid of action which may be taken by the Senate in the next Congress. The case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 175) points that out. But it does not follow that it is useful or proper to give effect to action of the Senate in one Congress not in aid but in restraint of action by the Senate in the next Congress.

The doctrine of the Senate being a continuing body cannot be availed of to take from the Senate the continuing power and responsibility entrusted to it to determine its rules of proceedings. The Constitution did not contemplate that the Senate of one Congress should be indefinitely bound by the dead hands of the Senate of past Congresses. There will be raised many, many questions like that as we go along.

I do not desire to detain the Senate further, because there are many other Senators on both sides of the question who wish to be heard. I only hope the Senate will realize that what is now sought is not something to be shoved aside on the theory that the Suez situation will suffer, or that some freedom fighter in Hungary will suffer. After all, some freedom in the Senate of the United States is worth while. It must be preserved if the Senate is to remain the great bulwark of liberty upon earth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico if any other Senator who wishes to address the Senate on his side of the question is available to speak at this time? I do not have a speaker on my side at this time. We are in the process of formulating such a list of speakers now.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senate is today in a situation very much like that of 4 years ago, at the opening of the 83d Congress. I rise to state again my strong view that every legislative body in a free government should adopt rules periodically. In the case of the Senate, periodically would be, logically, every 2 years—at the beginning of each new Congress.

Much has been said and much will be said during this debate upon the question of whether or not the Senate is a continuing body. That question, to my mind, is not material. Let us accept the contention that the Senate is a continuing body. Does that justify the assumption that the rules continue? That assumption appears to be based on two facts: one that approximately 64 Senators are continuously in office; the other that the rules of the Senate always have been treated as continuing.

The fact that something always has been done in a certain way is a footless argument for continuing to do it that way if a majority of those concerned wish to do it differently. I hope that the Senate will not become enslaved to the fallacy that what has always been must always be.

If we are to adhere rigidly to the view that the rules of the Senate continue, why then should we observe the present practice with respect to such matters as proposed legislation and nominations? We accept the fact that bills before the Senate die with the expiration of a Congress and must be reintroduced if they are to be considered in a succeeding Congress. We require the President to resubmit nominations on which the Senate failed to act before the end of a Congress. I contend that, in logic, the same condition should obtain with respect to the rules.

It is true that approximately two-thirds of the authorized membership of the Senate are always in office. But what about the one-third or so who arrive in this chamber every second year as newly elected or reelected Members? Are they never to have an effective opportunity to pass upon the rules by which they will be bound as Senators? Certainly they do not have such an opportunity if the Senate's rules are continued from Congress to Congress without reappraisal or readoption, without any affirmative action whatever. The Constitution provides that the Senate "may determine the rules of its proceedings." The fact is that the Senate cannot determine the rules of its proceedings whenever a minority—and it can be a very tiny minority—is opposed to such a determination.

This situation makes the Senate almost unique among legislative bodies in the United States. Under section 3 of rule 22, it is impossible to limit debate on any motion to take up a proposal to change the rules. Yet, according to a compilation which has come to my hand, 45 of the 48 States forbid filibustering in the upper houses of their State legislatures.

The great majority of the States which do put a limitation on debate provide that it shall be done by a majority vote. In other words, these bodies can bring legislation to a vote when it is the desire of the majority to do so. This cannot be done in the United States Senate unless 64 Senators agree to do so. And it amounts to an unreasonable and, from a practical standpoint, unattainable requirement.

I have always believed—this is my personal belief—that every legislative body should conduct its business by action of a majority of its authorized membership, except in the rare instances where constitutional or statutory mandate otherwise directs. I have always bemoaned the fact that in certain instances, and because it does not function through the majority procedure to which I refer, the United States Senate sometimes is powerless to control its own action.

It is probably unfortunate that the present issue before the Senate has become entangled with civil rights. It is vitally important that this Nation assure to every one of its citizens the effective exercise of his civil rights. And it is true that the Congress is powerless to provide that assurance as long as the Senate is hobbled by rule 22 in its present form. But there have been, and will be, other issues upon which the United States Senate should act. The point which is squarely before us is whether the Senate shall have the power to act if a reasonable number of its Members—and by that I mean 49 or more—believe that action by the Senate is necessary. There can be no such action if the Senate is to be bound eternally to rules adopted in the past, often generations ago.

I recognize, of course, that there is a difference of opinion among those of us who feel so strongly that the rules of the Senate should be changed so that debate may be limited through the action of a more reasonable number of Senators than are now required for that purpose. Although I myself, as I have stated, favor a majority of the authorized membership—in other words, 49—I would be perfectly willing to agree to a different requirement, assuming that it enables us in general to reach the goal which we are seeking.

In closing, I quote a remark made recently by Professor Samuel Beer, chairman of the Department of Government at Harvard University:

> Thomas Jefferson warned that the filibuster would bring Congress into disrepute and serve to transfer public confidence to the executive. It is remarkable how the Senate has been able to survive disrepute, but this sort of thing cannot happen too often. The champion of the Congress should be wary of the filibuster.

Mr. President, I yield back any time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from New York yields back 3 minutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Carl Hinshaw, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated the intelligence of the death of Hon. T. Millet Hand, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated the intelligence of the death of Hon. J. Percy Priest, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated the intelligence of the death of Hon. Antonio M. Fernandez, late a Representative from the State of New Mexico, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is operating on an allocation of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me inquire how much time the Senator from Indiana desires to have.

Mr. JENNER. I think 15 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I rise today to advocate freedom of speech. That may sound strange to newcomers in this body; but adoption of the proposals advanced by those who desire a majority-rule cloture procedure would, in fact, put an end to freedom of speech in the Senate.

Today I am in a unique position, because I favor civil-rights legislation, but I wish to have rule 22 amended in accordance with the amendment I submitted on January 7, 1953. That amendment would change the present rule 22 so as to require the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, and also to provide for 5 days' notice on the filing of a cloture petition. In other words, I think that rule 22 as it now exists should be modified; but, on the other hand, I do not think the modification should go to the extent of destroying freedom of speech in the Senate by letting a majority gag a minority.

Mr. President, I wish to give a little of the history regarding the previous question.

In 1816, the House of Representatives debated the issue of free debate. They adopted a strict cloture by a perversion of the meaning of the previous question.

Mr. Gaston, in speaking in favor of free debate, pointed out that the original purpose of the previous question was to postpone one subject in order to take up another. In other words, it was simply a demand that the House should first pronounce whether it was then expedient to decide the question under debate or to turn temporarily to other business.

The Continental Congress followed this procedure, and used the previous question properly.

However, through the years following the Continental Congress the meaning of the previous question changed.

This was the reason for the debate in 1816. Mr. Gaston pointed out at that time that the House, in attempting to change the historic and true meaning of the previous question, was abandoning true principles. It is interesting to note to which group of Members he referred. I quote:

> This sir, was in 1798, in the days which have been falsely called the days of terror; but which I feel a pride in showing were the days of correct principles. We had not then discovered how to construe away the rights of the people or their Representatives. This illustrious discovery was reserved for the genius of modern republicanism.

This view was further substantiated by the elder Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who in 1893 said:

> There never has been in the Senate any rule which enabled the majority to close debate or compel a vote. The previous question, which existed in the earliest years, and was abandoned in 1806, was the previous question of England, and not that with which everyone is familiar today in our House of Representatives. It was not in practice a form of cloture, and it is therefore correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate.

It would be a sad day for America if the right of free debate in the Senate were abolished. Surely, the Founding Fathers, many of whom were active in Congress, never intended that the Senate should prohibit unlimited debate.

Through the years the Senate has debated the pros and cons of unlimited debate. It is curious to note that for over 125 years, or from 1789 until 1917, the Senate had no cloture rules at all. During that time the parade of great men to the Senate continued, and most of them were firm advocates of free debate. Since 1917 we have had a two-thirds requirement in one form or another.

Today I should like to see the rule amended so as to require the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, instead of the favorable votes of two-thirds of a constitutional quorum.

I do not believe that our civil-rights legislation should be tied to the right of free debate. The principle of free debate is, in itself, one of the most important foundations of American liberty. Our civil-rights legislation should be introduced and passed. I think that ultimately it will be, and I believe it will be at this session.

As a supporter of civil-rights measures which have floundered and died in the Senate, I know full well that there have been abuses of the right of free debate. But, Mr. President, the end never justified the means. Therefore, the right of free debate should not be destroyed merely to bring about the passage of certain proposed legislation.

The Senate should be on guard against a strategy 1,000 years old. I refer to those who raise a great and perhaps valid

moral issue, on the one hand, and then relate it to the desired goal, on the other hand. Then the campaign is waged almost solely on the moral issue. The real goal is thus obscured. In the instant case the desired end and the real reason why some raise the civil-rights issue is to impose a majority rule on the Senate, not only for civil-rights legislation, but for all legislation to come.

I say that even if civil-rights legislation is enacted today, those opponents of free debate will continue to attack it until it is destroyed. To many people, civil rights is a convenient tool to be used to achieve a desired end.

The current rules of the Senate provide adequate remedies. Besides the well-known rule 22 Senators may:

Require speakers to stand and not sit or walk around.

Take away the floor for using unparliamentary language.

Rise to a point of order against quorum calls where no business has intervened since a rollcall disclosed the presence of a quorum.

Object to reading a paper, under rule 11.

Enforce rule 19.

Run the Senate 24 hours a day.

It is a well-known rule in every court that petitioners must exhaust all available remedies before filing an appeal. I believe the same principle applies here.

I like to think of Congress as trustees to preserve what the creators of the trust founded. The terms of this trust are to be found in the Constitution of the United States. The beneficiaries are the young people and unborn children of the future. Our duties as trustees are set forth in the Constitution.

Under its terms, the Senate was created to insure equality among the several States. The proposition which many of the original States demanded, and got—namely, equality of representation in the form of a United States Senate, is not even debatable. A Senator does not represent population or area, but, rather, a State.

Any limitation on debate impairs the equal representation of the States in the Senate. However, if we keep the present rules, each State will be adequately represented. But it is my firm belief that if the majority rule advocates prevail, the States would, in effect, be denied equal suffrage.

Article V of the Constitution provides that "no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." What right have we to determine to do precisely what the Constitution forbids? Where is Indiana's equal suffrage if a majority in the Senate decides that it has neither the time nor inclination to hear either of her Senators? This right to speak and be heard is the one means we have to protect and perpetuate this equality.

I now turn to another part of the Constitution. No citizen shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. Furthermore, every citizen in the country is recognized as possessing the right, either by himself or peaceably assembled with others, to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Citizens make known these grievances and desires through their trustees, or Senators. Because of our right to speak on this floor, these petitions are publicized, and many times laws are passed redressing their grievances. I believe that to refuse to receive petitions and redress grievances is an act of tyranny prohibited by the Constitution. Free debate on the Senate floor insures every citizen the right of petition and rightful redress. I assert, Mr. President, that the American people have a constitutional right to be heard before their money is voted or their liberty restrained, and we are their legal trustees. I believe that the entire Congress cannot, by law, deprive them of their constitutional franchise, the right to petition for redress of grievances. The Senate is not competent to close the mouth through which the petitioners speak.

Mr. President, our Founding Fathers believed that free debate was so important that they granted immunity to Senators and Representatives from libel actions. The privilege of a Senator to declare the will, to explain the views, to make known the grievances, and to advance the interests of his constituents and State, is no less precious now. This right would be narrowed, unreasonably, and I believe destroyed if a majority rule were adopted.

The concept of majority rule is noble. The concept of free debate is no less noble.

The advocates of majority rule allege that free debate has many evils, primarily, that it slows legislation.

Mr. President, majority rule, instead of being sanctioned by the constitutional authority which the Senate possesses of making rules to govern its proceedings, is at variance with the very object for the attainment of which this power was delegated.

The only purpose of rules in any deliberative body is to protect the minority against the potential tyranny of the majority. That was why the Senate was delegated this great and valuable power. To me the intent is clear. A second reason is that this right enforces the separation of powers doctrine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used the time allotted to him.

Mr. JENNER. May I have 5 more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say that all the time we have on this side has been allotted, but I shall take some time from that allotted to another Senator. Would the Senator be willing to take 3 minutes?

Mr. JENNER. I have about a page and a half of my manuscript remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the inevitable question arises as to what safeguards a minority has to be heard under majority rule. Some advocates propose a 15-day waiting period between the filing of a cloture motion and the imposition of cloture. This is no assurance whatever. Who is to guarantee that Indiana will be heard within this 15-day period? Others propose a 1-hour period for each Senator. Can such important matters as foreign aid, the Taft-Hartley law, and education, be covered adequately in 1 hour? The advocates of majority rule assure us that a minority has a right to be heard, but the only safeguard so far advanced is a promise—nothing more. Mr. President, that can never be called a right which owes its existence to a favor.

One evil of majority rule which has not been emphasized enough is its susceptibility to "bossism."

The late Senator Pat McCarran said:

> There is no doubt in my mind that legislative independence disappears in exact proportion to the diminishing of deliberation. Cloture is the foundation of machine rule. Once that foundation is established, the mechanics of machine rule will become very simple. One or two or a handful of bosses then will be able easily to attain and exercise supremacy. They can use the party-caucus system, employing the principle of control through a majority of a majority, which is inevitably a minority of the whole membership. The "bosses" in such circumstances would have at their fingertips many different kinds of coercion. They would be in a position to take care of subservient Members primarily interested in local legislation, and to dispense patronage favors to those who prove faithful. Such a machine, if established, can be manipulated from the outside by whatever political or economic interests may be dominant in the administrative field. There is already considerable influence wielded by pressure groups. I cannot become a party to a move which will increase the power of lobbyists.

Majority control might be used in combinations such as those which are geographical, industrial, or financial, with one group of States silencing another.

The advocates of majority rule forget that the Senate has an informing function, as well as a legislating one. The House can pass bills so fast the people do not even know they are being considered.

I cite, for example, a bill passed by the House which proposed to put railway employees in the Army and put guns at their backs to make them work; but the Senate, under the rule of unlimited debate, stopped such a bill from becoming legislation.

If measures are passed rapidly, without due consideration, public opinion has no chance to make itself known. The prolonged debates on the natural-gas bill in the Senate were designed, in part, to educate the people.

We may have a duty to legislate, but we also have a duty to inform and deliberate.

In the past quarter century we have seen a phenomenal growth in the power of the executive branch. If this continues at such a fast pace, our system of checks and balances will be destroyed. One of the main bulwarks against this growing power is free debate in the Senate.

Free debate has deterred power-seeking Executives from seeking legislation which is too dictatorial. So long as there is free debate, men of courage and understanding will rise to defend against potential dictators.

It is contended that the Senate would be paralyzed in times of emergency. I do

not believe that if America were ever in danger, 64 Senators would not invoke cloture under our present rule. Furthermore, we have gone through many crises in the past one hundred and fifty-odd years, and the Government has never before been rendered helpless by freedom of debate.

The Senate today is one place where, no matter what else may exist, there is still a chance to be heard, an opportunity to speak, the duty to examine, and the obligation to protect. It is one of the few refuges of democracy. Minorities have an illustrious past, full of suffering, torture, smear, and even death. Jesus Christ was killed by a majority; Columbus was smeared; and Christians have been tortured. Had the United States Senate existed during those trying times, I am sure these people would have found an advocate. Nowhere else can any political, social, or religious group, finding itself under sustained attack, now receive a better refuge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, one who has read the press reports and listened to the radio and the television for the past several days might have been led to believe that the only question involved in the issue pending before the Senate is the question of stopping filibusters or passing certain legislation which has been labeled "civil rights bills." I must say, in all frankness, that there has been a great deal of sloppy and, indeed, biased reporting, which has seemed to be almost a conspiracy to create the impression throughout the country that nothing was involved in the question before the Senate other than rule 22 of this body, and legislation which, in many cases, has been euphemistically labeled "civil rights bills."

Frankness further compels the statement that, in my judgment, freedom of debate in the United States has never been more abused than has been the constitutional right of freedom of the press in presenting this issue to the American people. Very few articles have even mentioned, much less fully discussed, the great constitutional issue which is before this body, as to whether the Senate of the United States is a continuing body, with its rules continuing from year to year, subject only to change in the manner prescribed in such rules.

That issue far transcends the ones which have been brought forward and hammered upon as dealing merely with abuses of freedom of speech in the Senate, and with legislation of the type to which I have referred.

Such a course can only be calculated to embarrass many conscientious Senators in reaching a conclusion on this issue. Many of them are as much in favor of tightening the cloture rule as are the sponsors of this proposal. Many of them favor the so-called civil-rights legislation. In some of its aspects the campaign is almost a conspiracy of intimidation.

I shall not undertake to deal with all the erroneous statements which have been made. Two or three of them which are extremely wild are now being picked up and given credence by creditable sources. I shall refer to at least one.

I have before me an article written by a gentleman named Irving Brant. The article was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 2, 1957. I quote one paragraph from the article:

> From 1789 to 1806, debate on a bill could be ended instantly by a majority of Senators present, through adoption of an undebatable motion calling for the previous question.

Even so eminent a scholar as Walter Lippmann picked up that statement and carried it in his column which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

If Mr. Brant had been as zealous in his research, and in seeking and producing the facts as he was in being an advocate in this matter, he would have found that there was absolutely no relationship, except in name, to the previous-question rule which applied in the Senate in those days. That was the previous-question rule from the British Parliament, which applied in that body for many years. A motion for the previous question was in the nature of a motion to postpone consideration of a bill before the Senate. It was open to debate. It could be debated without let or hindrance of any kind. It was merely a method of disposing of a measure before the Senate without taking action on it at that time.

The headline of Mr. Brant's article conveys the information that he is writing a book on James Madison. Walter Lippmann says he is writing on James Monroe. If he is writing on James Monroe, I am sure Monroe is turning over in his grave. I think Monroe served in the Senate during that period. He would doubtless prefer a more accurate biographer. So it becomes apparent how completely erroneous that statement is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

The statements to which I have referred are typical of much of the material which has been brought forward in the effort to influence public opinion in dealing with this question. My position in debate in the Senate has been stated on previous occasions. I believe that the fact that this is a forum of free expression is the one thing which distinguishes the Senate of the United States from every other parliamentary body that has ever assembled anywhere in the world. That is the reason why we are called a great deliberative body. I believe that when we gag the Senate of the United States we are not only diminishing the stature of every Member of this body, but we are impinging on the rights of the State he represents and the people he represents, by curtailing the powers, the rights, and the voices of States which should be sovereign.

I shall not deal at length with the constitutional question here involved. I will say that for 167 years the Senate has followed, without a single exception, the precedent that the Senate was a continuing body; and its whole philosophy of operation has been based upon that principle.

I shall not read at length from the Constitution. To me it is so clear that it seems almost incapable of being misunderstood, that when the Founding Fathers created the Senate they realized that they were creating a legislative body which was different from any other that was ever known. The representation was based upon States, the smallest having the same power as the largest. That issue caused more trouble in the Constitutional Convention than any other.

The Founding Fathers faced the problem of writing out the provision under which the Senate was created and handed down to those of us who sit here.

What did they say? I read from the original Constitution:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Listen to this language:

> Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year.

Could they have written a clearer provision to indicate that 64 Senators should be carried over, so that the Senate would be a continuing body?

In addition, they provided that the presiding officer of the Senate should be the Vice President, selected not by the Senate, but by the people. Did they say that he should have a 2-year term? The Constitution provided that he should serve for a term of 4 years.

Those considerations strike down any implication to be found anywhere that there was any intention other than that the Senate of the United States should be a continuing body.

Year after year the Senate has proceeded as a continuing body. The Supreme Court, in its decisions, has referred to the Senate as a continuing body. It is only at this late date that we are now told that the rules of the Senate have no application, that the Senate is not a continuing body, and that any Senator can come forward and offer the proposal which was offered when this proposition had its genesis in the testimony of Mr. Walter Reuther before the Committee on Rules and Administration in 1949, when he was advocating this very policy.

We are now told that any Senator can come forward at the beginning of the session and say, "Here is a set of rules. The Senate should proceed to adopt these rules."

I hope Senators will believe me when I say that, if I were in favor of majority gag rule in the Senate, and if I favored the so-called civil-rights legislation, I could not, in view of the respect which I have for the Constitution, accept the proposal that the Senate is not a continuing body.

Senators say, "We have brought forward a proposal to adopt rules of procedure, and the Senate should pass upon it." It would be just as reasonable for me to say, on the first day of the session, "I want the Constitution amended. I present for submission to the States a proposal to amend the Constitution. The Senate has had no opportunity to act upon it heretofore, but here it is and the Senate should act upon it." I am opposed to any such changes without first having hearings on the subject and pursuing the customary procedure. I would oppose such an arbitrary procedure without regard to my own views on any proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I was much impressed by the fervid oratory of some Senators. I shall try to take the points up in some detail. I refer now to the argument with reference to section 3 of rule 22, relating to taking up a motion to change the rules of the Senate. One Senator said that he was outraged that that provision should be in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, that provision has been in effect since the first Senate assembled. It was merely incorporated into the written form under rule 22 when it was rewritten, because the Senate at that time, by majority vote, decided that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure should be subject to the cloture provision of the rules. That was decided in an orderly manner, as prescribed by the rules of the Senate.

The fact that a motion was not subject to the cloture rule had been on three occasions sustained by presiding officers or by a majority vote of the Senate on an appeal from an adverse ruling.

Previously, rule 22 did not apply to a motion to take up a measure. Then this much-maligned rule was adopted, and it was made applicable to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure, as well as to the reading of the Journal, and to other proceedings.

Before that time such procedures were open to unlimited debate, and that situation had prevailed in the Senate from 1789 until 1917, when the first cloture rule was adopted. Some very able Senators served in the Senate during that period and at the time that rule was adopted. They were not a group of weak men. They felt no sense of outrage over the rules.

The Senate can change its rules whenever it wishes to do so, provided it does it in the manner prescribed by the rules of the Senate.

No Senator has the right to come forward, under my concept of the Constitution, and say, "Here is a resolution which you must consider on the opening day of Congress, because this rule needs to be changed." A Senator could as well submit for immediate consideration a provision to change the Constitution.

It is said that it is manifestly impossible to change the rules of the Senate in any way under rule 22. Yet, we have made several changes under that rule since its revision in 1949. We have changed the rules of the Senate by seven different resolutions. Yet, we are told that it is impossible to change the rules of the Senate under the provisions of that rule; but that has been done.

Mr. President, when these matters are brought up, I am always concerned by the reference to inherent powers or implied powers. I am opposed to inherent or implied powers. I do not believe in such powers. I remember that a President of the United States not so long ago seized the steel mills of the United States under his so-called inherent powers. I am afraid of inherent powers. I believe in law.

If the time ever comes when the rights of the American people are destroyed, I do not believe it will be done in Congress by the affirmative action of the representatives of the people of the United States. It will be done by the application of inherent powers or implied powers.

We have rules which have served us well for 167 years. They are written out, and they are spelled out. Nevertheless, we are told that we must do something under so-called inherent powers. We are asked to substitute for laws something called inherent powers or inherent rights. We are asked to substitute such powers for the law of the land and for the rules of the Senate that have been prescribed by the Senate.

Mr. President, it is said that a rule adopted in one Congress cannot bind the next Congress. The same can be said of a law. But if it becomes advisable to change a law, it can be changed at any time under the rules prescribed. In like manner the Senate has a right to change its rules, but it must do it in the manner prescribed by the rules of the Senate.

Let us not in the Senate rely on any doctrine of inherent or implied powers. We are told that because the House of Representatives changes its rules every 2 years, we must do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been said that we should follow the action of the House and change our rules. The Senate was designed to operate in a manner different from that of the House. God forbid that we should have to beg to speak for 3 minutes. That happens in the House. I hope that rule shall never apply to the Senate of the United States, where Members are at least supposed to be ambassadors from their sovereign States. The Constitution provides for orderly procedure.

The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote to adopt a constitutional amendment. We would be just as well justified in taking a short cut with reference to that procedure as we would be in taking a short cut in the present instance. We had better avoid short cuts in the field of legislation. The people of the United States would do well to scrutinize short cuts. It matters not how salutary the purpose, when we start striking down the established order by taking a short cut because it has been made popular, or because it has been well publicized throughout the country, or because there are powerful groups back of it, or even because Mr. Walter Reuther says that is the way to proceed, I think we should exercise great care.

I am not saying that out of any disrespect for Mr. Walter Reuther. I have a very wholesome respect for him. If I were organizing a labor union, he would be the first man upon whom I would call for advice. If I were starting a campaign to intimidate Members of the Congress, I would go to him for advice. He is a very brilliant man and has many fine qualities, I am sure, but I do not think we should substitute the proposition which he put before the committee, and set aside precedents which have controlled this body for 167 years, which are found, indeed, in the clear wording of the Constitution of the United States itself, a document which we are all sworn to uphold and to defend, on the advice of anyone not directly charged with the responsibilities of government.

Mr. President, what will happen if the pending motion shall be agreed to? What rules will apply in the Senate as we go about the business of starting out with rule I and rewriting the rules of the Senate of the United States?

The present rules provide that no Senator may speak more than twice on the same subject. If these rules are stricken down, what is to prevent a Senator from speaking 22 or 42 times on the same subject if he chooses to do so?

The present rules have a cloture provision. If all these rules are discarded and wiped out by the pending motion, and we proceed to write new rules, we shall not have any cloture provision of any kind. What rules are we going to apply? Mr. Reuther suggested before the committee that we apply Robert's Rules of Order. I do not know why he picked out Robert's Rules of Order. There are other very distinguished writers in the field of parliamentary law and procedure.

There are many manuals for high school debating societies, Kiwanis Clubs, and so forth. It is significant that Robert was a retired Army officer, and his rules are a little bit sharper in striking down any right of the minority than those of other writers. There are other authors of parliamentary rules, as I have stated. But Mr. Reuther suggested Robert's Rules of Order. How can we apply them in the Senate of the United States if we strike down all the rules and start again from the beginning? We can do so only by our inherent power. The rules of the Senate may be a little lax in some respects, but I would advise that we bear with those we have rather than to fly to others we know not of. We shall be opening up a Pandora's box——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to yield if I had unlimited time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I have about thirty seconds?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not going to preclude me from answering. I am well aware of the astuteness of the Senator from Illinois. I should be glad to answer any question propounded and to debate any phase of the matter at

length, but under the limitations we have, which are a little binding, I cannot yield.

No, Mr. President, we have some rules, and we shall do well to follow the Constitution of the United States and follow the precedents of the Senate.

If this type of resolution is ever adopted, I am afraid we shall find that the chaos and confusion which have been referred to as having taken place in the past will be akin to that in a ladies' knitting society compared with what will take place when we are without any guide, rudder, or compass of any kind.

We are 96 men, representing great constituencies. Where is the inherent right from any source to put such strictures as are contemplated upon the Members of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, the issue involved in this proposal is, to me, much greater than any question of freedom of debate. It is much greater than any civil right in any single phase of legislation that can come before us, whether it be a farm bill, a tax bill, or a bill of any other type, because this question goes to the very constitutional integrity of the Senate as a great deliberative body.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate come and go. I see the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], now in the Chamber. I heard him speak before the Committee on Rules and Administration, stressing the fact that the Senate should be a forum of free discussion. He said something at that time which appeals greatly to me. He said, "Of course, any of us wants to vote immediately whenever we think we have a majority in the Senate." That is true, Mr. President.

If I have a bill on which I wish to have a vote, and I know I have a majority for it, I sometimes become a little irked if I think we are debating too long. I am sure every other Senator has the same feeling.

After all, Mr. President, the Senate is the last forum on earth where man can discuss and deal with matters of vital importance without severe restrictions on debate. With all the weaknesses which we may have, as the complexion of the body changes, I think we have served the American people well under the rules of the Senate as they apply today.

It is said, Mr. President, that this proposed change is absolutely essential to get action on specific legislation. Whenever a substantial majority of the Senate is determined to take action, every man who has been a Member of the Senate for any considerable length of time knows the Senate can take action. Let us not, Mr. President, embark on a sea that we know not of, and open up a Pandora's box that will throw the Senate into unspeakable confusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks earlier today, a statement I made concerning the Senate rules before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the 82d Congress. The statement begins at page 250 and concludes on page 264.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am glad to have had the opportunity to be here this morning and hear the discussion by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. He has been in the Senate a long time, and has made a great contribution to legislation for many years. He is thoroughly familiar with the ebb and flow of political life in this country, which can readily make the majority of today the minority of tomorrow. He wisely advocates retaining the present rules.

Any proposition or proposal to change the rules of the Senate is of vital importance to all of the Members of the Senate. I am not here this morning to indulge in any lengthy discussion of the various proposals which are pending here before the committee.

I do wish to voice my opposition to any change in the rules that will in anywise further restrict freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. I find particularly obnoxious any proposal that a bare majority can gag Senators, prevent them from speaking, prevent them from representing their States.

I am, perhaps, a bit old fashioned, but I still think that a Senator of the United States occupies a very different position from a representative in any other legislative body that is known to human history.

One of my reasons for coming here was to correct the record of an error that was made—of a statement, without fact or basis of fact, that was made in the course of these hearings.

I also wish to attempt to clear the atmosphere as to this section 3 of rule 22, which has been the subject of a great deal of discussion here in the committee.

I am very proud of the Senate of the United States. It is unique among all parliamentary bodies. Its counterpart cannot be found in any other legislative body, nor do I know of any in history that has occupied the very peculiar position in our scheme of government that is held by the Senate of the United States.

The Senate has a peculiar composition. It has unusual rules. It is a very unusual agency of government. All of those things grew out of compromise, as all legislation is the result of compromise—a compromise of one of the most violent controversies in the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Indeed, the composition of the Senate was the rock that, for a while, threatened to wreck the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Small States were determined to have some protection.

There were those who had peculiar laws and customs in their individual States who were surrendering a great amount of their sovereignty to the Union of States, who were determined that those laws should be protected, and there were even in those days minority groups who were very jealous of any parliamentary body that might, on the spur of the moment, under the wave of prejudice or in a spirit of partisanship, effect immediate and drastic changes in the basic laws of this country.

The American people have been proud of the Senate. I think they are proud of the fact that it can be called the greatest deliberative body in the world. Of course, deliberation in this day and time does not appeal to some people. It never appeals to any Senator when he knows he has the votes to pass his measure; but nevertheless the rules and the composition of the Senate have admirably enabled the Senate to discharge its proper function in maintaining the very delicate system of checks and balances envisioned by the Founding Fathers when they created our dual system of government, with the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches.

The rules of the Senate, of course, have grown out of the peculiar position which the Senator does occupy in our scheme of government—wise and far-seeing men in the Senate—sometimes when they were in the majority, sometimes when they belonged to the party in power, have used them to stop men who sought summary action. They have jealously guarded the power of the Senate in its opportunities to protect the freedoms of our people.

Through the more than 150 years in which this Nation has grown to a position of world dominance, from the very weak and struggling combination of 13 colonies, the Senate has at times appeared to be limp and halting in its movements, but it has never fundamentally failed the American people.

The Senate has had attack after attack made upon its peculiar rules. Almost every President of the United States, who had a majority and who was convinced that he was right in his position, has assailed the rules of the Senate. The party in power, generally speaking, is more often than not very restive under the rules of the Senate.

All those who wish to make quick and drastic changes in our Government violently condemn the rules of the Senate, but the Senate has served its purpose throughout the years.

Now, all Senators have had feelings of great frustration at times in debate in the Senate. As I stated a moment ago, the majority always thinks it is right, and is impatient to act, but there have been a great many times when the majority was wrong. There will be times in the future when the majority will be wrong. It may be on issues that are more vital to liberties of the American people than any that we have seen up until now, when the function of the Senate as a deliberative body will serve the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would be the last to deny that there have been abuses of freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. We all know that the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech is also often abused. We value highly freedom of the press, which is also guaranteed by the Constitution. The freedom of the press is oftentimes abused.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the benefits that we derive from all of those freedoms greatly outweigh the detriment of the abuses that we suffer as the result, and no sound thinker would advocate changing or curtailing or modifying the freedom of speech or freedom of press, because they have been abused.

I have studied this question of the proposal to institute a more restrictive gag rule in the Senate. I once spent a couple of weeks in going back over the various occasions in the history of the Senate when these motions, these efforts, have been made to change the rules. I was interested to note two things: that almost always those who sought to change the rules to gag his adversary of the minority when he was in power became a great advocate of freedom of debate when he was translated from the majority to the minority. Further, almost invariably men who came to the Senate determined to change the rules of the Senate, if they stayed there long enough, came to defend the rules. I could give illustrations of that by the hour.

However, there is a clamor that we should have more speed in the legislative body. A democracy is, of itself, a cumbersome system of government. In our representative Government, we cannot act with tremendous speed. It was never designed to act with speed. If it is speed and speed alone that

you wish to have, why, of course, we should adopt the system of Hitler because we could get action and get it immediately. No one could debate any of his proposals. It was either "ja" or death—that was Mr. Hitler's cloture rule.

He had a very effective one. There is some complaint about the time that a Senator can speak. Some of the greatest speeches ever made in this body were not designed as what is commonly called a filibuster, but they would certainly be charged with being filibusters today.

Daniel Webster's great speeches often went anywhere from 4 to 8 hours in length. There are those today who say, "Well, that is too long; we will streamline the rules so no Senator can speak for longer than 1 hour."

Why not 5 minutes? Why not abolish all debate unless you are to have some rule that applies to debate in the Senate which will enable Senators to perform their duties?

Now, I do not wish to read into the record any large number of statements of eminent men of the past. One of those that appeals to me very much, because it was so concise and so thoughtful, was that made by Vice President Adlai Stevenson, who served under Grover Cleveland.

Mr. Stevenson had come up in the House of Representatives. He was an eminent Member of the House of Representatives, and he said—I shall not read it all—when he came to the Senate and when he first had to sit there in the chair and preside over the Senate, he thought that he had been deposited in the Cave of the Winds. He said that the lengthy speeches annoyed him and harassed him and were very distasteful to him. But when Mr. Stevenson stepped down out of the Vice Presidency he had changed his opinion as to the rules of the Senate.

I will read just a couple of short paragraphs from that statement because I think they are so touched with human wisdom:

"It must not be forgotten that the rules governing this body are founded deep in human experience; that they are the result of centuries of perilous effort in legislative halls to conserve, to render stable and secure the rights and liberties which have been achieved by conflicts.

"By its rules the Senate wisely fixes the limits of its own powers. To those who clamor against the Senate and its methods of procedure, it may be truly said, 'They know not what they do.' In this Chamber alone are preserved without restraint two essentials of wise legislation and of good government; the right of amendment and of debate. Grave evils often result from hasty legislation, rarely from the delay which follows discussion and deliberation.

"It is my humble judgment the historic Senate, preserving the unrestricted right of amendment and of debate, maintaining intact the time-honored parliamentarian methods and means which unfailingly secure action after deliberation, possesses in our scheme of government a value which cannot be measured by words."

The Senate of the United States, without any limitation of any kind, character, or description on the freedom of speech of its Members after 1806, served this country under the rule of unlimited debate to 1917. It went through the War of 1812 without the slightest restriction upon the freedom of debate in the Senate.

The Nation survived the horrible fratricidal strife of the sixties—during that period of time there was no limitation of debate upon the Members of the Senate. In 1917, as Senator Hayden has pointed out, we had the so-called armed shipping bill. Out of this came the first rule to restrict debate.

Of course, it afterward developed that the President had the power to arm the ships without any legislation, so the debate was futile, and the rule was adopted for a reason that did not exist, because he already had the power to arm the ships.

I do not propose to discuss the 1917 rule. I did hear the chairman say that all of the Members of the Senate at that time thought that they were imposing a rule that would limit debate on anything that came before the Senate.

Senator BENTON. I asked that as a question of Senator HAYDEN.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator BENTON. And the witnesses have indicated that that was their belief.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator BENTON. I cannot look into the minds of those 76 men, but——

Senator RUSSELL. That may well be. Of course, no man here can tell what was in the minds of all of those men. Each Senator who survives who was there in 1917 would know his thought and purpose. But in looking into the history of that rule I was impressed by the fact that the original rule, as introduced, said that whenever any petition, etc., shall be filed to bring debate on any issue to a conclusion—when it was brought before the Senate, the word "issue" as it appeared in the first draft had been changed to "measure." So it always occurred to me that some Senator, at least, may have known what he was doing, because the word "issue" would certainly have embraced a great deal more than the word "measure."

Senator BENTON. That is a very interesting point; and, of course, it goes back to my question to Senator HAYDEN whether some of the 76 men may have been conscious at the time of their vote of the loopholes that later developed. I suppose there is a presumption that not many of them could have been in that position. This presumption must apply to the great majority.

Senator RUSSELL. I shall not presume or conclude with respect to what was in their minds, but I think if you will look into it you will find the original cloture resolution that was introduced contained the word "issue," but when it came out on the floor for adoption it contained the word "measure."

It is proposed here by some of these resolutions that we adopt what is the equivalent of the previous-question rule in the Senate by a mere majority vote. There is no question in my mind that such action would be a deathblow to the Senate and could be a deathblow to our institutions of government.

It would immediately subordinate your whole legislative process to the whim and fancy of the party in power without regard to the violence of the change that might be proposed.

The Democratic Party has been in power for a good many years, but we must remember that we were not always in power, and it is very unlikely that we will always be in power. The rule of freedom of debate in the Senate has always prevented any effort in this country to threaten the American way of life or the American tradition through violent changes. It has deterred power-seeking Executives from even requesting legislation that is too drastic in its effect.

It has restrained them from seeking corruptive powers at the hands of the legislative branch, because any Chief Executive must have known that as long as there was freedom of debate in the Senate and courageous men in the Senate he would not only be thwarted, but that he would be discredited if he sought unconscionable power.

If the majority had the power, such as you have in your House of Representatives, to come in with a rule that even prevents an amendment to a bill, that the debate shall be very limited on a bill, and permit a bare majority to jam through such a proposal, not only would the Senate lose its value as a bulwark of individual liberty in this country, but it would be subordinated completely to the will of the party in power, and for that matter would be subordinated to the House of Representatives.

Senator MONRONEY. Would you elaborate on that, that subordination to the House of Representatives? Is that because the House has the power of the purse to originate all tax bills and appropriations?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; because it has constitutional powers to originate legislation; and, if you are going to base mandatory power on the rule of the bare majority, a majority of the House is larger than a majority of the Senate, and with the constitutional power they claim on appropriation bills—which I do not think they actually have, but there is no way to test it, because they will not take them up when you send them over there—but with the unquestioned power to originate revenue legislation, I think it would subordinate the Senate to the House of Representatives.

Senator MONRONEY. Plus the fact that the Speaker of the House is ahead of the President of the Senate in line of succession, too, now to the Presidency.

Senator RUSSELL. I think—well, not before the President of the Senate.

Senator MONRONEY. Of course.

Senator RUSSELL. The Vice President of the United States is next in line of succession. Of course, if the Vice President of the United States were to die during his term of office while the President was still alive, then it goes to the Speaker of the House, and I think that is very appropriate.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion here about the rule change which took effect in 1949, I believe it was, February 1949.

Up until that time, whether it was the intention or whether it was not—and I on my own part approved of the rule as it stood—the rules of the Senate made it impossible to apply any cloture rule to debate on a motion, and, under the ruling of the Senate which gave the highest priority to the discussion of the Journal of the preceding day's discussion, no cloture could be applied to amendments to the Journal in cases where there had been an adjournment. Of course, in more recent days that was always avoided, when a highly controversial issue was being brought up, by moving to recess rather than to adjourn.

The Journal was only used, I think, on two occasions as a means of delaying a vote in the Senate on highly controversial legislation.

There was a very determined effort made in 1949——

Senator BENTON. Excuse me; without an adjournment, was the old rule effective in achieving cloture? Was there no other loophole except the Journal?

Senator RUSSELL. There was no limitation of debate upon a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

Senator BENTON. So that you did not have to have the Journal?

Senator RUSSELL. It had been clearly held by two Presiding Officers, one of whom happened to belong to each of the major parties, that a petition for cloture or gag in the Senate did not apply to a motion to take up a bill but only to a measure when it had been made the unfinished business in the Senate.

Senator BENTON. So that there were two different ways in which a vote for cloture could be avoided?

Senator RUSSELL. That is right. But the one as to the Journal only applied where the Senate convened after an adjournment.

Senator BENTON. An adjournment?

Senator RUSSELL. And no majority leader who knew his way around would ever adjourn if he was going to bring up a bill that he knew was going to be debated at great length. However, a motion to amend the Journal did reckon rather prominently in one of the so-called filibusters of 1946.

Now, in 1949, when the resolution to change the rules was offered, there was a great division in the Senate. There were those, particularly those most responsive to the wishes of the President of the United States, who wished to change the rule and invoke cloture by a majority vote. This is really a previous-question rule for the Senate.

There were those who wished to apply cloture with two-thirds of those voting on all motions or issues which might arise in the course of parliamentary proceedings. There were those of us who were opposed to tampering with the rule, who believed in the time-honored tradition of the Senate as a body where Senators from sovereign States could express themselves as they saw fit upon any issue or measure that happened to come before the Senate.

The Senate was soon faced with a rather deplorable legislative situation. The different viewpoints were debated for some weeks.

During the course of that debate, as always happens, a number of informal conferences were held between Senators representing the conflicting viewpoints in an effort to arrive at some compromise which would enable the Senate to extricate itself from the position in which it found itself, break the deadlock, and get some changes in rules.

I do not recall all of those who sat in on those meetings. I know that the eminent majority leader, Mr. Lucas, of Illinois, at that time; and the minority leader, Mr. Wherry, of Nebraska; the majority whip, Senator Myers, of Pennsylvania; Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and I were present at practically all of the conferences, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, attended most of them.

Though I represented those who insisted on the right of unlimited debate, we finally, in the interest of compromise, agreed to accept a rule that would require three-fourths of the Members of the Senate chosen and sworn to impose cloture upon a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill or other legislative proposal not already covered by rule 22.

At one time we almost agreed on that at one of the conferences. Later, after each of the representatives had returned to their respective groups and discussed the matter with them, that agreement fell through. It was never put into effect.

Finally but reluctantly, those who believed in the traditional free debate in the Senate did agree to make a very substantial surrender of their position. We agreed to adopt a resolution which would make it possible to close debate and invoke gag rule on any proposition before the Senate with two-thirds of those chosen and sworn, with the exception of a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rules.

I ran through some of the hearings which you have had here before this distinguished committee—I did not read them all—and I was somewhat amazed by all of the curiosity that was expressed with respect to section 3 of rule 22. Witness after witness implied that it was something new in the rules. I think some of them referred to it as unconstitutional, and it was called a sleeper; one said it was a mockery of the rules.

Section 3 of rule 22 only expresses in clear terms the rule of the Senate as it has been in effect since its creation. It was adopted just after a vote in the Senate which had sustained the rule that you could not apply cloture to any motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill—I have forgotten the exact vote—I think it was 46 to 41. Section 3 had been the unbroken precedent of the Senate, and the Senate had been operating under that rule since 1807, and I was, therefore, astonished at the great surprise expressed with respect to section 3 of rule 22.

Senator BENTON. It was the contrast, was it not, to the 1917 agreement which caused the surprise?

Senator RUSSELL. Not the precedent that had grown out of the 1917 rule because under the 1917 rule cloture did not apply to any motion to take up any bill or resolution of any kind, whereas this rule merely——

Senator BENTON. This has been clearly brought out.

Senator RUSSELL (continuing). Reserved the right of unlimited discussion that had been in existence since the foundation of the Senate on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a rule change, while surrendering that right with respect to all other motions, legislation, and nominations or any other business that could possibly come before the Senate for transaction. To find that section was not a very remarkable discovery.

Many great Senators had served under that rule, and the parliamentary situation in the Senate with respect to motions to change the rule is the same as in the beginning of the Senate.

I am not the slightest bit ashamed to say, and indeed I derive great pride in saying, that I insisted upon having this clarifying language incorporated in the rule before any vote was had upon the change of the rules in order to eliminate any possible doubt about the right of unlimited debate on a motion to change the rules of the Senate.

Now, there is one other matter I would like to take up.

Senator BENTON. Senator SALTONSTALL told us the matter of section 3 was not discussed very much at these meetings, that it came in at the very last, more or less at the last minute; and that is where the word "sleeper" was used in our discussion, that section 3 was kind of a—not exactly an afterthought, but kind of a last decision at the last moment of the last meeting—without much consideration or discussion by the various men whom you have mentioned who were doing the conferring.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, it may be that the pitiful crumb of the right of debate that we were able to retain was so insignificant at the time that it did not create any very great excitement. It has certainly grown to monumental proportions since then, according to your record of these hearings.

Senator BENTON. I must say there has been a lot of interest in section 3 on the part of the witnesses before the committee; no doubt about that.

Senator RUSSELL. I think I have in my files—indeed I am sure I have them somewhere—the original proposition that I took down to the Sunday morning conference in Senator Lucas' office in the middle of that debate, where I had drafted a proposition for a three-fourths cloture, and the language of section 3 of rule 22 was included in that proposal, and it was in every written draft of a revision of the rules that I saw during those entire discussions. I did insist upon that protection against too hasty a change in the rules by any power-drunk and too arrogant majority of the moment in the Senate.

Now, I notice that a distinguished Senator came here before this committee and made some reference to some kind of a deal that he said was made during the course of these negotiations which had some effect upon the changes in the rule.

I regret that any Senator would have been deceived by an article that I first saw about a year after the rule was changed in the column of an irresponsible columnist.

I have some familiarity with the negotiations that took place. I had been selected as the chairman of a group that were opposed to imposing any further gag rule whatever in the Senate. I was also selected as the floor leader in that fight, and I attended all those conferences.

I never heard the first thing about the alleged deal affecting some powerline, as charged by the columnist, until after it appeared in this newspaper column quite some time after the vote on the cloture change as well as on the other issue referred to.

As a matter of fact, I looked into it at the time the article appeared to see the basis for the charge that certain southern Senators had been kept from voting by the persuasions of those who were advocating the powerline amendment. There were three other similar amendments that were voted on in the same bill and it so happened that more southern Senators voted on that particular amendment than voted on the other two.

Senator BENTON. Senator RUSSELL, if you glance at the testimony you will see that Senator MONRONEY and I expressed skepticism with respect to that charge, if only because of the very wide margin of the vote.

Senator RUSSELL. I just merely wish to observe that that statement is entirely false and without foundation; it is of the whole cloth; that is all there is to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabor this subject here. I am opposed to this change—any of these changes that are proposed in the rules——

Senator BENTON. How much difference in the rule do you think would there have been, in line with Senator HAYDEN'S previous testimony, by the change to the two-thirds of those present and voting, as advocated by Senators Wherry and HAYDEN?

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think it is such a substantial difference, I did not think so at the time. I thought that it might, in 1 of 15 to 20 cloture petitions, save advocates of free debate in the Senate from the imposition of cloture, but I do not consider it an earth-shaking difference.

When we surrendered the unlimited debate on all motions, when we surrendered the right to debate the Journal, when we surrendered the right to debate without limit the other ancillary motions in the Senate, we did insist upon a change to two-thirds of those chosen and sworn rather than two-thirds of those voting.

My recollections are not as fresh as in 1949—there has been a great deal of water over the dam since that time—up until that time I think there had been 21 votes on cloture; since then there have been 2. Out of 23——

Senator BENTON. That is right; that has been brought out.

Senator RUSSELL. Out of 23 votes on cloture, I think it has been imposed 4 times.

Senator BENTON. I am sorry, it was 19 before 1949 and 2 since, for a total of 21.

Senator RUSSELL. Is that right? Nineteen and two?

Senator BENTON. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. I was not sure.

Senator BENTON. Nineteen and two.

Senator RUSSELL. Cloture has been imposed 4 times. As I recall it, 3 times it got more than 64 votes, and the other time it got more than two-thirds, but it did not get two-thirds of those chosen and sworn.

Senator BENTON. Yes; that is right.

Senator RUSSELL. We have had two votes on cloture since the adoption of the new rule. If the rule had been adopted as it was originally proposed in the Hayden-Wherry resolution it would not have had the slightest effect upon those 2 votes. On one occasion there were 32 negative votes with the one Senator announced that he would vote in opposition, if present, so more than one-third of the whole Senate opposed cloture. On the other occasion, as I recall, there were either 33 or 34 who did vote in opposition, so the change in numbers required had no effect. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am at somewhat of a loss to understand why anyone would wish to change it from two-thirds of those chosen and sworn to two-thirds of those present and voting—why such person should be excited about it, because the rule has not failed as yet from their viewpoint. There has been no failure. I can understand how those who wish to transform the Senate into a body where debate can be limited to 5 minutes or even less, because if you ever start this movement, there is no telling where

you will wind up, I can understand why they would want to change the rule to majority gag of the Senate, but there is nothing that has occurred since the adoption of the rule that shows that even had it been adopted, as two-thirds of those voting, it would have affected the cloture votes that have been taken since 1949.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen a great many changes in this country. Back in 1925, I believe it was Vice President Dawes came into the Vice Presidency and he probably heard 3 or 4 long speeches, such as we have to listen to over there from day to day. He immediately became a great crusader to change the rules of the Senate.

He demanded that something be done to adopt a previous-question rule in the Senate. Well, if you look back even to the history of that period, you will find that there was a considerable discussion of it.

It is interesting to note that the principal organization in the Nation that came out and opposed it was the American Federation of Labor. They denounced Vice President Dawes for trying to gag the Senate as a threat to the rights of the people.

When you look at the composition of the Senate at that time you can understand why the American Federation of Labor felt that way about it. They did not know what kind of repressive legislation they might have gotten if the drive to gag the Senate by a mere majority vote had prevailed.

Senator BENTON. You think they thought the bankers were doing pretty well at that point in the twenties?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, they did not think that labor occupied quite as strong a position as it does today in our legislative scheme, so they were very much opposed to Vice President Dawes and to his suggestions.

Now, you had Mr. Walter Reuther here before this committee. I read his rather novel suggestion with a great deal of interest. He wants to just out of hand say, "Here are 49 men. We are going to just do whatever we wish to do right now with respect to these rules and legislation," without regard to anything that has ever transpired in this Senate and, as I think, without regard to the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps I should not have said that, because he said the Senate rules were not constitutional. I will say that I think that his suggestion is without doubt unconstitutional.

We will do well to bear in mind that the pendulum of politics in this country swings to and fro. Today Mr. Reuther, if he had 49 Senators who were subservient to the will of the CIO, would undoubtedly undertake to put through just such a change as he suggested here, and he would undoubtedly apply the most drastic limitations to debate whenever he had 49 votes favoring any bill which he thought was beneficial to labor.

But Mr. Reuther, despite his brilliance, might do well to look to human history. If free elections in this country are not abolished, it is wholly possible that due to some excesses, perhaps, by small minorities of labor, that you may elect a Senate where you would have 49 Senators who would be just as determined to strike down all of the laws for the benefit of labor that have been enacted in this country, particularly since 1933. Mr. Reuther then would be the first and the loudest to complain against any rule that would prevent any small group of courageous men who might be willing to express their opposition to any such action as that, from having the full right to do so in the Senate of the United States.

I noted with a great deal of interest, and I may say some surprise, that a large number of organizations representing those of the Jewish faith were here before the committee urging that freedom of debate in the Senate be further curtailed.

If there ever has been a people who have been subjected to terrible persecution down through the centuries, it is the Jews. The inhuman program of Hitler's in Germany, of course, could have been stopped if they had a parliamentary body of power and courage and freedom of speech, even though Hitler had controlled a majority of the membership.

Freedom of debate, as irksome as debate can be, as frustrating as it is to have to listen to long speeches is, in my opinion, essential to the salvation of this Nation. If you ever adopt a gag rule by a simple majority in the Senate of the United States, if you give a bare majority, drunk on power, the means to curtail criticism and prevent exposure of the real effect of the laws that they propose, if you ever deny full opportunity for the voice of reason and humanity to be heard in the Senate of the United States, we will have at last come to the end of this Republic.

An eminent Englishman, Lord Macaulay, came to this country in the 1850's and studied our institutions of government. He made a very significant statement in criticism of our form of government.

He said that "the Constitution of the United States is all sail and no anchor."

Senator BENTON. All sail and no what?

Senator RUSSELL. All sail and no anchor.

"When a society has entered on this downward progress either civilization or liberty must perish; either some Caesar or Napoleon would seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference: that the Huns and vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, but your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Lord Macaulay may have been a great student of government, but he overlooked the great anchor of individual liberty in this country, which is the Senate of the United States, and the rules under which it operates.

Mr. Chairman, these rules have enabled the Senate to function as a legislative body without any serious detriment to the welfare of the United States. They have enabled the Senate to discourage the temporary majority of the moment who seek drastic change for selfish reasons. Indeed, they are, so long as they are observed, a protection to the most fundamental rights of the American people.

Freedom of debate in the Senate, though it at times discourages changes, even though it has discouraged some that might be desirable—the good that flows from it far outweighs any ills that have ever been suffered under our rules, and in this day of change and passion, with the congregation of great numbers of people in small areas, it is the protection of all the rights and liberties that men have sacrificed for over thousands of years.

I am opposed, and shall oppose, any measure that will increase the likelihood of the application of gag rule in the Senate of the United States.

I thank you, sir, for the opportunity to be heard.

Senator BENTON. Thank you, Senator RUSSELL. I might say that much of your testimony is very eloquent indeed.

May I ask one question and then perhaps Senator MONRONEY [as others? We have had several witnesses here whose feelings have run high and, of course, their feelings have been generated by the operation of rule 22 to prevent the passage of civil-rights legislation; and some witnesses, including three distinguished Senators, have said that, if the only way out of this dilemma is to precipitate the issue on the floor, and wear out the opposition through breaking down a long filibuster, then they favor this direct and prolonged attack upon it.

Do you want to comment on this? It is in the minds of many people. Do you think such a procedure possible, at this time of world crisis? It would, in my judgment, make a spectacle of the United States Senate throughout the world that would not be an edifying one. I hope it can be avoided.

Some representatives of interested groups have come to me and have suggested that, as acting chairman of this committee, thanks to Senator HAYDEN's asking me to take the role, that I call upon the President and demand that he call the Senate back into session the minute we adjourn, so as to start this process of attrition. Attrition seems about the best word to apply to it.

Senator RUSSELL, this desire for a showdown is undercurrent that has run through much of the testimony. Perhaps, as our final witness, with all your experience, you would like to comment on it.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I could not comment with any certitude of correctness as to who would prevail in a struggle of that kind. I have seen similar contests waged on the floor of the Senate of the United States. They always are very, very distasteful to me. I dislike very much ever to be involved in that kind of struggle. But I have unavoidably been cast in that role. I think I was completely justified, and I have no apologies whatever to make for a single course that I have pursued in any of those contests. I really do not know who would prevail if the President called Congress back into extra session.

I do know that the contest which took place in 1949 when we finally did exact the present rule practically destroyed the legislative usefulness of that Congress for that session. The physical and nervous strain upon Members of the Senate was very great.

Of course, I know all about this as an argument for civil rights legislation. I had not mentioned it. I have no hesitancy though in saying that in my judgment it is dictated in large part by ignorance and in large part by desire for political advantage.

I have never thought that any condition obtains in any part of this country affecting the rights of any large number of our people that justifies all of the furore of this so-called civil rights movement. Civil rights is a very euphonious title. It is one that appeals to every American citizen. Every American is in favor of more and bigger and better civil rights, but it becomes a question as to whose civil rights, when you attempt to give doubtful civil rights to one group by various means, where that action infringes upon the civil rights of others. You must consider the effect of high-handed and drastic legislative action upon the sum total of the liberties of the American people.

It is natural for people to support their own convictions. Hitler in Germany may have been convinced that he was doing what was in the best interest of the German people. We think his acts were those of a monster.

I think that this agitation, in view of the very amicable relations between the races in this country—finer than they have ever been in any other part of the world where there was a comparable situation to that which we have in the United States—has damaged rather than bettered the cause of all civil rights.

We never had a time in this country under any system of government where the people at the bottom of the economic heap have had absolutely all their civil rights. It does not matter whether they are white or black or yellow, they have never had them.

In my own State, I know that there is a poor white man for every poor Negro in Georgia, and you are not going to help the situation by entering into the field of work relationships with a law designed to give special priorities to any one of the groups. The road to a perfect civilization is slow and

tortuous, it has ever been so, and we will have to view this thing from the standpoint of all the people and try to improve the conditions of all of them. If you ever start into this business of doing this for that group and that for that, why, you will only aggravate the injustices, the net aggregate of the injustices, of humanity.

Senator BENTON. But specifically on my question, out of your long experience, do you think the group that shares your views is sufficiently large so that it would be impossible to get the rule changed by the procedures of attrition that have been suggested to this committee?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I should certainly hope so, Mr. Chairman, and would exert every effort within my power to see that it was not possible to do so.

Senator BENTON. I am sure that you would.

Senator RUSSELL. In my opinion, you cannot do it by calling an extra session of Congress; you will not do it in 2 months if you are talking about calling the Congress here in November to take it up.

Senator BENTON. I reluctantly agree on that.

Senator RUSSELL. It may be possible to change the rules by that means. I hope I am spared that kind of test, but if it must come, I shall meet it squarely.

Senator BENTON. Such a test, it is claimed, would be a great educational experience for the American people. Even the people in your State, it is suggested, would be affected by it to the point where if it could be kept up long enough there would be a greater hope to get the rule changed.

Senator RUSSELL. There is no question in my mind that the net damage done to the welfare of the United States would be many, many times greater than any good that could possibly be derived from such a trial by exhaustion.

Senator BENTON. There is no doubt that such a test would be at a great cost.

Senator RUSSELL. No doubt about that.

Senator BENTON. On the other hand, the feeling runs high on this subject, and the demand is widespread that the test be made.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; I am aware of that.

Senator BENTON. The proponents feel the reward would be great, so it is a question of balancing the risk and the cost against the hope of reward.

Senator RUSSELL. I think they would be terribly disappointed. Even if they prevailed, they would be terribly disappointed, and there is no doubt in my mind that the cost would be far greater than any benefit that might be derived. But then I do not control those matters, and I must face these issues as they come.

Senator MONRONEY. Much of Mr. Reuther's testimony before the committee was based on the fact that the Senate was not a continuing body and, therefore, that our rules automatically expired with each new session of the Congress. I took issue with him on that point.

You, being a greater student of our rules and traditions and all, I mean, it would reverse precedent since the beginning of the Senate, would it not?

Senator RUSSELL. Not only reverse precedent, it would destroy the very intention of the Founding Fathers to have a continuing body.

Senator MONRONEY. That is why they are elected for 6 years.

Senator RUSSELL. That was shown by the debates at the Constitutional Convention, that it was intended to be a continuing body.

I think Reuther or someone else said, some rule of the Senate was unconstitutional. I have forgotten what witness it was.

Senator MONRONEY. That was Mr. Reuther.

Senator RUSSELL. If there is any one thing that is clear under the Constitution, it is that any rule a majority of the Senate sees fit to adopt is beyond the purview of any court or Executive. Who is going to write the rules of the Senate? Is the Senate to write them or are you to delegate to the President or the Supreme Court or some new agency that power? The Constitution says that we write the rules; we are the judge, and we fix our rules. Any rule that is fixed, however fantastic it might be, is completely protected, in my judgment, under the Constitution; but I do not think that the rules that we have are in anywise fantastic. They are much more restrictive than I would like to have them.

Senator MONRONEY. His position was something I had not heard of, that the Senate itself by a majority vote could declare its own rules unconstitutional, and therefore they would be automatically repealed, and it would be wide open then for the adoption of new rules, as I understood the testimony.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, of course, if you had Members of the Senate who were utterly without conscience in such a responsibility, you could pass a constitutional amendment by a mere majority vote—if you finally got your rules in such shape that you could do it that way, by perversion of the Journal and other means. You might also do it by a trial of brute strength, such as the duello, as you had, I believe it was, in an early French Assembly, when one party would bring in the best swordsman they could find to challenge the most able man on the other side, and then liquidate him and get him out of the way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. All the speakers are limited rather sharply in their time. The Chair feels compelled to protect them. If Senators feel it necessary to conduct private conversations, they should retire from the Chamber.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has presented the issues of his side of the argument on the question most eloquently and ably. However, I think it should be realized that the question before the Senate is not a matter of free debate; it is not a question of what the rules shall be. The question is whether the Senate in this Congress or the Senate in any other Congress has the right to make its own rules. The question is not whether the Senate will change its rules. The motion now before the Senate could be agreed to, and the Senate could then adopt the same rules.

I say that a Member of the Senate today should have the same right to adopt rules as did those Senators of years past, who conceived the present rules. I, as one Senator, resent the fact that the dead hand of Calhoun or Clay or any other distinguished former Senator can dictate to me the rules under which I must operate. The other Members of this body, including the new Senators who were sworn in yesterday, have the constitutional right, whether they choose to exercise it or not, to have a voice in determining the rules of the Senate.

An argument has been presented here about free debate. We are not threatening the concept of free debate. I am certain that I speak for all of my colleagues in stating that every Senator should have ample opportunity to debate. But I emphatically do not believe that one Senator or a small group of Senators should have the right to debate endlessly, in the form of a talkathon, for the purpose of avoiding a vote.

If the Senate, in adopting its rules, should decide that this body has the right to allow a small minority to dominate the Senate by blocking a vote, and invalidating the will of the majority, and if all Senators have the opportunity to participate in the adoption of such a rule, then that would be the will of the Senate.

I repeat, therefore, that the question before the Senate is not one of free debate. The question is whether the Senate has the right to determine the rules under which it will operate. Today the Senate deals with issues and problems of which our forefathers never dreamed. We do not live in a static society; our civilization is moving and dynamic. Therefore, the rules of the Senate can be changed, and the new Members of the Senate have as much right to participate in determining those rules as the first Senators who were elected to this body.

Today this Nation occupies the role of world leader. Today this Nation is confronted with problems and situations, many of which require quick and decisive action. A rule which allows a small minority to thwart the will of the Senate, so that a vote may not be taken, destroys the very concept of democratic government.

The people of the State of Michigan who have communicated with me resent the fact that their Senators are prohibited by a talkathon from voting on any issues, major or minor. They cannot understand why a few Senators, not for the purpose of informing the country, not for the purpose of enlightenment, but for the purpose of keeping the Senate from voting, can prevent this entire body from exercising their right to vote on those issues.

I respectfully remind my Republican colleagues that many of them ran for election on, and the rest of us campaigned enthusiastically for, the program of President Eisenhower. A vital portion of that program is the proposed legislation dealing with civil rights. I say to my colleagues that they will never have an opportunity to vote on a civil-rights measure in the Senate unless rule 22 is changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, every Senator who has told his constituents "I want to be reelected so I can support and carry out the Eisenhower program," should in all conscience support the pending motion. That motion will enable the Senate of the United States to express in democratic fashion its will in

regard to proposed civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, there are many other reasons for supporting the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; but if for none other than that of making President Eisenhower's objectives on civil rights a reality, I strongly urge support of the pending motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, the purpose of the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is to have the Senate adopt rules at the opening of the first session of each new Congress. This, if carried out, will establish a new precedent. For more than 150 years the Senate has always continued its rules from session to session, because although a session may adjourn sine die, the Senate itself as a body continues. It does not die. There never is a new Senate; there is merely a change in one-third of its Members. There is always a Senate, just as there is always a Supreme Court.

The pending motion involves a very fundamental question. We must consider it as a problem which relates to the Senate itself under the Constitution in accordance with precedents built up over the years; and we must reach our decision on a basis which will act to continue our democratic form of government to the best advantage.

I want to decide the question on this basis, and not on the basis of any action the Senate may or may not take on the problem of civil rights. I am confident that my own record on the subject of civil rights, both as an official of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and as a United States Senator, makes abundantly clear my own sentiments and sympathies on that vital issue. Before this session is completed, I hope to be able to vote on sound civil-rights legislation which properly should be enacted in areas in which the Federal Government is responsible. I trust that such measures may be passed by this Congress.

I have also long been interested in improving the rules of the Senate, especially rule 22, in ways which will be designed to permit reasonable limitation of debate after proper opportunity for full expression by all Members desiring to speak. I am personally very anxious to see rule 22 amended. In 1947 and in 1949, I filed resolutions to improve the cloture procedure, particularly with relation to a motion to take up a pending bill. Before the rule was changed in 1951, rule 22 was practically inoperative. In making cloture possible upon a motion to take up a measure, the rule was altered so as to make a constitutional two-thirds necessary to permit cloture, and not to permit cloture upon amendments to the rules themselves. I personally want to see rule 22 further amended so as to make it more simple to foreclose debate and yet not deprive the minority of all safeguards and rights.

It is my understanding that the proponents of the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico do not argue against the concept of the Senate as a continuing body. Hence the question is presented in a somewhat different form from the one in which it was presented in 1953. At that time there was considerable discussion as to whether the Senate was a continuing body simply because two-thirds of its membership continued. Now the question becomes one as to whether the Senate, itself continuing, continues its rules or whether new rules are to be adopted at the beginning of each new session.

Can a parliamentary body continue without any rules on which to proceed? Continuous existence implies potential continuous functioning. Are not continuing rules as essential to a continuing body as tracks to a moving locomotive? It seems to me clear that a distinction must be drawn between what is action and what is procedure. Rules are established to permit a parliamentary body to proceed to take action. Rules themselves do not constitute action. They are simply the tools by which a parliamentary body proceeds to take action. In the brief submitted by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the Vice President, this distinction, in my opinion, is not made clear. In the brief several instances are cited which appear to me to relate to actions taken by the Senate, rather than to its procedures. These are cited as examples to show that the Senate really starts afresh, and does not continue. I refer to the failure of the Senate to continue certain actions which formerly were carried on jointly with the House of Representatives, and to an action taken to discontinue a printer who was given a job by the Senate at a previous session. In one of these instances the Senate acted affirmatively to change an action it previously had taken in another session. In the other, the Senate refused to act, and thereby terminated a joint action with the House.

I mention these instances because they show a confusion, in my opinion, in the minds of the proponents of this motion as to the essential difference between rules set up to permit a parliamentary body to continue to act and actions taken by that body. Certainly one Senate cannot bind a future Senate by its actions, but that does not mean that the rules of the Senate do not continue until amended or rescinded.

The Founding Fathers in adopting the Constitution deliberately constituted the Senate in such a way that only one-third of its membership would be elected every 2 years. This was done purposely to permit the democratic processes in the Senate to be more consistent, more stable, and less liable to sudden changes, as opposed to the procedure in the House of Representatives, which was to be completely changed by new elections every 2 years. This principle has now been carried forward for some 160 years. It has worked well during that period of time.

The purpose of the continuing Senate under the Constitution is to make sure that our system of government shall not stop when a session of Congress closes. In the days before the 20th amendment to the Constitution, the Senate sat after the House recessed, to fulfill its duties of confirming Executive appointments. There is always a Senate, just as there is always a Supreme Court.

The action of legislative bodies ultimately is the result of the compromise of the views of its membership until a result is obtained. The faith of our fathers in the democratic processes has built this country to its present greatness. The pride of each one of us in being a Member of the United States Senate comes from the fact that over the years the Senate has, on the whole, acted wisely and well. If we are to provide that the Senate, while a continuing body, may adopt new rules at the opening of each session, we take away from it the continuity of its procedure as a legislative body, and we make it possible to have sudden changes in the rules which may completely alter the procedures under which the Senate acts.

Today the proponents argue that we should adopt a new set of rules because the present rule 22 permits a minority of Senators too much power in preventing the passage of sound civil-rights measures. The proponents also argue that the rules can never be changed by any future Senate action, because they say a minority can prevent, and intends to prevent, a change in the rules. To me, this shows a confusion between what the proponents believe the Senate should do in passing proposed legislation and what they believe regarding whether the Senate shall continue in the form established by the Founding Fathers of the Constitution, by continuing its rules of procedure.

Over the years, the Senate has amended its rules many times. Rule 22 was first established in 1917, with only three dissenting votes, after an agreement had been reached to establish the rule. It was amended in 1949, after a long filibuster, because a large majority of the Senators agreed that the rule was impractical when it did not apply to a motion to take up a measure. Now, again, there is an opportunity by observing the proper legislative procedures to amend rule 22. I want to help amend this rule, but I do not want to help amend the rule by altering the Senate procedures so as possibly in the future to give the Senate a different form, as a parliamentary body, from the form which was established in the Constitution, and which has endured since 1789.

If the precedent which the proponents wish to establish today is established—namely, that of adopting a complete set of new rules at the start of each new session, then the Senate may not be able to function for some days or weeks. Its rules, too, might well be constantly changing. A majority at the start of each session could establish its own set of rules. This certainly would end the continuity of the Senate, and might diminish its operating effectiveness.

Under the present rules, its committees do continue. I am personally on three investigating committees which

continue into the 85th session. If this motion prevails, these committees cease to exist, and will have to be revived. Treaties continue before the Senate, even though new hearings are started on them. So it is clear that the Senate itself continues; and, I repeat, if the Senate itself is a continuing parliamentary body, how can it operate unless it has rules of procedure which continue with it?

I, therefore, shall vote to lay the pending motion on the table. I do so with the hope that rule 22 may be amended to make it more workable, and I do so with the expectation that the Senate will act on civil-rights legislation at this session. But my vote to lay on the table will be cast with the conviction that it is in the best interests of the democratic procedures set up under the Constitution, procedures that have made it possible for our Government to continue in a stable manner and more consistently over the years, just as our forefathers intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the Senator from New Mexico, I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the simple, fundamental issue in this debate, to my mind, is whether the Senate of the United States approves filibusters. Shorn of all legalistic argument, that is what is being decided here today.

Yesterday a number of us, from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, coauthored a motion, which reads:

> In accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

Mr. President, that proposed motion rests upon the American Constitution, which provides that each House of the Congress may adopt its rules. The House of Representatives has seen fit, over the years, to exercise the right given to it by the Constitution. The Senate of the United States, by acquiescence, by inaction, has continued in effect, tacitly, the rules of prior years.

Mr. President, the old rules of the United States Senate have permited filibustering, to which some of us earnestly and vigorously object. What is a filibuster? My definition would be that it is irrelevant speechmaking in the Senate, designed solely and simply to consume time, and thus to prevent a vote from being taken on pending legislation. To my mind a filibuster is an affront to the democratic processes and to the intelligence of the people of the United States.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to stop a filibuster in all instances; and, under the old rules, absolutely impossible to stop filibusters in some instances. I refer, Mr. President, to rule 22 of the rules of the Senate. That rule provides that a constitutional two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, or 64 Senators, are required to vote in favor of so-called cloture, after which, in accordance with the rule, if 64 Senators so vote, each Senator has an additional hour of debate.

That is a higher standard than is required of the United States Senate in sitting as a court of impeachment to find a constitutional officer guilty, and to eliminate him from his official responsibilities. The Constitution of the United States provides that, sitting as a court of impeachment, the Senate of the United States shall find a man guilty merely by two-thirds of those present. That is not 64 votes. That is not a constitutional two-thirds. That, by the Constitution itself, is two-thirds of those Senators present and voting.

I also observe, for the benefit of my colleagues, that a declaration of war, requires but a majority of those present and voting in each House of the Congress of the United States. Why should we have more stringent rules to bring issues to finality?

Mr. President, there is a joker in rule 22. It has been alluded to in this debate. The fact is that in section 3 of rule 22, it is specifically provided that any motion to change the rules of the Senate is not subject to cloture at all; and that means, of course, it is possible to filibuster to death, ad infinitum, any motion which might be made to change the rules.

Let me again recall the sturdy words of a distinguished American citizen, a great Republican of his day, the late Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, who said years ago:

> I will state the principal objections to the Senate rules as they stand:
>
> 1. Under these rules individuals or minorities can at times block the majority in its constitutional duty and right of legislation. They are therefore enabled to demand from the majority modifications in legislation as the price which the majority must pay in order to proceed to the fulfillment of its constitutional duty. The right of filibuster does not affect simply legislation defeated but, in much greater degree, legislation passed, continually weaving into our laws, which should be framed in the public interest alone, modifications dictated by personal and sectional interest as distinguished from the public interest.
>
> 2. The Senate is not and cannot be a properly deliberative body, giving due consideration to the passage of all laws, unless it allots its time for work according to the relative importance of its duties, as do all other great parliamentary bodies. It has, however, through the right of unlimited debate, surrendered to the whim and personal purposes of individuals and minorities its right to allot its own time. Only the establishment of majority cloture will enable the Senate to make itself a properly deliberative body. This is impossible when it must sit idly by and see time needed for deliberation frittered away in frivolous and irrelevant talk, indulged in by individuals and minorities for ulterior purposes.
>
> 3. The rules subject the people of the United States to a governmental power in the hands of individuals and minorities never intended by the Constitution and subversive of majority rule under constitutional limitation. In the words of Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania:
>
> "The Senate, by sanctioning unlimited debate and by requiring a two-thirds vote to limit it, has in effect so amended the Constitution as to make it possible for a 33-percent minority to block legislation."
>
> 4. The present rules put into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President of the United States, and enabled them to compel the President to call an extra session of Congress in order to keep the machinery of Government itself in functioning activity. The reserved power of the States in the Constitution does not include the power of one of the States to elect a Senator who shall at times control a majority or even all the other States.
>
> 5. Multiplicity of laws is one of the admitted evils from which this country is suffering today. The present rules create multiplicity of laws.
>
> 6. The present rules are not only a departure from the principles of our constitutional Government but from the rules of conduct consistent therewith which governed the United States Senate for the first 17 years of its existence and which provided for majority cloture.

Mr. President, I devotedly believe in full and complete debate on every issue confronting the Senate and the American people. So, I feel assured, do all of us. But that is a far different thing from a situation where Senators speak for long hours, and sometimes for long days and long weeks, not to argue the merits or demerits of a public question, but solely and only to waste and consume time, and thus to frustrate and prevent a final decision by the Senate on an issue before it. How can any reasonable person uphold such tactics as that which occurred some years ago when the Senate ludicrously debated for 2 weeks a motion to amend the Chaplain's prayer?

In my first year in the United States Senate I saw a filibuster. I saw the Senate sit for 24 hours a day, never stopping, in an attempt to wear down physically the filibustering Senators, so that through sheer physical exhaustion, and nothing else, the filibuster might be broken and a vote be taken on a bill, incidentally, which had the enthusiastic support of a great majority of us.

I decline to accept the parliamentary theory that a physically and mentally exhausted Senate should be a prerequisite to a vote being taken on any matter. Furthermore, I hardly think that an exhausted Senate can intelligently pass bills.

It is argued that the Senate is a continuing body, and therefore a motion such as has been made cannot be in order under the old rules. Certainly under the terms of the Constitution our motion is in order. What more authority do we need?

I wish to refer to the distinguished late Vice President, Alben Barkley, who said, when he sat in the presiding officer's chair, and I read from page 10 of the proceedings of January 3, 1953:

> The organization of the Senate is an inherent right of the Senate, as it is of any sovereign body, and all that has taken place up to date has been under that inherent right.

Our motion is grounded upon the American Constitution, and it is upon that basis that I deny that this motion is out of order. Years ago I was a member of the California State Senate. That

senate is composed of 40 members. The California constitution provides that each 2 years half of them, or 20 members, shall be elected. The rules of the Senate of the State of California, in which I sat for a few years, provided then, as they provide now, that at the beginning of each session of the legislature the Senate shall adopt its rules of procedure.

Four years ago, when I was a new Member of the Senate, the same question was before us. I took the position then that I take today, and I believe sincerely that I do so completely in the public interest. Two of us who cast our vote then, in that fashion, here on the Republican side, are here today, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and myself.

We will not be so lonely today. I am proud of the greatly increased support both sides of the aisle are showing for their cause now.

I am proud to say that I cast my vote according to my own conscience. No one intimidates me. No one bullies me into taking positions on public questions. I devoutly believe that the motion which some of us have made ought to be adopted, making the pending business the consideration of adoption of rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress.

Meanwhile, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has made a motion to lay our recommendation on the table. I vigorously object to that motion, and I hope that a majority of my brethern on this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle will join in defeating the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to conclude my comments by placing in the RECORD at this point several paragraphs by a distinguished Republican Senator, the late Henry Cabot Lodge, who spoke up vigorously against the filibuster.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Of the two rights (of debating and of voting) that of voting is the higher and more important. We ought to have both, and debate certainly in ample measure; but, if we are forced to choose between them, the right of action must prevail over the right of discussion. To vote without debating is perilous, but to debate and never vote is imbecile.
>
> As it is, there must be a change, for the delays which now take place are discrediting the Senate, and this is greatly to be deplored. The Senate was perhaps the greatest single achievement of the makers of the Constitution, and anything which lowers it in the eyes of the people is a most serious matter. * * * A body which cannot govern itself will not long hold the respect of the people who have chosen it to govern the country.

If the position we take in the debate is upheld by a majority of Senators, we can, I feel assured, look forward to full and complete debate on every issue, but without the evil of filibustering.

DEFEAT OF SENATOR WELKER OF IDAHO

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I intend to speak very briefly on a subject which we are not discussing today. I should like to express my regret at the loss of a great Senator and a great statesman. He has been replaced by a young man who, I assume though I know nothing about him, has plenty of ability or he would not be here. What I say is not in criticism of the successor of the great Senator Welker.

We have lost a man who had the rare combination of good commonsense and guts, a combination we seldom find in Washington. We find plenty of brains and plenty of guts, but we so very seldom find them combined. That combination was represented in Senator Welker.

Why did we lose him? I think the answer is to be found in a most unusual occurrence during the last election campaign. We have often seen Presidents try to purge Members of the Senate. President Franklin Roosevelt gave us an example of that. Roosevelt, however, attempted his purges in the primaries, before a general election. When he was unsuccessful in the primaries, he did not try to purge them in the general election in favor of Republicans.

This year, I believe for the first time in the history of the country, we saw the President trying to purge a member of his own party after the primary. As the President knows, the Senate was organized by the Democrats yesterday. They took over the chairmanships of all the committees, and took over control of all the machinery of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 additional minute to me

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. When we look to see who is at fault for allowing the Democrats to gain control of the Senate during a Republican administration, we see that the key struggle was in Idaho, between former Senator Welker and Mr. CHURCH. Had Mr. Welker been elected, the Republicans would control all the committees, and all the machinery of the Senate.

In a planted article on October 26, very carefully timed after the Republican primary election, Mr. Paul Hoffman—a real throwback on the human race if ever there was one, who came in under the Democrat administration, and who was converted to be an Eisenhower Republican, referred to Senator Welker as—

> a man of dangerous thinking and reckless conduct.

Hoffman stated that Senator Welker had no place in the Republican Party. This would not mean much if it were only Mr. Hoffman saying it, but there was a carefully planned news conference immediately afterwards, at which President Eisenhower placed his stamp of approval on this article that attempted to read out of the Republican Party a man who was fighting for his political life as a candidate of that party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCARTHY. This Hoffman article would be harmless except that it had the approval of President Eisenhower at a time when Senator Welker was fighting for his political life. The outcome of that decision determined the control of the Senate.

The article by Hoffman was circulated by the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a completely left-wing group. Hoffman contributed to it. Archibald MacLeish, of unlamented fame, and Elmer Davis, formerly of OWI, raised money in New York, as did a group in the Waldorf Towers, all with the blessing of the White House palace guard, and sent it to Idaho, to defeat Senator Welker. So the control of the Senate today, by the Democrats, is the direct responsibility of a so-called Republican President. Eisenhower did not do it inadvertently. He did it deliberately. He knew what he was doing.

It might be well, Mr. President, to ask just why the White House palace guard considered Senator Welker "a man of dangerous thinking and reckless conduct," to quote the Hoffman article. Why did the White House want to get rid of him? Certainly not because of his position on domestic matters; Senator Welker's views on domestic legislation generally coincided with those of the administration. In several other areas, however, Senator Welker did indeed take issue with the administration line. He was, for example, a strong supporter of the Bricker amendment. Welker, along with a majority of the Members of this body, wanted to put a constitutional limit on the treatymaking powers of the executive branch. This, evidently, represented dangerous thinking and reckless conduct in the eyes of the White House palace guard. Senator Welker also had the temerity to oppose vast outlays in economic aid to neutralist and pro-Communist nations. Another example, in the view of the White House palace guard of dangerous thinking and reckless conduct. Senator Welker was also a vigorous opponent of the Status of Forces Treaty, which, as the Senators know, may subject American uniformed men to cruel and unusual punishment for alleged crimes committed in foreign lands. I would remind the Senators that this treaty has particular relevance today when the President is asking for authority to use American troops in the Middle East area, a policy that may result in the occupation of some of those areas by American men. In some Near Eastern countries, the theft of an orange from an ox-cart may be punished by cutting off the thief's arm. Senator Welker's efforts to protect American men in such circumstances against the possibility of cruel and unusual punishment represents, according to the White House palace guard, dangerous thinking and reckless conduct.

Finally, let us remember that Senator Welker was an outspoken and hard-hitting fighter in the campaign to root Communists out of Government. For that, too, he is considered a man of dangerous thinking and reckless conduct. For that, too, he was purged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from California as much time as he may desire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that in fairness a statement of the facts of the situation should be made. Later I shall have material to place in the RECORD, but I now make the statement that during the course of the recent campaign I spoke in the State of Idaho on behalf of the reelection of the Republican nominee, Mr. Welker. While there I had given to me by one of the supporters of Senator Welker, one of his local managers, a letter that had been written by the President of the United States on behalf of Senator Welker, which letter I personally read to the group at the meeting I was then attending. I think it is necessary, on behalf of the President of the United States, to clarify the record, and to state that he did write a letter in support of the reelection of Senator Welker.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Senator is aware of the fact that the statements which I have made have not been idly made. The President, in a news conference—and this is all a matter of record—placed his stamp of approval on the article by Hoffman, which attempted to read Senator Welker out of the Republican Party. Moreover, Eisenhower-for-President groups in Idaho worked against Senator Welker. They got the word directly and indirectly from the mouth of the President, that Welker did not belong in the new Republican Party. The White House palace guard encouraged the raising of money in New York, to be sent into Idaho to defeat Welker and elect a Democrat.

President Eisenhower may have written some milk-and-water letter to try to absolve himself, but he sent the direct word down the line that Herman Welker was not a good Republican.

As I have said, Senator Welker supported Eisenhower in most of his domestic objectives. He opposed him in some of the harebrained things, such as the President's opposition to the Bricker amendment. Welker opposed the Status of Forces Treaty. He differed with him honestly and sincerely on the question of how much foreign aid should be granted, and where the money should be spent. Because of that he was termed a man of "dangerous thinking and reckless conduct," characterization that got the approval of Eisenhower, after the question was raised by Pete Brant, a reporter for the St. Louis leftwing Post-Dispatch.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the limitation of debate in effect today, we shall not have an opportunity to discuss that subject. First of all, however, I wish to say that I did go to the State of Idaho in behalf of Senator Welker, who was the Republican nominee in that State. I followed a similar course in the case of other Senators; I went into their States and spoke in favor of their candidacy as strongly as I could.

At the time I spoke in behalf of Senator Welker I did read a letter written by the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 24, 1956.

The Honorable HERMAN WELKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HERMAN: I know that you are vigorously engaged in a campaign for reelection and that your record in the Senate over the past few years is bound to be an issue.

Of course, you and I have differed on certain issues in the past 3½ years, and I have been informed that these differences are being exploited in this campaign. Unfortunately, little recognition has been given to the many times you have wholeheartedly supported the administration in advancing key parts of its program. This distortion of your record is a disservice to the people of Idaho, and the purpose of this letter is to set the record straight.

I hope that your service to our country is continued in the United States Senate.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not approve of the article which was written by Mr. Hoffman. I have expressed myself in that regard both publicly and privately. I do not believe that article represents the views of the President of the United States.

Nevertheless, at a later time, perhaps, we can go into a more detailed discussion of the subject. In the meantime, I did not want any unfairness to be implied to the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to become involved in any differences across the aisle. However, I do wish to commend publicly the citizens of Idaho for sending to the Senate a very able young man. I heard him speak before the Women's National Press Club last evening. I know of no Member who has entered the Senate since I have been here who has greater promise than he has. I believe that the people of the State of Idaho will be very proud of the kind of representation he will give them.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 10 seconds to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to yield 10 seconds to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say that what I have said is not intended as any reflection on Mr. CHURCH. I do not know him. I assume that very likely he is a fine young man, or he would not have been elected by the people of Idaho. I was very happy that he defeated Taylor in the primaries.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall be very brief today.

The issue actually before us—whether or not the Senate is to begin this new session by adopting its rules—has been so clarified by many Senators of greater experience than mine in these matters that there is little which I would presume to add to the discussion.

I may merely say, however, that if the obscurity of elaborate legal, historical, and theoretical arguments is cleared away, commonsense shows the absurdity of the contention that the Senate is unable to adopt new rules at the beginning of each session.

The Constitution commands the Senate to adopt its rules, but on the so-called continuing body theory, no Senator alive today, or indeed since the organization of the first Senate, need ever have had any voice in the adoption of these rules. Imagine, Mr. President, that in a national calamity, the roof of this Chamber should cave in on the entire assembled membership of the United States Senate today. The Governors of the 48 States each would have to send to Washington two brandnew Senators to fill our unexpired terms. Yet, under the theory of those who oppose the authority of the Senate to adopt new rules under the Constitution, our 96 successors would be unable to adopt new rules. They would be bound by the rules of prior Congresses, including rule 22 which is designed to make it impossible to change the rules as long as an opponent of change is able to stand and to speak.

While such a catastrophe is, of course, inconceivable, Mr. President, it does illustrate why we who are assembled here today—who have all been elected since the adoption of the present rule 22—must surely have the authority to proceed to adopt our rules to govern our deliberations in the 85th Congress.

Nevertheless, it is possible that a majority of us may vote today not to proceed with this authority. In that case, I believe an amendment to rule 22 should be subsequently introduced and taken up, as early as possible, under the regular procedures. I am prepared to sponsor such an amendment, along with any other Senators who may wish to join in pressing for such an amendment.

Of course, a change in rule 22 then would have to be debated under rule 22, which has been carefully designed to permit unlimited and endless debate. Undoubtedly, opponents of the rule change would resort to the unlimited and endless debate permitted by rule 22. Nothing, in my opinion, could more emphatically be calculated to arouse American public opinion against rule 22 than to have rule 22 put into effect for 3 or 4 weeks in the United States Senate. This would be particularly true if the provisions of rule 22 were invoked to defend the continued and indefinite existence, far into the future, of rule 22 itself.

In other words, endless debate might be used to protect the privilege of endless debate. I doubt if America would rejoice in this spectacle, yet just such a

spectacle may be needed to alert America to precisely what rule 22 actually means.

Mr. President, let me ask a series of questions which, I hope, will place in proper perspective the elaborate claims and arguments which are made to support the idea, unique to the United States Senate, that nothing less than an unachievable two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate should be able to reach the decision that a subject has been adequately debated, and that the time thus has come to vote.

Are there not many decisions made in our democratic processes which are as important as the decision to stop talking in the Senate? If rule 22 is wise and right, why not extend its scope beyond the mere confines of the Senate Chamber?

Why not require a two-thirds majority before a citizen can be elected President or Vice President—yes, or even Senator, to come here and enjoy the perennial debating opportunities provided by rule 22?

If it is the course of wisdom to require a two-thirds vote of all Senators before debate can be shut off, why not make a two-thirds majority the requirement in all fundamental decisions reached in this great country? Thus, we would have to keep on holding elections until one candidate received two-thirds of the total number of possible voters—including those who do not vote—or the office would remain permanently vacant. This makes just as much sense as rule 22. Why require two-thirds merely to bring to a close debate in the Senate, but only a simple majority for election to the highest elective office on earth, the American Presidency

What about applying to these other spheres the whole idea of unlimited debate and endless discussion?

We now hold elections on fixed dates, such as November 6, 1956, or some other prescribed occasion. But what if one of the candidates felt on that day—Heaven forbid—that he had not said all there was to say? Suppose he had a few more speeches in his system? Why not postpone the election indefinitely, ad infinitum, until the very last word had been spoken exhaustively on all possible subjects?

Would this not be merely extending rule 22 to the realm of decisions outside the Senate Chamber?

If rule 22 should govern the United States Senate, why stop there?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the mere presentation of these questions may serve to highlight the actual absurdity of a rule which is designed specifically to allow unlimited debate in the Senate, and through this privilege to prevent any rollcall or voice vote on an issue opposed by a minority of Senators.

Today, that issue is civil rights—the question of Federal laws protecting the persons and privileges of all Americans regardless of race, creed, religion, color, or national origin.

Tomorrow it may be some other issue of preeminent importance. But, whatever the issue, the present terms of rule 22 assure that it is possible for a minority of Senators to prevent the United States Senate from reaching a vote on a matter opposed by those Senators.

For example, by a mere majority the Senate can pass a declaration of war, throwing this peace-loving Nation into mortal conflict and thus dooming thousands and perhaps millions of young Americans to death on the field of battle. Yet, rule 22 requires a two-thirds vote of all Senators to shut off debate. Rule 22 places a decision to end debate on a special pedestal elevated even above a decision between peace and war.

Rule 22 symbolizes to all the world that the United States Senate has to date been unable to pass civil-rights legislation safeguarding its colored citizens—and this in a world where there are far more men, women, and children of colored skin than of white skin. And, let me add, that this verdict as to the color of people's skins was made by an Authority far higher than a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate.

Eventually, rule 22 will go. Will it be now or in later years, when a more enlightened opinion has ultimately been brought to bear upon this crucial matter? I thank the Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me time for these remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am not in favor of making cloture easy. I am not in favor of making it practically impossible. There are good reasons for not making it too easy. This is not only the greatest deliberative body on earth, but it is also a runner-up for the title of the most deliberative body on earth.

The value of deferred voting has been shown more than once in the years just past. To my mind, the most typical and probably the most important case for deferring a vote occurred when President Roosevelt was endeavoring to pack the Supreme Court. Had it not been for the fact that voting was delayed day after day and week after week, the country would not have been aroused to the evils of the proposal to pack the Supreme Court.

There are, then, at least two reasons for not making it too easy to close debate. One of them is the obvious day-to-day one, that on any important and difficult question there should be an opportunity for all sides and all aspects of proposed legislation to be brought to the attention of Senators, so that they may, each and all, be fully informed on the questions on which they vote.

The second reason is the one which was evidenced in the case of the endeavor to pack the Supreme Court. In other words, when political pressures are great or currents are prevailing which are tending to throw legislation on to the wrong track, there must be time provided for the people of the country to understand the issues at stake and to discuss them with those who represent them in the Congress.

Therefore, it must not be too easy to end debate. I may say that to my mind the constitutional two-thirds requirement makes it unduly difficult. I am in favor of making a change in the rules which will not make it so nearly impossible to vote in any case, on any measure, and on any proposal which does not ordinarily by necessity require a two-thirds vote.

My mind is not at present made up as to just what the amelioration should be. I am very sure there should be one. When the time comes—and the time will come—for the possibility of changing the rule, I shall be among those who will seek to ameliorate the difficulties of cloture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the 1956 Democratic platform contained this pledge:

> We urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 85th Congress, to improve congressional procedures, so that majority rule prevails, and decisions can be made after reasonable debate, without being blocked by a minority in either House.

I supported that pledge, as I supported the rest of the platform, and the candidates nominated at that convention, and in Michigan for congressional office. I campaigned on that platform and that pledge. I did so in all sincerity, and without reservation.

I know of others, who stated that they had reservations regarding that platform, and I respected them for saying so while the campaign was on.

I am for the pending motion in principle, and because of my experience and observation, in the brief time since I became a Member of this body.

I have seen the filibuster in operation in this body, not as a knockdown, drag-out device for blocking a majority, and for preventing a vote and decision by majority rule, but as a subtle weapon, the mere threat of which brings the majority of the Senate to heel, to defeat and surrender to a determined minority.

This is what happened, Mr. President, in the closing week of the 84th Congress. Then the threat of filibuster, the threat of blocking final votes on the social security bill, on the foreign aid bill, on any and all items of legislation until adjournment, was sufficient to defeat the stripped-down civil rights bill.

This measure, endorsed by President Eisenhower after 3 years of hesitation, had been passed by a bipartisan 2 to 1 majority in the House.

It was condemned to death in the pigeonholes of the Senate Judiciary Committee. There it died with the death of the 84th Congress.

That, Mr. President, is how King Filibuster operates. A wave of his scepter and bills die.

A wave of his scepter and a bill is whittled down, reduced in scope and force, or a bill is changed in intent and distorted, if not reversed in its purpose and effect.

We hear much of the alleged dangers of a ruthless majority.

Mr. President, it seems to me that a ruthless minority, and I have seen such ruthless minorities in action in this Chamber—are worse, are more dangerous, than the so-called ruthless majority about whose behavior the defenders of minority rule are so concerned.

We are told that the filibuster protects the rights of the minority. What minority, Mr. President?

The Negro minority, which, in much of our Nation, is still denied first-class citizenship in terms of the right to vote, in terms of the security of the person, in terms of fair employment opportunity, and of equal access to public accommodation and travel?

Or is the consideration devoted to the protection of an entrenched and powerful minority, determined to continue to deny full first-class citizenship to all Americans, regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry?

It is this entrenched minority that is determined to continue rule 22, because it knows that the continuing reign of King Filibuster is necessary for the continuance of discrimination in American life.

How long has it been since any other minority was protected by the filibuster or the threat of filibuster?

I know that those who have long worked for the establishment of majority rule in the United States Senate are sometimes warned and taunted by those who depend upon the veto power of the filibuster as their most powerful lever for controlling and directing legislation. They are told: Beware. The time may come when you will need and want to use the filibuster to defeat a majority bent upon harming you or upon crippling your organizations.

The answer to this fright technique is simple:

You either believe in democracy, in majority rule, or you do not.

You either have confidence in the people, or you do not.

You either have confidence in our Constitution and our tripartite form of government, or you do not.

We who support this motion have confidence in majority rule, in the people, in the workability of the safeguards provided in the Constitution, in its wonderful mechanism of checks and balances.

We are not afraid of majority rule, because we are not afraid of the people. We are not afraid of their decisions.

We know that the Constitution contains sufficient built-in safeguards against the results of hysterical waves of emotion, thought, and action.

The Presidential power of veto and the power of judicial review provide brakes and corrective action sufficient to avert disaster.

This has recently been proved again in court decisions protecting individual Americans against invasion of their constitutional rights.

But beyond these safeguards, the people and the Nation have the final safeguard: the next election. The members of any majority must live with the record of what they have said and how they have voted on issues.

This final appeal to the people in elections every 2 years is the ultimate safeguard.

Of course we who believe in majority rule also believe in full debate. We have, many of us, engaged in thorough and prolonged debate, but not for the purpose of preventing a vote.

We have engaged in such debate for the purpose of winning a majority vote, of getting the facts and the arguments spread out before the American people so that we can win either on the rollcall taken in this Chamber, or if we lose on that rollcall, by appeal to the people in succeeding congressional elections.

So, Mr. President, we say to those who seek to frighten us by warning that we may one day wish we still had the weapon of the filibuster: We want, we demand, we shall ever continue to work for, the establishment of majority rule in the Senate of the United States.

We are for majority rule rain or shine, whether we win or lose. We will take our chances, because we believe we have everything to win by majority rule and everything to lose by an acquiescence in the continuance of minority rule.

Mr. President, we hear much about the greatest deliberative body in the world, the unique virtues of unlimited debate, and the dangers to the Republic, to our form of government, to the welfare and security of the individual citizen, which are alleged to be in this proposal.

May I say that outside this Chamber, in Michigan, and, I suppose, in other States where men and women talk simply and to the point, much of this talk is considered nonsense?

Four years ago, writing from the 1952 Democratic convention, Arthur Krock described the Senate as the graveyard of campaign pledges to enact civil rights legislation. In the most accurate and eloquent phrase yet applied to rule 22, he declared it was the gravedigger in that graveyard.

On Sunday, December 30, 1956, writing in the New York Times, after describing section 3 of rule 22 as providing for unlimited debate on "a mere motion to take up a change in any Senate rule," Mr. Krock restated his 1952 description.

In one sentence he cut through the fog of words to the heart of this fight, namely, whether the road shall be opened to action on civil rights legislation, or kept closed by renewed acquiescence in the veto power of the filibuster. This is what Mr. Krock said:

> Thus rule 22 has been the graveyard of all efforts to bring up for passage certain items of civil rights legislation; hence it is the real target of the forthcoming parliamentary struggle in the Senate.

And at the end of his article, after meticulously setting down both sides of the argument on rule 22, and the procedural possibilities in the consideration of the Anderson motion, Mr. Krock quoted the argument of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that new Senators cannot be deprived of their constitutional right "to participate in the making of the rules under which they must operate."

He then ended with a sentence which again cut through the fog to get at our opponents' real purpose, namely, the blocking of civil rights legislation, not by rollcall votes, but by preventing rollcall votes. He said:

> This argument (as stated by Senator DOUGLAS) falls on deaf ears of the Southern Senators, and some others who believe some of the civil rights proposals violate the constitutional system, because they know that the passage of these proposals is its real objective.

Mr. President, I am one of 45 Senators who, if the Anderson motion were to be defeated by the device of tabling, would be deprived of their constitutional rights under article 1, section 5, to participate in action by this House to "determine the rules of its proceedings."

We 45 Senators represent 36 States, with a combined total population of 138,936,000. Omitting consideration of the nonvoting residents of the District of Columbia, this amounts to 83.1 percent of the American people.

By depriving us of this constitutional right our constituents are deprived of the protection given them by the provision of the Constitution to which I have just referred.

Their hope of substance in legislation to meet their needs would be blighted by renewed acquiescence in the antidemocratic, unconstitutional provisions of the rule adopted March 17, 1949.

Mr. President, I find it interesting, if not ironic, that the filibuster issue and civil-rights legislation are always wrapped up as one package.

The filibuster issue does not stand alone in the minds of those who wish to continue this undemocratic process.

It does not stand isolated as a question of principle to be debated solely on its merits.

Some of those who oppose this move to defeat the filibuster apparently can ease their consciences by pretending that weighty matters of Senate procedure are involved.

But the real essence of the opposition is the desire to defeat civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, more than 7 million people live in my State of Michigan. To my mind, they are all members of one race—the human race. The people of my State, indeed of every State, are entitled to the rights and privileges of first-class citizenship.

If democracy can be blocked in the United States Senate, it can be blocked throughout our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reference has been made to the fact that the Senate rules are different from other rules. They have been compared with Robert's Rules of Order, the rules of the House of Representatives, and the rules of other groups; but I wish to emphasize that the Senate rules are different, and that that is one of the main things which makes the Senate different from other bodies. It is one of the main reasons which makes the Senate an institution within itself.

The question is, Shall the Senate adopt new rules in alternate years? Shall the Senate adopt new rules at the beginning of each new Congress? The motion is that the Senate proceed to the adoption of rules for the 85th Congress. If the motion shall prevail, then in one sweep we shall have wiped out the accumulated precedents and rules of procedure which have been founded in wisdom and experience and which have accumulated for more than 160 years. I say that the vote on this motion will be the most far-reaching

and most important vote which will be taken during the entire session.

Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that an attempt is made again to cast doubt on the continuity of the Senate. No more serious issue could be brought before this body today, and no graver change in our form of government could be wrought than by an affirmative vote on the motion to adopt new rules.

I had hoped that the decisive and overwhelming vote of 70 to 21 on January 7, 1953, on this very issue would lay aside forever the advocacy of this new theory of the nature of the Senate. I believe that its reemergence is a great disservice to the Senate, to the 48 States represented here, to the Government of the United States, and to the American people.

One of the truly great aspects of our form of government is its inherent stability. I believe there is a universal desire in America to retain that characteristic in Government. Surely the United States Senate, continuous and continuing since 1789 is the essence of stability. This continuity, grounded in the Constitution itself, and established by the minds which conceived that great charter, has resulted in the Senate's becoming the force in Government most effectively removed from the shifting sands of political expediency.

To destroy this long and useful life, to cast aside the status of continuity by voting for such a startling change, would be disastrous. Let there be no misunderstanding as to what is at stake here today: It is the character and prestige of the United States Senate.

The Senate's character is unique because it is the only place in the National Government where the States are represented as States.

Here I wish to make a particular appeal to the Members of the Senate who have been honored heretofore by being the governors of their States.

The rights of the States preserved by the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution find their protector in the Senate, and particularly in its standing rules.

The continuity of the Senate and its rules, which has contributed so much to the prestige of the Senate, also adds to the prestige of the individual States. We cannot permit this most fundamental aspect of the Federal-State union to be swept away by a single simple majority vote, and thereafter, by mere numbers, to see the rights of the States fall successively in ill-considered but politically astute legislation.

It is the Senate as an institution with which we are dealing today. It is the Senate as an institution that is at stake today in the vote which will be taken on the pending motion.

If we sweep the Senate rules aside—and that is what will happen if the motion of the Senator from New Mexico shall prevail—we shall sweep away the distinctive characteristic of this body.

In the vast field of the Federal Government, the only persons who represent the States are the Senators elected by the people of the respective States. The President does not represent the States—and he should not. The Supreme Court of the United States and the other Federal courts do not represent the States. The Members of the House of Representatives by special design are the direct representatives of the people within their districts. I repeat, Mr. President, that only the Senators represent the States. That representation is founded essentially on the great compromise feature of the Constitution itself, which is bottomed on the idea of creating a special institution, an institution in which the States are represented.

Time, custom, and precedent, clustered around and centered in the Senate rules, have built a foundation upon which rests the last remaining vestige of power and representation which the States have in the Federal Government.

Clause 2, section 3, article I, of the Constitution as originally written, provides:

> Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year.

That is the clause upon which the continuity of the Senate is so well founded. It is the part of the Constitution which provides for one-third of the Senators being chosen every second year.

Thus the institution was created; the basic formula provided for continuity; and this concept of continuity has been followed from the first session of the Senate until this very day.

Mr. President, how can any Member of this great body who has heretofore served as the chief executive and first citizen of his State cast a vote today which will change the entire nature of the Senate as an institution, and thus go the last mile in virtually wiping out his State's identity in all matters to come before this body?

We must face the fact that if the Anderson motion shall be agreed to, it will mean that we soon shall have the previous question in the Senate. That is what it will amount to. Let us face the situation now. I am reminded of Aesop's fable concerning the man who wanted to have roast pig. He burned down the house in order to get his roast pork. The Senate will be burning its house today in order to secure the passage of a small civil-rights bill. What we shall be getting will be the previous question, and it will apply to every measure and motion that comes to the floor. Thus the Senate, as the institution has existed for 160 years, will have been destroyed.

So, without referring to them personally, I ask Senators who formerly have been governors of their States and who have been elected to the Senate from their States at large to represent the States: How can they cast such at vote?

There is still a place in the American Government for deliberation; there is still a place in the legislative processes of the Government for a reconciliation of differences on vital issues. There is still a place in the American future for a continuing legislative body. There is a place and a need for the United States Senate as we now know it.

The proponents of the motion argue that what is sought is merely a change in the rule which will permit debate to be brought to an end, but I urge them to consider the consequences of such a precedent in future deliberations on other issues where they might have need to rely on the stability of this continuing body.

The standing rules provide a method of effecting the change here sought. The present rules constitute the law and the spirit by which such changes should be made.

There is nothing immutable about rule 22, modified to its present form in 1949, when it was amended to extend the types of Senate business to which cloture might be applied. It is possible that it may be amended again, in the manner prescribed by the standing rules, or I would not favor a further extension of the power to silence debate.

I, for one, feel that the Senate cannot continue as an institution under more liberalized rules for debate and for the consideration of other matters when Senators are counted by noses or merely by numbers, not as representatives of the States, to determine upon what issues they can agree as the representatives of the States. There has been much wholesome law passed under the present system, and very, very few wholesome measures have been rejected.

The present rules are strict in some ways, but they provide the very basis for the great compromises which have led to sound legislation, not only in the last decade, but over the many decades of the past. It requires no prophet to say that these rules will prove to be the bulwark and foundation upon which many sound compromises on many subjects can be bottomed in the future.

But once we shall have opened the floodgates and shall have adopted the previous question as one of our basic rules—and it will be the predominant rule—then we shall have destroyed the very character and foundation of this great body.

I, for one, do not think that debate should be terminated at the whim of a transitory majority. To inject a gag rule into the Senate rules is to insure that the voices of dissent on all major issues will soon be silenced forever. A bare majority rule, untempered by mature deliberations, will inevitably follow and legislating could become a mere mechanical principle in the formulation of laws. I do not think that any of the 169 million American people would sanction such a deterioration of our legislative branch. I do not believe that the States represented here should, by gag rule, suffer the indignity of being unable to present their points of view and thus gather such support as their positions merit.

However, if the wisdom of standing rule 22 must be tested, then let us follow the procedure prescribed by the standing rules, and not accomplish the dubious goal here sought by diminishing the stature of the Senate.

Mr. President, if I have time remaining, I shall be glad to yield it back as there is not sufficient time to discuss my additional points.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1953, when Senators debated the issue of the right of the United States Senate to establish its own rules of procedure and conduct, I said, among other things:

> This is a historic debate. I am honored to join with 19 of my colleagues in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, in urging that the Senate immediately proceed to the adoption of rules for its operation during the 83d Congress.

There have been some changes since then. This is the 85th Congress. We still have the same rules that governed our procedures in the 83d Congress—indeed, in the 82d and the 81st Congresses. But there is a singular difference. Instead of cosponsoring a motion with 19 of my colleagues, I believe I am accurate when I say the motion presented by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is cosponsored by by more than 30 Senators. That, on its face, reveals an increasing interest on the part of the membership of the United States Senate in the rules of procedure which govern its deliberations.

Mr. President, in the discussion of any matter, particularly any legislative matter, we are concerned with two items. The first is the substance of the matter. Obviously, substance or substantive law is of the utmost importance. The second is the procedure relating to the adoption or rejection of any substantive matter. I call the attention of my colleagues to the many dissertations we have had on this particular matter of procedure by one of the most able attorneys in this body, formerly the dean of the School of Law of the University of Oregon, the senior Senator from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Senator from Oregon has repeatedly admonished his colleagues in the Senate that one's substantive rights may very well be prejudiced by one's procedural rights. Particularly is this true in a court of law.

The junior Senator from Minnesota adds that the substance of legislative matter may very well be prejudiced by the procedure which allows a legislative body to discuss or prevents it from discussing substantive matter. What we are dealing with here is a situation in which we are told it is impossible for the United States Senate to modify the rules of its own procedure because of an action on the part of the Senate of the 81st Congress, in 1949.

Mr. President, I have no intention of arguing the question or the issue as to whether the Senate is a continuing body. I consider that question to be one of interest. I may say it is one which has received the careful attention of scholars, historians, and those who are profound students of the parliamentary procedures of the Congress of the United States. I shall allude to the continuing body theory, but I state now that it is not a controlling factor in this debate.

I should like to point, first, to the constitutional requirements relating to the rules of the Senate; and, second, to the rules of the Senate under those constitutional requirements.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that neither House may "by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there must be a reasonable relation between the mode or the method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained."

That citation is from the case of *United States* v. *Ballim* (1892, 144 U. S. 1).

How does that particular citation apply to the subject matter before us, namely, the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. This morning, the Senator from New Mexico, neatly narrowed this debate to its fundamental issue, namely, the relationship of the rules of the United States Senate to the obligations or the privileges of the Senate under article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States. By its very nature the Senate of the United States is, as a creature of the Constitution, bound by the procedures or by the articles and sections and subsections of that Constitution.

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution prescribes that the Senate shall engage in transacting legislative business. Let me read the pertinent quotation from article I, section 5:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business.

And, Mr. President, I would have my colleagues note that the mandate of the Constitution is "to do business."

I would also have my colleagues note that a majority is adequate, under the Constitution, to do business—to do the business, let me say, of Government which affects the rights of every man, woman, and child in this Nation. A majority, mind you, Mr. President, can declare war. In only a few instances in the Constitution is there a provision that the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate are required in order for the Senate to take action. What I emphasize is that the duty of the Senate is to do business within the confines of the Constitution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate—as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] did this morning—the fact that article I, section 5, provides that:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

Today we are attempting to exercise that privilege, which is accorded each House of the Congress, namely, the privilege of exercising the right, given to it by the Constitution, to determine the rules of its proceedings.

Again I wish to emphasize that the fact the Senate may not have exercised that right in the past, in no way denies it the right to exercise that right in the present. The fact that there was acquiescence in or tacit compliance with the rules of yesterday is not to be interpreted as a denial of the right of the Senate, to establish new rules today.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the pertinent comments of our former colleague, Senator Lehman, of New York, who in 1953 discussed this subject matter at some length in the Senate. Senator Lehman pointed out, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 215, that from 1789 to 1869 there were joint rules for the House of Representatives and the Senate, and those rules remained in force Congress after Congress because of the acquiescence of the two Houses. Then he said:

> However, after those joint rules had been in force for 80 years, the Senate of the United States decided to adopt, for its part, new joint rules, with certain changes included in them. The Senate did precisely that.

Mr. President, the situation today is virtually an analagous one. The joint rules to which I have referred existed for 80 years, but that circumstance did not prevent the Senate from acting to adopt new rules whenever it decided it wished to do so. The Senate did so in 1917, under the cloture rule, unler the leadership of the great Senator Walsh, one of the truly great men to serve in this body. The Senate acted in similar fashion in 1949. Whether we like rule 22 or not—and some of us are in disagreement with that rule—the fact is that the Senate did adopt that new rule in 1949.

That is the rule which I say is, in fact, an unconstitutional rule because it denies the will of the Constitution as set forth in article I, section 5. Let me say that section 3 of rule 22 provides that the rule of an absolute two-thirds of the total membership shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate. So in 1949 the Senate adopted a rule providing, in effect, that the rules which would govern the Senate of the United States could no longer be changed if a single Member was obstinately opposed. That is a denial of the privilege and the constitutional right guaranteed to this body by article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield additional time to the Senator from Minnesota? His time has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in this Chamber to the effect that the whole purpose of this rules fight is to

secure the enactment of civil-rights legislation. I have always tried to be candid and frank with my friends in this body. We have our moments of disagreement. There are obviously times when, because of our particular backgrounds, experiences, aptitudes, convictions, the areas in which we live, and developments in those areas, we disagree, and sometimes disagree rather heatedly and with a deep sense of conviction. I am not one who wants to deny a single Member of the Senate the complete right to express disagreement and to do everything he can to carry his argument to a successful conclusion.

What I wish to make clear, and I want it perfectly well understood, is that, regardless of the outcome of this particular debate and the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, it is the intention of the Senator from Minnesota to offer, as soon as the rules of the Senate so permit, civil-rights measures for action by the Senate of the United States.

I desire to make it crystal clear that I expect those measures to be acted upon by committees and debated on the floor. I am equally frank to say I am prepared to debate them for as long as may be required to bring them to a successful conclusion. I know that discussion will be heated. I trust that will not be bitter. I myself shall not indulge in bitterness.

The present debate is a part of the total fight for civil-rights legislation, but I want to be honest about it. The main civil right we are talking about today is not a civil right for someone outside of this Chamber, but a civil right for every Member of the Senate, the right of each Senator who, for the first time, occupies a seat in the Chamber to have something to say about the rules of the Senate.

I heard this afternoon an address by one of the most able and respected Members of this body. I heard him state correctly that the rules of the Senate should provide for representatives of States to state their opinions. How right he is. But I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi, how he would feel, or how any other Senator would feel, if that right under the rules had been denied him, and he had been stopped by such a rule from promoting the principles in which he and a majority of his colleagues believe.

The right we are really talking about today is the civil right of every Member of the Senate to have something to say about the rules procedure under which we are living and conducting our business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry of the presiding officer.

Mr. President, I shall withhold my request for a moment, in light of a suggestion from the Senator from New Mexico; and, if I may, at this time I ask unanimous consent that a study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, relating to limitation of debate in the United States Senate, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITATION OF DEBATE IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

(By George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government, December 1956)

PREFACE

This report is in effect a revision of an earlier Public Affairs Bulletin prepared in response to the request of several Senators for an historical study of filibustering in the United States Senate and of efforts to control it. It contains the following material:

1. Present Senate rules relating to debate.
2. A chronological history of efforts to limit debate in the Senate, 1789–1956.
3. A list of outstanding Senate filibusters, 1841–1955.
4. Legislation delayed or defeated by filibusters—a list of 36 bills between 1865 and 1950 which were delayed or defeated by obstruction in the Senate.
5. Senate votes on invoking the cloture role—a record of the 22 votes on cloture petitions in the Senate since 1917.
6. A summary of the arguments for filibustering.
7. A summary of the arguments against filibustering.
8. A list of remedies for obstructive tactics in the Senate which have been proposed by Senators in the past.
9. Limitation of debate in the House of Representatives.

The text of the present standing rules of the Senate relating to debate is taken from the current edition of the Senate Manual.

The chronological history of efforts to limit debate in the Senate since 1789 is based, for the most part, up the Senate Journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the article on "Legislative History of Cloture Rules in the Senate" from the Congressional Digest for November 1926. This history sketches the principal developments in the Senate on this question during the intervening period.

The list of outstanding filibusters mentions more than 40 famous examples of this device during the past century.

The list of bills delayed or defeated by filibusters in the past, while incomplete, includes the major legislation in this category. There have been at least 36 such bills of varying degrees of importance. In addition, many appropriate bills have either been lost in the last-minute jam caused by filibusters or were talked to death because they failed to include items desired by particular Senators or because their grants were considered excessive. A list of 82 such appropriation bills that failed of passage between 1876 and 1916 appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 28, 1916, on pages 10152–10153.

Analysis of the 22 cloture votes since 1917, when a cloture rule was first adopted, indicates that 4 petitions received the required two-thirds majority; 9 obtained a majority of the entire membership of the Senate; 15 obtained a majority of those present and voting; 6 obtained only a minority of those present and voting; and 1 resulted in a tie vote. The cloture rule of 1917 was drafted by a conference committee of 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans named by their respective party organizations. This committee stated that its purpose was to formulate a rule what would "terminate successful filibustering."

If the purpose of the cloture rule is to terminate successful filibustering, experience shows that it has failed to achieve its purpose in 18 out of 22 times. Experience also shows that a majority (of the entire membership) cloture rule would have failed of such a purpose 13 out of 22 times. Experience further shows that a simple majority cloture rule would have failed to stop successful filibusters in one-third of the cases in which cloture has been invoked since 1917.

The summary of the arguments for and against filibustering indicates that there is much to be said on both sides.

Review of proposed remedies for obstruction in the Senate reveals the repetition of the same basic suggestions for more than a century. They boil down to four: Majority cloture, the previous question, a rule of relevancy, and more effective enforcement of existing rules.

The principal sources of information on the limitation of debate in the Senate, used in this report, are:

Bendiner, Robert, Battle of Filibustering: New Round Opens. New York Times magazine, September 14, 1952.

Burdette, Franklin, Filibustering in the Senate (1940), 252 pages.

Douglas, Paul H., The Fight Against the Filibuster. New Republic, January 12, 1953, pages 6–8.

Furber, George P., Precedents Relating to the Privileges of the Senate of the United States (1893), Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 68, 52d Congress, 2d session, Limitation of Debate, pages 217–230.

Gilfry, Henry H., Senate Precedents, 1789–1909, pages 334–342.

Harris, Senator Isham Green, speech in Senate reviewing movement to limit Senate debate, 1806–1891. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Congress, 2d session, January 22, 1891, pages 1669–1671.

Haynes, George H., The Senate of the United States (1938), volume 1, chapter VIII, Debate in the Senate.

Maslow, Will, FEPC—A Case History in Parliamentary Maneuver. University of Chicago Law Review, June 1946, pages 407–445.

Maslow, Will, Limitation of Debate in State Legislatures. (In extension of remarks of William Benton, of Connecticut.) CONSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 10, pages A3491–3492.

Rogers, Lindsay, The American Senate (1926), chapter V.

Willoughby, W. F., Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration (1934), pages 486–500.

Congressional Digest, November 1926–February 1953.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, passim.

Control of Obstruction in Congress, Editorial Research Reports, April 4, 1935.

Majority Cloture for the Senate, Editorial Research Reports, March 19, 1947.

Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. Hearings and/or reports on limitation of debate in the Senate; 80th, 81st, 82d, and 83d Congresses.

Senate Journal, passim.

Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body. Senate Document No. 4, 83d Congress, 1st session.

This report has been prepared by George B. Galloway. Copies are available to Senators upon request.

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

PRESENT SENATE RULES RELATING TO DEBATE

Rule 7. Morning business

3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up:[1] *Provided, however,* That on Mondays the calendar shall be called under rule 8, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill,

[1] As amended; S. Jour. 548, 59–1, May 31, 1906.

resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar, except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in rule 8. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XIV.)

5. Every petition or memorial[2] shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have endorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate. But no petition or memorial[3] or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XIX.)

7. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose.[4] Any motion so made shall be determined without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XIV.)

Rule 8. Order of business

At the conclusion of the morning business for each day, unless upon motion the Senate shall at any time otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and continue such consideration until 2 o'clock;[5] and bills and resolutions that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order, and each Senator shall be entitled to speak once and for 5 minutes only upon any question and the objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceedings, but upon motion the Senate may continue such consideration; and this order shall commence immediately after the call for "concurrent and other resolutions," and shall take precedence of the unfinished business and other special orders. But if the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of any matter notwithstanding an objection, the foregoing provisions touching debate shall not apply. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XIV.)

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.[6] (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XIV.)

Rule 9. Order of business

Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar is completed, and not later than 2 o'clock if there shall be no special orders for that time, the Calendar of General Orders shall be taken up and proceeded with in its order, beginning with the first subject on the calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the calendar; and in such case the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or questions of privilege, to wit:

1. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.

2. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.

3. A motion to pass over the pending subject, which if carried shall have the effect to leave such subject without prejudice in its place on the calendar.

4. A motion to place such subject at the foot of the calendar.

Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named, and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions of order. (Jefferson's Manual, secs. XIV, XXXIII.)

Rule 10. Special orders

2. When two or more special orders have been made for the same time, they shall have precedence according to the order in which they were severally assigned, and that order shall only be changed by direction of the Senate.

And all motions to change such order, or to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.[7] (Jefferson's Manual, secs. XVIII, XXXIII.)

Rule 11. Objection to reading a paper

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XXXII.)

Rule 19. Debate

1. When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, secs. XVII, XXXIX.)

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.[8] (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XVII.)

3. No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.[9]

4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XVII.)

5. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, upon the demand of the Senator or of any other Senator, the exceptionable words shall be taken down in writing, and read at the table for the information of the Senate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XVII.)

Rule 20. Questions of order

1. A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XXXIII.)

Rule 22. Cloture

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule 3 or rule 6 or any other rule of the Senate,[10] except subsection 3 of rule 22, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule 8 (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

Rule 27. Reports of conference committees

1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read or a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XLVI.)

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO LIMIT DEBATE IN THE SENATE

In 1604, the practice of limiting debate in some form was introduced in the British Parliament by Sir Henry Vane. It became known in parliamentary procedure as the "previous question" and is described in section 34 of Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice, as follows:

"When any question is before the house, any member may move a previous question, whether that question (called the main question) shall not be put. If it pass in the affirmative, then the main question is to be put immediately, and no man may speak anything further to it, either to add or alter."

In 1778, the Journals of the Continental Congress also show that the "previous question" was used. Section 10 of the Rules of the Continental Congress reading: "When a

---

[2] As amended; S. Jour. 427, 428, 50–1, Mar. 6, 1888.

[3] On motion by Mr. Manderson: *"Ordered,* That when petitions and memorials are ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the order shall be deemed to apply to the body of the petition only, and the names attached to said petition or memorial shall not be printed unless specially ordered by the Senate." (S. Jour 280, 49–2, Feb. 7, 1887.)

[4] As amended; S. Jour. 431, 48–1, Mar. 17, 1884.

[5] Mr. Hoar submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to: "*Resolved,* That after today, unless otherwise ordered, the morning hour shall terminate at the expiration of 2 hours after the meeting of the Senate." (S. Jour. 1266, 50–1, Aug. 10, 1888.)

[6] As amended; S. Jour. 442, 48–1, Mar. 19, 1884.

[7] As amended; S. Jour. 442, 48–1, Mar. 19, 1884.

[8] As amended; S. Jour. 301, 57–1, Apr. 8, 1902.

[9] As amended; S. Jour. 71, 63–2, Jan. 14, 1914.

[10] As amended; S. Jour. 173, 81–1, Mar. 17, 1949.

question is before the House no motion shall be received unless for an amendment, for the previous question, to postpone the consideration of the main question, or to commit it." In the British Parliament and the Continental Congress the "previous question" was used to avoid discussion of a delicate subject or one which might have injurious consequences.

1789: The first Senate adopted 19 rules of which the following relate to debate in, and taking the time of, the Senate:

"2. No Member shall speak to another, or otherwise interrupt the business of the Senate, or read any printed paper while the Journals or public papers are reading, or when any Member is speaking in any debate.

"3. Every Member, when he speaks, shall address the Chair, standing in his place, and when he has finished shall sit down.

"4. No Member shall speak more than twice in any one debate on the same day, without leave of the Senate.

"6. No motion shall be debated until the same shall be seconded.

"8. When a question is before the Senate, no motion shall be received unless for an amendment, for the previous question, or for postponing the main question, or to commit, or to adjourn.

"9. The previous question being moved and seconded, the question from the Chair shall be: 'Shall the main question be now put?' And if the nays prevail, the main question shall not then be put.

"11. Where the yeas and nays shall be called for by one-fifth of the Members present, each Member called upon shall, unless for special reasons he be excused by the Senate, declare, openly and without debate, his assent or dissent to the question."

1806: When the rules were modified in 1806, reference to the previous question was omitted. It had been moved only four times and used only three times during the 17 years from 1789 to 1806. Its omission from the written rules left its status in general parliamentary law unchanged.

1807: In the following year, 1807, debate on an amendment at the third reading of a bill was also forbidden, and from this time until 1846 there were no further limitations on debate in the Senate.

1841: On July 12, 1841, Henry Clay brought forth a proposal for the introduction of the "previous question," which he stated was necessary by the abuse which the minority had made of the privilege of unlimited debate. In opposing Clay's motion, Senator Calhoun said, "There never had been a body in this or any other country in which, for such a length of time, so much dignity and decorum of debate had been maintained." Clay's proposition met with very considerable opposition and was abandoned. Clay also proposed adoption of the "hour rule" for the same purpose, but his proposal was not accepted.

1846: A species of cloture is the unanimous-consent agreement. This is a device for limiting debate and expediting the passage of legislation which dates back to 1846 when it was used to fix a day for a vote on the Oregon bill. Such agreements are frequently used to fix an hour at which the Senate will vote, without further debate, on a pending proposal.

1850: On July 27, 1850, Senator Douglas submitted a resolution permitting the use of the previous question. The resolution was debated and laid on the table after considerable opposition had been expressed.

1862: As the business to be transacted by the Senate increased, proposals to limit debate were introduced frequently in the following Congresses, but none were adopted until the Civil War. On January 21, 1862, Senator Wade introduced a resolution stating that "in consideration in secret session of subjects relating to the rebellion, debate should be confined to the subject matter and limited to 5 minutes, except that 5 minutes be allowed any Member to explain or oppose a pertinent amendment." On January 29, 1862, the resolution was debated and adopted.

1868: In 1868 a rule was adopted providing that: "Motions to take up or to proceed to the consideration of any question shall be determined without debate, upon the merits of the question proposed to be considered." The object of this rule, according to Senator Edmunds, was to prevent a practice which had grown up in the Senate, "when a question was pending, and a Senator wished to deliver a speech on some other question, to move to postpone the pending order to deliver their speech on the other question." According to Mr. Turnbull the object of the rules was to prevent the consumption of time in debate over business to be taken up. The rule was interpreted as preventing debate on the merits of a question when a proposal to postpone it was made.

1869: A resolution pertaining to the adoption of the "previous question" was introduced in 1869, and three other resolutions limiting debate in some form were introduced in the first half of 1870.

1870: Senate, on appeal, sustained decision of Chair that a Senator may read in debate a paper that is irrelevant to the subject matter under consideration (July 14, 1870).

On December 6, 1870, in the third session of the Forty-first Congress, Senator Anthony, of Rhode Island, introduced the following resolution: "On Monday next, at 1 o'clock, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the calendar and bills that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order; and each Senator shall be entitled to speak once and for 5 minutes, only, on each question; and this order shall be enforced daily at 1 o'clock until the end of the calendar is reached, unless upon motion, the Senate should at any time otherwise order." On the following day, December 7, 1870, the resolution was adopted. This so-called Anthony rule for the expedition of business was the most important limitation of debate yet adopted by the Senate. The rule was interpreted as placing no restraints upon the minority, however, inasmuch as a single objection could prevent its application to the subject under consideration.

1871: On February 22, 1871, another important motion was adopted which had been introduced by Senator Pomeroy and which allowed amendments to appropriation bills to be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill.

1872: Since a precedent established in 1872 the practice has been that a Senator cannot be taken from the floor for irrelevancy in debate.

1872: On April 19, 1872, a resolution was introduced, "that during the remainder of the session it should be in order, in the consideration of appropriation bills, to move to confine debate by any Senator, on the pending motion, to 5 minutes." On April 29, 1872, this resolution was finally adopted, 33 yeas to 13 nays. The necessity for some limitation of debate to expedite action on these annual supply measures caused the adoption of similar resolutions at most of the succeeding sessions of Congress.

1873: In March 1873, Senator Wright submitted a resolution reading in part that debate shall be confined to and be relevant to the subject matter before the Senate—etc., and that the previous question may be demanded by a majority vote or in some modified form. On a vote in the Senate to consider this resolution the nays were 30 and the yeas 25.

1879: Chair counted a quorum to determine whether enough Senators were present to do business.

1880: From 1873 to 1880 nine other resolutions were introduced confining and limiting debate in some form. On February 3, 1880, in the 2d session of the 46th Congress, the famous Anthony rule which was first adopted on December 7, 1870, was made a standing rule of the Senate as rule 8. In explaining the rule, Senator Anthony said "That rule applies only to the unobjected cases on the calendar, so as to relieve the calendar from the unobjected cases. There are a great many bills that no Senator objects to, but they are kept back in their order by disputed cases. If we once relieve the calendar of unobjected cases, we can go through with it in order without any limitation of debate. That is the purpose of the proposed rule. It has been applied in several sessions and has been found to work well with the general approbation of the Senate."

1881: On February 16, 1881, a resolution to amend the Anthony rule was introduced. This proposed to require the objection of at least five Senators to pass over a bill on the calendar. The resolution was objected to as a form of previous question, and defeated. Senator Edmunds in opposing the resolution said, "I would rather not a single bill shall pass between now and the 4th day of March than to introduce into this body, which is the only one where there is free debate and the only one which can under its rules discuss fully. I think it is of greater importance to the public interest in the long run and in the short run that every bill on your calendar should fail than that any Senator should be cut off from the right of expressing his opinion * * * upon every measure that is to be voted upon here."

1881: Senate agreed for remainder of session to limit debate to 15 minutes on a motion to consider a bill or resolution, no Senator to speak more than once or for longer than 5 minutes (February 12, 1881).

1882: On February 27, 1882, the Anthony rule was amended by the Senate, so that if the majority decided to take up a bill on the calendar after objection was made, that then the ordinary rules of debate without limitation would apply. The Anthony rule could only work when there was no objection whatever to any bill under consideration. When the regular morning hour was not found sufficient for the consideration of all unobjected cases on the calendar, special times were often set aside for the consideration of the calendar under the Anthony rule.

On March 15, 1882, a rule was considered whereby "a vote to lay on the table a proposed amendment shall not carry with it the pending measure." In reference to this rule Senator Hoar (Massachusetts, Republican), said: "Under the present rule it is in the power of a single Member of the Senate to compel practically the Senate to discuss any question whether it wants to or not and whether it be germane to the pending measure or not. * * * This proposed amendment to the rules simply permits, after the mover of the amendment, who of course has the privilege, in the first place, has made his speech, a majority of the Senate if it sees fit to dissever that amendment from the pending measure and to require it to be brought up separately at some other time or not at all." This proposed rule is now rule 17, of the present standing rules of the Senate.

1883: On December 10, 1883, Senator Frye, of Maine, chairman of the Committee on Rules, reported a general revision of the Senate rules. This revision included a provision for the "previous question." Amendments in the Senate struck this provision out.

1884: On January 11, 1884, the present Senate rules were revised and adopted.

On March 19, 1884, two resolutions introduced by Senator Harris were considered and agreed to by the Senate as follows:

1. "That the eighth rule of the Senate be amended by adding thereto: All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate."

2. "That the 10th rule of the Senate be amended by adding thereto: And all motions to change such order or to proceed to the consideration of other business shall be decided without debate."

From this time until 1890 there were 15 different resolutions introduced to amend the Senate rules as to limitations of debate, all of which failed of adoption.

Senate agreed (March 17) to amend rule 7 by adding thereto the following words:

"The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate."

1886: Senate agreed to strike out the words "without debate," from that part of rule 13 which provided that "every motion to reconsider shall be decided by a majority vote" (June 21, 1886).

1890: Hoar, Blair, Edmunds, and Quay submitted various resolutions for limiting debate in various ways (August 1890).

On December 29, 1890, Senator Aldrich introduced a cloture resolution in connection with Lodge's "force bill," which was being filibustered against. The resolution read, in part, as follows: "When any bill, resolution, or other question shall have been under consideration for a considerable time, it shall be in order for any Senator to demand that debate thereon be closed. On such demand no debate shall be in order, and pending such demand no other motion, except one motion to adjourn, shall be made." There were five test votes on the cloture proposal which "commanded various majorities, but in the end it could not be carried in the Senate because of a filibuster against it which merged into a filibuster on the force bill."

1893: Platt, Hoar, Hill, and Gallinger introduced resolutions for cloture by majority action during a filibuster against repeal of the silver purchase law, which evoked extended discussion.

Sherman (Ohio) urged a study of Senate rules with a view to their revision and the careful limitation of debate.

1897: Chair ruled on March 3, 1897, that quorum calls could not be ordered unless business had intervened.

1902: Senate agreed (April 8) to amend rule 19 by inserting at the beginning of clause 2 thereof the following:

"No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

"No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union."

1908: Three important interpretations of the rules were adopted in the course of the filibuster against the Aldrich-Vreeland currency bill: (1) The Chair might count a quorum, if one were physically present, even on a vote, whether or not Senators answered to their names; (2) mere debate would not be considered business, and therefore more than debate must take place between quorum calls; (3) Senators could by enforcement of the rules be restrained from speaking on the same subject more than twice in the same day.

1911: April 6, 1911, Senator Root, of New York, submitted a resolution requesting the Committee on Rules to suggest an amendment to the Senate Rules whereby the Senate could obtain more effective control over its procedure. No action was taken on the resolution.

1914: Smith (Georgia) proposed a rule of relevancy.

Senate decreed September 17 that Senators could not yield for any purpose, even for a question, without unanimous consent, but reversed itself on this ruling the next day, September 18.

1915: February 8, 1915, Senator Reed, of Missouri, introduced a resolution to amend rule 22 whereby debate on the ship purchase bill "S. 6845 shall cease, and the Senate shall proceed to vote thereon * * *." The resolution did not pass in this session.

1916: From December 1915 to September 8, 1916, the first or "long" session of the 64th Congress, there were five resolutions introduced to amend rule 22. The resolutions acted upon were Senate Resolution 131 and Senate Resolution 149. On May 16, 1916, the Committee on Rules reported out favorably Senate Resolution 195 as a substitute for Senate Resolution 131 and Senate Resolution 149, which had been referred to it, and submitted a report (No. 447). The resolution was debated, but did not come to a vote.

1916 and 1920: Democratic national platforms for both years included a statement that: "We favor such alteration of the rules of procedure of the Senate of the United States as will permit the prompt transaction of the Nation's legislative business."

1917: March 4, 1917, President Wilson made a speech in which he referred to the armed ship bill, defeated by filibustering. The President said in part, "The Senate has no rules by which debate can be limited or brought to an end, no rules by which debating motions of any kind can be prevented. * * * The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action. * * * The only remedy is that the rules of the Senate shall be altered that it can act."

On March 5, 1917, the Senate was called in extraordinary session by the President because of the failure of the armed ship bill in the 64th Congress.

On March 7, 1917, Senator Walsh, of Montana, introduced a cloture resolution (S. Res. 5) authorizing a committee to draft a substitute for rule 22, limiting debate. Senator Martin also introduced a resolution amending rule 22 similar to S. 195, favorably reported by the Committee on Rules in the 64th Congress. The Martin resolution was debated at length and adopted March 8, 1917, 76 yeas, 3 nays, as the current amendment to rule 22.

1918: On May 4, 1918, Senator Underwood introduced a resolution (S. Res. 235) further amending rule 22, reestablishing the use of the "previous question" and limiting debate during the war period.

On May 31, 1918, the Committee on Rules favorably reported out (S. Res. 235) with a report (No. 472).

June 3, 1918, the Senate debated the resolution and Senator Borah offered an amendment.

June 11, 1918, the Senate further debated the resolution and a unanimous consent agreement was reached to vote on the measure.

June 12, 1918, the resolution was further amended, by Senator Cummins.

June 13, 1918, the Senate rejected the resolution, nays, 41; and yeas, 34.

1921: From March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1923, during the 67th Congress, five resolutions were introduced to limit debate in some form. These were referred to the Committee on Rules.

1922: On November 29, 1922, upon the occasion of the famous filibuster against the Dyer antilynching bill, a point of order was raised by the Republican floor leader against the methods of delay employed by the obstructionists which, had the Chair sustained it, would have established a significant precedent in the Senate as it did in the House. The incident occurred as follows:

Immediately upon the convening of the Senate, the leader of the filibuster made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Curtis made the point of order that under rule 3 no motion was in order until the Journal had been read. He also made the additional point of order that the motion to adjourn was dilatory. To sustain his point, Mr. Curtis said: "I know we have no rule of the Senate with reference to dilatory motions. We are a legislative body, and we are here to do business and not to retard business. It is a well-stated principle that in any legislative body where the rules do not cover questions that may arise general parliamentary rules must apply.

"The same question was raised in the House of Representatives when they had no rule on the question of dilatory motions. It was submitted to the Speaker of the House, Mr. Reed. Mr. Speaker Reed held that, notwithstanding there was no rule of the House upon the question, general parliamentary law applied, and he sustained the point of order."

The Vice President sustained Mr. Curtis' first point of order in regard to rule 3 but did not rule on the point that the motion was dilatory.

Senate Republicans voted 32 to 1 in party conference on May 25 for majority cloture on revenue and appropriation bills.

1925: On March 4, 1925, the Vice President, Charles G. Dawes, delivered his inaugural address to the Senate, in which he recommended that debate be further limited in the Senate.

On March 5, 1925, Senator Underwood introduced the following cloture resolution (S. Res. 3) embodying the Vice President's recommendation on further limitation of debate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

"Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto, in lieu of the rule adopted by the Senate for the limitation of debate on March 8, 1917, the following:

"1. There shall be a motion for the previous question which, being ordered by a majority of Senators voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the Senate to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the presiding officer to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

"2. All motions for the previous question shall, before being submitted to the Senate, be seconded by a majority by tellers if demanded.

"3. When a motion for the previous question has been seconded, it shall be in order, before final vote is taken thereon for each Senator to debate the proposition to be voted for 1 hour."

Other resolutions introduced in the first session of the 69th Congress limiting debate were Senate Resolution 26; Senate Resolution 225; Senate Resolution 217; Senate Resolution 59; Senate Resolution 77; Senate Resolution 76; which were also referred to the Committee on Rules.

1925. Robinson (Arkansas) said: "No change in the written rules of the Senate is necessary to prevent irrelevant debate. Parliamentary procedure everywhere contemplates that a speaker shall limit his remarks to the subject under consideration. The difficulty grows out of the failure of the presiding officer of the Senate to enforce this rule."

Jones (Washington) proposed a threefold plan of reform: (1) extend the existing rule which forbids amendments not germane to appropriation bills to general legislation; (2) compel Senators to confine their remarks to the subject under consideration unless permitted by unanimous consent to

do otherwise; (3) limit debate on measures other than revenue or appropriation bills after they have been under consideration 10 days and it has been impossible to reach a unanimous consent agreement for their disposal.

Fess and Jones introduced resolutions for a rule of relevancy.

1926: Underwood (Alabama) offered a resolution to limit debate by majority vote on appropriation and revenue bills.

1933: Adoption of 20th amendment (February 6, 1933), by doing away with short sessions, would eliminate filibusters, so Norris believed. But subsequent events demonstrated that filibustering minorities are still able to delay urgent legislation. The final sessions of the 73d and 74th Congresses, the first two to function under the amendment, ended in filibusters.

1935: Chair ruled that a quorum call is the transaction of business and that Senators who yield for that purpose lose the floor. Under this ruling, a speaker yielding twice for quorum calls, if they are in order, while the same question is before the Senate is unable to regain the floor on that question during the same legislative day.

1939: Reorganization Act of 1939 (Public Law 19, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) limited debate to 10 hours, to be divided equally between those for and against, upon a resolution to disapprove a presidential reorganization proposal.

1945: The Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) contained the same "antifilibuster rule" as the Reorganization Act of 1939. This rule reads: "Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to."

1946: Republican steering committee delegated Senator SALTONSTALL to prepare an amendment to rule 22, "so that the various dilatory methods of preventing its application can be eliminated." (May 21, 1946.)

KNOWLAND proposed (S. Res. 312) new standing rule prohibiting the receipt or consideration of any amendment to any bill or resolution which is not germane or relevant to the subject matter thereof. Referred to Rules Committee (July 25, 1946).

Moses urged thorough study of the rules of the Senate "to the end of completely revising them." He also submitted a resolution (S. Res. 314) directing the Parliamentarian of the Senate to "prepare a complete and annotated digest" of its precedents (July 25, 1946). Referred to Rules Committee. (The Parliamentarian is compiling the precedents of the Senate under authority of a similar resolution passed several years ago.)

1947: Saltonstall, Knowland, Morse, and Pepper introduced resolutions to amend rule 22 so as to make cloture apply to any measure or motion or other matter pending before the Senate by a majority vote of those voting or by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate. Rules Committee on April 3, 1947, reported a resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule 22 by making cloture apply to "any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate or the unfinished business," but making no change in the current voting requirements of rule 22 or in the limitation of debate after cloture is invoked.

Pepper (Florida) revived suggestion that Senate adopt a new rule making irrelevant debate out of order. He also proposed to limit debate on a motion to make any subject the unfinished business of the Senate, to make such a motion privileged, and have it decided by majority vote.

HOLLAND (Florida) suggested that majority cloture be adopted only for the closing day or days of a session and that two-thirds cloture be required at other times.

1948: In July, Tobey introduced a resolution (S. Res. 270) "that during the present special session of the Congress, in the interests of efficiency and conservation of time, no Senator shall speak more than once on any subject and no more than 30 minutes thereon." No action.

Vandenberg, President pro tempore, in sustaining point of order against petition to close debate on motion to consider the anti-poll-tax bill, expressed his belief that "in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all * * * a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules * * * a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything * * * the existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum" (August 2, 1948).

Republican conference appointed committee of 10 Senators to consider and recommend revision of existing cloture rule (August 1948). Members of this committee were: Brooks (chairman), Wherry, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Lodge, Jenner, Bricker, Ives, Ferguson, Staltonstall.

1949: During the 81st Congress 8 resolutions were introduced to amend the cloture rule: 5 in the 1st session and 3 in the 2d session. Nineteen Senators joined in sponsoring these resolutions: Myers, Morse, Saltonstall, Knowland, Ferguson, Ives, Hayden, Wherry, Pepper, Humphrey, Lehman, Murray, Thomas of Utah, Magnuson, McMahon, Kilgore, Neely, Douglas, Benton. The resolutions were: S. Res. 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 283, 322, 336. All were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which held public hearings on the first 5 resolutions on January 24, 25, 26, 28, 31, and February 1, 1949. After a move to discharge the committee, it reported (Rept. No. 69) without amendment the Hayden-Wherry resolution (S. Res. 15) on February 17. A motion to take up Senate Resolution 15 was considered in the Senate at intervals from February 28 to March 17, 1949, when it was amended and agreed to. On March 10 a motion was presented to close debate on the motion to consider Senate Resolution 15. Mr. RUSSELL made a point of order against the cloture motion which was overruled by the Chair. On appeal from the decision of the Chair, the decision of the Chair was not sustained on March 11 by a vote of 41 to 46.

1950: During the second session of the 81st Congress 3 resolutions were introduced to liberalize the cloture rule adopted in 1949. They were Senate Resolution 283, by Mr. SALTONSTALL, on May 22, 1950; Senate Resolution 322, by Mr. MORSE and Mr. HUMPHREY, on August 2, 1950; and Senate Resolution 336, by Mr. Lehman and 9 others, on August 24, 1950. All these resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which took no action upon them.

On May 5, 1950, Senator Lucas moved to proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill (S. 1728). On May 19 a motion to close debate on the motion to take up the FEPC bill was defeated by a vote of 52 yeas to 32 nays. Under the 1949 cloture rule it would have required the votes of 64 Senators—two-thirds of those duly elected and sworn—to close debate. This was the first test of the cloture rule as amended in 1949. Republicans voted 33 for cloture, 6 against. Democrats voted 19 for cloture, 26 against. Twelve Senators were absent, of whom 9 were Democrats and 3 were Republicans. One of the absentees—Senator Withers, Democrat, of Kentucky—was formally announced as opposing application of cloture. (For discussion of the failure of the new cloture rule on its first try, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 6, pp. 7300–7307).

On July 12, 1950, a second attempt to invoke cloture on the motion to permit consideration of the FEPC bill (S. 1728) was defeated by a vote of 55 to 33, 9 votes short of the required number. (For further discussion of the pros and cons of the 1949 cloture rule, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, p. 8, pp. 9976–9985.)

1951–52: During the 82d Congress four resolutions to amend the Senate cloture rule were introduced:

Senate Resolution 41, by Mr. MORSE and Mr. HUMPHREY, providing for simple majority cloture;

Senate Resolution 52, by Mr. IVES and Mr. Lodge, providing for constitutional majority (49) cloture;

Senate Resolution 105, by Mr. Lehman and 10 others, providing for simple two-thirds cloture after a waiting period of 48 hours or, alternatively, for simple majority cloture after 15 days of debate; and

Senate Resolution 203, by Mr. Wherry, providing for cloture by two-thirds of those present and voting.

Cloture rule and resolutions compared

Author	Resolution	Voting requirement	Effectiveness in closing debate
	Rule 22	64 votes	3 out of 21 times.[1]
Ives-Lodge	S. Res. 52	49 votes	9 out of 21 times.[2]
Wherry	S. Res. 203	Two-thirds voting	4 out of 21 times.[2]
Morse-Lehman et al	S. Res. 41 and 105	Majority voting	14 out of 21 times.[2]

[1] Since 1917.
[2] Potential effectiveness, had this been the rule since 1917.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which held hearings on them on October 2, 3, 9, and 23, 1951. On March 6, 1952, the committee reported favorably on Senate Resolution 203, with an amendment lengthening the time limit between the filing of a cloture motion and the vote thereon from 1 to 5 intervening calendar days (S. Rept. No. 1256, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).

Senate Resolution 203, if adopted, would restore the voting requirement for cloture which was in effect from 1917 to 1949, i. e., two-thirds of those Senators present and voting instead of two-thirds of those duly chosen and sworn. Senate Resolution 203 leaves subsection 3 of the present rule 22 unaltered, which means that debate would remain unlimited on proposals to change any of the standing rules of the Senate.

Dissenting views were filed by Mr. Lodge who felt that Senate Resolution 203 "will make no practical difference insofar as the prevention of future filibusters is concerned"; by Mr. Hendrickson who urged adoption of a simple majority cloture rule; and by Mr. Benton who favored Senate Resolution 105. No further action was taken on the subject during 1952.

1953–54: During the 83d Congress four resolutions to amend the Senate cloture rule were introduced:

Senate Resolution 20, by Mr. JENNER, providing for cloture by two-thirds of those present and voting;

Senate Resolution 31, by Mr. IVES, providing for cloture by a majority of the Senate's authorized membership; a 12-day interval (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays) between the filing of a cloture petition and the vote thereon; and deleting subsection 3

of rule 22 and all reference to it in subsection 2;

Senate Resolution 63, by Mr. Lehman and seven others, repealing subsection 3 of rule 22 and providing two methods of cloture: By two-thirds of those voting after 1 intervening day following filing of the petition, or, if this failed, by a majority of those voting following an interval of 14 days; and

Senate Resolution 291, by Mr. MORSE, providing for cloture by a majority of those voting and repealing subsection 3 of rule 22.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which, after consideration, favorably reported Senate Resolution 20 to the Senate with an amendment (S. Rept. 268). The resolution was placed on the calendar, but no further action was taken. Senate Resolution 291 was ordered to lie on the table July 22, 1954. Individual views were filed by Mr. GREEN and Mr. HENNINGS (S. Rept. 268). Floor consideration of Senate Resolution 20 was objected to on 4 calendar calls during the first session and on 6 calendar calls during the second session of the 83d Congress.

The major event of the 83d Congress as regards efforts to limit debate in the Senate was the Anderson motion. At the opening of the 83d Congress advocates of majority rule in the Senate challenged the conception of the Senate as a continuing body. They based their strategy on the contention of Senator Walsh in 1917 that each new Congress brings with it a new Senate, entitled to consider and adopt its own rules. They proposed to move for consideration of new rules on the first day of the session and, upon the adoption of this motion, to propose that all of the old rules be adopted with the exception of rule 22. Rule 22 was to be changed to allow a majority of all Senators (49) to limit debate after 14 days of discussion.

Accordingly, on January 3, 1953, Senator ANDERSON, on behalf of himself and 18 other Senators, moved that the Senate immediately consider the adoption of rules for the Senate of the 83d Congress. Senator Taft then moved that the Anderson motion be tabled. In the ensuing debate the Anderson motion was supported by Senators Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, Ives, Hendrickson, Neely, Morse, and Murray.

Senator DOUGLAS told the Senate that the Anderson proposal was the only method with any hope of success. The 1949 rule, he said, "ties our hands once the Senate is fully organized * * *. For under it any later proposal to alter the rules can be filibustered and never permitted to come to a vote. * * * Therefore, if it be permanently decided that the rules of the preceding Senate apply automatically as the new Senate organizes, we may as well say farewell to any chance either for civil-rights legislation or needed changes in Senate procedure." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, p. 203.)

Opponents of the Anderson motion centered principally on the argument that the Senate is a continuing body, bound by the rules of earlier Senates. They said that this thesis was proved because:

1. Only one-third of the Senate is elected every 2 years.

2. The Constitution did not provide for the adoption of new rules every 2 years.

3. If the Senate had had the power to adopt new rules, it had lost that power through disuse.

4. The Supreme Court, they said, had decided that the Senate was a continuing body.

Debate against the rules change was led by Senator Taft who announced that the Republican Policy Committee had voted to oppose it in caucus; and by Senators Russell, Saltonstall, Stennis, Ferguson, Smith of New Jersey, Butler, of Maryland, Maybank, and Knowland.

The Anderson motion was finally tabled by a vote of 21 to 70, taken on January 7, 1953. Taft was opposed by 15 Democrats, 5 Republicans, and 1 Independent. He was supported by 41 Republicans and 29 Democrats. One additional Democrat was paired against the Taft motion; and one additional Republican was paired for it.

1955–56: During the 84th Congress only 1 resolution to amend the cloture rule was presented to the Senate. This was Senate Resolution 108, by Mr. Lehman, on June 14, 1955. On that day it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and on June 29 to the Subcommittee on Rules. No further action was taken on the Lehman resolution. Senate Resolution 108 provided, (a) for cloture by a two-thirds vote of those voting "on the following calendar day but one" after the presentation of a petition to close debate; and (b) for cloture by a majority of those voting "on the 14th calendar day thereafter."

OUTSTANDING SENATE FILIBUSTERS FROM 1841 TO 1955

1841: A bill to remove the Senate printers was filibustered against for 10 days.

A bill relating to the bank of the United States was filibustered for several weeks and caused Clay to introduce his cloture resolution.

1846: The Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

1863: A bill to suspend the writ of habeas corpus was filibustered.

1876: An Army appropriation bill was filibustered against for 12 days, forcing the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws.

1880: A measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16 by an evenly divided Senate, until 2 Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

1890: The Blair education bill was filibustered.

The force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, was successfully filibustered for 29 days. This resulted in the cloture resolution introduced by Senator Aldrich which was also filibustered and the resolution failed.

1893: An unsuccessful filibuster lasting 42 days was organized against a bill for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

1901: Senator Carter successfuly filibustered a river and harbor bill because it failed to include certain additional appropriations.

1902: There was a successful filibuster against the tri-State bill proposing to admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood, because the measure did not include all of Indian territory according to the original boundaries.

1903. Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item paying his State a war claim. The item was finally replaced in the bill.

1907: Senator Stone filibustered against a ship subsidy bill.

1908: Senator La Follette led a filibuster lasting 28 days against the Vreeland-Aldrich emergency currency law. The filibuster finally failed.

1911: Senator Owen filibustered a bill proposing to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood. The House had accepted New Mexico, but refused Arizona because of her proposed constitution. Senator Owen filibustered against the admission of New Mexico until Arizona was replaced in the measure.

The Canadian reciprocity bill passed the House and failed through a filibuster in the Senate. It passed Congress in an extraordinary session, but Canada refused to accept the proposition.

1913: A filibuster was made against the omnibus public building bill by Senator Stone, of Missouri, until certain appropriations for his State were included.

1914: Senator Burton, of Ohio, filibustered against a river and harbor bill for 12 hours. Senator Gronna filibustered against acceptance of a conference report on an Indian appropriation bill.

In this year also, the following bills were debated at great length, but finally passed: Panama Canal tolls bill, 30 days; Federal Trade Commission bill, 30 days; Clayton amendments to the Sherman Act, 21 days; conference report on the Clayton bill, 9 days.

1915: A filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship-purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

1917: The armed ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administration measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

1919: A filibuster was successful against an oil and mineral leasing bill, causing the failure of several important appropriation bills and necessitating an extraordinary session of Congress.

1921: The emergency tariff bill was filibustered against in January 1921, which led Senator Penrose to present a cloture petition. The cloture petition failed, but the tariff bill finally passed.

1922: The Dyer antilynching bill was successfully filibustered against by a group of southern Senators.

1923: President Harding's ship-subsidy bill was defeated by a filibuster.

1925: Senator Copeland (New York) talked at length against ratification of the Isle of Pines Treaty with Cuba, but the treaty was finally ratified.

1926: A 10-day filibuster against the World Court protocol was ended by a cloture vote of 68 to 26, the second time cloture was adopted by the Senate.

A bill for migratory-bird refuges was talked to death by States rights advocates in the spring of 1926, a motion for cloture failing by a vote of 46 to 33.

1927: Cloture again failed of adoption in 1927 when it was rejected by 32 yeas against 59 nays as a device to end obstruction against the Swing-Johnson bill for development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

One of the fiercest filibusters in recent decades succeeded in March 1927, in preventing an extension of the life of a special campaign investigating committee headed by James A. Reed, of Missouri. The committee's exposé of corruption in the 1926 senatorial election victories of Frank L. Smith in Illinois and of William S. Vare in Pennsylvania had aroused the ire of a few Senators who refused to permit the continuance of the investigation despite the wishes of a clear majority of the Senate.

1933: Early in 1933 a 2-week filibuster was staged against the Glass branch-banking bill in which Huey Long first participated as a leading figure. "Senators found him impervious to sarcasm and no man could silence him." Cloture was defeated by the margin of a single vote. Finally, the filibuster was abandoned and the bill passed.

1935: The most celebrated of the Long filibusters was staged on June 12–13, 1935. Senator Long spoke for 15½ hours, a feat of physical endurance never before excelled in the Senate, in favor of the Gore amendment to the proposed extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act. But the amendment was finally tabled.

1938: A 29-day "feather duster" filibuster in January-February 1938 defeated passage of a Federal antilynching bill, although an overwhelming majority of the Senate clearly favored the bill.

1939: An extended filibuster against adoption of a monetary bill, extending presidential authority to alter the value of the dollar, continued from June 20 to July 5, 1939, but finally failed by a narrow margin.

1942, 1944, 1946, 1948: Four organized filibusters upon the perennial question of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation were successful in these years. An attempt to pass fair-employment practice legislation in 1946 was also killed by a filibuster. The Senate cloture rule proved ineffective in these cases as a device for breaking filibusters.

1949: A motion to take up a resolution (S. Res. 15) to amend the cloture rule was debated at intervals in the Senate from February 23 to March 17 when it was amended and agreed to.

1950: A motion to take up the FEPC bill (S. 1728) was debated in the Senate, May 8–19, 1950, a total of 9 days. Ten Senators spoke in favor of the motion to take up (really in support of the bill) and 8 Senators spoke against the motion. According to a rough calculation, the proponents of the motion and bill used 35 percent, and the opponents used 65 percent, of the space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD devoted to the subject. During the 9-day period 3,414 inches of the RECORD were consumed with discussion of FEPC and 2,635 inches with other matters.

Mr. MALONE filibustered for 11 hours against the conference report on the slot machine bill (S. 3357) in December 1950.

1953: A prolonged debate took place on the so-called tidelands offshore oil bill. It began April 1 and ended May 5. The tidelands debate lasted for 35 days, one of the longest on record. During this debate Senator MORSE established a new record for the longest single speech. On April 24–25 he spoke for 22 hours and 26 minutes.

1954: An extended debate occurred in July 1954, on a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (S. 3690). The debate lasted 13 days. On July 26 Senator KNOWLAND sought to invoke cloture on S. 3690, but his motion failed by a vote of 44 yeas to 42 nays.

LEGISLATION DELAYED OR DEFEATED BY FILIBUSTER, BY YEARS [11]

Reconstruction of Louisiana, 1865.
Repeal of election laws, 1879.
Force bill (Federal elections), 1890–91.
River and harbor bills (3), 1901, 1903, 1914.
Tri-State bill, 1903.
Colombian Treaty (Panama Canal), 1903.
Ship subsidy bills (2), 1907, 1922–23.
Canadian reciprocity bill, 1911.
Arizona-New Mexico statehood, 1911.
Ship purchase bill, 1915.
Armed ship resolution, 1917.
Oil and mineral leasing bill and several appropriation bills, 1919.
Antilynch bills (3), 1922, 1935, 1937–38.
Migratory-bird bill, 1926.
Campaign-investigation resolution, 1927.
Colorado River bills (Boulder Dam project) (2), 1927, 1928.
Emergency officers' retirement bill, 1927.
Washington public-buildings bill, 1927.
National-origins provisions in immigration laws, resolution to postpone, 1929.
Oil industry investigation, 1931.
Supplemental deficiency bill, 1935.
Work-relief bill ("prevailing wage" amendment), 1935.
Flood-control bill, 1935.
Coal-conservation bill, 1936.
Anti-poll-tax bills (4), 1942, 1944, 1946, 1948.
Fair-employment practices bills (2), 1946, 1950.

Numerous appropriation bills. For a partial list of 82 such bills that failed from 1876 to 1916, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1916, pages 10152–10153.

Of the 36 measures listed above, all but 11 eventually became law, in some cases after compromises had been made in their provisions following the failure of cloture. The table below, prepared at the direction of Senator HAYDEN, shows the later action on 35 filibustered bills.

The 36th measure (the second FEPC bill) was filibustered in 1950, subsequent to the table that follows.

[11] Thirty-six bills appear in this incomplete list, not including the many appropriation bills that have either been lost in the jam that resulted from filibusters or were talked to death because they failed to include items that particular Senators desired for the benefit of their States or because grants they made were considered excessive. Several successful filibusters have sought and achieved the enactment of legislation favored by the filibusters. Filibusters have succeeded not only in preventing the passage of legislation, but also in preventing the organization of the Senate, the election of its officers, and the confirmation of Presidential appointees. They have also succeeded in modifying the terms of legislation; in delaying adjournment of Congress; in forcing special sessions, the adoption of conference reports, of neutrality legislation, and of a ship subsidy; in postponing consideration of legislation, and in raising the price of silver. Legislation has also often been defeated or modified by the mere threat of a filibuster. All the bills listed above, however, except the force bill, the armed ship resolution, and the so-called civil rights bills, were eventually enacted, in some form.

Later action on 35 filibustered bills

Bills	Filibustered	Passed	Not passed (10)	Bills	Filibustered	Passed	Not passed (10)
Reconstruction of Louisiana	1865	1868		Colorado River bills (2)	1927, 1928	1928 [1]	
Election laws	1879	1909 (repealed)		Emergency officers' retirement bill	1927	1928	
Force bill	1890–91		X	Washington public buildings bill	1927	1928	
River and harbor bills (3)	1901, 1903, 1914	At intervals		Resolution to postpone national-origins provision of immigration laws.	1929	1929	
Tristate bill	1903	1907, 1912		Oil-industry investigation	1931	1935	
Colombian Treaty	1903	1903 [1]		Supplemental deficiency bill	1935	1936	
Ship-subsidy bills (2)	1907, 1922–23	1936		Prevailing-wage amendment to work-relief bill.	1935	1936	
Canadian reciprocity bill	1911	1911 [1]		Flood-control bill	1935	1936	
Arizona-New Mexico statehood	1911	1912 (admitted)		Coal-conservation bill	1936	1937	
Ship-purchase bill	1915	1916		Anti-poll-tax bills (4)	1942, 1944, 1946, 1948.		X
Armed-ship bill	1917		X	FEPC bill	1946		X
Mineral lands leasing bill	1919	1920					
Antilynch bills (3)	1922, 1935, 1937		X				
Migratory bird conservation bill	1926	1929					
Campaign investigation resolution	1927	1927 [1]					

[1] In special or subsequent sessions.

NOTE.—Numerous appropriation bills, at intervals, passed in special or later sessions.

Source: Limitation on Debate in the Senate. Hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration, U. S. Senate, 81st Cong., 1st sess. On resolutions relative to amending Senate rule XXII relating to cloture. January and February 1949, p. 42.

Senate votes on invoking cloture rule [1]

Congress and session	Date	Subject	Senator offering motion	Yeas	Nays	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD		Cloture
						Volume	Page	
66th, 1st	Nov. 15, 1919	Treaty of Versailles	Lodge	78	16	58	8555–8556	Yes.
66th, 3d	Feb. 2, 1921	Emergency tariff	Penrose	36	35	60	2432	No.
67th, 2d	July 7, 1922	Fordney-McCumber tariff	McCumber	45	35	62	10040	No.
69th, 1st	Jan. 25, 1926	World Court	Lenroot	68	26	67	2678–2679	Yes.
	June 1, 1926	Migratory-bird refuges	Norbeck	46	33	67	10392	No.
69th, 2d	Feb. 15, 1927	Branch banking	Pepper	65	18	68	3824	Yes.
	Feb. 26, 1927	Retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War	Tyson	51	26	68	4901	No.
	do	Colorado River development	Johnson	32	59	68	4900	No.
	Feb. 28, 1927	Public buildings in the District of Columbia	Lenroot	52	31	68	4985	No.
	do	Creation of Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Prohibition	Jones of Washington.	55	27	68	4986	Yes.
73d, 2d	Jan. 19, 1933	Banking Act	Robinson	58	30	76	2077	No.
75th, 3d	Jan. 27, 1938	Antilynching	Neely	37	51	83	1166	No.
	Feb. 16, 1938	do	Wagner	42	46	83	2007	No.
77th, 2d	Nov. 23, 1942	Antipoll tax	Barkley	37	41	88	9065	No.
78th, 2d	May 15, 1944	do	do	36	44	90	2550–2551	No.
79th, 2d	Feb. 9, 1946	FEPC	do	48	36	92	1219	No.
	May 7, 1946	British loan	Ball	41	41	92	4539	No.
	May 25, 1946	Labor disputes	Knowland	3	77	92	5714	No.
	July 31, 1946	Antipoll tax	Barkley	39	33	92	10512	No.
81st, 2d	May 19, 1950	FEPC	Lucas	52	32	96	7300	No.
	July 12, 1950	do	do	55	33	96	9982	No.
83d, 2d	July 26, 1954	Atomic Energy Act	Knowland	44	42	100	11942	No.

[1] Many cloture petitions have also been withdrawn or held out of order since 1917.

ARGUMENTS FOR FILIBUSTERING

1. Minorities have rights which no majority should override. Government is constituted to protect minorities against majorities. Obstruction is justifiable as a means of preventing a majority from trampling upon minority rights until a broad political consensus has developed.

2. A Senate majority does not necessarily represent a consensus of the people or even of the States. Frequently popular opinion upon a question has not been formulated or, if it has been, it is often not effectively expressed. Prolonged debate may prevent hasty majority action which would be out of harmony with genuine popular consensus.

3. It is the special duty of the Senate, sitting in an appellate capacity, carefully to inspect proposed legislation, a duty not readily performed without freedom of debate. In our system of government, where legislation can be gaveled through the House of Representatives at breakneck speed with only scanty debate under special rules framed by a partisan committee, it is essential that one place be left for thoroughgoing debate.

4. Filibusters really do not prevent needed legislation, because every important measure defeated by filibuster has been enacted later, except the civil-rights bills. No really meritorious measure has been permanently defeated and some vicious proposals have been killed. The filibuster has killed more bad bills than good ones.

5. It is the unique function of the Senate to act as a check upon the Executive, a responsibility it could not perform without full freedom of debate. Unrestricted debate in the Senate is the only check upon Presidential and party autocracy. It is justified by the nature of our governmental system of separated powers.

6. The constitutional requirement for recording the yeas and nays is a protection of dilatory tactics. The provision of the Constitution which requires the yeas and nays to be recorded in the journal at the desire of one-fifth of the Members present is an intentional safeguard allowing the minority to delay proceedings.

7. Majority cloture in the Senate would destroy its deliberative function and make it a mere annex of the House of Representatives.

8. Simple majority cloture would have brought many a decision which would have accorded ill with the sober second thought of the American people.

9. The Senate, without majority cloture, actually passes a larger percentage of bills introduced in that body than does the House of Representatives, with cloture.

10. To enforce cloture by vote of a chance majority in the Senate might bring greater loss than gain.

11. Filibusters are justifiable whenever a great, vital, fundamental, constitutional question is presented and a majority is trying to override the organic law of the United States. Under such circumstances, Senators as ambassadors of the States in Congress have a duty to protect the rights of the States.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FILIBUSTERING

1. Under the practice of filibustering, the basic American principle of majority rule is set at naught. Not only is the majority thwarted in its purpose to enact public measures, it is also coerced into acceptance of measures for which it has no desire or approval.

2. The Senate should legislate efficiently, with responsibility only to the people. If the Senate is to be efficient, time should not be wasted in unnecessary delay merely for the sake of obstruction. Filibusters sometimes make special sessions of Congress imperative, with resulting unnecessary expense to the people and business uncertainty in the country. They also destroy responsibility of the majority party to the people.

3. Experience abroad and in the State legislatures indicates that debate can be limited without undemocratic results.

4. The constitutional provision that "the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal" requires an immediate vote when the yeas and nays have been properly demanded.

5. Filibustering gives one Senator or a little group of Senators a veto power. It enables a handful of men in the Senate to prevent the passage of legislation desired by the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and the country. It permits one Senator to hold up needed appropriations until he extorts the favor that he demands for his State.

6. Filibusters have delayed for decades the enactment of social legislation passed by the House of Representatives and desired by a majority of the American people. Many people are losing faith in American democracy because of its repeated and prolonged failures to perform its implicit promises. Responsibility for these failures lies in large part at the door of Senate filibusters.

7. They arouse popular resentment and bring the Senate into disrepute at home and abroad.

8. Filibusters cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars, consuming days and weeks of valuable time and many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at $80 a page.

9. They impose upon the Senate an indignity which would not be tolerated in any other legislative chamber in the world.

10. The present cloture rule (rule 22) is so cumbersome as to be unworkable. It has been successfully invoked only 4 out of 22 times in 39 years, the last time being in 1927.

11. Free speech would not be abolished in the Senate by majority cloture because, under the proposed amendment, adequate opportunity to deliberate upon a measure would be afforded during the prepetition stage plus the 2-day interval between the presentation of the cloture petition and the vote upon it, plus the 96 potential hours of debate allowed after cloture has been invoked.

12. Scores of appropriation bills and much meritorious legislation have been defeated or delayed by filibusters in the past.

13. Filibusters are undemocratic in that they permit one-third of the Senators present, plus one, to obstruct the majority. This group of Senators may be from only one section of the country, they may be from only one political party, and none of them may have been recently elected. It is a dubious argument to defend the filibuster on the ground that it protects the minority when actually its principal use, actual or potential, is to deny fundamental democratic rights to certain minorities. Most of the really undemocratic conditions in our country today exist because of the threat or use of the filibuster.

14. An effective antifilibuster rule ought to exist because (a) it is the imperative duty of a legislature not merely to debate but to legislate and, therefore, to tolerate no course of action by any of its members which will absolutely prevent legislation; (b) the majority is and must be held responsible for the conduct of affairs and is, therefore, entitled to use all means proper and necessary for the conduct of affairs; and (c) the vast and steadily increasing volume of business thrust on Congress renders it essential that not one moment of time be consumed uselessly.

REMEDIES FOR OBSTRUCTION IN THE SENATE [12]

1. Amend rule 22 to provide for cloture by majority vote of the total membership of the Senate, or by a majority of those present, applicable to any motion, measure, or other matter pending, after unlimited debate for a specified minimum number of days.

2. Adopt a rule providing for use of the motion for the previous question (as the House does) by which all further debate upon a matter may be terminated by a majority vote of the Chamber.

3. Adopt a rule that debate and amendments must be germane to the subject under consideration.

4. Limit duration of debate on bills by special orders as the House does.

5. Enforce the existing rules of the Senate by—

(a) Requiring the speaker to stand and not to sit or walk about.

(b) Taking a Senator "off his feet" for using unparliamentary language.

(c) Making a point of order against frequent quorum calls that no business has intervened since a rollcall disclosed the presence of a quorum.

(d) The Chair making drastic rulings against dilatory motions, on points of order raised from the floor.

(e) Objecting to reading a paper (rule 11).

6. Enforce rule 19 that "no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate."

7. Enforce the provision of Jefferson's Manual that "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously."

8. Let the Chair reverse the precedent, established in 1872, that a Senator cannot be called to order for irrelevancy in debate.

9. Let the Chair make a wise use of the power of recognition as between simultaneous claimants (rule 19, clause 1).

10. Let there be objection to yielding the floor, even though the Senator who has the floor consents to an interruption.

11. Resort to prolonged or continuous sessions.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1. Debate in the House of Representatives is prohibited on a large number of parliamentary motions. Cannon lists 30 questions and motions which are not debatable at pages 143–144 of his Procedure in the House of Representatives, fourth edition.

2. General limitations:

(a) Since 1789 no Member has been allowed to speak more than once to the same question without leave of the House unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending (rule 14, clause 6).

(b) Since 1841 no Member has been allowed to occupy more than 1 hour in debate on any question in the House or in Committee of the Whole (rule 14, clause 2).

(c) Since 1789 it has been possible to shut off debate and bring the matter under consideration to an immediate vote by the motion for the previous question (rule 17).

(d) Since 1789 Members engaging in debate have been required to confine themselves to the question under consideration, except during general debate in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union (rule 14, clause 1).

(e) Since 1789 no Member has been permitted to take the floor or engage in debate until he has been recognized by the Chair (rule 14, clause 2).

(f) Since 1883 time for general debate in Committee of the Whole has been limited by special orders reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House (rule 23, clause 5).

(g) Since 1847 and 1850 debate upon amendments to a pending bill has been limited by the 5-minute rule (rule 23, clause 5).

[12] As proposed by United States Senators from time to time through the years.

(h) Since 1880 debate has been limited to 40 minutes under suspension of the rules (rule 27).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas desire to yield time to any Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not have a speaker available at the present time. If the Senator from New Mexico has time to yield to a Senator who will speak on his side of the question for about 10 minutes, I shall then have a speaker.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out that we have used something over 100 minutes, and the Senator from Texas has used about 70 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New Mexico has been very kind. I have reminded him several times of that. I took time for lunch. While I was absent three of my speakers disappeared. I apologize. I shall get them back to the Chamber as soon as I can.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time the Senate is now using not be taken from the time allotted to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in one observation made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I apprehend, from the mail and from the telegrams I and other Senators have received, that there are a great many people who actually believe the Senate is going to vote on a modification of rule 22 today, when, in fact, the motion which is pending before the Senate is entirely different in character, and is certainly all inclusive, and would involve every one of the 40 standing rules of the Senate. That point must be made abundantly clear, for even if the motion to table should not prevail today, it would still be necessary for the Senate to deal with the question of rule 22 at some later time.

I am of the opinion that we have sort of gotten the cart before the horse. It is a fair assumption that the whole civil-rights issue has preceded the rules controversy. I have manifested an abiding interest in civil-rights legislation. In San Francisco last year I served as chairman of the subcommittee on civil rights at the Republican National Convention. Frankly, I am quite proud, modestly so, of the kind of platform we wrote on civil-rights legislation. In the last session of the 84th Congress I sponsored, jointly with other Senators, four bills which were pending before the Judiciary Committee when the Congress concluded its labors. The subject matter of some of those bills was engrossed in a single package which was passed by the House of Representatives.

If it is fair to assume that this whole controversy comes before the Senate because of a growing interest in the civil-rights issue, then perhaps for a moment we ought to go back to the beginnings. Bills can be introduced and properly referred under the rule to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, but the first problem is to get bills out of the committee. I think I authorized the motion under which the Judiciary Committee in its entirety would take testimony, and my record indicates that there were at least 8 hearings before the full committee on the question of civil rights, and that 17 bills were pending before the committee at the time. No action was taken, and when the Senate concluded its functions on the 27th of July it was on that day that a discharge resolution was filed by three distinguished Members of the Senate. That resolution languished on the calendar and no action was taken on it.

If we are going to deal with the question of civil rights, let us go back to beginnings. Let us go back to the committee. I have been introducing bills of this nature for more than 18 years. It probably was 18 years ago when I introduced in the House of Representatives my first bill on poll taxes, antilynching, and fair labor employment practices. Actually eight of those measures reached the Senate. The cloture rule was invoked at that time—several times on antilynch bills, several times on poll-tax bills, and several times on fair employment practice bills—but in no case was cloture actually put into effect by a vote of the Senate.

So we are back where we started. If we wish to do something constructive, why not modify the discharge rule? In the other House I served under a discharge rule which, in its inception, required signatures of two-thirds of all the Members of the House. Any Member who ever served in the House knows that any Member is free to file a discharge petition and lay it on the Clerk's desk. Members are then free to walk up to the Clerk's desk and sign it.

Later, I think in the 73d Congress—that rule was modified to require only a majority of signatures of Members of the House of Representatives. We could modify the discharge rule in the Senate so that it would be possible, after the lapse of 30 days, to bring a bill to the floor of the Senate and then determine what to do, and see whether or not, in order to prevent action, there would be a filibuster that could not be broken.

I think in all fairness it must be said that any filibuster on a question involving civil-rights legislation in this body can be broken. If we consider only the 8 or 9 States referred to as the Deep South, that means that if both Senators from each of the 9 States were religiously to set themselves against such measures as earnest crusaders, 18 Members of this body would be engaged in that effort. If other Members of the Senate were interested in civil-rights legislation, they could break that kind of filibuster. But I think the first problem is with respect to the discharge rule, to bring a bill to the attention of the Senate, and then determine where to go from there. That is why I say today that we have the cart before the horse.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe, therefore, that when a proposal comes before us to open up the entire package of rules, we may think we are choosing our battleground, but someone else will be fighting on it before we are through.

I see my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] nodding by way of assent. Once we open up the question, only to get at rule 22, there will be 40 standing rules of the Senate to engross the attention of Members of this body. I fancy that every Member is interested in different rules in the rule book. This procedure could then become a Donnybrook Fair, which might last 2 or 3 months before we got around to constructive legislation, and the consideration of the President's program.

It is not telling tales out of school, I think, when I say to my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. IVES] that I believe his primary interest is in rule 22. He nods assent. I am interested in rule 22. I wish we could modify it, and I am prepared to go along with some reasonable and decent modification of rule 22, but I am certainly disinclined to open up the all-embrasive controversy involving the 40 standing rules of the Senate.

This question arose in San Francisco. I served as chairman of the civil-rights subcommittee of the Republican Platform Committee. A great many persons came before the subcommittee to testify. They wanted to inject rule 22 into the platform. I said that if I had anything to do with it, under no circumstances would the party pass upon that question, because that is a matter of a procedural character, which lies wholly within the domain of the United States Senate. There is therefore no single allusion, directly or by implication, to rule 22 as a political matter. We tried to keep it on an affirmative, constructive basis.

So, speaking for myself as a Member of this body, I am prepared, by the normal and customary procedure, to go along with some reasonable modification of rule 22, without inviting and provoking the entire controversy which must necessarily ensue if we open up the whole package.

I am only too glad to serve under majority rule. I did so for 16 years. I did not find it very difficult. I am prepared, within limits, to do so again. I am delighted by the fact that the discussion today has been on a high level. I think I have been present in the Chamber most of the time. I listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and other Senators. However, I do not believe it can be denied that we are opening up a tremendous area of controversy for the one and only purpose of getting at rule 22.

I hope my memory served me correctly when I responded to a telegram which reached my office this morning. It was signed by the leader of a group in Chi-

cago. It said, in brief, "We trust that you will go along with the commitment you made with respect to the resolution which is before the Senate."

I have no recollection of any such commitment. I have a very definite recollection that I made the specific commitment that I would go along with some kind of reasonable modification of rule 22; and if our friends on this side of the aisle or on the other side are disposed to bring forward such a proposal, it certainly will receive careful consideration on the part of the junior Senator from Illinois.

However, I say very frankly that today I propose to vote for the motion to table, if for no other reason than that I do not want to see the United States Senate engrossed in a rulemaking controversy, with all the acrimony which invariably goes with it, while the program of the President of the United States, in a rather anxious hour, when there are so many fevers on the horizon of the world, waits until the Senate gets through with its procedural discussion.

For this reason, and because of the practical considerations involved, I shall vote for the motion to table.

I may say to the Senate that I have been circulating on our side this afternoon a package bill, which has in it the four proposals to which we alluded in the platform, and which have commanded the interest of the President of the United States. I trust that all Republican Senators may find it proper to join with us, so that this bill may be introduced on the first day when bills are to be received. I hope that it will receive speedy action in the House of Representatives, and that we can find some way to bring that measure out of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

There is only one further thing to which I wish to allude. In the Committee on the Judiciary we have a sort of gentlemen's agreement. If a Member wishes to hear a certain witness, we try not to be arbitrary or capricious. It might be said that the real filibuster comes in committee, rather than on the floor of the Senate. But who am I to say to a colleague on my side of the table or on the other side of the table, "We ought to get down to business and vote to report this measure," when he feels that there is a witness who could offer something constructive in connection with the proposal?

The first problem is to get the measure out of committee, to the floor of the Senate. When it reaches that point, I think we can find ways and means of effectively dealing with the issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have only a few remarks to make on the subject of the Senate being a continuing body. My purpose in making these remarks is to express my deep concern against the argument that the Senate is not a continuing body.

My concern is increased because I regard this attack on the continuing nature of the Senate as being an attack on constitutional government itself.

While the rules of the Senate do not in themselves comprise constitutional provisions, I am of the opinion that it should be recognized and accepted that the rules are established on a constitutional provision. This provision declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

If we accept the authorization and power of rulemaking from the Constitution, which was adopted in 1789, then we should also recognize and accept the other provisions of the Constitution.

After providing a name for the two legislative bodies of the Congress in article I, section 1, of the Constitution, its framers thereafter referred to the Senate as a definite body being permanently established. No reference was made in the Constitution to "the Senates," which would have indicated a conception of a series of bodies rather than a permanent one.

Nowhere in the Constitution is there an indication that our wise and learned forefathers expected there would be any gaps in the continuation of the Senate. Had they intended to establish the Senate as a noncontinuing or impermanent body. I believe they would have so specified.

The evidence is on the other side. In the preamble to the Constitution, the framers who drafted the Constitution, and the States and people who approved its adoption, stated their intention that the Constitution itself and the institutions established by it would be continuing.

They did not say they were ordaining and establishing the Constitution only for themselves. They used the language "to ourselves and our posterity."

To me, nothing could be clearer that the purpose and, in fact, the action of adoption of the Constitution, created a continuing Constitution and continuing bodies of government under the Constitution.

If we argue for or accept the proposition that the Senate is not a continuing body, it might also be argued that the Constitution itself should be revived and reapproved at regular intervals.

I do not believe any Member of the Senate would make such an argument as to the Constitution; therefore, I cannot see how logic leads anyone to the belief that the Senate is not a continuing body.

In my opinion, the people of this country should look upon efforts to declare the Senate a noncontinuing body as an effort in effect to amend the Constitution itself by a method not established in the Constitution.

I hope the people of this Nation still believe, as I believe, that the Government of the United States is a government of laws and not of men. I regret to say that there have been a number of recent instances in another branch of the Government which would indicate there are some who fail to follow this fundamental concept. But our concern now is with the specific matter under debate.

If it is logical to argue that the Senate does not exist as a continuing body, is it not just as logical then to argue that laws enacted during any given period become invalid upon the discontinuation of the Senate which approved them?

If the legislative body which creates a law is not itself continuing, how then can the law continue?

Of course, any argument that laws duly enacted are not continuing is ridiculous. I think it is just as ridiculous to argue that the Senate which was created by the basic and permanent Constitution of our Nation is not continuing.

The Constitution has been amended 22 times since 1789. No one would argue that these amendments have destroyed the Constitution. Then can it be said that a changing membership affects the continuation of the Senate?

Just as the Constitution provides the basis for a government of laws and not of men, so do the rules of the Senate provide an orderly plan of operation.

Legal provisions have been made in both instances for amendments. When amendments are necessary the duly established provisions should be followed whether it is to amend the Constitution or to change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the Democratic platform of 1956. The plank entitled "Improving Congressional Procedures" reads as follows:

> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 85th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

That statement is clear and unequivocal, and I feel that the effort being made here today is required by the clear and plain words of that provision of the platform. That plank was adopted without dissent at the convention in Chicago, as I remember. That kind of action is certainly persuasive with me.

After the adoption of the platform, I became the Democratic candidate for Vice President, and I accepted the nomination. I would certainly feel that it was my duty, if I had not been willing to live up to that plank, to make my position known before I became the candidate, and certainly before I accepted the nomination.

Later, as the vice presidential candidate, I campaigned throughout the country on that platform. Even though we were not successful, I think I have a duty to try to bring about the enactment of the pledges we made. I believe the people have a right to expect such action from those who run for office on a party platform.

I have joined with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and our other colleagues in proposing a change in rule 22 at this time because I believe their action to be in conformity with this plank of the platform that I have read; and I think this will be our only opportunity at this session to carry out that pledge.

Furthermore, I believe it to be in the national interest that we have a change in this rule.

Senators remember that in 1949 there was a proposal to amend rule 22. That was the year when I first became a Member of the Senate. The objection was raised that the rule as it was then effective did not apply to a motion to bring up a measure, and that the motion to change the rules was therefore subject to unlimited debate. The late, beloved Vice President Barkley held that the then prevailing rule, which provided for cloture by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, did apply to such a motion. I voted to sustain Mr. Barkley's ruling, but the Senate overruled him.

When the Senate overruled Vice President Barkley, it meant there was no limitation at all on a motion to bring up a measure, and I then voted for the 1949 amendment, believing it to be preferable to the situation in which we found ourselves. In so voting, however, I certainly did not intend to bind forever the hands of future Senators. I think every Senator has a right to have his say about the rules under which he operates.

After carefully studying the history and precedents, I decided to join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and our other colleagues in moving the adoption of new rules, providing a change in rule 22. My study has led me to believe that this is the proper time to make such a motion, and that each new Senate should, under the Constitution and precedents, have the right to decide the rules under which it operates.

Any legislative body should, in the final analysis, be able to bring a measure to a conclusion and a vote. I believe in freedom of debate, but it is not freedom when a handful of men can deny the overwhelming majority the right to even secure a final vote on a measure.

Frequently filibusters are thought of in connection with civil-rights legislation, but the veto exercised by filibusters is by no means exclusive to the civil-rights field. Important foreign policy and defense measures, such as the League of Nations Charter and President Wilson's ship-arming bill, can and have fallen victim of the filibuster. I am sure that Senators are familiar with the study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service listing the outstanding Senate filibusters from 1841 to 1955. This study shows that by far the greater number of filibusters concerned things other than civil rights—including appropriation bills, rivers and harbors bills, the admission of various States, including Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. In 1880, in an evenly divided Senate not unlike the one we have today, a measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16, until two Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

Mr. President, I doubt that there is any member of a legislative body who does not at some time think a measure about to be enacted is bad and not in the public interest. But the democratic way to fight that measure is to do so in debate, by the use of parliamentary procedure, by logic—and then to accept the decision. Any other way leads to paralysis of the legislative body.

Paralysis of the National legislative branch might someday occur at a critical period in history and we would be powerless to act. I therefore urge my colleagues to support the Anderson motion.

Many of us supporting the Anderson motion have different ideas as to which rule should replace rule 22. After adopting Mr. ANDERSON'S motion to take up consideration of rules, we should be able to agree upon a rule that would assure free debate, sufficient protection of the view of the minority, and would, at the same time, be a more workable and fairer rule than the one we have at the present time. Even a simple rule of two-thirds of those present and voting would be more just than the present rule 22, and it is difficult to understand how any Senator can ask for more protection than this.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had intended to inquire of the Chair relating to a matter or two, and I rise now for that purpose.

Prior to propounding my parliamentary inquiry, I should like to say that I note in the RECORD at page 11 a motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the Anderson motion.

I also note that a unanimous-consent agreement was arrived at which would permit us to have an orderly discussion of this crucial matter of Senate rules today. Therefore, Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is this:

In light of these developments and in light of what transpired yesterday, and thus far today, under what rule is the Senate presently proceeding?

I should like to have the Chair's view on that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is aware that the answer to that question is that the Senate is proceeding under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair is cognizant of the fact that the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators will propound parliamentary inquiries relating to this subject, and, consequently, it would perhaps be helpful if the Chair indicated by a general statement the Chair's opinion in regard to the parliamentary situation in which the Senate will find itself after the vote which will be taken on the motion to lay on the table.

The Chair emphasizes this because, strictly speaking, a parliamentary inquiry is for the purpose of guiding the Senate in its deliberations so that the Senate will know the effect of votes or other actions which are taken on specific matters. Therefore, the statement which the Chair now makes relates specifically to the question of what the parliamentary situation will be as the Senate votes on the matter currently being discussed. That question, and others which have been discussed in the debate today, in effect, go back to the basic question, Do the rules of the Senate continue from one Congress to another?

Although there is a great volume of written comment and opinion to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body with continuing rules, as well as some opinion to the contrary, the Presiding Officer of the Senate has never ruled directly on this question. Since there are no binding precedents, we must first turn to the Constitution for guidance.

The constitutional provision under which only one-third of the Senate membership is changed by election in each Congress can only be construed to indicate the intent of the framers that the Senate should be a continuing parliamentary body for at least some purposes. By practice for 167 years the rules of the Senate have been continued from one Congress to another.

The Constitution also provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." This constitutional right is lodged in the membership of the Senate and it may be exercised by a majority of the Senate at any time. When the membership of the Senate changes, as it does upon the election of each Congress, it is the Chair's opinion that there can be no question that the majority of the new existing membership of the Senate, under the Constitution, have the power to determine the rules under which the Senate will proceed.

The question, therefore, is, "How can these two constitutional mandates be reconciled?"

It is the opinion of the Chair that while the rules of the Senate have been continued from one Congress to another, the right of a current majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to adopt its own rules, stemming as it does from the Constitution itself, cannot be restricted or limited by rules adopted by a majority of the Senate in a previous Congress.

Any provision of Senate rules adopted in a previous Congress which has the expressed or practical effect of denying the majority of the Senate in a new Congress the right to adopt the rules under which it desires to proceed is, in the opinion of the Chair, unconstitutional. It is also the opinion of the Chair that section 3 of rule 22 in practice has such an effect.

The Chair emphasizes that this is only his own opinion, because under Senate precedents, a question of constitutionality can only be decided by the Senate itself, and not by the Chair.

At the beginning of a session in a newly elected Congress, the Senate can indicate its will in regard to its rules in one of three ways:

First. It can proceed to conduct its business under the Senate rules which were in effect in the previous Congress and thereby indicate by acquiescence that those rules continue in effect. This has been the practice in the past.

Second. It can vote negatively when a motion is made to adopt new rules and

by such action indicate approval of the previous rules.

Third. It can vote affirmatively to proceed with the adoption of new rules.

Turning to the parliamentary situation in which the Senate now finds itself, if the motion to table should prevail, a majority of the Senate by such action would have indicated its approval of the previous rules of the Senate, and those rules would be binding on the Senate for the remainder of this Congress unless subsequently changed under those rules.

If, on the other hand, the motion to lay on the table shall fail, the Senate can proceed with the adoption of rules under whatever procedures the majority of the Senate approves.

In summary, until the Senate at the initiation of a new Congress expresses its will otherwise, the rules in effect in the previous Congress in the opinion of the Chair remain in effect, with the exception that the Senate should not be bound by any provision in those previous rules which denies the membership of the Senate the power to exercise its constitutional right to make its own rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Presiding Officer for his opinion.

I had other parliamentary inquiries which I was prepared to state, but I find it unnecessary to state them. They have been comprehensively covered in the final remarks of the Vice President as to the apparent acquiescence in a readoption of the Senate rules by a successful motion to table. The Vice President has made the point perfectly clear.

I think we now, at last, have the issue before us clearly defined. We now have an opinion from the Vice President concerning the question whether or not the Members of the Senate—those who are new to this Chamber as a result of the most recent election, and those who have served in other years—may, if they wish, exercise their constitutional right to determine the rules of the Senate, the rules of procedure which shall govern our proceedings in this Chamber. I think that is the issue. Once that issue has been decided by a defeat of the motion to table, then we shall come to the issue of the rule itself, and the substance of the new rules.

I wish to make my position quite clear to my colleagues. I think every Member of the Senate knows that I believe in extended debate. I believe in the rights of minorities. I want it to be clear that I am not one of those who believe we should try to cut off debate summarily. I believe in walking the extra mile in terms of procedural protections necessary for the freedom of discussion, freedom of debate, and freedom of inquiry.

We have had reassurance in the Vice President's opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate on March 11, 1945, concerning the rules of the Senate and the entire matter of cloture.

I have not changed my views as I expressed them at that time. I followed the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, when he stated at that time that the only remedy the minority had in matters of this kind was unlimited debate. I agree with that principle, and I shall vote not to change the rules.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very briefly I want to state my position on this motion. In the 80th Congress I led the fight to have the Republican Party carry out its pledges. The Republican Party at that time did not do so. On June 7, 1943, I brought to the attention of the Senate that in the Republican platform of 1944 the Republicans had placed the following planks. First:

"We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission."

Second:

"ANTIPOLL TAX

"The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition."

Third:

"ANTILYNCHING

"We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment."

And, Mr. President, fourth:

"INDIANS

"We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs."

Mr. President, day after day I stood upon this floor, when the Republicans had a majority, begging them to carry out the solemn promises, the definite pledges they had made to the people of the United States, and it is significant to note that I got exactly 7 votes on 3 of the measures, and that only 1 of them was passed.

Mr. President, if I were assured that after this appeal had been decided my colleagues on the other side would make a sincere effort to carry out the wishes of President Truman, I would not take the few minutes I am taking. I have a definite idea as to their intentions. I wish to make perfectly clear the reason why I shall vote to overrule the decision of the Vice President yesterday afternoon.

In the first place, North Dakota holds a rather peculiar distinction. At the time rule 22 was adopted that grand and popular Viking, the late Senator Gronna, of North Dakota, was 1 of 3 Senators to vote against it. Also at that time there was in the Senate a man who was beloved all over the country, and particularly by the people of North Dakota. I refer to the late Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., one of the fighting champions—and one of the greatest—in behalf of the common people. Mr. La Follette was elected to the Senate in 1905. Because he had a lieutenant governor who disagreed with him politically he waited until 1906 before he came to the Senate. In 1917, 11 long years after Mr. La Follette first became a Member of this body, the question of cloture came up.

Mr. President, I believe that no other question which has arisen in the Senate during the 8 years I have been a Member has resulted in my receiving more telegrams and more telephone calls than I have received in this case, after announcing a few days ago that I would vote not to sustain the anticipated ruling of the Vice President.

In order that my position may be very clear, I wish to say that I fully agree with the late Robert La Follette, Sr. On March 8, 1917, in speaking of rule 22, just before the vote took place, Mr. La Follette said:

"With a rule such as is here proposed in force at that time, with an iron hand laid upon this body from outside, with a Congress that in 3 years has reduced itself to little more than a rubber stamp, let me ask you, Mr. President, if you do not think a rule of this sort would be bound to be pretty effective cloture? Especially is that true as some of the proposed legislation was of a character that appealed to certain Senators upon this side of the Chamber who, coming from States where the manufacture of munitions is a mighty important industry, are impressed with legislation that benefits the interests they represent?"

Mr. La Follette continued—and I invite this to the attention of every man who pretends to be a progressive. Everyone who has studied history knows that Rome, after 450 fine years, fell when Julius Caesar made himself a dictator and when he subjugated the Roman Senate to his will. The English Parliament was strong for many hundred years, until Gladstone succeeded in abolishing the right of free discussion, at the time when the matter of freedom for Ireland came up for debate in Parliament.

I read at this time what Senator La Follette said when a proposal for cloture was before the Senate 32 years ago:

"Mr. President, believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule upon this body, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty, you will have broken down one of the greatest weapons against wrong and oppression that the Members of this body possess. This Senate is the only place in our system where, no matter what may be the organized power behind any measure to rush its consideration and to compel its adoption, there is a chance to be heard, where there is opportunity to speak at length, and where, if need be, under the Constitution of our country and the rules as they stand today, the constitutional right is reposed in a Member of this body to halt a Congress or a session on a piece of legislation which may undermine the liberties of the people and be in violation of the Constitution which Senators have sworn to support. When you take that power away from the Members of this body, you let loose in a democracy forces that in the end will be heard elsewhere, if not here."

I have not time to quote all of Mr. La Follette's speech. He gave one or two quotations. Here is one from a former Senator from Indiana, Senator Turpie, who, some 50 years previously, had made a statement in regard to limitation of debate. This is what Senator Turpie said:

"I heard this body characterized the other day as a voting body. I disclaim that epithet very distinctly. I have heard it described elsewhere as a debating body. I disclaim that with equal disfavor. This body is best determined by its principal characteristic. The universal law and genius of language have given a name to this body derived from its principal attribute. It is a deliberative body—the greatest deliberative body in the world."

That was the first time, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that that description of the United States Senate was given. He continued:

"Now, voting is an incident to deliberation, and debate is an incident to deliberation; but when a body is chiefly characterized as deliberative there is much deliberation apart

from discussion and debate, and wholly apart from what is called the business of voting.

"The essence and the spirit of a body like ours, now over a century old, may be best gathered from its rules of action, the body of law governing it always very small, now very brief. Of the 21 rules properly affecting parliamentary procedure in this body 11 relate to the subject to deliberation. More than one-half relate exclusively to that subject and have nothing to do with debate or voting. I suppose that the form of law under which the will of the majority must control this body embraces at least the rules which govern us. Here is rule 22, one which touches us every day. I think it is the most frequently operative of any rule in the Senate."

Mr. President, after referring to the pledges made by the Republican Party, which they did not keep, I now call attention to the Democratic Party—whose members now say that they stand for civil rights. Mr. Truman was a member of this body for 5 years. What does the cold record show as to what he did for civil rights? Did he lead any fight for them in this body, Mr. President? I was here during those 5 years. He did not lead one fight for them. Where is he today? He is not in Washington. Mr. President, he is out fishing, in Florida. That shows his great interest in this matter.

Oh Mr. President, these Negro votes are very fine on election day. Apparently the Democrats think they have to make a showing for civil rights this year and perhaps next year and perhaps the year after that—but not a serious effort to get these civil-rights measures enacted; and the effort here these past 10 days has not been serious.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time; I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the effort has not been serious. I imagine the Senator from Florida might give us some of Mr. Truman's votes on various measures. I think that he voted right when it came time to vote; but at no time did he lead a fight for civil rights.

Mr. President, what a difference. When two or three times at the last session I tried to prevent the passage of a bill which, under selective service, would draft the last remaining son of a family whose two other sons had been killed in the service, the Members of the Senate stayed here and had two sessions all night long—two long, long night sessions. But I have not seen any so far this session, Mr. President. So far in this session we have worked no later than 8 or 9 or 10 o'clock at night, and then we have quit until the next day at noon, not 11 o'clock. I, for one, want to make it very plain that at any time that the Democrats really want to pass these civil-rights measures, I am prepared to stay here all night or stay here a week or a month in order to enact the civil-rights program that Harry Truman has advocated since he has become President.

Not long ago the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said he thought he was perhaps as good a friend of civil rights as was any other Senator upon this floor. I think he is correct. I wish to say that during the 8 years I have been here, I have voted for every bill, without exception, calling for the establishment of civil rights in this country. So today I wish to make it very plain that when I vote to override the decision of the Vice President I am still a firm, fighting friend of civil rights—just as strong a friend of civil rights as I ever was; and if the Democrats will begin tomorrow or Monday with a really serious, honest effort to carry out Mr. Truman's civil-rights program, I assure my friend the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Lucas] that he will find me voting with him every single time. I hope the Democratic Party will do that. I hope they begin on it right away, and never quit until they secure the enactment of that civil-rights program. I think they will receive a great deal of support from Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, apropos of the telegrams and telephone calls on this matter which have been received by Senators—and two of those communications are rather threatening, especially one from New York—I wish to say that it seems to me that the people who sent those messages do not really understand the problem we face here, which was so clearly set forth today by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg].

Mr. President, in closing let me say that when I came to the Senate I had no better friend than Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon, who at that time occupied the desk next to the one I now have in this Chamber. He was then the minority leader. I shall never forget when he said to me that, in his judgment, one of the greatest safeguards of democracy was the fact that the right of unlimited debate exists in this Chamber, and I remember very well that when a distinguished Senator came to me and asked me to sign a cloture petition I talked with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], and I also secured the advice of Senator McNary, of Oregon, and I did not sign it. Certainly when a Member of the Senate like Senator La Follette, who was here 11 years, or a Member of the Senate like Senator McNary, gave me such advice, I did not sign it. I took the advice of the distinguished Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish the Senator to be correct in his statement. I am sure he did not mean to say that I asked him to sign the cloture petition, for I was against signing it.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct; the Senator from Texas was against signing it. When such a petition was brought to me and I was asked to sign it, the distinguished Senator McNary, of Oregon, joined the Senator from Texas in saying that the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate was one of the finest things about this body.

Mr. President, again I wish to assure my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], the majority leader, that if he will bring up this question of civil rights he will find no better backer than myself, and I shall be one of those who will hold up his right arm in carrying on that fight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from North Dakota is in favor of the Wherry-Hayden resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I am not certain; that is a question we shall take up after this one. So far as the question of invoking cloture by a two-thirds vote is concerned, I am not quite sure whether I favor it or am opposed to it. I may even be opposed to it. I know that I do not favor cloture by majority vote, under any consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. In any event, the Senator from North Dakota is in favor of free and unlimited debate, and he has been in favor of it all the time, I understand.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator does not favor the Wherry-Hayden resolution, why would he wish to keep us here for a month?

Mr. LANGER. I may be in favor of that resolution; I have not stated that I am opposed to it. I wish to study it and go over it. I do not wish to commit myself regarding it until I look it over and study it and hear the debate on it. I may even wish to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been talking about breaking this filibuster, but he is in favor of free and unlimited debate. I do not quite follow his reasoning, if he is in favor of having the Senate stay here for a month and if he is in favor of free and unlimited debate.

Mr. LANGER. It is very simple. If the Senator needs help, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall need a great deal of help.

Mr. LANGER. All the Senator from Illinois has to do is keep the Senate in continuous session. If that is done, it will not be very long, as the Senator from Michigan said today, before we shall arrive at some understanding or agreement which will be mutually satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator says may be correct; but I am not sure that I shall be able to depend on the Senator from North Dakota, when we finally attempt to break the filibuster, to help us to break it, because he may not be in favor of the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I hope I can depend on the Senator from North Dakota when the time comes for him to go along with us.

Mr. LANGER. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I shall go along in helping secure the enactment of the Truman civil-rights program.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from North Dakota makes some qualifications in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. No; I make no qualifications. When the Senator from Illinois asks me whether I favor a resolution which I have not yet had ample opportunity to study, I say that I am not sure whether I shall favor it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from North Dakota has mentioned the name of the great Senator Bob La Follette. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because we were here together with another great Senator from the West, Senator Wheeler. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota well remembers the debates on the floor of the Senate with that distinguished Senator from Montana. I wish to remind the Senator that many a time Senator Wheeler——

Mr. LANGER. Senator Wheeler stood first, last, and all the time for free and unlimited debate upon this floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Also, as I remember, he was a candidate, along with the distinguished Senator Bob La Follette, of the liberal movement in America.

Mr. LANGER. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to inquire of the able Senator from North Dakota, in view of his statement and in view of the parliamentary situation with which the Senate is faced on the question of filibustering on a motion to take up a matter, how he anticipates he will ever get a chance to vote on any civil-rights legislation if we cannot even get it before the Senate for a vote.

Mr. LANGER. It would be delightfully simple. Just as the Senator from Michigan said today in his magnificent address, it will be possible to enact civil-rights legislation just as soon as either party makes up its mind it is going to do it—any time Republicans will make the sacrifices necessary to do it. The Senator will remember last year I brought up these Republican platform pledges. The junior Senator from Oregon rose on the floor and said he would bring up his cot every day, he would stay here a week, or a month. Just as soon as either the Republicans or the Democrats make up their

minds to get the civil-rights program through it can be done. Instead of that, we adjourned for 3 days at a time until toward the end of the session. Then, in the last 2 or 3 weeks, some of us who were opposed to the drafting of our boys under selective service were kept here 2 nights before the Republican convention at Philadelphia, all tired out. We were kept in session because Senators wanted to adjourn and go to the convention. Although many days had been wasted during the month or 2 or 3 months before that, there was an adjournment 3 days ahead of time. So I close by telling the people of this country that I am unqualifiedly for the civil-rights program and will help to enact it—if only the Democratic majority will bring it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I can sympathize with the able Senators who wish to adopt the Anderson motion. I find myself voting with most of those Senators a considerable part of the time.

I do not think that what has been proposed is an effort on the part of Walter Reuther, or of any other person or group in the country, to put something through the United States Senate. As a matter of fact, if a vote should occur on rule 22 in the regular processes of our legislative debate, I would favor cloture by a mere two-thirds vote of the Senators attending. I feel also that any rule change should be subject to cloture, the same as any legislative measure.

I fear that in the process offered here today the cure will be far worse than the disease. The motion on which we are asked to vote reads:

> In accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which declares that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * * I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate for the 85th Congress.

The motion does not say that the amendment which is sought is the amendment of rule 22; it would cover all the rules for the 85th Congress, and for all future Congresses, and it would destroy the historic concept of the Senate being a continuing body.

Until action on the "immediate consideration of the adoption of rules for the Senate for the 85th Congress" had been completed with respect to all 40 rules of the Senate, there would be no rules, no committees, and no committee jurisdictions. Indeed, the Senate would be operating without any procedures, precedents, or prohibitions of any kind until all the rules were adopted.

I feel that only by unanimous agreement, which apparently it would be impossible to secure in this Chamber, could the old rules of the Senate be continued in force while the Senate debated the proposed adoption of new rules.

Perhaps in the Senate today the fine Senators who seek only to amend rule 22 could control and prevent any other changes of the rules. But it would be possible, and likely probable, that other Senators would have other changes which they desired to have made.

Many other changes of the rules have been proposed in the past, such as the rule of germaneness, which is sought by many Senators who have tried to speed up and make more effective Senate procedure. I think not less than a dozen changes have been proposed at various times, including changes in the committee structure, the adding of new committees, the taking away of power from existing committees, and the changing of the jurisdiction of committees.

These are all a part of the Senate rules; and if the Senate were to start work on new rules, there would be no way to maintain, without unanimous consent, the rules under which the Senate historically has operated, and which I feel have been vital to the building of the Senate into the great legislative body that it is.

Thus, under this proposal, without committee consideration of any kind, various fundamental changes in the rules could be made on the opening day or in the tedious weeks that follow the opening day.

Furthermore, each Senate every 2 years would be a new Senate and would adopt a new set of rules on the opening day or in the tedious weeks that follow.

In my opinion, what is at stake is the importance of the Senate. Is it a continuing body? Certainly the precedents of 167 years of historic progress indicate as much. Certainly even those who today advocate a change in the rules would not wish to lose the mark that distinguishes the Senate from almost all other legislative bodies of the world. Certainly the precedent throughout history that the Senate is a continuing body should not be lightly cast aside.

The Constitution provides that always two-thirds of the Members of the Senate shall continue in office while only one-third are elected to each new Congress. Only the newly elected and the reelected Senators take the oath on the opening day. Incidentally, it is the oath prescribed by rule 2 and was used yesterday for the one-third of the Senate who were inducted into office.

The two-thirds of the membership who continue in office did not take the oath, under the precedents that the Senate is a continuing body.

If the Senate should adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress, it is interesting to note that the oath of office which many Senators took yesterday, as prescribed by rule 2, would have been a nonexisting oath. So if the Senate had no continuing rules, then the one-third of the membership who were sworn in yesterday would have taken an oath not provided for by the rules of the Senate of the 85th Congress.

During the 2 years in which the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress studied the matter—and I had the honor of serving on the joint committee with the late distinguished Bob La Follette—not a single witness, as I recall, challenged the concept that the Senate is a continuing body, or that its rules were anything other than continuing rules until they were changed by the Senate, by action in the Senate Chamber, in the form of an amendment to the existing set of rules.

Since during the debate that act has been brought into the question, I should like to correct a misinterpretation which may be current, namely, that inasmuch as the Legislative Reorganization Act is statutory law, and was signed by the President, therefore, all of its provisions are continuing.

Title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act provides as follows:

> SEC. 101. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:
>
> (a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and
>
> (b) With full recogintion of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

I think that provision clearly sets forth the concept under which that measure was introduced and explained to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, namely, that title I was strictly a rule-making procedure, incorporated in the omnibus bill to effect the reforms the bill sought to provide.

In addition to the provisions for committee structure, which are part II of the act, there are provisions for such things as the banning of the introduction of private bills, congressional adjournment, committee procedure, committee power, conference rules regarding amendments in the nature of a substitute, legislative oversight by standing committees, decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction, legislative budget, hearings and reports of the Appropriations Committees, records of Congress, preservation of committee data, and many others.

All of them are a part, not of title II of the Reorganization Act, but of title I, which was clearly specified and reserved as a part of the rulemaking powers of either House or, when the jurisdiction was concurrent, of both Houses.

It would seem to me that under the concept here presented, all the rules regarding reorganization which apply to standing committees would be subject to change without any committee consideration whatsoever; and such a change could occur either on the opening day of a session or in the first few weeks of a session.

That would mean that there would be no standing committees of the Senate and no jurisdiction of committees until the rules were either amended or reenacted, at the discretion of this Senate or of future Senates.

It would seem to me to be the part of wisdom that any changes in the rules—on which all of our Senate precedents are based—should receive committee consideration, testimony, and great care, before being thrown onto the floor for determination in the opening days of a Congress.

I am not arguing that rule 22 has not been adequately discussed. But we are talking about 40 rules of the United

States Senate. It seems to me that before opening up all the rules, in order to take up one particular rule with which we may disagree, we must consider the likelihood of amending other rules to which there has been no dissent.

How would we operate under the concept presented here that today the Senate has no rules until we adopt new ones, and that without having any rules we shall now proceed to put together a new set of rules?

How would traffic in the city of Washington operate if all its traffic laws were thrown out the window while an attempt was being made to amend a prohibition against overtime parking? That would create one of the greatest traffic confusions in history. Certainly wisdom and judgment should dictate that only the traffic regulation needing amendment should be considered, while the others should be allowed to stand.

Indeed, if the existing Senate rules were to be suspended, none of the rules providing for orderly procedure would apply during the course of the adoption of new rules, unless unanimous consent were given.

Would there be any limitation on debate on the new rules? I can find none which would apply. Would rule 19, prohibiting any Member from speaking more than twice on any one question on the same day, apply? I cannot find that it would. It seems to me that in that event, rule 19 would not apply. Thus, Mr. President, the very rule which time and time again helps the leadership to break a filibuster, by reason of the physical exhaustion of the speakers, would not be effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, in the Senate rules there is nothing to provide for the use of Robert's Parliamentary Rules of Order, Jefferson's Manual, or any other legislative procedure or guides.

It has been argued that the House adopts new rules at the beginning of each session. Let me point out that historically the House has been so limited in debate and discussion so often that when the question of the adoption of rules arises, it is merely standard operating procedure to approve the old rules. Most of the Members do not realize that a motion to amend them would be in order. To my knowledge, only twice in 18 years has an amendment to the rules of the House of Representatives been offered.

On the other hand, my experience with the Members of the Senate is that they will wish to discuss the matter at great length, before finally determining the rules by which the Members of the Senate shall live.

In that connection, the Members of the Senate would prefer to have any change made in an orderly way, with committee consideration, with testimony of witnesses, and with the proposed changes formally reported to the Senate, then if a filibuster should occur to take steps to break the filibuster by continuous sessions for weeks and weeks, if necessary.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that only by an orderly process of changing by amendment the rules of the Senate as a continuing body can we avert a dangerous crisis, namely, a situation in which we would be without any rules to guide our procedure as we would seek to adopt new rules.

Mr. President, I feel certain that Congress will soon pass proposed civil-rights legislation. But I would hate to see us lose so much for this Congress and for future Congresses, by doing away with a precedent which has existed for 167 years in order to bring up one piece of proposed legislation.

Historically, it has been the minority which has long been protected by the privilege in the Senate of unlimited debate. Although at this time this privilege of unlimited debate has prevented the passage of civil-rights legislation, I do not think this is the method to benefit the minorities affected.

In the future it would be highly dangerous to all minority groups if a pattern is set here today that could, on the opening day of any future Congress, impose a gag rule on the Senate.

We are asked to set a precedent for all time to come in this procedure. Sometime in the future an all-powerful majority might easily utilize this pattern to provide for closing debate with only an hour's discussion. Then the minorities themselves, who have benefited by the right of unlimited Senate debate, would be the severest losers.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to remind the Senate that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] speaks as a great authority with respect to the Legislative Reorganization Act, for it so happens that he was one of the authors of the act, and was also one of the most active Members of Congress in presenting it. He and the late Senator Bob La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, were the authors of that act. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Reorganization Committee; and I hold the same opinion as does the Senator from Oklahome, namely, that the fact that these rules are set forth in that act does not in anywise affect their character as rules of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who served so ably, that it was the only way we could change the rules and at the same time make the statutory changes which were necessary, and that the Senate understood that they were rule changes, and that each Congress could change them, so long as proposed changes were brought up in the regular way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only was it understood, but it was spelled out in explicit terms, so that he who runs may read. The distinguished Senator read it earlier in his remarks.

But the rules would expire upon the adoption of this motion, and then we would have no committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the scholarly opinion which we recently heard from the Vice President, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has, I believe, so completely covered this subject that it seems almost superfluous for me to make the remarks I have prepared, because the Vice President not only has answered the parliamentary question, but also has made a devastating argument in favor of the motion of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to immediate consideration of adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress in accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution which declares that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

Four years ago, when the Senate of the 83d Congress was being organized, I remember listening, somewhat awestruck, to the debate on this subject, which ended in a vote to table. I voted then in support of the motion to table, which was made by the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

As a newcomer to this Chamber, I was not familiar at that time with the rules of the Senate. Indeed, I sometimes suspect that to understand fully the rules and procedures of the Senate, supplemented and supported as they are by a mass of precedents and rulings not yet collected in printed form, would take a lifetime of study.

During the past week, I have had the opportunity of carefully reviewing the previous debates on the issues now before the Senate, and of studying the vast amount of material placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with those debates.

The debate of 1953 seemed to hinge on whether or not the Senate is a continuing body. I am now convinced that this is an immaterial issue.

What is the central question It is this: Is the Senate of each new Congress free to adopt rules for its proceedings under the Constitution? Or, stated in another way: Must the Senate be bound by the dead hand of the past, denying Senators of the living generation the right to participate in the formulation of the rules?

Reason and logic dictate the answer: The Senate must preserve its constitutional power to adopt its rules to changing conditions. As Senator Thomas Walsh, of Montana, said in 1917:

A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they

may deny to future majorities the right to change them.

If the question of whether the Senate is a continuing or a noncontinuing body were important, I believe that it is self-evident that for most purposes the Senate acts as if it were formed anew with each new Congress.

Do bills and resolutions carry over in the Senate from one Congress to the next? They do not. Do treaties which have been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations remain before the Senate from one Congress to the next? They do not.

Do executive nominations upon which no action was taken in the old Congress automatically remain before the Senate for consideration? They do not.

Certainly nothing in the matters just referred to, and others which could be mentioned, argues in favor of the continuity of the Senate. On the contrary, the fact that action must begin anew in so many cases argues strongly against the idea that the Senate is a continuing body.

It is true that in the past the Senate has acquiesced in rules which have continued from Congress to Congress, without adoption by the Senate in each new Congress. This has happened because the question of whether the Senate is free to adopt new rules has rarely been raised, and when it has been raised, as in 1917, and again in 1953, there has been no direct decision on the question. Only a few moments ago the Presiding Officer pointed that out very clearly.

Four years ago a direct decision was avoided by the device of tabling, and the Senate accepted the old rules by acquiescence, just as it accepted, by tacit consent, that its meeting place would be in this Chamber. I do not think the rules provide that the Senate shall meet in this place; but year after year the Senate does come to meet here, because it does so by acquiescence, by unanimous consent. Similarly, one may find many customs and precedents in the Senate which are observed and which go on for years unchallenged by the Senate in each succeeding Congress, even though they are not in the rules. This does not imply that the Senate is a continuing body; it merely implies that these traditions or precedents are observed from year to year by acquiescence, by lack of challenge, by general acceptance.

However, I believe we should come to grips with the essential questions before us, and not spend too much time in fruitless argument over whether the Senate is a continuing body or whether it is not.

Underlying the question of whether the Senate is free to adopt new rules is, of course, the issue created by rule 22 which contains no effective check against the filibuster. This rule requires a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate—64 Senators—to invoke cloture upon debate on legislation. And, most objectionably, in subsection 3 it prevents cloture on any motion or proposal to change the rules.

As the rule now stands, it is possible for a small group of Senators, a definite minority, to delay the business of the Senate for weeks by the tactic of filibuster. A small minority can thwart the will of the Senate at any time an issue arises which is distasteful to it.

The senior Senator from Connecticut is not one who wishes to make it possible to limit debate unreasonably. In fact, in considering a substitute for rule 22, I believe we should be very generous in providing for full and adequate, even prolonged debate. The important thing to establish at this time is the power of the Senate to reach a decision on a major issue, and to that end it must be possible to invoke cloture at some point. My personal preference is for cloture by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, coupled with the abolition of subsection 3 of rule 22.

It is evident that the issue of civil rights looms large in the background of this debate. Both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms of 1956 pledge action in this field of legislation. As chairman of the platform committee of the Republican National Convention of 1956, I personally feel a strong sense of responsibility to help implement by law the plank on civil rights which I supported and which we adopted in San Francisco.

This is one of the great issues of our day, and the Senate of the United States must come to grips with it. And unless we change rule 22, we are powerless to act. If history is any guide, it will be impossible for the Senate to act on civil-rights legislation unless a reasonable limitation upon debate can be achieved—unless the filibuster can be curbed by action of a substantial majority of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator yield me an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, acting for the Senator from New Mexico, I shall be glad to grant the Senator from Connecticut 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BUSH. The senior Senator from Connecticut is one who has a profound respect for the traditions and precedents of the Senate. We must preserve the Senate's dignity—its authority. We must strive to maintain, or even increase, by our behavior, the respect in which the Senate is held by the people of our country and the world.

But we cannot do so unless we make it possible for the Senate to act on important issues which come before it.

We cannot do so if we permit the dead hand of the past to rule the living generation.

We cannot do so if we are powerless to bring measures to a vote when a substantial majority of Senators desires the Senate to act.

We cannot do so if we permit rule by filibuster and by minority.

I hope that the motion of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to table the Anderson motion will be defeated.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the additional 3 minutes allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from New Mexico yield time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me ask the distinguished minority leader if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is available.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If no speaker is immediately available, I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico would object to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make two preliminary observations before I make my brief statement.

First, I have been very encouraged by the tone of the debate which I have heard in the Senate today. I think it is well worth while that such a debate on this subject is being held. The two sides have been very adequately presented.

I wish also to express my appreciation for the admirable statement made by the Vice President. He clearly stated the issues before us, as well as his own opinion relative to rulings which may have to be made on questions arising from this debate.

Mr. President, I shall be brief in stating my position on the pending question. First, I believe as thoroughly as any Senator who has spoken, in the maximum freedom of speech in this body. I think it most important that in the Senate we can discuss every question fully and completely without being limited by rules such as prevail in the House.

Secondly, I wish to commend my colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], for his splendid presentation of the dangers of what might be called despotic majority rule. In my judgment, we cannot allow any rule to be adopted under which a majority alone would control the debate. I think it is extremely important, when major issues arise, that we avoid any possibility of the majority being able abruptly to force a vote without allowing reasonable debate. There must be the opportunity for full debate.

Mr. President, I do not disagree with my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] when he calls the Senate a continuing body. I think it is a continuing body. I believe it was originally

intended to be a continuing body. However, in my opinion, we do not need to decide that question. When each new Congress is organized, the Senate should have the opportunity to determine what its rules shall be, whether the Senate is a continuing body or not.

Even though it has been the tradition of the Senate that the rules carry over from past Congresses I do not understand how the Senate of a previous Congress—even of the 84th Congress—can adopt rules by which we of the new 85th Congress must be bound. I can see no reason why the new Senators, who were sworn in yesterday, should not have some voice in the rules under which the Senate is to operate.

So, Mr. President, on the question of whether or not the Senate is a continuing body, and on the question of retaining the maximum freedom of speech, I am entirely in accord with Senators who have spoken on both sides. But in the last analysis I insist that the Senate of each new Congress must have ultimate control over its procedures.

I think what is really troubling us is that rule 22, as it reads at the present time, contains a provision that cloture will not lie in the case of debate on a proposed change in the rules. This simply means that if a determined minority, be it ever so small, decides that it does not wish debate to be brought to a close, it can prolong debate throughout the entire session, and thus prevent the Senate from transacting any business.

If we leave the rules as they are, we cannot change rule 22 because no cloture can be applied to the debate proposing to change it. I feel very strongly that the Senate in each new Congress should control its own rules. New Senators should certainly be entitled to a voice in what the rules should be.

I think it is unnecessary for me to say more, because the question has been adequately debated, but I should like to read to the Senate, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I issued a few days ago after I had given long thought to this subject. I said in that statement:

After twelve years in the United States Senate, it is my considered judgment that our present cloture rule—Senate rule 22—to limit debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, is too rigid to be of any practical value. This rule requires that two- thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn shall vote affirmatively to close debate.

As a practical immediate matter this rule virtually prevents any consideration or vote on President Eisenhower's civil rights recommendations during the 85th Congress. The present rule also might prevent any action on other matters, including national emergencies. Furthermore, under existing Senate rules, cloture cannot be applied to any motion to change these rules. This seems to me to be an intolerable limitation on the powers of the Senate as a legislative body.

I intend to support a more flexible cloture rule providing for two-thirds of those present and voting on a roll call vote. However, I do not favor a mere majority vote to determine cloture. I think debate must be sufficiently unlimited for the people of the country to have an opportunity to know all the pros and cons of any pending issue.

The exact formula of any proposed revision is subject to differences of opinion. The point I wish to emphasize is that the present rule is too rigid and should be changed. I will, therefore, support any parliamentary move that may be made which will assure that rules will be adopted by the Senate at the beginning of each new Congress as in the case of the House.

Irrespective of whether or not the Senate is a continuing body, the fact is that all pending legislation dies with the adjournment of each Congress and has to be reintroduced when the new Congress is organized.

Consistency would seem to require that the Senate should handle its rules as it handles its legislation.

Under that rule, all that it is necessary for those who oppose cloture to do is to absent themselves from the Chamber. All they have to do is to stay away. They can say, "I was not present. I did not vote for cloture, and I did not vote against cloture." Their absence is equivalent to a negative vote under the present rule.

As a practical immediate matter this rule virtually prevents any consideration or vote on President Eisenhower's very reasonable civil rights recommendations during the 85th Congress.

The present rule also might prevent any action on other measures, including those growing out of national emergencies.

A determined few might wish to prevent action on any legislative measure. We have not the power to bring debate to an end and get action. We must retain that power.

I am stating an extreme case. I make no reference to any present Member of this body, of course. However, in time to come an attempt might be made to prevent certain action which the administration in power vitally needed to take, and for which it could not obtain the necessary authority.

Furthermore—and I regret to say this again—under existing Senate rules, cloture cannot be applied to any motion to change the rules. This seems to me to be an intolerable limitation on the powers of the Senate as a legislative body. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that I should support a more flexible cloture rule, providing for closing debate by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting when the yeas and nays are taken. In that way, the country will know where each Senator stands on the then pending question, which might be of great interest to the country. Under the present rule, Senators may merely absent themselves, and their constituents might not know how they stand with reference to the particular question under consideration in the Senate.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, every State represented in the Senate has the right to be heard on any matter it desires to be heard on; and it is our duty to express ourselves on any such question.

I do not favor a mere majority vote to determine cloture. I think the debate must be sufficiently unlimited for the people of the country to have an opportunity to know all the pros and cons of any pending issue.

The exact formula of any proposed revision is subject to differences of opinion. We are not going into that question, however, because the Anderson motion does not embody any special form of rule.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the present rule is too rigid and should be changed. I will, therefore, as I have indicated, support any parliamentary move which may be made that will assure the adoption of rules by the Senate at the beginning of each new Congress, as in the case of the House of Representatives.

Irrespective of whether or not the Senate is a continuing body—and I believe that point to be irrelevant—the fact is that all pending legislation dies with the adjournment of each Congress and must be reintroduced when the new Congress is organized.

Consistency would seem to require that the Senate should handle its rules as it handles proposed legislation.

Mr. President, these are my views. I admit this is a controversial subject, and I certainly do not criticize my colleagues who disagree with me. However, I do feel that the present rule ties our hands on closing an unduly prolonged debate and reaching a vote. We should find some way to change that rigid rule.

I shall support the motion made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and I shall vote against the motion to table that motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the subject under discussion may be printed in the RECORD at this point. My statement is in support of the motion made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

When one considers in the abstract the democratic processes of legislative deliberation and the expression in law of the will of the majority, it would seem that unlimited debate is a manifestation of the purest form of democracy. Under a system of unlimited debate, every voice is heard, every argument pro and con expressed in every detail, and every side of the question at hand is thoroughly considered. We have come to learn, however, that democracy in the abstract or democracy in its purest theoretical form, cannot become a reality as long as democracy is a living tool in the hands of imperfect men.

Democracy in its purest form, including unlimited debate on all issues, is liable to many abuses, and among those is the abuse of obstructionism to which unlimited debate readily lends itself. Thus in our imperfect democracy, although I would insist that we have nevertheless achieved the highest form of democracy known to the world, we are accustomed to protecting ourselves from these abuses through such devices as our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, our court system, and so forth. But there is at least one abuse of the democratic process that we seem to perpetuate rather than remove. That is the abuse of unlimited debate, otherwise known as the filibuster.

Some would argue that the filibuster is a legitimate device to prevent tyranny by the

majority. I would agree that we must be protected from the tyranny of the majority, but this is a function of the judicial branch of our Government which can invalidate laws passed by a majority if they are deemed to be in conflict with the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. It is not the function of a self-designated minority to hold the majority perpetually at bay through the use of the filibuster, no matter how repugnant the will of the majority may be to this minority. If the majority is violating the law of the land or fundamental individual rights, then the aggrieved minority has recourse through the courts.

The filibuster is associated in our minds with civil-rights legislation. Undoubtedly this is the most dramatic contemporary example we have of obstructionism. It is without question that a majority of the Senators, including myself, in this Chamber favored a civil rights bill similar to that passed by the House of Representatives toward the end of the last session of Congress. But with rule 22 operating as an integral part of Senate procedure, it is inconceivable that the Senate could ever have passed similar legislation. We witness in the case of civil-rights legislation a minority not only blocking the will of the majority but also perpetuating an infringement of the inalienable rights of another minority. Thus are the sins of the filibuster compounded. One cannot regard this use of the filibuster without a deep feeling of regret that the democratic process can be so abused and perverted as to constitute a complete negation of the meaning of democracy.

We are inclined to think primarily of the filibuster in terms of civil-rights legislation. In point of fact, the only times I have witnessed a filibuster in the Senate, they were conducted, not against civil-rights legislation, not by a southern bloc, but against Dixon-Yates and tidelands oil by a group of Senators who are the most ardent opponents of the filibuster. To my mind this is particularly significant. Some would assert that this move against the filibuster is directed solely to the muzzling of the opponents of civil-rights legislation. On the contrary, this is only one particular manifestation of the general objective of a limitation on debate. We know that the filibuster can be used to delay consideration of any piece of legislation. We know that any group in the Senate can employ this device to thwart a majority if such a device suits its purposes. And more significant than the legislation that is actually blocked by the use of the filibuster are the many, many compromises that the Senate might accept because of the threat of a filibuster. In short there is no area of legislative action which is completely free from the pernicious influence of rule 22 and all that it implies. The filibuster must be eliminated in order to protect the entire fabric of the legislative process.

In 1953 when I first took my oath as a Senator, the question of the filibuster came before this body in the form of a motion introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to adopt rules. Subsequently, a motion to table was introduced by the late Senator Taft, then the majority leader of the Senate. At that time I supported the motion to table, believing, erroneously it is now apparent, that there was a better and more direct tactic for modifying rule 22. It is now obvious to me that rule 22 will stand as it is now written unless the strategy employed in 1953 can prevail and the Senate adopts its rules anew at the beginning of each Congress. In this manner a majority of the Senators who favor a modification of rule 22 can secure that modification by a majority vote. We all are aware that any attempt to modify rule 22 later in the session when the Senate is operating under rule 22 will result in a filibuster and finally in capitulation by the advocates of a change in the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my remarks will be very brief. I do not believe that any argument during the present very limited debate will materially influence any votes or change any views on the pending issue.

It is a highly controversial issue, with which most of us have become familiar throughout the years, except for the process now being used in this effort to change the rules of the Senate.

Because it is a controversial issue, there are on each side of it deep convictions. On such issues and on such proposed legislation or change of rules the Senate has never resorted to and should never resort to short cuts to bring about a decision and to enact bills of importance, particularly when such deep convictions prevail.

I shall vote for the motion to table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], which would change the rule, and declare that the Senate has no rules and is not a continuing body.

I shall do so, first, because I believe this method to be an improper procedure. It is one which we cannot in the future follow as a precedent without getting into serious difficulties.

Secondly, I do so—and I wish this statement to be clear in the RECORD—because I support rule 22, and the third paragraph thereof, just as it is written now, without any change, modification, or the crossing of a "t" or dotting of an "i." I want my position to be very clear on that point.

Third, the adoption of the Anderson motion would shatter precedents of more than 160 years in the history of the Senate. That is a very serious thing.

It is very serious to take quick action, instead of submitting a resolution, which would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, to be considered, as other important legislation is considered and processed by the appropriate committee so that not only Members of the Senate, but also other citizens of the country who are interested in the subject may have an opportunity to be heard and to express their views.

We would not take the action suggested here with respect to any other kind of proposed legislation.

We cannot afford to do that in the Senate. We cannot afford to strike down what has been a bulwark of protection to freedom of speech in the only legislative body in the world today where there is unlimited debate. I need not point out in the history of our country its progress and great growth, and our country's stature among nations. All that has developed and been achieved under existing rules of the Senate.

Neither do I wish to be a party to the undermining or the weakening of the very basic structure upon which our Republic and our liberties and our freedom rest.

Too many assaults are being made on the Constitution of the United States today from sources other than Congress. They are very high sources. These assaults are impairing and diminishing the prestige of the basic law of the land. This attempt here today, if successful, would be another step in the direction of procedure by the device of "the previous question." I do not believe that to be a sound and safe method for the Senate to adopt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, acting for the majority leader, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senators from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if we adopt the Anderson motion we will create a monster which will haunt us in the future, not only during the remaining days of the present Congress, but in each session of the Congress in the future.

I trust, Mr. President, our action will not place the stigma of Black Friday on this body for the deliberations and actions it takes on this vital issue today.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators have correctly argued that the Senate has the right, and indeed the duty, to adopt new rules at the beginning of a new Congress and that it is not then bound by the old rules governing debate while it is considering the new.

This must be true unless we are to permit future Senates to be indefinitely shackled by the rules of the past.

It is true because the Constitution expressly provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings"—and because one of the most fundamental principles of our constitutional law is the one Legislature cannot bind or fetter its successors.

As I understand it, the opinion which was recently outlined by the Vice President indicates his concurrence in the view that the restrictions in the past rules of the Senate upon the Senate's constitutional rulemaking power are invalid, that this is particularly true of section 3 or rule 22, and that they are invalid prior to our acquiescence in them. I welcome his opinion as supporting the real basis upon which the Anderson proposal is founded.

Our rules are made for the Senate and not the Senate for the rules. The rules are, in fact, merely instruments to help the Senate transact its business and express its will in an orderly manner. Whenever, in the opinion of the Senate, certain features of these rules impede or prevent these purposes from being carried out, then the Senate has the right under the Constitution to change these rules. And this right must be real and not nominal.

The present provision in clause 3, rule 22, that there can be no limitation of debate upon any motion to consider a change in the rules, in effect, makes any such change in rule 22 impossible once the previous rules have been adopted or acquiesced in. For we all know that a

strong group of Senators are determined to talk any such proposal to death and that no limitation can, under those rules, be applied against them. Theoretically, even one Senator, so long as he has the physical strength to hold the floor, could prevent any change in the rules. Certainly, a determined group can do so.

So, Mr. President, if we lay on the table the Anderson motion, I think we can be pretty certain that we cannot in this session of the Congress change rule 22.

If this provision in clause 3 of rule 22 and the limiting provisions of clause 2 as well, were to apply to every effort to change the rules, therefore, as they do apply after the old rules are approved by implication or acquiescence—this would rob our constitutional rulemaking power of all meaning and effect, and would perpetuate the fetters of the Senate rules of a past Congress in clear violation of the principle that one Congress cannot bind its successors.

What we are really seeking, therefore, is a change in rule 22 and only in rule 22, which will permit the Senate after free and full debate to vote and, hence, to come to a decision on proposals in reference to its own Rules and on matters of substantive legislation.

We are convinced that this can be done expeditiously and without great delay under the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], despite the tacit threats, delicately couched, by some opponents who suggest that there will be an interminable filibuster which will tie up the Senate if we try to proceed to a change in rule 22.

It is made further clear that the Senate can now reach a vote on changing its Rules by the indication of the Vice President that provisions of precious Senate Rules which expressly or practically deny the Senate majority's right to adopt its rules—notably section 3 of rule 22—are invalid and would not apply in such a discussion since they are unconstitutional.

At present under the old rules, however, the Senate does not have this power to reach a vote on matters which a minority—and sometimes a small minority—is determined at all costs to defeat. For, as is well known, by the Wherry amendment of 1949 it is now necessary to get 64 affirmative votes in order to limit debate, instead of two-thirds of those present and voting, which was the requirement between 1917 and 1949. This means that 33 Senators, by either voting "No" or by staying away and being absent from the vote, can defeat any such motion to proceed toward a vote.

The second aspect of this provision is worth special notice. All those who are absent, and hence do not vote, in effect count as voting "No," even though if present they would have voted "Yes." Those who are sick and unable to be present in the Senate Chamber automatically count, as much as those actually voting, against the limitation of debate, as do all those who are absent for any other cause. Each of these absentees is, in practice, allowed to cancel the votes of two Senators who attend and vote "Yes."

It is this provision which makes it possible for Senators who would never want to be recorded publicly as voting to uphold a filibuster to discover previously unrevealed ailments as a cloture vote nears and be compelled to seek solace in a hospital or rest place. Here they can help to uphold a filibuster without being formally compelled to go on record as favoring it.

This is why it will be virtually impossible to pass a meaningful civil-rights measure or a constructive rule change to limit debate as long as the present rule 22 is on the books. And while the general arguments in favor of the Senate's having the effective right to take up and modify its rules at the start of a new Congress are important for the conduct of its business in general, it is the question of civil rights which gives them immediate urgency.

We all know that over large areas of this country Negroes are openly or tacitly intimidated from voting; that they have been and still are discriminated against in education, in transportation, in the opportunity to get decent jobs and to rise on their merits within industry, and in many other respects.

I am not interested in assessing the comparative blame for these facts. We and our ancestors all share the blame to some extent. These denials of equal opportunity occur in many parts of the country, not in one section alone. Certainly I do not want to make the South the whipping boy for the abuses which exist, since all too often the different attitudes in some parts of the North and West are largely due to the simple fact that these areas have a much smaller percentage of Negroes.

But the vast majority of people in the United States have decided to try to right these wrongs. They realize that racism is ultimately incompatible with a free society. They also realize that in view of the political and economic situations in certain areas of the country, some national action will be necessary to help meet at least a portion of this problem.

We believe there is constitutional sanction for such action, both in the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which provides that no State shall deny to its citizens the equal protection of the laws, and in certain other provisions.

Many may, and indeed, do, question the desirability and even the constitutionality of such action. This is their right, and I do not question the sincerity or the good faith of these men.

But under our system of government, we have a supposedly accepted procedure for settling such differences of opinion. It is to have the issues debated before the public and the Congress, for bills to be introduced, hearings to be held, and votes to be taken in both House and Senate.

Then the expressed decision of the majority of the House and Senate, as embodied in the final measure, goes to the White House, and the President has the right to veto it. If he does this, a two-thirds vote is required to pass the bill into law over his veto.

Even then, however, there is still another check. The Federal judiciary and ultimately the Supreme Court have the power to decide whether or not the law is in harmony with the Constitution. If the Supreme Court decides that it is not, then the act is null and void.

I submit, therefore, that under our form of government, ample protection is provided for permitting minorities to be heard and to influence public opinion. But back of all this is the fundamental democratic assumption that, after ample discussion, the majority should have the right to decide. This is the only practicable way to run a democracy.

It is precisely this which the filibuster defeats, for a filibuster is protracted discussion of a motion intended to prevent a vote. The purpose and effect of a filibuster are to prevent the majority from ever having the chance to vote on a measure. In its essence, therefore, it permits a minority—and, frequently, a small, if determined, minority—to so tie up the business of the Senate that the majority opinion on fundamental issues can never be crystallized into law. The records of Congress show that this has happened many times.

This is a denial of democracy. For while thorough discussion is necessary for wise decisions, such discussion in a legislative body is not an end in itself. It must ultimately culminate in a decision and a vote. Unless it does so, this body becomes merely an empty debating society, and our comments mere conversation pieces.

As practical men we know that it is virtually impossible to pass meaningful civil-rights legislation as long as rule 22 is in effect, even though the vast majority of the American people may favor it. For we will immediately face the determined opposition of some 20 to 22 southern Senators, who will be backed up by the articulate public opinion of their region. If the past is any guide, they will be aided by a certain number of Senators from small States to whom the institution of the filibuster gives great opportunity to press the claims of their States for appropriations and for special treatment, and who, therefore, will not wish to surrender this special power to serve their constituents.

Then, we should never forget, as I have explained before, that rule 22 permits absentees to be counted as voting against any motion to limit debate. It is a rare occasion when two or three of our body are not actually ill or unable to attend. These are, in effect, counted as voting "No" on cloture. Then, a tempting opportunity is opened up for secret sympathizers with the filibuster and crypto-opponents of civil rights. As the fateful hour approaches, it will not be difficult for them to detect hitherto undiscovered and latent ailments, and to seek solace and relief in the comfortable precincts of the Bethesda Naval Hospital, or Walter Reed, or even more inaccessible places. A great outbreak of psychosomatic ailments will probably occur and these men in effect will vote "No," even though later they may claim to the public that if present they would have voted "Yes."

The practical realities, therefore, confirm the conclusion that unless we change rule 22, our prospects for constructive civil-rights legislation have gone glim-

mering. And, unless we act under the procedure proposed by the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and defeat the pending motion to lay it on the table, the chances for changing rule 22 are nil. A vote to table Senator ANDERSON'S motion is, therefore, a vote against civil rights.

From public statements and from loud buzzings in the cloakrooms, I gather that some opposition to the Anderson motion is being based upon assurances, first, that some change in the rules will later be made, and second, that civil rights legislation will later be passed even if the rules are not changed.

I only ask that Senators who may be tempted by these assurances recall and be guided by the hard, cold facts of Senate history. In 1953, the same assurances—no doubt just as sincerely as now—were given on the floor of the Senate. But no affirmative action on the rules or on civil rights bills resulted. Similar indications were, I understand, hopefully given by the leadership in 1955, but no rule change was made and no appropriate bill passed. Our own experience thus proves that the Senate, and the people of the country we are elected to serve, cannot go forward on such hopeless assurances for some tomorrow. As Shakespeare put it in Macbeth:

> Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,
> Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
> Unto the last syllable of recorded time,
> And all our yesterdays have lighted fools the way to dusty death.

Or, to paraphrase Lewis Carroll, I believe the argument of the opponents of the Anderson motion comes to this:

> Civil rights legislation every other day. Civil rights yesterday. Civil rights tomorrow. But never civil rights today.

The opponents also argue that we should lay aside the Anderson motion because otherwise we might tie up the Senate with endless debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for 5 more minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in all frankness, let me point out in answer to this second argument, that it is not the proponents of the Anderson motion who suggest long debate upon the rules; on the contrary, it is some of the opponents who apparently threaten lengthy debate, and then utilize their own threats of delay and prolonged talk as a ground to urge that the whole matter be dropped.

But the whole purpose of the Anderson motion is to take up this essential change in rule 22 at the one time when it can succeed—and without undue delay. For under general parliamentary usage, after reasonable debate on a motion for the previous question, a majority of the Senate can end debate and proceed to vote. The procedures under which the Anderson motion and succeeding proposals for a change in rule 22 would be considered are the assurance that the threatened delays can be avoided. The matter can be settled in 1 or 2 days if necessary, and, in any case, long before the possibility that action on any other Senate business might be impeded. Any further delay will be caused by the opposition and not by the proponents of the motion.

We who support the adoption of legislation for equality of opportunity have been greatly heartened throughout the years by the steadfast, courageous, and indomitable devotion to civil rights of that outstanding pioneer and champion in the cause, Herbert H. Lehman.

His voluntary retirement from the Senate has deprived us of his vote and his eloquent voice on the floor today. But I have requested for this occasion and am greatly pleased to present the following message from our former colleague to the Members of the Senate:

> Now is the time for action, not just for the sake of civil rights, but for the essential purposes of democracy. The issue of rule 22, and of the right of the Senate to adopt new rules at the opening of Congress, is inseparable from the issue of civil rights. The pending vote is truly the key vote on civil rights for this Congress but it is more than that. It is a key vote on the fair and democratic procedures, and on the broad principle of justice.
>
> Civil rights legislation must be passed to achieve justice in our land. The Anderson motion must be approved to achieve justice in the United States Senate.
>
> I pray for all who stand together on this issue, satisfaction in the rightness of their efforts—and success.

Arthur Krock, veteran correspondent of the New York Times, went to the heart of the whole matter when he wrote in 1952:

> Rule 22 is the barrier at which all congressional efforts to legislate the civil-rights program have been stopped dead. National conventions may approve by large majorities specific items • • • but the Senate has been the graveyard of such pledges, and the gravedigger has been rule 22.

We who support the Anderson motion and oppose the motion to lay it on the table propose to free the Senate from this mighty barrier of the filibuster, which has been so effective against civil rights and other legislation.

We propose to retire the gravedigger, rule 22, and install in its place a sensible traffic regulator, a reasonable rule for limitation of prolonged discussion after adequate opportunities for debate have been accorded. Only by thus removing the roadblock can the way again be opened for a majority of the Senate to act on matters of the most vital importance to national welfare and human dignity and freedom.

In closing, I wish to share with the Members of the Senate the earnest statement of a dedicated leader from one of our southern States, Father L. J. Twomey, S. J., of Loyola University, New Orleans. From his penetrating article, Challenge to America, printed in the September 21, 1956, issue of Commonweal, I quote the following passages, with which I fully concur:

> Every man is a sacred being, more precious than the material world and all the riches thereof; he cannot be made a cog in the collective machinery of an all-powerful state, or a prop to support the white man's pride of race.
>
> Political society is the instrument in the hands of a free people not alone to preserve law and order but also to take positive means to insure a reign of justice for all its citizens regardless of religion, race, or national origin. For all its serious faults, America has given her people the most equitable form of government in world history. Today we are passing through one of the great turning points of history, and whether men are to be free or slave depends to a large extent on the United States. Do we Americans have the dedication, the courage to think and to live in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights"? If so, it is time to prove it. And in the process we will prove to ourselves and the world that democracy is not an illusion.

A few weeks ago I was in the Louvre, in Paris. There I saw two noble statues by Michaelangelo—the Bound Slaves. Those who know those statues will remember the beauty and strength of the figures. But they will also recall that the figures seem to be almost dying; to have lost all vitality and the will to live.

As one examines the statues one finds that their arms are bound with narrow fetters. The arms are held in and fettered, and the spirit seems to be going out of them. They have accepted their servile fate.

But as one looks at the fetters more closely, he finds that they are in fact very insubstantial; that if those slaves could only assert themselves with their strength and their vigor they would be free and the fetters would fall to their sides.

So it is with this marvelous institution, our great Senate. We are indeed bound by the fetters of the past, namely the rules of the Senate as they are embodied in rule 22. But there is no reason why we should perish under those fetters or accept them. With a simple act of the will we can be free; and we can start that act for freedom by defeating the motion to table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Mexico object to my yielding time at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, with fair consideration of all the argument that I have heard on the subject now under debate, the ultimate decision to be made is whether discussion of proposed legislation pending before the Senate, and hence consideration of it, can be ended by a majority vote of the Senate, or whether, as now, a two-thirds vote of the membership shall be required to end the discussion and consideration of the bill.

This is in essence and conclusion the question we must now decide.

Enough has been written and said here to indicate that the real and immediate purpose of this proposed change is to give to the majority this new power of cloture of debate on legislation designated as civil-rights bills. If such a power could be limited in application to civil-rights bills I would be prone to give it my approval, because I intend to support any fair legislation that will properly secure the rights of all citizens under the laws of this country.

But such is not the situation as we well know. To vest this power in the majority means that henceforth a majority of this body can end debate and end consideration on any bill, any proposed legislation, that comes before it.

There has been abuse of the present rule—unwarranted abuse. When germane argument and true consideration of a pending matter cease and filibuster begins, a wrong is done, and abuse exists.

There has been very great abuse of the present rule. When germane arguments and true consideration of a pending matter cease, and filibuster begins, a wrong is done and an abuse is perpetrated. I am opposed to filibusters, and I have fought against them. I expect to do so again, if a filibuster develops. But I am not willing to place in a majority the power to end debate on any subject before this body, even on bills whose passage I may advocate. In my opinion, to do so would be to make the Senate and its acts and indeed, the National Government the victims of every wind of temporary sentiment which may blow, and of any heated clamor which may momentarily arise.

Doubtless, Mr. President, there are many Members of the Senate who remember that they have been confronted with situations which created the actual danger of which I speak. I recall that at the close of World War II I introduced a bill providing that preferred consideration be given to the return of fathers from the armed services after the fighting had ceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I have 1 or 2 additional minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, acting for the majority leader, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from California.

I had just stated, Mr. President, that at the close of World War II I introduced a bill providing that preferred consideration be given to the release of fathers from the armed services after the fighting had ceased. That measure was opposed by the administration, and great opposition to it developed. As a matter of fact, the bill was not reported from the committee. A motion then was made in the Senate to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. The discussion of that motion continued for weeks and weeks, until there developed strong sentiment in favor of the release of fathers from the armed services so that they might return to their homes to support their families and be with them. That sentiment developed to such an extent that finally the Defense Department relented and an order was issued to bring the fathers home to their families. That order was based not so much on a preference to fathers serving in the Armed Forces as on giving proper consideration to the families concerned. Mr. President, I am confident that if in that instance the majority could have cut off debate early that would promptly have been done; and in that case the result actually accomplished could not have been achieved.

So, Mr. President, although I state frankly that abuse has occurred under the present rule, and although I hope that some way to end such abuse may be found, yet I am reluctant to have lodged in a majority of this body the power to end discussion at any time regarding any measure, even one whose passage I may advocate.

We should not cut down the tree to gain one plum. We should not destroy the freedom of discussion on all subjects presented here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time yielded to the Senator from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Anderson motion.

I have joined in sponsoring the motion to proceed to the adoption of rules because I believe it is both wrong and dangerous to continue to permit a situation in which the proceedings of the Senate can be brought to a halt by a small minority of its membership.

That this is the situation is well known to all of us. It has been demonstrated on a number of occasions when an actual or threatened filibuster has foreclosed the Senate from consideration or action despite the wishes of Senators generally.

The Senate has frequently been described as the greatest deliberative body in the world. But how does this square with the fact that a handful of its Members can reduce it to legislative impotence? How does it comport with the view expressed here today, which would deny the Senate the right to pass on the rules which govern its conduct?

To me, the issue seems simple and clear. It is no more or less than whether the Members of the Senate shall be allowed to review the rules under which they must operate.

I realize that, as in the past, those opposing amendment of the Senate rules argue that, unlike the House, the Senate is a continuing body, and that therefore its rules continue, without readoption, from one Congress to the next. Whether the Senate is a continuing body is an interesting question. Plausible arguments can be mustered in support of the proposition that it is. Certainly there can be no doubt that in the sense that two-thirds of its membership carries over from one Congress to the next, it is a continuing body.

But even more convincing arguments can, I believe, be made to the contrary. It is equally certain, for example, that for purposes of legislation and nominations, the Senate is not a continuing body. An illuminating discussion of the absurdities to which this doctrine of the Senate as a continuing body can lead appears in yesterday's RECORD.

Whatever may be one's views on this point, I suggest that the question of a continuing body is not really relevant to the issue presently before us; indeed, it obscures, rather than illuminates, the real question we have to decide. Even if it be conceded for purposes of argument that the Senate is a continuing body, this cannot affect, as I see it, the Senate's right to set its rules, pursuant to the constitutional provision that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

It is significant that the opponents have again chosen to avoid meeting the challenge that a point of order would be present. Instead, they have once more sought to evade the question by making a motion to lay on the table.

It has become crystal clear that under the rule of the last and previous sessions, the Senate is in fact precluded from review of its rules. For my part, I think such a review should be undertaken at regular intervals; and the logical time for it is at the beginning of each new session of Congress. Indeed, if the matter is not raised at the beginning of a session, it could be urged—and undoubtedly would be urged later—that the Senate had, by acquiescence, readopted its previous rules. This is, in fact, what the Senate has, in my view, done in the past.

To me, it is the height of absurdity to suggest that a Senate rule adopted 10, 50, or 100 years ago cannot be changed by a Senate composed of entirely different Members. But this has been the situation, and it will continue unless the Senate at the beginning of each Congress takes the opportunity to have a fresh look at the rules and to adopt new or amended rules if a majority so desires.

I shall not attempt here to present an exhaustive brief on the matter. In the past it has been thoroughly explored in all its aspects, and the RECORD already contains thorough discussion of the main points involved. I should like, however, to add a few words as to my personal position.

I am solely concerned with ending the possibility of utter frustration of the Senate's will. I do not believe in cloture by simple majority vote at any time when a majority may be so inclined. I value the full expression of minority views too highly to endorse any proposal which could mean summary cutoff of debate before there had been an opportunity thoroughly to explore a measure. But neither do I believe that a small minority should be able to prevent the Senate from acting on a measure, no matter how thoroughly the measure might have been considered and discussed. The protection of minority rights does not require, in my view, that the majority should be able to act only when, and if, the minority is willing.

Yet, for all practical purposes, that is the present situation in the Senate. Such a situation was never contemplated, I am sure, by the framers of our Constitution. Indeed, it is a relatively recent development in Senate history.

As we know, the cloture provision in the rules was amended in 1949, so as to require a majority of 64 Senators—two-thirds of all Senators elected and sworn in—to close debate. Prior to 1949, cloture could be invoked by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Even

so, it was rarely attempted, and even more rarely was it attempted successfully. The last time was in 1927, nearly 30 years ago. Under the 1949 rule, the few attempts to invoke cloture have failed. On the face of it, the solution would seem to be simply to amend the rule, which can be done by majority vote. Practically, however, rule 22 makes that impossible, because it expressly excludes any limitation of debate on motions to amend the rules.

Even under the old rule prior to 1949, there was no effective cloture. In the words of Senator Vandenberg, in 1948, when he was President pro tempore of the Senate—

> A small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules * * * a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything * * * the existing Senate rules regarding the cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum.

How much truer are these words today, when whatever small possibility of cloture there might have been before 1949 has disappeared.

Today the question arises especially in connection with the problem of civil rights. This has not always been the question involved in the past, nor will it be in the future. I personally am deeply concerned with the need for adequate protection of the civil rights of all the people. But I am equally concerned with the maintenance of the integrity of the legislative process.

Obstructionism is hardly the way to secure proper consideration of legislation. For my part, I believe adoption of a method which would make it possible to limit endless talk, undertaken not to illuminate the merits of a proposal, but to frustrate any real consideration of it, is reasonable. It would encourage, not discourage, thorough exploration of important issues. It would improve the functioning of a vital part of our legislative structure in whose continuance lies, I believe, the best protection of the rights of both the majority and the minority.

While I do not wish to embarrass the present occupant of the chair, I want to express, in conclusion, my deep satisfaction and complete agreement with the statement which was made by the President of the Senate in answer to the recent parliamentary inquiry propounded by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. In my opinion, the statement was an historic one, and a brilliant reconciliation of the apparent dilemma which so long has made it possible to delay action on the rules of this body, the dilemma of whether the Senate is a continuing body, and the right and power and duty of the Senate under the Constitution to adopt its own rules. The statement by the Vice President, in my opinion, will be a landmark, whatever the result of the vote on the motion to table the pending motion of the Senator from New Mexico. In my opinion the Senate will be well advised to follow the statesmanlike, historic, and brilliant exposition of the situation which the Presiding Officer of this body has just presented to us.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I had previously announced, I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for this body in the 85th Congress.

During this debate and previous debates upon similar resolutions, much has been said upon the constitutional issue as to whether the Senate of a particular Congress has the power to prescribe its own rules, or whether it is bound by rules prescribed at some prior session of the Congress.

In the short time that I shall speak, I shall not labor this question. In 1953 when a similar resolution was before the Senate, I voted to lay it upon the table—taking a position opposite to that which I hold today. At that time my affirmative view upon one of the questions underlying the debate on the pending motion, that is, that rule 22 should be modified to permit an ultimate vote upon issues of great importance to the country, was the same as it is today. I believed then, as I do today, that it should be changed. But, I am frank to say that at that time I believed the procedural question—the method by which rule 22 or any rule could be modified, was determined by the theory that the Senate was bound by the rules of a previous session, because of its nature as a continuing body. I must say, upon further thought, that I think my position was an incorrect one. It is my view that the Senate is fundamentally a continuing body, but I do not believe that fact is determinative.

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution gives to both Senate and House the right to determine the rules of its proceedings. It is not written in the Constitution that any particular set of rules or that any method of making rules shall obtain in every session of the Congress.

It seems to me that if the Senate has adhered to rules that have been prescribed in past sessions of Congress, it has done so because of acquiescence, by consent, implicitly given. But, by doing so, the Senate has not in any way limited, and in fact could not limit, its right under the Constitution to adopt its rules at the beginning of each Congress, if it desires.

I recognize the difficulties that arise in making new rules, and perhaps the possible dangers to free and full debate, but this is a separate question which must be considered in the formulation or modification of rule 22, or any other rule. It does not bear upon the constitutional issue as to whether the Senate has the power to make its rules at each Congress, as I believe article I, section 5, establishes.

Whether this basic question will be decided or postponed by the motion to lay on the table, we cannot escape the fact that rule 22 is at the root of the issue before the Senate. I believe strongly that there should be full debate in the Senate. It is needed to assure the development of public opinion, and to protect against unwise or hurried legislation, such as the proposal made in 1937 to change the composition of the Supreme Court. I believe also that minorities must always remember that full debate assures a necessary regard and protection for their rights. But, as I have said, the kind of rule 22 the Senate may adopt if the motion succeeds is a separate question, and we must believe that the Senate will adopt a rule which will give full regard to these considerations.

I do not believe that a rule should be continued which, in practice, prevents a vote even after the fullest debate. I do not believe that a rule should be continued which prevents a vote upon questions of great importance to minorities, as has been the case in the field of civil rights. This is a question which is before the country and one which I do not think we can avoid or ought to avoid, for at stake is a decision as to whether our country and our Government shall assure in fact the rights that the Constitution guarantees. In whatever form legislation affecting civil rights is presented to the Congress, each Member must make a judgment regarding its constitutionality and its wisdom.

I would say only this. There is a grave obligation on our Government, and the people of this country who subscribe to the principle of our free system of Government and to its constitutional processes, to see that positive and effective steps are taken within those processes to remove discrimination and to assure full freedom for all our people.

While I recognize that this matter is not immediately at issue, in the consideration of this motion, the question of civil rights nevertheless has been the substantive issue which has again brought our attention to the rules of the Senate and to the necessity of modifying rule 22.

The question immediately before us, however, is fundamentally one of expressing the constitutional power of this Senate. It is the question whether each one of us shall be free to exercise the full powers and prerogatives provided us in our capacity as representatives of our States and our people.

I shall vote against the motion to lay on the table and thereafter for the motion of the senior Senator from New Mexico, in order to assure full sovereignty for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that the United States Senate is a continuing body. That is evidenced by the fact that two-thirds of the Members of this body, with the exception of vacancies occasioned by resignations or other causes, carry over from one Congress to another. However, the rules of the Senate are the responsibility of the Senate itself. Therefore, Mr. President, I believe the Vice President, the President of the

United States Senate, made a wise statement this afternoon.

Mr. President, I shall however oppose the motion to table the motion submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on behalf of himself and many other Senators. I think it is timely that we discuss the question as to whether rule 22 should be amended. In my opinion, rule 22 must be amended, because rule 22, in the many years of its existence, and in the years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate, has not permitted us to bring to an end debate on a pending question in order that we might take action and vote. I cannot foresee how certain legislation can be enacted in the future so long as a few men can hold the floor and thereby prevent taking up a measure for the purpose of consideration or the taking of final action on it. Therefore, I shall vote against the motion to table the motion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the many cosponsors of the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, every so often we are confronted with the proposition here of amending our rules for the stated purpose of permitting majority rule. This is not the real reason for the proposed change; the real reason lies in the fact that a few desire to modify our rules so that pet projects and pet legislation they have either originated, or which their constituents may demand, may come before the Congress. The net result of this change of our rules, in my humble judgment, would be to sound the death knell of the rights of a minority.

The safest guarantee for minority rights is free, untrammeled and unrestricted debate. Those who sponsor the pending motion today realize and understand this fact better than any other group in the United States. The group sponsoring the change today is the so-called liberal group. I rather think that type of a classification for my friends is not truly accurate. It is illiberal to deprive one of free discussion. It is a strange fiction that the so-called liberals of a generation or two ago were those who clamored successfully for the retention of a stricter rule than that which prevails today. The great liberal, the great progressive from Wisconsin, Senator La Follette, when an attempt was made to enforce cloture during World War I, said:

> I realize how the hysteria of the moment may be driving Senators to acquiesce here in this procedure which at another time they would resist with all their force. But so far as I am concerned I will never by my voice or vote consent to a rule which will put an end to freedom of debate in the Senate. The adoption of this rule marks a decline in the influence of the Senate in the Government.
>
> I know that the majority are determined. I believe that a majority of that majority are in this matter yielding their judgments, and that the time will come when the men who are now clamoring for this change and who by their votes are imposing cloture upon the Senate will see that rule invoked to deprive them and their States of what they deem their rights. I cannot prevent the adoption of this rule, so I am content at this time to protest and vote against it.

It is a strange turn of fate that those who sought to condemn another Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] a year or so ago, argued in effect that the Senate was a continuing body and that what had transpired in a preceding session of the Senate was the subject matter of concern and appropriate action in a succeeding session of the Senate.

Let me quote part of what appeared recently in the Evening Star on the subject of whether the Senate is a continuing body. I quote from the distinguished editor of the U. S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence:

> SENATE AND THE CONTINUING BODY—SOME WHO WANT TO CHANGE POLICY SAID TO HAVE FAVORED IT PREVIOUSLY
>
> Chickens come home to roost and so do the principles of true liberalism come back to plague those who abandon those principles for the sake of expediency.
>
> It will be interesting to see whether the "liberals" among the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate apologize now to Senator MCCARTHY, whom they voted to condemn in 1954 on one count relating to alleged conduct in a previous term. For some of these same Senators, who argued then that the Senate is a continuing body and can examine the conduct of a member in a previous term, now are contending that the Senate is not a continuing body at all.
>
> The present purpose, of course, is to get a new set of rules adopted in the January session so as to abolish lengthy filibusters against civil rights legislation. If the Senate decides that it is not a continuing body it would take only a majority vote to change the rules. Otherwise it requires a two-thirds vote, and the proponents of the idea of changing the rules know they can't muster two-thirds of the Senate.
>
> It will be recalled that in September 1954, it was proposed to censure the Wisconsin Senator for his "failing to cooperate" in 1952 with a Senate committee examining his income tax returns. Later the resolution was changed by the Senate to eliminate the word "censure"—which implies the power actually to punish—and to substitute for it the milder word, "condemn." The resolution was adopted in October 1954, by a 67 to 20 vote of the Senate, and not a single Democrat voted against it.
>
> Senator MCCARTHY always conceded that the Senate did have a right to examine the previous conduct of anyone entering the Senate, but he said the time to do it was at the opening of a Congress when a Senator presents his credentials. The Wisconsin Senator, just prior to taking his seat in January 1953, for a new term, directly challenged the Senate to take up all the accusations made against him, but his colleagues failed to do so.
>
> It was not until September 1954, that the Senate's select committee brought in a report proposing censure and arguing flatly that the Senate is a continuing body. It said the issue had been settled by the debate in the Senate in January 1953, when the liberals tried unsuccessfully to change the rules and insisted that each House can adopt new rules at the beginning of a new Congress. The Senate committee report in September 1954, said:
>
> "The fact that the Senate is a continuing body should require little discussion. This has been uniformly recognized by history, precedent, and authority. * * *"
>
> The Senate still can abolish filibusters any time it wishes to do so, but it takes a two-thirds vote to accomplish this, and the anti-filibustering group just doesn't have the votes.
>
> So the debate on whether the Senate is or is not a continuing body nowadays hinges really on whether there's a two-thirds vote available to accomplish the objects sought. Hence, the country now will be treated to many a hypocritical argument. Some of the same Senators who argued in the McCarthy case that the Senate is a continuing body will be heard now arguing the opposite; that the Senate is, after all, not a continuing body and that a majority vote is all that's needed to adopt new rules.
>
> Freedom of speech in the Senate, for example, usually championed by the so-called liberals, was dealt a severe blow by the resolution to condemn a Senator for expressing his opinions.

Yesterday I took my oath of office, along with 34 other Senators. The remaining Members of the present Senate took no new oath of office. They will continue in office and under their oaths from the time they were elected and sworn in until their terms expire. If the Senate were not a continuing body, all of us would be required to take our oaths on the opening day of each session of the Senate. Our terms were staggered for the very purpose of making the Senate a continuing body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas grant me an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe, Mr. President, that the United States Senate is the last citadel of man's freedom. It is the last representative body on earth that should hamstring, hamper, or restrict the fullest discussion of every problem and every question which may be presented to it. This right of free discussion affords me the opportunity to fight to the last ditch in defense of some fundamental principle or to prevent the destruction of some basic right. Without such a rule here we would and could become the prey of hysteria, and minority rights could exist only in theory and not in fact. Those who favor abolishing unlimited and unrestricted debate exercise such a right more freely and more often than do most of us whom some in the press are pleased to call reactionaries or conservatives.

As I stated in debate several years ago, there is no crisis at hand to justify a departure from the rules which time and experience have proved to be so valuable to almost every Member of this body. I predicted in my remarks on the Senate floor 7 years ago, and used the same phraseology used by Mr. David Lawrence, that as surely as the Senate modified its rules "the chickens would come home to roost."

I do not glory in seeing the chickens come home to roost, but there is a glaring inconsistency by some who would now for political purposes or political expediency grab the news headlines in a clamor to change our rules, which have been the source of so much benefit to them in the past, whatever may be the classification of Senators, liberals, or conservatives, or reactionaries.

It has been recounted in many a discussion on this floor how the great liberals of the past—and I include such men as Senators Borah, La Follette, Reed, of Missouri, Norris, of Nebraska, and others—banded together to defeat measures which they considered were in violation of basic, fundamental rights, and in so doing have been given the rewards of history for their efforts in engaging in prolonged debate and lengthy discussions.

Within more recent times we have witnessed prolonged debates in the Senate which have prevented the enlargement in membership of the Supreme Court of the United States. Such a measure was proposed by a Democratic President. I dare say there are only a few in this body today who would again propose such a radical change in the number of Justices on the Supreme Court, however dissatisfied many of us are with the personnel now sitting and with the decisions that Court in recent years has seemed so capable of rendering. The fault there does not lie with the number of Justices; the fault lies with the individuals appointed to the Court, if one has a complaint to make.

Therefore the argument today should be addressed to persuade two-thirds of this body to be present if debate is to be ended on a given bill or a given proposal. The fault does not lie with the rules as they exist.

I reiterate what I said at greater length several years ago, that the establishment of a rule which would restrict and hamper debate will some day plague those who sponsor its passage.

I warn that the cloth we may cut into garments today may at a later date pinch the wearers of them. In my judgment, the rules of the Senate should remain unchanged; and in urging this I make a further attempt at being consistent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have frequently spoken in the Senate on this same subject. Therefore I have no inclination and I have no time to dwell at length upon the issues involved.

However, I do wish to say that in my judgment the adoption of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other Senators, would be one of the worst steps imaginable. It would break down the outstanding characteristic of the Senate and take it far away from its traditional position of high stability and conservatism.

Mr. President, not long ago I had occasion to check on the statements of the framers of the Constitution as to what kind of Senate they proposed to create. In that check I discovered that stability is the thing which they were mostly seeking to achieve. Two papers by Mr. Madison, 1 by Mr. Jay, and 2 by Mr. Hamilton, published in the Federalist, bear upon this subject. Perhaps the best statement on that point is found in the two papers by Mr. Madison. I believe it is interesting to note that the words "stability," "stable," or "instability," depending on the context, appear exactly 9 times, as used by Mr. Madison in the 2 very brief articles which he wrote, describing the kind of Senate which was proposed to be set up.

Mr. President, the continuing feature of the Senate was mentioned by him only once. He used the word "continuing" simply to make it clear that the continuing quality of the Senate is just one of those things, among many others, which are designed to bring about a highly stable organization, one upon which the country, as well as the friends of our country, other nations, could continue to rely.

On one occasion they said that it was necessary because of the continuing attention that would be necessary to give to important problems which cannot be immediately or easily solved. On two other occasions they spoke of the necessity of creating a body which would establish a system that would have permanance, particularly for discussions of questions dealing with international affairs.

There is much more along the same line said in the papers I have mentioned. However, I wish particularly to emphasize that it is very important to establish and preserve stability and not to create a precedent under which every 2 years, every time a new Congress meets, it would be necessary for the Senate to enter into a Donnybrook type of scrap on the question of what its rules should be, when a majority—and only a temporary majority—influenced, perhaps, by the recent election of the then Executive—and I do not refer to the Executive now in office, but any executive then acting—could change the rules so as to accomplish what it desired or what the executive desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Under my understanding with the majority leader, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding 2 additional minutes to me.

Without the quality of stability, we would be confronted with a fight of this nature every 2 years.

The second point I wish to make is that no one knows what kind of rule 22 is proposed by the 31 signers of the Anderson motion. The Senator from New Mexico said he was not in favor of majority rule on cloture. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said he was for majority cloture. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said he was in favor of cloture by a majority vote of the full membership.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in his appearance in 1947 before the Committee on Rules and Administration, said he was for cloture by a majority of a quorum, which is 25 votes.

I say to the Senate that if it adopts the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, it will plunge the Senate into a fight over proposals ranging from cloture by 25 Senators to control by 64 Senators.

That is true because no formula has been agreed upon, and because it is admitted by the proponents of the motion that they are not together in their thinking. Therefore, it would plunge the Senate into a continuous fight on one rule alone. In that connection, I call attention to the fact that there are 40 standing rules, which would be involved, if the motion of the Senator from New Mexico should be adopted.

I hope with all my heart that the motion will be tabled, and the stability of the Senate, thereby, preserved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, under my understanding with the majority leader, I desire to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have been reading during the past few weeks comments made by several newspaper columnists. These columnists charge, in substance, that southerners obstruct action by the Senate. I wish to point out that there are not enough of us to prevent a vote on any measure. Some years ago Jiggs and Maggie went to Spain. While there, Jiggs joined a husbands' protective organization called the Society of Gazooks. Under the rules of the Gazooks whenever a husband got into any difficulty with his wife, the other members of the society were sworn to come to his rescue.

Maggie and Jiggs were walking along a street in Madrid. They got into some domestic difficulty, and Jiggs called "Gazooks."

In response to Jiggs' call, hundreds of his fellow Gazooks came running to his assistance. Maggie laid them all out with her umbrella.

The last picture in that particular cartoon showed Jiggs laid up in a hospital bed all bandaged up. He said, "The idea of the society is very good, but the trouble is we don't have enough members."

That is the trouble with us southerners. [Laughter.]

We are wrongly accused of being responsible for obstructing legislation in the Senate. As a matter of fact, we are too few in number to prevent a vote on any measure under rule 22. There are only 22 of us at the most.

Therefore I should like to have it set down as one true fact that southern Senators alone are unable to muster enough votes to invoke rule 22. I should like to lay at rest another statement frequently made by columnists—namely, that filibusters are used only against so-called civil-rights bills. Filibusters have been used in the Senate since 1841. During the 115 years the filibuster has been invoked 45 times. Of those 45 times it has been invoked against so-called civil-rights bills only 9 times, and in 4 of those 9 times, it was invoked against a civil-rights bill which by decision of the Supreme Court was clearly unconstitutional. It is certainly no harm to prevent the Congress from acting in an unconstitutional manner by filibuster or otherwise.

I would say that we are putting the Senate in a rather funny situation. I may be so old fashioned as to be denied the status of a liberal. However, I must confess that I believe the statement that consistency is a jewel.

In the fall of 1954 the Senate voted on the question of censuring the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. The main legal question involved was the question of whether the Senate

is a continuing body. The censure of the Senator from Wisconsin could not have been voted without first adopting the report of the Watkins committee to the effect that the Senate was a continuing body. One hundred percent of the Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle voted that the Senate was a continuing body, and 50 percent of the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle voted for acceptance of the report based on that proposition.

It is obvious that a parliamentary body cannot function without rules.

If the Senate has no continuing rules, it is not a continuing body. Seventy-five percent of the Members of the Senate voted within the last 2½ years that the Senate is a continuing body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] quoted Shakespeare. He would not have had any trouble with the soliloquy of the Prince of Denmark who said that the question which bothered him was whether he should accept the present ills rather than to fly to those he knew not of.

An attempt is being made to create a vacuum with nothing with which to fill that vacuum.

The Senators who are supporting the motion lead me to believe that they cannot even agree among themselves. If that be true, we shall wind up with the abolition of a set of rules and without the capacity to get a majority of the Members to agree on a new rule 22. So, Mr. President, the orderly thing to do is to vote for the motion to table and let the motion to amend the rules be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that we may proceed in an orderly legislative manner.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

ORDER FOR RECESS ON SATURDAY TO MONDAY AT 12 O'CLOCK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of the joint session tomorrow, the Senate stand in recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to announce, Mr. President, that there will be a joint session on Monday.

I thank my friend from Oregon.

RULES OF THE SENATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to lay on the table the motion of Mr. ANDERSON for himself and other Senators, to proceed to the adoption of rules of the Senate for the 85th Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I begin my speech I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks excerpts from speeches which I have made on this subject in previous debates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, new rules are required if majority rule is to prevail in the United States Senate. The present rule 22, with its unique requirement of 64 affirmative votes to bring debate to a close, gives a small group of Senators a veto power that cannot be reconciled with democratic majority rule.

Not only does this veto apply to legislation which reaches the Senate floor, but it has been used to discourage attempts to bring out legislation which could pass if a vote were possible.

One irony of the present situation is that the present rule with its requirement of 64 votes for cloture was adopted by less than that number. It was adopted by majority vote. Forty-four Senators in the Senate when the rule in its present form was adopted are no longer here. It is absurd that the 44 Senators who replaced them should be forced to vote on new rules, and specifically rule 22, on different terms from those who adopted it.

The present rule 22 is unamendable for practical purposes because cloture cannot be applied to amendments to the rule itself under the rule adopted in 1949. The Wherry rule is a fantastic bootstrap operation—by a majority vote it was sought to impose a requirement of 64 votes for cloture and to insulate this filibuster rule by making possible an unlimited filibuster against any attempt to amend it under the rule itself.

PURPOSES OF RULE

Ever since I have been in the Senate I have worked for the protection of minority rights, full and free debate, and majority rule. I know the merits of full debate because I have joined with others to use it to focus public attention upon undesirable legislation. On no occasion have I joined, nor will I join, in an attempt to prevent a vote on the merits of a bill if there has been opportunity for reasonable debate.

I well know the criticism made of the Senator from Oregon on the ground of alleged inconsistency of his position on the filibuster. I repeat today that I shall never participate in a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on an issue, but I shall engage in the so-called filibuster tactic for the length of time necessary to accomplish two things; namely, to get the time necessary to awaken the country to the merits of an issue which is before the Senate, and to prevent steamroller tactics. Thus in 1954 there was an attempt to push through the proposals of the administration on the atomic energy bill. I objected to hasty consideration of legislation in such a vital field and joined with several Senators to insure careful consideration of many sections of the measure. Debate continued for many days. But I made it clear then that I would agree to set aside the pending business long enough to adopt an antifilibuster rule. That has been my standing and repeated offer when engaging in prolonged debate. In each instance, those of us who used the "limited filibuster" did not and would not push it to its full powers to prevent a vote. Not all have exercised this restraint nor need they do so under the present rule. But the antifilibuster rule which I have always proposed is one which will protect the minority, and one which would permit a vote finally to occur on the issue before the Senate.

PRESENT RULE CONTRADICTS DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

But it is the very contradiction of democracy to operate under a rule which gives to a few the power to frustrate the will of a majority registered under our constitutional system with all of its built-in checks and balances. The Senate of the 85th Congress should not be deprived of the right to choose the rules under which it will operate.

Rule 22 is not a barricade for the protection of minority rights against temporary shifts of public opinion. Far from it. It has been used as the refuge of reaction against the steadily growing, deeply rooted American belief in fair play and equality. No fiction will fool the people of the country. They know that a vote for new rules is a vote for implementing the constitutional guaranties of personal liberty and equality before the law.

Mr. President, I close this speech by paying a deserved compliment to four Senators. I wish to mention the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], for the statesmanlike record he has made in regard to his long-sought attempt to change rule 22. The leadership which he gave us in 1953 and which he is giving us again in 1957 will go down in the history of the Senate as among the great records of statesmanship in the history of the entire body.

This morning the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] rendered great service in this historic fight. They set forth the thesis which many of us have proposed and defended since 1949. They pointed out—and I wish to emphasize it once again—that the issue before us is not the issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body.

EACH SENATE HAS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ADOPT NEW RULES

In 1953 I took the position that it was irrelevant to the issue before the Senate. The issue really is, Mr. President, whether the Senate is going to exercise its constitutional right to adopt rules of the Senate by a majority vote if the Senate wishes to adopt them. Whether we are or are not a continuing body is irrelevant to that issue. But, under the Constitution of the United States, as I have said for years, Mr. President, and as the Senator from New Mexico argued very eloquently in 1953 and again this year, and as the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Illinois have

pointed out, the question is not whether we are a continuing body, but whether we are going to exercise our constitutional right to adopt rules governing this body at the beginning of the session.

Mr. President, I wish to pay a very deserved tribute to the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, for the opinion or point of view he has handed down today. I wish to read just three paragraphs from that opinion. He said:

> Any provision of Senate rules adopted in a previous Congress which has the express or practical effect of denying the majority of the Senate in a new Congress the right to adopt the rules under which it desires to proceed is, in the opinion of the Chair, unconstitutional. It is also the opinion of the Chair that section 3 of rule 22 in practice has such an effect.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Vice President of the United States for taking that position, because it sustains the point of view which some of us have maintained for many years.

Then the Vice President goes on to say:

> The Chair emphasizes that this is only his own opinion, because under Senate precedents a question of constitutionality can only be decided by the Senate itself and not by the Chair.

Many of us, Mr. President, have been trying for some years to face up to that issue and to decide it by a majority vote.

A group of us for many years have sought to have the issue determined by the Senate directly and squarely by the exercise of majority rule. The principle of majority rule prevails in almost all the parliamentary bodies of this country. It is the common rule in the State legislatures; it is the rule of the United States House of Representatives. What is fantastic about making it the rule of the Senate of the United States? We can make it the rule if this afternoon we defeat the motion to lay on the table.

In the excellent opinion which he has handed down today, the Vice President has this to say about that point:

> Turning to the parliamentary situation in which the Senate now finds itself, if the motion to table should prevail a majority of the Senate by such action will have indicated its approval of the previous rules of the Senate and those rules will be binding on the Senate for the balance of this Congress unless subsequently changed under those rules.
>
> If on the other hand the motion to lay on the table fails, the Senate can proceed with the adoption of rules under whatever procedures the majority of the Senate approves.

The Vice President has joined in making the issue perfectly clear once again to the Senate of the United States.

I close these remarks by paying my sincere compliments to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and all the rest of the Senators who have stood shoulder to shoulder with us in this historic fight to restore to the Senate of the United States that basic principle of American Government; namely, that the people should be governed by the majority, and not be harassed and thwarted by the minority.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEHMAN

Nor should we forget the leadership and inspiration given by the giant of American liberalism—Herbert Lehman, of New York. When eventually this fight is won, his pioneering and steadfast championship of human freedom will be credited with pointing the way and marking the path.

When we vote this afternoon on the motion to lay on the table, let no one, as I said from the floor yesterday afternoon, have any doubt as to what we are doing. We shall be voting whether to restore majority rule to the Senate of the United States.

There is another irrelevant matter which has been raised in the debate; namely, what rule will replace rule 22? We will hammer it out on the anvil of exchange of opinion on the floor of the Senate.

But the first thing to do is to clear the way for the adoption of new rules, and that way cannot be cleared until we defeat the motion to lay on the table. Then we can come to grips with our clear constitutional obligation of adopting rules for the Senate which will protect all Americans from the unfair discrimination which now exists in too many parts of our land. When all is said and done, we have before us once again the issue as to whether the United States Senate will follow a procedural course of action which will protect first-class citizenship for all citizens of the United States, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

EXHIBIT 1

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, 1949]

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT MAJORITY RULE IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

I wish to make a brief comment upon the rather peculiar position in which I find myself this afternoon, a position that might be subject to misunderstanding or misinterpretation if I did not make a clarifying statement. I have no desire to assist in any way a filibuster in the Senate. But I think that, before the cloture petition is filed this afternoon, those of us who have very definite views on the merits of the filibuster issue should get them into the RECORD. I am not sure what the parliamentary situation may be as to our rights to place them in the RECORD, at least in time for them to become a part of the RECORD before the vote, so far as the cloture matter is concerned, if we do not do it now.

So I desire to state for the RECORD my reasons in support of the Morse antifilibuster resolution, and I want to reply briefly to some very able, but I think fallacious, arguments which have been made on this issue by some of my distinguished colleagues on the other side.

I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] this is a momentous debate. I think it is but another chapter in a great fight that is going to continue to be waged in the Senate until the coming of that happy day when the people's will will prevail and a rule in the Senate will be adopted making it possible for the will of the people through a majority vote of their elected representatives to be registered in this august body.

I do not think we are going to win the fight this time. I wish I could be more optimistic about it. But I expect now as in the other rounds of the fight in times gone by, the proponents of an antifilibuster resolution will lose. Why? Because neither party in the Senate, Republican nor Democratic, in my opinion, has stood up in the fight and made it clear it is willing to take those steps necessary to win the fight. Thus it must go back to the people, and the people once again are going to have to impress upon more Senators at the ballot boxes their determination to see to it that the fight is won in the Senate, either by getting men now in the Senate, once they come again face to face with the people on this issue in campaigns, to change their thinking on the issue, or by supplanting men already here, at future elections, with other candidates for the Senate, who will come here and make the fight which I think should be made now, and, as I have said on the floor on this issue in times past, which should have been made in previous battles.

We cannot win unless we are willing, as we have not been thus far in the fight, to continue in session for as many days, weeks, and months as may be necessary to demonstrate to the minority that we do not propose to have the majority will trampled by minority tactics in the Senate. It must be done sometime; why not now?

I have asked that question over and over again during the last 4 years. I shall continue to ask it, until the time comes, which I hope will not be in the far distant future, when my party in the Senate, as a Republican policy will organize by way of opposition to a filibuster, and declare our determination to remain here for as many months as may be necessary to break the filibuster. I hope the alleged antifilibusterers on the Democratic side of the aisle will with equal determination so organize themselves that we can get the issue behind us. I am satisfied the rule of the Senate permitting filibusters is devastating to the interests of the people in the case of issue after issue.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the rights of the people in legislation before the Congress of the United States are no better than their procedural rights in the Senate of the United States. So long as the rules of the Senate permit, through a filibuster, the defeat of the will of the great, overwhelming majority of the American people on various issues, then there must be eliminated the procedures which produce such an unconscionable result, if this is to be a truly representative government. To me it is a very simple issue. I am either right or wrong. Mr. President, in saying that the most fundamental tenet of a democratic form of government is that which says the majority will shall prevail, subject to the checks and balances of the Constitution, through a judiciary, and the veto of the President, in case the majority of the Senate and the House pass legislation which cannot be squared with the fundamental constitutional guaranties of the document which gave us all of our rights and liberties.

That is why I never have been able to accept, and cannot now accept, the able arguments of distinguished Democrats on the other side of the aisle, that the Constitution guarantees to them that, under the rules of the Senate, they shall have preserved to them the right to block the majority through procedural tactics, because, in their judgment, they do not believe certain legislation which the majority otherwise would pass is constitutional. Mr. President, that defies, in my judgment, our whole theory of government, not only of checks of powers but separation of powers as well.

The American people need to reflect once again on the fact that under our system of government, if we pass legislation which, in fact, is unconstitutional, the courts will pass on it unless, before it gets to the court, the President of the United States exercises his veto, which, under the Constitution, requires a two-thirds vote to override.

When the Founding Fathers were faced with the problem of establishing the checks in the Constitution they did not have any

difficulty in providing a two-thirds vote requirement when they wanted a two-thirds vote requirement as a check. They understood the effect of a two-thirds vote requirement as well as we do; and in the magnificent document which they wrote they checked us, the Senate of the United States, in the passing of unconstitutional legislation, by giving to the President the veto power over us and requiring that his veto shall stand unless a two-thirds vote of the Senate, as well as of the House, overrides it. But they did not anywhere in that document provide that the debate in the Senate of the United States shall be unlimited in the sense that a handful, a minority, of Senators can organize and block the will of the majority by preventing a vote ever occurring on a piece of legislation. If they wanted to place that power in any minority group in the Senate, the English language was perfectly capable of being so used. But they did not do it. What did they provide? They provided that the House and the Senate shall be allowed to make their own rules governing procedure.

Mr. President, I think one of the most able arguments which has been made in the course of this debate was the argument made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], for whom I have the highest respect and for whose views, as the RECORD will show, I find myself many, many times, I think, more often than not, in agreement; a man who, in my judgment, is a great lawyer, but with whom, on this issue, I find myself in complete disagreement. Because the argument he made recently on the floor of the Senate, in my judgment, has had great weight in the thinking of my colleagues, I propose, very humbly, this afternoon to answer a few of his observations, inasmuch as I disagree with the Senator on a great many of his historical observations and interpretations, and I disagree with him on some of his conclusions as to constitutional law.

In the speech of the Senator from Georgia, delivered on February 28, 1949, he said, at page 1640 of the RECORD, that had someone suggested a limitation on debate in a conference of the States before the formation of the Constiution, it would have dissolved the conference.

The Senator from Georgia can assert it, but it is an assumption, which, in my judgment, does not rest upon historical probability. Why do I say that? Because, Mr. President, the Continental Congress, which preceded these great constitutional debates, operated on the basis of a rule which permitted of the previous question. It did not dissolve over that parliamentary practice which limited debate. At the very time the constitutional fathers sat it was the common practice in parliamentary bodies, colonial, and, to the extent we had them, combinations of colonial bodies such as the Continental Congress to use the previous question technique as the device for limiting debate.

I most respectfully say to my good friend from Georgia that I know of no basis in history to support his assumption that had any such proposal been made at the Constitutional Convention to limit debate in the Senate of the United States, the Convention would have dissolved. To the contrary, I think the assumption ought to be that, in view of the parliamentary practice which prevailed at that time, by way of the previous question as a device for limiting debate just the opposite conclusion from that reached by the Senator from Georgia is the one which we should accept.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the Senator know that the previous question, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, was itself a debatable question, and that it has little relationship to the previous question as now known in the House of Representatives?

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly aware of that, but I am sure, also, that the Senator from Georgia would agree with me that at the time of the Constitutional Convention, at the time of the Continental Congress, the usages or practices which grew up around the use of the previous question did not fall into the evil way of a filibuster as it has developed on the floor of the Senate. Rather the fact is that Members voted on the previous question for limiting debate on a majority-vote basis. In other words, the practice was that men who assembled in parliamentary bodies, after full and fair debate on the merits of an issue, recognized the right of the majority eventually to end debate by the previous question.

In defending the right of unlimited debate in the Senate, Senators George and Connally, for example, relate it somehow to State sovereignty, to the sovereignty of the individual State.

Sovereignty means supreme power. The question of the location of sovereign power in the United States is to be answered, not by reference to the political theory of the American Constitution, but by reference to the hard facts of American life. Whatever the original design, the stubborn fact is that supreme power has come to reside in the Central Government (if it resides anywhere) as a result of the outcome of the War Between the States, the industrial revolution, and the onward march of science and technology. The intellectual edifice of State sovereignty and States rights, with its corollary doctrines of nullification and withdrawal, treating the National Government as the mere agent of associated States, which was elaborated by Calhoun, collapsed with the defeat of the South in the Civil War.

State sovereignty, in a narrow sense, no longer fits the cold hard facts of modern industrial society. It has passed away forever down the irreversible stream of time. Yet it lingers on in the southern mind like the nostalgic echo of a voice that is still. "But, oh, for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still."

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia, in his very able speech on February 28, said that a right which attaches to the sovereign State is this right of unlimited debate. As I have just said, the Constitution does not say so. Article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Therefore I do not think there can be any reasonable doubt, certainly no reasonable constitutional doubt, concerning the power of the Senate under the Constitution to adopt a rule regulating debate in this body. If that premise is sound under article I, section 5, paragraph 2, then certainly there is no invasion of sovereign powers of the States under the Constitution for this body to adopt a majority-vote rule, because article I, section 5, paragraph 2, contains no word of limitation on the power of the Senate of the United States to adopt its rules.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the Constitution, and he recognizes does he not, that there are some things which cannot be done by the Congress except by the consent of the States, and the one and foremost provision is that no State can be deprived of its equal representation or equal suffrage without its consent?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I also call the Senator's attention to another constitutional provision, namely, that there can be no subdivision of a State, or the creation of a new State out of an old State, or the creation of a new State by combination of parts of two States, except by the consent of the States.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator would not contend, would he, that by mere rule or regulation those constitutional prohibitions could be written out of the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all, but I do contend that the observation just made by the Senator from Georgia is entirely irrelevant to the issue before the Senate, as to whether or not under article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, the Senate of the United States has the right to adopt a rule governing debate in the Senate which will provide that a majority vote may limit debate. Such a proposed rule has not the slightest connection with the sovereign right of any State.

Mr. President, of course, there are rights given to the States under the Constitution which the Senate of the United States cannot take away from the States, but I cannot go along with what I consider to be a fallacious conclusion in the logic of the Senator from Georgia, that because certain rights of the States are guaranteed to them under the Constitution there is any connection whatsoever with the grant of rights and powers in article I, section 5, paragraph 2, which specifically reserve to the House of Representatives and the Senate the right to adopt rules governing their proceedings. I most respectfully say that the implication of the argument of the Senator from Georgia is a clear non sequitur.

Mr. President, in his very able speech, the Senator from Georgia pointed out that there is a danger of whittling away the rights of the States. Let us consider the Hayden resolution for a moment. I am sure the Presiding Officer knows that I am not in favor of the Hayden resolution, save and except I may in the last analysis be forced to vote for it because I apparently stand here this afternoon, as I said before, as the only defender of the President of the United States in support of a majority-rule principle for limiting debate in the Senate; and, of course, if I have no support at the present time for the position the President of the United States and I take in this matter, I shall have to bide my time until the electorate changes that situation, and during the interim I may have to go along with the Hayden resolution, inadequate as I think it is; but it is better than the present rule. So let us look at the Hayden resolution for a moment.

I say, Mr. President, that the safeguard of States rights is to be found in the equal representation of the States in the Senate, and not in its parliamentary procedure. I repeat, my first answer to the able argument of the Senator from Georgia is that the safeguard of States rights is to be found in the equal representation of the States in the Senate, not in its parliamentary procedure.

The Hayden resolution proposes no change in the voting requirements for the application of cloture, nor any reduction in the time allowance for debate following the vote on the cloture motion. No apprehension of the impairment of the rights of the States was voiced in the debate preceding the adoption of the existing cloture rule in 1917, for which all the southern Democratic Senators voted on that memorable day. Were States rights jeopardized during the 5-year period from 1917 to 1922, before the first breach in the ramparts of the present rule was found by a presiding officer? The States rights argument in this connection, I say most respectfully, Mr. President, is unsound, and designed to catch timid and unwary souls.

Mr. President, let us consider what an examination of the facts shows about the debates which occurred in 1917 at the time the present cloture rule was adopted.

The date was March 8, 1917. The debate consumed 6 hours, or 26 pages of the RECORD. Of the Senators who participated in the debate, six expressed their preference

for majority rather than two-thirds cloture. They were:

Hollis, of New Hampshire, whose comments appear on pages 26 and 27 of the RECORD for March 8, 1917.

Norris, of Nebraska, whose comments in support of majority rule appear on pages 27 and 28 of the RECORD for that date.

Stone, of Missouri, whose support of majority rule cloture appears on page 31.

Owen, of Oklahoma, whose comments appear on page 32.

Thomas, of Colorado. Read his support of majority rule on page 33.

Vardaman, of Mississippi. Note his comment on page 39.

Senator Stone on that occasion prophesied that the two-thirds cloture rule would prove ineffective, and I venture in my humble way to prophesy this afternoon that, even with the adoption of the Hayden resolution, we will not solve the filibuster problem in the Senate, and we will never solve it until we adopt the majority-vote principle in this body.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say why I will not yield, except to the Senator from Georgia. As a matter of courtesy to him, because of my reference to his argument, it would in my judgment be most unfair for me not to yield. But I am not going to yield to any other Senator, now that I have the floor, for two reasons. First, I do not want to be charged with engaging in a debate 1 minute longer than in all sincerity and good conscience I think I have to speak to make my case on the merits of the great issue pending before the Senate. In the second place, I am not going to yield because I do not want to be taken off the floor, and, although I know that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] would not attempt to take me off the floor by way of seeking to file a cloture petition while I am on the floor, I know he cannot necessarily control other Members of the Senate. I recall that at one time last year—I think my memory serves me correctly—a debate was proceeding when a ruling was handed down that if a Senator obtained the floor for the filing of a cloture petition he could take the speaker off his feet, and I am going to do my best to protect myself until I finish this argument, which so far as my political record is concerned, Mr. President, is of utmost importance to me. I submit that from the standpoint of future events in this country, the arguments which I propose to make this afternoon are going to be of utmost importance to some other Senators in the Senate of the United States.

On March 8, 1917, Senator Owen, of Oklahoma, stated that at least 40 Senators then favored majority cloture, but were bound by a gentlemen's agreement to vote for a two-thirds rule. It is my understanding that what happened behind the scenes in 1917 was that some 40 Senators expressed preference for a simple majority-vote rule in the Senate of the United States for limiting debate, but the leadership prevailed upon them, as so often happens in the Senate now, to modify their views or compromise their position by going along with a two-thirds vote rather than the majority vote which they preferred. It was that understanding and that arrangement which I assume Senator Owen was referring to when on March 8, 1917, he said that at least 40 Senators then favored majority cloture, but were bound by a gentlemen's agreement to vote for the two-thirds rule.

The RECORD shows, Mr. President, that Senator Thomas, of Colorado, on that day said:

"The principle of majority rule is an established and essential principle in American government from the Nation to its smallest hamlet. The majority should have and exercise the power of determining what its policy will be not only with regard to legislation, but, as well, the methods by which legislation is to be accomplished. Two-thirds cloture," he said, "will bring no real measure of relief. It will provide a delusion and a snare. Unless the rules be amended by providing cloture by majority the practical operation of this amendment will prove a deep disappointment to the hopes of its sponsors."

If prophetic words were ever uttered in the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, on March 8, 1917, Senator Thomas, of Colorado, uttered them in connection with the quotation from his speech I have just read to the Senate, because I think it is perfectly clear that the two-thirds vote rule in regard to cloture has proved to be a delusion and a snare.

On that same historic day, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Vardaman, stated that he recognized that unlimited debate has served the people of the South. "But," he added, "I would prefer that the rule would provide for the invocation of the cloture by a majority rather than by a two-thirds vote."

Mr. President, the two-thirds cloture rule was adopted on March 8, 1917, by a vote of 76 to 3. Of the 16 Senators not voting, it was announced that 11 would have voted "yea." Thus, at least 87 of the 96 Senators then favored a limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States. Where were the southern protests on that day when the sovereignty of the States was being invaded? Where were the southern protests on that day that a great constitutional safeguard was being destroyed in the Senate of the United States? Southern Senators on that day voted for the rule. I think it is also quite obvious that they voted for the rule, thinking, as was the practice for the 5 years thereafter, that it applied to all matters of business before the Senate, be it a motion to take up a bill, or to approve the journal, or to consider a measure in the sense of the subsequent interpretation of the word "measure" being limited, as the Presiding Officer 5 years later ruled, to a pending bill.

No; I am not impressed, Mr. President, with the argument that the sovereignty of the States is being invaded by putting into application the simple majority-vote principle in the Senate of the United States so that we can transact the people's business and protect the people from the obstructionist tactics of men who seek to talk a bill to death so that no vote can ever occur on it.

I repeat now what I think I have said before on the floor of the Senate—I certainly have said it in committee—that there is all the difference in the world between a prolonged debate on the merits of an issue and a prolonged debate that is intended to continue until such time as the majority yields to an agreement or understanding that no vote on the measure at all shall take place, but, rather, that the majority shall surrender to the minority and the proposed legislation shall be laid on the table or be withdrawn. That has happened since I have been in the Senate, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is filled with many instances of its happening before I came to the Senate. I say that that type of prolonged debate in the Senate of the United States defeats what I consider to be one of the fundamental purposes and principles of democratic government—majority rule.

Not only that, but let it be understood that one of the most costly prices we pay for the filibuster tactics in the Senate of the United States is in committee—not on the floor of the Senate, but in committee. The American people, I am sure, are not fully aware of the fact that the threat of the filibuster is a common weapon that profilibusterers use frequently in committee, where, after a committee by a clear majority is of one mind as to what kind of legislation should be recommended to the floor of the Senate, a minority of the committee will say, in effect, "If you vote the bill out in that form, we warn you we will talk it to death on the floor of the Senate." I call that parliamentary intimidation and, in my judgment, it is used too often in the Senate of the United States, with the result that too frequently committees bring to the floor of the Senate, not legislation by way of recommendation which corresponds to their real desires as a majority; not legislation which the majority of the committee thinks would be in the public interest; but legislation which has been whiplashed out of them by way of a threat of a filibuster if they do not yield in committee to the will of the minority.

Mr. President, if I had to state what I think is the greatest evil in the filibuster, I would not mention first the tremendous waste of time and expense involved in holding up the people's business on the floor of the Senate in actual debate, bad as I think that is. I should say that the great cost of the rule which permits a filibuster is paid in committee, in executive sessions of the committee, away from the public view, where the public is not aware of what is going on behind committee doors. We are confronted there with the threat that if we do not yield to the whiplash of the minority by writing into the bill provisions which we do not think ought to be in the bill, we either cannot get a bill at all, or if we get it to the floor of the Senate, the minority will talk it to death, to use the exact phrase which I have heard on several occasions in committees of which I have been a member since I have been in the Senate.

That is not good government. I do not think it is democratic government. Thus I repeat that I am proud to stand here today shoulder to shoulder with Harry S Truman in support of a principle of good government which I think in some way, somehow, we must make prevail in America—that the Senate of the United States shall operate and function on the basis of a majority vote principle. My invitation is an open one, and will continue to be extended over the months and years ahead, so long as I am in the Senate, for Democrats and Republicans alike to join with me in support of President Truman on this issue, because he is right.

Returning to the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in this very able argument he said, on February 28:

"We can have absolutism in a legislative body. We can bring about absolutism in the Congress by a gag rule."

Mr. President, absolutism means despotism. Absolutism is the doctrine or practice of unlimited authority and control. I repeat that there are ample limits upon public authority in our constitutional system of checks and balances; but unlimited debate in the Senate has never been a part of American political theory.

I quote from the scholarly book by W. F. Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration, published in 1934. I read excerpts from pages 495 and 499. In that book Willoughby says:

"The real issue involved in obstruction in the Senate is simply this: Shall majority rule and responsible party government prevail? Impartial students of the question have concluded that it is desirable that the Senate should provide by its rules for greater freedom of debate than obtains in the House, but that it should at the same time provide means by which an abuse of this freedom may be prevented. * * * Obstruction which goes beyond that of legitimate debate is an evil that should be brought under control, both because it consumes the time of the Chamber and because it places undue obstacles in the way of proper working of party government. * * * As in all cases where

power is granted, the opportunity for its abuse exists and * * * reasonable safeguards against such abuse should be provided. Such safeguards, however, should not go as far as to enable the minority, in an open contest, to make its will prevail over the majority. While a majority can use its powers in an illegitimate way, the same is true of the minority, and as between the two, the former * * * is the lesser evil."

Mr. President, I fail to see any basis in merit for the fear of the Senator from Georgia that the adoption even of a majority-vote rule in the Senate of the United States would run any danger whatsoever of absolutism. The Senator from Georgia was speaking of the Hayden resolution. I am sure that he would deplore even more my resolution. However, even under my resolution, I do not see any basis for the fear which he has expressed, if we constantly keep in mind the other checks against a majority which might seek to abuse its powers, as suggested by Mr. Willoughby in the book from which I have quoted; if we keep constantly in mind the veto power of the President, the two-thirds vote under the Constitution in regard to overriding the veto, and the great judicial safeguards of the United States Supreme Court in protecting constitutional rights both of individuals and of States.

That leads me to repeat for the record the protection to minority rights contained in the resolution for which I am fighting and which adopts majority-vote rule principle. It has been suggested in the course of this debate—in fact, in the committee the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] suggested it—that if we adopt a majority-vote principle in a resolution which provides for 96 hours of debate, as my resolution does, and which accords to each Senator the right to farm out his time, as my resolution does, there is nothing thereafter which would stop the Senate from further modifying such a rule so as to reduce the 96 hours to 48, the 48 to 24, the 24 to 12, the 12 to 6, or to use the argument of reducing it to an absurdity, wiping out entirely—so those who fear that danger say—any right to debate after cloture has been adopted.

I know that reducing things to an absurdity is frequently a very effective technique when someone wishes to argue from fear rather than from the realities. I believe that those who make that argument fly in the face of the realities of practice of the Senate. Why do I say that? I say it because, as I shall show later by certain statistics which I shall offer, it is most difficult to get 16 Members of the Senate to sign a cloture petition in the first instance. They are not going to do it, and they do not do it, unless and until they become convinced that there is in progress a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on an issue.

After the petition is signed, there is another safeguard reality. Those who employ the fear argument tell us that there is a danger that a majority may subsequently further modify the rule or overlook it. The safeguard is that after 16 Members have signed a cloture petition, under my resolution it would require a majority of the Members of the Senate to apply cloture. Has that happened very frequently? In the cases in which cloture petitions have been filed, we find that out of 19 times when such a petition was filed, it was possible to get a majority vote only 12 times. Incidentally, it was possible to get a two-thirds vote only four times. That is why I say that the proposal which is being offered here for a two-thirds vote is ineffective. Statistically it is shown to be little more than a gesture. A two-thirds vote was obtained only 4 times out of 19, and a majority vote 12 times out of 19. So it is evident that a majority of the Members of the Senate will hesitate a long time before they stop their colleagues from discussing the merits of an issue, unless they are convinced that the minority have organized in an endeavor to prevent the majority from even voting. Then I say it is proper for the Senate rule to vest in the majority the right to vote, as provided in my resolution. Although there are some Members of the Senate who seem to think that this type of a practical check in the Senate is not effective, I think the matter of fair play in the Senate and the matter of senatorial courtesy is one of the very practical safeguards protecting the minority from any steamroller tactics which those who have protested my use of the so-called senatorial courtesy argument seem to fear. History supports me, Mr. President, for the statistics which I shall shortly present show that the majority is very hesitant, as it should be, to apply any gag upon the minority, save and except in instances when it is satisfied that the minority is seeking to deny to the majority its democratic right to reach a vote on the issue in question.

So I say that when we examine the realities of Senate practices, the fear arguments, which are being advanced by the opponents of my resolution providing for a majority-vote rule, deserve very little weight.

But the Senator from Georgia apparently feels that there is a great danger of this, because in his speech on February 28 he said:

"Senate Resolution 15 is a grant of power which ultimately will be used to perpetrate a great wrong."

Mr. President, I do not share that opinion. I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia that Senate Resolution 15 is a grant of power. I say it is naught but a rule of procedure prescribing the conditions under which debate may be closed. It can be successfully invoked, under the Hayden resolution, only if two-thirds of the Senators present vote in favor of it. Two-thirds of the Senate will not perpetrate any great wrong upon the American people; in fact, the statistics show that, on the average, 83 Senators have voted on each of the 19 cloture petitions or motions which have been submitted since 1917. We see, therefore, that when a cloture fight arises in the Senate, and when the time comes for voting on that question, there are not very many empty seats in the Senate Chamber. The record shows that to be so. I repeat that, on the average, 83 Senators have been in their seats at the time of the vote on 19 different occasions since 1917 when cloture petitions have been filed and the question of invoking cloture has been voted on.

Mr. President, cloture does not take away any part, I submit, of the right of the smaller States of the Union to have their say in regard to what they wish to say.

In his speech on February 28 the Senator from Georgia also said:

"The smallest State in this Union * * * can say what it wishes to say."

I agree with the Senator from Georgia, but I deny his conclusion that Senate Resolution 15 will in any way take away that right. There will be ample opportunity for every State, large or small, to be heard upon the merits of a question, under Senate Resolution 15 or under my resolution providing for cloture by majority vote, if you will, Mr. President, both during the prepetition stage, during the 2-day interval between the filing of the cloture petition and the vote on it, and during the 96 hours of potential debate after cloture has been adopted, if it is adopted. Under those procedural steps, I ask, Can one really imagine a situation in the Senate of the United States in which the smaller States will not have ample opportunity or time to have their say, and all they want to say, on the merits of any issue pending before the Senate of the United States? Let us keep in mind, first, the reluctance of any 16 Members of the Senate to file a cloture petition unless they are convinced that a filibuster has started—which means that prior to that moment there has been adequate and ample time for debate on the merits of the issue in question—and, second, the fact that after the filing of the petition there is a 2-day interval which permits of 2 continuous days of debate on the merits of the issue involved in the cloture petition, and the further fact that after the adoption of cloture, if it is adopted, 96 hours of debate are permitted under the Hayden amendment, if each Senator wishes to use his hour, to discuss the merits of the issue, and the further fact that under my resolution 96 hours of debate are permitted, with the farming-out privilege, which I think is an additional safeguard to minority interests in the Senate—which I, too, wish to protect; I simply do not wish to give the minority the right to trample the majority underfoot. That is the difference. I do not wish to give to the minority the right to deny effectively to the majority the right to pass proposed legislation, which the present rule permits the minority to do.

No, Mr. President; the talk about taking away from the smaller States their right to say what they wish to say on an issue is a fear argument. It simply will not work out that way in practice. It does not work out that way in practice, and I submit it cannot work out that way in practice. My proposal does give—and its great merit is to be found in its strength—to the majority in the Senate the right to prevent any minority group of Senators from denying to the majority the right finally to pass proposed legislation.

My good friend the Senator from Georgia said on February 28:

"If a man's soul recoils from such a proposition as that, is he not justified in saying that, so long as he can prevent it, it shall not even be submitted to the Congress of the United States for decision?"

My answer to him is that I do not think such a right should be recognized under the rules of the Senate of the United States, because I believe such a claimed right, if allowed to be exercised, is equivalent to a license to defeat a fundamental tenet of democratic government, namely, the will of the majority. For one Senator or a minority of Senators to refuse to permit the Senate to vote upon a proposition, simply because the minority believe it is unconstitutional or is contrary to some sectional interest, in my judgment, is an arrogant substitution by the minority of their judgment for that of the entire Senate and of the courts of the land. The final arbiters of the civil rights and liberties of the American people are and should be the courts, not transient minorities in the Senate of the United States, whose Members may come from only one section of the country or from only one political party, and none of whom may have been elected recently. The fifth amendment to the Constitution did not enact Herbert Spencer's proposed social statics. Neither should rule 20 enable a handful of Senators to prevent consideration of legislation passed by the House of Representatives and desired by an overwhelming majority of the American people.

Let me say a word about the interesting question of political science and political ethics, as to just whom we represent in the Senate. Reasonable men may differ, as they differ on the point I now make; but so far as I am concerned it is a crystal-clear dictate that I feel was vested in me when the people of my State sent me to the Senate. They did not send me to the Senate from Oregon for Oregon. They sent me under our representative system of government from Oregon for the Nation; not to sit here and vote a blind partisan sectional interest on any piece of legislation. Great as the temptation sometimes is to vote and act in that way, weak and inclined as some of us at times may be to yield to the temptation, if and when we do, I say, in my judgment, we do not measure

up to the great trust the people of our States placed in us when they sent us to the Senate.

I look upon the Senate as a part of our representative government, as a part of a legislative government, I may say to my good friend from Georgia, as a part of one of the legislative branches of the Government, sent here to legislate in the interests of all the people from the Pacific to the Atlantic and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The people of Oregon did not send me here as an ambassador from Oregon. I thought we answered and found the solution to that issue, terrible as it was, costly as it was, in the War Between the States. I thought as the outcome of that war the notion of Calhoun that we sat here as ambassadors from our respective States was repudiated, and that from that time on we were to sit in the Senate, not as ambassadors from particular States, fighting for the selfish sectional interests, economic, political, and social, of various sections of the country, but fighting for the welfare of the Nation. At least it is in that spirit I propose to stand always on the floor of the Senate and fight as a representative in the Senate from the great State of Oregon, believing that by so doing I am carrying out the great principle of representation to which I pledged myself when I took the oath at the Presiding Officer's desk when I first came into the Senate, to support and defend the Constitution—which means all the rights set forth in the Constitution for the benefit of the whole Nation—and to pass legislation, if necessary, to see to it that millions of people in this country who may not be getting the full fruits of their constitutional rights as set forth in the letter of the Constitution shall be able to live in terms of those rights. That is my conception of my duty of representation in the Senate. I am perfectly aware of the fact, as I read the able speech of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, delivered on February 28, that he was a considerably different notion as to what representation in the Senate imposes upon him by way of duties and rights and obligations.

Since I have come to the Senate I have been saddened several times because I felt on both sides of the aisle alinements were formed on the basis of selfish sectional interests on various economic and social problems before the Senate for consideration. I know the pressure to do that is great, and I know that sometimes when one does not yield to the pressure his failure to do so may be at great cost to his own political fortunes. I have been able to practice it thus far, and I pray I shall have the strength and the courage to continue to practice it on specific issues, namely, that whenever I am satisfied a vote for a measure that would be of great benefit to my State would not at the same time be in the public interest, I intend to vote against the measure.

I say from the floor of the Senate this afternoon to the people of the State of Oregon I am willing to apply that concept of my duty now to two great measures about which much misunderstanding as to the facts exists in Oregon. Due consideration has not been given to the facts to which the Oregon people sent me here to give consideration. I suspect the people of Oregon, at a referendum, if it were held today might vote against the positions I think I shall probably take on those issues. But I shall take them because I do not think it important that any of us stay in the Senate, though I think it important that while we are here we vote on the basis of what we think is the national interest and not the interest of our respective States, if on an issue the national interests and the interests of our States are in conflict.

Thus, I mention the Tidelands case, and I say to the people of Oregon today that in spite of the fact that a tremendous drive is being made in Oregon to line up the State in support of the tidelands bill, and although I am convinced that on the basis of that propaganda and its effect on public opinion as of now, in the State of Oregon, if I wanted to play politics with the issue I would vote for it; I shall not vote for it if, when the debate is over, such able constitutional lawyers in this body as the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. Donnell, can convince me that, as a matter of law, the tidelands belong to all the people of the United States, and not merely to the people living in the States whose shores the tidewaters wash. That is a specific application of the principle I am talking about. That issue, so far as I am concerned, must be decided in answering the mixed question of fact and law: Who, as a legal proposition, under our Constitution, owns the tidelands? If the debate satisfies me they are owned by all the people of the Nation, I shall vote against the tidelands bill. And let me say, so far as considerations of party responsibility are concerned, that I shall vote against it, even though the Republican Party made the tidelands bill a part of its platform. Theory, Mr. President, is fine. The test comes as to whether one is able to practice the sound political theory which I think was clearly written into our organic law. I do not read the Constitution of the United States as containing one word which would support even a presumption that Members of the Senate should sit here and vote sectional interests, although I confess that too frequently that is what has happened.

There is another issue, and that is the labor issue. In my State I cannot find very many middle-of-the-roaders. They seem to want either the Taft-Hartley law or the Thomas bill, depending, apparently, upon whether they follow the lines of management or the lines of labor. I think that in due course of time the people of my State will awake to the fact that both the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law and the proponents of the Thomas bill are taking extreme positions which are not in the public interest. They have got labor so disturbed, in my State, that the letters and telegrams I am receiving from labor are phrased in terms of charging me with running out on some position I have heretofore taken in the Senate of the United States. It is probably asking too much that they read the RECORD but I say to organized labor, not only in Oregon but at the A. F. of L. headquarters, the CIO headquarters, and the brotherhoods' headquarters here, "you are being taken for a ride by the proponents of the Thomas bill. You are being taken for a ride in several respects. First, they apparently are giving you the false impression that the Thomas bill has a chance of passing the Senate."

I shall not argue a question of fact, Mr. President, and that is all it is. It is so simple that all we have to do is to count. I have done some counting. I say to labor that the Thomas bill cannot pass the Senate of the United States. It is about time for labor to take stock of that fact. What we need, as I have said before, is a piece of labor legislation which will protect the legitimate rights of labor, which is all labor has the right to ask, and which will protect the legitimate rights of management, which is all management has a right to ask, and which thereby will protect the public interest.

I thought I had made myself clear, time and time again, on this issue during the committee hearings, but propaganda works wonders when the propagandists seek to misinform. Let me say once again that one of the amendments I tried to offer in committee, but was not allowed to, and which I shall offer, in due course of time, on the floor of the Senate, calls for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, because, in my judgment, that law is an extreme piece of legislation which is productive of class-conscious conflict and labor unrest, and is unfair and unworkable in many of its provisions. I shall also propose amendments, with the joint sponsorship of Senators on both sides of the aisle, which will protect the legitimate rights of labor and of management and which, to the extent that we can use the figure of speech in this discussion, follow a fair middle-of-the-road course of procedure.

Mr. President, I say again that I refuse to sit in the Senate of the United States either as a blind partisan representative of a sectional interest, or as a biased representative of any pressure group, be it labor or management or any other group. I say that it is not important that I stay here, but it is important so long as I stay here that that be my course of action.

Some people say, "In this organized drive against you, what are you going to do when you are licked in 1950?" My reply is, "I am not licked yet, but if and when that shall happen, I shall go back to my home town and into my law office and into further public service on a lower level." I might even run for the city council, Mr. President, because I think I might do a pretty good job of public service even on the city council. We need to understand in America that good public service is needed on all levels of our governmental organization. I think it is to be taken for granted that one who is as devoted to the public interest as I think my record shows I am, can be counted upon, so long as he has the strength to do so, to devote a great deal of his energies to public service, irrespective of the height of the level. I shall keep it pure public service, too, Mr. President.

I return now to my major thesis, namely, that it is a mistaken notion to assume that we sit here as the representatives of the small States or of the large States; but it is a sound theory that we sit here as representatives of the Nation.

Mr. President, in his very able speech on February 28 the Senator from Georgia said:

"There are those who would repeal the Bill of Rights, but I am sure there are none of those persons in the Senate."

In reply to my good friend from Georgia, I say that the Bill of Rights is not involved in the fight to curb the filibuster. It would require a constitutional amendment to repeal the Bill of Rights. All that is involved here is a procedural reform in the parliamentary rules of the Senate. Some persons are seeing ghosts under their beds, in the fears they are stirring up over the implications of this fight to curb filibusters in the Senate. The Hayden resolution is not inspired by a desire to clear the way for this or that legislation, but by a desire to increase the efficiency of the Senate in the performance of its legislative functions. My resolution is devised and designed to accomplish the same ends more effectively and more efficiently than is the Hayden resolution.

Mr. President, another argument in the able speech of the Senator from Georgia was the statement that whenever a measure possesses any real merit there will never be a filibuster against its consideration.

I merely submit the record to answer that argument. I say that the annals of the Senate of the United States are replete with filibusters ranging in length from a few hours to 2 months, on many meritorious issues; and without taking the time to read them, I cite as a reference a list of outstanding filibusters from 1841 to 1948, as published in the corrected copy of George Galloway's pamphlet entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate."

Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point this list of filibusters in the Senate for the years mentioned, as set forth on pages 17 to 19 of the Galloway pamphlet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OUTSTANDING SENATE FILIBUSTERS FROM 1841 TO 1948

"1841: A bill to remove the Senate printers was filibustered against for 10 days. A bill relating to the Bank of the United States was filibustered for several weeks and caused Clay to introduce his cloture resolution.

"1846: The Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

"1863: A bill to suspend the writ of habeas corpus was filibustered.

"1876: An Army appropriation bill was filibustered against for 12 days, forcing the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws.

"1880: A measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16 by an evenly divided Senate, until two Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

"1890: The Blair education bill was filibustered. The force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, was successfully filibustered for 29 days. This resulted in the cloture resolution introduced by Senator Aldrich, which was also filibustered and the resolution failed.

"1893: An unsuccessful filibuster lasting 42 days was organized against a bill for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

"1901: Senator Carter successfully filibustered a river-and-harbor bill because it failed to include certain additional appropriations.

"1902: There was a successful filibuster against the tri-State bill proposing to admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood, because the measure did not include all of Indian Territory according to the original boundaries.

"1903: Senator Tillman, of North Carolina, filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item paying his State a war claim. The item was finally replaced in the bill.

"1907: Senator Stone filibustered against a ship-subsidy bill.

"1908: Senator La Follette led a filibuster lasting 28 days against the Vreeland-Aldrich emergency currency law. The filibuster finally failed.

"1911: Senator Owen filibustered a bill proposing to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood. The House had accepted New Mexico, but refused Arizona because of her proposed constitution. Senator Owen filibustered against the admission of New Mexico until Arizona was replaced in the measure. The Canadian reciprocity bill passed the House and failed through a filibuster in the Senate. It passed Congress is an extraordinary session but Canada refused to accept the proposition.

"1913: A filibuster was made against the omnibus public building bill by Senator Stone, of Missouri, until certain appropriations for his State were included.

"1914: Senator Burton, of Ohio, filibustered against a river and harbor bill for 12 hours. Senator Gronna filibustered against acceptance of a conference report on an Indian appropriation bill. In this year also the following bills were debated at great length, but finally passed: Panama Canal tolls bill, 30 days; Federal Trade Commission bill, 30 days; Clayton amendments to the Sherman Act, 21 days; conference report on the Clayton bill, 9 days.

"1915: A filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship-purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

"1917: The armed-ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administration measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

"1919: A filibuster was successful against an oil and mineral leasing bill, causing the failure of several important appropriation bills and necessitating an extraordinary session of Congress.

"1921: The emergency tariff bill was filibustered against in January 1921, which led Senator Penrose to present a cloture petition. The cloture petition failed, but the tariff bill finally passed.

"1922: The Dyer antilynching bill was successfully filibustered against by a group of southern Senators.

"1923: President Harding's ship-subsidy bill was defeated by a filibuster.

"1925: Senator Copeland (New York) talked at length against ratification of the Isle of Pines Treaty with Cuba, but the treaty was finally ratified.

"1926: A 10-day filibuster against the World Court Protocol was ended by a cloture vote of 68 to 26, the second time cloture was adopted by the Senate. A bill for migratory bird refuges was talked to death by States rights advocates in the spring of 1926, a motion for cloture failing by a vote of 46 to 33.

"1927: Cloture again failed of adoption in 1927 when it was rejected by 32 yeas against 59 nays as a device to end obstruction against the Swing-Johnson bill for development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

"One of the fiercest filibusters in recent decades succeeded in March 1927 in preventing an extension of the life of a special campaign investigating committee headed by James A. Reed of Missouri. The committee's exposé of corruption in the 1926 senatorial election victories of Frank L. Smith in Illinois and of William S. Vare in Pennsylvania had aroused the ire of a few Senators who refused to permit the continuance of the investigation despite the wishes of a clear majority of the Senate.

"1933: Early in 1933 a 2-week filibuster was staged against the Glass branch-banking bill in which Huey Long first participated as a leading figure. 'Senators found him impervious to sarcasm and no man could silence him.' Cloture was defeated by the margin of a single vote. Finally, the filibuster was abandoned and the bill passed.

"1935: The most celebrated of the Long filibusters was staged on June 12–13, 1935. Senator Long spoke for 15½ hours, a feat of physical endurance never excelled in the Senate, in favor of the Gore amendment to the proposed extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act. But the amendment was finally tabled.

"1938: A 29-day 'feather duster' filibuster in January-February 1938, defeated passage of a Federal antilynching bill, although an overwhelming majority of the Senate clearly favored the bill.

"1939: An extended filibuster against adoption of a monetary bill, extending Presidential authority to alter the value of the dollar, continued from June 20 to July 5, 1939, but finally failed by a narrow margin.

"1942, 1944, 1946, 1948: Four organized filibusters upon the perennial question of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation were successful in these years. An attempt to pass fair employment practice legislation in 1946 was also killed by a filibuster. The present Senate cloture rule proved ineffective in these cases as a device for breaking filibusters."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another argument of the Senator from Georgia was that some things in America cannot be settled by legislation. If this be true—and it may be—the remedy then certainly is not to deny to the Senate a chance to consider legislation in point, but for the Senate and the House to reject a bill, after full debate on the floor of each House, in accordance with a majority vote principle. That is the answer to that argument. But it certainly is no sound argument to set up a straw man and say, by way of assumption, that some things cannot be settled by legislation, and then say, "In order to prove we are right about that, we are going to deny to the majority any chance to try to settle them by legislation. We are going to put up our minority viewpoint as a blockade to any legislative attempt to try to settle things which we, the minority, may think cannot be settled by legislation."

The Senator from Georgia also said, in the course of his speech, that we should not shackle the States with respect to matters which offend their traditions, cultural institutions, and deep convictions. I submit that the Hayden resolution is not proposed to shackle the States. It is a reform, I repeat, in legislative parliamentary procedure. The civil-rights bills, if we want to discuss them at this point, are not designed to shackle the States, but to extend the frontiers of democracy throughout the country, and take the shackles off millions of fellow citizens who are being denied their constitutional rights and liberties in some sections of the country.

The Senator from Georgia refers in the course of his speech to the baneful influences of parties. I think it is clear that he means political parties. There are adequate safeguards, either under the Hayden resolution or the Morse resolution, to protect the minority from what I think the Senator from Georgia has in mind when he talks about the baneful influences of parties.

A few moments ago I listened to a very able and stirring address by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Myers], the Democratic whip, who, although he has left the President of the United States on this issue, nevertheless made perfectly clear this afternoon in his speech that he thinks there is an obligation resting upon the Democratic Party to carry out what he considers to be at least certain party commitments on which a great campaign was waged in this country prior to November 2, 1948. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to be talking about giving effect to party responsibility, and urging his Democratic colleagues to keep faith with what he considers to be the pledges of his party in the field of civil rights.

I recognize that there may be those who will characterize his position as an exhibition of the baneful influence of political parties, but I say that by way of legislation we ought to submit such proposals on their merits to the Congress and let the majority decide by majority vote whether or not the pledges of the Democratic Party—yes; and the pledges of the Republican Party—should be given their day in the Senate for submission to a majority vote of the Senate, in order to enact legislation which will make it possible to send those issues to the President for his signature or his veto, and to the United States Supreme Court ultimately for its determination as to whether they are constitutional.

Mr. President, let me say, on the question of the constitutionality of legislation, that if I felt that any piece of legislation in the field of civil rights violated any constitutional provsion I would not vote for it, and I would not have my friend, the Senator from Georgia, or any other Senator on the other side of the aisle who may differ with me on the issue of civil rights, vote for a piece of civil-rights legislation which he or they believed contained a single unconstitutional provision, because I believe we must live up to our oaths to support the Constitution. I have not yet, and I never shall vote for a piece of legislation in the Senate which I think contains any unconstitutional provision. But I am never going to take the position that because I think a piece of legislation contains an unconstitutional provision I have a right to organize a fighting minority in the Senate to block the majority

from ever voting on such a piece of legislation. I have lived up to my oath when I make my argument against the constitutionality of a legislative proposal, when I cast my vote against it, and then start the legislation on its way to the White House, if it passes, and to litigation, on the way to the courts, for their determination as to its constitutionality.

I do not know, Mr. President, how we are to preserve our democratic form of government if we adopt any other principle in regard to such issues. The principle which it seems to me the gentlemen of the opposition are in fact defending is that they ought to have the right, a right which should be recognized, by physical force and endurance, through a filibuster, to prevent a vote on a piece of legislation to which they are opposed, in their good judgment, reasonable as they may be in their attitude on whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional.

The word "despotism" has been mentioned in the debate, and I say it is more accurately applied to the position of a minority which wants to block a vote from ever occurring on an issue than to a majority which seeks to live within the checks and balances of our constitutional system of government.

At another place in his remarks the Senator from Georgia said, "You will come to majority rule in the Senate of the United States." Is not that a horrendous prospect? I thought that majority rule was always intended to be the rule governing the passage of legislation in the Senate. I thought that majority rule was the procedure for adopting amendments to the Senate rules. I thought majority rule to be the very essence, so far as a fundamental tenet is concerned, of our republican form of government. I thought that at all levels Federal and local officials are elected, laws are passed, and decisions rendered by majority vote, save and except in specific instances where by words of limitation in organic law exceptions are made to the majority-vote rule. As I said earlier in my speech, no such exception is set forth in the Constitution applicable to the issue to which we are addressing our attention, namely, the right of the Senate of the United States to adopt a parliamentary rule of procedure which will permit the majority to prevail in accordance with such provisions as are contained in the Hayden resolution and the Morse resolution.

At another point the Senator from Georgia said:

"There is an almost irresistible drift toward a larger and larger concentration of power in the Federal Government."

I agree to that statement; and I believe, Mr. President, I have, concerning that drift, some of the same fears the Senator from Georgia entertains. My fears are so deep that I think we must not delay longer in adopting in the Senate of the United States rules which will so improve its efficiency that we can move faster and more expeditiously to check abuses which develop through the great centralization of power in the Federal Government. So I say the drift to which the Senator from Georgia refers, to my way of thinking, presents all the more reason for increasing the efficiency of Congress so that it can cope more effectively in the public's interest with big business, big labor, and big government.

Filibusters weaken and delay the legislative processes and expose the Senate to public ridicule and the loss of public confidence. One has only to look at the calendar before us to see how correct I am as to the effects of a filibuster in producing delay in the enactment of legislation. Already in this debate both the proponents of the filibuster and the opponents of the filibuster have been expressing great concern over the fact that a backlog of vitally important legislation, such as rent control, ECA legislation, agricultural legislation, appropriation legislation—all vital to the welfare of the country—is beginning to pile up. No one should be surprised at that argument. It is the stereotyped argument. If Senators will read the past history of filibusters in the Senate they will find that the filibusterers say, in effect, "Yield now to us, the minority, because if you do not yield to us now you will be simply a party to piling up higher and higher important pieces of legislation which should be passed in the public's interest, because we will not let you vote on that legislation unless you withdraw the particular matter now before the Senate on which we are filibustering."

Mr. President, I have not analyzed myself sufficiently well to know just why it is that temperamentally, intellectually, yes constitutionally, I cannot yield to that sort of intimidation, and I never shall. I think the people of the United States had better understand the true meaning of that particular technique of the filibuster, because when they analyze its true meaning, then I think they will have a more adequate understanding of the common definition of a word which has crept into this debate, namely, "despotism."

In the course of his remarks the distinguished Senator from Georgia said:

"These proposals"—

Referring to the civil-rights bills—

"are essentially revolutionary."

I file my dissent to that conclusion and observation, because I do not think it is at all revolutionary to propose by law to abolish the poll tax, to outlaw lynching, and to promote fair employment practices.

As to the merits of such legislation, Members of the Senate can have many honest differences of opinion, but as to any conclusion that it is revolutionary, such a conclusion I think has to be based upon the assumption that giving to all the people of the country, irrespective of race, color, or creed, full protection to their constitutional rights, full constitutional liberties written into the organic law by the Founding Fathers, is revolutionary. To state the argument is to answer it. Revolutionary? No. Unfortunately, however, it represents a process of evolution we have had to develop in the field of civil rights, as the result of the already too long delay caused by refusal to accept, in some sections of the country, a full recognition of the fact that discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed cannot be reconciled with constitutional guaranties.

At another point in his notable address the Senator from Georgia said:

"It is impossible, except through revolution, ever to take away the equality of representation in the Senate."

As I stated to him earlier in our colloquy, no one is proposing to take away that equality. I think that is a false, bogey argument. That equality does not confer, however, upon any State or group of States, the right to prevent the Senate from considering and enacting legislation. The business of an organism is to function, and the constitutional rights and duties of the Senate call upon us to legislate, leaving to the other branches of Government the opportunity to exercise their checks upon us if we legislate contrary to the organic law.

The last comment I shall make on the distinguished Senator's remarks of February 28 is his reference to the formation of political policies along sectional lines. I deplore that, too. But I ask, What is the basic cause of the sectional aspect of some proposed legislation? I say out of deep conviction that I think the basic cause is to be found in the cultural lag of the South behind the political and economic standards of the rest of the country, plus the unwillingness of many southern leaders to use their influence in extending the frontiers of political and economic democracy in that region.

I recognize it is going to take time to satisfy the many needs of the South that need to be satisfied in order to give it comparable standing economically with other parts of the country. I have said before, and I now repeat, that we cannot do these things overnight. I do not happen to be one who believes that it would be in the best interests of the South or of the Nation overnight to put into effect all the reforms which the civil righters want to put into effect. I am severely criticized by some of them because I have taken that position. Of course, we cannot make progress, as I said before, by way of a social avalanche. But I do say that we cannot even take the first steps until the Senate changes its rules so that at least we can pass some legislation which will give hope to millions of our fellow citizens for a full share of the liberty and freedom which those of white skin are entitled to enjoy under the Constitution.

On January 27, 1949, I addressed a letter to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in answer to a point which he made, and a point which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made in his speech on February 28, the Senator from Arizona having set forth to me the fear that, if my resolution were adopted, at some subsequent time there might be a further change of the rule which would permit, not 96 hours of debate, but of a lesser time. In order that the RECORD may be complete, and in order that it may show that I have conscientiously tried to work out a conscionable compromise with those who have a vitally and fundamentally different point of view on this subject, I wish to read the letter of January 27 which I wrote to the Senator from Arizona:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You will recall that in conversation with me at the time I introduced my resolution (S. Res. 12) to amend the cloture rule, as well as in statements during the hearing (see discussion at pp. 66–69 of the transcript) on the pending cloture resolutions, you pointed out that if rule 22 were amended as I suggest in my resolution, to permit cloture to be voted by a majority, then in the future that rule or any other could be amended by a simple majority so as to further curtail freedom of debate.

While a majority may now amend the rules, I recognize that if the cloture rule were changed so as to permit cloture to be voted by a majority then the circumstance to which you refer could occur; and conceivably the guaranties to the minority contained in my resolution could be reduced. While I feel that the danger to which you refer is not likely to occur, your committee may wish to consider the following suggestion:

If, in addition to a rule such as is embodied in my resolution, rule 40 were amended at the same time to provide that a two-thirds vote would be necessary to amend that portion of rule 22 relating to cloture, the danger you envisage would be minimized. The result of such a combination of amendments to the rules would be that cloture could be applied by majority rule but the guaranties of adequate time for debate could be changed only by a two-thirds vote.

I considered proposing such a change as a formal part of my resolution, but I decided that there was no practical danger that the safeguards contained in my resolution would, if adopted, be cut down at a later time. Therefore, I limited my resolution to amending rule 22. I still feel the same way, but in view of the fears you and others have expressed, I thought it might be helpful to offer this additional suggestion for your consideration.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, if and when we get into such a position that amendments to the Hayden

resolution can be offered, I intend to offer my resolution, Senate Resolution 12, calling for cloture by majority vote with 96 hours of debating time after cloture has been adopted, with the right to farm out the time, plus a further amendment along the lines of the letter which I wrote to the Senator from Arizona on January 27.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. The amendment I have suggested would provide that thereafter the provision as to the length of time allowed the minority to debate after cloture had been adopted shall not be changed except by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia. First, let me state the condition under which I yield. I yield for a question only, and with the understanding that the Senator to whom I yield will not seek to offer parliamentarily any matter which will take me from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question; and if any interrupting Senator does not ask a question, the Senator can protect himself by refusing to yield further.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that I shall only ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Am I to understand from the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon that every matter to come before the Senate should be submitted to a pure majority vote, except the one final work of perfection, the resolution proposed by the Senator himself, allowing majority cloture, which can never be assailed in the future except by a two-thirds vote? Is that the position of the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator what my position is. I think it is fundamental that we adopt a cloture rule which will permit of proceeding with legislation and voting on legislation by way of a majority vote; and because I think it is so fundamental to preserving the democratic form of government in the Senate that we must adopt a majority-vote principle in order to stop a minority from filibustering us into inaction on a particular piece of legislation. I am willing to try to work out with those who say they fear my resolution will threaten and jeopardize minority rights in the Senate to the degree of denying the minority adequate time to debate an issue on the merits, some conscionable compromise which will give the minority assurance that they are to have at least 96 hours after cloture has been adopted, to debate an issue, unless, under my proposal for cloture limitation, in that particular respect two-thirds of the Senate decide to reduce the 96 hours to a further limitation of time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the position of the Senator that any question before the Senate should be decided on a majority basis except the one rule which the Senator himself proposes to write, which shall be sacrosanct, and can be assailed only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say that I do not propose to write it. I simply propose to yield to Senators who I think represent the minority point of view in this matter, and that in order to remove some of their fears about the majority not giving them adequate time to express the minority point of view. I am willing that they be given greater protection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator think it is somewhat unfair to denounce those of us who oppose the imposition of cloture or gag rule by a mere majority, while at the same time seeking to preserve, with the protection of a necessary two-thirds vote, the rule which he insists should be written?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not think there is anything unfair about it. On the other hand, I think I am clearly demonstrating great fairness in trying to answer the argument of the minority that if my so-called simple majority rule is adopted for limited debate, at some subsequent time the majority may try to take away from the minority the 96 hours of debate assured them under my rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator think that he should be a little more tolerant of the views of those who are seeking to protect themselves by a two-thirds rule, inasmuch as he himself is seeking to protect his provision by a two-thirds requirement that he proposes to write into the rule?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is mistaken if he thinks I am trying to protect my provision by a two-thirds rule. I want my provision as is; but many of the Senators on the minority side of this question have argued that my provision may, some time in the future, be changed to provide for cloture by a simple majority vote so as to deny the minority a reasonable time to debate. Unless the Senator from Georgia wishes to take the position that after cloture is invoked 96 hours is not adequate time in which to debate the merits of the issue—and, of course, those 96 hours would come after all the time that would be available prior to the invoking of cloture—I see nothing at all unreasonable about my offer of compromise.

I hasten to add that I do not prefer the compromise; however, I offer it in good faith only to assure those of the minority that I am willing to work out any conscionable proposal which will accomplish what I think is fundamental; namely, a basic rule which provides cloture may be applied by a majority vote and that after cloture is applied or invoked the minority shall be given 96 hours in which to debate the merits of their position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is impossible to carry on this discussion in the form of a question and really express my views, so I shall desist.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that throughout this debate I have not heard any mention of the rules of debate which prevail in legislative bodies generally in this country. Of course, the rules of other legislative bodies are not controlling in regard to our decision; I am perfectly aware of the fact that in a great many respects the Congress of the United States, which is created by the Federal Constitution, and is a part of a Federal Government of delegated powers, is quite a different legislative body from the legislatures of the States; but I am also aware of the fact that the legislative bodies of the States and the Congress of the United States have many similarities, many points in common. I think they certainly have one great common denominator, which is a general recognition on the part of the people of the country that legislative bodies, representing the people of the country either on a Federal level or on a State level, ought to carry out the people's will by way of a majority principle.

So I thought it would be rather interesting to find out what are the rules in the various State legislatures in regard to limitations upon debate, and to see whether, when I propose in the Senate of the United States the adoption of a majority-vote principle, I have proposed a parliamentary monstrosity which endangers the very foundation of our form of government. As I have listened to some of my friends of the opposition during this debate, I sometimes have asked myself the question, "What is it that you are proposing that is so terrible, so threatening to the perpetuation of democratic forms in this country?" Then I have reflected for a moment, and I have recognized that all I am offering is to put into practice a parliamentary procedure that is common throughout the Nation in the various State legislatures; and then I have felt a little better about it, because even momentarily I do not like to entertain the suspicion of a fear that I am proposing something that is revolutionary, as has been said by implication here on the floor of the Senate, in its effect on our great freedoms and liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, which I am just as desirous of defending as is any member of the opposition.

So I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare for me a study of the practices which prevail in the various States. I wish to read a few excerpts from those findings. I am satisfied—having checked them by a sampling process—that it is a very fine piece of research work which has been submitted to us, and I wish to give the entire Senate the benefit of the information set forth in the study.

The study shows that—

"Examination of the rules of procedure in effect in the several State legislatures indicates that four major approaches are followed in an effort to limit debates. These are: (1) limitation on the number of times a member may speak to any single question; (2) limitation on the length of time a member may speak; (3) use of the previous-question motion to cut off debate; and (4) special forms of cloture."

Now let us see very briefly what is the general finding in regard to each one of these methods of limiting debate:

"1. Limitation on number of times a member may speak: With but isolated exceptions, the rules of State senates and houses of representatives alike limit the number of times any member may speak on a single question at a single stage in procedure. The number specified is commonly twice, with a proviso that a member may not even speak the second time until all who desire to speak once have done so. Exceptions are, however, commonly made in favor of committee chairmen, bill sponsors, etc.

"2. Duration of normally permitted debate: About half of the legislative chambers go further and specify that, at least on a given day or at a given stage in procedure, a member may not speak in excess of a limited period of time without unanimous consent or other permission. Periods as short as 5 to 10 minutes are found (Oklahoma House and Senate respectively); a 30-minute limitation is common; while 1 hour (Alabama Senate and Arizona House), and 2-hour specifications (South Carolina and Colorado Senates) are also found. In some instances there are even more restrictive time limits in force for debate on special subjects, that is, question of privilege."

Mr. President, what about the technique by way of moving the previous question: We find that—

"Most State legislatures specifically permit use of the motion for the previous question as a device for cutting off debate, and word their rules so as to facilitate its use. Only two legislative chambers (the Senates of Utah and Vermont) are known to forbid the motion.

"4. Other forms of cloture: In view of the frequency of provisions of the above types, it is obvious that the State legislatures do not have any great need for other forms of cloture. The following are some examples of those special cloture rules known to exist."

Mr. President, without taking time to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LIMITATION OF DEBATE IN STATE LEGISLATURES

"Examination of the rules of procedure in effect in the several State legislatures indicates that four major approaches are followed in an effort to limit debate. These are: (1) limitation on the number of times a member may speak to any single question; (2) limitation on the length of time a member may speak; (3) use of the previous-question motion to cut off debate; and (4) special forms of cloture.

"1. Limitation on number of times a member may speak: With but isolated exceptions the rules of State senates and houses of representatives alike limit the number of times any member may speak on a single question at a single stage in procedure. The number specified is commonly twice, with a proviso that a member may not even speak the second time until all who desire to speak once have done so. Exceptions are, however, commonly made in favor of committee chairmen, bill sponsors, etc.

"2. Duration of normally permitted debate: About half of the legislative chambers go further and specify that, at least on a given day or at a given stage in procedure, a member may not speak in excess of a limited period of time without unanimous consent or other permission. Periods as short as 5 to 10 minutes are found (Oklahoma House and Senate respectively); a 30-minute limitation is common; while 1-hour (Alabama Senate and Arizona House) and 2-hour specifications (South Carolina and Colorado Senates) are also found. In some instances there are even more restrictive time limits in force for debate on special subjects, e. g., questions of privilege.

"3. Previous question: Most State legislatures specifically permit use of the motion for the previous question as a device for cutting off debate, and word their rules so as to facilitate its use. Only two legislative chambers (the senates of Utah and Vermont) are known to forbid the motion.

"4. Other forms of cloture: In view of the frequency of provisions of the above types it is obvious that the State legislatures do not have any great need for other forms of cloture. The following are some examples of those special cloture rules known to exist.

"New York Senate, rule 14, section 1, paragraphs 3 and 4:

" 'When any bill, resolution, or motion shall have been under consideration for 2 hours, it shall be in order for any senator to move to close debate, and the president shall recognize the senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put, and if it shall receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the senators present, the pending measure shall take precedence over all other business.

" 'The vote shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution, or motion with such amendments as may be pending at the time of such motion, according to the rules of the senate, but without further debate, except that any senator who may desire to do so shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding 5 minutes; upon the rollcall any senator may speak not to exceed 5 minutes in explanation of his vote.' (New Mexico Senate has a variant of this applicable after 6 hours with 30 minutes allowed subsequently.)

"Alabama Senate, rule 34:

" 'The committee on rules may at any time report a special rule that debate on a pending measure shall cease at a certain hour, and a vote be taken on the measure. The consideration of such special rule shall not exceed 30 minutes, when a vote shall be taken thereon.'

"Indiana Senate, rule 51, paragraph 2:

" 'The Senate at any time, by resolution adopted by a majority of the senators-elect, may further limit the time of debate.' (E. g., shorten normal half-hour allowed each member.)

"Louisiana Senate, rule 9, second paragraph:

" 'The senate may at any time, by a majority vote, limit debate so that no senator shall be permitted to speak longer than 1 hour at one time without permission of the senate, and a motion to that effect shall be in order at any time, taking precedence over every other motion, except a motion to adjourn.' (Par. 1 prohibits a member from speaking more than twice to any question without permission of the senate.)

"Massachusetts Senate, rule 47:

" 'Debate may be closed at any time not less than 1 hour from the adoption of a motion to that effect. On this motion not more than 10 minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no member shall speak more than 3 minutes.' (Motion has high priority under rule 46.)

"Colorado Senate, rule 10, paragraph 2:

" 'Debate may be closed at any time not less than 1 hour from the adoption of a motion to that effect, and upon a majority vote of the members-elect an hour may be fixed for a vote upon the pending measure. On either of these motions not more than 10 minutes shall be allowed for debate, and no senator shall speak more than 3 minutes; and no other motion shall be entertained until the motion to close debate, or to fix an hour for the vote on the pending question, shall have been determined.'

"Rhode Island Senate rule 23, is the most comprehensive existing, to our knowledge, and is quoted below:

" 'When any bill, resolution, or motion shall have been under consideration for 2 hours it shall be in order for any senator to move to close debate, and the president shall immediately recognize the senator who wishes to make such motion. Such motion shall not be amendable or debatable and shall be immediately put. The motion to close debate may be moved and ordered upon a single motion, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all pending amendments and include the bill, resolution, or motion to its passage or rejection. If such motion to close debate shall receive the affirmative votes of a majority of the senators present, a vote without further debate shall thereupon be taken upon such bill, resolution, or motion, provided that any senator who desires to do so shall be permitted to speak thereon not more than once and not exceeding 5 minutes, and provided further that one motion to adjourn shall be in order before such vote is taken. Should said motion to adjourn be carried, the measure under consideration shall be the unfinished business of the senate until disposed of. All incidental questions of order pending at the time of such motion to close debate is made, and on such questions arising after a motion to close debate has been made and before the final vote has been taken on the matter or matters to which the motion to close debate shall have been directed whether the same be an appeal or otherwise, shall be decided without debate.'."

* * * * *

LIMITATIONS ON DEBATE ADOPTED BY THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of debate it has been stated in effect that opponents of either my cloture rule or the proposed Hayden rule sometimes say one of the great traditions of the Senate is that it has carried on its proceedings for more than a century and a half without any effective limitation upon debate, so why change now? I should like to read now a memorandum showing that the Senate rules provided for a motion for the previous question during the first 17 years of its existence, and that a dozen other limitations upon debate have been adopted by the Senate over the passing years. Rather than take the time to read it, because I have talked longer than I intended, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum entitled "Limitations on Debate Adopted by the Senate in the Past" inserted in the RECORD at this point in rebuttal of the argument that we have gone along for 150 years without any rules or limitation of debate, so why adopt one now?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LIMITATIONS ON DEBATE ADOPTED BY THE SENATE IN THE PAST

"1. From 1789 to 1806 the Senate rules provided for a previous question motion which, if adopted by majority vote, had the effect of ending debate and bringing a question to a vote.

"2. Since 1846 the Senate has frequently adopted unanimous-consent agreements which are a species of cloture.

"3. During the Civil War debate in secret session on matters relating to the rebellion was limited by rule to 5 minutes by any Member and was confined to the subject matter.

"4. In 1868 the Senate adopted a rule providing that motions to take up or proceed to the consideration of any question should be determined without debate.

"5. In 1870 the Senate adopted the Anthony rule limiting debate on the call of the calendar to one 5-minute speech per Senator on any question. The Anthony rule was made a standing rule in 1880. (Rule 8.)

"6. During the 1870's Senate debate on appropriation bills was limited by the 5-minute rule.

"7. In 1881 the Senate agreed, for the remainder of the session, to limit debate to 15 minutes on a motion to consider a bill or resolution, no Senator to speak more than once or for longer than 5 minutes.

"8. In 1884 the Senate amended its rules to provide that all motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate. (Rule 8.)

"9. In 1884 the Senate amended its tenth rule so as to provide that all motions to change the order of precedence on special orders, or to proceed to the consideration of other business, should be decided without debate.

"10. In 1884 the Senate provided by rule that motions to lay before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives should be determined without debate. (Rule 7, 7.)

"11. In 1908 it was decided that Senators could, by enforcement of the rules, be restrained from speaking on the same subject more than twice in the same legislative day.

"12. In 1917 the Senate adopted its present cloture rule. (Rule 22.)

"13. In 1939 and 1945 the Senate passed executive reorganization acts containing an antifilibuster rule."

Mr. MORSE. The memorandum will show that such a generalization as the one advanced by those who have made the argument I am attempting to rebut is not sound. It will also show the matter of limitation of debate has been one of frequent discussion in the Senate. It has in recent years been successfully defeated so far as changing the existing rule is concerned, by way of the filibuster technique itself. Thus we are confronted with the paradoxical situation that in order to eliminate the filibuster technique from the Senate we first have to defeat a filibuster. I do not know how many times the Senate is going to be willing to surrender in the face of that intimidation. I can merely go on hoping, as I said earlier in my remarks,

that the happy day will come and come soon when both the Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate will awaken to the fact—and I believe it to be a fact—that the great majority of the American people want us to end the filibustering technique in the Senate by the adoption of a rule that will successfully banish it from the Senate.

There was another very able speech made during the course of the debate which I want to answer very briefly. I refer to the speech by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He made his speech on March 1, 1949. The Senator challenged the proponents of the Hayden resolution to show how the American people have ever been harmed by the filibuster. I have already had inserted in the RECORD a list of the filibusters, as set forth in the corrected copy of the Galloway report, and I say one need only read that list and take into account the implications of the legislation filibustered to recognize that the public interest did suffer and has suffered as the r sult of many filibusters in the Senate. I would answer him further that the public interest has suffered the rights of millions of fellow Americans have suffered, because the filibuster technique has made it possible to date to prevent the passage of civil-rig its legislation, for example.

Of course the Senator from Mississippi does not agree with me on the merits of civil-rights legislation. But the fact that he does not agree with me on civil-rights legislation does not make his argument a sound one when he says, "Wherein has the public interest suffered as a result of the filibuster technique?" It has suffered not only in respect to civil-rights legislation but it has suffered in my judgment because of the many compromises, as I stated earlier in my remarks this afternoon, which frequently have to be made in committee before we can even get legislation to the floor of the Senate, under a threat that if we do not yield to minority demands the bill will be talked to death on the floor of the Senate. That is a terrible cost to have to pay for minority rule in the Senate.

The public interest has suffered also, as is evident from a statement of the legislation involved in bills held up by filibusters, as set forth in the Galloway report, because of the compromise changes that had to be made before the legislation was subsequently passed. The argument has been made in the course of the debate that eventually the legislation was passed. But the proponents of that argument do not tell us in what form it was finally passed. In many instances it was passed in compromised form, compromises having been forced by the threat of filibuster. That is rule by intimidation, not by majority vote. That is rule by legislative blackmail, not by democratic processes.

Let us not forget that over the years of the history of the filibuster there is a filibuster on bill X or issue X, and a whole series of bills behind it never get to a vote in that session because of the delay caused by the filibuster. That is a tremendous loss to the public. The record will show that in many instances many appropriation bills were lost. Is it any answer when the Senator from Mississippi says, "But eventually the bills were passed, eventually the appropriations were made"? I say that is no answer at all. How much of a loss is it to the people of the United States to have postponed for 1 or 2 or 3 years a very important appropriation for some great public development that ought to have been passed at the very time a filibuster backlogged it and prevented it from getting to the floor of the Senate for passage?

If we want to add up the great cost to the people of the United States caused merely by delay alone to bills which were held up and never got to the floor of the Senate for a vote because another bill was filibustered, the delay cost alone would be a complete answer to the Senator from Mississippi, who says, "In what way has the public interest suffered from filibustering practices in the Senate?" I answer, in a multitude of ways, at terrific cost to the public welfare; and we ought to end it. The more quickly we end it, the better for the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table entitled "Citations to Later Action on Filibustered Bills."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Citations to later action on filibuster bills

Bills	Year of filibuster	Citations to later acts on same subjects
River and harbor bill.	1901	32 Stat. 331, June 13, 1902.
Do	1903	33 Stat. 1117, Mar. 3, 1903.
Do	1914	38 Stat. 1049, Mar. 4, 1915.
Colombian Treaty	1903	33 Stat. 2234, Feb. 23, 1904.
Canadian reciprocity.	1911	37 Stat. 4, July 26, 1911.
Arizona-New Mexico statehood.	1911	37 Stat. 39, Aug. 21, 1911.
Ship-purchase bill	1915	39 Stat. 728, Sept. 7, 1916.
Mineral lands leasing bill.	1919	41 Stat. 437, Feb. 25, 1920.
Migratory-bird conservation.	1926	45 Stat. 1222, Feb. 18, 1926.
Colorado River bill.	1927	45 Stat. 1011, May 29, 1928.
Do	1928	45 Stat. 1057, Dec. 21, 1928.
Emergency officers' retirement.	1927	45 Stat. 735, May 24, 1928.
Washington public buildings bill.	1927	45 Stat. 51, Jan. 13, 1928.
Oil-industry investigation.	1931	49 Stat. 30, Feb. 22, 1935.
Work relief bill, prevailing wage amendment.	1935	49 Stat. 1609, June 22, 1936.
Flood-control bill	1935	49 Stat. 1570, June 22, 1936.
Coal-conservation bill.	1936	50 Stat. 72, Apr. 26, 1937.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, can the colored people of the South seek and secure protection in the Senate of the United States with respect to the passage of civil-rights legislation? I do not think so. I do not believe they will get such protection until we shall be able to modify our rules so that the majority-vote principle will prevail, and we can pass legislation free from the blockade of a minority that says, "We will not let you get to a vote."

At another point in the debate a statement was made, I think by my good friend the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to which I desire to refer. I may say in passing that all I have said about the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] with respect to the high regard in which I hold him, I say with equal affection in regard to the junior Senator from Georgia. But here, again, on this point, he and I disagree. At one time in the debate he challenged, as I read the RECORD, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to name some prominent Democrats who ever favored cloture. There were many Democratic Senators who signed the cloture petition on November 13, 1919, to close debate on the reservations to the Versailles Treaty, among whom were Senators McKellar, Harrison, Hitchcock, Robinson, Sheppard, Swanson, Underwood, Walsh, and others.

I may say further to my good friend from Georgia that if he will go back to March 8, 1917, when cloture was first adopted, he will find all the Southern Democratic Senators who were present on that day voting for it. He will find Senator Vardaman, of Mississippi, saying on that date, as I have previously stated here today, that he favored a majority rule. In effect, he said: "Yes; the filibuster has protected the South," but, nevertheless, he felt that the majority-vote principle ought to be adopted. There were distinguished statesmen from the South in years gone by who favored cloture.

Mr. President, by way of summary I desire to emphasize the points in regard to my own resolution. To me it is a very simple issue: We either favor making it possible to act by a majority in the Senate of the United States, or we favor permitting a minority to block the will of the majority. We either believe the people of the United States want our representative form of government to function on the basis of majority rule, or we believe that the people of the United States favor minority blockage of their will.

I submit that the objective evidence clearly supports the conclusion that the American people want majority rule in the Senate of the United States. I submit, Mr. President, that, taking the country as a whole, when the present President of the United States took the issue to the people in the last campaign, it is a fair conclusion, by and large, that the people supported his position in regard to majority rule.

As I have said heretofore on the floor of the Senate in respect to another issue, I recognize that I cannot in all honesty say that there has been any mandate on this subject to date. We have to judge as we read or take the public pulse what public sentiment is, but I am firmly of the opinion based upon my observation and from my talks with thousands of them, that the American people by and large are sick and tired of the retention of the filibuster technique in the Senate. I am satisfied that the great majority of the American people are applauding Harry Truman today because of his great courage in saying to Congress and to the people of this country, "Yes, I favor majority rule and the majority rule principle in respect to cloture in the Senate."

Mr. President, I close with the same premise with which I started my speech; I am very proud to stand here today helping Harry Truman fight his battle for majority rule in the Senate. I am saddened and deeply regret that I do not have a whole army of Democrats behind me in backing up the President of the United States. I am sorry the majority leader and the Democratic Whip have left me on this issue. But I think they will come back, perhaps not at this session of Congress, but as the President takes this issue to the people, as I hope he will, and as other men who hold firm convictions about the importance of preserving majority rule if we are to preserve democratic government itself take their position to the people of this country. The time will come, and I think in the not too distant future, when there will be a sufficient number of men, either those now serving in the Senate who will have changed their thinking on this point, or new men who will be elected by the people who will have the point of view of majority rule to accomplish what I think we should accomplish now, namely, the adoption of Senate Resolution 12 rather than Senate Resolution 15, the resolution which would give us a cloture rule based upon the majority-vote principle.

REPUBLICAN COALITION WITH REACTIONARY DEMOCRATS GREAT MISTAKE

(Remarks of Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, in the Senate of the United States, March 14, 1949)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hesitate to rise to speak at this hour of the morning, but there were some remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from California with which I am in complete disagreement. Therefore, for the record, and at the time the remarks are made, I wish to answer them.

As we all know, for a great many years prior to 1946 the Democrats were in control of the Senate. They did not take effec-

tive steps to adopt a cloture rule so as to make it possible to control filibustering in the Senate. So much, from the standpoint of the responsibility of the Democratic Party on this issue.

But during the 80th Congress the Republicans were in control of the Senate. What did the Republicans do about making that fight which sometime must be made if we are to check filibustering in the Senate? By and large, they did nothing. For a large part of that time the Senator from Nebraska was acting majority leader on the Republican side of the aisle. I want to say what I have said before, that the Republican Party cannot escape its responsibility between the years of 1946 and 1948 for not doing anything effective about checking the filibuster in the Senate. There is no question about the fact, at least in the cloakrooms, if they do not want to admit it on the floor of the Senate, that there is a general admission that a great deal of political strategy is taking place in regard to party position on this issue.

The responsibility of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, who really went to do something about filibustering in the Senate, is to join forces and drive the filibuster off the floor of the Senate, by sitting here for as many hours and days and weeks as necessary to break it. I think we could break the present filibuster in 10 days if we were willing to sit here as Republicans and Democrats in continuous session to break it. Of course, it would cost a price; it would cost a price in respect to certain legislation; but the American people are never going to get rid of the practice of the filibuster in the Senate without paying a price, because whenever this fight is made, there is always going to be some important legislation backlogged as a result of it. I am willing to trust the American people on that issue, and I happen to hold to the point of view that an overwhelming majority of the American people want the practice of filibustering in the Senate stopped.

I also happen to hold to the point of view, contrary to that held by my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for whom I have an exceeding high respect, that the American people do no think it fantastic to make a fight for majority rule in the Senate. Why? It is the principle of majority rule that controls in the overwhelming majority of the State legislatures in limiting debate. It is majority rule that prevails in the House of Representatives in regard to a limitation of debate. Since when does it become fantastic to stand for the principle of majority rule in limiting debate in the Senate? The only thing fantastic about it is that there has been for many years a strong minority in the Senate from a section of our country that has taken the position it ought to have the right preserved to them to domineer the majority in the Senate by filibuster tactics.

They talk about our sitting here as ambassadors from our States. I say that notion of representation in the Senate died with Calhoun and with the War Between the States. We sit here, in my judgment, to do the people's business, and we cannot do the people's business, in my judgment, with any such proposal as I have heard from the lips of the Senator from Nebraska tonight, which he calls a compromise, that does not in effect involve a tightening of the cloture rule.

The statistics cited by the Senator from California and also by the Senator from Nebraska include pairs and dead pairs. Senators who have gone away and walked off the floor of the Senate cannot be included in any statistical analysis of what the effect of the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska will be.

The Senator from Rhode Island is correct when he points out that in the last 19 cloture-petition attempts in the Senate, the average vote was 83. That means that in some instances the vote was down to 76. But what the Senator from California and the Senator from Nebraska are overlooking is that when there is a constitutional two-thirds requirement, men are encouraged to take "walk-out powders" in the Senate and let the Sergeant at Arms find them—if he can. Mr. President, if you will check up on the experiences of the attempts of the Sergeants at Arms over the years to find Senators who do not want to be found, I will tell you that the constitutional two-thirds majority will open the way, will open the door to some very unfortunate practices in the Senate if what we are actually trying to do is have an effective cloture rule against filibustering.

I said at one time that if I went along with anything other than a majority rule, I would go along with the Hayden-Wherry resolution. It does not make much difference whether I go along with it or not, because, for the present, I think the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry], if they can get it to a vote, will get a majority vote for it in the Senate of the United States. But that will not solve the problem, because, in my judgment, time will show that it will not effectively check filibusters. We shall not check filibusters in this body until we come to majority rule. I am perfectly willing to let the last forum decide that, which will be the people of the Nation, if we have to take this issue to them in the next 4 to 6 years.

I desire to say, in closing, Mr. President, that I shall continue to fight for majority rule in the Senate, and I do not care what adjectives any colleague wants to attach to that fight for what I consider to be a basic tenet of American democracy. The Senator from California can call it fantastic if he wants to, but I will meet him anywhere in California, before his own constituents, and let them decide whether the issue I am fighting for in the Senate of the United States is fantastic, because I believe the people of America believe that the time has come to put into practice in the Senate majority rule. They will not reach the judgment, Mr. President, that it is fantastic.

I say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am not in the slightest degree interested in such a compromise as that which he has outlined tonight. The only way he will get it by me is by a motion by which I shall be outvoted. He will never get it by me on any parliamentary basis that requires unanimous consent.

I repeat what I have said several times since I have been in the Senate, that once again the time is here for Republicans to stand up and be counted before the minority groups of America who want to know whether we are going to protect their civil rights by meeting head on this filibuster intimidation which is raised in this case, by continuous sessions for so long as it shall take to drive the filibusterers down in the fight which they are waging against the majority.

Mr. President, it was day before yesterday that a Senator stood up on the floor of the Senate and compared the fight which some of us are making for majority rule in the Senate with communistic tactics. Let me say that the commonest communistic tactic is to use minority devices to defeat the majority. That is my answer to that Senator who sought to spread on the RECORD the innuendo that those of us who are fighting for majority rule in the Senate of the United States are fighting for a communistic principle.

Once again I say, in closing, Mr. President, that I am willing at any time to let the American people decide whether the fight I have made and which I shall continue to make in the Senate for majority rule conforms to their idea of democratic processes.

MARCH 16, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of this speech I wish to say that I am addressing my remarks principally to those Members of the Senate who have not signed the Wherry substitute for Senate Resolution 15. I say I am addressing my remarks to those Members of the Senate who have not signed that resolution, because it is my understanding, and I wish I could believe it is a mistaken understanding, that those who signed the Wherry substitute have, in fact, committed themselves in advance of this debate to vote in accordance with the terms of the substitute, and, therefore, nothing that any of us can say in this debate in regard to what we consider to be the serious limitations of the substitute measure could possibly open their minds. That is the understanding which has been given to me, Mr. President. Unfortunately, one of the conditions which were exacted for the ending of the filibuster last night was that definite commitments be made not to accept amendments. Over half, at least, of the Members of the Senate were in favor of the resolution, and, therefore, over half of the Senators in favor of the Wherry substitute amendment pledged themselves to vote for the subject matter of that amendment, in advance of debate. If I am not correct in regard to that, with respect to any Senator who signed it, that any Senator who did sign it is open to conviction upon this matter, I should be glad to be so advised. But in the absence of such advice, let me say, as the second point in my introduction, that I shall not yield even for a question from any Senator who signed the Wherry substitute, because if those Senators have closed their minds, as I believe they have by way of a commitment to vote for the Wherry substitute, I do not care to discuss any of the questions I intend to raise in regard to this resolution with any of them, because it would be a waste of my time. I like to carry on discussion only with men who are not committed and who have their minds open at least to what I consider to be serious facts.

I shall not talk at any great length, Mr. President, because I think from this point on those of us who are opposed to the position which has been taken by those who have committed themselves to the Wherry substitute must, from now on, take it to the people of America and not to the Senate of the United States. I am satisfied that the people of America will not share the point of view and the philosophy of those who have signed the amendment in regard to cloture in the Senate of the United States.

I repeat today what I said a few days ago, that I am satisfied that an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States believe that the principle of majority rule ought to govern not only the passage of legislation in the Senate, Mr. President, but also the rules which make possible our getting into a position in which it is difficult to pass legislation.

* * * * *

It has been interesting to note the propaganda which has been set afoot in America in regard to the evils of majority rule and in regard to the desirability of filibustering on the floor of the Senate. There is a force in America which I shall characterize as a spirit of financial fascism which has the audacity these days to tell the American people that the practice of filibustering on the floor of the Senate should be protected. It is clever, but not too subtle, propaganda.

I hold in my hand a copy of Business Week for March 12, 1949, containing an editorial entitled "The Trend." Note the title of the editorial, "The Tyranny of the Majority." I ask unanimous consent to have published as a part of my remarks this editorial in full at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. George in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY

"Filibustering has become a horrid word in the American language. It has been described in the mildest terms of its critics as a technical evil connected with the machinery of lawmaking.

"It has been cursed and condemned as a device against democratic decision.

"The sharpest criticism has been leveled at filibusters in recent times by those who carry the 'liberal' label. They are good and mad at the southern Democrats. They lambast the southerners in the Senate for filibustering against all attempts to put civil-rights legislation on the Federal statute books.

"Unconsciously, the zeal of the so-called liberals has befogged their minds. Unwittingly, they are sniping at democracy and liberty. They assert that what they are seeking is a further expression of democracy, and that they are going after it in the democratic way. But they obviously are not remembering their American history.

"Lessons of history

"A refresher course would remind them right at the beginning that this Nation's Government was framed to avoid tyranny in any form. The drafters of the Constitution put in safeguards against despotic power in any hands.

"The Founding Fathers went to great pains to set up a system of checks and balances. They apportioned power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. They determined to place checks on the powers of all—even the powers of the people who had the right to vote. Thomas Jefferson, for example, was convinced that government by a simple majority could be as despotic as the one-man tyranny of the British King.

"This aversion to simple majority rule explains the makeup of the Senate. The upper House of Congress was designed deliberately as an offset to the popularly elected House of Representatives. Each State has an equal number of Senators, regardless of population. The Senators are elected three times as long as the Representatives, and only one-third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years. Obviously, the Senate was never intended to perform its functions and reach its decisions by snap judgments of temporary majorities. It is supposed to function only after the careful deliberation permitted by unlimited debate.

"Through the years when slavery was the big national issue, there were great debates. The North sought to impose its will on the minority of States. The South clamored for States rights. After a war was fought to preserve the Union, President Lincoln was moved to say:

" 'There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those (southern) States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights.'

"The fundamental belief in the democratic rights of a substantial minority has never been successfully submerged. It has been the salvation, in turn, of both conservatives and liberals. The latter certainly can recall the power of the individual expressions of such liberals as the two La Follettes, expressions which took the form of filibusters more than once. In a speech against cloture, the elder Senator La Follette said:

" 'Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty. * * *'

"Full and free debate in the Senate is more than a precious heritage. It is more than an effort to protect the right of free discussion. It is an expression of the doctrine that no one group should be in a position where it could beat down all opponents mercilessly. The doctrine states that important minorities should be persuaded and must not be coerced. No one group should be able to impose its own opinions, its interests, its views on others if, by so doing, the vital interests of other groups are not at all respected. This is the practical core of American Government in operation.

"Longstanding tradition

"The principle, of course, is not written down in black and white as a Government law. It is simply a tradition. There is serious doubt whether it could ever be made official. But it is workable nevertheless.

"Any infringement of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate would lead to coercion of important minorities. Stifled debate would give to the majority free and careless sway over legislation. This would defeat the basic American idea that all absolute power must be limited, including the power of the majority of the moment.

"As long as there are conflicts between the majorities and the minorities, there will be dilatory debate of some sort. And delay is not easy to accept. But an intelligent majority will be wise to accept some measure of delay if it is really convinced that its objective is basically sound.

"Filibustering admittedly is a negative device. But so is a brake on an automobile. The brake can check the speed of the car if it gets out of control. Filibustering is useful when it checks the impulses of an unscrupulous or an inconsiderate majority. In the present situation, filibustering is not directed solely against the passage of civil-rights legislation. The filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on certain paragraphs from the editorial from Business Week. I hasten to add that I just do not believe that the views of the writer of this editorial represent the views of 95 percent of the businessmen of America. The businessmen with whom I talk, at least at a percentage rate of 95, are just as devoted to the principle of majority rule in a democracy as is the junior Senator from Oregon. But there are at work in the business fraternity of this country, just as there are at work among other pressure groups, certain propagandists who are seeking in their subtle way to undermine the basic tenets of democracy. I consider this editorial in Business Week a serious undermining of what I think are very elemental principles of our constitutional form of government with its guaranties.

The editorial says:

"Filibustering has become a horrid word in the American language. It has been described in the mildest terms of its critics as a technical evil connected with the machinery of lawmaking.

"It has been cursed and condemned as a device against democratic decision.

"The sharpest criticism has been leveled at filibusters in recent times by those who carry the liberal label. They are good and mad at the southern Democrats. They lambast the southerners in the Senate for filibustering against all attempts to put civil-rights legislation on the Federal statute books.

"Unconsciously, the zeal of the so-called liberals has befogged their minds. Unwittingly, they are sniping at democracy and liberty."

Mr. President, as one of those liberals, according to the editor of Business Week, I am sniping at democracy and liberty because I stand on the floor of the United States Senate and defend what I am satisfied the Founding Fathers had clearly in mind, namely, that our constitutional form of government should operate on the basis of a majority-rule principle, save and except in those specific instances in the Constitution where a two-thirds vote requirement was specifically set forth.

Let me say, Mr. President, as has already been pointed out in this debate, that the two-thirds requirement, where it is set out in the Constitution of the United States, was not a so-called constitutional two-thirds requirement, as the defenders of the Wherry amendment contend in this debate, but a requirement of a two-thirds vote of those present and voting.

At the time the Constitution was adopted, when the two-thirds vote was used in a parliamentary body it was used on the basis of a two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting, and in the Continental Congress a majority vote meant a majority vote of those present and voting. When a vote was taken on a motion for the previous question, the issue was determined by a majority of those present and voting. Now in the year 1949, more than a century and a half after the Founding Fathers wrote into the organic laws of this country these precious tenets of democracy, the Senate of the United States proposes to adopt a two-thirds-vote requirement more stringent than our Founding Fathers themselves used in connection with their own parliamentary bodies.

Someone, if my ears serve me right, said that the amendment is a step forward. Well, if going back more than 150 years is a step forward, then it is a forward-looking resolution, but only on the basis of such a premise.

I say to the editor of Business Week that when he says that those of us who are liberals in the Senate of the United States unwittingly are sniping at democracy and liberty when we defend the principles of majority rule, he confesses either his ignorance of democratic principles or he deliberately seeks to propagandize the American people by way of falsehood.

He continues in his editorial: "They assert," referring to the liberals, "that what they are seeking is a further expression of democracy, and that they are going after it in the democratic way. But they obviously are not remembering their American history."

Now let us see what aspect of American history the editor of Business Week wants us to remember.

"A refresher course would remind them right at the beginning that this Nation's Government was framed to avoid tyranny in any form. The drafters of the Constitution put in safeguards against despotic power in any hands."

Ergo, standing for majority rule in the Senate of the United States is then playing into the hands of despotic power, according to editor of Business Week. Nonsense. Why does not the editor at that point in his editorial start talking about specific checks and balances set out in the Constitution to protect us from the tyrannical will of a majority when a majority seeks to follow a tyrannical course of action?

No, his conclusion, which he would have us adopt, is that the very practice of majority rule, putting it into application, would contstitute tyranny. Is it tyranny when we pass legislation by majority rule? Why, no, Mr. President, because we have those precious safeguards in our Constitution that check the Senate of the United States. Whenever a majority passes legislation that in fact violates constitutional guaranties, there is the veto power, and when that power is exercised by the President, then the Constitution provides that two-thirds of those present and voting shall be required to override the veto.

The second check which apparently the editor of Business Week has never heard about, though we know better—we know he knows about it, but in this slanted writing of his he did not tell his readers about it—is the Supreme Court. And if this body, practicing the majority-rule principle, passes a piece of legislation which is unconstitutional, the check is in the Supreme Court, not in a right under the Constitution of the United States for a minority to filibuster and prevent a majority from passing legislation that it, the majority, believes is constitutional but which the minority believes to be unconstitutional.

The editor says:

"The Founding Fathers went to great pains to set up a system of checks and balances. They apportioned power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government."

But he failed, as I have just pointed out, Mr. President, to tell how it operates, and how it operates consonant with the application of a majority-rule principle.

"They determined to place checks on the powers of all—even the powers of the people who had the right to vote. Thomas Jefferson, for example, was convinced that government by a simple majority could be as despotic as the one-man tyranny of the British king."

Oh, what a blot on the memory of Thomas Jefferson, to take out of context one observation and seek to give the impression that that great defender of human and social rights, were he in the Senate of the United States today, would be voting to protect the filibuster technique.

"This aversion to simple majority rule," says the editor of this Business Week, "explains the make-up of the Senate. The upper House of Congress was designed, designed deliberately, as an offset to the popularly elected House of Representatives."

In respect, Mr. President, I ask, to the operation of a majority rule? Clearly not. Because article 1, clause 5, section 2, of the Constitution gives to each House the right and privilege of devising its own rules for carrying on its proceedings. The Founding Fathers did not put on any check, which by implication and innuendo the writer of this editorial seeks to give the impression they intended, that the Senate of the United States should operate on a voting principle other than majority rule.

"Each State has an equal number of Senators, regardless of population."

Correct. But what has that got to do with the application of a majority rule? Nothing.

"The Senators are elected for a term three times as long as the Representatives, and only one-third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years."

Correct. But what has that to do with the question as to whether or not we ought to have a rule in the Senate whereby majority-vote principles can prevail? Nothing.

"Obviously, the Senate was never intended to perform its functions and reach its decisions by snap judgments of temporary majorities."

Why, the editor apparently is not aware of how legislation passes in the Senate of the United States, how it has to go through committees, how it is subjected to committee hearings, and to debate on the floor of the Senate. He, apparently, is not aware of the safeguards of minority rights that have been set out in every proposal offered to the Senate which I have read, that provides for any form of majority rule for limiting debate in the Senate of the United States.

The editor of Business Week ought to know, if he does not, that every resolution we have offered seeking to outlaw the filibuster through the application of the principles of majority rule provides, first, that 16 Senators must sign the cloture petition; provides, second, that it must lie on the table, as under the present rule, for a day; provides that thereafter 96 hours of debate is possible, which amounts, as we usually operate in the Senate, to more than a week of debate if we follow our ordinary meeting schedule of the Senate.

What more protection has the minority the right to ask for? What the minority seeks in the Senate of the United States is a continuation of its protection to block the majority by the minority tactics through the filibuster.

I contend, Mr. President, that the Wherry substitute is not to any appreciable extent going to injure in any way the effectiveness of a southern filibuster, or a northern filibuster, or the filibuster of any other minority group in the Senate that wants to organize under the Wherry substitute for a filibuster.

To say that I am at a complete loss to understand how the editor of a magazine such as Business Week could write such a slanted and propaganda editorial against the democratic system of majority rule in America is to put it mildly, Mr. President.

The editorial goes on to say:

"Through the years when slavery was the big national issue, there were great debates. The North sought to impose its will on the minority of States. The South clamored for States' rights."

Mr. President, I think great debates in the Senate of the United States still are carried on in regard to social slavery. I think the great debates in the Senate on issues of civil rights are basically debates on whether or not large groups of minorities in this country are to be held shackled to the will of a minority in the United States Senate, or whether my party, the party of Lincoln, the great emancipator, whom the editor of Business Week quotes in the next paragraph, is going to put into effect and practice the true meanings of the liberties and freedoms of the Constitution, which the War Between the States was fought to settle. I sometimes wonder who won that war. Certainly the Negroes of America, who are denied their civil rights, must say that the North did not win it so long as filibustering tactics in the Senate are allowed to prevail and deny the passage of civil-rights legislation.

Let us see what the editor of Business Week took out of context from Lincoln's statement:

"After a war was fought to preserve the Union, President Lincoln was moved to say:

" 'There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights'."

What has that to do with the debate in the United States Senate over the question whether or not majority rule shall govern our proceedings here? Absolutely nothing. We can all agree that the carpetbag days carried along with them human abuses and injustice and tyrannical conduct; but that chapter in our history has nothing to do with the issue as to whether or not the Senate of the United States ought to adopt a rule of procedure which will make certain, as the Wherry resolution does not, driving out of this body control by a minority.

The editor continues:

"The fundamental belief in the democratic rights of a substantial majority has never been successfully submerged. It has been the salvation, in turn, of both conservatives and liberals. The latter certainly can recall the power of the individual expressions of such liberals as the two La Follettes—expressions which took the form of filibusters more than once."

He then proceeds to quote the elder La Follette. Let us quote him; and let us recognize that that quotation was based upon the clear understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that in 1917 it was the intention of this body to prevent filibustering by way of cloture, with respect to any and all business of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] said in effect the other day, in his notable speech, that he did not know what was in the minds of Senators in 1917 when they adopted rule 22, but he did know what they said 2 years later. Mr. President, I think it is very clear, as was so ably pointed out by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his exceedingly able speech, that if we search the record of 1917 even in a cursory manner, it is perfectly obvious that Senators thought they were debating a cloture rule to apply to all matters of business.

One cannot read the speeches of the elder La Follette, as I have, without being completely satisfied that Bob La Follette, who believed in filibustering—in respect to which belief I am in complete disagreement—believed, as this quotation, I think, clearly implies, that the attempt was being made to adopt a cloture rule which would apply to all matters of business before the Senate. Thus he voted against it. He did say, as the editor of Business Week states:

"Believing that I stand for democracy, for the liberties of the people of this country, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I shall stand while I am a Member of this body against any cloture that denies free and unlimited debate. Sir, the moment that the majority imposes the restriction contained in the pending rule, that moment you will have dealt a blow to liberty."

That was the view of the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, based, I submit, if we check his record, upon his conviction that in 1917 an attempt was being made to apply cloture to all items of business before the Senate.

On the merits of his opposition to giving effect to majority rule in the Senate of the United States subject to those safeguards and checks which will protect minority rights to adequate debate on the merits of the issue, I am in complete disagreement with the record of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, just as, as a citizen of Wisconsin in those days, I was in complete disagreement with the record of the senior Senator from Wisconsin with regard to the war issue.

Mr. President, in my judgment any argument on the part of the editor of Business Week, or of any Member of this body, past or present, that we destroy any liberties to which we are entitled under a democracy by adopting a rule which would permit of majority limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States so long as the minority has adequate time to discuss the merits of the issue, flies in the face of the whole theory of our system of checks and balances under our Constitution. I cannot read that document, or the constitutional debates, or any chapter of American history and reach the conclusion that the people of America ever intended, at any period of our history, to set up a Government under which minorities could rule.

I repeat what I said on this floor about 2 o'clock the other morning. When those in this body argue that fighting for a principle of majority rule in the Senate follows communistic tactics, I say that the contrary is true. Basic to the whole theory of communism is the adoption of a governmental system under which small groups of men can dictate to the majority. Those of us in the liberal camp, fighting the leftists on the one hand and the reactionaries on the other, bottom our case for democracy upon putting into practice in all branches of our Government the principle of majority rule.

We follow it in our courts and our court decisions determining the very interpretation of the Constitution itself. That is done on the basis of the majority-rule principle. The House of Representatives functions on that basis. The Senate passes legislation on

that basis. We are limited by the Constitution to majority rule, save and except in respect to the specific requirements for a two-thirds vote as definitely set out in the Constitution.

I think it is rather sad in the year 1949 to have contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a charge that those of us who are fighting for majority rule in the Senate of the United States are standing for the tactics of communism. I am sorry if I seem to express some resentment about it; but there is no Member of the Senate who makes such a charge to whom I will yield, so far as my patriotism and my devotion to a political democracy and to a capitalistic economy are concerned. I assert today that the members of my party are coming to living up to the principles of majority rule in the Senate, some day. Believe me, Mr. President, they are coming to it, because the American people are going to drive them to it, and are going to drive them to it by first driving some of them out of the Senate. Just wait and see, Mr. President. The American people will never take this lying down. They will not and should not tolerate a coalition which seeks to prevent majority rule in the Senate. Some of us may be defeated in the meantime, while fighting for majority rule; but we shall take our chances on that; and if defeat comes, we shall go down in it with a smile on our face, knowing that at least we stood firm in our devotion to what I think is one of the principles which is of the very essence to a society of freemen operating in a democratic system—namely, majority rule.

Thus, before I close my remarks, I shall offer as a substitute for the Wherry amendment, my resolution, Senate Resolution 12, which calls for majority rule; and I shall ask for the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote on it, because I want the Members of the Senate to stand up and be counted on the question of whether they are willing to vote for, or whether they will oppose, majority rule in the Senate. I am perfectly willing to let future events take care of themselves, so far as my political future and theirs may be concerned.

The editor of Business Week says:

"Full and free debate in the Senate is more than a precious heritage. It is more than an effort to protect the right of free discussion. It is an expression of the doctrine that no one group should be in a position where it could beat down all opponents mercilessly. The doctrine states that important minorities should be persuaded and must not be coerced."

Mr. President, just see the clever, subtle innuendoes which the editor of the magazine works into his writing, and the idea which he seeks to implant, that if we wish to have the principle of majority rule observed in the Senate, with adequate time for debate on the merits of the issue, and with a check by the President and a check by the Supreme Court of the United States, in some way we favor coercing minorities. Mr. President, that is vicious propaganda, and it is such propaganda that is undermining the faith of our people who are attempting to follow the basic tenets of democratic government.

The editor of Business Week further says:

"Any infringement of the right of unlimited debate in the Senate would lead to coercion of important minorities."

In what way? It would lead to putting into effect and into law what the elected representatives of the people of the United States believe to be the desire of the country, and that law, in turn, as I have said, would be subject to the checks and safeguards of the reviewing bodies, as provided by the Constitution.

The editor further says:

"But an intelligent majority will be wise to accept some measure of delay if it is really convinced that its objective is basically sound."

Mr. President, is it delay that he wants us to accept? The operation of our normal procedure is pregnant with delay, so that full opportunity can be given to the minority to make its case on the merits. We provide for hearings, the printing of reports, debate on the floor of the Senate. How many times do we hold up action until we can obtain the full report and have it before us for study? Then there is the delay which occurs in the case of a veto, if a veto comes; and then there is the delay which finally goes along with the eventual application of the law, through judicial processes, ending in the decision of the highest court of the land.

Mr. President, I repeat that so much of this editorial is nonsense—to seek to give the American people the impression that if the majority-vote principle is adopted in the Senate, minority rights will be destroyed.

The editor almost made one confession, when he said in the editorial that "Filibustering admittedly is a negative device. But so," he says, "is a brake on an automobile. The brake can check the speed of the car if it gets out of control."

Of course, Mr. President, if the brake freezes, it simply stops the car from moving at all. In my judgment that exactly will be one of the results of the Wherry amendment. It will function as a frozen brake, upon what ought to be a forward movement on the part of the Senate.

I read further from the editorial:

"In the present situation, filibustering is not directed solely against the passage of civil-rights legislation. The filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society."

Mr. President, it is with that sentence that the editor of Business Week lets the cat out of the bag. In my judgment, in those words he represents the type and spirit of financial fascism in America which wishes to stymie legislation that is needed in order to make the capitalistic system work for the benefit of all our people. He represents the spirit of financial fascism which believes we can best preserve capitalism by denying to great groups of people in our country the full fruits of a capitalistic system. He represents the type of selfish interest in America that is selling the capitalistic system short. I will have none of his philosophy. I happen to be so devoted to the capitalistic system as the only economic system that can possibly preserve for us political democracy that I say we, the representatives of the people, must keep ourselves in position at all times so we can pass whatever legislation is necessary to make democracy work. That is our job. That is the job of the 81st Congress. I am of the opinion that too many Republicans in the 81st Congress have completely forgotten that our job is to pass legislation which will promote the social, economic, and political welfare of the American people. It is our job to pass those reforms necessary to make the capitalistic system work. Instead of carrying out that great responsibility, too many Republicans are forming coalitions with southern Democrats who appear to be determined to defeat such legislation in the Senate. I am willing to suggest here and now, Mr. President, that most of those southern Democrats will be just as opposed to most of the major provisions of the President's legislative program as they are opposed to civil rights.

Mr. President, I do not swallow the President's legislative program hook, line, and sinker. If I have not made that clear already in the 81st Congress, if I did not make it clear in 70 major speeches across the country in the last campaign, then nothing I would say now could make it any clearer. However, let me put this in the throats of a few of my Republican colleagues to swallow right now. I do not know how many of them can stand up and be counted as having made 70 major speeches in behalf of the Republican Party in the last campaign. But the junior Senator from Oregon did. He would do it again, and he intends to do it again in 1952 for his party. But at the same time he is not going to endorse the mistakes of the Republican Party, either. Where he considers the Republican Party wrong on an issue he is going to tell his audiences in what respects he thinks the Republicans are wrong, and let the voters decide then who is right. That is democracy put to work.

But I want to say that, whether we Republicans like it or not, the fact is that, as between the program we offered in the last campaign—and I speak here not of our platform, because we heard so little about our platform during the campaign, from so many of our speakers—but as between what our Republican political speakers in the last campaign, for the most part, offered the American people, and what the Democratic speakers in support of the President's program offered, we can find part of the explanation of the Republican defeat. I am satisfied the people made a choice favorable to the general overall proposals of the President of the United States in contrast to the evasion, the noncommittal program which characterized the Republican campaign. I tried in my way to convince the voters that our program was based upon our excellent platform. I talked about that Republican platform which, by and large, was one of the most progressive platforms we have adopted in the last quarter of a century. What did I find by way of voter reaction? I found that audience after audience and group after group expressed to me by questions from the floor and discussions from the floor a clear indication that if the voters could be sure we would carry out the pledges of our platform, the people would support the Republican Party. Some way, somehow, I believe they developed a fear that they could not count on us to carry out the pledges of the Republican platform. I have seen little evidence in the 81st Congress showing that their lack of confidence was a mistake. So I am going to watch, Mr. President, I am going to watch for the voting records of Republicans on great pieces of social legislation, to see whether or not we as a party are ready to implement the major planks of the Republican platform.

I say, Mr. President, it is such leaders of business as the editor of Business Week who are selling capitalism short when in the last sentence of his editorial he said:

"Filibuster is being employed to curb the headlong enactment of an ill-advised administration program fraught with great peril to a free society."

With these words he confesses as to why certain reactionary forces in America are supporting the retention of a filibuster in the Senate. Representatives of financial fascism certainly want to keep the minority strong and the majority weak in all our governmental processes.

Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that the decision of the distinguished Vice President applying the cloture rule to motions was not sustained by the Senate. I think it is most unfortunate that a majority of the Republicans did not sustain that decision.

I say that, Mr. President, with these observations. I think that when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] a year ago or thereabouts handed down a decision holding that under the facts and circumstances existing before him at the time cloture did not apply to the motion then before the Senate he was right on the precedents. If he wanted to follow those precedents, he was right. I said so at the time, and I say so now. But I want to make two points about his decision.

In the first place, there was a clear distinction between the facts and circumstances, or, as we lawyers say, between the operative

facts presented to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and the facts presented to the distinguished Vice President. On the basis of that distinction alone, one could vote to sustain the Vice President, and one could have voted, if it had come to a vote, to sustain the distinguished Senator from Michigan at the time of his ruling.

The second point I want to make, Mr. President, is that the first precedent and all the other precedents upon which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] based his ruling were wrong. The first precedent as I think has been brought out so clearly in this debate, and as I have satisfied myself, since the Vandenberg ruling, was wrong because the first precedent went contrary to the clear intent of those who passed the cloture rule in 1917. There has been a great deal of talk about the value of precedents, but no mention yet have I heard of the clear duty of a court, once it decides that a precedent is wrong, to reverse the precedent by handing down a decision that the court feels is right and sound as a matter of law. Thus I say, Mr. President, that although the Senator from Michigan could justify following precedents based on facts, similar to the facts which were before him when he ruled he likewise could have justified a refusal to follow those precedents. He would have been just as right in fact more so had he taken the position that the first precedent did not conform to the spirit and the intent of the framers of the cloture rule because they thought they were providing for limitation of debate on all matters of debate or business which might come before the Senate. Finding that the precedents violated the spirit and intent of the Senate when it passed rule 22 he could have refused to follow the bad precedents which always make bad law. He did not follow the course of action which many courts follow, of not accepting as binding upon him a precedent in this case which violated the intent of rule 22. In comparable situations before a court which adopts a liberal construction of a statute in order to carry out the intent of Congress we find many decisions reversing unsound precedents.

So, on the basis of my analysis of the distinction between the cases, Mr. President, I had no hesitancy a few days ago in refusing to follow the precedent established by the ruling of the Senator from Michigan. I satisfied myself on the basis of study, in my preparation for speeches on this subject in this term of Congress, that the first precedent handed down in the Senate after the passage of the cloture rule and upon which the Senator from Michigan relied was an erroneous one. I decided that we should overrule it at the first opportunity. So I say, if the operative facts before the Vice President had been identical with the operative facts before the Senator from Michigan, I would still have voted to sustain the Vice President, because my study had convinced me that the first precedent which the Senator from Michigan had followed was unsound in that it violated the intent of the cloture rule. Therefore, it should have been reversed by the Senator from Michigan. Most certainly the Republicans should have sustained the Vice President because of the different facts presented by the situation which arose on this matter this year.

Mr. President, I wish to register my deep opposition to the compromise resolution which has been proposed by the minority leader for himself and 51 other Senators. This substitute has been called a compromise, but, in my judgment, in actual fact and truth, it represents a surrender. If it is adopted there will be less likelihood of curbing the filibuster, I believe, than there is under the existing rule of the Senate. I say the people of America should know that what is labeled a reasonable compromise and a step in the direction of more effective controls on obstructionist tactics in the Senate is, in reality, a long stride backward from which it will be extremely difficult to recover.

The first part of that substitute resolution would permit cloture to be invoked on any measure, motion, or other matter save and except any motion to consider a proposal to change any standing rule of the Senate. It is argued that this will close the loophole in the present rule which permits filibustering on the Journal or on a motion to take up a bill. That is correct, Mr. President, but on paper only. I repeat, that is correct, Mr. President, but on paper only. If there are no vacancies, it means 64 Senators must vote affirmatively to bring debate to a close, as contrasted with the present rule which requires only two-thirds of those present and voting.

As I said earlier in my remarks, the present rule, in regard to the two-thirds requirement, carries out the general practice in respect to the application of two-thirds rules in any phase of the business of most parliamentary bodies. It is the rule which prevails where a two-thirds vote is required in most of the legislative halls of this country. It is the rule which is set forth in the Constitution in respect to any two-thirds vote requirement designated in the Constitution. Yet here, in 1949, in order to stop a filibuster we Republicans are asked to make a compromise, or a deal, or a trade, or whatever one may wish to call it, with a group of men who have made clear that they will not enter into a compromise unless they are assured that they are adequately protected in what they consider is basic in this fight, namely, the right to filibuster on their terms. They agree to this deal because they are satisfied it will enable them to prevent the passage of legislation which they do not want passed. In order to carry out such a trade we have this proposal which seeks to establish as a rule of the Senate a so-called, but miscalled, constitutional two-thirds majority requirement to stop a filibuster. This deal is a poor horse trade. It is a surrender of even the simple two-thirds majority vote requirement we have under the present rule 22.

Let us consider, Mr. President, whether this difference in size of the vote is as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] told us, a very small difference, indeed. On the 19 occasions on which cloture has been invoked since 1917 the average total vote has been 83. Two-thirds of that number is 56. It is obvious, therefore, that the difference between the average vote in the past and the required vote under this substitute is eight. That is scarcely a very small difference, to use the language of the Senator from California, Mr. President. That difference of 8 votes is an increase of 14 percent. Do not tell me, Mr. President, that this substitute proposal involves only a small difference between its operation and the operation of the existing cloture rule.

* * * * *

The argument is made by the Senator from California that cloture-vote history shows an average of more than 90 Senators present and voting, or paired. I say, Mr. President, that reference to pairs means nothing in this discussion. What counts under the procedure of the Wherry substitute is votes actually cast for and against, assuming a quorum. However, under the substitute proposal a Senator who is paired or absent is, in effect, voting against cloture. Hence, a premium is placed upon absenteeism in the Senate of the United States.

* * * * *

As I said the other morning on the floor of the Senate, some of the great dangers of the Wherry substitute are the parliamentary devices which are permitted under the Wherry substitute. It will encourage the development of some clever strategy, on the floor of the Senate in order to keep a filibuster going. It will encourage men to take what I call a walk-out powder, absenting themselves from the Senate, and letting the Sergeant at Arms engage in a hide-and-seek contest with them. We know that if men want to hide themselves away, and if that is going to help along in a filibuster fight—and that is what it will get down to—they are going to hide themselves away, and we will be frozen here by a requirement that we have to garner 64 of them in order to get a single rollcall vote. It is unfair for the signers of the round-robin Wherry resolution to impose such an unreasonable rule upon the Senate.

Mr. President, that is not my conception of a new cloture rule which will be more effective in harnessing filibustering in the Senate of the United States. That is not my conception of a cloture rule which will prevent domination of the Senate by a minority group of willful men, as Woodrow Wilson referred to filibusters. It places a premium on absenteeism. It will make filibustering more effective, not less effective, in the Senate of the United States.

I repeat, Mr. President, that what counts, under present procedure, are the votes actually cast for and against cloture assuming a quorum. However, under the substitute proposal a Senator who is paired or absent is in fact voting against cloture.

* * * * *

Only three times in history has a favorable two-thirds vote of the entire Senate been obtained, not four times, as has been said, but three times—in 1919, on the Versailles treaty, in 1923, on the World Court, and in 1927, on the branch banking bill. In other words a constitutional two-thirds vote of the entire Senate membership has been obtained on a cloture petition only three times. On one additional occasion a two-thirds vote of those present and voting was secured to pass a cloture petition thus making the four times that a cloture petition has ever passed the Senate.

That is why I have been heard to say so frequently that even the existing rule, with its mere two-thirds requirement, is not an effective check against filibustering, because as it has worked out seldom have we been able to obtain a two-thirds vote to support a cloture petition. That is why I say that if we want an effective check against filibustering in the Senate we must come to a majority vote rule.

Instead of that we move in the opposite direction under the Wherry amendment with a proposal to freeze a 64 vote requirement, whereas in 1927, in the case of the branch banking bill, a so-called constitutional two-thirds vote requirement could not have been obtained, and the measure would have fallen. Thus on one of the occasions when cloture succeeded in the Senate, it would have fallen 9 votes short, had there then been in effect such language requiring a so-called constitutional two-thirds vote as is provided by the Wherry substitute. Thus instead of having the situation that in the 19 times cloture has been attempted it has been successful only 4 times, the situation would have been worse under the Wherry substitute because under it cloture could have been obtained only 3 times instead of 4.

Mr. President, I dislike to reiterate unnecessarily, but this point must be emphasized for the RECORD. Looking at the record of cloture since 1917, if the Wherry substitute had been in existence and applied to the cases where the Senate attempted to apply cloture, success would have been less rather than more, because in the same number of cases the vote of 64 Senators, as required under the Wherry substitute, could not have been obtained, because in the case involving the Bureau of Customs and Prohibition, in which the Senate was successful in bringing about cloture under the existing rule, the vote was 55 to 27.

Mr. President, if we propose to strengthen th antifilibuster rule, it should be obvious

that progress lies in reducing rather than in increasing the percentage of the Senate required to close debate. Assurance that a cloture petition will lie against a filibuster to take up a bill is an empty assurance and of no comfort if it is a foregone conclusion that when put to a vote the petition will fail to receive 64 affirmative votes, even though the actual votes in favor may be a two-thirds vote or more of those voting.

I am exceedingly disturbed, Mr. President, over that effect of the Wherry amendment. I am at a loss to understand why the Senate of the United States here today, having the power to change its rules by majority vote, would now use that majority vote—and 52 Senators have committed themselves by way of a round-robin petition on the Wherry substitute—to fasten upon themselves and the rest of us a frozen two-thirds so-called constitutional majority of 64 votes.

Well, Mr. President, I am going to stick by the majority-rule principle even when it licks me. Therefore I shall be sportsman enough to say that if that is what the will of the majority is today I am going to have to take it. I will cast my vote against. I shall proceed to do all I can to see to it that in the not too distant future we have enough Members of the Senate of the United States who will reverse that action and bring us back, not to a principle of increasing the votes required for cloture by a so-called constitutional two-thirds vote, but by reducing the votes required in the direction of what I consider to be the ideal—a majority vote. That is why I say, whether we like it or not, this matter is now a great political issue. We are not going to get the politics out of this matter, if I understand some of my friends on the Democratic side correctly, as far as the Democratic Party is concerned. We are not going to get the politics out of it, I can assure the Senate, so long as it is my privilege to represent my people in the Senate in the Republican Party, because it is being made a political issue by the action which is being taken here.

I take the position that we must carry the fight of civil and human rights to the American people in the form of making clear to them that if they want protection in the legislative form that those rights ought to be protected, then they must send to the Senate of the United States men who will adopt an effective check against filibusters. I am of the opinion that the Wherry amendment is not an effective check against the filibuster.

So I say, the proposal, insofar as it relates to the size of the vote required to invoke cloture, is definitely a backward step.

I have said before, Mr. President, that the American people want majority rule in the Senate and are in favor of abolishing the filibuster technique. New evidence in support of this position is found in the recent public-opinion polls, published in the Washington Post for March 11, 1949. That poll shows that, among voters who know what a filibuster is, 54 percent were in favor of changing the rules to permit cloture by a simple majority rather than the present two-thirds majority. Only 35 percent disapproved, and 11 percent had no opinion.

* * * * *

If my colleagues do not think that existing public opinion in respect to majority rule in the Senate is right, they ought to try to take some facts to the American people to convince them that majority rule should not prevail in the Senate. I shall await with interest and some amusement, Mr. President, those great public discussions in which Senators go before a constituency and tell their voters that they think we ought to retain a filibuster rule in the United States Senate which will permit a minority successfully to block the action of the majority on needed legislation. I should like to be present in those minority-group audiences when my colleagues tell them that, and at the same time tell them that they want the votes of the members of those minority groups. If Senators are going to recognize that minority groups are composed of American citizens they should recognize right now in the Senate before this vote is taken on the legislative rights of minority groups.

Unfortunately in some sections of the country they do not have the right to vote unless they pay a tax to vote. That is one reason for part of the civil-rights fight. They ought to have the right to vote. There ought to be a free franchise in America, so that when men come to the Senate of the United States their election will be by all the adults of their State who exercise a free right to vote. The fact is that many of them come to the Senate of the United States from States where many people are not even eligible to vote because of a poll-tax requirement. Such Senators are among those who are now taking the position that we ought to retain a rule in the Senate which would permit them to further their minority-rule principles by being protected in their claim to filibuster as the Wherry plan protects them. Count me out on that one.

I leave it to my colleagues speaking before those minority groups to justify that sort of minority domination in the United States Senate. But they had better be sure, before those audiences, that they are talking to adults who do not have the right to vote, because, if they make the argument before audiences composed of members of minority groups entitled to vote, they will not get a vote out of the audience, and by all means should not, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate very long. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] surprises me very much. His fervor is so much greater than the logic of his reasoning that I must say a word or two.

The Senator from Oregon seeks to leave the impression that majority rule is an ingredient—even a principal characteristic—of our Constitution. It is no such thing I think one of the distinguishing characteristics of our Constitution is the denial of rule by the majority. The Constitution requires, in its own rules—that is, the rules by which it may be changed—three-fourths of the States to change it. The fact of the matter is that there never would have been a Constitution if the principle which the Senator from Oregon advocates had been insisted upon by the Founding Fathers.

The question of the method by which the Constitution could be changed was one of the principal considerations in the ratification of the Constitution; it was essential to its ratification by several of the smaller States, particularly Delaware, John Dickinson representing that State.

So I think it is quite inaccurate and very mischievous to leave the impression that majority rule in some way is a distinguishing characteristic of our Constitution, or to equate majority rule with democracy, as the Senator from Oregon has so fervently attempted to do.

There is nothing whatever to the argument that majority rule is essential to a democratic system of government. I again call attention to the fact that, under its rules, the United States Senate is the only upper body I know of in the civilized world which has continued to function and to exercise any real influence upon the course of events.

If we destroy the rules of the Senate, and if we subject the Senate to the kind of rules which the Senator from Oregon has advocated, there will be no real reason for the Senate to continue in existence in this country, other than, perhaps, as a refuge to which persons may retire in their old age, there to spend an honorary retirement, as is done in other countries.

The Senate of the country which is our neighbor to the North has no real power. In England, the House of Lords has no real power; its power was destroyed years ago, for one reason or another in other parliamentary countries with an upper and a lower house, the upper house generally speaking, has little real power.

Should rule 22 be changed, and the Senate have no power to resist the arbitrary imposition of his will by the Executive, I should say it would have no real reason to exist. There would be no excuse for the expenditure of money to pay our salaries, if we could perform no function other than to give instantaneous approval to whatever measures might come to us from on high.

The great distinction between the Senate and the other body of Congress is the power of the Senate to examine and to subject approval of measures to delay, in order that the people themselves may be able to understand controversial issues.

I hope Senators will not take seriously the argument that democracy is in some way equivalent to majority rule, because there is nothing whatever to such an argument. There is nothing in our Constitution which in any respect implies, directly or indirectly, that majority rule should be the rule of the Senate. The Constitution itself requires that the Senate discharge many of its responsibilities by a two-thirds majority.

For the Senator from Oregon to say that in some way the Constitution provides that the Senate must adopt its rules by majority vote is a complete inaccuracy; there is no justification whatsoever for such a statement.

One last word about the practices in other parliaments, to which the Senator from Oregon made reference. I believe he said that majority rule is a common practice in almost all parliaments. I presume he meant the Legislature of Oregon. But it is not the common practice in the parliaments of other countries. It was not the practice at all in the mother of parliaments, the Parliament of England, from which our Congress sprang, in a sense. At the time the Founding Fathers were considering our rules, the rules of parliament were the rules which guided them. So I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Oregon is quite incorrect in his theory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on January 4, 1957, I believe the Senate of the United States is facing one of the most crucial decisions which any Member of this body has had confront him during his period of service, regardless of how long that may be. I have served in this body, now, some 11 years. There are Senators who have served for a much longer period of time. Regardless of the length of time which Senators on my side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle may have served, I do not believe any Senator will be faced with a more important decision than that which will face him this afternoon at the hour of 6 o'clock. One hundred and sixty-seven years of experience and of tradition are deeply challenged, with far-reaching consequences to the Senate of the United States and, I believe, to our country, as well.

As has been suggested, in the absence of any rules, the procedures of the Senate could be delayed for weeks or, indeed, for months. Without rules there would be no Senate committees; and without committees, the legislative business of the Senate could not be conducted, except by unanimous consent. Mr. President, that would be minority rule with a vengeance, for then any one of the 96 Members of the Senate could hold up the proceedings of this great body, because our hands would be tied, and we could not conduct the public business, including matters affecting the vital defense of the Nation, except by unanimous consent. In such a case a single arbirtary Senator could prevent the great Government of the United States from functioning, inasmuch as the Government cannot function by Executive edict. Nor can legislation be enacted by the operations of the House of Representatives alone. Laws can be passed and appropriations made only by the Congress of the United States, functioning as 2 equal bodies, the 2 of them together constituting a coordinate branch of the Government, not a subordinate branch. If the Senate were turned into a jungle, without any rules, the very security of the Nation could be jeopardized—for instance, on the eve of the receipt from the President of the United States of a message on matters which may vitally affect the security of Europe, the security of the Middle East, and the very security of our own Nation, as well.

Mr. President, this is a grave question upon which men may honestly differ. Each Member of this body is sincere and deeply devoted, and undoubtedly each Member has searched his conscience and is trying to reach a decision in the public interest. I do not question the motives of any Member of the Senate. But I feel that, at this place, I have the responsibility of pointing out what I believe to be some of the very grave consequences facing the Senate this afternoon if the Anderson motion should prevail.

The distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], my able colleague who sits directly across the aisle from me, has made a motion which will be voted on this afternoon. His motion is precisely the same as a motion made 4 years ago at this time by the then occupant of the chair I now occupy; I refer to Robert Taft, late a Senator from Ohio, and then the majority leader of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I fully support the position taken by the distinguished majority leader of this body. If he were not the majority leader, and if, instead, the duty of the majority leadership had fallen upon my shoulders, I would have made the motion which he made yesterday—to be voted on today—a motion similar to the motion made 4 years ago by my distinguished predecessor in this chair, who at that time bore the responsibilities of the majority leader of the Senate. Today I fully support the present majority leader in the motion he has made.

Like most of us, Mr. President, I have been called upon by delegations of sincere persons who are vitally interested not only in proposed civil-rights legislation, but also in other proposed legislation which they believe to be for the public good. Under the Constitution they have the right of petition, the right to call on their Senators and their Representatives; and that right must never be taken from them. I have had some suggest to me, as a Republican leader of the Senate, that under the circumstances there might be some partisan advantage for my party if we were to gather sufficient votes to defeat the motion of the Senator of Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. My reply on the several occasions when that suggestion has been made has been that I will never use the position I occupy in this body to gain a partisan advantage for my party at the expense of the prestige or power of the Senate of the United States.

As I have pointed out, if the Senate were to have no rules on January 3, that would mean that the Senate then would proceed, in effect, in committee of the whole to adopt rules—every one, from rule 1 to rule 40. In that event, every rule—including every section, every paragraph, and every line—would be subject to debate. Those of us who have had experience in the Senate and those of us who have read about the history of the Senate know that even when legitimately keeping to the pending subject matter, not when filibustering and, as sometimes pointed out by columnists, consuming large amounts of time by reading from the World Almanac or from other documents not pertinent to the question or measure before the Senate—which I do not deny has happened in the Senate in the past—but even if debate in the Senate were confined strictly to the subject of the rules, 1 month or 2 months or 3 months could easily be consumed before the business of the Senate could be conducted.

Mr. President, let me also point out that under the conditions which then would prevail, assuming that we could ultimately reach a vote, a bare majority of the Senate could determine what the rules of the Senate would be. Although I am confident that the present membership of the Senate would not do that, yet it is possible that at some time in the future some Senate might by a bare majority determine what the rules of the Senate would be.

Let me point out that in this case we are not making a decision governing only the 85th Congress. Instead, today, while we are trifling with 167 years of Senate tradition and American history, we may be making history for the next 150 years of American life. If the motion of the Senator from New Mexico were agreed to, at some time in the future some Senate with a disciplined majority might, by a bare majority, adopt rules which would provide that on a question before the Senate there could be not more than 1 hour's debate on either side, and that no Senator could speak for more than 5 minutes. Such a rule could be adopted if there were a bare majority in favor of doing so. A rule of germaneness could also be adopted.

When I first became a Member of the Senate, coming from the legislative body in my State of California, I favored, I am frank to say, cloture by majority vote, because both houses of the California Legislature, in which I had served, had had very tight rules of a kind. So, I thought it would be a fine thing to have a rule of germaneness for the Senate of the United States, until I began to serve here and found that under the procedures of this body, proposed legislation to be called up is normally handled by a motion on the part of the majority leader. Sometimes the membership of this body is closely divided—as is now the case, with 49 on the other side of the aisle and 47 on this side of the aisle. Under such conditions, it is rather difficult for either side, even if it wished to do so, to be arbitrary. Certainly with my able colleague, the majority leader, and the other 48 Members now on the other side of the aisle serving in the Senate, I know—and I know it as an American citizen, not as a partisan—that even if the distinguished majority leader had 67 votes on his side of the aisle, he would not ride roughshod over the Members on my side of the aisle. I also know from history that sometimes the representation of my party in the Senate has been reduced to 17 votes. I realize that if there were a majority leader and a majority party in the Senate which wished to ride roughshod over Senators on this side of the aisle, that could be done, in the jungle which would develop in the Senate of the United States in the absence of any rules.

A rule of germaneness could preclude a Senator from gaining the floor at any time to discuss vital matters of national or international policy even though the bill under consideration related to patents, agriculture, or school lunches. He would be restricted to the subject matter of the bill established as the pending business by motion of the majority leader.

I do not believe it is prudent to put one's neck in a guillotine because of a desire to cure a bad headache; but I think that is precisely what the Senate is being asked to do by the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. Neither is it wise, in my judgment, to change the precedents of 167 years, in order to meet one problem of civil rights.

I am in favor of the President's civil-rights program which will be presented to the Congress. I expect to join with other Senators—with Senators on both

sides of the aisle, I hope—in favoring such a program. To my mind, although perhaps not to the minds of some Senators on the other side of the aisle, it will be a reasonable and a fair program, and one which the Senate of the United States should adopt. I believe the correct procedure would be to have the bill introduced next Monday, when Senators will be able to introduce bills, to urge early committee hearings, to have it reported to the Senate, and to debate it fairly and fully, as it should be debated, affecting as it does many citizens in all parts of our country. We shall have a committee to which to refer such a bill next Monday, if the Senate has any rules under which to proceed. We shall have a Committee on Foreign Relations to which to refer the President's message which will be delivered tomorrow, if the Senate has rules tomorrow. But whether the Senate has rules or not apparently will depend to no small extent upon whether this body in its judgment lays on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

On Monday next, when it will be possible to introduce proposed legislation in the Senate, I shall introduce, and I shall ask all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope, many of them on the other side of the aisle, to join with me, a proposal to amend rule 22 of the Senate. I cannot introduce such a proposal now, under the general agreement, but I should like to read it to the Senate.

I do not say this proposal is the final solution. I do not say, after a committee has met, after hearings have been had, after testimony has been taken, after there has been a study made of the traditions of 167 years and the needs of the present, that the proposal may not be greatly improved. That is what we have committees for. But I propose to introduce, on behalf of myself and any other Senator who cares to join me, a proposal which reads:

That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22," and (2) by striking out "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

Section 2 would read:

Subsection 3 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is repealed.

There would thereby be provided cloture by a two-thirds vote of those voting, and it would provide that cloture could be applied against a change in the rules themselves.

There has been considerable talk about the difference between requiring a two-thirds vote of the membership and a two-thirds vote of those present and voting. I am perfectly willing to admit that, from an academic point of view, there could be a difference. I am perfectly willing to admit that, from a practical and realistic point of view, there could be a slight difference. However, I think we all know that whenever there is an attempt to tamper with the rules of the Senate, any Member who can get out of a sick bed, or come from anywhere else he will return from wherever he may be, and will be present in the Senate Chamber to cast his vote one way or the other. While it is true that in some exceptional cases a Senator might not be able to be present, and his absence would be equivalent to a negative vote, I think the full vote of the Senate would be recorded in most cases.

I think my proposal would be a reasonable change. I appeal to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those from the North and the South, the East and the West, to keep an open mind on the proposal for a number of reasons. First of all, in the Constitution of the United States, it is provided that only a two-thirds vote of those voting is necessary to impeach a President of the United States or other public Federal officer. It takes only a two-thirds vote of those present to expel a Member of the Senate. It takes only a two-thirds vote of those present and voting to ratify a treaty, which can have tremendous importance at home and abroad. It takes only a two-thirds vote of those present and voting to override a Presidential veto. It takes only a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress to propose a constitutional amendment which may ultimately be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Much has been said about majority government. Yet we lose sight of the fact sometimes that we are operating as a republic and not as a pure democracy, as that term is sometimes used. There has been reference to a comparison of the Senate of the United States with other legislative bodies. I say most respectfully I do not believe that any comparison can be made between the Senate of the United States and any other legislative body in the world. It is not comparable to the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol. All 435 Members of that great body are elected each 2 years. There is no continuity of membership in that body except as determined by the voters in the respective States.

The Senate is not comparable with a State legislature. I say it most respectfully, because I have served in both houses of the legislature of my State. The Senate of the United States was created as a result of a compromise in order to build this Republic. Unless there had been that compromise, unless the States as sovereign entities could have had equal representation in this Chamber, there might never have been created the Republic which has now grown from a small Nation of 3 million people on the Atlantic Coast to a great Nation of 168 million people stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific—the greatest Nation ever known, a Nation which has provided for our people a higher standard of living than any other people have known at any time and at any place in history.

It was a part of the contract that was entered into for the creation of this Federal Republic that the Senate of the United States should be constituted as it is, and so long as I have the breath of life in my body, I will fight to prevent diminishing in the slightest degree the power, the duties, and the responsibilities of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, what is the situation? If the motion to lay on the table should be defeated. There would be created the jungle to which I have referred. Under what parliamentary rules would the Senate then proceed? It has been suggested by some outside sources that the Senate could use Robert's Rules of Order. But why Robert's Rules of Order? Is anyone to say that we should take a book, able though it is, which is sold for profit, in which, so far as I know, not a single Member of the existing Senate or of any past Senate has had a word to say about 1 page or 1 line or a single rule of the book, and adopt it in place of the rules adopted by the Senate over the years and supported by 167 years of tradition. These rules have been handed down to us by Members of this body, or our predecessors at least, who helped to adopt the rules and to amend them. Why Robert's Rules of Order? I have in my hand a list of a few other rules of order, about which I have some idea, and which are in current use in schools, colleges, debating societies, chambers of commerce, and perhaps in union meetings; but these organizations—all of them—are different from the Senate of the United States, which is a part of our great Federal system, and those rules cannot be compared with rules devised to govern the Senate of the United States.

What are those other "rules of order?"

Parliamentary Procedure, by Rose Marie Crugan; Handbook of Parliamentary Procedure, by Henry A. Davidson; Lex Parliamentaria Americana, by Luther Stearns Cushing; Manual of Parliamentary Practice, by Luther Stearns Cushing; Rules of Proceeding and Debate in Deliberative Assemblies, by Luther Stearns Cushing; Precedents of Proceedings in the House of Commons, by John Hatsell; A Manual of Parliamentary Practice, by Thomas Jefferson; Manual of Legislative Procedure, by Paul Mason. This work is used in the California Legislature.

Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, by Alice Fleenor Sturgis; A Handbook on Parliamentary Practice, by Rufus Waples.

All these are in addition to Robert's Rules of Order.

Are we to take 2 weeks, or a month, to decide what temporary rules we shall use, before we establish a single committee of the Senate?

Mr. President, I have used more than my time, but I have a very deep conviction on this subject, and I would not feel that, as minority leader, I was discharging my duty to my colleagues on this side of the aisle or to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, unless I mentioned these matters.

I think there is an orderly way to proceed. When I occupied the position of majority leader, I helped to break what some people called a filibuster with respect to legislation to which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] referred. I know that he is a very sincere man. He did not consider that he was conducting a filibuster. I assume that he

considered that he was educating the people of the country, so that they might finally be opposed to the proposed legislation which was adopted despite his opposition. Other Members, when they conduct prolonged discussion, feel that it is not a filibuster, but that it is an educational process. Senators may honestly differ on that question. But I certainly would not deny any Member of this body the opportunity freely and fully to discuss legislation of importance to the Nation and to the respective States.

There was some talk earlier to the effect that the statement that we would have no rules if the pending proposal were adopted was not accurate, because of the passage of the La Follette-Monroney Act. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who was then a Member of the House, and who coauthored, with the great Bob La Follette, the La Follette-Monroney Act, spoke a while ago. I wish every Member of this body could have been present to hear him. He made it very clear, I believe, that the rule change sections of the La Follette-Monroney Act, in effect only amended existing rules of the Senate. If there are no rules, obviously there can be no effective amendments. Therefore we fall back to the jungle. If we have no rules, there are no committees to which the President's message can be referred tomorrow. There is no committee to which we may refer a proposed amendment to the rules. There is no committee to which we can refer the civil-rights bill, which I hope will be introduced on Monday.

The Senate of the United States, consisting of 96 Members, should recognize the conditions with which the Senate will be confronted if the proposed action is taken.

I conclude by saying that, of course, I am interested in civil rights. I think every American is interested in civil rights. I am interested in making certain that every American who is entitled to a vote under the Constitution shall enjoy the right to vote, and to express his views as an American citizen, whether he lives in the North, the South, the East, or the West.

But, as an American citizen and as a United States Senator, I am equally interested in making sure that if a citizen, under existing law, casts his vote, and the vote is counted, the vote shall be honored, whether in the North, the South, the East, or the West. The counting and the honoring of the votes already cast by American citizens is also an important and a basic civil right.

I make this final plea: Before the vote is taken at the hour of 6 o'clock, the Senate of the United States should recognize that it is proposed to upset 167 years of tradition, of precedent, of orderly procedure, by reason of which, regardless of whatever emergency occurs, the Senate is always ready for business.

I point out one situation which is likely never to happen, but which could happen. Suppose that on the third day of January of 1957 the new Members-elect, representing one-third of the membership of the Senate, had decided, in the interest of getting together and becoming acquainted, that they would meet at a luncheon. Suppose that some great catastrophe had occurred and all 32 of the Senators-elect had been killed in a single instant. It is true that in due time the governors of their respective States could fill the vacancies, and probably in days, weeks, or months, if the vacancies could be filled by appointment, without requiring election—as is the case in most States, where the governor can fill a vacancy—those places could be filled. But in the meantime, without a single new Member, the Senate of the United States, as a continuing body, with continuing rules, could meet, could receive messages from the President of the United States, and could carry on the public business.

I hope the motion of the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] will be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I honor and respect the views just voiced so ably by the minority leader. But I am not afraid, on this evening, that the United States Senate is about to enter into a jungle, or into a period of anarchy.

I oppose the motion made by the majority leader, and I do it upon a legal and constitutional ground.

First of all, it seems to me that one of the greatest mistakes that has been made in connection with this entire subject is to confuse the question of civil rights with the question which is here being considered.

The fundamental question before the Senate is whether or not the Senate shall proceed to adopt its rules. If we deny that the Senate now has the opportunity and the right to do so, in effect we deny that at the time the Senate meets to organize it can adopt the rules which shall govern it. If the Constitution means anything, it means that as we meet, we can adopt rules to govern the procedure of the Senate.

I think the minority leader placed his finger very ably on one point, when he defined what he would be willing to vote for in the way of a modification of the rules. That is what I would vote for. I do not say glibly, "Let us have a vote and a rule by majority," because there are some things in Government procedure, some things in connection with procedures of this body, which are far too serious to be governed by a mere majority vote. At times there are votes which affect one State or two States. Any Member of the Senate may find himself in the position of voting upon a proposal which involves only his own State, or perhaps his own State and another State. We do not wish to be shut off by a mere majority vote from having an opportunity to discuss any subject before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I have an additional half minute?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Because I feel that we should not impose upon this session of the Senate fewer rights than the Constitution gave to the Senate when it originally created it, I shall vote against the motion of the majority leader, which, in effect, will be a vote in support of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the vote which I shall cast in favor of the motion to table this attempt to rewrite the rules of the Senate may be the last that I shall cast as a Member of this distinguished body. If so, I am thankful that circumstances permit my last vote to be in favor of continuing freedom of debate in the United States Senate.

It has been a great honor and privilege to have served in this body during the past 4 years. I shall miss the association and service with my distinguished colleagues. Accurately, this has been called the world's greatest deliberative body. One reason for that is the fact that here we have preserved freedom of debate. If ever that freedom is limited by less than a vote of two-thirds of the membership as now provided by the rules, the Senate will be reduced to the level of an ordinary debating society or the common variety of lesser legislative assemblies.

There are many reasons for this time-honored free debate in the United States Senate. One of the most important is that this is the last resort for elected representatives of the respective States to present their arguments and protect their rights even when they hold what may be for the moment a minority viewpoint. If that right is destroyed here, it is forever lost.

It so happens that during my years in the Senate the only extended debates, sometimes referred to as filibusters, have been conducted or participated in by many of those who speak the loudest today against such procedure of free and full debate. I hold here a document from the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate," dated December 1956. Beginning on page 23 there is a list of Outstanding Filibusters from 1841 to 1955, and on page 26 is found:

1953: A prolonged debate took place on the so-called tidelands offshore oil bill. It began April 1 and ended May 5. The tidelands debate lasted for 35 days, one of the longest on record. During this debate Senator MORSE established a new record for the longest single speech. On April 24–25 he spoke for 22 hours and 26 minutes.

1954: An extended debate occurred in July 1954, on a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (S. 3690). The debate lasted 13 days. On July 26 Senator KNOWLAND sought to invoke cloture on S. 3690, but his motion failed by a vote of 44 yeas to 42 nays.

Debate extended almost to filibuster proportions last year against the Harris-Fulbright bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, and again many of the proponents of this change in the rules actively led that demonstration of free speech.

I happened to be on the other side, actually a coauthor of the tidelands and natural gas bills. The filibusters

were against my own legislation, but never did I wish to deny the opponents the right to speak as long as they desired. It would seem that those who have so freely enjoyed the right of extended debate in this body would be among the last to deny that right to others.

Mr. President, the constitutional and legal precedents against this procedure have been covered fully by others who have spoken in favor of the motion to table. I simply concur in what has been said, and ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a brief prepared by the Library of Congress citing the precedents for what should be our decision today—that the Senate is a continuing body with existing rules which cannot be changed except as provided for therein.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE SENATE A CONTINUING BODY?

PRO BRIEF

I. Constitutional construction supporting the theory that the Senate is a continuing body

Applying two cardinal rules of constitutional construction, viz: That the Constitution must be construed as a whole, *Town of Concord* v. *Portsmouth Savings Bank* ((1875) 92 U. S. 625), and that it cannot be presumed that any clause is intended to be without effect, *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803) 1 Cr. 137), to article I, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides for two-thirds of the membership of the Senate to be in office at all times, and to article I, section 3, which provides that a majority of the Senate shall constitute a quorum to do business, it is apparent that the Senate was intended to be and is a continuing body. These provisions assuring a quorum of qualified Senators at all times could have no other purpose than to make the Senate a continuing body.

II. Judicial decisions supporting the theory that the Senate is a continuing body

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the Senate is a continuing body. *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* ((1926) 273 U. S. 135). In this case the Court said, at pages 180–181:

"Another question has arisen which should be noticed. It is whether the case has become moot. The investigation was ordered and the committee appointed during the 68th Congress. That Congress expired March 4, 1925. The resolution ordering the investigation in terms limited the committee's authority to the period of the 68th Congress; but this apparently was changed by a later and amendatory resolution authorizing the committee to sit at such times and places as it might deem advisable or necessary. It is said in Jefferson's Manual: 'Neither House can continue any portion of itself in any parliamentary function beyond the end of the session without the consent of the other two branches. When done, it is by a bill constituting them commissioners for the particular purpose.' But the context shows that the reference is to the two houses of Parliament when adjourned by prorogation or dissolution by the King. The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives whose Members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it cannot well be the same with the Senate, which is a continuing body whose members are elected for a term of 6 years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation.

"Mr. Hinds in his collection of precedents says: 'The Senate, as a continuing body, may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of a Congress'; and, after quoting the above statement from Jefferson's Manual, he says: 'The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of a Congress.'"

The people ordained and established the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, *United States* v. *Butler* ((1936), 297 U. S. 1), and the Constitution established the Supreme Court as the final authority to determine the meaning and application of those words of that instrument which require interpretation. *Pennkamp* v. *Florida* ((1946), 328 U. S. 331). The argument of the opponents of the thesis that the Senate is a continuing body to the effect that the foregoing statement in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, supra, is obiter dictum, because the Court did not rest its finding exclusively on this point, is without foundation. A reason for a decision is not obiter dictum merely because it is one of two reasons for the conclusion. *Richmond Screw Anchor Co.* v. *United States* ((1928), 275 U. S. 331); *United States* v. *Title Insurance & Trust Co.* ((1924), 265 U. S. 472). A tacit recognition of a point in a decision is equivalent to an expressed determination. See *Cliquot's Champagne* ((1866), 3 Wall. 114).

The highest courts of two States recognize the rule of decision in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, supra, that the United States Senate is a continuing body. See *Robertson* v. *State* ((Ind. 1887), 79 N. E. 582); *Petition of Special Assembly Interim Committee, etc.* ((Cal. 1938), 90 P. 2d 304, 308); *Swing* v. *Riley* ((Cal. 1939), 90 P. 2d 313).

The opponents of the theory that the Senate is a continuing body cite these two cases along with a New Jersey case, *State* v. *Rogers* ((1894, 28 A. 726), for the proposition that courts of these States, with constitutional provisions for overlapping terms for senators, have held that their senates are not continuing bodies. While the bald statement is true, it fails to disclose the underlying differences between these senates and the United States Senate. The following quotes show beyond cavil that these cases cannot be used by way of analogy as authority for the proposition that the United States Senate is not a continuing body.

In the Indiana case the court stated:

"In the Senate of the United States a majority constitutes a quorum and as there is always more than a quorum of qualified Senators holding seats in that body, its organized existence is necessarily continuous. But in the senate of this State two-thirds of its members are necessary to make a quorum. As one-half of its members go out of office at the end of each legislative term of 2 years—that is to say, on the day after each general and biennial election—it becomes, at the end of each such legislative term, a disorganized body."

In the New Jersey case the court stated:

"Beyond all question, we here find that a duty is imposed on both the assembly and the senate to confer at an appointed time, and to effect a yearly organization. Such a regulation is appropriate to a body that expires yearly, but it is inappropriate and unprecedented in its application to a body that is possessed of a permanent life In the practice of the United States Senate, which, we have stated, is an ever-living body, there is no fixed day for the admission of new members-elect."

Here is a State court, before the decision in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, stating that the Senate is a continuing body.

In California, the court in the case of *Petition of Special Assembly Interim Committee, etc., supra*, stated at page 310:

"Whatever may be the rule as to the United States Congress, it is quite clear that in this State the legislature is not a continuing body—each session is composed of a new body, separate from its predecessor, all of the members of the assembly and one-half of the members of the senate being newly elected for each regular session."

In the second California case the court disposed of the contention that its senate was a continuing body by pointing out that 50 percent of the senate membership at each regular session is newly elected. See page 315.

III. Customs and rules of the Senate support the theory that the Senate is a continuing body

While there is no direct precedent on the question as to whether the Senate is a continuing body, most of what might be called collateral precedents flowing from the customs and rules of the Senate definitely point to the acceptance of the theory that the Senate is a continuing body.

It has been the custom of the Senate since its organization, to begin the operation of each new Congress without readopting or reaffirming its rules and to continue its elected officers from Congress to Congress, except when there has been a change of party control. In addition to these customs, the rules of the Senate, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, would appear to be predicated upon the underlying concept that the Senate is a continuing body. Rule 25 (2) provides that "each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed." Section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act provides that: "each standing committee of the Senate * * * is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate as it deems advisable."

These long-continued, contemporaneous, and practical precedents, necessarily predicated on the Senate being a continuing body, must be given great weight. See *United States* v. *State Bank of North Carolina* ((1832) 6 Pet. 29). A congressional construction of the Constitution which has been followed since the founding of the Federal Government is entitled to great respect. *Ex parte Quirin* ((1942) 317 U. S. 1).

IV. Support for the theory that the Senate is a continuing body from authoritative writers in the field of Government

Many of the authoritative writers in the field of Government have stated categorically that the United States Senate is a continuing body. "The Senate has never required reorganization since the beginning of the Government." Lodge, "Senate of the United States," page 11. "It * * * meets fully organized and provided with rules determining its methods of procedures." Willoughby, "Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration," page 243; "[It] * * * is a continuing body." Haynes, "Senate of the United States," page 341. See IV, Hinds Precedents, 4396, 4400, 4404-4405.

The reasoning of distinguished writers and the unbroken rule followed by the Senate may be considered in determining the meaning of provisions of the Constitution. See *Stockton* v. *McFarland* ((Ariz. 1940) 160 pp. 2d 328).

V. Nonapplication of the proposition that one Congress cannot bind another to the issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body

The argument that one Congress cannot bind a subsequent Congress has no application to the issue as to whether the Senate is a continuing body. Neither a continuing nor a noncontinuing body may pass an irrevocable rule. To admit that difficulty exists in changing the rules of the Senate is to admit that the rules are revocable.

VI. Conclusion

The pertinent constitutional provisions, an unequivocal decision by the Supreme Court that the Senate is a continuing body,

Senate customs and rules, and writings by leading authorities in the field of Government prove conclusively that the Senate is a continuing body.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in order that the majority leader may have an opportunity to close the debate, I yield myself the remainder of the time available to my side of the question.

I wish to reply, at least in part, to what the able minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] has stated. I am sure no Senator will misunderstand what I say. I wish to assure everyone that I regard the able minority leader as a fine and upright and honorable man, as my good friend, and as an able leader. I am sure everyone will understand that nothing I say is intended to be critical of him.

I should like to say to him that I have walked with him and have shivered with him and have gone through the jungle with him—through the jungle where no rules exist. I should like to reassure him and bring him a little faith by pointing out to him that the House of Representatives yesterday walked into the same jungle and 30 seconds later marched out intact. The House had adopted rules, just as the Senate can adopt rules.

If he will read from page 47 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he will find that in the House rules were adopted in about 30 seconds.

The able minority leader also has said that we would be breaking the traditions of 167 years. Yes, Mr. President, in the House of Representatives, in 1890, they did break the traditions, by the courage of a great Speaker. The last time I visited the Hall of the House of Representatives there was not a crack in it. The Republic had not fallen. Somehow the Members of the House got through that jungle unscathed. The minority leader said that some awful Senate, by a bare majority, could adopt a rule of germaneness and thereby hurt the people of the country.

By a majority vote, in 1949, the Senate did just that. It provided that the Senate could not change its rules except by almost unanimous consent.

At that time I was one of those who were rolled under. Ever since then I have lifted my voice in an effort to get away from that evil situation. Why should it not be possible to end this evil thing in a decent fashion?

I should like to say to the able minority leader, as I have said to other Senators, that I subscribe exactly to what he has outlined. I have never advocated majority cloture. I subscribe almost identically to the words he has used. I say to him, as St. Paul said to the Athenians: "That which ye have worshipped without knowing, come I to declare unto you."

Let us extirpate this evil. Let us do it now. In view of the statement made by the Vice President, it can be done now.

Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from California will find that he can send his resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but that after weeks and after months it will not see the light of day on the floor of the Senate. It will not see the light of day on the floor, anymore than did the resolution of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The Committee on Rules and Administration wrestled and wrestled with the matter. It labored long and brought forth a mouse, and placed it on the calendar of the Senate. There it reposed, quietly. No one ever moved to bring it up.

In the last Congress, we talked about doing something about cleaning up elections. A bill to control and clean up elections was introduced with the sponsorship of 88 Senators. That bill never saw the light of day on the floor of the Senate. If all the Senators on the other side of the aisle and half of the Senators on this side of the aisle will join in the proposal the Senator from California has made, it will still safely stay on the calendar and never see the light of day. Why do I say that? I say it advisedly, because I have been trying to follow this matter for a long time.

I refer Senators to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 1, page 131, where the Senator from California said that something should be done to end filibusters and to make it possible for the Senate to operate. He said:

> So long as a filibuster may be conducted against a motion to take up a bill, not even two-thirds of the Members of the Senate can bring to a close the debate whenever it is the desire of one man or a small group of men to obstruct the legislative process.

On the same day, at page 133 of the RECORD, I find this statement by the able Senator from California. The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, had yielded to the Senator from California. The able Senator from California said:

> I should like to say to the able Senator from Kentucky, who is soon to leave the floor of the Senate and to preside over its deliberations, that I can testify that on a number of occasions he has been vitally interested in finding some way to terminate a filibuster, as were some of us on this side of the aisle. But I also wish to point out to the able Senator from Kentucky, and I think he will agree to this, that if we are ever to get an amendment to the rules of the Senate we should endeavor to get it very early in the session.

That is why I say if we wish to do anything about it, we must do it now.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 1, page 597, he is quoted as saying that he would try to bring about a change in the rules. I say he was sincere in that statement. That statement was honestly made. He tried hard, because I was doing my best to help him.

On page 598 of the RECORD of the same day he said:

> The Senator from California in the 3 years he has been privileged to serve as a Member of this body has certainly learned that unless an amendment to the rules of this nature is brought to the Senate of the United States in the early days of the session, there is no opportunity of obtaining consideration for it.
>
> If the Senator from California seems to be a little aggressive along these lines—

And he was a little—

> I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is because of the experience I have gained in this honorable body, that action should be taken early in the session.

Therefore, Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to take action early in the session. Now is the hour. This is the time to move. Do not lay the motion on the table. Let it come to a head, and we shall get rules just as the House of Representatives gets rules—possibly not quite so quickly, but we shall have rules, and get them without difficulty. In the meantime, we shall find an easy way to operate, as the House does. It has no particular rules while it is organizing, except general parliamentary rules. That is what the first Senate had, and that is what this Senate can have.

I hope the Senate will not vote to lay the motion on the table, but will, instead, in the early days of the session, have a chance to change the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired, and the Senator from Texas is recognized for 19 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, like my distinguished friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I served several terms in the House of Representatives, and I have great respect for that body. But God forbid that there will come a time when we turn the Senate into a House of Representatives or the House of Representatives into a Senate. Each body was conceived to fulfill a specific function and it would not serve the country for either to trespass on the other. We will not stay within our own proper function if we merely search for an easy way to operate as has been suggested.

Mr. President, I believe the issue which is before the Senate today involves the most difficult decision that any Senator will be called upon to make during the entire session.

It is an issue upon which feelings are strong and honorable men differ deeply. Attitudes cut across party lines and separate men who are otherwise together.

Some years ago I anticipated the type of situation in which there is no clear-cut viewpoint divided within the customary groupings of the Senate. This is an occasion which always brings great difficulties to a man who occupies a position of leadership.

Speaking to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I outlined to them my concept of how I could properly act under such circumstances. I said, and I quote:

> In those instances where we may disagree I will state and vote my disagreement. But I will do my utmost at the same time to protect the rights of those with whom I disagree.

In my opinion, we have reached a position where no one man can fully express the views of all the Members of the Senate or all of the Members on either side of the aisle. In this situation I have tried to carry out my pledge—a pledge which covers not just my colleagues on this side of the aisle but all of the Members of the Senate.

I have sought to work out conditions of debate in which every Member will have the fullest opportunity to present his views. This, of course, is purely a procedural question. There are a number of courses which could have been followed.

Without the unanimous-consent agreement it would have been possible to shut off debate at any time—even immediately following the presentation of the motion by the junior Senator from New Mexico—and bring the motion to a vote. This might have brought everything to a close immediately but it would not have been in accord with the rights Senators should have to state their views.

As the situation now stands, everyone has the right to present his case under reasonable conditions worked out by reasonable men. At the end of the presentation, the Senate itself can vote and can decide.

With that responsibility fulfilled to the extent of my capacity, I now have an obligation to state my attitude as a United States Senator toward this question which involves the nature of our Senate and the conditions under which we will legislate for many years to come.

These views are my own as an elected Senator for the State of Texas. I do not seek to impose them on anyone else as I am sure that other Senators do not seek to impose their views upon me.

My viewpoint does not reflect my attitude toward any specific piece of legislation. My concept of the rules of the Senate remains the same regardless of whether I favor or oppose any bill to which they may be applied.

I believe in taking the bitter with the sweet. If the rules operate against me, I shall never complain; and if they operate in my favor, I shall never exalt. I consider the rules a stabilizing force—and they must be stable if we are to maintain our social and economic freedom in this rapidly changing world.

I do not believe that those who favor this motion will contend that they are primarily interested in the nature of the Senate as a continuing body. Their move is being made for one reason and one reason only.

They seek through the continuing body issue to reach rule 22 today. They seek through rule 22 to reach civil-rights legislation which they insist cannot be passed by any other means.

I do not question the sincerity of their procedures or their objectives. But I think they are wrong—and that their proposal, if successful, could open the way to legislative turmoil and could produce a weapon that could be used with frightening consequences against the minorities in our Nation.

However irksome it may be at times, I think we will all agree that the procedures of the Senate are designed to protect minorities under all circumstances. Sometimes minorities have used these procedures foolishly and sometimes wisely. But we do not substitute wisdom for folly by granting a majority the right to override the minority at any time.

In this instance, we are asked to abandon our traditional safeguards of minority rights in order to get legislation which might protect a minority under specific circumstances—and then again might not. I am not opposed to legislation just because it is experimental. But I am opposed to paying too high a price for experimenting—too high in terms of sacrificing traditional protection for freedom.

Furthermore, I cannot agree with the contention that rule 22 prevents the Senate from acting on any subject within its proper jurisdiction.

It has been my experience in the Congress that a truly determined and united majority cannot be blocked from exercising its will. A majority that is frustrated should reexamine its position and it will find a proper and constructive path for action.

For these reasons, I am compelled to oppose this effort to upset a concept under which the Senate has operated for 168 years. I agree with those urging this course of action that longevity alone is no reason to maintain a procedure.

But it is a reason to stop and ask ourselves whether the change is proper, whether the change is necessary, and whether it will enrich, rather than impoverish, our national life.

Within the limits of the material I have been able to find, I cannot see any shadow of doubt as to the continuing nature of the Senate.

This is apparent from the expressed philosophy of the men who wrote the Constitution; from the 6-year terms and the rotational service which leave us at all times with a quorum able to transact business.

This fact is so apparent that it is not now seriously challenged by those who are pursuing this course of argument. Instead, they are claiming that the continuity of the Senate does not include the continuity of the rules and that article I, section 5, of the Constitution requires the Senate in each Congress to adopt its rules anew.

I am not a lawyer and I do not pretend to be an expert on constitutional interpretation. But I cannot see that the language of article I, section 5—which is written in exceptionally clear English—provides for any such thing. It merely states:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

There is nothing here which gives any shadow of substance to the belief that we must act upon our rules every 2 years. Trying as hard as I can, I can find no other interpretation except that we have the right to determine our rules without regard to any other parliamentary body.

Had there been any other intention, the men who wrote the Constitution—men who had a tremendous capacity to express themselves—would certainly have said so. And had they intended to establish the novel and precedent-breaking concept that a continuing body must change its rules every 2 years, they could hardly have failed to notice the clear lack of any such expression in the document they were drafting for the permanent guidance of the United States.

It seems to me that this point is clear and accepted by practically every authority. I will cite only one, although it would be a simple matter to find others.

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, for many years editor of the annotated volume of the Constitution published periodically by the Library of Congress, is an outstanding authority. He says:

> The Senate is a continuing body. * * * Hence its rules remain in force from Congress to Congress except as they are changed from time to time, whereas those of the House are readopted at the outset of each new Congress.

We can, of course, change the rules at any time a sufficient number of Senators desire to do so. To insist that they cannot be changed because the present cloture rule is inadequate does not accord with our history. The fact remains that a Senate which had no cloture rule at all was able to write and adopt a cloture rule.

And the cloture rule to which I refer was adopted without going around Robin Hood's barn to obtain a ruling that the Senate is not a continuing body.

I cannot see the prudence of now opening the Senate to a prolonged and chaotic period by making a decision which would deprive us of all of our rules and all of the things that go with those rules, including our committee structure.

If we were to find ourselves in such a situation, I am afraid we might lose our power to act—and the loss might be much more than temporary.

I am well aware of the problems that have arisen in our country that the proponents of this motion seek to solve. I agree with them that effective methods should be found to solve those problems—methods that guarantee justice and the preservation of our free institutions.

But there is no solution in abandoning a rule that was designed specifically to protect minorities. We do not add to the sum total of human freedoms by exchanging one protection which we know works for another which at best is only speculative.

We are being asked for a ruling that the Senate is a discontinuing body insofar as its rules are concerned, and this course could have unforeseen and troublesome consequences. We are being asked to abandon a reasonable freedom of debate, a freedom which once rescued one of the most basic of our liberties, the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. President, it is my belief that this Congress can act effectively on any proposed legislation that is within its legitimate sphere. Hasty or ill-conceived action that does not accord with the realities within our Nation will encounter stern and unrelenting opposition.

But I have great faith in the ability of reasonable men to find a solution to any problem, no matter how grave it may be. And the solution does not require that a majority have the right to ride roughshod over a minority.

But the rules of the Senate are a bulwark against rash action by a temporary majority. No one needs such a bulwark more than the minorities.

I should like to remind my colleagues, Mr. President, that while we are a temporary majority today, we may be a minority tomorrow; and we may be protecting that minority by the rules of the Senate which are denounced today.

There are times, of course, when such a bulwark may be vexatious and irksome. But I know of no way to write a rule which can be applied in some cases and withheld in other cases.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the rules of the Senate cannot be conducted on the basis of a popularity contest, changing with every stray gust of wind from all points of the political compass. I hope that a majority of my colleagues in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, will subscribe to that view. But whatever their view, I wish to congratulate each and every Senator for the dignity and the reason with which he has approached the debate on this question.

I say with great pride that as a young Member I sat in this body and heard the then distinguished majority leader, Senator Taft, perform his duty to protect the rules of the Senate by moving to table a similar motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. That was 4 years ago. The motion to table was made on the instruction of the Republican conference, with, as I recall Senator Taft saying, only one dissenting voice. As I further recall, there were only a few dissenting votes when the vote was taken in the Senate.

There is an old saying that if you know you are right, and you just keep a-coming, no gun can stop you.

It was with great pride that I listened to the eloquence of the minority leader when he pleaded for reason and sanity and due process in order that a majority of the Senate may work its way, but work its way under the rules the Senate has laid down.

I urge that my motion to lay on the table be supported.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case, N. J.	Flanders
Allott	Case, S. Dak.	Frear
Anderson	Chavez	Fulbright
Barrett	Church	Goldwater
Beall	Clark	Gore
Bennett	Cooper	Green
Bible	Cotton	Hayden
Bricker	Curtis	Hennings
Bridges	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Bush	Dirksen	Hill
Butler	Douglas	Holland
Byrd	Dworshak	Hruska
Capehart	Eastland	Humphrey
Carlson	Ellender	Ives
Carroll	Ervin	Jackson
Jenner	McCarthy	Russell
Johnson, Tex.	McClellan	Saltonstall
Johnston, S. C.	McNamara	Schoeppel
Kefauver	Monroney	Scott
Kennedy	Morse	Smathers
Kerr	Morton	Smith, Maine
Knowland	Mundt	Smith, N. J.
Kuchel	Murray	Sparkman
Langer	Neuberger	Stennis
Lausche	O'Mahoney	Symington
Long	Pastore	Talmadge
Magnuson	Payne	Thurmond
Malone	Potter	Thye
Mansfield	Purtell	Watkins
Martin, Iowa	Revercomb	Williams
Martin, Pa.	Robertson	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair restate the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON.]

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—55

Barrett	Byrd	Daniel
Bennett	Capehart	Dirksen
Bible	Carlson	Dworshak
Bricker	Case, S. Dak.	Eastland
Bridges	Cotton	Ellender
Butler	Curtis	Ervin
Frear	Kerr	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Knowland	Schoeppel
Goldwater	Langer	Scott
Gore	Long	Smathers
Green	Malone	Sparkman
Hayden	Martin, Pa.	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Talmadge
Hill	McClellan	Thurmond
Holland	Monroney	Watkins
Hruska	Mundt	Williams
Jenner	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Robertson	
Johnston, S. C.	Russell	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Hennings	Morton
Allott	Humphrey	Murray
Anderson	Ives	Neuberger
Beall	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Bush	Kefauver	Pastore
Carroll	Kennedy	Payne
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Potter
Chavez	Lausche	Purtell
Church	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Clark	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Martin, Iowa	Symington
Douglas	McNamara	Thye
Flanders	Morse	

NOT VOTING—2

Neely	Wiley

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from New Mexico was laid on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ARTICLES PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, an article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

A series of articles entitled "Senator McCARTHY Reports to the People of Wisconsin."

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, January 5, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy Reports to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 4, 1957

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, from time to time I plan to send to the people of Wisconsin a series of reports. I hope to cover topics of current interest so as to give them a clearer idea of the work we are doing in Washington.

I hold in my hand now the reports already made, comprising 11, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT No. 1

The first major legislation on the Senate calendar this year is the Harris bill which seeks to remove direct Federal controls over natural gas production. This bill has stirred up an unusual amount of public interest since it will affect the household budgets of millions of gas consumers.

I am supporting the Harris bill because I believe that our free enterprise system, which the bill promotes, not only safeguards our liberties, but also is the best protection we have against high prices. If the Harris bill is passed, it will mean cheaper gas for the home-user.

The gas producing industry is not a monopoly. There are over 8,000 producers of natural gas, not one of whom supplies over 5 percent of the market. Beyond this, gas producers must compete for the fuel market with producers of coal and oil. The gas production business is thus highly competitive and does not need Federal regulation.

Now, how will the removal of Federal controls affect your gas bill? First, it should be noted that the field price of gas (which

opponents of the Harris bill want to regulate) is only a very small part of the customer's gas bill. To illustrate this point: The cost of gas to the average Wisconsin family is $74.62 a year; but if the gas producer should give away his product—if gas were free—this average family would save only $4.96 a year. (The major portion of the consumer's gas bill goes to those who transport and distribute the gas.) The prices charged by those who transport the gas would still be regulated under the Harris bill.

The aim of the Harris bill is to reduce the price of gas to the home-user by increasing the supply of gas.

The principal reason for the recent increase in the price of gas is that increases in the supply of gas have not kept pace with the increased demand for it. In the last 10 years, the consumption of gas has doubled—as you know, millions of homes have converted over to gas from coal or oil. During the same period, available gas reserves have increased by only one-third. Now: when demand outstrips supply, prices will rise—it is the law of supply and demand.

But why is the supply of gas lagging so as to drive up the price the housewife must pay for gas. One of the main reasons gas prices have risen sharply in the past 2 years is Federal regulation of gas production. Federal controls—the very controls that the Harris bill seeks to remove—have discouraged the investment of risk capital that is needed for new gas discoveries. As a result, additions to gas reserves have drastically decreased. Moreover, many producers in Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana—instead of submitting to Federal regulation—have begun to divert their gas to local utilities and to nonfuel uses, such as the manufacture of carbon black. This also cut down the supply of gas available to home-users in Wisconsin.

If Federal controls are kept on, the present trend is bound to continue: Less and less gas will be added to present reserves, and more and more of the gas that is available will be diverted for local use in the gas-producing States. This means that the Wisconsin housewife will have to pay higher and higher prices for gas, and it may mean, in the not too distant future, that the gas supply to the Midwest will be cut off altogether.

The Harris bill seeks to prevent this from happening.

In the event a gas producer corners some section of the market and tries to hike his price above the market level, the Harris bill provides adequate protection. It prevents any producer from selling gas in interstate commerce at higher than the reasonable market price.

If the Harris gas bill is passed it will mean more gas which in turn will mean cheaper gas for the housewife.

Finally, I fear that Federal regulation of this competitive industry is a step toward socializing our entire economy. If gas production is subjected to Federal regulation, there is no logical reason not to regulate coal and oil production. And if all fuel production is regulated, why stop there? Why not impose Federal controls on the production of cheese and milk? To prevent the socialization of our country, I believe Americans must stand together and oppose the attempts of the planners and the socialists to pick off competitive industries, one by one.

JANUARY 26, 1956.

REPORT NO. 2

The fabulous case of *U. S.* v. *Hughes*, concluded last week in New York, indicates the unconscionable lengths to which powerful Liberals in this country have gone, and will still go, in order to discredit and defame those who are attempting to expose the Communist conspiracy.

The United States prosecuting attorney, in his opening statement at the Hughes trial, described the case as "one of the most fantastic schemes * * * in all the annals of political intrigue." This was, if anything, an understatement.

Paul Hughes came to my office late in 1953 seeking a job. I never saw the man; but members of my staff interviewed him, and turned down his application. He then went to a number of prominent Liberals, posing as a McCarthy investigator. The Liberals paid him handsomely for a mountain of scandalous and defamatory information about me and the committee—information that is now admitted to be completely false. (An example of this sort of information Hughes peddled: The McCarthy committee maintained an arsenal of submachine guns and Lugers in a secret cache in the Senate Office Building.) All in all, the anti-anti-Communists paid their "secret spy" $10,800 for such information, in an effort that they now admit was designed to eliminate MCCARTHY.

The names of the men who were involved in this attempt to defame a committee of the United States Senate and its chairman read like a who's who of my leading political opponents over the past 6 years: Joseph L. Rauh, chairman of the ADA; Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Democrat National Committee and editor of the Democratic Digest; Telford Taylor, chairman of the National Committee for an Effective Congress (which masterminded the censure movement); James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post; Philip Graham, James Wiggins, Alfred Friendly, publisher, editor, and managing editor, respectively, of the Washington Post; and Paul Porter, partner of the law firm of Arnold, Fortas, and Porter, attorneys for Owen Lattimore.

The main issue in the Hughes trial was whether Rauh and his cohorts knew that the information they paid for was false—or whether, through their unreasoning hatred of MCCARTHY and congressional investigating committees, they had been duped into believing that Hughes' manifestly ridiculous reports were authentic. The verdict, which resulted in the freeing of Hughes, indicates that an impartial jury believed the Liberals were in the plot as deeply as Hughes. Hughes was indicted for perjury on six counts. Four of them charged that he had lied when he told a grand jury that several of these Liberals were involved in an attempt to get Harvey Matusow to repudiate his testimony against Communists. The other two counts charged that Hughes lied when he testified that Rauh knew that fictitious documents furnished by Hughes were indeed fictitious, and that Rauh knew that the name "Bill Decker," which was affixed to the documents as an attesting witness, was a fictitious name, and was in reality an alias for Paul Hughes.

On 2 of the 4 counts involving Matusow, the jury voted unanimously to acquit Hughes; on the other 2 it split. On the remaining 2 counts, involving Rauh, chairman of the ADA, the jury voted 11 to 1 that Hughes had not lied when he said Rauh was aware that the documents were fraudulent.

Even if the Liberals are to be believed when they claim they were innocent dupes (which the jury verdict makes difficult), they stand convicted of hypocrisy and duplicity of the worst sort. For years they have attempted to frighten the American people with concocted stories about paid secret informers; then, on their own showing, they turn around and hire one of their own. For years they have railed against smearing people on the basis of unsubstantiated evidence; yet on their own showing, Rauh and Fritchey paid $10,800 for smear material to an impostor whose credentials they never bothered to verify. For years they have piously pleaded for fair play in politics; yet on their own showing they paid thousands of dollars for such items of advice from Hughes as that "MCCARTHY will not be defeated by extensive use of fair play (or) squeamishness"—and that a Senate committee and its chairman can be discredited only by relaxing somewhat on ethics.

I am convinced that the full truth behind this ugly attempt to discredit a Senate committee has not yet been revealed—that probably many prominent people are involved beyond those already named. I believe, therefore, that a congressional committee ought to be instructed to investigate the entire matter. I wonder if you agree with me. Since I want you to have all the facts, I regret that space does not permit more than a brief explanation of the case in this letter. A detailed and revealing account of the case can be found in the February 8 and February 15 issues of National Review magazine, 211 East 37th Street, New York City.

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

REPORT NO. 3

Since the Senate is now debating the farm bill recommended by the Senate Agriculture Committee, I want to devote this letter to the farm problem.

I am seeking to amend this proposed legislation, so that the bill will provide for a mandatory 90 percent support price for dairy products, and will thus give dairy farmers the same benefits as other farmers. As the bill now stands, basic commodities, such as corn, cotton, tobacco, etc., must be supported at 90 percent of parity, while dairy products may be supported at as low as 80 percent of parity, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that all farmers should be treated equally, irrespective of what they produce.

As regards the general question of fixed price supports, I continue to believe they are desirable—until such time as just and sensible steps are taken to bring farm production into line with consumption of farm products. I have always felt that President Eisenhower was right when he said in Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, that high, fixed price supports are in the nature of a "moral and legal commitment which must be upheld." Over the past 15 years the farm community has been encouraged by the Government to commit maximum manpower, maximum natural resources, maximum plant and machinery, toward the objective of maximum production. Farmers have made these long-range commitments—often against their best judgment as to the volume of production the domestic market would bear—on their understanding that the Government would see to it that whatever they produced would be bought at fair prices. It seems to me that when the Government suddenly yanks out the rug, and thus defeats the farmer's expectations, it is, in effect, repudiating a moral contract with the farm community.

My own belief is that farmers should get 100 percent supports if they are to receive their fair share of the national income; but since 90 percent supports are the best we can get this year, I shall vote for supports at that level.

What I cannot understand, however, is why the committee should have decided that producers of corn, cotton, tobacco, milling wheat, etc., are entitled to mandatory 90 percent supports, but that producers of dairy commodities are not. Why the discrimination against dairy farmers? Certainly such discrimination cannot be justified by comparing how, say, corn producers have fared under the Benson flexible support policy with how milk producers have fared under that policy. We all know that the Benson policies have had a disastrous effect on the net income of the producers of basic commodities. But the Benson flexible support policy has had the same kind of effect on the income of dairy farmers.

In April 1954 Secretary Benson decided to reduce the support price for dairy products to 75 percent of parity. You know the effect that decision had on the income of Wisconsin farmers who are, primarily, dairy farmers. In 1953, with a 90 percent support price, the average farm family in eastern Wisconsin earned $3,760 net. In 1954, with the Benson low supports in effect, the average family earned only $3,321 net—a drop of 11 percent. In the same period the net income of the average western Wisconsin farmer dropped from $3,159 to $2,494—a decrease of 21 percent. I have been unable to obtain 1955 statistics from the Department of Agriculture, but we all know that the same dreary situation prevailed last year.

Now, if it is true that the tragic consequences of Secretary Benson's policies are being shared by the dairy farmer—and every diary farmer knows this to be true—then why should the Congress deliberately single out dairy farmers as a group that deserves only half-way support measures? The effect of the farm bill, without my amendment, is to treat dairy farmers as though they were second-class citizens in the farm community.

(You should understand that the 80 percent floor on supports for dairy commodities, which the farm bill now authorizes, is a reasonably sure guaranty that dairy prices will be supported at no higher than 80 percent. Secretary Benson is now supporting dairy prices at 75 percent of parity, the minimum allowed by law, and thus appears determined to support dairy prices at as low a level as he can get away with.)

As for the problem of surpluses, one fact that you may not know is that the Agriculture Department is, right now, extremely slow in filling applications for dairy surpluses from charitable institutions. If these orders were filled promptly, the problem of dairy surpluses would not be as pressing as it is today. Nor do I think that the Agriculture Department has done all it might by way of encouraging hospitals, homes for the old and needy, and other charitable institutions, to apply for dairy surpluses. The demand for butter, for example, especially amongst the needy, is relatively elastic; thus if the Department adopted more liberal policies as regards the allotment of dairy surpluses to charitable institutions, we would find that more dairy products would be consumed by the needy without affecting the market price.

Also it seems to me that we have not adequately exploited the opportunities for supplying our friends abroad with our excess dairy commodities. The sorely tried people of Korea, for example, would dearly like to consume dairy products that are surplus in the United States.

Since the basic farm problem is the discrepancy between production and domestic consumption, I think that steps must be taken to reduce the production-consumption gap. But I do not believe that the whole burden of this agonizing readjustment should fall on the farmer, as has been happening under the Benson farm program.

Nor do I believe it is fair to try to lessen the suffering of some farmers, and to leave others in a state of critical depression, as the present farm bill would do. Under our Constitution, and under the American tradition, all of our citizens deserve the equal protection of our laws. This includes dairy farmers.

MARCH 5, 1956.

REPORT NO. 4

Our committee (the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations) has just completed an investigation of current United States-authorized strategic trade with the Communist nations. Since most newspapers have printed few, if any, of the hair-raising details of the committee's findings, I thought I should bring the principal facts to your attention.

The long and short of the matter is that you, the American taxpayer, are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine. This conclusion is inescapable since you are footing the bill for billions of dollars of American aid to so-called friendly nations that, in turn, are supplying highly strategic war materials to the Soviet war economy.

The committee's investigation of this matter began in 1954 under my chairmanship and has continued up to the present in the face of strenuous efforts by the executive branch to keep the story from Congress and the American people. The committee discovered that in August 1954 our Government made secret concessions to our allies as regards what they could ship to the Communist bloc without losing American aid. As a result of these concessions, over 200 highly strategic items—such as machine tools, metals, and electronics, transportation and electrical equipment—were removed from the anti-Communist embargo.

I list below a few examples of the materials we agreed to let countries receiving United States aid ship to Soviet Russia, together with an indication of their strategic value.

Electric-power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts, turbines up to 85,000 horsepower, and motors up to 12,500 horsepower: This electrical equipment is used in making fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

Horizontal boring mills: These machine tools, which cost between $200,000 and $500,000 each, are used in making tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, and atomic reactors such as those used on the submarine *Nautilus*.

Vertical boring mills: Essential in making jet engines.

Dynamic balancing machines: Used in making jet engines and guided missiles.

External cylindrical grinding machines: Used in making guided missiles and radar equipment.

Surface grinding machines: Used in making jet engine parts, guided missiles, radar equipment, and diesel engines.

High-precision boring mills: Used in making jet engine and guided missile parts.

Copper wire: Next to fissionable materials, copper is the single most strategic metal. Thousands of miles copper wire, for example, go into the engine of every bomber.

Aluminum: Indispensable in making aircraft.

Nickel alloys up to 30 percent: Used in making aircraft parts and tanks.

Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent: Used in making jet aircraft parts.

Magnesium: Used in aircraft construction and in foot-soldier equipment.

In return for these highly strategic war materials, the Communists are shipping to the free world, butter, cotton, and wood pulp.

The American people were not informed of these secret concessions to our allies; indeed, deliberate and (until our committee got on the track) successful attempts were made to conceal them. Here is how the strategic trade agreements were reported to the Nation by Harold Stassen, who was the central figure in the negotiations. The agreements, Stassen announced in the summer of 1954, "will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items."

Not content with misleading statements of a general nature, Mr. Stassen resorted to specific falsification when, as Battle Act Administrator, he made his annual report to Congress in November 1954. The following is a paragraph from Mr. Stassen's report: "Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the embargo list."

Mr. Stassen's statement, with respect to aluminum, copper wire, magnesium, and alloys of nickel and molybdenum, was simply untrue.

The seriousness of our concessions can be appreciated by taking a closer look at just one of the items being shipped to the Communists—copper. Mr. Stassen said that copper was still embargoed. He was right about unprocessed copper, but he failed to mention that the finished product, in the form of highly strategic copper wire, was taken off the embargo. The committee then learned the following additional facts: (a) Since August 1954, when the embargo was relaxed, over 200 million pounds of copper wire have been shipped to the Soviet bloc by countries receiving United States aid; (b) the principal shipper is Britain; (c) the United States is providing a direct subsidy to British copper mines in Rhodesia; moreover, (d) copper is on the United States critical stockpile list, and because it is in short supply in this country, we found it necessary during 1954 and 1955 to divert 150 million pounds of copper from our strategic stockpile for industrial use. In other words, although copper is badly needed in this country for our own war potential, we are giving the British money to mine copper, which they then turn around and sell to the Communists.

Congress provided in the Battle Act of 1951 that the President must immediately terminate United States aid to nations that ship materials of "primary strategic significance" to the Communists, or that he must immediately explain to Congress why he is not doing so. In this case, aid was not cut off, nor were the facts of the 1954 embargo revision transmitted to Congress. The way Mr. Stassen, as Battle Act Administrator, got around the Battle Act was to determine that certain obviously strategic items were not of "primary strategic importance," despite the fact they had been so regarded in the past. The executive branch thus brazenly defied the clear intent of Congress.

Later on in this session, Congress will be asked to appropriate some $5 billion for aid to nations that are now shipping the Communists strategic war materials. I intend to oppose that appropriation unless it is accompanied by an airtight guaranty that American money will not be used in the future to build the Communist war machine.

I should add that the executive branch is now studying British demands to relax the embargo against Red China. These demands must be resisted. I trust you agree with me that trading with any of our enemies, in any goods whatsoever, is contrary to American interests.

MARCH 19, 1956.

REPORT NO. 5

AGAIN GOVERNMENT BY SECRECY

The Senate hearings on strategic trade with the Communists (which I discussed in my last report) have dramatically spotlighted the still serious problem of government by secrecy. The Investigations Subcommittee, now headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, is running into the same problem that plagued committees investigating communism during the Truman administration, and that prevented this same subcommittee during my chairmanship from getting the full story behind the Peress and subversion cases.

Government by secrecy stems from the tendency of career bureaucrats, who manage to stay on in the executive branch from one administration to the next, to view themselves as all-wise rulers. The bureaucrats figure that they know much better than the elected representatives of the people what is good for the country. Therefore, they reason, it is advisable to keep Congress in the dark about matters on which Congress might oppose them.

The East-West trade controversy is an excellent case in point. The bureaucrats in the executive branch who arranged to let our

allies ship highly strategic war materials to the Communists realize that this decision is unpopular in Congress, for Congress declared its opposition to trading with the enemy in the Battle Act of 1951. Therefore, in order to forestall congressional intervention, it is important to the bureaucrats that Congress and the public not learn how and to what extent the intent of Congress has been defied.

The Executive has dropped the cloak of secrecy on two types of information sought by the subcommittee:

1. "Classified" data: The committee is asking for the complete list of strategic goods that we are permitting our allies to ship to the Communists. The bureaucracy, however, claims that the release of this information would jeopardize security. For the Executive to classify this information for security reasons is perfectly absurd. The Communists themselves have had this information since 1954. Since the Soviet Union can find out what it can buy from our allies merely by putting in a purchase order, what conceivable justification is there for keeping this information from the American people? Plainly, the liberal bureaucrats in the executive are trying to avoid embarrassment to themselves and are trying to forestall objections by Congress and the public to the continuance of American aid to countries that help build the Communist war machine.

2. "Privileged" data: The committee also wants to know who in our Government recommended that we take scores of highly strategic items off the strategic-trade-control list. But the Executive claims that the release of this information will impair the efficiency and morale of Government employees.

Before the blackout order was enforced by the Executive, the committee got the impression from Defense Department witnesses that the Defense Department was strongly opposed to decontrols. But the cloak of secrecy fell before the committee could learn the identity of those who overruled the Defense Department—or their reasons for doing so. Congress obviously needs this information: otherwise, how can Congress make an informed judgment as to whether such persons should be kept on the Government payroll?

The bureaucracy seeks to justify its position by citing the separation-of-powers doctrine. Actually, there is neither legal authority nor respectable precedent to support this interpretation of separation of powers. Present Government secrecy practices date back to the blackout orders of the Truman administration, by which Truman sought to cover up Communist infiltration of the Government. At the time of the first Truman order, it is interesting to recall, RICHARD NIXON and a host of other Senators and Congressmen charged that the order was unconstitutional and illegal.

It is, of course, impossible to include in this report all the constitutional and statutory arguments that prove that executive secrecy orders are invalid. Suffice it to cite a law passed by Congress in 1912, and reenacted in 1948. You will remember that I referred to this law on numerous occasions during the Army-McCarthy hearings:

"The right of persons employed in the Civil Service of the United States [this means all Government employees beneath Cabinet officers and assistant secretaries of the departments] * * * to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

This is the law of the land. It obviously conflicts with executive secrecy orders that forbid Government employees to give information to congressional committees. And when a statute of Congress conflicts with an Executive order, there is no question, under our Constitution, but that the statute prevails.

That is why I announced last week that I would not respect executive classification of information on strategic trade with the Communists—that I would tell the American people the truth, no matter how much the truth might embarrass the bureaucrats. That is why, also, several days later, I walked out of the hearing room when executive witnesses sought to give the committee certain information on the understanding that it would not be divulged to Congress and the people. I cannot be a party to an agreement to keep the public in the dark about the mismanagement of our Government. To do so would be to join with the bureaucrats in the conspiracy of silence against the American people.

After I walked out, the executive witness refused to talk further. That is the way the matter was left when the Senate began its Easter recess. I am hopeful that when we reconvene next week, Chairman MCCLELLAN will bring the matter to the Senate floor for a showdown resolution demanding public release of the information. The committee has let the bureaucracy know that it is fed up with government by secrecy. Let's hope the Senate as a whole will be equally firm.

The issue of government by secrecy is far more important than the immediate question of East-West trade. If bureaucratic arrogance goes unchallenged we will, for all practical purposes, have ceased to be a republic. If the bureaucracy is allowed to treat the conduct of government as its own private affair—which it may or may not tell Congress and the public about as it sees fit—we will have replaced government by the consent of the governed with government by decree of the bureaucrats.

APRIL 9, 1956.

REPORT NO. 6

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON COMMUNISM

In recent months, the Supreme Court has handed down a series of very disturbing decisions on the Communist issue. These decisions are not only very bad law, they have had the effect of seriously weakening our defenses against the Communist conspiracy. Your legislative officials, on the local, State, and National level, have attempted to construct effective barriers against Communist subversion. I am afraid that all of these anti-Communist efforts will soon be nullified unless something is done soon to check the wrecking program that has been inaugurated by the Supreme Court.

The American people will make an effective protest only if they are given the facts; therefore, I would like to discuss, very briefly, three of these decisions.

The Steve Nelson case—involving State sedition laws

Steve Nelson was a member of the national board of the National Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, when he was convicted under Pennsylvania law on subversive charges. Nelson, in the 1930's, attended the Lenin School in Moscow which is reserved for only the most promising and worthy Communists, and which stresses instructions in espionage and sabotage. Thereafter, during the entire time he was outside the United States, Nelson performed espionage for the Soviet Government. In 1933, for example, he was in China working for the Shanghai branch of the Comintern.

When he returned to America, Nelson became a top official in the United States Communist Party. Naturally we do not know the full extent of Nelson's activities. But we do know that in April 1943, he met with a top official of the NKVD in California to plan espionage activities on the West Coast, and that earlier that year he had transmitted highly secret atom-bomb information to the Soviet Union.

Nelson was finally apprehended, and convicted under Pennsylvania's Sedition Act. The Supreme Court, however, overruled the conviction on the incredible grounds that the States have no right to prosecute those who attempt to overthrow our Government by force and violence. This decision has the effect of invalidating all State antisubversion laws, including Wisconsin's criminal anarchy law. And it means that all the Communists who have been put in prison under State laws must be set free and permitted to resume their efforts to overthrow our Government.

Let us look at the two principal reasons the Supreme Court gave for its decision. The Court said, No. 1, that Congress intended to prevent the States from prosecuting Communists when it passed the Smith Act (which made it a Federal crime to advocate or to attempt the forcible overthrow of our Government).

The truth of the matter is that the title of the United States Code which contains the Smith Act includes the following very explicit provision:

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Now, what could be plainer than that? I do not see how the Supreme Court can maintain the respect of the American people when it holds that a law means the exact opposite of what it says.

The Court said, No. 2, that State prosecution of Communists interferes with Federal prosecution of Communists.

The truth of the matter is set forth in an advisory opinion submitted by the Justice Department during the hearing of the Nelson case:

"The administration of the various State laws has not in the course of the 15 years that the Federal and State sedition laws have existed side by side, in fact, interfered with, embarrassed, or impeded the enforcement of the Smith Act."

But the Supreme Court judges completely ignored that statement, apparently on the theory that they know more about the Justice Department's business than the Justice Department does. Such arrogance and arbitrariness by our highest court not only helps individual Communist leaders like Steve Nelson; it destroys public confidence in our whole judicial system—which has always been an objective of the Communist Party. Is it any wonder that the Communist Daily Worker hailed the Nelson decision as a tremendous victory?

Fortunately (due to the unique circumstances in this case), Congress may be able to overrule the Nelson decision. I have introduced a bill which restates Congress' intention to permit the States to prosecute the Communists. I am happy to be able to report, after conferring with other Senators, that the prospects are excellent that the States' constitutional right to investigate and bring to justice those involved in the Communist conspiracy will be restored during the current session.

The Slochower case—involving fifth amendment teachers

Slochower is a New York public school teacher who took the fifth amendment when asked about his Communist affiliations. His school fired him, but the Supreme Court ordered him reinstated. While this case happened to involve a New York school, it applies equally to Wisconsin schools. Therefore, let us discuss the Supreme Court's ruling in terms of its effect on the people of Wisconsin.

Let us suppose that Mr. X, a teacher in one of Milwaukee's public schools, is asked by a congressional investigating committee whether he is a member of the Communist Party. Mr. X replies: "I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate me." Now, I trust that the Milwaukee Board of Educa-

tion would decide that Mr. X is unfit to teach the children of Milwaukee—since it must be concluded from Mr. X's answer that he is either a Communist or that he lied when he took refuge in the fifth amendment. But the Supreme Court forbids the dismissal of Mr. X. Thus, under the Supreme Court ruling, we are required to entrust the education of our youth to fifth amendment-Communist teachers, and Wisconsin taxpayers are required to pay the salaries of such teachers.

The Communist Party, U. S. A. versus Subversive Activities Control Board

This was the worst decision of all. In an opinion handed down on April 30, the Supreme Court said there were not sufficient grounds for holding that the Communist Party was under the control of the Soviet Union. The decision was based on the argument of the Communist lawyers that three of the Government's witnesses were "professional informers" and thus were "unreliable." It is incomprehensible to me how the Court could have fallen for that argument in the light of the fact that literally hundreds of unimpeachable witnesses and thousands of pages of unimpeachable documentation have established beyond any possibility of doubt that the Communist Party is Moscow dominated. Moreover, Congress has officially declared the Communist Party to be an arm of the Soviet Union. But the Supreme Court professes to be unconvinced—with the result that the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is still being defied by the Communist Party.

Such decisions present a real danger to our republican form of government. The Supreme Court must somehow be made to understand that its job is to interpret our laws, not to make them. Our Constitution provides for a government of laws, made by the representatives of the people—not for a government by Supreme Court judges who assume they are a law unto themselves.

REPORT NO. 7

OLD NAME, NEW FACTS: FORT MONMOUTH

In the fall of 1953 the Senate investigating committee began a major investigation of subversion in the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth. As chairman of the committee, I stated that secret radar information had been purloined from Fort Monmouth by Soviet espionage agents, and that the committee was determined to expose the Communist spy ring that was evidently operating there. You may recall that this charge was labeled a "fraud" and a "hoax" by the Pentagon bureaucrats and their propagandists in the liberal press; the Fort Monmouth investigation, they said, was just another instance of McCarthyism. The administration then called on the Army-McCarthy hearings and succeeded in halting our investigation of communism in Government.

Now, 2½ years later the chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, Senator EASTLAND, and the subcommittee's ranking minority member, Senator JENNER, have issued a special statement asserting that the Fort Monmouth investigation was justified. The Senators' statement was based on testimony by a former Soviet officer, now living in exile in the United States, which described the "receiving end" of the Fort Monmouth espionage operation in Russia.

Soviet officer's testimony

I am devoting this newsletter to a verbatim account of the Soviet officer's testimony, not for reasons of personal vindication, which I regard as a relatively unimportant matter, but because I feel it is urgently necessary for you to appreciate the appalling success of Communist espionage operations, and thence the vital importance of disregarding the advice of those who belittle the Communist threat to our internal security.

(The questions at this hearing are asked by Robert Morris, chief counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee. The witness is described by the pseudonym of "Mr. Andriyve" in order to avoid retaliation against his family in Russia.)

"Mr. MORRIS. Were you employed in the Soviet Union during the war?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Since latter 1943 I was in the Red army, mobilized along with millions of other people, and during 1944, and probably January 1945, I was employed with the Signal Corps Military Research Institute in Moscow.

"Mr. MORRIS. Now, what were the functions of that job?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. I had the function of, I would say, examining a series of documents, all of them in foreign languages. I would say 90 percent of them of American origin and 10 percent of British and French origin."

Documents obtained by secret police

"Mr. MORRIS. Where did those documents come from?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. I received them from the secret police section. A batch of the documents would be given to me practically every day for perusal, examination, and determination of their nature, that is, technical nature, with the task to determine how should they be channeled among the Soviet institutions. Part of the documents had to do with high-power super-high-frequency and ultra-high-frequency tubes that are used for radar.

"Mr. MORRIS. Now, was there anything to indicate the point of origin of these documents? You say 90 percent came from the United States?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Yes; 90 percent came from the United States—very many were printed on Soviet photopaper. So we could safely assume that the microfilms got into Russia from America and were developed and enlarged at some local Soviet level.

"Mr. MORRIS. Now, what were some of the places they originated?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Honestly, it is already 12 years after the event, and I forgot a lot except for maybe, two, both of them because I saw them quite often on the documents. One is Fort Monmouth and the other is RCA.

"Mr. MORRIS. Is there anything more you can tell us about the Fort Monmouth documents? Did they appear in quantity?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. I would say, yes; in quantity."

Reds continued to get secret radar data from Fort Monmouth

"Mr. MORRIS. And what year was this, now?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. That was 1944. After 1944 I was transferred to other business, doing other business within the radar part. But I saw a friend of mine who was doing the same type of work—I saw him repeatedly in 1945—and we talked on the general state of affairs of his work and my work, so he said that the flow of documents continued.

"Mr. MORRIS. And were they contemporaneous documents; I mean, did the dates that appeared thereon indicate they were freshly acquired?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Yes, sir; the documents I dealt with were fresh and sometimes very fresh.

"Mr. MORRIS. Now, were there any photographs involved? Of equipment?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Equipment; oh, yes; very much."

"Thousands" of "classified" documents were stolen

"Mr. MORRIS. Did any of these documents bear a classification mark 'secret,' 'top secret,' 'confidential'?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Very many of them had classification marks. I would say the vast majority had some classification, either 'secret' or 'top secret' or 'confidential.'

"Mr. MORRIS. And you say that these [classified] documents appeared in great numbers?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MORRIS. I know it is a hard thing, but I wonder if you could estimate approximately how many were turned over to your section by the secret police?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. Thousands.

"Mr. MORRIS. And how they came into your possession you do not know, except for the fact they were given to you by the secret police?

"Mr. ANDRIYVE. I had no way of knowing that. The only thing I could tell you, was just in a facetious vein, we would tell to the secret police officer, 'Where did you steal them?' and he would say, "Shut up; it is none of your business. Your business is to try to find out how to use them, and it is our business how to get them.' "

It was the business of our committee back in 1953 to find out how the Communists were getting our radar secrets. But after we had brought about the suspension of 33 security risks, and were on the trail of the higher ups who were responsible for the Fort Monmouth situation, the Pentagon bureaucrats intervened and said, in effect, "Shut up, it is none of your business." We now have a clearer idea of why it was so important to highly placed individuals in the Federal bureaucracy to call off the Fort Monmouth and other anti-Communist investigations. We have a clearer idea of why it was important to them to provoke the Army-McCarthy hearings, and thus to divert public attention from espionage at Fort Monmouth.

I hope the American people will learn from this lesson, and will never again listen to those who try to discredit efforts to expose the Communist conspiracy. Remember: the Soviet espionage apparatus still flourishes in America. The Red agents who were responsible for the immense volume of stolen information described by Mr. Andriyve (only a small part of which, we must assume, came to Mr. Andriyve's attention) have never been apprehended and are still operating.

REPORT NO. 8

MORE AID TO TITO?

On June 28, I introduced an amendment to this year's mutual aid bill calling for the immediate termination of American aid to Communist Yugoslavia. I introduced the amendment because I believe that it makes no sense to include in our foreign aid program—which is designed to fight world communism—an appropriation of $65 million in military and economic assistance to a Communist country that has said it will be an ally of Soviet Russia for all time to come.

Unfortunately, the attempt to deny Tito the use of American money was defeated in the Senate by a 50 to 38 vote. The Senate decided to leave the Yugoslav question to the executive branch, which has already indicated that it favors continuing American aid to this Communist country. Believing that Americans who are aware of the facts will be opposed to further Yugoslav aid, I want to set forth in this newsletter what I believe to be the relevant facts in this controversy. I hope that you will see fit to write the President and advise him of your views.

The lost gamble

Over the past 5 years we have poured into Communist Yugoslavia $946 million of American taxpayers' money in order to build up Tito's military machine and bolster his economy. We have subsidized Tito on the theory that with our help, he would make his alleged break with the Kremlin permanent. That policy was always a gamble, at best; now it is perfectly clear, after Tito's recent visit to Moscow, that the gamble has been lost. I quote now the statement made

by Yugoslavia's Communist dictator when he arrived in Moscow.

The Tito-Kremlin alliance

Referring to the temporary break between Communist Russia and Communist Yugoslavia, Tito said, "We were greatly pained, but we believed that the time would come when everything separating us would be overcome and when our friendship would receive a new and still more firm foundation. This time has come, thanks to the Leninist policy of government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"The arrival of Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan and others in Belgrade, the talks with them, the declaration which was drawn up on that occasion, and afterward the courageous and farsighted foreign policy of the collective leadership of the Soviet Union are, in my profound conviction, a guaranty that nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

And at the end of his speech, Tito cried, "Long live the Soviet Union! Long live the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia!"

Yet, incredibly, our State Department is requesting an additional $65 million in military and economic aid for Yugoslavia. It is asking for more aid, even though our reward for past aid has been Tito's public profession of the Marxist-Leninist faith and of his solidarity with the Soviet Union.

The meaning of Tito's statement

It should be obvious to all that when Tito says that Russia and Yugoslavia are now marching together along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is saying that Russia and Yugoslavia are marching together toward their joint goal of destroying the United States. But some of those in our Government seem to forget what Leninism means. In 1848, in the Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx said that bloody revolutions were necessary in all countries of the world except England and the United States. Marx made it clear that England and the United States were to be communized but felt that it could be done by Communist infiltration of the governments from within. In 1914, however, Nikolai Lenin corrected Marx, and said that bloody revolutions would be necessary in the United States and England as well as in other countries. Ever since, it has been a cardinal principle of Leninism—which Tito professes to be following—that the Communist world must bring about a bloody revolution in the United States. I do not understand why American taxpayers should be asked to finance and bolster the dictatorship of men like Tito who has declared that he is for Leninism, which means he is for a revolution in America to establish a Communist dictatorship here.

The reasons for the State Department's policy

In my mind, the reasons the State Department gives for its policy of continued aid to Yugoslavia are even more fantastic than the policy itself. First, Secretary of State Dulles says that if we cut off American aid we might drive the Yugoslavs back into the camp of the Russians. That statement was made a full 3 weeks after Tito proclaimed an eternal alliance with the Kremlin—which would seem to have put him about as far into the Russian camp as he could get. It would appear that Mr. Dulles and his advisers do not even read the newspapers.

Second, Dulles says that we must continue American aid because we do not want to make the Yugoslav economy dependent on the Russian economy. This kind of reasoning is fairly typical of the State Department; yet it baffles me. If Yugoslavia is a firm ally of the Soviet Union—as, of course, it is—why is it an advantage to America to drain off American wealth into Yugoslavia instead of Russian wealth?

Third, Mr. Dulles argues that Yugoslavia is not subservient to Soviet Russia, as are the other countries of eastern Europe. In other words, Dulles says that while we should not give aid to a satellite of our enemy, it is all right to give aid to an ally of our enemy. Precisely the same argument could have been made during the Second World War in favor of giving American aid to Japan on the grounds that Japan, though allied with Nazi Germany, was not subservient to Nazi Germany. But anyone who would have made such a statement at that time would have been hooted out of town. What is the difference between that case and the one confronting us today? Surely everyone recognizes that we are at war with the Communist world. How can our Secretary of State recommend that we give financial assistance to one of our Communist enemies? To be sure, the war is a cold war today; but in all of the crucial diplomatic battles, Yugoslavia supports the Soviet Union. And if the war should become a hot one, we have it on the word of Marshal Zhukov that Communist Russia will be shoulder to shoulder with Communist Yugoslavia in any future war. I am sure that if American men ever fall victim to Yugoslav bullets, they will not be able to derive much consolation from the fact the bullets were fired by a Soviet ally rather than by a Soviet satellite.

The attempt to cut off aid to nations shipping war material to the Communists

Of course, it also makes no sense to give American aid to nations that ship strategic war materials to the Soviet bloc. I devoted my newsletter of March 19, 1956, to this subject, pointing out that our so-called allies were shipping machine tools and metals to Soviet Russia that are used to make hydrogen bombs, jet planes, guided missiles, and other equipment for the Communist war machine. Since these nations, notably Great Britain, have been receiving huge financial subsidies from the United States, the result is that American taxpayers are indirectly financing the construction of the Communist war machine. Therefore, I introduced another amendment to the foreign-aid bill providing that no nation that shipped strategic war materials to the Soviet bloc could receive American aid. The McCarthy amendment on strategic war materials was supported by 22 other Senators, but was rejected after a vigorous floor fight.

As the result of these Senate actions, I was forced to vote against this year's foreign-aid bill. I favor aid to our fighting allies in the Far East such as the Republic of China, South Korea, southern Vietnam, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines, but the foreign-aid bill is a package deal by which all requested aid must be voted for, or none of it. I could not bring myself to vote for a package that included such items as aid to Tito, aid to Nehru, and aid to countries that ship strategic war materials to the Communist bloc.

REPORT NO. 9

CONGRESS WINDS UP

Congress packed a large volume of legislation into its closing days, most of which (with the exception of the foreign-aid appropriation) I favored. I was especially glad that my amendments to the Rivers and Harbors bill, which authorized the construction of new dock and harbor facilities at Port Washington, Prairie du Chien, and Milwaukee, were passed. I feel this legislation will bring substantial benefits to the people of southeastern and southwestern Wisconsin.

I am also gratified that the Social Security Act was extended and improved, though I feel that if my amendments had been adopted, the new legislation would have been better still. These amendments would have reduced the retirement age of women to 60 and of men to 62, and would have increased the amount of money a person may earn, and still be eligible for retirement benefits, from $100 to $150 per month.

There was considerable interest during the social security debate in the proposal to provide disability benefits at age 50. I voted against this proposal, though with considerable misgivings. I strongly favor the idea of helping those who cannot earn a living because of physical disability, but I was convinced that the bill, as drafted, was undesirable for three reasons: (1) It contained no workable definition of "disability," and thus invited fraud on the part of persons who are not really disabled; (2) it limited the benefits to persons who are 50 years of age or over, whereas I believe that we should help anybody who is really disabled, regardless of age; (3) I don't believe that disability payments should be taken from social security funds, but should be taken from the general Treasury fund. I plan to urge improved legislation during the next session of Congress, which will put into effect the principle of aiding all disabled persons.

The Stassen affair

I have long felt that I should publicly express regret for having suported Harold Stassen in the 1948 presidential campaign. Stassen's unsavory attempt to dump Vice President NIXON is only the last in a long series of actions that, in my opinion, qualify Stassen as one of the most contemptible politicians of our era. His recent career has been such that I have had to oppose Stassen at nearly every turn since 1952, but the NIXON episode is final proof that anyone who ever thought well of Stassen was sadly deluded.

I call Stassen's attack on NIXON unsavory, not because he is opposing a man who I happen to think has done a good job, but because the attack obviously has the single purpose of promoting Harold Stassen's personal political fortunes—whatever may be the cost to the Republican Party and to the Nation. Harold Stassen is obsessed by an overpowering ambition to become President. As for his methods—anything goes that promises to place Stassen's name in the limelight.

Stassen's secret poll

Take, for example, the so-called secret poll that, according to Stassen, showed that the Republican ticket would run 6 percent stronger with Gov. Christian Herter of Massachusetts as the Vice Presidential candidate than with NIXON. It is impossible to believe that Stassen was telling the truth about this poll. Whether the poll was never taken, or Stassen lied about the results of it, I do not know. But it is inconceivable that Governor Herter, whom a vast majority of Americans had never heard of, would have run ahead of a man who is known by all Americans and well liked by most of them. Other polls bear out this conclusion. For example, a Roper poll, taken about the time of Stassen's alleged poll, asked the question: "If Eisenhower decides not to run, whom would you like to see as the Republican Presidential candidate?" NIXON was selected by 12 percent of those who indicated a choice; Herter by barely 1 percent.

A reputation for untruthfulness

There were other reasons that prompted Washington observers to conclude that Stassen's poll was a "phony." Stassen had been known to falsify the facts before. He falsified the facts, both in his official reports to Congress and in his testimony before a Senate committee, in an effort to cover up the fact that the United States was permitting its allies to ship strategic war materials to Communist nations. I quote from the Senate Investigations Committee's official report on East-West trade (p. 46):

"The Battle Act Administrator, Mr. Stassen, in 1954 misstated the facts in his Fifth Battle Act Report, when he reported: 'Miner-

als and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power, such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the embargo list.' In this and other portions of the Fifth Battle Act Report, Mr. Stassen misrepresented the facts, which thus misled the Congress and the American people. Moreover, when he testified before this subcommittee, Mr. Stassen appeared to be an arrogant, evasive, and uncandid witness. The subcommittee feels that Mr. Stassen is to be severely criticized for his conduct in this matter."

It is no wonder, in the light of his record, that the motives for Stassen's attack on NIXON have been suspect. Moreover, Stassen's pose of martyrdom in the face of almost universal criticism of his actions, fools no one. Those who know Harold Stassen know that he has never been a martyr to any "cause" except his own.

Stassen's real motivations

What, then, does Stassen hope to gain for himself? For one thing, Stassen believes that if he should succeed in dumping NIXON, there is a good possibility that the vice presidential nomination will be his. He knows that the leftwing of the Republican Party wants desperately to get rid of NIXON, and he believes that if NIXON is dumped, the triumphant leftwingers will be in a mood to reward the man who led the dumping campaign. The fact that the Herter-for-Vice President campaign is, in reality, a Stassen-for-Vice President campaign is amply demonstrated in the following news item. Referring to the "Herter headquarters" set up by Stassen, a Washington newspaper reported:

"Heading up the volunteer crew at the 'Ike and Chris' headquarters is H. Brooks Baker * * * who also serves as chairman of 'Young Americans for Eisenhower First, and Stassen Second'."

(I should add, in case there are any doubts about it, that this organization was set up several months ago, under Stassen's auspices, to drum up support for making Stassen the vice presidential candidate.)

Actually, however, Stassen is not placing all of his bets on getting the vice presidential nomination this year. He is probably playing for much higher stakes. Stassen knows that at the present time there is no "heir apparent" to President Eisenhower as the leader of the leftwing of the GOP. There are many who aspire to that title besides Stassen—Sherman Adams, Milton Eisenhower, Tom Dewey, Paul Hoffman, to name a few. But none has yet definitely emerged as the man who will be the leftwing's leader when President Eisenhower leaves office. Stassen believes that his attack on NIXON will give him a large head start over his rivals. Stassen believes, moreover, that the leftwingers will control the Republican Party in the future, and that in 1960 or 1964, they will be disposed to make "the hero of the anti-Nixon campaign" the GOP presidential candidate. Stassen figures there is no better way to ingratiate himself with the leftwingers than to lead a fight against NIXON, a man whom the leftwingers fear and dislike. His chances will be especially good, Stassen believes, if an Eisenhower-Nixon ticket should be defeated in November. In that event, the leftwingers will place the blame for a Republican defeat on NIXON, and Stassen will be hailed as the man who called the turn, and thus the man who should be nominated for President in 1960.

These, I firmly believe, are Harold Stassen's real motivations. It is likely, however, that Stassen will fall victim to his own overpowering ambition. I think that the Republican Party and the American people will reward his dump-Nixon efforts by dumping Stassen himself into political oblivion, which is where he has belonged for some time.

REPORT NO. 10

AMERICAN MONEY TO COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA

Recent events in Eastern Europe show that we must begin giving American aid to anti-Communist elements in the satellite countries, and halt all aid to Communist regimes such as the Tito government in Yugoslavia.

The uprisings in Poland and Hungary are eloquent proof that the spirit of freedom still lives in the Communist world and that the captive peoples are determined to throw off their chains. We must give all possible assistance to the gallant efforts of the Polish and Hungarian people to rid their countries of their Communist oppressors.

At the same time we must halt aid to Tito. It certainly makes no sense to send arms and economic aid to Tito while we fail to send arms to anti-Communists in Hungary and Poland. It is true that we did cut off the shipment of a proposed 380 jetplanes to Yugoslavia, but we are still sending the smaller weapons to them. Last June I introduced legislation to stop all aid to Tito on the twofold grounds that it is immoral to subsidize the Communist enslavement of Yugoslavia and that Tito is a self-proclaimed partner of the Soviet Union in the Communist conspiracy to conquer the world. The Senate defeated that legislation by a 50 to 38 vote—a very grave mistake. Just the other day, Tito gave his approval to the Kadar government in Hungary, which is currently presiding over the Soviet massacre and deportation of Hungarian patriots. This is additional proof that Tito is playing the bloody Soviet game, and an additional reason why Tito should not be subsidized by the American taxpayer.

The Congress at the last session gave President Eisenhower the power to stop this aid to Yugoslavia. Why has he not done so?

A NEW CHEESE PROCESS—GOOD NEWS FOR WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMERS

I am happy to report that it appears that we may have found a way to dispose of the gigantic cheese surplus that has been depressing the prices of Wisconsin dairy products for so many years. A new process has been developed that transforms cheese into a liquid concentrate that can be bought by foreign governments for undernourished millions abroad. During recent weeks I have been in constant contact with the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration in order to expedite the testing of this new product in Pakistan. As a result, large quantities of this concentrate are being sent to Pakistan this month for field tests in which United States Army and ICA technicians will participate. I hope that this will be the first step in establishing a greatly expanded market for Wisconsin dairy products.

The problem of cheese surpluses

As you know, the existing cheese surplus is one of the chief reasons that dairy prices have been low. The best information we can obtain on this is that the surplus is now approximately 330 million pounds. This huge surplus not only depresses dairy prices—the cost of cheese storage is a heavy burden on the American taxpayer. It costs the United States Government approximately 9 cents per pound per year to store this cheese. We have good reason to believe that the new process will reduce the surplus by at least 100 million pounds within a single year, which will result in substantial savings to taxpayers as well as an increase in farmers' incomes.

How the new process helps solve the problem

We have a large cheese surplus in this country because there is more cheese produced than is bought by American consumers. One of the answers to this problem is to create a foreign market for American processed cheese—especially a market in Asia where there is a great need for high-protein food and where cheese is not produced in large quantities. Until now, it has been difficult to develop this Asian market—for two reasons. First, the cost of shipping ordinary cheese abroad is practically prohibitive due to the fact that cheese must be refrigerated. Second, the Asian people are not accustomed to the taste of cheese, which has made it difficult to persuade Asian governments to buy ordinary cheese for their people. The new process overcomes both of these obstacles.

The American Consultants Corp., which has its headquarters in Milwaukee, has developed a process that converts cheese into a comparatively tasteless liquid concentrate. This permits any desired flavor to be put into the concentrate so as to accommodate the taste of the consumer. For instance, it can be given a curry flavor for the Pakistanis, as is being done with the shipment that will soon be tested in Pakistan. It also permits the product to be shipped in small, hermetically sealed containers, without need of refrigeration. Finally, the elements of the concentrate are the same as ordinary cheese, so that the nutritional value of cheese is preserved. This means that the concentrate will be of great benefit to the Asian people suffering from protein-deficient diets.

There is also reason to hope that this new process will provide a greater market for cheese in the United States. Experiments have shown that by injecting a different taste into cheese, it may be used in the preparation of many new products. For example, the adding of chocolate flavoring and water to the concentrate makes an excellent chocolate syrup, from which excellent chocolate milk can be made by adding 6 ounces of water to 2 ounces of the concentrate. Several South American countries have indicated great interest in this product and are testing it. The concentrate can also be used to make bread, pies, and candy bars.

The processing is so easy that any cheese factory can make the concentrate from its own cheese.

Disposing of the cabbage surplus

As most of you know, Wisconsin cabbage-growers faced a serious crisis last month due to their inability to find buyers for this year's bumper cabbage crop. I am glad to report that this situation is now somewhat improved, thanks to the excellent cooperation we have gotten from the Department of Agriculture and the United States Army.

Early in October, when the crisis was reaching the acute stage, I requested the Fruit and Vegetable Division of the Department of Agriculture, through its director, Mr. Sylvester Smith, to come to the aid of the cabbagegrowers by purchasing surplus cabbage for the school-lunch program. Mr. Smith, and Mr. Gordon Gunderson, the head of the Wisconsin school-lunch program, responded to our call for help and immediately began to make arrangements for large purchases of cabbage for the school-lunch program. As of the date this newsletter is being written, the Agriculture Department has moved out 54 carloads.

Help from the Quartermaster Corps

We are in constant contact with the Quartermaster Corps of the Fifth Army and military establishments such as Great Lakes and Camp Lucas to see if they can arrange to buy some of the sauerkraut, knowing that is part of the diet of the military personnel. We hope that they will buy some of the kraut so as to help empty the vats, which are full. Such purchases would allow the sauerkraut manufacturers to purchase more cabbage, much of which is now in makeshift storage bins. Unfortunately, time has almost run out and unless we can get speedy action, much of the cabbage will spoil.

NOVEMBER 20, 1956.

REPORT No. 11

Jean and I have been out in Wisconsin since shortly after the close of the session. We have an office and a home in Appleton where I have been available to discuss any problems our Wisconsin people have wanted to talk over with me. We have spent about half of our time in Appleton and the remainder has been spent in traveling as much as possible throughout the State. Unfortunately, my stay in Wisconsin has been cut shorter than I expected, as I have been subpenaed to testify in the case of Aaron Coleman against Newark Star-Ledger. Coleman was one of the men suspended from the secret radar laboratory during the Fort Monmouth hearings on the grounds that he was a security risk.

SURPLUS CHEESE PROBLEM

We are still working on the problem of disposing of the 330 million pounds of surplus cheese which is depressing the dairy market. I shall not go into detail at this time, but field tests are being run on the new process in some parts of Latin America and also in Asia. We hope to have a report for you on this in the near future.

SOME FACTS ON THE "CENSURE" VOTE

Since I have been back in the State I have been asked by a sizable number of people about the so-called censure vote. Actually there was no vote to censure. It was a vote to condemn me for saying what I thought about the Gillette committee and the Watkins committee. I was not disturbed by the vote to condemn. However, I was very much disturbed and still am disturbed by the Senate's one-sided vote to accept a report which said, in effect, that no one had the right to criticize a Member of a "duly-authorized Senate committee." Of course, every Member of the Senate is a member of a "duly-authorized Senate committee." It is needless for me to say that I shall not abide by that ridiculous and dangerous rule. Whenever I find any wrongdoing, whether it is on the part of a Senator or anyone else in Government, I shall do my best to expose it.

In talking to some of my Wisconsin friends I got the impression that they may not have had a complete report on what happened before and subsequent to the so-called censure vote. At that time I was condemned because I would not reveal all of my finances to the Gillette committee, although I had told that committee that I would appear if they decided to subpena me, but would not dignify their kangaroo court by a voluntary appearance. For some unexplainable reason they never did issue a subpena asking me to appear.

After the vote to condemn, the Internal Revenue Bureau conducted a field audit covering a period of 6 years time. As you know, a field audit consists of examining each and every item of expenditures and of income. This was done in painstaking detail. At the end of the audit by the Internal Revenue Bureau, their findings were to the effect that I had overpaid my taxes over that period of time in the amount of $1,066. A check was sent to me by the Treasury Department. A photostat of that check was carried in a number of the papers. If any of the readers of my newsletter would care for a photostat of this check they may get it by merely dropping a line to my office at Washington, D. C. The only address necessary is Senator JOE MCCARTHY, Washington, D. C.

Actually rather than to have voted to condemn MCCARTHY they should have made it stronger and voted to hold me in contempt of the two committees, which I have mentioned, and in contempt of the Senators who voted to approve the report to the effect that it was improper to criticize any Senator. The reason I say they should have made the resolution stronger and voted contempt is because I had and have the utmost contempt for the Gillette committee and also for the Watkins committee, as well as the Senators who tried to establish the rule that no Senator could be criticized for his activities.

Some of my Wisconsin friends have forgotten that former Senator Johnson, of Colorado, who was one of the six-man jury allegedly "trying MCCARTHY," had given a public interview to the Denver Post, in which he said all of the Democrats, which included himself, and that practically all of the Republicans loathed me—apparently because of my exposure of graft, corruption, and communism in government. No other reason for this loathing was given by him. Before he was appointed, Senator SAM ERVIN, another member of the six-man jury, gave a statement to his local press to the effect that he was prejudiced against me to the extent that if he were appointed on the committee he should be disqualified. The chairman of the six-man jury, Senator ARTHUR WATKINS, of Utah, went on television and radio and smirkingly stated that it made no difference whether the six-man jury of Senators were prejudiced against me or not. As I stated at the time, if while I was a circuit judge, a justice of the peace had made the statement that WATKINS made that prejudice on the part of a jury was unimportant, I would have immediately taken steps to disbar him.

The greatest example of cowardice that the Senate has witnessed in its long history was when Senator WATKINS, after having taken the chairmanship of this so-called censure committee, refused to answer my questions or debate the ridiculous provisions of the report they had issued. For example, when I started to question him about the provision of the report that said it was improper to criticize a Senator, he dashed from the floor and said he would not answer any questions by me unless they were submitted in writing a day ahead of time—an unheard of thing—a disgrace to the State of Utah and a disgrace to the United States Senate.

Incidentally, a leading columnist, David Lawrence, who is also the editor of U. S. News & World Report, on November 28 pointed out the ridiculous and contradictory arguments made by the Senators during this disgraceful show.

One of the ablest editors in the country, Richard Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, on November 24 of this year in his editorial had this to say:

"MCCARTHY * * * was punished for revealing the cruel arrogance and murderous contemplations of the Communist forces that are directed by the Kremlin at Moscow."

Incidentally, Senator FLANDERS, who filed the charges against me admitted that he had not drafted them himself, but that an extreme leftwing group, which had taken up offices across from the Senate Office Building, had concocted all of the 72 charges which he filed. In passing, it is of some interest to note that Paul Hoffman, who recently tried to read Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, former chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, and others out of the Republican Party, contributed $1,000 for the preparation of this leftwing smear.

UNITED NATIONS

As you know, the Internal Security Committee made an official report to the effect that the United Nations was ridden from top to bottom with Communist spies, saboteurs, and extreme leftwingers. This together with the United Nation's speedy action to protect the Communist stooge, Nasser, in Egypt, and their failure so far to do anything about the blood bath in Hungary, plus the past history of the United Nations, has caused me to lose confidence in that body. Nevertheless they could, even at this late date, take the commendable step of expelling Soviet Russia from the United Nations.

As a positive suggestion I would urge that we withhold all American funds from the United Nations at least until Russia has been expelled.

A MESSAGE TO FUR FARMERS

As you know, my amendment was passed cutting down the tax on United States raised fur, but the job has not been completed. There are still two major problems which stand in the way of prosperity for the fur farmers and which also increase the price of clothing for people who live in the cities. Those problems are the carryover of the old wartime tax on furs and the dumping of furs on the American market from Russia and Russia-controlled countries. I have discussed this with Members of the Senate and hope to be able to do something about this during the next term of Congress.

DECEMBER 12, 1956.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, amid the bewilderments of these confused and chaotic days upon the earth, uncertain and troubled as we are about so many things, we must be sure of Thee, else we are lost and undone. In these times that try our souls as we gird the might of the Nation to defend threatened liberties, we pray that we may take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without Thee we build on sinking sand. With evil forces which deal in fetters and chains for the body and mind, loose in the world, make our America worthy to be Thy channel of liberty to all men who yearn to be free.

We pray for a special bestowment of Thy enabling grace upon the President of the Republic as with his coadjutors he faces the difficult and delicate problems of this desperate hour. May the listening world this very day be assured by what it sees and hears that those who speak for America lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 4, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that, in accordance with the order entered yesterday, when the joint session with the House of Representatives ends today, it will not be necessary for the Senate to return to its Chamber, since the Senate will be in recess until Monday next, January 7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets at noon on Monday, there be a morning hour, for the purpose of the introduction of bills and the submission of petitions, memorials, and resolutions; that between 12 noon and 1 p. m. on Monday, nothing but routine business be transacted; and that at the conclusion of the joint session on that day, the Senate stand in recess until Wednesday noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, again I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the President will deliver a message at the joint session today, at 12:30 o'clock. Following the delivery of that message, our next session of the Senate will be at 12 o'clock noon, on Monday, at which time it will be in order to introduce bills and submit petitions, memorials and resolutions; and, under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered, nothing but routine business is to be transacted. We shall have a quorum call after 12 o'clock. We shall confine our activities to the introduction of bills, the submission of petitions and memorials, and the making of insertions in the RECORD, with nothing but routine business to be transacted. At 1 p. m. the Senate will go to the House of Representatives for a joint session, to count the electoral votes. At the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate will stand in recess until Wednesday.

ASCERTAINMENTS OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate three communications from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, official copies of ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President from the States of Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Morton
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Revercomb
Carroll	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lausche	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Talmadge
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TRANSMITTING ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution which I should like to have read for the information of the Senate, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have discussed it with the distinguished majority leader. What the joint resolution does is allow 3 extra days for the filing of the economic report by the President of the United States. The date as now fixed is the 20th of January but the 20th falls on a Sunday, and, of course, now January 21, Monday, will be Inauguration Day. The request is for 3 extra days' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) was read the first time by title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the President), the economic report for the first regular session of the 85th Congress shall be transmitted not later than January 23, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that I introduce the joint resolution on behalf of myself and the majority leader.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if this request has been called to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I have not called it to the attention of that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think generally it is good procedure, before such unanimous consent is requested, that as a matter of courtesy, the request should be submitted to the chairman of the committee in question or to the ranking minority member; but I intend to make no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say normally, if there were any substantive matter involved, that procedure certainly would be followed. I thought, since there was merely a request for a 3-day extension, because of the time element, there would be no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not objecting, but I am sensitive to the procedures of the Senate. I hope in the future the minority leader, when he submits unanimous-consent requests, will have the courtesy to proceed in an orderly fashion by consulting the chairmen of the respective committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that he is no more sensitive of the Senate procedures than is the minority leader. Really, until last night, I was not sure that the Senate had any committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Secretary informs me that it is the wish of those in charge in the House that Senators proceed to the House at 12:15, or as near that time as they can. Therefore, pursuant to the order previously entered, I suggest that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House for the joint meeting.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States of America.

(For the address delivered by the President see pp. 224–227 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Pursuant to the order entered on Friday, January 4, 1957, at the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate stood in recess until Monday, January 7, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thou alone art invincible in strength and infallible in wisdom, and Thy love never forgets or fails.

At the noon hour of this new day we are coming unto Thee with our prayers of adoration and praise, of confession and supplication, offering them in simplicity and sincerity.

Grant that the Day Star from on high may daily shine upon our hearts giving us the light that is bright with Thy presence.

We pray that the whole life of men and nations everywhere may be pervaded and permeated by that divine light.

Help us daily to reflect and reveal the splendor and richness, the beauty and freedom of the spirit of our blessed Lord.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to build a social order wherein dwelleth justice and righteousness, peace and good will.

As we plan for the future wilt Thou lift us out of a fear that trembles and stands still in weakness to a faith that is adventurous and walks in courage and confidence.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 3, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Saturday, January 5, 1957; and

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Monday, the 7th day of January 1957, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the United States Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GORDON; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND; and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the great pleasure of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 46)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress, first may I express to you my deep appreciation of your courtesy in giving me, at some real inconvenience to yourselves, this early opportunity of addressing you on a matter I deem to be of grave importance to our country.

In my forthcoming State of the Union message, I shall review the international situation generally. There are worldwide hopes which we can reasonably entertain, and there are worldwide responsibilities which we must carry to make certain that freedom—including our own—may be secure.

There is, however, a special situation in the Middle East which I feel I should, even now, lay before this body.

Before doing so it is well to remind ourselves that our basic national objective in international affairs remains peace—a world peace based on justice. Such a peace must include all areas, all peoples of the world if it is to be enduring. There is no nation, great or small, with which we would refuse to negotiate, in mutual good faith, with patience and in the determination to secure a better understanding between us. Out of such understandings must, and eventually will, grow confidence and trust, indispensable ingredients to a program of peace and to plans for lifting from us all the burdens of these expensive armaments. To promote these objectives our Government works tirelessly, day by day, month by month, year by year. But until a degree of success crowns our efforts that will assure to all nations peaceful existence, we must, in the interests of peace itself, remain vigilant, alert, and strong.

I

The Middle East has abruptly reached a new and critical stage in its long and important history. In past decades many of the countries in that area were not fully self-governing. Other nations exercised considerable authority in the area and the security of the region was largely built around their power. But since the First World War there has been a steady evolution toward self-government and independence. This development the United States has welcomed and has encouraged. Our country supports without reservation the full sovereignty and independence of each and every nation in the Middle East.

The evolution toward independence has in the main been a peaceful process. But the area has been often troubled. Persistent crosscurrents of distrust and fear with raids back and forth across national boundaries have brought about a high degree of instability in much of the Mideast. Just recently there have been hostilities involving Western European nations that once exercised much influence in the area. Also the relatively large attack by Israel in October has intensified the basic differences between that nation and its Arab neighbors. All this instability has been heightened and, at times, manipulated by international communism.

II

Russia's rulers have long sought to dominate the Middle East. This was true of the Czars and it is true of the Bolsheviks. The reasons are not hard to find. These reasons do not affect Russia's security, for no one plans to use the Middle East as a base for aggression

against Russia. Never for a moment has the United States entertained such a thought.

The Soviet Union has nothing whatsoever to fear from the United States in the Middle East, or anywhere else in the world, so long as its rulers do not themselves first resort to aggression. [Applause.]

That statement I make solemnly and emphatically.

Neither does Russia's desire to dominate the Middle East spring from its own economic interest in the area. Russia does not appreciably use or depend upon the Suez Canal. In 1955 Soviet traffic through the canal represented only about three-fourths of 1 percent of the total. The Soviets have no need for, and could provide no market for, the petroleum resources which constitute the principal natural wealth of this region. Indeed, the Soviet Union is a substantial exporter of petroleum products.

The reason for Russia's interest in the Middle East is solely that of power politics. Considering her announced purpose of communizing the world, it is easy to understand her hope of soon dominating the Middle East.

This region has always been the crossroads of the continents of the Eastern Hemisphere. The Suez Canal enables the nations of Asia and Europe to carry on the commerce that is essential if these countries are to maintain well-rounded and prosperous economies. The Middle East provides a gateway between Eurasia and Africa.

It contains about two-thirds of the presently known oil deposits of the world and it normally supplies the petroleum needs of many nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The nations of Europe are peculiarly dependent upon this supply, and this dependency relates to transportation as well as to production. This has been vividly demonstrated since the closing of the Suez Canal and some of the pipelines. Alternate ways of transportation and, indeed, alternate sources of power can, if necessary, be developed. But these cannot be considered as early prospects.

These things stress the immense importance of the Middle East. If the nations of that area should lose their independence, if they were dominated by alien forces hostile to freedom, that would be both a tragedy for the area and for many other free nations whose economic life would be subject to near strangulation. Western Europe would be endangered just as though there had been no Marshall plan, no North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The free nations of Asia and Africa, too, would be placed in serious jeopardy. And the countries of the Middle East would lose the markets upon which their economies depend. All this would have the most adverse, if not disastrous, effect upon our own Nation's economic life and political prospects.

Then there are other factors, which transcend the material. The Middle East is the birthplace of three great religions—Moslem, Christian, and Hebrew. Mecca and Jerusalem are more than places on the map. They symbolize religions which teach that the spirit has supremacy over matter and that the individual has a dignity and rights of which no despotic government can rightfully deprive him. [Applause.] It would be intolerable if the holy places of the Middle East should be subjected to a rule that glorifies atheistic materialism. [Applause.]

International communism, of course, seeks to mask its purposes of domination by expressions of good will and by superficially attractive offers of political, economic, and military aid. But any free nation, which is the subject of Soviet enticement, ought, in elementary wisdom, to look behind the mask.

Remember Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1939 the Soviet Union entered into mutual assistance pacts with these then independent countries; and the Soviet Foreign Minister, addressing the Extraordinary Fifth Session of the Supreme Soviet in October 1939, solemnly and publicly declared that "we stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of the pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity, and we declare that all the nonsensical talk about the Sovietization of the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs." Yet in 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Soviet control of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe has been forcibly maintained in spite of solemn promises of a contrary intent, made during World War II.

Stalin's death brought hope that this pattern would change. And we read the pledge of the Warsaw Treaty of 1955 that the Soviet Union would follow in satellite countries "the principles of mutual respect for their independence and sovereignty and noninterference in domestic affairs." But we have just seen the subjugation of Hungary by naked armed force. In the aftermath of this Hungarian tragedy, world respect for and belief in Soviet promises have sunk to a new low. International communism needs and seeks a recognizable success.

Thus, we have these simple and indisputable facts:

1. The Middle East, which has always been coveted by Russia, would today be prized more than ever by international communism.

2. The Soviet rulers continue to show that they do not scruple to use any means to gain their ends.

3. The free nations of the Mideast need, and for the most part want, added strength to assure their continued independence.

III

Our thoughts naturally turn to the United Nations as a protector of small nations. Its charter gives it primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our country has given the United Nations its full support in relation to the hostilities in Hungary and in Egypt. The United Nations was able to bring about a cease-fire and withdrawal of hostile forces from Egypt because it was dealing with governments and peoples who had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind as reflected in the United Nations General Assembly. But in the case of Hungary, the situation was different. The Soviet Union vetoed action by the Security Council to require the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Hungary. And it has shown callous indifference to the recommendations, even the censure, of the General Assembly. The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved.

IV

Under all the circumstances I have laid before you, a greater responsibility now devolves upon the United States. We have shown, this country has shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purpose and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate. Seldom in history has a nation's dedication to principle been tested as severely as ours during recent weeks.

There is general recognition in the Middle East, as elsewhere, that the United States does not seek either political or economic domination over any other people. Our desire is a world environment of freedom, not servitude. On the other hand many, if not all, of the nations of the Middle East are aware of the danger that stems from international communism and welcome closer cooperation with the United States to realize for themselves the United Nations goals of independence, economic well-being, and spiritual growth.

If the Middle East is to continue its geographic role of uniting rather than separating East and West; if its vast economic resources are to serve the well-being of the peoples there, as well as that of others; and if its cultures and religions and their shrines are to be preserved for the uplifting of the spirits of the peoples, then the United States must make more evident its willingness to support the independence of the freedom-loving nations of that area.

V

Under these circumstances, I deem it necessary to seek the cooperation of the Congress. Only with that cooperation can we give the reassurance needed to deter aggression, to give courage and confidence to those who are dedicated to freedom and thus prevent a chain of events which would gravely endanger all of the free world.

There have been several Executive declarations made by the United States in relation to the Middle East. There is the tripartite declaration of May 25, 1950, followed by the Presidential assurance of October 31, 1950, to the King of Saudi Arabia. There is the Presidential declaration of April 9, 1956, that the United States will within constitutional means oppose any aggression in the area. There is our declaration of November 29, 1956, that a threat to the territorial integrity or political independence of Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, or Turkey would be viewed

by the United States with the utmost gravity.

Nevertheless, weaknesses in the present situation and the increased danger from international communism convince me that basic United States policy should now find expression in joint action by the Congress and the Executive. Furthermore, our joint resolve should be so couched as to make it apparent that if need be our words will be backed by action.

VI

It is nothing new for the President and the Congress to join to recognize that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security.

We have joined to create and support the security system of the United Nations. We have reinforced the collective security system of the United Nations by a series of collective defense arrangements. Today we have security treaties with 42 other nations which recognize that our peace and security are intertwined. We have joined to take decisive action in relation to Greece and Turkey and in relation to Taiwan.

Thus, the United States through the joint action of the President and the Congress, or, in the case of treaties, the Senate, has manifested in many endangered areas its purpose to support free and independent governments — and peace—against external menace, notably the menace of international communism. Thereby we have helped to maintain peace and security during a period of great danger. It is now essential that the United States should manifest through joint action of the President and the Congress our determination to assist those nations of the Mideast area which may desire that assistance.

The action which I propose would have the following features:

It would, first of all, authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

It would, in the second place, authorize the Executive to undertake in the same region programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid.

It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the armed forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.

These measures would have to be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States, including the Charter of the United Nations and with any action or recommendations of the United Nations. They would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the charter.

The present proposal would, in the fourth place, authorize the President to employ, for economic and defensive military purposes, sums available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, without regard to existing limitations.

The legislation now requested should not include the authorization or appropriation of funds because I believe that, under the conditions I suggest, presently appropriated funds will be adequate for the balance of the present fiscal year ending June 30. I shall, however, seek in subsequent legislation the authorization of $200 million to be available during each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 for discretionary use in the area, in addition to the other mutual security programs for the area hereafter provided for by the Congress.

VII

This program will not solve all the problems of the Middle East. Neither does it represent the totality of our policies for the area. There are the problems of Palestine and relations between Israel and the Arab States, and the future of the Arab refugees. There is the problem of the future status of the Suez Canal. These difficulties are aggravated by international communism, but they would exist quite apart from that threat. It is not the purpose of the legislation I propose to deal directly with these problems. The United Nations is actively concerning itself with all these matters, and we are supporting the United Nations in that effort. The United States has made clear, notably by Secretary Dulles' address of August 26, 1955, that we are willing to do much to assist the United Nations in solving the basic problems of Palestine.

The proposed legislation is primarily designed to deal with the possibility of Communist aggression, direct and indirect. There is imperative need that any lack of power in the area should be made good, not by external or alien force, but by the increased vigor and security of the independent nations of the area.

Experience shows that indirect aggression rarely if ever succeeds where there is reasonable security against direct aggression; where the government disposes of loyal security forces, and where economic conditions are such as not to make communism seem an attractive alternative. The program I suggest deals with all three aspects of this matter and thus with the problem of indirect aggression.

It is my hope and belief that if our purpose be proclaimed, as proposed by the requested legislation, that very fact will serve to halt any contemplated aggression. We shall have heartened the patriots who are dedicated to the independence of their nations. They will not feel that they stand alone, under the menace of great power. And I should add that patriotism is, throughout this area, rightfully a powerful sentiment. It is true that fear sometimes perverts true patriotism into fanaticism and to the acceptance of dangerous enticements from without. But if that fear can be allayed, then the climate will be more favorable to the attainment of worthy national ambitions.

And as I have indicated, it will also be necessary for us to contribute economically to strengthen those countries, or groups of countries, which have governments manifestly dedicated to the preservation of independence and resistance to subversion. Such measures will provide the greatest insurance against Communist inroads. Words alone are not enough.

VIII

Let me refer again to the requested authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to assist to defend the territorial integrity and the political independence of any nation in the area against Communist armed aggression. Such authority would not be exercised except at the desire of the nation attacked. Beyond this it is my profound hope that this authority would never have to be exercised at all.

Nothing is more necessary to assure this than that our policy with respect to the defense of the area be promptly and clearly determined and declared. Thus the United Nations and all friendly governments, and indeed governments which are not friendly, will know where we stand.

If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

In the situation now existing, the greatest risk, as is often the case, is that ambitious despots may miscalculate. If power-hungry Communists should either falsely or correctly estimate that the Middle East is inadequately defended, they might be tempted to use open measures of armed attack. If so, that would start a chain of circumstances which would almost surely involve the United States in great military action. I am convinced that the best insurance against this dangerous contingency is to make clear now our readiness to cooperate fully and freely with our friends of the Middle East in ways consonant with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. I intend promptly to send a special mission to the Middle East to explain the cooperation we are prepared to give.

IX

The policy which I outline involves certain burdens and indeed risks for the United States. Those who covet the area will not like what is proposed. Already, they are grossly distorting our purpose. However, before this Americans have seen our Nation's vital interests and human freedom in jeopardy, and their fortitude and resolution have been equal to the crisis, regardless of hostile distortion of our words, our motives, and our actions. [Applause.]

Indeed, the sacrifices of the American people in the cause of freedom have, even since the close of World War II, been measured in many billions of dollars and in thousands of the precious lives of our youth. These sacrifices, by which great areas of the world have been preserved to freedom, must not be thrown away.

In those momentous periods of the past, the President and the Congress have united, without partisanship, to

serve the vital interests of the United States and of the free world.

The occasion has come for us to manifest again our national unity in support of freedom and to show our deep respect for the rights and independence of every nation—however great, however small. We seek not violence, but peace. To this purpose we must now devote our energies, our determination, ourselves. [Applause.]

Thank you very much.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock p. m. the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. The message of the President will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

JOINT SESSION OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 40

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purposes of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMPOWERING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 10, 1957, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. POAGE on Wednesday next, or the first date thereafter that the House is in session, for 1 hour.

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM FOR THE MERRIMACK RIVER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 1956 issue of Industry, which is published monthly by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, describes the Merrimack River as being potentially the most dangerous flood site in Massachusetts today."

This continuing threat is in addition to the loss of eight lives and property damage estimated at $35 million, suffered in the disastrous flood of 1936, and the lesser losses that resulted from the flood of 1938, and the hurricanes of 1954 and 1955, when the river overflowed its banks under torrential rains.

The report of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee states in section 6, page 3, that—

> It is estimated that about 40 percent of the total 1936 recurring flood damages would be in the area of Lawrence, Mass.

Some flood control projects have been built along the upper reaches of the Merrimack in New Hampshire, and another reservoir is in the red-tape planning stage, which means that the Merrimack will be a threat to us for 5 more years.

Meanwhile, the danger increases as silt piles up in the lower channel of the Merrimack from Lawrence to the sea, reducing the capacity of the river to contain the floodwaters.

It is clear that we need interim protection and the most practical way to do this is by dredging the Merrimack River and by building retaining walls for flood control where needed, from Lawrence to the sea.

In order to expedite this program, I have introduced two bills: one to authorize the necessary projects, and the other to appropriate $10 million for dredging and construction.

Since the exodus of the textile industry from Lawrence, we have acquired new industries, and some of them are vital to the production of equipment for our national defense. This is an added reason why our local economy must have more protection from "potentially the most dangerous flood site in Massachusetts today."

Local industrialists, who strongly oppose the expenditure of Federal funds unless absolutely necessary, are supporting a flood control program for the Merrimack River. From the damages suffered in the past by the properties they now occupy, they realize that further losses are in prospect unless some protection is provided.

Instead of disaster relief after the fact, we prefer control projects as soon as possible, to avert the floods that threaten our valley.

GREETINGS TO OUR SPEAKER ON HIS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with your numerous friends in extending heartiest felicitations to you on this happy occasion of your 75th birthday.

This is indeed a golden anniversary for we are very fortunate to have a man of your vision and wisdom to lead us and guide us in these crucial days. Your good judgment and wide influence have always been in the best interests of the American people and have helped steer our ship of state in the right direction.

On this occasion, I pray that the good Lord bless you with many long years of health and strength, so that we your younger colleagues may be privileged to enjoy the benefits of your guidance and leadership and wise counsel in the years ahead. My sincerest wishes also go forth that the coming year may prove to be a very happy one for you. Your experience and achievements will always serve as a shining example for all of us.

HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a few moments to say that we have just heard a very fine address by the President of the United States. The President suggests positive, affirmative action. It must be tried if no other better plan is suggested. Coasting along from day to day is weak and dangerous to the United States of America and to the world.

I should like to add one word of caution in connection with the receiving into our country of Hungarian and other refugees. They should be given admiration for their courage and sympathy for their suffering, but jobs that do not interfere with the workers of our own country. A committee should be set up that would protect everyone. If they are given jobs of our workers, the economy in the United States will be in a very bad way and our people will be in want.

We should by all means welcome these refugees in a most kind and helpful manner, but we must protect our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TALLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 7, 1957.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

249. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the certificate of ascertainment of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors for the State of Indiana; to the Committee on House Administration.

250. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an order canceling a certain amount of delinquent irrigation operation and maintenance assessments against 91 tracts of Indian lands and eliminating certain acres of land from the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C. 386a); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1905. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to extend the act for 2 years; and to authorize barter transactions with satellite countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 1906. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to extend the act for 2 years; and to authorize barter transactions with satellite countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1907. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 1908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 1909. A bill for improvement of Salem Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1910. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services to receive benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without relinquishing their retirement pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1911. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1912. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to change the formulas for computing the Federal share of State public-assistance programs, and to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1913. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 1914. A bill to provide for the extension of rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1915. A bill to eliminate the 15-acre requirement for voting in any national wheat referendum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1916. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to conduct an investigation and survey to determine the number of residences not now receiving direct-to-home mail service and to recommend methods and means of providing such rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1917. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1918. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1919. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize payment of operating-differential subsidy to contract carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1920. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1921. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to a planetarium, or a museum, or similar educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1922. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1923. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1924. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day over Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1925. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1926. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1927. A bill to exempt farm transportation from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1928. A bill to provide for two judicial districts and the appointment of an additional Federal judge for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 1929. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 1930. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida, provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1931. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1932. A bill to provide for a term of court of the fifth circuit court of appeals to be held at Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1933. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1934. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. R. 1935. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1936. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1937. A bill to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1938. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 1939. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1940. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1942. A bill for the relief of the Sergeant Bluff Consolidated School District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1943. A bill to repeal the dual employment statute and amend the dual compensation statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1944. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to make inappli-

cable, in the case of the survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces, the provisions which presently prevent the payment of benefits to aliens who are outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1945. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1946. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1947. A bill to provide for the establishment of a harbor of refuge for light-draft vessels at Lake City, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1948. A bill to provide for the establishment of a harbor of refuge for light-draft vessels at North East, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1949. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1950. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1951. A bill to change the designations of certain positions in the postal field service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1952. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 1953. A bill to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1954. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Mills Creek, Fla., for drainage, flood control, and navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1955. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1956. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1958. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1959. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1960. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies, and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1961. A bill to assist the several States in providing scholarships to enable high-school graduates of Indian blood to pursue their education at colleges and universities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 1962. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1963. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1964. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 1966. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1967. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 1968. A bill to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial, in or near Calhoun, Ky., in honor of the late Cpl. James Bethel Gresham; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1969. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1970. A bill to incorporate the National Society Army of the Philippines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1971. A bill to prohibit the assignment of certain duties to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1972. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1973. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over, to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation, and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1974. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 1975. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1976. A bill to provide a system of scholarships for persons of unusual ability in certain sciences; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1977. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport, Waterbury, Hartford, and New Haven; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1979. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make loans for the construction of nonprofit hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1980. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1981. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 1982. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1983. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1984. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain volunteer firemen injured while performing duty as firemen on real property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1985. A bill to create the position of mail handler-in-charge in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1986. A bill to provide rates of pay for training periods of substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1987. A bill to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., toward the cost of the water-filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1988. A bill to establish a postal rate-making procedure in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Postal Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for programs of inservice and outservice training for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1990. A bill to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1991. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1992. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 1993. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a State or local government employee who is covered by a retirement system, but who cannot receive the benefits of such system, to elect social-security coverage as a self-employed individual if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system has not been extended to his services by an agreement under section 218 of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 1994. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1995. A bill to provide that the amount of social-security benefit based on disability will not be reduced by any benefit awarded under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or Armed Forces based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1996. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 1997. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1998. A bill to permit producers to donate surplus wheat to religious organizations, without payment of marketing penalty, where such donation will divert the wheat from normal trade channels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2000. A bill to provide effective congressional control over the budget of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2001. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2002. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to credit for retirement purposes the accumulated and accrued annual leave and unused sick leave of persons separated from the service with entitlement to immediate or deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 2003. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2004. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2005. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Sergeant Floyd Monument as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2006. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide for payment of the burial allowance in certain cases where funeral expenses are met in whole or in part by a burial association; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2007. A bill to amend the law with respect to the payment of pensions to widows or children of veterans to permit such widows or children to deduct from their income, for the purpose of determining their eligibility for a pension, amounts paid by them toward the costs arising from the veteran's final illness and funeral; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2008. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2009. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to facilitate the freedom of association of professional personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2010. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the drilling of the first oil well at Titusville, Pa., in 1859; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2011. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for Erie, of the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2012. A bill to encourage construction and maintenance of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels in the interest of peacetime commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultrahigh-frequency television channels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2014. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2015. A bill to establish a program for the insurance of loans made to assist students in the pursuit of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2016. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2017. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 2018. A bill to permit any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2019. A bill to establish the policy of Congress with respect to public use of the national forests and to provide for the development and maintenance of facilities for public use; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2020. A bill to prohibit the courts of the United States and all other Federal agencies from deciding or considering any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2021. A bill to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals and to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 2022. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service in certain agricultural vocational programs rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2023. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2024. A bill to provide for the credit, upon retirement of an officer or employee from Government service, to the individual account of such officer or employe in the civil-service retirement and disability fund of a sum representing compensation for accumulated and current accrued sick leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2025. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that compensation paid thereunder shall be based on wage rates currently in effect; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2026. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2027. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 2028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes to make it clear that the taxes on transportation of persons and property do not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2030. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that while butter is in surplus supply, it shall be part of the ration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2031. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2032. A bill to provide that post-office fixtures and equipment for use in first-, second-, and third-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2033. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years, to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into

account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 2035. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies from flood-control and river and harbor projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the election of judges of Federal courts of original jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the election of judges of Federal courts of original jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Planning Commission for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Sixth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to political activities on the part of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution requesting the United States mission to the United Nations to take all possible steps expeditiously to bring about consideration by the United Nations of the question of self-determination of the population of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 76. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the distribution of pornographic materials; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 77. Resolution to amend the rules of the House, to restrict the reporting of business to the calendars during the closing days of a session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study the problems of the aging and aged; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 79. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the illegal imprisonment of 10 Americans by the Chinese Communist Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. Res. 80. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of employment problems of American citizens who are between the ages of 40 and 65; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2036. A bill for the relief of Felix John Prevete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2037. A bill for the relief of Won Chen and Mrs. Rose Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2038. A bill for the relief of Wong Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2039. A bill for the relief of George L. Lee, Sophie Lee, and their children, David, Irene, and Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2040. A bill for the relief of Miss Emily Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2041. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sassan Shahmanesh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2042. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 2043. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David Tsun-Ngang Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2044. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Elizabeth Creusen Sneeden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2045. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Miller, of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2047. A bill for the relief of Sol Carrillo and Nelson Carrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2048. A bill for the relief of William P. Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 2050. A bill for the relief of Domenico Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill for the relief of Kerttu Poutiainen Mayblom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2052. A bill for the relief of Albina Mesesnel Lombardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2053. A bill for the relief of Aneida Alonso Amaral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Cheenu Rassmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sally King Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Margaret G. (Citrone) Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Erdne Cucukow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Moshe Davidovitz and Frieda Davidovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Richard Wukovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of John F. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Vinicio Soto Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chiyoko Yoshima Shumard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Levy Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of Paolina Toscano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rhea Silvers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Angeles Cervera de Kothe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Ciro (Jerry) Barile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Mary Felicia Ling Vong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Kaufmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Albert A. Heinze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of M. E. Boales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Victoria V. F. Farhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie C. Odom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of John Spaniola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin S. Pecson, his wife Leticia Simpao Pecson, and his children Mary Mediatrix S., Benjamin S., Jr., and Carmelita Cresencia S. Pecson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Moisze Karp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Hersch Rinzler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Willson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Carmela Andreone Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2085. A bill for the relief of Basille Ignatios Mavridis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Tsiolkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Alf Andreassen Maberg, also known as Alf Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Chinghwa Hsiao and Ching-yen Hsiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Daniel Souang and Michele Souang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene Dimitrowa Shiver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Joseph Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of Ezra Dweck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Biricio O. Acosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmela DiMascio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2096. A bill for the relief of Luis Laca Cristobal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2097. A bill for the relief of Maria G. Connolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2098. A bill for the relief of Berthilde Vogler Ganno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2099. A bill for the relief of Agavnie Moutoukian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2100. A bill for the relief of Herta Friedrichs Rockwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2101. A bill for the relief of Eliza Kalfayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sabastiano Poletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 2103. A bill for the relief of Andres Amadeo Macha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2104. A bill for the relief of Magallano Tiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2105. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2106. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Leibovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2107. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George R. Stilson; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2108. A bill for the relief of Fausto Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2109. A bill for the relief of David W. S. Ahn and Margaret Y. A. Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2110. A bill for the relief of Hendrik Brand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2111. A bill for the relief of Anna Czekajlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2112. A bill for the relief of Alice MacLeod Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2113. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gabriella Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Gaida Murnieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna De Rosa Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Charlotte A. Ruffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2118. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Scholaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2119. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alexandrine von Saldern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2120. A bill for the relief of Tullio Stabilito and Ida Stabilito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2121. A bill for the relief of Abdel Hafiz Husein Farraj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2122. A bill for the relief of Sui Tang, Una Wong Tang, James Tang, and Lily Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2123. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alkos Giagtzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 2124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie B. (Winkler) McClendon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Must Protect American Labor and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, January 5, 1957

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in Congress a tariff bill designed to protect Connecticut's industries and labor from an influx of cheap-labor foreign-made products. This bill has been changed from the quota bill that was introduced a year ago by my honorable colleague HENDERSON LANHAM. The changes that have been incorporated in this bill were the result of further study and consideration of the objections that are sometimes made against absolute quotas.

Members of this House in whose home districts are located various industries that are adversely affected by import competition do not have to be told that we need a new approach to the problem. And I understand that several other Members of this body will join me in the introduction of a general import quota bill. I welcome the cooperation of my honorable colleagues.

The remedies against injury from imports provided in recent years by Congress and to which we have looked successively with renewed hope as new laws were passed have now proved themselves ineffective. This is not because Congress has not legislated; nor is it because Congress has not sought to close loopholes in the remedial legislation, such as the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act.

On the contrary, Congress has sought repeatedly to make the escape clause effective by amendments; and the law as it stands today seems to be what it was designed to be, namely, a remedy against serious injury from import competition. Unfortunately it has not operated in this way. Its intent has been largely nullified by executive action.

The trouble lies with the power vested in the President to modify or veto Tariff Commission recommendations. So long as this power remains and so long as the Department of State advises the President, very few remedies recommended by the Tariff Commission will see the light of day. They will be rejected as they have been on one pretext or an-

other during the past 5 years, particularly on grounds of avoiding the disturbance of international relations.

The situation obviously cannot be remedied so long as the President retains his veto power. Therefore, legislation is needed to withdraw that power.

However, in exploring the legislative possibilities of correcting the unsatisfactory condition facing us I, together with others, have been struck by the inadequacy of the old tariff remedies.

The weakness of the tariff is particularly glaring in those instances where imports come principally or in large part from Japan or other low-wage countries. The rate would have to be raised to such a high level to be effective that it would appear exorbitant, possibly as high as 200 to 300 percent. Not only would it be legislatively most difficult to obtain such a rate but it would not be desirable in any case. A rate high enough to limit imports from Japan would actually bar imports from countries of higher wage standards and thus would deliver our market over to Japan. This would, of course, not be desirable.

As a result of much thought and inquiry in an effort to find a more effective and more suitable remedy and after examining various alternatives we have concluded that a system combining the tariff with import quotas will provide the best remedy.

I am fully aware that the Department of State is opposed to import quotas; but I say to you that it is not the function of that Department to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States. This is the function of Congress; and we have but to take a look at what the State Department has done with the power delegated to the Executive by Congress to resolve that no longer should our industry and the workers in the plants that are hit hard by imports be left to the tender mercies of State Department indifference or callousness.

Without going into detail about the new quota plan it can be said that such a plan would overcome the principal weaknesses of the tariff alone and at the same time not be subject to the principal objections to an absolute import quota—one of the remedies often suggested as an alternative to the tariff.

I shall try to describe the tariff-quota plan which has been incorporated into the bill that I have introduced, and to set forth its advantages.

One of the guiding principles of the plan is a sharing of the domestic market with imports but without incurring the risk and the damage that may be inflicted by virtually unregulated imports. In other words, the view is that domestic producers can live with imports without being injured materially if imports are properly regulated. This regulation does not contemplate cutting imports back severely, but would hold them within bounds. In some instances it would allow some margin of increase.

If imports are held in bounds and domestic producers know that they will be held within reasonable bounds much of the fear of imports and, therefore, most of the damage resulting from them will be eliminated. At the same time no damage of any consequence will be done to imports.

The plan proposes that imports be measured by what is the most significant aspect of import competition, namely, the trend in the share of the market supplied by them. Merely measuring imports by volume in dollars or other common denominator may be meaningless. What counts is how much of the market they are taking away and the prices at which the competing imports are sold.

This being the case it seems clear that the best way to control imports is to hold them to some fair share of the market. This could be done by setting aside a given share such as 10 or 20 percent and then not allowing any imports at all beyond that level. This restriction, called an absolute quota, however, offers considerable administrative burdens and is often opposed as being too rigid. It should be employed only where imports have already captured a large share of the market and no other remedy would suffice.

The same end can be accomplished, with a leeway for flexibility, by combining the tariff with a quota. In this way a stated percentage share of the market for the product could be allowed to come in with the proviso that any imports in excess of that level must pay, let us say, the 1930 tariff rate. This should materially slow down the imports above the stated level. If it did not do so and if imports continued to take a larger share of the market, a secondary backstop would be set up. This would be in the nature of a surcharge of 50 percent on the 1930 rate on all imports exceeding a further 5 percent share of the market. Such a rate could be expected to put a real brake on any additional imports.

Imports could still increase from year to year if the domestic market should expand. They would, however, be cut back if the domestic market should shrink: For example, 10 percent of a shrunken market would be less than 10 percent of a larger one. In this way imports, while sharing proportionately in an expanding market, would also share in a shrinking market.

With an assurance of this kind domestic manufacturers could face the future with confidence so far as import competition is concerned. They could plan for plant expansion, increase in employment or installation of new equipment, and could expend funds in advertising and sales-promotion campaigns, secure in the knowledge that imports would not take the expanded market from them.

Provision is indeed made in the bill for absolute quotas if imports have gained 25 percent or more of the domestic market for any particular product. However, no absolute quota would be imposed unless, in the opinion of the Tariff Commission, a tariff quota would not remedy the injury. There is an exception in those cases in which imports supply 50 percent or more of the market. In such cases a presumption in favor of the absolute quota would be created. In other words, the absolute quota would be given priority but if, in the opinion of the Commission, a tariff quota was adequate the latter would still be used.

Action would be initiated as under the escape clause, that is, by application of an interested party or by the Tariff Commission or upon resolution of either the Finance Committee or the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Tariff Commission would be the administering agency and would act only after public hearings. The bill lays down definite guide lines as limits to Commission discretion. It spells out the share of the market and the trend of imports that would make a given product eligible for a quota. If the conditions specified in the law were found to be present a presumption of serious injury would be created; and it would require a majority vote of the Commission to overcome the presumption. This is to say that the burden of proof would be upon the opposition instead of the applicants. Should a majority of the Commission not oppose the quota it would be established. The case would not go to the President for review.

The tariff quota would have many advantages over an absolute quota. It would not place imports into a straitjacket as would a rigid absolute quota. The amount of policing required would be held to a minimium. There would be no need to allocate imports among the countries of exportation. All imports up to the specified level would come in at the lower rate of duty.

The objectives of the bill are consistent with such domestic legislation as the fair labor standards law, agricultural price supports, obligatory collective bargaining, and other interferences with the free economy that result in higher fixed cost burdens on industry. Our producers have lost much of their competitive flexibility because of obligations placed upon them by law. Therefore, it is only fair to shield them against the onslaught of foreign competition that is not similarly bound. That is what the quota bill would seek to do, and without interfering unnecessarily with the flow of trade.

The regulation of foreign commerce is a constitutional function of Congress and import quotas are a suitable instrument for such regulation. Properly devised the quota can also be an instrument of a liberal trade policy. The present bill would make it clear that Congress means to recapture its function.

The bill would not repeal the trade-agreements program. It would even leave GATT untouched. On the other hand, its passage would serve notice that Congress will henceforth resume its responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce and that the State Department has no power to bind Congress to any particular course of action in such regulation.

An important feature of the proposal is the offer of a higher quota to any foreign product in the production of which wages are raised sufficiently to narrow significantly the gap between the foreign wages and those prevailing in the same industry in this country. This would put a premium on more liberal wage policies

abroad and at the same time would discourage wage cutting as a means of selling more goods in this market because it would not expand sales beyond the limit set or that could be set under the law.

I make the plea that this bill be given hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means at an early date. The time has come when we can no longer rely on the present legislation as it is administered to do what is necessary for many industries and lines of agriculture in this country. It is as much in the interest of the workers in these industries as to the plant owners to hold a fair share of our own market under conditions of fair competition. The bill that I have introduced is designed to make this possible. I urge that way be made for its consideration on the floor during this session.

Our First Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 5, 1957

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, this day is memorable in the history of our country not only because the President addressed the 85th Congress in joint session prior to delivering his message on the state of the Union but for another reason also.

On January 5, 1777—180 years ago—Benjamin Franklin arrived in Paris on an important diplomatic mission in behalf of the American Colonies, which were then fighting for their independence. Franklin was 71 years of age and was numbered among the most renowned Americans. His experiments in electricity and his earlier activity as a diplomatic representative from Pennsylvania to England had brought him great recognition in Europe.

The French aristocracy got an excellent impression of Franklin, and he was well received everywhere. His mission was a complete success. He won French support for the American struggle for independence. An alliance was established which resulted in military help for the Colonies both on land and sea.

Benjamin Franklin remained in France until a year following the signing of the treaty which ended the Revolutionary War. In accordance with Franklin's desire, Thomas Jefferson was nominated to succeed him as Ambassador to France.

Mr. Speaker, this brief statement about Benjamin Franklin is a free translation of an editorial which appeared in Decorah Posten under date of January 3, 1957. That newspaper is printed in the Norwegian language and has a wider circulation than any other newspaper of its kind in the United States. The editorial staff of Decorah Posten deserves praise for consistent scholarly work and for giving appropriate recognition to notable men and events—of which the editorial referred to is a sample.

This Nation Under God and Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 5, 1957

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this great legislative body a resolution seeking to add amendment 23 to our present United States Constitution to the end that the basic and fundamental law of our land might recognize the Master Architect, Creator, and Builder of the Universe, the Almighty God, who hung out the stars and lit the burning taper of the sun and draped the glorious rainbow as a scarf about the shoulders of the storm; and also to the further end that there may be recognized in that same Constitution Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Universal Saviour of all mankind. Many people, I believe, think the greatest deficiency of our present Constitution lies in its failure to recognize specifically God Almighty and America's definite position as a great Christian nation. In this modern day of paganistic and mundane attitudes, when communism and all of its philosophy of atheism and statism and materialism hold full sway in many places of the earth and embrace millions of its peoples, there is surely a great need for America to assert humbly her unalterable dependence upon God and her own daily followership of Christianity as the prevailing ideology of most of her people. As most everyone knows, the Constitution is whatever the people decree it shall be, and since most of the American people are God fearing and Christ following, the Constitution itself should make manifestation accordingly.

This proposed amendment is in no way any encroachment upon the demarcation line of church-state separation that has always characterized our Government, since this amendment would neither recognize nor support with tax revenue any church organization whatsoever. While this amendment would not in anywise establish a church, yet it would in a positive way recognize the authorship and authorityship of the Supreme Being and His Son, Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible tells us:

> Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

And the great Apostle Paul once wrote:

> For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I hope our great Constitution may come to recognize God as our Lord and may also come to recognize that the Nation's foundation must be laid upon Jesus Christ as the firm Rock of Ages and Saviour of the world.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, from the limitations of our partial knowledge we turn in our deep need to Thee, whose dwelling place is light, without the shadow of earth-born clouds. Save us from trying to live our lives as if we had to live them by ourselves. The mystery of prayer, where spirit with spirit may meet, brings to us the stupendous fact that we are not alone—that another stands always beside us and our humanity—that other of whom we say with utter confidence, "This is my Father's world." Bewildered, uncertain, and fearful as we are, we are Thy children, and we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy love. So we come with yearning words upon our lips, "Our Father, hallowed be Thy name." As in these fateful days our frail hands have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be as a fit habitation for us and all Thy other children, give us the vision, the wisdom, and the courage which will make for both justice and lasting peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 5, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY, under authority of the order of July 27, 1956, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted on December 10, 1956, a report (No. 2831) entitled "Development of Upper Columbia River Basin, Canada and the United States," which was printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, under authority of the order of July 27, 1956, submitted, on December 31, 1956, a report (No. 2832) on Communist Interrogation, Indoctrination, and Exploitation of American Military and Civilian Prisoners; which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JOINT SESSION OF TWO HOUSES ON THURSDAY NEXT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a House concurrent resolution, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT MEETING OF ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES TO HOLD HEARINGS ON THE PRESIDENT'S NEAR EAST PROPOSAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee be given permission to sit jointly for the purpose of holding hearings on the President's Near East proposal, presented to Congress on last Saturday. I further ask unanimous consent that when these two committees sit jointly for that purpose, they be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, there will be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the presentation of petitions and memorials, but only for the transaction of routine business; and in connection therewith I ask unanimous consent that any statements be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate September 24, 1956, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 10th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual-security program, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956.

The accomplishments during this 6-month period under this program of mutual effort have further advanced the security, the economic progress and the well-being of the United States and our partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 20, 1956.*

ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Vice President on October 15, 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 15, 1956.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides for a suspension of assistance to Yugoslavia as therein specified unless I find and report to the Congress with my reasons therefor: (1) That there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union; (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world; and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

After careful study and examination of all the relevant facts available to me I hereby find and report to the Congress affirmatively with respect to the three matters above mentioned.

My reasons therefor are the following:

1. The policy of assisting Yugoslavia was begun by this Government in 1949. That policy was not based upon approval of, or affinity with, the internal policies of the Government of Yugoslavia. It was undertaken because, despite such internal policies, it was then deemed in the interests of the United States to support the independence of Yugoslavia against a major effort by the Soviet Union to dominate that country. The balance of available evidence leads me to find that Yugoslavia remains independent of control by the Soviet Union and desires to continue to be independent; that it is still subject to efforts by the Soviet Union to compromise that independence; and that some assistance from the United States continues to be required and is desired by the Government of Yugoslavia to assure the maintenance of its independence.

I am aware of the fact that the designs of the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia are more subtle than heretofore, and that perhaps those designs are not adequately appreciated, or defended against, by Yugoslavia. Nevertheless there remain the basic factors, that is, the independence of Yugoslavia; the dedication of Yugoslavia to its independence; and the Soviet endangering of that independence.

2. My finding that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for Communist conquest of the world is based upon the fact that the ideology and doctrine of the Yugoslav Communist Party appear to adhere to the concept that each nation should determine for itself which kind of a society it wishes and that there should be no interference by one nation in the internal affairs of another.

3. My reason for finding that it is in the interests of the national security of the United States to continue to furnish at least limited assistance to Yugoslavia is that otherwise, in my opinion, there is a danger that Yugoslavia will be unable to maintain its independence. I believe, moreover, that the United States policies inaugurated in 1949 to enable Yugoslavia to maintain its independence remain valid.

This determination on my part meets the statutory requirement in section 143 regarding the utilization of the public funds allotted to Yugoslavia under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and under prior mutual security legislation. Its primary immediate effect will be to clear the way for conversations with appropriate Yugoslav officials to examine the various possibilities for bilateral cooperation in the economic field thus made feasible under our laws. In the military field, the various departments of the Government have, since the enactment of section 143 in July of this year, at my direction, followed a policy of permitting only small, routine, and long-planned deliveries of equipment. I intend that this attitude, which implies the nondelivery of jet planes and other items of heavy equipment, shall be maintained until the situation can be more accurately appraised during the days to come. I believe, however, that economic aid for the people of Yugoslavia, primarily in the form of foodstuffs, may now prudently and wisely be proceeded with.

In any case, I shall not consider that my action herewith definitely settles the various questions pertaining to United States-Yugoslav relations. These problems will, on the contrary, remain under my constant review, and I have, in addition, directed that those officers who conduct our day-to-day relations with Yugoslavia vigilantly apply the very helpful criteria established by the Congress in section 143 to insure that the decision which I have now made remains justified in future circumstances. I have made it clear, furthermore, than my determination is not, even in economic matters, to be taken as a continuing directive necessitating the obligation or expenditure of the funds available for Yugoslavia, regardless of circumstances,

but is one which restores discretion in this area to me and my subordinates to take such actions as accord with the applicable national policy relating to Yugoslavia and serve the national interest. Such an approach will, I am sure, serve the foreign policy interests of our country and, at the same time, afford adequate protection against the unwise expenditure of public funds.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF PEANUT STATISTICS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of June 24, 1936, as amended, (relating to the collection and publication of peanut statistics) to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING OF FOODSTUFFS AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposition of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DESIRABILITY OF A FOOD-STAMP PLAN

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the desirability of a food-stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and local units of government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF AGRICULTURAL PROLUCTS BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposition of agricultural products by the Commodity Credit Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Three letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were no significant developments to report for the months of June, July, and September 1956 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Three letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were no significant developments to report for the months of August, October, and November 1956 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 3)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS REGARDING THE OVEROBLIGATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation for the installation of automatic telephone equipment at an overseas post (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 144 reports on violations relating to the overobligation of appropriations in the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations in regional offices of the Forest Service, in region 1 at Missoula, Mont., and region 5, at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in the United States Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Deputy Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations for "Operations, 1956" which occurred in the offices of the Regional Director, New York, N. Y., and the Regional Director, Philadelphia, Pa., respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, six violations regarding the overobligation of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Three letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the reapportionment of the following appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, for the Indian Claims Commission for "Salaries and expenses;" the Department of State, for "Salaries and expenses," and the Veterans' Administraiton for "Readjustment benefits" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Justice Department for fees and expenses of witnesses, for the fiscal year 1957, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Eleven letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to the reapportionment of certain appropriations in the following departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1957, which indicate the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Comimttee on Appropriations:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance";

Treasury Department, for "Administering the public debt, Bureau of the Public Debt";

Treasury Department, for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Treasurer";

Department of Agriculture, for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service";

United States Tariff Commission, for "Salaries and expenses";

National Mediation Board, for "Salaries and expenses";

United States Civil Service Commission, for "Annuities, Panama Canal Construction Employees and Lighthouse Service Widows";

Railroad Retirement Board, for "Salaries and expenses";

Commodity Credit Corporation, for administrative expenses authorization;

Department of Defense, for "Maintenance and Operations, Army," "Medical Care, Navy," "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force," and "Hospitals and Medical Care, Public Health Service"; and

Department of Agriculture, for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service."

LUMP-SUM APPROPRIATION FOR CREDITING POSTAL REVENUES

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, requesting a lump-sum appropriation in the amount of $2,081,000 be made to the Post Office Department for crediting postal revenues, for the fiscal year 1957, relating to franked mail by Members of Congress and others, and penalty mail of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 4)

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 29, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semiannual report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semiannual report, together with the semiannual reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955 (with an accompany-

ing report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF SURRENDER TREE SITE, SANTIAGO, CUBA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix responsibility in the American Battle Monuments Commission for the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree Site in Santiago, Cuba (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMANDANT OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL TO AWARD DEGREES AND CREDITS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commandant of The Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CHIEF OF ENGINEERS TO PUBLISH INFORMATION PAMPHLETS, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CHAPLAIN, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of an Assistant Chaplain at the United States Military Academy, to fix the compensation of civilian clergymen appointed as Chaplain and Assistant Chaplain thereof, and for certain other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

IMPROVEMENT OF CAREER OPPORTUNITIES OF NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEFINITION OF CERTAIN SERVICE AS ACTIVE MILITARY SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of propose legislation to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS FOR PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT TO MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND THE ARMY GENERAL STAFF

Two letters from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of June 30, 1956, and September 30, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts, in excess of $50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AVERAGE MONTHLY FLIGHT PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of certain officers in the Coast Guard and the average monthly flight pay paid to such officers, for the 6-month period ended December 26, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, transactions under the helium production fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period January 1, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that System as of June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts of that Department, for the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, National Security Training Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated September 14, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Federal contributions under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, for the quarters ended June 30, 1956, and September 30, 1956, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for the quarters ended June 30, 1956, and September 30, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ABACA FIBER OPERATIONS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by the Administration on Abaca Fiber Operations, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT," DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of that Department entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1957, September 30, 1956, there was an aggregate of 2,759 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE FLYING PAY

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the United States Air Force flying pay, for the period March 1, through August 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the contracts negotiated by that Committee, during the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STUDY OF PROBLEMS RAISED BY GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on a preliminary study of the problems raised by Government-sponsored research and development progams in industry, dated November 9, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF TAX AMORTIZATION PROGRAM IN NITROGEN INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report concerning the results of a survey of the effects of the tax amortization program on competition and small-business participation in the nitrogen industry (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTERIM REPORT ON NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report regarding the special investigation and study of the production, allocation, distribution, and use of nickel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTERIM REPORT ON SURVEY OF IRON AND STEEL SCRAP

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pusuant to law, an interim report on a survey of iron and steel scrap available and potentially available

(with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the supply and distribution of nickel, dated December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 36th quarterly report on Export Control, for the 2d and 3d quarters of 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as of September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work, for the period of July and August 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military price contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of all procurement actions with small business and other firms, for the periods July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956, and July 1, 1955, to May 31, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of procurement actions with industrial and commercial firms and educational and nonprofit institutions, for the period July–September 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of procurement actions with industrial and commercial firms and educational and nonprofit institutions, for the month of July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Corporation, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of that Administration, for the period January 1–June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth semiannual report of that Administration, covering operations between January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report on the voluntary home-mortgage credit program, covering the activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee and its regional subcommittees for the period August 2, 1954, to March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Corporation on tin operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on borrowing authority for the quarter ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Bank covering the period January–June 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Director, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing lands acquired by that Commission for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system, during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

A letter from the former president of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Conference for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION—TAX AMORTIZATION WRITEOFF

A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report of that committee relating to tax amortization writeoff (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

IMPORTS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, reporting for the information of the Senate, that effective November 12, 1956, all quantitative restrictions have been abolished on imports of whisky into the United Kingdom from the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISTILLED SPIRITS (S. DOC. NO. 5)

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 314, 84th Congress, a report on distilled spirits (whisky), dated December 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW POLICY RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF TAX CERTIFICATES

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a public notice of that Commission, issued September 27, 1956, relating to a change of policy applying to transactions based on contracts entered into after October 15, 1956 (with an accompanying notice); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion, dated October 31, 1956 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION WITH NORWAY

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, entered into force on November 9, 1948, relating to the disposition of the claim against the United States asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES WITH FINLAND

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report on educational exchanges with Finland entitled "An Investment in Understanding: Educational Exchange Program Between the United States and Finland, 1950–54" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISARMAMENT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U. S. S. R.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a communication from the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., dated July 27, 1953, relating to disarmament (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF EAST-WEST TRADE IN 1955

A letter from the Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth semiannual report entitled "Survey of East-West Trade in 1955" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, on the educational exchange activities conducted during the period January 1–June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISTRIBUTION OF NOBEL PEACE PRIZE OF 1957

A letter from the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, signed by A. Schon, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a circular regarding the distribution of the Nobel peace prize of 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION AND DISPOSAL OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY TO EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions, for the period April 1 through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Department of State under the Federal Propery and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the disposition of foreign excess property, in the Department of Defense, for the period January 1, to June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for research and development purposes, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board, constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the abaca fiber program, administered by General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON CENTRAL VALLEY, FOLSOM RESERVOIR, KINGS RIVER, AND ISABELLA RESERVOIR PROJECTS, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Central Valley, Folsom Reservoir, Kings River, and Isabella Reservoir projects in Central Valley Basin, California, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON MISSOURI RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Missouri River Basin water resources development program, Corps of Engineeers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARKANSAS, WHITE, AND RED RIVER BASINS POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins power system and related activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR ISRAEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Assistance Program for Israel, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1952–1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Information Agency, for the period August 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Administration of Indian Lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF INDIVIDUAL MONEYS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Administration of Individual Indian Moneys by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated November 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Columbia River Power System and Related Activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RENEWAL OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report relative to consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, dated September 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SAN LUIS UNIT, WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on

the San Luis Unit, West San Joaquin Division, Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON HILLCREST UNIT, MOUNTAIN HOME DIVISION, SNAKE RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Hillcrest Unit, Mountain Home Division, Snake River project, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a preliminary report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, dated July 18, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Interior relating to synthetic liquid fuels, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the lands to be benefited by the North Side Pumping Division, Minidoka project, Idaho, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT ON FORD'S THEATER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to the report on the Ford's Theater, Washington, D. C., which was transmitted to the Senate on July 12, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Olympic National Park, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES UNDER THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE CHOCTAW NATION v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of the claim of the *Choctaw Nation* v. *The United States of America* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMISSARY OPERATIONS, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual financial report on the commissary and messing facilities activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THUNDERSTORMS AND OTHER ATMOSPHERIC DISTURBANCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances, dated July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Department in providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that department in providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SEALS FOR BUREAUS AND OFFICES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period April 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period July 1, 1956, through September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Two letters from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting for the information of the Senate copies of recent publications of that Commission entitled "M-46—Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines, June 30, 1956"; "M-47—Principal Electric Utility Generating Stations and Transmission Lines, 1956"; "S-123—Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost" and "Annual Production Expenses, 1955 Supplement" and Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1955 with accompanying publications); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of recent publications of that Commission entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1956," and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1954" (with accompanying publications); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 22d annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Five letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, for the period June 30, 1956, to October 31, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS EXECUTED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing contracts executed by negotiation for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19–20, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, for the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS AND CLAIMS FOR TOWAGE OR SALVAGE SERVICES RENDERED TO NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims settled for damage caused by vessels of the Navy and of claims for towage or for salvage services rendered to

Navy vessels, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS ARISING FROM CRASH OF AIR FORCE AIRPLANE NEAR WOLD-CHAMBERLAIN AIR FIELD, MINNEAPOLIS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims settled and not settled, arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS PAID UNDER MARITIME CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Department under the Maritime Claims Act of October 20, 1951, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. HAROLD J. HECK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dr. Harold J. Heck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GEORGE T. MOORE, CARL D. BERRY, AND DR. HAROLD J. HECK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES *v.* HELDENFELS BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the final settlement on August 28, 1956, of the claim of the *United States* v. *Heldenfels Bros. Construction Co.;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES *v.* GULF OIL CORP.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the final settlement, on October 24, 1956, of the claim of the *United States* v. *Gulf Oil Corp.;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, confidential copies of orders issued granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Ho Kee alias Kee Ho, and Fred Alexander Haddix, Jr., from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, and June 1, 1956, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Mo Ling Hwang-Chen nee Hwang, Cheung Kam Yin, William G. Yu-Ming Diao, Sing Chue, and Tai Look Wong, from reports transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, and April 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of George J. Martinek, Eva Martinek, and Carolina or Karla Martinek from a report transmitted to the Senate on March 1, 1956, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

A letter from the United States attorney, District of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report, for the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the Corporation Agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the financial statement of that legion for the period July 21 to September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL REPORT RELATING TO SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF CLAIMS BASED ON CORRECTIONS OF MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report for consideration in connection with the semiannual reports, respecting payment of claims based on corrections of military records, which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury are required to make (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIM OF ERNEST HAGLER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Ernest Hagler against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Commission, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, that the tort claim of Walter J. Sowell, of Bluemont, Va., had been settled during the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that government, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that agency, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that agency, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND REPORT OF SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Trenton, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit of the books of, and the annual report of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO INJURY, DISABILITY, AND DEATH SUFFERED BY EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN INJURIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT RELATING TO ALLOWANCES TO SUPERINTENDENT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL AND HIS ASSISTANTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report and letter concerning allowances in kind furnished the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and his two immediate assistants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, transmitting an interim report of that committee, dated November 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, Washington, D. C., transmitting a progress report of that committee, dated September 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN POSITIONS, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the establishment of certain positions by that committee, during the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter, signed by the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wilson Dam, Alabama, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of operation and maintenance of navigation projects, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of operation, maintenance, and administration of recreational facilities at reservoir projects, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institution, for the year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter signed by the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., signed by Hollington K. Tong, expressing his appreciation of the resolution recently adopted by the United States Senate opposing the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17–XX

A concurrent resolution denouncing the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States and demanding the preservation of our inherent rights

Whereas in the life of a democratic nation when it becomes necessary for the people to take notice of and enter a solemn protest against any usurpation of power by those who have been entrusted with high public office, and to demand, as of right, that public officers remain subservient to the people and that they desist from assuming powers which have not, by the people, been placed in their hands, the opinions of their fellow men require that the people set forth in clear and unmistakable language the causes which impel them to such action.

To the end that the declarations now about to be made may be thoroughly understood, and the motives which impel them may be fully appreciated, we first pronounce the following principles, each of which we hold to be an integral part of our American system of Government:

1. All political power is inherent in the people and all government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed.

2. When the people form a government by the adoption of a written constitution the words of that constitution are but the instrumentalities by which ideas, principles, and plans present in the minds of those who adopt the constitution are recorded for accuracy and for preservation to posterity.

3. Those who are temporarily invested with power over their fellow countrymen, by being chosen to occupy public offices provided for in a constitution, are charged with a solemn responsibility to exercise only such powers as, under such constitution, have been entrusted to them.

4. A division of the powers of government into three departments, executive, legislative, and judicial is expressed or implied in every constitution of the American Union, including the Constitution of the United States.

5. The Constitution of the United States is a grant of powers to the central Federal Government, and all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people.

6. The judicial powers delegated to the Federal Government are vested by the Constitution in the Federal judiciary and include the power to interpret, construe and apply the Constitution of the United States.

7. The power to interpret, construe and apply the Constitution is limited to an ascertainment of the ideas, principles and thoughts that were in the minds of those who drafted and adopted the Constitution, including amendments thereto, and the application of those ideas, principles and thoughts to particular factual situations from time to time presented to the courts. The application of constitutional principles may differ with changing conditions, but the principles themselves are unchanging and unchangeable except by the people and then only by the method provided in the Constitution.

8. A judicial construction of the Constitution enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States and understood and acquiesced in by the executive department, the Congress and the people over a long period of time becomes as much a part of the fundamental law of the land as that which has been written in the Constitution itself, and is binding equally upon the people, the States of the Union, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States may be amended only in the manner provided in the Constitution. In the course of history since the adoption of the Constitution the people have 21 times found it expedient to amend the Constitution, and when that unanimity of public opinion which justifies a change in the Constitution has developed among the people they have found no difficulty in effecting the changes they found desirable.

The assumption by any public official, or group of public officials, of power to change the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, other than by the method provided by article V of the Constitution, is an abuse of public trust and a tyrannical usurpation of power; and

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States when evidences of the assumption of tyrannical powers appear in the executive or in the Congress the people may, by means of the ballot, protect and preserve their liberties by the repudiation of those in office. But when the Federal judiciary, which is insulated from the heat of political differences by the life tenure of its membership, enters upon a course of action inimical to the rights of the people, this method of reform is unavailable. Under such circumstances those restraints which characterize men capable of self-government require that by orderly and peaceable means the inherent and unalienable rights and powers of the people shall be utilized to restore those rights of which they have unjustly and unlawfully been deprived.

We call to the attention of all thinking Americans the following unwarranted and unauthorized acts of invasion of the powers reserved to the States and to the people:

(1) By decisions rendered May 17, 1954, in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Harry Briggs, Jr., et al.*, v. *R. W. Elliott, et al., Dorothy E. Davis, et al.*, v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, Frances B. Gebhart, et al.*, v. *Ethel Louise Belton, et al.* (347 U. S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873), the Supreme Court of the United States denied to the sovereign States of the American Union the power to regulate public education by the use of practices first declared constitutional by the State of Massachusetts, adopted by the Congress, approved by the Executive, affirmed and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States and practiced by States for more than a century.

It has based these decisions upon matters of fact as to which the parties affected were not given an opportunity to offer evidence or cross examine the witnesses against them.

It has cited as authority for the assumed and asserted facts the unsworn writings of men, one of whom was the hireling of an active participant in the litigation. Others were affiliated with organizations declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be subversive, and one of whom, in the same writing which the Court cited as authority for its decision stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions."

In reaching its conclusion the Supreme Court has disregarded its former pronouncements and attempted to justify such action by the expedient of imputing ignorance of psychology to men whose knowledge of the law and understanding of the Constitution could not be impugned, and has expressly predicated its determination of the rights of the people of the several sovereign States of the American Union upon the psychological conclusions of Kotinsky, Brameld and Myrdal, and their ilk, rather than the legal conclusions of Taft, Holmes, Van Devanter, Brandeis and their contemporaries upon the bench.

In reaching its conclusion the Court, professing itself to be unable to ascertain the intent of those who adopted the 14th amendment to the Constitution, arbitrarily chose to repudiate the solemn declaration of its meaning rendered under the sanctity of their oath of office by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States at a time when all of its members were contemporaries of those who proposed, discussed, debated, submitted, and adopted the amendment.

However, much as citizens of other States may approve and applaud these decisions, they dare not embrace the theory upon which they are based nor the fallacies therein contained lest they themselves by the application of the same theory and fallacies bring destruction to their institutions and to their liberties.

(2) In a decision rendered May 21, 1956, in *Railway Employees Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists, et al.*, v. *Robert L. Hanson, et al.*, (—— U. S. ——, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 633), the Supreme Court of the United States held that a union shop agreement negotiated between certain railroads and certain organizations of employees of such railroads which had been authorized by an act of the Congress superseded the right-to-work provisions of the constitution of the State of Nebraska and the State statutes enacted pursuant thereto.

The effect of this decision, made in a case instituted by free American citizens to enforce their rights under the Constitution of the United States, was to deny these American citizens the right to work at their chosen trade unless they became members of and contributed to the funds of organizations to which they did not wish to belong and to which they did not wish to contribute of their substance.

The effect of this decision was to advise these free American citizens that their right to be immune from any deprivation of liberty or property without due process of law, supposedly guaranteed to them by their Federal Constitution, did not extend to their right to work, supposedly guaranteed by the constitution of their State, as against the demands of a nonofficial labor organization that they pay to it money to be expended in the negotiation of labor contracts, the terms of which these citizens might or might not seek or desire.

The effect of this decision is to vest in the Congress the power to prohibit, permit, or require, closed shops, union shops, or open shops or to outlaw unions in each and every industry in America whose activities come within the present expanded concept of interstate commerce.

The effect of this decision is to abrogate, with respect to all employment in interstate business, the constitutions and laws of those 17 sovereign American States which have sought to protect the rights of their citizens to a free and open labor market, making union membership optional with each worker, protecting him on the one hand from an employer who might desire the destruction of the union, and on the other hand from the union which might desire to exploit him or advocate policies which he did not endorse.

(3) By a decision rendered January 16, 1956, *Dantan George Rea* v. *United States of America* (—— U. S. ——, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 213), the Supreme Court held that it was within the power of the Federal courts to enjoin an officer of the executive department of the Federal Government from testifying in the courts of the State of New Mexico in a criminal prosecution of one charged with a violation of a statute of that State prohibiting the possession of marihuana.

In so doing the Court assumed the power to direct the activities of executive officers of the Federal Government to the extent of forbidding them from testifying voluntarily, or under the process of a State court, as to matters within their knowledge in a case in which no question of privilege or national security was involved.

In so doing the Court assumed power to control the administration of local justice in State courts by the indirect method of forbidding witnesses to testify in such State courts while giving lipservice to the letter of the rule which denies to the Federal courts any power to control the acts or proceedings of State courts.

In so doing the Court assumed power to fix the rules of evidence which should control the administration of justice in State courts.

In so doing the Supreme Court refused to follow the law as established by former decisions of that Court, which were followed and adhered to for many years.

(4) By a decision rendered April 2, 1956, in *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson* (—— U. S. ——, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 415), the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that, so long as the present Federal law providing punishment for sedition exists, the sovereign State of Pennsylvania and those 41 of her sister States who have enacted laws against sedition, are without power to enforce their statutes enacted for the purpose of preserving the lives and safety of their citizens from those who would by force and violence overthrow the Government of the United States, the States themselves, or any of their political subdivisions.

This decision was rendered in the case of an acknowledged member of the Communist Party who had been duly convicted

in the constitutional trial courts of Pennsylvania of violating the sedition laws of that commonwealth.

In reaching the conclusion announced, the Supreme Court refused to follow the previously accepted construction and interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as stated in unmistakable language in prior decisions of that Court.

In reaching the announced conclusion, the Court decried, and seemed to find obnoxious the fact that under the Pennsylvania law a private citizen could set in motion the legal processes by which those charged with conspiracy against the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania could be brought to trial and, if found guilty, be punished by due course of Pennsylvania law.

In reaching the announced conclusion the Court dismissed with a casual comment in a footnote to its decision the solemn declaration of the Congress that "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

In reaching the announced conclusion the court did not limit the impact of its judgment to statutes involving sedition against the Government of the United States, but expressly pointed out that a State has no power to enact laws for its own protection, but must rely upon the Federal authorities for the suppression of sedition against the State itself or its political subdivisions.

(5) In a decision rendered April 23, 1956, in *Judson Griffin, et al.* v. *People of the State of Illinois* (—— U. S. ——, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 483), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution of the United States rendered illegal the imprisonment of one charged with armed robbery and duly convicted in the trial court of Illinois, unless the State of Illinois provided the defendant, free of charge, with a transcript of the proceedings to be used in an appeal of his conviction.

The basis of this decision was that, since the law of Illinois authorized appeals in criminal cases, and the particular defendant in question was insolvent, the 14th amendment required the State to pay the cost of his appeal.

The effect of this decision is to place upon each of the States the duty of guaranteeing the financial ability of every citizen to exercise constitutional rights.

(6) By a decision rendered April 9, 1956, in *Harry Slochover* v. *Board of Higher Education of the City of New York* (—— U. S. ——, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 449), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the city of New York had violated the Constitution of the United States by the summary discharge of a public employee who had refused to answer questions relative to his communistic activities and claimed the benefit of the 5th amendment to the Constitution in so doing.

In so holding the Court held invalid a charter provision of the city of New York designed to provide for the removal, as quickly as possible, of those public employees who were deemed by the people of that great city to be unfit to be entrusted with any part in the administration of the public affairs of the city.

In so holding the Court revoked the prompt removal from a State school of a teacher whose influence was deemed by the school authorities to be inimicable to the best interests of the students in such school.

In so holding the Court construed the due process clause of the Constitution to give to the Federal courts the power to examine into minute details of all administrative State action and to apply arbitrarily to such State action the personal concepts of the Justices of the Supreme Court rather than fixed principles of constitutional law; and

Whereas these, and other decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, can lead the student of law, of government, or of history to but one unavoidable conclusion:

As presently constituted, the Supreme Court of the United States has embraced the philosophy that the Constitution of the United States is not a declaration of fixed or definite principles, unchanging in their meaning, although varying in their application to different factual situations. On the contrary, recent decisions are obviously the result of a theory that changing conditions and variations in social and economic practices justify the Court in changing, by judicial fiat, the meaning of the Constitution in order that it may serve what the members of the Court deem to be the best interests of the people.

Unless the application of this concept of the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to the rights of the people, the powers of the different departments of government, and the separate and distinct powers of the States and of the Federal Government be stopped, the inevitable result will be to end the American system of constitutional government, and to substitute therefor government by a judicial oligarchy under which the States, and the executive and legislative departments of the Federal Government may exercise only such powers as the federal judiciary deems fit to permit them to exercise; and Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That we, the people of the State of Florida, speaking by and through our duly elected representatives in the senate and house of representatives of the State of Florida, do hereby solemnly declare:

(1) That the Supreme Court of the United States of America as presently constituted knowingly, willfully, and over the most respectful protest of litigants before the court, including many of the sovereign States of the union, has determined to, and has entered upon a policy of substituting the personal and individual ideas of the members of the court as to what the Constitution of the United States should be for the letter of the Constitution as it was written by our forefathers, the meaning of the Constitution as it was understood by those who drafted it and voted for its adoption, and the intent of the Constitution as it has been declared by the highest court of the Nation over many years and in many able decisions.

(2) That the personal, social, economic, and political ideas of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States do not constitute the proper criterion for the admeasurement of States rights or the powers of the several Departments of the Federal Government or the rights of individual citizens.

(3) That acts of the Federal judiciary in willfully asserting a meaning of the Constitution unsupported by the written document, the history of the times in which it was adopted, the construction placed upon it by the contemporary courts and the meaning ascribed to it by the people for generations constitute usurpation of power which, if condoned by the people and allowed to continue, will destroy the American system of government.

SEC. 2. That, if wise and beneficent men may make changes in the Constitution that are beneficial in the light of changing conditions, others may, with equal propriety make changes which will destroy the rights of the people. It was to guard against conferring the power upon public officials to make mistakes that the people reserved unto themselves the power to amend the Constitution when changing conditions demand a change in the basis law.

That while disobedience to constituted authority is the mother of anarchy, it is the history of freemen that they will not supinely permit government to become the master of the people, and will never yield unrestrained authority to any group of public officers.

SEC. 3. That it is the duty of every public official sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and of every citizen who would maintain the principles of Government under which this Nation has grown to its present greatness, regardless of their views as to the abstract justice of the result of any of the acts of usurpation herein enumerated to insist, and we do hereby insist and demand that the Supreme Court of the United States recede from its arbitrary assertion of power to change the fundamental law of the land to meet the personal views of its members as to the present needs of the people, leaving to the people themselves the responsibility of determining when, and to what extent, their Constitution should be amended.

SEC. 4. That, and to this end we respectfully and earnestly urge the executive officers of the Nation, the Congress of the United States, the governor and the attorney general of each of our sister States, and the Bar of America, the traditional defender of constitutional Government, and all who love and reserve the Constitution of the United States, to join us in this declaration, and to do everything within the scope of their personal and official authority to initiate and effect an amendment to article X of the Constitution of the United States defining the powers reserved to the respective sovereign States, enumerating and defining the powers so reserved to include, among others, the power to regulate the fields of activity mentioned in this report.

SEC. 5. That copies of this resolution be sent to the chief executive officers of each State in the Union, the Members of Congress of the United States, the attorney general of each sister State, the American Bar Association and to any other persons designated by the Members of the legislature.

Approved by the Governor August 1, 1956.

Filed in Office of Secretary of State August 1, 1956.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

House Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution interposing the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against encroachment upon the police powers reserved to this State by the United States Constitution, and appealing to her sister States to resolve a question of contested powers

Be it resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the members elected to each house concurring):

That the Legislature of Louisiana express its firm resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State—as the same were originally adopted and have since been legally amended in the manner prescribed therein—against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the great principles embodied therein;

That the Legislature of Louisiana explicitly declares that the powers of the Federal Government result solely from the Constitution of the United States, a compact in which the several States are principals, and that, hence, the powers of the Federal Government, including all of its branches and agencies, are limited by the terms of the instrument creating that compact, and by the plain sense and intention of its provisions;

That the terms of this basic compact, and its plain sense and intention, are that the several States, the principals therein, have

agreed voluntarily to delegate certain of their sovereign powers, but only those sovereign powers specifically enumerated, to a Federal Government thus constituted, and that all powers not expressly delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

That this basic compact may be legally amended in one way, and in one way only, that is by ratification of a proposed amendment by the legislatures of not less than three-fourths of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; that the judicial branch of the Federal Government has authority only in "cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution" and, hence, has no power or authority to amend the Constitution of the United States either by declaring a different meaning for the words therein found or otherwise;

That by its decision of May 17, 1954, in the school cases, the then occupants of the offices of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States attempted to amend the Constitution by declaring that regardless of the meaning or intention of the 14th amendment when adopted by the States (which was explicitly shown to be contrary to the decision in these cases) it would be construed, in view of changing conditions, to deprive the several States of authority over their respective public school systems never surrendered by them;

That following this decision a Federal District Court for the State of Louisiana, in the case entitled *"Bush et al.* v. *Orleans Parish School Board et al."* attempted to declare unconstitutional certain portions of the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Louisiana, some dealing with segregation of the races in public schools and others dealing simply with the administration of public schools, basing its opinion upon the proposed change in the Constitution of the United States decreed by the Supreme Court in its above mentioned May 17, 1954, decision;

That the Legislature of Louisiana, further, takes cognizance of the fact that under this proposed judicial amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of several of our sister States relating to the segregation of races in public parks and recreational activity have been declared unconstitutional by Federal courts, and litigation, and threat of litigation, on this score exists in the State of Louisiana;

That the State of Louisiana, and the other States of the United States, have never surrendered the right to regulate their public-school system or their public parks and recreational activities, whether in the 14th amendment or any other provision of the United States Constitution, that hence, if this State fails to clearly assert its power in regard to these matters it might be construed as a tacit surrender thereof and that such submissive acquiescence to palpable, deliberate and dangerous usurpation of such power would, in the end, lead to the surrender of all powers, and inevitably to the obliteration of the sovereignty of the States, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of usurped power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the usurper to determine, and, hence, under these circumstances, the judgment of all the principals to the compact must be sought to resolve the question;

Therefore, the Legislature of Louisiana, appealing first to our Creator as the only Supreme Authority, next appeals to her sister States for that decision which only they are qualified under our mutual compact to make, and respectfully requests them to join in taking appropriate steps, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, by which an amendment designed to set at rest the usurpation herein complained of may be proposed to all the States.

And, be it further resolved, that until the usurpation herein complained of by the State of Louisiana be settled by legal constitutional amendment, the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby solemnly declare the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, the decision of the Federal District Court in the case of *Bush et al.* v. *Orleans Parish School Board et al.*, and any similar decisions that might be rendered in connection with the public-school system and public parks and recreational facilities, insofar as such decisions may affect or apply to the sovereign State of Louisiana, to be in violation of the Constitutions of the United States, and of the State of Louisiana; and,

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon the rights of the several States, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the reserved powers of each of the States.

The Governor of Louisiana is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution to the governing body of every parish, city and town in this State; to the executive authority of each of our sister States; to the Clerk of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; to Louisiana's Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and to the President of the United States and each of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States for their information.

LETHE E. TEAGAR,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

LOUIS M WIMBERLY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to setting aside a day each year to be known as Children's Day

Whereas the Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., Department of Massachusetts, in convention assembled at Fall River, Mass., on June 24, 1956, have, at the suggestion of C. P. O. Henry Boucher of the U. S. S. *Saratoga,* requested the General Court of Massachusetts to memorialize the Congress of the United States relative to setting aside a day each year to be known as Children's Day; and

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts is cognizant of the significance and value of a Children's Day at which time the leaders of tomorrow, our children of today, may be appropriately honored and recognized: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation setting aside the second Sunday of August in each year as Children's Day; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, July 31, 1956.
Adopted.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Assistant Clerk, Acting Clerk.

House of Representatives, August 1, 1956.
Adopted, in concurrence.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to adopt Senate Resolution No. 298, pertaining to objections by certain foreign countries to American citizens in the military and other services on grounds of certain affiliation

Whereas there is pending before the United States Senate a resolution, No. 298, pertaining to discrimination in the assignment of American citizens to military, diplomatic, or other service within any foreign country, solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of Americans; and

Whereas the freedom and independence of every American citizen, for which American youth have fought and died, are seriously threatened by such action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representative of Massachusetts, where the rights of freemen were born, being cognizant of the peril which faces thse rights, hereby urges the Members of the United States Senate to adopt Resolution No. 298; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, July 25, 1956.
Adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

House Resolution No. 10

A resolution urging the Congress of the United States to examine the United States Postal Regulations and Federal legislation concerning the transmitting of obscene material to members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and to make recommended changes necessary to curtail such practices

Whereas allegations have been made that the members of the United States Armed Forces are receiving through the mails of the United States large amounts of obscene materials from many sources, supplied to them by well-meaning friends as well as groups of a more devious nature; and

Whereas many complaints of a general nature have been made by members of the United States Armed Forces themselves that they sicken of such a flood of obscene materials being sent to them; and

Whereas in the interests of maintaining a high morale among the members of the United States Armed Forces it is well within the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States to be concerned with such complaints and to make a full and complete investigation, in cooperation with the authorities of the United States Armed Forces, of such practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States is urged to examine the United States Postal Regulations and Federal legislation concerning the transmitting of obscene material to members of the United States Armed Forces, and to make recommendations necessary to curtail this practice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress and to the Michigan delegation of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the House July 18, 1956.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution of condemnation and protest against oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the several States of the Union and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina recognizes its allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States and is ever mindful of its responsibility to defend the Constitution of the United States against every attempt, foreign or domestic, to undermine the dual structure of this Union or to destroy those fundamental principles embodied in the written Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the founders of this great Nation, fearful of the tyranny that naturally and always follows the unrestricted concentration of governmental power, secured the passage of the "Bill of Rights," consisting of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution; and

Whereas the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution expressly and explicitly limit the Federal Government to specific powers delegated to it by the terms of the compact and reserved to the States and their people all other powers, unless specifically prohibited by it to the States; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina is ever mindful of the admonition that "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty"; and

Whereas the Constitution is a solemn compact between the States, and the Federal Government is the creature born of that compact from sovereign powers inherently residing in the States and their people but delegated solely for the purposes clearly and manifestly set forth in the Constitution; and

Whereas the methods and procedures for amending the Constitution of the United States are distinctly and plainly stated in article V of that instrument in these words: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress;" and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States may be validly amended only in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, and the United States Supreme Court has never had, does not now have, and should never possess, the power and authority to amend the Constitution; and

Whereas neither the judicial power granted the United States Supreme Court in article III of the Federal Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as Congress has conferred, or may confer, can constitute that Court the dominant and ultimate authority with the power of determining without regard for the Constitution what is and is not in the best interest of the Nation; and

Whereas by its decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, in seeking to establish itself as the dominant and ultimate policy-setting agency of the Nation, in effect amended the Constitution by interpreting the 14th amendment in a manner clearly contrary to the well-settled construction of that amendment; and

Whereas the State of North Carolina in ratifying the 14th amendment did not intend to delegate to the Federal Government the power to deny to the States the inherent right to operate racially separate schools; and when the 14th amendment was ratified, there were 37 States in the Union, and 23 of those States had segregated schools and others had no public schools at all; and the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment established segregated schools in the District of Columbia; and both State and Federal courts, without exception, beginning with a decision of the Massachusetts' Supreme Court in 1848, and subsequently followed by the courts of Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and others, recognized the power of the States to operate a system of separate public schools; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina relying upon the United States Supreme Court's own interpretation of the 14th amendment and the numerous and uncontradicted decisions of other Federal and State courts established and developed a segregated public-school system; and North Carolina properly assumed that it could rely upon congressional action and earlier court decisions as is demonstrated by the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Myers* v. *United States* (1927): "* * * when Congress, after full consideration and with the acquiescence and long practice of all branches of the Government, has established the construction of the Constitution, it may not by its mere subsequent legislation reverse such construction. It is not given power by itself thus to amend the Constitution;" and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina, mindful that powers assumed by the Supreme Court in one field today will become precedents for further assumption of power in other fields tomorrow and recognizing, as did the founders of this great Nation, that tyranny naturally and always follows naked power; and the Supreme Court of the United States has recently denied to the States the right to have laws of their own to deal with subversion or espionage against the Nation; and the States have been denied the right to dismiss individuals from their employment who refuse to answer questions concerning their connections with communism by invoking the fifth amendment, and the fears of Thomas Jefferson are rapidly becoming realities—"The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance * * * is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them"; and

Whereas there is implicit in these recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court a most grievous and deplorable disrespect for declared and established law; and

Whereas by reason of this disrespect for declared and established law on the part of the United States Supreme Court, the people's faith and confidence in the judicial ability and temperament and judicial self-restraint of our highest Federal judges has been most severely shaken; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina recognizes its solemn duty to help alert the Nation to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, by interpretations and constructions of the Constitution, encroaches upon the reserved powers of the States; and our failure to discharge the solemn duty to alert our people and the Nation would constitute passive acquiescence in dangerous precedents aimed at undermining our democratic form of Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the States have never granted to the United States Supreme Court, or any other court, the power to amend the Federal Constitution, nor does the Federal Government possess any powers not delegated to it by the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the grievous and deplorable disrespect for the declared and established law of the land on the part of the United States Supreme Court constitutes a most dangerous and oppressive usurpation of the power of the Congress and the rights of the States and the people, and a grave threat to constitutional government in these United States.

SEC. 3. That the State of North Carolina does condemn and protest the oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the State of North Carolina does call upon all States and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power by the United States Supreme Court and to prevent now and in the future other and further encroachment upon the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, to the end that constitutional Government shall ever be preserved.

SEC. 5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor and the legislature of each of the States, to the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to North Carolina's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the several judges of the United States Supreme Court.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 27th day of July 1956.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide appropriations for authorized Federal buildings and post offices; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by the Downieville Civic Club, and Naomi Parlor No. 36, Native Daughters of the Golden West, both of Downieville, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to return to the gold standard; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Rhode Island Textile Association, Providence, R. I., signed by E. F. Walker, secretary-treasurer, transmitting a statement issued by the executive committee of the Rhode Island Textile Association on August 1, 1956, relating to conditions in the textile industry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Hawaii Postal Employees Association, at Hilo, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the exemption of Federal income tax on annuities received by employees under the Civil Service Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York, N. Y., relating to an investigation of Communist aggression against Hungary, and Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Kalman Govrik, president of the Hungarian Baross Gabor Association, St. Paul, Minn., transmitting copies of circulars relating to Hungarian independence (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Castro Valley, Calif., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by The Guardians of Liberty, an association of nationality groups, at a special meeting held in Miami, Fla., on October 29, 1956, relating to the Communist occupation of Hungary and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the cities of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the Club of the National Guard of Lithuania in exile in Wisconsin, at the city of Racine, in observance of the 38th anniversary of the armed forces day of independent Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Dallas, Tex., relating to communism in art; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Ethnic Groups of the American Friends of Antibolshevist Block of Nations, relating to the occupation of Hungary by Russian troops, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Buffalo Chapter, American Friends of Antibolshevist Block of Nations, Inc., Ukrainian Division, at Buffalo, N. Y., relating to the freedom of all captive countries now under Russian domination, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Francis Jean Reuter, of College Park, Md., remonstrating against the adoption of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88, 84th Congress) proclaiming faith in the Word of God and favoring renewed observation of the Ten Commandments (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Alfred J. Fortino, of St. Louis, Michigan, relating to conditions in Hungary, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet Domination, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the denial of recognition of the present Communist Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Guardians of Liberty, an association of nationality groups, at Miami, Fla., relating to the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners in the Soviet and Nazi Concentration Camps, Detroit, Mich., relating to the freedom of all countries under Soviet domination (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Catholic Laymen's League of Orange and Rockland Counties, New York, condemning the invasion of Hungary by Soviet Russia, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York, N. Y., relating to the elimination of unnecessary expenditures by the Government which are not essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the American War Dads, Inc., Nebraska Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to grant relief to the American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the National Society of Public Accountants, at Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, relating to payments in lieu of taxes and assessment on Federal property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, relating to Federal insurance of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A statement in the nature of a memorial, adopted by the Fort Yukon (Alaska) Town Meeting, on September 4, 1956, remonstrating against the existing liquor laws of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Casa Grande, Ariz., relating to the Buttes Dam project on the Gila River in central Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Employer and Employee Service, Honolulu, Hawaii, signed by Wm. H. Crozier, Jr., enclosing a resolution which was adopted at a public mass meeting held at Aala Park, Honolulu, Hawaii, on July 4, 1956, relating to conditions of employment, and so forth, in the Territory of Hawaii (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Sacramento, Calif., Chinese Benevolent Association, signed by Walter Fong, president, and Rev. Hiram Fong, English Secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, favoring the enactment of legislation to renew the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, relating to immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, favoring the repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, relating to capital punishment in the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, relating to human brotherhood and freedom for all men; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of William Roundtree, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Lula May Heard, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, chairman, 1937 Supreme Court Security League, relating to qualifications of Justices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Huestis Atwood, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Alfred J. Jacobi, of New York, N. Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the United Chinese Society of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of C. S. Bowen, of Greenville, S. C., relating to the seating of the two Senators from South Carolina in the 85th Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Crusade of Safety Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, relating to a charter of incorporation by that foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted at the 65th annual convention of the Wisconsin Library Association, at Madison, Wis., expressing the thanks of that association for the enactment of the Library Services Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two resolutions adopted by the first district, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars, relating to the return of the Veterans' Administration regional office to the San Diego area; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, relating to the allocation of funds for the support of public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the State Hospital and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Authorities on November 5, 1956, at their annual conference with the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, extending their appreciation for the enactment of the Hill-Burton construction program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at the sixth annual convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, at Miami, Fla., endorsing the proposal for the establishment of the Pan American University in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bert S. Crossland Post, No. 170, the American Legion, Department of California, relating to complaints on the treatment of veterans at the post office at Torrance, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of military access roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of arterial highways through municipalities adjacent to national forests; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Greater Hazleton (Pa.) Community-Area New Development Organization, Inc., commonly known as Can Do, Inc., favoring the inclusion of the throughway from Stroudsburg to Sharon, Pa., as a part of the Federal road-construction program; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Anthracite Motor Club, of Hazleton, Pa., relating to the construction of additional highway facilities in the vicinity of Hazleton; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter from the Trade Union Council, Liberal Party of New York State, New York, N. Y., transmitting petitions signed by sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, favoring the abolition of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation instructing the American Battle Monuments Commission to design and construct a monument or memorial in honor of those who died in recapturing the Aleutian Islands in World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Furriers Joint Council of New York, N. Y., favoring the abolition of rule 22 of the Senate Rules of Procedure; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Young Democratic Clubs of West Virginia, Moundsville, W. Va., signed by Steven D. Narick, treasurer, transmitting a resolution adopted by that organization, expressing condolences on the death of the late Harley M. Kilgore (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Ernest Gruening, William A. Egan, and Ralph J. Rivers, relating to the election of Senators and a Representative of the Territory of Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF RULE 22

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Friday last, I announced that today I was going to submit a resolution proposing to amend the Senate rules. I have

had the amendment drafted, but I shall withhold submitting it until Wednesday when there will be more time.

I have been in consultation with the distinguished majority leader and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I hope that on Wednesday the resolution will be in such shape that it may receive substantial bipartisan sponsorship.

For the information of the Senate, however—although I am not submitting the resolution at this time—I should like to read the proposed resolution in its present form, which is slightly different from the form I read on last Friday. It now reads as follows:

That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22,", and (2) by striking out "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and of subsection 2 of this rule."

SEC. 3. Rule 32 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting "1." immediately preceding "At", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"2. The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

At this time I have read the proposed amendment of the rule merely in order that the Senate may be informed. The resolution is not being submitted today, but will be submitted on next Wednesday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just heard the distinguished minority leader make his statement about the submission of a resolution proposing to amend rule 22. It would help very greatly if, when he submits his proposed resolution, he would move its immediate consideration, without reference to a committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that, so far as the minority leader is concerned, when he submits the proposed resolution on next Wednesday—and he hopes that at that time it will receive bipartisan sponsorship—it will be his intention that it go in the regular order to the Committee on Rules and Administration, so that it may be considered along with such other proposed amendments of the rules as may be submitted, and may be reported in the regular order.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that, insofar as I have any influence, I hope we can have very early consideration in the Senate of a change in rule 22.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can well remember, Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, the extreme solicitude of the Senator from California that early action be taken on a change in the rules. My colleague, at that time, Senator Lucas, then occupied the seat of majority leader now occupied by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; and I can remember that at virtually every session of the Senate, the Senator from California was on his feet, demanding that action be taken in regard to amending rule 22.

I hope that in this case the Senator from California will be equally solicitous; and I see no reason why the proposed resolution, if he is so anxious about it, should be referred to the Rules Committee. The resolution could be moved for immediate consideration. When it is moved for immediate consideration, I hope the existing section 3 of rule 22 will be adjudged unconstitutional and therefore not applicable to any debate which may ensue.

When consideration is given to this proposal, whether on the floor or in committee, I think we should try to find out the precise meaning of some of the subtly phrased provisions of the proposed rule. In particular I should like to call attention to section 3 of the Knowland resolution. This provides that "the rules of the Senate shall carry over from Congress to Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

This would appear to be an attempt to bind or limit the constitutional rule-making power of the Senate in a future Congress, in direct violation of the constitutional principles set forth in the brief of the proponents of the recent Anderson resolution and endorsed in the opinion of the Vice President last Friday.

If this is its intended or practical effect, there will be strong opposition to this provision. I hope the Senate will never again try to fasten shackles upon future Senates as was attempted in 1949. For these very fundamental reasons, clarification of the Knowland proposal is imperative.

Now, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I submit a resolution proposing changes in rule 22. It provides, first, that limitation of debate may be effected by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting two calendar days after a petition signed by 16 Senators has been presented to the Senate, and by a majority vote of those Senators "duly chosen and sworn," that is a constitutional majority, namely, by 49 of the 96 Senators, 15 calendar days—excluding Sundays and legal holidays—after a petition is presented by 16 Senators to limit debate.

Such a change would permit virtually 3 weeks of debate after a petition had been presented unless limited by two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, and thereafter would permit cloture to be applied by a constitutional majority. In practice, of course, a petition to limit debate is not submitted until after extensive debate has already occurred.

I send the resolution to the desk, and ask that it lie there for 1 day. I hope that other Senators whom we have not been able to see this morning, but who may be in favor of the general proposal, will serve as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I believe that the vote taken on last Friday indicates that there is a very strong and growing feeling in the country that the practice of the filibuster in the United States Senate should be limited. Four years ago, when this question was brought up, as all of us know, those of us who were opposed to the filibuster mustered only 21 votes. This time we mustered 38 votes, and 2 of our supporters were absent; and we believe the numbers will increase in the future.

Despite the determined opposition of the leaders of both parties, the forces of reform made a fine showing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that there also be printed in the RECORD an abstract of this resolution.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution (S. Res. 17) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to lie on the table for 1 day, as follows:

That section 2 of rule 22 of the standing rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"2. (a) If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 3 or rule 6 or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 3 or rule 6 or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished busi-

ness, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of rule 22 of the standing rules of the Senate is repealed.

The abstract of the resolution (S. Res. 17) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, is as follows:

PROPOSED CHANGES IN RULE 22

Debate may be limited by two-thirds of those present and voting 2 calendar days after a petition has been submitted by 16 Senators and by a majority of those chosen and sworn (49) after 15 calendar days.

ABSTRACT OF PROVISION

(1) Substitutes for section 2 of rule 22, which requires 64 affirmative votes to limit debate:

(a) A provision that debate may be limited by a vote of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting 2 calendar days after a petition signed by 16 Senators has been presented to the Senate; and

(b) A new subsection which states that debate may be limited by a majority vote of those Senators "duly chosen and sworn" (49) 15 calendar days (excluding Sundays and legal holidays) after a petition is presented by 16 Senators to limit debate.

(2) Leaves intact the present provisions with respect to a petition by 16 Senators, and the procedures following a favorable vote on a motion to limit debate; that is, that each Senator shall be limited to 1 hour and that no dilatory motion may be presented, etc.

(3) Deletes section 3 of rule 22 which states that there can be no limitation of debate whatsoever on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rules of the Senate.

(4) Clearly provides that the new cloture provision applies to a motion to proceed to consider a change in the rules by the broad language which includes "any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business."

This is to insure that the new language does not restore the loophole of the 1917 rule.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 3. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 4. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 6. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the Southeastern United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 8. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 9. A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 10. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 11. A bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. ERVIN:

S. 12. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 13. A bill for the relief of Kuo Cheng Wu and his wife, Edith Wu, and their two sons, Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu;

S. 14. A bill for the relief of Vizulis Lagzdins;

S. 15. A bill for the relief of Margaret C. Morris;

S. 16. A bill for the relief of Lucy Lin and her minor child, Peter Lin;

S. 17. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Y. Yip;

S. 18. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Renda; and

S. 19. A bill for the relief of Shu Tah Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 20. A bill for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 21. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 22. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade;

S. 23. A bill to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

S. 24. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees;

S. 25. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; and

S. 26. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 27. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 28. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; and

S. 29. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 30. A bill to authorize the taxation of certain Federal real property by State and local tax authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 31. A bill to be known as the Urgent Minerals Purchase Program Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1957;

S. 32. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada;

S. 33. A bill to provide for the allocation of portions of the costs of Davis Dam and Reservoir to servicing the Mexican Water Treaty, and for other purposes;

S. 34. A bill to provide relief for producers of certain critical minerals, metals, and materials indispensable in the construction of jet engines;

S. 35. A bill to provide that the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory; and

S. 36. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory; for

the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of the Territory; and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 37. A bill to protect the security of the United States by preventing the employment by the United States of persons found to be disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 38. A bill to authorize river improvement on the Truckee and Carson Rivers and tributaries, California and Nevada, in order to provide for additional flood control protection on the Truckee and Carson Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 39. A bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 40. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 41. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a two thousand four hundred seventy-seven and forty-three-one hundredths-acre tract of land, avigation and sewer easements, in Tarrant and Wise Counties, Tex., situated about 20 miles northwest of the city of Fort Worth, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 42. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 43. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 44. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the State of New Mexico; and

S. 45. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to the village of Central, State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by him formerly part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 46. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 631 and the following), so as to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years;

S. 47. A bill to authorize the further extension of certain noncompetitive oil or gas leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; and

S. 48. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Mary Barme and her two minor children, Steran Barme and Dinah Barme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 52. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 53. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himslf and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 54. A bill to amend section 9 of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Rehabilitation Act to extend the matching formula provided by such section to State plans under the Social Security Act for the permanently and totally disabled and to administrative expenditures under the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 55. A bill to repeal section 221 and amend certain other sections of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 56. A bill for the relief of George P. Provencal;

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Mordecai Israel;

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Duk Chang Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 59. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 60. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 61. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Young Women's Christian Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 62. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas;

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Joan Yung-en Chao;

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Maria Lenz;

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Helen Cruz Ball; and

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hamasaki Fawcett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 67. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of those leaders who pioneered in the field of mental health;

S. 68. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine, who pioneered in the field of public health education;

S. 69. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of Christopher "Kit" Carson;

S. 70. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; and

S. 71. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (by request):

S. 72. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 73. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Amelia Earhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 74. A bill to amend part VII, subchapter B, chapter I, subtitle A, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (68A Stat. 69); to the Committee on Finance.

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Vincent Lee Lao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 76. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 77. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 78. A bill to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Karras alias Costas Karras;

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Alessandroni; and

S. 81. A bill for the relief of Luigi Frione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 83. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of

persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 84. A bill to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 85. A bill to provide for the review and revision of certain soil-bank contracts relating to 1956 wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 86. A bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 87. A bill for the relief of Pavel Blaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 88. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages securing loans which are guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 89. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance Fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Nasseff;

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt;

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Robert Karia;

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Anna Teresa Steinhauser and Dominic Paul Steinhauser (Iliroshi Tsuruda);

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Lee Chong Taik;

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Yu Tseng Hsi;

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Corazon A. Manayan; and

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng-en Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 98. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 99. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Winona, Minn., for flood-control purposes;

S. 100. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River, Minn., for navigational purposes;

S. 101. A bill to authorize certain flood protection work on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn.;

S. 102. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Root River at Rushford, Minn., for flood-control purposes; and

S. 103. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 104. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 105. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 106. A bill to exempt motor vehicles sold for the use of religious and nonprofit educational institutions from Federal excise tax;

S. 107. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits;

S. 108. A bill to exempt shipments of livestock from the tax on transportation of property;

S. 109. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on household-type equipment;

S. 110. A bill to repeal the tax on admission, refreshment, service, and merchandise at roofgardens, cabarets, and other similar places;

S. 111. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on electric flatirons and electric ironers;

S. 112. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property;

S. 113. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons and property;

S. 114. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal;

S. 115. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 116. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois;

S. 117. A bill to amend section 753 of title 28 of the United States Code to prescribe more fully the duties and obligations of official reporters appointed by district courts of the United States;

S. 118. A bill for the relief of the General Box Co.;

S. 119. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

S. 120. A bill for the relief of James F. Walsh;

S. 121. A bill for the relief of the Florida Dehydration Co.;

S. 122. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley;

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Dr. James R. P. Wong;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Josephine Suydam;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Vasil Theodosovitch Stepanchuk;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Ljubischa Nikolich;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Nicola Accettura;

S. 129. A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), and for other purposes; and

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District Numbered 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 132. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 133. A bill creating the city of Saint Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

S. 134. A bill authorizing the acquisition of certain lands in the Sinnissippi Lake, Ill., in connection with the operation of Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes; and

S. 135. A bill to authorize certain improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barner Muentsch Cox;

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Hans Paul Lange;

S. 138. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Rustler;

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Maria D. F. Piadis;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Jan Szpytman;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Jean Alma Walsh and Jennifer Elaine Walsh;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Suyama;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fricano, Maria Scelba Fricano, Stefano Fricano and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano; and

S. 144. A bill for the relief of Lucrecia Zuckermann Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 146. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey certain property located in the vicinity of Montgomery, Montgomery County, Ala., to the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Guido William Grambergs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 148. A bill to provide that the daily ration of personnel in the Armed Forces shall include at least 1 quart of milk per day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 149. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 150. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 151. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 152. A bill for the relief of George P. Nelson;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Tsui Yung Wong;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of H. B. Woolf and H. B. Woolf, Jr.;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Abraham Harry Wyman;

S. 156. A bill for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co.;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Frosene Nichols; and

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 159. A bill to provide additional cotton acreage for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ioannou;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Elias Youssef Mikhael (Ellis Joseph Michael);

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Jew Gim Gee;

S. 163. A bill to extend the period for filing claims under the War Claims Act of 1948;

S. 164. A bill for the relief of John G. Michael; and

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 166. A bill to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans so as to extend, with respect to certain individuals, the period during which such benefits may be offered; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 167. A bill to allow a credit of $7 against the manufacturers' excise tax in the case of ultrahigh frequency television receiving sets; and

S. 168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of minimum old-age insurance benefit; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Basa Alonso Dominguez;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Maria Karageorge; and

S. 171. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prescribe certain qualifications for persons appointed as members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 172. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 173. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the requirement that an individual have attained 50 years of age in order to be eligible for disability benefits thereunder and repeal the provision which requires that the amount of disability benefits thereunder be reduced by the amount of certain other benefits payable by reason of the same disability; and

S. 174. A bill to provide for accrued servicemen's indemnity payments in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 175. A bill to allow an additional income-tax exemption for a dependent child who is a full-time college student; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 176. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the importation free of duty of religious vestments and regalia presented without charge to a church or to certain religious, educational, or charitable organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the individual exemption for income tax purposes from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith;

S. 179. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability; and

S. 180. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Lindbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 181. A bill to amend section 4201 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Anne Schwellenbach;

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Anne Schwellenbach;

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Frederick;

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk;

S. 186. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability;

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kalyna Maya Chalk; and

S. 188. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Peter V. Bosch; and

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Jean Pfeifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 191. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 192. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees;

S. 193. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 194. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees;

S. 195. A bill to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes", approved September 1, 1954, so as to limit its application to cases involving the national security; and

S. 196. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 197. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 198. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 199. A bill to amend the act pertaining to the establishment of a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the national capital; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LONG (for himself ond Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 200. A bill providing for control and eradication of the water hyacinth and certain other obnoxious aquatic plant growths;

S. 201. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana;

S. 202. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, Louisiana;

S. 203. A bill to provide for the improvement of Fresh Water Bayou, Louisiana;

S. 204. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayou Chevreuil, Louisiana; and

S. 205. A bill to provide for the improvement of the waterway between Barataria Bay, La., and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 206. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; and

S. 207. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 208. A bill to prohibit the denial of a deduction as a business expense for compensation paid to a dependent of the taxpayer for personal services actually rendered in the taxpayer's trade or business; and

S. 209. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 210. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, and the portion of Standing Rock Indian Reservation which is located within the boundaries of the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 211. A bill to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces;

S. 212. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior;

S. 213. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; and

S. 214. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay a certain sum for school construction under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to Underwood School District No. 8, Underwood, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 216. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor;

S. 217. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during month of December;

S. 218. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fun, and for other purposes;

S. 219. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers;

S. 220. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for payment of annuities to widowers of female employees, and to surviving children, without regard to dependency; and

S. 221. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 222. A bill to provide for the preservation of acreage history for the purpose of future wheat-acreage allotments where such allotments are underplanted because of unfavorable weather conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

S. 223. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain land to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak.; and

S. 224. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, the Oahe Dam project, the Gavins Point Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 225. A bill for the relief of Kew Chan (Chan Kew), Nancy Tsui Mei (Leung) Chan, and Cecilia (Oi Fan) Chan;

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Earl E. Brown;

S. 227. A bill declaring September 17 a legal public holiday to be known as Constitution Day;

S. 228. A bill for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; and

S. 229. A bill to authorize United States attorneys to institute denaturalization proceedings by filing a verified complaint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 230. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, in order to make certain nonprofit corporations and associations eligible for Federal aid under such title; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 231. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 232. A bill to require the filing with officials of the Congress of information copies of statements filed with State or Territorial officials with respect to contributions received, or expenditures made, in connection with primaries, conventions, and other processes for the selection of party candidates for election to the Senate or House of Representatives or for the selection of delegates to the national conventions of political parties; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 233. A bill to permit the importation of a trademarked article, without the consent of the owner of the trademark, when such article is for the personal use of the person importing such article; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 234. A bill to amend the definition of the term "Airport development" in the Federal Airport Act, as amended;

S. 235. A bill to increase from $50 to $75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service;

S. 236. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended, relating to the retirement pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; and

S. 237. A bill to regulate the interestate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 238. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the ascertainment of the physical inability of the President to perform the duties of his office and for other purposes;

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Maria Parisi; and

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Cesar William Delgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 241. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; and

S. 242. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 244. A bill to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 246. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Max Mazak Terian and his wife, Maria Terian;

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Herta Kubelle Shields;

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Theodora Hegeman;

S. 250. A bill for the relief of Kyu Yawp Lee and his wife, Hyung Sook Lee;

S. 251. A bill for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Katarzyna Siwik;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Josef Michael Adolf; and

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Susana M. Umanos;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Shikanuki;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Aristea Vitogianes; and

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Deimbeck Major; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 258. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 259. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; and

S. 260. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 261. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Kautsouradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James S. Carpenter;

S. 263. A bill for the relief of the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership;

S. 264. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; and

S. 265. A bill for the relief of Jalal Besharat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 266. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. STENNIS, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 267. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1957 and subsequent crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. STENNIS and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 268. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Fischer; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 271. A bill for the relief of Johannes Sukevainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 272. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure payment of the full face value of national service life insurance policies on which payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 273. A bill to amend section 8 (c) (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 274. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the arrival of the *Mayflower II* in Plymouth, Mass., during 1957; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 275. A bill to amend section 48 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at Miami, Fla.;

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Mae Howell;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Paul Burkhart;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Arenas Torre;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Agapito Jorolan;

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Jaffa Kam;

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley;

S. 283. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court;

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Miyako Ueda Osgood;

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Paul Gustin;

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Maria Matilde Picallo;

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Irene Yanez Gonzalez;

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Esther Guagliardo; and

S. 289. A bill for the relief of L. Foster Udell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 290. A bill to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalties of the Government of the United States;

S. 291. A bill to provide for payment of the balance due on joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States;

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Eero Juno Valkonen;

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Donald S. Beckwith;

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins;

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Manesis and George Orphanos;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Choon Hi Kim;

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian P. Stumm;

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Sorensen Fish Co.; and

S. 299. A bill for the relief of Yi Nyong Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 300. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 301. A bill to continue the present price-support program for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Col. Ernest B. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Mattioli Cicchini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 304. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 305. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands to require competitive bidding for leases of deposits of oil and gas not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 306. A bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation of passengers by common carriers by water engaged in foreign commerce and in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Noemi Maria Vida Williams; and

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Maria Caccomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 309. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 310. A bill to establish procedure to be followed by Secretaries of the military departments for adjustment or settlement of claims of less than $2,500 resulting from United States acquisition of land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 311. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the channel leading from Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, Del.; and

S. 312. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the channel leading from Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. THYE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. IVES):

S. 313. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 314. A bill to assist the United States cotton-textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 315. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing thereof to the States for civil-defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 316. A bill to provide for stating appropriations on an accrued-expenditure basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 317. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 318. A bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 319. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 320. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for the designation of a certain portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ruff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 322. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for nonrecognition of gain if property held for productive use or for investment is compulsorily or involuntarily converted into property of a like kind to be held for productive use or for investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 323. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 324. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 325. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 326. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 327. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the State of Montana to Theresa Brost;

S. 328. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 329. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 330. A bill to declare that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; and

S. 331. A bill to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 332. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 333. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 334. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Tokuhata; and

S. 336. A bill for the relief of Angela Ferrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 337. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 338. A bill to authorize modification of existing project for the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 339. A bill to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 340. A bill to amend section 4 (c) of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), relating to the construction of small reclamation projects;

S. 341. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1954, on termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 342. A bill to implement the 10-year Mission 66 plan that has been undertaken for the public benefit concerning the rehabilitation, improvement, and preservation of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 343. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 344. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

S. 345. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; and

S. 346. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 347. A bill to authorize modification of existing project for the Siuslaw River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the payment of the estate tax in installments;

S. 349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships;

S. 350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plan;

S. 351. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of certain methods and rates of depreciation for used property acquired after 1956; and

S. 352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 353. A bill for the relief of George A. Zizicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 355. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

S. 356. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia" so as to provide for the appointment of a referee; and

S. 357. A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 358. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of about 37.75 acres of land comprising a part of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 359. A bill to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of an one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 360. A bill to amend section 2 (d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the maximum amount which a recipient of disability benefits under such act may receive as earnings from employment or self-employment to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution designating the Saturday before Palm Sunday in each year as Crippled Children's Day; and

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 12, 1957, to February 19, 1957, as National Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument in the city of Decatur, Ill., to the memory of, and in honor of, the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prescribing the term of office of members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway traffic safety conditions; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and propose improvements in the methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

BASIC WORKWEEK FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2) to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement, presented by Mr. PURTELL, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PURTELL

I have today introduced for appropriate reference a bill providing for a 35-hour workweek for Federal Government employees. My purpose is primarily exploratory. I believe Senate hearings on the proposed legislation will develop much valuable information as to the shorter workweek not only for Federal Government employees but for the Nation's work force in general. Such a study, I hope, will be all-inclusive and will extend to a review of the possibilities of making the wage-and-hour law more flexible and practical as to overtime provisions in the event the 35-hour workweek becomes a general reality. Obviously there are great ramifications attendant upon a shorter workweek and we must study and understand them and their impact on our economy. When all the facts are ascertained, as I hope they will be, we will be able to act on information reflecting the true picture in its effect on business, industry, and labor throughout our Nation. I trust the bill will result in a pilot study which will in itself be a most valuable service.

I know I have been and will be criticized by some people, but not by those who really understand my objective and who appreciate the great problems which lay before us. Changing social and economic conditions seem certain to bring about a shorter workweek, not necessarily this year or next year, but inevitably. Why then should we fear facing the facts? Why should we turn our

backs to the future? Why not explore, understand and intelligently prepare for the absorption into our economic structure of such inevitable changes?

It is true that today we have approximately 65 million employed and there are relatively few areas of under employment. This is particularly so in my State of Connecticut. But we must look beyond the present.

It is also true that more than one-half of our national budget today must be spent for defense. Millions are employed directly or indirectly as a result of defense spending, but certainly our future is not predicated upon forever being thus engaged. Surely we hope and believe the time will come when our defense needs lessen and a substantial portion of the labor force now so engaged will be channeled into consumer goods production. Our population is increasing rapidly—some estimate the 1970 population of our country as high as 200 million people. Millions are entering our work force yearly and their number will increase. The individual life span has been lengthened and will be lengthened further. Also while it is probably true that, today in our defense activity, middle age is not a particular deterrent to gaining employment, this has not always been true nor will it probably be true in a peacetime economy unless we so provide.

There should be, there must be, a continuing place in our work force for those over 45 or 50 or 55 or 60 years of age, able, willing and ready to work. A perusal of the help-wanted columns particularly in metropolitan papers even today clearly indicates the age limitation placed upon job opportunities.

As an industrial nation, we have developed a highly interdependent society. With continuing advances in mechanization, in automation, we shall be even more interdependent. Let us, then, look ahead and prepare to meet intelligently the changing social and economic needs of our people and our Nation.

A workweek of fewer than 40 hours is neither novel nor new. Most Connecticut State employees work a 35-hour week. This is generally true also of Rhode Island and New Jersey. At least 20 of the States and Territories have less than a 40-hour workweek. In Connecticut, the insurance companies work an average week of a little over 36 hours.

In many metropolitan areas the printing industry has reduced the workweek below 40 hours and the reduction is spreading throughout the industry. In the construction field, more than 10 percent of union tradesmen have a standard 7-hour day in major cities. In Akron, Ohio, the rubber industry has been on a 36-hour week for more than 20 years. Schedules of less than 40 hours have been in effect in some areas of the country, in lumbering, millinery, jewelry, coal mining, retailing, fur, motion pictures. A large portion of clerical employees and other office workers are on schedules of less than 40 hours a week in many areas. More than 95 percent of the organized lady garment workers are now working under agreements providing for a 35-hour week at the present time or before the expiration of present contracts.

The objective of the proposed study is not to find out how to maintain the present work schedules and to encourage the payment of overtime for all hours worked in excess of 35. The objective is to examine the question of a 35-hour workweek schedule for Federal Government employees. In the process of doing so, I hope, will be produced much helpful information on how such a shortened schedule may be generally adopted in all fields when economic and social needs require it.

What is wrong with exploring this whole matter so that the Nation may gear itself to changing conditions and to prepare itself to meet such changes without weakening our economic structure?

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT OF WEBER BASIN, UTAH, FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3) to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS,) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I am reintroducing a bill for myself and Senator WATKINS which would authorize flood control improvements along the Weber and Ogden Rivers in Utah. An identical bill, S. 722, which I offered in 1955 was included in the Omnibus Public Works bill, H. R. 12080, as it passed the Senate and House in 1956 and was also approved by all of the executive agencies including the Bureau of the Budget. Unfortunately other projects which had not been investigated by the Bureau of the Budget were included in H. R. 12080 and it was therefore vetoed by the President.

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The year 1952 saw a severe flood pour down the Weber and Ogden Rivers inundating and severely damaging 1,200 acres of key residential, business, industrial and manufacturing property in the city of Ogden, while at the same time washing out one transcontinental highway artery in several places and flooding another, as well as flooding strategic railroads and the Ogden railroad yards. Twenty thousand acres of improved agricultural lands were damaged and 100 acres of important residential and business land in Morgan were flooded.

The Corps of Engineers estimates, I believe conservatively, that unless protective measures are taken, flood damage will average $264,000 each year.

NATURE OF THE PROJECT

The Army Corps of Engineers proposes in the flood control plan to operate several existing and authorized projects for flood control including Echo, Wanship, Pineview, Lost Creek and East Canyon Creek reservoirs as well as the Willare Bay diversion canal. I have been assured that the present contemplated uses of these structures will not be jeopardized or harmed in any way by operating them for flood control purposes together with their original purposes.

Channel improvements will be made where necessary on the Weber River between Morgan and the mouth of the Ogden River. These improvements will consist of about 5 miles of low disconnected levees; rock revetment where required to prevent bank erosion; about 12 miles of clearing and snagging; and channel enlargement in Ogden by raising the banks, removing the Hooper and Plain City diversion dams, and deepening the channel after removal of the dams.

The plan will afford protection from floods downstream from the Echo reservoir on the Weber River, and from Pineview reservoir on the Ogden River from all floods with an indicated frequency of occurrence of once in 50 years in rural areas and once in 100 years in urban areas.

COST OF THE PROJECT

The estimated first cost of the channel improvements is $635,000 of which $500,000 would be provided by the Federal Government and $115,000 by the local interests. The estimated charges after completion will be $40,000, of which $15,800 is Federal and $24,200 will be locally provided.

This cost is more than justified when compared to the estimated annual benefits from the project of $242,000, particularly when it is realized that the 1952 flood causing better than $1,600,000 in damages would have been largely prevented if this project had been in existence.

LOCAL COOPERATION PLEDGED

Both Weber and Morgan Counties which are principally involved in this project have pledged their fullest cooperation in assuming the local portions of the project operation and cost. The State of Utah wholeheartedly supports the project, feeling that nothing but good can come from its approval. The only reservation the State had concerned the fear that fishing might be damaged. However, the Corps of Engineers has assured the State that developments on the project will be coordinated with the Utah Fish and Game Commission so as to minimize any harmful effects the construction may have on the fishery resources, so the only problem has been removed.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

A survey of the Bonneville Basin was authorized in 1938 and included the Weber and Ogden Rivers. A report was completed by the Army Corps of Engineers in June of 1954, and I introduced a bill, S. 3607, embodying the Corps' recommendations. Unfortunately, it was too late for the bill to be included in the omnibus flood control bill of 1954, since the final report by the Corps was not submitted to Congress until May 9, 1955.

In January of 1955, at the beginning of the new Congress, I reintroduced my bill, now S. 722, which was followed by H. R. 4262 introduced by Congressman DIXON in February of the same year.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, seven bills.

The first, entitled, "A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft," received strong support from all areas of the country during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. I deem this proposed legislation to be of vital importance to the safety and well-being of all Americans who travel the airways and those on the ground who may be subjected to the tragedy of an air crash caused by the actions of some berserk passenger under the influence of alcoholic beverages. I hope this bill will receive prompt attention by the committee to which it is referred so that hearings can be held in the Senate for the purpose of presenting the real facts about the dangers inherent in the continuation of the practice of serving intoxicating beverages aboard commercial and military aircraft.

The second bill I introduce is entitled, "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation

of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes." The purpose of this proposed legislation, Mr. President, is to curb the practice of channeling Government procurement contracts to preferential areas of the country at the expense of other areas where manufacturers are capable of providing the same goods and services at lower cost to the Government and American taxpayers. This totally unfair method of awarding Government contracts has resulted in gross inequities under both administrations. At one time, the Office of Defense Mobilization had authorized set-asides of as much as 50 percent and I protested against this. But, during the 84th Congress, I discovered that Dr. Arthur Flemming had authorized a 100 percent procurement set aside for a labor-surplus area. This order excluded all plants outside this particular area from presenting any bids whatsoever, thereby knocking from contention a plant in Greenville, S. C., which specialized in that type product and which could have undertaken these contracts at a low cost to the Government. I have written to Dr. Flemming protesting this type of action, but I have received no satisfaction from his replies. Thus, legislation is necessary to bring about a reversal of this discriminatory policy by administrative decree.

The third bill I introduce for appropriate reference is entitled "A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities." This bill is designed specifically to prohibit contractors negotiating contracts with the Federal Government from gaining immunity from State and local sales taxes on their purchases used in fulfilling these obligations. Too many revenue sources have already been closed to the States. This is clearly one area in which the taxing power of the State should not be denied under the guise of Federal immunity.

I introduce another bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the southeastern United States." This great agricultural area of our country has been struck by serious droughts during the past few years and also by adverse weather conditions resulting in increased soil erosion. This proposed legislation is needed to aid our conservationists in discovering better practices for preserving both our valuable soil and water resources.

The fifth bill I introduce is entitled "A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C." I hope this bill will receive early consideration by the Congress, as its passage is vital to the operation of the new Bowater Paper Mill near Rock Hill. The Catawba Indian leaders have agreed to the acquisition of certain land by the city of Rock Hill for the purpose of erecting a sewerage-treatment plant for this new and important industry in that community.

Another bill which I introduce for appropriate reference is entitled, "A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party." This bill is designed to plug another loophole in our tax laws which permits organizations to spend tax-free money to promote litigation to which such organizations are not a party.

Finally, I send to the desk and introduce, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina] and myself, a bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage-reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments." Many of our tobacco farmers are facing economic collapse as a result of continuous slashes in tobacco acreage quotas. We propose this legislation in an effort to provide these farmers with a small benefit which may mean enough to many of them to keep them in America's greatest and most vital business—that of farming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 4. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 6. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the southeastern United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 8. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 9. A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 10. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage-reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several colleagues, I am reintroducing today the bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act, the so-called equality of opportunity bill, which is designed to give small business an opportunity to compete fairly with big business. I ask, Mr. President, that after receiving a number, this bill remain upon the desk 1 week for the addition of the names of any other Senators who might wish to join in its sponsorship.

In the last session, this bill passed the House by a vote of 393 to 3. It was caught, however, in the closing days of the Senate when unanimous consent was required to bring up a bill, and was never given Senate consideration.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act and a life-long friend of small business, has reintroduced an identical bill in the House.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to close a loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act. The loophole is the so-called good-faith defense, which permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon competition, so long as it is made in good faith.

The burden is upon enforcement agencies to prove the discrimination was not in good faith—which is extremely difficult as a practical matter.

The loophole stemmed from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case (340 U. S. 231). In that decision the Court held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended merely to give all business, large and small, an equal opportunity in the competitive race for survival. At the time of its enactment in 1935, small business was being driven to the wall. Large buyers were obtaining price concessions which enabled them to sell at prices the small merchants, regardless of their efficiency, could not possibly meet.

In passing the Robinson-Patman Act, Congress sought to remedy this situation. The rule underlying the new law was a simple one. A seller must not discriminate in price where such discriminations are not justified by differences in cost of servicing different customers and where the effect of such unjustified discriminations may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The essence of the Court's decision in the Standard Oil case is that wherever the FTC challenges a discriminatory practice, and the supplier pleads that he has carried on that practice in good faith, the Government is stopped from issuing a cease and desist order, and the supplier is free to continue the practice, regardless of its effect on competition.

The bill which we are introducing today would go a long way toward attaining the objectives which the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act thought they had secured when the act was passed originally. Under it good faith would not be a complete defense, where probably the effect of the discrimination is to injure competition; but, where the discrimination is of lesser dimensions, good faith would still be a complete defense.

We seek no special favors for small business. We seek merely to preserve the free competitive system. The enactment of this bill, which has now had a legislative history of some 8 years, would go a long way toward protecting that free competitive system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for the addition of the names of other sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED MONTHLY WARTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 2 days so that other Senators may avail themselves of the opportunity to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 39) to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MURRAY) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEATH PENSION PAYABLE TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 2 days to enable Senators who wish to cosponsor it to add their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 40) to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. YOUNG) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SAN ANGELO RECLAMATION PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, two particularly crucial problems face this new Congress: the crisis in foreign affairs and the great drought of the Southwest. On Saturday we heard the President's foreign policy proposals. Later this month the President will begin his trip into Texas and other States to appraise the economic and human damage that has been done during a catastrophic drought.

The Senate will soon apply itself to the President's foreign policy proposals. Today I should like to comment on another crisis facing our Nation—the drought.

This drought in the Southwestern States has been going on now for 7 or 8 years. It is the worst, in severity and duration, which my State has ever suffered.

But even if we should have more than adequate rainfall for the next 12 months; even if the Federal Government responds to the great need for drought relief, the problem will remain. In Texas—even when rainfall is adequate—we are continually plagued by two dilemmas: too much rain in the wrong places; the threat of flash floods and these agonizing, interminable periods of drought.

West Texas is particularly susceptible to these harassments. When it does rain in this region, it overflows the arroyos and riverbeds, threatening property, life, and devastating the land. Moreover, rain is of little benefit when 80 percent of these waters flow unused into the Gulf of Mexico.

And when there is no rain, of course, farmlands lie useless and public water supplies are imperiled.

I am introducing today a bill, providing for the construction of a reclamation project near San Angelo, Tex., which is designed to meet both the flood-control and water-supply problems in this area. This identical project was approved by the Senate in the closing days of the 84th Congress. The only difference between last year's bill and this one, is that the crisis which the project is designed to relieve has become even more severe.

The major features of this project are Twin Buttes Dam and Reservoir, which will impound the waters of the Middle and South Concho Rivers to a capacity of 810,000 acre-feet, and a complete irrigation system providing water for 10,000 acres of land downstream from San Angelo.

Senators who have traveled in the West during the past year do not need my words to convince them of the gravity of the water problem there. I earnestly hope the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will turn its attention to this project with all sympathy and dispatch.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 42) to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the honor to introduce, on my own behalf and that of a number of other Senators of both political parties, bills to admit the strategic American Territories of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the United States. Appropriately, I have asked that the symbolic numbers 49 and 50 be assigned to these measures.

The two bills I am sending forward for appropriate reference differ from the statehood bills of previous years in that they are proposed acts of admission, as distinct from enabling acts. That is, S. 49 and S. 50 recognize the fact that both Alaska and Hawaii already have adopted State constitutions. The bills would give approval to these constitutions under proper safeguards. They would authorize the people of the Territories to elect congressional and State officers in the general elections of 1958, and thereafter be admitted as States.

Thus, the Alaska bill does not call for the immediate seating in the Senate of the two distinguished citizens of Alaska who were elected as "provisional United States Senators," so to speak, last fall. It is my present belief that the Members of the Senate well may wish to consider that question separately.

Mr. President, I desire to explain why this year statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is being proposed in separate bills, rather than in a single joint bill, as in the 83d and 84th Congresses. Frankly, this procedure is at the request of the duly elected Delegates of both Territories, and, as nearly as can be ascertained, is in accord with the wishes of a majority of the citizens of both Territories.

Separate bills in no way reflect any change whatsoever in my belief and that of the other sponsors of the measures that both Alaska and Hawaii are equally ready for statehood, and that both should be accorded equal treatment by the Congress and by the administration. We have been assured that the President will carry out the provisions of his party's platform this year in respect to Alaska, as well as to Hawaii, and give the administration's support to both, equally.

I want to give the Senate my solemn assurance that we will insist upon such equality of treatment when it comes to legislative action.

A majority of the continuing members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both parties have indicated their intention to give prompt attention to the statehood bills, and it is my hope we can bring these measures before this body very early in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, for himself and other Senators, were received, read twice by their titles, and

referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; and

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and Senators ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BRICKER, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, COTTON, DWORSHAK, FLANDERS, HRUSKA, IVES, JENNER, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, WATKINS, REVERCOMB, SCHOEPPEL, and WILEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 2 days to enable other Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPERIMENTAL SEARCH PROGRAM AND CLOUD MODIFICATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 84) to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, every Member of Congress is interested in the studies being made by the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. Capt. Howard T. Orville, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control and consultant to Friez instrument division, Bendix Aviation Corp., on the 10th of December 1956 delivered an address on that subject before the national convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Miami, Fla. The address is entitled, "What Every Farmer Should Know About Weather Modification (Cloud Seeding)."

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to the reading of all who are interested in the subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE FARMER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WEATHER MODIFICATION (CLOUD SEEDING)

(By Howard T. Orville, chairman, Advisory Committee on Weather Control and consultant to Friez instrument division, Bendix Aviation Corp.)

Recent reports received from the United States Department of Agriculture tell us that we are now experiencing one of the worst drought conditions in history. Twelve States comprising a total of over 500 counties, or parts of counties, have been declared disaster areas in connection with the hay and feed program. More than 600 counties, or parts of counties, in 12 States have been declared disaster areas as far as the soil-bank acreage reserve grazing program is concerned and more than 400 counties or parts of counties in 7 States have been declared disaster areas insofar as hay and feed for livestock are concerned. In all of these areas the serious water shortage has directed attention to the urgent need for supplementing present sources of water by every possible method known to man. One method which has been given wide publicity over the last 10 years is known as weather modification or cloud seeding.

Almost 10 years ago to the day 2 scientists, Dr. Irving Langmuir, a Nobel prize winner, and his assistant, Dr. Vincent Schaefer, succeeded in creating a snowstorm by dropping dry ice pellets from an aircraft into a supercooled cumulus cloud (a cloud having the appearance of a pack of wool and drifting along in temperatures well below freezing).

This successful flight was the culmination of some 5 or 6 years of exhaustive research at Mount Washington, N. H., and at the General Electric Laboratories at Schenectady. This historic flight probably represents the first time that man successfully modified the weather using accepted scientific methods and had created additional precipitation, although the amount was very small. However, the results of these experiments were so dramatic and aroused such widespread interest that it was not long before commercial cloud-seeding companies, World War II pilots, and many others were exploiting for personal gain these initial successful experiments. During the next 4 years, 1946–50, there were many newspaper accounts of almost phenomenal increases in rain or snowfall caused by artificial seeding of the clouds with dry ice or silver iodide, a chemical which has essentially the same crystalline structure as ice particles. Dr. Vonnegut, an associate of Dr. Langmuir and Dr. Schaefer, is credited with discovering that silver iodide may be used to milk the clouds of their moisture.

Unfortunately, these fantastic claims did not produce the water which was needed so badly in many of the Western States, and the farmers soon became very, very critical of any rainmaker who offered to seed the clouds and produce more rain over his farm. This is understandable, because in 1951–52 almost 20 percent of the total area of the United States was a target area for rainmaking operations. Many of these operations were being conducted by people who had little or no knowledge of the scientific aspects of weather modification and were endeavoring to make a quick fortune out of the poor farmers who were struggling to survive under terrific handicaps.

It is not surprising that Members of Congress became alarmed when their constituents from the farmlands and other areas experiencing water shortages informed them that the new methods of rain increasing were not producing the results claimed by the cloud-seeding companies. Others reported flood damage which they attributed to cloud-seeding operations.

This situation led Congress to start a series of investigations. Several bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Exhaustive hearings were held in which a large number of persons from every walk of life were asked to appear before the congressional committees to give their opinion as to the effectiveness of cloud-seeding experiments. After more than 2 years of hearings, a bipartisan bill was passed. This bill was originated by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, and sponsored by Senator Clinton Anderson, of New Mexico; Senator Warren Magnuson, of Washington; Senator Arthur Watkins, of Utah; and Senator Guy Gordon, of Oregon. President Eisenhower signed the bill on August 13, 1953. This became Public Law 256, which created the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, an 11-man committee consisting of 5 members from private life of recognized standing in business, science, and agriculture, and 6 Cabinet members (or their designees) of interested Government departments. This committee held its first meeting 9 days after the appointment by the President of the 5 members from private life. At its first meeting the committee adopted 4 guiding principles which are quoted below:

"First, the committee will base its conclusions on facts obtained and interpreted and not any preconceived notions. Experiments to date have suggested that weather control may eventually provide benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government. Without such a hint of substantial benefits, the Congress would most likely not have created this committee. However, the committee will not now proceed under the assumption that weather control, including rainmaking, does 'work' or does not 'work.' It will aim to examine all of the evidence with scholarly care and scientific impartiality.

"Second, the committee recognizes the need for additional basic research dealing with processes related to rain, snow, and cloud phenomena. There is also the need to develop ways and means of providing methods for reliable evaluation of weather-control activities. The committee will encourage such research in industry, at our universities, and throughout Government.

"Third, the committee will welcome, and will solicit, the information possessed by and the opinions held by all individuals and groups having an interest in the field of weather control. It will carefully consider all facts and opinions pertinent to its study.

"Fourth, the committee will not act in any way prejudical to responsible individuals and concerns attempting to modify the weather."

The committee has endeavored to carry out an impartial evaluation of commercial cloud-seeding operations in spite of technical and political prejudices and many sinister influences which have attempted to contaminate the findings to suit their own personal interests.

During the 3 years that the committee has been in existence it has held 14 meetings, has traveled over 150,000 miles throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands visiting field operations and talking to cloud seeders and their clients, consulted with or sought the advice of more than 100 prominent scientists familiar with one aspect or another of cloud physics or weather modification. It has reviewed innumerable technical documents covering the results of domestic or foreign cloud-seeding experiments. By January 1955 the committee had assembled a technical staff which developed a two-phase evaluation program. One phase dealt with the

rainfall data and statistical treatment to determine by well-known statistical methods whether the rainfall data measured over areas which had been seeded could detect any increase over that which would have occurred from natural causes. The other phase consisted of a physical evaluation program to determine whether the field methods used by the commercial cloud-seeding companies were valid. This overall evaluation program has been developed extensively in the past 2 years and one interim report has been submitted to President Eisenhower.

This report shows that, in spite of many difficulties, including defective instruments, great scarcity of or total lack of rainfall data and many other obstacles too numerous to mention, it was possible for the committee's technical staff to develop a methodology which, when applied to 6 west-coast projects, produced average increases of 9 to 17 percent over the expected precipitation in these States. Mountainous areas favor the forced ascent of cloud-seeding material into the deep cool moist storms characteristic of the late winter and early spring months. Of these 6 projects that have been operating continuously for a period of 3 to 5 years, 5 of them produced the increases quoted above, the sixth project was inconclusive.

In its report the committee emphasized that the results obtained in California, Oregon, and Washington could not be extrapolated to other States or other areas. There are 24 of the 48 States which have mountainous areas that favor positive results. The other States comprise those States in the Mississippi Valley, the gulf region, and the Great Plains and have shown inconclusive results for one reason or another or they have not yet been evaluated. This does not mean that cloud seeding is ineffective in these areas. This is the task which the committee will tackle during the next 2 years of its existence, to July 30, 1958.

It is of interest to note the economic benefits which might accrue to many areas receiving additional rain during the growing season. Senator CASE, of South Dakota, reported on January 12, 1956, "When the Congress first considered making appropriations to get this work underway, I told one of the committees of the Senate that:

"'If the advisory committee finds that weather modification experiments cannot produce important results, it will so report and thus deter farmers and ranchers from spending their money unwisely. This will, if such a report has to be made, save the public millions of dollars.

"'If the advisory committee finds that weather modification activities work only in certain circumstances, it will find out what those circumstances are and thus encourage feasible projects and discourage those which are not feasible.

"'If the advisory committee finds out it can confirm the results claimed by the reports it has so far received from reputable and scientifically competent operators—increases of from 7 to 50 percent and more—then the dollar benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government will be so great as to be incalculable.'

"In other words, I said at that time, whatever the committee reported, this would produce tangible and real economic benefits to the water users of this Nation."

And in the same remarks, "I can reasonably and conservatively estimate that precipitation increases of the magnitude indicated (9 percent to 17 percent by the committee) could produce average annual benefits of $20 million and quite possibly up to $50 million in these States."

In quoting further, Senator CASE has stated, "I hope that farmers, ranchers, and other water users will continue to sponsor cloud-seeding projects, keeping in mind the uncertainty of results in some areas but also the importance of the benefits compared to the relatively small cost if the seeding succeeds. They should probably insist on more careful scientific design of these projects and should probably introduce greater permanency in the projects so as to make evaluation feasible."

The committee is watching closely extensive cloud-seeding projects which are being carried out in foreign coutries, especially Australia, Japan, France, Switzerland, Spain, Israel, and Pakistan. At least 40 other countries have recently or are presently conducting some form of research using the scientific methods first proposed by Doctors Langmuir and Schaefer.

Another phase of the weather modification program which is of interest to those of you who are from the Midwestern States is the possibility of hail abatement.

As many of you well know, hailstorms cause extensive damage to crops, especially wheat and corn acreage in Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and Iowa. Fruit, especially apples, peaches, apricots, grapes, and plums, are easily damaged by hailstorms. Because of its broad leaves tobacco is particularly susceptible to hail damage. It has been reported that North Carolina has annual hail losses to its tobacco crop exceeding $3 million.

Destructive hailstorms have caused great damage in the Midwestern States. In 1951 hail damage amounted to $31,300,000 in the State of Kansas alone. The other Midwest States have also experienced some very destructive hailstorms. The largest hailstone ever officially recorded fell on Potter, Nebr., in 1928. Some of these hailstones measured 4½ inches to 5½ inches in diameter and the largest was 17 inches in circumference and weighed 24 ounces or 1½ pounds. In Lubbock, Tex., in 1930 a farmer was caught in an unprotected field and was pounded to death by these stones. However, this was an exceptional case.

Scientists have informed the committee that cloud seeding techniques may very well be used to suppress hail. They tell us that by seeding potential hail producing thunderstorms early enough it may cause the rain to start much earlier in many small drops and that the storm will dissipate before it ever reaches hail-producing proportions.

Last summer the committee was watching closely attempts to suppress hail in Scottsbluff, Nebr., Hudson Valley, N. Y., Wenatchee, Wash., and one or two other fruit-growing areas in Oregon and California. The reports of the success or failure of these projects have not yet been received in committee headquarters.

Hail suppression cloud-seeding operations require the use of a great number of silver iodide generators which are placed around and up-wind of the target area. When reports of impending thunderstorms are received the generators are automatically turned on and operate continuously until the threat of hail has passed. In some cases airplanes are also used to supplement the ground generators. In a few cases radar, the "magic eye" of electronics, is used to observe the effects of cloud seeding.

The committee has also been informed that the same techniques for suppressing hail should reduce the frequency of lightning strikes. If this is true then it is of utmost importance to reduce fire losses caused by lightning strikes in our national forests. Last spring damaging forest fires were experienced in Arizona and New Mexico. The United States Forest Service reported that 85 percent of these fires were caused by lightning strikes. Seventy-five percent of all forest fires in the Western States are caused by lightning. The cost of fighting forest fires exceeds $100 million annually.

As a result of initial success in cloud-seeding efforts there have been many inquiries covering a wide variety of problems, some of them are mentioned briefly below. Many unscrupulous individuals and outright quacks have attempted to sell cartridges and rockets supposedly filled with silver iodide or dry ice. Other charlatans have attempted to sell farmers electrical devices of various types which they claim will bring rainfall. All of these methods are fraudulent and persons known to be selling such products should be prosecuted. The county agricultural agent or the better business bureau can advise farmers whether or not a commercial cloud-seeding company uses scientific methods.

The question of "robbing Peter to pay Paul" has been asked repeatedly. Some individuals in Midwestern States believe that cloud seeding on the west coast has robbed them of precipitation which they would otherwise get were it not for the seeding. Others maintain that seeding clouds up-wind a few miles will rob them of rain which they would normally get. The best scientific opinion today indicates that present cloud seeding techniques will remove not more than 5 percent of the potential amount of moisture in a cloud and that even including the rain which would fall naturally probably more than 90 percent of the total moisture in a cloud moves on down-wind. So there appears to be little likelihood that in the overall picture cloud seeding takes moisture away from farmers down-wind from the target area.

Since cloud seeding operations cost only 2 cents to 18 cents an acre, depending upon the type of crop and soil, the cost-benefit ratio is so great, 1 to 20 or better especially during the growing season, many farmers have told the committee that the risk is well worth the money it costs to employ cloud-seeding companies. Others have indicated that many of the "calculated" risks that they take daily are much greater than those experienced with cloud seeding. Current estimates today are that the annual gross income from cloud seeding is $3 million to $5 million.

Cloud seeding to increase precipitation or for hail or lightning suppression is in its infancy. Much remains to be learned about the precipitation processes. Rain, snow, hail, and lightning occur under natural processes which are imperfectly understood today by our best informed scientists. Our ignorance level of the precipitation processes is extremely high. This means that our efforts should be devoted to conducting field experiments under controlled conditions with highly qualified scientists supervising the cloud-seeding operations.

Farmers should seek advice from their respective water resources agencies, State universities, or agricultural agents before entering into any contract with commercial cloud-seeding companies. There are a few very reliable companies, but there are also many individuals who are quacks and who are attempting to capitalize on the small knowledge which has been gained recently by scientific cloud seeding experiments.

It is of interest to summarize the results of the committee's evaluation program to date. It has found:

1. That supercooled stratified clouds can be dissipated by aircraft seeding with dry ice or silver iodide.

2. That precipitation can be initiated by seeding warm cumulus clouds with water.

3. That dry ice and silver iodide seeding of cumulus clouds extending to 5,000 feet or more above the freezing line and with a temperature at the top of the cloud of −10° centigrade will induce precipitation.

4. That ground generator seeding with silver iodide in the three Pacific coast States has produced average increases of 9 percent to 17 percent under the conditions mentioned in an earlier paragraph.

5. That an intensive study of hail prevention and the possibility of reducing lightning seems well justified. Many destructive forest fires in the Western States are started

by lightning strikes. It is believed that cloud seeding will start the precipitation process earlier and will prevent the storms from building up to hail and lightning-producing proportions. Much more study of this problem must be made before any final conclusions can be drawn.

6. That Federal regulation of rain-increasing operations is not justified at this time.

7. That continued controlled experimentation holds promise of developing new techniques which may be of greatest economic importance to the farmer.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills which I hope will be more effective than the verbal protests many of us have made against the proposed raising of the 4½-percent GI home loan interest rate. These bills would provide a renewed flow of investment money into the sagging GI home loan market. They are companions to proposed legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

These bills, if passed, would mean a saving to prospective veteran home purchasers of half a billion dollars in interest charges.

To put it very simply, they would save the average veteran who purchases a $14,000 GI home about $5 every month for 30 years because that is what it would cost the veteran in additional interest payments if he were required to pay 5 percent for his mortgage loan.

These measures provide that up to $3 billion shall be made available to purchase VA-guaranteed GI home mortgages at par. They would also reestablish the section of the Housing Act of 1950 which gave the VA authority to prohibit discounting of VA underwritten mortgages—a section which was repealed by the Republican 83d Congress.

Mr. President, I was shocked and dismayed during my travels around the country during the past year, to discover the alarming discounts which home builders and sellers of GI homes are being forced to pay lending and financial interests in order to place a GI mortgage, many of them running as high as $600 on an $11,000 house and in some areas even higher.

Under the proposed GI mortgage assistance bill, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized and directed to invest up to 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance premium reserves in VA guaranteed GI mortgages at their par value. Since the NSLI fund at present totals more than $5.5 billion, this will provide more than $1 billion to support GI home financing at the present ceiling interest rate of 4½ percent. The proposals also provide for supplementary financing, if that should be needed. This includes earmarking $1 billion of FNMA special assistance funds to be used immediately for purchases and advance commitments to purchase GI mortgages at par, and authority for the President to activate an additional billion dollars for such special assistance purchases, if necessary to carry out the objectives of the bills.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that the NSLI is guaranteed against any loss by provisions in the bills which require that any GI loan acquired by the fund which defaults shall be refunded or purchased directly by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. NSLI funds are already being invested in special issues of Treasury notes which yield a return of 3 percent. These proposals would give holders of NSLI policies the possibility of either lower insurance premiums or higher NSLI dividends.

The scandalous and exorbitant discounting practices which are being permitted since the administration persuaded the Congress in 1954 to repeal the 1950 prohibition should be stopped. I vividly recall the administration's 1953 argument that if the interest rates could only be raised to 4½ percent on GI and FHA mortgages, there would be enough mortgage funds activated so that discounting would no longer be a serious question.

Congress repealed the provision against discounting in the Housing Act of 1954, and look what we have—discounts up to 10 points this year. The effect has been to give an exorbitant gross yield to mortgage bankers of nearly 6 percent on a nominally 4½ percent Government-guaranteed mortgage.

The projected increase in the GI home-loan interest rate itself is simply one more item on the tight-money agenda. Where is it going to end? First they raise the FHA interest rate by a half percent. Now they want to raise the GI rate. What is this going to do to the interest rates on conventional loans? This indefinite boosting of interest rates is no answer at all. I think we should ask ourselves if we are not approaching the point where home buyers will not be able to meet the monthly payments on mortgage loans. An extra $5 a month for interest is a lot of money to budget for most home purchasers.

Mr. President, we must take some positive action to bring additional funds into the GI home-loan market. Home-building activity is being sharply curtailed, and is likely to be strangled by the hard-money policies of this administration if they are continued.

The bills I send to the desk are designed to help reverse these policies before it is too late.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 88. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special-assistance functions by purchasing mortgages securing loans which are guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 89. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REDUCTION OF CERTAIN CORPORATION INCOME TAXES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I announced publicly on December 23 that I would continue my efforts to adjust corporate tax rates and give relief to low-income corporations. Today, I introduce a bill for this purpose. I would be pleased, of course, if the House of Representatives would send the Senate a bill containing this or more favorable tax relief for small businesses. If the House does not, however, I plan to offer the substance of this bill as an amendment to any corporation income tax proposals passed by the House of Representatives.

This bill is the same as S. 3129, which I introduced on February 3, 1956, and which I offered as an amendment to revenue measures on two different occasions in the second session of the 84th Congress. I regret that the Finance Committee was unable to hold hearings on my bill and that its merits were not debated on the floor of the Senate. On one occasion, the Senate was told that the urgency for extension of certain excise taxes did not permit consideration of my proposal. On the other occasion, my amendment was objected to on the ground that it was not germane to the bill under consideration. I am hopeful that the early introduction of this proposal in the 85th Congress will permit the scheduling of hearings before the Finance Committee and full consideration by the Senate.

My proposal is easily understood and provides a partial answer to the vexing problem of halting the trend toward bigger and more powerful economic concentration in this country. Existing law prescribes a normal tax rate of 30 percent on all taxable corporate income, and a surtax rate of 22 percent on taxable corporate income in excess of $25,000. My bill, in essence, reverses these rates in a way which will increase Federal revenue and will reduce the tax bill for corporations earning less than $225,000 per annum. I propose a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent. The effects of this change appear in the following table:

Effects of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,750	−1,750	−8.5
$100,000	46,500	45,250	−1,250	−2.7
$225,000	111,500	111,500	(1)	(1)
$500,000	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
$1,000,000	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
$100,000,000	51,994,500	52,992,250	+997,750	+1.9

[1] No change.

The small tax increase for corporations earning in excess of $225,000 a year

will more than offset the tax reductions for small businesses, and will increase the total Federal tax yield from corporate taxpayers.

I will defer until a later date a detailed justification for this change in the corporate tax rates. For the present, however, I merely point out the prime consideration which moves me to introduce this bill. It is axiomatic that no living thing can remain static—it must grow or it must wither. The small corporations in our free economy cannot escape the inevitable—if they cannot grow, they must eventually pass from the business scene by failure or by absorption into a larger business unit. If present trends continue, we conceivably may find our economic fate in the hands of fewer and fewer corporate giants.

Small businesses can survive and grow only by retention of earnings. Earnings are their only reasonable source of new capital. They cannot compete for borrowings or in the securities markets. If Federal tax policies are not adjusted to relieve this biased position of small business units in their efforts to obtain growth capital, they have little hope for the future. I am convinced that tax relief is essential to a resolution of their dilemma.

Mr. President, I am quite optimistic about the prospects for small business tax relief this year. The small businessmen of the country were promised tax relief by both parties in the recent political campaign. In spite of recent discouraging statements by administration spokesmen, I believe that the Congress will not forget so quickly. I respectfully request the sympathetic consideration of this bill by all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 150) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1957

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal aid for school construction.

The bill I introduce today would provide for this purpose an emergency program of $2 billion in Federal funds, over a 2-year period. It would allocate funds on the basis of each State's population of school-age children. The States and their communities would be required to provide matching funds.

Mr. President, I call this an emergency program. I believe that today we face no graver domestic emergency than the tremendous shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation.

Even the most conservative estimates place the current shortage at a staggering 247,000 classrooms. In addition, our ever-increasing population creates a net increase of about one million new school-age children each year.

My bill is not intended to provide a long-range program. Neither does my bill seek to answer other pressing problems, such as those of teachers' pay and the promotion of scientific education.

The bill is intended, however, as a measure which will result in the building of schools, and will do so promptly, while suitable long-range policy is developed.

Enactment of the bill could mean a start in building more than 100,000 new classrooms in the next 2 years.

I urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of December 18, 1956, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 197) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1957."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, or the Canal Zone.

(3) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(4) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public schools. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(5) The term "school facilities," except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or other structures or facilities, intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or offsite improvements, or structures or facilities designed to be used exclusively for special activities, such as single-purpose auditoriums and gymnasiums.

(6) The terms "constructing" and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. The Congress finds that there is an appalling national shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities despite strenuous efforts of local communities, because their limited financial resources simply are not adequate to support necessary construction programs to eliminate such shortages. In many cases, local communities are hampered in their efforts to solve their problems by restrictive debt and tax limits, by their inability to borrow necessary funds at reasonable rates of interest, or similar reasons.

The Congress, while recognizing that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities is primarily that of the several States and their communities, finds that the national interest in our public-school system requires that the Federal Government assist State and local governments, consistent with their respective responsibilities, in meeting school-construction needs. The Congress recognizes that the solution of this problem will require a long-range Federal assistance school-construction program. However, in view of the emergency created by the appalling shortage of classrooms, an immediate Federal school-construction program is necessary. It is the purpose of this act to provide such emergency assistance to the States, so that this critical problem of inadequate school facilities may be attacked immediately in the light of current and anticipated school shortages, by authorizing grants to State educational agencies.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the next succeeding fiscal year, such amounts, not to exceed $1 billion in either fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 4, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States. As used in this section, the term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, as determined on the basis of the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) Any State which desires to accept the benefits of this act shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which shall—

(1) provide that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) set forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this act will be expended solely for school facilities construction projects approved by the State educational agency;

(3) set forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State for assistance under this act which will assure that first priority will be given (consistent with the matching requirements of section 8) to local educational agencies which, upon making an effort commensurate with their economic resources, are unable, solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of needed school facilities; the priority principles set forth in accordance with this paragraph shall take into account (A) the financial resources of the several local educational

agencies in the State, (B) the efforts which have been and are being made to meet their needs for school facilities out of State and local funds, and (C) the urgency of their needs for school facilities, determined according to conditions of overcrowding or lack of facilities, and extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are in use;

(4) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this act;

(5) provide to each local educational agency within the State applying for approval of a construction project under this act an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

(6) provide for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and constructing school facilities; and

(7) provide that the State educational agency will make reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as is reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this act.

(b) Any State plan or modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) shall be approved by the Commissioner, but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State educational agency involved reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

no further reservations shall be made under section 7 (b) for projects in the State, and there shall be no further payments for any project directly affected by such failure, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended. The Commissioner, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State, may suspend further reservations of funds under section 7 (b) for projects pending the making of findings under this subsection.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 7. (a) Payments under this act shall be made only to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 6 and which furnish statements to the Commissioner in accordance with this section. Every statement shall set forth one or more projects approved by the State educational agency under the plan, the estimated cost of each such project, and the amount which the State educational agency desires to be paid out of the State's allotment for each project.

(b) Except as provided in section 8, the Commissioner shall issue, to each State educational agency furnishing a statement in accordance with subsection (a), a commitment reserving, out of the State's allotment, for each project included in the statement, the amount requested by the State educational agency for that project. Upon request of the State educational agency and receipt of an amended statement from such agency, the Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved, but only to the extent that the change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of the act. Such payments to the State educational agency shall be made by the Commissioner through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury, upon certification by the State educational agency that the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of the project has been arranged. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was reserved and for no other purpose.

(c) If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner, the State to which such payments were made shall repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

MATCHING BY STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

SEC. 8. The Commissioner may issue or modify a commitment under section 7 only if the amount to be reserved under the commitment, plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this act to the same State educational agency, does not exceed one-half of the sum of (1) the cost of constructing the project in question and (2) the total cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued, and if the State educational agency certifies that the remainder of the cost of constructing the project in question will be paid out of funds other than funds paid by the Commissioner under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. Until actual construction costs are available, cost determinations under this section shall be made on the basis of estimates furnished under section 7 (a) and revised estimates furnished in compliance with section 6 (a) (7).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 9. (a) Any State dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action under section 6, may appeal to the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. Summons and notice of appeal may be served any place in the United States and the Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The court shall have jurisdiction either to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States, as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) No payments shall be made by the Commissioner under this act to assist in financing the construction of any school facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 11. The Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government to assist him in administering the provisions of this act, and, without regard to section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution concerned.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for administration of this act.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 13. The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this act except the making of regulations.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 14. In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

The editorial submitted by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

(From The Detroit Free Press of December 18, 1956)

MCNAMARA'S SCHOOL BILL—BUILD NOW; DEBATE LATER

With his eyes wide open, Michigan's Senator PATRICK V. MCNAMARA has proposed a $2 billion emergency school building program.

He frankly labels the bill he will introduce in the coming 85th Congress as "no permanent answer to the shortage of school classrooms and no solution to such pressing problems as teachers' salaries and the need for scientific education."

"But it will build schools—now," he said.

MCNAMARA suggests that the Federal Government appropriate a billion dollars a year for 2 years as a "crash" program to reduce the need for 247,000 new classrooms in the United States. He proposes that the money be distributed on a strict per capita basis with $27.09 being reserved for each school-aged child in each State.

His proposal goes far beyond the ill-fated Kelly bill, which provided only $400 million a year for 4 years and was snarled up and defeated when an amendment was attached to withhold Federal money from Southern States which failed to integrate children of all races in their schools.

MCNAMARA shrewdly avoids the racial question. His proposal may gain favor simply because it's a short-term emergency program free of long-range policy-setting strings. MCNAMARA is an increasingly potent Senator. He is a former able Detroit Board of Education member. His influence on educational matters in Congress is growing. He may be able to head off those who wish to complicate the bill with troublesome amendments.

Under his plan, Michigan—with 1,573,000 school-age children—would be eligible for $42,604,000 in Federal money if either the State or local school districts could match the Federal grant on a 100-percent basis. Current reservations in school budgets wouldn't count, but any money set aside for building in budgets for the year beginning July 1, 1957, could be counted as matching funds.

The $100 million State loan program, approved by voters last spring, also probably

would be considered as a source of matching money. The McNamara plan thus would help distressed school districts, at least in Michigan, by doubling the money available to them. The Kelly bill approached the need of distressed districts in a different and complicated fashion. The Federal grants would have been made only after considerations to determine each school district's need and its ability to finance its own school classrooms.

Under McNAMARA's plan, Michigan presumably could build in 2 years $85,208,000 worth of schools if the State and local districts took 100 percent advantage of the proposed bill.

It is our continual claim that schools are the responsibility of local school districts. Some districts are poor. Some are comparatively wealthy. Some districts have taxpayers interested in schools who tax themselves heavily to provide good schooling for their young. Others are niggardly in their support of education.

The McNamara plan would override all these difficulties and help every child, every school district, and every State on an emergency dollar-for-dollar basis.

The Congressional Quarterly has predicted that a Federal-aid bill for school construction will be passed by Congress in the session opening January 3.

McNAMARA, who concedes that his bill isn't perfect but claims that his bill will build schools while the arguments rage over more permanent solutions, has what appears to be the best approach yet in a market that probably will be glutted with school-aid bills.

Until a better one is found, we support the McNamara plan.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court at Miami, Fla.

The need for this proposed legislation is simply predicated upon the tremendous amount of the appellate work originating in Miami. In fact, more appellate work originates there than in all the rest of Florida put together.

Miami, as all Senators know, has undergone a period of fast growth and development in recent years. Requiring the United States court of appeals to hold terms of court there is a service to which the people of the area are long since entitled. In addition, I feel confident that it will contribute immeasurably to the effectiveness of our judicial process.

I hope and trust that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate will act favorably on this bill at an early date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 275) to amend section 48 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at Miami, Fla., introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERMANENT STATUS FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 300) to give the Small Business Administration permanent status, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is my feeling that in introducing this amendment to the Small Business Act, of which I was the author in 1953, the time has now come when the agency should be firmly established as a permanent agency. The agency has done a creditable job in the field of financing to small firms, providing disaster aid, improving Government procurement programs, and affording technical and management aids to small firms.

However, any Government agency which is not established as a permanent agency operates under a handicap. It is difficult to staff such an agency with efficient and competent personnel, and public acceptance is hard to obtain when the future status of the agency is in doubt.

I feel that both Houses of Congress will take action in the present session to give SBA permanent operating authority. This act by Congress would constitute a major step forward in solidifying the position of the small-business firms in our expanding economy. No economy can endure and prosper without a healthy and vigorous small-business community.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of my very able and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and myself, I introduce, for apropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida.

The creation of an additional judgeship for the southern district of Florida is badly needed to alleviate the civil and criminal-case logjam which presently exists. As a matter of fact, the situation is so bad that it is almost an impossibility properly and effectively to administer justice to litigants involved.

As you know, Mr. President, in the 83d Congress the Judiciary Committee, after a very extensive and thorough study unanimously recommended two judgeships for the State of Florida. When the legislation finally passed, Florida received only one.

As presently constituted the southern district comprises 45 counties, extending westward from the Atlantic along the boundary of the State of Georgia to and including Madison County, then southward from Levy and Alachua to include the greater part of the peninsula. Located within the boundary are the populous areas of Tampa, St. Petersburg, Palm Beach, and Miami. According to the last official census taken in 1950, this area had a total population of 2,277,535 as compared to that of 493,770 of the northern district. The population of Dade County alone, one of the counties included in the southern district, was 495,083, or 1,300 more than the total population of the northern district. Of the State's total population of 2,771,305, which has increased substantially since the last official census—it being in the neighborhood of 3,800,000 today—over 80 percent is located within the southern district. The phenomenal growth in population within the southern district has increased the volume of Federal litigation, both civil and criminal, to such an extent that unreasonable delay in the proper administration of justice is the net result.

Statistics taken from the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office, United States Courts, furnish ample proof of the heavy case burden now carried by the southern district. As of July 1, 1955, in the southern district of Florida, there was a total of 1,407 pending civil cases. During this fiscal year, 1,355 cases were commenced and 1,508 cases terminated, leaving pending as of June 30, 1956, 1,254 civil cases.

In the northern district, there was a total of 181 pending civil cases as of July 1, 1955; 197 cases were commenced and 254 terminated, leaving 124 civil cases pending on June 30, 1956.

On the criminal side there was a total of 474 cases pending on July 1, 1955; 816 criminal cases were commenced, and 1,023 terminated, leaving pending as of June 30, 1956, 267 cases, compared with the northern district which showed 49 criminal cases pending on July 1, 1955; 193 commenced, 213 terminated, leaving 29 criminal cases pending as of June 30, 1956.

The impact which the heavy case burden has on the proper administration of justice in the southern district was recognized by the Judicial Conference of the United States which recently recommended the creation of an additional judgeship for this area. This recommendation came only after a careful analysis was made of the situation which presently exists. The bill introduced today is designed to alleviate the case logjam in this district and to give effect to the views of the Judicial Conference, of the members of the bar, of the press, and of all citizens of the State of Florida who are familiar with the problem.

We know only too well that the orderly, speedy, and effective administration of justice is the concrete function of our system of government. It is a pillar of strength to our democracy and should never be allowed to decay. Not too infrequently have we been reminded of the fact that justice delayed is tantamount to justice being denied. Nothing could contribute more toward undermining the faith of our people in their institutions of government than carelessly to permit or condone by inaction a situation which prevents litigants from having their cases disposed of promptly and effectively, or which imposes upon such litigants undue hardships in seeking disposi-

tion of their cases. Unreasonable delay in the administration of justice, both civil and criminal, is therefore a situation which warrants prompt and effective corrective action by the Congress.

Since the facts justifying the need for an additional judgeship in the southern district are uncontrovertible, it is our hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will act promptly and favorably in reporting this bill to the Senate. In this way, we in the Congress can make a very marked contribution toward effective and proper administration of the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 324) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Southern District of Florida, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products. A similar bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last summer, but was not acted on by the Senate. There are included as sponsors of the bill the names of Senators who sponsored the original bill. I understand there are several other Senators who wish to become sponsors. I ask unanimous consent that they may be permitted to add their names to the bill at any time through Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

The bill (S. 313) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to lie on the desk through Wednesday next.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF INTERPRETATION GOVERNING QUESTIONS OF EFFECT OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators whose names appear on the measure, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

This bill is similar to that reported by the Senate Judiciary committee during the last session of the Congress, Senate bill 3143.

I ask that the bill lie on the desk during the day so that other Senators who may wish to join as cosponsors may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and the bill will be on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 337) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to lie on the desk.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize modification of the Yaquina Bay and Harbor project in Oregon, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers for this project.

The Yaquina Bay project is one of those which were added by the Senate to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill that passed the Congress at the end of the last session. It is an important project for the economic development of the area on the Oregon coast which would be served by the improved harbor facilities, and it has been determined by the Army engineers to have the favorable benefit cost ratio of 1.43 to 1. Consequently I was glad to have the opportunity during the last session, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, to have the facts about the project brought out in the committee's hearings in testimony by Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, and to win the committee's approval for including the Yaquina Bay project in the omnibus bill. With the help of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the project won authorization by the Senate and the conference with the House of Representatives, where it had not been included in the original omnibus bill.

However, along with many other worthy public works projects, the Yaquina Bay project authorization fell before President Eisenhower's veto of the omnibus bill after the end of the last session of the 84th Congress. The President's announced reason for his veto was that a number of projects in the omnibus bill had not completed all of the steps of administrative review and approval before their authorization by Congress. I am very pleased that, since last summer, the Yaquina Bay project, which had already won the approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and has been reported on by the Bureau of the Budget. I expect, therefore, no further objections to the authorization of the Yaquina Bay project again by the 85th Congress, and I hope that this action will be possible soon enough to permit the appropriation of funds to begin the work as soon as possible.

It is because of my faith in the basic importance of the Yaquina Bay project to the economic future of the Oregon seacoast that I have introduced this bill on the first day of this Senate session available for such purpose. All Senators have delayed until now out of courtesy to the President of the United States, so that he might appear before us with a special message before any legislation was offered for introduction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 338) to authorize modification of existing project for the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TEN-YEAR PROGRAM PROPOSED TO IMPROVE RECREATION IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to provide for a 10-year program of improving and developing recreational facilities within the national forests of the United States. I introduce this bill on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, three compelling reasons have motivated me to offer again a proposal which I first suggested in 1956. They are these:

First, the national forests, of which there are 149 in number, are of vast importance to the outdoor activities and recreation of the American people and thus to their health and outlook on life—indeed, more important than are the national parks in terms of annual visits.

Second, it is my fervent hope that this action, by a Member of the Senate, may prod the Eisenhower administration into demonstrating some leadership and activity in this all-important realm of national forest rehabilitation.

Third, when I recently spent over 4 months in my home State of Oregon, I met with my many friends and fellow members of such groups as the Izaak Walton League, National Wildlife Federation, the Mazamas, the Sierra Club, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs, the Oregon Roadside Council, and the National Park Association. I found the leaders of these conservation and outdoor groups

just about unanimous in their recommendation that I once more press for action on my original proposal for a program to promote recreation in the national forests—a program to parallel the so-called mission 66 of the National Park Service.

Nearly 50 million Americans now ski, hike, hunt, fish, swim, picnic, boat and mountain-climb in the national forests. Their wants and needs have been neglected. The multiple-use program has bogged down so far as recreation is concerned. There has been no general rehabilitation of recreational facilities since the bygone era of the Civilian Conservation Corps, two decades ago.

Due to advances in technology and short working hours, Americans today enjoy more leisure hours than during any period before in history. The automobile has brought our scenic outdoors within minutes of every city dweller. Americans own more than 50 million automobiles; the travel urge has perhaps never been so widely felt nor so easily satisfied.

In 1955 over 80 percent more people visited our national forests than in 1950. As our population continues to grow our forests will be utilized to an even greater degree by persons seeking wholesome outdoor recreation.

The expanded use of our recreational facilities has already been recognized through mission 66—a program of rehabilitation of the national parks. This bill would extend such a plan to cover our national forests, which were visited by 2½ times as many people as the national parks during 1955. Perhaps it should be called mission 67. The campsites and picnic areas in national forests require a major face-lifting operation if they are to serve adequately the millions of peripatetic outdoor lovers who migrate to the "woods" on vacations, for weekends, or even for an afternoon picnic.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing the comparative attendance in the national parks and national forests of the United States, and in my own State of Oregon, during the recent past be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States

	Attendance	
	National park	National forest
1950	13,918,872	27,368,000
1951	15,079,165	29,950,000
1952	17,142,658	33,007,000
1953	17,372,080	35,403,000
1954	17,968,596	40,304,000
1955	18,829,541	45,713,000

Oregon

	Attendance	
	National park	National forest
1950	310,796	1,778,000
1951	289,286	1,907,000
1952	312,677	2,275,000
1953	332,835	2,413,000
1954	370,554	2,803,000
1955	343,839	3,221,000

Mr. NEUBERGER. The bill which I introduce today provides for a survey and plan for the proper development of necessary facilities in our national-forest system, including such areas as might in the future be reserved for conservation and outdoor recreation. By this bill Congress would establish the recreational use of national forests as a national policy. Provisions of the bill direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive 1-year study of national forest recreational needs, and to present to Congress at the end of that time an overall plan for national forest improvement. Such a program would include provisions for development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities, and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat.

I believe that it is imperative that a comprehensive program should be prepared prior to appropriation of new and greater funds for the improvement of recreation areas, in order to facilitate the sound and constructive expenditure of such appropriations and to secure maximum utilization of the recreational opportunities offered by our national forests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 339) to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the fact that the national forests constitute an invaluable asset in the recreational life of the people of the United States, providing actual and potential recreational possibilities of great importance to the national economy; that use of such forests for recreational purposes, including picnicking, camping, skiing, swimming, hunting, fishing, hiking, and mountain climbing is rapidly increasing, reaching an alltime high of 45,500,000 visits in 1955; that visits to improved recreational areas within the national forests have almost tripled since the 1930's when most of such areas were planned and their facilities constructed in connection with Civilian Conservation Corps projects; that many of such facilities are now reaching the age where heavy maintenance and even replacement are becoming necessary; that many popular recreational areas are now regularly overcrowded and an extensive program of construction of new facilities to accommodate present use is necessary; that the continuing increase in our population emphasizes the growing need for increasing the national forest recreational opportunities with new facilities; that the national forests comprise the largest area of productive habitat for public fishing and hunting grounds in the country; and that funds available to the Department of Agriculture for providing the necessary maintenance, replacement, and construction of national forest recreational areas and facilities and for wildlife habitat management are not adequate to meet present and future needs; it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that public use of the national forests for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of such forests and that development and maintenance of areas and facilities for such public use, including maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to initiate and carry out a comprehensive study of the personnel, funds, and other requirements necessary to develop within 10 years an adequate program for recreational use and wildlife habitat on the national forests and to provide the proper services and facilities to carry out the program. The Secretary shall within 1 year report to the Congress the results of the comprehensive study and his program recommendations including funds and any legislation necessary to permit implementation of the recommendations, such report and recommendations specifically to include provisions for (a) the development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, (b) coordinating wildlife management with other resource uses and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and (c) adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in the closing days of last session, the Congress passed the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, a measure of outstanding importance to the western reclamation States.

When the measure went to the President for signature, however, he took exception to certain language in section 4 of the bill, which he deemed either an unlawful delegation of legislative function to a congressional committee, or an unconstitutional infringement on the separation of powers prescribed in articles I and II of the Constitution.

The President signed the bill because of its general merits and its extreme importance to the semi-arid States of the West. However, he pointed out in a message of August 6 that he had approved the measure upon assurances that the committees which handled the bill in the Congress would take action to correct its deficiencies early in the next session.

As a representative of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I had carried such assurances to the President prior to his action on the bill. My action was taken after consultation with colleagues on the Senate and House subcommittees.

I feel sure that all Members of Congress from the 17 reclamation States greatly appreciate the action of the President in giving his approval to this vital legislation under these circumstances. And I believe that this body can be assured that the Reclamation and Irrigation Subcommittee will expedite action on the proposed legislation.

My amendment eliminates the language to which the President took exception. The language deleted from the 1956 act provided for a veto by congressional committees of contracts negotiated by the executive branch. Under the

amended language, the Secretary of the Interior remains charged with determining project feasibility, but execution of the contract is deferred until congressional committees have had 60 days to consider it.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and request unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 340) to amend section 4 (c) of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), relating to the construction of small reclamation projects, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4, subsection (c), of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044, 1045), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to both branches of the Congress for consideration by the appropriate committees thereof. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to the disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this act shall have been executed."

IMMIGRATION BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the Judiciary Committee four bills amending the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

These measures are identical to those introduced by me in the 2d session of the 84th Congress designed to carry out the recommendations of President Eisenhower's special message on immigration.

At the outset I emphasize one particular point: I have no intention of repudiating the general conclusions reached by Congress in 1952 when the Immigration and Nationality Act was adopted. I continue my agreement with the general principles of immigration policy which were incorporated in that law. Therefore, I will highlight what my proposed amendments do not do:

First. They do not make a single change in the provisions of the law relating to the acquisition of citizenship; except for certain veterans of the United States Armed Forces and their close relatives. My amendments make no changes as to the loss of United States citizenship.

Second. They do not add or subtract a single ground for deporting an alien from the United States.

Third. They do not lift a single one of the bars which now forbid the admission to the United States of an alien who would be a danger to the national security. In a nutshell what do the amendments seek to accomplish? My amendments would do the following:

First. They would transfer to the executive branch of the Government much of the discretionary powers in the enforcement of the immigration law which are now exercised by the Congress through the lengthy, inefficient, and expensive process of private legislation, without surrendering any of the powers of a Member of Congress to introduce such a bill when the executive branch could not or would not act.

Second. They would incorporate into the law a number of technical amendments recommended by those who administer the present law, including three provisions to enlarge the citizenship privileges of—and revise the expatriating provisions relating to—members of the Armed Forces, past and present, and their families. They would also grant legislative approval to four different administrative interpretations of existing law.

Third. They would guarantee the use but prevent the abuse of our judicial process by deportable or inadmissible aliens whose sole object is to prevent or delay their removal from this country.

Fourth. They would increase the maximum limitations upon the number of aliens who may obtain visas to come to the United States to live permanently. This does not mean that the amendments guarantee the admission of a greater number of aliens; they do increase the potential maximum number.

The four major amendments, which I have introduced, parallel bills which I previously introduced on February 8, 1956. These were the only specific bills on which open hearings were conducted by the subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the 84th Congress. At those hearings, my bills, S. 3167, S. 3168, S. 3169, and S. 3170, were officially endorsed by the administration, and their enactment was urged by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, representing the two agencies of the Government directly concerned in the administration and enforcement of the immigration and nationality laws.

EXPLANATION OF THE FIRST OF THE FOUR BILLS WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3167 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

SUBSTITUTION FOR PRIVATE RELIEF IMMIGRATION BILLS

The need:

First. Private legislation ties up Congress and committees.

Second. System inequitable because not all deserving cases are considered.

Third. Congressional committee works through a staff. Staff does not investigate but obtains reports from executive agencies, chiefly the Justice Department. Proposal gives powers to agencies, which now investigate selected cases for the Congress, to act directly on every deserving case. The proposal does not seek to cut off right of any Member of Congress to introduce a bill. It should materially reduce the number.

The bill:

Classes eligible: Veterans; husbands wives, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of (a) citizens and (b) permanently admitted aliens; clergymen, missionaries, brothers and sisters in religious sense of the term.

Charges forgiven: Any ground of inadmissibility, except those relating to certain subversive classes, for aliens seeking to come to the United States; any ground of deportability for aliens already here.

How administered: By the Attorney General in both cases. With respect to those outside the United States only upon recommendation of the Secretary of State or the United States Consul abroad.

Limitations: Five thousand in any calendar year total of both classes. Reduction of a quota number for each case unless alien had previously used a quota number or was or is a nonquota alien. Attorney General must be of opinion in each case that action would not be contrary to national interest, safety, or security.

EXPLANATION OF THE SECOND OF THE FOUR BILLS WHICH IS SIMILAR TO S. 3168 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS BILL

Section 1: Repeals paragraphs 16 and 17 of section 212 (a) of the act which relates to aliens who have been excluded or deported or removed from the United States. It eliminates requirements that they obtain permission from the Attorney General before they may apply for visas or for entry to the United States. It also repeals section 276 of that same act which requires prosecution of such aliens who return without having complied with the permission requirement.

The requirement is archaic. It existed in law before the present quota system became a part of the law. An applicant for admission or for a visa should be judged on his present eligibility to enter and there are adequate other safeguards to protect the Government without this requirement.

Section 2: Amends section 212 (d) (4) of the act which provides for a waiver of visas and passports for nonimmigrants on conditions, one of which is on the basis of unforeseen emergency in individual cases. Removing the word "unforeseen" permits greater administrative latitude.

Section 3: Eliminates the requirement of inspecting and of applying all grounds of exclusion to aliens coming from Alaska and Hawaii to the mainland United States. By definition, these Territories are a part of the United States. Aliens who are already in these Territories are subject to all the provisions of the act.

If an alien was deportable before he came to the mainland he would remain deportable. An additional exclusion order avails nothing in his case; unnecessarily delays travel and ties up inspecting manpower.

Section 4: Amends sections 221 (b) and 263 (a) of the act which require the fingerprinting of all aliens applying for visas, and all nonimmigrants who came to the United States without visas who have remained for 30 days or more. The proposal would amend these sections and would permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, respectively, to waive fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens. There would be no change in requirement that every person coming here to reside permanently must be fingerprinted. No need to gild the lily on various reasons which prompt this proposal.

Section 5: Amends section 236 (a) of the act by clarifying statutory authority for separating the role of hearing officer from that of the officer who presents the Government's case in the conduct of selected admissibility hearings. It removes any doubt as to the authority of the Immigration Service to separate these two functions where the Service deems it advisable. All are agreed on the desirability of separating them in certain contested cases. The law presently makes specific provision for such separation in deportation hearings, but is silent on admissibility hearings.

Section 6: Amends section 238 (d) of the act to the extent that the Attorney General would be authorized, in his discretion, to dispense with examination inspection in the case of aliens proceeding in direct transit through the United States, under safeguards, and subject to agreements with the aliens and carriers. Under the present law, though they may be exempted from documentary requirements, they must be inspected and examined and are subject to the exclusion and deportation provisions which apply to immigrants coming here to reside permanently. This proposal in effect creates something like the "free-port" which exists for customs purposes on goods which are merely stored in the United States waiting transshipment out of the country after they have been brought here from abroad by another carrier. The aliens involved are, for the most part, individuals who are traveling from Europe or the Orient destined to Canada or Latin-America who are using our air gateways at New York, San Francisco, and Miami. The proposal facilitates international travel and encourages use of our own flag carriers by passengers desiring to use our more direct air routings to their ultimate destinations.

Section 7: Would grant relief from deportation for certain refugees under the DP Act of 1948 who are now subject to deportation under the act because they obtained their visas fraudulently. Relief of this kind would be given only to cases where the alien perpetrated the fraud to avoid repatriation to his homeland for fear of persecution and not where it can be shown the fraud was perpetrated to evade quota restrictions or to prevent investigation of his background.

Section 8: Amends section 242 (b) of the act to furnish statutory authority for the Attorney General to commence deportation proceedings with an order to show cause, which procedure is now being followed. It was thought necessary to commence every deportation case by physical arrest, which in most instances was not only unnecessary but frequently caused great fright and considerable anguish, particularly in cases involving infants, aged aliens, and persons who were not likely to abscond. While the authority for the new procedure under existing law is believed implicit in the statute, the proposed legislation would remove any doubt and prevent a possible challenge of a proceeding on this ground. The right to issue a warrant of arrest in the relatively few cases where it is found necessary to take an alien into custody or impose restrictions on him is not limited or restricted by this amendment.

Section 9: Amends section 245 of the act by deleting clause 5 of subsection (a). Under the present clause an alien who seeks to adjust his status in the United States without reentry, as the husband or wife of an American citizen, cannot do so unless he had been in the United States for a year before such a marriage. All the present statute accomplishes in most cases is to require the money put aside to start a new family unit in the United States to be expended on travel out of the country to obtain a piece of paper from an American consul abroad—there is no quota for these aliens; they come in extraquota—and reenter with that document. There are ample other safeguards in the law to take care of the rare fraudulent marriage.

Section 10: Codifies several statutes relating to the naturalization of war veterans with proper safeguards to make certain that benefits are limited to those who have served honorably in an active-duty status. Veterans who have had active duty during wartime shall be eligible for naturalization regardless of length of service. Peacetime veterans shall be eligible for naturalization after 3 years. A person who was unable to serve the full 3 years because of a disability incurred during service is provided with a special exemption. The requirement that certain veterans must present proof of admission for permanent residence has resulted in many deserving veterans not being eligible for naturalization and this proposal would eliminate that requirement.

No person shall be regarded as having been separated under honorable conditions if he was separated on account of alienage, or if he was a conscientious objector, or if he performed no military, air, or naval service whatever, or if he refused to wear a uniform. Such persons would not benefit from this proposal. Citizenship granted pursuant to this proposal may be revoked if, at any time subsequent to naturalization, the person is separated from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions.

Sections 11 and 12 of S. 3163 of the 84th Congress as introduced dealt with the deportation of alien violators of our narcotics laws. Those provisions were included in other legislation last year and now appear on the Statutes as part of Public Law 728, Title III; therefore, I have added two other technical amendments in place of those sections which have been adopted:

Section 11 (a) Under section 316 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who are employed abroad by American firms, and so forth, can obtain permission to go abroad for extended periods without losing their eligibility for naturalization which might result from the interruption of their residence in this country. However, the law makes no provision at present for their spouses and children who also wish to go abroad and also are anxious not to lose their residence in the United States. This proposal would give the spouse or children of such alien the same privileges as the employed alien himself.

(b) Under section 310 of the existing law, a petition for naturalization must be filed in a court in the jurisdiction where the petitioner actually resides. Bearing in mind that the existing selective service acts call for induction of many persons in the United States who are sent away for training to various camps throughout the country, a terrific burden is placed on an alien who goes into the Armed Forces and then finds that although he has all the qualifications for naturalization, he is unable to return to his home State to file a petition for naturalization, and remain long enough to complete the naturalization case. This proposal would permit a member of the Armed Forces who is applying for naturalization under the ordinary provisions of the law to file a petition in any naturalization court.

(c) Under section 316 (a) of existing law, a petitioner for naturalization must have 6 months continuous residence in a particular State immediately preceding the filing of his petition. For the same reasons given above this is a barrier to the naturalization of aliens who are in the United States Armed Forces. The proposal would eliminate the requirement of a particular period of residence in any particular State. This would mean that the soldier could apply wherever he was stationed or any other place that would be convenient for him.

Section 12: Under existing law much difficulty has been encountered in the interpretation of section 101 (b) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the meaning of the term "stepchild." As now written that term has been held not to apply to a child born out of wedlock to a woman who subsequently married a man not the father of the child. This results in a separation of families since a child in the circumstances described is not in a position to be given a nonquota or preferred status under the law. The proposal would place a stepchild born out of wedlock in the same position as other stepchildren, so far as the admission provisions of the law are concerned.

Section 13: Amends section 101 (b) (1) of the act by extending the definition of

"child" to include an illegitimate child claiming benefits under the law through its mother and also to include adopted children under the age of 12, if prior to seeking benefits under the immigration law, they have resided with the adoptive parents at least 2 years. The proposal would cover appealing and distressing hardship cases which have arisen in the case of illegitimate children and children of tender age who have been adopted.

Section 14: Amends section 202 (a) (5) of the act by removing the limitation which prevents an Asian whose quota is exhausted from coming under the quota or nonquota classification of the accompanying spouse. These privileges are presently available to aliens of other origins. There is no desire or plan here to change the requirement that a primary applicant for admission who is of Asian origin must be chargeable to the special Asian quota regardless of birthplace.

Section 15: Amends section 203 of the act to grant the same preference status to a spouse or child "following to join" an alien entitled to a preferred classification by reason of his special skills, as if the spouse and child were accompanying the alien. It is not possible for families always to travel together and the change would be desirable in order to cover the situations where the spouse or children follow the principal alien.

The proposal would also result in the fourth preference category under the quota being accorded a fixed 10 percent of the quota instead of the present undetermined portion, reducing the second category of preference immigrants from 30 to 20 percent.

The proposal would also establish the limitation wherein the immigrant would be eligible for fourth preference only on the approved petition of a United States citizen 21 years of age or over, and would include in that preference the spouse or child of a primary applicant.

Section 16: Amends section 281 of the act so as to give the Secretary of State wider latitude to waive visa fees for nonimmigrant aliens and to permit clarification of the existing provisions relating to the computation of such fees.

Section 17: Amends section 212 (a) (9) of the act. The proposal would have the effect of providing that in determining whether a criminal misdemeanor was committed, as a ground for exclusion of an alien, United States law shall control.

Section 18: Amends section 221 (f) of the act to eliminate the requirement for eventual individual documents for alien crewmen. The requirement for the issuance of individual documents has proved to be difficult to administer, unduly burdensome, and unnecessary. The present visaed crew list satisfies both State and Justice Departments.

Section 19: Amends section 222 (a) and (c) of the act to eliminate the reference to "race and ethnic classification" information in applications for immigrant and nonimmigrant visas. The terms are not susceptible of definition and have served no useful purpose in the administration of the law.

Section 20 and section 21: Amend sections 353 and 354 of the act to broaden those sections by giving to veterans of the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II, their spouses, children and dependent parents broader foreign residence privileges without losing United States citizenship.

Section 22: Amends the proviso to section 223 (b) of the act to give the Attorney General the right to extend the life of the reentry permit, for such period as he deems appropriate, of a wife or child of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad, beyond the 1 year period allowed by present law. The existing law has resulted in hardship to alien spouses and children of servicemen stationed abroad.

Section 23: Adds a new subsection to section 323 of the act which would permit the expeditious naturalization of children adopted by United States citizens stationed abroad in the Armed Forces, or abroad in the employment of the United States Government, or abroad in the employment of an American firm or international organization. The new subsection would provide that there must be a showing that the child is residing and will continue to reside with the adoptive parents. At the present time the adoptive child is required to establish 2 years' residence and 1 year's physical presence in the United States during the 2 year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The proposal would remove these requirements. The citizen adoptive parent would be required to declare before the naturalization court an intention to have the child take up residence in the United States as soon as the adoptive parent terminates his service or employment abroad. This worthy proposal prevents unnecessary separation of families.

EXPLANATION OF THE THIRD OF THOSE FOUR BILLS WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3169 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

JUDICIAL RELIEF BILL

The need: Repetitive court actions of administrative decisions by way of habeas corpus declaratory judgment actions, applications for injunctive relief, and so forth, enabling some of the more notorious among our deportable criminal aliens to defeat deportation for years.

The bill:

Form of review:

First. Habeas corpus for any alien found deportable and held in custody or for any alien excluded from admission to the United States; or

Second. Petition for review for any alien found deportable and not held in custody.

Limitations:

First. Alien must not have physically departed United States after administrative order of excludability or deportability.

Second. All administrative review must have been exhausted.

Third. The administrative order must not previously have been determined to be valid in any judicial proceeding—unless new grounds presented or court finds prior proceedings inadequate or ineffective to test validity.

Fourth. No action may be withdrawn without consent of both respondent and court.

Fifth. Issue determined on administrative record and findings of fact in administrative proceeding if supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence shall be considered conclusive; except a trial de novo is provided when United States nationality is claimed.

Sixth. Court action must be brought in vicinity where alien is located instead of at Washington, D. C. This will greatly serve to eliminate the delays resulting from the congestion of the court calendar in the District of Columbia.

EXPLANATION OF THE FOURTH OF THE BILLS WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3170 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

Quota bill:

First. Computation of quotas:

Formula	Total	Allocation
Present ⅙ of 1 percent selected 1920 population.	154,657	To each area according to its percentage of representation in United States population.
Proposed ⅓ of 1 percent total 1950 population.	219,461	(a) 154,657 as at present. (b) 5,000 to aliens having special skills regardless of nationality. (c) 5,000 plus increase of 100 for all minimum quota areas. (d) 55,000 plus to each country in proportion to its share of total immigration to United States in last 3 decades.

Second. Cancels mortgage upon quotas resulting from Displaced Persons Act and previous sheepherder laws.

Third. Permits use of unusued quota numbers of basis of four geographical regional pools throughout the world: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. Unused quotas in each region would be available for distribution each year to aliens entitled to preference status under the present law, if they were born within the region, regardless of the particular country in which they were born.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 343. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 344. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

S. 345. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; and

S. 346. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR SIUSLAW RIVER, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished

colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize modification of the existing project for the Siuslaw harbor and bar at Florence, Oreg. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District has introduced an identical bill, H. R. 1212, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill for the development of Siuslaw Harbor be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, development of Siuslaw Harbor and Bar at Florence, Oreg., will give the 140,000 people of Lane County and the lower Willamette Valley a port of direct access to the Pacific Ocean.

The port of Siuslaw was the first port district formed in Oregon back in 1909 and is the only port on the Oregon coast in which local people have more money invested than the Federal Government. No maintenance work has been done on the north jetty since its completion in 1917 and the south jetty has not been maintained since its completion in 1918. At the present time the outer end of the north jetty is completely under water at all times, and with gaping holes in its structure all the way back to the beach line. Tons of sand wash into the channel during the prevailing northwest winds of the summer.

The area to be served by the development of Siuslaw Harbor has grown rapidly, and the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area has a population of almost 140,000 and retail sales of $162 million and is the fifth largest metropolitan district in the entire Pacific Northwest. The population growth in Western Lane County, in the area of Florence, has been rapid, and current population estimates place the number of people at 30,000. The population of the city of Florence has doubled since 1950.

Lane County is currently constructing Route F, a highway which will provide Eugene and Springfield with direct water-level access to Florence and will bring these major Oregon cities closer to an outlet to the sea than any other major metropolitan area in Oregon. Route F will open up vast new possibilities in transportation of commodities, and this highway goes hand in hand with the development of the port of Siuslaw. The Southern Pacific Railroad furnishes rail transportation to Western Lane County at Mapleton and Cushman on their line from Eugene to Coos Bay.

To show the potential of an improved harbor at Florence, recently one of the largest single barge loads of lumber to cross the bar was shipped from the Siuslaw by Sause Bros. Ocean Towing Co. The barge was loaded with 1,800,000 board-feet of lumber from Davidson Industries at Tiernan and LaDuke Lumber Co. at Cushman bound for California markets. The port commissioners have been informed that no more attempts will be made to bring LST's in until improvements are made, as the risk is too great under existing conditions.

The division engineer reports that a realistic estimate of the production that would move from Siuslaw River with the desired improvements is believed to be about 80 million board-feet annually.

Mr. President, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at its meeting on November 29 to 30, 1956, held in Washington, D. C., accepted the views and recommendations of the North Pacific division engineer. The Board recommends modification of the existing project for the Siuslaw River to provide for a 600-foot extension of the north jetty; an entrance channel 18 feet deep and 300 feet wide from deep water in the ocean to a point 1,500 feet inside the outer end of the existing jetty; thence a channel 16 feet deep, 200 feet wide with additional widening at bends, and about 5 miles long, to a turning basin, 16 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and 600 feet long, opposite the Siuslaw dock at Florence. Construction of the north jetty extension is to be deferred until experience demonstrates, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, that this work is advisable.

The port of Siuslaw has concurred in the recommendations of the Board and of the North Pacific division engineer.

The improvements to Siuslaw Harbor and Bar can add much to the growth and economy of Oregon, Lane County, and the lower Willamette Valley. With the completion of Route F from Eugene to the coast, Eugene, Springfield, and the metropolitan area will have a direct access to the sea.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will give careful consideration to the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and that the improvements for the Siuslaw will be authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 347) to authorize modification of existing project for the Siuslaw River, Oreg., introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the modification of the project for improvement of the Siuslaw River, Oreg., is hereby adopted and authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated November 30, 1956, at an estimated Federal cost of $1,693,100, the work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE TAX LAWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the time has come when for the Congress to delay any further extending critically needed help to the small-business men of this Nation is to court economic disaster. There are many vital domestic problems which call for speedy and wise action by the Congress. None of these problems, however, cries out for our attention in more urgent tones than those relating to small business.

That a large portion of the small-business community of our Nation, comprising more than 4 million firms, and accounting for more than 95 percent of our total business enterprises, in the past few years has been pushed closer and closer to the brink of bankruptcy is a matter of common knowledge.

As recently as last Wednesday, January 2, headlines in the New York Times proclaimed: "Failures Climb to 15-Year High—Small Business Has Big Troubles." Beneath this headline the facts were set forth, in part, as follows:

> Heightened competition, particularly in the field of retail and wholesale distribution, took a higher toll in failures in 1956 than any year since 1941. From the standpoint of dollar liability of failures, the total last year was the highest since 1935.

The article continued:

> Small business was much in the news in 1956. It made news because it was in trouble.

This is not news to the members of the Select Committee on Small Business. In its reports to the Senate, reports which have been based on careful studies and investigations, the committee for the past several years has tried to drive home the inescapable fact that our free-enterprise system has become imperiled by the rapid deterioration in the position of small and independent business establishments.

The extent and gravity of this deterioration is frightening in its implications. We know that in the distributive trades, in wholesaling and retailing, there has been what almost amounts to an epidemic of failures.

The position of small and medium-size manufacturing plants would seem to be equally precarious. From 1952 through 1955, a period during which our overall economy continued to expand, we find that there has been a net decrease of 18,900 manufacturing companies. Almost 19,000 manufacturing establishments fell by the wayside, the victims of what for many small-business men has been a prosperity without profits. This high mortality rate among small manufacturers cannot be attributed to normal attrition, because during this period our business population in other fields of endeavor has expanded. In this connection, it is significant that small manufacturers' share of total manufacturing sales has declined from 19 percent in 1947 to a completely inadequate 12.3 percent during the first half of 1956.

I am convinced, as one must be convinced who has given the subject serious thought, that independent small business in this country will never regain its rightful and traditional share of the rich rewards of our economic system, unless, to the degree that commonsense and national self-interest dictate, it is assured an opportunity to compete on equal terms with its larger rivals in the market place.

Of the many small-business-problem areas susceptible of legislative relief, none should take precedence over those involving taxes, financial and credit assistance, and increased antitrust protection.

To bring much-needed relief to small business in the tax field, I introduce for appropriate reference five bills. Each of these bills is designed to bring the maximum relief to those who need it most—the very smallest corporations, partnerships, and proprietorships, whether they be machine shops, farms, or the corner grocery store.

I propose at an early date to present a detailed analysis of each of these five tax bills, but today I shall confine myself to a brief description of them and what they are designed to do.

The first bill provides for a graduated corporate income tax. I first introduced this bill in the closing weeks of the 84th Congress. While the press of other major legislation prevented its consideration last year, the response to the bill was so encouraging that I decided to reintroduce it in this Congress.

This bill would substitute graduate rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. The present law imposes a normal tax of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 percent, for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over $25,000. My bill would start with a tax rate of 5 percent on the first $5,000 of corporate net income and would result in a tax saving of all corporations having up to $375,000 of net income. This would mean a tax saving to nearly 98 percent of all corporations. The top rate on my bill would be 55 percent and would apply to all net income over $100,000. Only some 2 percent of all corporations would pay increased taxes under this bill, and then only in relatively minor amounts.

I am sure my colleagues would be interested in a more detailed comparison of this bill and the present law, and I am therefore requesting that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing the tax yields at various taxable income levels, together with data showing the amount and percent of change in corporate income tax payments that would result from the bill which I have introduced.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of present and proposed corporate income tax laws*

Income subject to tax	Effective rate (percent)		Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
	Present law	Proposed law			Amount	Percent
$5,000	30	5	$1,500	$250	−$1,250	−83.3
$10,000	30	7.5	3,000	750	−2,250	−75.0
$15,000	30	10	4,500	1,500	−3,000	−66.6
$20,000	30	13.75	6,000	2,750	−3,250	−54.2
$25,000	30	18	7,500	4,500	−3,000	40
$50,000	41	31.5	20,500	15,750	−4,750	−23.2
$100,000	46.5	38.25	46,500	38,250	−8,250	−17.7
$250,000	49.8	47.7	124,500	120,750	−3,750	−3.01
$375,000	50.53	50.53	189,500	189,500	None	None
$500,000	50.9	51.65	254,500	258,250	+3,750	+1.22
$1,000,000	51.4	53.33	514,500	533,250	+18,750	+3.6
$5,000,000	51.9	54.68	2,594,500	2,733,250	+138,750	+5.3
$10,000,000	51.95	54.83	5,194,500	5,483,250	+288,750	+5.6

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that this bill will not cause any loss in revenue. In fact it would bring about an increase in revenue in the neighborhood of ninety to one hundred million dollars. While this amount is significant, I am further informed that it would not be possible to reduce any of the rates in the bill as it stands without causing revenue loss.

It would, of course, be highly desirable to avoid an increase in the tax rate of any corporation. As I have already noted, the bill which I have introduced, with a top rate of 55 percent, would bring increased taxes to about 2 percent of the corporations in this country today. Retaining a top rate of 52 percent in my bill, so that the rates would not exceed those under the present law, would mean a revenue loss of around $900 million. That would be the extent of the loss if corporate income continued at its mid-1956 rate. This body might well wish to consider placing a top rate of 52 percent in this bill, however, bearing in mind the President's endorsement last August of recommendations of his Cabinet Committee on Small Business which would have resulted in revenue losses approaching $740 million.

The enactment of this bill, taken in conjunction with the provision of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code which gives partnerships and proprietorships an election to be taxed as corporations, would do more than anything I can propose to bring quick and meaningful relief to small firms which are now so heavily burdened by our tax structure.

The other four tax bills which I have introduced today would benefit all forms of small business, unincorporated as well as incorporated.

One of these bills would extend the benefits of rapid depreciation to purchasers of used equipment. The 1954 Internal Revenue Code added a new provision to our tax law which enabled purchasers of new equipment to write off the cost of such equipment at accelerated rates. This, of course, means a tax saving to such businessmen. It is a well-recognized fact, however, that many small concerns cannot afford the present-day high costs of certain equipment which they need to run their businesses. They must buy used equipment at the prices they can afford to pay. I know of no good reason why the purchasers of such equipment should not be granted the same privilege of rapid depreciation now given to purchasers of new equipment. By virtue of the very fact that the equipment is used and possibly approaching obsolescence when purchased, it would appear to me to be only fair that the purchaser should be entitled to write off his cost over a relatively short period of time.

Another one of the bills which I have introduced today would liberalize the requirements on the payment of estate taxes. It is a well established fact that our Federal estate taxes often drain off all of the liquid funds of the small, family business when one of the proprietors dies. Under the present law, the tax on the estate of the deceased is payable 1 year after the death of the decedent, except that on a showing of hardship the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may authorize payment over a 10-year period. The administration of this phase of our tax law has proven burdensome to some small businesses, indeed fatal to some, for the reason that the test as to what constitutes hardship is not clear. The bill which I have introduced on this subject will alleviate the problem to a great extent. It grants an estate an election to pay the estate tax over a period of 10 years without any showing of hardship. In addition, where hardship can be shown—and the term "hardship" is defind in the bill in terms of equities in a business—the tax be paid over a period of 20 years.

One of the great benefits extended to businesses in the 1954 Internal Revenue Act was that contained in the provisions relating to approved profit-sharing plans and pension plans. Those provisions authorized sizable deductions from taxable income for contributions made by employers to pension and profit-sharing plans established for the benefit of their employees. By virtue of the language of the law, only employees could benefit from the plans. This means that a sole stockholder of a corporation who also serves as the president of the corporation may qualify as an employee of the corporation and thus be a beneficiary under its pension or profit-sharing plan. But a member of a partnership or a proprietor of an unincorporated business does not qualify as an employee under the law and thus cannot be a beneficiary under any of these tax-exempt plans. Such plans have great and obvious advantages for the man who wants to save for his own future and for the future security of his family. One of the bills which I have introduced today would entitle the proprietors of unincorporated businesses to the benefits of the tax-exempt plans.

Lastly, I have introduced a bill which would grant an election to certain corporations to be taxed as partnerships. This would benefit some small corporations which are hit especially hard by double taxes—first on the corporation and then on its stockholders on receipt of dividends. It would also be of some benefit to small corporations which might otherwise be vulnerable to the surtax on surplus accumulations. The election would be extended to all corporations having not more than 10 stockholders, all stockholders being active in the business.

With respect to the last four bills which I have mentioned, I was encouraged to note that the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, in its report of last August, recommended similar tax legislation for the relief of small business. In view of the President's endorsement of the Committee's proposals, I am very hopeful that the program which I have outlined briefly here today will receive substantial bipartisan support.

I firmly believe that all of these measures are necessary. If small business is to continue to serve its vital part in our economy, and if we are to reverse the trend of recent years toward ever-increasing concentration of economic power, then tax relief for small business is the one quickest way of reaching that goal. I fervently hope that my colleagues will give this legislation the support I believe it deserves.

I am also drafting legislation which will strengthen the antitrust laws by providing for prior notification to the appropriate governmental agencies of anticipated significant mergers, strengthening the enforcement powers of the Federal Trade Commission, and providing that bank mergers involving asset acquisitions which substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly be subject to the provisions of the Clayton Act. In recognition of the dire need that small businesses have for adequate credit, I expect within the next few days to introduce legislation which, if enacted, will establish capital banks and a procedure whereby loans to small concerns can be insured by the Federal Government.

Of course, the Congress has recognized that there is a continuing need for an independent agency which will concern itself with the problems of small business; an agency to make such recommendations to the Congress and the President as are necessary in the public interest for the maintenance of a healthy small-business community. The authorizing legislation for the present agency for small business, the Small Business Administration, is to expire on June 30, 1957. In some respects this basic legislation has failed to give the agency the authority it needs to become the independent spokesman for small business it ought to be. Therefore, I expect to introduce legislation which would strengthen this agency and provide for its continued operation.

I have outlined a legislative program for small business which, if adopted, will, I feel certain, go a long way toward making it possible for our more than 4 million small and independent enterprises to survive and prosper in today's fiercely competitive economy. Senators now have the text of my tax proposals for their consideration and, as I have pointed out, I expect to discuss in the near future each of the proposals more completely. When, in the near future, I introduce the other measures of this small-business program, I shall at that time fully discuss and explain the need for each of these bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills may be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk until Friday next to enable other Senators to join in cosponsoring them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 348

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the payment of the estate tax in installments

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subchapter A of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to place and due date for payment of tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax.

"(a) Election to make installment payments—

"(1) Payments in 2 to 10 installments: The executor of any estate subject to the tax imposed by chapter 11 may elect to pay the amount of such tax in 2 or more (but not exceeding 10) equal installments.

"(2) Payment in 11 to 20 installments: If the Secretary or his delegate finds that the payment in 10 installments of the tax imposed on any estate by chapter 11 would result in undue hardship to the estate, the executor of such estate may elect to pay the amount of such tax in any number (not exceeding 20) of equal installments as may be approved by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Date for payment of installments: If an election is made under subsection (a), the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for payment of the tax by section 6151, and each succeeding installment shall be paid 1 year following the date for payment of the preceding installment.

"(c) Proration of deficiency to installments: If an election has been made under subsection (a) and a deficiency is assessed, the deficiency shall be prorated to the installments remaining unpaid on the date of such assessment, and the part of the deficiency so prorated to each such installment shall be collected at the same time and as a part of such installment.

"(d) Installments paid in advance: At the election of the executor, any installment, or part thereof, under subsection (a) may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b).

"(e) Acceleration of payments: If any installment under subsection (a) is not paid on or before the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b), the whole of the unpaid tax shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate.

"(f) Undue hardship: For purposes of subsection (a) (2) of this section and for purposes of section 6161 (a) (2), there shall be considered to be an undue hardship to an estate in any case in which property comprising 50 percent or more of the value of the gross estate consists of any of the following:

"(1) Capital assets (other than money), or property used in the trade or business, of an unincorporated business enterprise in which the decedent owned a proprietary interest.

"(2) An undivided proprietary interest in a partnership of which the decedent was a partner.

"(3) Stock of a corporation in which the decedent owned (at the time of his death) 10 percent or more of all outstanding stock."

(b) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax."

SEC. 2. Section 6161 of such code (relating to extension of time for paying tax) is amended—

(a) by striking out "10 years" in subsection (a) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "20 years," and

(b) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), and inserting after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Installment payment of estate tax: In any case in which an executor has elected under section 6157 to pay the tax imposed by chapter 11 in installments, subsection (a) (2) shall not apply to the amount determined by the executor as the tax imposed by chapter 11, and subsection (b) shall not apply to the amount determined as a deficiency with respect to any such tax."

SEC. 3. Section 6601 (c) (2) of such code (relating to determination of last date prescribed for payment of tax) is amended by striking out "6152 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (a) or 6157 (a)", and by striking out "6152 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (b) or 6157 (b), as the case may be."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1956.

S. 349

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subchapter R of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is amended—

(1) by striking out the heading and table of sections for such subchapter and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER R—ELECTION OF CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS, PROPRIETORSHIPS, AND CORPORATIONS AS TO TAXABLE STATUS

"Part I. Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships.

"Part II. Alternative taxable status of certain corporations.

"Part I. Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships

"SEC. 1361. Unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations."; and

(2) by inserting after section 1361 a new part as follows:

"Part II. Alternative taxable status of certain corporations

"SEC. 1371. Certain corporations electing to be treated as partnerships.

"(a) General rule: Subject to the qualifications in subsection (b), a domestic corporation may, not later than 60 days after the close of any taxable year, elect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be treated as a partnership for such year and all subsequent years, if all the shareholders owning stock in such corporation at any time on or after the first day of such year and on or before the date of the election consent to the election.

"(b) Qualifications: The election described in subsection (a) may not be made by a domestic corporation unless at all times during the period on or after the first day of the taxable year with respect to which the election is made and on or before the date of election—

"(1) such corporation has — or less shareholders all of whom are individuals (including all partners of any partnership owning stock in such corporation);

"(2) all the shareholders are actively engaged in the conduct of the business of such corporation;

"(3) no shareholder of such corporation is a nonresident alien or a foreign partnership;

"(4) such corporation is not a corporation which was a party to a reorganization described in section 368 (b), or a corporation to which section 355 (or so much of section 356 as relates to section 355) applies and such corporation has not received a distribution under section 332 (relating to liquidations of subsidiaries) except in a case in which the basis of the assets distributed is determined under section 334 (b) (2);

"(5) such corporation has only one class of stock; and

"(6) no more than 80 percent of the stock of such corporation is owned by persons who formerly owned the business of such corporation as an unincorporated enterprise taxable as a domestic corporation under section 1361.

"(c) Partnership provisions applicable.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a domestic corporation making the election under subsection (a) shall be considered a partnership for purposes of this subtitle (except chapter 2 thereof) and shall be subject to subchapter K (sec. 701 and following, relating to partnerships) with respect to formation, operation, distributions, liquidation, sale of an interest, and any other purpose; and each shareholder of such corporation shall be considered a partner owning an interest in the partnership in the proportion which shares owned by such shareholder bear to the total number of outstanding shares of such corporation.

"(d) Election irrevocable.—Except as provided in subsections (e) and (g), the election described in subsection (a) by a domestic corporation shall be irrevocable with respect to—

"(1) the electing corporation and its shareholders; and

"(2) any corporate successor to the business of the electing corporation and the shareholders of such successor.

"(e) Change of ownership.—In the first year in which the shareholders who consented to the election described in subsection (a) own 80 percent or less of the stock of a corporation described in subsection (d), such corporation shall not be treated as a partnership for such year or for subsequent years, unless such corporation makes a new election in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a).

"(f) Constructive ownership.—For purposes of subsections (b) (6) and (e), the ownership of a stock interest shall be determined in accordance with the rules for constructive ownership of stock provided in section 267 (c) other than paragraph (3) thereof.

"(g) Disqualification.—If a corporation described in subsection (d) issues stock of a different class than that outstanding, the election described in subsection (a) shall be deemed never to have been made and the corporation shall be liable for all taxes due (except penalties) and such taxes may be assessed and collected as if no return had been filed.

"(h) Cross reference:

"For period of limitations on assessment and collection of tax where no return has been filed, see section 6501."

(b) Section 1361 (b) of such code (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"(5) no proprietor or partners having more than 80 percent interest in the profits or capital of such enterprise formerly owned stock in a corporation treated as a partnership under section 1371 which carried on the business of such enterprise."

(c) Section 1504 (b) of such code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"(8) Corporations subject to tax as partnerships under section 1371."

(d) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such code is amended by striking out—

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships, proprietorships, and corporations as to taxable status."

(e) The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 350

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Proprietors of unincorporated businesses—

"(1) Treatment as employees: For purposes of this part, an individual who—

"(A) owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business enterprise, and

"(B) performs services in the conduct of the trade or business of such business enterprise, which, if performed by an individual who does not own a proprietary interest in such business enterprise, would constitute services performed by an employee,

shall, at his election, be treated as an employee of such business enterprise. Except as provided in paragraph (3), such election shall be irrevocable. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(2) Election by partners: In the case of members of a partnership, paragraph (1) shall not apply to any member unless all members who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make an election under paragraph (1).

"(3) Change of ownership: An election by a member of a partnership under paragraph (1) shall cease to be effective—

"(A) upon the withdrawal from the partnership of a partner who has made an election under paragraph (1), unless, within 90 days after such withdrawal, the remaining members who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make a new election under paragraph (1); or

"(B) upon the addition to the partnership of a new partner who performs services described in paragraph (1) (B), unless, within 90 days after such addition, all partners (including the new partner) who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make a new election under paragraph (1).

"(4) Status as employer unaffected: The election by an individual under paragraph (1) to be treated, for purposes of this part, as an employee shall not affect the status of such individual as an employer for purposes of this part or of any other provision of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 1361 (d) of such code (relating to limitation on treatment of certain proprietors as employees) is repealed.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 351

A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of certain methods and rates of depreciation for used property acquired after 1956

Be it enacted, etc., That section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to depreciation) is amended—

(a) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (c) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or";

(b) by adding at the end of subsection (c) a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) acquired after December 31, 1956, if the original use of such property does not commence with the taxpayer, and the use of such property by the taxpayer commences after such date."; and

(c) by redesignating subsection (h) as (i), and inserting after subsection (g) a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Limitations with Respect to Used Property:

"(1) Annual limitation: Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year only to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all other property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the same taxable year, does not exceed $50,000. This paragraph shall not apply to property acquired by the taxpayer during any taxable year which is included within a 60-month period with respect to which an election under paragraph (2) has been made.

"(2) Five-year limitation: At the election of the taxpayer, paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the 60-month period which includes such taxable year, does not exceed $250,000. The 60-month period shall begin, with respect to any taxable year, with the first day of the first taxable year for which the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of this paragraph apply. Such election shall be irrevocable, except with the approval of the Secretary or his delegate, and shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 352

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on corporations) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Corporations in general: A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the taxable income of every corporation. The tax shall be computed under subsection (b) in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, and under subsection (c) in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956.

"(b) Taxable years beginning before January 1, 1957: In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, the tax shall consist of—

"(1) a normal tax equal to 30 percent of the taxable income, and

"(2) a surtax equal to 22 percent of the amount by which the taxable income (computed without regard to the deduction, if any, provided in section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest) exceeds $25,000.

"(c) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956: In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956, the tax shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	5 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $10,000.	$250, plus 10 percent of excess over $5,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $15,000.	$750, plus 15 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $15,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,500, plus 25 percent of excess over $15,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000.	$2,750, plus 35 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 45 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$38,250, plus 55 percent of excess over $100,000."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 12 (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (cross references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by striking out "section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11 (b) (2)."

(b) Section 244 (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends received on certain preferred stock) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(c) Section 247 (a) (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends paid on certain preferred stock of public utilities) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11 in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(d) Section 511 (a) (1) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable and so forth, organizations) is amended by striking out "a normal tax and a surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax."

(e) (1) Sections 802 (a) and 802 (c) (2) (A) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life-insurance companies) are amended by striking out "a normal tax (computed under section 11 (b) and a surtax (computed under section 11 (c))" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax (computed under section 11)."

(2) Section 811 (a) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life-insurance companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Tax imposed: A tax (computed under section 11) is hereby imposed on the life-insurance company taxable income of every life-insurance company for each taxable year beginning after December 31 1956."

(f) Section 852 (b) (1) of such Code (relating to taxation of regulated investment companies and their shareholders) is amended (1) by striking out "normal tax and surtax" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "tax," (2) by striking out "a normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax," and (3) by striking out "the normal tax under section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax under section 11 (but only the normal tax under such section in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957."

(g) Section 922 (2) (B) of such Code (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income) in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(h) Section 1361 (h) (1) of such Code (relating to imposition of taxes on unincorporated business enterprises electing to be treated as domestic corporations) is amended by striking out "the normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax."

(i) Section 1503 (a) of such Code (relating to computation and payment of tax on consolidated returns) is amended (1) by striking out "tax imposed under section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "surtax imposed under section 11," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the first sentence of this subsection, the term 'surtax imposed by section 11' means (1) the tax imposed by section 11 (b) (2), in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, and (2) that portion of the tax imposed by section 11 (c) which is attributable to taxable income exceeding $25,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(j) Section 1551 of such code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is amended by striking out "provided in section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided (in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957) in section 11 (b) (2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the United States Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has been conducting hearings and investigations on the problem of juvenile delinquency for the past several years. Our investigations have gone into the many facets of juvenile delinquency and special youth problems among the Indians, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, which are under the special jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. During this 85th Congress our subcommittee will submit bills which we believe will aid in the fight against juvenile delinquency in this country. These bills will cover the many aspects of the juvenile-delinquency problem which come under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States and are beyond the police powers of the several States.

This morning, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a series of juvenile-delinquency bills: First, a bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, which will provide that the Director of Social Work shall carry out his duties and functions in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the juvenile court judge. We believe this amendment will materially aid in the administration of justice in juvenile-delinquency matters; second, a bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. This bill will provide additional police powers in eradicating the distribution, publication, and sale of indecent publications in the District of Columbia by permitting the confiscation of equipment used; and, third, a bill to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia. This bill provides for the appointment of a referee to aid the juvenile court judge in hearing juvenile-delinquency cases.

We urge the immediate consideration and passage of these bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Senator KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

S. 355. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

S. 356. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee; and

S. 357. A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the various sections of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation, presented by Mr. BRICKER, is as follows:

TEXT OF PROPOSED TREATY-CONTROL AMENDMENT AND ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement not made in pursuance of this Constitution shall have no force or effect. This section shall not apply to treaties made prior to the effective date of this Constitution.

"SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation, except to the extent that the Senate shall provide affirmatively, in its resolution advising and consenting to a treaty, that the treaty shall have legislative effect.

"SEC. 3. An international agreement other than a treaty shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation valid in the absence of such an international agreement.

"SEC. 4. On the question of advising and consenting to a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the Senators voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

SECTION 1

Section 1 would in nowise impair the well-recognized constitutional treaty making power with respect to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations, nor the constitutional authority of the President to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States.

In *Asakura* v. *Seattle*, 265 U. S. 332, 341, the Supreme Court said:

"The treatymaking power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and, though it does not extend 'so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids,' it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations."

In *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, 133 U. S. 258, 266, the Supreme Court said:

"The treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations."

It is also firmly established that the treatymaking power is vested solely in the national government to the exclusion of the States.

Section 1, however, would give effect to what the Supreme Court has said by way of dicta, and therefore not authoritatively, in a number of decisions that a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which violates the Constitution, or which undertakes to do what the Constitution forbids, or which is inconsistent with the nature of our Government or the relation between the States and the United States, would be invalid.

See *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 11 Wall. 616, 620–621; *Holden* v. *Joy*, 17 Wall. 211, 243; *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, supra, and *Asakura* v. *Seattle*, supra.

The opinion of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, 252 U. S. 416, contains the following dictum:

"Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention."

Since it is a settled rule that in construing statutory and constitutional provisions the instrument should be considered as a whole, it is necessary to negate that dictum. Section 1 does this and would prevent a construction that although a treaty conflicts with the Constitution, such conflict is neutralized by the supreme law provision of article VI with respect to treaties.

The phrase, "not made in pursuance of this Constitution," is employed because it is the language of the present Constitution and has a well-defined and settled meaning. The phrase means that an international agreement must conform to, and not conflict with, the Constitution.

Examples of the effect of section 1 are: a treaty would be invalid if it undertook to impair freedom of speech, press, or religion; and a treaty would be invalid if it undertook to take private property without due process of law and just compensation.

A treaty would be open to challenge on the ground that it dealt with a subject having no legitimate relation to matters of international concern or foreign affairs and dealt with matters of purely domestic concern. That would be using a treaty as a subterfuge to enact domestic law.

Neither section 1 nor section 2 embraces the so-called "which clause." The power of Congress to implement a valid treaty by legislation under the "necessary and proper clause" would remain unimpaired.

Of course, an invalid treaty could not bring into being legislative power under the "necessary and proper clause."

SECTION 2

Section 2 does not affect the self-executing provisions of a treaty or other international agreement as a binding contract between the governments which are parties thereto.

The contractual effect and the legal consequences which flow from a treaty or other international agreement as a binding contract would not be limited. However, if a treaty or other international agreement is to have legislative effect, as distinguished from its effect as a contract between the States parties thereto, it must be implemented by legislative enactment.

With regard to earlier drafts of an amendment concerning the treaty power, the requirement that treaties be implemented by legislation in order to be effective as domestic law (as is the case in most other countries) provoked the argument that sometimes where implementing legislation is required for a treaty, it might take so long to get the legislation as to prove internationally embarrassing.

To meet this criticism under section 2 when immediate legislative effect of a treaty is deemed necessary, the Senate at the time of consenting to the treaty can, if a sufficient case is made, provide affirmatively that it should have immediate legislative effect.

Under section 2 most treaties would be implemented by Congress, while others might require implementation by State legislation.

Examples in the latter category are the French treaty of 1853 involved in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, 133 U. S. 258, 268, and treaties with China made in 1946, and with Italy made in 1948 and with Denmark, Greece, Israel, Ethiopia and Japan made in 1953, portions of which were made dependent for their domestic effect in the United States upon conformity with State law then existing or thereafter enacted, in respect of such matters as ownership of real and personal property and engaging in business.

In *United States* v. *Pink*, 315 U. S. 203, 230 (1942), the Court said:

"Frequently the obligation of a treaty will be dependent on State law."

SECTION 3

Section 2 above deals with the need for legislation to make treaties or other international agreements effective as domestic law within the United States. Section 3 embodies constitutional limitations with respect to legislation which implements international agreements other than treaties.

Section 3 does incorporate the "which clause" with respect to international agreements other than treaties. Section 2 recognizes that a treaty ratified by the Senate would bring into being legislative power by Congress to implement the treaty under the "necessary and proper clause," notwithstanding it would have no authority to enact such legislation in the absence of the treaty. However, it is thought that the President, acting alone, by entering into an executive agreement should not have authority to bring into being legislative power which would not otherwise exist.

Here again, it should be kept in mind that section 3 does not affect the international agreement as a contract or the legal consequences that flow from its contractual provisions. It only limits the general legislative effect, absent implementing legislation, and contains the "which clause."

SECTION 4

The distinguished minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, is responsible for the language to prevent treaties from being approved by only a handful of Senators present and voting. Both the administration and I have endorsed Senator KNOWLAND'S contribution to the amendment. On February 16, 1954, the Senate approved this provision by a vote of 72 to 16.

EFFECT, RETROACTIVE OR PROSPECTIVE, OF SECTIONS 1, 2, 3, AND 4

Section 1 is intended to be prospective and also retroactive to the effective date of the original Constitution. Of course, under well-established legal principles, the retroactive effect of this section would not apply to treaties or provisions thereof already fully performed, nor to rights or interests established by final adjudication under prior treaties.

Section 2, as drawn, is intended to be prospective in operation only, as shown by the clause beginning "except to." It is not intended to require any legislation not otherwise required, with respect to treaties that become operative prior to the effective date of section 2.

Section 3 is intended to be prospective in operation only.

Section 4 is prospective only.

TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY CONDITIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway safety traffic conditions on interstate highways.

This is a subject which concerns the hearts and minds of all of us. In view of the tremendous number of fatal and near-fatal accidents on the highways, and also in view of the number of new highways being built with Federal assistance, I believe that at this time such a study by a Federal commission is very wise and practical; and I hope that ultimately the Senate will pass the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway traffic safety conditions, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR AND PAYMENT TO CROW TRIBE IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution "to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin Project and Payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith and for other purposes."

Co-sponsors, with me, of this joint resolution are five distinguished Members of the Senate: My colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The joint resolution is designed to pave the way to start construction of Yellowtail Dam and powerplant on the Wyoming-Montana border. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Congress has appropriated funds to start construction, but we in Montana are unwilling for work to go ahead until the right-of-way problem is settled to the satisfaction of the Crow Indian Tribe on whose land the dam and part of the reservoir are located.

In the 84th Congress, the Senate, without a dissenting vote, passed Senate Joint Resolution 135, to pay the Crow Indians $5 million for the dam and reservoir right-of-way. The House concurred in the passage of the resolution by a recorded vote.

President Eisenhower vetoed the resolution on grounds that indicate that he was not in possession of all the facts and precedents that justified the Congress in providing $5 million in connection with Yellowtail Dam right-of-way. The resolution we are introducing today, and the supporting data we shall present, are designed to meet the President's objections to Senate Joint Resolution 135.

In addition to payment for the actual value of the land required for the right-of-way, the new resolution recognizes "special values" in support of a $5 million payment to the Crow Indians.

The resolution is identical with House Joint Resolution No. 2, introduced January 3 by Representative LEROY ANDERSON, of the Second Montana District. Early hearings will be held by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses.

A similar resolution will be introduced in the House by Representative LEE METCALF, of the First Montana District.

We shall show at public hearings to be held soon that the Crow Indian Tribe is fully entitled to $5 million in connection with the transfer of the right-of-way and related factors. The Crow Indians are entitled to fair and just treatment.

In the last hundred years their reservation area in Montana and Wyoming has been reduced from 38.5 million to about 2 million acres. This is about 5 percent of the reservation area in 1851.

We shall also show that practically all of the payment to the Crow Indians will be returned to the Federal Treasury, with interest from power revenues paid by consumers in Montana, Wyoming, and elsewhere in the Missouri River Basin. Therefore, the payment will not be a drain on the taxpayers of the country.

It is significant to note that the Federal agencies require non-Federal power projects to pay Indians elsewhere for the lease of land for dam and power sites at rates which would exceed the proposed Crow figure. This is true in the case of the Flathead Indian Tribes in western Montana and the Warm Springs Indians in Oregon. In both instances, the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior, acting for the Federal Government, approved these high payments.

In other words, power installations and productions represent the established basic criteria for dealing with Indians elsewhere. This resolution merely proposes that the Crow Indians be treated on a similar basis.

In my opinion, the Federal agencies that opposed the $5 million payment in Senate Joint Resolution 135, passed by Congress last May, failed to advise President Eisenhower of the precedents established by Interior and the Federal Power Commission.

All of these facts will again be brought out in the RECORD so that the Congress and the President may be fully advised of all the facts and circumstances that justify the payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe in connection with the Yellowtail Dam right-of-way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in the introduction of the Senate joint resolution "to provide for the transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes."

In essence, this resolution provides for the payment to the Crow Indian Tribe of Montana the sum of $5 million for the right-of-way lands, together with special values and other justifiable considerations in connection therewith.

I call the attention of the Senate to the preamble to the resolution, which I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The preamble calls attention to the veto message of the President, dated June 7, 1956, when he returned without approval Senate Joint Resolution 135, which was passed by the 84th Congress in May of last year. Pertinent paragraphs from the President's message are included in the preamble for the information of the Senate.

Needless to say, we do not concur with the basis for the President's refusal to approve Senate Joint Resolution 135. Unfortunately, it appears, doubtless through oversight, that the President's advisers on this matter did not place him in possession of all of the facts and circumstances in connection with the justification for the payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe for the surrender of its rights to the land required for the construction and operation of Yellowtail Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant on the Big Horn River in Montana and Wyoming.

As set forth in the resolution, there are special values and other justifiable considerations that make the payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe a sound investment for the United States in connection with the Yellowtail Dam development.

Montana, the Missouri River Basin, and the entire country needs Yellowtail Dam for its water conservation, flood control, irrigation storage, river regulation, and power production. It is a vital development of natural resources that has been endorsed by the Congress of the United States, not only through its authorization in the Flood Control Act of 1944, but through the appropriation of $4 million to initiate its construction.

The record shows, as set forth in the preamble to the resolution, that the Crow Indian Tribe has been most cooperative with the Federal Government in connection with development of the West. At the time of the treaty of September 17, 1851, the Crow Indian Reservation included 38.5 million acres of land in Montana and Wyoming, which was made up of exceedingly valuable grazing and other agricultural lands, with vast timber and mineral resources. Through various treaties and acts of Congress, the reservation has been reduced to approximately 2 million acres, or about 5 percent of the area fixed by the treaty of 1851. Last year, the Crow Indian Tribe voted to accept $5 million in connection with the transfer to the United States of the right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam.

The resolution, as my distinguished colleague has stated, sets forth precedents under which agencies of the Federal Government have required private power companies to pay compensation for special values in connection with the lease, for 50 years, of Indian lands required for non-Federal power developments. In the case of the Crow Indian Tribe, at the Yellowtail Dam site, it is proposed that title to the land be transferred to the United States.

In its major features, the resolution introduced today is esentially in terms agreed to by the Crow Indian Tribal Council in resolutions adopted last year. In addition, the Crow Indian Tribal Council officers telegraphed the President on May 29, 1956, urging him to sign Senate Joint Resolution 135 into law.

We expect to bring out in full all of the facts and circumstances in connection with this resolution at public hearings, and to demonstrate that the payment of $5 million is fully justified by the circumstances set forth in the preamble to the resolution.

I trust that early hearings will be held, so that the Crow Indians may be paid the $5 million, and that construction of Yellowtail Dam can be gotten underway promptly, so that public power production and other conservation developments in connection with the project may be speedily advanced.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the preamble of a copy of the Senate joint resolution, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the preamble of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 84th Congress, 1st session, adopted Senate Joint Resolution 135 providing "for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming," to which reference is hereby made; and

Whereas on June 7, 1956, the President returned said resolution, "without my approval," with comment which included the following:

"In essence, this resolution culminates a decade of negotiation and disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Crow Indians with respect to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tribe for lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, for which the initial construction appropriation was made in the fiscal year 1956 and for which an additional $10,850,000 was included in the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

"The standard of payment for land acquired by the Government is 'just compensation,' or 'fair market value.' However, I recognize that, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government has made awards in excess of 'just compensation' in other cases involving Indian lands. If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is 'just compensation.' The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it, should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this.

"A statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute. I regret that the extravagant nature of the award contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 135 requires this action which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit. It is my hope that the Congress can approve a statutory settlement which will permit expeditious action to proceed with the construction of this much-needed project,"; and

Whereas, as established by treaty of September 17, 1851, with the United States Government, the acreage of the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana and Wyoming included an area of 38½ million acres of land, including valuable grazing and other agricultural lands, as well as vast timber and mineral resources; and

Whereas, subsequently after the treaty of May 7, 1868, the act of Congress of April 21, 1882 (22 Stat. 42); the act of Congress of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 989); the act of Congress of April 27, 1904 (33 Stat. 352); and the act of Congress of August 31, 1937 (50 Stat. 884), and subsequent adjustments between allotted, unallotted, and reserved lands, the Crow Indian Reservation (now confined to a part of one county in Montana) has been reduced without just compensation to 2,018,218 acres, or to approximately 5 percent of the area fixed by the treaty of September 17, 1851; and

Whereas the Crow Indans, by a majority vote of its tribal council through resolution No. 63, adopted January 11, 1955, showed its willingness to cooperate in advancing the construction of Yellowtail Dam as a multiple-purpose development as a part of the Missouri River Basin system for flood control, river regulation, irrigation storage, and hydroelectric power production by a further surrender of a valuable part of the remaining reservation; and

Whereas, by telegram dated May 29, 1956, the duly elected officers of the Crow Indian Tribal Council withdrew opposition to said Senate Joint Resolution 135 and urged the President to sign said resolution into law; and

Whereas the Congress has repeatedly shown its willingness and readiness to recognize cooperation by Indian tribes in advancing resource development through multiple-purpose projects such as Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior have approved awards to Indian tribes in connection with hydroelectric power developments by non-Federal agencies in at least two transactions, where special values and justifiable considerations were essential factors (to the Flathead Indians in western Montana and to the Warm Spring Indians in Oregon where Indian lands for power-site purposes are leased at rates which in 50 years yield proportionately more than proposed in this resolution); and

Whereas said amounts of special values and considerations in connection with Yellowtail Dam will be repaid to the Federal Treasury through power revenues paid by power consumers of the Missouri River Basin power system; and

Whereas facts and circumstances are available to support the special values and other justifiable considerations and thereby meet the objections set forth in the President's message of June 7, 1956.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. President, under the terms of the joint resolution the President would be directed to call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11 and to invite the people of the United States to observe that day in churches and schools.

This year we commemorate the 177th anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish patriot who gave his life for our country during our fight for its freedom. During the past few months the world has again witnessed the great devotion of the Polish people to freedom. Their heroic rebellion against the yoke of Communist tyranny earned for the people of Poland the respect and compassion of the entire free world. In the light of their dramatic fight for freedom, I think it particularly fitting that we commemorate the anniversary of General Pulaski's death.

The zeal and sacrifice exemplified by General Pulaski in defense of our country gives inspiration to those who keep alive the spirit of freedom not only in Poland but in all oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Let us take time this year to pay tribute to this great Polish patriot—Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski—who lived and died in the cause of freedom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a joint congressional Committee on Scientific Research.

In view of the prominent position achieved by the United States in the fields of science and industry, it is my feeling that the continued scientific development is essential to our industrial strength and national defense. In this respect, the Congress should be in a position to maintain current information on all aspects of this country's scientific development in order that it may more intelligently legislate means of eliminating shortages of scientists and engineers, and to promote our further scientific development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which provides for the creation of a temporary joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of their nomination until the termination of their terms of office. The purpose of the contemplated study is to achieve a sound basis for such remedial legislation as may be necessary to make the laws certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties.

The resolution is similar to those I have submitted in each Congress during the past 11 years. Three times my proposals received Senate approval—in 1946, 1949, and 1956—but failed final action in the House. My zeal for the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to study the problems of presidential succession in its broadest aspects has not waned with these disappointments. In fact, I believe that the constitutional questions and legal problems involved become more acute with each passing year. We can ill afford further delay in reaching their determination. For the good of the country, I hope the resolution I now submit will receive the prompt approval of both Houses of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by Mr. GREEN, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Concurrent resolution

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

I. As to the election of the President and Vice President—

(1) Whether or not candidates for President and Vice President should be nominated by national political conventions, as at present, and, if so, recommendations which should be made to the parties for improving the convention process, and, if not, a method which would be preferable.

(2) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it.

(5) Whether or not a constitutional amendment should be proposed under which failure of candidates for President and Vice President to receive a majority of the electoral votes shall be resolved by popular vote rather than by the House of Representatives.

II. As to succession to the office of President—

(1) Whether the provisions of Public Law 199 of the 80th Congress, approved July 18, 1947, relating to Presidential succession, adequately provide for all possible contingencies, occasioned by the removal, resignation, death, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

(2) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual succeeding to the office of President.

(3) Whether or not the term of the Vice President or other individual succeeding to the Presidency should be limited to a duration of approximately 2 years, a new presidential election to coincide with election of Members of the House of Representatives where such individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of the term for which the President was elected.

III. As to inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties—

(1) How it shall be determined whether the President is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office; and how the extent and duration of such inability shall be determined and defined.

(2) How it shall be decided that the inability requires the constitutional discharge by the Vice President of the powers and duties of the office of President, or results in the succession of the Vice President to the office of President.

(3) What provision should be made to determine a similar inability affecting the Vice President, or other individual, acting during the inability of the President.

(4) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual executing the powers and duties of the office of President, during a period of temporary Presidential inability.

IV. As to the powers and duties of the President—

(1) Whether the heavy burdens of the Presidency necessitate the creation of an office of Executive Vice President; whether the establishment of such an office requires a constitutional amendment; and what powers and duties of the President should be assigned to such office.

(2) Whether the act of October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 712), which provided generally for the delegation of Presidential functions should be modified or extended.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, including drafts of any legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1957, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

STANDARD OF LIVING OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Concurrent resolution

Whereas it is the understanding of Congress that its responsibility in the American Indian problem cannot be fulfilled by the dispersal of Indian communities, but by the continuous development of their human and economic potential; and

Whereas it is recognized that Indian communities cannot be considered to have reached the American level of well-being until the principles of consent of the governed, self-determination, and local self-government are operative, nor until Indian opportunities in economy, education, and health are measurably equal to those of their fellow citizens; and

Whereas the American "point 4 program," as it has been applied successfully in underdeveloped areas of the world, reveals tested techniques whereby American Indian communities may be so developed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be, by definition, an agency to assist American Indian communities to reach the level of well-being enjoyed by other communities in the United States, and the governing program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be an American Indian point 4 program.

It is declared to be the sense of Congress that this program shall be offered to the American Indian communities without exacting termination of Federal protection of Indian property or of any other Indian rights as its price; that Indian culture and identity shall not be restricted or destroyed; that technical guidance and financial assistance shall be made available; that the request for assistance shall come from the Indians themselves after each Indian group has studied itself in terms of its own needs; that an impartial effort shall be made to deal with the development of natural resources to maximum capacity, to develop the full capabilities of industrial and agricultural production, of improvements in housing, nutrition, clothing, sanitation, and health, and of the resettlement on their initiative of individuals and families in other areas; that technical assistance shall be given to long-term general, vocational, technical, and professional education to enable American Indians to share fully in our total American society and to contribute to it; and that older, revered values shall be respected and used as new forms of living are introduced.

It is further declared to be the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior shall review all programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in order to develop its activities to further an American Indian point 4 program, and that he shall report to Congress at the earliest possible date his recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

Finally, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that Federal protection and services shall be ended for any tribe, band, or group only when such unit shall have adopted a plan for its organization and operation under State law, and such plan shall have been approved by the appropriate State and by the Secretary of the Interior prior to its submission to the Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS OF INCREASING HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12) which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States. In making such investigation and study the committee shall give consideration to—

(1) the need for Federal assistance to State and local governments in the enforcement of necessary highway safety and speed requirements and the forms such assistance should take;

(2) the advisability and practicability of uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws and what steps should be taken by the Federal Government to promote the adoption of such uniform laws;

(3) possible means of promoting highway safety in the manufacture of the various types of vehicles used on the highways;

(4) educational programs to promote highway safety; and

(5) such other matters as it may deem advisable and appropriate.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in keeping with a statement which I made late in the last session of the Congress, I am resubmitting today a resolution providing for an investigation of labor racketeering by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or by a subcommittee thereof.

I recognize that, since the submission of the similar resolution last July 5, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has done much preliminary work in this field. The staff of that subcommittee has produced a considerable amount of material which will be of great value in any overall investigation which is authorized by the Senate.

Despite this valuable activity by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I feel strongly that the entire subject of racketeering in organized labor lies squarely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Labor racketeering affects the whole field of labor-management relations; it also affects directly the public welfare, which is endangered so long as racketeering exists.

It is in line with this thinking that I am submitting again a resolution which would give to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the funds necessary to carry out an investigation of labor racketeering.

I find it difficult to express how strongly I feel the necessity for such an investigation. Racketeers intimidate honest workers and pervert the purpose of the labor movement. They add incalculably to the cost of doing business, and thereby to the price paid by consumers. They flout their government and make a mockery of its duty to preserve law and order.

In my opinion, only the Congress has the power to deal with this nationwide problem in the vigorous and comprehensive manner required. Undoubtedly the investigation which I have proposed would lead in time to recommendations from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for strengthening the Federal law regarding racketeering. I am certain that the law needs strengthening.

It is regrettable, but true, that an investigation of this nature will have difficulty in avoiding charges that it is baiting labor or bringing politics into labor-management relations. We are dealing here, however, with a subject which is far too serious to permit any maneuvering for political advantage or any attempt to persecute labor.

I made a promise when I submitted the similar resolution last year, and I should like to renew it now. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I shall do all that is within my power to make certain that this investigation, if it is authorized, shall be conducted without partisanship and with scrupulous fairness to labor organizations, employers and other interested parties.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I submit the resolution for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) providing for an investigation of labor racketeering by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or by a subcommittee thereof, submitted by Mr. IVES, for himself and Mr. PURTELL, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the penetration of criminal elements into, and their influence on, organized labor in the United States, for the purpose of ascertaining whether legislation is necessary for the protection of labor organizations, employees, employers, and the general public. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INFILTRATION OF CRIMINALS, ETC., INTO THE FIELD OF ORGANIZED LABOR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution providing funds and authority to conduct an urgently needed investigation of such magnitude that it requires additional funds beyond those ordinarily needed for the general functions of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

This investigation involves the infiltration of criminals and hoodlums and dishonest elements into the field of organized labor. May I say at the outset, it is not the intention of my committee or its subcommittee to infringe on the authority or jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nor is it the intention of the committee to interfere with legitimate union activities. We seek only to help legitimate unions to function without the interference and influence of criminals and hoodlums.

Although our investigation may touch on some aspects of labor law, it concerns itself primarily and to a larger degree with such matters as Government procurement, Government operations, violations of our tax laws, interference with interstate commerce, and violations of criminal laws, and the failure to file the full and complete financial records under Public Law 101, 80th Congress.

We do not intend to examine into labor matters such as wages and hours regulations, regulations affecting labor disputes, or other purely labor functions.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, as its name implies, involves an examination into the operation of all branches of the Government. I wish to point out that the scope of this investigation is broader than merely matters pertaining to the Department of Labor.

Without seeking to disparage any other committee, I feel that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by reason of the long experience and efficiency of its staff, is the best equipped to conduct this type of investigation.

For the past 4 months, a majority of the staff of the subcommittee has been engaged in a preliminary investigation in New York City, Chicago, Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and other areas, and has uncovered specific evidences of collusion between dishonest employers and union officials, extortions, the use of violence by certain segments of labor leadership, the diversion and misuse of labor union funds by high-ranking dishonest union officials for their own profit and gain, and large-scale frauds in income taxes.

Furthermore, for the past 2 years, this committee has been studying Army procurement matters which involve collusion between dishonest contractors and criminals who have managed to seize control of certain unions.

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as early as last May 17 and May 29 held executive hearings and brought before it such well-known criminals as the notorious John Dioguardia, alias Johnny Dio; his brother, Tommy Dioguardia; Albert Anastasia, notorious as one of the gunmen of Murder, Inc., and reputed to be involved in a large number of unsolved murders; Harry Stromberg, Joseph Profaci, and James Plumeri, all well-known underworld characters who were either directly or indirectly connected with the pattern of underworld control of unions and the dishonest contracting firms acting in collusion with labor fronts.

The investigation into these hoodlum activities has broadened into a nationwide investigation into similar racketeer controls over unions, whose activities, if

left unexposed and unchecked, will have an impact not only on Government procurement, but may seriously impair the efficiency, economy, and the operation of Government.

In one instance we have evidence indicating that dishonest teamster officers sought to use their union power to take over the control of the municipal government for the purpose of controlling vice, including gambling and prostitution.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received from the city council of Portland, Oreg., formally requesting that my committee investigate this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
December 21, 1956.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Investigations Subcommittee of Governmental Operations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As auditor of the city of Portland, Oreg., I have been directed by the city council, the governing body of the city of Portland, to extend to your investigations subcommittee an invitation to hold, here in Portland, your current investigations concerning activities of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and vice conditions in the Pacific Northwest. The council of the city of Portland approved this invitation as a result of discussion concerning newspaper reports of possible delays to the committee in examining records and reports, and approved the view that: An investigation hearing held in Portland, Oreg., would minimize delays to the committee; would permit city and State officials to testify as the committee may desire and supply their records to the committee as it may request, with greater facility; and, would afford to the 13,000 members of the teamsters' union in the greater Portland area, a wider knowledge of organization operations.

I am further directed by the city council to assure you and the committee that, if the committee so desires, it may have the use of the city council chambers with recording equipment for use of the committee, and that the city of Portland will make available to the committee the facilities of the bureau of police of the city of Portland, insofar as the committee may desire to use such facilities, and will offer the full cooperation of the city of Portland.

Yours respectfully,

WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I also ask to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared only yesterday, January 6, 1957, in the New York Times, entitled "Labor Union Rackets a Continuing Problem," by A. H. Raskin. I do not wish to burden the Senate by reading the entire article, although I consider it well informed and pertinent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 6, 1957]

LABOR-UNION RACKETS A CONTINUING PROBLEM—AFL–CIO TAKES UP TWO CASES BUT IS POWERLESS IN OTHERS

(By A. H. Raskin)

The united labor movement is determined to resort to major surgery, if necessary, to rid itself of cancerous growths of gangster penetration.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, made this clear last week in suspending the heads of two small unions, accused of unethical conduct and welfare-fund abuses.

The get-tough policy toward union racketeering will receive added emphasis when the AFL-CIO executive council meets in Miami Beach on January 28 for its midwinter meeting. The council is expected to give its blessing to preparation of what would amount to a 10 commandments of honorable practice for union officials. This would take the form of a code designed to prevent unionists from using their labor posts for personal profit.

How much corruption there is in the 15-million-member federation is not susceptible of statistical measurement. Many of the largest unions—the United Automobile Workers, the United Steelworkers, and the International Association of Machinists, to name three in the million-member class—are almost completely free of underworld elements. Scores of the smaller unions are similarly without blemish.

RACKETEERING SURVIVES

But their good record is obscured by the predatory tactics of crooked officials in a relatively small number of strategic unions that deal with thousands of small and medium-sized businesses. Involved in a constant competitive struggle for survival, the small employer is often powerless to resist the extortions of union racketeers. Sometimes, it must be added, he not only does not resist but actively seeks the aid of unsavory forces to defeat legitimate union demands or to win some other business advantage for himself.

The greatest racket inroads have been made in trucking, waterfront activities and in a multiplicity of service, construction, distributive, and manufacturing trades. No one has any real idea of the annual "take," but the freedom with which the heads of tiny unions fling around money at plush hotels, night clubs, race tracks, and other gambling establishments makes it clear that labor piracy is not in the petty larceny class. Diverted fees from welfare funds alone run to many millions a year.

MAIN OBSTACLE

The chief obstacle to a gigantic broom-wielding job by the parent federation is the ability of the crooks to hide behind the self-governing rights of the international unions in which they hold sway. Under the AFL–CIO constitution, the only unions that are within the direct administrative rule of the federation itself are the so-called Federal labor unions and local industrial unions.

These are single-unit unions unattached to any national industrial or craft organization. There are 900 of them, scattered through every State, and they have a combined membership of about 250,000. It was against two unions in this group that Mr. Meany directed his crackdown last week.

One was a local of 900 Chicago junk handlers and the other was made up of 1,750 workers in Philadelphia can factories. Trustees were put in charge of their funds, offices, and records, and the suspended secretary-treasurers of the two organizations were called to hearings in the AFL–CIO headquarters in Washington tomorrow.

However, the task is far harder in the international unions, which comprise 98 percent of the federation's enrollment. The 140 unions in this category range from the Horse Shoers Union with 246 members, to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, which pays per capita dues on 1,300,000. These unions hold charters that make them sovereign over their own affairs.

POSSIBLE SUSPENSION

The federation's only recourse if the internationals refuse to correct conditions that bring discredit on the entire movement is to suspend or expel them. Three relatively small internationals already face the possibility that this amputation process will be practiced on them. They are the Laundry Workers, the Distillery Workers, and the Allied Industrial Workers, with a joint membership of 170,000. The AFL–CIO ethical practices committee will submit recommendations to the Miami Beach meeting on whether to suspend their charters for welfare-fund maladministration.

The leaders directly involved in the abuses now under investigation by the merged organization are in the small-fry class in terms of the economic importance of their unions. But the high command of the AFL–CIO is becoming increasingly convinced that there is an interlocking directorate of crime operating within labor. Crooks in west coast unions are on remarkably intimate terms with those on the east coast. The same comradely spirit is manifest at all way stations.

RACKET UPSURGE

The imminence of an upsurge of racket power in the New York trucking industry has sharpened the resolve of Mr. Meany and his associates to act decisively in areas where the normal processes of law-enforcement appear of little effect. The retirement of Martin T. Lacey as president of the Teamsters Joint Council here opens the way for control of trucking by the same elements that have dominated the docks for many years.

In 1953 the old A. F. of L., under Mr. Meany's leadership, kicked out the International Longshoremen's Association. Now the men of the Teamsters Union who were most active in helping the pier union keep its stranglehold on the port will have a commanding grip on the city's trucking. This is a prospect that is as unpalatable to labor's top echelon as it is to District Attorney Frank S. Hogan or United States Attorney Paul W. Williams. Whether labor can deal with it more successfully than the public prosecutors remains to be seen. Up to now the tide has been running strongly in the underworld's favor.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I quote from this article very briefly:

The greatest racket inroads have been made in trucking, waterfront activities, and in a multiplicity of service, construction, distributive and manufacturing trades. No one has any real idea of the annual "take," * * *

* * * the high command of the AFL–CIO is becoming increasingly convinced that there is an interlocking directorate of crime operating within labor. Crooks in west coast unions are on remarkably intimate terms with those on the east coast.

Not the least important is that this committee has been engaged for many years in investigating frauds and other illegal practices which have been perpetrated on the Government in its procurement and building programs.

The Government is about to embark on a vast, long-range road building program which will entail the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Too often in the past we investigated the mulcting of Government after the fact. Now we propose to take preventive measures to eliminate those criminal elements which are preying upon the Government by using apparently legitimate labor unions as fronts, or work in collusion with dishonest management to

defraud the Government on its procurement and construction programs.

This investigation in this field, conducted properly and thoroughly, will prevent losses to our Government far exceeding the costs of such investigation.

I will have more to say on this subject at a later time.

At an early date I will also offer a separate resolution for the funds to continue the other functions of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred. The question of committee jurisdiction will be taken under consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 14), submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, was ordered to lie on the table and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 14

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in the course of investigations into Government procurement practices of the Defense Department, has found evidence of racketeering and collusion between certain labor officials and employers which might seriously affect and impair proper Government procurement; and

Whereas a preliminary staff investigation of such subcommittee with respect to the general field of improper activities of certain segments of labor union leadership and collusive practices of such leadership with management has disclosed conditions requiring a thorough investigation and exposure of the facts to determine whether further legislation should be recommended; and

Whereas the United States Government spends billions of dollars on procurement of goods and services every year, and hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of public works; and

Whereas the United States Government is about to embark on a vast roadbuilding program which will involve the expenditure of many billions of dollars; and

Whereas the free flow of goods in interstate commerce is necessary for the efficient and economic administration of Government; and

Whereas the continuance of any such improper, illegal, and racketeering activities by certain union officials, in collusion with management or otherwise, may result in an enormous loss to the United States Government; and

Whereas evidence tending to show (1) the infiltration by criminal elements into the field of organized labor, (2) the use of violence, shakedowns, blackmail, bribery, embezzlement, extortion, by certain segments of union leadership, by collusion with management or otherwise, (3) the existence of other forms of corruption, violation, evasion of laws of the United States on the part of corrupt union officials, (4) that union funds are being misused and misappropriated for the personal benefit of certain union officials and true and accurate financial statements are, therefore, not being filed with the Labor Department as required by Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, chapter 120, 9 (f) and (g), (5) the failure on the part of any agency of the Government to enforce existing laws and regulations; should be thoroughly investigated. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in the exercise of its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to study the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, to examine, investigate, and to study the impact of labor irregularities on Government operations, and to determine and make a complete study of—

(1) whether there exist any infiltration of persons engaged in pursuing criminal practices and activities in the field of organized labor or any other corrupt, collusive, or illegal practices such as racketeering, extortion, and blackmail, and improper practices which are against the public interest or against the interest of labor organizations or their membership;

(2) whether any such practices have occurred or resulted in violation of, or may occur or result in evasion or impairment of, any statutes of the United States, or violate the civil rights and liberties of individual members of organized labor or other persons;

(3) whether such statutes have been properly, efficiently, and vigorously enforced and administered by officers and agencies of the United States charged with responsibility for their enforcement and administration; and

(4) whether existing laws of the United States are adequate to protect the public interest and the interest of labor organizations and their membership against the occurrence of such practices.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, until January 31, 1958, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall reports its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United Nations emergency force should be made permanent.

We could thereby bring into being a truly international police force—something which for many years has been the dream of men seeking a world order based on law and justice.

The Charter of the United Nations itself provides for the establishment of such a force, but the Charter intended that this should be done under the aegis of the Security Council. Because of the cold war which has developed since the Charter was adopted in 1945, the Council, of course, has been unable to function as was contemplated.

Consequently, the functions of the General Assembly have greatly increased in importance. It will be recalled that in 1950, during the Korean fighting, the Assembly adopted what is popularly known as the uniting for peace resolution. This resolution provided for action by the Assembly to meet world crises in which the Security Council was paralyzed by the veto. Among other things, the Assembly in that resolution recommended that each member of the U. N.—

maintain within its national armed forces elements so trained, organized and equipped that they could promptly be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as a United Nations unit or units, upon recommendation by the Security Council or General Assembly, without prejudice to the use of such elements in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter.

It may also be recalled that generally similar objectives were sought in Senate Concurrent Resolution 50 of the 80th Congress, which I submitted in the Senate and which was sponsored by 16 Senators and in the House in the case of a similar resolution by a number of Representatives; also in Senate Resolution 133 of the 81st Congress which was submitted by 11 Senators, including myself.

The resolution which I submit today is not so detailed as these earlier resolutions. It contents itself, rather, with stating the broad principles involved. First, it welcomes the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force. Second, it expressed the sense of the Senate that this force should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations. Third, it endorses the principle that participation in this force should not be open to nationals or units of the armed forces of the great powers. This will insure that the force is composed of men from the smaller or medium-sized nations. Finally, the resolution says that the expenses of the force should be met by the United Nations out of its regular budget. This is in keeping with the concept of the force as a permanent arm of the U. N.

Within the broad framework of these general principles, Mr. President, there is ample room to work out details governing the operation and organization of the U. N. force.

Although the resolution which I submit today is not inconsistent with the U. N. uniting-for-peace resolution, it goes further than that resolution in one important respect and differs from it in another. The uniting-for-peace resolution contemplated that each member of the U. N. would maintain within its armed forces units which could be promptly made available to the U. N. My resolution would have the force maintained on a permanent basis by the U. N. itself. My resolution would also prevent participation in the force by the great powers—that is, the permanent members of the Security Council. This is in accordance with the regulations governing the U. N. emergency force now in operation in the Middle East. I do not see any objection, however, to the great powers contributing some equipment to the force; and, indeed, the United States has done so in the present instance.

It will no doubt be observed, Mr. President, that my resolution does not deal with the question of whether U. N. control of the force is to be exercised by the Security Council, the General Assembly, or both. It would seem to me personally that the pattern of the uniting-for-peace resolution might well be followed; that is, that the force would be under the Security Council initially, but that control could also be asserted by the Assembly when the Security Council is unable to act. This is a question, however, which I think can just as well be left for future determination by the U. N.

The important thing is to establish the force as a permanent fixture. Had it been in existence 2 years, or even 1 year, earlier, the tragic events of October and November in the Middle East might never have occurred.

Who can say that situations might not arise in other parts of the world calling for intervention by such an international force? I believe that the simple existence of this kind of force might well prevent the development of such situations.

Mr. President, the U. N. General Assembly has resumed its 11th session in New York. I hope that before it adjourns in February, the Assembly will itself take steps to constitute UNEF on a permanent basis. Favorable Senate action on a resolution such as I am introducing today would undoubtedly encourage the Assembly to take these steps.

I hope that this resolution may receive the early attention of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senate, that it will be sympathetically considered by the State Department and the President, and that the sentiments it expresses will be followed by our representatives at the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to lie on the desk until Friday next, as follows:

Whereas the United Nations Emergency Force, created pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly of November 3 and 4, 1956 (A/RES/391 and A/RES/394), has made an important contribution to international peace and security in the Middle East; and

Whereas the need for such a force appears likely to continue; and

Whereas such a force could be an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security not only in the Middle East but also in other areas of the world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate welcomes the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Senate that:

(a) The force should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations.

(b) The force should be composed of units made available by members of the United Nations: *Provided*, That no such units should be accepted from permanent members of the Security Council.

(c) Consideration should be given to arrangements whereby individuals would be allowed to volunteer for service with the force: *Provided*, That individuals who are nationals of permanent members of the Security Council should not be acceptable.

(d) Equipment and expenses of the force should be provided by the United Nations out of its regular budget.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I am submitting today, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Permanent U. N. Police," published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 6, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT U. N. POLICE

It is becoming increasingly apparent that some kind of international police force will be needed in the Near East for a long time. Unless the United Nations assumes a positive responsibility for preventing the renewal of clashes between Egypt and Israel pending a political settlement, the prospect of any stability will be dismal indeed.

What is required, in this newspaper's opinion, is United Nations occupation of a buffer zone along both sides of the Israeli-Egyptian border from the Gaza strip down to and including the coastline around the islands in the tip of the Gulf of Aqaba. This means a U. N. police force of sufficient size to patrol the border against raids. Ideally it also would mean United Nations purchase of the narrow border zone from both countries and administration of this zone as an international territory.

Obviously the United Nations ought not to be used to reward Israel for her attack. Israel will be unreasonable if she seeks aggrandizement or if she refuses to withdraw her troops in accordance with the U. N. request. She will not be unreasonable if she seeks guaranties against the sort of provocations that led to the attack. It would be wholly unrealistic for the U. N. to be concerned only with a return to the status quo before the invasion.

Indeed, such a narrow concern would surely invite contempt for the U. N. as an agency to maintain peace. It is necessary for the U. N. to consider causes as well as effects—to condemn the Israeli attack, but also to remember the constant Egyptian fedayeen raids that provoked it. The State Department is being pusillanimous in disregarding the substantial justice of Israel's appeal for guaranties. It requires no endorsement of Israeli tactics, which sometimes have seemed bloodthirsty, to understand that some kind of protection against renewed provocation is fundamental.

A buffer zone would not afford much protection, of course, unless there were some sort of military force to maintain it. Conceivably this would be possible with the United Nations Emergency Force now in existence. But most of the nations which have furnished troops for this undertaking regard it as a strictly temporary and limited assignment; some, indeed, have precluded the use of their troops in any effort to facilitate political settlement. In any event a U. N. police force made up of diverse national units would be subject to constant pulling and hauling.

Is it not time to take up the Canadian suggestion for a small permanent United Nations police force recruited as a unit? This could be on the order of a foreign legion under a commander responsible to the Secretary General and the General Assembly. Always before, proposals for a permanent international force have foundered because they have been considered too abstract. Here is a real situation that cries for this kind of policing. Following its request for broad authority to create an American shield over the Near East, the administration could usefully take some further initiative in strengthening the capability of the U. N. to keep peace within the area.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine and make a full and complete study and review of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government Employees Life Insurance Program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF METHODS USED IN CALCULATING AMOUNTS PAID TO WHEAT PRODUCERS FOR PARTICIPATING IN ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the methods and formulas used by the Department of Agriculture in calculating the amount paid to producers of wheat for participating in the acreage reserve program, provided for in the Soil Bank Act, with a view to ascertaining what if any changes should be made in such act with respect to such methods and formulas.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized until June 1, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the

consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 1, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADOPTION OF RULES OF THE SENATE FOR THE 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Senate do now adopt as its rules for the 85th Congress the rules which prevailed during the 84th Congress except that rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking from subsection 2 the words "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting but in no case less than a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

AUTHORIZATION FOR ONE TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because my name was mentioned in the Douglas resolution, I wish to say that the resolution is not my first choice. I shall go along with it if there is no better choice. However, I have a better choice.

I resubmit a longstanding resolution providing for the imposition of cloture by a majority vote of the Senate of the United States, with a guaranty to the minority that 96 hours' time will be permitted, if the Senate so desires, so that each Senator will be allowed 1 hour to debate the issue, or farm out his time if he does not want to use it.

The resolution (S. Res. 21), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entiled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXTENT OF FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be composed of 5 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the majority party and 2 shall be members of the minority party.

(b) The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of (1) the extent and nature of foreign investment in and control of corporations having defense contracts with the United States or having information the disclosure of which would be detrimental to the national defense, and (2) the extent to which the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and other applicable Federal statutes may be violated by persons in foreign countries in connection with the purchase or sale of securities of United States corporations, including persons controlling or seeking to acquire control of United States corporations, or acting for persons controlling or seeking to acquire control of such corporations.

SEC. 2. The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the committee may provide that fewer than five but not less than two members shall constitute a quorum: *Provided*, That both the majority and minority parties are represented.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than April 1, 1958.

(b) Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, commencing with the 85th Congress, rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committes and no more."

PROHIBITION OF INTRODUCTION OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, OR AMENDMENTS BY TWO OR MORE SENATORS JOINTLY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution amending rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate relating to the introduction of bills and other measures by two or more Senators jointly.

This proposal would amend paragraph 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate to prohibit the multiple sponsorship of bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments, except to permit cosponsorship only in cases of (a) legislation of a local nature or interest primarily to residents of a particular State, which may be introduced jointly by two Senators from that State; and (b) legislation authorizing two or more States to negotiate or enter into an interstate compact, which may be introduced jointly by the respective Senators from the States parties to the compact.

The prohibition of cosponsorship of legislation in the Senate would eliminate the current frequent practices of authors of legislative proposals who request that their measures "lie on the desk" so that the names of additional Senators can be added or who seek unanimous consent to add the names of other Senators to legislative proposals.

For a number of years it has been the firmly established precedent in the House of Representatives that two or more Members of that body cannot jointly introduce a bill or resolution, and that procedure is governed by the practice of the House rather than by any expressed rule.

I ask that the resolution, together with the accompanying papers, may be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph No. 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by 2 or more Senators, except that (1) the 2 Senators from any State may jointly introduce any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) 2 or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."; so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by 2 or more Senators, except that (1) the 2 Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) 2 or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

Report No. 2022

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 250) prohibiting the introduction of bills or joint resolutions by two or more Senators jointly, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute), and an amendment to the title, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Resolution 250, as submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, would prohibit the multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions in the Senate. To achieve that purpose it is proposed to amend paragraph 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate by adding an additional clause to that paragraph. Paragraph 1 of rule 14 is here reproduced with the proposed amendment indicated by italic:

1. Wherever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; *and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of two or more Senators.*

The author of the resolution, the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, gave the following explanation of his proposal at the time he submitted the resolution to the Senate:

(From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 4, p. 6941.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have observed with some regret, as I am sure many other Senators have, the growing practice in the Senate of multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions. It is a practice which has developed in the past few years, and it seems to me to be a very bad one; indeed, in a sense, multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions seems to be assuming the aspects of a vicious practice.

During the entire history of the United States Senate, until very recently, it has been customary for a single Senator to introduce a bill or joint resolution. That is the practice which should have been followed, and, in my judgment, it is the one which should be observed now. The habit of introducing bills and having them lie on the table, in order that Senators may walk down the sawdust trail and attach their names to the bill, seems to me to be undignified in the highest sense of the word.

Furthermore, a Senator who works out a bill to canvass around among his colleagues to obtain signatures to his bill, in order that it may carry the prestige of many of the Senators and their names, frequently creates a situation in the Senate which is utterly indefensible.

If a Senator is able to peddle his bill around among other Senators, either by mail or in person, until he obtains a majority of the Senate, and they become committed to the bill by joint introduction, of what value is it to have committees? What function can a committee perform if a majority of the Senators have already committed themselves to a bill before its introduction?

It is embarrassing to Senators to deny to their colleagues sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions they contemplate introducing. I myself have adopted the uniform custom of not joining in the introduction of bills or joint resolutions, no matter how much I might favor them in principle. I have recently received letters from constituents asking why I did not join in a bill which had been jointly sponsored.

We have all seen Senators vote against bills which they had cosponsored. Very recently a very able, distinguished, and honorable Senator, one respected by all of us, cosponsored a measure. Then he was compelled not only to vote against it, but to speak against it in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives there is a rule against multiple sponsorship of bills, and only one Member may introduce a bill. That is a dignified practice. That is a proper way to proceed. Such a rule in the Senate would be the only way to keep Members of the Senate from being embarrassed by requests of colleagues to join in cosponsoring a bill. It seems to me it is the practice which should be followed, although there is no rule prohibiting multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions.

I believe every Senator present, in his heart, would like to see the rule amended, because we have all been embarrassed by importunities on the part of our colleagues. We all have received letters with a copy of a bill about to be introduced. We must either sign the bill, remain silent, or give some reason for not cosponsoring the bill. It is an undignified procedure.

NATURE OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

While the committee subscribes generally to the principle involved in Senate Resolution 250, it believes that joint sponsorship of legislation should continue to be permitted in certain instances. The committee also believes that the prohibition on joint sponsorship should not be restricted to bills and joint resolutions, but should apply as well to concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments.

Senate Resolution 250 as reported with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute) incorporates the following changes from the text of the resolution as submitted:

1. The blanket prohibition against joint sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions has been modified to permit joint sponsorship only in the cases of—

(*a*) Legislation of a local nature or of interest primarily to residents of a particular State, which may be introduced jointly by the two Senators from that State; and

(*b*) Legislation authorizing two or more States to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact, which may be introduced jointly by the respective Senators from the States parties to the compact.

2. The prohibition on joint sponsorship has been made applicable to concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments, as well as to bills and joint resolutions which alone were specified in the original text.

3. The prohibition on joint sponsorship or proposal of legislation in the Senate has been extended to encompass the current frequent practice indulged by authors of legislative proposals who ask that their measures "lie at the desk" so that the names of additional Senators can be added, or who seek unanimous consent to add the names of other Senators. The committee amendment provides that the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution or amendment is unauthorized.

The committee has also amended the title of Senate Resolution 250 so as to reflect the changes made in the text of the resolution.

JOINT SPONSORSHIP IS PROHIBITED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In the House of Representatives two or more Members cannot jointly introduce a bill or resolution. This procedure of the House is governed by the practice of the House rather than by any express rule. The practice is firmly established, however, and proceedings in the House are governed just

as effectively by practice as by established written rule.

In the 2d session of the 60th Congress, a select committee was appointed to investigate and report to the House concerning the right of Members to present bills and resolutions with the names of more than one Member attached thereto. The select committee was under the chairmanship of Mr. John J. FitzGerald, of New York. He presented the unanimous report of the select committee to the House on March 3, 1909 (vol. 34, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, 60th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3808–3811). The report of the select committee was adopted by the House and is now the precedent of the House. (See Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, 1936 edition, vol. VII, pp. 145–146.)

This report, in discussing rule 22 of the House of Representatives, which relates to the introduction of bills, resolutions, memorials and petitions, reads as follows:

"While the rule itself does not in express terms prohibit the attaching of the name of more than one Member to a bill or resolution when it is delivered to the Clerk or to the Speaker, as the case may be, for reference, attention is called to the second clause, requiring that under certain conditions the bill 'shall be returned to the Member from whom it was received.' The House however, in the conduct of its business is not controlled, nor is the business conducted, merely in accordance with the expressed Rules of the House. There are many situations not specifically covered by the written rules which are nevertheless regulated definitely by the procedure which has come down from time immemorial and which procedure is essential to the orderly conduct of the business of the House. * * * A casual examination of rule 22 does not disclose any inhibition against the attachment of more than a single name to a bill or resolution. Examined in the light of the evolution of the rules and practice relating to the presentation of bills, however, and bearing in mind the purpose sought to be accomplished by the changes made from time to time resulting finally in the introduction of all bills without the formality of recognition, it seems clear to the committee that the underlying principle of individual recognition still prevails and that the presentation of a bill involves such recognition. * * * the committee is unanimously of the opinion that under the true and proper construction of the rule the attaching of the name of more than one Member to a bill or resolution is unauthorized."

DISADVANTAGES OF COSPONSORSHIP

1. Cosponsorship interferes with the underlying principle of individual recognition and responsibility for legislation.

2. Cosponsorship of a particular bill by a large majority of Senators is an ineffective substitution for normal committee proceedings and constructive senatorial debate and deliberation. It leads to the elimination of committee hearings and does away with the occasion for Senate debate.

3. The availability of cosponsorship in the Senate has encouraged individual Senators to make a show of sentiment in support of a particular bill by entreating other Senators to join as cosponsors. In recent years this practice has run rampant. It has become a frequent occurrence nowadays for Senators introducing bills to ask that their bills "lie at the desk" so that the names of additional sponsors can be added. Also, individual Senators frequently rise nowadays and ask unanimous consent to have the names of certain other Senators added to a particular measure.

4. Through friendship, embarrassment, or fear of misinterpretation, it appears that some Senators consent to cosponsor bills without sufficient study of their detailed provisions.

5. Individual Senators who (a) because of personal principle refrain from all cosponsorship, or (b) fail to cosponsor a particular measure because of lack of time to study its provisions or because of disagreement with some particular provision therein, may wrongfully be thought opposed to the objectives of popular legislation, when, in reality, they are in deep sympathy with those objectives.

That paragraph numbered 1 of rule 14 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."; so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

PROHIBITION OF JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may introduce a joint resolution and make a brief statement on it, without his losing the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have observed with some regret, as I am sure many other Senators have, the growing practice in the Senate of multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions. It is a practice which has developed in the past few years, and it seems to me to be a very bad one; indeed, in a sense, multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions seems to be assuming the aspects of a vicious practice.

During the entire history of the United States Senate, until very recently, it has been customary for a single Senator to introduce a bill or joint resolution. That is the practice which should have been followed, and, in my judgment, it is the one which should be observed now. The habit of introducing bills and having them lie on the table, in order that Senators may walk down the sawdust trail and attach their names to the bill, seems to me to be undignified in the highest sense of the word.

Furthermore, for a Senator who works out a bill to canvass around among his colleagues to obtain signatures to his bill, in order that it may carry the prestige of many of the Senators and their names, frequently creates a situation in the Senate which is utterly indefensible.

If a Senator is able to peddle his bill around among other Senators, either by mail or in person, until he obtains a majority of the Senate, and they become committed to the bill by joint introduction, of what value is it to have committees? What function can a committee perform, if a majority of the Senators have already committed themselves to a bill before its introduction?

It is embarrassing to Senators to deny to their colleagues sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions they contemplate introducing. I myself have adopted the uniform custom of not joining in the introduction of bills or joint resolutions, no matter how much I might favor them in principle. I have recently received letters from constituents asking why I did not join in a bill which had been jointly sponsored.

We have all seen Senators vote against bills which they had cosponsored. Very recently a very able, distinguished, and honorable Senator, one respected by all of us, cosponsored a measure. Then he was compelled not only to vote against it, but to speak against it in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives there is a rule against multiple sponsorship of bills, and only one Member may introduce a bill. That is a dignified practice. That is a proper way to proceed. Such a rule in the Senate would be the only way to keep Members of the Senate from being embarrassed by requests of colleagues to join in cosponsoring a bill. It seems to me it is the practice which should be followed, although there is no rule prohibiting multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a resolution to amend the rule of the Senate so as to provide that only one Senator may introduce a bill or joint resolution, and that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give it earnest and prompt consideration, and hope I may be permitted, if necessary, to appear before the committee. [Applause.]

I believe every Senator present, in his heart, would like to see the rule amended, because we have all been embarrassed by importunities on the part of our colleagues. We all have received letters with a copy of a bill about to be introduced. We must either sign the bill, remain silent, or give some reason for not cosponsoring the bill. It is an undignified procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

"*Resolved*, That paragraph numbered 1 of rule 14 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word 'day,' after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: 'and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of two or more Senators', so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"'1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of 2 or more Senators.'"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in believing that the resolution does not bear multiple sponsorship? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that assumption; and if he does not wish to take my word for it, he can go to the desk and examine the resolution. He will see that it has only one name on it.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to state that action similar to that proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] had been proposed in the committee and had been approved by the committee; and such a resolution is now in process of being drafted. I make that statement for the information of the Senate, and, in particular, for the information of the Senator who submitted the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that a similar resolution has already been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. GREEN. No, Mr. President; I did not say that. I said such a resolution is under consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and is being drafted or redrafted, or a restatement of it is being drafted, by the staff of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ILLUSION OF REFORM ON THE PART OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it is extremely difficult for an untrained observer to keep up with the trend of events of a world character from day to day. The rapid changes of a fundamental nature in faraway trouble spots make it increasingly difficult for the people of our country to appraise properly the precise situation existing particularly in those areas behind the Iron Curtain.

After the meeting at the summit a year ago last summer, many people became convinced that at long last the leaders of the Kremlin had seen the light and that they were now ready to cooperate with the free world in an effort to find the road to peace. It was a high challenge, and reasonable men the world over searched their souls for a way to foster a growth of understanding between these two armed camps. When the true picture of Stalin was exposed to the eyes of the Russian people, many persons jumped to the conclusion that the Bolsheviks had really reformed. But when the red empire brought out its heavy artillery to crush the totally unarmed and defenseless people of Hungary, it was apparent to all that the Russian Communists had not deviated in the slightest from their historic policy to impose their atheistic and communistic system of philosophy on the whole world by subversion if possible and by force if necessary.

Mr. President, the word from Budapest this morning, that Russian tanks had rolled into that city to be on hand when Premier Kadar announced the imposition of "an old-style Communist dictatorship of the proletariat," made it clear that the last hope for political freedom in Hungary had been effectively crushed.

The danger to our country both at home and abroad from the onslaught of the Russian menace is plain and evident to every red-blooded American. President Eisenhower served notice in a dramatic fashion to the madmen of Moscow, and by now they know that they can go so far but no farther.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by my good friend and former associate, Lewis E. Bates, editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, under date of January 2 last, entitled "Those Reformed Reds." To my way of thinking, the editorial puts the Kremlin in a proper perspective. It is heartening to know that after all these years the minions of Red Russia have been unable to sell the youth of Hungary and perhaps of all the Iron Curtain countries the communistic bill of goods and, by the same token, surely not many people in our country will be taken in by the phony pleas and doctrines of communistic Russia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE REFORMED REDS

The daily flow of the news is a sufficient contradiction of the strange claim of many Americans that the Russians have reformed.

Hard on the heels of the utter brutality visited upon the defenseless people of Hungary—brutality continuing virtually every hour on the hour—comes additional evidence of Soviet viciousness on the other side of the world.

It is the report of Japanese repatriates from Russian labor camps in northern Siberia. They were the last to be returned under a recent Russian-Japanese treaty, and fell into Soviet hands in World War II.

It was captivity extended over 11 years, in itself pronounced inhumanity.

The repatriates said the 1,300,000 prisoners in Siberian camps were treated as vicious criminals, worked a minimum of 10 hours daily, and had to subsist on a diet of mostly powdered oats. No matter what work a prisoner had to do—most mined uranium, gold, chrome, manganese and other metals—the ration remained the same. Thousands, therefore, died of malnutrition.

Despite this, despite the news of Hungary, voices are still being heard in the land that the Russians have turned over a new leaf, that they are trying to be responsible members of world society.

These voices say the Reds have admitted Stalin was brutal and wrong; they point to the peace feelers put out before Geneva a year or so ago; they give emphasis to Russian disarmament proposals, particularly the outlawing of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

On the other hand, we remember the Reds promised, at Geneva, to release prisoners of war.

Russia has changed in no meaningful particular. Soviet atrocities have, in cold fact, grown worse under the successors of Stalin.

World opinion is reacting. The people of Iceland were about to exercise their option and ask us to leave, but after Budapest they took a second look. The people of Asia, who have been friendly inclined toward Moscow are now very disturbed.

It is all so plain. The free world still has to contend with a ruthless and vicious aggressor. There is no other way to look at it, not if we value our liberties.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on the first of the year there retired from this body a Member who, in my opinion, was one of our great Americans.

On January 1 the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Mr. Lehman Retires."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LEHMAN RETIRES

As Herbert H. Lehman was approaching the end of his third term as Governor of the State of New York a political observer wrote from Albany that "one gets the impression that this is his last year in public life and that he is saying to the public: 'This has been my work and I think I have done it well.'"

That was in 1938, when Governor Lehman had already established a permanent place for himself in the history of this State as a distinguished chief executive as well as a noted

philanthropist and businessman. In the 18 years since then the people of the State of New York and of all of the United States can be thankful that Herbert H. Lehman did not retire from public life when he was a mere 60 years old. Now at last, at the age of 78, he really is retiring—or, as he himself puts it, relinquishing public office—not retiring from public affairs.

We hope that he will have many more years in which the State and the Nation can benefit from his advice and experience, and above all from his unswerving integrity of purpose. Mr. Lehman's is one of the voices in the Senate that could always be counted upon to speak up for justice, for decency and for dignity in the conduct of national and international affairs, in the relations of our Government to the defenseless as well as to the most powerful. There are few men in public life today of whom it could be said more feelingly on the eve of their retirement: "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it had been my intention to ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the beautiful and merited editorial tribute to former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times of January 1, 1957. Inasmuch, however, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has requested the printing in the RECORD of this excellent editorial, which honors the distinguished and illustrious public service of Herbert Lehman over a period of more than three decades, I shall not duplicate the request.

PARITY PRICES REST ON QUICKSAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the agricultural issues that requires the consideration of this Congress is the method used by the Department of Agriculture to determine price support levels for dairy products.

The November issue of Hoard's Dairyman, one of the outstanding publications serving the interests of dairy farmers, contained an enlightening and informative article explaining this parity formula situation. Written by H. Willis Tobler, director of legislation for the National Milk Producers Federation, the article should clear up much of the confusion and misunderstanding that exists regarding this issue and emphasize the need for corrective legislation. I commend Hoard's editors for a real service to the dairy industry in publishing this analysis of what is happening to dairy price supports under administrative juggling, and to congratulate Mr. Tobler on his excellent presentation.

Because I intend to seek the corrective action need at a later date, I desire to call attention of my colleagues to this article as a valuable reference document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY PRICES REST ON QUICKSAND

(By H. Willis Tobler)

Through March 31, manufacturing milk, testing 3.95 percent, is supported at $3.25 per hundredweight. Butterfat is supported at 58.6 cents per pound.

Dairymen will recall that the Secretary of Agriculture established this support level following the President's veto message on the general farm bill, April 16, 1956. Previously, the Secretary had announced, February 14, supports of $3.15 for manufacturing milk and 56.2 cents for fat. The same prices had prevailed the previous year.

What percentage of parity is provided by the increased support price? There are two answers: 80 percent and 85 percent.

Which is correct? Both are, depending upon the formula used by the Department of Agriculture.

Which formula should be used? The answer requires a review of the legislative history of dairy price supports.

When Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1948, it stated with respect to milk and its products: "To support until January 1, 1950, a price to producers of commodities * * * of not less than 60 per centum of the parity or comparable price therefore, nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that * * * milk and its products * * * shall be supported at 90 percent of parity or comparable price."

To carry out the law, United States Department of Agriculture developed plans in late 1948 for a purchase program. Butter, cheese, and other dairy products would be acquired at prices which would result in farmers receiving the announced support price level for milk and butterfat.

In 1948, and today, United States Department of Agriculture computes only the parity price of all milk (fluid and manufacturing) sold wholesale by farmers. There is no parity price for milk used in manufacturing dairy products.

The Department held, and rightly so, that a support purchase program should involve only manufacturing milk and not all milk sold wholesale. In the absence of a parity price for manufacturing milk, therefore, a substitute yardstick was necessary. After consulting with dairy leaders and others interested, a formula was devised, and put into operation by administrative action, which would provide a "parity equivalent" price for manufacturing milk.

To apply the formula two factors were needed:

1. The parity price of all milk sold wholesale.

2. The ratio between the average price for all milk sold wholesale and the average price paid for manufacturing milk.

The only free market period available was July 1946 through December 1948. During these 30 months, price controls were not in effect and there were no price support inventories. During this time the average price paid for manufacturing milk was 88.5 percent of the average price for all milk sold wholesale. Somewhat later a statistical correction was made which resulted in a ratio of 88.

Now, let's see how the parity formula works. It looks like this: parity price of all milk sold wholesale × ratio = parity equivalent price × percentage of parity price support level = support price.

When United States Department of Agriculture started to purchase dairy products, in February 1949, the parity price of all milk sold wholesale was $3.92. The law provided 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of formula applied:

$3.92×88.5=$3.47×90%=$3.12

The next year Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1949. This stated: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefore as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

From 1949 and into the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954, United States Department of Agriculture calculated price supports, as shown in table A.

Note that during this period the parity equivalent ratio of 88.5 was used to determine the support price on manufacturing milk.

Early in 1954 two important changes took place insofar as dairy farmers are concerned. The Secretary of Agriculture announced, February 15, that price supports would be reduced to 75 percent of parity. This would apply in the marketing year beginning April 1 and continue through March 31, 1955.

In figuring a support price of $3.14 (subsequently adjusted to $3.15) note that the Department, in establishing a $3.14 price, used the old ratio of 88.5 as it had for the previous 5 years. This point has an important bearing on the controversy which has developed over which formula should be used.

Two months later the Department abandoned the 88.5 ratio and by administrative action picked up instead a "modernized" parity equivalent price.

This new method provided that the ratio would be computed annually. It would use the base period July 1946 through December each year until a period of 10 years had elapsed. Thereafter the base period would always be the most recent 10 years. In other words, the ratio would be set on a 10-year moving average.

During April, then, the ratio dropped from 88.5 to 84.1. This was due to the inclusion of the average prices received by farmers for the years 1949 through 1953. Table B indicates the base period which will be used for the marketing years through March 31, 1960:

These two actions, in early 1954, sparked a dairy controversy which has raged ever since. Recall that the announcement was made February 15 that supports would be at 75 percent of parity, or $3.14, beginning April 1. The Department used the ratio of 88.5. The next month, in March, the Department again stated that the support level would be 75 percent of parity. However, in the next month, April, after the new marketing year started, the Department announced the ratio of 84.1 instead of 88.5 would reflect the parity equivalent price. The $3.14 floor was retained, however.

Significant here, then, is that the new ratio meant that the Government was supporting prices at 78.6 percent of parity instead of 75 percent. And here is where the confusion and juggling began. Ever since, farmers have been getting a higher and higher percentage of parity for manufacturing milk * * * but no more money, until the President's veto message.

To justify the new procedure, the Department referred to an announcement it made early in 1949. At that time it was stated that the method of calculating the parity equivalent price would be subject to revision as additional data became available.

Dairy leaders countered by pointing out that such data became available in January 1950. Why, then, did the Department wait until April 1954 to use it?

Perhaps table C may give some clue to the answer:

Note that for 3 years the support price was announced as $3.15. With an enlarging base period, however, the ratio was decreased each marketing year. With each decrease in the ratio, the $3.15 meant a higher parity level. What had been 75 percent of parity was now 82.4 percent of parity but the price was still the same.

The Department, of course, had some precedent for using the new 10-year moving average. It could point to a similar process developed for modernized parity on so-called basic agricultural commodities.

Dairy leaders claim that such a comparison is not valid. They point out that, since January 1950, the parity price of all milk sold wholesale by farmers has been computed under modernized parity or a 10-year moving average. They emphasize that dairy farmers already are subjected to the modernized parity concept. The Department's action, therefore, has the effect of modernizing an already modernized formula.

So much for the past and present. What really concerns us is the future. Let's look at table D (which assumes that price indices remain unchanged):

Note that we assume a support price of $3.15 through March 31, 1964. Because of the changing ratio, that support price which was 75 percent of parity 2 years ago has become over 90 percent of parity.

Let's look now at what can happen by establishing the support price at the legal minimum level of 75 percent under the changing ratio. See table E.

During the next 4 significant years the support price can drop from the present $3.25 to $2.74 or a total of 51 cents per hundredweight.

Why hasn't something been done about this? Actually, a very determined fight was put up by dairy leaders during the recent session of Congress. Both Republicans and Democrats from dairy States vigorously supported setting the ratio at a firm 88.

Initial success was achieved when the Senate Agriculture Committee provided in the original farm bill for mandatory use of the base period reflecting the 88 ratio. The entire Senate subsequently approved it.

Since the House of Representatives and the Senate passed conflicting farm bills, they had to iron out their differences in conference. In that conference the ratio was dumped.

When the compromise bill came to the floor of the House an effort was made to reject the conference report and send it back to committee with certain instructions. Through the action of some Representatives from dairy districts, one of those important specifications was the use of the 88 ratio. The motion failed to carry, however, and the conference report was adopted. As a result, the original farm bill which President Eisenhower vetoed, contained no protection for dairy farmers against the changing ratio.

At present, the $3.25 price support level is maintained solely by presidential directive. There is no assurance whatsoever that it will be maintained beyond next March 31. Of course, the price could be increased by administrative action even for the balance of the current marketing year.

However, unless Congress acts early next year, price supports for manufacturing milk can drop to an estimated $2.83 beginning April 1. The Secretary of Agriculture can, as in 1954, make a finding that a 75 percent support level will assure an adequate supply which is specifically referred to in the Agricultural Act of 1949. Also, he can continue to use the changing ratio.

The issue which you should discuss in your organizations, and with your Senators and Representatives, is whether or not you want to continue on with the changing ratio formula, or return to the stabilized procedure. Your income for the years ahead and its relation to parity will depend largely on the course which is approved by Congress during the first 3 months of next year.

TABLE A.—*How price supports were calculated until Apr. 1, 1954*

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk sold wholesale	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Price-support level	Support price
				Percent	
Feb. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1949	$3.92	88.5	$3.47	90	$3.12
Jan. 1, 1950 to Mar. 31, 1951	[1] 4.40	88.5	3.89	79	3.07
Apr. 1, 1951 to Mar. 31, 1952	4.69	88.5	4.15	87	3.60
Apr. 1, 1952 to Mar. 31, 1953	4.84	88.5	4.28	90	3.85
Apr. 1, 1953 to Mar. 31, 1954	4.70	88.5	4.16	90	3.74
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	4.74	88.5	4.19	75	[2] 3.14

[1] No official record. Reflects estimated revision made in January 1950.
[2] Adjusted to $3.15 on July 7, 1954.

TABLE B.—*New base periods through 1960*

Marketing year	Base period
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	July 1946 to December 1953.
Apr. 1, 1955 to Mar. 31, 1956	July 1946 to December 1954.
Apr. 1, 1956 to Mar. 31, 1957	July 1946 to December 1955.
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	January 1947 to December 1956.
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	January 1948 to December 1957.
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	January 1949 to December 1958.

TABLE C.—*Higher parity but same price*

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Support price	Support price as percentage of parity equivalent
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	$4.74	84.1	$3.99	[1] $3.15	78.9
Apr. 1, 1955 to Mar. 31, 1956	4.70	83.7	3.93	3.15	80.2
Apr. 1, 1956 to Mar. 31, 1957	4.59	83.3	3.82	[2] 3.15	82.4

[1] Adjusted from $3.14 on July 7, 1954.
[2] Adjusted to $3.25 on Apr. 18, 1956, in accordance with farm veto message.

TABLE D.—*How 75 percent becomes 90 percent of parity*

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Support price	Support price as a percentage of parity equivalent price
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	$4.60	82.0	$3.77	$3.15	83.5
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	4.63	80.8	3.74	3.15	84
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	4.63	79.3	3.67	3.15	85.8
Apr. 1, 1960 to Mar. 31, 1961	4.65	78.5	3.65	3.15	86.3
Apr. 1, 1961 to Mar. 31, 1962	4.70	77.2	3.63	3.15	86.7
Apr. 1, 1962 to Mar. 31, 1963	4.76	75.1	3.57	3.15	88
Apr. 1, 1963 to Mar. 31, 1964	4.75	73.0	3.47	3.15	90.7

TABLE E.—*Support price can drop 51 cents*

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Price support level	Support price
				Percent	
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	$4.60	82.0	$3.77	75	$2.83
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	4.63	80.8	3.74	75	2.81
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	4.63	79.3	3.67	75	2.75
Apr. 1, 1960 to Mar. 31, 1961	4.65	78.5	3.65	75	2.74

OUR POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Saturday President Eisenhower addressed a joint session of Congress and asked for new commitments in connection with our policy in the Middle East.

Recently I have been privileged to attend the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as one of the American delegates in the company of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND]. During these weeks it has become clearer to me than ever before that there is no single area in the world that provides more complicated and difficult problems for American policy than the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered at the Overseas Press Club, in New York, on December 20, 1956, an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune, of December 26, 1956, and a newsletter which I have just released dealing with the Middle East situation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech, editorial, and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB, NEW YORK, DECEMBER 20, 1956

We are almost at the end of the most momentous year since World War II. It has

been a paradoxical year, one in which both the United States and the Soviet Union have suffered severe diplomatic defeats. The United States saw the North Atlantic Alliance shaken to its roots when war broke out in the Middle East. And the Soviet Union lost its grip on the captive countries of Eastern Europe.

It is too soon to attempt to strike a balance as to who lost more. It is not too soon, however—indeed, we have waited too long already—to begin an urgent reappraisal, however agonizing it may be, of the world situation and of our own posture toward it.

Quite obviously, fundamental changes of enormous consequence have taken place. No man can foresee where they will end. The old, static condition has ended; conditions are more fluid than at any time since 1945. The cold war has changed from one of fixed positions to one of maneuver. This increases somewhat the dangers; but it also greatly increases the opportunities for statesmanship that is both wise and bold, imaginative and judicious.

Our first task is to assess the nature and implications of these changes that are taking place.

The first thing we must realize is that in today's world there can be no effective foreign policy without risks. There is no risk-proof insurance policy that will guarantee freedom and security in today's world.

One of the basic facts of our time is the spirit of nationalism which dominates the thinking of most of the underdeveloped areas of the world. We are all familiar with the manifestations of this force, the antiwesternism throughout much of Asia and Africa and the irresponsible fashion in which the Soviet Union has tried to take advantage of this feeling and use it for its own ends. What we are now seeing is the reemergence of this same spirit of nationalism in the Soviet captive countries of Eastern Europe.

Nationalism is challenging international communism on its home grounds, and the end is not yet. This points up, as clearly as anything possibly could, the truth of what many Americans have been saying for years, namely, that international communism is fundamentally inconsistent with nationalism and that it presents the most serious threat of all to the hard-won independence of the new states of Asia and Africa.

The rise of nationalism throughout so much of the world presents a paradox in that it comes at the time when most of the more highly developed countries, such as the United States and the nations of Western Europe, are moving more and more toward forms of international organization which play down nationalism. It is both useless and wrong to try to oppose nationalism—useless because any such opposition would be foredoomed to failure; wrong because nationalism springs from basically good, patriotic feelings which are shared to some degree by all men everywhere. Of course, self-determination of national groups has been a keystone of American policy since the days of Woodrow Wilson, so all this is nothing new to us.

One reason we need the U. N. is to provide a constructive focus for this tremendous force of nationalism which otherwise would be running wild. The U. N. does not control nationalism, but it does provide a framework in which nationalism can find its proper and responsible place in a world society that is becoming increasingly interdependent. The U. N. can likewise protect and encourage nationalism.

The problems we now face in Eastern Europe and the Middle East have little in common, but it can be said, I think, that the roots of the problems in both instances are nationalist in origin. The challenge, both before the U. N. and before our own Government, is how we deal with these problems in a responsible manner calculated to promote the principles of the United Nations Charter, to advance the national interests of the United States, and to bring some greater measure of peace and freedom to the people of the areas concerned.

Before I come to some specific steps which I think we could well take to deal with this new world situation, let me emphasize two very important points which are often overlooked in discussions of American foreign policy and the United Nations. One is that our ability to control events beyond our own borders is sharply limited. There is available neither in the State Department nor Congress nor the United Nations a magic wand by which we can bring into being, at will, situations abroad precisely to our liking.

The other point is that the U. N. itself is only what its members make of it. It is a vehicle for its members, a mechanism for expressing their combined judgments. As a result of Soviet abuse of the veto, the Security Council has come to be considerably less important, and the General Assembly has come to be considerably more important, than the founders of the U. N. envisaged. The Assembly obviously cannot be controlled by any one power, but many members of the Assembly do look for leadership to states who are more vitally interested in specific questions. This makes it all the more important that the United States, as one of the members which must supply the leadership, have a clear, well-conceived policy.

I applaud the recently repeated statements by the President that some of these problems, such as those in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, must be dealt with by the U. N. But if that is to be our attitude, then it urgently behooves us to have some clear idea of what we think the U. N. ought to do. The U. N. does not act automatically; it is not a kind of international Univac into which you can feed a problem and get an answer. So far, I regret to say, the United States has had only general objectives; it has not had clearly defined policies in regard to achieving those objectives.

There is a tendency among some people to pooh-pooh the United Nations as a debating society which can do no more than adopt pious resolutions. What these people overlook, however, is that these resolutions express the collective conscience of mankind. Even the mighty Soviet Union is not wholly insulated from the force of world public opinion. It has taken a considerable beating because of its actions in Hungary. Increasingly, in United Nations votes on the Hungarian question more and more so-called neutralists have shifted from a position of abstention to a position of voting against the Soviets. Soviet fakery, doubledealing, and doublecrossing has been clearly exposed. Not for a long time, if ever, can the Soviets count on the same kind of openminded reception in many of the Asian-African states that they were receiving a year ago. The more we can keep the truth about the U. S. S. R. before the people of the world the better off we will be.

The ferment in Eastern Europe obviously presents opportunities, but it also places a great obligation on us to act in a sober, responsible manner.

We should be prepared to discuss sympathetically economic aid with the independent governments of Eastern Europe, as, for example, Poland. But there is no occasion for us to rush forward with a massive aid program; among other things, such action on our part would probably tend to push the Poles, and others like them who might come along, back more completely under the Soviet thumb. In this connection—and it applies to our problems in other parts of the world as well—there is altogether too great a tendency in the State Department to think of some form of assistance as the answer to every problem. This is what my late colleague, Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, once called the checkbook reflex—whenever a new world crisis occurs, there is a sort of reflex action in the State Department to reach for Uncle Sam's checkbook. Now, the checkbook is a very useful thing, and I have supported our aid programs generally, but too many people have the fallacious notion that aid is good for what ails you, and that if you have aid you don't need anything else.

Much can be done through other policies if we but have the wit to think of them. And we had better think of some, pretty fast, because the manifestations of nationalism in Eastern Europe increase the urgency of finding some sort of security system that Europe can live with. In some respects, the obvious weaknesses of communism in the captive countries may well give the Soviets pause. But in other respects this situation could trigger world war III—either as a Soviet tactic to reestablish control or as a consequence of some as yet more violent explosion in one of the satellites.

Germany is the crux of this matter. A revolt in East Germany in any way comparable to that which occurred in Hungary would have even more serious repercussions. It behooves us, therefore, constantly to seek new ways and means of achieving our objective of a reunified Germany. It might be worthwhile, for example, to consider a European security arrangement of which an important part might be an agreement whereby we would pull our troops out of West Germany if the Russians would pull their troops out of East Germany. If we could thereby achieve a free, united Germany, which would remain in NATO, I think we would have made a good bargain. Let me make emphatically clear that I am not proposing an American withdrawal from all of Western Europe, but only from Germany and only on condition of Soviet withdrawal from Germany and a free, united Germany as a NATO partner.

One of the important effects of such an agreement would be that the frontiers of freedom would be pushed right up to the Polish border. The Poles would inevitably feel, and benefit from, such a development. Their isolation would be reduced. Their contacts with the West would be increased. And the net result would be, I believe, more strain upon their ties with Moscow.

Now, this deal has so many dangers for the Soviets that they might very well reject it out of hand. But the Soviets are having their troubles in East Germany. And in any event, the more they refuse to agree to reasonable proposals, the more difficult their international position becomes.

We should continue, of course, to use every avenue available to put increasing pressure on the Soviets through the United Nations in regard to the Hungarian situation. By their arrogant defiance of the U. N., they are increasingly isolating themselves from the rest of humanity.

The U. N. actions in regard to Hungary have not been as vigorous as I would have liked and the situation has dragged on longer than I would have liked, but by proceeding one step at a time we have been able to resolve some of the doubts that troubled many of the Asian-African states at the beginning.

It is my personal view, however, that the U. N. should go further in regard to Hungary. In commenting upon the U. N. action in regard to the Middle East, Vice President NIXON recently said that it upheld the rule of law—"the same law for the powerful and the strong as for the weak and the defenseless." What the U. N. must now do in regard to Hungary is to apply the same

law to the scoundrels and aggressors as to the decent and honorable.

At the same time, we might as well recognize that, if the Soviets are determined to stay in Hungary, we can get them out only by force—and this would extend the danger of the use of force beyond Hungary. But we should certainly make it as expensive and uncomfortable for them as we possibly can. Certainly the U. N. cannot content itself with condemnatory resolutions, no matter how strongly worded. We should not only take steps to insure against the return of the spurious Hungarian representatives who walked out of the U. N. last week; we should also give consideration to economic and diplomatic sanctions against the Kadar regime in Hungary and against the Soviet Union itself.

As of now, the Soviet Union and her puppet regime in Budapest have refused to let U. N. observers come into Hungary. We must continue to press hard to demand that these observers be admitted.

Even without observers, the world has learned several things from these recent horrors in Hungary.

1. These uprisings show that there still exists in satellite lands the same love of freedom which is the natural heritage of man everywhere.

2. We have learned how totally unrealistic it is to assume that the people of the satellite countries will automatically support Moscow. That is a very important lesson.

3. We have learned that you cannot easily crush the spirit of liberty. It keeps glowing in spite of years of totalitarian repression and in spite of foreign armies.

4. We have learned that even the youth brought up during such periods of repression still desire liberty and are willing to fight for it.

There are still other lessons that the United States, in particular, has learned from the Hungarian affair. We have learned that our Immigration Act and provisions for the reception of refugees need overhauling—badly and urgently. Such basic overhauling should be one of the first jobs of the next Congress.

We have also learned that food is tremendously important as a weapon—both in a cold war and in a hot war, and this has been something of a hot war.

Our policy with regard to food assistance has not been clear. It is disgraceful that we should receive dispatches about food shortages, even in Austria, when we have adequate supplies, including supplies of milk, that we could easily have sent. We should dramatize the airlift, which we're using to bring in refugees, by sending every plane back on the return trip loaded to capacity with powdered milk and other food supplies, so that our response could be immediately seen and our aid would be dramatic, and inspiring to those who are fighting for freedom.

We should also extend the use of American food to any country that takes refugees and needs such aid, besides Austria.

Finally, we must not treat these Hungarians who have come here just as another lot of refugees. We should be placing the technically trained and skilled people at once, and advertising to the world that we have welcomed them as a permanent part of our free American economy. This is no time to sit around, feeling that we have done our good deeds, once we have brought out a few of these people to our side of the ocean, and housed them in barracks here. That is only a start, which will do little good in this present situation unless we follow it up with other deeds.

Revelation of the Soviet oppression in Hungary has had the most damaging effect on the Communist Party of anything since the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939. It has increased the chances of the breakdown of the Soviet empire and has contributed to the unrest of students and intellectuals in Russia itself. Now is the time when America should speak not only in terms of good will, but in terms of definite actions—actions which may involve risks, but as I said before, there is no riskproof insurance policy covering such things as freedom and security.

Turning now to the Middle East, we find an area where the problems are so many and so complex that one hardly knows where to start. It is now truly a power vacuum. Although Soviet influence has greatly increased, American prestige is also at a new high. As the Soviet threat makes solutions to the area's problems more urgent, so does the new American position, coupled with the new solidarity which has developed in the U. N., offer hope of finding solutions.

The U. N. has an especially important role to play. It is dangerous for either the United States or the Soviet Union to try to be the dominant power in the Middle East; this is an area ready-made for the kind of international ministrations that the U. N. is peculiarly equipped to undertake.

As Germany is the key in Europe, so I think the Arab-Israeli conflict is the key in the Middle East. It is idle to expect peace ever to come to that unhappy area until some settlement of this conflict is reached.

It has been amply demonstrated that the U. N. will not tolerate aggression in the Middle East. It is also, I think, becoming increasingly clear to the states of that area that it is not in their own interests to rely on the Soviet Union. What we must now do is to make it still more clear to the Arabs and Israelis alike that it is in their own interests to reach a settlement, that they hurt themselves more than anyone else by stubbornly insisting that the world has not moved since 1947. In the last analysis, this dispute can be settled only by the parties concerned, and we cannot expect them to do that until they realize that they will be better off with it settled than with it unsettled.

The United States and also the United Nations must be firm and just with both sides. As we acted to halt the invasion of Egypt, so we should now take steps to halt persecutions of Jews in Egypt. We can certainly not stand idly by in the face of increasing reports of anti-Semitism as an official policy of the Nasser government.

In the best of circumstances, it will take at least a generation—probably 2 or 3—for the hatreds of the Middle East to entirely abate. The more each side retaliates against the other, the longer it will take.

It is unrealistic to expect an Arab-Israeli settlement to spring fullblown from any single set of negotiations. A settlement in the Middle East must be pursued one step at a time.

The first step is obviously to bring about a complete withdrawal of foreign forces from the area, in prompt compliance with U. N. resolutions.

The second step is a settlement of the Suez Canal problem over and above the physical work of clearance. Here the six principles unanimously agreed to by the U. N. Security Council offer a good starting point for reaching an agreement on the canal's operation.

With these immediate issues out of the way and with a groundwork of quiet, careful, diplomatic preparation, we can approach negotiations for a general settlement. There are other things, however, that we can also be doing in the meantime. What the Middle East desperately needs is economic development—not simply for its own sake but as a constructive endeavor to occupy the minds and energies of the people and their leaders. We have furnished a considerable amount of economic and technical assistance to the area; yet, with a few exceptions, it has not been particularly effective. We have tried very hard, and have failed, to get agreements on regional projects, such as the Jordan River plan.

The time may now be more propitious for such undertakings, and we should vigorously renew our efforts, not only to get the Jordan River and similar projects under way but also to get some action on the refugee problem.

It might be useful, in this connection, to consider establishing, under United Nations auspices, a Middle East Development Authority. Most of the economic as well as the other problems of the area are international in their scope. Most of them also require outside assistance, either in the form of capital, of technical aid, or of good offices. Why not, then, have an international agency to deal with them? The kind of Middle East Development Authority that I have in mind would have, on its Board of Directors, representatives of all the states of the area as well as representatives of the states furnishing capital and technical assistance. Ample provision could be made to protect national sovereignties.

In any event, it appears obvious that we are going to have to extend more aid to the Middle East—and do it more effectively.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the whole Suez affair is that innocent bystanders, both in Europe and in the Middle East, are getting hurt. All of Western Europe is suffering from oil shortages along with Britain and France, though none of the other countries in Western Europe can be charged with any responsibility for their present troubles. And in the Middle East, the oil-producing states are suffering from lack of markets, though two of those states—Iraq and Iran—had nothing to do with the events which brought this situation about.

And the poor old American taxpayer is left to pick up the check. I don't think there is anything else for him to do, however, in his own interests. After too long a delay, we properly began steps to relieve the Western European oil shortage. We had to do so; otherwise, the West European economy would be wrecked and we would lose our $13 billion investment in the Marshall plan. I think we should also take a look very soon at the economic effects of the Suez crisis in the Middle East.

To sum up:

In the Middle East we must insist that the canal be opened and cleared. We must insist upon the use of British and French and any other available equipment in helping achieve a purpose that is vital to all of us. We must keep U. N. forces in the Middle East large enough to cope with any danger in the area, and as long as is necessary, until a permanent settlement has been worked out. That settlement must be one which opens the Suez Canal and guarantees that it will remain open, free, and unfettered, for the safe conduct of the shipping of all the world, including Israeli ships. The question of national ownership is secondary—but the effectiveness and enforcibility of these guaranties must be absolute.

In the end, an Arab-Israeli settlement must be brought about in Palestine. While the Arabs refuse to recognize the existence of Israel such a settlement is impossible. We must use every device available to American diplomacy, operating through the United Nations and otherwise, to overcome this intransigence, to make it clear that we expect to see a settlement reached, and that we insist upon an ending of the interminable border raids from either direction. Meanwhile, we must move forward with a bold regional plan for economic aid, such as I have already outlined.

Political factors must not be allowed to prevent settlement of the refugee problem. Wherever these refugees came from—and there are Jewish refugees from Arab countries as well as Arab refugees from Palestine—they are all of them people, and our

first concern must be to get these human beings settled and reintegrated as part of the permanent economy of an area in the world that is easily able to support them, given some sensible economic plan and reasonable assistance.

Now to conclude, the year 1957, which is almost upon us, is likely to be even more crucial than 1956. We have got to be both steadfast in principle and flexible in tactics. Today I have had time only to scratch the surface of some of the problems we face. I have raised more questions than I have answered.

I think we can find the answers, but it will take more imagination and courage, fewer platitudes and less blinking at facts, than we have shown heretofore.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of December 26, 1956]

MORAL FORCE NOT ENOUGH

There appears to be growing concern in many quarters that United States foreign policy is being administered more often by Dag Hammarskjold than by John Foster Dulles. This is another way of saying that the United States seems to be putting more reliance on the moral force of the United Nations and less on its own military might.

In Western Europe, this new trend in American foreign policy is being viewed with some alarm. It has led to expressions of concern about whether the United States is planning to withdraw or reduce its forces in Western Europe. This idea was planted by the Soviet Union when it suggested that it might reduce or withdraw its forces in the satellites as a quid pro quo for an American withdrawal or reduction of its forces in Germany.

In Asia, however, the new American foreign policy emphasis is being widely hailed by the neutral nations. They heartily approve of the United States action in calling upon Israel, Britain, and France to withdraw their forces from Egypt. They now tend to regard the United States as a new champion of the rights of the one-time colonies that have emerged into statehood of their own.

During the Middle Eastern crisis it is true that the United States has voted in the United Nations against its NATO allies, Britain and France. And it is true that we have relied upon the U. N. General Assembly and its token police force and its moral suasion to restore peace to that area of the world.

Yet the new emphasis on the United Nations by the United States does not mean that we can disarm or dissolve our military alliances or even withdraw from Western Europe until we are certain that the threat of Communist domination of the world is ended. And nobody is making that claim after what happened to Hungary.

President Eisenhower did appear to rule out the use of force in the Middle East in his preelection speech October 31, but we suspect that American military might still is ready for use in that area of the world if the Soviet Union tries to start something. In spite of our reliance upon the U. N., history has shown time and again that force is the one sure deterrent to aggression.

Until the U. N. possesses that force—and perhaps the tiny international army in the Middle East is a start—it is senseless to talk about substituting U. N. policy for American foreign policy. Those who continue to do so are not serving the best interests of the United States.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Newsletter from the desk of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Concern over the Middle East overshadowed everything else during opening week of the 85th Congress. The President's request for congressional sanction to the use of force if necessary has been met with mixed reactions from Democrats and Republicans alike. On the one hand, Congress certainly would not repudiate the power and responsibility the President already has as Commander in Chief. It is not conceivable that our country, in our own interests, could ignore Soviet military aggression against any other country in the vital Middle East. On the other hand, there is widespread regret that the President felt it necessary to seek formal action of the Congress which in effect means little more than reaffirming authority he already has. It was apparently felt necessary only because the President and his Secretary of State had previously declared just the opposite—that there would be no involvement of American forces in the Middle East.

NOT MUCH NEW

The consensus here has been that there is really little new in the President's foreign-policy proposal. What he is saying is that he is Commander in Chief. What he is saying is that the Constitution does place upon him the responsibility for protecting American interests. What he is saying, in effect, is that he never should have said what he did in the first place—that the United States would not assert its own power unilaterally in the Middle East. It was that declaration, virtually removing ourselves as a powerful force in that area, which created a vacuum that had to be filled by reasserting our intention of forcefully opposing aggression. Actually, we already have treaty obligations to some of these states in the Middle East. So in substance what the President was doing was to say that we will fulfill our commitments to Greece and Turkey under NATO and to Pakistan under SEATO—something that should have been assumed all along.

POLICY WEAKNESS

Much of the concern in Congress is centered on the fact that the Eisenhower proposal is directed solely against the Soviet Union in terms of Soviet military aggression. There is not a very clear-cut view of what it would do, or what effect it could have, in terms of offsetting Soviet political penetration or infiltration, such as Soviet arms sales to Syria and Egypt, or Soviet conspiracy in the area with native leaders and native forces, or what it could do for example to restrain Syria or Egypt if they wanted to attack someplace in the area and expand their own area of influence backed up by Soviet money, Soviet technicians, and Soviet arms.

CONGRESS' ATTITUDE

While asking searching questions and seeking more explicit clarification, Congress certainly will uphold the President in an effort to redeem our good name. It will concur in an effort to recapture the strength we had and almost tossed overboard. It will probably be accepted with modifications to reassert a truth we all accept—that we will oppose Soviet military aggression wherever it occurs, and whatever it requires of us. Unfortunately, it comes late. And, unfortunately, it is an official announcement of our willingness to use force right after we have made too many official announcements some weeks ago that we would not use force. Is it any wonder that our friends are confused, and that our enemies are doubtful as to our purposes?

COOPERATIVES AND TAXATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us who are friends of the great cooperative movement have been deeply disturbed lately to see advertisements in large national magazines designed to convey a completely false picture of cooperatives and taxation. A recent advertisement by some of our electric light and power companies appeared in Look magazine and is a special case in point.

The general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, has written me exposing this particular bit of fraudulent advertising. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ellis' letter to me be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed for your information and study is a copy of an advertisement appearing in Look magazine on November 13, 1956. It may have appeared in several other publications simultaneously, as has been the custom with such ads.

This advertisement is not sales advertising. It is not goodwill advertising. It is propaganda advertising, designed to convey a completely false picture, and for lobbying purposes. There can be little doubt that it is carefully designed to poison the minds of the American people and their public officials against rural electric cooperatives and public agencies such as municipalities, public power districts, and the Federal power program.

The advertisement is part of a lobbying program that has been carried on through national magazines, daily newspapers, radio, TV, and other media for several years, with the tempo greatly increased over the past few years. The cost of this propaganda campaign unquestionably runs into many millions of dollars a year.

The total cost of this program of misrepresentation and political pressure is paid by those who must of necessity buy electricity from the companies who sponsor these ads, for they are monopolies within their respective areas. In addition, since the costs of such ads and other manipulations of the public mind are deductible expenses for tax purposes, 52 percent of the cost of this propaganda comes out of the Federal Treasury. We do not believe that it was the intent of Congress for consumers and taxpayers to pay the cost of their own misinformation.

The attached ad alleges that there is a privileged class of people in this country who pay little or no taxes in their electric bills. This privileged class, according to the ad, is made up of those people who secure their electricity from Government wholesale power sources.

The rural electric cooperatives purchased during the year ending June 30, 1956, only 6 percent of all federally generated power, whereas private power companies secured 10 percent and private industry 20 percent. Obviously, the implications with respect to taxes are false.

We could go on criticizing this particular ad and others, but we are sure you will recognize these and the other misleading and the categorically false statements contained in this and similar ads.

It seems to us that the time has long passed when the Congress should take legislative notice of the use of tax-free funds for propaganda purposes by so-called regulated monopolies and enact statutes to place the cost of these programs on those who really sponsor them. For, under the law of the land as interpreted by the highest courts, in handling funds collected for the privileged conduct of a public service, they are in the same position as agents of the State engaged in a public business.

In this connection, the full House Committee on Government Operations, 84th Congress, has at least recognized the problem. In House Report No. 2279, the committee made this recommendation:

"(6) Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation by both Houses to determine whether or not there is an organized effort of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States, and the political life of the Nation."

Many of these ads have in the past branded as socialistic programs of the Federal Government, such as Rural Electrification Administration, TVA, Bonneville, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, etc. In so doing the authors of these ads are apparently endeavoring to cast serious doubts on the intelligence and judgment of the Members of the Congress in passing legislation which they regard as vital to the welfare of the Nation.

We recognize the right of free speech, including the right of the capital stockowners of privately owned electric companies to use such propaganda advertisements to place their views on current issues before the public, provided the owners do it at their own expense. But, we are convinced that remedial legislation is today necessary to close the door to the use of ratepayers' money collected to pay the cost of a public service for their own private purposes.

We further question whether as a matter of policy a democracy can afford to permit privately owned public service monopolies—monopolies licensed to provide the public with a basic service and authorized by the Legislature and public courts to engage in public service business—to engage in unlimited propaganda activities.

And if and to whatever extent such propaganda spending is tolerated, the cost of it, we insist, should be borne by the owner-stockholders and not by the ratepayers.

The farmers' rural electric systems of the country have a direct interest in these propaganda expenditures for two reasons:

1. Nearly two-thirds of the rural electrics are purchasing their wholesale power requirements from the privately owned public utilities, for which they paid them $59,449,112 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and

2. Nearly one-third of the rural electrics are purchasing all or part of their wholesale power requirements from the Federal wholesale power agencies under laws being attacked by these ads, and for which the rural electrics paid the Government $26,844,795 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALTER EVANS EDGE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I announce to my colleagues with deep regret, the death on October 29 last of Walter Evans Edge, a former Senator in the Congress of the United States from New Jersey.

The career of Walter Edge is the story of a gifted man who unceasingly served his State and his Nation with the many skills at his command. Legislator, governor, businessman, newspaper publisher, diplomat, banker, and author, he liberally gave of his manifold talents; and his death was a personal shock not only to those of us who cherished his friendship, but a deep loss to his State, his country, and his party, where his valued experience and sage counsel was sought and always granted with unstinting courtesy and generosity.

Walter Edge was majority leader of the State Assembly of New Jersey in 1910; he was president of the Senate of New Jersey in 1915; he was twice elected Governor of New Jersey, first during World War I and then subsequently during World War II; he was a member of the United States Senate from 1918 to 1929, where he served on the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committees on Finance, and Banking and Currency; he was Ambassador to France by appointment of President Hoover from 1929 to 1933; and he was the personal representative of President Eisenhower at the coronation of King Faisal II of Iraq in 1953. His brilliant career covered half a century of significant public life.

His vibrant personality, depth of character, personal loyalty, and discerning judgment, and his readiness to recognize the desirability of and to strive for changes, were manifest traits of his outstanding leadership ability.

To his tasks as a public servant he brought his rich and bountiful business experience and acumen, and his career was devoted to working toward "a government attuned to the needs of an industrialized state." His record both in New Jersey and in this body comprises a living memorial in such diverse fields as workmen's compensation and social legislation, highway construction, international trade, fiscal and administrative reform, interstate cooperation, constitutional revision, and housing and veterans' legislation.

His association with the first successful workmen's compensation legislation in the United States, with the building of the Holland Tunnel, the Philadelphia and Camden Bridge, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, revision of the century-old New Jersey constitution in 1947, and the intricate negotiations between the United States and France over debt moratorium in 1932, strikingly exemplify the successful adaptation of his businessman's approach to public service: "The public official today must have an appreciation of cold, hard facts, and a courage to face them."

Close friend of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and early sponsor of President Eisenhower, his participation as an elder statesman in the Republican Party was crowned last August by his attendance as delegate at his 13th national convention, a record probably unsurpassed by anyone in our Nation's history.

Walter Edge was a firm advocate of the deeply ingrained American philosophy that every person should utilize his natural gifts to the utmost. To him the first "'law of manliness' was to be completely on your own, and while there might be a limit to your grasp, there could be no limit to your goal." The constant devotion of his talents in following this precept to the enrichment of his own life and of the lives of those whom he served is mirrored in our awareness today of the loss which his State and his Nation have suffered by his death.

Walter Edge was a self-made man, and although his Quaker parents died while he was still a young boy, by the time he was 18 he had obtained control of an advertising agency in Atlantic City, N. J., which he later built into an international business. His launching of a newspaper at the age of 20 in the same city was so successful that in 2 years he was able to buy out the leading newspaper in Atlantic County. By the time he was 25 this son of a railroad worker was well on his way to becoming a wealthy man.

It was shortly afterward, in 1897, that he made his first entry into politics as the journal clerk of the New Jersey Senate. From there his brilliant rise in public service continued through the remainder of his life.

To his State and to his country is left the record of a man who exemplified the finest which this Nation can produce. His deep-lying principles offer sure guidance to those who will succeed him in public service. His message is the message of America.

In his autobiography in 1948, Governor Edge modestly wrote:

> These notes are not important in themselves and perhaps the historian will find little in them to footnote his previous studies, but if the record lends assurance to a few aspiring young men and women that America is still free to those who will use their freedom, and that no form of public security can permanently replace the God-given right of every citizen to achieve the fullest expression of his life, the purpose of this volume will have been fulfilled.

His many achievements in helping to further the growth and the glory of his State and his country during his years as a public servant constitute the most enduring tribute to these imperishable principles of this generous and gifted American.

I desire to close these remarks with a warm personal appreciation of a close friendship of many years. Walter Edge could play as well as work. He was an ardent fisherman, and regularly went salmon fishing to his favorite Canadian river, the Ristigouche; he enjoyed each year the bird shooting on his southern plantation in Georgia. Walter Edge loved people, and people loved him.

My wife joins me in this tribute to Walter Edge, and we record our affectionate sympathies for his wife and family in their great loss.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join with my able colleague from New Jersey in his tribute to Walter Edge, who was one of the outstanding figures of our State. Few men have served their country over such a long span of years as did former Senator Edge.

Through the years his warm and generous spirit brightened the lives of everyone with whom he came into contact.

Mrs. Case and I join in expressing our deep sympathy to the members of his family; and I wish to pay a personal tribute to the man whose influence on my life has been very great.

DEATH OF T. MILLET HAND, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution

coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 15) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable T. MILLET HAND, a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that I announce the death of the Honorable T. MILLET HAND, a Representative in the Congress from the Second District of New Jersey.

In submitting the appropriate resolution, I wish to say that Representative HAND was one of my closest friends, and I had known him for many years. He was one of the most outstanding legislators we have had in Congress for the past 10 or 12 years.

In his memory, I send a resolution to the desk, which I ask unanimous consent to have immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. T. MILLET HAND, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in sponsoring the resolution which was just agreed to.

DEATH OF CARL HINSHAW, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 14) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I submit a resolution relative to the death of the Honorable CARL HINSHAW, a Representative from the State of California. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 9) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Wednesday next.

DEATH OF J. PERCY PRIEST, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 16), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GORE] and myself, I submit a resolution with respect to the untimely death of Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

DEATH OF HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 17), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANTONIO F. FERNANDEZ, a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution with reference to the death of the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ. I should like to have the RECORD show that the resolution is submitted by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for himself and myself.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 11) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, late a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order of January 5, I suggest that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint session of the two Houses for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

Under the order of Saturday last, at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday next.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

(For the proceedings in the House of Representatives in connection with the counting of the electoral votes, see today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Pursuant to the order entered on Saturday, January 5, 1957, at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate stood in recess until Wednesday, January 9, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian, the recess being taken, in accordance with resolutions adopted today as a further mark of respect to the memory of deceased Members of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offering the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, as we now unite our hearts in prayer, wilt Thou

answer our loftiest aspirations with Thy divine inspirations.

We rejoice that Thou art always drawing us to Thyself, seeking to give us Thy blessed companionship and to guide us by Thy unerring counsel.

Grant that daily we may be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy holy spirit and may there be in us a new nativity of the cardinal virtues of faith, hope, and love.

May our life be rich in the love that seeketh not its own and the courage that remains strong and steadfast in times of trial and tribulation.

Show us how we may be partners with Thee and with one another in the great redemptive ministry of leading bruised and brokenhearted humanity out of the darkness of hatred and fear into the glorious light of the kingdom of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 5, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to extend the time for transmitting the economic report of the President for the first regular session of the 85th Congress.

The message also announced that in compliance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 85th Congress, 1st session, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], are appointed tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are Members present who desire to take the oath of office. If they will present themselves, they will be sworn in.

Messrs. PASSMAN and UDALL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford., Jr., Michigan; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio.

Committee on Armed Services: Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; James P. S. Devereux, Maryland; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Robert C. Wilson, California; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Donald L. Jackson, California; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Alvin M. Bentley, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed, New York; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Antonio N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

At 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. William M. Miller, announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. GREEN and Mr. JENNER on the part of the Senate, and Mr. BURLESON and Mr. LECOMPTE on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Senator GREEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, received 10 votes for President, and Walter B. Jones, of the State of Alabama, received 1 vote for President. Estes Kefauver, of the State of Tennessee, received 10 votes for Vice President, and Herman E. Talmadge, of the State of Georgia, received 1 vote for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will omit in further procedure the formal statement just made and will open in alphabetical order and pass to the tellers the certificates showing the votes of the electors of each State. The tellers will read, count, and announce the result in each State as was done in the State of Alabama.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and WILLIAM E. JENNER, tellers on the part of the Senate, and OMAR BURLESON and KARL M. LECOMPTE, tellers on the part of the House

of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957:

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President		
		Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Pennsylvania	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois	Walter B. Jones, of Alabama	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee	Herman Talmadge, of Georgia
Alabama	11		10	1		10	1
Arizona	4	4			4		
Arkansas	8		8			8	
California	32	32			32		
Colorado	6	6			6		
Connecticut	8	8			8		
Delaware	3	3			3		
Florida	10	10			10		
Georgia	12		12			12	
Idaho	4	4			4		
Illinois	27	27			27		
Indiana	13	13			13		
Iowa	10	10			10		
Kansas	8	8			8		
Kentucky	10	10			10		
Louisiana	10	10			10		
Maine	5	5			5		
Maryland	9	9			9		
Massachusetts	16	16			16		
Michigan	20	20			20		
Minnesota	11	11			11		
Mississippi	8		8			8	
Missouri	13		13			13	
Montana	4	4			4		
Nebraska	6	6			6		
Nevada	3	3			3		
New Hampshire	4	4			4		
New Jersey	16	16			16		
New Mexico	4	4			4		
New York	45	45			45		
North Carolina	14		14			14	
North Dakota	4	4			4		
Ohio	25	25			25		
Oklahoma	8	8			8		
Oregon	6	6			6		
Pennsylvania	32	32			32		
Rhode Island	4	4			4		
South Carolina	8		8			8	
South Dakota	4	4			4		
Tennessee	11	11			11		
Texas	24	24			24		
Utah	4	4			4		
Vermont	3	3			3		
Virginia	12	12			12		
Washington	9	9			9		
West Virginia	8	8			8		
Wisconsin	12	12			12		
Wyoming	3	3			3		
Total	531	457	73	1	457	73	1

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.
OMAR BURLESON,
KARL M. LECOMPTE,
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, of the State of Pennsylvania, has received for President of the United States 457 votes;

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 73 votes;

Walter B. Jones, of the State of Alabama, has received 1 vote.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Richard M. Nixon, of the State of California, has received for Vice President of the United States 457 votes;

Estes Kefauver, of the State of Tennessee, has received 73 votes;

Herman Talmadge, of the State of Georgia, has received 1 vote.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair directs that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 82

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs: BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois; L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina; DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida; FRANK M. COFFIN, Maine; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMINISTERING THE OATH OF OFFICE TO REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JAMES B. BOWLER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] pursuant to House Resolution 10, 85th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect JAMES B. BOWLER of the Seventh District of Illinois, I have the honor to report that on Friday, January 4, 1957, at Chicago, Ill., Mr. BOYLE administered the oath of office to Mr. BOWLER, form prescribed by section 1757 of the revised statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. BOWLER subscribed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 83

Whereas JAMES B. BOWLER, a Representative from the State of Illinois, from the Seventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES B. BOWLER as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM FOR THE MERRIMACK RIVER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my very deep appreciation for the fact that my colleague from Lawrence, a neighboring city to Lowell, on the Merrimack River spoke yesterday of the tremendous need we have up there for flood control. He referred to our great danger from floods in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I would request the help of all the Members to get the State of New Hampshire to agree to a compact which is necessary if we are to build a dam in New Hampshire. Massachusetts has agreed to and signed its part of the compact. New Hampshire must do its part. Otherwise the people in the Merrimack Valley of New Hampshire, as well as our people in the State of Massachusetts, will suffer horribly if there is another devastating flood, which is likely to occur at any time. There was very grave danger last spring when minute by minute the flooded river was watched. We in the Merrimack Valley are sitting on a volcano. The people in New Hampshire in the Merrimack Valley are of course in great danger also.

CATHOLICS HIT VISIT BY TITO

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 5, 1957, the Detroit Times carried an article entitled "Catholics Hit Visit by Tito," reprinted in part from the Michigan Catholic, one of the largest archdiocesan papers in the country. I would like to register, along with these distinguished papers, my strongest opposition to extending the hand of friendship to this ruthless dictator whose avowed purpose in life is advancement of atheistic international communism. Does the administration realize the deep psychological damage that could be done around the world by the reception at the White House of this enemy of freedom and human dignity? I hope a roar of protest from every corner of this land will make it abundantly clear to our officials that the American people do not want anything to do with the "Butcher of Belgrade."

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1956 the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, held extensive hearings on the subject of civil defense in our Nation. At the conclusion of those hearings we brought forth a report. During the interim we had the staff prepare a legislative draft of a bill which I have introduced today.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the draft of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point and a brief analysis of the contents of the bill be printed thereafter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Civil Defense Reorganization Act."

Table of Contents

Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.

TITLE I—CREATION AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT

Sec. 101. Department of Civil Defense.
Sec. 102. Secretary of Civil Defense.
Sec. 103. Other principal officers of the Department.
Sec. 104. Compensation of principal officers.
Sec. 105. Delegation of authority.
Sec. 106. Seal.
Sec. 107. Provisions of law applicable to Department.
Sec. 108. Military Liaison Committee.
Sec. 109. Scientific Advisory Board.
Sec. 110. Civil Defense Advisory Council.

TITLE II—DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

Sec. 201. National plan of civil defense.
Sec. 202. Execution of national plan.

TITLE III—TRANSFERS OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 301. Transfer of Federal civil disaster functions.
Sec. 302. Transfer of Office of Defense Mobilization civil defense functions.
Sec. 303. Transfer of records, personnel, etc.
Sec. 304. References to transferred functions.
Sec. 305. Effect of existing official actions.
Sec. 306. Abolition of Federal Civil Defense Administration.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Employment of personnel.
Sec. 402. Employment of temporary personnel.
Sec. 403. Establishment of advisory boards.
Sec. 404. Procurement of property.
Sec. 405. Disposal of property.
Sec. 406. Utilization of Federal agencies.
Sec. 407. Utilization of other services.
Sec. 408. Acceptance of supplies, etc.
Sec. 409. Purchase of printing work.
Sec. 410. Identity insignia.
Sec. 411. Exemption from certain provisions.
Sec. 412. Security regulations.
Sec. 413. Appropriations and transfers of funds.
Sec. 414. Annual report to the Congress.
Sec. 415. Definitions.
Sec. 416. Separability.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

Sec. 501. Declaration of policy.
Sec. 502. National civil defense emergency.
Sec. 503. Emergency powers.
Sec. 504. Additional emergency powers.
Sec. 505. Reports on emergency actions.
Sec. 506. Immunity from suit.
Sec. 507. Waiver of Administrative Procedure Act.
Sec. 508. Compensation for nongovernmental property acquired.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that civil defense is an integral part of national defense and a direct responsibility of the Federal Government in keeping with its constitutional duties to provide for the common defense and to protect the States against invasion. The purpose of this act is to reorganize and redefine the civil defense functions of the Federal Government to enable the Government to more effectively perform these functions and thereby to protect the people of the United States from attack and to help maintain the security and integrity of the Nation. In affirming the Federal responsibility for civil defense, the Congress recognizes that the States and their political subdivisions have an important supporting role and should be assisted and encouraged to perform appropriate civil defense tasks consistent with the national plan of civil defense provided for in this act. In declaring civil defense to be an integral part of the national defense, the Congress recognizes that civil defense is essentially a nonmilitary function because of its major dependence upon civilian agencies and resources and its intimate bearing upon the normal peacetime pursuits of Government, industry, community and civic bodies, and individual citizens.

TITLE I—CREATION AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT

Department of Civil Defense

SEC. 101. There is hereby established an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Civil Defense (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Civil Defense.

Secretary of Civil Defense

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Civil Defense (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The Secretary shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to civil defense, and shall, under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this act, have direction, authority, and control over the Department.

(c) The Secretary shall serve as a member of the National Security Council.

Other principal officers of the Department

SEC. 103. (a) There shall be in the Department a Deputy Secretary of Civil Defense, an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Civil Defense, three Assistant Secretaries of Civil Defense, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The Deputy Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary during his absence or disability or during a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

(c) The Administrative Assistant Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, and the General Counsel shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe; and one of them (determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary during the absence or disability of both the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary or during a vacancy in the offices of Secretary and Deputy Secretary.

Compensation of principal officers

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

(b) The Deputy Secretary of Civil Defense shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(c) The Administrative Assistant Secretary of Civil Defense, the Assistant Secretaries of Civil Defense, and the General Counsel shall each receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

Delegation of authority

SEC. 105. The Secretary may, without being relieved of general responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, make such provision as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of any function vested in him (except the function of being a member of the National Security Council) by or through such officers, agencies divisions, or other organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

Seal

SEC. 106. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

Provisions of law applicable to department

SEC. 107. Except to the extent inconsistent with this act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

Military Liaison Committee

SEC. 108. There is hereby created a Military Liaison Committee (hereinafter called the "Committee") consisting of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and of a representative or representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, detailed or assigned thereto, without additional compensation, in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense may determine. Representatives from each of the three departments shall be designated by the respective Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of the Department.

The Secretary shall advise and consult with the Committee on all Department of Defense matters which relate to civil defense, including scientific and technological developments in nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare, nuclear weapon effects, shelter and other protective measures planned or utilized by the Armed Forces to minimize such effects, passive defense plans or systems for military installations, radiological monitoring and bomb reconnaissance and disposal techniques, civil defense training and exercises of military personnel, availability of military personnel, facilities, supplies, and equipment for potential or actual use in civil defense, and such other matters as the Secretary or the Committee deems to be of interest and benefit to the Department. The Secretary and the Committee shall keep each other fully informed on all of the activities of their respective departments relating to civil defense matters. The Committee shall have authority to make written recommendations to the Secretary on matters relating to Department of Defense activities from time to time as it may deem appropriate.

Scientific Advisory Board

SEC. 109. There is hereby created a Scientific Advisory Board (hereinafter called the "Board") to advise the Secretary on scientific and technical matters related to civil defense. The Board shall make periodic evaluations of current civil defense research projects and programs and shall make recommendations for undertaking new projects and programs. The Board shall be composed of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability appointed from civilian life by the President. Each member shall hold office for a term of 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 4 at the end of 2 years, 4 at the end of 4 years, and 4 at the end of 6 years. The Board shall designate 1 of its members as Chairman. The Board shall meet at least twice in each year. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem, plus transportation expenses and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence, while engaged in the work of the Board.

Civil Defense Advisory Council

SEC. 110. There is hereby created a Civil Defense Advisory Council (hereinafter refererd to as the "Council") which shall advise and consult with the Secretary on general policies which relate to civil defense, including civilian and industrial participation in civil-defense activities, State and local government relationships with Federal civil defense authorities, and educational and information programs for instructing the public in civil-defense activities. The Council shall consist of the Secretary, who shall be Chairman, and 15 additional members to be appointed by the President, with the following representation: 3 representing State government, 3 representing political subdivisions of the States, 3 representing industry, 3 representing labor, and 3 to be selected from among the citizens of the United States of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest (other than employees of any department or agency of the United States who, as such, regularly receive compensation for current services). Each member shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 5 members (1 from each representative group) at the end of 2 years, 5 (1 from each representative group) at the end of 3 years, 5 members (1 from each representative group) at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. The Council shall meet at least four times in each year and at such other times as the Secretary shall determine. Each member of the Council shall receive his transportation expenses and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence while engaged in the work of the Council.

TITLE II—DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

National plan of civil defense

SEC. 201. The Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and with the appropriate State and local officials, prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense for the United States which, in the event of anticipated or actual enemy attack, will effectively provide for—

(1) clear and prompt warning to the civilian population;

(2) public information as to the immediate measures which must be taken to minimize the effects of enemy action;

(3) shelter of the civilian population against the primary and secondary effects of nuclear explosions;

(4) control of traffic, lighting, and civil communications;

(5) enforcement of civil-defense regulations;

(6) evacuation of persons from target areas when evacuation is feasible;

(7) food and clothing and medical, health, sanitation, welfare, and other services for sheltered, displaced, and evacuated persons;

(8) monitoring for radiological, biological, and chemical hazards;

(9) decontamination of areas, facilities, and supplies subjected to such hazards;

(10) unexploded bomb reconnaissance and disposition;

(11) fire fighting, rescue, debris clearance, and other emergency services;

(12) movement of essential personnel to places of employment;

(13) repair or restoration of essential industrial, communications, transportation, utility, and other facilities; and

(14) resumption and continuity of essential industrial production, economic activities, and governmental functions and services.

Execution of national plan

SEC. 202. In order to accomplish the foregoing and in furtherance of the national plan of civil defense, the Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate State and local officials—

(1) define the potential target areas of the United States and determine their relative importance, taking into account population density, production role, and other factors;

(2) institute systematic measures to reduce the vulnerability of such target areas to enemy attack;

(3) construct group shelters in each target area and make appropriate arrangements for their maintenance in a condition of readiness, including their use for commercial or civic purposes consistent with civil defense requirements;

(4) establish and maintain warning and communications systems or devices and control centers;

(5) procure, stockpile, and store in strategic locations necessary medical supplies and equipment, foodstuffs, industrial, transportation, communications, utility and other materials, supplies, and equipment;

(6) establish and operate technical schools and training centers and provide expert instruction and training in civil defense organization, operations, and techniques to Federal, State, and local civil defense personnel;

(7) provide timely, periodic, and authoritative information to State and local civil defense officials and to the public concerning civil defense measures and requirements;

(8) establish civil defense research laboratories and conduct research directly or by contract for civil defense purposes;

(9) provide advisory services to industry concerning plant location and protection, participation in civil defense training and exercises, and other civil defense activities;

(10) continuously review Federal programs for their civil defense aspects, and make recommendations to the President and the Congress concerning administrative or legislative changes to conform such programs to civil defense requirements;

(11) direct, with the approval of the President, other Federal departments and agencies to undertake specific civil defense projects or programs, and evaluate performance in such undertakings;

(12) establish such regional, area, or local offices and civil defense organizational arrangements as will facilitate the execution of the Secretary's duties and functions;

(13) integrate civil defense measures with those for the protection of military, atomic, and other defense installations;

(14) assist State and local civil defense organizations by contributing funds for personnel and administrative expenses and for purchase of equipment, supplies, training devices, and other civil defense requirements, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe;

(15) insure that State and local civil defense organizations receiving Federal financial or other contributions will comply with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary, including the conditions that the contributions shall be used for civil defense purposes and in conformity with the national plan for civil defense; and

(16) conduct civil defense training exercises and make such other preattack preparations as in the judgment of the Secretary will improve the civil defense of the United States.

TITLE III—TRANSFERS OF FUNCTIONS

Transfer of Federal civil disaster functions

SEC. 301. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all of the functions vested in the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and the Federal Civil Defense Administration under the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as provided for in Executive Order Numbered 10427 (dated January 16, 1953).

Transfer of office of defense mobilization tion civil defense functions

SEC. 302. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all of the functions vested by any statute, reorganization plan, or Executive order in the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, or in the Office of Defense Mobilization, which pertain to the duties and functions of the Secretary as prescribed in title II of this act. To give effect to this section, the President shall determine which of the functions of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization or of the Office of Defense Mobilization shall be performed by the Secretary in accordance with this act and shall make appropriate provision for their transfer within a period of 90 days following the date of enactment of this act.

Transfer of records, personnel, etc.

SEC. 303. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments of the Federal Civil Defense Administration (including those originally transferred to such Administration by section 404 of the Federal

Civil Defense Act of 1950), and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to such Administration.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary so much of the personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and so much of any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (or to be made available) to such Office, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be attributable to or required for the peformance of the functions transferred under section 302. Funds transferred under this subsection may be merged or consolidated with funds transferred under subsection (a) which are available for the same purpose.

References to transferred functions

SEC. 304. Any reference to the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, or to the Office of Defense Mobilization or the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in any other law, delegation, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, or other official action in force on the effective date of this act, where applicable to functions transferred under this act, shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department or the Secretary, respectively.

Effect of existing official actions

SEC. 305. (a) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this title, all delegations of authority by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and all defense mobilization orders of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization relating to functions transferred under section 302, as well as all other orders, regulations, certificates, directives, issuances, and other official actions relating to functions transferred under this act which are in force on the date of such transfer, shall continue in full force and effect until modified, amended, superseded, or revoked by the Secretary.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this title, all boards, councils, committees, and similar organizations and groups established by the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Office of Defense Mobilization pursuant to law which relate directly to any of the functions transferred to the Secretary under this act may be abolished or continued by action of the Secretary.

(c) Arrangements for representation of the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Office of Defense Mobilization on interagency committees, panels, or working groups which on the date of enactment of this act are performing duties relating to functions transferred under this act shall continue in effect until modified, amended, superseded, or revoked by the Secretary.

Abolition of Federal Civil Defense Administration

SEC. 306. The Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the Offices of Federal Civil Defense Administrator and Deputy Administrator, are abolished; and the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 is repealed.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Employment of personnel

SEC. 401. In the performance of his duties and functions, the Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Department. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and the compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that to the extent that the Secretary deems such action necessary to the discharge of his duties and functions, scientific or technical personnel possessing special qualifications or required for exceptional duties may be employed, and their compensation fixed, without regard to such laws.

Employment of temporary personnel

SEC. 402. The Secretary is authorized to employ such part-time or temporary advisory personnel as he deems necessary in carrying out his duties and functions. Such personnel, while so employed, may serve without compensation or may receive compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem (as determined by the Secretary) and shall receive their transportation expenses and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Establishment of advisory boards

SEC. 403. The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory boards, in addition to those provided for in this act, as he deems necessary in carrying out his duties and functions. Persons holding other offices or positions of the United States for which they receive compensation, while serving as members of such advisory boards, shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of advisory boards, while serving as such, may serve without compensation or may receive compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem (as determined by the Secretary) and shall receive their necessary transportation expenses and not to exceed $20 in lieu of subsistence.

Procurement of property

SEC. 404. The Secretary may procure by condemnation or otherwise, construct, or lease (with the right to take immediate possession thereof), and transport, maintain, store, renovate, distribute, or redistribute, any materials, equipment, facilities, or other real or personal property for civil defense purposes: *Provided*, That property acquired by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this act, prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 255): *Provided further*, That proceedings for condemnation under this section shall be instituted and conducted in accordance with and subject to the provisions of law and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure which are generally applicable to the acquisition of real property, through condemnation proceedings, by officers of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That real property actions by or for the use of the Department shall be subject to the provisions of sections 601 through 604 of the act of September 28, 1951 (40 U. S. C., secs. 551–554): *Provided further*, That the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, where applicable and not otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall govern the procurement of property under this act.

Disposal of property

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise prescribed in this act, the Secretary is authorized to arrange for the sale or disposal of materials, equipment, and facilities found by the Secretary to be unnecessary or unsuitable for civil-defense purposes in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Utilization of Federal agencies

SEC. 406. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, materials, and facilities of Federal departments and agencies and to reimburse any Federal department or agency for any of its expenditures or for compensation of its personnel and utilization or consumption of its services, materials, and facilities under this act to the extent funds are available.

Utilization of other services

SEC. 407. The Secretary is authorized to accept and utilize the services of State and local civil agencies; utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services by individuals or organizations as might from time to time be needed; and authorize the States to establish and organize such individuals and organizations into units to be known collectively as the United States Civil Defense Corps: *Provided*, That the members of such corps shall not be deemed by reason of such membership to be appointees or employees of the United States.

Acceptance of supplies, etc.

SEC. 408. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to accept gifts of supplies, equipment, and facilities; and utilize and distribute the same for civil-defense purposes in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Purchase of printing work

SEC. 409. The Secretary is authorized to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies as the Secretary may deem necessary upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C., sec. 14).

Identity insignia

SEC. 410. The Secretary is authorized to purchase insignia, armbands, and other distinctive articles (including designs previously covered under letters patent which were assigned to the United States and held by the Office of Civilian Defense created by Executive Order No. 8757, issued May 20, 1941) which may be manufactured for or possessed or worn by persons engaged in civil defense activities pursuant to rules and regulations for the manufacture, possession, or wearing thereof established by the Secretary. The manufacture, possession, or wearing of any such insignia, armband, or other distinctive article otherwise than in accordance with such rules and regulations shall be unlawful, and shall subject such persons to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

Exemption from certain provisions

SEC. 411. The authority granted in section 402 shall be exercised in accordance with regulations of the President who may also provide by regulation for the exemption of persons who are employed or whose services are utilized under the authority of such sections from the operation of sections 281, 283, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

Security regulations

SEC. 412. (a) The Secretary shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property as he deems necessary. No employee of the Department shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under this section, until it shall have been determined that no information is contained in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any other investigative agency of the Government indicating that such employee is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, or, if any such information is so disclosed, until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have conducted a full field investigation concerning such person and a report thereon shall have been evaluated in writing by the Secretary. No employee of the Department shall occupy any position determined by the Secretary to be of critical importance from the standpoint of national security until a full field investigation concerning such employee shall have been conducted by the Civil Service Commission and a report thereon shall have been evaluated in writing by the Secretary. In the event such

full field investigation by the Civil Service Commission develops any data reflecting that such applicant for a position of critical importance is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, or if the Secretary for any other reason shall deem it to be advisable, such investigation shall be discontinued and a report thereon shall be referred to the Secretary for his evaluation in writing. Thereafter the Secretary may refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation by such Bureau. The result of such latter investigation by such Bureau shall be furnished to the Secretary for his action.

(b) Each Federal employee of the Department shall execute the loyalty oath and appointment affidavits prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. Each person other than a Federal employee who is appointed to serve in a State or local organization for civil defense shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath in writing before a person authorized to administer oaths, which oath shall be substantially as follows:

"I, ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I am about to enter.

"And I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advocate, nor am I a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; and that during such time as I am a member of the ——— (name of civil defense organization), I will not advocate nor become a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

After appointment and qualification for office, the director of civil defense of any State, and any subordinate civil defense officer within such State designated by the director in writing, shall be qualified to administer such oath within such State under such regulations as the director shall prescribe. Any person who shall be found guilty of having falsely taken such oath shall be punished as provided in section 1621 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Appropriations and transfers of funds

SEC. 413. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Funds made available for the purposes of this act may be allocated or transferred for any of the purposes of this act, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any Federal department, agency, or Government corporation; but each such allocation or transfer shall be reported in full detail to the Congress within 30 days after such allocation or transfer.

Annual report to the Congress

SEC. 414. In addition to any other reports prescribed in this act, the Secretary shall annually submit a written report to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, contributions, work, and accomplishments of the Department pursuant to this act, accompanied by such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

Definitions

SEC. 415. As used in this act, the terms "United States," "State," and "States" include the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Separability

SEC. 416. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

Declaration of policy

SEC. 501. In enacting this title it is the policy and intent of Congress to preserve the supremacy of civilian rule under emergency conditions to the greatest posible extent. While recognizing that in the event of enemy attack military rule may be necessary in certain areas and under exceptional circumstances, the Congress intends that such rule shall be strictly limited in time and place and instituted only to serve urgent and immediate military requirements. The Congress further intends that military resources and personnel, when available for civil defense operations, shall be utilized under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary, and that the Secretary should, it become necessary to exercise his authority under this title, shall receive the wholehearted cooperation and fullest assistance of the Department of Defense and military authorities consistent with their defense missions, in a common endeavor to protect and defend the people and preserve the integrity of the United States.

National civil defense emergency

SEC. 502. The provisions of this title shall be operative only during the existence of a state of civil defense emergency (hereinafter referred to in this title as an "emergency"). The existence of an emergency within the United States or any part thereof may be proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress if the President in such proclamation, or the Congress in such resolution, finds that an attack upon the United States has occurred or is anticipated and the national safety therefore requires an invocation of the provisions of this title. Any emergency shall terminate upon the proclamation of the termination thereof by the President, or the passage by the Congress of a concurrent resolution terminating such emergency.

Emergency powers

SEC. 503. During the period of an emergency the Secretary is authorized to carry out all the civil-defense operations required by the national plan of civil defense provided in title II of this act and to exercise all the duties and functions prescribed in this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exercise the authority contained in title IV on such terms and conditions as the President shall determine (subject to the provisions of this title) and without regard to the limitations of existing law: *Provided further*, That any funds received from the sale or other disposition, during the period of an emergency, of materials or for services shall be deposited to the credit of appropriations currently available and made pursuant to this act and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of such appropriations.

Additional emergency powers

SEC. 504. During the period of an emergency the Secretary is further authorized to—

(1) requisition materials, supplies, equipment, and other personal and real property, whether privately or publicly owned, necessary for civil-defense purposes;

(2) coordinate and direct for civil-defense purposes the activities of the various Federal departments and agencies of the United States and utilize such of their personnel, services, materials, supplies, equipment, and other personal and real property as the President shall determine are not required for military purposes, under such conditions as to donation, compensation, or return as the President may prescribe;

(3) incur such obligations on behalf of the United States as may be required to meet the civil-defense requirements of an actual or anticipated attack;

(4) direct and supervise civil-defense operations of the States and the political subdivisions;

(5) assume control and operation of any State or local government when requested by its duly elected or appointed chief executive;

(6) reimburse any State, including any political subdivisions thereof, for the compensation paid to and the transportation, subsistence, and maintenance expenses of any employees while engaged in rendering civil-defense aid outside the State and to pay fair and reasonable compensation for the materials of the State government or any political subdivision utilized or consumed outside of the State, including any transportation costs, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary. As used in this paragraph, the term "employees" shall include full- or part-time paid, volunteer, auxiliary, and civil-defense workers subject to the order or control of a State government or any political subdivision thereof, and such employees shall not be deemed by reason of such reimbursement to be employees or appointees of the United States; and

(7) provide financial assistance for the temporary relief or aid of any civilian injured or in want as the result of any attack.

Reports on emergency actions

SEC. 505. During the period of an emergency, the Secretary shall keep the President fully informed and shall submit quarterly to the Congress a detailed report concerning all action taken pursuant to this title.

Immunity from suit

SEC. 506. The Federal Government shall not be liable for any damage to property or for any death or personal injury occurring directly or indirectly as a result of the exercise or performance of, or failure to exercise or perform, any function or duty, by any Federal agency or employee of the Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title during the period of an emergency. Nothing contained in this section shall affect the right of any person to receive any benefit or compensation to which he might otherwise be entitled under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 751 and the following), or any other Act of Congress providing for any pension or retirement benefits.

Waiver of Administrative Procedure Act

SEC. 507. During the period of an emergency, the functions and duties exercised under this act shall not be subject to the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 1001 and the following), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Compensation for nongovernmental property acquired

SEC. 508. (a) Except in the case of property acquired pursuant to section 404 of this act in conformity with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or through judicial proceedings for condemnation, the Secretary shall promptly determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any property (other than that of the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof, or that of any State or political subdivision thereof) or the use thereof acquired pursuant to this act, but each such determination shall be made as of the time it is acquired in accordance with the provisions for just compensation in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If the person entitled to receive the amount

so determined by the Secretary as just compensation is unwilling to accept such amount as full and complete compensation for such property or the use thereof, he shall be paid promptly 75 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to recover from the United States, in an action brought in the Court of Claims, or, without regard to whether the amount involved exceeds $10,000, in any district court of the United States, within 3 years after the date of the Secretary's award, such additional amount, if any, as, when added to the amount so paid to him, shall be just compensation.

(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that any real property acquired by him under this title is no longer needed for the purposes of this act, he shall, if the person from whom the property was acquired desires the return of the property and pays to the Secretary the then fair value thereof, return such property to such owner. In the event the Secretary and the original owner do not agree as to the fair value of such property, the fair value shall be determined by three appraisers, one of whom shall be chosen by the Secretary, one by the person from whom the property was acquired, and the third by the first two appraisers; and the expenses of such determination shall be paid in equal shares by the Government and the person from whom the property was acquired.

(c) Whenever the need for the purposes of this act of any personal property acquired by him under this title shall terminate, the Secretary may dispose of such property on such terms and conditions as he shall deem appropriate, but to the extent feasible and practicable he shall give to the person from whom the property was acquired an opportunity to reacquire it (1) at its then fair value as determined by the Secretary, or (2) if it is to be disposed of (otherwise than at a public sale of which he shall give reasonable notice) at less than such value, at the highest price any other person is willing to pay therefor; but such opportunity to reacquire need not be given in the case of fungibles or items having a fair value of less than $1,000.

Brief Description of New Civil Defense Bill

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Congressional policy is restated to affirm that civil defense is squarely a Federal responsibility and a vital part of the national defense. At the same time the important supporting role of the States and local units of government is recognized, as well as the essentially nonmilitary nature of civil defense.

A NEW DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Title I of the bill would establish a new executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, headed by a Secretary, in place of the existing Federal Civil Defense Administration. Elevation of FCDA to regular departmental status was recommended in the subcommittee report and is endorsed by various groups, including the American Legion.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT

Besides the Secretary of Civil Defense, the bill provides for a Deputy Secretary, an Administrative Assistant Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries and a General Counsel, each to be appointed by the President with Senate approval, at rates of compensation comparable to those for such officers in the Department of Defense.

MILITARY LIAISON COMMITTEE

To provide a two-way channel of communications and cooperative working relationships with the military, the bill provides in title I for a Military Liaison Committee representing the three military departments and a chairman appointed by the President with Senate approval. The setup of the committee is patterned on the one provided by law for the Atomic Energy Commission. The Military Liaison Committee and the Secretary of Civil Defense would be obligated to advise and consult on civil defense matters of mutual interest, several of which are set forth specifically in the bill.

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

The bill also provides in title I for a Scientific Advisory Board of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability, selected by the President and serving for 6-year staggered terms. As with the Military Liaison Committee, this board is patterned on the one provided by law for the Atomic Energy Commission. The new statutory board would replace the loose contractual arrangement which FCDA now has with the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, and would bring much-needed scientific talent to civil defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill finally provides in title I for a Civil Defense Advisory Council of 15 members serving for staggered 4-year terms, appointed by the President, with the Secretary of Civil Defense acting as Chairman. An advisory group is provided for in existing civil-defense legislation, but has been little used. The new council would give statutory representation not only to State and local government but to industry, labor, and the public. Broad representation of this kind would serve to link Federal civil-defense activities with normal peacetime pursuits.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I

The first title is thus an organizational measure, transforming FCDA into a regular department of Government, establishing a Military Liaison Committee as a bridge to the military, a Scientific Advisory Board as a bridge to science, and a Civil Defense Advisory Council, as a bridge to local, industrial, and civic interests.

NATIONAL PLAN OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Title II would require the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and with the appropriate State and local officials, to prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense for the United States. This follows a major recommendation in the subcommittee report for a master plan of civil defense based on the testimony of many informed witnesses.

Fourteen broad objectives of the national plan are set forth in the bill to forestall or minimize the effects of an enemy attack. These include such things as attack warning, information to the public, shelter, control of traffic, radiological monitoring, rescue and welfare services, and restoration of essential industry. Note that the objectives are not narrowly conceived as temporary rescue services, but extend to placing the national economy back on its feet after an enemy attack. Thus, the Secretary of Civil Defense would be responsible for postattack operations now illogically divided between FCDA and ODM.

Note also that the objectives are derived from the broad definition of civil defense contained in the 1950 legislation. In effect, the components of that definition have been translated into substantive law, so that they become an operating rather than a semantic definition of civil defense.

EXECUTION OF NATIONAL PLAN

Having set forth the broad objectives of a national plan of civil defense, title II then specifies some 16 civil-defense functions in execution of the national plan which are mandatory upon the Secretary of Civil Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate State and local officials. These functions include defining target areas, systematic action to reduce target vulnerability, group-shelter construction in each target area, establishment of warning and communications systems, stockpiling necessary equipment, training and research, continuous review of Federal programs for civil-defense aspects, integration of civil and military plans for passive defense, assistance to State and local civil-defense organizations through contributions, and civil-defense training exercises and other preattack preparations.

The provisions for assisting State and local civil-defense organizations do not specify any matching requirements or ratio of Federal to State-local contributions, but leave such determinations to the Secretary of Civil Defense, with the conditions that Federal contributions be used for civil-defense purposes and in conformity with the national plan for civil defense. Also, the shelter program is made a Federal activity, authorizing the Secretary to make such arrangements for commercial or civic use of group shelters as he considers appropriate.

SUMMARY OF TITLE II

This title seeks to redefine Federal civil-defense functions making mandatory a national plan of civil defense and making the Secretary of Civil Defense responsible for the preparation and execution of such a plan. This contrasts with the 1950 legislation, which not only relieves the Federal Government of major responsibility for civil defense but which also leaves the FCDA Administrator's responsibilities in a rather indeterminate status.

TRANSFER OF DISASTER FUNCTIONS

Having established the new organizational base of civil defense (title I) and having restated its basic functions (title II) the bill proceeds in title III to make certain transfers of existing functions associated with civil defense. Thus, the new Department would acquire the civil-disaster functions now vested in the President and delegated to FCDA by Executive order. Since this bill would supersede the 1950 civil-defense legislation, the transfer of civil-disaster functions is made necessary to keep them in being under civil-defense direction.

TRANSFER OF ODM CIVIL-DEFENSE FUNCTIONS

The other reorganization step in title III, following a recommendation in the subcommittee report, is to eliminate overlapping or divided authority between FCDA and ODM in the civil-defense field. Those functions of ODM which the President determines to be of a civil-defense nature and more appropriately exercised by the Secretary of Civil Defense would be shifted over to the new department. The bill does not attempt to specify what functions should be extracted from ODM since they are somewhat vague and their present exercise is without benefit of a clear legislative mandate. ODM is largely an executive creation, having been first created by Executive order and having been formalized by Presidential reorganization plan. Consequently it is considered appropriate for the President to make further necessary reorganizations in this field for a 90-day period, under authority in title III of the bill.

Note that the merger of civil-defense functions would not mean a complete elimination of ODM. Insofar as it is an advisory organ to the President in the mobilization field or administers certain statutory functions, the ODM still carries on, but the Secretary of Civil Defense rather than the ODM Director would be responsible for such civil defense matters as location of Government buildings, post-attack restoration of essential industry, and the like.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title IV provides for various necessary activities of the new department such as the employment of personnel, property procurement and disposal, and the like. Mainly these provisions are those in the 1950 legislation. No change is made, for example, in the personnel security procedures.

EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

Title V deals with the emergency situations created by expected or actual enemy attack. The 1950 legislation had a similar title but the bill makes several important changes. First of all, this title carries a declaration of congressional policy, making it clear that the Congress intends to retain strong civilian direction of civil defense in any emergency. The possibility of martial law is recognized but its use is to be limited in time and place and to be resorted to only for urgent and immediate military requirements. The military role is conceived to be one of full cooperation and assistance to civil authorities consistent with military missions.

During an emergency, which may be declared by the President or the Congress, the Secretary is authorized to carry out the civil-defense operations required by the national plan of civil defense, but is relieved from certain legal restrictions on procurement, employment of personnel, and the like. Also the Secretary would be authorized to requisition supplies, to coordinate and direct civil-defense operations of the Federal Government, to direct and supervise State and local civil-defense operations, and if necessary to assume control and operation of any State or local government. The duly elected or appointed chief executive of the State or local government would decide when a breakdown of civil government under his jurisdiction required the Federal authority to take over.

The purpose of such emergency authority is to create a civilian government substitute for military rule and martial law. Such an arrangement is patterned on the Presidential proclamations for exercise of Federal authority issued during Operation Alert 1956.

A PROPOSAL TO CREATE A NEW DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, events of the past months in Europe and the Middle East and the President's message to Congress January 5 have brought into sharp focus that often it is only a very small factor that determines whether there shall be war or peace. The turmoil in the Middle East, the uprisings in Hungary, and now our President's important declaration of policy to the Congress certainly has shaken the American people from any drift of complacency that may have existed concerning the questions of defense, of our Nation and of the free world.

No longer do we have the arguments raging over whether we shall or shall not have a peacetime military force. Indeed, that is almost ancient history. Our debates today concern whether what we have is enough to deter any aggressor from making the fatal mistake of engaging in war with this Nation. Only few would deny that one of the free world's most effective means of keeping peace is through an armed might capable of destroying any nation that would gamble on war as a method of solving international difficulties.

Today's peace hinges greatly on one main point, our country's strength, a factor that carries tremendous weight in the minds of those who would conquer the world if they thought the opportunity ripe for such an onslaught.

A part of that strength lies in an effective military force, which we are fortunate to possess. The other part of that strength is our civil-defense organization. These two great units, a strong military force and a highly coordinated, strengthened civil-defense program form a powerful deterrent to the ambitions of any aggressor as well as providing maximum security for this Nation. Our President has outlined one phase of our program devoted to keeping the peace—a program concerning areas of the free world presently endangered. Civil defense plays an equally important role in our Nation's security and must be coordinated to the extent that both our military-defense and civil-defense organizations know constantly what the other is doing and is capable of doing.

Today, I offer a bill which provides for a revision of our present civil defense program that would give this Nation a highly-effective organization closely coordinated with our present Armed Forces' Establishment and our State and local government units upon which we are dependent.

The purpose of this bill is not to create another Federal agency, but to create an organization which can adapt the new concepts of the military into a coordinated program of readiness and action, capable of meeting any future involvement that may be thrust upon us. Through such preparation and capability I am certain we would be making an investment in a security that would be the strongest guaranty we could have for preserving the peace.

Certainly we have dedicated men and women who are working diligently for maintenance of a successful civil defense program. These people are to be commended for their untiring efforts. But they have been handicapped immeasurably because the present program is not designed to meet the present day needs and will not meet these needs if continued in the same form.

Civil defense has been thought of in the past as a program which would be made effective should troops invade our shores and enemy planes bomb our cities and industries. But civil defense is more than that, it is a program designed to show that this country is prepared, from the Pentagon to the main street, for any eventuality. Our armed might certainly stands as formidable power to an aggressor. And our civil defense can also stand as a great moral and physical strength—it can show the enemy that we are not weak in any respect, but that our strength and resistance is everywhere in this Nation.

Civil defense also is the key to our own preservation should we suffer enemy attack. With an energetic, efficient and far-reaching civil defense program our Nation will be equipped to survive the devastation of war, and better than ever before, with losses minimized and production continued.

Without a survival program, which actually is what civil defense is, this Nation, within a very short time, could be brought to its knees. Our industries could be halted permanently, our people could be terrorized into panic, and without either industry or the men and women to operate these plants, our effectiveness would be reduced immeasurably.

We have entered into a new era—the atomic age, in which weapons so powerful can wipe out entire areas. It is time for our civil-defense program to enter this age also, to become an integral part of our national defense planning, so as to provide our country with a program of survival designed to meet any eventuality.

The bill which I introduce, and which is the product of many months of study and hearings, calls for a reorganization of the civil defense functions of the Federal Government and will establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense. Under this bill civil defense will become an executive department of the Government, with a Secretary of Cabinet status who would become a member of the National Security Council.

The intent of this bill should in no way be constructed as removing from the States and local governments the authority and responsibility which they must continue to undertake for the well-being and security of our people.

Important to the organization of civil defense, as provided in this bill, are three groups appointed to participate in the functions of the department. The groups are: military liaison committee, scientific advisory board and civil defense advisory council.

Representatives from the Army, Navy and Air Force would serve on the military liaison committee. The chairman would be appointed by the President. This committee is to advise and consult with the Secretary of Civil Defense in all Department of Defense matters relating to civil defense.

The Scientific Advisory Board is to be composed of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability and would be appointed by the President. The Board, which would elect its own Chairman, is to advise the Secretary on scientific and technical matters and shall make periodic evaluations and recommendations of current civil-defense projects and programs.

The third group, a Civil Defense Advisory Council to confer on general policies, will consist of 15 members appointed by the President, and the Secretary who shall be Chairman. Representatives would include 3 from State government, 3 representing political subdivisions of the States, 3 from industry, 3 representing labor, and 3 to be selected from among citizens of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest.

The bill provides that the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and other officials, shall prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense in event of anticipated or actual enemy attack.

The 14-point plan includes provisions for: First, clear and prompt warning to the civilian population; second, public information as to immediate measures which must be taken to minimize the effects of enemy action; third, shelter of civilian population against primary and

secondary effects of nuclear explosions; fourth, control of traffic, lighting, and civil communications; fifth, enforcement of civil-defense regulations; sixth, evacuation of persons from target areas when evacuation is feasible; seventh, food, clothing, medical, health, sanitation, welfare, and other services for sheltered, displaced, and evacuated persons; eighth, monitoring for radiological, biological, and chemical hazards; ninth, decontamination of areas, facilities, and supplies subjected to such hazards; tenth, unexploded bomb reconnaissance and disposition; eleventh, fire fighting, rescue, debris clearance, and other emergency services; twelfth, movement of essential personnel to places of employment; thirteenth, repair or restoration of essential industry, communications, transportation, utility, and other facilities; and fourteenth, resumption and continuity of essential industrial production, economic activities, and governmental functions and services.

A 16-point program is outlined for execution of the Nation plan which includes: First, define potential target areas and determine their relative importance; second, institute systematic measures to reduce vulnerability of such target areas to enemy attack; third, construct group shelters in each target area and make arrangements for their maintenance; fourth, establish and maintain warning and communications systems or devices and control centers; fifth, procure, stockpile, and store in strategic locations necessary medical supplies and equipment, foodstuffs, industrial, transportation, communications, utility, and other materials, supplies, and equipment; sixth, establish and operate technical schools and training centers and provide expert instruction and training in civil defense; seventh, provide timely, periodic, and authoritative information to State and local civil-defense officials and to the public concerning civil-defense measures and requirements; eighth, establish civil defense research laboratories and conduct research directly or by contract; ninth, provide advisory services to industry concerning plant location and protection, participation in civil-defense training and exercises and other civil-defense activities; tenth, continuously review Federal programs for their civil-defense aspects and make recommendations to the President and Congress concerning administrative or legislative changes to conform such programs to civil-defense requirements; eleventh, direct, with approval of the President, other Federal departments and agencies to undertake specific civil-defense projects or programs; twelfth, establish regional, area, and local offices and civil-defense organizational arrangements; thirteenth, integrate civil-defense measures with those for the protection of military, atomic, and other defense installations; fourteenth, assist State and local civil-defense organizations by cooperating in financing for personnel and administrative expenses and other requirements; fifteenth, insure that State and local civil-defense organizations receiving Federal assistance comply with terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary; and sixteenth, conduct civil-defense training exercises and make such other preattack preparations as needed.

The bill also provides for transfer of all functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and certain functions of the Office of Defense Mobilization to the Secretary of Civil Defense.

In addition to the major change of establishing civil defense as a regular executive department of the Government, as provided in this bill, other important provisions should be noted which place civil defense as a part of our total military-defense program.

The scientific advisory board will bring much-needed scientific talent to civil defense and will offer a highly coordinated program to replace the present system which has not been utilized to the fullest. Provision for a civil-defense advisory council gives statutory representation to State and local government, industry, labor, and the public, and for the first time would provide a definite connection between Federal civil defense and normal peacetime activities.

Placing functions of the FCDA and ODM under one program will result in coordination of both purpose and activities, while the national plan takes on a much broader objective in that its purpose also is aimed at restoring our national economy following enemy attack.

The new department also receives clear determination as to its role in our Nation's defense pattern as well as acquiring civil-disaster functions now vested in the President and delegated to the FCDA by Executive order.

Emergency authority is granted to the Secretary of Civil Defense under this bill, but it also is made clear that the purpose of emergency authority is to create a civilian government substitute for military rule and martial law. The military role in a national emergency is to be one of full cooperation and assistance to civil authorities consistent with military missions.

I have stated in the past that our civil-defense program is dangerously outmoded. Should a national emergency arise, I am not at all certain that under our present civil-defense system we could cope successfully with a disaster of national proportion.

I am convinced that legislation providing for reorganization of our civil-defense program is long overdue, and to neglect or ignore this vital arm so necessary to our self-preservation could lead to our own destruction.

It is my most earnest hope that this 85th Congress will take the steps that result in revising and revitalizing our civil-defense program—steps that could well rank in importance with other great efforts to keep the peace.

It should also be pointed out that the bill introduced today is a draft of proposed legislation and does not constitute the final form in which the bill may appear. Committee hearings will be held, at which time we will hear various witnesses, and it is expected changes will be made in the bill through committee action.

THE HONORABLE JAMES P. RICHARDS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce that one of our former colleagues, the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable James P. Richards, has a new assignment. He was appointed as special assistant to the President with the rank of an Ambassador and will head the special mission to the Middle East. I am sure that all of his colleagues, as I do, wish him well. I am sure we all join his host of friends and admirers in extending to him our best wishes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, would welcome this splendid appointment. Our former chairman had the respect and the affection of the Congress on both sides of the Capitol, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President has made a wise decision in choosing our former chairman for that post.

TITO VISIT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the newspapers reported that the President of the United States was about to issue an invitation to Dictator Tito, of Yugoslavia, to visit Washington.

Tito's record as a Communist tyrant and the numerous murders and massacres inflicted on innocent people within the borders of Yugoslavia should forever bar him from being invited by the leaders of our free democracy to visit our shores. He personifies antifreedom, antireligion, antidemocracy, and antilabor. His record as a noncompromising and ruthless tyrant should estop any recognition and honor which our Government would extend to him by an invitation to the White House.

I have received a great number of protests from citizens and organizations in the Calumet region in Indiana asking that President Eisenhower refuse to invite this dictator to Washington.

I hereby incorporate with my remarks a telegram received from Mr. John T. Marich, honorary president of the Gary chapter of the Serbian National Council of America.

GARY, IND., *December 23, 1956.*

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Congressman, First District of Indiana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The general press of the United States has been flooded with the most devastating and disgraceful news of President Eisenhower's pending invitation of the Yugoslavia Dictator Tito to visit the United States. As one of the citizens of Serbian descent who have been voting for the last 55 years for a better and fuller democracy of the United States, I vigorously and indignantly protest against the disgraceful and dangerous act of the White House of inviting the dictator and murderer of so many Serbian democracy-loving people, including my own immediate relatives, to honor him with the White House invitation to visit this country and thereby impliedly, if not actually, sanction and approve of his fiendish deeds of the killing of the liberty-loving Serbian people, as well as American aviators. Every self-respecting Serbian in America will suffer agony from shame for his adopted country, America, to compromise its world's prestige by such an unthinkable invitation.

I ask you, Congressman, to lodge a strong protest on the Congress floor in behalf of the Serbian people and all other democratic-loving people of the United States against the President's invitation of Dictator Tito.

JOHN T. MARICH,
Honorary President of the Gary Chapter of the Serbian National Council of America.

MAKING INAUGURATION DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN METROPOLITAN AREA OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1—making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 20th day of January 1957 and the 20th day of January in every fourth year thereafter, known as Inauguration Day, is hereby made a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area: *Provided, however*, That whenever the 20th day of January in any such year shall fall on a Sunday, the next succeeding day selected for the public observance of the inauguration of the President of the United States shall be considered a legal holiday as provided by this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery, and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is similar to one I introduced at the beginning of the session. It provides on a permanent basis a holiday for Inauguration Day for Federal employees in the District of Columbia area. This will include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington and Fairfax Counties in Virginia; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

Traditionally schools in this area have been excused on Inauguration Day. For the past several inaugurations arrangements have been made for the Federal employees to be given a holiday in order that they may observe the historical and important activities in connection with the inauguration. By making this a permanent arrangement—one which will occur only once every 4 years—my resolution will eliminate the necessity for acting upon this matter on every inauguration. It will provide for uniformity.

Four years ago I introduced a similar resolution directed toward the Inauguration Day of 1953. This resolution was approved by the House.

With the intensive and exciting activities of Inauguration Day, it would be most difficult for employees to get to and from work in this area or to perform satisfactorily their functions once at their desks.

Heads of departments and agencies can, of course, under my resolution, provide for the manning of necessary posts where for special public reasons employees must be on duty on Inauguration Day.

This resolution does not authorize an additional legal holiday. It merely takes care of a situation that happily occurs every 4 years in the United States and affects only the working situation of the employees around the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following members on the part of the House:

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]; the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]; and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 6, 1957, and tomorrow, January 8, 1957, mark two significant anniversaries in the life of a great American.

Yesterday was the birthday anniversary of our great Speaker. Tomorrow marks his 50th anniversary as a legislator. It was on January 8, 50 years ago, that SAM RAYBURN, in the year 1907, at the age of 25, held up his hand for the first time and took the oath of office as a member of a legislative body. At that time, 50 years ago, he became a member of the Texas House of Representatives. Four years later he became the youngest speaker of the Texas House. He was then 29 years of age. The next year he came to this Congress, and, as I think most of you know, he has been here ever since.

Mr. RAYBURN'S 50 years of legislative service, including the 5 years in the Texas Legislature, is the most extensive service in American legislative bodies, according to the Library of Congress. The late Senator Carter Glass and Speaker Cannon ranked as near competitors with 46 years each. Senator Hayden of Arizona, Senator Hale of Maine, and Representative Sabath, of Illinois, follow with 45 years. These figures include service in State legislatures.

You may be interested in comparative information from other great democracies. William E. Gladstone was about the only man that Speaker RAYBURN can now seek to surpass. As far as the Library of Congress can tell, Mr. Gladstone served in the Parliament of Great Britain for 60 years. Arthur James Balfour served for 56 years. Sir Winston Churchill has now served 54 years, and Sir Winston is still serving.

Speaker RAYBURN has already surpassed any such record in France. Mr. Charles Freycinet served there for a total of 44 years.

Therefore, I think it very significant that we pause here today between two great anniversaries in the life of our distinguished Speaker—his birthday and, on tomorrow, the 50th anniversary of his official service to his State, to his Nation, and to the free world.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I join the gentleman from Louisiana in his eulogy and praise of our distinguished Speaker. May I say in behalf of all the Republicans that we appreciate the fine service rendered by Speaker RAYBURN. He is a great American, and the country has benefited greatly from his long and faithful services. May he have many years of further service and good health is the wish of all.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The people of Tennessee take great pride in the fact that our beloved and distinguished Speaker was born in the Volunteer State of Tennessee. I am confident that I express the true sentiment and feeling of all the Tennessee delegation in Congress as well as all the people of the State in conveying hearty congratulations and sincere

best wishes for many happy returns to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The people of Texas of course are very proud of the distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN tells new Members of Congress, as he told me when I first came here and as he has told all new Members, that this body is one in which a Member can succeed or fail according to his own conduct and actions. That is, a Member has two constituencies. One constituency makes it possible for him to come here and remain here and thereby give him the opportunity to serve the people. The other constituency is represented by his colleagues, those with whom he serves here on the floor of the House. He must likewise get along with them in order to be of service to the people who make it possible for him to serve in this body. Mr. RAYBURN has many achievements to his credit as a Member of the Congress, and I would just like to mention one or two.

No. 1. Texas was deficient in road building. Texas was not alone. All States were in a similar position. The farmers were in the mud, in the sand. There was an effort to get farm-to-market roads, but that effort never was successful until Mr. RAYBURN, as Speaker of the House, refused to permit a bill to be brought before this body when he was Speaker in 1944 until the Committee on Roads—at that time it was the Committee on Roads—went back and agreed to earmark at least 30 percent of all Federal highway funds for farm-to-market roads. That started our farm-to-market road program in the United States. You know how successful it has been and how acceptable it has been to the people.

No. 2. Mr. RAYBURN was author of the Rural Electrification Administration Act. That act not only helped the farmers to receive the blessings of electricity, and one of the greatest blessings of mankind is electricity, but also created a great market. It created a good market for many other things. Since that law was passed under the leadership, guidance, and authorship of Speaker RAYBURN, the farmers of this country on REA lines have purchased more than $15 billion of appliances of all kinds. So that created a great market for many manufactured products. Of course, we know what that means.

Those are just two things that I have mentioned in the life of this great statesman. I could mention a number of others, including Federal Securities Act, Stock Exchange Regulation Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Act, Soil, Water Conservation and Flood Control Acts, authorizing the Denison and Lavon Dams, Farm Price Support Act, Communications Act, GI bill of rights, and Social Security.

THE TRUE STORY OF THE LIFE OF SPEAKER RAYBURN SURPASSES ANY HORATIO ALGER STORY

The true story of Speaker RAYBURN's life is more interesting, touching, and dramatic than any Horatio Alger story ever written. His life discloses what a young man can do if he possesses certain qualities and virtues, even though he and his parents were poor in this world's goods.

Mr. RAYBURN started out 50 years ago when he first entered public service, as he is now, an honest, sincere, trustworthy and genuine man. His word has always been good. He has always been forthright and courageous in his methods and policies. His great success has been due to many factors, but most outstanding were fairness and justice toward all people with whom he came in contact.

It is my belief that every day of his life he has given much thought and study to ways and means of being of greater service to the people he has the honor to represent and to the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest rewards of any public official is the knowledge that he has performed his duties without fear or favor. Anyone who has ever known Speaker RAYBURN knows that he has never been unduly influenced in casting any vote or taking any action affecting the interest of the people of the country; he has always been considerate and kind to people who visit his office and visit him personally, particularly new Members of Congress.

If, when I have served the allotted time in the Congress of the United States, it can be said that I have achieved certain things that are helpful to the people of our country, Speaker RAYBURN will be entitled to a royalty interest in all of any such achievements of mine due to the fact that he gave me the proper help, guidance, and leadership during my service in Congress with him.

It cannot be said of Speaker RAYBURN that he has no enemies because he has enemies. He has accomplished something. In his many achievements he has stepped on the toes of powerful, influential and some greedy people, who were violently opposed to his actions. I am reminded of what I heard many years ago about the person who had no enemies:

He has no enemies, you say,
My friend, your boast is poor,
He who hath mingled in the fray
Of duty, that the brave endure
Must have many foes.
If he has none, small is the work that he has done.
He has hit no traitor on the hip.
He has cast no cup from the perjured lip.
He has never turned the wrong to right.
He has been a coward in the fight.

That is the reason that Speaker RAYBURN has some enemies. He has been a courageous man and never in his life one time has he ever been guilty of any action that could not be considered honorable and forthright.

SAM RAYBURN LIBRARY

The Sam Rayburn Foundation will complete the Sam Rayburn Library in the city of Bonham, Tex., within a few months.

It will, in a small way, recognize the greatness of this wonderful statesman.

In the library brochure that was prepared by friends of SAM RAYBURN in 1955 is found the following information:

SAM RAYBURN—AMERICAN

To close observers of the national scene and to his colleagues who have seen the Rayburn genius for persuasive legislative diplomacy through the decades he stands out in the history of his time as the great leader. It is one of his special talents to reconcile the judgments of men of strong conviction but of opposite views on controversial legislation. Basically, this was achieved by the respect and the confidence he had built up among his legislative friends and opponents for granite integrity and complete knowledge of the issues and the needs. The Rayburn influence in enabling the legislative branch to meet crisis after crisis in four decades of war and peace will go down as the outstanding major individual contribution to the events that have shaped United States and world history.

SAM RAYBURN was born on the Clinch River, Roane County, Tenn., January 6, 1882. At the age of 5 he moved from Tennessee and settled on a farm south of Windom, Tex. He attended country school at Flagg Springs, Tex. After receiving his bachelor of science degree from Mayo School, Commerce, now the East Texas State Teachers College, he studied law at the University of Texas in preparation for a legal profession. He embarked on his political career as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, serving from 1907 to 1913, the last 2 years as speaker of the house. He was elected to the 63d Congress of the United States in 1912, taking his seat on March 4, 1913, and has served continuously since.

In 1913 he became chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and as such pressed to enactment important legislation of historic significance. In 1937, as the Democratic majority leader, he was the first Texan to hold that position. In 1940 he became Speaker of the House, the second Texan ever elected to that high and respected post, and the 44th incumbent in the history of the United States. SAM RAYBURN has served as Speaker longer than any other man in history. During the 80th Congress and the 83d he was elected Democratic leader. The Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia in 1948 and the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1952 elected him permanent chairman. Again on January 5, 1955, RAYBURN was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives—the day preceding his 73d birthday. Altogether, he has been elected Speaker of the House 7 times: 1940, 1941, 1943, 1945, 1949, 1951, and 1955.

The Speaker of the House is first in presidential succession next to the Vice President.

I have been very close to my fellow Texan during my 28 years in the Congress. He has given fatherly aid to many a young man coming to Congress for the first time. As majority leader and as Speaker, he has been endowed with great powers but has used them sparingly because he relies more upon persuasion than coercion. He is a friend of the farmer, the worker, the aged, the businessman—and especially the small-business man—and a genuine friend of those who serve their country and their loved ones.

SAM RAYBURN is not only honest, able, and affable, but he is dependable and loyal. It can truthfully be said of him what Thomas Jefferson once said of a great public official, and that is, "You

could turn his soul inside out and not find a speck on it." His life conclusively reveals that he is guided by the teachings of the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

The Speaker typifies much of what is most attractive in American life. He is a man of simple faith and simple utterance; indignant in the presence of injustice and scornful of shame; restrained in his tastes and his pleasures; determined but not dogmatic; dignified but not pompous; hardworking, kind, and patient. Many men of his kind have sat in the House before him and helped direct America in the paths of greatness. He is a fine example of our kind of civilization, created and tempered by the peculiar conditions of American life. No Member of Congress is more anxious to assist one of his constituents or more eager to be of help to his own Congressional District than SAM RAYBURN. His national leadership has not in the least distracted his thoughts from his own constituents, about whom he often says, "I shall never cease to be grateful to the people, who make it possible for me to remain in Congress."

We in Texas and in Congress are proud of SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is natural and proper that the State of Tennessee be very proud of our distinguished Speaker for the fact that he was born in that great State, and that the State of Texas be very proud of our distinguished Speaker because of his residence and citizenship in that State for so many years. But, I might say, the entire United States is proud of SAM RAYBURN and the public service that he has rendered and which he typifies. To him public office is a public trust. He served in this great body during many trying periods in the history of our country and in the history of the world. He has always been found true. He has always acted with vision and with courage. Whenever the national interest of our country is involved, SAM RAYBURN always has given the type of leadership within the Halls of this body which was for the best interest of our country as a whole. He is tremendously respected by all Americans without regard to political affiliation. He is a sound progressive—and there is no political implication in the remark that I am about to make—but in the Halls of Congress, SAM RAYBURN pioneered and led the fight for the great reform measures of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in the years 1933 and following that time when he was chairman of that great and responsible committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He led the fight for important measures in those days that are now accepted by a great majority of our people—and again without regard to political affiliations—as a necessary part of our domestic economy and our domestic strength.

From a personal angle SAM RAYBURN is a man with a heart of gold. He is a very sentimental gentleman. He has a very warm heart. He is always trying to do something to help someone else. I have referred to him on several occasions in the past, and from a personal angle I think the best way to refer to him is as I did a few moments ago, that he is a man with a heart of gold.

He and I have been very closely associated with each other since my freshman days in the House. He has been very kind to me as a Member of the House and, during the last 17 years in our relationship to each other, he as Speaker and I as Democratic leader on the floor. I can say that my feeling of respect for SAM RAYBURN and deep friendship for him is the same inwardly when I am talking with friends of mine in my office and elsewhere, as it is when I express myself outwardly to the public.

My life and the life of all others who have had the honor to know this great man, and he is greater because he is humble, and he is greater because he is good, my life because of having known him has been enriched immeasurably.

Like the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and all of my other colleagues I join with them in extending to our Speaker our congratulations and our felicitations on these two anniversaries, and we pray that God will continue to shower upon him for years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Let me say for all the Florida delegation in Congress that on this day Florida proudly casts all of its sunshine votes for SAM RAYBURN. We are proud indeed to have an opportunity to pay homage and respect to this great American.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my collegaue from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] upon the excellent statement he has made concerning the life and service of our beloved Speaker.

Secondly, on behalf of the people of my State who love SAM RAYBURN and look upon him as a Congressman at large from the State of Oklahoma, I extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to add my congratulations to SAM RAYBURN for his long service in the House of Representatives, and for another birthday. I speak for myself and on behalf of all the Members of the Missouri delegation. We honor SAM RAYBURN not just for his longevity of service but for the gentleman that he is and for the many services that he has so efficiently rendered to all of the people of this great Nation of ours and to all of the people of the free world.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I would like to join in the tribute to our great Speaker. I think sometimes when we are living close to an historic character we do not realize it. The fact is, however, this man has served longer than anyone in the history of the Republic in the great office which he now holds, and that continuity of service is no accident but is a tribute to his many fine qualities. Let me mention just one of them: In the past decade and a half there have been times when, in the management and arrangement of our affairs here in the House, I have consulted with the Speaker on many matters where it might have been quite possible to have some little misunderstanding. On many occasions a slight misunderstanding, or a slight misinterpretation, of an agreement might have been used to partisan advantage. I want to say, and I know there are scores of others here who will join me in this, that in any matter involving the business of this House SAM RAYBURN's word is good, and a nod of his head is as good as his word. There has never been any misunderstanding, or any misinterpretation of any agreement I have had with him through the years, even though some of those agreements were quite informal, but involved complicated procedures. SAM RAYBURN is completely and thoroughly reliable. That is just one quality among many others that has caused him to hold this historic position longer than anyone in our history, and to continue to hold our affection and respect.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it has become a custom on January 6 of each year, and a very pleasant one it is, to sing the praises of the life and character of the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, and to wish him well in the days to come. The main characteristic of all these encomiums is that they come from the heart and everyone really means what he says. This is especially true this year when our beloved Speaker celebrates his 75th birthday, and may I say he doesn't look a day older than he did when I first came to Congress 14 years ago. Indeed, his keen mind is just as sharp as ever, his code of ethics is still outstanding, his warmth of friendship is just as strong, his sense of humor is even brighter, and his love of country remains as immovable and stanch as the Rock of Gibraltar. He was always a great man—today he is greater than ever.

Not many men have experienced such active and intimate service for their country, nor have lived in such exciting and changing times as has SAM RAYBURN. He has walked with the leaders of the world, he has advised them in critical times, but he has always maintained the common touch and the understanding heart which attract men to him. He honors us by his friendship. He has sponsored and aided in the passage of legislation which has affected the economy of mankind, and he has presided over the House of Representatives longer than any other Speaker in history. I

hope someone will write his biography so the world may know and realize what a great man he is and to learn to understand why we love and respect him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many happy returns of the day, and may God's rich blessings be showered upon you.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING].

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my remarks of congratulations from the Sunflower State of Kansas. As a new Member, as an individual, and as a Representative of the people of Kansas, I wish Speaker RAYBURN many happy returns of the day and even longer service to the people of our great country.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS].

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii numbers among its citizens many who claim citizenship in Texas. I would be remiss if I did not extend on their behalf and on behalf of the people of Hawaii our fondest me ke aloha, and the desire that many more years of health be given to you so that you may continue to serve the people and provide the inspiration in fairness and justice that you have in the past. Aloha.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the North Carolina delegation, and on behalf of the new members of the North Carolina delegation, I should like to express our appreciation of the long and splendid service which has been rendered by our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

It was my privilege to meet Speaker RAYBURN in 1940 when he visited our community with the late Congressman A. L. Bulwinkle, who was my very dear friend. I know Mr. RAYBURN'S many visits to North Carolina since that time have endeared him to the people of my State. The outstanding record of public service which he has established is sufficient laudation to him on this significant occasion.

However, I would like to say that I join with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and the others who have spoken today, in wishing for our Speaker the success, the long life, and the happiness which will cause him to exceed even the record of the late Sir William Gladstone.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak the sentiments of the entire Republican delegation from Ohio when I join in this tribute that is being paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on his 75th birthday. While we on this side voted for our good friend and our leader on this side, Mr. MARTIN, for Speaker, I want you to know that the Republican delegation from Ohio not only respects but we love Speaker Sam.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN is not only a great legislator but he is also a philosopher and on this eve of his 50th anniversary as a legislator I should like to quote for the edification of all of us just one or two of his sayings which have become famous.

The first is: "Commonsense—that's just about all the sense there is."

Another one: "In politics if you cannot trust your instincts, you are not going anywhere."

Here is another one: "Damn the man who is always looking for credit. I have always noticed that if a man does his job, and does it well, he will get more credit than he is really entitled to."

Another one, and this is a very important one: "You never have to explain something you did not say."

Here is another one and the last one: "Life is a great romance—the greatest romance there is."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to our great Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, may I join with all of your many friends in extending to you felicitations on the occasion of your 75th birthday. This is a memorable event and an important milestone in your long and fruitful life. As one of the most beloved men in public life today, you enjoy the affection and good will of every Member of the House irrespective of party. Your untiring service to the Congress and to the Nation should be an inspiration to the new Members of this body who are just beginning their legislative careers as it has been a source of strength and guidance to those of us who have been privileged to serve under your leadership in the past. Our wish for you is that you will have many more happy birthdays to come and that you will enjoy continued good health.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of our Wisconsin delegation, I wish to convey our sincerest congratulations to our eminent Speaker upon his 75th birthday and the 50th anniversary of his legislative service to his community, his State, and to our Nation.

We have been fortunate, indeed, to have a man of your experience and wisdom leading and guiding us in these crucial years. You have devoted your energies and your many talents to unselfishly serving the public interest, and you have earned the respect and gratitude of the Nation.

In expressing our congratulations, I wish to voice my hope and prayers that the good Lord will bless you, Mr. Speaker, with many years of good health and happiness, and that, we in the House of Representatives and our entire Nation, may continue to have the benefit of your distinguished service and leadership for many years to come.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, may I also have the sincere pleasure and honor of saying for the distinguished Speaker, who sits in the Speaker's chair at this moment, that ever since I first came to this great legislative body a bit over 10 years ago now, his patriotic devotion, his fairmindedness, his equal justice in his rulings, and his consecrated purpose and service to our beloved country—these are some of the factors which have made my work in this House of Representatives most pleasant, most satisfying, and most inspiring. I join with each and all in most cordial felicitations on his birthday, on his anniversary of great legislative contribution to the legislative history of our Nation and to progress toward an enduring world peace. I am sure that I speak these extemporaneous words not only for myself but for those members of the California delegation who do not happen to be on the floor at this moment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleague, Congressman COOPER, of Tennessee—the dean of our delegation—and my other colleagues in extending to Speaker RAYBURN my very best wishes on the occasion of his 75th birthday anniversary—may there be many such future celebrations.

As Congressman COOPER has indicated, we of Tennessee claim Speaker RAYBURN as one of our State's most distinguished sons. I feel compelled to repeat and to remind my colleagues that our Speaker is not only a native of Tennessee, but that he was born in Roane County which is located in the district immediately adjacent to the great district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Speaker RAYBURN has many relatives in Tennessee—and a host of friends and admirers who are proud of his great achievements and attainments. I know they would want me to salute our Speaker and to extend to him best wishes on this his birthday anniversary.

Speaker RAYBURN'S achievements in the Congress have been unexcelled. We are fortunate to be able to call him our friend and we wish for him many more years of happiness and usefulness.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my main remarks this afternoon I would like to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying a well-deserved tribute to our beloved and distinguished Speaker upon the completion of these two memorable anniversaries.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress, as well as millions of our fellow citizens, has been shocked and sickened in recent weeks by the events that have taken place in the little central European country of Hungary. Those tragic events had particular significance for me since I spent 2 years in the city of Budapest, from 1947 to 1949, watching the Communists progressively enslave the Hungarian people.

A brief review of the events of the critical period, October 23 to November 4, would, I think, be useful at this point. On October 23 student demonstrations broke out in Budapest and the demonstrators were fired on by the Communist police. Street fighting ensued and the

puppet Hungarian Government called for help from the Soviet occupation forces.

More Soviet troops entered the fighting the next day. The Hungarian Government appealed for the fighting to stop and announced surrender deadlines, which were ignored. Meanwhile fighting broke out in several large provincial cities.

As the revolt spread new elements were brought into the Hungarian Communist Government which broadcast promises of substantial reform, including negotiations for the withdrawal of Soviet troops in exchange for a cease-fire. Non-Communists were included in the Government for the first time on October 27.

On Sunday, October 28, the Government announced a cease-fire and the Prime Minister, Imre Nagy, stated that Soviet troops would withdraw from Budapest immediately. It was at this time that the local revolutionary committees and revolutionary workers' councils came to prominence with their demands, including Soviet military withdrawal from Hungary, free elections, and free speech, Hungarian neutrality, and many others.

A coalition government was formed on October 30, headed by Prime Minister Nagy. The next day he stated that Hungary was prepared to quit the Warsaw Pact and had asked for negotiations to get Soviet troops out of Hungary. It was at this time that Hungary's best-known anti-Communist, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty, was liberated from his political prison and arrived in Budapest.

On November 1, Nagy formally announced that Hungary had withdrawn from the Warsaw Pact and proclaimed Hungarian neutrality. He also requested the United Nations to put the Hungarian question on its agenda. Meanwhile, Soviet troops were beginning to encircle Hungarian airfields and take key railways. This action was protested by the Hungarian Government on November 2 and the United Nations was notified of Soviet activities. The U. N. was also requested to appeal to the great powers to recognize Hungarian neutrality. Because of the importance of this appeal, I am going to read its text as broadcast by the Hungarian radio and monitored by the free Europe committee:

To Mr. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD,
Secretary General of the United Nations, New York:

Your excellency, the the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic wishes to bring the following supplementary information to the knowledge of your excellency:

I have already mentioned in my message of November 1 that new Soviet military formations had entered Hungary, that the Hungarian Government had informed the Soviet Ambassador about this, that it had repudiated the Warsaw Pact, that it had declared Hungary's neutrality and had turned to the United Nations to guarantee the neutrality. On November 2 the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic received new important information, army reports, according to which considerable Soviet military formations have crossed the country's frontier. They are advancing toward Budapest, occupying railway lines, railway stations, railway traffic installations and so forth on their way. Reports have also been received about Soviet troop movements, in an east-west direction, in western Hungary.

In view of the above-mentioned facts the Hungarian Government deems it necessary to inform the Soviet Embassy in Budapest and the other diplomatic missions accredited to Budapest about the steps directed against our people's republic. The Hungarian Government has at the same time made concrete proposals to the Soviet Government concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary, and the place for negotiations concerning implementation of the repudiation of the Warsaw Pact, and has also communicated the names of the Hungarian governmental delegation. In addition to this, the Hungarian Government has proposed to the Soviet Embassy in Budapest the setting up of a mixed committee to prepare the way for the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

I ask Your Excellency to call on the great powers to recognize Hungary's neutrality. The Security Council should instruct the Soviet and the Hungarian Governments to begin negotiations immediately. I ask Your Excellency to inform the members of the Security Council about the above facts and to accept the expression of my sincere esteem.

On Sunday, November 4, the blackest day in modern Hungarian history, Soviet forces attacked Budapest and other large cities of Hungary. The result was as expected, although fighting in Budapest continued until November 14 and partisan activity still is believed to be carried on. Typical of the appeals which went out from Hungarian transmitters is this one:

Civilized people of the world, listen and come to our aid, not with declarations, but with force, with soldiers and arms. Do not forget that there is no stopping the wild onslaught of bolshevism. Your turn will also come, once we perish. Save our souls! Save our souls!

Peoples of Europe whom we helped for centuries to withstand the barbaric attacks from Asia, listen to the tolling of Hungarian bells warning against disaster. * * * Civilized peoples of the world, we implore you to help us in the name of justice, of freedom, of the binding moral principles of active solidarity. Our ship is sinking. Light is failing, the shadows grow darker every hour over the soil of Hungary. Listen to the cry, civilized peoples of the world, and act; extend to us your fraternal hand.

SOS—SOS—may God be with you.

These bare, matter-of-fact developments which I have outlined form the skeleton of the Hungarian fight for freedom. Other noteworthy developments have, of course, subsequently taken place in Hungary, such as the protest strikes, sitdowns and slowdowns, the large-scale demonstrations by Hungarian womanhood, and other forms of passive protest. None of them, however, appear to have been successful in obtaining any major concessions from the Soviets or the Communist puppet regime of Janos Kadar. Not by terrorism, but by hunger and cold, the backbone of the Hungarian revolt appears to have been broken.

Having briefly sketched events in Hungary, Mr. Speaker, let us review the action on the part of this Government. Relief supplies of food, clothing, and medicines have been made available since the first days of fighting. While the frontier was open, these supplies were sent into Hungary through any and all means available. Assistance is still going in via the International Red Cross and CARE, Inc. There has also been large-scale economic relief for the thousands of Hungarian refugees who entered Austria and the chances that the Congress will be asked to authorize further aid, both to the refugees and to the Austrian Government itself, are quite considerable.

I am sure that the Members are familiar with action which has been taken concerning the refugees themselves. I am equally sure that this subject will be thoroughly covered during the debate on our current immigration legislation and it is my purpose to touch on it now only briefly. I should like to point out, in the first place, that many other Western countries have taken similar and even greater action, comparably speaking, toward the admission and resettlement of roughly 150,000 refugees from Hungary that have entered Austria up to this time.

Last Tuesday Vice President NIXON submitted to the President his report of the Hungarian refugee problem. I shall not go into the details of this report but, in general, I should like to express my own approval of the ideas and recommendations contained therein.

There have, of course, been fears and concern expressed regarding the possible inclusion of Communist agents among the refugees. It is, admittedly, difficult to apply standard security checks to such large numbers of people in a very short space of time. But I believe that the Hungarian refugees themselves are relatively capable of determining whether or not there are spies and informers in their midst. Having sacrificed so much to make their escape to freedom, I know they will do all possible to warn of undesirable individuals among them. Actually, people have already been detected and returned to Hungary on legitimate grounds of suspicion. Further, I would not like to be in the shoes of any Communist spy among the refugees who was discovered by his compatriots. If you saw news pictures of the treatment of the secret police at the hands of the Budapest freedom fighters, you will understand what I mean.

There has also been concern expressed regarding the possible effect the admission of large numbers of refugees might have upon our own employment situation. I might in this connection state that the large labor unions themselves have been foremost in urging the admission of larger numbers. Personally, I believe that these people can and will be readily absorbed within our economy. I have so stated to many of my own constituents who have expressed some fears in this regard.

There is, however, one cause for concern which I have myself in this whole problem. The majority of the refugees were engaged in the Hungarian uprising—they formed the center and the core of anti-Communist resistance. They would certainly have been the leaders of future resistance or opposition to the Communist regime if they had remained behind. Now they have escaped in large numbers to Austria. Under the

operation of the refugee program, they are being scattered to the four corners of the globe, to Canada, to Australia, to South America, to this country and to many other far-removed places. Should not some thought be given to the possibility that by this dispersal we are harming the effectiveness of future anti-Communist resistance in Hungary? I offer this thought as worthy of some consideration by those persons in charge of our refugee program as well as those responsible for our overall foreign policy.

In this connection, it is not surprising that the Soviets and Hungarian Communists have allowed the frontier to remain relatively open and have permitted the exodus of large numbers of refugees. By so doing, they have been able to get rid of many anti-Communist Hungarians who otherwise would have to be deported or imprisoned.

I think that the House is likewise familiar with action which has been taken by the United Nations, to a very considerable extent as the result of the initiative of our own representatives there. Of particular note is the strong resolution of condemnation of Soviet military intervention which was passed by the General Assembly recently. Other resolutions of similar sense had been adopted earlier. The Secretary General of the U. N., Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, has tried repeatedly to visit Hungary in person or to send in a team of observers. These efforts have all come to naught due to the uncompromising attitude of refusal taken by the present Hungarian Government. Such attempts now appear to have been abandoned, at least for the time being.

I notice by the news ticker in the Speaker's lobby that Mr. Hammarskjold admits they might as well give up trying to get United Nations observers or himself into Hungary, and that he intends to ask the Assembly for further extension of his authority, whatever that may mean. One idea that occurred to me when this came up was the possibility of getting together volunteers either as individuals or as units and seeing if we could get permission for these volunteers to get into Hungary. Then, on November 8, I received a telegram from the American-Hungarian Federation requesting me to wire the President and Ambassador Lodge, urging that the United States ask the United Nations to give permission for volunteers from America, Canada, Austria, South America, and so forth, to go into Hungary as nurses, aids, or volunteer soldiers if necessary. On the same day I sent the desired telegrams requesting our Government to ask the United Nations to permit international volunteers to enter Hungary in any capacity that will aid the Hungarian patriots. The White House replied on November 10 that this suggestion would receive very careful consideration and that I would have further advice very soon from the State Department.

Ambassador Lodge responded on November 15 and I quote the pertinent parts of his letter:

> The United States is doing everything possible to speed United Nations action on this vital matter. We are giving priority to the urgency of getting United Nations observers into Hungary and Secretary General Hammarskjold is taking rapid steps to this end. The question of volunteers is one for the State Department to decide. * * *
>
> The United States will continue to do everything in its power to keep faith with the Hungarian people. Their historic struggle has aroused the admiration of all freemen.

The State Department's reply was not forthcoming until December 7. Because of its importance, I quote it in full:

> The tragedy which has occurred in Hungary has again exemplified the fierce desire for freedom on the part of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. The Department of State and the people of the United States are deeply concerned about this tragic situation; indeed, our first concern is for the physical safety and well-being of the Hungarian people. In quick response to their pleas, President Eisenhower made millions of dollars' worth of relief and medical supplies immediately available; and has made it possible for thousands of uprooted Hungarians to find refuge in America, should they so desire.
>
> The United States does not believe that military action on the part of this country or of the free world would have been in the interests of the Hungarian people. Rather, such action would have almost surely led to the utter destruction of that valiant country and opened up the possibility of a conflict engulfing the entire world.
>
> The United States Government cannot approve the participation of American volunteers for the following considerations:
>
> 1. Section 349 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 provides that American citizens shall lose their citizenship by entering or serving in the armed forces of a foreign State unless, prior to such entry or service, the entry or service is specifically authorized in writing by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Such authorization for service in Hungary has not been granted in any individual case and there is no intention of departing from this policy.
>
> 2. American volunteers could not travel to Hungary without violating the neutrality of Austria and would undoubtedly be prevented from such a course by that Government.
>
> 3. In the light of the foregoing, American passports cannot now be validated for travel in Hungary.
>
> 4. We believe that the best opportunity for helping the Hungarian people at the present time is through our support of the efforts that are being made in the United Nations. These efforts would be seriously jeopardized if American volunteers were to proceed to Hungary.
>
> Ambassador Lodge has taken a forceful lead in the United Nations and was instrumental in obtaining a majority for support of a resolution aimed not only at ending Soviet intervention and armed attack in Hungary, but also at upholding the right of the Hungarian people to freedom and justice.
>
> President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are giving their continued urgent attention to the courageous efforts of the Hungarian people. Certainly it is the hope of all America that they achieve their aims of greater liberty, national independence, and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

I would like to make a few comments on this letter setting forth to a considerable degree the official policy of our Government at the time of the Hungarian uprising. First, you will note that the State Department entirely ruled out the use of military force, either on our part or even as part of an international police force. I take it then, that had a U. N. police force been in existence at the time, this Government would have opposed its use on the grounds that further destruction of and loss of life in Hungary would have been the result and the prospects for world war III would have been considerably enhanced. In other words, we opposed any military help of any kind being sent to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

The fact that American volunteers would have run the risk of expatriation if they had somehow been able to join the Freedom Fighters is, of course, a fact under our present nationality legislation. Whether this should be changed or not is, of course, for the Congress to decide. I can only express my gratitude that, during the days of our own American Revolution, no such legislation was operative to prevent the many foreign patriots (including Hungarians) who came to our shores to assist us in our own struggle for liberty and independence. It is truly fortunate that the help we received at that time from France and other countries was not confined to relief packages and resolutions condemning King George III.

Regarding the question of Austrian neutrality and the consequences that might ensue from its violation, that, of course, is a delicate problem. I understand that this fear operates to rule out many forms of assistance to Hungary that have been suggested, such as a food-lift by U. N. planes, the employment of balloons to carry in relief packages, in short, any departure from channels of relief work which have been permitted by the Communists. It would, naturally, be operable against any form of military assistance to the Hungarians, whether volunteers, military supplies, or anything else.

From reliable sources, I have learned that there has been considerable concern recently lest Soviet military forces might invade Austria. Now, under the terms of the Austrian peace treaty, the neutrality of that country is guaranteed by this Government as well as the Soviet Union. If Austria were invaded by Soviet troops, I cannot pretend to say what the reaction of this Government would be. I would suggest, however, that Austria would certainly be deserving of our protection as many of the Middle Eastern countries covered by the resolution presented to the Congress 2 days ago.

I do not necessarily take objection to the State Department's belief that we could best help Hungary through the United Nations. The government set up by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters themselves evidently thought so. There were no appeals direct to this Government from the Nagy regime at the time of the Soviet attack—they were all directed to the United Nations. What is reasonably certain is that, to this time, U. N. action has certainly not produced the hoped-for results.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many, many suggestions as to what could have been done and what might still be done to aid the embattled Hungarian patriots. There have been suggestions of economic, diplomatic, and political sanctions against the Soviet Union by all free nations. There have been sugges-

tions for the severance of diplomatic relations with the puppet Hungarian government and the expulsion of that government from membership in the United Nations. Similar suggestions have even been made regarding the Soviet Union itself. There have been suggestions to fly the U. N. Secretary-General or his appointed observers into Hungary without the permission of the Soviets or the Hungarian Communists, even though this would technically be a violation of the U. N. Charter. Another suggestion was to appoint U. N. observers from the staffs of Western diplomatic missions accredited to Budapest. Other suggestions, made while there was still widespread fighting, involved the immediate dispatch of military supplies to the Hungarian anti-Communists by any and all means available. I have already referred to the suggestion of a U. N. airlift of relief supplies to be dropped by parachute.

Leaders of the American-Hungarian Society with whom I recently discussed these matters laid particular emphasis on the urgency of getting large amounts of relief supplies into Hungary by any and all means available. They explained that Red Cross supplies are being shipped from Vienna direct to Budapest and CARE parcels direct from Belgrade to Budapest with the result that the Hungarian countryside is completely bypassed. Since the need in Budapest alone greatly exceeds the available supply, the chances are that several months will pass before the provincial cities receive their share of aid. It was suggested, therefore, that all other forms of relief supplies be sent across the Hungarian border wherever there might be an opening. The proposal of using balloons to get substantial amounts of food and medicine into Hungary was also suggested. Other proposals from these sources included the formation of a government in exile and permitting young Hungarian escapees to volunteer in NATO army units.

The Hungarian National Council recommended the establishment of a central register to keep track of all Hungarian Freedom Fighters who escaped. It suggested the use of appropriate economic assistance to the Hungarian people themselves and exploration of the possibility for private relief packages to be sent from this country to Hungary. A United States Government loan to the council itself was suggested to enable that organization to expand its activities. Economic sanctions against the Soviet Union were suggested and strong hope was expressed that the Congress would continue to keep the whole Hungarian question in the forefront of its attention.

All of these suggestions have varying merits and all deserve consideration by our Government and other governments of the free world. As far as the American people themselves are concerned, I think our feelings were best expressed in an editorial which appeared in the November 5 issue of the New York Times entitled "We Accuse." Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert it in my remarks at this point.

WE ACCUSE

We accuse the Soviet Government of murder. We accuse it of the foulest treachery and the basest deceit known to man. We accuse it of having committed so monstrous a crime against the Hungarian people yesterday that its infamy can never be forgiven or forgotten.

Lenin wrote in 1900: "The Czarist Government not only keeps our people in slavery but sends it to suppress other peoples rising against their slavery (as was done in 1849 when Russian troops put down the revolution in Hungary)." How apt these words sound today when we substitute "Soviet" for "Czarist," and 1956 for 1849.

Hatred and pity, mourning and admiration, these are our emotions today: hatred for the men and the system which did not hesitate to shed new rivers of innocent Hungarian blood to reimpose slavery; pity for the Soviet soldiers, duped into thinking they were fighting Fascists when they killed defenseless or nearly defenseless men, women, and children; mourning and admiration for the heroic Hungarian people who feared not even death to strike for freedom.

Gone now are the last illusions. Moscow now stands self-exposed. The torrent of Soviet bullets yesterday did not kill only Hungary's freedom and Hungary's martyrs. Those bullets killed first of all the picture of a reformed, penitent Russia seeking to repudiate Stalinism and practice coexistence. Could Stalin have acted more barbarously than did his successors yesterday? Can we have any doubt now of what awaits us if we ever relax our vigilance and permit ourselves to become prey to Soviet might, as was Hungary yesterday?

The day of infamy is ended. The foul deed is done. The most heroic are dead. But the cause of freedom lives and is stronger than ever, nurtured by the blood of those who fell martyred in freedom's cause. The Hungarian people will never forget. We shall not forget. And out of hatred and tears is born the resolve to carry forward the struggle till freedom is triumphant.

Both in respect to responding to appeals for relief and in opening our doors to thousands of homeless refugees, the American people and the American Government have done a great deal and are prepared to do more. But I have a feeling that our people are unhappy and concerned that more concrete, more positive assistance was not forthcoming. I have not talked with anyone in a private capacity who is satisfied that we have done all we can.

The other day I read a rather remarkable article in the December 29 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "The Man Who Wanted to Help Hungary." It tells the story of Mr. John Richardson, a young associate of a New York banking house, who became stirred by the Hungarian fight for freedom and who was personally instrumental in securing substantial contributions of drugs, food, and money for the Hungarian relief. According to the article, Mr. Richardson was finally afforded the opportunity of purchasing supplies of weapons and sending them to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. On the advice of the State Department, however, he abandoned this idea. I would now like to quote the concluding paragraphs of this article, written by Mr. Harold H. Martin:

He still is not convinced that he was right when he gave up trying to find weapons and send them into Hungary. To him, the Hungarians, in their week of bloody agony before the tanks rolled over them, were not fighting for one form of communism as opposed to another. They were fighting for liberty, for the things that free men everywhere believe in and will die for. And he feels that he, and all the free world, let them down. If the Hungarians could have held out just a little longer, he believes that the restive, conquered nations of all the satellite countries might have flared into revolt. In east Germany, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland, brave and angry men inspired by Hungary's fight might have risen to strike down the iron curtain behind which they have lived in slavery for a decade.

If this flame of rebellion that flared so suddenly in Hungary could have been fanned, he feels—if the fire of revolt could have been spread by our help, official or unofficial—it might have finally reached the Kremlin. It might have meant the end of the Soviet tyranny, the finish for Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Khrushchev, and Mr. Bulganin, and all that crew of grim or smiling murderers who dream of a Communist empire that will dominate the world. It might have been the end of them and the beginning of the peace that men have prayed for through years of fear and frustration and cold war.

It was a turning point in history, he feels, when the first homemade Hungarian bomb explored under a Soviet tank. Then, for just a moment, the door of freedom opened. But a cold voice spoke in the U. N., and the door slammed shut, and Hungary felt the clamp of Communist chains again while the anger and compassion of the free world dissolved in talk.

And this is why John Richardson today feels little pride in what he did to help, and is embarrassed and a little angry when you speak to him about it. Maybe he did do all that one man could do, he says. And maybe this country's Government and the United Nations did all that they could do. But it all boiled down to the things that are easy to give—to money, and medicine, and food, and sympathetic words, and a haven of peace for a few thousand homeless refugees. And that was not enough.

Mr. Speaker, it is a subject for legitimate debate, I believe, as to what our Government should or should not have done during the Hungarian crisis. Personally, I believe we should have done more, much more. I believe that as a result of our inability or our inaction or both, our so-called policy of liberation has to all intents and purposes gone down the drain. The peoples of any other satellite country know now that we are, or at least allege to be, nearly powerless to really assist them in their efforts to throw off their chains. If, by their own efforts, they should succeed in gaining partial independence, we will probably assist them from an economic point of view. But, so far as helping them when they need it the most, we either can, or will, do little or nothing.

But if the question of blame for this country's lack of action is debatable, surely the weak, pusillanimous, and vacillating attitude of the United Nations in this affair is deservedly subject to strong criticism. By its failure to go beyond words, beyond resolutions in this instance, the U. N. has shown its true impotency in a real crisis.

There is no question as to its responsibility—the Nagy government had appealed directly for U. N. assistance. But, as compared to the Suez matter, the U. N. has rather clearly shown that it is willing to abide by a double standard of

international law—one code for civilized aggressors, such as Britain and France, and one code for international barbarians and gangsters, such as the Soviets have proven themselves to be. No real attempt was made to get U. N. observers into Hungary, in spite of the mandate of the General Assembly, and now all pretense has been dropped by the disbanding of the three-man commission. As I said, Mr. Speaker, today's Bulletin carries the story from New York. Now Dag Hammarskjold has admitted his complete inability to get U. N. observers in and has asked the General Assembly for a further extension of the orders.

Now I ask, what faith can the Hungarian people or any other Communist-controlled people now have in U. N. promises and pledges, what hope can they have in resolutions?

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell me if this statement is true: Is it true that the representatives of Hungary, representatives of the Kadar government, have been invited by the Inaugural Committee here in Washington, to the inauguration and to the inaugural ball, and the festivities pertaining thereto?

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman's information on that is better than mine. I have not heard anything about it. I, of course, would regard it as atrocious if such an invitation had been issued, and certainly I hope none has. Certainly for such an invitation to be issued to the representatives of the puppet Hungarian government would be the last straw.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to tell the gentleman that I very much appreciate the vast amount of research he has done on this subject which is a very vital matter and is something that is in order, as far as I personally am concerned, for debate in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Members of this House owe the gentleman from Michigan a vote of thanks for the thorough manner in which he has analyzed some of the most important aspects of the Hungarian freedom revolution. It is a well-known fact that Mr. BENTLEY is an outstanding American authority on the Hungarian nation. His broad knowledge concerning the conspiracy of communism makes him eminently qualified to perform the public service which he has so well done today.

I note that the Department of State, in rejecting the idea of American volunteers to aid the Hungarian patriots, advanced as one of its reasons that American volunteers could not get into Hungary without going through Austria and that to do so would violate the neutrality of Austria. I should like to draw attention of the Members of this House to an oversight on the part of the Department of State. If President Eisenhower's policy evaluation of Yugoslavia under date of October 15, 1956, which was made known to Congress only a few days ago, is valid, then American volunteers could have gone through Yugoslavia without violating anyone's neutrality. President Eisenhower has stated that Yugoslavia is not connected with the international Communist conspiracy and that Tito is prepared to assist all nations fighting for their freedom and independence—that being according to the President, the policy of Tito's regime. It is important—and I hope the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will ask the Department of State why they consider Austria as the only means of entry into Communist-occupied Hungary.

The answer is apparent to anyone who has studied the situation. Here the Department of State, without equivocation, admits that the billion dollars of United States taxpayers money spent on Tito has been wasted and also that the President's policy evaluation of October 15, 1956, with respect to Tito, is invalid. Tito, by turning back to the Russians hundreds of the enemies of communism, including defectors from the Red Army, has provided additional proof that his first loyalty is to Moscow and that he holds nothing but contempt for the basic freedoms.

Mr. BENTLEY. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio, my good friend, who has dedicated himself to the cause of freedom in the captive countries, that among other things, Tito has turned back some 150 Hungarians across the border into Yugoslavia.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. They have been turned back to the Communists.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

I commend the gentleman for expressing the hope that Congress would help to keep the Hungarian revolution in the forefront of world attention. It is quite apparent that the Russians are attempting to divert world attention from the massacre of Hungarians by causing new trouble elsewhere in the world and that we are likely to aid and abet this Russian maneuver if we emphasize only the problems of the Middle East without keeping them in the focus of the Hungarian fight for freedom. I feel certain that the gentleman from Michigan who was 1 of 7 who introduced identical resolutions to create a select committee to investigate the latest acts of Communist aggression in Hungary, will help keep the story of the Hungarian fight for freedom before the people of the world. I also commend the gentleman for his excellent analysis of the political paralysis which now grips the United Nations and prevents enforcement of a resolution passed December 12, 1956, by the General Assembly condemning this Russian aggression against Hungary and calling for the Red Army to get out of Hungary. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he would agree with me that it is time the United Nations either called upon the Russians to abide by the charter of the United Nations or be expelled from that body.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly would agree with the gentleman. It is high time. This is not the first example of Charter violation on the part of the Soviets, and I have long advocated that the United Nations take some action against them. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution very much.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I want to commend the gentleman for making the very interesting statement which he has made. I think his summary of the facts is most important and most apposite. On Saturday last I placed in the RECORD some data of the International Commission of Jurists from The Hague. I have in my hands here today another statement of theirs dated December 7. It is very interesting on the strictly legal aspects of the matter, and I ask unanimous consent that this matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949

The reports from Hungary about mass arrests, summary trial,[1] deportations,[2] and other measures which are alleged to have infringed the rule of law have attracted worldwide attention.

The present Government of Hungary contends that the national uprising suppressed by Soviet armed forces is an internal affair of Hungary. The Soviet Union holds the same view.

It is, however, to be remembered that there are rules of international law which apply even if the conflict in question is merely a "civil war." These rules are laid down in the Geneva Conventions for the protection of the victims of war,[3] concluded in 1949 and

[1] Cf. Decree on criminal procedure of November 10, 1956 (Radio Budapest, November 10, 1956, 14.00 hours, as monitored in BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, pt. II B, No. 777/1956/, pp. 8–9 with text of decree).

[2] Cf. Report of Radio Budapest, November 14, 1956, 15.00 hours (BBC, The Monitoring Report, No. 5, 200 /November 15, 1956/, p. 1) as well as the case of Imre Nagy and his group. According to several testimonials of Hungarian refugee camps of deportees exist in Soviet Carpatho-Ukraine.

[3] Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (hereafter called "Convention I").

Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (hereafter called "Convention II").

Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (hereafter called "Convention III").

Convention for the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (hereafter called "Convention IV").

ratified among others by the Soviet Union[4] and by the Hungarian People's Republic.[5]

The obligations entered into by the signatories of the convention depend on the character of the conflict, and are more specific if it is an international conflict and less detailed if it is an internal one.

I. OBLIGATIONS IN AN INTERNAL CONFLICT

If it is assumed that the conflict is an internal one, the parties are bound to apply among others the following provisions at least:

Persons taking no active part in the hostilities shall be treated humanely. The following acts in particular are prohibited:

"(a) Violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture.

"(b) Taking of hostages.

"(c) Outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment.

"(d) The passing of sentence and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guaranties which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples" (art. 3, convention IV).

During the negotiations the Soviet Union supported[6] a draft approved by the XVIIth International Red Cross Conference at Stockholm in August 1948[7] which served as a basis for discussion at the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva in 1949. This text reads:

"In all cases of armed conflict not of an international character * * * the parties to the conflict shall be bound to implement the provisions of the present convention [i. e., as a whole, not only art. 3 mentioned above], subject to the adverse party likewise acting in obedience thereto."

When this text met with opposition on the part of a number of Government delegates, the Soviet Union introduced the following version of the provision:

"The parties to the conflict shall be bound to implement the provisions of the present convention which guarantee:

"Humane treatment of the civilian population.

"Prohibition within the territory occupied * * * of reprisals against the civilian population, the taking of hostages, * * * damage to property.

"Prohibition of any discriminatory treatment of the civilian population."[8]

The delegate from Hungary also favored as wide as possible an application of the convention to civil wars:

"The essential aim of the conference was to extend the field of action of the convention as much as possible for the protection of the victims of conflicts."[9]

[4] The Belorussian and Ukrainian republics are also signatories of the Conventions.

[5] English text: Final Record of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva of 1949, Berne (hereaft r cited Record), vol. I; French text: Actes de la Conférence diplomatique de Genève de 1949, Berne, tome I; Russian text: Zhenevskie konventsii o zashchite zhertv voiny, Izadanie Vedomostei Verchovnogo Soveta SSSR (publication of Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S, S, R.), Moscow, 1954, 219 pp.; German text: Bundesgesetzblatt, Bonn, teil II, S. 781 ff; Die Genfer Abkommen zum Schutz der Kriegsopfer vom 12. August 1949, hrsg. vom Deutschen Roten Kreuz, 2. Aufl., Bonn 1953.

[6] Cf. Record, vol. IIB, pp. 13–14, 34, 37, 42, 44, 47, 76, 93, 325–327.

[7] Art. 2, par. 4 of the draft. Text: Record, vol. I, p. 113.

[8] Amendment of the Soviet Union, July 21, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex no. 15, p. 28). Corresponding amendments for the other conventions.

[9] Joint committee, first meeting, Apr. 26, 1949. (Record, vol. II B, p. 11).

II. INTERNAL OR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT?

The view that events in Hungary represent merely an internal conflict has no basis in international or Hungarian law. It is the considered view of the International Commission of Jurists that the events in Hungary amount to an international conflict with two adverse parties—the Hungarian nation on the one side and the Soviet Union on the other side. The reasons for this view are as follows:

1. The suppression of the national uprising in Hungary constitutes an agression in the sense of the Soviet definition of aggression proposed to the United Nations in 1953 (cf. the paper Hungary and the Soviet Definition of Aggression, released by the International Commission of Jurists, November 16, 1956).

2. The overthrow of the Nagy government and the setting up of the Kadar regime was effected with the help of Soviet armed forces and constitute an indirect aggression in the sense of the definition just mentioned.

3. The request for military assistance made by the Kadar government was therefore not valid under international law.

4. The request was also invalid in Hungarian constitutional law. The armed attack began before the Kadar regime was in power. Five days later—on November 9—a constitutional amendment was enacted to legalize subsequently the existence and the acts of the Kadar government.[10]

5. The request, even if validly made, could have had no legal effect on the application of the convention, since article 47 of convention IV stipulates:

"Protected persons * * * shall not be deprived, in any case or in any manner whatsoever, of the benefits of the present convention * * * by any agreement between the authorities of the occupied territories and the occupying power * * *."

The Soviet and Hungarian Governments are therefore under a legal duty to carry out those obligations which the Geneva conventions provide for cases of an international conflict.

III. OBLIGATIONS IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT

The obligations apply to all cases of armed conflict between two or more of the parties as well as "to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a high contracting party, even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance" (art. 2/2/2/2).[11]

The obligations of the signatory states in such cases include among others:

A. With respect to all victims of war

The provisions mentioned under this heading "cover the whole of the populations of the countries in conflict, without any adverse distinction based in particular on political opinion, and are intended to alleviate the sufferings caused by the war" (art. 13).[12]

1. Particular protection of the wounded and children (arts. 16–22, 24).

2. Allowing free passage of all consignments of medical and hospital stores and, if intended for children and mothers, also of essential foodstuffs, clothing, and tonics (art. 23).[13]

3. Allowing family correspondence and facilitating inquiries made by members of dispersed families (arts. 25, 26).

B. With respect to civilian persons

The provisions mentioned under this heading cover all persons who are nationals of a state bound by the convention and find themselves in the hands of an occupying power of which they are not nationals. The protection extends to all persons who are not covered by one of the other three conventions (see note 3) (art. 4). The protection lasts for the duration of the occupation (art. 6). If a protected person is suspected or engaged in activities hostile to the security of the occupying power he forfeits certain rights under convention IV, but retains at least the right of fair and regular trial (cf. infra under 10) (art. 5).

4. Human treatment, respect for the person, honor, family rights, religious convictions, customs. Equal treatment, "without any adverse distinction based, in particular, on political opinion" (art. 27).

5. No exercise of physical or moral coercion (art. 31). Prohibition of any measures causing physical suffering or extermination of protected persons, including, e. g., torture, or any other measure of brutality (art. 32).[14]

6. Prohibition of collective penalties and all measures of intimidation or terrorism (art. 33).[15] Prohibition of taking hostages (art. 34).

7. Prohibition of "individual or mass forcible transfers,[16] as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the occupying power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, regardless of their motive" (art. 49, cf. also arts. 52, 76–77).

The phrase "into the territory of the Occupying Power or the territory of any other country" was incorporated on the suggestion of the Soviet Union.[17]

8. No sanctions or any measures of coercion against public officials or judges, should they abstain from fulfilling their functions for reasons of conscience (art. 54).

9. Duty to ensure food and medical supplies to the population (art. 55)[18] as well as hospital establishments and services (art. 56). Duty to allow and facilitate relief schemes for the population if inadequately supplied (art. 59–62). Red Cross Societies shall be able to pursue their activities (art. 63).[19]

10. Respect for existing criminal legislation (art. 64). Duty not to enact retroactive criminal laws (art. 65). Courts of the Occupying Power shall apply only those provisions of law which are in accordance with general principles of law (art. 67). The penalty shall be in proportion to the offense (art. 67–68). There shall be no prosecution for acts committed or for opinions expressed before the occupation (art. 70). No sentence shall be pronounced by the competent courts of the Occupying Power except after a regular trial (art. 71). An accused person shall have the right of defense (art. 72) and a convicted person the right of appeal (art. 73). They shall be detained and serve their sentences in the occupied territory (art. 76).

C. With respect to prisoners of war

The convention also protects apart from the traditional category of "members of the

[10] Decree of November 10, 1956. Text broadcast by Radio Budapest, November 9, 1956, 7 p. m. (BBC summary, pt. IIB, No. 777 (1956), p. 7).

[11] Article common to all four conventions.

[12] This and the following article refer to convention IV.

[13] Cf. text proposed by the Soviet Union (Record, vol. III, annex No. 222, p. 114).

[14] Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 14, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annx No. 231, p. 116), supported by Hungary in the 13th meeting of committee III, June 15, 1949 (Record, vol. IIA, p. 717).

[15] Cf. Text presented by the Soviet Union, June 7, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 234, p. 117).

[16] The words "individual or mass" are missing from the Russian text, as reproduced in the source quoted supra, note 5. The English and French texts are, however, authentic (art. 55/54/133/150).

[17] Amendment of the Soviet Union, May 12, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 45, p. 130).

[18] Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 28, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 282, p. 136).

[19] Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 28, 1949, (Record, vol. III, annex No. 292, p. 139).

armed forces of a party" the following persons among others:

(a) Members of organized resistance movements, if they are commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates, if they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

(b) Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the detaining power.

(c) Inhabitants who on the approach of the enemy sponstaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, if they carry arms openly and respect the laws and custom of war (art. 4 A).[20]

The convention applies to these persons from the time they fall into the power of the enemy until their final release (art. 5).

The inclusion of the persons mentioned under a–c was considered imperative considering the experience of Nazi occupation of Denmark and other countries which were invaded without resistance on the part of the armed forces. The innovation was supported by the Soviet delegate who declared:

"Civilians who took up arms in defense of the liberty of their country should be entitled to the same protection as members of armed forces." [21]

He spoke also in favor of protection of members of resistance movements (partisans).[22] The Hungarian delegate supported the Soviet Union in both cases.[23]

The individual obligations of the detaining power include among others:

11. Duty to treat prisoners of war humanely (art. 13).[24]

Respect for their person and honor (art. 14). Equal treatment "without any adverse distinction based on political opinions" (art. 16).

12. Duty to allow prisoners of war to send and receive letters and cards (art. 71).

13. Duty not to bring a prisoner of war before a court unless it offers the essential guaranty of independence and impartiality as generally recognized and in particular, a procedure which affords the accused the rights of defense (arts. 84, 105) and of appeal (art. 106).

14. No prisoner of war may be tried or sentenced for an act which is not forbidden by the law of the detaining power or by international law, in force at the time the said act was committed. No moral or physical coercion may be exerted on a prisoner of war in order to induce him to admit his guilt. No prisoner of war may be convicted without having had an opportunity to present his defense and the assistance of a qualified advocate or counsel (art. 99).

15. Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities (art. 118).

D. Provisions for enforcing these obligations

The following provisions are incorporated into all four Geneva Conventions in order to assure their strict performance.

1. The parties undertake to respect and to insure respect for the present convention in all circumstances (art. 1/1/1/1).[25]

2. The protected persons may in no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present convention (art. 7/7/7/8).

3. The convention shall be applied with the cooperation and under the scrutiny of the protecting powers (art. 8/8/8/9). The parties may agree to entrust to an impartial organization the duties incumbent on the protecting powers (art. 10/10/10/11).[26]

4. The parties undertake to enact any legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing or ordering to be committed, any grave breaches of the conventions (art. 49/50/129/ 146 and art. 50/51/130/147).[27]

The Hungarian delegate stated that the Hungarian military penal code, in force since February 1, 1949, stipulates severe penalties for violations of the convention.[28]

5. An inquiry shall be instituted concerning any alleged violation of the convention (art. 52/53/132/149).

IV

In publishing this paper the International Commission of Jurists hopes to act in the interests of the signatories of the Geneva Conventions, including the Soviet Union and Hungary, since articles 47/48/127/144 of the conventions provide:

"The high contracting parties undertake * * * to disseminate the text of the present convention as widely as possible in their respective countries, * * * so that the principles thereof may become known to the entire population."

December 7, 1956, International Commission of Jurists, Buiitenhof 47, The Hague.

Mr. HALE. I hope very much that we shall succeed in keeping this whole matter in the forefront of public attention in such a way that this country can act as effectively as may be for these oppressed people.

Mr. BENTLEY. I might say to the gentleman from Maine I was very interested in reading the article which he inserted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD last Saturday.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for the great contribution he is making on an important matter about which so little is known. It is particularly important for the American people, and all the people for that matter, to remember that there were two phases of this upheaval that occurred in Hungary: First, when the Hungarians overthrew the Communist Hungarian Government and, second, when Russia invaded Hungary. The fact that the gentleman has so well pointed out the phases of this matter is certainly a great contribution.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I certainly hope that someday in the near future he will give the Congress the benefit of his observations and experiences while he was recently on the Austrian border so close to Hungary. I am sure the House would be interested in hearing it.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in raising this discussion today. I think it would be well to point out that he has been one of those who for many years has maintained, contrary to the belief of some persons in high places in Government, that it would be possible for the people behind the Iron Curtain to throw off the yoke of Communist slavery. There were those, such as Mr. George Kennan and others who held high positions in the Department of State who have consistently maintained that we might as well recognize the fact that certain areas of the world belonged to the Communists. The gentleman from Michigan and others have maintained the reverse; that it was still possible behind the Iron Curtain to be free and be independent.

Is it not true that the significant point in the Hungarian revolution is the fact that it was led by two categories of people which were supposedly completely indoctrinated by the Communists? No. 1, the young people and, No. 2, the workers. They led the revolution. It was said that they could do nothing about the situation, but, the Hungarians have shown the whole world that young people and workers in Communist areas, despite many years of indoctrination, are not necessarily convinced. Is it not true also that we should keep the lesson of Hungary in mind when we talk about China and when we talk about many other countries, because the same thing that happened in Hungary could happen elsewhere. I might add the hope that the gentleman's remarks and the remarks of my colleagues here today will be listened to and read by some of the leaders in our Government and will help to make our foreign policy, because if the day ever comes when our leaders in Government say that we should write off certain areas to the Communists, we will be making one of the most tragic mistakes in history.

Mr. BENTLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I thank him very much.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we started to face facts. The moral strength of the free world is a powerful force when used against a government which is responsive to the will of its own people. But when it is faced with a government completely devoid of all standards of international morality, a government which cares little or nothing for popular feeling, a government such as the Soviet Union, it is a very different matter indeed. If the U. N. is to survive in this world as a force for international peace and justice, it is going to have to learn to deal with aggressors to whom nothing is sacred and who are deaf to resolutions and expressions, however genuinely uttered. The Soviets do not acknowledge the will of the majority in their own country, why should we expect them to acknowledge it within our international forum.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that there is little in the way of concrete, positive action that we as a Nation can take at this time in honor of the brave and courageous people of Hungary, either within or without the United Nations. But cer-

[20] This and the following articles refer to convention III.

[21] Committee II, fifth meeting, May 16, 1949 (Record, vol. II A, p. 426).

[22] Loc. cit., p. 429.

[23] Source as in notes 21 and 22.

[24] Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, May 4, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 99, p. 64).

[25] This and the following articles are common to all four conventions.

[26] Cf. an amendment by the Soviet Union, July 20, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex 26, p. 34) and the reservation of the Soviet Union and Hungary to art. 10/10/10/11.

[27] Cf. Amendments of the Soviet Union of July 20 and 21, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 53 and 53 A, pp. 44).

[28] Record, vol. II B, p. 32.

tainly we can all unite in paying tribute to these brave men, women, and children of Hungary who showed the world not only an example of the highest form of courage but also that there are still things in this world worth fighting and dying for. Surfeited with 11 years of tyranny and oppression, they rose up against their masters and, while the world waited breathlessly, seemed miraculously to have won for a few short days. Then the black shadow of totalitarian despotism again set in. They believed in the prospects of help from the free world, from the major western powers, from the U. N. itself. They were justified in their belief, for were they not fighting the battles of the free world, were they not defending the cause of liberty and independence against tyranny and slavery? And is that not our own cause and the cause of free men and free nations everywhere? Bitter must have been their realization and boundless must have been their despair when they finally learned that there was to be no help, no hope, and they had been left to wage a hopelessly unequal battle alone.

Some will say that this was merely another milestone on the road to liberation by peaceful means. Others will say and have said that any further intervention on our part would have risked world war III, that it would only have brought further bloodshed, misery, suffering, and destruction to unhappy Hungary. No one now can tell what would have happened if we had acted differently. The only thing that can be said with certainty is that a brave little people rose up and fought for their freedom against the mightiest tyrant of modern times, a brave little people who asked the free world for help to enable them to carry on their own fight. A brave little people who failed to receive that help and who were mercilessly drowned in a sea of their own blood. That much is history.

The very day of the Soviet invasion, Sunday, November 4, I had the honor to address a large joint Hungarian-Polish rally in the city of Detroit, even as early reports of the Communist treachery and massacre were being received. At that time I said that we were standing at the crossroads and that if this opportunity were missed, we might not have another. I said at that time that our action in the next few days might determine not only our own fate but the fate of the entire free world for years to come.

Maybe I was wrong. Maybe a final opportunity has not been missed. Maybe a divine providence will still grant us another opportunity as a people to prove our own devotion to the cause of freedom and justice for all men in all parts of the world. Maybe this Congress can win immortal glory for itself by taking action that will bring freedom to those who so richly deserve it. Our Government appears to be at a loss to know what to do next, it feels that any further assistance would run the risk of another world war. May be it is up to us as representatives of the American people to resolve on and adopt a course of action that will rekindle a flame of hope in the hearts of those who have now lost all hope.

In conclusion, I would like to say this. I am still firmly convinced that one day the Hungarian people will be free along with the other enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Their sufferings and sacrifices of recent weeks has revealed a great victory for the cause of freedom everywhere throughout the world. It has shown the Soviets that not only the satellite troops but even, in some instances, their own soldiers, are hardly to be trusted for the purposes of military aggression. It has shown the internal weaknesses of the Soviet Government more clearly than any other single event of the last decade. It has shown that the spirit of freedom cannot be crushed among those who have once enjoyed it, it has clearly demonstrated that even half a generation of intensive Sovietization was insufficient to win the allegiance of young people who had never known anything else. But these victories must be exploited and not accepted passively by the leaders of the free world and especially of our own Government.

I say that recent events have strengthened my conviction that Hungary will again be free along with the other Moscow-dominated peoples. But it still remains for us as leaders of the free world to do even more than we have already done to help keep this spark of freedom alive. I would not wish to see this Government or the United Nations render any form of assistance that would strengthen the control of the present Communist puppet regime in Hungary, or elsewhere. If assistance is to be forthcoming there must be no doubt in the minds of everyone that it is received by the Hungarian people themselves.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has assured the Soviet Government on many occasions that we only want to see the Eastern European countries in the hands of governments which are friendly to the Soviet Union, that we have no thought of using those countries as bases for military action against Russia. The Hungarian people themselves declared their desire for neutrality at the start of their fight for freedom. But in view of the record of Soviet treachery and brutality which ensued, can one imagine the Hungarian people having friendly feelings for the present Soviet regime for years to come? And are we therefore going to abandon the cause of freedom in Hungary merely because it is at present an anti-Soviet cause for which so much justification has been presented.

Some will say that it should be left to the United Nations. But, in his address on Saturday, President Eisenhower referred to the inability of the United Nations to be effective in the case of Hungary. He said, and I quote:

> The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved.

I certainly agree that not only can we not depend on the United Nations to protect the cause of Hungarian freedom but we must frankly admit that its efforts have been a complete failure. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members have seen the newspaper story from Budapest on the front page of today's papers, a story whose lead paragraph reads:

> Premier Janos Kadar's regime today crushed the last hope for political freedom in Hungary in announcing an old-style Communist dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even as we are speaking here, Russian tanks in Budapest are drawn up before the secret police building. The Hungarian puppet government has announced a return to a system of political control that is even tighter than the system before the revolution took place last October. The Hungarian people are worse off today than they were before the revolution started, even in spite of the fact that the United Nations has attempted to take certain action in this respect.

And yet this same puppet regime is requesting the United Nations and "Western Nations" for financial and economic assistance to strengthen its control over the Hungarian people. I think it is obvious to everyone that when Hungary finally achieves its freedom, it will either be through the unsupported efforts of the Hungarian people themselves or through positive support given by nations such as our own.

Many ardent supporters of peaceful liberation seem to believe that the Hungarians were wrong to stage a violent uprising; that they should follow the line of peaceful evolution as the Poles are now attempting to do. I will admit that such an approach might have been the more practical one. On the other hand, we certainly cannot condemn the brave Hungarians for their uprising against tyranny and fighting for freedom. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will recall these noble words: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes: and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security." The question now, Mr. Speaker, is whether this Government is prepared to support such action on the part of others.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to commend the gentleman for the outstanding statement he has brought to the attention of the Members of the House regarding the Hungarian situation. I endorse the thoughts and comments set out in his statement. May I add that the gentleman from Michigan was a very diligent and hard working member of the special committee in the 83d Congress investigating Communist aggression.

I served as a member of that committee. We held hearings in this country and abroad. Over 200 witnesses testified before that committee investigating

Communist aggression. Some of these witnesses were leaders of former free countries which are now Communist captive countries. Others were leaders of religion, professions, business, and labor. This committee assimilated an avalanche of testimony exposing the criminality, physical tortures, and tyrannical inflictions which the Soviet leaders perpetrated on the captive countries, including Hungary. When the work of that committee was completed, the gentleman from Michigan, including myself and other members of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], and others, submitted a resolution to the House asking that this testimony and our recommendations be sent to the United Nations. I firmly believe that had the Congress 2 years ago sent our findings, recommendations, and testimony to the United Nations for consideration before the General Assembly the facts and revelations would have alarmed the world. Now we find that practically a repetition of the tyrannical attrocities took place in Hungary during the last couple of months that our committee revealed took place in Hungary and other captive countries 12 to 15 years ago. In fact, the reason, the unfortunate reason, that the testimony and records and recommendations of our committee were not sent to the United Nations was that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, asked that our resolution be not acted on pending the meeting to be held at the summit in Geneva. I happened to be chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee in the previous Congress, and we had an avalanche of revealing testimony of the same atrocities committed against the Poles. This was revealed in the 82d Congress. Four years ago, as chairman of the Katyn Committee, I filed a similar resolution, asking that our findings be sent to the United Nations. Secretary of State Dulles asked that the Katyn resolution not be acted upon because of the pending negotiations on the armistice that were then taking place in Korea. I heard the President when he addressed the Congress here last Saturday. I will quote his words taken from his speech. He said:

> International communism, of course, seeks to mask its purposes of domination by expressions of good will and by superficially attractive offers of political, economic, and military aid. But any free nation, which is the subject of Soviet enticement, ought, in elementary wisdom, to look behind the mask. Remember Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The President could have added Poland and Hungary and other captive nations to those three nations. I firmly believe that had the findings of the committee investigating Communist aggression, of which the gentleman from Michigan was a member, been sent to the United Nations and had the findings and recommendations of the Katyn Committee of the 82d Congress been forwarded to the United Nations, I firmly believe that the result of laying before the United Nations and laying before the people of the world what happened at Katyn, and the revelations of the committee in the 84th Congress, would have contributed a great deal possibly toward averting what occurred in Hungary during the last few months.

Our greatest weapon against the Communists is to inform the people of the world the truth about the Communist conspiracy.

Two congressional committees have recorded sworn testimony of hundreds of witnesses who testified how the Soviet leaders succeeded in placing 800 million humans in slavery during the last 25 years.

The Geneva Conference proved to be a great mistake. The leaders of two great world democracies flew to Geneva to break bread and sit in conference with two world criminals.

Immediately the two Soviet leaders launched a propaganda trip through the Middle East to advertise their new prestige and lay the foundation for most of our present Middle East troubles.

The recommendations and comments of Mr. BENTLEY on the floor this afternoon are indeed practical and should be given serious consideration by the President and Secretary Dulles.

Mr. BENTLEY. I want to thank my friend from Indiana for his contribution. I certainly agree with him in regard to the findings of those committees. I want to say to the House that the gentleman from Indiana has distinguished himself in the last several years in Congress by taking the lead in the effort to inform the American people of the true nature of communism.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I have but 3½ minutes left and have not completed my statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the termination of the special order of the gentleman from Michigan, that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like, if I may, at this time to ask consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this subject, this to include the requests that have already been made to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for focusing our attention on this important problem. This is, as has been said, indeed a real contribution to our thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the whole free world—indeed, all people of the world who knew of the events have been stunned and shocked at recent events in Hungary. The bravery of the people of Hungary who rose up against their Communist oppressors is perhaps unequalled in modern history. That these people, subjected to Communist terror and continually ground under the heel of tyrannical masters, should have the courage to fight tanks literally with their bare hands, knowing full well the futility of their cause, is something for all who love freedom to ponder long and well.

We cannot, of course, measure at this time the full effects of the uprising in Hungary. That is something which only time and the march of history will be able to record conclusively. However, we can at this time begin to judge some of the more immediate repercussions of events in Hungary.

Certainly we have overwhelming evidence from all sides that the bloody stamping out of Hungarian resistance has met with the condemnation of all the civilized world with the exception of those satellite nations so closely bound to Russia that they dare not speak their minds.

Among Communists all over the world the horrible aftereffects of the Hungarian uprising have opened the eyes of even the strongest zealots of the Communist line to the real meaning and methods of modern communism. In the ranks of the intellectuals of France, for instance, there are marked signs of disaffection with the men and operations of the Kremlin.

The effect on the neutral powers of the world has been perhaps more significant. Even among these people, who pride themselves on staying aloof from the entanglements of clashing ideologies and have more often than not sided with the Communist line, there have been encouraging signs of awakening to the true colors of the Russian bear.

This was evident at the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Bangkok in November, which I attended, where such neutral powers as India emphatically condemned Russian tactics in Hungary. It was clear from the sentiments expressed by nation after nation at the Interparliamentary Union Conference that the Russians have been set back drastically in their efforts to gain further allies and footholds in the Far East.

But in our interest in the ways in which Communist suppression tactics in Hungary have lost them supporters all over the world, we cannot for a moment forget those courageous people who first ignited this latest spark of anti-Communist sentiment. As our hearts go out to them in this hour of darkness, we all hope and pray that the day will not be too long delayed until they join us in the sunlight of freedom.

We cannot give tangible aid to those tragic victims of tyranny who are still

behind the Iron Curtain. We who are free and secure in our freedom and strength should not, however, remain silent in the face of such brutal suppression.

Aside from the help we can give to the victims who escape, we as members of the legislative arm of the strongest of the free nations of the world, can and should express our repugnance and indignation over the recent brutalities the Communist conspiracy has wreaked in Hungary.

I am therefore introducing today a concurrent resolution designed to express our condemnation and revulsion that a member of the United Nations should resort to such tactics. Since the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian people is clearly in violation of the charter of the United Nations, this resolution calls upon the United States to continue to press for an investigation of the issues as to such violations by the United Nations, or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

It is my hope that Congress will pass this resolution unanimously, to demonstrate to the whole world that these hapless victims of Communist oppression are not forgotten, but that we are conscious of the bestial acts of the Soviet overlords which some day will bring their day of retribution.

There is immediate and effective action which can be taken by the United States to help those who have left the tragic inferno that is Hungary today. This is by means of enacting legislation to facilitate the flow of Hungarian refugees into this country.

I have been conferring with various representatives of pertinent government agencies on this subject, and it is my intention, when the administration's ideas have been developed in concise form, to introduce a bill aiding the flow of Hungarian refugees to our land.

By this decisive and affirmative action, Congress can express the sentiment of the whole Nation. By our action, the United States can once again stand before the world as Emma Lazarus depicted us in her poem on the base of the Statue of Liberty, offering a haven to "your huddled masses yearning to be free."

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from New York who made a very fine speech. I may say that I will be looking with great interest to receiving his resolution before our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has made a remarkable speech. I believe, however, that I should rise at this time to pay tribute to President Eisenhower and other officials of our Government for the remarkable job that has been done at Camp Kilmer now Camp Mercy, N. J., in receiving and caring for the Hungarian refugees. I can speak with authority because I have visited that camp three times in recent weeks. While the Soviet Government has been writing in Hungary a story of tyranny, hatred, and oppression, our country at Camp Mercy, N. J., has been writing a story of love, compassion, and mercy.

The United States Army under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Sidney C. Wooten, is caring for the refugees today. At the very outset he and his aides combed the armed facilities of the United States in order to obtain for Camp Mercy men of Hungarian extraction who could act as interpreters and who could be helpful to the newcomers.

These refugees are fed well, they are cared for well in every particular. I have spoken with many of them. Most of them are teen-agers and I can add they are young men and young women of character. We should be glad to see them coming to our country. I spoke with a young woman, 23 years of age, who was a machine gunner in the Freedom Forces. She had accounted for some seven or eight Soviet soldiers. She knew that to be true, but at the same time she had been wounded in the body with eight Soviet bullets. She is expected to recover and resume her way in our beloved America. I saw and chatted with 15-year-olds who climbed on and hacked away at Soviet tanks with hammers. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I found those people most appreciative of the reception accorded them, and they are so happy that they are on freedom's shore.

I do not think the gentleman from Michigan would want the RECORD to fail to show that our Government has gone all out in caring for these refugees.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. Personally, I want to commend the wonderful job done by the members of our own armed services in getting these people over here as expeditiously as they have. A marvelous job has been done. I do not quarrel with that at all. It is only with respect to other things that I referred to that more has not been done.

Would the gentleman permit me to read this one paragraph, and then I will have finished.

Two days ago we listened to our great President request authority that would enable him to guarantee our protection to the peoples of the Middle East. Surely, the peoples now under Communist slavery as richly and fully deserve our protection as any others. Surely, we will not say that some men will be free and others must be slaves merely because their homeland lies in a different part of the world. If we are willing to defend freedom and independence in one part of the world, we should be willing to defend it everywhere. Let us meet this challenge as leaders of free men, let us show the noble freedom fighters of Hungary that their honored dead shall not have died in vain, and let us so conduct ourselves that liberty and justice, under God, shall continue to be the inalienable right of all men in all parts of this earth.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. I want to join my colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Michigan on the very strong, forthright statement he has made about the situation in Hungary. Once again our colleague's service in the Foreign Service stands him in good stead to tell us in the House what the situation is among the people he has worked with.

I had the privilege in the last month to join with the Vice President on a tour of Austria and Hungary up to the Hungarian border. I hope to be able to express myself at greater length when we go into debate on the situation when the immigration law is brought up for discussion on the floor.

I would like to say that the gentleman has mentioned the fact that the people in Hungary have suffered grievously and are probably worse off than they were before the revolt. There is no question in my mind that international communism has suffered and is much worse off now than before the revolt came about. I hope we will not let the people of the world, and those in other countries who are resisting international communism, believe we have let the people of Hungary down.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to ask the gentleman one question. I am in full accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana about these reports. They were held up from the United Nations on account of the recommendations of the Secretary of State. Are those reports still in existence?

Mr. BENTLEY. Oh, yes. They were printed and distributed by our committee. We have many copies still available, but they were not transmitted officially to the United Nations, as I understand it.

Mr. BURDICK. Officially or otherwise, the United Nations should have them.

Mr. BENTLEY. I agree with that.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, generally, as I understand it, the President wants Congress to declare a policy which this Government will follow in regard to aggressions against countries in the Middle East.

In wording that policy, the President wants authority from Congress to enable him to send troops at the request of the United Nations, and thereby resist such aggression by force. I am entirely favorable to stopping aggression, but I fear this request is unconstitutional. Under the President's plan and the authority now asked of Congress, a real war could start any time we met aggression by force, and thus a war would be begun without any further declaration from Congress.

The Constitution provides that Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to declare war. Can Congress delegate this power to the President or anybody else? We might find ourselves engaged in a war of any size, without Congress doing any more than it will be asked to do now, when there is no war in sight.

The authority the President asks is the power to wage war if necessary. Hence, the result is that Congress is exercising its power to declare war by delegating that power to the President, and I fear this is contrary to the Constitution. As I see it, Congress cannot delegate this power.

It might be that in the event of a move to stop aggression I would be in favor of it, but if a war broke out, I would have no voice in the matter, as that power I would have already voted away in voting for the power and authority the President now asks.

Very much the same power as the President now requests is contained in the NATO agreement. There we are obligated to enter into a hot war whenever any one of the signatories to the NATO agreement or pact is attacked. Congress will have nothing to do about that, as it lost its authority by the Government's agreeing to the pact. If the Russians attacked West Germany tomorrow we would be in a hot war without any declaration from Congress. Inasmuch as I have always maintained we had no constitutional right to make such an agreement, as it takes away from Congress the power to declare war, the present request is similar. I can see no difference between the NATO pact and what the President now proposes. Under the express terms of the Constitution Congress should not surrender this power to declare war.

The President could well define his foreign policy under the power he now already has, and I am sure the country would approve it, but we should not go so far as to permit a war to be started without having Congress pass directly on the subject at the time the occasion arose. The President might feel that a war should be started, while Congress at the time might differ. I believe this President would handle the matter to the satisfaction of the American people without any further action by the Congress. But we might sometime have a President who is not so well versed on foreign affairs. We had better stay with the Constitution. It wouldn't take the President 3 hours to get a declaration of war any time the facts warranted it, as was demonstrated in the declaration of war against Germany and Japan.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Michigan for the valuable and splendid contribution he has made. He is so well informed on the subject that I would like to ask him a question which perhaps he can answer. During the past week I received a letter from one of our colleagues in the House asking that I join in a petition to the President of the United States asking that this country withdraw its recognition from the puppet government of Hungary. I am wondering whether he has any thoughts on the matter.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say that I signed the petition of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] but I made one reservation with respect to the withdrawal, that some provision has to be made with respect to Cardinal Mindszenty, who is a refugee in our Budapest Legation, before we talk about breaking off diplomatic relations.

Mr. SCHERER. May I make this observation? I am wondering if the Members of this House, in considering the withdrawal petition to the President to withdraw recognition of the puppet government of Hungary, should not go to the real cause, the heart of the problem, and hit the real culprit, namely, that a petition be directed to the President of the United States asking for the withdrawal of recognition of Soviet Russia.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say to the gentleman if such a petition is circulated, I would be among the first to sign it.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for the excellent statement he has made concerning the Hungarian revolution.

I am in accord with his views, which are based upon his intimate knowledge of the Hungarian people and also indicates a great deal of research and knowledge of foreign affairs as they relate to the Soviet Union.

The great courage and heroism of the Hungarian people in their struggle against the armed might of the Kremlin with their bare hands and at great loss of lives and property is one of the most amazing efforts of any nation in world history for freedom and liberty. The Hungarian people have not only shown the way, at great loss, to the other satellite states but have shown the world the great stamina and determination they have to liberate themselves from Russian control.

The Hungarian revolution is the greatest example of a Christian uprising against atheistic communism and should give heart and hope to all Christian nations that have been suppressed by Russia.

I am happy to associate myself with Mr. BENTLEY in his recommendation and urge that all possible help be given to the people of Hungary to encourage them in their valiant fight for freedom.

I have also signed a petition urging the President to withdraw recognition of the present puppet government in Hungary, which was also signed by many other Members of Congress. The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned Members of the Congress, irrespective of political party affiliation, but being entirely cognizant of the savage and reprehensible conduct of the Soviet Union in its current massacre of innocent, helpless, and freedom-seeking peoples of the nation of Hungary, do hereby petition the President of the United States to act as follows:

1. We strongly urge you, Mr. President, to completely withdraw recognition, in the name of the people of the United States of America, of the puppet government of Hungary that is now headed by Janos Kadar and imposed upon the people of Hungary by the Soviet Union. Moreover, we urge you to refuse recognition of any Soviet-imposed puppet government of Hungary that might succeed the Kadar government.

2. We suggest, Mr. President, in view of the continued warfare in Hungary, that you explore through appropriate channels, the feasibility of intervention in Hungary by a police force comprised of representatives of various members of the United Nations.

GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
15th District of California.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the great and powerful United States will render every assistance to the valiant patriots of Hungary who since the days of their great leader and advocate of freedom and liberty, Kossuth, have kept alive the spark of democracy in Europe which flowed into bloody revolution against the arrogant and heartless Russian occupation of their native land.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], for securing this time to discuss the gallantry of the Hungarian fight for freedom.

It is shocking to find the administration so unprepared and without plans to assist people of a nation in obtaining their God-given rights.

We on the Foreign Affairs Committee are now holding hearings on a resolution "to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence."

Is this consistent with the lack of action in Eastern Europe? I agree with Mr. BENTLEY's statement in reference to our fight for Independence—that "it is truly fortunate that the help we received at that time from France and other countries was not confined to relief packages and resolutions condemning George III."

I insert at this point an article from America magazine of November 17:

HUNGARY: STORY OF HEROISM AND PERFIDY

We have no words to describe the courage and agony of the Hungarian people. We have no words to describe the bestial cruelty of their Soviet oppressors. So long as the light of freedom burns anywhere, the gallant rising of the Hungarians against the soul-destroying rule of communism will thrill human hearts. So long as the light of freedom burns, the brutal perfidy of Soviet Russia will be remembered with unspeakable loathing and disgust. To such depths of barbarism can man made in God's own image fall. To such heights of heroism can he soar.

Though we lack the words, the story of the Hungarian tragedy must nevertheless be told. In stark outline, this is what history will record.

On the night of October 29, with the 7-day-old rebellion against Communist domination still unappeased, the desperate Titoist Premier, Imre Nagy, announced that he was demanding forthwith the withdrawal of Russian troops from Budapest. The next afternoon Soviet tanks began moving out of the battered city. In Moscow Marshal Georgi Zhukov told a press conference that Russia was prepared to discuss a revision of the Warsaw pact. An official Soviet Gov-

ernment statement quickly confirmed this. It said:

"The Soviet Union is ready to examine with the other Socialist states which are participants in the Warsaw treaty the question of the Soviet troops stationed in the • • • Hungarian and Rumanian Republics [and] in the Polish Republic."

To this statement the embattled Hungarians reacted with unrestrained joy. In Washington President Eisenhower expressed the cautions hope that if the Soviet Union meant what it said, the world might witness "the greatest forward stride toward justice, trust, and understanding among nations in our generation."

That was the high tide of the Hungarian revolt. The Nagy government had by this time been broadened to include non-Communist parties. Cardinal Mindszenty, symbol of Hungarian independence, was safely back in Budapest. Town after town was in the hands of the rebels. Free elections were on the way.

Then on Thursday morning, October 31, the Soviet tanks headed back for Budapest. Premier Nagy immediately protested to the Soviet Ambassador. He did more: he repudiated the Warsaw pact, announced Hungarian neutrality and appealed to the United Nations. He wrote to the U. N. Secretary General:

"I request Your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the General Assembly the question of Hungary's neutrality and defense of this neutrality by the four great powers."

Friday a heavily reinforced Red Army was fanning out in all directions. It seized airfields, occupied all important rail junctions, blocked the main highways. When Nagy again protested to the Soviet Ambassador, he was solemnly assured that "no additional Soviet military formation had been introduced into Hungary." The Ambassador blandly explained that the planes and tanks at the Budapest airport were there solely to remove Russian civilians and wounded soldiers.

In New York, where the Security Council was considering the Hungarian appeal, Arkady A. Sobolev, the Soviet representative, dutifully discharged his ignoble role in the elaborate deception. He affirmed that reports of Soviet tanks moving back into Hungary were "utterly unfounded."

For a few more hours the perfidious Russian Communists carried on their drama of deceit. In Budapest the Soviet Ambassador talked soothingly to Nagy about a regroupment of troops. At a secret rendezvous a joint Russian-Hungarian military committee ostensibly worked on plans for the orderly withdrawal of Soviet troops. Saturday afternoon a member of the new Hungarian Cabinet, fooled by this elaborate Soviet duplicity, told reporters that the situation looked hopeful.

Then at dawn on Sunday the Russians struck. They struck with 8 divisions—7 of them armored—and fleets of bombers. In a broadcast from Budapest Premier Nagy announced that Soviet troops had attacked "with the clear intention to overthrow the lawful, democratic Government of the Hungarian people." Within a few hours most of the Nagy Cabinet were prisoners. Cardinal Mindszenty was reported safe in the United States legation. One by one the Hungarian radio stations went silent. In Vienna, toward the middle of the afternoon, listeners heard this heartbreaking message:

"Civilized people of the world: on the watchtower of 1,000-year-old Hungary the last flames begin to go out. The Soviet Army is attempting to crush our troubled hearts. Their tanks and guns are roaring over Hungarian soil.

"People of Europe, civilized people of the world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help • • • Listen to our cry. Start moving. Extend to us brotherly hands."

Under the circumstances no brotherly hand could be extended. To have answered the Hungarian appeal with armed legions of free men would have precipitated world war III. President Eisenhower appealed to Moscow to withdraw its troops. The U. N. General Assembly condemned the Soviet Union. The Holy Father warned the Communists that "the just freedom of peoples can never be drowned in blood."

None of these appeals was, of course, effective. With a sickening crash the Iron Curtain dropped again along the Austro-Hungarian frontier. Save for a single clandestine radio station, which reported still unconquered pockets of resistance, the only voice that sounded from the Hungarian watchtower was the alien voice of the conqueror. It announced the formation of a new Government of "peasants and workers" headed by the Titoist Janos Kadar. Fittingly, the free world learned of the new program from Radio Moscow.

And in another editorial of the same magazine, America, of November 10, article enttiled "Hungary: Graveyard of Red Myths," was stated:

We know now—

That communism, in Hungary and elsewhere, survives only with the help of a foreign army;

That the Soviet army's role is to protect the regime from its own people;

That the youth and the intelligentsia are today the most dangerous anti-Red forces;

That the years of absolute control over the economic life of a Communist country have produced such misery and discontent that a small spark is sufficient to touch off a gigantic conflagration all over the country;

That the armies of the satellite regimes are absolutely unreliable, not only for the U. S. S. R. but for their own governments as well;

That in a free election communism would be swept away.

Since we are speaking of Red-sponsored myths that have crumbled in the ruins of Budapest and a dozen other centers in Hungary, we may allude to some of our own clichés that need revision. These include the idea that revolution is impossible in a Red-run country and that liberation can come only from the outside. We have underestimated the desire for freedom among the youth in Communist lands. We have apparently underrated the power of the church and the family and of decency in general, at the same time that we were overimpressed by the staying power of oppression based on fear and terror.

Honesty should also compel us to admit that the Hungarian people did what they did on their own, without any help, or hope of help, from the United States or the United Nations. We have been too prone to give up on a people who, like the Hungarians, for a thousand years have kept guard on the frontiers of the civilization we call Christian. From Stettin to Trieste the Iron Curtain is shaken. The heroic peoples of Eastern Europe, too long separated from the community to which they belong, are forcing up that barrier by the strength of their own moral courage.

It is significant that the leader of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to whom the United States and the West have given so much military and economic aid, showed his true colors by publicly assessing the suppression of the Hungarian revolt by the U. S. S. R. as completely justified.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I was on the floor today to listen to the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], which I consider to be a courageous one, a timely one, and a marked contribution to the affirmative deliberations of this body. I have discussed this subject in the past before the Congress met. We now have at least 10 weeks gone by with only expressions of sympathy for the people of Hungary. While sympathy is all right when one is dead and you express it to the bereaved relatives, it does not lend much hope to the living who are fighting and dying for liberty. As I followed the newspaper reports in connection with Hungary, my mind went back in history to those days which constituted the inception of our own Government, and to me the saying of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," became something living, and in Hungary with its thousands, yes, millions of people, a little nation of about 9 million, whether they realized it or not in their conscious minds, were imbued with that desire under law and under God, and that is nothing more or less, when they are willing to give their lives, than to "give me liberty or give me death." Like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and my other colleagues and countless millions of others, I have been concerned and I have asked myself the question "What can we do? What can my Government do?" On November 25 in Boston I made a speech and I reduced it to writing. I shall later incorporate it in the RECORD. I very seldom reduce my remarks to writing; I usually speak from notes, but on this occasion I reduced my entire remarks to writing in which I discussed the Middle East situation and also the Hungarian situation. At that time I suggested one of two alternatives for the United Nations to take. This was after the resolution had been adopted by the United Nations: First, send observers over to the border of Hungary. That is a concrete act, an overt act. Or better still, second, have the observers fly into Budapest in a United Nations marked plane. It would take a little courage, but this is a time when courage is necessary. When they arrived there, they would either have to let them stay there, which would be a victory, or they would have to expel them, which would also be a victory in connection, at least, with worldwide public opinion.

I might say that a few weeks prior to that there was a conference at the White House at which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and others were present. I asked the question, "Are we going to recognize the Kadar government in Hungary that the gang in the Soviet Union have put in there, it being a nonlegitimate government?" As far back as that, 8 weeks ago, I raised that question. That was also incorporated in the speech that I made in Boston on November 25.

In consequence of some questions that I asked on that occasion, one of the high career officials of the State Department called me up that afternoon, saying he wanted to see me. I was always glad to see him, of course, but on this occasion particularly to get some information I had asked of Under Secretary Hoover about the status of Cardinal Mindszenty.

He came up to see me. We discussed the question. I talked about the observers; why not send them to the border. I did not have in mind at that time the other suggestion of flying them in on a marked United Nations plane. I did not think the Communists would dare to shoot that plane down. At that time they were not letting the Red Cross in with medicines and food. I made the suggestion about the observers going to the border and also I said, "Why do not the Red Cross trucks move up to the border of Hungary and say, 'We want to go in to bring relief to these unfortunate people,' and then have them refuse the Red Cross?"

World-wide public opinion would be aroused and while we are dealing here with a Communist dictatorship, some recognition sometimes must be given even by the Kremlin to world public opinion.

Within 24 hours that was done. I do not know whether my suggestion contributed to it or not. I do not want to claim credit for it. But within 24 hours the trucks went up and, Mr. Speaker, you will remember they said, "No, we will not let you in. You have to be screened and go into Hungary by way of Yugoslavia." The Red Cross refused to do that, and properly so. But within 24 hours after that refusal, they recanted and permitted the trucks to go in. How much of what they brought in has gotten to the populace I do not know. How much my suggestion to this high career official contributed to that, I do not know. But I made the suggestion to him less than 24 hours before.

The reason the Communists are in there, the reason the Soviet Communist forces are in there, is because the point which the uprising had reached was a point where the people were rising up against any form of Communist government. That is why they went in. And that is why they have not gone into other places. I do not think they are satisfied with the situation in Poland, but they feel they can give a little, consolidate their position, consolidate their position within the Soviet Union and then they can move in and tighten up once more. The situation is the same as when Khrushchev visited Hungary only a few days ago and Kadar came out with this statement yesterday, that appeared in today's papers and to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] so properly and aptly referred.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that we cannot have two courses so far as action is concerned by the United Nations in operation at the same time, one where the U. N. can move against democracies when they are declared to be aggressors and the other where the U. N. cannot move against Communist nations when they are declared to be aggressors.

As far as the sending of the United Nations forces into Suez is concerned, I am one of those who regret that England and France did not take all of the Suez Canal and then start negotiating from there. I have no hesitancy in stating that. It was not a question of colonialism, and I introduced the anti-colonialism resolution in the last Congress and it went through under my leadership. It was a question of the violation of an international agreement, the usurpation of power, a question of the future use of a canal which means so much to countless nations throughout the world. Colonialism was not involved. It was a question of use of the canal involving the very life blood of nations and their very existence.

I approved of the U. N. police force going in there. If we can only send it into the Suez and other areas where democratic nations or non-Communist nations are declared to be the aggressors, and the U. N. cannot send a force into the areas of the world where the Communist nations are in control and declared to be the aggressors, then that would have serious implications as to the future existence of the United Nations itself.

One thing is certain, that the United Nations resolutions in relation to Hungary have been completely disregarded.

There are many things we can do. This is a fight of the spirit that is going on in Hungary, within Hungary today. It may be Poland tomorrow, or Lithuania or Czechoslovakia another day, or some other satellite country. This is the fight of men and women who want to be free under their own law. It is the eternal fight for liberty. This is a fight against the worst force and power that the known history of man records. In the past there were trying periods, but usually the aggressor was seeking additional territory, and lust and loot followed in the wake. This is for that, but it is also for the conquest of the mind and the spirit.

The desire for liberty was not man-made and the desire for liberty cannot be man-destroyed. It can be man-suppressed for a period. That is what important parts of the world are undergoing. The people of Hungary have expressed their God-given right, their desire for liberty. But man can never destroy what God created; what man did not create. Man can preserve and strengthen the exercise of liberty or man can suppress it, but man can never destroy it. That is what the battle is that is going on over there, whether in their conscious minds those poor, humble human beings like you and I realize it or not. This eternal fight is going to go on.

There are involved other countries, because the people of other countries who hate the Communist dictator and overlord are looking to America. They are hoping and praying for liberty, for an early day of deliverance. They pray to God and their hopes are toward America. They are evaluating everything we do or that we do not do. There are many things that we can do—there are economic sanctions—volunteers if necessary, the other side uses them—that is one of the convenient way for them to carry out their designs. Whether or not the point has arrived yet, I am not going to say, but certainly there are many things that we can do. We could publicly say that we will not recognize the Kadar regime. That would be a stimulating action. United Nations observers could at least go to the border. It might be well for this body through one of its committees to appoint a subcommittee to go over there to Austria, officially. That, at least, would have a contributing effect because it would percolate through and get to the people of Hungary and Poland and Czechoslavakia and other countries because one of the great weaknesses of communism is the desire of countless of millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain to some day again be freemen and freewomen under their own laws.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that we should do something. You said you would favor withdrawing recognition of the puppet Government of Hungary. Do you not think the most effective thing we could do is to withdraw recognition of the real culprit, the Soviet Union?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, absolutely. As a matter of fact, in 1938 or thereabouts, an appropriation bill was before us for consideration. I offered an amendment to the effect that no part of the funds appropriated for the Department of State could be used to maintain an embassy in the Soviet Union. On a teller vote, it was defeated by about 20 votes, as I remember.

Mr. SCHERER. Would that not be the most effective thing we could do insofar as the rest of the world is concerned?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Soviet Union does not obey or comply with the resolutions passed by the United Nations, then not only that, but the question of the refusal to recognize within the United Nations certain countries properly arises and might also be acted upon. We are not going to win this battle by inaction. We are not going to win this battle by fear. We are not going to win this battle by drifting. To the Communists and to the dictatorships, that is a sign of weakness. It encourages them to go further. To them that is appeasement, and the policy of appeasement, we know from Chamberlain's experience, is the road to war. In addition to what has been said, there is one other subject that I want to discuss. I regret very much, I might add, that this statement has been made. I have here a letter dated December 4 from Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State. Like other colleagues, I might say, a few days prior to November 19, when I wrote the Secretary of State, I received a telegram from the Emergency Committee for Arms to Hungary. I sent it to the Secretary of State. On December 4, I received a reply from Robert C. Hill in which he acknowledged the receipt of my letter and of the enclosed telegram. In his letter, he said among other things:

As President Eisenhower remarked in his news conference on November 14, "The

United States doesn't now, and never has, advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

In order that the RECORD might be complete, I include at this point the entire letter.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 4, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I have received your letter of November 19 transmitting a telegram from the Emergency Committee for Arms to Hungary in which that committee recommends that the United States send arms to the Hungarian people.

It has been the position of the United States Government that the Hungarian situation can best be dealt with through the United Nations. It is our hope that through the joint efforts of freedom loving nations working within and through that organization a solution will be found which will assure that the Hungarian people achieve their aims of greater liberty, national independence and the withdrawal of foreign troops. The provision of arms by the United States, if such were indeed feasible, to the Hungarian insurgents who are faced with the overwhelming might of the Soviet army would not, it is felt, contribute to such a solution. As President Eisenhower remarked in his news conference on November 14, "The United States doesn't now, and never has, advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

I am returning the telegram of the Emergency Committee herewith. Thank you for bringing its views to the Department's attention.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

When I read that, my mind went back to the Declaration of Independence and I said—that is the policy—it is all right for one to think it as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] well said—my thoughts may be this way, but it is another thing to state a policy. That is the policy of our Government. My mind goes back to the Declaration of Independence. It is well to read and reread these famous documents that are the fundamental law of our land so that once in a while our memory may be refreshed. What does the Declaration of Independence say? In part, it says:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evidence a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. In 1775 and 1776, had the head of France said that to the colonies and those in the Continental Army who were fighting for independence, that would be practically saying to them, "Quit. Do not fight. Ask the King of England if he will send over some Duke of England to be King over here while subject to the domination of England, and go through an evolutionary stage."

I wonder if we would have a United States of America today.

Those words are understood abroad. They are understood here. I say it, and I say it with regret, that those words ignore the very history of our country and they constitute an abandonment of one of the most important grounds upon which those who signed the Declaration of Independence based the cause of the colonists.

Are not conditions oppressive over there? Is there anyone who denies it? Are they not living under inhuman conditions? Is not martyrdom being undergone by those people? Is there not just cause for them to rebel? Have they not exhausted all their means? Is there not just cause? That is the very origin of our Government, yet that statement says to Hungary and the people of other subjugated countries: "Do not do it, no matter how oppressive conditions are."

I hope that policy will be changed.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. It occurred to me that the best witnesses the distinguished majority leader could have to answer that question would be if we could breathe life into the two pictures that stand facing the gentleman on this wall. He has two most eloquent witnesses to give the answer "Yes" to his questions.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. This is what is contained in this letter. That language speaks for itself. We are all Americans and we know the history of our country, and if there ever was just cause for a people under hopeless conditions to rebel, it exists in the people of Hungary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would it not be fair to characterize that sentence to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred, as not saying, "Do not do it," but rather as saying, "It is not the policy of our Government as a government to actively encourage an uprising in a foreign country where only hopeless bloodshed can ensue"?

It is not necessary for the Government as such to be on record as encouraging an uprising in a foreign country under such circumstances.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I do not agree with that latter statement; I certainly disavow that. If we were a dictatorship that is one thing; but the United States is not, and the gentleman's last statement I thoroughly disavow. This is stating to the world what our policy is.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it is the gentleman's position that our Government should actively as a government encourage an uprising in these states?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; I did not say that. I said our Government should not actively discourage; that is what I said. That is the meaning of my statement.

Mr. KEATING. I agree that we should not actively discourage rebellion. Will the gentleman read that again?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

"The United States does not now and never has"—I cannot agree with that, but all right—"The United States of America does not now and never has advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

Many people did not think the Thirteen Colonies could prevail.

Mr. KEATING. That statement of our policy simply says we do not advocate—I repeat, advocate—open rebellion where there is no possible chance of success, but it is not saying that our Government has discouraged or will discourage active rebellion.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Suppose the gentleman lived in Poland and he hated the Communists; or, better still, suppose the gentleman were one of those Hungarians who are involved now; reading that, what would you think? What would you think?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman and I are in no difference as to our desires or objectives. What I am trying to do is to clarify the record as to the position of the Government. The way I interpret the sentence which the gentleman from Massachusetts has read as to our Government's policy and the statement of the President, is that it has not been the policy of our Government actively to encourage open rebellion in another country where it can only result in fruitless slaughter; but he does not say that we are discouraging active rebellion in any foreign country.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That language is a complete discouragement of it. Furthermore, another statement has been made that we should let these countries go through an evolutionary stage. First, they should go through the state of national communism before striving to get real liberty and emancipation from any communistic control. That is another statement that has been made. The plain letter and spirit of that statement to the people of the subjugated nations is that so far as the United States is concerned the message is: "No matter how justified you are in uprising, we frown upon it and we would not countenance it in any way." That is the clear import of that language.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman and I are in disagreement on the correct interpretation of this statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEATING. The President and the administration have been repeatedly criticized by orators of the gentleman's party over the fact that they were too active in starting things in these foreign countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who was too active?

Mr. KEATING. This Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not me.

Mr. KEATING. I think probably that is true. I do not think my remarks are directed to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who else? Who else?

Mr. KEATING. Repeatedly on this floor and elsewhere we have heard objections to the so-called liberation policy of the Government insofar as it differed from the so-called containment policy of the preceding administration. There have been repeated instances of criticism of the Secretary of State because he was alleged to be leading us up to the brink of war by statements that were made to encourage rebellious activities in these satellite governments. The gentleman knows that that has been repeatedly said. I am happy that the gentleman from Massachusetts is directing his criticism along the opposite line.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, wait a minute; the gentleman is not going to put in the RECORD something that is not in my mind. I did not rise in a critical mood.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that. The gentleman has made an important contribution to the debate on this crucial subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. I rose to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and to state some views of my own, and to call attention to this sentence which is in a letter to me. The letter will be in the RECORD tomorrow. I also wanted to express my regret over this policy and to hope that it will be changed quickly to coincide with the policy of the United States not only since its inception but also since its origin as expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman prefers the policy which would actively encourage revolution in these satellite governments?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly we should never do anything to discourage.

Mr. KEATING. That is right. With that I emphatically agree.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the other hand, encourage, yes. The expression, the operation of encouragement might be a different question under certain circumstances. I would not criticize our Government if it did not expressly state a policy of encouragement, but I do not think that anything should be stated that constitutes a policy of discouragement.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which would be an abandonment of the very origin of our own country.

Mr. KEATING. May I point out that a policy of active encouragement is a delicate matter, as the gentleman from Massachusetts realizes. The implications of such a policy are very far-reaching. I know of no instance in our history where we have pursued or, at least, announced a policy of active encouragement of rebellion in another country. On the other hand, certainly we should do nothing which would discourage such action by brave patriots; in fact, our hearts go out in unbounded praise and admiration for a group of people who have the matchless courage to do what the Hungarian people did.

Mr. McCORMACK. We see what has happened in Hungary. Suppose you and I lived in Poland; we despise and hate the Communist form of government; we are looking for the day of deliverance; we want to be a part of the uprising, whether wise or not at a particular time. Our inherent rights are involved when conditions become so oppressive that we can no longer endure them. We see what happened in Hungary. Then we see this statement. We see nothing but sympathy being extended. It would not be difficult for JOHN McCORMACK, if I were in Poland, to say: "What is the use?" seeing what happened in Hungary. I might defer, I might become disillusioned, I might become depressed. We are all human beings. The law of self-preservation might become more prominent in my mind and guide my actions.

A statement of this kind is most unfortunate, I submit, and I hope that it will be rectified quickly to be consistent with the origin and the history of our country.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of joining my colleagues who have extended their compliments on the free analysis and presentation of this very difficult problem on Hungary as presented by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan today. I direct the Chair's attention to the remarks made by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] when he referred to the reports of the Katyn Committee and the Committee Against Communist Oppression. I join in presenting those remarks to the House.

I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, that I seldom have heard a more carefully prepared or studied analysis of a difficult problem than was presented by our friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.

Mr. McDONOUGH.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mrs. PFOST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts for 5 minutes today.

Mr. POWELL for 1 hour on Thursday, January 10.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

251. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

252. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of local participation on flood control and navigation projects of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2125. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Govern-

ment, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 2126. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2127. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2128. A bill to establish a pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2129. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2130. A bill to establish a program of economic relief for distressed areas through a system of loans and grants in aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H. R. 2131. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2132. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2133. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2134. A bill to insure that the scheduled reductions in the manufacturers excise tax on automobiles and other vehicles, and on parts and accessories therefor, will take effect on April 1, 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 2135. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2136. A bill to amend section 124 (c) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer Shelby County from the Beaumont to the Tyler division of the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2137. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2138. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2140. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2141. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2142. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to declare the primacy of free enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2143. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2144. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, to establish standards for the organization and operation of Government Advisory Groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2145. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2147. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 2148. A bill to provide that certain payments shall be made to the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station under the conditions which obtained before the enactment of Public Law 352, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 2149. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2150. A bill to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 2151. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2152. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2153. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the civil-rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2154. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2155. A bill to amend section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to increase the classes of persons entitled to receive payment of certain claims under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2157. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2158. A bill to create a Joint Committee on Extraterrestrial Exploration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2159. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 2160. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2161. A bill to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount which corporations may deduct for tax purposes for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2162. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 2163. A bill to provide for the establishment of a purchase program for domestic manganese ore for the southern Appalachian area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2165. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuities for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder to equal 50 percent of taxable wages of the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2166. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2167. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2168. A bill to prohibit the disposal of certain surplus real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2169. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2170. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consummate desirable land exchanges; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2171. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the exception of Federal taxes from a discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2172. A bill to adjust the limitations imposed on veterans outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2173. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2174. A bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit retired officers and enlisted men to use available hospital facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2175. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2176. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2177. A bill to modify certain bars to payment of pension under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2178. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2179. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2180. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2181. A bill to amend Public Law 881, 84th Congress, to grant dependency and indemnity compensation to widows of deceased veterans who at the time of death are disabled 50 percent or more and whose disabilities are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2182. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to extend the loan benefits thereunder to all unremarried widows of eligible veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2183. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2184. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2185. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the deletion, from the records of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of any entries showing wages paid for service as an employee of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2186. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2187. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum amount of certain loans which can be insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2189. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on account of the real property constituting Sunflower Village, Johnson County, Kans.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2190. A bill to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2191. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the term "child" shall include a child of a veteran who is a member of the veteran's household and who becomes permanently incapable of self-support; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2192. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces without regard to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2193. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2194. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2195. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2196. A bill to provide medical and hospital treatment for certain non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2197. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2198. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2199. A bill to provide for the improvement of Fresh Water Bayou, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2200. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2201. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2202. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2203. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2204. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2205. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHMORE (by request):

H. R. 2206. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued thereunder shall be convertible and participating; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2208. A bill to amend section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to alter the period for applying for insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2209. A bill to modify the basis for award of gratuitous national service life insurance to a dependent parent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2210. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2211. A bill to require Federal officers, agencies, and employees to act in accordance with and submit to the laws of the several States relative to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water and providing that the United States shall sue and be sued in the courts of such State in litigation arising therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2212. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2213. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 2214. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2216. A bill authorizing the preparation of detailed plans for the Littleville Reservoir on the middle branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2217. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where such individual, before his death, had filed an appropriate petition for the adoption of such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the wife or widow of an insured individual shall be deemed to have been living with him, at the time required for entitlement to benefits, if at any such time they were separated without fault on her part; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for interest and taxes paid by the taxpayer for his spouse or for a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2220. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2221. A bill to extend the time for making application for compensation for unused leave accumulated on September 1, 1946, by members or former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2222. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a

spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2223. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2224. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2225. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translater facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2226. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2227. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of producers of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2228. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2229. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for utilization of commercial marine terminal facilities by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2230. A bill to implement the 10-year "Mission 66" plan that has been undertaken for the public benefit concerning the rehabilitation, improvement and preservation of the national park system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2231. A bill authorizing the modification of the general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Missouri River Basin to include certain flood-control works in the Gering Valley, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2232. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2233. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a new method for determining monthly compensation in computing annuities, and to eliminate all restrictions upon the right of a spouse to receive benefits simultaneously under that act and the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2234. A bill to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so that certain awards of the Mixed Claims Commission having a residual balance of $15,000 or less will be paid in full immediately and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2236. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 20 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2237. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn. to Johnson City National Farm Loan Association and the East Tennessee Production Credit Association, local units of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2238. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 2239. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2240. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill to amend the Federal property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that surplus real property of the United States shall be disposed of only after giving former owners thereof an opportunity to repurchase such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2242. A bill to authorize the establishment, maintenance, and operation of auxiliary communication networks composed of licensed amateur radio operators for military radio communications; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2243. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for disability incurred in combat or outside the continental limits of the United States during a war, campaign, expedition, or conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2244. A bill to amend chapter 209, 58 Statutes at Large, which was enacted as Public Law 314, 78th Congress, approved May 27, 1944 to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2245. A bill to provide for the modification of the Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2246. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the White River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development, for the control of floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2247. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2248. A bill to amend subparagraph (A) of subparagraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2249. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to exempt certain retired officers of the Armed Forces from the operation of section 216 thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2250. A bill to exempt churches from the excise tax on bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution condemning recent Communist tactics in Hungary and calling for investigation by United Nations of violations of its Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 84. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 85. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries, relating to the operation of the monetary and credit structure of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 87. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 88. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2251. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2252. A bill for the relief of Stephanos J. Cotsoradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 2253. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Carmela Lanza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Raymond H. Hsieh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Rita Keskula Vigla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2259. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain real property in Prairie County, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Anita F. Crowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Gertrud (Scholz) Bayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Donald F. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Emilio Aluen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER or California:

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Banueclos-Haro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Billy Shao-Ru Hwang (Wong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Doring Hampac Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Ygnacia Osequera T. De Montes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Galvez Buenrostro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Ema Goncalves Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Edgardo Villanueva Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Gumaro Rubalcava-Quezada (also known as Gumero Rubalcava-Quezada and Gelasio Juaregi-Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Guadalupe Aguilar-Buenrostro de Montano (also known as Victoria Rosas de Montano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alejandres-Diaz (also known as Antonio Alejandres-Valencia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wha Dee Loo, his wife Margaret Chan Loo, and their three minor children Mary, Josephine, and John Loo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Kim Sheung Fong and Kim Shing Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Ivo Paiva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Cornelia Minus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Ralph (Raffaele) Gargiulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of John H. Orth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Tom Pritchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Irma Flora Bissessar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Charles Whaley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elizabeth Branch (Yumi Ishiki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Philip I. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Abdul Ali Munshi (also known as Abdul Mojid Munshi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2293. A bill for the relief of Valeriano Melchiori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Jude Anthony Branch (Koji Aoyagi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Gordon Seymour Peter Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Horace Wilberforce King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Ding Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2298. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emmeline Carter Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Alberto Teodoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Andor Muller and Rosa Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Ebanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Phyllis L. Ware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Dudley Cheesman (also known as Dudley T. Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Julian Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Max Karl Roder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2306. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive Zaudie Makuria, a citizen and subject of Ethopia, for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Natan Zepelovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Prudence Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Ryon Gzoon Chough and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Atara Couse Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Joyce Delores Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Pietro Pipitone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Leon Popiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2314. A bill for the relief of George McPherson Gray (Reginald Pugh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Zalman Blumenfeld (Sol Blum); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of James Neville Beaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Harris, Mrs. Lydia E. Harris, and Olney Elva Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Rolando Aravena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Nanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Gallofin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Rista Milosevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2322. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Strazzullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Arthur Frank Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Americo Discepolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Anthony Valamvanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Amin Rahmin Roubin, Mrs. Esther Mordkhay Roubin, and Abdul Rahmin Roubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Herbert Arnold Sparks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2328. A bill for the relief of Walter Adolphus Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2329. A bill for the relief of Clayton Holmes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2330. A bill for the relief of Patrick Joseph Blewett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Cecil Edgar Deonarine, Mrs. Gloria Deonarine (nee Ramjattansingh), and Jessel J. Deonarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Hiromi Kashiwagi Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Tomas Lieno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Lazay Manendez and Josefina Vallin y Lambillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Moosa Ebrahimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2338. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal property damage sustained by the Security Feed & Seed Co. of Johnson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soledad Tejera Suarez Herreros and her son, Rafael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Simon Brill and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jytte Starel Synodis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katarzyna Sachnowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Margaret Shand (Chansior); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Alice Selim Nikhla Fakhouri (also known as Denise Fakhouri); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Constantinos F. Agoris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Manolis N. Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Campoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of the estate of Leatha Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of A. W. Mussallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Tzapik Bagdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

29. Mr. MUMMA presented a resolution adopted by the 87th annual meeting of the house of delegates of the Pennsylvania State Dental Society, Harrisburg, Pa., in support of legislation amending present tax laws to permit dentists to set aside voluntarily certain amounts for retirement programs that would not be taxable during the years in which earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Radio Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, on December 14, 1956, Entitled "The Bill of Rights and Hungary's Fight for Freedom," Sponsored by the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND HUNGARY'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

One hundred and sixty-five years ago tomorrow, Virginia ratified the first 10 amendments to our Constitution now known as the Bill of Rights. Virginia's ratification wrote the Bill of Rights into the basic law of our land. The far-sighted vision of James Madison and a few other Founding Fathers laid down the granite foundation stone not only of our basic freedoms but of our whole American concept of the rights of man about which Europeans dreamed.

And before I turn to pressing problems of today let me observe that there is a forgotten amendment which even the Supreme Court of the United States seems to have shoved into the deep freezer. I refer to the 10th or last amendment. Let me read it to you:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Let every American remember that—"are reserved to the States or to the people."

From paying my humble tribute to the great founders of our Nation it seems appropriate tonight to speak out in behalf of the valiant Hungarian Freedom Fighters. Perhaps only a few Hungarians knew anything about our Bill of Rights. But they did understand just how precious is human freedom—and they gladly gave their lives, 50,000 or more, in a desperate and well-nigh hopeless attempt to obtain even a little freedom for themselves and their children.

Seven weeks ago the entire free world was thrilled and astonished by the news from Hungary. The impossible and the unbelievable had been achieved. The Iron Curtain had been smashed wide open by fighting Hungarian students, workers, and unorganized white collar workers. Armed with little more than magnificent courage and bare hands these heroic Hungarian Freedom Fighters had scattered their brutal secret police like dust before a gale. Hungarians had risen almost as a man against the full might of their Communist oppressors. The Red-dominated Hungarian army simply melted away or defected wholesale to the side of liberty.

By November 3 it was clear that the Hungarian patriots were in firm control of most of the country. The toppling to the ground of a huge statue of Stalin in Budapest was symbolic of the imminent collapse or overthrow of the whole Soviet system of terror and slavery.

Then came the night of November 3-4. By noon of Sunday, the 4th, the world once more had to swallow the bitter lesson of Communist perfidy and treachery. The bitter truth that so many of our wishful-thinking Pollyanna seem unable to learn is that you cannot do business with or ever trust Communists. You all know the rest of the sickening story. Masses of savage Asiatic troops poured across the frontier to overwhelm the poorly armed and exhausted freedom fighters. The Soviets brought in 5,000 tanks which systematically wiped out small units of brave men and boys—yes, and some women, too—armed only with rifles, hand grenades, and homemade Molotov cocktails. Soviet commanders kept their infantry safely out of action. Entire buildings and blocks of dwellings were blasted to rubble by Soviet tanks if they appeared to house a few snipers.

The death toll has been estimated as over 50,000. The full, unlimited horror of Communist terror was unleashed by the supercriminals in the Kremlin. Long trains of sealed cattle cars, packed with the youth of Hungary, began their awful journeys to the slow-death camps of Siberia.

I have just returned from 5 days in Vienna. I went to Austria to do what I could to expedite entry into the United States of as many Hungarian patriots as possible. As you know, Hungarians have been fleeing from the Soviet slaughterhouse at the rate of 5,000 or 6,000 a day. Over 90,000 in Austria are now straining the resources of that small and impoverished country.

With typical Communist disregard for the truth, my visit to Austria was described by a Russian representative in the United Nations as "an indication of how definite United States circles are interested in lending special political tinge to the refugee question." Humanitarian motives are unknown to these beasts of the Kremlin.

The attitude of the refugee Hungarians surprised me. Many of them had no desire to emigrate to this country or anywhere else overseas. They want to stay as close as possible to the borders of their own country. They hope to go back in a matter of a few months when their country is freed of Soviet troops and Communist terror. I must admit that I was deeply impressed by their demeanor and fervor of their patriotism. They love their country and have no desire to leave it forever.

The Hungarian refugees with whom I talked were fearless, dignified, and proud. Unlike other refugees who often are completely demoralized and beaten down, these Hungarians held their heads high. Exhausted after days of bitter hand-to-hand fighting

and inwardly heartsick over the titanic tragedy that had overwhelmed their beloved country, they nevertheless stood proud and erect, as they have every right to do. They had done something that no other western people had ever attempted or accomplished—they had destroyed the myth of Soviet invincibility. Schoolboys, workers, and hastily armed intellectuals had made Soviet troops run like rabbits.

They had demonstrated once more to an unbelieving and propaganda saturated world that it is still possible for free men to rise with primitive weapons against heavily armed helots with no heart in the fight. The Hungarians of 1956 had brought Patrick Henry's immortal words back to life in flaming letters of fire. A blasé and intimidated world was shown once more that death holds no terror for men determined to be free.

Some of these Freedom Fighters addressed some rather searching and embarrassing questions to me. They all thanked me and the American people for our generous relief supplies and offers of asylum in the United States. But they quickly added that while they were all grateful for the kindness shown to them what of those left behind in Hungary? Their own future was of little consequence—just what, they wanted to know, was the free world and particularly America going to do to help those still under the iron heel of the Soviets? I must admit that I had no ready answer. Besides it is a question that all of us must answer.

Don't offer these heroic people empty platitudes and meaningless phrases hoping for the best. We had better start doing some serious thinking about the full implications posed by the Hungarian uprising. And our heavily overstaffed and top-heavy State Department had better start doing some serious planning for future freedom explosions behind the Iron Curtain. I am sure that the new Congress convening in January will do some serious studying of budgets offered by the administration for Voice of America and other multi-million dollar programs ostensibly set up and maintained "to keep alive the spark of freedom in Soviet satellites and to assure enslaved peoples that we have not forgotten or abandoned them." These are fine words but they ring awfully hollow and empty right now. A Soviet-enslaved people did arise, they threw off their chains alone and unaided, and we were caught completely flat-footed and befuddled without a plan or course of action.

What can we do about all this? Can we do anything? This brings me to the crux of the whole Soviet problem. With very few exceptions the West has followed a policy of retreat and appeasement—appeasement and retreat. Plus endless talk-fests, conferences "at the summit," etc., etc.

At every showdown we always seem to be offered the same bitter Hobson's choice—further mollification and retreat or world war III with all the horrors of a nuclear weapons war. For some unexplained reason, Russia's rules do not seem to be afraid of stumbling into war—at least they never make any concessions in the interest of world peace. Frankly, I think a gigantic swindle has been perpetrated on the American people.

Time and time again we have reluctantly surrendered moral principles and backed down before some new Soviet act of aggression "lest we provoke the Soviets into war." Let me destroy this pernicious fallacy once and for all time. If Soviet Russia were ready for or wanted war with the United States it would not patiently wait year after year for a pretext or excuse. It would strike treacherously in the dead of night and think up an excuse or justification later.

What should we do about Hungary short of risking armed conflict? Very simple. Enforce the United Nations resolution demanding the withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Hungary. If the Soviets fail to comply in a reasonable length of time we break off diplomatic relations on the humanitarian grounds that we will not exchange diplomatic niceties with brutalitarian regimes. The same, of course, applies to the six Communists who presently call themselves the Government of Hungary. The State Department's discontinuance of cultural exchanges with the Soviets is commendable but does not go far enough. Culture means nothing to barbarians but economic and political action does.

Can anyone in the State Department give me a good reason why we should maintain diplomatic relations with mass murderers? When a military junta, in a bloodless revolution, overthrows some legitimate government in Latin America it is established State Department policy to withhold recognition for a long time. We do this for the practical reason to see if the new regime can maintain itself in power and on the sound, moral principle that to grant instant recognition is to invite more of such military adventures against established law and order.

We have steadfastly refused to recognize the Red gangsters now in control of unfortunate China. Is there anyone seriously prepared to argue that Soviet Russia is governed by a more decent and human regime than Red China? Is there any discernible difference between the two? To me, and I am sure to most Americans, it seems rather plain if the Soviets deserve the status of moral equals and diplomatic equality then so does Red China. If Red China, the disciple, has put herself outside of the pale of humanity and is unacceptable in the family of nations then surely her Soviet mentors have even less right to sit beside us with the blood of free men still on their hands.

So it seems fitting to me that in commemorating the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights that we Americans not only pay tribute to the gallant Hungarian people in their terrible hour of martyrdom for freedom but that all of us do something practical now for their immediate liberation and relief of their suffering and misery. To the end that the Hungarian uprising will mark a definite turning point in history. That from the agony and bloodshed of this tortured nation the whole free world will become imbued with that spirit of the crusaders and begin at long last the grand offensive against that malignant and consumate evil, world communism. An offensive on every plane except the military—moral, religious, political, economic, and cultural.

Zanesville: All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the city of Zanesville in Muskingum County, located in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, has received nationwide recognition for civil achievement as an All-America City selected by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. The naming of Zanesville is included in the January 22 edition of Look magazine which is available throughout the country tomorrow.

It is highly significant that Zanesville is the only city in the State of Ohio which has been selected for this honor this year and is one of only 11 cities throughout the Nation which have been so honored. I should like also to point out proudly that this is the second city in the 15th district in the past 2 years which has been so honored. Last year my hometown city of Cambridge, Ohio, was accorded this recognition and honor and it is a tremendous compliment to my district that the neighboring city of Zanesville, Ohio, should be honored this year.

This is recognition of the new spirit of dynamism which has developed in southeastern Ohio. There local programs are being attacked aggressively and with imaginative force. The results of these efforts are now becoming apparent in the improvement of civic, social, and economic conditions.

I have watched the city of Zanesville deal with a great number of problems throughout the years. I have seen it succeed in meeting seemingly insurmountable obstacles which stood in the way of progress and growth. The people of that community are hard-working, determined people. The merchants and the industries of Zanesville have put forth a cooperative effort to achieve success in creating a prosperous and better community. Recognition of this fine cooperative effort by the award of All-America City to Zanesville, Ohio, is justly earned, richly deserved, and the people of the community are to be congratulated. Zanesville now stands as an example to other communities throughout the Nation.

Salary Increases for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill which provides for an increase in the rates of basic compensation for postal workers. I believe that the rates of compensation advocated in my bill are more realistic in the light of the current high cost of living.

When Congress enacted Public Law 68 back in 1955, postal employees were well aware of the inadequacies of that law, but most particularly were they aware of the fact that the salary increase it provided was too low. The simple truth is that the pay increases granted to our postal workers in recent years have not kept pace with the steady upward movement of the cost of living, which by the end of 1956 had reached its highest level.

In many instances it was found that the wage scale for postal workers is lower than the scale paid to unskilled laborers in private industry. In 1939 the average weekly wage for all factory workers was $23.86, while the entrance salary for postal workers at that time was $30.76. At the present time the average weekly wage for factory workers is $82, but the entrance salary for letter carriers and

postal clerks is only $70.36. This is a substantial difference.

Under these circumstances, the Post Office Department is having much difficulty in recruiting competent employees for its service. The present low entrance salaries are no inducement for a family man to want to make a career in the postal service when he can earn more in private industry and provide his family with a better standard of living.

In order to augment their earnings, it has become customary for many postal workers in recent years to take on a second job or to encourage their wives to seek employment. Many employees, particularly those in the lower-income brackets, find this situation intolerable as they struggle to maintain their family, the upkeep of the household, and the education of their children.

In an article published in the U. S. News & World Report, in the issue of August 3, 1956, it is shown that of some 34 different working groups in the country, Federal employees are listed at the very bottom as having secured only a 14-percent increase in their effective pay rate since 1939.

In my bill it is provided that the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, known as Public Law 68, be amended by setting up a field-service schedule with entrance salaries between $4,645 to $5,170, and that the present steps be reduced from 7 to 4. When we consider the fact the average income of all American families in 1955 was estimated at $5,519 and that for 1957 the average income is estimated to reach $6,063, then the salaries proposed in my bill are fair and most reasonable.

I am firmly convinced that the proposed pay increases for postal workers would be used largely for meeting normal family needs rather than for luxuries. Adequate pay increases for these people are long overdue. I believe that Congress should grant them a substantial pay increase and thus afford them the fullest opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living commensurate with the rest of the country.

Los Angeles Times 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on December 4 I had the privilege of attending a luncheon celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Los Angeles Times under the auspices of the Los Angeles Advertising Club at the Ambassador Hotel at Los Angeles.

Among the nearly 1,000 persons attending were civic and political leaders of the present and the past. The principal speaker was Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, who spoke as the United States delegate to the United Nations, having flown from New York City to Los Angeles to attend this affair.

Senator KNOWLAND's remarks were characteristic of his firm stand for a sound, strong, positive foreign policy and a denunciation of the Soviet Union's atrocious attack on the patriots of Hungary who revolted for freedom and liberty in their native land.

One of the features of this meeting was the introduction of Norman Chandler, the present publisher of the Los Angeles Times, who succeeded his father, Harry Chandler, to this position, and Norman Chandler's introduction of his brothers and his son, Otis Chandler, a third generation of the Chandler family, who is learning the newspaper business from the bottom, and is at present employed in the circulation department of the Los Angeles Times.

The Los Angeles Times is among the greatest newspapers of the United States which has grown with Los Angeles and through its policies has helped Los Angeles expand and grow into one of the great cities of the world.

At this meeting a booklet entitled "History in Headlines" was distributed to all present which contained the front page of the Los Angeles Times from its first edition on December 4, 1881, up to the edition of November 7, 1956. In reading this interesting volume, the history of Los Angeles and the history of international and national events in the Nation are recorded.

In the 7½ decades that this great newspaper has been published, many stirring events have occurred, in war and peace, in economic expansion, in population increase, and the Los Angeles Times has grown in prestige and importance during that time together with the great city of Los Angeles.

From its beginning on December 4, 1881, up to its 75th anniversary on December 4, 1956, the following is a brief recorded history of each 10-year period:

THE VIGOROUS DECADES, 1881–99

In 1881 Los Angeles—a town of 11,000—gave first evidence of the growth and vitality that was to make it a metropolis of the first rank. In this vigorous era, the Los Angeles Times was born—a fledgling newspaper that caught the spirit of the community and gave quick evidence, by its enthusiasm and growth, of the role it was to play in the development of the area. Locally, the eighties and the nineties saw the first big wave of immigration, the real-estate boom, the beginnings of the great petroleum and agriculture industries, the struggle for the free harbor, that are still so important to the economy of this area.

THE TURN OF THE CENTURY, 1900–10

In 20 years, Los Angeles had increased its population more than ninefold and by 1900 numbered 102,479 persons. The decade of the 1900's saw the rapid development of interurban transportation lines that made the city the capital of a vast suburban empire. Two important events passed almost unnoticed—behind a Chinese laundry, a motion picture was filmed, the first in Los Angeles; in a Santa Ana church, a flying machine was built, the first in the world to take off under its own power.

CRUSADES, LOCAL AND WORLDWIDE, 1910–19

The decade of 1910–19 began with a great surge of growth in Los Angeles—the completion of the harbor breakwater for which the Times had fought; the Owens Valley aqueduct, another Times crusade; a great interest in aviation; the rise of giant oil industry; and the establishment of the southland's first truck-manufacturing concern. Motion pictures were booming. Then came the war with its Liberty Loans, conscription, shortages, and economic disruption. Civic progress was shelved for grimmer business.

THOSE ROARING TWENTIES, 1920–29

In Los Angeles, as throughout the country, the twenties were an amazing era. Here there were booms of all kinds—real-estate booms, oil-drilling booms, oil-stock booms, and rapid business expansions. County population soared from 936,000 to 2,208,000 in 10 years. The harbor was greatly enlarged. Hollywood stumbled temporarily at the impact of talking pictures and then the whole economy was brought up short by "black Tuesday," October 29, 1929.

THE BUSY THIRTIES, 1930–39

Bright spot of the thirties in Los Angeles was the Olympic games—tremendously successful and prestige building. This was the decade of public works with a shift into rapid industrial expansion stimulated by the threats of war from abroad. It experienced a great wave of immigration by drought-stricken farmers and indigent families. Some of these later returned where they came from, some kept moving, many remained to man the assembly lines of factories turning out the materials of war and became important factors in the area's economic growth.

THE WAR HITS HOME, 1940–49

Of all major American cities, Los Angeles came closest to knowing the physical impact of war, first when enemy submarines cruised its shores and shelled oilfields to the north, then when an air raid alarm seemed uncomfortably genuine. The arsenals of war worked round the clock and industrial production soared to record heights. Yet the coming of peace brought little economic dislocation as factories shifted smoothly from war to peacetime production—proof of the diversity of manufacture underlying the prosperity of the area.

THIRD LARGEST CITY IN THE NATION, 1950–56

The quiet pueblo of 1881 has become the third largest city in the Nation. To accommodate its new citizens, it has built more than 97,000 new homes every year this decade. Statistics tell the story of Los Angeles today. With a population of 2,278,000 it is the third city of the Nation. It ranks third also in manufacturing, buying income, and retail sales. The Times which has served it for 75 years has kept pace—the Times today leads all newspapers in the United States in volume of news content and in advertising linage; and stands first in the West in circulation.

May it be many more decades before "30" is written on the Los Angeles Times.

The "Big Stick" Declaration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower-Dulles Middle East policy will be a stabilizing influence in that troubled and highly sensitive area. If the pronouncement had come from the head of a government that could not fulfill such a mammoth undertaking, the effect would be meaningless. The United States is the acknowledged leader of the world free forces. The effect of the "Eisenhower doctrine" will be that aggressive aims or moves in that part of the world will be deterred. A crystallized policy on the part of the Government and people of the United States is timely, in order, and overdue.

Congress will approve the recommendations, but not without full hearings and adequate debate. The House will act with dispatch. The Senate will require considerably more time in its discussions. In the end, a resounding and topheavy majority will approve use of armed forces should one of the Middle Eastern nations be attacked by a Communist aggressor. The one-package resolution will include a proposal for economic aid to alleviate poverty, suffering, offer employment, and provide needed power for accelerating industrial development.

Communism thrives on distress, hunger, and poverty. The British had aided many of the countries before withdrawing its forces. With the closing of the Suez Canal and the sabotaging of oil pipelines, the economy of the area has suffered extremely and, as a result, new problems have been created.

During the campaign of 1956 the President emphasized an effective slogan, "peace and prosperity." The "big-stick" pronouncement—coming so soon after the election—was a shock to many of his supporters, as well as a large number of those who opposed him. The administration's action in opposing the recent Anglo-French moves in the Suez Canal zone had the United States pictured as being for "peace at any price." The President's unprecedented appearance before the joint session of Congress prior to delivering the state-of-the-Union message quelled those rumors. The remarks of Mr. Eisenhower left no doubt in the mind of anyone that America will not stand idly by should Russia attack a Middle Eastern nation.

The trouble in the Suez and adjacent territory was fomented in 1955 when the Kremlin decided to move into the area through economic and military aid, subversion, or other means.

After World War I, we allowed our military forces to become impotent. As a result of such policy, Germany invaded the low countries and Japan attacked our fleet at Pearl Harbor. Fortunately, we had time to train and equip our armed might, but the war was long and costly in the loss of our manpower and in dollars. After World War II, we fell back once again into the doldrum of complacency. Then trouble broke out in the Far East. The situation is different today. The President's words should carry with them real respect throughout the world. The only respect the Communists appreciate is armed might.

The Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the things that are being done in the 15th District of Ohio with regard to the low-income farm families and the low-income farm problems that we have there.

Southeastern Ohio is hilly, in many places wooded, and the farms, though some of them are very fertile, are small, cut up and diversified. Ask almost any farmer in the seven counties of southeastern Ohio what kind of a farm he has, or what type farming he does and he will explain that he has a small farm and is engaged in general farming. By general farming, he means that he is growing those things to which his land is adapted. He follows a system of rotation of crops. He has several acres of corn, some oats, a few acres of wheat. He has some meadow and pastureland. He has cattle, some sheep, some pigs, and his wife looks after some chickens. There is usually a portion of his farm that is in woodland or is a nonproductive area which should be in woodland. In many cases, his income is the barest minimum sufficient to support him and his wife and his family. Many times he finds it not only convenient, but very necessary to work off the farm, for his neighbors, or to take a job in town as a factory worker or a clerk in a store. Very few of the farmers in the hill regions of southeastern Ohio might be called prosperous.

For this reason, among others, two of the counties of southeastern Ohio were selected and designated as "pilot counties." This is a part of the rural development program advocated by President Eisenhower and directed by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to meet the economic inequities which exist between such farm families and citizens who are engaged in other pursuits.

Of course equality could be obtained and the inequities erased, insofar as income is concerned, by a handout from the Federal Government. It would be possible to assure a kind of false prosperity for all farmers, either by handing them money or by guaranteeing them artificially high prices for the products which they grow. Such a program—and we have come dangerously close to pursuing a program of that sort—would result in great expense on the part of the Federal Government, and would create an attitude on the part of the recipients which would do anything but inspire ambition and desire to succeed. American farmers are made of something more sturdy than that. They do not want handouts. They have traditionally been the business pioneers and examples of industry and hard work in this Nation. It is true that they have reached a point where they are no longer sharing in as large a proportion in the prosperity of this Nation as are other segments of the population.

The rural-development program is one which is designed to improve the farmer's plight by showing him how to do things better and, where necessary, by offering him assistance to operate his farm in a more economic fashion. It also is designed to bring into play all other segments of the population in a cooperative effort to make agriculture and the agricultural industry a more profitable field of endeavor. Not only the Department of Agriculture but all other departments of the Federal Government, State agencies and local government are called into cooperative action. The two phases of the program are diagnosis and treatment. At this time, the program is not being attempted on a nationwide scale but only in those areas which have been determined to be in greatest need, and where there are present local attitudes and desires to improve the situation as it exists. These counties are the so-called pilot counties. They are comparable to an experimental laboratory or a pilot plant. Diagnosis is made of the difficulties and problems which exist and then machinery is set in motion in an effort to treat those ills.

I have watched with interest the beginnings of the program in Monroe County and Guernsey County, both of them in Ohio's 15th District. The local minds and facilities are set into organized motion to learn what is wrong with agriculture in those particular communities and, secondly, to determine what steps are best for the treatment of it. I have attended some of the organization meetings and beginnings of the rural-development program in those counties in my district and I have watched the local people sit down together, and begin the process of cooperation to pave the way for a successful program. I am confident that there is sufficient determination on the part of the communities in those two counties to improve, not only the agricultural conditions, but, inasmuch as agriculture is the backbone of our Nation, to improve many other conditions as well. The assistance of know-how and show-how, which the Federal Government can throw into gear will bring about a new day for Monroe and Guernsey Counties.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is the most important phase of the rural development program: Inasmuch as its success in these two counties will come, not from the mere fact of handing money to a segment of population which is less prosperous than another, but will come from developing a program with concrete objectives, the lessons learned in Monroe

County and in Guernsey County can then be applied in the other counties of the State and of our Nation. I would like to urge that the 85th Congress give very serious consideration to this most economical of all expenditures of Federal funds for the benefit of agriculture—the rural development program. The Congress needs to expand this program. It will be money well spent and result in more prosperous times for all of our small-scale, family farmers.

The 561st Air Force Band, California Air National Guard, Participated in Inaugural Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest features of the inaugural parade and the most welcome to a Californian was the appearance of the California Air National Guard of the United States, represented by an outstanding band from my district.

The 561st Air Force Band at the California Air National Guard, based at Hayward, was flown from the Oakland International Airport via a Western Air Defense Command C–119 to represent California in the inaugural parade.

Despite the unaccustomed low temperatures, the bandsmen were among the few service bands which marched without overcoats, showing off to advantage their striking uniforms.

Those uniforms were provided in large part from proceeds of tickets bought by appreciative citizens of the area who have so greatly enjoyed the band's annual variety shows in the Oakland auditorium, an event which yearly draws large audiences.

Cheers greeted the smart appearance and precision of the California Air National Guard men, and there was solid applause for the musical selections, each of which was introduced with a special arrangement of a few bars of California, Here I Come. Capital musicians joined with the throngs in rating that music among the very best.

Following are the names and addresses of band members:

C. W. O. John D. Schary, 1647 Oakview, Berkeley, Calif.

M. Sgt. Ernest S. Baptista, 746 Elsie Avenue, San Leandro, Calif.

M. Sgt. Eugene Rolandelli, Jr., 24524 Broadmore Avenue, Hayward, Calif.

T. Sgt. Arthur M. Hamilton, 3922 Ardley Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. James W. Halford, 1045 Cecilia Court, San Leandro, Calif.

S. Sgt. Clarence W. Mehrwein, Jr., 3588 Harper Street, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. Bill L. Owens, 1430 Second Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. William A. Pacheco, 118 Via Buena Vista, San Lorenzo, Calif.

S. Sgt. Clyde B. Pound, 2439 68th Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. Michael E. Starr, 1452 Bay Street, Alameda, Calif.

A1c. Jack J. Beecher, 372 San Francisco Boulevard, Sharp Park, Calif.

A1c. Sidney R. Bergquist, 2328 Channing Way, Berkeley, Calif.

A1c. John L. Lambert, Jr., 325 Garnet Street, Oakland, Calif.

A1c Donald I. Madera, 1951 Foothill Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A1c. Wilbert L. Thomas, 3045 Texas Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Richard S. Adams, 1315 Curtis Street, Berkeley, Calif.

A2c. Charles L. Cunningham, 527 Superior Avenue, San Leandro, Calif.

A2c. Matthew T. DiMercurio, 3620 Concord Boulevard, Concord, Calif.

A2c. Robert M. Giambruno, 7941 Arthur Street, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Jerry D. Michael, 1701 Springbrook Road, Walnut Creek, Calif.

A2c. Royce A. Noe, 1915 89th Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Stephen C. Oswald, 1985 Grove Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A2c. Kow Takemoto, 1 Candlestick Road, San Francisco, Calif.

A3c. Fred W. Cochran, Jr., 73 Carlos Court, Walnut Creek, Calif.

A3c. Morris E. Grossman, 276 Bristol Boulevard, San Leandro, Calif.

A3c. Thomas A. Hannen, 5409 Thomas Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A3c. Albert L. Keehn, 3001 Madeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

A3c. Terry L. Summa, 1142 College Avenue, Alameda, Calif.

A3c. Robert G. Wallin, 828 Mandana Boulevard, Oakland, Calif.

AB. Donald W. Beckie, 317 Central Avenue, Alameda, Calif.

AB. Phillip R. Lemos, 3426 Mount Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette, Calif.

A1c. Norman E. Hibbard, 348 South 11th Street, San Jose, Calif.

A2c. Norman J. Owen, 1420 Finley Lane, Walnut Creek, Calif.

AB. Robert C. Reeves, 1529 Everett Street, Alameda, Calif.

Retirement of Federal Employees After 30 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which provides for the retirement of Federal employees on full annuities after they have completed 30 years of service. This bill has the support of responsible Government employees' organizations.

Specifically, my bill would permit all Government employees optional retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act after 30 years of service, regardless of the employee's age and without reduction in annuities because of a person's early retirement.

Under provisions of the act at the present time, Government employees who have completed 30 years of service are permitted optional retirement with full annuity when they reach the age of 60, or with reduced annuity at the age of 55. Annuities are not provided at ages below 55, regardless of an employee's length of Federal service, except in certain cases of disability or other special circumstances.

I feel that retirement upon the completion of 30 years of Government service, on full annuity and without regard to a person's age, would serve as a great boost to the morale of all those now in the Federal employ. Furthermore, it would also attract many able people toward a career in Government and it would encourage others now in the service who may contemplate leaving because of inadequate salary or insufficient retirement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Federal employees are a most loyal, hard-working, and conscientious group. They deserve adequate recognition for the valuable services they perform for this Nation, and they also deserve adequate retirement benefits after they have completed their terms of public service. For this reason, I believe that early and serious consideration should be given to the measure I have just introduced.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the flag of the Ukraine will be raised over the city hall in Passaic, N. J., a brave, bright symbol of that nation's short-lived independence and the burning determination of her people once again to be free.

To all who will see that flag flying there against the free American sky, the tragic plight of the sons and daughters of the Ukraine and all the enslaved nations within the orbit of Communist domination will be dramatically brought home. It will give heart to those now feeling the pain of wounds laid bare in the recent revolts of Hungary and Poland, and will awaken memories of other smaller but no less inspiring uprisings in the slave-labor camps of Europe and Central Asia and in Germany's Communist-ruled Eastern Zone. It will hurl to the skies the challenge that those who stand for freedom stand not alone, and its rippling folds will whisper to the breeze that those who fell have not been forgotten.

As the people of Passaic, N. J., mark the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, so all America will remember and pledge anew sympathy and support for those who remain enslaved.

The road to freedom is no easy path; and, although the recent incredible heroism of the Freedom Fighters has torn a rent in the Iron Curtain, its complete

obliteration presents a Herculean but not insurmountable task. It is a road that must be trod with caution as well as courage and determination, lest the entire world be plunged into cataclysmic destruction. As President Eisenhower has so effectively put it:

> The building of such a peace is a bold and solemn purpose * * * to attain it we must be aware of its full meaning * * * and ready to pay its full price.

But, as surely as sunrise follows darkness, the dawn of freedom must return to the brave people of the Ukraine, of Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, and all the rest. For freedom is the divinely endowed birthright of all men, and no tyranny shall ever permanently destroy this heritage.

Aspinall States the Issues on Reclamation and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, made an outstanding speech at the National Reclamation Association annual convention in Salt Lake City on November 16, 1956.

He clearly and forcefully set forth the main issues on national reclamation policy and discussed those issues with clarity and good sense. I think our colleagues will be interested in the speech on this important subject and, therefore, ask permission to include it at this point in the RECORD.

COOPERATION IN RECLAMATION, BY HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, OF COLORADO, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, once again it is a happy and pleasing experience for me to be here with the members and guests of the National Reclamation Association. A part of this pleasure, I fear, comes from some personal surprise. I thought it an honor to address this group last year. But, I must confess that only in being asked back a second time do I properly appreciate the honor.

In thinking on what I might say to the many specialists of the water and water conservation and development field who are here, I could not help but wonder about the impact of what I said last year. Did I say so little that you assumed I might do better, or did I say something of such value that it demands a second treatment? Whatever the reason, I am pleased to be here because this field—the use of our most precious of all resources—is one close to my heart. I know that it is a subject of daily importance to all of you. For most of you, it is also the field of your labor, either in the dedication of your spare time—and by that we understand clearly that we mean time you cannot easily spare—or in your employment. This association has rendered a great service to water conservation and development in the years of its life. We are all aware, I am sure, that it must meet greater demands in the future. It is of these demands that I propose to speak today.

It is a valuable axiom of the physical sciences that for each force in one direction, there is an equal and opposite force. It is on this principle that the outrush of hot gases from the turbine pushes the jet forward at speeds almost beyond comprehension—faster than the fired bullets from its own guns. We tend to forget, I think, that something of this same principle spills over into the field of the arts of man and that governing and government is an art of man.

What has this to do with water, with reclamation, with this great body of believers, the National Reclamation Association? Just this. The success of the reclamation program in the past tends to create two opposing forces, one toward advances in the future, and the other toward opposition that might sound its death knell.

We cannot rest upon our efforts of yesterday. I know that none here plan to do so, but are we ready for the opposition we must meet tomorrow?

Last year in my talk, I tried to give a short review of the reclamation program, what brought it into being, how it developed, how early problems were overcome, and where we stood at that time. As best I can today digest that address into a sentence or so, it is this: The Federal reclamation program began at the turn of the century as a natural and necessary outgrowth of the land disposal and development programs of the Nation. It grew slowly at first, but did much to settle the dry West. With the utilization of the multiple-purpose concept, it took new strides forward, yet met new opposition at almost every turn. The power end of multiple-purpose projects, for a time, seemed about to gobble up reclamation of which it, power, was but a creature. Federally produced power, accordingly, became a matter of great controversy. This remains at the present even though our sights are more clearly on our primary goal which is land settlement and development, and use and conservation of water in an arid or semiarid region.

In the year that has passed since I spoke to you, giant steps have been taken in the reclamation field. I take some personal pride in these great steps, not because I think that I am responsible to any appreciable degree, but rather because I was in a position to see the changing tide of battle as the lines formed and broke, reformed, and finally made the telling charge to victory. For me, it has been a great and rewarding experience to serve as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and to sponsor some, and labor in the passage of other, great pieces of legislation. It has been a rewarding experience to work with my chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California, and his counterpart across the aisle, the Honorable A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska. I cannot here list all the names of all of those who fought in these battles, but many of the patriots are here today. I miss, and we shall all miss in the years to come, the counsel and aid of our good friend, Senator Gene Millikin, of Colorado. It grieved me that we did not agree on some programs, such as Hells Canyon, but Senator Millikin was a tower of strength in the Senate and his talents will be sorely missed. I wish each man could be recognized, but I know that their names are known and appreciated by this audience.

What was achieved? First and foremost, the reclamation program was rescued from the doldrums and reestablished as an important objective of the Federal Government.

When the last Congress began its labor, great debate was raging over the reclamation program. From the administration had come a new viewpoint on water policy. The so-called new partnership program had been proposed. It was being argued and debated. Into this debate, the long-established foes of reclamation rushed with glee—they were happy to fish in these troubled waters. As a consequence of this debate, of a shift of attitude on the part of the administration, of the increased opportunity of opponents to sow doubt and discord, reclamation had been badly mangled. Expenditures which had reached $367 million in 1950 had dropped to less than $150 million by 1954. The big factor, and it a part of the lack of executive push, was the absence of new authorized projects. The 82d Congress approved but one project, and the 83d authorized only a few small projects totaling about $56 million in estimated cost.

Into this sea of uncertainty and strife, the 84th Congress pushed with vigor. For the most part, it ignored the debate on the so-called partnership program and pursued instead the tried and true of past policy. Thirty-five pieces of reclamation legislation were enacted into law in the most dramatic demonstration of faith in reclamation since its founding. Total new authorizations of about $1.16 billion were pushed into law. Largest of these authorizations was the $760 million upper Colorado storage and development program—a program to insure to the four upper-basin States of the Colorado River the use of their water in the development of their land and other resources. Other significant projects were approved, including the Trinity in California, the Washoe in California and Nevada, the Ventura in California, the Crooked River in Oregon, the Little Wood River in Idaho, the Washita in Oklahoma, and others.

We are not proud of this record for the sake of a record. We are proud of it because we know that it is a contribution to the future strength and well-being of the areas affected and the Nation as a whole. Construction of these projects will bring under irrigation about 471,000 acres of new land and provide supplemental water to an additional 805,000 acres. Some 1.5 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity, generating some 6.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power annually, will come on the line. Other values, including domestic water, flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation, will be served. These values would be enough for the Nation even if repayment of construction costs were not provided. And much of the repayment will be with interest. Reclamation has been reestablished. Now we must make sure that we sustain these projects and that money for their actual construction is forthcoming as necessary.

Second in importance, and may I say to many even first in importance, was the passage of the Small Projects Act. Legislation of this concept had been before the Congress for a number of years. This association and its leadership looms large in the development of this program and in its passage. This addition to traditional policy can take care of projects too large for individuals or associations on a private basis, but which can be accomplished by local water users' organizations with some financial assistance from the Federal Government. This legislation establishes simplified planning, review, and authorization procedures for sound but small projects, and provides financial assistance in the form of interest-free loans for irrigation and grants covering national benefits such as flood control. It will encourage the traditional participation by local organizations and the States. The law carries the limitation that full reimbursement costs must be repaid in 50 years, and this will limit the number of feasible projects. However, it will be of great value in rehabilitation and betterment, or extension of existing projects.

We now have the soil-conservation program, which does much to take care of soil-and-water conservation on individual farms. We now have the Water Facilities Act of the Farmers Home Administration providing benefits for small individual or associated water projects. Next in line comes the Small

Projects Act and its blood cousin, the Small Watersheds Act. Beyond that, we have the regular reclamation program of the Department of the Interior. With these programs, an energetic and sympathetic administration, and traditional cooperation, the West, and the Nation, for that matter, should now be able to meet its water and resource development needs.

I confess that I have skipped rapidly over a vast territory. Most of you here will know the great obstacles that were met and overcome in each of these programs. In some, we had strong support from the administration, but in others we had disinterest, and in other cases, opposition. Each was strongly opposed by the usual phalanx of antireclamationists. We had, additionally, opposition to some of these programs from within what has always been the reclamation family. We had the problem of those who were concerned that these programs would add to our farm problem and to our surpluses in that field. Still—I wish to say here and now that the greatest opposition which we had can be laid to the debate which raged in and around the new partnership presentation of the administration. I do not say that the idea of true and equitable partnership has given us any trouble. Far from it. Partnership as such has been traditional with the reclamation program from its very beginning.

What has caused much grief is a new tack in water policy which passes under the banner of partnership. I refer to it as a banner or slogan, because we who are here today know that we have had cooperation, participation, joint local-State-National effort in reclamation for a long, long time.

Having plunged into the icy waters of controversy, I proceed. However, as I assume the position of critic, let me first give well-deserved credit to the present executive department in the aid and cooperation to the success which we had. I would not accept the responsibility of critic at this time if I did not think of water as our most precious resource. I assure all of you that I have no partisan ax to grind. Reclamation and water development has been one of our most treasured bipartisan programs in the West. We have all always tended to believe in, and give support to, Federal assistance for resource development. I believe that we have no alternative. I believe with equal firmness, however, that the pressure for partnership, as it is interpreted in its extreme by the present administration, has done great damage to western development. If pursued as an established policy, and I remind you that it is not yet established policy, I see only trouble ahead for all of us.

The greatest impact of the new policy presentation of the administration is that it is not partnership but rather partitionship. It does not operate to bring groups together, as I conceive partnership, but rather to partition a program into several separate interests. It does not bring together those having a community of interest; rather it divides them into competing groups. It stifles a common goal.

I do not think that this splintering is the unintended result of a possible program. It is the result of the very concept itself. I am convinced, in fact, that this very splintering was well understood by those who put this concept together, and that this splintering was one of the major purposes of the new look.

The first question that came to me, and it took a long time for me to find an answer since I was working hard to move legislation along a tried and proven pathway, the first question about this policy was: Why was it necessary at all? What has been wrong with our water-development policy that necessitates a change? I could find no answer that satisfied me. I have yet to find one that justifies the damage done. I'll grant that the new proposal achieves rather quickly an apparent decrease in governmental outlay—but are we to measure the success of a monumental program merely by how cheap it is in today's budget? Are we to ignore recognized and proven measurable returns? I think not. The Nation's budget is far more than this year's figures of income and outgo. It is also an accounting of the Nation's investment in itself. Cheap investment is likely to bring cheap results. Miserly appropriations will bring miserly results, and if some other agency is to make up the funds, what have we saved in the Nation's budget? Precisely nothing, since the cost must still be met and must still be paid by the users of the services provided. The new argument, if appealing, is specious. Something more solid is needed because it manifestly saves no money to the users or consumers. Indeed, the most casual analysis of cost to the users of projects under the so-called new partnership program reveals that costs to them are greater. Even worse, not only are out-of-pocket costs greater for services provided, especially power, but the loss of resource potential is a cost that has not yet been calculated, nor has the cost of providing necessary national facilities at alternative sites been considered.

It is stated that this program will give us more development of our resources since it will not need to depend upon uncertain Federal appropriations. And how does this assertion square with the facts? We have had less, not more, development. The most conspicuous example that we have today of this new policy approach is the Hells Canyon controversy. Apparently such project is to be developed by private interests without outlay by the Federal Government. Thus, we, as a Nation, are supposed to have gained. Unfortunately, we have not gained and, on the contrary, we have lost and I mean that all of us have lost.

We have lost part of the immediate powerhead, even if the three-dam plan is followed and the consensus seems to be that it will not be followed. Worse, we have lost valuable upstream storage for downstream power production and thereby, a further loss of power is to be noted. Beyond that, we have lost valuable flood storage; and, that has a value which depends upon the vagaries of nature. We have lost also potential reclamation development on lands that might have received financial assistance from the high dam. Also, by this change in emphasis and direction, it will be harder now to obtain necessary headwater storage on the Snake for existing uses. Finally, by this shift of program, we have dealt a body blow to the maximum and comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin—the greatest power storehouse left in the Nation. If I had partners like that, I would get out of such partnership with all possible speed.

Speaking now as a lawyer, the so-called partnership program reminds me of a bitterly contested estate matter where one ends up with someone sawing a house in half, although the sawing in this case has been into more pieces. This great policy pronouncement has been an unwise and unnecessary intrusion of private interests into public policy. It has, as it was apparently designed to do, operated to the benefit of a few who will now be able to lay tribute upon public waters converted to private use. This is no way to develop our Nation's resources.

What was so wrong in the Northwest that we had to have a partitioning program offered? Nothing. Rather, it was a showplace of development, second only to the TVA area. Its very success, just as the success of the TVA had done, brought the upthrust of opposition which, with favorable political ground, was able to turn back the clock—clear back to the days before Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, and the elder Taft—back to the days when resources were considered mere prizes for the first favored individual to grab.

Policies initiated under former President Theodore Roosevelt and nurtured with bipartisan support over the dark years of contest between private spoliation and unified basinwide development, were thrown out in a moment in payment for services rendered in an election contest. The early leaders, and would that we had them back to retestify to their dreams, conceived of development as something which was to bring the greatest good to the greatest number and not the greatest profit to the more fortunate entrepreneur. Those earlier advocates of reclamation did not bother with specious arguments about public versus private, or local versus national. They did not waver before the stained flag of socialism. They believed in the comprehensive development of our Nation's rivers by the most practical plan, regardless of the name-calling by the opposition.

But, after these great battles for TVA, for the Hoover Dam and its related developments, for Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and for countless small projects scattered over the landscape of the Nation, we became terrified by scare words. It was discovered by the enemies of reclamation and conservation programs that people had no particular feeling one way or another about public power * * * but that they were quite naturally opposed to socialism. Suddenly, the developing hand of Uncle Sam was charged with being "Red"—it was socialism to harness our resources under a program big enough and grand enough to do the job. Now we are to partition this development in the name of private and local development and give it the soothing sobriquet of "partnership."

For all the shock job done to belittle and demean Federal development, it was not possible to make a frontal assault upon proved operations. One couldn't shoot the TVA or cleanse it directly in a bath of enterprise through sale, but someone could enter through the back door and institute a deal to break its back. Someone could starve its appropriations since that would make good political capital and help toward a balanced budget. Someone could do things more directly to the Bonneville Power Administration and it now limps along, a mere shadow of the dynamic organization which revitalized the Northwest and brought to it a power grid where each purchaser got his juice at the same price and a price low enough to open a virgin land. Now the backbone grid has osteomyelitis and it is getting homeopathic treatment—another dose of the same for the cure.

You may be saying to yourselves, well you shouldn't complain. The upper Colorado River project was carefully insulated from such assaults and was certified as pure and in the public interest for public development. Also, 35 pieces of nonpartitionship (as presently defined) legislation were passed and the future of reclamation looks rather bright as a consequence—so why complain?

Well, for many reasons. Primarily, the intended criticism, constructive I hope, is a deep and sincere objection to the promotion of a program which does damage to the best development of the Nation's resources. Falling water in Utah, or Colorado, or New Mexico, or Wyoming is not different politically or policywise from water falling in Oregon, Washington, or Idaho, or on the international border along the St. Lawrence. It should, in each place, be developed for the maximum good for the maximum number—and without knee-bending for egghead debate about what is socialism and what is not—or whether private or public agencies are pure enough to enter a river canyon at point A as opposed to point B.

In the Tennessee Valley we got an absolute basin program of development. Political overtones now appear to make impossible a basin-type authority anywhere else and as a consequence, it is all that much harder to get a basinwide organization with sufficient

efficiency, zeal, determination, and support to develop the area to its maximum. Why then add even more problems and institute a partitioning concept that splinters what little unity which is left. The only answer is that the splintering must be desired by some interest.

It is my understanding that this association over the years has favored unified basinwide development without unnecessary concern for political overtones. I believe that it should emphatically reaffirm this goal and this philosophy. Partnership we have always had and private enterprise parts of the unified development program we have always had. What we need to do now is fight this divisive, partitioning aspect of a program which gives the revenues to private interests for piecemeal and partial development of a river or its basin and leaves to the public the expense of constructing nonrevenue facilities. We have learned already on the Columbia that this lately announced program of public responsibility and construction means construction on sites where the expense is greater and where the damage to other values, such as fish or wildlife or wilderness, is much more.

Those of you who have visited the Columbia Basin know firsthand what that long-planned development could have meant. You can also understand what it would be like if Grand Coulee had been built under the so-called partnership concept of the last several years. Where would all the farms be? How would the situation have been in the Central Valley of California; or for that matter, even at Hoover Dam?

We believe in unified basinwide development. We have ample evidence that these great programs have paid great dividends not only to the area of operation but to the whole Nation. Let us reaffirm our support here and now for such programs which have brought to the Nation great successful achievements such as the Central Valley in California, the Hoover Dam complex, the partially developed Columbia Basin, and the presently authorized upper Colorado project.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill designed to give needed tax relief to small businesses. This bill, which I introduced originally during the 84th Congress, first of all, reduces the present normal corporate tax rate from 30 percent to 22 percent. This normal tax is applicable to all taxable income of the corporation. The bill also provides that a surtax rate of 32 percent be applicable to all taxable income over $50,000, a matter of considerable importance to small businesses. Under present law the surtax rate is 22 percent and is applicable to quite small taxable income; it is charged against income over $25,000.

When I introduced the original bill in 1955 I showed statistically that big business has been enjoying an appreciable increase in profits, whereas the profits of small business have declined considerably. I have also illustrated how small businesses are suffering from a high casualty rate, while the big corporations disappear only by merger to become even larger.

We have been experiencing recently a wave of mergers and business concentration which we can trace directly to our tax rates. This economic trend is incompatible with the American traditional concept of free enterprise upon which the foundations of our democracy rest. The danger from this has become so acute that the administration is belatedly sponsoring legislation of this sort together with antimerger amendments to the antitrust statutes.

Small corporations having assets less than $250,000 have had a rate of profit for the years 1953 to 1955 only about one-fourth to one-half as high as enjoyed by corporations having assets over $100 million. Without adequate earnings these small enterprises cannot survive. Furthermore, it would indeed be injudicious to hope that the high rate of bankruptcy of small businesses will be alleviated if we maintain the present stifling tax rates.

On May 31, 1956, President Eisenhower indicated the importance of the problems facing small business when he appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business which was charged with making recommendations to eliminate obstacles hindering the growth of small business. In its progress report in August of 1956 the committee recommended that the corporate normal income tax rate be reduced to 20 percent. The committee said that the tax reduction would help smaller firms to retain earnings for financing expansion and would generally encourage the formation of new businesses.

The combination of changes in this bill will give tax relief of not less than 26.7 percent to corporations earning less than $75,000. Corporations earning between $75,000 and $525,000 will receive tax relief, but of a lower percentage; and corporations earning more than $525,000 will pay slightly more tax.

Compared to the larger and better established corporations the small and new businesses have limited access to credit and equity capital from external sources. These small and new businesses must rely more heavily on internal funds, such as retained earnings, for financing expansion. Since, therefore, retained earnings are a more critical source of funds for financing expansion for small businesses than for larger companies, we can reasonably conclude that high corporate income taxes will restrict the growth of smaller firms more severely than that of larger corporations.

This bill reduces the tax rate which is applicable to all the net income of the small corporations, namely the normal tax rate. In the interest of maintaining Federal revenue at as high a level as possible and also of restoring a competitive position to small business, my bill provides that the surtax rate, which will apply to taxable income over $50,000, be raised by 10 percentage points. It must be pointed out that according to Treasury revenue estimates that this balancing of the tax reduction for small business, with a slight tax raise for the very large corporations, will hold Treasury income from corporate rates very near present levels or at only a very slight loss which can be recouped through closing of some small loopholes.

In view of the present plight of small and new business, the expressed desires of President Eisenhower to improve the competitive position of small business for the good of the economy, and the recent recommendation of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business to reduce the tax load of these small businesses, what better course of legislative action can we take than to adopt a sound tax proposal such as my bill contains?

SENATE

Wednesday, January 9, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S. J., of Boston College, Newton, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost:

Almighty and eternal God, the Creator and common Father of all men and all nations, in whose eyes we are all brothers, and by whose blood we are all redeemed, deign to pursue and bless the efforts of our President and our legislators to achieve peace without sacrifice of honor or dignity or moral principle; aid them to exercise world leadership commensurate with the wealth of natural and human resources with which Thy bounty has blessed this Nation of ours; guide and strengthen the will of each individual Member of this august deliberative body so that no private or sectional interest will be furthered to the detriment of the common good of all.

Inspire, we beseech Thee, each and every member of our Government with particular devotion to the welfare of those segments of our population most in need of protection; but never let governmental aid degenerate into the preservation of special privilege or result in the loss of true freedom, initiative, and responsibility in our citizens; help the makers and executors of our laws to discern and follow the thin line of demarcation between expedient action based on no firm principles and that art of political realism which accepts the immediate partial achievement of ideal goals without the sacrifice of principle.

Extend, finally, Thy sympathetic consolation to these, our political representatives, when the endeavor to follow conscience produces misunderstanding, abuse, or even outright misrepresentation; remind them of Thy promise of a general judgment when the light of Thy justice will read all hearts, when all things will be set right, and Thy justice will say to all who have followed it: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter into thy reward." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 7, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit other resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, notwithstanding the provisions of Senate Resolution 120 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman and members of the Select Committee on Small Business, created by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, 2d session, shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairmen and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress—

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to submit the names of the chairmen and members of the standing committees without at the same time submitting the names of the chairman and the full membership of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR KNOWLAND OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of personal regret that I learned on Monday of the decision of the minority leader to retire from the Senate at the end of his present term.

Over the years, BILL KNOWLAND and I have had many differences of opinion. But our disagreements have always been on questions of principle—on issues over which honorable men can dispute.

As a human being, I know of no finer man than the senior Senator from California. Integrity and honor are words which frequently are used with little content. But when they are applied to BILL KNOWLAND they assume a precise accuracy that cannot be matched by Webster.

Mr. President, I have been transacting business with the senior Senator from California for many years. When I came here as a new Member, I sat with him on the Committee on Armed Services. I would rather have his word than an engraved bond, when it comes to determining the amount of confidence that I place in any transaction.

Even more important, he has the courage to carry out his convictions—and since those convictions are strong, they frequently require courage.

In the hill country of Texas, where the Johnsons have lived for more than 100 years, we talk about the kind of people who "will go to the well" with a man. It is an expression rarely used, and it implies the highest kind of praise. It means that the man deserves the utmost of confidence in any situation—no matter how dangerous or how risky it may be.

BILL KNOWLAND is that kind of a man. He has the qualities of head and heart which have made him a great public servant. One of the proudest boasts of my life is that he is my treasured and trusted friend.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it was unanimously agreed in the Republican conference that I should publicly express, on behalf of all Republican Senators, extreme regret over Senator KNOWLAND's announcement that he would not seek reelection to the Senate 2 years from now when his term expires.

Senator KNOWLAND has the deep respect and admiration of all of his colleagues both for his qualities as a Senate leader and as a person. This was amply demonstrated at the opening of this Congress when he was unanimously chosen by Republican Senators to continue as their floor leader.

His great integrity and devotion to duty and his conscientious dedication to principle have set a high example for all his colleagues.

These are qualities which make him an outstanding Senator and a trusted and admired Senate leader.

We anxiously hope that Senator KNOWLAND's plan to leave the Senate does not mean his permanent withdrawal from public life.

We sincerely wish he will find a way to continue giving the Nation his services. In the critical times ahead we have need of statesmen of his stature.

In addition to these remarks expressing the views of the Republican Conference I should like to add a few personal reflections of my own.

Mr. President, the announcement by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND that he would not be available for re-election in 1958 can only be termed a great future loss to this Nation. All who know him well and even those who know him only as a public figure will realize that his decision was reached only after a period of arduous soul searching; such is the character of BILL KNOWLAND. Severe as the loss will be to the Senate and the Nation his highly personal decision must be utterly respected.

BILL KNOWLAND first came to the Senate in 1945 as an appointee of the then Governor of California, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, to fill the unexpired term of Senator Hiram Johnson. Indeed it was from the battlefields of Europe where he had risen from enlisted man to officer that he was recalled on August 14, 1945, to assume his duties in the Senate. Elected in 1946 for the remainder of that term he was also elected to a full term expiring in 1953. So well did he serve his State and Nation and so highly was he regarded by the people of his State that he was reelected in 1952 by the largest vote ever polled in that State; a 6-to-1 triumph over his opponent.

So well and ably did he serve in the Senate that when illness forced the late Senator Taft to step down from the post of Republican floor leader, his personal nomination for successor was BILL KNOWLAND. His Republican colleagues later made the nomination unanimous.

BILL KNOWLAND at the young age of 48 has been the recipient of more honors than come to the vast majority of men in a whole lifetime; yet he wears his honors modestly as befits his greatness. Never does he lack the time for a friendly hello nor the patience to explain complex legislation or parliamentary procedures to a colleague.

To the almost man-killing pace of floor leader, Bill has brought a seemingly boundless energy and enthusiasm. His tenacity in a fight has been an inspiration to all of us on the Republican side of the aisle and has earned for him the sincere respect of those on the Democrat side. His keen analysis and unerring logic characterize his debating style, and even in the pent up impassioned moments of debate his logic remains clear, based on an inexhaustible store of information.

One of the great privileges of serving in the United States Senate is the association with men of leadership from all sections of the country who have been entrusted by their fellow citizens to conduct the affairs of the Nation under our Republican form of government. In my more than two decades in this body I have known many Senators and I have known them well. My professional association with BILL KNOWLAND has been particularly close and continuous for some years because of committee assignments and our respective positions. The warmth of our relationship has been all that is epitomized in the word friendship. I shall miss Bill keenly. Besides my great sense of personal loss I want to tell my colleagues why, as I have said, Bill's decision is the Nation's loss also.

Over the years we have had many great outstanding leaders in the Senate. In my long years here I have served with many of them. All Senators are outstanding, or they would not have attained their position in the Senate. During the period of my service, among the "greats" of the Senate—and there have been many great Senators—BILL KNOWLAND, because of his forthrightness, his hard work, his dedication and devotion to the service of the Nation and its people, and his fine ability to render such service, has stood among the greatest. BILL KNOWLAND will rate among the all-time "greats" of this body.

But let us not talk about Bill as though he were no longer our colleague. Instead let us hail the fact that for 2 more years his matchless leadership will

be found in the No. 1 seat on the right-hand side of the aisle. I know that I shall be joined by millions of fellow Americans in hailing Bill for the many things he has accomplished for the welfare of our great country, and in expressing the hope that his fine talents will not be permanently lost to public life.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to me, first on behalf of my Republican colleagues, and second in speaking from my own heart, to say these words regarding BILL KNOWLAND.

In closing and by way of emphasis, let me repeat that I am delighted that he is to be with us here for 2 years more, and I hope that the expiration of those 2 years will not end his public service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has ably expressed the feelings of the members of the Republican conference. He also has clearly expressed his high personal feelings toward the present minority leader, our friend, BILL KNOWLAND.

I should like to add a personal word. I sat side by side with Senator KNOWLAND on the Armed Services Committee for about 6 years. I sat side by side with him on the Appropriations Committee for the same length of time. On the floor of the Senate we had companion desks for some years. During all that period I have never seen Senator KNOWLAND lose his temper. I have never seen him lose his poise. I have always heard him express himself clearly and forcefully, and with obvious sincerity and honesty.

I personally shall miss him when he leaves the Senate, but, like the senior Senator from New Hampshire, I am very happy he is going to be with us for 2 more years.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to rise to endorse everything that has been said about BILL KNOWLAND. I am very sad because of the occasion that prompts these words. Probably I have known BILL KNOWLAND longer than many of the other Members of the Senate, for some years ago he and I served together on the Republican National Committee, and he was the promising young member from California whom we named, as I recall, chairman of our executive committee at that time. We recognized Bill's ability when he was a very much younger man.

My relationship with Bill and his charming wife Helen has been one of the valued privileges of my life. Here in the Senate he not only has been our leader, but he has also been on the Foreign Relations Committee with me, and we have worked together in cooperation on the policies in which we believed in respect to Formosa and many similar important issues. I have felt that I had the closest of contacts and the closest of associations with him, and that experience has been one of the real values in my life.

Bill, I can say to you I regret your leaving, and I sincerely hope you will continue in public service, in view of your wonderful service to the public good of your country and the world.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be derelict to a very deep feeling if I did not undertake to say a few words expressive of my regret over the announcement which has been made by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that he would not be a candidate for reelection to this body at the expiration of his present term.

I well remember the first time I ever saw BILL KNOWLAND. He had hurried here from the battlefields of Europe, and, as I recall, on the day before he took the oath of office as Senator, he came in the uniform of a major of the United States Army to a small gathering in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, where he was introduced to a few of those with whom he would serve in this body.

His character was stamped on his face then, as it is today. He moved then, as he moves today—as someone has said, forward like a tank—regardless of obstacles, to achieve the objectives he believes are in the national interest.

Mr. President, in the days since he took his seat in the Senate and since he served as the youngest Member of the Senate, I have watched this man develop as a Senator of the United States. I was glad when he was elevated to the leadership of his party. He has graced that chair with fairness, intellectual honesty, courage, and willingness to work with other Senators in the achievement of common objectives, whether those Senators be Republicans or Democrats.

I have no hesitancy in saying that Senator KNOWLAND, in my opinion, is a Senator of the United States in the finest tradition of this body. He has intellectual honesty. He is incapable—utterly incapable—of stooping to any underhanded, unfair, conniving method of achieving any end, however desirable he may consider it to be. He has the courage of conviction, and he has an attachment to his convictions in all circumstances.

As has been said today by another Senator who loves him, no one in this body or outside has a right to challenge his decision in any way, but I cannot refrain from expressing my great regret that he has found it necessary to make the decision.

With his service in this body Senator KNOWLAND came to have a fine appreciation of what the Senate of the United States means as an institution of government; to appreciate it as the most unusual of all of the checks and balances which were designed by the Founding Fathers in their effort to protect the rights and duties which were sought to be assured when the Constitution of the United States was written. He understands the part the Senate must play in the scheme of American Government. He knows the responsibilities of a Senator, and he has never shirked one of them. He is aware of the obligations we have here, not only to the people of our own States, not only to the people of the United States, but to the Senate of the United States as a lasting institution of government.

Mr. President, some men come into this body and serve for a long time, and draw their compensation as Senators. They exercise on a day-to-day basis their influence and the weight that attaches to the high and powerful office of a Senator of the United States. Many of them, after serving here for years, pass on without ever fully understanding and appreciating what they owed to the Senate of the United States as a vital institution of government, without understanding the heritage that attaches to any man privileged to serve in the Senate of the United States, and the importance of protecting that heritage and handing it down inviolate, in order that the people of the Nation may continue to enjoy the benefits that have been preserved for them by the proper exercise of the duties of Senators by many great Senators during the 167 years this body has operated.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to refer to the integrity of Senator KNOWLAND. The worst enemy he ever had would not question, much less challenge, his integrity. Senators who have seen him on the floor and who have worked with him in committees are aware of his thorough understanding of the Nation's problems and his devotion to reaching a proper solution of them.

He is a tough and resourceful fighter. We have often differed on legislative matters. When he is on the other side I know that I am confronted with an antagonist who possesses great ability and does not know the meaning of the word "surrender." But win or lose I know that insofar as he is concerned the fight will be fairly fought. Those opposed to him do not have to fear that they will be sandbagged in the back of the head in any legislative dark alley. He meets any adversary head on just as he never dodges any issue nor tries to carry water on both shoulders.

In my opinion, it has been a very fortunate thing for the people of the United States that we have had two comparatively young men as our leaders in the Senate, and that they have been men who can work together. When I say work together, I do not mean they see eye to eye on legislative proposals. I mean work together under the procedures of the Senate to maintain the place of the Senate in our scheme of government.

Mr. President, I had prepared no remarks on this occasion because it did not occur to me this would be the time that Senators would speak their feelings about Senator KNOWLAND's announcement that he would no longer be a Member of this body after the expiration of his present term. I merely wish to make this additional observation. In the years I have been privileged, through the forbearance and kindness of the people of my State, to serve in this body, I suppose I have served with approximately 250 Members of the Senate. Nearly all of them were good men, but I have served with very few really great men. I place the name of WILLIAM KNOWLAND of California high on the list of the few truly great Senators with whom I have been privileged to serve.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to add my voice to the voices of those who have expressed regret at the

announcement of the senior Senator from California that he will not be a candidate for reelection when his present term expires. I think BILL KNOWLAND's decision to retire from the Senate in 1958 will result in a loss not only to California and the country, but to the world. I think BILL KNOWLAND is one of the great Senators of all time.

May I say, Bill, in view of the fact that you are still a young man, I hope that you will not retire from public life.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, it would indeed be supererogation to add to what has been said about our friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the minority leader, in terms of his sterling character, his courage, and his devotion to duty, and, above all, his high sense of friendship for all his associates, particularly for those of us who have been the beneficiaries of the many kindnesses and many considerations extended to them by him.

I am sure, Bill—and I know that you have many more years left to you—in whatever field it may be, whether it be political endeavor or private business, or whatever activity you decide to pursue, that you will take with you the very good wishes of all of us, irrespective of party.

I trust that, as a Democrat from a two-party State, I may be forgiven for saying that I hope the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California, will be succeeded by a good Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret and dismay at the announced plan of the distinguished minority leader to retire from the Senate.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of dogged determination. At the same time, however, he is a man of tolerance, willing to consider the other man's point of view. He is willing to meet anyone halfway. I am indeed sorry that he is leaving this distinguished body.

I wish to express to him my affection and admiration for the integrity, courage, and honesty he has manifested throughout his entire life, particularly during his public career.

When Senator KNOWLAND retires from the Senate, he will leave a place which will be hard to fill. I certainly want him to know that all of us have a great respect for him, and that we wish him well in the many years that lie ahead.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by other Members of the Senate, especially those made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Many of us in the Senate, as well as the millions of other Americans, were shocked by the statement of our distinguished minority leader, BILL KNOWLAND, that he would not be a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate.

The shock came when we and the people of the Nation as a whole realized that this legislative body, the greatest in the world, would loose this forthright man and his great ability and judgment and courage.

In the course of time, many great men have been on the stage in places of leadership in the Senate of the United States. None has excelled BILL KNOWLAND for courage, forthrightness, and adherence to sound, staid principles. None has excelled BILL KNOWLAND in protecting, in every constructive way, the great traditions of the Senate of the United States. In his dealings with other Members of the Senate, no one has excelled him in the consideration he has extended to his colleagues.

To stand firm on principle, to be outspoken, as he is and has been, in this great body and in his life, marks him as a great leader and as a man unafraid.

I wish to say to Senator KNOWLAND that we will indeed be deeply sorry to lose him and his influence in the Senate, and I wish to add my voice to the voices of millions of my countrymen in wishing BILL KNOWLAND well when he departs from the Senate, and to hope for him and his family the very best in the years ahead.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all that has been said by other Senators in paying tribute to the great Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I shall be brief, but I do wish to assure you, Bill, that it is from the bottom of my heart when I say "Amen" to everything that has been said here.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who have already expressed their regret at the announced retirement of the distinguished minority leader, and who have spoken in commendation of the great Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I am a few years older than the distinguished Senator from California; therefore I can justly praise his work and his leadership in the Senate from the standpoint of a man who is his senior in years.

I have been greatly impressed by the able leadership in the Senate of Senator KNOWLAND, both when he has served as majority leader and as minority leader.

He has been forthright. He has always listened to the other Members of the Senate before making decisions or acting as majority leader or minority leader. That is one commendation I wish particularly to pay him. What has also impressed me about the Senator from California has been his great courage and his character. He has never been afraid to make decisions.

His intelligence is above the average. The United States Senate will certainly lose a very able and distinguished Member when Senator KNOWLAND retires.

I only hope that the good people of California will continue to keep him in public service, because America needs the type of leadership that Senator KNOWLAND possesses on both the national and State level.

It was with deep regret that I learned, when he informed us in the Republican conference the other day, that he would retire from the Senate at the conclusion of his term.

Again I say I regret to learn that he does not intend to seek reelection to the Senate.

Senator KNOWLAND, you have been an able leader, both as majority leader and as minority leader. The name of KNOWLAND will linger long in the minds of the Senate and of the people and will have an enduring place in the history of this Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the many tributes that have been paid to the high character and integrity of Senator KNOWLAND. His presence in Washington will certainly be greatly missed.

It should be mentioned that many ladies in Washington, including our wives, and also we younger Members, who appreciate beauty and charm and grace, will equally miss the presence of Senator KNOWLAND's attractive wife, Helen, who is very popular and has always been very gracious to our wives and to all Members of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I turned on the television and saw there our good friend BILL KNOWLAND making his announcement that he would retire from the Senate. A man sitting next to me said, "Do you think he means it?" Of course there are a great many people who announce that they will retire from one office or another, and then do not do so.

I said, "You don't know BILL KNOWLAND. Look at that jaw. He means it."

The poet has said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. President, today we have had a diagnosis of what constitute's Bill's greatness. First, he is an honest, able, and devoted public servant. Second, he is a fine husband, a good son, a good father, and a good grandfather. I well remember him as a young man coming to the Senate 11 years ago. At that time he was a stripling, and the years have done much for him in many ways. They have added maturity of judgment and wisdom.

Sitting right back of him in the Senate, since he was elevated to his present position, through the years I could not help noticing how the majority leader and minority leader have, as someone has said, "manipulated" the affairs of the Senate. They have done quite a job, and I have had a great deal of enjoyment in seeing the give and take between them.

No, Mr. President, I do not think BILL KNOWLAND is through. I think he is going back to sunny California and to his grandchildren and other loved ones. After that—well, no one can tell; but BILL KNOWLAND will always be available for service.

I wish to mention one other of his characteristics, which I think is a very important one. He has the faculty of making up his mind and sticking to his decision. I think that must be the English in him. It is well that we have men with that characteristic—honest men, determined men.

Mr. President, friends and citizens alike all agree that they can say of Bill, "Well

done, thou good and faithful servant, but go ahead and do some more."

We wish for him and his wife and all his loved ones health, happiness, and success.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with everything good that has been said about BILL KNOWLAND I wish to associate myself. If this announcement had come from a man of lesser reputation for veracity I would have assumed that it was an effort on the part of California boosters to show that the pulling power of California climate is greater than the pulling power of service in the Senate. Not so with BILL KNOWLAND. Those who have served with him have recognized that he is a man of firm and strong opinions. Happily, he is a man who, having made up his mind, is still not the type that freezes it into a fixed position.

Mr. President, I think the past few Congresses have been exceedingly successful and fortunate in the type of leadership they have had. In the Senate we have two men sitting across the aisle from each other, members of different political parties, with very similar leadership characteristics. One is a little taller than the other; one is a little thicker than the other; one has something of a southern accent; the other has a western accent. But whether the political pendulum has been going to the right or to the left—and it has not been swinging very much either way, so far as the Senate is concerned—Senators on both sides of the aisle have had confidence in the leadership we have had.

I believe these two men BILL KNOWLAND and LYNDON JOHNSON share in common two great qualifications for leadership in the United States Senate. I referred to one of them indirectly when I pointed out that BILL KNOWLAND, while a man of firm convictions, is not one who is frozen into them. He is always willing to reevaluate the position at which he has arrived; and BILL KNOWLAND and LYNDON JOHNSON both recognize that in the Senate we very seldom get everything we want. We get as much as we can. I suspect that in most instances what we get is about as much as we ought to have. As a consequence, there is compromise; there is give and take. Both Bill and Lyndon have recognized that fact, and that is one reason, in my view, that we have had a series of successful sessions which have contributed much to the continuation of freedom in America.

I think these leaders share another characteristic, in addition to the faculty of working with men of different political convictions. They recognize that not at any time will all the logic, all the wisdom, and all the facts be found on either side of the political aisle. So, they confer together and work together as leaders of the Senate, rather than leaders of their respective political parties. I respect them for that characteristic, as well as for many others. They are reestablishing and perpetuating the concept that a Senate leader is a leader of the Senate, which I submit is more important than the leader of a political party, or the legislative spokesman for the executive branch of Government.

BILL KNOWLAND is the leader of the Republicans in the United States Senate. While I am not so intimately acquainted with what goes on behind the scenes on the other side of the aisle, I suspect that LYNDON JOHNSON is the leader of the Democrats in the Senate. The Senate is just as great an instrumentality of the Government as is any other institution created by the Constitution. I respect both these men for their substantial contributions in that connection.

I hope LYNDON JOHNSON will be with us for many years, but BILL KNOWLAND is leaving us in 2 years. I wish to pay special tribute to him for his contribution to the concept that the Senate is a coordinate branch of Government. It is just as great as is any other branch of the Government of the United States created by the Founding Fathers. Bill and Lyndon have always been faithful to that concept.

For that, Bill, as well as for your many other fine qualiites, I salute you. I have enjoyed working with you on the Committee on Appropriations and in that small, compact unit and fraternity known as the subcommitee. It has been a pleasure, and I wish you and your family well in whatever you decide to undertake in the years ahead.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with what my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has said with respect to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and also with what he has said regarding the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, there are six words which people usually employ on an occasion such as this. They are "integrity," "courage," "fairmindedness," "industry," "ability," and "vision."

All these words I think, must be used in speaking of BILL KNOWLAND.

Some years ago I read this sentence:

> The world makes way for the man who knows where he is going.

Someone may have written that in reference to BILL KNOWLAND, not with reference to the way he goes down the hall, but for the way he obtains his objectives.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words of well-deserved tribute to Senator BILL KNOWLAND. I deeply regret his decision to leave the Senate at the end of his present term. No man has ever served with greater distinction.

I became a Member of the Senate at about the same time Senator KNOWLAND came to the Senate. He was a leader when he came here and he steadily increased in stature as the years went by. He increased in stature because of his many fine qualities so ably described by other Senators. He was never afraid to take a firm position. His position on all issues has been in accord with what his conscience dictated even if that position was contrary to that of his own administration. That is one of the great qualities which I think has endeared Bill to all the Members of this body. We should have more BILL KNOWLANDS and not fewer.

In closing, I may say that I do not know of anyone who will leave the Senate with more good and loyal friends. May good fortune attend all your undertakings, BILL KNOWLAND.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for the splendid statement he made on behalf of the Republican Members of the Senate, and to associate myself enthusiastically with what he said. I also desire to associate myself with the many complimentary references which have been made to this very strong and able man who has announced that he will retire from the Senate.

Mr. President, there have been many illustrations of Senator KNOWLAND's great ability as a leader. I think perhaps the most outstanding instance I can recall is that which took place 2 years ago when we were dealing with what some persons had the temerity to call a filibuster in connection with an atomic-energy bill. Although some Senators denied that it was a filibuster, many Senators considered that it was—and it had all the earmarks of a filibuster for a long time.

It might not be untimely now to mention that the then majority leader's admirable handling of that situation probably had more to do with the ending of the filibuster and the bringing of that debate to a close than did any other single factor. I think his efforts culminated one day when he had been under attack for 2 or 3 days for trying to break the prolonged debate. Not being able to resist longer the temptation, he made a very strong and vigorous speech extemporaneously on the floor of the Senate. I consider that to be the greatest speech I have heard in the 4 years I have been a Member of the Senate. Every Senator who was in sympathy with BILL KNOWLAND'S views rose spontaneously and instantly to applaud him upon his magnificent statement.

So, Mr. President, I join with all who have spoken in expressing admiration for Senator KNOWLAND, and in wishing him Godspeed and happiness in the future.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, soon after I became a Member of the Senate in 1955, I had the pleasure of meeting the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. In my opinion, he and the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] are two of the ablest men with whom I have ever come in contact. I feel that the Senate and the Nation are fortunate in having these two men in positions of leadership in the Senate.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of high character and integrity. Lofty character is his very heart; he is the epitome of integrity; he is a man of fine intellect.

I am sure every Senator realizes the great ability of this man, for he has demonstrated it on many occasions. One of the finest addresses I ever heard in the Senate was a speech by Senator KNOWLAND on the Formosa resolution.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of intense industry, although he is a leader, and

does not have the time to do many things a Senator would do in the ordinary course of events. He is a hard worker, and he accomplishes as much, possibly, in many minor matters on behalf of Senators as even Senators themselves could do.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of great resolution. I do not know any other Member of the Senate who has more courage than has Senator KNOWLAND.

I admire him for his forthrightness and fairmindedness.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of great erudition. There are very few questions, I believe, which one could discuss with him without realizing that he is a learned man.

Senator KNOWLAND is dependable. I have the feeling, as I believe all other Senators have, that what Senator KNOWLAND tells us is absolutely the truth, without any question. His word is his bond. It affords one great satisfaction, in dealing with people, to have confidence in one's fellow men.

Senator KNOWLAND is a man of great physical stature and a man of commanding brain. He looks like our ideal of a President, and some day he may become President. He is a fine man and a great American. I admire him for his great record of service in the Senate and to the Nation.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues concerning Senator KNOWLAND. He certainly is a man of courage, character, and integrity. But as for myself, I like to describe him as a great constitutional American.

This body will miss the services of Senator KNOWLAND, but I have a feeling, away down deep, that when he retires his State and the Nation will not have lost him forever. I know not what course he may take, but I wish Godspeed to him and his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have waited until toward the end of the tributes because most of the Senators who have spoken thus far have served in the Senate with my colleague, BILL KNOWLAND, far longer than I have. But I must say that I share the regret to which various Senators have given voice because of the announcement by the senior Senator from California that he will conclude his Senate service in 1958. My regret is as a Member of the Senate, as a Californian, and as one who has had the very great honor and privilege to call BILL KNOWLAND my friend over the many years. My colleague and I served together in the California Legislature some 20 years ago.

I say again, Mr. President, what I said to the Republican caucus earlier this week. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND is as well qualified to hold any position of public trust in America as is any other person in the Nation.

Earlier, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] suggested that my colleague's seat in the Senate should be graced in the future by a member of the Democratic Party. I should like to tell my friend from Missouri—indeed, all my brethren in the Senate—that California is not a partisan-minded State. California judges the worth of a candidate for public office. My colleague sits in the Senate today as the result of the elective process 5 years ago, when he became the nominee not alone of the Republican Party but of the Democratic Party, as well.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment.

Three and one-half years ago BILL KNOWLAND became the majority leader by the acclamation of his Republican brethren upon the untimely passing of a great American and a great Senator, the late Bob Taft. He inherited the responsibilities of leadership of the Republicans in the Senate, but he inherited something else, too. Bob Taft had earned for himself during his tenure in the Senate the accolade for Mr. Integrity. BILL KNOWLAND has inherited that accolade, and well deserves it.

Native son of California, and son of a native son of California who graced the House of Representatives many years ago, BILL KNOWLAND will leave the Senate with a deserved reputation as a devoted American, a great statesman, and a "great guy." The friendships which were accorded to him by Senators on both sides of the aisle will endure, as I feel certain will his long and active interest in the Government of the United States.

I now yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I do not know whether my distinguished and very good friend, the junior Senator from California, was here when I made my observations with respect to my admiration for the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. I was present.

Mr. HENNINGS. I also expressed the hope, as a Democrat from a two-party State, that he might be succeeded by a Democrat of equal caliber.

It so happens that I believe in the two-party system. I believe in the Democratic Party. For that reason, I certainly meant no unkindness; I meant nothing invidious. I merely suggested my hope that a Democrat might succeed to the seat held by my good friend from California.

I am certain the State of California does select men and women for public affairs based upon their individual ability, because they are good men and women. Our friend's presence attests to that fact. But I think, too, that there are other States in the Union which perhaps have some apperceptive basis for the selection of their candidate for elective office as well. I like to think that my State, and indeed all the States, possess those same virtues and qualities.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to assure my friend from Missouri that he is incapable of any unkindness. I was merely indicating what the record was with respect to the election of my colleague.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to testify that the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has rendered invaluable services in his capacity as a Senator. In my judgment, he has been able to do this because of his fine qualities of mind and heart, and especially because of his complete intellectual honesty and his unexcelled moral courage. I wish him Godspeed in his future activities.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know the distinguished minority leader and his gracious wife for many years. In my opinion there is no one on this side of the aisle for whom the members of my party have greater respect or more affection. I also believe that if it had not been for Senator KNOWLAND's long fight in the Senate for adequate defense, we would have nowhere near the military strength this country has today, especially in airpower.

I join my colleagues in expressing deep regret that one of the finest men it has ever been my privilege to know has decided to leave the Senate. We will remember always the character and devotion to duty of this American patriot.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, very few men who serve in the Senate leave their mark upon this body. Senator KNOWLAND has accomplished that. He has had a very distinguished career in the Senate of the United States. Not only has he been an effective Senator, and not only has he been a great Senator, but he has won for himself a large number of warm personal friends in this body. I do not believe there is anyone who has more warm personal friends here than he had.

He has been very honorable. He has been very conscientious. Furthermore he is one of the friendliest Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we are very fortunate in having in this body two men who are so alike in character and in traits as the majority leader and the minority leader.

I am sorry that Senator KNOWLAND is leaving the Senate. I know that when he leaves, I shall lose a friend in this body. Also, Mr. President, I know that his loss to the Senate will be a loss to our country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am delighted, indeed, and honored to be able to add a few words of tribute to the very deserved tributes already paid to our distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I never met a finer gentleman or a more devoted public servant in all my life.

In speaking with the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I remember that once he casually said to me, "Whenever BILL KNOWLAND gives you his word, his word is his bond."

Somehow, Mr. President, I am not saddened by the announcement that BILL KNOWLAND is leaving the Senate of the United States, because I derive comfort from the fact that if BILL KNOWLAND has made that announcement, that is precisely what he chooses to do, for BILL KNOWLAND has developed a faculty of doing what he wants to do. That is the reason why he exemplifies such a strong courage of conviction.

We shall miss BILL KNOWLAND from this body. I know I will miss him both as a Senator and as a personal friend.

But again I derive comfort from the knowledge that, because of his vigor and his enthusiasm, we shall hear many bigger things from BILL KNOWLAND in the years to come.

Mr. President, at the moment, and speaking for myself, I extend to him my best wishes for continued health, happiness, and service in the years to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to associate myself with the very warm and meaningful remarks being made today regarding our distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

During the past month I have had the privilege of knowing Senator KNOWLAND in a new capacity, namely, as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly; both Senator KNOWLAND and I have been honored by being appointed to the position of delegate. I have watched his service there, as I have witnessed his service here; and in both places I have observed the dedication to purpose and conviction with which he applies himself. Let me also say that the strength of his character is always evident in his activities.

Mr. President, BILL KNOWLAND believes in the two-party system. Not only does he believe in it by lip service, but he believes in it by legislative service and by political service, both in this body and from the public platform and in every action in his public life.

Mr. President, the two-party system is vital to the successful operation of this Government. BILL KNOWLAND makes it quite clear to both friend and foe, alike—if he has any foes—that his party is the party of his conviction, and not merely of convenience; and that it is his party that he represents when he serves as a partisan member. However, let me say that he always places his party second to his country.

If I were to say only one sentence to typify BILL KNOWLAND, it would be that no greater patriot ever served his country. Mr. President, BILL KNOWLAND is a patriot. Even as he and I have disagreed on matters of legislation—and by the way, Mr. President, one can disagree with BILL KNOWLAND without being disagreeable or without having him be disagreeable—I have said to some of my colleagues, some of whom are present at this time, that Senator KNOWLAND has an inestimable value to his country because of the depth of his conviction about the defense and security of the United States. To me, that means everything. It means the protection of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution and the whole basic structure of our social and political order.

Mr. President, I wish to add that all too often we speak of someone in public life as being forthright, honorable, and a man of integrity. I wish we did not use those words so loosely as they have been used at times. But let me make it crystal clear that when I say BILL KNOWLAND is forthright, every Member of this body and everyone else in the country will agree, because he is; in fact, sometimes he is so forthright that he disturbs his close friends because of his willingness to express his convictions.

Senator KNOWLAND is honorable in every relationship. If he disagrees with you, you do not have to learn of it from someone else, for Senator KNOWLAND is willing to tell you. If he supports you or agrees with you, he is also willing to let you know of that. Integrity is a definite part of his character. I have never known him to be anything but a man of honesty—intellectual honesty from his point of view and personal honesty.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that Senator KNOWLAND is a skilled legislator. It will be difficult to find one of equal skill, because legislative skill comes both from experience and from insight. He has both. His service as majority leader and as minority leader is a credit to himself, to his party, and to his country.

Let me add, in a spirit of true friendship, that I hope he is always successful in the primaries. I am not sure that I would want him to be so successful in some of the general elections. [Laughter]. But if it happens that he is successful in them, too, the country will do well.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall always remember that, soon after I became a Member of this body, I attended a conference of Senators when a memorable reference to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was made. A complicated question was pending. The position of various Senators was under discussion. Someone asked, "How does Senator KNOWLAND stand on this?" Someone else replied, "I talked with him about this particular phase of the question, and he made no commitment." A little later a different phase of the complicated question was under discussion. Among those about whom inquiry was made was Senator KNOWLAND. One Senator asked, "How does Senator KNOWLAND stand on this?" Another Senator replied, "I discussed this with Senator KNOWLAND, and he told me he stood thus." A very senior member of the group said, "Well, when BILL KNOWLAND takes a stand, he stands as if his feet were in concrete."

Mr. President, I consider that a great tribute. In this body, where integrity is prized above almost every other quality, if not above every other, BILL KNOWLAND stands out for possession of that quality in the maximum degree. That would imply that he is held in respect by all of his colleagues. I am sure that is true. In addition to being held in respect, I know that among all of my close associates with whom I have conversed on the subject, he is held in the deepest of affection.

It is my personal pleasure to serve on the same committee with Senator KNOWLAND—sitting side by side with him on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It is not only my pleasure, but also my profit, to do so.

Mr. President, great men have graced this Chamber, but none has done so with more sterling capabilities and qualities than has Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California. I can only express the hope that he will reconsider his decision, and afford to the people of California the opportunity to choose between him and another to continue to represent them in this great body.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have listened to a great many eulogies which have been delivered on the floor of the Senate, and I never at any time heard any eulogy or any series of eulogies which were more suitable, more accurate, more in order, or more deserving than are those which have been spoken this morning in connection with the announcement of our distinguished minority leader.

There is nothing I can say in addition to what has already been said, but I do want to point out to Bill that there has been no exaggeration in anything that has been said. Everything which has been said has been spoken from the heart. Every Senator has been sincere in what he has said, and, in my opinion, that means a great deal.

I join in the eulogies which have been made as a colleague of Senator KNOWLAND. I think I have been in the Senate almost as long as he has; but, at one time or another, we have worked closely together. Bill, I admire your steadfastness, your courage, and your integrity. Those qualities are what make a great leader. Those qualities have been demonstrated by you on the floor. When you made the statement of your intention to retire from the Senate, I was dismayed. It takes a long time to build a great leader. I know something about that. You have demonstrated that you are a great leader, as has LYNDON JOHNSON on the other side. We trust you will reconsider your decision, but, knowing you as we do, we know you will not. At the same time, I am sure I express the feeling of all of us here when I say that we hope you will not retire entirely from public life, which would be a great disaster to the people of California and to the people of the country. The Lord be with you and keep you and your family.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, although I have had the privilege of serving in this body only a few days, I have worked closely with Senator KNOWLAND over a period of years, and I have had the privilege of knowing him and his charming wife since I came to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives 10 years ago. I am indeed grateful that, as a freshman Member of this body, I shall be privileged, for at least 2 years, to serve under his able and understanding leadership.

As Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, I worked very closely with Senator KNOWLAND for a period of about 3 years on matters of vital concern to the security of our country. During that period, he served with distinction as majority leader and subsequently as minority leader. He was always fair, frank, courageous, and most diligent. His energy and his ability will be missed, not only in the Congress, but I am sure I can speak for my former associates in the State Department. He will be missed throughout the entire Government.

I wish to you, Bill, and your family all happiness and Godspeed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the re-

marks of those Senators who today have paid tribute to our distinguished minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I have no idea what has prompted his course; but if he feels that he must not seek reelection and that he must leave the Senate, I wish to say that it has not only been a genuine pleasure to serve with him, but that at times he has afforded me an inspiration by reason of his courage, by reason of his sincerity, and by reason of his devotion to what I conceive to be the ideals and principles of Americanism. I wish him to know that wherever he goes and whatever fortune he may pursue in the future, my respect, my esteem, and my good will go with him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to ask permission to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the remarks with regard to Senator KNOWLAND, a public statement which the Chair issued yesterday with regard to the Senator's announced retirement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make that request, Mr. President, and I should also like to request that each Senator may be permitted to insert in the RECORD at the appropriate place in today's proceedings any statement he may care to make on that subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Several Senators have made such a request, and the Chair appreciates that fact.

Is there objection to the Chair's request?

There being no objection, the Vice President's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

BILL KNOWLAND'S service to his State and Nation has been in the highest and best traditions of the United States Senate. I have never known a man who has worked harder or who has been more dedicated in his public service.

I know I reflect the sentiments of his many friends in California and throughout the Nation in expressing the hope that despite the decision he announced yesterday, he will return to public service in the future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my very deep appreciation of the remarks that have been made by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this occasion. It is difficult to make a proper response, and I shall not try to do so today; but I do want to say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, who sit with me in my own Republican Party, and to those who sit on the other side of the aisle, Members of the great Democratic Party, that so long as I shall live, I shall deeply cherish the associations and the friendships that have grown out of 11 years of service which I have had up to this time, and some 13 years of service which will be completed when my term expires in 1958.

I respect the Senate of the United States as a great institution. I believe that it is an institution upon which at some point, as it has in the past, the very survival of our Republic may depend. I believe that the Senate of the United States possesses certain features and characteristics which no legislative body in the world, or at any time in all history, has had. I think it is vital to our Nation, and vital to the freedom of our people, that we keep intact the great traditions, the great responsibilities, and the peculiar powers which reside in this body and its 96 Members. We share the legislative power with the great body on the other side of the Capitol, and together, under the Constitution of the United States, we are the possessors of, not a part of the legislative power, not half of the legislative power, but we are the possessors of all the legislative power, as a coordinate, and not as a subordinate, branch of the Government of the United States.

I think every man who comes to this Chamber, from the very newest to the most senior in years or senior in service, has a heavy responsibility resting upon him to preserve, insofar as he can, the traditions, the responsibilities, and the powers of the Senate of the United States. So long as I serve in this body, I shall seek to do so to the best of my ability. So long as I am privileged to draw a breath of life, I shall cherish deeply the friendships that I have made on both sides of the aisle, which I know I shall carry with me even after I leave this Chamber.

I hope that, either in my visits to your respective States or in your visits to mine, we may have an opportunity to meet together often, and perhaps reminisce over some of the great associations we have had together as Senators of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, along with several other Members of the Senate, I was waiting to join other colleagues in paying well-earned tributes to the distinguished minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND.

In keeping with Senator KNOWLAND'S usual selfless attitude, he was more eager to have the oath taken by another Republican Senator and thus acquire another Republican vote than he was to hear the encomiums which were justly due him.

Therefore, I know that several Senators have failed to express their appreciation for the able way in which the distinguished minority leader and former majority leader has discharged the duties of his office.

Personally, I know of no man, in my 18 years of legislative experience, who has been more dedicated, more sincere, more competent, and more determined that the legislative processes and the importance of the legislative branch be fully protected as the great independent body of Government it is, than has been the distinguished senior Senator from California, the minority leader.

I should like to say that the Republican Party perhaps is luckier than it has a right to be in having been able to find such an able and competent and sincere leader to succeed its former leader, the late Robert Taft.

Therefore, I should like to join with my other colleagues in expressing my appreciation to Senator KNOWLAND, not only because of what he has done officially, but also for the friendship and good will and kindly attitude he has always manifested toward Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

I wish also to say that he sometimes gives the impression, perhaps, of concealing the great humanitarian impulses he has. I should like to recite only one instance to illustrate that point. A war veteran, who was paralyzed as a result of a postwar injury and was near death in a civilian hospital, required special legislation to be passed in order to admit him to the specialized treatments which would be available to him in a veterans hospital, but which, because of legislative technicalities could not be given to him. Such advantages which are extended to all other veterans could not be extended to him because his service had been largely with the Canadian Air Force, although he had enlisted in that force with encouragement and sanction in this country. At that time Senator KNOWLAND was majority leader, and the Senate had under consideration a bill which dealt with billions of dollars in foreign aid appropriations. We explained to him the urgent necessity of enacting legislation in order to help this dying ex-serviceman, who was a victim of paralysis. Without giving the matter another thought, Majority Leader KNOWLAND moved to lay aside the billion dollar appropriation bill then before the Senate so that one veteran could receive consideration in the Senate of the United States.

Bill will never attempt to show his softer and kindlier side. I hope Senators will forgive me for reciting this incident, of which I have personal knowledge, to show how warmhearted this man is. The Senate will deeply miss him, as will all of us his friendship.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with my colleagues in expressing regret on the prospective retirement of the senior Senator from California. I think his character and type of service have placed him in a special niche in the Senate.

Mr. BEALL subsequently said: Mr. President, for more than a decade I have considered it an honor to know BILL KNOWLAND as a friend and as a colleague, and although my State and his are a continent apart, the East and West have indeed met in the admiration I have for his integrity and ability. Perhaps I should take this occasion to thank the senior Senator from California for the help he has given to me and the people of the great Free State of Maryland, but, instead, I will address my expressions of gratitude to the citizens of the State he has so ably represented. Following his appointment to the Senate of the United States in 1945, the people of California watched his work and then indicated their approval by providing him with overwhelming victories in the elections of 1946 and 1952. It is to the voters of California, therefore, that I extend my thanks, for they gave this Nation a chance to profit from the services of an honest and forthright leader. The man they named to represent them as their senior Senator—WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND—has been a credit to his State and his party, and his services will be missed by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I apologize to the great State of New York, because during the proceedings which have just taken place the Senator-elect from the State of New York has been waiting very courteously. Under the rules of the Senate the administration of the oath to a Senator-elect is a highly privileged matter.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the Senator-elect from the great State of New York may now be allowed to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of election of the Senator-elect from the State of New York was laid before the Senate on Thursday, January 3, 1957.

If the Senator-elect will approach the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. JAVITS, escorted by Mr. IVES, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President and was subscribed by him.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have had a very wonderful time today in heaping encomiums on the senior Senator from California. I understand that the Vice President is marking his birthday today, and I wish to join with all other Senators in congratulating him. Let us give him a big hand.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appreciates the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of Senators, that the Senate will take such time as may be necessary for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and other routine business, and at the conclusion of that time we shall ask permission to consider a number of committee assignments that must be made on behalf of the majority and minority. They are suggested committee assignments for this session. Prior to submitting the list of names, the majority leader will suggest the absence of a quorum so that all Members may be on notice.

I now trust the Senate will proceed with the regular routine business.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the vice president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1956, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SOVIET VIOLATION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER IN HUNGARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Father George Council, No. 3758, of the Knights of Columbus, at Wayzata, Minn., has sent me a resolution in connection with the Soviet violation of the United Nations Charter during the recent Hungarian revolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Federal Courthouse Building,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, the members of the Knights of Columbus, Father George Council, No. 3758, propose the following resolution:

"Whereas basic human rights guaranteed by the natural law ordained by God have been openly, wantonly, and cruelly violated by Soviet Russia and its puppet government of Hungary over a period of many years, this repression finally erupting into such violence as to draw world attention;

"Whereas the recent and continuing violence in Hungary has alarmed many people and nations, largely unaware of the true state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain;

"Whereas the opportunity is thus afforded to focus the pressure of world opinion through every possible channel upon the diabolic forces at work in Hungary and thus, it is hoped, to ease the pressure on those heroic and suffering peoples;

"Whereas basic human rights and national sovereignty have specifically been guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations to all people and by the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947 as ratified by the Allied Powers to Hungary;

"Whereas the deportation of the flower of Hungarian youth is continuing, and the systematic reduction of the will to resist is being carried forward ruthlessly at the present moment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, We call upon all such nations as subscribe to the Charter of the United Nations to deny recognition to the present Hungarian puppet government and call attention to the importance of such denial in the case of Red China;

"We further urge said nations subscribing to the United Nations Charter to implement immediate and effective measures to stop the deportation of Hungarians into Soviet Russia and to restore fundamental freedom and national sovereignty in Hungary and in all Eastern European countries;

"And to implement said measures within the framework of the United Action for Peace plan of 1950 which enables nations within the General Assembly of the United Nations to take effective measures against aggression by the employment of an international police force, irrespective of Soviet veto;

"And to further implement said measures by economic pressure on Soviet Russia, severance of all cultural relations in the fields of art, science, and especially athletics until such time as it can be demonstrated that such relations inure to the benefit of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain and not to the propaganda purposes of the Soviet masters.

"Adopted by Father George Council No. 3758, Knights of Columbus, December 17, 1956.

"LEON LEVER,
"*Grand Knight.*

"Attest:

"GEORGE W. MEISTER,
"*Recorder.*"

TAX SAVINGS ON CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS BY SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Louisiana State Dental Society, relating to the Jenkins-Keogh proposal for tax savings on certain contributions by self-employed persons.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF JENKINS-KEOGH PROPOSAL

Whereas the Internal Revenue Code grants to corporate officials and employees substantial income-tax savings on certain amounts contributed to corporate pension or retirement program for the benefit of these officials and employees; and

Whereas similar tax savings are not granted under the law to self-employed individuals in connection with amounts contributed by them to their private pension or retirement programs; and

Whereas legislation, popularly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bills, to correct this tax inequity and to encourage sound saving practices on the part of self-employed individuals has been before the Congress for the past 6 years; and

Whereas during this period the essential equity of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal has been proven by irrefutable evidence and has gained the endorsement of both political parties and of the President of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Louisiana State Dental Society supports the principle of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal which would entitle self-employed individuals to realize tax savings on specified amounts contributed to voluntary pension or retirement programs comparable to the tax savings enjoyed by corporate officials and employees in connection with their pension or retirement programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the Louisiana State Dental Society urges the 85th Congress to enact this proposal into law and asks each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation to lend his leadership and influence in the Congress to the achievement of this objective at the earliest possible date.

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS" (S. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report of that committee entitled "Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations," for the 84th Congress, which was ordered to be printed.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF TELLERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as one of the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, pursuant to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to provide for the counting on January 7, 1957, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States, I submit the report, which I send to the desk.

This report is identical with the report submitted to the House of Representatives on Monday last, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and WILLIAM E. JENNER, tellers on the part of the Senate, OMAR BURLESON and KARL M. LECOMPTE, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957:

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President		
		Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Pennsylvania	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois	Walter B. Jones, of Alabama	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee	Herman Talmadge, of Georgia
Alabama	11		10	1		10	1
Arizona	4	4			4		
Arkansas	8		8			8	
California	32	32			32		
Colorado	6	6			6		
Connecticut	8	8			8		
Delaware	3	3			3		
Florida	10	10			10		
Georgia	12		12			12	
Idaho	4	4			4		
Illinois	27	27			27		
Indiana	13	13			13		
Iowa	10	10			10		
Kansas	8	8			8		
Kentucky	10	10			10		
Louisiana	10	10			10		
Maine	5	5			5		
Maryland	9	9			9		
Massachusetts	16	16			16		
Michigan	20	20			20		
Minnesota	11	11			11		
Mississippi	8		8			8	
Missouri	13		13			13	
Montana	4	4			4		
Nebraska	6	6			6		
Nevada	3	3			3		
New Hampshire	4	4			4		
New Jersey	16	16			16		
New Mexico	4	4			4		
New York	45	45			45		
North Carolina	14		14			14	
North Dakota	4	4			4		
Ohio	25	25			25		
Oklahoma	8	8			8		
Oregon	6	6			6		
Pennsylvania	32	32			32		
Rhode Island	4	4			4		
South Carolina	8		8			8	
South Dakota	4	4			4		
Tennessee	11	11			11		
Texas	24	24			24		
Utah	4	4			4		
Vermont	3	3			3		
Virginia	12	12			12		
Washington	9	9			9		
West Virginia	8	8			8		
Wisconsin	12	12			12		
Wyoming	3	3			3		
Total	531	457	73	1	457	73	1

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.
OMAR BURLESON,
KARL M. LECOMPTE,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, of the State of Pennsylvania, has received for President of the United States 457 votes;

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 73 votes;

Walter B. Jones, of the State of Alabama, has received 1 vote.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of the State of California, has received for Vice President of the United States 457 votes;

ESTES KEFAUVER, of the State of Tennessee, has received 73 votes;

HERMAN TALMADGE, of the State of Georgia, has received 1 vote.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Frances A. Seed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 362. A bill to amend section 4 (c) of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 364. A bill for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Yukio Nobuta;

S. 366. A bill for the relief of certain Korean war orphans;

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Tara Singh;

S. 368. A bill for the relief of Jose Medina-Chavez (Joe Medina);

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Vicenta Gonzales Orejel de Irving; and

S. 370. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yan-Lin Mui (Yan-Cho Kwan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 371. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended;

S. 372. A bill to further amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; and

S. 373. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 374. A bill for the relief of John Yung-Fong Liu, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 375. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such Act;

S. 376. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to establish rules and regulations and make orders with respect to networks and their activities;

S. 377. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 378. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such Act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 379. A bill to authorize the temporary furnishing of water from the Crow Creek pumping unit, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; and

S. 380. A bill to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals and to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) (by request):

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Constantinos G. Diapoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 382. A bill to amend section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to prohibit the making of adjustments in the support price of tobacco on the basis of varieties; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 383. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; and

S. 384. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 385. A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes; and

S. 386. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 387. A bill to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 388. A bill to restore to the rolls certain emergency officers heretofore granted retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 389. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served as contract surgeons or contract dental surgeons during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Rosa Hendrica Maria Warrick and Maria Josephina Warrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 391. A bill to prohibit the promulgation of rules and regulations by the Veterans' Administration requiring that real estate loans to veterans have maturities which are less than the maximum maturities provided for in title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or that downpayments be required with respect to such loans; and

S. 392. A bill amending paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a) by including the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Alfred C. Conder; and

S. 394. A bill to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Commander Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 395. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Lock Ting King;

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Willem Woeras; and

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Wachtfogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income a portion of the gain realized upon the condemnation of business property of an individual who has attained the age of 60 and is retiring from the conduct of any trade or business; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Paul Thury;

S. 401. A bill for the relief of Gladys Florence Thomas; and

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Martha Huber Vavra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 403. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes;

S. 404. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; and

S. 405. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (For Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 406. A bill for the relief of Lily Wu;

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Julian D. Dycaico; and

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Faith Hilda Kung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Cynthia D. Stark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 410. A bill to authorize the establishment by the Government of recreational facilities in certain reservoir areas of reclamation projects having a national significance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 411. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 412. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MALONE):

S. 413. A bill to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof; and

S. 414. A bill to provide for the conveyance, upon completion of the payment of construction charges, of the Newlands project, including lands and works, to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, Fallon, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 415. A bill to amend section 301 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, relating to the loss of nationality and citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 416. A bill to make the retirement benefits of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 available to certain persons who rendered active Federal service during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 417. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at the Birch Coulee battlefield site in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Trout; and

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Francis Cho-Yuan Lin and his wife, Wong Su-I Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 420. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; and

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shong Chan (Dong She); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 422. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; and

S. 423. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Herbert James Bramley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 425. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers by the construction of a dam at Chain of Rocks; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 426. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 427. A bill to protect the right to political participation;

S. 428. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; and

S. 429. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 430. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the Middle District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 431. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 432. A bill to allow additional income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; and

S. 433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORTON, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 434. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 435. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Shiloh National Military Park to the State of Tennessee for the relocation of highways, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amal Kumar Das; and

S. 437. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the Eastern, Middle, and Western Districts of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Paul Er (Ear) Chen and Lydia Chen, nee Shih Ming Chung;

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Susan Tsiang Ho; and

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Irene Ellenbogen Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Jose Remirez-Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 442. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Atkinson, Nebr., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 443. A bill authorizing the modification of the general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Missouri River Basin to include certain flood-control works in the Gering Valley, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 444. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Sho-Tse Tsiang;

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Maria Sabatino;

S. 446. A bill for the relief of Ki Young Kwan;

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Theresia Koenig;

S. 448. A bill for the relief of Maria Lorenz;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of Johann Kalatschan;

S. 450. A bill for the relief of Jakob Harjung;

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Johann Merle;

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Julia Sliwinska;

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Peter Menzer;

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Ursula H. Mueller;

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Johan Leber;

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Karl Schopko;

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Joseph Neuschl;

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Nicholas Prittes (also known as Thomas Prites, or Tom N. Phillips);

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Francisco Salinas (also know as Daniel Castro Quilantan) and his wife Graciela de Jesus Garza Salinas (also known as Graciela de Jesus Garza Quilantan);

S. 460. A bill for the relief of Arthur Fu-ju Lieu and his wife, Pauline Yin Lieu;

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Paul Yen-Hsiung Feng and his wife, Mary Stella Pao-Ching Feng, and their minor child, Joseph Shao-Ying Feng;

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Anarbal Contreras-Cueaves;

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ampo;

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Cacilie Emilie Eichman; and

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 466. A bill to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, providing for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 467. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans) to authorize additional financial assistance in connection with public projects made necessary by certain activities related to the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 468. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 469. A bill to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni; and

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Sophie Schipul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 472. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; and

S. 473. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 474. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit;

S. 475. A bill to authorize Capt. Merwin D. Hennings, United States Air Force, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of Thailand; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 476. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 477. A bill to grant to the landowners a certain percentage of the income to the Federal Government from mineral rights in lands acquired by stock-raising homesteads;

S. 478. A bill to cede to the State of New Mexico concurrent jurisdiction over certain areas of land in the State of New Mexico now under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 479. A bill to convey waterway to Eagle Creek Intercommunity Water Supply Association; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 480. A bill for the relief of Julia van Reigersberg Versluys;

S. 481. A bill for the relief of Caecilia Rama;

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Yueh Lee;

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Francisco Alfieri;

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Julian William Pozenel;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lino Turel;

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Hortensia Andrade;

S. 487. A bill for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales;

S. 488. A bill for the relief of Eva S. Winder;

S. 489. A bill for the relief of Mary K. Ryan;

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Jubencio Lucero, Sr., and his wife, Adela R. Lucero;

S. 491. A bill for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger;

S. 492. A bill for the relief of John A. Lynn;

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Irene Montoya; and

S. 494. A bill to permit the United States to be named a party defendant in certain suits to quiet title if the United States is a necessary party thereto by reason of its right, title, or interest in or to real property acquired from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 495. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia, and the construction thereon of additional facilities for the United States Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 496. A bill to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 497. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 498. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for full old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 499. A bill for the relief of Daniela Renata Patricia Zei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 500. A bill to protect the right to political participation; and

S. 501. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 502. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 503. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 504. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 505. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 506. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 507. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 508. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes;

S. 509. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary serviture; and

S. 510. A bill to secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. J. Res. 18. A joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Friday of October of each year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to study and make recommendations for the prevention of claims against the United States or the citizens thereof and for the security of American foreign investments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO ADJUSTMENTS IN SUPPORT PRICE OF TOBACCO

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to prohibit the making of adjustments in the support price of tobacco on the basis of varieties.

Recently, the Department of Agriculture announced it was inaugurating a new program to curtail the production of certain types of tobacco. The Department said it would begin this year to support certain varieties of tobacco at only one-half of parity in the hopes that this would discourage farmers from growing these certain varieties.

Mr. President, legally the Department has this authority under the law, but morally it has no such right because the intent of Congress certainly was not for this sort of discrimination to be practiced. It is for this reason that I introduce this amendatory bill.

Investigation into the Department's program for enforcing this new regulation indicates it is one of the most difficult problems they have ever brought upon themselves.

It appears the Department is going to presume every farmer guilty of planting the wrong variety of tobacco until the farmer can prove otherwise. This is not in keeping with the American form of justice.

I have been advised that the Department of Agriculture does have a few experts who claim they can determine one variety from another growing in the field. I do not doubt their claim, but any farmer will tell you, Mr. President, that this is practically an impossibility. The Department intends to send these experts into the field and spot-check tobacco crops. Then they will extort a sworn statement from each farmer as to what variety he is growing. If the expert determines otherwise, the farmer will be charged with fraud or perjury and his crop will be declared subject to only one-half parity support until the farmer proves himself not guilty.

The Department's program is impractical, demoralizing, unworkable, and unfair. I do not oppose the application of different parities on the basis of grades of tobacco and for certain other natural reasons, but to apply parity against a variety of tobacco is not right and is impossible to enforce without the use of Hitler tactics.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate will go along with this amendment to the law which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 382) to amend section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to prohibit the making of adjustments in the support price of tobacco on the basis of varieties, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT AND SALE FOR FEEDING PURPOSES OF LIMITED QUANTITIES OF CERTAIN WHEAT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills.

The first exempts producers from liability for harvesting wheat in excess of their marketing quotas when all the wheat so produced is fed or used for seed or food on the producing farm.

The second authorizes the annual sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of 100 million bushels of less desirable milling quality wheat for feeding purposes.

My action is prompted by a genuine concern for the welfare of livestock producers in deficit feed-producing areas, such as the Intermountain and New England States. In most of these States, production of poultry, eggs, turkeys, dairy products, sheep, lamb, and beef cattle—not the basic commodities and feed grains—constitutes the major agricultural activity. These bills, if enacted, in my opinion, would go a long way toward alleviating much of the distress producers in these areas are experiencing. In some States, drought conditions not only have reduced local feed production, which at best cannot meet local needs, but also in many cases have served to increase store-feed prices. Producers who have not adequate financial resources simply cannot make ends meet even in spite of the United States Department of Agriculture's feed grain subsidy program. In other States, rising costs of production and marketing, especially transportation, when coupled with heavy production of livestock products in the "basic commodities" producing areas of the country, have resulted in market prices below costs of production.

If any part of agriculture has been hard hit by the cost-price squeeze, it has been the livestock industry. It is imperative that the Congress provide relief for this segment of our most basic industry. These two bills are a step in that direction.

In January 1956, the President recommended to the Congress that producers, who use for feed, food, or seed on their own farms all the wheat they grow, be exempted from marketing quota penalties. Such legislation would be of major benefit to livestock producers in the deficit feed-producing States. At the same time, such legislation would not adversely affect the welfare of commercial wheat producers, since such wheat would not

find its way into trade channels, or end up under price support.

By way of illustration, let me point out that whereas farmers in my own State of Utah produced more than 6.5 million bushels of wheat in 1954, less than 8 percent of it was placed under price support. That same year 969.7 million bushels of wheat were produced in the United States, but 44.3 percent, by comparison, went under price support.

In most of the deficit feed-producing States which are designated as being in the commercial wheat area, acreage allotments are very small. With respect to 1954, the only year such data are available, the USDA reported that of 12,163 farms which produced wheat in Utah, only 1,313 had wheat acreage over 100 acres, 2,993 had acreage between 16 and 100 acres, and 7,857 had acreage below 16 acres. Utah farmers derive only 6.4 percent of their income from wheat production, and although it qualifies as a commercial wheat State, because Utah farmers produce more than 25,000 acres of wheat, it plainly is not an important commercial wheat-producing State. On the other hand, Utah farmers derive a major portion of their income from livestock products as follows: 22.5 percent from beef cattle and calves, 16.8 percent from dairy products, 8.8 percent from eggs, and 7.7 percent from turkeys. Most of the grains produced, including wheat, are fed to livestock, not sold in the commercial trade.

In general, what is true of Utah's agriculture, is also true of the agriculture of many other States in the intermountain area, in New England, and in the North Central States. Authority for farmers to produce on their farms, without penalty, wheat for feed would be of material assistance under prevailing economic conditions.

Historically, wheat used for livestock was a significant proportion of our annual wheat crop. For many reasons, this is no longer true. But the fact remains, as the President noted in his special agricultural message of a year ago, "There are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas distant from the Corn Belt."

The Commodity Credit Corporation as of November 30, 1956, had in inventory some 857 million bushels of wheat valued at $2.3 billion. If limited quantities of low-grade milling quality wheat, which comprise a part of this inventory, were sold at the discretion of the Secretary not only would it aid livestock producers in such areas, but also it would give a strengthening effect to wheat prices by reducing surplus CCC stocks which overhang the market. Also, if the authorized sale price reflects the feeding value of the wheat, and adequate administrative precautions are taken as to the effect such sales have on the prices of other feed grains, all parties concerned will be benefited.

The Congress to date has given very little attention to the pleas of livestock producers. Other than a few purchase programs, which more often than not have had little positive effect upon prices of livestock products, they have received no assistance. Farmers and ranchers in the nonbasic commodity producing areas are the forgotten members of the agricultural community. To enact these two bills would be doing little enough for them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

S. 403. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; and

S. 404. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality.

DEVELOPMENT OF FARM INCOME DATA BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, although the farm price and income situation has improved somewhat during the past year, agriculture has not shared equally in the unprecedented prosperity which other segments of the economy have enjoyed. One reason for such a situation, perhaps, is that we have tried to apply the same farm program to different types of farm enterprises, with the hope that in some miraculous way all farmers would benefit equally. For example, many persons have assumed that farm price support programs benefit all farmers. Others have suggested that the cure for the disparity between per capita farm and nonfarm income is a higher level of price support on the basic and other commodities.

A little reflection, however, upon these observations, I believe, will make it clear that there are certain fundamental problems in agriculture relating to size and type of farm, location, etc., which require different solutions and perhaps different types of public assistance than those generally assumed to be beneficial to agriculture as a whole. The 1954 Agricultural Census reveals that 2 million of the larger commercial farms, mostly family-type, produce about 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value and receive about 80 percent of net farm income. It also indicates that 2.7 million smaller family-type commercial farms, part-time, and residential farms produce only about 15 percent of the annual marketable crop value, and receive about 20 percent of the net farm income.

What conclusions can be drawn from this set of facts? Namely these: First, it is apparent that the owners and operators of one-third of our farms, mostly family-type, who produce 85 percent of our annual marketable crop value are the ones who benefit through the price support programs; second, two-thirds of our family-type farms produce so little for sale that they cannot materially benefit from price support programs regardless of the level of price support; third, it should be obvious that there exist great ranges of income disparity in agriculture, and, therefore, that average and per capita farm income figures, derived by dividing the number of farms and farm people into a net-income figure, are of questionable utility for policy determination.

Mr. President, it was concern over finding solutions to these diverse problems which prompted me to introduce S. 3145 in the 84th Congress. S. 3145 would have required the Bureau of the Census to collect and publish annually money and nonmoney income data, on a per capita and family income basis, by economic class of farm. Why by economic class of farm? Because such a survey will reveal the number of farms producing crops within different "crop value sold" ranges. For example, the 1954 Agricultural Census notes that:

First. There were 134,041 farms in so-called class 1, which are farms producing over $25,000 worth of produce.

Second. At the other extreme, 462,442 farms in class VI produced crops sold in amounts ranging from $250 to $1,199.

Depending upon the annual shifts of the number of farms in each of these economic classes of farms, the Congress should be able to develop more appropriate public agricultural programs. Such information would help the Congress to decide whether more or less emphasis needs to be put on price support programs, or whether more emphasis needs to be put on long-intermediate or short-term credit, or whether research and extension activities directed toward small-sized farms ought to be increased, and so forth.

The Department of Agriculture in its favorable report on S. 3145 likewise noted that:

> The bill will make it possible to obtain more adequate farm-income information by economic class of farm. This identification of farms by economic classes will be very helpful in many respects in dealing with the problems of agriculture. In fact, as indicated by the President's message to Congress on January 9, 1956, and a House Committee on Agriculture report issued March 31, 1956, some of the most difficult farm problems are with low-income farms. This measure will be helpful in identifying this class of farms. Moreover from a statistical standpoint, the national and regional estimates of gross and net income that would be obtained would supply useful information for strengthening our regular estimates of farm income, both on a National and State-by-State basis. In getting the income material which this bill would make possible, there also would be obtained enough information identifying the farm population as to aid substantially in keeping track of the farm manpower situation and other related developments. This would be especially valuable in case of a national defense emergency.

In its report on S. 3145, the Department of Commerce observed:

> The Department of Commerce agrees that data now available on farm income are inadequate. Agricultural policy determinations are frequently based on the farm-income situation. Since the incomes of commercial and noncommercial farmers and on large and small farms may differ substantially, information about income by economic class of farm is needed. The Department believes that positive, immediate action should be taken to supply these data.

Thus, both of the major executive departments concerned recognize the need

for more current and accurate farm-income data. So did the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for it ordered the bill reported with minor amendments on June 7, 1956, and it passed the Senate on June 11, 1956. The appropriate House committee, however, failed to take action on the measure.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk, for proper reference, a bill which incorporates the exact language of S. 3145 as it passed the Senate. It directs that "the Secretary shall collect annually money- and non-money-income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 405) to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm-income data by economic class of farm, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges.

This bill is in accord with the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, with the exception of the recommendations relating to the State of Tennessee. In this respect the bill is in conformity with a resolution passed by the judicial council of the sixth circuit recommending the additional judgeship for eastern Tennessee to be a roving judge for all three districts rather than a judgeship for the eastern district of Tennessee. The recommendations in the bill provide for the creation of 2 new circuit judgeships and 35 district judgeships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 420) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROJECT BETWEEN OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers by the construction of a dam at Chain of Rocks, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 425) to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers by the construction of a dam at Chain of Rocks, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement, presented by Mr. SYMINGTON, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

On behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize modification of the existing navigation project for the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, by construction of a rock fill dam across the Mississippi River at the upper limits of the Chain of Rocks, above St. Louis, Mo.

The estimated cost of the proposed dam is $5,810,000, and the bill authorizes the necessary appropriation to complete the project.

In accordance with the authority of a resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted December 6, 1955, the district engineer has completed his studies and investigations of this project. His report thereon was approved by the division engineer of the Lower Mississippi Valley Division, and has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as required by law, has been approved by the affected States, the interested Federal agencies, and the Bureau of the Budget, and the report has been transmitted to Congress.

The emergency condition which necessitates construction of the dam has been created by erosion of the river channel below lock and dam No. 26 on the Mississippi River, which during periods of low flows reduces the clearance over the lower lock sill to below the authorized 9-foot depth, thereby necessitating loading barges to drafts of 6½ to 7 feet, with consequent loss of cargo capacity.

To alleviate this condition, the Corps of Engineers recommends construction of a rock-fill dam across the Mississippi River about 900 feet below the Chain of Rocks Highway Bridge. The dam would form a broad-crested weir with a depressed spillway section capable of passing the minimum recorded flow of 40,000 cubic feet per second at a stage that would provide project depth of 9 feet over the lower sill at lock No. 26. The estimated first cost of this improvement is $5,810,000 with annual maintenance of $302,000. Construction of the project at Federal expense is recommended and no local contribution will be required.

State and municipal agencies, shippers of grain, petroleum products, bulk chemicals, and coal; inland waterways operations; small-boat club officials and riparian landowners have expressed deep concern over the existing obstruction to navigation presented by inadequate water depths over the lower lock sills at lock and dam No. 26 during periods of low water, such as have been experienced in the past, and which exist at the present time. This deficient channel depth causes light loading of barges with resultant loss of efficiency in barge loading; causes some increased damage to barges; requires use of more barges to maintain normal delivery schedules, thus creating a scarcity of barges; and causes serious delay in passing through lock No. 26 by reason of lightening loads and double tripping.

Other direct results of deficient channel depths at Alton have been a shortage of materials and supplies in certain localities, either because of inability to ship or because of delayed shipments, and loss of revenue to waterways operators because of diversion to other means of transportation and, in some instances, reallocation of tonnages from original shipping point to an alternate shipping point.

These low-water conditions have prevailed many times over the past few years, principally during the late summer, fall and winter months, when the main stem dams on the upper Missouri River are only discharging the power flows. During the fall of 1956, and at the present time, these low-water flows and channel deficiencies have been particularly acute because of the additional factor of the severe drought which now grips the area.

The waterway operators and the District Engineer report the revenue losses during low water approximate $1 million per month. The Federal Barge Lines have estimated their loss alone at approximately $166,000 per month during these periods.

These losses are occasioned by either bringing a loaded barge to the vicinity of lock and dam No. 26, where a portion of the cargo is placed on another barge or transshipped, or by partially loading the barge at its original shipping point to a draft sufficient to pass through the lock.

It can very easily be seen how much cargo capacity is lost by loading a 9-foot barge to 6½-foot draft at Houston, Tex., for shipment to Chicago, Ill.

The District Engineer estimates the benefit-cost ratio for this project to be 5.0, which is exceedingly high for a project of this magnitude.

It is recognized, however, that with the great growth of water traffic in the past few years, which will probably continue at an increased rate in the future, the project will completely return its investment over a period of a few months of channel deficiencies, by reduction of revenue losses. Continuation of these losses can only result in higher transportation costs to the shipper, who would inevitably pass such charges on to the consumer.

The former bottleneck in the Mississippi River at the Chain of Rocks has been removed by the completion of the Chain of Rocks Canal and lock. Practically all the traffic now passes through that canal. The bottleneck that now exists at lock 26 is the most serious one between New Orleans and Chicago, and between Pittsburgh and Minneapolis.

The recommended low-water dam at Chain of Rocks is not a new proposition. Its construction was recommended by the District Engineer in his report dated December 15, 1938, published as House Document No. 231, 76th Congress. In that report construction of the Chain of Rocks Canal was recommended, and the fear expressed that low-water flows as a result of operations in the basin upstream therefrom would become sufficiently small to limit the draft of vessels using the Alton lock, and would eventually necessitate construction of a movable low-head dam near the Chain of Rocks Bridge. The authorization and construction of the dam, if and when necessary, was recommended.

Mr. President, in view of the urgency of this situation, the early construction of this dam is the necessary solution to the navigation problem in the Chain of Rocks area. The project is urgently needed now. It will take at least 18 months to complete the project after construction is initiated. Its authorization at the earliest practicable date will permit expeditious planning, rapid completion, and realization of the full benefits that will accrue therefrom.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, so that a foundation may be laid as early as possible in this session of the Congress for that reform of our Federal election

laws which has elicited the support, in principle, of an overwhelming majority of the Senate, I introduced for appropriate reference, the bill I first introduced at the opening of the 84th Congress and which in the last Congress carried the number S. 636. I am quite aware that a great deal of electoral and legislative history has been made in our country since my introduction of this bill 2 years ago.

Certainly all of us who were here in this Chamber a year ago will remember vividly that 84 Senators then joined the majority and minority leaders here in cosponsoring another bill to amend our electoral laws—a bill numbered S. 3308. We must all of us, I think, remember how the need for such long overdue reform was dramatized suddenly in the minds of the American people last February by the so-called Case incident.

This incident, as will be remembered, was the announcement by the very distinguished and honorable Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that he had been offered a campaign contribution by an oil lobbyist in appreciation of his anticipated vote in favor of the natural-gas bill. It will be recalled that immediately after Senator CASE's announcement of that offer, the distinguished majority leader called for an investigation of the incident. When he did that, the Senate may remember, I attempted to have his resolution amended, so that the investigation for which he was calling could be broadened. I sought to have it cover the entire subject of the use of money to influence legislation in Congress and Federal elections.

I hope that the Members of this Chamber will remember that at that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and that I announced as soon as the request for an inquiry was made that this committee would meet to investigate Senator CASE's charges. I obtained at that time the unanimous consent of the committee to take jurisdiction in the matter. This subcommittee, which was created to deal with just this kind of public issue, among others, was thwarted then in its efforts to conduct its investigation. Simultaneously a select committee was appointed, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate, to make a broad study of campaign contributions, lobbying, and related matters.

That special committee started its labors. I am informed that its studies are still continuing and that they embrace possible alternatives to the provisions of S. 636—the bill which has been called the honest elections bill—and of S. 3308.

I certainly welcome the best efforts of this committee, and of its distinguished chairman [Mr. MCCLELLAN], to bring new thought and new information to the urgent task of enacting some amendment to the antiquated and obsolete Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 at this session. I am hoping that concrete results of the committee's activities to speed the passage of legislation of this character will be placed before us shortly.

So, also, I am sure we should congratulate ourselves on the fact that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and its very able chairman [Mr. GORE] have been amassing for us a great deal of information on campaign contributions during the national election campaign of last autumn. We all know that this election was characterized by the lavish use of funds by many political committees. We all know how essential it is to have adequate funds in any election and how difficult is the problem of their regulation.

Without in any way casting any derogatory reflections upon any other bill which has been introduced in the past, or which may be introduced during this session, to amend our election laws, I may say of my own bill that it has been endorsed by a majority of the Rules Committee, and when endorsed it represented the most adequate and advanced attempt ever made in this country to enact a satisfactory elections law.

In reporting it, a majority of the Rules Committee suggested that legislative provisions in the field of political expenditures for radio and television might well be incorporated into the bill as amendments. Majority members of the committee also favored inclusion of the provisions of a bill which was proposed last year in the House of Representatives to give tax exemption to political contributions of individuals up to $100.

I trust that as early as possible during this session of the Senate, all necessary or desirable hearings may be held to complete the consideration and final formulation of this proposed legislation. I hope that it will be brought to the floor of the Senate as early as possible and enacted into law. I know there will be many another important matter brought before us in the days which are now approaching. But in my thinking about the needs of our country I give high priority to this revision of the old Corrupt Practices Act, which has proved to be so ineffective.

Mr. President, this honest-elections bill, S. 636, is a measure based on many proposals by many distinguished Members of this body, made over a period of three decades. It was drafted on the basis of numerous committee recommendations, and with full attention to the advice and counsel of lawyers, political scientists, party officials, and officeholders. It is no hastily drawn measure.

I do not wish to claim for it so great a perfection that it is incapable of refinement during our normal legislative process. But more than any other measure so far brought before us it embodies the results of long and exhaustive studies by many persons, and of due deliberation by senatorial committees. In particular, it embodies one amendment to existing law without which no new law which we may pass will ever be adequate. It extends the coverage of Federal law which attempts to wipe out corruption in general elections to all primaries and caucuses held for the purpose of selecting candidates for Federal office.

Because of that provision, this bill of mine becomes a part of that great and historic legislative effort, now under way in this Congress, to assure all citizens of the United States the fullest Federal protection in the exercise of their constitutional rights. The right to untainted elections is one such right, implicit in the very nature of our Government.

We in this Congress owe it to the citizens of our country who elected us to make every possible effort to assure them honest elections. Unless I am grievously mistaken, the citizens of our country do not want the results of their elections weighted in favor of men and women and families of large means who not only cast their votes but subscribe large sums of money to obtain the election of candidates whom they favor. The use of the money power to influence elections, legitimate as it is, is a matter that has disturbed the American people for years. It is high time that we made a new attempt to deal wisely and vigorously with this problem. And it is to advance the consideration of it that I now reintroduce this honest elections bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 426) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four civil rights bills in the Senate of the United States.

These bills correspond to those favorably reported in the preceding Congress by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I have been privileged to be chairman.

This proposed legislation is intended to strengthen protection of constitutional rights guaranteed to all our people in our fundamental document of liberty and government, the Constitution of the United States.

I want it to be known that I am sponsoring these measures in an effort to get meaningful civil rights legislation enacted by the 85th Congress.

Passage of this proposed legislation, by increasing Federal protection of the basic constitutional rights of all our people, will help greatly to bring about equality of citizenship in this country, without regard to race, color, religion or ancestry.

I think it is high time that Congress exert a genuine bipartisan effort to enact meaningful civil rights legislation. I promise to do all in my power to see that this is done.

The bills I am introducing today:

First. Include primaries in increased safeguards for Federal voting rights.

Second. Outlaw lynching.

Third. Improve the Justice Department for handling civil rights violations.

Fourth. Extend to Armed Forces personnel the Federal protection against bodily attack now enforceable for the

Coast Guard and certain other Federal employees.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain summaries and comments which I have made on these legislative proposals.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First bill: This bill corresponds to S. 903, of the 84th Congress.

The purpose of this measure is to increase safeguards for Federal voting rights and thereby "protect the right to political participation."

Section 1 amends section 1 of the Hatch Act (U. S. C. 594) to include primaries and special elections among the elections protected. The section punishes anyone who intimidates, threatens, coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any other person for the purpose of interfering with the right of the latter to vote for candidates for Federal office. Punishment may be a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

In addition to the criminal penalties, the legislation provides:

(a) For civil suits by the injured party, or his estate;

(b) For suits by the Attorney General in Federal district courts for preventive or declaratory or other relief; and

(c) Concurrent jurisdiction by Federal district courts, with State courts.

Section 2 amends section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, to protect the rights of United States citizens to vote in local elections without distinction due to race, color, religion, or national origin. The amendment also seeks to protect "the right to qualify to vote."

The full, free, and unhampered right to vote is one of the most distinguished rights of an American citizen. The right itself, or the unfettered use thereof, today is still denied to millions of people in other lands, principally due to the continued presence of tyranny in the world. But there can be no excuse for any failure of the United States Government to adequately protect this right in the full process of participating in the selection of Government officials. "The consent of the governed," which forms the bedrock of our Government and our free society, contains the logical implication that the governed have full opportunity to give their consent.

The right of United States citizens to vote is grounded in the selection of Members of Congress in article I and amendment 17 of the Constitution of the United States, and is further clarified, defined, and protected by amendments 14, 15 and 19.

In many respects, the legislation proposed simply codifies sound case law. The right here recognized, protected by criminal sanctions and strengthened with civil remedies, should no longer be denied to anyone on such inexcusable grounds as race, color, religion, or national origin. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of feeling that the right to vote is protected adequately today when we know that many of our citizens are prevented from participation in the operation of their Government on these inexcusable and undemocratic grounds.

Second bill: This bill corresponds to S. 900, of the 84th Congress.

This legislation would be cited as the "Federal Antilynching Act."

The stated purposes of this legislation are given thusly:

"The Congress finds that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish the following purposes:

"(a) To insure the most complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States, and to enforce the provisions of the Constitution.

"(b) To safeguard the republican form of government of the several States from the lawless conduct of persons threatening to destroy the systems of public criminal justice therein and threatening to frustrate the functioning thereof through duly constituted officials."

The succeeding provisions of this measure:

(a) recognize the right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to be free from lynching, by virtue of provisions of the Constitution of the United States;

(b) punish—

(1) lynching;

(2) instigation of lynching;

(3) any governmental officer's or employee's refusal "to make all diligent efforts to prevent the lynching";

(c) require the Attorney General of the United States to cause an investigation to be made whenever informed on oath that a lynching has occurred, and that a governmental officer or employee is guilty of (b) (3), above;

(d) amend the Antikidnaping Act to include certain persons;

(e) provide suits for civil damages to injured person, or his next of kin, in event of his death, as result of a lynching; suits to be permitted against persons, the United States or subdivisions, a State or subdivision.

Punishment for lynching may be a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment not more than 1 year, or both. Where death or more serious injury results, the fine may be not more than $10,000, or imprisonment up to 20 years, or both. Nondiligent governmental officials could be fined $5,000, or imprisoned for 5 years, or both.

The definition of lynching in the proposed statute covers the common understanding of the offense and recognizes the unlawful nature of mob violence, whether death results or not. A "lynch mob" and "lynching" are defined as follows:

"Whenever two or more persons shall knowingly in concert, (a) commit or attempt to commit violence upon any person or persons or on his or their property because of his or their race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or (b) exercise or attempt to exercise, by violence against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person or persons in the custody of any governmental officer or employee or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person or persons, or of imposing a punishment not authorized by law, such persons shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of this act. Any such action, or attempt at such action, by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of this act."

We can be happy, as American citizens, that old-fashioned, narrowly defined lynchings have become comparatively rare in recent years. Nonetheless, mob violence directed against a person, or his property, because of his race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, is equally incompatible with law and order, whether or not death results.

And a close examination will disclose the distinction between lynching and murder. These distinctions between the homicides will apply, for the same reasons, to assaults.

In murder, one or more individuals take life generally motivated by some personal reason. In lynching, a mob sets itself up in place of the State, in disregard of the processes of law, and attempts to mete out punishment to persons accused or suspected of crimes. The mob in such cases sets itself up as the judge, the jury, and the executioner. In murder, the accused merely violates the laws of the State. In lynching, the mob arrogates to itself the powers of the State and the functions of the Government. It is, therefore, not only an act of killing but a usurpation of the functions of the Government, and it is this combination of acts which this legislation seeks to prevent. If there is no usurpation of governmental authority, and a homicide has been committed, the homicide, if punishable, is punishable under State laws. But where a homicide occurs, having as its basis the denial of justice to a person because of his race, color, or religion, or any associated reason, the crime committed is against the sovereign and should be punishable accordingly.

Where does the Congress derive authority for the punishment of such actions? First of all, from its authority to punish attempts to usurp Federal authority; secondly, from its constitutional power to guarantee to each State of the Union a republican form of government; thirdly, from the constitutional power to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment, prohibiting States from depriving any person of due process and equal protection of the laws.

It should be clear that those who participate in mob violence and lynching know no boundaries or sections. The evil which is to be corrected is not confined to any geographical area or political subdivision, nor does this legislation treat the offense as if it were a local or sectional problem.

Third bill: This bill corresponds to S. 902, of the 84th Congress.

The purpose of this measure is to reorganize the Department of Justice for the greater protection of civil rights.

This legislation would elevate the civil-rights section in the Department of Justice to the status of a Division, to be headed by an Assistant Attorney General.

The Division would be "concerned with all matters pertaining to the preservation and enforcement of civil rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

Another provision of the proposed legislation would authorize an increase in personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and their specialized training, for effective investigation of civil-rights cases.

These two proposals were among several recommendations made in 1947 by the President's Commission on Civil Rights (established pursuant to Executive Order 9808, December 5, 1946) when it completed its intensive study. But in the 10 years they have never been implemented.

I try not to delude myself or anyone else that this legislation by itself would work miracles on the protection of civil rights. However, if the other civil-rights measures I am proposing at this time are enacted, this legislation will be most important for effective enforcement purposes.

Merely increasing the number of attorneys assigned to the section would not accomplish enough at this date. The importance of a vigorous Federal civil-rights enforcement program warrants stature for the intradepartmental machinery and skilled technicians, ably aided by appropriately trained FBI investigators.

Fourth bill: This bill corresponds to H. R. 5205, and S. 1089, of the 84th Congress. I was a cosponsor of S. 1089 in 1955.

The purpose of this measure is to extend to all members of the Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard—the same protection against assault, manslaughter, and murder which is now provided for Coast Guard personnel and certain other Federal employees while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties.

This legislation would amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, by including members of the branches of the Armed Forces among the Federal employees designated to

be protected. The killing of any such persons while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties is punishable under sections 1111 (murder) and 1112 (manslaughter) of title 18 of the United States Code.

Furthermore, section 111 of title 18 of the United States Code punishes for forcibly assaulting, resisting, opposing, impeding, intimidating, or interfering with any of the above persons while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties.

Members of the Armed Forces are protected by Federal criminal laws while they are within the special maritime and Territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code. This jurisdiction includes United States military bases, installations, vessels, etc. But even though they may be engaged in the performance of official duties elsewhere, they are not provided similar Federal criminal-law protection. This legislation would correct the omission and extend them the coverage necessary to their occupations.

I believe that members of our Armed Forces, in the performance of official duties, whether on or off a military reservation, are entitled to the protection we have seen fit to grant to certain other Federal officers and employees. I believe we owe them this protection, particularly since we are drafting young men, and will probably continue to employ the draft for many years to come, although our country is not now at war.

The Department of Defense supports this legislation, but does not feel it should be limited to uniformed members of the Armed Forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. LANGER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 427. A bill to protect the right to political participation;

S. 428. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights;

S. 429. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; and

S. 468. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

A few years ago the Congress authorized the creation of a temporary judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee, which judgeship was subsequently filled. At the last meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States that body recommended that this temporary judgeship be made permanent, which indicates the necessity for two district judges for the middle district of Tennessee.

Unfortunately, the able and esteemed senior judge for the middle district of Tennessee, Judge Davis, passed away a few days ago. This, of course, makes the temporary judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee self-executing. By the terms of that law, the vacancy occurring cannot be filled and, therefore, the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States in this respect is of no force and effect. The bill would put into effect their recommendation.

In order to carry out the intention and recommendation of the judicial conference providing two judges for the middle district of Tennessee, it becomes necessary to introduce a different type of bill than has been recommended. I, therefore, introduce the bill which will create an additional permanent district judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 430) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DELINQUENT CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1957

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 431) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The investigations of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency have sharply pointed up the urgent need for more national leadership in the field of juvenile delinquency. It has also highlighted: (1) The striking gaps in existing programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; (2) the need for better coordination of services; and (3) the great need for more training programs for personnel serving delinquent youth.

In view of the above situation, on behalf of Senator HENNINGS, Senator LANGER, and myself, I wish to introduce a bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

I sincerely feel that the enactment of this proposed legislation into law would result in the following beneficial effects:

1. Better State and local planning for improving programs in behalf of juvenile delinquents. It would, we feel, make the same kind of contribution in this area that the planning grants under the hospital construction program have made.

2. A greater degree of coordination within each State of the programs of the various State and local agencies concerned with the control of juvenile delinquency.

3. Increased cooperation between voluntary and governmental organizations in this field.

4. Development of training programs for a wide variety of kinds of personnel in many agencies and institutions concerned with juvenile delinquency.

5. Stimulation of new and creatively conceived projects and programs that would contribute to methodology and to individual treatment.

6. Encouragement of research activities so that we may learn new ways of helping delinquent youth and evaluating the effectiveness of present treatment programs, and certainty of programs for the prevention of delinquency.

Such a deliberate refocusing of attention can be encouraged if the National Government were to make it possible for local communities to be effective in dealing with problems in local situations. I do not mean by this that the National Government can afford to become a police agency with reference to juvenile delinquency; I do not mean by this that the National Government can afford to give direction to these local programs or should be permitted to give direction to these local programs; but I do think the Government would be equipped, through this bill, to provide a permanent agency and immediate resources in an effort to make communities out of localities that are not communities, and can give, for example, to police departments and various agencies in those communities, the wherewithal, the training, the understanding, and the skills in terms in which the problem can be effectively handled at that point. I urge that we face up to the fact that what we need, and what this legislation in fact is, is not a proposal for the National Government to become the caretaker of the delinquents of the country, but is a proposal to offer resources to local communities to deal with the problem at the only point where it can be effectively dealt with, at the family level, at the local community level, and through the organization of these local communities, by the agencies of the States.

The appropriation of moneys in this bill falls into three categories felt to be vital in the fight against delinquency. These are: (1) grants-in-aid; (2) grants for training; and (3) provision of "risk capital."

GRANTS-IN-AID

The object in this area is to provide increased consultation or technical aid, give assistance in attracting and training personnel, and temporarily provide the "risk capital" needed for local organizations and agencies to launch and demonstrate the value of new services and programs.

The activities of the present Children's Bureau staff in the field of juvenile delinquency will lay the groundwork for development of the programs in the States which are contemplated under this bill. Important as the technical aid and research activities of the Bureau are in helping States, their experience over the past 3 years shows that the States cannot make the most effective improvement in their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency unless Federal grants are available to assist them in this undertaking.

The treatment and control of juvenile delinquency requires the cooperation of a wide variety of services and agencies. These include the police, detention care, courts, probation services, foster-family care, health services, including psychiatric consultation, vocational counseling, and education, training schools, and other types of group-care facilities, and aftercare, which refers to

placement and supervision usually after release from a training school.

Some of these services and facilities have been traditionally looked upon as responsibilities of local communities, while others have been generally accepted as responsibilities of the State. Whether State or local, public or voluntary, these activities are interrelated. Again, our experience shows that often a major reason why prolonged and costly treatment is not successful is that continuity in treatment and followup care is lacking at both the State and local levels.

Coordination of effort, then, is a key factor in effective planning and development of programs for the treatment and control of juvenile delinquency. Yet, because of the variety of services and agencies involved, most States and local communities have not yet developed a mechanism for effectuating this coordination. It is necessary, therefore, that plans must be made for this as well as for the detailed technical and training activities.

This bill authorizes a major grant for strengthening and improving State programs. This grant would be available on an annual basis for a period of 7 years. The purpose is to assist the States to establish, strengthen, and improve their plans and programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. This will be done by assisting them: (1) To estimate their needs for services to strengthen and improve their existing programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; (2) to develop plans for State and local action to strengthen and improve these services, including their effective coordination; (3) to coordinate services on a continuing basis at State and local levels; (4) to demonstrate or develop improved techniques and practices; and (5) to conduct research and investigations for assessing the causes and extent of juvenile delinquency and the effectiveness of existing control programs, and for developing improved methods for the control of juvenile delinquency.

The grant-in-aid formula provided for in this bill, making financial assistance available to the States, is a sound one. This was first demonstrated during the 1920's under the Sheppard-Towner Act, under which the Federal Government gave grants to the States to help build up health programs for mothers and infants.

It has been demonstrated for the past 20 years in the grant-in-aid programs for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare, under the Social Security Act. Under this formula, the States are given complete freedom to draw up their own plans, tailored to their own needs, subject only to broad requirements of the act.

In providing States and communities both with the leadership of the Children's Bureau and with financial grants to initiate and strengthen programs, the Congress is recognizing that the people of the Nation have a right to use their Federal, as well as their State and local government, to work on a problem of national proportions that, to put it in constitutional terms, provides for both the general welfare and the national defense.

The American parents committee, in a statement advocating the legislation under consideration, stated that "treatment and prevention must both take place in the cities and towns and counties where the children live and play and go to school. The problem is so big, however, that most communities are overwhelmed by it. We believe a grant-in-aid program set up in this bill will bring the communities some of the help they need."

GRANTS FOR TRAINING

The proposed legislation has provision for grants for training. The objective is to get money out to the States so that people can be training to fight juvenile delinquency with the utilization of all available knowledge at their disposal.

The primary purpose of all the various types of assistance to be provided under this bill is to improve the quality of the care and treatment given to delinquent children and youth and thus to inject throughout the treatment process elements that are preventive in nature and that will reduce repetition of delinquent acts.

And so in this bill there is emphasis on training personnel who come in day-to-day contact with boys and girls who are in trouble with the law; emphasis on special projects that will provide opportunity to try out new and improved methods of locating and working with delinquents; emphasis on finding ways and means for public and voluntary agencies to work together and pool their planning and experience; emphasis on research to gain new knowledge about causes and treatment.

Thomas J. S. Waxter, director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, spoke to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and stated: "Services which are to deal effectively with the deep complexities of human problems must be given with skill and understanding by persons who have a professional level of training and experience. One handicap faced by Maryland and other States is a lack of such personnel. In our opinion any Federal legislation must make provision for obtaining and training the staff necessary to do the job. We strongly advocate that funds for the training of the various types of necessary personnel be provided for in Federal legislation. Because of the urgency of this need, we recommend that funds be made available on a nonmatching basis."

The encouragement this bill gives to the employment of trained personnel in treatment services is highly desirable. We have seen the damage that is done, and the wastage of human lives that follows, when youngsters in trouble with the law are handed on from one untrained worker to another. The stimulus this bill would give to experimentation and demonstration will get many communities out of the mood of discouragement. It would get them off the dead center of inertia about their delinquency problems.

PROVISION OF "RISK CAPITAL"

Here the objective is to make funds available to States for utilization as risk capital to be used solely to launch and temporarily support new services only.

We must expect the Federal Government to share the leadership role in an attack on this problem by assuming the financial responsibility for the provision of such programs which are designed to strengthen local and State programs. Such grants can and should be made through the Children's Bureau, which has already accomplished a great deal in this field and is universally recognized as the agency through which these grants should be made.

It would devolve upon the Children's Bureau to coordinate all national efforts by public and private agencies toward the accomplishment of the following objectives:

1. It would provide technical aid to States and local communities.

2. It would help in devising programs for training of personnel which would deal with prevention and rehabilitation; it would use existing formulas of their grants-in-aid program to make certain that proper and adequate funds would go to those areas which are most in need in the attack upon this problem.

Congressional action is essential to authorize and appropriate the necessary funds to aid the States and localities in promoting decent housing, welfare, health, education, and recreational facilities which will make it possible to rear our children under conditions which will give them a fighting chance to avoid the pitfalls of juvenile delinquency.

Title I: Provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency. This Advisory Council would consist of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee, and 21 members appointed by the Secretary.

Objective: The Council would review applications for special projects submitted to the Secretary under title IV of this act and to recommend to the Secretary for grants under such title. The purpose in creating this Council is to get the expert knowledge of the leaders in the many fields concerned with juvenile delinquency, education, and related areas, who will be in a position to give valuable assistance to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in matters necessary to properly administer said act.

Section 101 provides for an Advisory Council to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The members of various associations who would be on the Advisory Council should be persons who have had experience in rehabilitative work, medicine, juvenile court work; in fact, a variety of people who have had different types of experience in the delinquency field. It is felt that this Council would greatly strengthen the position of the division in the Federal Government.

It is clear that this bill provides for the inclusion of agencies, both governmental and voluntary, whose concern is not merely with a specialized approach to delinquency, but also with a broad community approach as a part of the program. This offers a real hope for the development of a broader approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency in our country. It gives the voluntary organizations their proper place in the picture, but even more important, it provides a hope that in this program a beginning may be made in a true community approach which is the only sound approach in dealing with problems of juvenile delinquency.

Recognition of the fact that the control of juvenile delinquency can best be achieved through close-working relations between public and private agencies concerned with the well-being of children is sound. We hold firmly to the principle that public funds should and must be expended by public agencies, but we also believe that private or voluntary agencies have a great deal of value to contribute to public agencies and the work of all should be meshed together.

It was the hope of people in the delinquency field that whatever final act was passed by the Congress, it would contain ample encouragement to the Children's Bureau and to the State public agencies receiving Federal funds to draw on the advice and counsel of all other public and private organizations, both in designing plans for action and in carrying out such plans.

Title II: Provides for grants to the States to strengthen and improve programs.

Purpose: To provide the States funds to strengthen and improve statewide programs to combat juvenile delinquency.

Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Children's Bureau would have primary responsibility for the planning and administration of the grants provided under this bill, and for giving technical assistance as requested by the States. In addition, an interdepartmental mechanism would be established so that the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, and other constituents would contribute toward developing an overall plan for the administration of the program under this act. The Secretary would expect to appoint the advisory committee contemplated in the bill as soon as possible.

For the administration of strengthening and improving grants, we find that title II of the bill places administration in a State agency in concert with representatives of voluntary agencies and public agencies. This will have the good effect of bringing new ideas into the program.

Coordination among State and local public and voluntary agencies and organizations working in behalf of delinquent children is generally inadequate. State services for the control of juvenile delinquency are often scattered among many State departments—such as State departments of welfare, health, education, or correction; State youth authorities; and employment agencies. In most States, certain functions are entirely local and are not represented by a State department. This is particularly true of courts, probation departments, police, and often recreational agencies.

In most States provisions are lacking for assuring continuity in planning and providing care for individual delinquent youth. Responsibility for an individual child often shifts back and forth from the courts, to public or voluntary child-caring agencies, clinics, local and State institutions for delinquent youth, and other State departments or institutions. In many States and communities, there is little continuity in treatment during this movement. While certain avenues of cooperation between agencies and departments have been established, the procedure is often cumbersome and slow. As a result, many delinquent children do not receive the proper care and treatment at the time when it would be the most effective.

In order to eliminate such practices, the bill provides planning, and program grants for strengthening and improving State and local programs. One of the major purposes of the planning grants is to enable official State agencies and local agencies with responsibility for services in the control of juvenile delinquency to have time and funds to develop a coordinating mechanism and a coordinated plan for strengthening and improving their programs. Each State will determine the mechanism best adapted to the needs, resources, and organizational pattern within the particular State. Then, through the strengthening and improvement grants, the States will be helped to effectuate the plan developed for coordination of services.

Should this legislation be enacted, I believe that it would stimulate the States and local communities to greater accomplishments than ever before in strengthening and improving programs for the control of juvenile delinquency.

Title III: Provides for grants for the training of personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, or for the development of courses for such training, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships.

Objective: To provide the trained personnel in all categories in both the preventive and correctional aspects of the delinquency problem.

We feel that there are many things which are currently known in terms of the handling of troublesome and delinquent children which a national training service, made available to State training schools, could get over to them in terms of inservice training, and do an excellent job in a relatively short space of time. This should not be imposed from above and no one would suggest that. But if the service were available on request, I am confident that State after State and agency after agency would seek that service.

Alfred J. Kahn, professor at Columbia University, who represents the American Association of Social Workers and the Citizen's Committee on Children said that New York State recently passed legislation which provides a sound structure for State aid to probation training, State aid to curriculum building, State aid to inservice training, but the appropriations are very small despite the soundness of the total act. And the passage of Federal grant-in-aid legislation would certainly permit the expansion of training of this kind in a manner similar to that now projected in the field of vocational rehabilitation and the manner similar to that which has proven to be so effective in the field of child welfare and mental health.

Therefore, in reacting to this piece of legislation, Professor Kahn stressed the importance of those items in the proposed bill dealing with demonstration, research, pioneering efforts, expansion of services, inservice training, and particularly the importance of enabling institutions of higher education to expand training facilities and to offer scholarships and fellowships to people on the job who want to qualify themselves by leaves of absence and also people who want to enter into this field as a career after leaving their undergraduate training.

Services which are to deal effectively with the complexities of human problems must be given with skill and understanding by persons who have a professional level of training and experience. One of the primary obstacles to the development of the total range of social-welfare services is the shortage of people who have these qualifications. If it is agreed that these services are necessary, and that they call for personnel with special qualifications, it then follows that any broad measure to improve services must provide among other things, for increasing the number of persons having the requisite qualifications. Among the ways for achieving this are training stipends for individuals and support for schools in providing specialized kinds of training that is otherwise not readily available.

As matters stand today, it is futile to expand services to deal with the delinquency problem without also doing something about acquiring personnel—and in this field, acquiring them means training them. It should also be borne in mind that a critical shortage of qualified personnel exists in all social-welfare fields. Moreover, people who do have the necessary qualifications move from one job to another. It is, therefore, not likely that concentrating on improving the personnel shortage in one specialized field alone, such as delinquency, will raise that one specialty to a position of distinct advantage. All parts of the pool rise together. But at least it is reasonable to expect that a specialized field should contribute as much to the personnel pool as it expects to take out.

Title IV: Provides for special projects for the purpose of demonstrating improved techniques and practices for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Objective: To encourage special projects which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening of programs for the control or treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Despite our inadequate understanding of juvenile delinquency, we are not making effective use of the knowledge and techniques we presently possess. The attacks on the problem which are represented by existing programs are too often halfhearted and uncoordinated and overwhelmed by the vastness of the task and the imperfections of the available equipment. Moreover, communities frequently find that the various agencies and services are working at cross purposes as a result of conflicting concepts and objectives.

There must be a willingness to face up to the true proportions of the problem of juvenile delinquency, and to develop programs and services which represent the best available information and methods which provide consistent coverage without major gaps and in which all work in harmony and coordination toward a common purpose.

Much has been learned about the nature of juvenile delinquency and how to prevent and treat it, but there is also much more that we need to know. We need more scientific information about the social, psychological, and physical aspects of delinquency and the ways of applying this knowledge. We need to know more about the ways in which to organize and administer programs for making our services more effective in the communities throughout the country. For this reason, it is of particular importance to experiment and try new ways of doing things. Any Federal legislation should make possible special projects carried out at a Federal and State level to help discover new methods of approach and to test the old.

Title V: Provides for certain activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would serve the purpose for which the bill was introduced.

Objective: The above includes the following:

1. To make such studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports as will promote the strengthening of programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.
2. To cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.
3. To disseminate information as to studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports.
4. To provide short-term courses of training and instruction in technical matters relating to the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

It is felt by some that the most important feature of this bill is that which has to do with grants for planning and coordination at a State level. This sounds pretty dry when you read it in the legislative language, but in the course of the past 3 years the subcommittee has traveled in many States and talked with the public officials and voluntary officials, and the programs that have impressed the subcommittee members most are those in a few States, such as California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, where at a State level, an agency has employed a small number of persons, usually called community organizers, community service consultants, with training who are available not to give service to any individual youngster, but to go into a local county or a city where there is a group of persons—it might be the Rotary, it might be the Legion, it might be a religious group—but to go into a local community and help citizens that have an interest in this problem in assessing what happens to youngsters in that local community, what they can do about it, what are the obstacles to doing it and how can they overcome those obstacles.

These programs, which are planning and coordination in action, seem to me to have great significance insofar as they use a small amount of tax money, of public money, to help people do for themselves and they create thereby, by giving people an avenue of action, the spirit of caring, which we seem to agree in the testimony is the essential for licking this problem.

There is much that remains to be learned of the nature of juvenile delinquency and of the techniques that will be effective in its prevention and treatment. Therefore, there must be increased attention to studies and research that will yield more knowledge in these areas. At the same time, there is such a wide range of firmly held yet conflicting opinions as to how to deal with this problem that the more serious and less spectacular efforts are too often lost in the confusion.

It is true that more knowledge of delinquency is needed. Nevertheless, there is enough well-established information now available to demonstrate that a great many of the opinions and recommendations which are advanced on the subject are too narrowly conceived. Juvenile delinquency seems to be a prime example of a subject upon which quickly formed opinions and theories are held with great firmness and assurance while those arrived at after years of thoughtful study and objective deliberation are modestly advanced as tentative and incomplete.

Research—even the best research—is not going to be of much help if the information developed is not put to constructive use. Therefore, there must also be increased understanding on the part of the Federal Government and a willingness to support legislation such as this, which is positive, well-balanced, and comprehensive.

One of the most important measures to originate from the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency was S. 728 introduced during the 84th Congress, 1st session. A similar bill, S. 894, was introduced by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and both bills were referred to the Special Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under the chairmanship of Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York. Extensive hearings were held on these two bills, during which experts from many fields concerned with delinquency were heard from and whose testimony was utilized in drafting the final version of the combined bills, which was reported out as S. 4267 of the 84th Congress, 2d session.

This bill was approved by the Senate during the last days of Congress. Unfortunately, Congress adjourned before it was brought up for debate in the House. Since I feel the provisions in this bill are vitally necessary in our Nation's attempts to reduce juvenile crime, I urge its speedy passage.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Internal Revenue Code relating to income-tax exemptions for certain students.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to these bills, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, were received, read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 432. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; and

S. 433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, two bills which I consider vital to the development of our educational institutions, and to the general educational standards of our country.

The first bill would allow an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level. The exemption may be claimed by the taxpayer himself, or on account of a spouse or a dependent child under the age of 23, who is in attendance on a full-time basis at an educational institution above the secondary level.

The second bill would allow a taxpayer, who is a student in an institution of higher learning to deduct expenses for books, tuition, fees, and other supplies necessary to the courses of instruction in which he is enrolled. This bill is primarily designed to assist those students who work their own way through college, and it would apply to both full-time and part-time students, whether self-supporting or supported by outside sources.

Last April, I introduced these bills but was unable to obtain action on them before the adjournment. Since I have been a Member of the Congress, I have supported virtually every measure designed to aid and assist our students and to improve the educational facilities and institutions of this country. These bills are merely another method of providing an avenue for our students toward the goals they seek through adequate educational opportunities. Because I am convinced that the problem of improving our educational system is one of the most pressing of our time, I am once again introducing the bills in the hope the Congress will act on them during this session.

The continually rising cost of a college education, of course, varies, but I believe it reasonable to estimate the average cost at $1,500 per year, or roughly $6,000 for a 4-year college education. The cost of the more specialized courses in science and medicine quite often is much more than this, and yet the parent, or the individual himself, receives only a $600 a year personal tax exemption. Consequently, there is no incentive provided in our tax laws for one to pursue an educational goal.

There has been for decades a continual and serious deterioration in the general quality of our education. More recently, we have read and heard much about the mounting shortage of trained engineers and scientists in the United States. It is interesting to note that universities and technical institutions in Soviet Russia are graduating engineers in numbers some two and a half times greater than are similar institutions in the United States where we are now training only one-half the required number of engineers and scientists. In the decade 1950–60, the Soviet Union is expected to produce 1,200,000 trained engineers and scientists as compared to our 900,000. In the category of engineers alone, the Soviets have multiplied the number trained tenfold since 1930, when records show they had 41,000 engineers. This situation is all the more critical because of the demands, not only of industry, but of national security.

The United States, if it is to succeed in its role of world leadership, must produce citizens who have vision, foresight, wisdom, and the knowledge to compete successfully with world problems.

Assuming that the objective of these bills is a proper one, it seems to me much more efficient, in the long run, to encourage and enable a parent to pay for his children's education than it is for the Government to directly assume the burden of educating its citizens.

In addition to these reasons, enactment of these proposals will, I believe, add to the income of the Government, as well as the gross income of its individual citizens. Dr. Paul Glick, of the Census Bureau, estimated about a year ago that male college graduates will receive an average of $100,000 more in lifetime income than the average high school graduate, and we must remember this increased income will be fully taxed.

Under present tax laws, if one pays $1,000 for an acre of land and sells it for $2,000, he pays only on the increment of $1,000, at reduced capital gains rates. If he pays $1,000 for a truck to be used in his business and takes in $2,000 in drayage fees, the cost of the truck amortized over its useful life is deductible from the $2,000 income as earned. But if he spends $1,000 for an education and as a result his income is increased $1,000 per year, the tax laws do not allow application of these theories. He receives no deduction for the thousand dollars which he has invested in his education, and the yearly increase in his income of $1,000 is taxed in full as ordinary income.

As I said a moment ago, I feel strongly that to encourage the education of our young people is in the national interest. In this period of competitive coexistence with the Soviets, the task of insuring that every youth in our land is aided in achieving his highest potential intellectual growth is a formidable one. This task arises not alone from the military situation posed by Russia, but also from the realities of the rapidly spiraling scientific revolution. The great emphasis which the Soviets have placed on the training of scientists, technicians, and engineers is a challenge which cannot be ignored by the Western World. These bills will provide some incentive to the students and parents to meet and accept this challenge.

In addition to these considerations, public and private educational institutions face a precarious future. They are essential to the preservation of our way of life. These bills, if enacted, would give them some assistance and enable them to accept additional students who can pay their own way. Thus, the bills would have a further beneficial effect upon the finances of our fine educational institutions.

I sincerely hope the Congress will favorably consider these bills.

IMPROVED METHODS OF STATING BUDGET ESTIMATES AND ESTIMATES FOR DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and 48 other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of the bill, and an analysis of the bill by the General Accounting Office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement, bill, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement, bill, and analysis, presented by Mr. KENNEDY, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

On behalf of myself, Senator PAYNE, of Maine, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and 46 other distinguished Members of this body, I have introduced a bill to provide for the stating of appropriation estimates on an annual accrued expenditures basis.

This bill, which has received vigorous bipartisan support, as noted by the names of the distinguished Members of this body from both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored it, will be an important step toward implementation of the Hoover Commission's recommendation that appropriations be determined on an annual accrued expenditures basis.

As Members are aware, in the 84th Congress the Senate, on June 20, 1956, unanimously approved S. 3897, which, except for certain technical changes, contained the identical objectives set forth in the bill I

introduce today. However, as I am certain Members also recall, the section relating to appropriation estimates was stricken in conference when it became obvious we could not, because of objections of the House of Representatives, get a bill through implementing the Hoover Commission's other budgeting, accounting recommendations with that provision in it.

As I pointed out in the Senate when I filed the conference report (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 11, pp. 13339–13340), the Hoover Commission's recommendation relating to the determination of appropriations (recommendation No. 7 in the Commission's Budgeting and Accounting Report), is the very heart of the Commission's highly recommended revision of our complicated financial structure.

While the administrative improvements in budgeting, accounting, and allotment systems made by Public Law 863 of the 84th Congress are of the greatest importance, they, nevertheless, are but half of a loaf because full implementation of those improvements with the economies they can bring depends upon the basic revision of the appropriations process the Hoover Commission proposes.

I do not, nor do my colleagues who have joined in this significant action, stand alone in our conviction that this much-needed overhauling of our fiscal affairs is imperative if we are ever to put our financial house in order, restore to the Congress its constitutional responsibility for the disbursement of the public funds and achieve economies in today's almost 70-billion-dollar budget.

This all-important change in our appropriations procedures—as the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operation's Subcommittee on Reorganization upon S. 3897 last spring reveal—has the strongest endorsement of the highest financial officers of the Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. And, as Senators know, the President of the United States, on three occasions, I believe, including a special message to the 84th Congress last May 10, has urged enactment of appropriate legislation which would implement the Hoover Commission's recommendation on this matter.

This bill not only has the endorsement of the Government's highest financial officers. It is the product of literally months of research, analysis and consultation by technicians of the General Accounting Office, of the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget.

Beyond that firm foundation lies the vast experience of the distinguished members of the Hoover Commission itself, two of whom, Senator MCCLELLAN and Senator BRIDGES, gave their distinguished efforts to the Commission's work; as well as that of the members of the Commission's Task Force, among them some of the foremost financial authorities in the Nation, who drafted the report from which this legislation stems.

I am the first to realize that this revolutionary change, which would place the entire governmental financial structure on an annual expenditures basis as opposed to the present complicated obligation system, cannot be achieved overnight, nor is it intended to be. The implementation of this legislation by the executive branch after its enactment into public law, I am certain, will receive the same thoughtful deliberation that its prepartion has received, with the least disturbance to the operating agencies.

This is not a mandate by the Congress to the President. This, in effect, is a response to the President's request for the authority that he believes he must have, in the light of the tremendous burdens pressing upon us, to maintain this Government on a sound, nay, solvent, financial basis. The bill states clearly that appropriation estimates shall be determined on an annual expenditure basis, and I quote, "to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President," and "in such manner and at such times as may be determined by the President." Thus, the widest flexibility is given the Chief Executive in his implementation of this authority he requests.

There are many other points I would like to impress upon Senators, did time permit. For example, this bill would reduce or eliminate the tremendous carry over balances of appropriations, amounting to some $74 billion today, over which the Congress, for all practical purposes, has lost complete control.

Moreover, not only would it provide the Congress with much-needed information relating to actual costs of Government programs, accomplishments obtained, and justification for new money required each fiscal year, but it would make these essentials of financial management more meaningful to the executive agencies themselves, thereby enabling them to achieve improvements in their operations with substantial savings.

And, to avert any fear or confusion that this legislation will in any way impair the maintenance of the military establishment at the levels that the preservation of our national security dictates, I should like to state that the evidence presented before the Government Operations Committee makes clear that the stating of appropriations on an expenditures basis will not affect the existing statutory authority of the executive departments, including the Department of Defense, to contract for or make commitments for capital expenditures in future fiscal years, provided that the existing requirement that advance approval be obtained from the Appropriations Committees of the Congress is met.

However, to conserve the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have sent to the desk be included in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, and that the attached analysis prepared by the General Accounting Office relating to the improvements that it will make in the management of our fiscal affairs also be incorporated thereafter as part of my remarks, so that Senators may be given the opportunity to give more thoughtful consideration to this matter than is possible at this time.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) It is the sense of the Congress that revisions in presentation of budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations are essential in order to provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by the Congress, to reduce or eliminate the large carryover balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to another, and to bring about economy in Government expenditures. It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

"(c) The amount of proposed appropriations referred to in sections 201 (a) and 203 of this act shall, to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President, be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

" 'Annual accrued expenditures' shall relate to goods and services to be received in a fiscal year, advance payments, progress payments, and such other payments as are authorized by law to be made in such fiscal year.

"This subsection shall not apply to appropriations for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General and of judgments; appropriations for the refund of Federal taxes and of other moneys erroneously received and covered into the Treasury of the United States; appropriations for private relief; appropriations for the payment of interest on trust funds; appropriations to provide or increase revolving funds; appropriations for the payment to former members of the Armed Forces, their dependents and beneficiaries, of any benefits to which they are entitled by reason of military service; appropriations for the payment of pensions and annuities; appropriations for the payment of any obligation of the United States for which liability is fixed by treaty, and other appropriations or funds analogous to the foregoing.

"(d) The conversion to the use of the annual accrued expenditures method for stating proposed appropriations in accordance with section 201 (c) of this act shall be accomplished in such manner and at such times as may be determined by the President.

"(e) As of the end of each fiscal year, the excess of any appropriation or fund made on an annual accrued expenditure basis over the accrued expenditures under such appropriation or fund shall lapse, unless hereafter provided otherwise in an appropriation act or other law. Any remaining balances of each such appropriation or fund shall be merged with any appropriation or fund made for the same general purpose for the ensuing fiscal year and shall constitute a single account."

ANALYSIS BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The above bill, in addition to including a Declaration of Policy, adds a new subsection 201 (c) to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. This authorizes the submission to Congress of requests for proposed appropriations on the basis of the amounts of annual accrued expenditures to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President.

This change in the basis of stating of appropriations can provide improved control over costs and expenditures if the companion tools of accrual accounting and budgeting on a cost basis, as authorized by Public Law 863, 84th Congress, 2d session, are effectively installed by the executive agencies.

The annual budget surplus or deficit is measured by the difference between annual receipts and expenditures. Establishing a direct correlation between annual appropriations and expenditures vests in the Congress and the President a much greater opportunity to control the level of operations during a particular budget year on the basis of conditions existing in that year.

This would mean the elimination of the vast carry-over balances now available for expenditure at the discretion of the executive agencies. As matters now stand, Congress has little control over spending once the funds are voted, and the President has limited control over spending after apportionments of authority to incur obligations are made by the Budget Bureau to the agencies. The present situation stems from the fact that congressional control through appropriation authorizations and Budget Bureau control through apportionments are both stated in terms of authority to obligate rather than budgeted work plans for the cost of goods and services estimated to be received by the agencies.

Aside from the question of improved control, the annual accrued expenditure basis of appropriations affords a better means of obtaining information needed in relating past accomplishments to present performance and future plans. Under the obligational basis of appropriations the information supplied to the President and the Congress through the budget process is in terms of obligations (contracts, etc.) issued, unissued, and planned for issue. This does not measure currently the cost of progress or performance. It is only when a program is totally completed that obligations approximate costs and then only if all resources have been consumed. Under the

annual accrued expenditure basis of appropriations, Congress would require and be supplied with data as to costs in relation to annual periods, the accomplishments obtained and to be obtained for those costs, and the inventories and other assets on hand, as well as the new money required to carry on the program.

It is inherent in an accrued expenditure basis for budgets and appropriations, as provided in this bill, that congressional authority be granted as necessary for the advance planning which precedes the phase of operations covered in an annual accrued expenditure appropriation. This would be determined by the Congress for each type of situation. However, the need for contract authority, or any other form of obligational authority, in conjunction with annual appropriations on the accrued expenditure basis is limited to the areas of operations where forward contracting is required to provide an orderly flow of product. It is not required in operations concerned primarily with salaries, allowances, travel expense, and other current administrative expenses.

In view of the substantial changes that would be required in many agencies to place into effect the accrual accounting and cost budgeting practices needed to support appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis, subsection 201 (d) permits flexibility in the timing of the change in the method of stating appropriation requests. It is believed that it is essential to approach such a change on the basis of individual programs or appropriations rather than any sweeping across-the-board plan.

Subsection 201 (e) is a necessary part of the annual accrued expenditure basis of appropriation to provide that funds not required to finance work performed during a fiscal year shall cease to be available after the end of that fiscal year. It is inherent, however, under an accrued expenditure method of financing that liabilities must be recognized as work is performed. This subsection permits the portion of the appropriation represented by liabilities for work performed but not paid for by June 30 of any year to be carried forward and merged, for payment purposes, with the appropriation for the ensuing year.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 3 days so that other Senators who wish to do so may join in the cosponsorship of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR EASTERN, MIDDLE, AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the appointment of an additional judge for the three districts of Tennessee, the east, middle, and west districts.

As my senior colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] has stated, if sufficient evidence is presented to the Judiciary Committee to show the need for a permanent judgeship, I shall be glad to support it. I have had the feeling, however, that a roving judgeship with jurisdiction to serve all three districts might serve the needs of the people.

I wish to join my colleague in regretting the passing of a distinguished judge, the late Honorable Elmer E. Davies. His passing was a very great loss to the judiciary of the State of Tennessee and the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 437) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Tennessee, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HASTY TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION OF KLAMATH TRIBE MUST BE PREVENTED TO SAVE RESOURCES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to delay for 18 months the proposed termination of Government supervision over the affairs and resources of the Klamath Indian Tribe, in the State of Oregon.

This bill, which I am introducing on behalf of my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself, is made necessary by the chaos and waste which would be certain to follow if the Indians and their tribal assets were too hastily cut adrift.

I should like to add that an identical bill is to be sponsored on Thursday in the House of Representatives by the outstanding new Member of Congress from the Second Oregon District, where are located the Klamath Indians and their vast reservation. This man is ALBERT C. ULLMAN, and the bill now being introduced was prepared only after consultation and conferences with Mr. ULLMAN.

On October 18, 1956, there was held at Klamath Falls, Oreg., under the able leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], a hearing to inquire into the standing and progress of the Klamath Indians under termination.

At the hearing it was agreed overwhelmingly, although not without some dissent, I must concede, that the final termination should be suspended so that orderly and sound disposal can be made of the important assets belonging to the tribe. It was considered essential, for example, that the immense stand of Indian pine timber not be sold recklessly on the auction block, but that it be added to a contiguous national forest for prudent and sustained management by the United States Forest Service. The Klamath Tribe, I may add, is linked in lineage and culture to the famous Modoc Nation, of the Northwest's historic past.

The management specialists, appointed by ex-Secretary of the Interior McKay, even recommended that the Government buy back the entire Klamath Reservation—although when termination legislation first had been proposed, in much of the oratory it was contended that the Government should be eliminated completely from the management of this main asset of the tribe.

Now we can see that the Indians and the entire economy of southeastern Oregon will suffer if the timber, land, marshes, minerals, and other Klamath resources are disposed of under forced sale. That is the purpose of the proposed legislation which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], Representative ULLMAN, and I are cosponsoring.

Some of the considerations underlying this measure were expressed in certain portions of my statement at the Klamath Falls hearings, last October.

Since the passage of the Termination Act, Public Law 587, the provisions of that act have given rise to widespread consideration and many second thoughts among interested people in Oregon. The progress of plans for the termination of the Klamath Reservation has been studied over the past months by interested individuals and groups, and certain problems which were not fully apparent at the time when the law was passed are being more clearly recognized.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS OPPOSE HASTY LIQUIDATION

An outstanding example of this growing interest and concern, for instance, was a conference held on September 27, 1956, under the auspices of the Oregon Council of Churches, which brought together representatives of the Klamath Tribe, the Federal and State Governments, church groups, several Oregon colleges, and private organizations for a discussion of the problems arising under Public Law 587.

The overriding consideration for these Oregon groups has, of course, been the welfare of the Klamath Indians themselves. To many of them, the termination of the reservation will mean a drastic economic and social and perhaps cultural change. Some of the problems arising from this change cannot be solved wholly in the course of the Federal Government's program, but must be assumed by the local communities themselves. But it must at least be the concern of the Federal Government to assure that the termination program protects the Indian from exploitation and preserves his opportunity to use his assets in such a manner as to ease the transition from reservation life to full participation in life in the outside community.

We know that in the case of the Klamath Reservation, these assets are particularly great. The reservation includes approximately 600,000 acres of ponderosa pine, estimated at 4.5 billion board-feet, which may have a value of as much as $80 million. This is one of the finest stands of ponderosa pine in the United States. Under sustained-yield management, the reservation produces approximately 70 to 80 million board-feet of timber a year.

A forest stand and an annual cut of this magnitude are of crucial importance to the economy of the surrounding area. Next to the question of the best interests of the Klamath Indians, the economic impact of termination must be of second consideration. It is now becoming widely recognized that both considerations point definitely to the conclusion that the reservation should not be chopped up into small individual pieces, to be logged off as fast as they can be

sold, but that it should continue under scientific, long-run, sustained-yield forest management as a single unit.

FOREST RESOURCES REQUIRE SOUND MANAGEMENT

As the management specialists have themselves concluded, if the Termination Act were carried out as enacted, one of the finest stands of timber in the United States would be destroyed, with great loss not only to the sustained-yield program and sound conservation practices, but also to small lumber mills which would lose any opportunity to bid on trees that are made available from year to year on the reservation. Personally, I am inclined to share their conclusion that the only solution may be for the Federal Government to purchase the entire reservation and incorporate it into the national forests. The Congress, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Klamath Tribe, and all other interested parties need more time to give serious study to this, as well as to take another look at the overall consideration of the wisdom of the termination program, as incorporated in Public Law 587.

Our objective must surely be to develop a program for maintaining the integrity of the great forest on the reservation, while assuring fair and equitable shares in their assets to the individual members of the Klamath Tribe. I believe that, above all, more time will be needed to complete the development of such a program which will be sound and fair to all concerned.

This, I repeat, is the major objective of the bill which I introduce today. In addition, it also provides for repayment to the Klamath Tribe, from Federal funds, of the expenses incident to the termination program. I expect that the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which I serve, will be able to take early action on this urgent measure, in pursuance of its work on this problem during the second session of the 84th Congress last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 469) to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES AND TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT, BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, bills to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut, and for the holding of terms of the court at Bridgeport, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by the senior judge of the court, the Honorable J. Joseph Smith, in which he discusses the need for this proposed legislation, be printed at this point in the RECORD, followed by the tables which are enclosed in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, December 3, 1956.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: I again write to ask your assistance in meeting the problems of our district court. We now request an increase in the judgeships for the district from 2 to 4. I realize that this is a great increase percentagewise, and comes very soon after our request for the third judgeship 2 years ago which has not yet been provided. We feel, however, that the increase to four judges is essential to the proper functioning of this court.

The district of Connecticut has had two judges since 1927. In general the dockets have been current until 1951. In some years the judges were able to help in other districts, principally the southern district of New York and Vermont, and on the court of appeals, although in other years, as during the early years of the war, it was necessary to sit 12 months without recess. Since 1951 conditions have changed substantially. Civil cases filed have practically doubled. We have lost ground steadily on our dockets. The rising trend of filings continues. The criminal caseload also is rising although more slowly. Population, business activity, motor vehicle registrations and licensed motor vehicle operators in the district are still increasing. Some of the changes since this became a two-judge district are as follows:

	1927	1950	1956 estimate
Population of Connecticut	1,546,201	2,007,280	2,313,000
Motor vehicle registrations	306,784	760,044	923,000
Licensed operators	323,881	836,983	1,150,000

The better acquaintance of the members of the bar in recent years with the advantages of the broader discovery procedures provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, coupled with the congestion in the State courts in the larger counties, has also been a factor leading to increased use of this forum where there is diversity of citizenship between the parties to litigation.

Two years ago, on surveying the results of the rise since 1951, request was made for an additional judge, and legislation was sought by yourself and the other Connecticut Members of Congress which was approved by the committees of both Houses, and included in the omnibus judgeship bill which was reported out, but not reached for action in the Congress. This year the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference, on a survey of our situation proposed that an additional (fourth) judge be provided on a so-called temporary basis (the first vacancy occurring more than 3 years after initial appointment not to be filled) in order to help cut down our present backlog. On further consideration, it was felt that the fourth judge is needed on a permanent basis and recommendation was made to the conference that a fourth judgeship, in addition to the third already approved by the conference and included in the omnibus bill, be provided. The Judicial Conference of the Second Circuit recommended approval, and the Judicial Conference of the United States at its September 1956 meeting recommended it.

Our calendar situation continues critical, and the need for more judges is steadily becoming more pressing. Dispositions continue to be fewer than civil filings, with resultant growth in the backlog, which stands at over 900 cases, including a number of cases which will involve lengthy trials and, most important, increasing delay in disposing of litigation. A considerable number of such cases involving lengthy trials are among those pending. A nonjury civil action at New Haven which has already consumed some 4 months of trial time will take approximately as long again. A Smith act case will take some months to try. Several income-tax invasion cases will take time. An action by a trustee in bankruptcy based on alleged preferences will be reached shortly at Hartford and will take at least a month's trial. A stockholders' suit and a fraud action at New Haven involving several hundred plaintiffs will each involve very lengthy trials. The backlog will take time to reduce, not only because of the number of cases, but because there are awaiting trial so many cases of an extraordinarily time consuming nature. If the backlog did not exist, the 2 present judges and 1 additional judge would enable us to meet the present rate of filing except for the long trial cases, 3 judges giving us a rate of approximately 215 new civil cases per judge per year based on filings for fiscal 1956. The size and nature of the backlog, however, makes it impossible even for three judges to clear it up and at the same time handle the new filings. Two additional judgeships, making a total of four for the District of Connecticut, are therefore essential now, and for some years to come. The trend in court business in recent years, caused by the increase in population, business activity, motor-vehicle traffic, and other causes makes it quite evident that there will be sufficient work for four judges on a permanent basis as recommended by the Judicial Conference. It has happened that most of the recent long trials have been at New Haven, so that the most serious delay occurs there, where a substantial number of cases claimed more than a year ago have not yet been reached for pretrial conference.

We have at present one courtroom at Hartford and one at New Haven. A second courtroom at New Haven is being provided by alterations in the present post office and court building. A proposed new Federal building at Hartford is expected to provide two courtrooms, with the present building to be altered for post office use only. The judicial council for the second circuit has recommended the provision of an additional court building at Bridgeport in Fairfield County, the caseload from that area and the crowded quarters at New Haven, the nearest seat of court, justifying such provision.

Air conditioning of the Hartford courtroom made it possible to hold summer jury trials which we did starting early in August. The large number of land parcels under condemnation has led me to remove a number of the condemnation cases from the jury list and appoint committees to hear them, over the objection of the United States. By this means it was possible to go through the remainder of the Hartford civil jury list and dispose of about 40 cases by trial or settlement in these last 4 months, with all civil jury cases other than condemnation cases pending at Hartford and ready for trial prior to August having at least an opportunity to be heard. If two additional judges are provided, it should be possible after the calendars are brought to a current condition to return land condemnation cases to the jury lists.

I expect to take up the Hartford nonjury trial list of some 65 cases starting tomorrow, an income-tax evasion case on trial to the

jury at Hartford having ended today with a change of plea. One of the cases near the top of the Hartford nonjury trial list, against a Hartford bank by the trustee in bankruptcy to set aside alleged preferences in the Leopold case, will take at least a month to try. If we can complete that list before summer, and not too much criminal, habeas corpus, or other preferred work comes in, we hope to have both judges spend part of 1957 in New Haven, where all civil calendars have been at a virtual standstill for more than a year because of criminal trials, including a Smith Act case, and the long nonjury civil case which started in June, and which, as I have indicated, probably will consume 4 months' more trial time.

I enclose comparative data on the filing and termination and number pending of civil and criminal cases in recent years, through fiscal 1956, and the time intervals for the period 1951–56, which demonstrate the change from a current condition to one of increasingly more serious delay.

I ask your assistance and that of your colleagues in obtaining the needed legislation increasing the number of judges for this district from 2 to 4.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

J. JOSEPH SMITH,
United States District Judge.

[Enclosure.]

Time intervals from issue to trial of civil cases in which a trial was held

Fiscal year:	Median interval (months)
1951	4.7
1952	5.5
1953	6.4
1954	7.6
1955	12.0
1956	15.3

Time intervals from filing to disposition of civil cases in which a trial was held

Fiscal year:	Median interval (months)
1951	8.9
1952	7.8
1953	9.6
1954	11.2
1955	18.8
1956	24.4

Civil cases commenced and terminated during the fiscal years 1940–56 and pending cases

CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1940	318	316	180
1941	293	244	229
1942	211	230	210
1943	262	235	237
1944	206	197	246
1945	324	301	269
1946	407	433	243
1947	332	270	305
1948	267	294	278
1949	337	324	291
1950	378	373	296
1951	371	312	355
1952	563	432	486
1953	622	473	635
1954	499	413	721
1955	638	510	849
1956	642	579	912

Private and United States cases commenced during the fiscal years 1952–56

Fiscal year	Private	United States	Total
1952	255	308	563
1953	349	273	622
1954	402	97	499
1955	404	234	638
1956	365	277	642

Criminal cases commenced and terminated during the fiscal year 1940–56 and pending cases

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending, June 30
1940	141	146	19
1941	134	131	22
1942	146	151	17
1943	276	247	46
1944	320	337	29
1945	265	252	42
1946	138	140	40
1947	120	131	29
1948	124	116	37
1949	132	142	27
1950	105	126	6
1951	127	109	24
1952	104	111	17
1953	164	152	29
1954	208	187	50
1955	166	193	23
1956	167	162	28

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 472. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; and

S. 473. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] I introduce, for appropriate reference, an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill.

During the last session of the 84th Congress, the Public Works Committee held extensive hearings on a similar bill. That bill was passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President on August 10, 1954.

The bill which I have introduced would authorize appropriations totaling about $1.6 billion for 99 projects or project modification and 14 river-basin authorizations, involving improvements for navigation, shore protection, flood control, and related purposes.

The last general authorization bill was approved in 1954. The Public Works Committee believes it necessary to carry forward these important programs for development and improvement of the rivers and harbors of our Nation, for the protection of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, and for the general development of the Nation's water resources, and the alleviation of drought conditions in many sections of the country.

In his veto message on H. R. 12080, 84th Congress, the President called attention to 32 projects included therein on which review by all interested agencies had not been completed. Such review has now been completed on most of these projects and the reports properly processed. The President further stated that his veto action on H. R. 12080 need cause no delay in starting the many worthwhile projects in the bill. This, of course, is true only if such projects are promptly authorized by the Congress in time to have appropriations therefor considered at an early date, and certainly during this session of Congress.

The Public Works Committee believes that this legislation is urgently needed for the general enhancement of the national economy, and that delay would have unfortunate results in retardation of the projects and postponement of the benefits that would result therefrom.

It is my hope that the Congress will give favorable consideration to this measure at an early date, and that construction on many of the projects included therein can be initiated without further delay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 497) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REDUCTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AGE FOR WOMEN TO 60 YEARS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I am reintroducing today for appropriate reference the proposal which was the first bill I introduced upon coming to the United States Senate at the beginning of the 84th Congress.

Mr. President, this is the bill to make the retirement age under the Social Security Act 60 years of age for all women eligible for benefits under that act, without any reduction in benefits.

In introducing this bill 2 years ago I gave some of the reasons for this proposal. I pointed out that in most instances women are some years younger than their husbands. Whether a woman has earned social-security coverage of her own, or whether she is entitled to the wife's benefits as a result of her husband's coverage, this fact has acted as a great deterrent to the retirement of men when they reach their own eligibility age of 65, because the benefits would not be adequate to support a family until the wife, too, had reached eligibility age. Moreover, women thrown upon their own resources late in life, through widowhood or otherwise, find it difficult to find employment and should certainly have the opportunity at the age of 60, rather than at age 65, to retire on such social-security benefits as they or their deceased husbands have earned. For these and related reasons the amendment of the Social Security Act which I propose was for many years recommended in the reports of the Federal Security Agency itself.

These facts and the principles underlying my bill won some recognition in the amendments of the Social Security Act which the Congress passed last year. The age at which women may become eligible

for social-security benefits has been reduced to 62 years. Of course, even this step in the right direction was won only over the opposition of the present administration; and in order to win even this compromise at a minimum financial cost to the social-security system it was accompanied by a sliding scale which substantially reduces the benefits paid to women who choose to take advantage of the opportunity for earlier retirement.

I have not changed my mind; I still believe that we should go the whole way to the reduction to age 60, without diminution of benefits, as I proposed last year. From the mail I have received and the many people who have spoken to me about this, I am sure that women resent being confronted with the cruel choice of accepting a substantial reduction in their already very modest retirement income or postponing for 3 years the enjoyment of the social-security benefits, which in many cases constitute their sole means of livelihood.

Mr. President, I continue to be convinced that many improvements and extensions yet remain to be made in our social-security system, and that the vast majority of the people of this country are prepared to undertake, in their working years, the additional burdens of contributing to the social-security fund, so as to be able to enjoy more extensive benefits in the increasing span of years when they will no longer be able to rely upon their earning capacity to maintain the decent American standard of living on which this Nation prides itself. For this reason, I reintroduce my bill today as one worthwhile step toward further improvement of the social-security system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 498) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for full old-age and survivors insurance benefits, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 216 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"RETIREMENT AGE

"(a) The term 'retirement age' means—
"(1) in the case of a man, age 65, or
"(2) in the case of a woman, age 60."

(b) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of benefits under subsection (e) of section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after September 1957, but only, except in the case of an individual who was entitled to wife's or mother's insurance benefits under such section 202 for September 1957, or any month thereafter, on the basis of applications filed after the date of enactment of this act. The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of benefits under subsection (h) of such section 202 for months after September 1957 on the basis of applications filed after the date of enactment of this act.

(2) Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (4), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of lump-sum death payments under section 202 (i) of the Social Security Act with respect to deaths after September 1957, and in the case of monthly benefits under title II of such act for months after September 1957 on the basis of applications filed after the date of enactment of this act.

(3) For purposes of section 215 (b) (3) (B) of the Social Security Act (but subject to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection)—

(A) a woman who attains the age of 60 prior to October 1957 and who was not eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of such act (as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) for any month prior to October 1957 shall be deemed to have attained the age of 60 in 1957 or, if earlier, the year in which she died;

(B) a woman shall not, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), be deemed to be a fully insured individual before October 1957 or the month in which she died, whichever month is the earlier; and

(C) the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be applicable in the case of any woman who was eligible for old-age insurance benefits under such section 202 for any month prior to October 1957.

A woman shall, for purposes of this paragraph, be deemed eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for any month if she was or would have been, upon filing application therefor in such month, entitled to such benefits for such month.

(4) For purposes of section 209 (i) of such act, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after September 1957.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (q) and (r) of section 202 of the Social Security Act are repealed and subsection (s), (t), and (u) are redesignated as (q), (r), and (s).

(b) The subsection of such section 202 redesignated as subsection (q) is amended to read as follows:

"(q) (1) If any woman becomes entitled to a widow's insurance benefit, parent's insurance benefit, old-age insurance benefit, or wife's insurance benefit (if she becomes entitled thereto by reason of having attained retirement age) for a month before the month in which she attains the age of 65, such woman may not thereafter become entitled to disability insurance benefits under this title.

"(2) The entitlement of any woman to disability insurance benefits shall terminate with the month before the month in which she becomes entitled to old-age insurance benefits."

(c) The last sentence of subsection (a) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "Except as provided in subsection (q), such", and inserting in lieu thereof "Such."

(d) Clause (D) of subsection (b) (1) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows:

"(D) is not entitled to old-age insurance benefits, or is entitled to old-age insurance benefits each of which is less than one-half of an old-age insurance benefit of her husband,".

(e) So much of subsection (b) (1) of such section 202 as follows clause (D) is amended by striking out "or she becomes entitled to an old-age insurance benefit based on a primary insurance amount which is equal to or exceeds one-half of an old-age insurance benefit of her husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "or she becomes entitled to an old-age insurance benefit equal to or exceeding one-half of an old-age insurance benefit of her husband."

(f) Subsection (b) (2) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "Except as provided in subsection (q), such" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such."

(g) Paragraph (1) (E) of subsection (c) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "the primary insurance amount of his wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "an old-age insurance benefit of his wife."

(h) So much of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section 202 as follows clause (E) is amended by striking out "the primary insurance amount of his wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "an old-age insurance benefit of his wife."

(i) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of such section 202 and the first sentence of subsection (d) (2) of such section 202 are each amended by striking out "primary insurance amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "old-age insurance benefit."

(j) Paragraph (3) of subsection (j) of such section 202 is repealed.

(k) Paragraph (3) of subsection (k) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) If an individual is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit for any month and to any other monthly insurance benefit for such month, such other insurance benefit for such month shall be reduced (after any reduction under section 203 (a)) by an amount equal to such old-age insurance benefit."

(l) Subsection (m) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "and subsection (q)" each time it appears therein.

(m) Section 203 (b) (3) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) in which such individual, if a wife under retirement age entitled to a wife's insurance benefit, did not have in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child of her husband entitled to a child's insurance benefit; or."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by subsection (a) of section 2 of this act shall be effective with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after September 1957, and the amendments made by subsections (b) through (m) of such section shall take effect October 1, 1957.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3121 (a) (9) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "the age of 62" and inserting in lieu thereof "the age of 60."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to remuneration paid after September 1957.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE STRENGTH AND VITALITY OF DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 15 minutes concerning a number of bills which I shall introduce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 20 years ago, in the New York Times for September 23, 1937, there was published a dispatch from Czechoslovakia which pointed a moral for our generation. The writer was apprehensive, but he could not then have known that 1937 was the twilight of Czechoslovakian democracy: that two decades of Nazi and Communist tyranny were shortly to follow. The statement read:

Our country might conceivably be overwhelmed by superior military forces, but our democracy will never be imperiled by outside attacks. Democracy is always weakened from within. Only its own feebleness or complacency destroys it. It dies unless it draws life from every citizen. The job of those who believe in the democratic process is to be positive, not negative, to build it up, expose and correct its mistakes, keep it alive.

Mr. President, whether the democracy we live in be as small as Czechoslovakia or as large as United States, this task remains an essential one: to improve and increase the strength and vitality of our democratic processes. No conscientious observer who has ever examined the American scene has failed to put his finger on our greatest national weakness: the gap between our pretensions and our performance in the field of civil rights.

By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in the democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to work, the right to education, the right to housing, the right to the use of public accommodations, of health and welfare services and facilities, and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color, ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which government has the duty to defend and expand.

I appreciate, Mr. President, that even the statement I have just made will not attract the unanimous concurrence of my colleagues. I am aware that the 96 Members of the United States Senate come here from widely scattered localities, backgrounds, traditions, and interests. These differences are legitimate, and it is the first major purpose of the legislative structure to allow these differences to be expressed.

I believe it is equally true, Mr. President, that the second major purpose of the legislative structure is to provide for action, once these differences have been reasonably accommodated and balanced. It is self-evident that Senators are sent to Washington to represent the needs and desires of their own constituencies. But it is equally true that we share common responsibilities toward the national good, and that these responsibilities may—and in this case do, I believe—extend beyond the current attitudes of important segments of opinion in some of our States.

The issue of human rights, Mr. President, also goes beyond partisanship—concerning, as it does, the very life of our democracy, whether our homes happen to be in the North, the South, the East, or the West. I know full well that some of us would prefer not to face these problems; but the fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the problems are facing us. The fact of the matter is that they must be dealt with. Since we must deal with them, let us hope that we may approach them in the spirit of toleration and understanding, rather than with recrimination or bitterness.

For myself, Mr. President, human rights is not basically a social issue, an economic issue, a political issue, or even a legislative issue. It is primarily a moral issue, and it is for that reason that I feel as I do about it. I know, of course, that it is an issue, and a very real one, in all of these other contexts. Most particularly, in the past few years it has become an issue which has begun to affect with a sudden and dramatic impact the conduct of our foreign policy. Brotherhood and equality of opportunity have now become central aspects of the image we cast abroad. Just as Lincoln decided upon emancipation of the slaves, not only as an "act of justice" but also as a "military necessity," so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on both of these grounds.

We know, too, Mr. President, that this is an issue which has taken on new force and meaning for the millions of uncommitted peoples throughout the world. We know that their spokesman, Mahatma Ghandi, once asked of Anglo-Saxons everywhere, "What can conquer your unpardonable pride of race?" We know in our hearts that we must answer him; and we know, too, that the Kremlin gloats every time our answers seem hesitant and insincere.

Nevertheless, it seems to me, Mr. President, that world reaction is a shallow and insufficient motivation to impel us to take the great strides which are required of us. We shall not even convince others if our motiviations are essentially tactical or political in nature. Our proper response, both to the Kremlin, which is waiting for us to falter, and to the millions of people in Asia and Africa who want to believe in us, but are undecided, is to do what we should have done anyway to make this Nation, in Lincoln's words, the "last best hope of earth."

It is undeniable, of course, that we have made great progress during the past 100 years—from the Dred Scott decision, which totally denied the Negro the protection of our laws, to the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case, which affirmed the right of the Negro to full protection of the law. It has been a long fight, in which the power of American principles has slowly overcome the imperfections of American practice. It has been a long process of remolding old attitudes and reestablishing old truths. And it is not yet finished.

Mr. President, I like to think that both political parties are beginning to recognize their responsibility in taking up this moral challenge. We have just completed a national election. During the campaign, spokesmen for both of our major parties went before the people as the champions for human rights. Both parties have claimed credit for the progress which admittedly has been made, especially in the last decade. While much of this progress was nonlegislative—flowing, instead, from voluntary action, court decisions, or administrative measures—the record from 1948 to 1957 has been an encouraging one. An excellent summary of this record has just reached my desk. It is entitled "The People Take the Lead," and is the latest annual authoritative report of its kind published by the American Jewish Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during last fall's campaign civil-rights statements were bolstered by the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Hence, Mr. President, we have reached a point where a commitment to civil-rights legislation, both as Senators and supporters of our respective party platforms, can no longer be denied. I think our consciences are equally impelling. Consequently, on behalf of myself and several of my colleagues, I send to the desk, for reintroduction in the 85th Congress, 12 civil-rights bills which constitute a comprehensive human-rights program. I ask that the bills lie on the desk until the end of business Monday next, for the purpose of permitting other Senators who have expressed a desire to join in sponsoring the bills, but whom I could not contact in time, to add their names as sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am glad to yield to my good friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who has been with me through thick and thin in the battles for civil-rights legislation. Let me say that when the Republicans have been in the majority in the Senate, the Senator from New York has been my leader in this area; and when the Democrats have been in the majority here, the Senator from New York has permitted me to introduce bills, particularly the one in regard to equality of opportunity in employment, for both of us.

Now I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Minnesota is very gracious in his kind remarks.

Mr. President, when the Democrats have been in the majority in the Senate, invariably the Senator from Minnesota has been so kind as to invite me to go along with him in the introduction and sponsorship of the bills. It has been a mutual arrangement, to be sure. When the Senate has been under Democratic control, the Senator from Minnesota has been the chief introducer of this particular bill. When the Republicans have been in control, the Senator from New York has been the chief introducer.

I understand that the bill prohibiting discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is the one to which the Senator from Minnesota has just referred, and is the one which Republican Senators have been invited to join in sponsoring.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I wish to add that I further understand that particular bill is now being treated as it has been in the past, namely, with the name of the Senator from Minnesota being listed first, as the chief Democratic Senator sponsoring the bill, followed by the name of the chief

Republican Senator sponsoring the bill, and then followed by the names of the other Democratic and Republican sponsors, alternately, right down the list, so as to make the bill as bipartisan as possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Therefore, I shall approach my Republican colleagues on that basis; and I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his splendid cooperation in connection with this matter, as well as in connection with others.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. Let me state to him that I wish to be listed as a cosponsor of the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That has been done.

Mr. President, other Members of the Senate know that these measures are the product of long legislative refinement. These proposals now embody the considered judgment of present and past members of the Congress from both parties, and of interested citizens, educators and religious leaders. I have presented earlier versions of most of these bills to each Congress since the 81st, and on most of them I have had bipartisan support.

Members will know, too, Mr. President, that extensive hearings have already been held on many of these measures—hearings which themselves have contributed to revision and refinement in the proposals. The substance of at least three of these bills was favorably acted upon by the House during the 84th Congress, and is now supported by the executive branch. Bills similar in most respects to four of the measures which I now reintroduce were favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, last year. Those were the bills and other measures which I was privileged to introduce with the cosponsorship of many of my colleagues who are present in the Chamber today.

A brief list of the 12 measures which I now introduce and send to the desk is as follows:

First. A bill to protect the right to political participation, and prohibiting any intimidation, coercion, or other interference with the right to vote.

Second. A bill to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government.

Third. A bill to establish a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, headed by a new Assistant Attorney General.

Fourth. A bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation, designed to implement Supreme Court rulings that segregation in interstate transportation is a denial of constitutional rights.

Fifth. A bill to extend to members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard.

Sixth. A bill to protect persons within the United States against mob violence or lynching.

Seventh. A concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights.

Eighth. A bill to establish equal opportunity in employment.

Ninth. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers.

Tenth. A bill to strengthen existing civil rights statutes.

Eleventh. A bill to strengthen the criminal laws relating to peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

Twelfth. An omnibus bill including all the above measures in one general measure.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that I have listed first the bill to protect the right to vote, because it is becoming increasingly clear that this is the key to all of the rest of our human-rights objectives. I have more to say about the importance of this measure in the summary of it which I have prepared, but I want to stress here and now that a strong case may be made for saying that Federal protection for the right to vote is the greatest civil right in a democracy. I welcome President Eisenhower's recognition of the special need for action in this direction.

While all of these bills are desirable, and while it is not up to me to assign priorities, nevertheless I do want to say that the first five can, and should, be enacted by this Congress. In addition to the right-to-vote bill the second, third, fourth, and fifth are of especially timely importance: The bipartisan-commission bill, the civil-rights-division bill, the interstate transportation bill, and the bill to protect members of the Armed Forces against discrimination.

I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. President, that I have prepared statements containing detailed but not burdensome summaries of all of these bills, except the last, which is a general omnibus bill incorporating the first 11.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 11 statements and bills and concurrent resolution to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bills I introduce today constitute singly and together an attempt to add the strength of a congressional mandate to the continuing challenge before us—to hasten the day in a variety of ways when American practice conforms with American principle. The challenge itself has never been stated more eloquently than in the complaint of a Negro student a generation ago:

> If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I am ignorant, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me my color. I have no possible protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness, hatred, and despair. I am a Negro-American. All my life I have wanted to be an American.

Mr. President, this is why prejudice and discrimination cost too much for democracy to afford. This is also, Mr. President, why history has a claim on the 85th Congress. Human rights is a concept whose time has come. It is a concept with the highest priority on the world's agenda, and it deserves a priority no less high on the agenda of the United States Congress.

We know that our Constitution guarantees full equality of rights and opportunities to Americans of every race, color, religion, and national origin. We know that proposed legislation to assure to every American his constitutional rights has been introduced in Congress after Congress, only to die in committee, on the calendar, or by the veto of the filibuster.

I am convinced, however, that the strong upsurge of liberal strength evidenced last week in the rules fight proves that dramatic changes are on the horizon. We are coming to realize that a Congress which continues to be unresponsive to the greatest moral demand of our generation is an irresponsible Congress. We are coming to realize that, to the degree that procrastination, temporizing, delays, and obstruction continue, we are convicting ourselves of hyprocrisy. We are coming to realize that the enemies of society are not those who promote the processes of freedom but those who try to block them.

Mr. President, the danger to any civilization or any living thing whatever lies not in progress but in stagnation; not in growth but in decay; not in change but in the lack of change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wonder whether my colleagues will bear with me for an additional 1 or 2 minutes, so that I may complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota requests additional time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the peril is that under the pressure of locally entrenched and satisfied majorities we shall stone the prophets once too often. The danger is that we shall cling to the shell of social and economic institutions too long after they have been outgrown—that we shall adhere to the husk and form of ideas too long after they are dead.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I am a liberal without apology, a liberal without misgivings, a liberal without regret. Insofar as I am sorry for anything, it is not because I am a liberal, but it is because I am not more liberal than I am.

As a liberal, I am confident that we shall not progress too fast. The overwhelming danger is that we shall not be able to progress fast enough. There is plenty of conservatism in the world to adjust the balance, if that is needed. The Belgian author, Maurice Maeterlinck, once made an observation that is profoundly true: At every crossway on the road that leads to the future, each progressive spirit is opposed by a thousand men appointed to guard the past.

The least that the most timid of us can do is not to add to the immense deadweight that nature drags along.

In matters like these, Mr. President, the legislative process, in general, and the Congress of the United States, in particular, has a special obligation not to add any longer to the deadweight of retrenchment, obstinacy, and inaction. Now, more than ever before, spirits are ready and the time is right for progress.

Mr. President, in the same sense that history has a claim on the 85th Congress, I am convinced that the 85th Congress may have a claim on history. We have an excellent chance, if we will seize it, to pass the first meaningful civil-rights legislation in 80 years.

I want to say that I am convinced that we shall. I am convinced that this Congress, despite the debate which will take place, and despite the honest differences of opinion, will adopt meaningful civil-rights legislation. I have enough faith in the wisdom, reasonableness, and sheer Americanism of my colleagues to hold high hope for legislation in 1957 to safeguard the dignity and promote the security of all of our fellow citizens.

EXHIBIT A

THE PEOPLE TAKE THE LEAD—A RECORD OF PROGRESS IN CIVIL RIGHTS, 1948–57—STATEMENT BY AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, JANUARY 1957

This edition of the People Take the Lead commemorates 9 years of nationwide progress since the President's Committee on Civil Rights issued its hardhitting report in October 1947. It is a record of constantly expanding freedoms and opportunities—a testament to this Nation's unending effort to match America's promise with deeds.

The report of the President's Committee highlighted, unflinchingly, those areas where freedom was lagging. It pointed to segregation in the Nation's Capital; racial and religious discrimination in employment, housing, and education; infringements of the right to vote, to serve in the Armed Forces, to enjoy equal justice under the law.

The People Take the Lead reviews the more important steps taken to correct those abuses: Presidential orders that paved the way for integration in the armed services; State and local laws barring discrimination on the job, in public housing, and in tax-supported colleges; court rulings outlawing racial segregation in the schools and in a wide variety of public accommodations; and spontaneous actions of private citizens and groups which have helped to realize the American dream.

Of course, all these advances have not come with ease. Few Americans—indeed few literate people anywhere in the world—have missed the glaring headlines of the year just past: Mobs threatening children on the way to school; hooded crossburners and would-be respectable white citizens councils terrorizing communities; a handful of governors searching for ways to evade the Supreme Court's desegregation decision.

There can be no question that serious and delicate problems remain to be solved. Time and patience will be required to change practices that have long been the only accepted pattern for millions of Americans. But each passing year makes it increasingly clear that the clock will not be turned back—that America will continue its ever-forward march toward "one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

ARMED SERVICES

Administrative measures

Washington, July 1948: President's Executive Order No. 9981 forbids discrimination in military service; creates Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services.

United States of America, 1949–50: Governors' proclamations in Michigan, Minnesota, and Washington end segregation in National Guard (see Legislation below).

Washington, 1950–55: Army drops quotas for Negro enlistments; Selective Service drops questions on race for draft registrants; Air Force, Army, Marines, and Navy report segregation entirely eliminated. Defense Department reports number of Negro officers and enlisted men has more than doubled in 6 years.

Washington, October 1954: Veterans' Administration announces end of segregation in all VA hospitals.

Baltimore, Md., November 1955: Maryland is first State south of Mason-Dixon Line to desegregate National Guard.

Legislation

United States of America, 1947–49: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin forbid discrimination in the National Guard.

CITIZENSHIP

Administrative measures

Mobile, Ala., November 1948: Federal officers invoke rarely used civil-rights statutes; arrest sheriff and deputy for inflicting physical punishment on Negro prisoners.

New Orleans, La., December 1949: Two policemen are dismissed for depriving two Negro youths of their civil rights.

Olympia, Wash., June 1955: Attorney General rules State law barring questions on race or religion from applications for employment or license includes marriage licenses.

Legislation

U. S. A., 1949–51: South Carolina and Texas adopt antilynch laws.

U. S. A., 1949–53: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia forbid wearing of masks and burning of crosses.

U. S. A., 1950–53: South Carolina and Tennessee abolish poll tax; Alabama reduces cumulative tax from 24 years to 2 years.

U. S. A., 1951–55: Legislatures in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, and Oregon repeal ban on intermarriage between whites and Negroes, Mongolians, or Chinese

Philadelphia, Pa., January 1952: New city charter prohibits discrimination in use of city property; establishes human-relations commission to administer law.

U. S. A., 1953–55: Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, and New Mexico end ban on liquor sales to Indians.

Sacramento, Calif., April 1953: Legislature repeals restrictions on property rights 'of orientals.

Washington, August 1953: Congress repeals Federal prohibition against sale of liquor and firearms to Indians.

Lincoln, Nebr., March 1955: Legislature adopts law removing racial references in register of voters.

Court action

Washington, January 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Oyama* v. *California*) invalidates California Alien Land Law which raises presumption of fraudulent ownership of agricultural land by persons ineligible for citizenship.

Washington, June 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Takahashi* v. *Game Commission*) invalidates California law prohibiting issuance of fishing licenses to persons ineligible for citizenship.

Santa Fe, N. Mex., August 1948: Federal district court removes last restriction on the right of American Indians to vote.

Sacramento, Calif., October 1948: State supreme court invalidates law barring interracial marriages.

Columbia, S. C., November 1948: Federal district court enjoins State Democratic Party from barring Negro voters from primaries or from participation in party affairs.

U. S. A., 1949–52: Supreme Courts of California and Oregon declare State alien land laws, barring sale or lease of land to Japanese aliens, unconstitutional.

Washington, March 1949: United States Supreme Court (*Schnell* v. *Davis*) upholds Federal district court decision that Alabama's Boswell amendment, which set up stringent educational requirements for voting, is unconstitutional.

Atlanta, Ga., July 1949: State supreme court rules that counties with substantial Negro populations must add Negroes to grand jury and petit jury lists.

Montgomery, Ala., September 1949: Federal grand jury, with 2 Negro jurymen, indicts 1 policeman and 3 former officers on charges of violating civil rights.

Birmingham, Ala., May 1951: United States court of appeals upholds sentencing of Georgia sheriff and deputy to 12 months' imprisonment and $1,000 fine for delivering 7 Negroes to a masked mob.

Richmond, Va., October 1952: United States court of appeals upholds kidnaping convictions against seven North Carolina Klansmen.

Madison, Wis., January 1953: State supreme court rules that a State-administered life-insurance fund may not reject Negro applicants on ground that they are substandard risks.

Washington, May 1953: United States Supreme Court (*Avery* v. *Georgia*) sets aside death sentence of Georgia Negro, because jury was chosen on racial basis.

Washington, May 1953: United States Supreme Court (*Terry* v. *Adams*) outlaws "jaybird" primary in Texas as device to prevent Negroes from voting.

Washington, May 1954: United States Supreme Court (*Hernandez* v. *Texas*) rules that systematic exclusion of Mexican Americans from juries in Texas is unconstitutional.

Sioux City, Iowa, October 1954: Municipal court declares State law prohibiting liquor sales to Indians is unconstitutional.

Oklahoma City, Okla., July 1955: United States court of appeals rules that designation of Negro candidates by race on State election ballots is unconstitutional.

Voluntary action

United States of America, 1949–51: Democratic State primaries opened to Negroes in Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas.

Chicago, Ill., November 1951: Independent Voters League of Illinois gives Negro "best legislator award."

EDUCATION

Administrative measures

Washington, July 1948: Report of President's Committee on Higher Education condemns segregation and discrimination in colleges and professional schools.

Albany, N. Y., November 1949: Commissioner of education orders rezoning of school districts to eliminate segregation by gerrymandering.

Nashville, Tenn., September 1950: Attorney general, in first voluntary compliance with United States Supreme Court decisions in college cases, rules that the State university must admit Negro graduate students.

Tucson, Ariz., September 1951: All school districts except Phoenix abandon segregation in public schools; Phoenix follows in 1953.

Paduach, Ky., June 1953: City College admits first Negro students.

Oak Ridge, Tenn., December 1953: Town council asks end of school segregation in community run by United States Government.

Louisville, Ky., January 1954: City-supported general hospital accepts first Negro student nurses.

Washington, February 1954: Secretary of Defense orders end to segregated military post schools.

U. S. A., 1954–56: Following United States Supreme Court decision outlawing racial segregation in public schools (May 1954), moves toward desegregation are initiated in close to 1,000 school districts and units in Southern and border States. By October 1956, desegregation is underway in 797 school districts, affecting 319,000 Negro and 2 million white children. Some 110 of 208 tax-supported Southern colleges now admit Negro students. Progress by States: Arkansas, three districts desegregated; several more scheduled for 1957–58. Delaware, integration proceeding smoothly throughout State; 4,100 of State's 11,000 Negro pupils attend desegregated classes. Kentucky, some integration in practically all of State's 221 school districts; 88 percent of State's college students attend desegregated classes. Maryland, 13 of State's 23 school districts desegregated; 6 more planning to do so. Missouri, 95 percent of State's Negro students attend integrated schools, mostly in Kansas City and St. Louis; 35 school districts still segregated. Oklahoma, desegregation proceeding smoothly; 52 of 96 previously all-Negro high schools integrated; 11 more school districts to desegregate shortly. Tennessee, 2 school districts, Clinton and federally operated Oak Ridge, desegregated. Texas, fewer than 100 of State's 1,857 school districts begin desegregation. West Virginia, integration underway in all but 3 of State's 55 counties. Washington, D. C., all public schools desegregated. Eight States, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, have made no steps toward desegregating public schools.

Albany, N. Y., September 1954: State education department admits Indian children to regular schools, ending century of segregated reservation schools.

Trenton, N. J., June 1955: Commissioner of education rules Englewood must rezone school districts to permit all children, regardless of race, to attend schools nearest their homes.

Annapolis, Md., summer 1955: Attorney General rules that United States Supreme Court's desegregation decision nullifies State laws requiring segregation.

Columbus, Ohio, July 1956: Attorney General rules State board of education may withhold funds from school districts or boards permitting segregation.

Legislation

Trenton, N. J., 1947–49: New constitution ends segregation in New Jersey's public schools; omnibus civil-rights law extends jurisdiction of the division against discrimination to all nonsectarian educational institutions.

Albany, N. Y., 1948–51: Legislature adopts first State law outlawing racial and religious discrimination in colleges and universities (March 1948); later extends coverage to business and trade schools (March 1951).

Indianapolis, Ind., March 1949: Legislature adopts progressive elimination of segregation in public schools.

Springfield, Ill., July 1949: Legislature bars State funds to school districts discriminating against pupils because of race or creed.

Madison, Wis., July 1949: Legislature forbids exclusion of children aged 4 to 20 from any public school on account of religion, nationality, or color, and prohibits segregation in public schools.

Boston, Mass., August 1949: Legislature adopts fair education law.

Louisville, Ky., July 1950: Legislature amends 46-year-old State law requiring racial segregation of students; Louisville colleges announce registration of Negroes for fall term.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1951: Legislature repeals education law requiring segregation, permitting individual school boards to establish unsegregated public elementary schools.

Salem, Oreg., April 1951: Legislature outlaws discrimination in vocational, professional, and trade schools licensed by State.

Albany, N. Y., April 1953: Legislature bars institutions of higher learning from accepting gifts or endowments conditioned on teaching racial superiority.

Sante Fe., N. Mex., March 1955: Legislature repeals law requiring racial segregation in public schools.

Court action

Washington, January 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents*) decides unanimously that Negro students cannot be excluded from State university which offers educational opportunities unavailable at Negro school.

Austin, Tex., June 1948: Federal district court rules that public schools of Texas may not segregate children of Mexican descent.

Washington, June 1950: United States Supreme Court (*McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma; Sweatt* v. *Painter*) rules that forcing a Negro to sit apart from his classmates at a State university or to attend a school lacking the educational opportunities of the State university is unconstitutional.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1951: Federal district court rules that segregation of Mexican American children in public schools is unconstitutional.

Phoenix, Ariz., February 1953: State superior court invalidates 1951 statute which permitted local school boards to segregate.

Washington, 1954–55: United States Supreme Court (*School Segregation Cases*) rules compulsory segregation in public schools is unconstitutional; finalizes lower court decision admitting Negro students to State-supported schools (May 1954). Following further arguments on implementation, Court orders school segregation ended "with deliberate speed" and rules that moves toward integration must be carried out in a "systematic and effective" manner, within a "reasonable" time (May 1955).

El Paso, Tex., July 1955: Federal district court voids all sections of State constitution and other State statutes sanctioning racial segregation in schools.

Austin, Tex., October 1955: State supreme court rules that State funds can be used for desegregated schools.

Washington, October 1955: United States Supreme Court (*Lucy* v. *Adams*) orders University of Alabama to admit Negro students.

Washington, March-May 1956: United States Supreme Court (*Hawkins* v. *Bd. of Control*) upholds lower court ban on racial segregation in tax-supported colleges and universities, bars delay in admission of Negro students; later (*Bd. of Supervision* v. *Tureaud*) refuses to review lower court ruling ordering Louisiana State University to admit Negro student.

Voluntary action

Lexington, Ky., May 1949: Catholic Committee of the South urges all Catholic institutions of higher learning to admit Negro students without discrimination.

Annapolis, Md., May 1949: United States Naval Academy graduates first Negro midshipman.

Chicago, Ill., November 1949: Over 100 university presidents, deans, and admissions officers from 24 States, at Conference of American Council on Education, urge elimination of college admission quotas based on race, religion, or national origin.

Washington, November 1949: Poll of 15,000 southern college teachers by Southern Conference Educational Fund reveals 70 percent favor integration in professional and graduate schools.

Easton, Pa., January 1950: Lafayette College refuses $140,000 bequest restricted to non-Jewish and non-Catholic students.

Birmingham, Ala., October 1951: Southern Episcopal Synod urges admission of Negro students to theological schools at Lexington, Ky., and Sewanee, Tenn.

Chapel Hill, N. C., October 1951: Students' protest wins right of five Negro students at University of North Carolina to sit with white students at athletic events.

Washington, D. C., 1952: New Roman Catholic high school and several Episcopal elementary schools announce nonsegregation policy.

Sewanee, Tenn., June 1952: Faculty of Cumberland Forest Musical Festival and eight leading religious instructors cancel teaching and concert contracts in protest against University of the South's refusal to admit Negro divinity students; following year, university admits Negroes to school of theology.

Denver, Colo., December 1952: Colorado-Wyoming Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers votes to delete references to race and religion from applications.

Gadsden, Ala., June 1953: Cumberland Presbyterian Church admits Negro students to theological seminary.

Boston, Mass., December 1953: Department of education announces that all of the State's 1,131 private schools have eliminated discriminatory questions on admission applications.

U. S. A., spring 1954: Catholic archbishops forbid segregation in Nashville, Tenn., and San Antonio, Tex., archdioceses.

Richmond, Va., May 1954: Bishop rules Catholic high schools will admit Negro students.

Nashville, Tenn., August 1954: Fisk University is first Negro college invited to join Rhodes Scholarship competition.

Baltimore, Md., November 1954: Society of Friends inaugurates gradual integration in its nursery-through-high private school.

Oklahoma City, Okla., April 1955: State voters approve constitutional amendment paving way for desegregated schools.

Tiffin, Ohio, September 1955: United Student Christian Council takes steps to include more Negro colleges and universities in student Christian movement.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Administrative measures

Washington, D. C., 1948–55: President Truman orders Federal agencies to ban discrimination in employment; creates Fair Employment Board in Civil Service Commission to investigate complaints (1948); President Eisenhower creates Committee on Government Employment Policy to replace Fair Employment Board; makes heads of Government departments responsible for preventing job discrimination in their agencies (1955).

Philadelphia, Pa., March 1949: Unemployment compensation board rules employee may refuse to work on Sabbath without sacrificing unemployment compensation.

U. S. A., 1950–51: State commissions against discrimination in Massachusetts and New York issue cease and desist orders against employment agencies discriminating in job placements.

New Haven, Conn., January 1950: Connecticut Interracial Commission conducts first public hearing under a State FEP law and finds complainant was denied employment because of race.

U. S. A., 1951: State employment services in California and Illinois announce they will refuse to accept discriminatory job orders and will delete all racial and religious data from records.

Sacramento, Calif., July 1951: Attorney General rules that California Employment Stabilization Commission has many powers of a State FEP Commission.

Salem, Oreg., August 1951: State labor commissioner orders Brotherhood of Railway Carmen to cease racial discrimination against applicants.

St. Louis, Mo., October 1951: State employment service merges Negro and white offices.

Washington, 1951-54: President Truman creates Committee on Government Contract Compliance (December 1951) to enforce prohibition against discrimination in employment by firms contracting or subcontracting Government orders. President Eisenhower creates new Government Contract Committee with Vice President as chairman (August 1953); Committee tightens nondiscrimination regulations (April 1954).

Raleigh, N. C., September 1952: Governor eliminates Negro-white salary differentials for staff of mental hospital in Goldsboro.

Washington, October 1953: District's Board of Commissioners orders inclusion of anti-bias clause in future contracts.

Louisville, Ky., March 1954: Segregation eliminated in city's fire department.

Sacramento, Calif., September 1954: Attorney general rules that Negro firemen in Los Angeles may not be segregated.

Washington, September 1954: District Commissioners order desegregation of Negro firemen.

Silver City, N. Mex., December 1954: State fair employment practices commission orders Kennecott Copper Corp. to cease segregating employees in company-owned housing, washrooms and on payroll lines.

Washington, January 1955: President's Committee on Government Contracts refuses to permit Bureau of Indian Affairs to negotiate a contract with Mississippi omitting standard nondiscrimination clause.

Washington, January 1955: Capital Transit Co. drops ban on Negro bus and trolley operators after conferences with transit union and President's Committee on Government Contracts.

Red Bank, N. J., March 1955: State highway authority orders nondiscrimination clause added to all future construction contracts for Garden State Parkway.

New York, N. Y., April 1955: State commission against discrimination approves consent decree in which brewery local of the AFL Teamsters Union agrees to admit Negro applicants and to end practices deemed discriminatory by the commission.

New York, N. Y., June 1955: State commission against discrimination announces agreement by local of International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, AFL, to admit Negro stagehands to full membership.

Los Angeles, Calif., July 1955: City civil-service commission requires all applicants for municipal employment to swear that they will "willingly work with or for any associates regardless of race, color, or creed."

Washington, September 1955: President's Committee on Government Contracts inaugurates plan to eliminate employment discrimination in the transportation industry.

Washington, December 1955: Director of General Services Administration orders removal of partitions separating white and Negro maintenance workers in Government buildings.

Trenton, N. J., June 1956: State commission against discrimination orders Erie Railroad to end discrimination against Negro employees in hiring and upgrading.

Washington, October 1956: President's Committee on Government Contracts reports that the country's business leaders "are responding in encouraging numbers to the philosophy that equal job opportunity is both good business and good citizenship."

Legislation

U. S. A., 1948–51: Ordinances in Richmond, Calif.; Sioux City, Iowa, and Cincinnati, Ohio, bar discrimination in public employment or in work under city contracts.

U. S. A., 1948–56: City ordinances bar discrimination in public and private employment in Chicago, Ill. East Chicago and Gary, Ind.; Des Moines, Iowa; Ecorse, Hamtramck, Pontiac and River Rouge, Mich.; Duluth, Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.; Campbell, Cleveland, Girard, Hubbard, Lorain, Lowellville, Niles, Steubenville, Struthers, Toledo, Warren and Youngstown, Ohio; Braddock, Clairton, Duquesne, Erie, Farrell, Johnstown, Monessen, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Sharon, Pa.; and Milwaukee, Wis. Cities with FEP ordinances now total 37.

United States of America, 1949–55: Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington adopt enforceable FEP laws, bringing total to 11.

Albany, N. Y., May 1949: Legislature prohibits questions concerning birthplace on applications for State civil service.

Sacramento, Calif., June 1949: Revised civil-service law prohibits discrimination against State employees on grounds of religion, political belief, marital status, race, color, sex, or blindness.

Los Angeles, Calif., January 1951: Ordinance forbids discrimination in hiring of building construction workers on urban redevelopment projects.

Sacramento, Calif., November 1952: State constitutional amendment eliminates last prohibitions against employment of Chinese on public works.

Juneau, Alaska, March 1953: Alaska adopts fully enforceable FEP law.

Topeka, Kans., March 1953: Legislature adopts FEP law patterned after Wisconsin's educational plan. Four States now have nonenforceable FEP laws.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1955: Legislature bars discrimination in public employment and in firms holding public contracts.

Denver, Colo., April 1955: Legislature extends State FEP law to include private employers engaged in any work "financed in part or in whole by money raised by taxation."

Hartford, Conn., June 1955: Legislature extends FEP law to include discriminatory job advertising.

Sacramento, Calif., September 1955: Legislature bans discrimination in hiring teachers.

Baltimore, Md., St. Louis, Mo., spring 1956: Limited fair employment practice ordinances adopted by first two cities south of Mason-Dixon line.

Court action

United States of America, 1948: Suits to equate salaries of Negro and white teachers are successful in Atlanta, Ga.; Oklahoma City, Okla., and Surrey, Va.

Washington, November 1949: United States Supreme Court (*Graham* v. *Brotherhood*) sustains injunction against Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, barring discrimination against Negro railroad employees.

Birmingham, Ala., May 1950: Federal district court finds Gulf, Mobile & Ohio R. R. and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers guilty of discrimination and awards damages based on wages plaintiffs would have earned on jobs denied them.

Charlotte, N. C., January 1951: United States court of appeals reverses lower court decision which permitted railroads to restrict hiring of Negroes as firemen.

Hartford, Conn., 1952–54: State courts sustain civil rights commission's order against International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (1952). Superior court fines Hartford local of IBEW $2,000 for refusing to drop discriminatory membership policy, plus $500 per week until compliance. Union abandons 5-year defiance of State FEP law; admits two Negro apprentices (April 1954).

Washington, June 1952: United States Supreme Court (*Brotherhood* v. *Howard*) rules that a railway brotherhood may not use its power as a bargaining representative under the Railway Labor Act to effect racial discrimination against Negroes, regardless of how they are classified.

U. S. A., spring 1954: Supreme Courts of Michigan and Ohio rule workers may refuse to work on their sabbath without sacrificing unemployment compensation.

New York, N. Y., April 1954: State court of appeals upholds authority of State Commission Against Discrimination to direct an employment agency to cease inquiries, direct or indirect, as to race, creed, color, or national origin of applicants for employment.

Milwaukee, Wis., August 1954: Circuit court upholds cease-and-desist order of State industrial commission under so-called educational FEP law.

Daytona Beach, Fla., August 1955: State district court orders electrical union to admit Negro applicant.

Houston, Tex., September 1955: State district court approves agreement by Shell Oil Refinery and Shell Chemical Co. not to restrict workers to certain jobs on the basis of race or color.

Voluntary action

U. S. A., 1948–54: Many big league teams admit Negro baseball players, following successful employment of Jackie Robinson by Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947. Pacific Coast League hires first Negro umpire (December 1953).

U. S. A., December 1948: Ten railroad unions agree to eliminate discriminatory clauses from their national constitutions, or to make them inoperative in States with FEP laws.

New York, N. Y., April 1950: New York Telephone Co. announces that discriminatory advertisements by employment agencies will not be accepted for classified telephone directories throughout State.

New York, N. Y., June 1950: Journal of American Medical Association announces that designations of race and creed will be dropped from all "situation wanted" advertisements.

New York, N. Y., July 1951: New York Telephone Co., RCA Communications, American Cable and Radio Corp., and Western Union Telegraph Co. form voluntary committee to cooperate with State commission against discrimination in eliminating discrimination in communications industry.

New York, N. Y., October 1951: Metropolitan Opera Co. signs first Negro ballet dancer.

New York, N. Y., October 1952: International Geneva Association, a society of chefs, headwaiters, and managers serving fashionable hotels and restaurants, lifts ban on Negro members.

Los Angeles, Calif., January 1953: Negro and white locals of Musicians Union merge.

Indianapolis, Ind., July 1953: Railway hires first Negro trolley drivers.

Dade County, Fla., October 1954: Local of Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union admits Negro members.

Chicago, Ill., March 1955: Armour & Co. assures United Packinghouse Workers Union that qualified Negro workers will be employed in white-collar positions.

New York, N. Y., March 1955: United, American, and Trans-World airlines hire Negro reservation clerks.

Baltimore, Md., June 1955: Baltimore local of National Federation of Postal Clerks votes to admit Negro applicants.

Orlando, Fla., November 1955: Local of American Federation of Musicians admits Negro members.

New York, N. Y., December 1955: Merger convention of AFL–CIO calls for equal rights for all workers; creates committee on civil rights to further this goal.

Washington, June 1956: Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., serving the District of Columbia and its environs, agrees to hire Negro telephone operators.

New York, N. Y., August 1956: Greyhound Bus Line is first major interstate bus company to hire Negro drivers.

Pittsburgh, Pa., August 1956: American Federation of Teachers votes to void charter of any local union which continues to segregate members after December 1957.

New York, N. Y., October 1956: Eighteen major passenger airlines agree to end ban on Negro pilots and other crewmen.

HOUSING

Administrative measures

Washington, December 1949: Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration refuse to insure loans on new housing covered by recorded restrictive covenants.

United States of America, 1950–55: City housing authorities in Los Angeles County; San Bernardino and San Francisco, Calif.; Washington, D. C.; Wilmington, Del.; Chicago, Ill.; Baraga, Mich.; St. Paul, Minn.; Omaha, Nebr.; Newark, N. J.; Buffalo and Schenectady, N. Y.; Toledo, Ohio; Allegheny County and Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Pasco, Wash., eliminate segregation in city housing projects.

Charlotte, N. C., January 1950: Public Housing Administration rejects bid for Federal aid in construction of segregated housing project; city council reverses segregation policy.

Washington, November 1950: Public Housing Administration declares low-rent housing programs "must reflect equitable provisions for eligible families of all races determined on the approximate volume and urgency of their respective needs."

New York, N. Y., April 1951: State commissioner of housing rules that, for the purposes of the housing law, segregation is discrimination.

New York, N. Y., June 1951: Federal Housing Administrator announces that all projects to which FHA obtains title will be administered on a nonsegregated basis.

San Francisco, Calif., January 1954: Housing authority includes nonsegregation clause in contract for operation of four temporary housing projects.

Albany, N. Y., October 1955: Governor appoints new housing advisory council to aid State commission against discrimination in administering laws barring bias in publicly assisted housing.

Hartford, Conn., December 1955: State commission on civil rights rules real-estate agents are covered by State law barring discrimination in services offered to public.

Hartford, Conn., June 1956: State commission on civil rights orders private housing development receiving city tax abatement to end discrimination against Negro applicants.

Legislation

United States of America, 1949–52: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin forbid discrimination and segregation in public housing.

United States of America, 1949–52: Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., and Cincinnati, Ohio, bar discrimination and segregation in urban redevelopment.

United States of America, 1949–52: Ordinances in San Francisco, Calif.; Hartford, Conn.; Boston, Mass.; New York, N. Y.; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa., and Providence, R. I., bar discrimination and segregation in public housing.

United States of America, 1949–53: Legislatures in Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania forbid racial and religious discrimination in publicly assisted housing.

New York, N. Y., March 1951: Ordinance bars discrimination in publicly assisted housing.

Madison, Wis., June 1951: Legislature repeals State law recognizing validity of racial restrictive covenants.

St. Paul, Minn., April 1953: Legislature prohibits race restrictions in real estate contracts.

Denver, Colo., September 1953: City council bars approval and recording of subdivisions containing racial restrictive covenants.

New York, N. Y., July 1954: Ordinance makes it illegal for owners of multiple dwellings, erected with loans or guaranties from public agencies, to discriminate against tenants because of race, creed, color or national origin.

Albany, N. Y., 1955–56: Legislature outlaws discrimination in virtually all housing to be built with Government insurance (1955); gives jurisdiction to State commission against discrimination (1956).

Trenton, N. J., July 1955: Legislature bars discrimination in granting of mortgage loans.

Court action

Washington, May 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Shelley* v. *Kraemer; Hurd* v. *Hodges*) rules that courts cannot enforce racial restrictive covenants. Five years later (July 1953), Court rules that courts may not award damages for breach of racial restrictive covenant (*Barrows* v. *Jackson*).

Birmingham, Ala., December 1950: United States Court of Appeals holds that city racial zoning law is unconstitutional.

Chicago, Ill., June 1953: State circuit court bars condemnation of land owned by Negro, thwarting attempt to drive his family from neighborhood by turning property into a public park.

U. S. A., July 1953: Federal district courts in Evansville, Ind., and Toledo, Ohio, enjoin local housing authorities from segregating Negro tenants in public housing projects.

San Francisco, Calif., 1953–54: State court of appeal upholds earlier superior court ruling that San Francisco Housing Authority must abandon "neighborhood pattern" of resident selection and admit applicants without discrimination (August 1953). United States Supreme Court (*Housing Authority* v. *Banks*) rejects appeal (May 1954).

Akron, Ohio, April 1955: State board of tax appeals rules that the advent of Negro residents into a "white neighborhood" does not necessarily reduce property values.

Chicago, Ill., October 1955: State appellate court upholds right of Negro plaintiff to sue city because of injuries caused by mob protesting rental of public housing to Negroes.

Detroit, Mich., October 1955: United States Court of Appeals upholds lower court ban on racial segregation in city's public housing.

Columbus, Ohio, November 1955: Federal district court orders city housing authority to end segregation in public housing.

St. Louis, Mo., December 1955: Federal district court bans racial segregation in public housing in first ruling south of Mason-Dixon line.

Voluntary action

Chicago, Ill., January 1948: Chicago Improvement Association negotiates agreement under which white owners agree not to enforce existing restrictive covenants.

Miami, Fla., November 1950: National Association of Real Estate Boards votes to change code which held it was unethical for a realtor to introduce new races into a neighborhood.

Buffalo, N. Y., October 1952: Builder of Philadelphia's first nonsegregated private rental housing tells National Association of Housing Officials venture is "outstanding success."

Philadelphia, Pa., April 1954: Commission on human relations reports that 88 percent of the city's Negro families and 22 percent of white families live in blocks with some racial integration.

Trevose, Pa., November 1954: Cooperative interracial development of one-family homes opens in Bucks County.

San Francisco, Calif., December 1954: Study by University of California reports west coast white neighborhoods are accepting the arrival of nonwhite residents without incident.

Teaneck, N. J., July 1955: White citizens unite to integrate Negro newcomers and to prevent "panic" selling in neighborhood.

New York, N. Y., June 1956: Commission on race and housing plans nationwide survey of housing opportunities for minorities, to be financed by Fund for the Republic.

PROFESSIONAL, BUSINESS, RELIGIOUS, AND FRATERNAL SOCIETIES

Voluntary action

Chicago, Ill., 1948–54: The American Nurses' Association votes to give direct membership to Negro nurses refused district membership; 2 years later, National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses votes to disband. By 1954, 53 State and Territorial associations — all except Georgia — include Negro nurses in membership.

United States of America, 1949–55: Negroes are admitted to membership in State medical associations of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Tennessee, and Virginia; medical societies of Pulaski County, Ark., Fulton County, Jackson County, and St. Louis, Mo., Charleston County, S. C., Bexar and Harris Counties, Tex., northern Virginia, Roanoke, Va., and Washington, D. C.; American Pediatric Society; American Board of Surgery; St. Louis Dental Society; bar associations of Cincinnati, Galveston, Los Angeles, Louisville, St. Louis, and Washington, D. C.; Arkansas Education Association; Arlington Education Association; Albany Junior Chamber of Commerce; North Carolina Academy of Science, and California Rotary.

United States of America, 1949–56: Southern Presbyterian Church votes to absorb colored presbyteries in white synods; Washington Cathedral selects Negro canon; South Carolina Diocese of Protestant Episcopal Church welcomes Negroes to convention; Bishop of Raleigh bans segregation in Catholic churches of the diocese; Episcopal Diocese of New Jersey bars church segregation; Bruton Parish Church (Williamsburg, Va.) admits Negroes; Bradenton-Palmetto (Fla.) Ministerial Association admits Negro pastors; Texas-Louisiana Presbyterian Synod admits Negro members; archbishop suspends Catholic mission (New Orleans) for rejecting services of Negro priest; Austin Baptist Association (Texas) admits Negro members; white and Negro ministerial associations in Asheville (N. C.), Daytona Beach (Fla.), Little Rock (Ark.), and Cleveland County (N. C.) form integrated associations; white and Negro Episcopal congregations in Maywood (Ill.) merge; Methodist Board of Evangelism abolishes Negro section; First Methodist Church of Mission (Tex.) bans segregated congregation; general assembly of United Presbyterian Church votes for complete integration of all churches, agencies, and institutions in denomination; Disciples of Christ announces some degree of integration in 464 local congregations in 40 States.

U. S. A., 1948–55: Following example set by Amherst, steps are taken to eliminate discrimination in Greek-letter societies at: Allegheny College, American University, Colgate, College of the City of New York, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Lafayette, Lake Forest College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Middlebury, Northwestern, New York University, Ohio Wesleyan, Pennsylvania State, Rutgers, San Francisco State College, State University of New York, Syracuse, Tufts, Wayne, Wesleyan, Williams, and Universities of California, Chicago, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas City, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Vermont, and Washington. National Committee on Fraternities in Education is organized to fight bias. Action by fraternities to prevent universities from ordering elimination of discriminatory charter clauses is dismissed by United States Supreme Court (*Webb* v. *State University*).

Lexington, Ky., September 1952: Fisk and Howard Universities are first Negro colleges to obtain chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

U. S. A., 1955: Exchange Clubs of St. Paul, Minn.; Mount Vernon, Norwich, Peekskill and Port Chester, N. Y., drop racial bars to membership.

Washington, February 1955: National Press Club elects first Negro member.

Washington, May 1956: American Bar Association votes to drop questions on race from membership application forms; declares inquiry "serves no useful purpose."

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION

Administrative measures

Louisville, Ky., May 1948: Public library admits Negroes to all departments on same basis as whites.

Washington, 1949–50: Department of Interior prohibits discrimination and segregation in any activity or facility conducted in parks and public swimming pools of the Nation's Capital.

Miami, Fla., June 1951: City erases color line in its library.

Washington, November 1951: Interstate Commerce Commission bars racial discrimination in sale of tickets on Washington-Mount Vernon excursion boat.

Houston, Tex., December 1951: City authorities bar segregated restrooms and eating facilities in new airport terminal buildings.

Boston, Mass., 1952–53: State commission against discrimination awards damages to complainants denied accommodations at motor court, and service in cafe, because of race.

Chicago, Ill., May 1952: Illinois Commerce Commission bans racial segregation by Illinois Central Railroad.

St. Paul, Minn., July 1953: Governor orders discriminatory resort literature removed from State tourist bureau offices.

New York, N. Y., July 1953: State commission against discrimination orders summer resort to discontinue "club" membership procedures used as subterfuge for religious discrimination and to eliminate brochure references to "selected clientele."

Salem, Oreg., January 1954: Attorney general rules that, under new civil rights law, restaurants may not segregate patrons.

Dallas, Tex., June 1954: Park department ends segregation on municipal golf courses.

Washington, October 1954: Justice Department asks Interstate Commerce Commission to ban segregation on interstate railroads.

New York, N. Y., December 1954: State commission against discrimination rules swimming pool operating as a private club is still a public accommodation and must admit customers without racial discrimination.

Washington, December 1954: Board of Commissioners announces it will enforce 85-year-old antidiscrimination laws in all places of public accommodation, ending 75-year lapse in enforcement.

Washington, January 1955: Police Commissioner orders Metropolitan Police Boys Clubs to stop using Government facilities on a segregated basis.

New York, N. Y. February 1955: State commission against discrimination announces drive to bar out-of-State resort brochures containing discriminatory racial or religious references.

Washington, February 1955: Interstate Commerce Commission rules Greyhound Corp. guilty of unlawful discrimination in forcing Negro patron to take rear bus seat in Texas.

Columbus, Ohio, June 1955: Ohio Turnpike Commission announces it will not publicize any place along the turnpike practicing racial discrimination.

Washington, November 1955: Interstate Commerce Commission bans segregation in interstate transportation and waiting rooms.

Montpelier, Vt., May 1956: Attorney general rules resorts practicing racial discrimination may not be listed in official State tourist publications.

Washington, May 1956: Civil Aeronautics Administration bans use of Federal funds for construction of segregated rest rooms, dining rooms, and other facilities at airports.

Legislation

United States of America, 1948–54: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island extend jurisdiction of State commissions against discrimination to public accommodation statutes; Oregon prohibits discrimination in places of public accommodation; Washington strengthens antidiscrimination law.

Miami Beach and Surfside, Fla., 1949–51: Ordinances bar advertising which discriminates against any religion.

St. Thomas, V. I., October 1950: Legislative assembly passes law providing "equal rights in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement."

Annapolis, Md., February 1951: Legislature repeals mandatory racial segregation in public transportation.

Kansas City, Mo., June 1951: Ordinance forbids segregation at Municipal Air Terminal, Municipal Auditorium, and Starlight Theater.

Madison, Wis., July 1951: Legislature prohibits discriminatory advertising.

Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 1952: Ordinance bans racial discrimination in public accommodations.

Knoxville, Tenn., January 1954: Ordinance bans segregation at privately owned restaurant at municipal airport.

Richmond, Va., March 1954: Legislature bans religious discrimination in advertising.

Houston, Tex., June 1954: Ordinance bans segregation on municipal golf courses.

Helena, Mont., Sante Fe, N. Mex, 1955: Legislatures ban racial and religious discrimination in public accommodations.

Miami, Fla., June 1955: Legislature bans religious discrimination in advertising.

Springfield, Ill., July 1955: Legislature bars tax exemption for any hospital found guilty of discriminating against patients because of race, creed, or color.

Oklahoma City, Okla., February 1956: City ends racial segregation in municipal parks and pools.

San Antonio, Tex., March 1956: City abolishes segregation in all municipally owned public facilities.

Lansing, Mich., April 1956: Legislature amends civil rights law to strengthen antidiscrimination provisions; extends definition of public accommodations to include motels and Government housing.

Court action

U. S. A., 1948–54: Courts in Minneapolis, Minn.; Kansas City, St. Louis, and Webster Groves, Mo.; Trenton, N. J.; Oxford, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa., and Houston, Tex., rule that public swimming pools and bathing beaches may not discriminate against Negroes.

Washington, February 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Bob-Lo Excursion Co.* v. *Michigan*) decides unanimously that Michigan law forbidding discrimination in places of public accommodation applies to excursion boat operating between Michigan and Canada.

Baltimore, Md., July 1948: Federal district court orders Baltimore to open its three public golf courses to Negroes, though permitting restriction of Negroes to certain days of the week. Three years later (July 1951), park board votes to end segregation in city's municipal courses.

Washington, January 1949: Federal district court sustains right of Civil Aeronautics Administrator to prohibit discrimination and segregation at Washington National Airport, although airport is in Virginia, which has a compulsory segregation law.

Louisville, Ky., May 1950: Federal district court awards $1,500 damages to Negro ejected from bus on interstate trip.

Washington, June 1950: United States Supreme Court (*Henderson* v. *U. S.*) outlaws segregation in dining cars on interstate railroads.

Richmond, Va., January 1951: United States Court of Appeals holds that segregation on interstate railroad violates United States Constitution.

New York, N. Y., April 1951: Federal district court allows damages to plaintiff forced to move to segregated railway car traveling interstate.

Charleston, W. Va., June 1951: Federal district court rules county airport dining room must serve all, regardless of race.

Orlando, Fla., June 1952: Federal district court holds Negroes may not be refused admission to municipal auditorium if Negro auditorium has inferior facilities and entertainment.

Kingston, N. Y., December 1952: Jury awards substantial damages to Negro patrons refused resort accommodations after their reservations were confirmed.

Washington, June 1953: United States Supreme Court (*District of Columbia* v. *Thompson*) upholds 1873 statute prohibiting public eating places from refusing service because of race or color; voids long-standing segregation tradition of capital restaurants.

New York, N. Y., 1955–56: State supreme court upholds ruling of State commission against discrimination ordering swimming pool to admit Negro patrons (June 1955); ruling upheld by appellate court (April 1956).

Richmond, Va., 1955–56: United States court of appeals declares segregation on intrastate buses unconstitutional (July 1955); United States Supreme Court (*South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.* v. *Flemning*) refuses to review (April 1956).

Washington, 1955–56: Municipal court invokes 1869 statute to bar discrimination in public bowling alleys (September 1955); ruling upheld by United States court of appeals (April 1956).

Norfolk, Va., 1955–56: Federal district court rules racial segregation in State parks is unconstitutional whether operated by State or private lessee (July 1955); ruling upheld by United States court of appeals (April 1956); United States Supreme Court (*Tate* v. *Dept. of Conservation*) refuses to review (October 1956).

Washington, November 1955: United States Supreme Court (*Mayor* v. *Dawson*; *Holmes* v. *Atlanta*) affirms lower court ruling barring segregation in public beaches and bathhouses; reverses lower court ruling permitting segregation on public golf courses.

Frankfort, Ky., December 1955: State court of appeals bans racial segregation in public parks.

Beaumont, Tex., December 1955: Federal district court holds "separate but equal" principle was destroyed by United States Supreme Court in *School Segregation Cases*; enjoins city from enforcing segregation in public parks.

Washington, January 1956: United States court of appeals upholds right of Negro passengers to sue air carrier for damages resulting from racial discrimination in violation of Civil Aeronautics Act.

Voluntary action

Washington, 1948–54: National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital issues report condemning discrimination in Washington, D. C. (December 1948); Actors' Equity bans Washington bookings, because theater rejects Negro patrons (May 1948); National Theater drops segregation and reopens for legitimate stage productions (November 1951); last dime-store chain operating segregated lunch counters drops ban against Negro patrons (September 1952); motion-picture theaters drop color line (October 1953).

New Orleans, La., October 1949: Archbishop cancels annual holy hour services in city stadium, because park commission insists on segregation of participants.

New York, N. Y., April 1950: New York Travel Agents Committee resolves not to recommend discriminatory resorts.

Washington, October 1950: American Prison Association votes not to meet in cities where hotels practice racial discrimination.

Washington, April 1951: Daughters of the American Revolution drops 12-year ban on Negro performers in Constitution Hall.

Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1951: Dining room concession at municipal airport ends discrimination against Negroes.

New York, N. Y., May 1951: Unions representing more than 70,000 restaurant employees, and management associations comprising more than 1,500 restaurants, pledge equal treatment of patrons regardless of race; Committee on Civil Rights in East Manhattan, Inc., finds (June 1952) discrimination against Negro patrons in East Side restaurants has decreased from 42 percent to 16 percent in 2 years.

Atlanta, Ga., June 1951: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People holds first nonsegregated meeting since reconstruction days in municipal auditorium.

U. S. A., 1952–53: Legitimate theaters in Baltimore, Md., and St. Louis, Mo., end segregation.

Miami, Fla., January 1952: First nonsegregated audience since Civil War gathers to hear Marian Anderson.

Norfolk, Va., June 1952: Norfolk Ministers Association cancels annual January preaching mission until racial segregation of audiences is eliminated.

Washington, September 1952: American Psychological Association votes unanimously to hold no future meetings in cities imposing racial segregation.

Washington, November 1953: Southern Railway system, faced with lawsuit, orders patrons seated in order of their entrance into dining cars.

Washington, January 1954: Columbia Hospital announces complete racial integration of patients.

Houston, Tex., June 1954: Protestant Episcopal Church protesting segregation, cancels plans for 1955 convention in Houston.

Danville, Va., June 1954: Democratic Committee breaks century-old precedent with unsegregated Jefferson-Jackson dinner.

Portland, Maine: August 1954: Medical association changes site of State medical convention to protest discrimination by resort originally chosen.

Detroit, Mich., October 1954: Michigan Tourist Council bars discriminatory advertising in 1955 Regional Guide Books of Michigan Tourist Association.

Chicago, Ill., November 1954: National Association of Attorneys General switches convention site from Phoenix, Ariz., to Sulphur Springs, W. Va., to avoid possible racial restrictions.

Lake Junaluska, N. C., June 1955: 375 students from 90 southern colleges, attending Methodist conference, call for end to racial discrimination and resolve to shun local pools barring Negro students.

Haverhill, Mass., October 1955: State Baptist convention cancels reservations at hotel barring Negro educator.

Washington, January 1956: American Association for the Advancement of Science votes to hold no future meetings in cities where racial segregation is practiced.

White Plains, N. Y., May 1956: Directors of YMCA vote to merge Negro and white branches in city.

MISCELLANEOUS

Administrative measures

Trenton, N. J., September 1952: State banking and insurance commissioner orders auto insurance companies to remove questions on race from applications, and to stop charging Negroes higher rates.

New York, N. Y., April 1955: Police department initiates special police-training course in intergroup relations.

Washington, March 1956: Federal Bureau of Investigation plans special civil-rights training courses in cooperation with State and local police, for Nation's 200,000 enforcement officers.

Legislation

New York, N. Y., June 1952: City ordinance bars public funds to any child-care institutions discriminating against youngsters because of race, creed, or ancestry.

United States of America, spring 1953: Legislatures in Iowa and Washington bar cemeteries from refusing burial because of race or color.

Sacramento, Calif., April 1955: Legislature bars racial discrimination in automobile insurance.

Voluntary action

Washington, May 1950: CIO orders local unions to disregard State segregation laws and operate all CIO facilities without discrimination.

Chicago, Ill., November 1950: Red Cross votes to eliminate racial data on blood donations.

Tuskegee, Ala., December 1952: Tuskegee Institute reports 1952 is first year free of lynching in United States since records were begun in 1882.

New Haven, Conn., December 1952: Yale Divinity School undertakes 2-year survey of racial and cultural references in Protestant church literature.

St. Louis, Mo., March 1955: The St. Louis Globe-Democrat decides not to label persons by race in news columns unless the information is pertinent.

Chicago, Ill., July 1955: City's major radio and television stations adopt program to guard against inflammatory statements in reporting on race tensions.

Washington, September 1956: Executive council of AFL–CIO declares community and welfare services seeking union support must be free of discrimination.

I. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO PROTECT THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Violence, threats, fraud, coercion, other forms of terrorism, boycotts, and discriminatory qualifications are today successfully disfranchising large numbers of American citizens. Well-documented cases have been publicly reported within the past year, cases involving a pattern of threats from physical attack to loss of jobs against Negroes who exercise their right to vote. As a penalty for voting, these threats have included discrimination in hiring or tenure; discrimination in regard to the withdrawal or granting of a business franchise or other benefit; efforts to cause an employer or principal to discriminate against an employee or agent to discourage the employee or agent from voting; boycotting of a business firm to encourage the firm to discourage its employees in exercising their right to vote; discharging or otherwise discriminating against any person because such person has encouraged others to vote.

The results has been to contribute to the great imbalance in the value of a vote cast in one section of the country as against another section. The extent of the limitation of the franchise is illustrated by the testimony of Assistant Attorney General Olney before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections on October 10, 1956. Mr. Olney cited illegal practices by voting officials in Onachita Parish, La., acting in conjunction with local white citizens councils. In the course of several months in 1956, over 3,000 of the approximately 4,000 Negro voters in this particular parish were removed from the voting list.

The Jackson Daily News of December 18, 1956, carried a story of a plan by the white citizens councils to extend this program to other sections of the State and thereby clear Negroes from the voting lists. According to this report, 11,000 Negro voters were removed from the voting lists in northern Louisiana. A leader of the State's white supremacy movement was quoted as promising that a new purge would begin on January 1, 1957.

A more direct example of effective disfranchisement by intimidation occurred in January 1956 when a group of 12 Negroes registered to vote in Liberty County, Fla. They were the first Negro voters to register in that county. Before a week elapsed, the homes of some of these citizens were shot into and crosses were burned throughout the area in which they lived. As a result of this intimidation, none of these new registrants voted.

These instances are not unique. Yet in these and in similar instances the Department of Justice has been powerless to act under existing law, beyond investigations which may be conducted by the FBI. It is manifestly apparent that any new Federal legislation adopted must be broad enough to give the Attorney General discretion to intervene and the Federal courts jurisdiction whenever arbitrary and discriminatory devices are used to interfere with the right to vote. Obviously if the legislation is to be meaningful it must explicitly extend to voters in primary as well as general elections.

The proposed bill, originally requested by the Justice Department in the 81st Congress, is designed to do just this.

The Hatch Act (18 U. S. C. 594) now makes it a crime for anyone to intimidate or coerce an American citizen for the purpose of interfering with his right to vote as he wishes in elections for national office. This law was enacted in 1939, at a time when there was doubt in Congress as to the constitutionality of Federal regulation over nominating primaries. It is clear, however, today that the Federal Government does have the right to regulate the nominating primaries system. This has been so since 1941 and the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (317 U. S. 299). It is therefore essential that our laws be clear and unequivocal in this respect.

The proposed bill therefore provides that it is a crime to intimidate or coerce an American citizen and thus interfere with his right to vote in primary and special elections, as well as general elections for Federal office. The proposed bill also makes certain minor technical changes in the existing laws so as to declare it to be the unequivocal right of citizens to vote at any election without distinction as to race, color, religion, or national origin. Interfering with that right by anyone is made a crime. These changes have been requested by the Justice Department, which itself is responsible for carrying out the provisions of the law and protecting the rights of the citizens.

It is clear that discrimination against voters on the basis of race or color is a direct violation of the 15th amendment (*Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)), and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment (*Nixon* v. *Herndon* (273 U. S. 536); *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73)). Our courts have continually ruled that discrimination in voting based on religion or national origin is arbitrary, unreasonable, and "by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded on the doctrine of equality."

The proposed bill further strengthens the existing civil-rights statutes insofar as voting is concerned by providing in addition to criminal penalties that the party whose voting rights are interfered with can bring a suit for injury against the person or persons who interfered or attempted to interfere with his right to vote. Another most important provision of this bill would authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief in Federal court to prevent violation of the law or provide relief if violations take place. This would put a discretionary burden of protecting a citizen's right to vote directly upon the proper agent of the Federal Government rather than upon the individual citizen, who is often subject to local pressures. This is a bill, similar to S. 903 of the 84th Congress, which was favorably reported by the Senate

Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in 1956.

The text of the proposed bill follows:

"A bill to protect the right to political participation

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title 18, United States Code, section 594, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 594. Intimidation of voters: Whoever intimidates, threatens, coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any other person for the purpose of interfering with the right of such other person to vote or to vote as he may choose, or of causing such other person to vote for, or not to vote for, any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegates, or Commissioners from the Territories and possessions, at any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing such candidate, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U. S. C. 1971) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2004. All citizens of the United States who are otherwise eligible by law shall be entitled to and allowed the same and equal opportunity to qualify to vote and to vote at any general, special, or primary election by the people conducted in or by any State, Territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other Territorial subdivision, without distinction, direct or indirect, based on race, color, religion, or national origin; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or Territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding. The right to qualify to vote and to vote, as set forth herein, shall be deemed a right within the meaning of, and protected by, the provision of title 18, United States Code, section 242, as amended, section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U. S. C. 1983), and other applicable provisions of law.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Any person violating the provisions of section 594 of title 18 of the United States Code (whether or not such person has been convicted of such violation) shall be subject to suit for damages by the party injured, or by his estate.

"(b) Upon a showing that any person is violating (whether or not such person has been convicted of such violation) or is threatening to violate section 594 of title 18 of the United States Code, or is depriving or threatening to deprive an inhabitant of any State or Territory of the right to qualify to vote and to vote as set forth in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, the party injured or threatened to be injured by such violation or threatened violation, or by such deprivation or threatened deprivation, or the Attorney General of the United States, in the name of the United States but for the benefit of such party, may commence and maintain an action for preventive, mandatory, or declaratory relief to prohibit or prevent such injury or threatened injury.

"(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings brought pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) and shall exercise such jurisdiction without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies provided by law and without regard to the amount of the matter in controversy. The term "district courts of the United States" means any district court as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28 of the United States Code and the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

II. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO CREATE A COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

There is an urgent necessity for Congress to establish a permanent, bipartisan, regionally representative Federal Commission on Civil Rights to make continuous appraisals and to recommend action with respect to civil rights problems.

In a democratic society, the systematic, critical review of social needs and public policy is a fundamental necessity. This is especially true of a field like civil rights, where the problems are enduring and range widely. Yet, nowhere in the Federal Government is there an agency charged with the continuous appraisal of the status of civil rights and the efficiency of the machinery with which we hope to improve that status.

This gap was noted in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights which called for the establishment of a permanent Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Office of the President.

Such a Commission would inquire into and give guidance in specific trouble areas as well as in broad problems and would make recommendations for legislative and executive action. It would have subpena powers but not regulatory or enforcement authority.

Bills to establish such a Commission have been pending in the Congress since 1948.

The bill I offer today is a revised version of S. 906 which I sponsored in the 84th Congress. It may be summarized as follows:

1. There is congressional finding that civil rights of some persons today are being denied, abridged, or threatened, and that to protect these rights the executive and legislative branches must be continuously informed concerning the denials, abridgments, or threats.

2. Hence a five-man Commission on Civil Rights is set up in the executive branch, appointed by the President, with the protection that these appointments are to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Certain Commission operating procedures and financial compensation are set out in the bill. A full-time staff director and secondary personnel are authorized.

3. The duties of the Commission are essentially informative: to gather authoritative information concerning developments in the civil-rights field; to appraise from a civil-rights perspective current policies and activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, and of private individuals and groups; to assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in conducting civil-rights studies; to make an annual report to the President and to the Congress with recommendations for action.

4. The Commission may constitute advisory committees and is expected to consult with representatives of State and local governments as well as private organizations.

5. The Commission is given subpena power to require the production of evidence relating to its studies or investigations. Any refusal to obey a subpena is punishable by contempt procedure in Federal district court.

Until last year, no such bill was brought to the floor of either House for a vote. When the House acted on H. R. 627, it did adopt a measure which has some of the aspects of the bill I propose today. I believe the present version is preferable however, for several reasons. Among them are these: (1) H. R. 627 would have established a Commission only for a period of 2 years; today's bill would establish it on a continuing, permanent basis.

(2) Under H. R. 627 the Commission would investigate denial of the right to vote, unwarranted economic pressure and denial of equal protection of the laws; under today's bill the investigations could be broader, touching on all aspects of civil rights. (3) Under H. R. 627 the Commission would report only to the President; under today's bill it would also recommend legislation to Congress.

The bill I propose today is a very meaningful one to me personally. Since it would be set up primarily as an advisory Commission, it is not at all to be confused with FEPC. It is a Commission patterned after the Mayor's Council on Human Relations which I established while I was mayor of Minneapolis and which is still operating successfully. I consider it to be one of the factors in changing Minneapolis from what Carey McWilliams in 1945 called "the capitol of anti-Semitism in America" to the city which received the annual Brotherhood Award of the National Conference on Christians and Jews in 1948. It is interesting to note that our mayor's commission continues to function in Minneapolis even though we have an FEPC in the city. The idea for such a commission, by the way, was supported by the old Truman Commission on Civil Rights.

On occasion I have had a chance to discuss with, or send, this bill to representative southern editors. I have had an excellent and affirmative response from them. The long-term, essentially voluntary gradualist approach appeals to them. The necessity for Senate confirmation of the appointees to the Commission should result in a Commission representing many viewpoints.

The provision contemplating bipartisan, local, and regional consultation should also help assure that the Commission would approach its business from a serious but sympathetic perspective, recognizing that the problems which it is called upon to meet are more difficult in some areas of the country than others.

It seems to me that this is a moderate proposal upon which many Senators of varying convictions might agree.

The text of the proposed bill follows:

"EXHIBIT C

"A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the 'Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1957.'

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States have contributed, in large measure, to the rapid growth, productivity, and ingenuity, which characterizes our Nation; that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation with respect to the protection of the rights of individuals, the civil rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States are being denied, abridged, or threatened. The Congress recognizes that the national security and general welfare of the United States call for more adequate protection of the civil rights of individuals; and that the executive and legislative branches of our Government must be accurately and continuously informed concerning the extent to which fundamental constitutional rights are abridged or denied.

"SEC. 3. There is created in the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the 'Commission'). The Commission shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. In appointing the members of the Commission, the President is requested to provide, insofar as possible, representation for the various geographic areas of the United States. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman and

one as Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Each member of the Commission shall receive the sum of $50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, together with actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred while engaged in the work of the Commission (or, in lieu of subsistence, a per diem allowance at a rate not in excess of $12).

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Commission to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic, social, legal, and other developments affecting the civil rights of individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to appraise the policies, practices, and enforcement program of the Federal Government with respect to civil rights; to appraise the activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, and the activities of private individuals and groups, with a view to determining what activities adversely affect civil rights; to assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in conducting studies to protect civil rights of all Americans without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin; and to recommend to the Congress, legislation necessary to safeguard and protect the civil rights of all Americans.

"(b) The Commission shall make an annual report to the President and to the Congress on its findings and recommendations, and it may in addition from time to time, as it deems appropriate or at the request of the President, advise the President of its findings and recommendations with respect to any civil-rights matter.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments, and private organizations, as it deems advisable. The Commission shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information of other Government agencies, as well as private research agencies, in the performance of its functions. All Federal agencies are directed to cooperate fully with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its functions and duties.

"(b) Within the limitations of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint a full-time staff director and such other personnel, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable.

"(c) The Commission may accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and pay any such personnel actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred while engaged in the work of the Commission (or, in lieu of subsistence, a per diem allowance at a rate not in excess of $12).

"SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under study or investigation. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof."

III. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO CREATE A CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

Recent events have made it more than obvious that we need a statutory Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice, headed by an Assistant Attorney General, with authority to protect civil rights in all sections of the country.

The need to strengthen the machinery of the Federal Government to provide for more effective enforcement of civil rights statutes was emphasized in the historic Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights during the Truman Administration. At the moment, responsibility for the enforcement of existing civil rights laws is vested in a nonstatutory Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. It has proved ineffective in the face of flagrant civil rights violations. The Civil Rights Section must be elevated to divisional status and given the prestige, the resources, and the authority necessary for the protection of civil rights.

President Truman's Committee urged as its first recommendation, the creation of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, with regional offices, a sufficient appropriation to enable the division to engage in extensive research and to act more effectively to prevent civil rights violations, and increase investigative action in the absence of complaints, and a greater use of civil sanctions.

Legislation to accomplish these purposes has been before the Congress continually since 1948. No such legislation was ever brought to the floor of either House for debate and vote, until 1956.

The provisions of the bill I introduce today spell out in detail the proposal which was incorporated in H. R. 627 last year. This bill is similar to S. 902 which I introduced in the 84th Congress, as well as to its earlier counterparts in previous Congresses. S. 902 was favorably reported by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in the 84th Congress. Such legislative encouragements from last year lead me to hope for effective action on this proposal this year.

The text of the proposed bill reads as follows:

"EXHIBIT D

"A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights

"Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of Justice an additional Assistant Attorney General, learned in the law, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall, under the direction of the Attorney General, be in charge of a Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice concerned with all matters pertaining to the preservation and enforcement of civil rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"SEC. 102. The personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice shall be increased to the extent necessary to carry out effectively the duties of such Bureau with respect to the investigation of civil-rights cases under applicable Federal law. Such Bureau shall include in the training of its agents appropriate training and instructions, to be approved by the Attorney General, in the investigation of civil-rights cases."

IV. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

A decade ago the Supreme Court ruled that segregation in interstate transportation was a denial of constitutional rights.

The illegality of racial discrimination in interstate transportation was conclusively adjudicated in *Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 372 (1946)) and *Henderson* v. *United States* (339 U. S. 816 (1950)). Millions of Americans have recently taken justifiable pride and satisfaction in further decisions by the Court that the 14th amendment forbids segregation in intrastate commerce as well. Yet, Mr. President even within the jurisdictional confines of the interstate commerce, there is no adequate machinery to protect these rights with the result that segregation and other discriminatory practices persist.

Despite all the recent court decisions outlawing government-imposed segregation in the field of transportation, such segregation continues unabated. On December 26, 1956, 21 persons were arrested in Birmingham, Ala., for exercising their constitutional right to travel unsegregated.

On December 27, 1956, in Tallahassee, Fla., the manager and nine drivers of the local busline were arrested for complying with the Supreme Court's decision.

Many other interferences with the right of travel have occurred, which indicate mass defiance of the rulings of the Supreme Court and of the ICC.

On February 27, 1956, Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau, NAACP, was arrested in Florence, S. C., for violating local custom by not using a segregated railroad waiting room. Although the custom was temporarily abandoned following the collapse of the case against Mr. Mitchell, recently a police officer has been placed at the station to enforce segregation.

In Flomaton, Ala., the L. & N. R. R. has signs designating "white" and "colored" waiting rooms, "by order of the Flomaton police."

In Mobile, Ala., Rev. Martin L. King recently was threatened with shooting by a police officer if he violated the segregated pattern.

In New Orleans, Mr. John Le Flore, former president of the Mobile NAACP, was threatened with arrest in the Greyhound bus station unless he left a "white" waiting room.

It is shocking to learn that in Union Station, District of Columbia, porters are directed to assign passengers on the Piedmont Limited, a daily train of the Southern Railroad, according to a segregated pattern.

The harm done our international relations by this type of incident is shown by the insult to the Indian Ambassador, Hon. G. L. Mehta, who was "jim crowed" in the restaurant of the Houston, Tex., airport in August 1955, while en route to Mexico.

Despite the Supreme Court rulings, the Federal Government seems powerless to act under existing law.

Attorney General Brownell in a press statement, following the Supreme Court ruling in the Montgomery bus-segregation case, threatened arrest and prosecution to those who violated the ruling. After meeting with southern United States attorneys, the Attorney General, on December 10, issued another statement calling for "voluntary compliance."

Legislation to provide specific penalties for those who impose segregation in interstate transportation has been before the Congress continually since 1948. None of this legislation has ever been brought to the floor of either House for debate and vote. Legislation must be enacted now to provide adequate remedies for this discrimination. The

bill I send to the desk today is a revised version of S. 908 of the 84th Congress, itself a bill similar to earlier ones which I have introduced ever since I have been in the Senate.

Just as in S. 908, this bill provides that all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States should be entitled to equal treatment in any public conveyance engaged in interstate commerce, without segregation or other discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

This bill would also make punishable by fine and subject to a civil suit the conduct of anyone who denies or attempts to deny equal treatment to travelers of every race, color, religion, or national origin in the use of a public conveyance or carrier.

The bill would make it unlawful for the bus, railroad, or other public carrier facility engaged in interstate commerce to segregate or otherwise discriminate against passengers based on race, color, religion, or national origin. It would also make it unlawful for an officer, agent, or employee of such carrier to so discriminate.

I should also like to add that the above provisions which are similar to S. 908 of the 84th Congress, have now been amended to include the following revisions:

(1) To provide that "facilities furnished or connected therewith shall include, but not be limited to, waiting rooms, rest rooms, restaurants, lunch counters, and similar operations and taxi cabs and limousines operating to service passengers in interstate or foreign commerce.

(2) To provide that any person operating any such facility or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, also shall be subject to the provisions of section 2 of the bill.

(3) To provide in section 1 (b) and section 2 that any action thereunder for injunctive or declaratory relief may be brought by the Attorney General for the United States or in the name of the United States, but for the real party in interest.

The text of the proposed bill is as follows:

"EXHIBIT E

"A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in furnishing transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, and of all facilities furnished or connected with such transportation, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(b) Whoever, whether acting in a private, public, or official capacity, denies or attempts to deny to any person traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States the full and equal enjoyment of any accommodation, advantage, or privilege of a public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in furnishing transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce, or of any facility furnished or connected with such transportation, except for reasons applicable alike to all persons of every race, color, religion, or national origin, or whoever incites or otherwise participates in such denial or attempt, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 and the following), or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction. Any such suit or proceeding for preventive or declaratory relief may be brought by the Attorney General for the United States, or in the name of the United States, but for the benefit of the real party in interest.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in furnishing transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or otherwise discriminate against passengers using any public conveyance of such carrier on account of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. It shall be unlawful for any person operating any facility furnished or connected with transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or otherwise discriminate against such passengers on account of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. Any such carrier, or officer, agent, or employee thereof, or any such person, officer, agent, or employee thereof, who segregates or attempts to segregate such passengers or otherwise discriminates against them on account of race, color, religion, or national origin shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person in an action of law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 et seq), or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction. Any such suit or proceeding for preventive or declaratory relief may be brought by the Attorney General for the United States, or in the name of the United States, but for the benefit of the real party in interest.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the facilities furnished or connected with the transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce include, but are not limited to, waiting rooms, restrooms, restaurants, lunch counters, and similar facilities, and taxicabs and limousines, operated to service passengers using the public conveyances of carriers engaged in furnishing transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce."

V. A STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO PROTECT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AGAINST DISCRIMINATORY BODILY ATTACK

Not long ago the papers reported the beating of Airman Paul Ferguson at New Albany, Miss., by police officers and a bus driver. Similar instances of attack on our servicemen, motivated by racial intolerance, have occurred in sufficient numbers to warrant Federal action.

The proposed bill is identical to H. R. 5205 of the 84th Congress which passed the House of Representatives in January 1956, and was favorably reported by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights last spring. The bill would amend 18 U. S. C. 1114 to include members of the Armed Forces under its protection. The present statute makes it a Federal criminal offense to murder or assault the Government personnel named herein while they are in the performance of their duties. The proposed bill would extend the protection, presently guaranteed to Coast Guard personnel, to all members of the Armed Forces.

In no single area where discrimination presently occurs does the Federal Government owe a more distinct obligation than in the protection of its servicemen and women. Nowhere is racial violence a more direct insult to American democracy than here. Nowhere is the necessity for Federal action more obvious and impelling.

The text of the proposed bill is as follows:

"EXHIBIT F

"A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard

"That section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uniformed member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard'."

VI. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO PROTECT AGAINST LYNCHING

What has been done in Congress to make lynching and other assaults by public officials or private citizens, acting either in concert or individually, on persons or property because of race, color, religion, or national origin, a Federal crime?

Legislation to make lynching a Federal crime was killed by filibuster in 1922. This matter has been before Congress continually since that time but has not been brought to a vote in the Senate.

That the old style of lynch-type action is not dead (i. e., removal of a prisoner from jail and inflicting violence on him) has recently been illustrated in the Jesse Woods case in Florida. According to reports, Woods was removed in October 1956 from jail in Wildwood, Fla., by a mob, taken to an isolated spot, and flogged. Fortunately he was not killed.

Organized mob violence and terror of the Ku Klux Klan variety, in collusion with enforcement officials, are reappearing in new forms. The modern-day lynchers organize economic boycotts and reprisals, or bomb or otherwise injure individuals who do not conform to established patterns in the community.

Examples of the worst of these incidents are the George W. Lee, Lamar Smith, and Emmett Till murders in Mississippi, and the wounding of Gus Courts in that State.

Each legal victory by Negro citizens brings a series of bombings or other violence by antidemocratic forces. The total is too large to enumerate, but a listing of some follows:

On Christmas 1956, in the evening, the home of Rev. F. L. Shuttleworth in Birmingham was bombed and his children were injured. Reverend Shuttleworth is the leader of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights.

Two days prior to this, mobsters had fired into the home of Rev. Martin Luther King, the leader of the Montgomery bus boycott.

In August 1956, the home of Lutheran minister Rev. Robert Graetz, a sympathizer with the Montgomery bus boycott, was bombed.

In August 1956, the home of Booker T. Gulley, in Mobile, Ala., was burned after it had previously been blasted by shotgun fire. Mr. Gulley had moved into a previously all white section of town.

A similar incident occurred in Cleveland, Ohio, on January 3, 1956, when the home of Attorney John G. Pegg was bombed. No successful prosecutions have taken place in any of these cases, either by State or Federal Governments.

It is essential that antilynching legislation apply in all circumstances where the violence is precipitated because of race, color,

religion, or national origin, and not just in those instances where law enforcement officials are involved. Otherwise, acts of violence by private citizens will continue to go unpunished, and many of our citizens will remain inadequately protected.

The bill I now introduce is a revised version of S. 900 which was favorably reported by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in 1956. It is designed to make it a criminal offense, punishable by a sentence up to 20 years, for two or more persons to commit violence on a person because of his race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or for the purpose of punishing such person for alleged crime. It also makes it a criminal offense for any governmental officer charged with the custody of a prisoner to neglect to protect such prisoner or to fail to apprehend or prosecute any member of a lynch mob. It authorizes the Attorney General to investigate violations of the act. It provides civil remedies for the victim or his next of kin against lynch mob members.

The text of the proposed bill follows:

"EXHIBIT 6

"A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the 'Federal Antilynching Act.'

* * * * *

"Purposes

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish the following purposes;

"(a) To insure the most complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States, and to enforce the provisions of the Constitution.

"(b) To safeguard the republican form of government of the several States from the lawless conduct of persons threatening to destroy the systems of public criminal justice therein and threatening to frustrate the functioning thereof through duly constituted officials.

* * * * *

"Right to be free of lynching

"SEC. 3. It is hereby declared that the right to be free from lynching is a right of all persons, whether or not citizens of the United States, who are within the jurisdiction of the United States. As to all such persons, such right accrues by virtue of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. As to citizens of the United States, such rights additionally accrues by virtue of such citizenship. Such right is in addition to the same or any similar right or rights they may have as persons within the jurisdiction of, or as citizens of, the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, possessions, or other areas within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

"Definitions

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever two or more persons shall knowingly in concert (a) commit or attempt to commit violence upon any person or persons or on his or their property because of his or their race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or (b) exercise or attempt to exercise, by violence against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person or persons in the custody of any governmental officer or employee or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person or persons, or of imposing a punishment not authorized by law, such persons shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of this act. Any such action, or attempt at such action, by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of this act.

"(b) The term 'governmental officer or employee,' as used in this act, shall mean any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof, or any officer or employee of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory, possession, or other area within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

"Punishment for lynching

"SEC. 5. Any person, whether or not a governmental officer or employee, (a) who is a member of a lynch mob or (b) who knowingly instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided, however,* That where such lynching results in death or maiming or other serious physical or mental injury, or in damage to property, constituting a felony under applicable State, District of Columbia, Territorial, or similar law, any such person shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. A felony, for purposes of this section, shall be deemed an offense which, under applicable State, District of Columbia, Territorial, or similar law, is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year.

"Punishment for knowing failure to prevent or punish lynching

"SEC. 6. Whenever a lynching shall occur, (a) any governmental officer or employee who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make all diligent efforts to prevent the lynching, and (b) any governmental officer or employee who shall have had custody of a person or persons lynched and shall have neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching, and (c) any governmental officer or employee who, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, shall neglect, refuse, or knowingly fail to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who is a member of the lynch mob or who knowingly instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both.

"Duty of Attorney General of the United States

"SEC. 7. The Attorney General of the United States shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been any violation of this act, whenever information on oath is submitted to him that a lynching has occurred, and (a) that any governmental officer or employee who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent such lynching, has neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make all diligent efforts to prevent such lynching, or (b) that any governmental officer or employee who shall have had custody of a person or persons lynched and has neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching, or (c) that any governmental officer or employee, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, has neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who is a member of the lynch mob or who knowingly instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever.

"Amendment to Antikidnaping Act

"SEC. 8. The crime defined in and punishable under the act of June 22, 1932, as amended (18 U. S. C. 1201, 1202) shall include knowingly transporting in interstate or foreign commerce, any person unlawfully abducted and held because of his race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or for purposes of punishment, conviction, or intimidation.

"Civil actions for damages

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person, or in the event of his death the next of kin of any person, who, as the result of a lynching suffers death, physical or mental injury, or property damage shall be entitled to maintain a civil action for damages for such death, injury, or damage against—

"(1) any person who violates section 6, 7, or 9 of this act in connection with such lynching;

"(2) (A) the United States, or the District of Columbia, or any Territory, possession, or other governmental subdivision of the United States to which local police functions have been delegated and in which the lynching takes place; or

"(B) the State or governmental subdivision thereof to which local police functions have been delegated and in which the lynching takes place.

In any action brought against the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession or other governmental subdivision of the United States, or against any State or governmental subdivision thereof, proof by a preponderance of evidence that any officers charged with preventing the lynching used all diligence and all powers vested in them for the protection of the property damaged, or of the person or persons killed or injured shall be an adequate affirmative defense. In any action brought pursuant to this section, the satisfaction of a judgment against any individual or governmental defendant shall bar further proceedings against any other individual or governmental defendant. Where recovery in any action brought pursuant to this section is based in whole or in part on death or on physical or mental injury, the judgment shall be not less than $2,000.

"(b) Where any action under this section is brought against the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession or other governmental subdivision of the United States the action shall be brought and prosecuted by the claimant or claimants and any judgment recovered shall include reasonable attorney's fees.

"(c) Any judge of the United States district court for the district in which any action under this section is instituted, or in which such action may have been transferred under the provisions of section 1404 of title 28 of the United States Code, may direct that such action be tried in any place in such district as he may designate.

"(d) Any action brought pursuant to this section must be initiated within 3 years of the accrual of the cause of action.

"Severability clause

"SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

VII. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The concurrent resolution I now submit is similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the 84th Congress. It would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights.

Its purpose is to have the joint committee make and conduct a study on matters related to civil rights and civil liberties, to study means of improving responsibility for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the committees of the Congress who have the legislative responsibilities relating to this vital area.

The joint committee would not be a legislative committee, but it would have the authority to hold whatever hearings it deems necessary with the power of subpena to carry out its functions.

Its functions would not only be advisory with regard to the Congress and its legislative committees but it would also have the function of consulting with representatives of State and local governments and with private organizations vitally interested in the preservation of human rights.

The purpose of the resolution is to help highlight congressional responsibility in this crucial area.

The text of the proposed concurrent resolution follows:

"EXHIBIT H

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the joint committee), to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to civil rights.

"SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

"SEC. 5. Funds appropriated to the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

"SEC. 6. The joint committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable."

VIII. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO CREATE A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

It has been a long time since President Truman wrote in his state of the Union message to Congress, January 5, 1949:

"We in the United States believe that all men are entitled to equality of opportunity. Racial, religious, and other invidious forms of discrimination deprive the individual of an equal chance to develop and utilize his talents and to enjoy the rewards of his efforts.

"Once more I repeat my request that the Congress enact fair employment practice legislation prohibiting discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, or national origin. The legislation should create a fair employment practice commission with authority to prevent discrimination by employers and labor unions, trade, and professional associations, and Government agencies and employment bureaus. The degree of effectiveness which the wartime Fair Employment Practice Committee attained shows that it is possible to equalize job opportunity by Government action and thus to eliminate the influence of prejudice in employment."

What has been done since by Congress to set up an effective Federal FEPC to prevent discrimination in employment? We know that FEPC bills have been before every session of Congress since 1944. Committees have reported FEPC bills favorably in at least six Congresses.

Yet, no FEPC bill has ever been allowed to come to the floor of the Senate for debate and vote. In 1946, the vote to break the filibuster and take up an FEPC bill was 48 to 36; in 1950, the votes were 52 to 32 and 55 to 33 for taking up FEPC. Yet the filibusterers blocked the majority will because rule 22 required a two-thirds vote to break a filibuster.

In the House, no FEPC bill has ever been approved by the Rules Committee for floor debate and vote.

Yet the problem continues. There is presently no effective Federal protection from discrimination for workers engaged in interstate commerce.

The President's Committee on Government Contracts supposedly grants such protection to workers employed on Government contracts.

But in spite of its publicity releases and the newspaper and magazine articles extolling its work, the fact remains that in its 3 years of operation, the Committee has never canceled or denied a contract for failure of the contracting firm to live up to its contractual obligation not to discriminate.

A typical case that the Committee has allowed to be whitewashed is that of the Lockheed Aircraft plant at Marietta, Ga.

When discriminatory conditions were complained of, an investigation was conducted by the Department of the Air Force which found no discrimination. The Committee went along with the Air Force's findings.

Only because of the persistence of the victims of discrimination has the case been reopened and it is now being reinvestigated.

Other cases similarly occur to me. Indeed in some communities not only is segregation in employment practiced by custom, but is imposed by law.

The situation urgently requires the establishment of an administrative agency to receive and investigate complaints, attempt to eliminate discrimination by conference, conciliation, and persuasion and, if unsuccessful, to hold hearings and issue cease and desist orders. Such orders would be reviewable and enforceable in the courts.

I am particularly proud to have such widely based, bipartisan support for this FEPC proposal.

The text of the bill follows:

"EXHIBIT I

"A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act.'

"Findings and declarations of policy

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation, the practice of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

"(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

"(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary for the following purposes:

"(1) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

"(2) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States.

"(3) To advance toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'

"Definitions

"SEC. 3. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, other than a labor organization.

"(c) The term 'employment agency' means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or associa-

tion, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having 50 or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collecting bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(e) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession but through any point outside thereof.

"(f) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(g) The term 'Commission' means the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

"Exemption

"SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

"Unlawful employment practices defined

"SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

"(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry;

"(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to properly classify or refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

"(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual or any employer, because of the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of any individual;

"(2) to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

"(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, employment agency, or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

"The Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, one for a term of 5 years, one for a term of 6 years, and one for a term of 7 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 7 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

"(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

"(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year.

"(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, chapter 3, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

"(g) The Commission shall have power—

"(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court;

"(2) to cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies;

"(3) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder;

"(4) upon the request of any employer whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

"(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

"(6) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens resident of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance; the Commission may, to the extent it deems it necessary, provide by regulation for exemption of such persons from the operation of title 18, United States Code, sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99); such regulation may be issued without prior notice and hearing.

"Prevention of unlawful employment practices

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided,* That an agreement between or among an employer or employers and a labor organization or labor organizations pertaining to discrimination in employment shall be enforceable in accordance with applicable law, but nothing contained therein shall be construed or permitted to foreclose the jurisdiction over any practice or occurrence granted the Commission by this act: *Provided further,* That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, to such agency jurisdiction over any cases or class of cases, if such agency, in the judgment of the Commission, has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in such cases.

"(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, and Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter called the respondent) a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such complaint. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than 1 year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission and the service of a copy thereof upon the respondent, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the 1-year period.

"(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

"(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

"(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

"(j) If, upon the preponderance of the evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination), as will effectuate the policies of the act: *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

"(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, and district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(d) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(e) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(f) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(g) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(i) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(j) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(k) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101, 115).

"(l) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously.

"Investigatory powers

"SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(b) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

"(e) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"(f) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by

the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(g) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission.

"Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors

"SEC. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

"(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least 50 individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

"Notices to be posted

"SEC. 11. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted, a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of this act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"Veterans' preference

"SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 13. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or recission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or recession, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or recission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution.

"Forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives

"SEC. 14. The provisions of section 11, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties.

"Separability clause

"SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"Effective date

"SEC. 16. This act shall become effective 60 days after enactment, except that subsections 7 (c) to (l), inclusive, and section 8 shall become effective 6 months after enactment."

IX. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO OUTLAW THE POLL TAX

A few moments ago I discussed the variety of methods now being employed by unscrupulous persons to cause others to forfeit their right to vote. There is, as we all know, a "legalized" method of doing the same thing. The poll tax has been an obvious and glaring infringement on the constitutional rights of many Americans for years and years.

Yet what has been done in Congress to wipe out interference with the right to register or vote in primary or general Federal elections, and to abolish the poll tax?

Legislation to outlaw the poll tax has passed the House five times, but has never come to a vote in the Senate.

In four instances since 1942 the filibuster kept poll-tax bills off the Senate floor. In more recent years the mere threat of a filibuster has prevented action on this measure.

The bill I now introduce would outlaw once and for all the poll tax in national elections. In decreeing that no State shall exact a price of admission to the Federal voting booth, it advances the United States a long step forward on the road to universal suffrage.

The evil of the poll tax has long been recognized. Although Congress has exempted servicemen from the poll tax and the tax has been abolished by State legislatures in all but six States, there are still millions of Americans to whom the priceless heritage of voting is a luxury. Today, when the very meaning of freedom is challenged by the ruthless forces of totalitarianism, Americans can no longer tolerate this excise on democracy.

To eliminate this obstacle in voting, this bill declares it unlawful "to levy, collect, or require the payment of, any poll tax" as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives. The bill empowers Federal district courts to enjoin or otherwise prevent violations of the act and authorizes the aggrieved voter or the Federal Government to bring civil suit for relief should a violation take place.

The basis of a democracy is that its government rests on the consent of the governed. The machinery for expressing that consent is the right to vote. The history of our Government has been one of an expanding democracy. The efforts of our people have been to enlarge the area of suffrage. We have, with slow and yet deliberate movement, been removing the blights on our democracy. Property, religious, and sex qualifications have all disappeared. Racial qualifications have now largely been abolished and exist only by subterfuge and indirection.

Poll tax laws were enacted following the period of reconstruction. There are historical reasons for these laws, and I fully appreciate them. The North must never forget and never ignore its share of the blame for the serious injury done the South in the period following the Civil War. All the poll tax laws now in effect were enacted between 1890 and 1903. That sorry era in our national history explains to a large extent the reason for the lingering prejudices which still continue to exist in many sections below the Mason-Dixon line.

In an attempt to keep the Negro from voting a number of States used ingenious legal devices. The most famous of those are the "grandfather clause," the white primary, and the poll tax. The one that remains today is the poll tax.

Whatever historical reasons there may be for the poll tax, however, there can be no justification for this undemocratic infringement upon the franchise. The purpose of the poll tax was to limit the electorate and that it has done. In Virginia, for example, 1 of the 6 remaining poll-tax States, the number of votes cast in the election of 1900, the last election before the enactment of the poll tax, was 266,000. The number voting in Virginia in the election of 1902, the next election after the tax was enacted, was 136,000. The poll tax evidently caused a reduction in the electorate of 49 percent. Another State which illustrates the extent to which the poll tax was successful in limiting the electorate was Mississippi, which enacted its poll tax in 1890. The number of votes cast in the election prior to the enactment of the tax was 117,000. In the very next election the number voting was 52,000, a reduction of 56 percent.

The poll tax continues to disenfranchise American citizens and frustrate the principles of majority representative government.

Today the statistics clearly demonstrate that those States which have the poll tax exclude from a meaningful right of citizenship many millions of people who, because of the poll tax, are prevented from voting. This is serious not only to the States involved, it is also serious to the Nation, since Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives elected from those States vote on crucial matters of national importance when they arrive in the Congress and occupy positions of national power.

The poll tax is a threat to democracy not only because of its undesirable political consequences but because it has damaging social consequences. It affects the segment of the population which has the lowest per capita income. When those individuals are denied their voice in the choosing of the Government it is only logical to assume that their desire as to how the Government is to be run will, in fact, be ignored. We cannot be certain that we, indeed, have representative government in America so long as we cannot be certain that the representatives elected to the Congress are chosen by the majority of the people in their respective districts and States.

I think it is fair for me to state that all who have the best interests of our Nation at heart will agree that the poll tax must be abolished. The legislative debate that has recently taken place in connection with this issue seems more directly to hinge on the question of how the poll tax is to be abolished. Many advocate a constitutional

amendment as the means to accomplish this objective. In my honest judgment, I believe that an anti-poll-tax bill enacted by the Congress would be constitutional without an amendment.

There are many who say that the poll tax should be abolished by State action and by State action alone. They, too, condemn the poll tax but believe the most effective way to rid our Nation of its consequences is through local action. Local action is, of course, always preferable but we have waited too long. These laws have been on the books in most cases for about 60 years. There are resistances to changing the poll tax within the States that now have such a tax because the very forces controlling the instrumentalities in the State government which have the power to abolish the tax are the very ones who benefit most from it. It is expecting a great deal to expect a genuine repeal of the tax by those whom the tax has put into authority.

President Truman in his message on civil rights in 1947 said, "We cannot await the growth of a will to act in the slowest State or the most backward community. Our National Government must show the way." The responsibility rests on the Congress. I pray that the Congress will live up to its responsibilities and accept the challenge.

The text of the proposed bill follows:

"EXHIBIT J

"A bill to outlaw the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"TITLE I. FEDERAL ANTI-POLL-TAX ACT

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Anti-Poll-Tax Act."

"SEC. 102. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'poll tax' shall be construed to include specifically, but not by way of limitation, any tax, however designated, which is, or at any time was, imposed, increased, accelerated, or otherwise unfavorably modified, as a direct or indirect prerequisite to or consequence of voting in a national election.

"(b) The term 'voting in a national election' shall mean voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, or elector or electors for President or Vice President, or for United States Senator or for Member of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 103. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting on behalf of any State or any governmental subdivision thereof or therein, to levy, collect, or require the payment of any poll tax, or otherwise interfere with any person's voting in any national election by reason of such person's failure or refusal to pay or assume the obligation of payment of any poll tax. Any such action by any such person shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding such elections, an abridgement of the right and privilege of citizens of the United States to vote for such officers, and an obstruction of the operations of the Federal Government.

"SEC. 104. (a) In the event of a violation or threatened violation of this title, either the United States, or any person aggrieved or likely to be aggrieved by such violation or threatened violation, may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States for an order enjoining such violation or threatened violation, or for an order compelling compliance with this title. Upon proof of such violation or threatened violation, the court shall issue, without bond, such restraining order, temporary or permanent injunction, writ of mandamus, or other order or orders as may be appropriate to insure prompt and effective compliance with this title.

"(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over all actions brought pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Any such action may be instituted in any judicial district in which any defendant resides or is violating or threatening to violate this title.

"(c) In any action brought under subsection (a) of this section, any appeal to the appropriate court of appeals and any review thereof by the Supreme Court shall be heard expeditiously and shall, where practicable, be determined before the next national election in connection with which the violation or threatened violation of this title is alleged.

"SEC. 105. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

X. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO STRENGTHEN EXISTING CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTES

This bill is identical to S. 905 of the 84th Congress. The need to enlarge the scope of Federal legislation protecting the rights of individuals to liberty, security, and citizenship is very clear. This can be achieved by enacting new legislation and it must also be achieved by strengthening existing civil rights laws. One such law to be strengthened is a criminal conspiracy statute (18 U. S. C. 241) which has been used to protect rights secured by the Federal Government against encroachment by private individuals and public officers. Section 201 of our bill is designed to achieve that effect. It does so by extending the protection of the Federal Government to any "inhabitant" of the United States, not just a "citizen" alone. Our courts have ruled (*Baldwin* v. *Franks* (120 U. S. 678)) that an alien does not come within the protection of the statute. In deciding that case the Court stated:

"It may be by this construction of the statute some are excluded from the protection it affords who are as much entitled to it as those who are included; but that is a defect, if it exists, which can be cured by Congress, but not by the courts."

The amendment which this bill proposes would bring the language of the statute into conformity with other supplemental protective statutes (18 U. S. C. 242). Under the broader statutes, the courts have already decided (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)) that an inhabitant is protected from interference by a State official in his constitutionally protected right to vote in a congressional election or primary. There is more than the need for conformity to support this section, however. The protection of inhabitants is a well established public policy of our country. We, in fact, subscribed to that policy in the United Nations Charter to promote respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

This bill would make a further change in the existing statute by protecting inhabitants not only when their Federal rights are infringed upon as a result of the conspiracy but also where the infringement is performed by persons acting individually. Whenever a person enjoins, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any inhabitant of the United States in the free exercise or enjoyment of his rights and privileges, that inhabitant should be protected by our laws.

Our bill would also plug gaps in the existing laws insofar as civil remedies to the aggrieved are concerned. The present statute (sec. 47, title 8) appears to provide a civil remedy whenever a citizen's rights are interfered with as a result of a conspiracy. Even this remedy is inadequate, as demonstrated by a recent Supreme Court decision (*Collins* v. *Hardyman*, June 4, 1951). It appears to me, and I am pleased to report that this and the other recommendations of the bill apparently have the support of the Department of Justice, that a civil remedy should be provided the injured person, either where he has been the victim of a conspiracy or the victim of individual action to interfere with his rights and privileges as an inhabitant of the United States. Such an individual, therefore, should have the right to sue those found guilty of violating the law, whether the violators are public officials or private citizens. These suits should be brought in the Federal courts or appropriate State courts no matter what the sum of money involved in the controversy.

One other question has been raised by the courts (*Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91)) with regard to the rights, privileges, and immunities which inhabitants of the United States should enjoy. The courts have held (*Pullen* v. *United States* (164 F. (2d)) that our statutes protect inhabitants only against being deprived of their constitutional rights "willfully." The proof of a general "bad" purpose alone may not be enough. We therefore consider it essential to enumerate in some detail some of the rights to be protected by our laws. All of these rights have already been sustained by the courts and are not new. The rights we desire specifically to set forth follow:

1. The right to be immune from exaction of fine without due process of law. (*Culp* v. *United States* (131 F. (2d) 93).)

2. The right to be immune from punishment for a crime except after a fair trial and confession after due process of law. (*Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91); *Crews* v. *United States* (160 F. (2d) 746); *Moore* v. *Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86); *Mooney* v. *Holohan* (294 U. S. 103).)

3. The right to be immune from physical violence applied to compel a confession of a crime or to exact testimony. (*Chambers* v. *Florida* (309 U. S. 227); *United States* v. *Sutherland* (37 F. Supp. 344).)

4. The right to be free of illegal restraint such as being detained by a sheriff without jurisdiction. (*Catlette* v. *United States* (132 F. (2d) 902); *United States* v. *Trierweiller* (52 F. Supp. 4).)

5. The right to protect the person and property without discrimination by reason of race, color, or national origin. (*Catlette* v. *United States; Yick-Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 35).)

6. The right to vote as protected by Federal laws. (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *United States* v. *Saylor* (322 U. S. 385); *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649).)

The text of the proposed bill follows:

"A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes

"Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 241, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 241. Conspiracy against rights of citizens

"'(a) If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"'If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, they shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"'(b) If any person injures, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"'If any person goes in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free

exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, such person shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; or shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, if the injury or other wrongful conduct herein shall cause the death or maiming of the person so injured or wronged.'

"SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, section 242, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 242. Deprivation of right under color of law.

"'Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, wilfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; or shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, if the deprivation, different punishment, or other wrongful conduct herein shall cause the death or maiming of the person so injured or wronged.'

"SEC. 3. Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 242 thereof the following new section:

"'§ 242A. Enumeration of rights, privileges, and immunities.

"'The rights, privileges, and immunities referred to in section 242 shall be deemed to include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

"'"(1) The right to be immune from exactions of fines, or deprivations of property, without due process of law.

"'"(2) The right to be immune from punishment for crime or alleged criminal offenses except after a fair trial and upon conviction and sentence pursuant to due process of law.

"'"(3) The right to be immune from physical violence applied to exact testimony or to compel confession of crime or alleged offenses.

"'"(4) The right to be free of illegal restraint of the person.

"'"(5) The right to protection of person and property without discrimination by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin.

"'"(6) The right to vote as protected by Federal law."'

"SEC. 4. (a) Any person who deprives an inhabitant of any State of any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected by the Constitution or the laws of the United States shall be liable to such inhabitant, or to his estate, for damages sustained thereby and for injuries, including death, suffered by such inhabitant in the course of, or as a result of, the commission of the acts which constitute such deprivation.

"(b) Upon a showing that an inhabitant of any State is being deprived or is threatened to be deprived of any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, such inhabitant, or the Attorney General of the United States, in the name of the United States, but for the benefit of such inhabitant, may commence and maintain an action for preventive, mandatory, or declaratory relief to prohibit or prevent such deprivation or such threatened deprivation.

"(c) The rights, privileges, and immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States referred to in subsections (a) and (b) include the rights, privileges, and immunities protected under title 18 of the United States Code and all other criminal laws of the United States. In any action brought under subsection (a) or (b) based upon an alleged violation of any provision of title 18 or of any other criminal law of the United States, it shall not be necessary to the commencement or maintenance of such action that any person against whom such action is brought has been convicted of violating such provision.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings brought pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) and shall exercise such jurisdiction without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies provided by law and without regard to the amount of the matter in controversy.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'district courts of the United States' means any district court as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28 of the United States Code and the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(2) The term 'State' includes the Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

XI. STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON THE BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE LAWS RELATING TO CONVICT LABOR, PEONAGE, SLAVERY, AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

The bill I send to the desk is identical to S. 904 of the 84th Congress. I earnestly hope that this measure will achieve the merited attention which it has been denied in the past.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the Department of Justice received 85 complaints concerning possible peonage and involuntary servitude. I have not checked to see what the present rate of complaints is, but I have reason to believe that the number of complaints has not diminished in recent years. Peonage, of course, is a form of involuntary servitude rising out of a payment of a debt. It is essential that our laws be strengthened so that this form of involuntary servitude will be eliminated once and for all from our society. This is certainly the intent of the 13th amendment to our Constitution.

Our existing laws (secs. 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, U. S. C.) declare the following to be a crime: Holding or returning persons to conditions of peonage; arresting persons with the intent of pressing them or returning them to conditions of peonage; kidnaping, arresting, or carrying away persons with the intent that they be sold into involuntary servitude or held as slaves; enticing, persuading, or inducing persons to go on board vessels with the intent that they be made or held as slaves; and knowingly and willfully holding persons to involuntary servitude or selling a person into any condition of involuntary servitude.

There are two basic changes which must be made to strengthen these laws. First it is essential to make clear that to hold an individual in involuntary servitude is punishable. Secondly, it is important that not only the acts described above to be considered criminal, but an attempt to commit the acts be in itself criminal. Every human being must have the right to be protected in this most vital area of his personal security and human dignity.

During the 82d Congress I was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations. We had brought to our attention specific evidence of peonage which our staff investigated. The staff informed me that the persons reduced to peonage are impoverished, uneducated colored men, and that all persons having knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the peonage are for one reason or another extremely reluctant to discuss it.

The system apparently calls for certain law-enforcement officers to release prisoners to the custody of employers when those employers pay the fine or post the bond necessary. The prisoners remain with their employers until the fine is repaid through payroll deductions. When the bond is posted, employment continues until the time of trial. If the accused leaves employment before the time of the trial, the bond is withdrawn and the accused is again put in jail.

This is an outrageous state of affairs. There is evidence of conspiracy with police officials which the Justice Department must investigate. Our laws must be strengthened to deal with this problem, and our enforcement officers must be reawakened to the need for firm and serious activity.

The bill follows:

"EXHIBIT L

"A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsection (a) of section 1581 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Whoever holds or returns any person to a condition of peonage, or arrests any person with the intent of placing him in or returning him to a condition of peonage, or attempts to hold, return, or arrest any person with such intent, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1583 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 1583. Enticement into slavery.

"'Whoever holds or kidnaps or carries away any other person, or attempts to hold, kidnap, or carry away any other person, with the intent that such other person be held in or sold into involuntary servitude, or held as a slave; or

"'Whoever entices, persuades, or induces, or attempts to entice, persuade, or induce, any other person to go on board any vessel or other means of transportation or to any other place within or beyond the United States with the intent that he be made a slave or held in involuntary servitude, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.'

"SEC. 3. Section 1584 of such title is amended to real as follows:

"'§ 1584. Sale into involuntary servitude.

"'Whoever knowingly and willfully holds to involuntary servitude, or sells into any condition of involuntary servitude, any other person for any term, or brings within the United States any person so held, or attemps to commit any of the foregoing acts, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both'."

COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the senior Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. WILEY], a joint resolution authorizing the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East. This resolution is the one which the President requested in his message to the Congress of last January 5.

In sending this resolution to the desk for appropriate referral, I do so in order that the Senate may have before it a

document embodying the views of the President on this subject.

In introducing this joint resolution it should be made clear that I reserve my right to support amendments to the resolution if they are found to be advisable. The proper Senate committees have not yet had the opportunity to examine this proposal in detail. We expect to hold hearings beginning next week on this important subject, and it is likely that our exploration may lead to some proposals for changes in the resolution.

Arrangements have been made for the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services to open joint hearings on this resolution next Monday morning, January 14, at 10 a. m. in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. This will be a public hearing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I am a cosponsor of the joint resolution which he has introduced. On reading the joint resolution, several questions come to mind:

First. Does the contemplated action set forth in the resolution provide an instrument for the promotion of the security of the United States?

Second. Is this changed world, which is shrunken by man's ingenuity so that every nation is neighbor to every other nation; is this changed world, with its guided missiles, H-bombs, and confused thinking, to be left to drift without continuing our search or quest for a deterrent or answer to a third world war?

Third. Is the Middle East—with its oil and a gateway to the vital and strategic materials of Africa—is the independence of the Middle East vital and necessary to the security of the United States and the free world?

Fourth. Until the race discovers a solvent that will dissolve the hates, intolerance, and misunderstandings among the peoples and the nations is there any other course open, except to be alert and adequate to meet any and all emergencies?

These questions I believe present the issues. May we be guided and directed by wisdom from on high to find the correct answers.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a statement respecting the Near East joint resolution which was introduced today by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The joint resolution is consistent with past acts of the United States, which has not failed to come to the assistance of nations whose freedom and independence were threatened by would-be aggressors. In the period since the Second World War, the United States has successfully acted in cooperation with the free nations of Europe, Asia, and Latin America to frustrate the designs of international communism. While these efforts have taken different forms in different situations, they have been born of a profound respect for the rights of freemen everywhere, and of the conviction that the subordination of free peoples to totalitarian regimes is a threat to international peace and, therefore, to the security of the United States. The present resolution, which applies specifically to the free nations of the Middle East, is therefore a logical expression of our determination, in their interest and in ours, to join with them in assuring their continued existence as sovereign states, and in achieving that peace which is dear to all freemen.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for the purpose of setting aside the second Friday in October to be known as American Indian Day.

I have done this for the purpose of making it possible to give special recognition and honor to the original citizens of this country, our Indians. For too long a time, we have neglected to take note, in this way, of our Indian friends and neighbors. It seems to me that we should take steps to repair this neglect.

At this point I should like to read the text of the resolution:

Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Friday of October of each years as American Indian Day

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested and authorized to officially proclaim the second Friday of October of each year as American Indian Day, and to issue annually a proclamation inviting the governments of the States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In addition, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, and article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, January 6, 1957. This piece, which is entitled "Today's Powwows Aren't Just Talk," was written by Aubrey Graves.

This article outlines the splendid work being done by our Indian Commissioner, Glenn L. Emmons, who is trying to give Indians an opportunity to become full-fledged citizens in every sense of the word. Mr. Emmons has initiated a program for bringing industry to the Indian reservations so that economic and social opportunities will be available to our Indians. This article tells the story of achievement of the Indian Bureau under the direction of Glenn Emmons and testifies to the special devotion he has given to his job. I hope that all Senators will read it since it will bring them up to date on the current situation among our Indians and outline some of the progressive steps being taken to help solve America's No. 1 social problems.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S POWWOWS AREN'T JUST TALK

(By Aubrey Graves)

In earlier days, when Indian chiefs wanted to powwow with the Great White Father, it meant a long journey to Washington and, in many cases, little satisfaction once they got here.

Nowadays, the Great White Father, in the person of Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, goes to them. Twice since he took office in August 1953, this "courtly gentleman with the common touch" (as the Navajo Council described him to President Eisenhower) has met with each major tribal group in or near its home territory.

The President, in his 1952 campaign, promised the Indians that in formulating policy affecting them, full consultation with them would be a basic principle of his administration. In fulfillment of this pledge, he asked Emmons in 1953 to make an extensive tour "to learn firsthand from the Indian people about their problems and needs, their hopes and aspirations."

It was suggested that he do "a minimum of talking and a maximum of listening."

"That's the way I tried to carry it out," Emmons reported on his return.

MANY POWWOWS

Last December 13 the Commissioner completed his second tour—one which took him away from his office here continuously for exactly 5 months. He participated in 9 area meetings—in Omaha, Denver, El Paso, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Portland, Boise, Des Moines, and Dallas.

This time out, Emmons also did some talking. In a series of 3-day sessions, he explained the Administration's plan of "positive programing" to give the Indians (1) better health, (2) better educations, and (3) better social and economic status.

At each stop, Emmons talked with the three top elected officials of each tribe. Not more than 10 tribes were called to any 1 meeting. His procedure was to talk for an hour or so to the full group. The Indians appointed their own chairman and resolutions committee. Later, each tribal delegation was invited to Emmons' suite for discussion of its particular needs and "to say anything anybody wanted to say."

THE INDIAN VIEWPOINT

This type of meeting, said the Commissioner, had never been held before in the history of the Bureau. "It gave the Indians opportunity to discuss their problems not only with me but with the other tribes."

On the final day, Emmons received the full delegation's resolutions. These, inspected here last week, generally applauded the Commissioner for his easy accessibility, admitted a need for more medical help and greater education, and carried the promise of delegates that, upon returning home, they would seek to instill greater initiative into their own people.

One of his big tasks, Emmons declared, has been to make the Indians realize they must assume some responsibility for setting up and carrying out their own betterment programs. He said that since the Bureau was established in 1825 it had operated along paternalistic lines. This, he said, had blunted the Indians' initiative.

"Now," declared Emmons, "they are being made to feel they have something to hope for. We are trying to make every Indian boy get the feeling that through education he himself, someday might become President of the United States."

The basic job of BIA, spelled out in a raft of Indian laws enacted by Congress, and

under treaties ratified prior to 1871, has been twofold:

(1) To exercise trustee responsibilities covering the Indians (today they number just under 400,000) and 57 million acres of Indian land and (2) to provide the Indians with public or community services, such as education and hospitalization, when they are not available from other sources.

TOWARD A BETTER FUTURE

Emmons' goal, a better future for Indian people, envisages something more. It means Bureau employees and tribal representatives jointly coming to grips with basic difficulties that have been retarding Indian progress for so many decades. It means equipping them, physically and mentally, for a more productive and enjoyable kind of life.

Indians, the Commissioner has found, are by no means all of one mind about the kind of life they want to lead.

A substantial number, particularly in the younger generations and among veterans of military service, want to take their place in non-Indian society and make their way without discrimination and without special favors.

Others prefer to go on living in the old tribal way, following the custom and religion of their ancestors. Still others—and I suspect they constitute a majority—want a kind of mixture of the two cultures.

In the Commissioner's opinion, there is an unnecessary amount of confusion and emotional discussion revolving around such questions as preservation of Indian culture and around such words as "assimilation" and "integration."

He regards as unrealistic the attitude of those who would keep the American Indian as he is, "as a museum piece."

"As I see it, all matters of this kind—involving culture or religion or basic way of life—are outside the sphere of Indian Bureau action. They are strictly up to the individual Indian and should be decided by him in accordance with the dictates of his own personality."

He adds that, by the same token, the Bureau has no intention of breaking up tribal organizations or selling off reservation lands against the wishes of the Indian people.

Emmons has found health conditions among some tribes pretty bad. For instance, the incidence of tuberculosis among all Indians in 1954 was 12 times that of the general population of the United States. Diarrhea, induced by lack of sanitation, was and still is a big killer. Held to blame for the great incidence of disease are "poor housing, inadequate food, unsafe water, and adherence to beliefs and practices hazardous to health."

Responsibility for the health of the Indians was transferred to USPHS in July 1955. "It has proven effective," declares Emmons.

Educationwise the BIA is now getting Indian children into public schools wherever possible. The biggest and most urgent area of need in 1953 was on the Navaho Reservation, where, according to the Commissioner, about 80 percent of the adults were illiterate and roughly half of the children in the school-age bracket between 6 and 18 were growing up, through no fault of their own or their parents, as the potential illiterates of the future.

Under an emergency program, a seat had been provided for every Navaho child of school age (28,000 of them) by the fall of 1955.

Federal school facilities for Navahos were expanded, both on and off the reservation. BIA provided board and room in border towns such as Gallup, Flagstaff, and Winslow, so that Navaho children beyond the early grades could attend the public schools of these communities. In some sections where permanency of the population was in doubt, trailer schools were set up.

Emmons reports that the Indian youngsters are holding their own in the public schools. In Gallup, where 500 Navahos are in integrated classes, a Navaho boy is leading his class.

A program of adult education has been started on a pilot basis among five tribal groups, including the Seminoles, of Florida, and the Papagos, of Arizona, where the ratio of illiteracy is described as critical.

Among those most grateful for getting their children in school, according to the commissioner, are the old medicine men, "who eventually will be driven out of business by education." He credits former servicemen with helping greatly in reversing their attitude.

On the economic front, BIA is attempting to develop resources of lands in Indian ownership so as to support a maximum number of people on a decent plane of living. Last year, $16.5 million was spent for soil conservation, irrigating and other resource development projects. The possibilities here are limited, however, for the simple reason that on most reservations there is not enough land to go around.

Said Emmons: "If we should divide the whole Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota into economic-size livestock units, it would provide an acceptable standard of living for just about 500 families. There are 1,800 families living on the reservation now and the population is growing."

The Navaho reservation will support only between 35,000 and 45,000 people on an acceptable standard. Today, 78,000 Navahos live on it. By 1962, it is estimated, there will be 100,000.

The BIA is attacking this problem in two ways: through a voluntary relocation program and by attracting industries to areas adjacent to reservations.

Any Indian who would like to leave his reservation, and who feels he has enough skill to make out in the non-Indian world, is helped to make and adjust to the change. During fiscal 1955, 3,461 Indians were so assisted. Of these, 2,656 were in family groups and 805 were unattached men and women.

In 1956, Congress authorized $5 million to be used for relocation assistance.

A pilot program has been set up to help about 100 of the more settled city-dwelling Indian families to buy homes.

Less than one-third of the Indians who were helped to relocate during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1954, returned to the reservation. Some of those went out a second time.

Five industrial plants recently established near reservations have provided new jobs. The Navaho Tribal Council put up $300,000 in tribal funds to draw 2 industrial establishments. These were a subsidiary of Baby Line Furniture of Los Angeles and an electronics plant affiliated with Lear, Inc., of Santa Monica. Each will soon be employing 100 Navaho workers.

A metal fabricating firm has been operating at Kingman, Ariz., near the Jualapai Reservation since January 1956. A subsidiary of Saddlecraft, Inc., of Knoxville, Tenn., was opened on the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina last May. Casa Grande Mills, a subsidiary of Parsons & Baker, Phoenixville, Pa., is scheduled to open a garment factory near the Pima and Papago Reservations in Arizona next March.

Negotiations are under way for establishment of additional plants near Indian population centers in Oklahoma, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

"States and local communities," Emmons points out, "will benefit from the increasing financial independence of the Indian people and the general invigoration of the economic climate in and around the reservations. In time, the whole country will benefit by a reduction in Federal expenditures needed for Indian affairs."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to authorize the President to proclaim the second Friday of October of each year as American Indian Day, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION TO STUDY AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to create a commission to study and make recommendations to prevent the filing of claims against the United States and for the security of American foreign investments.

My work as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act has revealed a vast reservoir of potential claims against the United States. It has revealed further that there is an immediate necessity for studies to be undertaken so that recommendations may be made to the President and to the Congress for the safeguarding and the security of American foreign investments already made, and the ever-expanding investments of our Government and American citizens generally abroad.

I ask that the memorandum of explanation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum of explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a commission to study and make recommendations for the prevention of claims against the United States or the citizens thereof and for the security of American foreign investments, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum of explanation, presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, is as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF EXPLANATION—COMMISSION TO STUDY AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PREVENTION OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AND FOR THE SECURITY OF AMERICAN FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

GENERAL

Recent reports of the Secretary of Commerce indicate that American enterprise, small and large, has private investments in foreign countries of the world approximating $30 billion. Loans from taxes levied against our taxpayers and made through the Export-Import Bank to various enterprises in foreign countries exceed $17 billion. Likewise, all Americans have investments in our hundreds of national-defense installations throughout the world in excess of $4 billion. Our national-defense costs since the close of World War II have arisen to and averaged in excess of $30 billion yearly. The aggregate costs of our foreign-aid programs since the close of hostilities now exceed $50 billion. America is on the threshold of further and continuing costs and aid through loans and grants and for the defense of the free world.

These enormous investments, private and governmental, create a vast reservoir of potential claims against the United States. The Congress, through some instrumentality, should make a detailed study specifically directed to the point of devising and recommending ways and means for the safeguarding and security of these investments, thereby preventing or diminishing the potential of claims against the United States, whether such claims are founded in law or based upon the Government's moral obligation to its citizens. Treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation seem not to be sufficiently adequate. Such treaties result from favorable climates already created, rather than are they directed to creating favorable conditions for the protection of foreign investments. An interdependent world economy demands a uniform system of rules and regulations for the security and stability of lawfully acquired rights.

NECESSITY FOR STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is an ever-increasing demand on the part of those engaged in foreign commerce and capital investments that the United States take positive and affirmative action to protect these investments from expropriation or interdiction. Treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation now exist. Whether these should be expanded or whether supplemental undertakings should be explored and recommended requires special study and analyses involving the domestic laws of nations, and regulations and practices among nations in the field of international law. Lack of uniformity with respect to investments jeopardizes them, disturbs the peace of the world, and provokes international discord, resulting in hostilities with untold losses in spiritual, human, and material values.

The inadequacies in existing world conditions for the protections sought are obvious. Recent pronouncements of the National Foreign Trade Council, representing as it does every phase of American foreign investments, accentuate the problems. At its November 1956 meeting the council in New York adopted certain declarations of policy. Among these declarations were:

"III. Sanctity of contract: The convention holds that maintenance of the principle of sanctity of contract is fundamental to the whole process of international trade and investment. Without sanctity of contract there can be no respect for private property rights and no reliance upon agreements made between nation and nation or between nations and private parties or between the private parties themselves.

"The deterioration of respect for solemnly undertaken obligations has spread dangerously since the Second World War. As each lapse is condoned on grounds of expediency others will occur. It is our responsibility as a member of the world community not to condone any deviation from the principles of integrity which are inherent in the concept of property rights and which are, in consequence, essential to the achievement of world security and world economic advancement. The convention holds that no country in which a proper recognition of the sanctity of contract is lacking can be a healthy or useful part of a free world.

"XVI. Proprietary rights: The convention holds that the international trade and investment essential to the economic development of nations demands respect for and effective protection of proprietary rights.

"Private industry has, in general, been responsible for the development and compilation of the technical industrial information required for the successful application of modern manufacturing processes. The dissemination of such information is usually based on contractual relationships, and the benefits derived from such dissemination are dependent upon the faithful observance of the terms of the contracts.

"The convention holds that technical industrial information is entitled to protection as effective as that accorded to any other property right, and it believes that economic development will be enhanced in those nations which provide the necessary protection."

The United States Chamber of Commerce, whose members reflect the views and recommendations of every segment of American business in every geographical area, in its declaration of policy in 1956, respecting the protection of foreign investments, declared that a "vigorous policy should be pursued against any measures of foreign countries which are hostile to or discriminate against American investors or investments. Assurances are needed of a fair and nondiscriminatory treatment for existing and future investments. Pledges should be sought from foreign nations against expropriation of property of investors without prompt, adequate, and effective compensation. Agreements made within the general legal framework or in the form of specific contracts should be honored fully in letter and spirit. Modifications should be by mutual consent. This is of special importance when governments are parties to agreements or partners in enterprises. Adequate safeguards for existing investments and for encouragement of a continued flow of new capital would increase the productivity of recipient countries and keep open the channels of private enterprise."

Treaties, collective agreements, or governmental insurance through the International Cooperation Administration, or private insurance companies, under existing world conditions appear unsatisfactory or inadequate thus necessitating closer study and scrutiny if the protection demanded by business and government is afforded.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES

This measure has for its primary purpose two principal objectives, (a) the prevention of claims against the United States, and (b) the security and protection of our foreign investments—both private and governmental. The questions immediately arise: (a) What have we done? (b) What are we doing? (c) What more may we do to insure the protection and security of our private and governmental investments abroad and thereby prevent the assertion of moral or legal claims against our Government? Existing claims against the United States now total over $300 million as a result of World War II. The potential of all claims is unknown. Those known claims remain unsatisfied and present problems for congressional solution.

Studies concentrated upon and directed exclusively to these two principal objectives should be undertaken without delay by a bipartisan commission established for that specific purpose.

Studies have been made of our foreign economic policy by the Commission created in the 83d Congress. The Commission was known as the Randall Commission. That Commission restricted its activities and report in the main to economic factors in the development of foreign commerce with observations on the creation of favorable climates and legal environment for private investments abroad. No positive declarations or formulas for the protection of existing or the ever-expanding foreign investments, or protection against the United States, were made. The broad field for the protection of investments, the prevention of claims, the potential of losses from interdiction, nationalization, or confiscation needs immediate study, exploration, and recommendations for corrective consideration. Ways and means ought to be developed for the security of the Government as a whole and for private industry in particular. To that end a commission with representatives from industry and Government should be established to make such special studies and be charged with the responsibilities of formulating protective measures for the consideration of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government.

As was observed by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy:

"The Government can and should give full diplomatic support to the acceptance and understanding abroad of the principles underlying the creation of a climate conducive to private foreign investment. This requires better coordination of policy and action by the various United States agencies and representatives in the field of foreign economic policy, and, in particular, a clear formulation of the Government's position with respect to private investment abroad, stressing support of the private-enterprise system and the interests of the United States investors.

"To some extent the general climate and legal environment for private investment may also be improved through the negotiation of international treaties relating to foreign investment. Although it must be recognized that such treaties more often record the existence of a favorable climate than create it, the discussions which take place in the attempt of two governments to reach agreement may in themselves be beneficial. The United States Government should continue to use the treaty approach to establish common rules on the fair treatment of foreign investment. Negotiations should be undertaken first with like-minded countries, and gradually be extended as additional countries become convinced of the desirability of a friendly attitude toward private enterprise.

"The United States Government also can remove uncertainties in its own policies which affect foreign investment."

As a result of the foregoing observations something more than our usual commercial treaties and agreements is essential. Studies should be undertaken without delay looking toward the establishment of a collective form of agreement or a uniform business code founded upon ethical rules of trade and commerce for the protection of business and industry—large and small. The feasibility of establishing such a uniform international code relating to all business, trade, investments of capital and commercial transactions should be specifically examined and reported upon by the Commission. Governmental inducements to private citizens and corporate entities to trade with and invest in foreign enterprises make it imperative that such inducements be accompanied by adequate safeguards for such investments thus made. The President in his message to the 43d National Trade Convention in November 1956, said:

"Security and prosperity are promoted by foreign trade and investment. This theme of yours is central to the foreign policy of our Government. In recent years there has been a significant expansion of world trade and investment. This is now threatened from many sides but we must continue in our efforts to strengthen the climate of confidence in which trade between nations can flourish for the well being of all."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 contains a brief statement of fact concerning existing potential claims against the United States as related to foreign investments and the policies of our Government toward the same; the need for the establishment of a uniform international code regulating and protecting investments of capital, goods and services, private as well as governmental, coincident with and beyond the normal scope of treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation is made evident from governmental policies and world conditions.

Section 2 follows the pattern heretofore set by the Congress in establishing bipartisan

commissions and provides for the designation of 15 members, 5 to be appointed by the President, 5 by the Vice President and 5 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Provision is made for representation on the Commission from industry, the Senate and House of Representatives. The possible conflict of interests statutes are removed so that the Commission may be constituted from groups or individuals directly concerned with and affected by the studies and recommendations of the Commission.

Section 3 eliminates from compensation the Members of Congress or employees of the executive branch of Government who may be designated to serve as members of the Commission, with a maximum $50 per diem compensation for those designated who are not in the Government service. Travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses of members of the Commission incurred in the performance of the prescribed duties are to be paid.

Section 4 empowers the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of its temporary personnel without regard to the Classification Act of 1949.

Section 5. The duties of the Commission to examine, study, and investigate the actual and potential liabilities of the United States for claims assertable against the United States with recommendations for appropriate policies, measures and practices for the prevention of claims and the security of American investments abroad are specifically detailed. The Commission will be charged with determining the advisability, desirability or necessity for the establishment of a uniform code of regulations to which the nations of the free world may subscribe for the security and protection of foreign commerce and investments against nationalization or confiscation; and, further the Commission is charged with submitting to the President and the Congress drafts or recommended submissions for such a code.

Section 6: Authority is granted the Commission and its members to hold hearings and take testimony in pursuit of the authorized functions of the Commission. The executive agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in the administration or execution of its functions.

Section 7 provides for the authorization for appropriations.

Section 8 provides that the report of the Commission be made 90 days after the commencement of the second regular session of the 85th Congress and a termination of its activities, 90 days following such a report.

CONCLUSION

Studies are being made by national and international bar groups and societies and various business associations directly affected. They may well be coordinated and supplemented by official studies of the Congress and executive branch of the Government. The United States has too large a stake in the promotion of trade, the security of our investments already made, and the peace of the world to fail to assume a fair share of the responsibilities thus entailed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION DAY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which, when passed by both Houses, will designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day. I understand that a similar resolution is being introduced in the House of Representtives by Congressman HEBERT BONNER, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

With the passage of this joint resolution, for the first time the transportation industry of the country will have an opportunity to observe a day of its own and emphasize transportation preparedness for national defense.

Senators will note that this joint resolution calls upon "the people of the United States, including labor, management, users, and investors in all communities served by any of the various forms of transportation by land, by sea, and by air, to observe this occasion—on the Friday preceding the third Saturday of May each year (May 17 in 1957)—by appropriate ceremonies which will give full recognition to the importance to each and every community and the people thereof of our transportation system and the maintenance of its facilities in the most modern state of adequacy to serve our needs in times of peace and in national defense."

It is my understanding that, after the passage of the resolution by the Congress, the President of the United States and the governors of the 48 States will be asked to issue similar proclamations.

With the establishment of this annual day of recognition, the individuals and organizations that are intimately concerned with our transportation system will have a new opportunity to develop programs and publicity in their communities to emphasize the importance of our great transportation system to the community life and security of all our people. It will have great significance that the Congress sees fit to designate this day within Armed Forces Week; in fact, it is the day preceding the officially proclaimed Armed Forces Day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL FAMILY FARM, FOOD, AND FIBER POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution on national family farm, food, and fiber policy. It is intended to be a statement of national policy which the Senate and House of Representatives might appropriately adopt.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and that the resolution itself be held at the desk until the close of business on Monday, January 14, so that cosponsors who desire may join with me in its introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "National Family Farm, Food, and Fiber Policy Joint Resolution."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) food and fiber supplies per person in many families in the United States and in many areas of the world are far below the minimum required for healthful and productive living;

(b) it is now possible to accurately determine by scientific nutrition, dietetic and other research the national and world shortages in these basic needs;

(c) failure of food supplies to attain this basic adequate allotment, and of fiber supplies to attain equivalent standards for clothing, undermines the maintenance of health, efficiency, and morale of the American people and the people of friendly nations;

(d) supplies of food and fiber products available from time to time should be efficiently distributed among the various sections of the Nation and friendly nations among persons in all income groups;

(e) the development of more adequate reserves of farm products would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes such as drought, flood, and pestilence; from breakdowns in distribution; and from inflation, insurrection, and war;

(f) the assurance of adequate food and clothing supplies would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace, and an effective roadblock to the inroads of communism;

(g) it is essential to the national security and the general welfare that production and consumption of farm products be maintained at a high level in the United States as a means of maintaining a healthy population and a strong, productive economy, and to buttress the Nation's foreign policy;

(h) in many friendly nations more rapid economic development is blocked by lack of universal, general, and technical education and facilities resulting from the inability of parents of farm children to release them from day-to-day labor in food and fiber production; United States farm products could be used to break the poverty cycle in these nations by supplying food and clothing for children and adults attending and teaching schools;

(i) both the foreign domestic markets for American farm products have historically been characterized by fluctuations and recurrent depressions;

(j) the maintenance of a healthy and prosperous agriculture on the family farm pattern is essential to the preservation and improvement of democracy in America;

(k) the prices and income received by American farm families have been declining and threaten to decline still further; each such decline brings with it the threat of reduced farm purchasing power and purchases, reduced demand for industrial products used on the farm and by farm families, and a resulting enforced reduction of industrial employment;

(l) American farms and farm families are fully capable of producing efficiently a

greater abundance of food and fiber products, while at the same time conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources;

(m) this great productive ability of American farmers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people;

(n) since the earliest days of the Republic the family-farm pattern of the American agriculture has been considered as essential to a strong democracy and the policy of the Nation has been to favor the establishment and preservation of family-owned and family-operated farms. A large number of prosperous farm families on family farms is a strong balancing force within the Nation against the political and social extremes of economic class warfare;

(o) family farms make up the great bulk of all American farms; the traditional pattern is one where the farm or ranch provides the main source of income for the farm family and the operator and his family manage the farm, arrange for its financing, own, or hold with secure tenure the land and other capital, participate regularly in work on the farm and supply most of the labor needed to operate the farm.

(p) on the family farm, the economic functions of capital ownership, or arranging for financial needs, of managing the productive enterprise, and of working are performed by the farm operator and his family, thus making impossible controversy and tension along economic class lines;

(q) the family-farm pattern of agriculture is the basis of agricultural progress and good community life; it builds in farm family members attitudes of self-reliance, social responsibility, individual initiative, tolerance, and self-government—the attitudes that make for a sound democracy and the human qualities that have done so much to make this Nation great; the family farm is the most efficient production unit in agriculture; family farms build strong social communities; and the family farm builds strong families; and

(r) the Nation's family farms is democracy's answer to Soviet collective farming; unrest in many parts of the world today results from insecure and inequitable farmland tenure creating hopelessness among those who work the soil making them an easy prey for communism's glittering false lines; the restless peasants of the world can find the ray of hope they seek in the American pattern of family farming and family-farm ownership that enables the Nation's farmers to farm efficiently, conserve soil and water resources, participate fully in civic, community, and public affairs, and perform a vital role in making our system of government operate.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is the policy of Congress that the United States should take appropriate action to insure that—

(a) the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and sufficient clothing for an adequate standard of clothing will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

(b) the food and fiber products produced on American farms and not needed for foreign policy through facilitating (1) the inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them, (2) more rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations, (3) the elimination of the threat of starvation and famine, and, (4) increases in the security and income-earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations;

(c) adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and/or food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

(d) extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

(e) the family-farm pattern of American agriculture is preserved and encouraged by programs and policies that will provide greater economic opportunity for families on presently low-income farms, and discourage the further development of industrial-type agricultural production; and to provide the opportunity for economically adequate family farms to earn enough income from the sale of products to provide for a family living standard equivalent to that earned in other occupations, cover cash operating costs, replace used-up machinery and equipment, repay operating loans and interest, return the capital investment (through rent or principal and interest payments on real-estate mortgages), pay taxes, and conserve the soil and water resources of the farm through adaptation and implementation of policies that will fulfill the following family farmers' bill of rights:

(1) The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

(2) The right for improved standards of rural living.

(3) The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

(4) The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

(5) The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

(6) The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

(7) The right to decent and land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

(8) The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.

(9) The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

(10) The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

(11) The right to assurance that land reclamation development will result in establishment of new family farms, not factories in the field.

NATIONAL JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Inc., through its learn-by-doing program is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their experience for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 27, 1957, and ending February 2, 1957, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 27, 1957, through February 2, 1957, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the "joint committee"), to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to civil rights.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. Funds appropriated to the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

SEC. 6. The joint committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he submitted the above concurrent resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PASTORE (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications;
(8) federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics; and
(10) fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution submitted by the minority leader on behalf of himself and the majority leader. It deals with the number of Senators who are to serve on committees of the Senate. I also ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to explain the resolution for not more than 2 minutes, and that thereafter the Senate vote on the resolution without further proceedings with relation to whether the resolution is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 27), as follows:

Resolved, That during the 85th Congress—

(1) Section (1) of rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(a) by striking out "11" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "13"; and

(b) by striking out "11" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "13."

(2) Section (4) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended, is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "(4)" and by striking out "14" and inserting in lieu thereof "16" and by striking out "3" and inserting in lieu thereof "5" and by adding the following:

"(b) In the event that during the 85th Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 21 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats

Majority	Minority
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"Third committee assignments

Majority	Minority
18	3
16	5
14	7
12	9"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent requests of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the 84th Congress there was a 49–47 relationship between the parties in the Senate. By mutual agreement we had agreed that we would have a certain number of third committee assignments. We also had agreed that the regular standing committees would consist of 15 Members, 8 from the majority and 7 from the minority.

That relationship remains the same this year. In the pending resolution we merely ask that the same division be had in the 85th Congress that obtained in the 84th Congress. There is no controversy about the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which, if adopted, would amend rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. I have been pleased to cosponsor another resolution to amend rule 22, which has already been submitted. As is true of that resolution, the resolution, which I am now submitting, also would eliminate section 3 of rule 22. I believe the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration should also consider a resolution providing that debate in the United States Senate may be limited solely by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate after a reasonable period of time.

As I stated on January 4, I believe the Senate should have the power to act if 49 or more Members believe that action is necessary. However, I am perfectly willing to agree to a different requirement if we would be able thereby to reach the general objective which we are seeking.

The resolution (S. Res. 28), submitted by Mr. IVES, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is modified as follows:

1. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22."

2. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "on the following calendar day but one," and inserting in lieu thereof, "on the 12th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays)."

3. The second paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn," and inserting in lieu thereof, "by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate."

4. Subsection 3 is hereby deleted.

REPEAL OF SECTION 3 OF RULE 22 OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I submit appropriate reference a resolution for, in this instance for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The purpose of the resolution is to make it quite clear for the legislative record of this session that there are some Members of the Senate who feel that at least a portion of the opinion delivered by the Vice President relating to the rules of the Senate is sound and should become the prevailing rule. The resolution reads:

It is the sense of the Senate that section 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, having operated as an infringement on the constitutional right of the Senate to make its own rules is null, void, and of no further effect during the 85th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that section 3 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, having operated as an infringement on the constitutional right of the Senate to make its own rules, is null, void, and of no further effect during the 85th Congress.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 32 other Senators, I submit a resolution to amend the rules. I ask that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee, under the normal procedures of the Senate, and I also ask that it be made available for one day so that any other Senators who desire to join in the sponsorship of the resolution may be privileged to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie

on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22," and (2) by striking out "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and of subsection 2 of this rule."

SEC. 3. Rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting "1." immediately preceding "At," and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"2. The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for only a moment to make a very brief statement in connection with the resolution the distinguished minority leader has submitted, and which is now at the desk, so that other Senators who may wish to do so may join the Senator from California in cosponsoring the resolution.

I should like to have the Senate know that I have decided to join in cosponsoring a proposed change in rule 22. I am doing so because I believe that the change would expedite the business of the Senate but would retain legitimate safeguards of minority rights.

The proposal, of course, will go to the Senate Rules Committee where it can be studied thoroughly. It will have the careful consideration of men who are trying to do a good job for their country and who will consider the issue on the basis of its merits, rather than on the basis of temporary expediency.

This proposal appeals to me as being based upon the middle ground which is the strongest to stand upon It would permit an orderly change of the rules but would recognize that the rules are continuing and not subject to change merely because of a temporary gust of political wind.

I have always believed that there are orderly ways of solving problems before the Senate. I also believe that unless the Senate takes advantage of the orderly procedures that are available, disorderly procedures will eventually prevail to the harm of the Nation and the different sections of the Nation.

For these reasons I am joining the Senator from California in cosponsoring the resolution which is now at the desk.

CONSTRUCTION OF CANAL ACROSS THE ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That in the furtherance of inter-American defense and Western Hemisphere economic progress and solidarity, the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of ascertaining the willingness of that Government to make a treaty providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an interoceanic ship canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

AMENDMENT OF RULES RELATING TO CLOTURE AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two resolutions proposing modifications of amendments to the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The first resolution proposes a modification of rule 22 so as to provide for cloture by the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, instead of by two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate as now provided. It also eliminates subsection 3 which prevents cloture being invoked on a motion or proposal to consider changes in the rules.

My resolution differs from that of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] in that it provides a waiting period of at least 5 calendar days before action can be taken upon a cloture petition. This provision assures ample time to enable Senators who may be absent upon official business to return to Washington to participate in the debate and voting upon the question.

It differs also in omitting section 3 of the Knowland resolution which provides that "the rules of the Senate shall carry over from Congress to Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules." That section of the Knowland resolution appears to be in conflict with the opinion of the Vice President, and might be interpreted as an attempt to limit the constitutional rulemaking power of the Senate in a future Congress.

The second resolution, submitted for myself and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], proposes a code of procedures for Senate investigations. The proposed code is identical with that which the junior Senator from California and I sponsored two years ago in the early days of the 84th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I made at that time be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am submitting for appropriate reference a resolution embodying a code of fair procedures for Senate investigations. I am pleased to have the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] join me in sponsorship.

The problem of providing fair treatment for witnesses and other persons affected by Senate investigations without crippling the Senate's essential power to investigate has been under intensive study for many months.

Since May 24, 1954, when I introduced my first draft of a code of fair procedures, as Senate Resolution 253, many recommendations for additions to the Senate rules have been made.

Most recent of these were the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Rules of the 83d Congress, introduced in the present session as Senate Resolution 17, and based on hearings at which all points of view were thoroughly explored.

In examining the report of the Subcommittee on Rules, it has seemed to me that its recommendations give too few rights to witnesses and other persons who may be exposed to defamation, degradation, and incrimination during the course of Senate investigations.

It is possible to go too far in the other direction, as some have proposed, and have a set of rules which would entangle committees in crippling legalisms and redtape which would seriously interfere with, if not stultify, the work of investigating committees.

The resolution introduced by myself and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] seeks a sound course between the two extremes. Drawn upon suggestions originally contained in Senate Resolution 253 and upon the recommendations of the select committee in the 83d Congress headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and those of the Subcommittee on Rules, we have attempted to draft a comprehensive code which will preserve the Senate's essential power to investigate and at the same time give to witnesses and others affected the basic protections demanded by the American sense of justice and fair play.

We must maintain and strengthen the weapons of the Senate to ferret out subversives, while respecting the rights of decent citizens who appear before investigating committees.

During the past session many Senators expressed their support, in principle, for fair investigating procedures. The time has now come for action. I hope that the Senate will proceed promptly to set its house in order.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in my judgment, the need for the rule changes provided for in the two resolutions has been amply demonstrated. I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will proceed promptly to the consideration of these and other proposals dealing with the same matters, and report recommendations for action during the present session of the 85th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions, submitted by Mr. BUSH, were received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 32 (by Mr. BUSH):

"*Resolved,* That rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is modified as follows:

"1. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out 'except subsection 3 of rule 22.'

"2. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out 'on the following calendar day but one,' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'on the fifth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays).'

"3. The second paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out 'by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn,' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'by the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.'

"4. Subsection 3 is hereby deleted."

S. Res. 33 (by Mr. BUSH, for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

"*Resolved,* That rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by deleting the title "Standing Committees" and inserting in lieu thereof "Senate Commit-

tees," and by inserting at the end of such rule the following:

"'5. The following shall be the rules of the standing, select, and special committees of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and subcommittees thereof, and the term "committee" as used in this subsection (except in paragraphs (a) (7) and (b) (1)) means any such committee or subcommittee:

"'(a) (1) Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

"'(2) Unless otherwise provided, committee action shall be by vote of a majority of a quorum.

"'(3) No committee hearing shall be held in any place outside the District of Columbia unless authorized by the committee.

"'(4) All hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee orders an executive session.

"'(5) No measure, finding, or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

"'(6) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by the committee.

"'(7) A subcommittee of any standing, select, or special committee may be authorized only by a majority vote of the members of such committee.

"'(8) Authority to issue subpenas may be delegated to the chairman or any member by the committee at a meeting called for such purpose.

"'(9) A majority of the members of a committee may call a special meeting of such committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, who shall notify each member.

"'(10) The professional and clerical staff personnel of each committee shall be appointed, and services of such staff personnel terminated, by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"'(b) (1) No committee or subcommittee investigation shall be initiated unless specifically authorized by the Senate or by the standing, select, or special committee having jurisdiction.

"'(2) The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest date practicable, report to the Senate the general nature of inquiries or investigations the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case in which he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall in writing advise the President of the Senate of that fact.

"'(3) The chairman or one of the members of a committee shall when practicable consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"'(4) In any investigation in which witnesses have been subpenaed, requests to subpena additional witnesses shall be received and considered by the chairman of the committee, except that in any investigation where the provisions of paragraphs (d) or (e) apply, any such request from a witness or other person exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination in such investigation shall be considered and acted upon by the committee at the earliest date practicable.

"'(5) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein.

"'(c) (1) No subpenaed witness shall be required to testify before a committee with less than 2 members present, unless the committee decides that 1 member may hold the hearing, or the witness waives any objection to testifying before 1 member.

"'(2) The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted, on behalf of the committee, by members and authorized staff personnel only.

"'(3) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during a hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

"'(4) Witnesses shall be permitted to be advised by counsel of their legal rights while giving testimony, and, unless the presiding member of the committee otherwise directs, to be accompanied by counsel at the stand. A witness may be deemed to have waived this right if, after receiving timely notice of his appearance, he fails to provide himself with counsel.

"'(5) Witnesses, counsel, and other persons present at committee hearings shall maintain proper order and decorum. Counsel shall observe the standards of ethics and deportment generally required of attorneys at law.

"'(6) Witnesses at committee hearings shall be required, so far as practicable, to submit written statements of their proposed testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"'(d) Whenever a committee determines that evidence relating to a question under investigation may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons called as witnesses therein, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"'(1) Preliminary staff inquiries in such investigation may be directed by the chairman, but no witnesses shall be called to testify until approved by the committee.

"'(2) All testimony, whether given under subpena or voluntarily, shall be given under oath.

"'(3) Counsel for a witness may be permitted, in the discretion of the presiding member at any hearing and as justice may require, to be heard briefly on points of right and procedure, to examine his client briefly for purposes of amplification and clarification, and to address pertinent questions by written interrogatory to other witnesses whose testimony pertains to his client.

"'(4) Testimony shall be heard in executive session when necesasry to shield a witness or other person about whom he may testify.

"'(5) The secrecy of executive sessions and of all matters and material not expressly released by the committee shall be rigorously enforced.

"'(6) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit concise, pertinent, oral, or written statements relating to their testimony for inclusion in the record at the opening or close of such testimony.

"'(7) An accurate verbatim transcript shall be made of all testimony, and no alterations other than to correct clerical errors shall be permitted therein.

"'(8) Each witness may obtain transcript copies of his testimony given publicly by paying the cost thereof. Copies of his testimony given in executive session shall be furnished a witness at cost if the testimony has been released or publicly disclosed, or if the chairman of the committee so orders.

"'(9) No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly disclosed in part only, except when the committee decides that deletions from the transcript are required by considerations of national security.

"'(e) Whenever a committee determines that any testimony, statement, release, or other evidence or utterance relating to a question under investigation tends to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons who are not witnesses, the committee shall observe the additional procedures prescribed by this paragraph, so far as may be practicable and necessary, to insure fair treatment of such persons:

"'(1) Persons so exposed to defamation, degradation, or incrimination shall be afforded an opportunity to appear as witnesses, promptly and if possible at the same time such evidence or utterance is given, and under subpena if they so elect. Testimony relating to such adverse evidence or utterance shall be subject to the applicable provisions of paragraph (d) of this subsection. Any such person may, in lieu of appearing as a witness, submit a concise, pertinent sworn statement which shall be incorporated in the record of the hearing at which the adverse evidence or utterance was submitted.

"'(f) Vouchers covering investigating expenditures of any committee shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the chairman of such committee that the investigation was duly authorized and conducted under the provisions of this subsection.

"'6. In any case in which a controversy arises between committees as to the jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate to make any inquiry or investigation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal. Such decision finally arrived at, with or without appeal, shall not operate to invalidate proceedings of the committee prior thereto.'"

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANTS AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34) which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the 85th Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated August 16, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON JOHN DAY DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH. AND OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 10)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 29, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on John Day Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of April 22, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON DES MOINES RIVER, IOWA (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 6, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on the Des Moines River, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce (Public Works), United States Senate, adopted July 10, 1945. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BETWEEN ST. LOUIS, MO., AND LOCK AND DAM NO. 26 (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated August 13, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam No. 26, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works on December 6, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA-ST. LUCIE CANAL (S. DOC. NO. 6)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 28, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Central and Southern Florida-St. Lucie Canal, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted November 15, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY ON DIRKSEN CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (S. 83)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have added my name as a cosponsor of the civil rights bill (S. 83) introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I wish to explain that, in doing so, I feel there are a number of serious "bugs" in the bill. To that end I shall offer some amendments in committee. If the amendments are not accepted in committee—and it may be that the Senator from Illinois will accept my amendments—I shall offer them on the floor of the Senate. If they are not accepted, I doubt very much that I shall be able to vote for the bill, even though I am a cosponsor of it. I am a cosponsor of it because I favor the general objectives of the proposed legislation.

SENATOR MALONE JOINED BY SENATOR BIBLE IN INTRODUCTION OF S. 31, S. 32, S. 33, AND S. 38

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of my colleague the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] to S. 31, S. 32, S. 33, and S. 38, introduced by me on Monday. In view of the press of the introduction of bills and resolutions, it was inadvertently overlooked in the RECORD.

S. 31 is a bill to be known as the urgent minerals purchase program deficiency appropriation of 1957.

S. 32 is a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado (the Eldorado area) River Commission of Nevada, acting for the State of Nevada.

S. 33 is a bill to provide for the allocation of portions of the costs of Davis Dam and Reservoir to servicing the Mexican Water Treaty, thus reducing power costs.

S. 38 is the Truckee-Carson River improvement bill.

Mr. President, at a later date I expect to explain fully the objective of this proposed legislation in detail.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1957

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held by the Banking and Currency Committee on the committee print bill entitled "Financial Institutions Act of 1957." The purpose of the bill is to amend and revise the statutes governing banks, credit unions, and savings and loan associations. The hearings will begin on Monday, January 28, 1957, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Monday, January 21, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] outlining the major provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

The proposed bill is the result of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's study since last July of the Federal statutes governing financial institutions and credit. The bill is based on the 175 legislative recommendations submitted by the Federal supervisory agencies, the views of the various trade organizations in the financial field, the recommendations of our 27-man advisory committee and the suggestions offered by many other persons.

At the outset of the committee's study, I stated that I had two primary objectives in mind—(1) to eliminate obsolete provisions from the statutes in order to make our financial laws more workable and understandable, and (2) to add new authority where needed to meet the modern-day needs of our economy. The bill meets both of these objectives.

In regard to the elimination of obsolete provisions, we propose to delete the 50 sections of law dealing with national bank notes, the 40 sections of law on the national agricultural credit corporation, the provisions on double liability of national bank shareholders, and many other statutes that have been outdated for at least 20 years.

In the area of new legislative authority, the bill provides for the regulation of bank mergers, the limitation of mandatory cumulative voting in the election of national-bank directors, the liberalization of lending authority of national banks, the issuance of preferred stock by national banks and the authorization of stock options by national banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would be strengthened by adding new authority to meet problem situations, and by substituting an administrator for the board of directors of the corporation.

New regulatory authority is also proposed in the savings-and-loan association field. Savings-and-loan holding companies, mergers, and branches all would be made subject to new statutory regulation. Many other provisions are added to the statutes governing the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to bring them up to date.

Under the proposed legislation Federal credit unions would be required to have annual audits, the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions would be authorized to fix maximum loan limits, and loan limits on unsecured loans would be increased to $500.

These are just a few of many amendments made by the committee-print bill, which is over 300 pages in length.

The bill will be the subject of extensive public hearings by the committee beginning on January 28, 1957, and, of course, will be open to further amendment. I am not finally committed to every section of the bill but feel it covers the matters which should be considered and studied. I hope that all persons interested in improving the financial system of our country will study the bill carefully and give the committee the benefit of their views.

The major provisions of the bill, in outline form, are:

TITLE I. NATIONAL BANK ACT

Section 8: Adds new conflict of interest provision.

Section 21: Authorization for the issuance of preferred stock, debentures and capital notes. This section amends the present provision of law which authorizes issuance of preferred stock as an emergency measure and which has not been used since the early days of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 23: Requires national banks to report large stock transactions.

Section 25: Eliminates mandatory cumulative voting in election of national bank directors on the same basis as S. 256, of the 84th Congress.

Section 29: Strengthens provision for removal of officers and directors of national banks who have engaged in unsafe and unsound practices. Also provides for a hearing for such directors and officers and review by the courts.

Section 31 (a) (9): Authorizes stock option for employees of national banks.

Section 32: Authorizes national banks to temporarily purchase and hold the stock of another bank as one step in a merger or consolidation.

Section 33: Transfers authority over trust powers of national banks from the Federal Reserve Board to the Comptroller.

Section 34: Increases the maximum loan limitation for national banks on obligations covering frozen foods and dairy cattle, and on consumer installment paper.

Section 36: Authorizes national banks to make 18-month industrial and commercial construction loans, and increases aggregate limit on construction loans to 100 percent of capital and surplus. Increases the limit on real estate loans to include 20 percent of demand deposits. Permits national banks to make loans to construct public buildings in connection with the lease-purchase program. Authorizes national banks to make working capital loans.

Section 37: Increases limit on bank's indebtedness to 100 percent of capital and surplus.

Section 39: Provides that the operation of a school savings program shall not be construed as operating a branch office.

Section 43: Total permissible amount for investment in national bank buildings is increased to 50 percent of capital and surplus.

Section 45: Authorizes national banks to act as insurance agent or real-estate broker in States where State banks are given such authority.

Section 51: Prohibits national banks from being subject to State licenses and examinations.

Section 52: Revises requirements for reports from national banks and gives authority to Comptroller to vary the form of the reports according to the size of banks or other reasonable classifications.

Section 64: Adds new authority for Comptroller to appoint a Conservator in the case of a defalcation in a national bank.

TITLE II. FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Section 7: Requires Federal Reserve banks to pay 90 percent of their net earnings to the United States as a franchise tax.

Section 8: Limits service on Federal Advisory Council to 6 consecutive terms of 1 year each.

Section 17: Limits service of Directors of Federal Reserve banks to 2 consecutive terms of 3 years each. Requires Director either to live in the Federal Reserve district or within 50 miles of Federal Reserve bank.

Section 23 (b): Revises reporting requirements for member banks on same basis as section 52 of title I.

Section 23 (d): Permits State member banks to purchase and hold bank stock as in section 32 of title I.

Section 23 (i): Requires State member banks to report large stock transactions to Board and is similar to section 23 of title I.

Section 23 (j): Increases permissible investment in State member bank buildings as in section 43 of Title I.

Section 28 (e): Increases exempted loans to officers and directors of member banks from $2,500 to $5,000 and liberalizes reporting requirements.

Section 29: Revises removal provisions similar to section 29 of title I.

Section 38 (h): Requires Federal Reserve Board to be audited annually.

Section 38 (i): Adds new provision on conflicts of interest involving employees of the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks, and is similar to section 8 (b) of title I.

Section 39 (m): Requires annual audit of Federal Reserve Board.

Section 53–6: Incorporates Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 as part of the Federal Reserve Act.

TITLE III. FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

Section 6: Establishes position of Administrator to replace the Board of Directors of the FDIC.

Section 7: Creates an Advisory Board consisting of the Comptroller, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or his designee, and one of the State bank supervisors. Advisory Board to consult with Administrator at least four times a year.

Section 23: Provides for regulation of bank mergers on same basis as S. 3911 of the 84th Congress.

Section 26: The language of the Federal Reserve Act prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits is incorporated in this section.

Section 27: Requires insured banks to report large stock transactions.

Section 29: Strengthens provision on termination of insurance of insured banks for unsafe and unsound practices.

Section 30 (c) and (d): Strengthens corporation's position to pay off depositors of a closed insured bank.

Section 40 (d): Relates to conflicts of interests by employees of corporation.

Section 42: Abolishes Board of Directors of FDIC.

TITLE IV. FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 4 (d): Restricts advertising by an uninsured member of a Federal home-loan bank.

Section 19 (b): Conflict of interest provision.

TITLE V. FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION ACT

Section 1: Title of act is changed from "Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933" to "Federal Savings and Loan Association Act."

Section 5 (d) (3): Provision for removal of officers and directors of Federal savings and loan associations similar to sections 29 of title I and II.

Section 6: Regulation of Federal savings and loan branches as contained in S. 972 of the 84th Congress.

Section 7: Requires annual audits of Fedconduct on officers and directors of Federal savings and loan associations as are now applicable to officers and directors of Federal Reserve member banks.

TITLE VI. FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

Section 401: Adds new short title of act. Section 408: Amends provision on termination of insurance on a basis similar to section 29 of title III.

Section 409: Provides for regulation of savings and loan holding companies.

TITLE VII. FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

Section 7: Requires annual audits of Federal credit unions.

Section 15: Maximum limit on unsecured loans is increased to $500 and Director of Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is given authority to impose maximum loan limits on secured loans.

Section 18: Board of directors of credit union given authority to declare dividends and may declare semiannual dividends.

Section 21: Conflicts of interest provision.

TITLE VIII. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

Section 801: Repeals obsolete provisions relating to circulating national bank notes, national agricultural credit corporations, associations to issue gold notes, double liability of national bank shareholders, and others.

Section 803: Amends Criminal Code (1) to extend coverage of provisions prohibiting loans by financial institutions to employees of the Federal supervisory agencies; (2) to extend coverage of provisions prohibiting contributions by financial institutions to political campaigns; and (3) to extend coverage of other provisions.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him before the Air War College, at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., December 13, 1956, on the subject of the influence of Congress on military strategy.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Friday of this week we shall commemorate the 200th birthday of Alexander Hamilton. Beginning on that day there will be ceremonies in Chicago, New York, Washington, and other places throughout the country. Throughout the year 1957 there will be commemorative services held in various places in this country, as well as in Great Britain and in the English colonies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD tomorrow, so that it will be delivered to the Senators' desks, a proclamation issued by the President of the United States relating to the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago today, on Monday, September 17, 1787, the Constitution of the United States was signed by the Founding Fathers, and a crucial 9-month campaign for its adoption was begun. As we celebrate that momentous event, it is fitting that we take notice of Alexander Hamilton, who, at the age of 30, was recognized as one of the principal architects and leaders of the movement for "a more perfect Union" of the States.

Five years earlier Hamilton's imagination had shown him the noble and magnificent prospect of a great Federal Republic, closely linked in the pursuit of a common interest, tranquil and prosperous at home, and respected abroad. His vision, together with that of other patriots, brought forth the United States of America under the Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton served his country well throughout his life—during the Revolutionary War as aide-de-camp and military

secretary to General Washington, as commander of the American columns in the final assault on Yorktown, and, later, as major general and senior officer of the Army; in the Continental Congress, in the Assembly of the State of New York, in the Annapolis Convention of 1786, which led to the momentous meeting in Philadelphia the following year, and in that meeting in 1787 during which the Constitution was framed. During the succeeding months he was untiring in his efforts to secure acceptance of the Constitution by the States, and his subsequent service as first Secretary of the Treasury under the new Government proved him to be one of the boldest and most farsighted of the founders of our Nation.

The opportunity has now come to our generation to demonstrate our gratitude and our obligation to Alexander Hamilton by a fitting celebration of the 200th anniversary of his birth—a happy opportunity for all of us to think afresh of his sincere efforts and inspiring leadership in the work of the men who laid the foundations, raised the structure, and built the sustaining traditions of the Government of the Unted States.

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, in accord with the purposes of the Congress, do hereby urge the Governors of the several States, and do call upon all officials and agencies of Federal Government, and upon all citizens, to observe the year commencing January 11, 1957, as the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial, and to do honor to his memory during that period with appropriate activities and ceremonies commemorative of his inspiring role in our national life.

And I hereby direct that on January 11, 1957, the anniversary of Alexander Hamilton's birth, the flag of the United States be appropriately displayed on all Government buildings in the United States and all offices of this Government abroad.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 17th day of September in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 181st.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:
[SEAL] JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

OIL IMPORTS AND THE SUEZ CONTROVERSY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a speech prepared by my colleague from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for delivery yesterday. The Senate was not in session yesterday and the Senator requested that I place his speech in the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL IMPORTS AND THE SUEZ CONTROVERSY

Recent events in the Middle East have brought deep concern to the American people and their leaders in Government. Now that the shooting has stopped and as we work for a peaceful settlement of the serious differences in that troubled area, it is an appropriate time to examine some of our own policies and to take forthright action based on the lesson this conflagration should have taught us.

I refer to the urgent necessity for executing a firm national import policy on petroleum as authorized by Congress in the so-called defense amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. It is most unfortunate that we must look to tragic situations for arguments to protect an industry so vital to the national economy and defense as the domestic oil industry. Yet the recent seizure of the Suez Canal by President Nasser of Egypt and the subsequent disrupting of Middle East oil shipments provide sobering evidence of the complete incompatibility between excessive oil imports and our own security.

We cannot depend on imports from the Middle East in time of war and therefore should never let them supplant our domestic industry in time of peace.

Here was a minor shooting war in which we did not become militarily involved. We did not need to join Britain and France to protect our source of power, heat, and light and to maintain our industrial strength. In all probability, this difference avoided world war III. Even so, our petroleum shipments from that area, as well as those of Britain and France, were cut off. Fortunately, because we still have a large reserve productive capacity here, we cannot only fill our own requirements but also make up the European deficit.

This is the type of situation I had in mind more than 2 years ago when I spoke in the Senate about the settlement of the Iranian oil dispute. In discussing the need for a proper balance between imports and domestic production, I stated on August 13, 1954:

"It will serve no useful end for America to save the economy and oil industry of the Middle East if it is done in a manner that would destroy the economy and national defense potentialities of the United States. * * * Excessive imports constitute a threat to the economic health and security of the entire Nation. Accessible oil at home is vital to our defense. Foreign supplies are not reliable if war should come."

I went on to point out:

"Some have argued that we should use the Middle East oil now and save our own for the future. That would be excellent if we knew where all the oil in this country is located and if our domestic industry and its millions of employees could go without their livelihood for several years on end. Neither of these conditions is possible. All of the oil in this country has not been discovered. The search for new reserves must continue, and it can and will continue only if there is a healthy and profitable industry. The search for new oilfields is being retarded even now by necessary reduction of production.

"A man will not risk a million dollars wildcatting for new oilfields if he cannot expect to produce at a rate necessary to return the cost of his investment. Giant corporations may be able to wait but not the independent producers, who are the lifeblood of a healthy oil industry."

The situation was already serious in 1954 when, as part of the same remarks, I observed that:

"Even now oil imports to the United States are too high. They have reached the point of supplanting rather than supplementing domestic production."

To remedy this problem, I joined Senator NEELY and 14 other Senators during the first session of the 84th Congress in the introduction of a bill which would limit foreign oil imports to 10 percent of the total domestic petroleum demand for the preceding year. Meanwhile, a special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President, had studied the plight of domestic producers and came up with the following highly significant recommendation:

"The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply. * * * The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

With this report in mind, the Senate Finance Committee and then the Congress adopted as a substitute for the Neely proposal an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which provided as follows:

"* * * Whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

Those of us who had sponsored the Neely proposal supported the Finance Committee amendment in the light of assurances that the executive branch of the Government would take action under this new authority to make certain that oil imports would not exceed the 1954 relationship to domestic production. That this constituted the legislative intent is clearly evident: The Senate Finance Committee in its report on the Reciprocal Trade bill set out in full the pertinent part of the Cabinet Committee report, and during the Senate debate, the chairman and ranking members of the Finance Committee gave repeated assurances to the same effect.

With this firm declaration of the Congress, the intent of which was unmistakable, we sincerely hoped that the oil imports matter was behind us. Unfortunately, those in the administration charged with enforcing this clear mandate have seen fit to allow other considerations to deter the institution of procedures adequate to accomplish the objective.

Efforts have been made by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Cabinet Committee, of which Dr. Flemming is Chairman, to implement the basic policy agreed to by the executive and legislative departments of Government. Up to this point, however, Government action has not progressed beyond attempts to secure voluntary compliance by the importing companies. Since September 1955, Director Flemming has continually warned importers against excessive shipments of petroleum into this country and declared that the Government would act if the companies failed to do so.

How effective have been these attempts to secure voluntary compliance? The evidence clearly shows that until the Suez controversy importing companies revised their importing schedules upward, rather than downward, in the face of continued legislative concern and numerous requests by the ODM for voluntary action.

During 1954, imports of crude and residual oils amounted to 16.6 percent of domestic crude-oil production. By the end of 1955, this figure had climbed to 18.4 percent and in 1956 stood at 19.8 percent. Except for the closing of the Suez Canal and the bombing of Middle East pipelines, 1956 imports would have been even higher. This is made abundantly clear by the schedule of imports for the last 6 months of 1956 filed by the importing companies with the Texas Railroad Commission, which reveals the companies

intended to import 21.7 percent of domestic production.

The effect upon small domestic producers, the real wildcatters of that industry, of unlimited imports is so severe that true exploratory work is seriously lacking. The economies of our oil-producing States, particularly Texas, are suffering dire consequences. Our oil discoveries, as was the case many times in the past under similar adverse conditions, have fallen far short of levels needed to assure America's self-sufficiency in oil. Even substantial independents are experiencing serious financial distress, and risk capital for the real wildcat wells has become difficult if not impossible for many to get.

Alarmed at the trend toward greater imports despite new statutory policy, I joined 26 of my colleagues in advising Director Flemming on July 30, 1955, that importation of foreign oil at the rates which have prevailed during the first half of 1955 constitute a threat to our security. With imports still rising, 31 Senators wrote Director Flemming on July 10, 1956, that no evidence is available to us that oil imports have been, or are being, restricted within the limits determined to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Pointing out that appeals for voluntary restraints had not been effective, 19 domestic oil-trade associations petitioned Director Flemming on August 7, 1956, for whatever other action might be necessary to adjust imports of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and other petroleum products to a level which will not threaten to impair the national security, which level is the 1954 relationship of such imports to domestic crude-oil production.

At this point, a large part of oil from Middle East was dramatically cut off. Once again it was the United States to whom the free world turned to fill the deficit. Fortunately, our reserve productive capacity remained entirely adequate to accomplish the job and the day was saved. Had the curtailment of Middle Eastern oil occurred a year or two later, I tell you frankly, that it is extremely doubtful that we would have had the producing capacity to fill the gap. Imports were eating away at this most vital of all defense weapons. The reason our President was able to keep a cool head throughout the extremely serious crisis in the Middle East was America's ability to supply herself and here allies with oil lost through Middle Eastern despotism.

It came as a deep disappointment to me, and I am sure to every American concerned with the vital necessity for maintaining a healthy domestic oil industry, when Director Flemming announced on December 4 that he was suspending action on the petition of the 19 trade associations in view of the present situation in the Middle East. He went on to say that "whenever the end of these conditions can be foreseen," he will again study import plans with a view as to whether other action should be taken.

When could there be a more opportune time to establish a definite pattern for future oil shipments to this country? As pointed out by Mr. Ray L. Dudley, publisher of World Oil, in the January 1957 issue:

"Normal shipping and marketing patterns have already been disrupted by stoppage of Middle East shipments. It would be much easier on Middle East countries and companies, and on United States producers too, if they know in advance what conditions will exist at the end of the current emergency. If the United States made known its intentions now, everybody concerned would sometime have to take steps that might soften their hardships.

"If a definite course of action is postponed until after the Middle East emergency, as Office of Defense Director Flemming has stated it will be, the question will be more difficult to solve than now."

Serious economic conditions will face the domestic oil industry when the current emergency is over. American production and exports will have to be curtailed to normal levels. The import problem will again confront the industry and Government officials alike, and the question may well be more serious than experienced previously. Many factors will contribute to increased pressure for greater imports: Tanker capacity is being increased, and most important, Middle East companies and countries will want to make up some of their lost revenues.

A number of possible remedies are available. In discussing the defense amendment on the Senate floor, Senator MILLIKIN referred to "tariffs, quotas, import taxes, or other methods of import restrictions." In short, the President is authorized to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports when they threaten to impair the national security.

Senators and spokesmen for the domestic oil industry were deeply concerned over letters of May 11 and June 26, 1956, from Director Flemming to the importing companies, which seem to exclude from any restriction, or approve at increased levels, about three-fourths of total imports. By exempting certain areas of the country and types of imports, this action leaves the appearance of substantial compliance by the importing companies but actually delays a restriction of imports within the standard recognized by the Senate in amending the trade agreements law.

Any exceptions made should be within a fixed formula. Defense is vital to our Nation as an entirety. The defense amendment is applicable to all of our States and all sources and types of imports.

The citizen of America enjoys the benefits of United States self-sufficiency in oil not only because oil is our No. 1 munition of war without which all of our atomic bombs and advance planes would be of no avail; the American consumer also benefits by having available to him plentiful oil products at prices which are the cheapest anywhere in the world. Despite the fact that Middle Eastern oil costs the companies producing it far less than is the cost of producing oil in America, products from that oil sell the world over at prices vastly higher than do products from American produced oil. If we ever become dependent upon this unreliable source, we will not only be jeopardizing our security but will be assuring ourselves of highjack prices. We will be at the mercy of a few Middle Eastern rulers and a handful of large companies which dominate development in this region of the world.

Without some definite and effective restriction on oil imports, the domestic industry cannot long survive. The evidence is now conclusive that voluntary restraints by the importing companies will not work. It is time to enforce the law as written to assure a fair apportionment of imports to domestic production.

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION WITH REFERENCE TO ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from time to time agreements for cooperation with other nations have been sent to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. I have had inserted in the RECORD most of these agreements for cooperation.

Since the Congress adjourned, only one agreement for cooperation has reached the Joint Committee. This was the agreement with Guatemala, which arrived at the Joint Committee on August 27. I request unanimous consent that it be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF GUATEMALA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Guatemala desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Guatemala desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Guatemala in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Guatemala or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools, and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completenes, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Guatemala uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Guatemala, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Guatemala uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Guatemala may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Guatemala shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the government of Guatemala to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Guatemala shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Guatemala or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Guatemala, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Guatemala by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Guatemala, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Guatemala or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Guatemala. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Guatemala may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Guatemala and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Guatemala to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Guatemala.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Guatemala agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Guatemala agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Guatemala or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Guatemala decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Guatemala agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Guatemala will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Guatemala may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Guatemala, the Government of Guatemala shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of Guatemala or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Guatemala shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Guatemala or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Guatemala guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Guatemala or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise, will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Guatemala except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial Agreement for Cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Guatemala.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement, or of any extension thereof, the Government of Guatemala shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Guatemala and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 15th day of August 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY F. HOLLAND,
Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Guatemala:

JOSÉ LUIS CRUZ SALAZAR,
Ambassador of Guatemala.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 24, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of July 23, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of Guatemala and the Government of the United States for cooperation

concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of Guatemala desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of Guatemala special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Guatemala enclosed with your letter of July 23, 1956.

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Guatemala, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Guatemala.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JULY 23, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Guatemala Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Guatemala in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Guatemala, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Guatemala. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Guatemala has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Guatemala up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Guatemala.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Guatemala and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 24, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Guatemala;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Guatemala on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Guatemala, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of this agreement, to render other assistance to Guatemala. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Guatemala up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Guatemala or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict Gautemala in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Guatemala under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Guatemala to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission, and article II contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expressed the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Guatemala.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS, *Chairman.*

DRAFT STATUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on September 20, 1956, 81 nations met together in the General Assembly Hall of the United Nations at New York City to go over a draft statute for the International Atomic Energy Agency, which was first proposed by President Eisenhower in his memorable address of December 8, 1953. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], Representative COLE, Representative KILDAY, and myself were designated to be congressional advisers to Ambassador Wadsworth who headed the negotiations on behalf of the United States. I should add at this point a personal note of appreciation for the fine way in which Ambassador Wadsworth and his staff handled this negotiation. On October 20 a draft statute was approved without objection by all of the nations and to date 73 nations have signed the draft statute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

There being no objection, the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

ARTICLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AGENCY

The parties hereto establish an International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter referred to as "the agency") upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE II—OBJECTIVES

The agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world. It shall insure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

ARTICLE III—FUNCTIONS

A. The agency is authorized:

1. To encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world; and, if requested to do so, to act as an intermediary for the purposes of securing the performance of services or the supplying of materials, equipment, or facilities by one member of the agency for another; and to perform any operation or service useful in research on, or development or practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

2. To make provision, in accordance with this statute, for materials, services, equipment, and facilities to meet the needs of research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power, with due consideration for the needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world;

3. To foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy;

4. To encourage the exchange and training of scientists and experts in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy;

5. To establish and administer safeguards designed to insure that special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its supervision or control are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and to apply safeguards, at the request of the parties, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or, at the request of a state, to any of that state's activities in the field of atomic energy;

6. To establish or adopt, in consultation and, where appropriate, in collaboration with the competent organs of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies concerned, standards of safety for protection of health and minimization of danger to life and property (including such standards for labor conditions), and to provide for the application of these standards to its own operations as well as to the operations making use of materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its control or supervision; and to provide for the application of these standards, at the request of the parties, to operations under any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or, at the request of a state, to any of that state's activities in the field of atomic energy;

7. To acquire or establish any facilities, plant, and equipment useful in carrying out its authorized functions, whenever the facilities, plant, and equipment otherwise available to it in the area concerned are inadequate or available only on terms it deems unsatisfactory.

B. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall—

1. Conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international cooperation, and in conformity with policies of the United Nations furthering the establishment of safeguarded worldwide disarmament and in conformity with any international agreements entered into pursuant to such policies;

2. Establish control over the use of special fissionable materials received by the Agency, in order to insure that these materials are used only for peaceful purposes;

3. Allocate its resources in such a manner as to secure efficient utilization and the greatest possible general benefit in all areas of the world, bearing in mind the special needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world;

4. Submit reports on its activities annually to the General Assembly of the United Nations and, when appropriate, to the Security Council: if in connection with the activities of the Agency there should arise questions that are within the competence of the Security Council, the Agency shall notify the Security Council, as the organ bearing the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and may also take the measures open to it under this statute, including those provided in paragraph C of article XII;

5. Submit reports to the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations on matters within the competence of these organs.

C. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall not make assistance to members subject to any political, economic, military, or other conditions incompatible with the provisions of this statute.

D. Subject to the provisions of this statute and to the terms of agreements concluded between a state or a group of states and the Agency which shall be in accordance with the provisions of the statute, the activities of the Agency shall be carried out with due observance of the sovereign rights of states.

ARTICLE IV—MEMBERSHIP

A. The initial members of the Agency shall be those states members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies which shall have signed this statute within 90 days after it is opened for signature and shall have deposited an instrument of ratification.

B. Other members of the Agency shall be those states, whether or not members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies, which deposit an instrument of acceptance of this statute after their membership has been approved by the General Conference upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors. In recommending and approving a state for membership, the Board of Governors and the General Conference shall determine that the state is able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership in the Agency, giving due consideration to its ability and willingness to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

C. The Agency is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members, and all members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with this statute.

ARTICLE V—GENERAL CONFERENCE

A. A General Conference consisting of representatives of all members shall meet in regular annual session and in such special sessions as shall be convened by the Director General at the request of the Board of Governors or of a majority of members. The sessions shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise determined by the General Conference.

B. At such sessions, each member shall be represented by one delegate who may be accompanied by alternates and by advisers. The cost of attendance of any delegation shall be borne by the member concerned.

C. The General Conference shall elect a President and such other officers as may be required at the beginning of each session. They shall hold office for the duration of the session. The General Conference, subject to the provisions of this statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure. Each member shall have one vote. Decisions pursuant to paragraph H of article XIV, paragraph C of article XVIII, and paragraph B of article XIX shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional questions or categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting. A majority of members shall constitute a quorum.

D. The General Conference may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of this statute or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in this statute, and may make recommendations to the membership of the agency or to the Board of Governors or to both on any such questions or matters.

E. The General Conference shall:

1. Elect members of the Board of Governors in accordance with article VI;

2. Approve states for membership in accordance with article IV;

3. Suspend a member from the privileges and rights of membership in accordance with article XIX;

4. Consider the annual report of the Board;

5. In accordance with article XIV, approve the budget of the agency recommended by the Board or return it with recommendations as to its entirety or parts to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference;

6. Approve reports to be submitted to the United Nations as required by the relationship agreement between the agency and the United Nations, except reports referred to in paragraph C of article XII, or return them to the Board with its recommendations;

7. Approve any agreement or agreements between the agency and the United Nations and other organizations as provided in article XVI or return such agreements with its recommendations to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference;

8. Approve rules and limitations regarding the exercise of borrowing powers by the Board, in accordance with paragraph G of article XIV; approve rules regarding the acceptance of voluntary contributions to the agency; and approve, in accordance with paragraph F of article XIV, the manner in which the general fund referred to in that paragraph may be used;

9. Approve amendments to this statute in accordance with paragraph C of article XVIII;

10. Approve the appointment of the Director General in accordance with paragraph A of article VII.

F. The General Conference shall have the authority:

1. To take decisions on any matter specifically referred to the General Conference for this purpose by the Board;

2. To propose matters for consideration by the Board and request from the Board reports on any matter relating to the functions of the agency.

ARTICLE VI—BOARD OF GOVERNORS

A. The Board of Governors shall be composed as follows:

1. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the first Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in annex I) shall designate for membership on the Board the five members most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials and the member most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials in each of the following areas not represented by the aforesaid five:

(1) North America
(2) Latin America
(3) Western Europe
(4) Eastern Europe
(5) Africa and the Middle East
(6) South Asia
(7) Southeast Asia and the Pacific
(8) Far East.

2. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the first Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in annex I) shall designate for membership on the Board two members from among the following other producers of source materials: Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Portugal; and shall also designate for membership on the Board one other member as a supplier of technical assistance. No member in this category in any one year will be eligible for redesignation in the same category for the following year.

3. The General Conference shall elect 10 members to membership on the Board of Governors, with due regard to equitable representation on the Board as a whole of the members in the areas listed in subparagraph A–1 of this article, so that the Board shall at all times include in this category a representative of each of those areas except North America. Except for the 5 members chosen for a term of 1 year in accordance with paragraph D of this article, no member in this category in any one term of office will be eligible for reelection in the same category for the following term of office.

B. The designations provided for in subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 of this article shall take place not less than 60 days before each regular annual session of the General Conference. The elections provided for in subparagraph A–3 of this article shall take place at

regular annual sessions of the General Conference.

C. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 of this article shall hold office from the end of the next regular annual session of the General Conference after their designation until the end of the following regular annual session of the General Conference.

D. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraph A–3 of this article shall hold office from the end of the regular annual session of the General Conference at which they are elected until the end of the second regular annual session of the General Conference thereafter. In the election of these members for the first Board, however, 5 shall be chosen for a term of 1 year.

E. Each member of the Board of Governors shall have one vote. Decisions on the amount of the Agency's budget shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, as provided in paragraph H of article XIV. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional questions or categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of those present and voting. Two-thirds of all members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

F. The Board of Governors shall have authority to carry out the functions of the Agency in accordance with this statute, subject to its responsibilities to the General Conference as provided in this statute.

G. The Board of Governors shall meet at such times as it may determine. The meetings shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise determined by the Board.

H. The Board of Governors shall elect a Chairman and other officers from among its members and, subject to the provisions of this statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

I. The Board of Governors may establish such committees as it deems advisable. The Board may appoint persons to represent it in its relations with other organizations.

J. The Board of Governors shall prepare an annual report to the General Conference concerning the affairs of the Agency and any projects approved by the Agency. The Board shall also prepare for submission to the General Conference such reports as the Agency is or may be required to make to the United Nations or to any other organization the work of which is related to that of the Agency. These reports, along with the annual reports, shall be submitted to members of the Agency at least 1 month before the regular annual session of the General Conference.

ARTICLE VII—STAFF

A. The staff of the Agency shall be headed by a Director General. The Director General shall be appointed by the Board of Governors with the approval of the General Conference for a term of 4 years. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Agency.

B. The Director General shall be responsible for the appointment, organization, and functioning of the staff and shall be under the authority of and subject to the control of the Board of Governors. He shall perform his duties in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board.

C. The staff shall include such qualified scientific and technical and other personnel as may be required to fulfill the objectives and functions of the Agency. The Agency shall be guided by the principle that its permanent staff shall be kept to a minimum.

D. The paramount consideration in the recruitment and employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be to secure employees of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence, and integrity. Subject to this consideration, due regard shall be paid to the contributions of members to the Agency and to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

E. The terms and conditions on which the staff shall be appointed, remunerated, and dismissed shall be in accordance with regulations made by the Board of Governors, subject to the provisions of this statute and to general rules approved by the General Conference on the recommendation of the Board.

F. In the performance of their duties, the Director General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any source external to the Agency. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as officials of the Agency; subject to their responsibilities to the Agency, they shall not disclose any industrial secret or other confidential information coming to their knowledge by reason of their official duties for the Agency. Each member undertakes to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the Director General and the staff and shall not seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

G. In this article the term "staff" includes guards.

ARTICLE VIII—EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

A. Each member should make available such information as would, in the judgment of the member, be helpful to the Agency.

B. Each member shall make available to the Agency all scientific information developed as a result of assistance extended by the Agency pursuant to article XI.

C. The Agency shall assemble and make available in an accessible form the information made available to it under paragraphs A and B of this article. It shall take positive steps to encourage the exchange among its members of information relating to the nature and peaceful uses of atomic energy and shall serve as an intermediary among its members for this purpose.

ARTICLE IX—SUPPLYING OF MATERIALS

A. Members may make available to the Agency such quantities of special fissionable materials as they deem advisable and on such terms as shall be agreed with the Agency. The materials made available to the Agency may, at the discretion of the member making them available, be stored either by the member concerned or, with the agreement of the Agency, in the Agency's depots.

B. Members may also make available to the Agency source materials as defined in article XX and other materials. The Board of Governors shall determine the quantities of such materials which the Agency will accept under agreements provided for in article XIII.

C. Each member shall notify the Agency of the quantities, form, and composition of special fissionable materials, source materials, and other materials which that member is prepared, in conformity with its laws, to make available immediately or during a period specified by the Board of Governors.

D. On request of the Agency a member shall, from the materials which it has made available, without delay deliver to another member or group of members such quantities of such materials as the Agency may specify, and shall without delay deliver to the Agency itself such quantities of such materials as are really necessary for operations and scientific research in the facilities of the Agency.

E. The quantities, form, and composition of materials made available by any member may be changed at any time by the member with the approval of the Board of Governors.

F. An initial notification in accordance with paragraph C of this article shall be made within 3 months of the entry into force of this statute with respect to the member concerned. In the absence of a contrary decision of the Board of Governors, the materials initially made available shall be for the period of the calendar year succeeding the year when this statute takes effect with respect to the member concerned. Subsequent notifications shall likewise, in the absence of a contrary action by the Board, relate to the period of the calendar year following the notification and shall be made no later than the 1st day of November of each year.

G. The Agency shall specify the place and method of delivery and, where appropriate, the form and composition, of materials which it has requested a member to deliver from the amounts which that member has notified the Agency it is prepared to make available. The Agency shall also verify the quantities of materials delivered and shall report those quantities periodically to the members.

H. The Agency shall be responsible for storing and protecting materials in its possession. The Agency shall insure that these materials shall be safeguarded against (1) hazards of the weather, (2) unauthorized removal or diversion, (3) damage or destruction, including sabotage, and (4) forcible seizure. In storing special fissionable materials in its possession, the Agency shall insure the geographical distribution of these materials in such a way as not to allow concentration of large amounts of such materials in any one country or region of the world.

I. The Agency shall as soon as practicable establish or acquire such of the following as may be necessary:

1. Plant, equipment, and facilities for the receipt, storage, and issue of materials;
2. Physical safeguards;
3. Adequate health and safety measures;
4. Control laboratories for the analysis and verification of materials received;
5. Housing and administrative facilities for any staff required for the foregoing.

J. The materials made available pursuant to this article shall be used as determined by the Board of Governors in accordance with the provisions of this statute. No member shall have the right to require that the materials it makes available to the Agency be kept separately by the Agency or to designate the specific project in which they must be used.

ARTICLE X—SERVICES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES

Members may make available to the Agency services, equipment, and facilities which may be of assistance in fulfilling the Agency's objectives and functions.

ARTICLE XI—AGENCY PROJECTS

A. Any member or group of members of the Agency desiring to set up any project for research on, or development or practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes may request the assistance of the Agency in securing special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, and facilities necessary for this purpose. Any such request shall be accompanied by an explanation of the purpose and extent of the project and shall be considered by the Board of Governors.

B. Upon request, the Agency may also assist any member or group of members to make arrangements to secure necessary financing from outside sources to carry out such projects. In extending this assistance, the Agency will not be required to provide any guaranties or to assume any financial responsibility for the project.

C. The Agency may arrange for the supplying of any materials, services, equipment, and facilities necessary for the project by one or more members or may itself undertake to provide any or all of these directly, taking into consideration the wishes of the member or members making the request.

D. For the purpose of considering the request, the agency may send into the territory of the member or group of members making the request a person or persons qualified to examine the project. For this purpose the agency may, with the approval of the

member or group of members making the request, use members of its own staff or employ suitably qualified nationals of any member.

E. Before approving a project under this article, the Board of Governors shall give due consideration to:

1. The usefulness of the project, including its scientific and technical feasibility;

2. The adequacy of plans, funds, and technical personnel to assure the effective execution of the project;

3. The adequacy of proposed health and safety standards for handling and storing materials and for operating facilities;

4. The inability of the member or group of members making the request to secure the necessary finances, materials, facilities, equipment, and services;

5. The equitable distribution of materials and other resources available to the agency;

6. The special needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world; and

7. Such other matters as may be relevant.

F. Upon approving a project, the agency shall enter into an agreement with the member or group of members submitting the project, which agreement shall:

1. Provide for allocation to the project of any required special fissionable or other materials;

2. Provide for transfer of special fissionable materials from their then place of custody, whether the materials be in the custody of the agency or of the member making them available for use in agency projects, to the member or group of members submitting the project, under conditions which insure the safety of any shipment required and meet applicable health and safety standards;

3. Set forth the terms and conditions, including charges, on which any materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by the agency itself and, if any such materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by a member, the terms and conditions as arranged for by the member or group of members submitting the project and the supplying member;

4. Include undertakings by the member or group of members submitting the project: (a) that the assistance provided shall not be used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and (b) that the project shall be subject to the safeguards provided for in article XII, the relevant safeguards being specified in the agreement;

5. Make appropriate provision regarding the rights and interests of the agency and the member or members concerned in any inventions or discoveries, or any patents therein, arising from the project;

6. Make appropriate provision regarding settlement of disputes;

7. Include such other provisions as may be appropriate.

G. The provisions of this article shall also apply where appropriate to a request for materials, services, facilities, or equipment in connection with an existing project.

ARTICLE XII—AGENCY SAFEGUARDS

A. With respect to any agency project, or other arrangement where the agency is requested by the parties concerned to apply safeguards, the agency shall have the following rights and responsibilities to the extent relevant to the project or arrangement:

1. To examine the design of specialized equipment and facilities, including nuclear reactors, and to approve it only from the viewpoint of assuring that it will not further any military purpose, that it complies with applicable health and safety standards, and that it will permit effective application of the safeguards provided for in this article;

2. To require the observance of any health and safety measures prescribed by the Agency;

3. To require the maintenance and production of operating records to assist in insuring accountability for source and special fissionable materials used or produced in the project or arrangement;

4. To call for and receive progress reports;

5. To approve the means to be used for the chemical processing of irradiated materials solely to insure that this chemical processing will not lend itself to diversion of materials for military purposes and will comply with applicable health and safety standards; to require that special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a by-product be used for peaceful purposes under continuing Agency safeguards for research or in reactors, existing or under construction, specified by the member or members concerned; and to require deposit with the Agency of any excess of any special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a by-product over what is needed for the above-stated uses in order to prevent stockpiling of these materials, provided that thereafter at the request of the member or members concerned special fissionable materials so deposited with the Agency shall be returned promptly to the member or members concerned for use under the same provisions as stated above;

6. To send into the territory of the recipient State or States inspectors, designated by the Agency after consultation with the State or States concerned, who shall have access at all times to all places and data and to any person who by reason of his occupation deals with materials, equipment, or facilities which are required by this statute to be safeguarded, as necessary to account for source and special fissionable materials supplied and fissionable products and to determine whether there is compliance with the undertaking against use in furtherance of any military purpose referred to in subparagraph F-4 of article XI, with the health and safety measures referred to in subparagraph A-2 of this article, and with any other conditions prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and the State or States concerned. Inspectors designated by the Agency shall be accompanied by representatives of the authorities of the State concerned, if that State so requests, provided that the inspectors shall not thereby be delayed or otherwise impeded in the exercise of their functions;

7. In the event of noncompliance and failure by the recipient State or States to take requested corrective steps within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate assistance and withdraw any materials and equipment made available by the Agency or a member in furtherance of the project.

B. The Agency shall, as necessary, establish a staff of inspectors. The staff of inspectors shall have the responsibility of examining all operations conducted by the Agency itself to determine whether the Agency is complying with the health and safety measures prescribed by it for application to projects subject to its approval, supervision or control, and whether the Agency is taking adequate measures to prevent the source and special fissionable materials in its custody or used or produced in its own operations from being used in furtherance of any military purpose. The Agency shall take remedial action forthwith to correct any noncompliance or failure to take adequate measures.

C. The staff of inspectors shall also have the responsibility of obtaining and verifying the accounting referred to in subparagraph A-6 of this article and of determining whether there is compliance with the undertaking referred to in subparagraph F-4 of article XI, with the measures referred to in subparagraph A-2 of this article, and with all other conditions of the project prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and the State or States concerned. The inspectors shall report any noncompliance to the Director General who shall thereupon transmit the report to the Board of Governors. The Board shall call upon the recipient State or States to remedy forthwith any noncompliance which it finds to have occurred. The Board shall report the noncompliance to all members and to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations. In the event of failure of the recipient State or States to take fully corrective action within a reasonable time, the Board may take one or both of the following measures: direct curtailment or suspension of assistance being provided by the Agency or by a member, and call for the return of materials and equipment made available to the recipient member or group of members. The Agency may also, in accordance with article XIX, suspend any noncomplying member from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership.

ARTICLE XIII—REIMBURSEMENT OF MEMBERS

Unless otherwise agreed upon between the Board of Governors and the member furnishing to the Agency materials, services, equipment, or facilities, the Board shall enter into an agreement with such member providing for reimbursement for the items furnished.

ARTICLE XIV—FINANCE

A. The Board of Governors shall submit to the General Conference the annual budget estimates for the expenses of the Agency. To facilitate the work of the Board in this regard, the Director General shall initially prepare the budget estimates. If the General Conference does not approve the estimates, it shall return them together with its recommendations to the Board. The Board shall then submit further estimates to the General Conference for its approval.

B. Expenditures of the Agency shall be classified under the following categories:

1. Administrative expenses: these shall include:

(a) Costs of the staff of the Agency other than the staff employed in connection with materials, services, equipment, and facilities referred to in subparagraph B-2 below; costs of meetings; and expenditures required for the preparation of Agency projects and for the distribution of information;

(b) Costs of implementing the safeguards referred to in article XII in relation to Agency projects or, under subparagraph A-5 of article III, in relation to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, together with the costs of handling and storage of special fissionable material by the Agency other than the storage and handling charges referred to in paragraph E below;

2. Expenses, other than those included in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph in connection with any materials, facilities, plant, and equipment acquired or established by the Agency in carrying out its authorized functions, and the costs of materials, services, equipment, and facilities provided by it under agreements with one or more members.

C. In fixing the expenditures under subparagraph B-1 (b) above, the Board of Governors shall deduct such amounts as are recoverable under agreements regarding the application of safeguards between the Agency and parties to bilateral or multilateral arrangements.

D. The Board of Governors shall apportion the expenses referred to in subparagraph B-1 above, among members in accordance with a scale to be fixed by the General Conference. In fixing the scale the General Conference shall be guided by the principles adopted by the United Nations in assessing contributions of member states to the regular budget of the United Nations.

E. The Board of Governors shall establish periodically a scale of charges, including reasonable uniform storage and handling charges, for materials, services, equipment,

and facilities furnished to members by the Agency. The scale shall be designed to produce revenues for the Agency adequate to meet the expenses and costs referred to in subparagraph B–2 above, less any voluntary contributions which the Board of Governors may, in accordance with paragraph F, apply for this purpose. The proceeds of such charges shall be placed in a separate fund which shall be used to pay members for any materials, services, equipment, or facilities furnished by them and to meet other expenses referred to in subparagraph B–2 above which may be incurred by the Agency itself.

F. Any excess of revenues referred to in paragraph E over the expenses and costs there referred to, and any voluntary contributions to the Agency, shall be placed in a general fund which may be used as the Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference may determine.

G. Subject to rules and limitations approved by the General Conference, the Board of Governors shall have the authority to exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the Agency without, however, imposing on members of the Agency any liability in respect of loans entered into pursuant to this authority, and to accept voluntary contributions made to the Agency.

H. Decisions of the General Conference on financial questions and of the Board of Governors on the amount of the Agency's budget shall require a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

ARTICLE XV—PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

A. The Agency shall enjoy in the territory of each member such legal capacity and such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions.

B. Delegates of members together with their alternates and advisers, Governors appointed to the Board together with their alternates and advisers, and the Director General and the staff of the Agency, shall enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary in the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Agency.

C. The legal capacity, privileges, and immunities referred to in this article shall be defined in a separate agreement or agreements between the Agency, represented for this purpose by the Director General acting under instructions of the Board of Governors, and the members.

ARTICLE XVI—RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

A. The Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference, is authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements establishing an appropriate relationship between the Agency and the United Nations and any other organizations the work of which is related to that of the Agency.

B. The agreement or agreements establishing the relationship of the Agency and the United Nations shall provide for:

1. Submission by the Agency of reports as provided for in subparagraphs B–4 and B–5 of article III;

2. Consideration by the Agency of resolutions relating to it adopted by the General Assembly or any of the Councils of the United Nations and the submission of reports, when requested, to the appropriate organ of the United Nations on the action taken by the Agency or by its members in accordance with this statute as a result of such consideration.

ARTICLE XVII—SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

A. Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this statute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the statute of the court, unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement.

B. The General Conference and the Board of Governors are separately empowered, subject to authorization from the General Assembly of the United Nations, to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question arising within the scope of the Agency's activities.

ARTICLE XVIII—AMENDMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS

A. Amendments to this statute may be proposed by any member. Certified copies of the text of any amendment proposed shall be prepared by the Director General and communicated by him to all members at least 90 days in advance of its consideration by the General Conference.

B. At the fifth annual session of the General Conference following the coming into force of this statute, the question of a general review of the provisions of this statute shall be placed on the agenda of that session. On approval by a majority of the members present and voting, the review will take place at the following General Conference. Thereafter, proposals on the question of a general review of this statute may be submitted for decision by the General Conference under the same procedure.

C. Amendments shall come into force for all members when:

(i) Approved by the General Conference by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting after consideration of observations submitted by the Board of Governors on each proposed amendment, and

(ii) Accepted by two-thirds of all the members in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. Acceptance by a member shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the depositary Government referred to in paragraph C of article XXI.

D. At any time after 5 years from the date when this statute shall take effect in accordance with paragraph E of article XXI or whenever a member is unwilling to accept an amendment to this statute, it may withdraw from the Agency by notice in writing to that effect given to the depositary Government referred to in paragraph C of article XXI, which shall promptly inform the Board of Governors and all members.

E. Withdrawal by a member from the Agency shall not affect its contractual obligations entered into pursuant to article XI or its budgetary obligations for the year in which it withdraws.

ARTICLE XIX—SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGES

A. A member of the Agency which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Agency shall have no vote in the Agency if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceeding 2 years. The General Conference may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member.

B. A member which has persistently violated the provisions of this statute or of any agreement entered into by it pursuant to this statute may be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership by the General Conference acting by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting upon recommendation by the Board of Governors.

ARTICLE XX—DEFINITIONS

As used in this statute:

1. The term "special fissionable material" means plutonium-239; uranium-233; uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233; any material containing one or more of the foregoing; and such other fissionable materials as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; but the term "special fissionable material" does not include source material.

2. The term "uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233" means uranium containing the isotopes 235 or 233 or both in an amount such that the abundance ratio of the sum of these isotopes to the isotope 238 is greater than the ratio of the isotope 235 to the isotope 238 occurring in nature.

3. The term "source material" means uranium containing the mixture of isotopes occurring in nature, uranium depleted in the isotope 235; thorium; any of the foregoing in the form of metal, alloy, chemical compound, or concentrate; any other material containing one or more of the foregoing in such concentration as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; and such other material as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine.

ARTICLE XXI—SIGNATURE, ACCEPTANCE, AND ENTRY INTO FORCE

A. This statute shall be open for signature on October 26, 1956, by all states members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies and shall remain open for signature by those states for a period of 90 days.

B. The signatory states shall become parties to this statute by deposit of an instrument of ratification.

C. Instruments of ratification by signatory states and instruments of acceptance by states whose membership has been approved under paragraph B of article IV of this statute shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, hereby designated as depositary government.

D. Ratification or acceptance of this statute shall be effected by States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

E. This statute, apart from the annex, shall come into force when 18 states have deposited instruments of ratification in accordance with paragraph B of this article, provided that such 18 states shall include at least 3 of the following states: Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Instruments of ratification and instruments of acceptance deposited thereafter shall take effect on the date of their receipt.

F. The depositary government shall promptly inform all states signatory to this statute of the date of each deposit of ratification and the date of entry into force of the statute. The depositary government shall promptly inform all signatories and members of the dates on which states subsequently become parties thereto.

G. The annex to this statute shall come into force on the first day this statute is open for signature.

ARTICLE XXII—REGISTRATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

A. This statute shall be registered by the depositary government pursuant to article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

B. Agreements between the Agency and any member or members, agreements between the Agency and any other organization or organizations, and agreements between members subject to approval of the Agency, shall be registered with the Agency. Such agreements shall be registered by the Agency with the United Nations if registration is required under article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XXIII—AUTHENTIC TEXTS AND CERTIFIED COPIES

This statute, done in the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish languages, each being equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the depositary government. Duly certified copies of this statute shall be transmitted by the depositary government to the governments of the other signatory states and to the governments of states admitted to membership under paragraph B of article IV.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this statute.

Done at the Headquarters of the United Nations, this 26th day of October 1956.

ANNEX I—PREPARATORY COMMISSION

A. A Preparatory Commission shall come into existence on the first day this statute is open for signature. It shall be composed of one representative each of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America, and 1 representative each of 6 other states to be chosen by the International Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Preparatory Commission shall remain in existence until this statute comes into force and thereafter until the General Conference has convened and a Board of Governors has been selected in accordance with article VI.

B. The expenses of the Preparatory Commission may be met by a loan provided by the United Nations and for this purpose the Preparatory Commission shall make the necessary arrangements with the appropriate authorities of the United Nations, including arrangements for repayment of the loan by the Agency. Should these funds be insufficient, the Preparatory Commission may accept advances from governments. Such advances may be set off against the contributions of the governments concerned to the Agency.

C. The Preparatory Commission shall:

1. Elect its own officers, adopt its own rules of procedure, meet as often as necessary, determine its own place of meeting, and establish such committees as it deems necessary;

2. Appoint an executive secretary and staff as shall be necessary, who shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as the Commission may determine;

3. Make arrangements for the first session of the General Conference, including the preparation of a provisional agenda and draft rules of procedure, such session to be held as soon as possible after the entry into force of this statute;

4. Make designations for membership on the first Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 and paragraph B of article VI;

5. Make studies, reports, and recommendations for the first session of the General Conference and for the first meeting of the Board of Governors on subjects of concern to the Agency requiring immediate attention, including (a) the financing of the Agency; (b) the programs and budget for the first year of the Agency; (c) technical problems relevant to advance planning of Agency operations; (d) the establishment of a permanent Agency staff; and (e) the location of the permanent headquarters of the Agency;

6. Make recommendations for the first meeting of the Board of Governors concerning the provisions of a headquarters agreement defining the status of the Agency and the rights and obligations which will exist in the relationship between the Agency and the host government;

7. (a) Enter into negotiations with the United Nations with a view to the preparation of a draft agreement in accordance with article XVI of this statute, such draft agreement to be submitted to the first session of the General Conference and to the first meeting of the Board of Governors; and (b) make recommendations to the first session of the General Conference and to the first meeting of the Board of Governors concerning the relationship of the Agency to other international organizations as contemplated in article XVI of this statute.

RESCUE OF EGYPTIAN JEWS—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY GENERAL JEWISH COMMITTEE OF PROVIDENCE, INC.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a resolution from the General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc., a resolution upon a subject which deeply disturbs me—as it must disturb every right-thinking person in the freedom-loving world.

The committee represents some 25,000 residents of greater Providence, and comprises 30 local Jewish organizations. The signers of the resolution are all my personal friends. The board of directors of the committee comprises a long list of distinguished men. It is a rollcall of men and women who have given devoted service to many public causes without consideration to race or creed. They are sincere citizens; they are loyal Americans. In their resolution they fervently addressed themselves to the rescue of Egyptian Jews suffering under the terror and violence of Nasser, deprived of the citizenship they have earned in Egypt, despoiled of their possessions, held as hostages or exiled forever from the Egypt they had called home.

I am sure that no one could improve on the moving language of the resolution, nor the true Americanism of the measures—five in number—which are respectively proposed. Therefore, I ask the privilege of incorporating the language of the resolution in my remarks. It reads as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED AT THE SPECIAL CONFERENCE CONVENED BY THE GENERAL JEWISH COMMITTEE OF PROVIDENCE, INC., ATTENDED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF 30 LOCAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

At the call of the General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc., representatives of 30 local Jewish organizations convened in special conference on Sunday, January 6, 1957, in Providence, R. I., to consider crucial problems facing world Jewry at this moment and, more specifically, the brutal and inhumane treatment of the Jews in Egypt by the Egyptian Government.

The situation of the Jews of Egypt living under conditions reminiscent of those existing in Germany during the Hitler era, is a direct challenge to the moral conscience of the world.

Egypt's announced intention to destroy Israel has been accompanied by continued acts of terror and violence. Nasser has demonstrated by his acts that he is not only willing to open Egypt and the whole Middle East to Communist penetration but that he has adopted for his own purposes the barbaric tactics of a vicious dictator.

He has canceled the citizenship and seized the possessions of thousands of Egyptian Jews. Over one-half of the 50,000 Jews living in Egypt have been ordered to leave the country and large-scale deportation is proceeding at this very moment.

Other thousands have been imprisoned and held as hostages in concentration camps where the conditions are intolerable. The property and assets of all Jews, including bank accounts, factories, business establishments, et cetera, et cetera, have been confiscated by the State. These frightful acts have naturally caused panic among the Jews remaining in Egypt.

We, citizens of Rhode Island, can never forget that when Hitler began to rage there was woeful tolerance of the evil of his teaching by those people who were slow to understand that such toleration would only encourage wrongdoing and ultimately threaten the moral and spiritual values of all people.

We find a terrifying imitation and refinement of the Hitler program and practices. We further believe that the conflict in the Middle East is more than a struggle between Egypt and Israel. It is a struggle for human rights of international concern.

In recognition of the common danger to all free peoples, and to prevent the further stripping of a helpless and law-abiding portion of the Egyptian populace of life, liberty, property, and human rights, and further to assist in achieving permanent peace in the world, we, therefore, respectfully and urgently propose the following action:

1. As Americans, we are proud of the historic concern of the United States for human rights and human welfare all over the world, expressed again most recently in the action in relation to the Hungarian crisis. We turn to our Government at this disturbing moment and ask comparable action in condemning the violation of human rights and freedom in Egypt.

2. That the President of the United States use his good offices and personal prestige as the leader of the free world to remind the Government of Egypt that the charter of the United Nations, with its guaranty of human rights, applies to Jews as well as all other people in Egypt, and that the campaign of arrests, economic strangulation, persecution and deportations, of which there has been incontrovertible evidence should cease at once.

3. That the United States through the United Nations forthwith call for an investigation of Egypt's violation of human rights and to take action consistent with the charter of the United Nations and the declaration of human rights.

4. We reaffirm our hope for world betterment and peace through the United Nations and urge the United Nations to bring about immediate and direct peace negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbors in order to achieve a permanent and just peace.

5. That the United Nations shall press as vigorously for Egyptian compliance with U. N. resolution of November 2 as she has for compliance by Britain, France, and Israel. Unless this is done, Israel's very survival will be threatened and even greater chaos could sweep the Middle East with all the terrifying prospects of setting off a global conflict.

The following are the members of the resolution committee who drafted this resolution: Max Winograd, chairman; Bertram L. Bernhardt; Rabbi Eli A. Bohnen; Alter Boyman; Mrs. Irving Brodsky; Irving J. Fain; Joseph M. Finkle; Maurice W. Hendel; Harry Jagolinzer; Judge Frank Licht; Mrs. Israel Mandell; Joseph W. Ress; Paul J. Robin; Rabbi Morris Schussheim; Milton Stanzler; Martin M. Temkin.

As befits its importance, this resolution received the front-page headlines in our local newspaper. By coincidence, in the same newspaper there was living confirmation of the charges, for even as this resolution was being drawn there came to anchor in the harbor of Naples, Italy, a rickety 7,000-ton ship bearing 967 Jewish refugees from the land of Egypt—967 victims of the violence of Nasser. This was the other newspaper story—no propaganda—the personal saga of suffering of men, women, and children whose only crime is that they are Jews. Here was the evidence of exile of many whose citizenship had been torn from them by threats and torture; who were deported, to be cast, stateless, on a troubled world. Here was proof of the confiscation of homes and all possessions, as all but a pittance of what they had earned goes to the coffers of

Nasser, to suit his plans, to serve his purposes, to support his power. Here was testimony of torture, but these exiles might be called the fortunate few, for left behind them in the seven concentration camps of Egypt are thousands and thousands who, if they ever escape with their lives, will escape with little else.

The resolution very properly addresses itself to the President of the United States. His words still echoed, on January 6, in Providence and in Naples, when he said:

> The United States was able to bring about a cease-fire and withdrawal of hostile forces from Egypt because it was dealing with governments and peoples who had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

Not in Providence, not in Naples, and surely not in the concentration camps of Egypt, will any Jew believe that the President meant to include Nasser in his praise. No. Every right-thinking man will believe that the President meant these to be brave, bold words which would stimulate and strengthen the oppressed, and put fear into the hearts of the oppressor.

Perhaps in Naples and Providence the message we heard here may have seemed to retreat from reality. Perhaps the people there might think the principal problem to be solved in the Near East is that of Arab-Israeli relations. There are many everywhere who share those views. To them the message would seem to tone down and taper off when the President said:

> There are problems of Palestine and relations between Israel and the Arab States. It is not the purpose of the legislation I propose to deal directly with all these problems.

But the message does not shut the door in the face of these anxious people, for it goes on to say—

> The United Nations is actively concerning itself with all these matters and we are supporting the United Nations.

It says also that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, said as much on August 26, 1955. So the Providence resolution very properly addresses itself to action by the United Nations. For much has happened since August 26, 1955, and none of what has happened has been of help in Israeli-Arab relations. It is high time that something is done about it.

I quote a distinguished Catholic priest, Father Ralph Gorman, C. P., of the Passionist Fathers, who, in an article in Sign magazine in December 1956, said:

> If there is to be peace in the Near East, the first problem to be solved is that of Israel and her Arab neighbors. Unless a lasting peace is made between them, very little benefit will be derived from settling questions of the Suez Canal or the Aswan Dam or other such problems.

This editor is not a stanch defender of Israel any more than he is a champion of Egypt. He accepts the facts of history when he declares:

> The Arabs will have to acknowledge that the State of Israel exists and will continue to exist and that its people cannot be pushed into the Mediterranean or returned to the countries whence they came.
>
> The Israelis must recognize the fact that they must live in the future surrounded by Arab nations and that they must make concessions if they want their country to be anything more than an armed camp in the midst of enemies.

So we very properly ask the United States to lend its voice and its vigor to the United Nations so that justice and humanity shall return to this troubled area, and a great step shall be taken toward a tranquil and stabilized Middle East, where we of America, who abhor war and love peace, can lead the way with our minds and our means to end hunger and disease for the Arab peoples. For their land and all the lands along the Jordan, Tigris, and Euphrates Rivers we can carry out the long-range water-power plans to make millions of fertile acres to bloom again as they did in antiquity. We have the assurance of Israel that she will abide by the action of the United Nations. We have the declaration of Nasser that he wishes to destroy Israel as a state. These views, I feel, will be composed in time. But, placing first things first, let us make certain that a state is not destroyed one soul at a time.

The American heart responds to oppressed people everywhere. We must make sure that Egypt does not become a house of bondage. We must make certain that there shall not be a slaughter of the innocent anywhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the parole provisions of the present immigration law, the so-called McCarran-Walter Act, which the President is now utilizing wisely in the instance of the Hungarian refugees, are also available to the Jewish refugees from Egypt? In other words, has not the President the authority to use those parole provisions?

Mr. PASTORE. I answer my friend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota by saying that that is the case. I hope that those provisions of the Immigration Act will be used with the same sense of equality for humanity as they are being used for the benefit of other oppressed people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator for his excellent remarks and associate myself with the general theme and spirit of them.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished minority leader must go to an organization meeting of an important joint committee. I have assured certain Senators that I would suggest the absence of a quorum prior to the time the Senate took up the question of committee assignments. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum, for the purpose thereafter of submitting the majority and minority committee lists and obtaining action thereon by the Senate. Any Senator, of course, will have an opportunity to express himself, but at the conclusion of action on the committee lists I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TOMORROW AND ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY AT 12 O'CLOCK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that, under the resolution previously agreed to, there will be a joint session of Congress at 12:30 o'clock noon tomorrow.

It is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate assemble in its Chamber at 12 o'clock tomorrow and then, at 12:15, to proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

We do not contemplate that any business will be transacted following the joint session.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the joint session tomorrow, the Senate stand in recess until Monday, January 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the steering committee of the majority, I send to the desk a list of the members of the standing committees of the Senate, as unanimously agreed to by 14 of the 15 members of that committee.

The name appearing at the top of each committee is the suggested chairman of that committee, as follows:

Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. ELLENDER; Appropriations, Mr. HAYDEN; Armed Services, Mr. RUSSELL; Banking and Currency, Mr. FULBRIGHT; District of Columbia, Mr. NEELY; Finance, Mr. BYRD; Foreign Relations, Mr. GREEN; Government Operations, Mr. McCLELLAN; Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. MURRAY; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. MAGNUSON; Judiciary, Mr. EASTLAND; Labor and Public Welfare, Mr. HILL; Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina; Public Works, Mr. CHAVEZ; Rules and Administration, Mr. HENNINGS.

I send the list to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the members of the committees. After the list has been read I suggest that the minority follow its usual procedure by doing likewise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the distinguished majority leader made a motion for the adoption of the committee assignments as shown on the list he has sent to the desk?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; they have not even been reported to the Senate, and the minority has not yet submitted its list. When the Senate has the full information before it, such a motion will be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the clerk is requested to read the list. Without objection, the clerk will read the names on the list.

The Chief Clerk read, as follows:

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Ellender, Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Talmadge.

Committee on Appropriations: Messrs Hayden, Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore.

Committee on Armed Services: Messrs. Russell, Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Messrs. Fulbright, Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Lausche, Clark.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Messrs. Neely, Bible, Morse, Frear, Clark.

Committee on Finance: Messrs. Byrd, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Messrs. Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy.

Committee on Government Operations: Messrs. McClellan, Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, ———.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Murray, Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. Magnuson, Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche.

Committee on the Judiciary: Messrs. Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Neely, Ervin.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Hill, Murray, Neely, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Church, Clark.

Committee on Public Works: Messrs. Chavez, Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Scott, Carroll.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Messrs. Hennings, Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, by unanimous vote of the minority conference, I send to the desk our nominations for members of the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the names.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations: Messrs. Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter.

Committee on Armed Services: Messrs. Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Messrs. Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Messrs. Beall, Case of New Jersey, Morton, Javits.

Committee on Finance: Messrs. Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Messrs. Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations: Messrs. McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary: Messrs. Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Messrs. Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Case of New Jersey, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works: Messrs. Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Messrs. Curtis, McCarthy, Cooper, and Javits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the lists as submitted, in the order submitted for both the majority and the minority, be approved by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I regret that I must vote against the designation of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. This is painful to me since my personal relations with the Senator have always been pleasant and he has been uniformly courteous and friendly in his treatment of me. I believe him to be sincere in the positions which he has taken. I would certainly not object to his appointment to any other legislative post. But in view of his severe attacks upon the Supreme Court because of its integration decisions and his apparent opposition to compliance with those decisions, I cannot find it in my heart to vote for his appointment to the most influential judicial post in the organization of the Senate, and to become to some degree the spokesman for our party, which, I believe, has adopted a different point of view. I am strengthened in this feeling by the apparent fact that not so much importance seems to be attached to the seniority principle as is sometimes alleged.

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has requested me to state that, if present and voting in the Senate today, he would vote against the pending motion for the same reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senate approve the committee lists as submitted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was asked this morning if I had changed the point of view which I had previously expressed in the Senate on March 2, 1956, concerning the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee. I made it clear that I had not changed my position, but that I thought in due course of time a resolution should be introduced which would deal with the criterion of seniority which is now the controlling criterion for appointing committee chairmen. That is similar to the position which I have taken ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have contended for years that the seniority practices of the Senate should be discontinued as a basis for committee assignments. I am having prepared under my instructions such a resolution, and at the appropriate time I shall submit it and suggest to the Committee on Rules and Administration that it then consider the whole blanket problem in regard to the seniority customs of the Senate. The approach I suggest does not involve singling out at this time just one committee chairman, but calls for a uniform application of a new rule based upon selecting committee chairmen because of their qualifications for a particular assignment rather than on the basis of an arbitrary seniority rule. Therefore I file this dissent against the seniority criterion for selecting committee chairmen and serve notice that I shall offer a resolution later which will seek to end once and for all the type of controversy we have had over the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on June 13, 1956, I reported to the Senate on the progress of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, of which I am chairman. That was a preliminary progress report on the work of the committee. Consistent with my purpose to keep the Senate informed of the committee's progress, I am again reporting to you.

You will recall that even prior to that date, on behalf of and by direction of the committee, I wrote a letter to each Member of the Senate, inviting their cooperation and assistance and requesting that they submit to the committee any facts or information within their knowledge and that was within the purview of the committee's responsibilities and which might be helpful to it. I also publicly called upon all the press, the columnists, commentators, and the public at large to provide the committee with any facts or information of wrongdoing in this area within their knowledge.

Thereafter, I specifically asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Attorney General, and the President of the United States for any facts or information in their possession concerning the subject matters the committee was created to investigate. I did this particularly because the President's veto message of the Harris-Fulbright gas bill contained the statement that "a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons * * * have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities."

We assumed there was such "body of evidence," which, if made available, would be most helpful to the committee in carrying out its responsibility. No such "body of evidence," however, has been made available to the committee. We have done everything possible that is practical to secure the cooperation and assistance of our colleagues, of the press, the public, and the executive branch of the Government. The facts and information the committee obtained in response to these efforts were negligible.

Therefore the committee, without benefit of many specific charges, allegations, complaints, or information providing leads for it to follow up and investigate has undertaken to make a general exploration and develop evidence to establish a pattern of the general practices that now prevail in the field of lobbying, political activities, and campaign contributions.

To date, the committee has heard 146 witnesses in public session. Parenthetically, I may say that well over half of the public hearings of the committee were held during the recess period of Congress. In addition, some 300 other prospective witnesses have been interviewed and screened out by staff activity. This interviewing and screening by the staff is arduous and painstaking work, but it is vital and essential in order to eliminate prospective evidence which is neither pertinent nor of value, and which would only encumber the record without providing anything of substance or benefit to this Congress or to the public. This process of screening by the staff we have found also protects the innocent from being unjustly embarrassed or smeared by unfounded charges, allegations, or testimony that would be irrelevant to the committee's objective.

We have undertaken, and are doing, extensive research in all of these fields by gathering statistics, facts, and information that will be helpful to the committee in reaching sound conclusions and in making its report and recommendations.

The few specific charges or allegations that have been brought to the committee's attention have been thoroughly investigated. In a previous report, I referred to the charges made against the junior Senator from North Dakota, Senator MILTON YOUNG, by the North Dakota Leader, a publication of Bismarck, N. Dak., which charged in large, front-page headlines, "YOUNG Sells Out Again." This article impugned Senator YOUNG's integrity as a United States Senator, and specifically his vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill. After full investigation and executive hearings, the record of which was promptly released to the press, the committee without a dissenting voice voted unanimously that the article and libelous charges made against Senator YOUNG were completely without foundation in fact; that they were utterly misleading, irresponsible, and maliciously false.

In a somewhat similar incident, the committee heard testimony from Mr. Guy Nunn, a news commentator, who in a news broadcast at 7:15 p. m., Friday, February 3, 1956, from station CKLW, Windsor, Ontario, stated to his listeners with reference to the Harris-Fulbright bill:

> It has been known for months that the gas and oil lobby has been buying Senators by the bushel.

The committee heard Mr. Nunn and gave him every opportunity to submit any facts or knowledge that he possessed, or any information available, to support his slanderous statement against the Members of the United States Senate. He failed completely to substantiate his charges and, upon reflection, admitted that his statement and insinuations and the implications of it were in error.

The committee has undertaken to supplement the work of its predecessor, the George select committee, and toward that end it has undertaken to identify the forces working for and against the Harris-Fulbright bill. It has heard testimony from representative groups interested in this legislation.

The principal associations that were most actively supporting the measure were the General Gas Committee, the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee, and the Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers. The principal groups opposing and most active against the measure were the Council of Local Gas Companies, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and the United Auto Workers Union. The committee heard testimony from representatives of each of these groups.

The Committee also heard testimony from major oil companies concerning their activities on the legislation. These included, among others, the Socony-Mobil Oil Co., the Shell Oil Co., Humble Oil & Refining Co., and the Standard Oil Companies of Indiana and California. Numerous other oil and gas companies and groups were the subject of preliminary staff inquiry.

The General Gas Committee, although registered under the Lobbying Act, was represented to be a service unit financed by the major oil companies but having no direct connection with lobbying for the legislation. However, testimony presented to the committee strongly indicated that this group was not disassociated from lobbying actvities.

The Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee was also an association created and financed by the major oil interests. It was established simultaneously with the General Gas Committee and financed generally by the same gas and oil interests. It differed from the General Gas Committee principally in that it had as its avowed purpose "the education of the public" on the subject of Federal control of gas at the wellhead. This group spent approximately $2 million pursuing this purpose over a period of some 15 months. It opposed Federal control or regulation, and therefore favored the Harris-Fulbright bill. The activities of this group, concurrent with the pendency and congressional consideration of the gas bill, engaged the committee's interest. They posed the question of the need for legislation covering the area of indirect lobbying.

The committee has brought to light a practice—possibly an exceptional one—which gives it deep concern. On two separate pieces of proposed legislation, and from geographical areas separated from each other by a thousand miles, there emanated telegram lobbying campaigns designed to promote the passage or the defeat of particular pieces of legislation. A number of telegrams were sent to Members of Congress, expressing views for or against legislation, without the consent or knowledge of the purported sender. In a number of instances, these telegrams falsely represented the true sentiments of the persons whose names were signed to them. Such actions constituted a fraud on Members of Congress to whom they were sent and on the persons whose names were used and whose views were misrepresented. This practice should not be permitted to continue with impunity.

The committee has inquired into the efforts of many other groups espousing other legislation of interest to them. We have thus far heard representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Medical Association, the American Legion, the National Milk Producers Association, the Association of American Railroads, the American Trucking Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the American Automobile Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others.

The committee undertook to select for inquiry some bill of recent legislation which involved varied types of interests. It selected the sugar bill, which was enacted during the last session of Congress. In reviewing the activities of important segments of the sugar industry, the committee has heard testimony from representatives of domestic, Territorial, and foreign sugar interests, and also representatives of the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture.

Many groups and witnesses which the committee has heard have expressed much concern over what they consider to be, and what obviously is, the vagueness of the present statutes governing legitimate representations to Congress in pursuance of the constitutional right of petition. The problems of definition in this area are intricate and substantial. The constitutional guaranty of the right of petition cannot be abridged. The committee believes there are some practices that are so clearly fraudulent and misleading that they should be prohibited by criminal penalties. But the greater problem is to spell out those legitimate activities which should be disclosed through registration and reporting. We hope the committee will be able to make recommendations to the Senate worthy of its consideration.

In the field of campaign contributions and political activities, the committee has undertaken to inform itself of practices and problems related thereto. It has solicited the assistance of and heard testimony from witnesses who appear to be in the best position to provide practical information and to give helpful counsel.

Mr. Leonard Hall and Mr. Paul Butler, chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees, respectively, were called to testify and were interrogated regarding their activities as such; how the national committees functioned, and their relationship to the State, district, and community committees and to committees of other groups, such as volunteer and citizens committees organized to support either party and their candidates.

The committee also heard from Mr. Arnold Peterson, national secretary of the Socialist Labor Party of America, as a representative of minority political groups. The chairman of the Volunteers for Stevenson and Kefauver Committee and the chairman of the Citizens for Eisenhower and Nixon Committee were also heard.

These witnesses have provided financial data respecting contributions and expenditures of their organizations and have given their views concerning the laws and practices which now exist.

Representatives of important labor groups, including the AFL–CIO committee on political education, the Machinists Nonpartisan Political League, the United Steel Workers, the United Automobile Workers, and others were called and interrogated regarding their lobbying activities and practices, and also with respect to their political activities in the raising and expenditure of campaign funds. They were also given the opportunity to make suggestions and recommendations for legislation in this field.

Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, testified regarding a plan that his union has advanced proposing a limitation on campaign contributions: specifically, that no individual would be permitted to contribute more than a total of $20 in any one campaign year. The unions' practice of collecting, by voluntary contributions, funds for use by the leaders of their national organizations to aid and support candidates of their choice was developed by testimony from various union officials.

Officials of corporations who testified before the committee were interrogated regarding their activities and contributions in support of political parties and candidates for office. All maintained that they have operated within the law and made no corporate contributions, but freely acknowledged that as individuals they contribute to the party and candidates of their choice, and in some instances they encourage their top management personnel to do likewise.

All candidates for the United States Senate in the recent election have been asked to supply the committee with certain information respecting campaign contributions received and expenditures made. This data is presently being assembled and evaluated.

To summarize, Mr. President, much work has already been done by the committee, but our task is not finished. Representatives of other groups and interests need to be heard, and some further research made and data assembled before the committee will be ready to submit its final report, conclusions, and recommendations. Obviously, the committee cannot conclude by the date of January 31, 1957, the date fixed for its expiration by the establishing resolution. Additional time will be required, and I expect to submit within the next day or two a resolution for such extension.

However, Mr. President, I am happy to report that the committee has operated economically. To date, it has expended less than one-third of the funds appropriated to it. While an extension of time for the committee to complete its task will be required, no additional funds will be needed; in fact, it is presently anticipated that approximately one-half of the funds that were made available will not be expended.

Mr. President, as I have said, within the next 2 or 3 days I hope to submit a resolution providing for a reasonable extension of time so as to give the committee an opportunity to conclude its work. I may say that each member of the committee is very anxious to conclude it; and, as chairman, I can assure my colleagues that no one is more anxious to finish the job than I am, because I have other responsibilities which are awaiting my attention.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I feel certain that I speak for the other members of the Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying when I congratulate the chairman upon his statement and also pay tribute to him for the tremendous amount of time and energy he has given to the work of the committee, particularly last fall, when the members of the committee did not, perhaps, give him the attendance that he deserved. But I think the report indicates how comprehensive the work of the committee has been to this point. That has been due in great part to the work of the chairman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations on the work he has done in studying needed revisions of the Lobbying Act. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, provisions for the registration of lobbyists were contained in the Legislative Reorganization Act. That was the first attempt to require public information concerning professional lobbying. We realize that as such those provisions lacked the basis of experience and the basis for knowing how to make the registration provisions absolutely effective.

I feel certain that the careful and exhaustive study which the chairman and his committee have given to this subject will lead to an effective lobby registration act; perhaps an act which will prohibit, by criminal penalties, the false and misleading sending of letters or telegrams to Members of Congress by those engaged in pressure activities.

I feel that, in order to protect the information given to Congress and to protect the right of Congress to act independently of pressure groups from any side, the act certainly needs to be revised and rewritten. The criminal provisions of the act were declared to be unconstitutional by a high court. This leaves further doubt as to the validity of the entire act.

Therefore, I express my appreciation for the work which the distinguished and able senior Senator from Arkansas has inaugurated. I feel certain that he will carry through to completion and bring about the passage of a modern, effective, realistic lobby registration act at this session of Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Let me say, for the information of all my colleagues, that when Congress undertakes to legislate in this area, where the Constitution requires preservation of the right of petition, it is operating in a very delicate area. When we try to draft legislation to define that which is proper and that which goes over the borderline of propriety and legality, the work is difficult and intricate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as one member of the committee, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and to commend him for the fair, impartial, and very efficient manner in which he, as chairman, presided over and conducted the hearings. At no time has he ever denied a witness the right of full expression of the witness' views; and at no time has the Senator from Arkansas ever denied any one of us, as committee members, the right either to interrogate a witness or to express our views on a question. So I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for his able job as chairman of the committee. I know we have developed information which will be helpful to the Senate in its deliberations regarding legislative proposals, which may be introduced or considered in the future, in reference to this very sensitive and important phase of our congressional work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am very glad I was present to hear his report this afternoon, and I wish to compliment him on its substance and clarity.

I was glad to follow the proceedings of the committee as closely as one could through the press, and, to some extent, otherwise. I feel that the committee has handled a very difficult assignment, and one which, at the time when the committee was formed, was regarded as being a very onerous one. In my opinion the committee has handled it in a very creditable manner.

Let me say that I do not envy the Senator from Arkansas the job he says the committee will try to perform, namely, that of safeguarding the right of petition. I wish him every success and all luck in that endeavor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am afraid that both the chairman and all the other members of the committee will need it, in order to comply with the law.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last Saturday, President Eisenhower appeared before Congress and asked that the United States make certain declarations and commitments of a very serious and far-reaching nature concerning future American policy in the Middle East.

I listened very carefully to the President's speech and since then I have gone over the text of it. In the newspapers I have read a great deal about it, and also about the reaction to it in both the United States and abroad. I have also tried to follow the statements made by the Secretary of State concerning the President's proposals.

In all, I have tried to get all the information that is available on the matter. I have done this because, after all is said and done, the President's address was an undated declaration of war.

It is obvious that situations of a very grave nature motivated him to ask for the powers he requested.

So far, I must confess that the more I delve into the proposals the President made, the more confused I become.

I should like to make it clear that I do not speak as an expert on the matter. When it comes to foreign policy, I speak strictly as a layman, because I have to depend on the debate here in the Senate and the facts the administration sees fit to release to the press.

Because of the recent declarations by officials in the administration that have appeared in various publications and in their appearances before Congress, I am deeply disturbed about all the confusion that is being created in the mind of the public.

No one seems to know who is playing what position, or even the score of the ball game. One day the President is the pitcher. The next day, the Secretary of State is on the mound.

Last October I was shocked when fighting flared again between Egypt and Israel. Then, when Britain and France moved into the picture with their armed forces, I felt that the string of uncertainty about American policy in the Middle East had run out. I thought the time had come when we must make our position strong and clear.

On October 31, the President stated emphatically that the United States would not involve our Armed Forces in the Suez crisis. In no uncertain terms, he said, we would seek settlement only through the United Nations.

I accepted this as a firm expression of our Middle East policy. But, with the President's latest proposal, things are all out of kilter again.

In view of the President's address last Saturday, if Russia, by an act of overt armed aggression were to take over the canal tomorrow, what would the United States do?

The President is committed to both a policy of working through the U. N. and a policy of go-it-alone intervention.

In regard to using American troops in the Middle East, the President said that if Congress was in session, he would maintain an hour-by-hour contact. If Congress was not in session, he said, he would at once call a special session if the need arises to use our Armed Forces.

But the President did not make clear whether he would shoot first and then consult Congress, or obtain the advice of Congress before employing the Armed Forces.

To me it seems that whatever course we take in respect to the President's request concerning the use of Armed Forces, we are shadow-boxing in the dark. In the final analysis, as Commander in Chief, the President has full authority to use the Armed Forces in a national emergency.

There are many other things that bother me about the President's so-called new program in the Middle East. The proposals dealing with future economic aid are vague.

The President asked for blanket discretion in furnishing economic aid to all Middle East nations. There is a complete lack of any proposals for long-range planning and expressions of the overall goals we seek.

Only a few weeks ago, it seemed that our general policy was to let the struggles of the Middle East be settled in the United Nations. Today it seems that we are on the road to leaving many basic problems with the U. N., and at the same time picking and choosing other squabbles in the area to settle ourselves—all at the discretion of the President.

Above all else, it seems to me that the primary problem facing us is to work out a policy upon which the world can rely. There is a crying need for positive, firm action. But to be successful, it must be a consistent policy. It cannot be one thing one day, and something else the next.

In the final analysis, I would feel a lot more secure about voting for a program if I knew we, and the world, could depend on it once it was pronounced. In the past few years, I am afraid this has not been the case.

If this new program spells the difference between the success and downfall of freedom in the Middle East, as the administration contends, then I think it is high time that we use every ounce of brain power this Nation has in making certain that we are on the right track.

Certainly, as the President acknowledged in his address, the Marshall plan and the program for aid to Greece and Turkey, for example, have done a great deal to solve some of the basic problems in that area of the world.

If this be true—and I think everyone will agree that it is true—then why cannot we bring in the people who conceived and put into operations these programs?

Would not it be wise to get the thinking of former President Truman, Dean Acheson, and Gen. George Marshall on future policies?

Certainly, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles do not have a monopoly on the knowledge of foreign affairs. But, if we can judge by past actions, it seems obvious that President Eisenhower wants this to be strictly a one-man show.

The President can nurse along any petty hatred of former President Truman he cares to indulge, but when the security of this Nation and peace in the world are involved, jealousy, pride, or stubbornness have no place in the picture.

If it would cause any genuine damage to his personal pride to call in the more experienced people like Mr. Truman, General Marshall, and Mr. Acheson and get their ideas on the subject, then I think it is high time President Eisenhower took a deep gulp and swallowed his pride when it comes to the future security of this Nation.

Until this day, so far as I know, Mr. Eisenhower has refused to seek the advice of any of the people who formulated many of the programs he praises as successful in combating communism.

President Truman proved, in spite of any differences of political opinion, that it is wise to use all resources at hand. After all, President Truman asked former President Hoover to carry out the reorganization studies of the Government. When the welfare of the Nation is at stake, petty political and personal feuds are ridiculous.

If we are to prove to the world that we really mean well in the Middle East, then we have got to put all the know-how we have into this program.

At the present we are following a grab-bag, catch-as-catch-can policy to do it. Only in recent months we have shown the world that any of our policies are subject to change without notice. And, in the eyes of the world, our Secretary of State is the champion quick-change artist when it comes to diplomacy.

The management of the State Department needs a good cleaning out. We have got to rebuild confidence from the bottom up.

In order to make effective any policies the Congress might work out, foreign nations will have to do business with somebody in the State Department who can be depended upon not to change his mind every time the wind changes.

Mr. Dulles has demonstrated time and time again that he is not dependable. And nations all over the world, even our closest allies, have demonstrated that they have lost confidence in our present Secretary of State.

Regardless of what course Congress decides to take in the Middle East, Secretary Dulles is not qualified to carry out the program as it should be conducted.

Because of his unique talent to confuse things, I think it would be in the interest of national security for Mr. Dulles to resign as Secretary of State.

If the President expects to keep this country on an even keel in foreign affairs then he must have a Secretary of State who generates confidence instead of confusion. I say this with all sincerity, because we must start with a clean board.

I can also say with all sincerity that I am willing to do anything to halt the spread of communism anywhere, but I would feel a lot better about proceeding with a new policy if Mr. Dulles was not calling the signals.

I have nothing whatever against him personally, but the time has come when we must put the future of our country beyond politics.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the concluding

remarks of the Senator from North Carolina, and I should not want to let them pass without stating strongly that I could not disagree more with him than I do with respect to his calling for the resignation of the Secretary of State. I wish to dissent strongly from the views he has just expressed for the RECORD.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate and for the benefit of the Senators who may read the RECORD, that the Senate will assemble in its Chamber at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow; that at 12:15 o'clock we will gather at the door of the Chamber and proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint session of Congress, to hear the President's message.

At the conclusion of the joint session, under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess. The Senate will not return to its Chamber to transact any business. The Senate will recess at the conclusion of the joint session, and the recess will be until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

So that all Members of the Senate may make their plans accordingly, I have made this announcement at this time.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Influence of Congress on Military Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 9, 1957

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address which I delivered for the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations before the Air War College, at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., on December 13, 1956, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INFLUENCE OF CONGRESS ON MILITARY STRATEGY

(Address by Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman, Defense Department Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations Committee, before the Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., December 13, 1956)

INTRODUCTION

General Giffin, faculty and students of the Air War College, I consider it a very real honor to be invited to address the students of the Air War College. In my position on the Senate Appropriations Committee, my connection with the Board of Visitors of the Air Academy, and as a private citizen I have always been an avid supporter of our Air Force and have long felt that the greatest security of this country lies in having the strongest and finest Air Force in the world. The select group to whom I am speaking represents, I know, the pick of the men whose ability and courage in their chosen field are unequaled in any other nation.

Thus, knowing a little about your own backgrounds, I confess I was a bit startled when asked to speak on the subject of military strategy.

But since I shall not discuss military strategy but relationship of the Congress to military strategy, perhaps I shall be on safe ground.

MILITARY STRATEGY DEFINED

When we speak of the influence of Congress on military strategy, the first question which comes to mind is what is meant by the term. Obviously, I will use it in its broadest sense. It will not mean, for example, strategy as Clausewitz defined it, "The use of battles in furtherance of war." But rather, the most effective use of our military machine for the general welfare.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The Founding Fathers of this Nation realized from the start the necessity of providing a military force sufficient to repel or discourage foreign invasion and suppress possible civil insurrection. Madison pointed out that "public force must be used, when resistance to the laws required it, otherwise the society itself must be destroyed."

And Justice Joseph Storey was later to state that "the surest means of avoiding war is to be prepared for it in peace." To these men, then, a standing military force was recognized as essential to the continued safety of our country.

At the same time, the men who wrote the Constitution were profoundly aware of the need for safeguards against the misuse of such a force once it was created. Their recent experience with the redcoats of King George reminded them as we find in the Federalist papers, that the people might well find themselves "crushed between standing armies and perpetual taxes" and that "the liberties of Rome proved the final victim of her military triumphs."

With this in mind, the Constitutional Convention placed in the hands of the Congress the power to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; the power to declare war; and the power to raise and support armies and a navy.

They did this with the knowledge that the Congress was to be the expression of the will of the majority of the people. It gave them assurance to provide that one branch of the Congress and one-third of the other branch were to be elected every 2 years.

With even greater caution, they provided that the President—another elected official, but separate from the Congress—shall be the Commander in Chief. They even added a further safeguard against the Congress itself: that no appropriation of money for the support of the Army shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Then in article I, section 8, the Founding Fathers further stated that the Congress shall have the power to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

It is on these constitutional provisions, in dealing with defense matters, that the power of the Congress rests.

Obviously this is both a responsibility and a sacred trust. What is involved here are the peace and security of our country and the welfare of our people. It is no wonder, therefore, that more time is spent by Congress in dealing with matters relating to defense than with any other single problem area.

Writers on the subject of the constitutional powers of the Government agree that the power of the National Government in wartime is clear, but there is doubt as to which branch—the executive or the legislative—may exercise that power. Thus Madison found that Congress was given the right to declare war rather than to make war because the latter might be understood to conduct it, which was an executive function. And the courts have stated that "the President cannot, under the disguise of military orders, evade the legislative regulations by which he in common with the Army must be governed; and Congress cannot in the disguise of rules for the government of the Army impair the authority of the President as Commander in Chief."

Down through the pages of our history we will find both the executive and the legislative jealous of their prerogatives. That our Government has emerged stronger and better balanced through the years is a tribute both to the wisdom of the initial planners of the Constitution and to the willingness on the part of both branches to place the welfare of the country above personal convictions.

BASIC DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

In the discharge of its constitutional responsibilities for the Armed Forces, the Congress is faced with three fundamental mandates. These are as follows:

1. To provide the basic legislation necessary for the operation of the Defense Establishment;

2. To provide adequate funds for the maintenance and operation of that establishment; and

3. To ascertain, through the investigative process, that the substantive laws and the appropriation acts are carried out according to the intent of the Congress.

The problems arising from this congressional responsibility are many and complex. Some of the major areas I have grouped for convenience sake into what may be called the four "M's." These are money, men, material, and management.

Let us examine each briefly.

Money: For the present fiscal year the Congress appropriated for the Department of Defense a little over $36 billion. This is 58 percent of the total amount appropriated for the operation of the whole Government. It is 20 times the amount appropriated for defence in the last peacetime year of 1940, and it is 40 percent of the amount appropriated in 1944, when our defense appropriations reached an all-time high. Present defense efforts and commitments from past wars take almost 90 percent of the annual budget.

To equate the needs of the military to the capacity of the Nation to absorb these vast expenditures has no easy solution. One Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated the matter simply: "If we do not have war, I am asking for too much money; if we do have war, I am not asking for nearly enough." The Congress would like nothing better than to appropriate much larger sums

for defense, if needed, than it does. So would the departments, the Secretary of Defense, the President, the Bureau of the Budget. Yet each of these control groups makes reductions in worthwhile requests because, in the overall picture, the total of the requests would strain the economy of the country.

I am sure that the general public does not realize that congressional cuts of appropriations for the Armed Forces are almost negligible when compared with the reductions made by the executive branch. Furthermore, at no time in my memory has Congress cut Defense Department requests so as to impair the carrying out of the overall strategic concepts of the establishment. On the other hand, the Congress has made very sizable increases in appropriations—over and above the President's request—not once but repeatedly. Of this I shall speak later.

We believe strongly in economy, but we do not place it above national security when we vote.

Men: Next to the problem of adequate funds is the manpower problem. You are as familiar as I with many of its aspects.

Not only is the Congress concerned with actual levels of forces, but we are required to be intimately familiar with a myriad of details such as promotion procedures and policies, retirements, pay scales, commissaries and exchanges, dependents' schooling and a host of others.

These problems associated with manpower are frequently the most perplexing, dealing as they do with human values as well as defense objectives.

Material: Because of the tremendous advances in the sciences in recent years, this is a relatively new problem which has engrossed the Congress, along with much of the scientific brains of the country. Basically it poses the question "Are we progressing rapidly enough in the development and procurement of modernized weapons and materiel?" This subject is probably the source of more congressional inquiries than any other.

Because of our interests, we have actually forced the acceleration in the research and development program on new weapons and weapons systems. We continue to push the production of the most modern military aircraft and are intimately concerned in assuring accelerated missiles development and production.

Management: Congressional problems related to this subject include most of the investigative work of congressional committees. The subject matter is varied, and includes such items as the economical and efficient use of funds, manpower, and materiel; the question as to whether the departments are well organized and well prepared for their functions; and the problem of interservice rivalries.

It is through the search for satisfactory answers to these questions that the Congress has entered into the field of military strategy.

CAUSES OF CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST IN MILITARY STRATEGY

I believe that at no time in our history has the Congress taken as much interest in the policies of the Military Establishment as it has since World War II. One reason for this has been the introduction of thermonuclear weapons. Another war, if it comes, will dwarf other wars by comparison. It is the responsibility of the Congress to assure itself and the American people that we are preparing ourselves properly for our defense. If we are ever caught napping, it will be a permanent sleep for democracy.

Another reason, I believe, is the end of isolationism. In terms of heavy bomber speed, the world has shrunk to one-third its size 10 years ago. We no longer have two great oceans as bastions of defense. The safety of nautical miles has been destroyed by the supersonic power of the jet thrust.

From another viewpoint, isolationism died with the beginnings of foreign aid. The billions of dollars we have poured into friendly hands around the globe for military defense have tied our strategic concepts with those of foreign countries. The necessity for the Congress to make a thorough examination of these vast sums yearly has of itself brought about interest in our unified defense.

Still another reason is the complexity of modern warfare. You gentlemen are familiar with the mechanical labyrinth which is the foundation of the modern war machine. But its effect on the economy of the country, on the taxpayer, on a multitude of contractors and workers, on our youth and schools and universities, are responsibilities of the Congress.

Congress has asserted this responsibility largely when it has believed phases of defense planning are lagging behind current military requirements, when controversies have occurred, and when weaknesses of policy or individuals have revealed soft spots which require remedy.

Gen. Omar Bradley, when he was Chief of Staff, stated: "Under our form of government, the military policy of the United States is shaped by the Congress, not by the Armed Forces, * * * because the Congress controls the appropriations which, in the final analysis, * * * control the military policy."

The realization of this does not lie lightly on the heads of congressional leaders.

EXAMPLES OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I should like now to give you a few examples of congressional awareness of its responsibility in maintaining a strong defense.

The Armed Services Committees, which handle substantive legislation, the Appropriations Committees, the Committees on Government Operations, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have all assumed important roles.

From the Armed Services Committees came the National Security Act of 1947. This was the legislation which created the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the unified Department of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No legislation has ever had more lasting strategic effect on military policy.

Since then the Congress has delved into the B–36 controversy, the cancellation of the 65,000-ton carrier, the question whether strategic bombing furthered the national objectives, the reduction in strength of the Marine Corps and the marine air arm, the problem of planning for partial mobilization, the use of inactive Reservists, the reasons for the ammunition shortage in Korea, procurement policies, the Nike-Talos controversy, and, of course, the adequacy of our airpower.

THE MACHINERY OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

You will note that most of the instances just referred to were either legislative or investigative in character. This brings us to the fiscal relationship of the Congress with the Defense Establishment, which is handled by the Appropriations Committees through the machinery of hearings. Despite the many commitments of Senators, hearings on the defense bill are usually long and exhaustive. This past year our Senate hearings began on May 8 and did not conclude until June 12. They ran to over 1,300 compact pages of testimony from every branch of the services from the Secretary of Defense to the smallest of units.

Tremendous masses of material are utilized by the Members in their consideration of the defense bill. In addition to the Budget itself, the Members have the testimony, including prepared statements, to refer to. Constant reference is made to the so-called justifications, the Air Force alone last year presenting over 50 volumes of these justifications which were examined by the committee and its staff.

Most of the members of the defense subcommittees have served for many years reviewing defense requirements. This is also true of the members of the Armed Services Committees. To give a few examples, Chairman HAYDEN, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has been dealing with defense appropriations since 1927; Senator RUSSELL, also chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, since 1933; Senator BRIDGES since 1937; Senator SALTONSTALL since 1947; Chairman MAHON, of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has worked on defense appropriations since 1940; Congressman CANNON, chairman of the full committee, since 1929; Congressman TABER since 1923. Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Congressman VINSON, has been studying defense legislation since 1917. I cannot equal Mr. VINSON'S long record. I have been associated with the defense budget for only 18 years.

In addition many Members of Congress have backgrounds of military service. Of the 23 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, 17 have served in the Armed Forces.

The members are constantly adding to their knowledge by visiting field installations during the time when Congress is not in session. Staff members are at work 12 months of the year reviewing defense problems and preparing information for the use of the committees.

This impressive record, I believe, speaks for itself. Certainly no stone is left unturned by the members to make themselves as well informed on defense matters as is humanly possible.

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION IN 1940

During my own congressional life I have been closely associated with the Senate Appropriations Committee and that committee's relationship to the Department of Defense. I believe that it will help provide a fuller understanding of the role of the Congress in securing a strong Defense Establishment if I recount certain highlights of those years.

I came on the Senate Appropriations Committee in January of 1939. Eight months later Hitler marched into Poland and World War II began. The following April the war Department came before our committee to defend its budget for the fiscal year 1941.

After hearing several days' testimony, the committee was not satisfied with the nominal amounts included in the request. As one member stated, "Anyone who reads the hearings will note that the principal discussion is not what was in the bill, but what ought to be in the bill in order properly to meet the situation which confronts us."

As a result of this committee dissatisfaction with the amounts requested, a confidential letter was sent to the War Department. Departmental officials were told that although they might feel bound by budget limitations, the committee was not. The letter requested full information as to what changes should be made in the bill to accomplish a stronger defense.

After the letter was sent, but before a reply was received, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg were invaded.

Six days after the reply was received, the Senate committee reported a bill which increased the amounts to be provided for the War Department by 100 percent. Subsequent events were ample proof of the wisdom of the Senate's position.

For the most part through the years the Congress and its committees have accepted military policies as initiated by our defense planners. But the Congress has not hesitated on occasion in voicing its doubt as to

the adequacy of certain phases of our defense posture.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE

As long ago as in April of 1948—2 years before Korea—the Congress sensed the inadequacy of our airpower, and over the objections of the administration increased funds for the Air Force by over $700 million to provide for an Air Force of 70 groups. You will recall that these funds were subsequently impounded.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

The question often is asked, "Is the role of Congress limited to accepting or reducing defense budget requests since it is the prerogative of the Executive to impound the funds appropriated when they exceed the amount of the President's request?"

My answer to that is a vehement "No."

It is true that the President has on occasion impounded funds appropriated by the Congress. It is also true that the President has refused to obligate funds included in his own request. He impounded funds in 1948, as I mentioned, for the 70-group Air Force. He did so, in effect at least, in 1956 with funds to maintain the Marine Corps at the then present strength. I shall speak about this in a moment.

The responsibility for these reductions in potential power lies then with the Executive, and not with the Congress. And the effect of moral suasion, public pressure, and an open mind may yet bring the Executive around to the thinking of the Congress. Certainly, the Congress was proved right in regard to the need for more airpower subsequent to 1948. We can only hope that future events will not give it further justication.

DIFFICULTY IN ELICITING WITNESSES' CONVICTIONS

When the Congress doubts that the funds requested by the Executive are sufficient to provide adequate defense, it finds most witnesses extremely reluctant to venture their own opinions.

During and after the Korean emergency, the hearings before congressional committees were replete with such questions as, Do you have enough money? Many times we have despaired when the answers have been guarded and equivocal "yeses," couched in ambiguous language. Sometimes the answer will be, "within the limits of the budgetary ceilings imposed upon us, and short of all-out war, we believe the funds to be sufficient," or more briefly: "We stand by the budget estimate." These answers are understandable, human, and predicated upon the rule that requires support of policies laid down by a higher command, but they do not ease the problems of the Congress in determining the adequacy and the correctness of the Executive's strategic concept. I might add that notable exceptions to this have been the candid and forthright testimony of Generals Vandenburg, Twining, Ridgway, and LeMay.

1956 MARINE AMENDMENTS

There are a number of recent examples of congressional action when the adequacy of the budget was questioned.

A little over a year ago, my subcommittee felt that the administration's cuts in Marine Corps strength were ill advised and untimely. As a result, funds were provided which would have maintained the Marine Corps at a constant strength. But these funds were never allocated to the Marine Corps.

1956 AIR FORCE SPENDING

In another instance, during the consideration of the 1956 budget, many Members of the Senate expressed grave doubts as to the adequacy of the Air Force production goals. These doubts became very real alarm when the Defense Department released information previously unpublished, about recent advances in the Soviet's air capabilities. The resulting furor was only quieted when the Secretary of Defense came before our committee, requested, and received an increase of $356 million over the amount previously provided. This additional sum permitted the Air Force to increase the production rate of the B–52 bomber by 35 percent over the previously planned production rate, and permitted the conversion of the B–36 heavy bomber wings to B–52 jet aircraft at an earlier date than contemplated. Although it cannot be proved, there is no doubt in my mind that the grave alarm voiced by Congress over the unlooked-for advances in Russian capability had a very real influence over the rightful decision of the Department to ask for additional funds immediately.

1957 BILLION-DOLLAR AMENDMENT

Again, in this past session of the Congress, I believed that the funds requested for the Air Force were far short of providing us with an air strength necessary to our needs in such troubled times. At my insistence, we invited General LeMay to testify on the requirements of the Strategic Air Command. In addition, the high-ranking officials were searchingly questioned regarding related aspects of our defense needs. As a result, I offered an amendment which added a billion dollars to the Air Force appropriation for strategic bombers, tactical aircraft, tankers, and research and development. The amendment passed and some of these funds have, I understand, been utilized.

ANOTHER BATTLE LOOMING?

And now in this coming year it looks as though another fight is shaping up. The Secretary of Defense in a memorandum to the members of the Armed Forces Policy Council on November 26 last stated that "it is evident that the tactical air forces programed for Army support should be reconsidered and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been requested to furnish me"—the Secretary of Defense—"with their recommendations for specific adjustments as to the number and types of planned Army guided missile and unguided rocket units and with the number of Air Force tactical wings which may be eliminated as a result of these decisions."

If this is another attempt to reduce the 137-wing Air Force goal, I, for one, shall do everything in my power to defeat that purpose. I do not believe that in this time of world stress it is practical to reduce production goals in this essential weapon of defense. I stated when I first learned of this proposal that Congress has a responsibility here. I think we will win out on this matter as we did before.

CONCLUSION

I and my committee know that material resources are not the sole determiner of military effectiveness. In the last analysis our real strength lies in the caliber of men within the services. I know of your problems in recruiting and retaining skilled manpower. Our action to provide medical care for your dependents, to improve the survivors' benefit program, to increase reenlistment bonuses, to provide for increased military housing, to authorize increased mileage and temporary duty allowances, to improve retirement benefits, just to cite a few, were all designed to improve your life in a military career. I also recognize that more must be done and I visualize the need for a readjustment in the rates of military pay for technical personnel.

This country and all the free world are today threatened by a force which is as strong as it is evil. Men like yourselves stand ready to make the necessary sacrifices so that our country and our way of life shall endure.

You are the military planners of the future. As such you can expect the Congress to continue to play an active role in evolving those programs which so profoundly affect our daily life and our national safety.

If the efforts of the Congress at times appear laborious, it is because of the complexities involved. But in our concern for effective military forces we are just as cognizant of our responsibilities to you and your families as we are of our responsibilities to the American people—those whom you serve.

Through a clearer understanding of our mutual convictions and our mutual problems we can work together toward the common goal of peace and security.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who has promised that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee: Thou hast so made us that the glory of our lives can never be beneath us, but always above us. So, from the deep valley of our need for light and guidance, we lift our eyes to the shining peaks that break the far horizons. Even in these fields of time, Thou hast set eternity in our hearts. With that sense of the unseen strong within us, in a clamorous world where the lowest is so commonly the loudest, we bow at this wayside shrine, that the highest may have a chance at our lives.

As this day there is surveyed by the Nation's Chief Executive the state of the Republic and of the agitated world it is called by Thy providence to serve, we commend our country and ourselves into Thy hands, praying that, unworthy though we are, even as we strive eagerly to purge the defects which mar our democracy, Thou wilt use us to defeat the defiling blasphemies which defy Thy kingdom. Nerve us, we pray, for the sacrifices which the better world of our dreams will demand. According to Thy purpose, may the high aims for which we contend come to their final coronation in a brotherhood of nations where justice, truth, freedom, and the sacred dignity of all Thy children shall be secure in all the earth. We ask in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 9, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON was

excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate because of official business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit other resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me express the hope that we shall be able to go to the Hall of the House of Representatives a little after 10 minutes after 12; and some time in the intervening period I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D. C., for the year ended December 31, 1956, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the foreign policy of the administration of President Eisenhower; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the enactment of legislation to include Puerto Rico in the Federal program of financial aid for disaster stricken areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's policy on the civil rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's program for an increased purchasing power for the labor class, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's plan for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 511. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 512. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. NEELY):

S. 513. A bill for the relief of Ines Giacomelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a Federal tax lien shall not be valid, as against a holder of a mechanic's lien, until notice of such tax lien has been duly filed; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 516. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into and to execute an amendatory contract with the Northport Irrigation District, Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MALONE):

S. 517. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 518. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person; and

S. 519. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Eleanor M. Horton;

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Fernando Urriza Duralde and his wife, Pilar Ampuero Duralde; and

S. 522. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 524. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Gross;

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Elizabeth Graubart; and

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Tikva Polsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 527. A bill for the relief of Achille Aquino Fu' Giovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 528. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 529. A bill providing for the acceptance by the United States of a conveyance by the town of Hammond, Oreg., of the military cemetery formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 530. A bill for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung); and

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Erika Ohm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 532. A bill to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 533. A bill to provide for the inclusion of employees of the Memorial Hospital, Cumberland, as participants in the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. POTTER):

S. 534. A bill to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconditioning, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in the continental United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 535. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services;

S. 537. A bill authorizing the Commissioner of Public Housing to convey certain land to the State of Arizona for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency;

S. 538. A bill to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 539. A bill directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study

the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

S. 540. A bill for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 542. A bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit retired officers and enlisted men to use available hospital facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 543. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to provide increased punishment for persons convicted of a felony for the fourth time; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 544. A bill to provide for the modification of the authorization for the flood protection project at Jackson Hole, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 545. A bill to amend section 204 (d) of the Small Business Act of 1953 relating to the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DROUGHT RELIEF FOR TEXAS AND THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have lately returned from Texas, and it is with regret and concern that I announce the continued existence in my State—as well as in the Southwest generally—of an unprecedented and disastrous drought.

In many areas of Texas this drought is now in its 8th year. Many cattlemen have been forced to sacrifice their herds of livestock. Many small farmers have been forced to abandon their land.

Mr. President, the present Federal drought-relief program is inadequate. It does not propose to do enough. What it does propose is too often bogged down in a maze of bureaucratic redtape.

The present disaster in Texas and the Southwest might well become a permanent condition unless we provide a program which not only will give immediate relief where it is needed, but also will enable landowners to give their land an opportunity to recover its former productivity.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill containing a plan for meeting these two pressing needs.

As immediate assistance, this proposal specifically instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to give assistance in providing protein-food concentrates—that is, cottonseed cake. An immediate supply of protein cake is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the range herds of the drought-stricken pasture areas.

The second section of this program is much more far reaching, and is of tremendous long-range importance. It calls for the conduct of an extensive soil-conservation program, through the use of a deferred grazing program.

The present situation is this, Mr. President: The average cattleman finds his pastures almost completely without grass. When the first rain comes, he will be under great pressure to put livestock back on any land where grass will grow. He has many back bills to pay, and he cannot pay them except by putting stock on his land. Yet, it is obvious that this land should be given a chance to recover. Otherwise, large areas of the Southwest may become desert land, unfit for human or animal habitation.

This bill would require the Department of Agriculture to make payments to landowners who will agree to defer the use of their depleted pasturelands for periods of not less than 1 year. This program would become immediately effective in the drought-disaster area, and would continue for a period of 3 years after the drought has broken. The bill provides for payments at the normal annual rental value of the land.

Mr. President, this program will make it possible for our hard-hit stockmen to do what they know is sound from a conservation standpoint, but what they cannot afford to do unless an adequate Government program is provided.

I urge upon Members of the Senate their study of this bill and their sympathetic consideration of the problems it would help to solve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 511) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), to meet what we understand to have been certain objections of the President when he signed the bill H. R. 5881 into law last summer. At that time, it was agreed by sponsors of the measure in both Houses that a proposal to amend the law would be made to the 85th Congress. On those assurances, the President signed the bill, notwithstanding his objection to certain language with respect to possible unlawful delegation of power to congressional committees or an unconstitutional infringement on the separation of powers prescribed by the Constitution.

The language of the bill we are introducing is identical to that of the Watershed Protection Act, (Public Law 1018), 84th Congress, approved by the President on August 7, 1956, and to that of the Public Buildings Lease-Purchase Act of 1954, which was approved July 22, 1954 (68 Stat. 518).

In essence, our amendment provides that before an appropriation is made for financial participation by the United States in a small-projects contract, such financial participation shall be approved by the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. Under this amendment, the Congress will exercise financial control over the small-projects program, through its duly constituted committees having jurisdiction.)

We trust that in both Houses early hearings will be held on this and similar bills, so that the small-projects program may be gotten underway.

The 17 western reclamation States are intensely concerned with this program, which will contribute greatly to western irrigation stabilization and development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 517) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASED MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to raise the level of monthly compensation payments to service-connected disabled veterans and their dependents.

The continued rise in the cost of living has steadily depreciated the present compensation payments to veterans who have suffered disabling injury or illness during military service.

In addition, the present disability payment for the totally disabled, who are so handicapped as to preclude employment of any kind, is at the very low level of $181 monthly. Such a payment provides far less than is adequate for even marginal living standards, and needs to be given a firm boost even beyond increases designed to take up the slack caused by the rise in living costs.

Consequently increases under this bill range from $3 a month for the 10-percent disability ratings to an increase of $69 for the 100-percent disabled. In addition, there are moderate increases in compensation payments for dependents of the disabled veterans, and in the statutory awards.

This proposal has the full support of the Disabled American Veterans, who are intimately familiar with the plight of the service-connected veteran, and who know at first hand the quiet tragedy of men who have sacrificed their health in the service of the Nation.

No group of living Americans deserves greater consideration and respect than our disabled veterans, and it seems to me to be our clear duty to see that they and their families are not permitted to slip into poverty and disillusionment through our failure to see what is happening to them because of the continued rise in living costs.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 535) to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraphs (a) to (j) inclusive, of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If and while the disability is rated 10 percent the monthly compensation shall be $20.

"(b) If and while the disability is rated 20 percent the monthly compensation shall be $40.

"(c) If and while the disability is rated 30 percent the monthly compensation shall be $60.

"(d) If and while the disability is rated 40 percent the monthly compensation shall be $80.

"(e) If and while the disability is rated 50 percent the monthly compensation shall be $100.

"(f) If and while the disability is rated 60 percent the monthly compensation shall be $120.

"(g) If and while the disability is rated 70 percent the monthly compensation shall be $140.

"(h) If and while the disability is rated 80 percent the monthly compensation shall be $160.

"(i) If and while the disability is rated 90 percent the monthly compensation shall be $180.

"(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be $250."

SEC. 2. (a) Subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by deleting "$47" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$55," and the subparagraph is further amended by increasing the maximum rate of compensation set forth therein to $450 per month.

(b) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (l), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $300.

(c) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (m), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $350.

(d) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (n), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $400.

(e) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (o) and the maximum rate payable under subparagraph (p), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby increased to $450.

(f) The minimum rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (q), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for an arrested tuberculous disease, is hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 3. The basic rate of compensation provided by section 202 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for any disability rated as total is hereby increased to $250 per month. If and while the disability is rated as partial, the monthly compensation shall be the same percentage of $200 as the degree of the reduction in earning capacity resulting from the disability but no compensation shall be payable for a reduction in earning capacity rated at less than 10 percent.

SEC. 4. The rate of compensation payable under section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for the loss of the use of both eyes is hereby increased to $300; the rate payable under that section for the loss of use of both eyes and one or more limbs is hereby increased to $400; the rate payable under that section for double total permanent disability is hereby increased to $400; and the additional compensation payable under that section for the loss of the use of a creative organ or one or more feet or hands is hereby increased to $55: *Provided,* That in no event shall the rate of compensation received hereunder plus the amounts payable under any other provision of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, exceed $450 per month in any case.

SEC. 5. The additional sum payable under section 202 (5) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for a disabled person in need of a nurse or attendant, is hereby increased to $80.

SEC. 6. The minimum rate of compensation payable under section 202 (7) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for an arrested tuberculous disease, is hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 740), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, 73d Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $25;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $41;

"(c) has a wife and 2 children living, $53;

"(d) has a wife and 3 or more children living, $65;

"(e) has no wife but 1 child living, $17;

"(f) has no wife but 2 children living, $29;

"(g) has no wife but 3 or more children living, $41;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then in addition to the above amounts, $21 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 10 percent, in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress (38 U. S. C. 741), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents at a rate equal to 80 percent of the additional compensation now or hereafter payable under section 1."

SEC. 8. The increases provided by this act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

AMENDMENT OF RULE 22—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, again I wish to announce to the Senate, as I have previously, that the resolution proposing an amendment to rule 22, which I submitted, and which is at the desk, will remain there until tonight, in order to give any other Members of the Senate who may so desire an opportunity to add their names to the resolution as cosponsors.

The resolution was submitted jointly by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and myself and other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I believe that at the present time the resolution has more than 33 cosponsors, both Republicans and Democrats. All other Senators are cordially invited to join in sponsoring the resolution, which will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration at the close of business today.

So I express the hope that any other Senators who desire to join in cosponsoring the resolution will do so.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 1957,

The name of Mr. BIBLE was added as a cosponsor of the following bills, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 39. A bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans; and

S. 40. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict.

The names of Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. WATKINS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 86) to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, on January 7, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. EASTLAND were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 313) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 7, 1957.

The names of Mr. MORTON, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 7, 1957.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address on the subject of the need for scientific and technical education in the United States, delivered by Senator SYMINGTON before the American Vocational Association at St. Louis, Mo., on December 6, 1956.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, Friday, January 11, 1957, marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, a remarkable man, to whom the United States of America and the State of New York owe much. By proclamation of the President, the entire year beginning January 11, 1957, is designated as the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial. Several appropriate observances have been arranged for the year, by or in cooperation with the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, which was created by the 83d Congress, and of which I have the honor to be a member.

Hamilton is known and justly famed for his pivotal role in the framing of our magnificent form of Government. He is likewise remembered for his success in winning public understanding and approval of the new Constitution through the renowned series of essays known as "The Federalist." Hamilton conceived the notion of The Federalist papers, and wrote most of them. Hamilton is perhaps most famous of all for his enduring accomplishments as our Nation's first Secretary of the Treasury, a post in which he labored with outstanding success to put the Nation's finances on a sound and reputable basis.

Hamilton is remembered by New Yorkers for these accomplishments, of course, but also for some others which are less well known outside the State. It was he who represented New York at the Constitutional Convention. It was his personal leadership which overcame a hostile majority at the New York State ratification convention, and brought New York into the Federal Union.

In 1793, despite his many burdens, Hamilton agreed to serve as a trustee of a school which was being established in New York State, for the education of the Oneida Indians. That school, originally named the Hamilton-Oneida Academy, is now Hamilton College, of which I am proud to be an alumnus and a trustee.

As President Eisenhower said in proclaiming the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial—

Alexander Hamilton served his country well throughout his life.

RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Honorable George Wharton Pepper, once a distinguished member of this body, and for many years a civic leader and outstanding member of the bar of the State of Pennsylvania, has submitted for my attention a statement in reply to recent attacks upon the Supreme Court of the United States.

His statement represents the thinking of a group of American lawyers—100 in number—who reside in 31 States and Territories of the United States. It concerns a matter of great national significance, not only to the legal profession, but to every American citizen.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement, together with the names of the lawyers who signed it, printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—A STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE BAR

As members of the bar we have been deeply disturbed by recent attacks on the Supreme Court of the United States. No institution of our Government, including the judiciary, stands beyond the reach of criticism; but these attacks have been so reckless in their abuse, so heedless of the value of judicial review, and so dangerous in fomenting disrespect for our highest law that they deserve to be repudiated by the legal profession and by every thoughtful citizen.

The Constitution is our supreme law. In many of its most important provisions it speaks in general terms, as is fitting in a document intended, as John Marshall declared, "to endure for ages to come." In cases of disagreement we have established the judiciary to interpret the Constitution for us. The Supreme Court is the embodiment of judicial power, and under its evolving interpretation of the great constitutional clauses—commerce among the States, due process of law, and equal protection of the laws, to name examples—we have achieved national unity, a nationwide market for goods, and government under the guarantees of the Bill of Rights. To accuse the Court of usurping authority when it reviews legislative acts, or of exercising "naked power" is to jeopardize the very institution of judicial review. To appeal for "resistance" to decisions of the Court "by any lawful means" is to utter a self-contradiction, whose ambiguity can only be calculated to promote disrespect for our fundamental law. The privilege of criticising a decision of the Supreme Court carries with it a corresponding obligation—a duty to recognize the decision as the supreme law of the land as long as it remains in force.

There are ways of bringing about changes in constitutional law, but resistance is not such a way. Changes may be wrought by seeking an overruling decision, or by constitutional amendment. It is through the amending process, and not by resistance, that the people and the States stand as the ultimate authority.

The current wave of abuse was doubtless precipitated by the school segregation decisions, though it has by no means been limited to them. Since our position does not depend on agreement with those decisions, it is not our purpose to discuss their merits. As individuals we are entitled to our own views of their soundness. Some of us are definitely in disagreement with them. In an appendix we have sought to put these decisions in historical perspective and our signatures to this declaration are intended to evidence our approval of the statements in the appendix. Our present concern is for something more fundamental than any one decision or group of decisions; our concern is for the tradition of law observance and respect for the judiciary, a tradition indispensable to the cherished independence of our judges and orderly progress under law.

The American Bar has been alert to defend the judiciary against assaults which would undermine the Rule of Law, and to make plain to the American public the dangers lurking in such challenges. In 1937 when the Court was threatened, the bar rallied to its support as an institution, regardless of individual dissatisfaction which many felt toward important decisions of that time. We must do no less today.

The signers of this statement represent diverse political outlooks and geographic associations. We are all the more firmly united in our resolve to defend the Rule of Law against the present challenge.

APPENDIX

Occasionally in our history decisions of the Court have met with official resistance on the part of one or more States. No section of the country has had a monopoly on such aberrations, and in their outcome these episodes have only served to strengthen the tradition of respect for law. In 1803 the legislature of Pennsylvania asserted that a Federal court had illegally usurped jurisdiction and that its decree ought not to be supported or obeyed. Reviewing this action, the Supreme Court in 1809, through Chief Justice Marshall, took note of a supposed right of interposition:

"The act in question does not, in terms, assert the universal right of the State to interpose in every case whatever; but assigns, as a motive for its interposition in this particular case, that the sentence, the execution of which it prohibits, was rendered in a cause over which the Federal courts have no jurisdiction."

The answer which Marshall gave is as valid and compelling today as it was almost a century and a half ago:

"If the legislatures of the several States may, at will annul the judgments of the courts of the United States, and destroy the rights acquired under these judgments, the Constitution itself becomes a solemn mockery; and the Nation is deprived of the means of enforcing its laws by the instrumentality of its own tribunals. So fatal a result must be deprecated by all; and the people of Pennsylvania, not less than the citizens of every other State, must feel a deep interest in resisting principles so destructive of the Union, and in averting consequences so fatal to themselves." (5 Cranch 115, 136 (1809).)

The President at the time was James Madison, whose earlier views may have given some reason to the Governor of Pennsylvania to solicit his support. But when thus approached, Madison was firm in upholding the rule of law. He said: "* * * the Executive is not only unauthorized to prevent the execution of a decree sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States, but is expressly enjoined, by statute, to carry into effect any such decree, where opposition may be made to it." (Cong. Globe, 11th Cong. 2d sess., p. 2269 quoted in I Warren Supreme Court in United States History, p. 382).

It is unnecessary to recount additional episodes of this kind. Surmounting attacks prompted by local pressures, it was this very authority of the Court that served to foster reconciliation after the Civil War, when State and Federal statutes disqualifying former supporters of the Confederacy from public and professional employment were held by the Court to be repugnant to the Constitution as bills of attainder. Thus the attacks on the power of the Court proved to be as short sighted as they were short lived.

Concerning the school cases themselves, it should be enough to point out that they do not warrant any departure from our tradition of respect for law. It has been said that they were a usurpation because the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment does not speak of schools and Congress had not legislated on the subject. But the equal protection clause was deliberately

couched in general terms; it does not speak of jury service or transportation or any of the other specific fields in which the Court has been faced with racially restrictive laws. These problems must be resolved by the Court.

Whether as individuals we agree or disagree with the school decisions, we recognize that they were the culmination of a steady line of growth in the application of the concept of equal protection of the law, and that each stage was preceded by sincere and determined opposition. In 1880 the right of Negroes to be included on juries was established by judicial decision. In 1917 racial restrictions in municipal zoning laws were held unconstitutional, and in 1948 this principle was applied to prevent the enforcement of private racial covenants for housing. In 1927 the first of a series of cases outlawed the all-white primary under the 14th amendment. In 1938 the first of a series of cases applied the principle of equal protection to higher education; through Chief Justice Hughes the Court held that a State did not satisfy its constitutional duty by offering to pay for a student's tuition at a nonsegregated university in another State. The elementary-school cases themselves were presented in a series of oral arguments and written briefs that advanced every possible contention; the Court heard reargument on the merits and still another argument on the form of the decree. The cases were treated with the utmost deliberation. Recognizing the problems of adjustment in some localities, the Court left the decrees to be carried out under the supervision of the district courts. The local authorities are obligated to see that the Court's decision is complied with in good faith.

Signatories to statement entitled "Recent Attacks Upon the Supreme Court of the United States":

Dillon Anderson, Houston, Tex.; Ernest Angell, New York City, N. Y.; J. Garner Anthony, Honolulu, T. H.; Philip W. Amram, Washington, D. C.; Howard L. Barkdull, Cleveland, Ohio; Paul Bedford, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Laird Bell, Chicago, Ill.; Robert M. Benjamin, New York City, N. Y.; Charles L. Black, Austin, Tex.; Frank T. Boesel, Milwaukee, Wis.; George E. Brand, Detroit, Mich.; Henry Brandis, Jr., Chapel Hill, N. C.; James E. Brenner, Stanford, Calif.; Joseph I. Brody, Des Moines, Iowa; Bruce Bromley, New York City, N. Y.; John G. Buchanan, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Howard F. Burns, Cleveland, Ohio; Pierce Butler, St. Paul, Minn.; Harold G. Cant, Minneapolis, Minn.; Claude E. Chalfant, Hutchinson, Kans.; Grenville Clark, Dublin, N. H.; Herbert W. Clark, San Francisco, Calif.; Charles A. Coolidge, Boston, Mass.; Walter E. Craig, Phoenix, Ariz.; Homer D. Crotty, Los Angeles, Calif.; Carl W. Cummins, St. Paul, Minn.; Charles P. Curtis, Boston, Mass.; Paul R. Dean, Washington, D. C.; Robert Dechert, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lloyd W. Dinkelspiel, San Francisco, Calif.; James M. Douglas, St. Louis, Mo.; Douglas L. Edmonds, Los Angeles, Calif.; William D. Embree, Jr., Denver, Colo.; Harold Evans, Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert J. Farley, University, Miss.; Jefferson B. Fordham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ray Forrester, New Orleans, La.; Eugene H. Freedheim, Cleveland, Ohio; Arthur J. Freund, St. Louis, Mo.; Paul A. Freund, Cambridge, Mass.

Fred E. Fuller, Toledo, Ohio; Robert P. Goldman, Cincinnati, Ohio; William T. Gossett, Dearborn, Mich.; John Raeburn Green, St. Louis, Mo.; Milton D. Green, St. Louis, Mo.; Albert J. Harno, Urbana, Ill.; James P. Hart, Austin, Tex.; Paul M. Hebert, Baton Rouge, La.; Allan A. Herrick, Des Moines, Iowa; Charles A. Horsky, Washington, D. C.; Charles B. Howard, Minneapolis, Minn.; William S. Jackson, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Charles W. Joiner, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William J. Kenealy, New Orleans, La.; Allen T. Klots, New York City, N. Y.; Barton H. Kuhns, Omaha, Nebr.; Mason Ladd, Iowa City, Iowa; Jacob M. Lashly, St. Louis, Mo.; Monte M. Lemann, New Orleans, La.; William B. Lockhart, Minneapolis, Minn.; Alan Loth, Fort Dodge, Iowa; Thomas D. McBride, Philadelphia, Pa.; William L. Marbury, Baltimore, Md.; Jesse E. Marshall, Sioux City, Iowa; Theodore R. Meyer, San Francisco, Calif.; Arthur S. Miller, Emory University, Georgia; Frederic M. Miller, Des Moines, Iowa; James R. Morford, Wilmington, Del.; Edmund M. Morgan, Nashville, Tenn.; Charles E. Nieman, Minneapolis, Minn.; Arthur L. Newman, New York City, N. Y.; John Lord O'Brian, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Papale, New Orleans, La.; Benjamin M. Parker, Atlanta, Ga.; George Wharton Pepper, Philadelphia, Pa.; Maynard E. Pirsig, Minneapolis, Minn.; John Carlisle Pryor, Burlington, Iowa.

Frank J. Remington, Madison, Wis.; Alvin J. Rockwell, San Francisco, Calif.; James Grafton Rogers, Georgetown, Colo.; Eugene V. Rostow, New Haven, Conn.; Murray Seasongood, Cincinnati, Ohio: Ethan A. H. Shepley, St. Louis, Mo.; Joseph H. Stamler, Newark, N. J.; Edwin B. Stason, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Charles M. Storey, Boston, Mass.; Robert G. Storey, Dallas. Tex.; George W. Stumberg, Austin, Tex.; Frank J. Sulloway, Concord, N. H.; Benjamin F. Swisher, Waterloo, Iowa; Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio; Henry J. Te Paske, Orange City, Iowa; Harrison Tweed, New York City, N. Y.; Robert W. Upton, Concord, N. H.; George S. Van Schaick, Binghamton, N. Y.; Robinson Verrill, Portland, Maine; Leon H. Wallace, Bloomington, Ind.; Olin E. Watts, Jacksonville, Fla.; Bethuel M. Webster, New York City, N. Y.; Roy E. Willy, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Francis E. Winslow, Rocky Mount, N. C.; Julius J. Wuerthner, Great Falls, Mont.; Aaron G. Youngquist, Minneapolis, Minn.

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, next Sunday, January 13, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the venerable and kindly author of the Townsend plan, will celebrate his 90th birthday. January 13 has in past years been an occasion for celebration by Townsend groups throughout the country, but the celebration this year will be a special one.

I doubt, Mr. President, that any of us can fully estimate the great role which history will assign to Dr. Townsend in connection with the many great social advances which we as a nation have made in the last 25 years. The Townsend plan itself is almost 25 years old now, and even though it has not been adopted in the precise form which Dr. Townsend and his multitude of friends have sought, nevertheless, the influence for good of Dr. Townsend and the Townsend movement has been undeniable.

At a time when world events seem to continue to emphasize the importance of force and materialistic power, it is good to have people in America who think in terms of the heart. Dr. Townsend has symbolized for millions of Americans our faith in human decency, generosity, and compassion.

Indeed, Mr. President, one of the things that has impressed me more than anything else in my contacts with the Townsend movement—and these contacts have been many—is the forthright conduct of its membership, their dedicated loyalty to God and country. Many other Americans have yet to realize the essential economic importance of maintaining purchasing power among the constantly increasing ranks of our retired citizens. I think that the Townsend movement can always be counted on as one of the great constructive forces in this Nation for keeping the economic well-being and the human values of our democracy alive.

I should also, Mr. President, like to add a personal note of appreciation and congratulations to Dr. Townsend. He has been very kind to me in numerous ways, helped me with his good advice and council, encouraged me with his indomitable spirit, and placed me in his debt with his friendship. It is typical of this man that the autobiography which he wrote a few years ago is called New Horizons. His alertness, far from dimming through the years, is even now being evidenced by his personal attention to the revision and improvement of his basic legislative proposal. I know that a great many of my colleagues will want to join me in expressing our heartfelt good wishes to this distinguished American on this important anniversary. We wish for him many more years of health and public service.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to ask that insertions be made in the RECORD, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McNamara
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Green	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Morton
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Javits	Revercomb
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clark	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young
Fulbright	McClellan	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest that Senators assemble at the rear of the Chamber so that the Senate can proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives. I announce that at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate will stand in recess until noon on Monday.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending a joint session to hear the state of the Union message to be delivered by the President of the United States.

(For the state of the Union address delivered by the President, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Pursuant to the order entered on yesterday, Wednesday, January 9, 1957, at the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate stood in recess until Monday, January 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all goodness, Thou art always standing at the door of our hearts waiting to be welcomed and to temper them by some larger measure of the spirit of forbearance and patience, of mercy and compassion, of love and good will toward all mankind.

Grant that here, in this Chamber, we may be united in our longings and labor to hasten the dawning of that day of prophetic insight when a nobler moral and spiritual life shall emerge from the soul of humanity.

Take away from us all moods of apathy and indifference and may we never become cynical and discouraged and be tempted to feel that, in hoping and praying and working for world peace, we are being deceived by a vague impossibility.

Help us to believe that none of the lofty aspirations and hopes, which have been vouchsafed unto us and which we cherish, are too high and too holy to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and strength.

In Christ's name we offer our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 7, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 8

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. T. MILLER HAND, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

Senate Resolution 9

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Wednesday next.

Senate Resolution 10

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

Senate Resolution 11

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, late a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California, Mr. KING, desires to take the oath of office. If he will present himself, he may be sworn in at this time.

Mr. KING appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the United States Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. COOPER; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND; and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the Committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, I appear before the Congress today to report on the state of the Union and the relationships of the Union to the other

nations of the world. I come here, convinced that at no time in the history of the Republic have circumstances more emphatically underscored the need, in all echelons of government, for vision and wisdom and resolution.

You meet in a season of stress that is testing the fitness of political systems and the validity of political philosophies. Each stress stems in part from causes peculiar to itself. But every stress is a reflection of a universal phenomenon.

In the world today, the surging and understandable tide of nationalism is marked by widespread revulsion and revolt against tyranny, injustice, inequality, and poverty. As individuals, joined in the common hunger for freedom, men and women and even children pit their spirit against guns and tanks. On a larger scale, in an ever more persistent search for the self-respect of authentic sovereignty and the economic base on which national independence must rest, peoples sever old ties; seek new alliances; experiment—sometimes dangerously—in their struggle to satisfy these human aspirations.

Particularly, in the past year, this tide has changed the pattern of attitudes and thinking among millions. The changes already accomplished foreshadow a world transformed by the spirit of freedom. This is no faint and pious hope. The forces now at work in the minds and hearts of men will not be spent through many years. In the main, today's expressions of nationalism are, in spirit, echoes of our forefathers' struggle for independence.

This Republic cannot be aloof to these events heralding a new effort in the affairs of mankind.

Our pledged word, our enlightened self-interest, our character as a Nation commit us to a high role in world affairs: a role of vigorous leadership, ready strength, and, above all, sympathetic understanding.

The state of the Union, at the opening of the 85th Congress, continues to vindicate the wisdom of the principles on which this Republic is founded. Proclaimed in the Constitution of the Nation and in many of our historic documents, and founded in devout religious convictions, these principles enunciate:

First, a vigilant regard for human liberty.

Second, a wise concern for human welfare.

Third, a ceaseless effort for human progress.

Fidelity to these principles, in our relations with other peoples, has won us new friendships and has increased our opportunity for service within the family of nations. The appeal of these principles is universal, lighting fires in the souls of men everywhere. We shall continue to uphold them, against those who deny them and in counselling with our friends.

At home, the application of these principles to the complex problems of our national life has brought us to an unprecedented peak in our economic prosperity and has exemplified in our way of life the enduring human values of mind and spirit.

Through the past 4 years these principles have guided the legislative programs submitted by the administration to the Congress. As we attempt to apply them to current events, domestic and foreign, we must take into account the complex entity that is the United States of America; what endangers it; what can improve it.

The visible structure is our American economy itself. After more than a century and a half of constant expansion, it is still rich in a wide variety of natural resources. It is first among nations in its people's mastery of industrial skills. It is productive beyond our own needs of many foodstuffs and industrial products. It is rewarding to all our citizens in opportunity to earn and to advance in self-realization and in self-expression. It is fortunate in its wealth of educational and cultural and religious centers. It is vigorously dynamic in the limitless initiative and willingness to venture that characterize free enterprise. It is productive of a widely shared prosperity.

Our economy is strong, expanding, and fundamentally sound. But in any realistic appraisal, even the optimistic analyst will realize that in a prosperous period the principal threat to efficient functioning of a free enterprise system is inflation. We look back upon 4 years of prosperous activities during which prices, the cost of living, have been relatively stable—that is, inflation has been held in check. But it is clear that the danger is always present, particularly if the Government might become profligate in its expenditures or private groups might ignore all the possible results on our economy of unwise struggles for immediate gain.

This danger requires a firm resolution that the Federal Government shall utilize only a prudent share of the Nation's resources, that it shall live within its means, carefully measuring against need alternative proposals for expenditures.

For success, Government's efforts must be paralleled by the attitudes and actions of individual citizens.

The national interest must take precedence over temporary advantages which may be secured by particular groups at the expense of all the people.

In this regard I call on leaders in business and in labor to think well on their responsibility to the American people. With all elements of our society, they owe the Nation a vigilant guard against the inflationary tendencies that are always at work in a dynamic economy operating at today's high levels. They can powerfully help counteract or accentuate such tendencies by their wage and price policies.

Business in its pricing policies should avoid unnecessary price increases, especially at a time like the present when demand in so many areas presses hard on short supplies. Of course, a reasonable profit is essential to the new investments that provide more jobs in an expanding economy. But business leaders must, in the national interest, studiously avoid those price rises that are possible only because of vital or unusual needs of the whole Nation.

If our economy is to remain healthy, increases in wages and other labor benefits, negotiated by labor and management, must be reasonably related to improvements in productivity. Such increases are beneficial, for they provide wage earners with greater purchasing power. Except where necessary to correct obvious injustices, wage increases that outrun productivity, however, are an inflationary factor. They make for higher prices for the public generally and impose a particular hardship not only on the active workmen, but on those whose welfare depends on the purchasing power of retirement income and savings. Wage negotiations should also take cognizance of the right of the public generally to share in the benefits of improvements in technology.

Freedom has been defined as the opportunity for self-discipline. This definition has a special application to the areas of wage and price policy in a free economy. Should we persistently fail to discipline ourselves, eventually there will be increasing pressure on Government to redress the failure. By that process freedom will step by step disappear. No subject on the domestic scene should more attract the concern of the friends of American workingmen and women and of free business enterprise than the forces latent and active that threaten a steady depreciation of the value of our money.

Concerning developments in another vital sector of our economy—agriculture—I am gratified that the long slide in farm income has been halted and that further improvement is in prospect. This is heartening progress. Three tools that we have developed—improved surplus disposal, improved price-support laws, and the soil bank—are working to reduce price-depressing Government stocks of farm products. Our concern for the well being of farm families demands that we constantly search for new ways by which they can share more fully in our unprecedented prosperity. Legislative recommendations in the field of agriculture are contained in the budget message.

Our soil, water, mineral, forest, fish, and wildlife resources are being conserved and improved more effectively. Their conservation and development are vital to the present and future strength of the Nation. But they must not be the concern of the Federal Government alone. State and local entities, and private enterprise should be encouraged to participate in such projects.

I would like to make special mention of programs for making the best uses of water, rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, just as it can be, when neglected, a destroyer of both life and wealth. There has been prepared and published a comprehensive water report developed by a Cabinet committee and relating to the various phases of this particular problem.

In the light of this report, there are two things I believe we should keep constantly in mind. The first is that each of our great river valleys should be considered as a whole. Piecemeal operations within each lesser drainage area can be

self-defeating or, at the very least, needlessly expensive. The second is that the domestic and industrial demands for water grow far more rapidly than does our population.

The whole matter of making the best use of each drop of water from the moment it touches our soil until it reaches the oceans, for such purposes as irrigation, flood control, power production, and domestic and industrial uses clearly demands the closest kind of cooperation and partnership between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities in these vast projects we can obtain the economy and efficiency of development and operation that springs from a lively sense of local responsibility.

And until such partnership is established on a proper and logical basis of sharing authority, responsibility, and costs, our country will never have both the fully productive use of water that it so obviously needs and protection against disastrous flood.

If we fail in establishing and sustaining this partnership, all the many tasks that need to be done in America could be accomplished only at an excessive cost, by the growth of a stifling bureaucracy, and eventually with a dangerous degree of centralized control over our national life. [Applause.]

In all domestic matters, I believe that the people of the United States will expect of us effective action to remedy past failure in meeting critical needs.

High priority should be given the school-construction bill. This will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now. [Applause.] A program designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms should be enacted without delay. I am hopeful that this program can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration. [Applause.] I urge the people in all sections of the country to approach these integration problems with calm and reason, with mutual understanding and good will, and in the American tradition of deep respect for the orderly processes of law and justice.

We have much reason to be proud of the progress our people are making in mutual understanding—the chief buttress of human and civil rights. Steadily we are moving closer to the goal of fair and equal treatment of citizens without regard to race or color. But unhappily much remains to be done.

Last year the administration recommended to the Congress a four-point program to reinforce civil rights. That program included:

In its first part: Creation of a bipartisan commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights and to make recommendations;

Its second provision: Creation of a civil rights division in the Department of Justice in charge of an Assistant Attorney General;

Its third: Enactment by the Congress of new laws to aid in the enforcement of voting rights; and

Its fourth: Amendment of the laws so as to permit the Federal Government to seek from the civil courts preventive relief in civil-rights cases.

I urge the Congress to enact this legislation.

Essential to the stable economic growth we seek is a system of well-adapted and efficient financial institutions. I believe the time has come to conduct a broad national inquiry into the nature, performance, and adequacy of our financial system. This inquiry should be in terms of its direct service to the whole economy and in terms of its function as the mechanism through which monetary and credit policy takes effect. I believe the Congress should authorize the creation of a commission of able and qualified citizens to undertake this vital inquiry. Out of their findings and recommendations the administration would develop and present to the Congress any legislative proposals that might be indicated for the purpose of improving our financial machinery.

In this message it seems unnecessary that I should repeat recommendations involving our domestic affairs that have been urged upon the Congress during the past 4 years, even though in some instances, they have not reached the stage of completely satisfactory legislation.

The administration will, through future messages either directly from me or from heads of the departments and agencies, transmit to the Congress specific recommendations. These will deal with our financial and fiscal affairs, our military and civil defenses; the administration of justice; our agricultural economy; our domestic and foreign commerce; the urgently needed increase in our postal rates; the development of our natural resources; our labor laws, including our labor-management relations legislation, and vital aspects of the health, education, and welfare of our whole people. There will be special recommendations dealing with such subjects as atomic energy, the furthering of public works, the continued efforts to eliminate Government competition with the businesses of taxpaying citizens. [Applause.]

A number of legislative recommendations will be mentioned specifically in the forthcoming budget message, which will reach you within the week.

Turning to the international scene:

The existence of a strongly armed imperialistic dictatorship poses a continuing threat to the free world's and thus to our own Nation's security and peace. There are certain truths to be remembered here.

First, America alone and isolated cannot assure even its own security. We must be joined by the capability and resolution of nations that have proved themselves dependable defenders of freedom. Isolation from them invites war. Our security is also enhanced by the immeasurable interest that joins us with all peoples who believe that peace with justice must be preserved, that wars of aggression are crimes against humanity.

Another truth is that our survival in today's world requires modern, adequate, dependable military strength. Our Nation has made great strides in assuring a modern defense, so armed in new weapons, so deployed, so equipped, that today our security force is the most powerful in our peacetime history. It can punish heavily any enemy who undertakes to attack us. It is a major deterrent to war.

By our research and development more efficient weapons are being constantly created. These vital efforts we shall continue. Yet we must not delude ourselves that safety necessarily increases as expenditures for military research or forces in being go up. Indeed, beyond a wise and reasonable level, which is always changing and is always under constant study, money spent on arms may be money wasted on sterile metal or inflated costs, thereby weakening the very security and strength we seek.

National security requires far more than military power. Economic and moral factors play indispensable roles. Any program that endangers our economy could defeat us. Any weakening of our national will and resolution, any diminution of the vigor and initiative of our individual citizens, would strike a blow at the hearts of our defenses.

The finest Military Establishment we can produce must work closely in cooperation with the forces of our friends. Our systems of regional pacts, developed within the Charter of the United Nations, serves to increase both our own security and the security of other nations.

This system is still a recent introduction on the world scene. Its problems are many and difficult, because it insists on equality among its members and brings into close association some nations traditionally divided. Repeatedly in recent months, the collapse of these regional alliances has been predicted. The strains upon them have been at times indeed severe. Despite these strains our regional alliances have proved durable and strong, and dire predictions of their disintegration have proved completely false.

With other free nations, we should vigorously prosecute measures that will promote mutual strength, prosperity and welfare within the free world. Strength is essentially a product of economic health and social well-being. Consequently, even as we continue our programs of military assistance, we must emphasize aid to our friends in building more productive economies and in better satisfying the natural demands of their people for progress. Thereby we shall move a long way toward a peaceful world.

A sound and safeguarded agreement for open skies, unarmed aerial sentinels, and reduced armament would provide a valuable contribution toward a durable peace in the years ahead. And we have been persistent in our effort to reach such an agreement. Indeed we are willing to enter any reliable agreement which would reverse the trend toward ever more devastating nuclear weapons; reciprocally provide against the possibility of surprise attack; mutually control the outer-space missile and satellite development; and make feasible a lower level of armaments and armed forces and an easier burden of military expenditures.

This quest for peace requires as well a constructive attitude among all the nations of the free world toward expansion of trade and investment. This ex-

pansion will give all of us opportunity to work out economic betterment.

An essential step in this field is the provision of an administrative agency to insure the orderly and proper operation of existing arrangements under which multilateral trade is now carried on. To that end I urge congressional authorization for United States membership in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. Such action will speed removal of discrimination against our export trade.

We welcome the efforts of a number of our European friends to achieve an integrated community to develop a common market. We likewise welcome their cooperative effort in the field of atomic energy.

To demonstrate once again our unalterable purpose to make of the atom a peaceful servant of humanity, I shortly shall ask the Congress to authorize full United States participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

World events have magnified both the responsibilities and the opportunities of the United States Information Agency. Just as, in recent months, the voice of communism has become more shaken and confused, the voice of truth must be more clearly heard. To enable our Information Agency to cope with these new responsibilities and opportunities, I am asking the Congress to increase appreciably the appropriations for this program and for legislation establishing a career service for the Agency's overseas foreign service officers.

The recent historic events in Hungary demand that all free nations share to the extent of their capabilities the responsibility of granting asylum to victims of Communist persecution. I request the Congress promptly to enact legislation to regularize the status in the United States of Hungarian refugees brought here as parolees. I shall shortly recommend to the Congress by special message the changes in our immigration laws that I believe necessary in the light of our world responsibilities.

The cost of peace is something we must face boldly, fearlessly. Beyond money, it involves changes in attitudes, the renunciation of old prejudices, even the sacrifice of some seeming self-interest.

Only 5 days ago I expressed to you the grave concern of your Government over the threat of Soviet aggression in the Middle East. I asked for congressional authorization to help counter this threat. I say again that this matter is of vital and immediate importance to the Nation's and the free world's security and peace. By our proposed programs in the Middle East, we hope to assist in establishing a climate in which constructive and long-term solutions to basic problems of the area may be sought.

From time to time, there will be presented to the Congress requests for other legislation in the broad field of international affairs. All requests will reflect the steadfast purpose of this administration to pursue peace, based on justice. Although in some cases details will be new, the underlying purpose, the objectives, will remain the same.

All proposals made by the administration in this field are based on the free world's unity. This unity may not be immediately obvious unless we examine link by link the chain of relationships that binds us to every area and to every nation. In spirit the free world is one because its peoples uphold the right of independent existence for all nations. I have already alluded to their economic interdependence. But their interdependence extends also into the field of security.

First of all, no reasonable man will question the absolute need for our American neighbors to be prosperous and secure. Their security and prosperity are inextricably bound to our own. And we are, of course, already joined with these neighbors by historic pledges.

Again, no reasonable man will deny that the freedom and prosperity and security of Western Europe are vital to our own propsperity and security. If the institutions, the skills, the manpower of its peoples were to fall under the domination of an aggressive imperialism the violent change in the balance of world power and in the pattern of world commerce could not be fully compensated for by any American measures, military or economic.

But these people, whose economic strength is largely dependent on free and uninterrupted movement of oil from the Middle East, cannot prosper—indeed, their economies and strength would be severely impaired—should that area, the Middle East, be controlled by an enemy and the movement of oil be subject to its decisions.

Next, to the eastward, are Asiatic and Far Eastern peoples, recently returned to independent control of their own affairs or now emerging into sovereign statehood. Their potential strength constitutes new assurance for stability and peace in the world—if they can retain their independence. Should they lose freedom and be dominated by an aggressor, the worldwide effects would imperil the security of the whole free world.

In short, the world has so shrunk that all free nations are our neighbors. Without cooperative neighbors, the United States cannot maintain its own security and welfare, because:

First, America's vital interests are worldwide, embracing both hemispheres and every continent.

Second, we have community of interest with every nation in the free world.

Third, interdependence of interests requires a decent respect for the rights and the peace of all peoples.

These principles motivate our actions within the United Nations. There, before all the world, by our loyalty to them, by our practice of them, let us strive to set a standard to which all who seek justice and who hunger for peace can rally.

May we at home, here at the Seat of Government, in all the cities and towns and farmlands of America, support these principles in a personal effort of dedication. Thereby each of us can help establish a secure world order in which opportunity for freedom and justice will be more widespread, and in which the resources now dissipated on the armaments of war can be released for the life and growth of all humanity.

When our forefathers prepared the immortal document that proclaimed our independence, they asserted that every individual is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. As we gaze back through history to that date, it is clear that our Nation has striven to live up to this declaration, applying it to nations as well as to individuals.

Today we proudly assert that the Government of the United States is still committed to this concept, both in its activities at home and abroad.

The purpose is Divine, but the implementation is human.

Our country and its Government have made mistakes—human mistakes. They have been of the head—not of the heart. And it is still true that the great concept of the dignity of all men, alike created in the image of the Almighty, has been the compass by which we have tried and are trying to steer our course. [Applause.]

So long, Members of this Congress, as we continue by its guidance, there will be true progress in human affairs, both among ourselves and among those with whom we deal.

To achieve a more perfect fidelity to it, I submit, is a worthy ambition for all of us as we meet together in these first days of this, the first session of the 85th Congress. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p. m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p. m.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President

be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 10, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

LESTER HOLTZMAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 8, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs effective this date.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN JARMAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 89) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the 85th Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 34 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 37 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 32 members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 32 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 31 members; and

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 34 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION of MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 90) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; John C. Watts, Kentucky; Harlan Hagen, California; Lester R. Johnson, Wisconsin; Victor L. Anfuso, New York; Ross Bass, Tennessee; Coya (Mrs.) Knutson, Minnesota; W. Pat Jennings, Virginia; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida.

Committee on Appropriations: Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; James B. Bowler, Illinois.

Committee on Armed Services: James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Toby Morris, Oklahoma; A. Paul Kitchin, North Carolina.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Martha W. (Mrs.) Griffiths, Michigan; Thomas Ludlow Ashley, Ohio; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio; James C. Healey, New York; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; Merwin Coad, Iowa; LeRoy H. Anderson, Montana; J. Floyd Breeding, Kansas.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Olin E. Teague, Texas; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Abraham J. Multer, New York; John Dowdy, Texas; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden (chairman), North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., New York; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Lee Metcalf, Montana; Edith (Mrs.) Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Stewart L. Udall, Arizona; Elmer J. Holland, Pennsylvania; Ludwig Teller, New York; George S. McGovern, South Dakota.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: D. S. (Judge) Saund, California.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Jack Brooks, Texas; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John E. Moss, California; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Martha W. (Mrs.) Griffiths, Michigan; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Elizabeth (Mrs.) Kee, West Virginia.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Michigan; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; George S. Long, Louisiana; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Edith Green, Oregon.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Clair Engle (chairman), California; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Gracie (Mrs.) Pfost, Idaho; James A. Haley, Florida; George A. Shuford, North Carolina; Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., New York; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Lee Metcalf, Montana; George H. Christopher, Missouri; B. F. Sisk, California; Stewart L. Udall, Arizona; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Al Ullman, Oregon.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Oren Harris (chairman), Arkansas; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Martin Dies; Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; John E. Moss, California; John D. Dingell, Michigan; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank Chelf, Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; E. L. Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Charles A. Boyle, Illinois; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; John Dowdy Texas; Lester Holtzman, New York.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Marlyand; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Thomas Ludlow Ashley, Ohio; John D. Dingell, Michigan; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Alfred E. Santangelo, New York; John Young, Texas.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; Gracie (Mrs.) Pfost, Idaho; Chet Holifield, California; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Charles O. Porter, Oregon; Alfred E. Santangelo, New York; John Young, Texas; Robert W. Hemphill, South Carolina; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley (chairman), New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; John J. Dempsey, New Mexico; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Iris Faircloth (Mrs.) Blitch, Georgia; Jim Wright, Texas; W. R. Hull, Jr., Missouri; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; John J. McFall, California; Charles H. (Charlie) Brown, Missouri.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter (chairman), Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee, Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Elizabeth (Mrs.) Kee, West Virginia; George S. Long, Louisiana; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; George A. Shuford, North Carolina; George H. Christopher, Missouri; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; B. F. Sisk, California; James A. Haley, Florida; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 91

Resolved, That E. L. BARTLETT, the Delegate from Alaska, is hereby elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and that ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, and JOHN A. BURNS, the Delegate from Hawaii, are hereby elected additional members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GAEL E. SULLIVAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of Congress, on October 27, 1956, Hon. Gael E. Sullivan died very suddenly at his home in New York City. In his passing this country lost a valued citizen, the Democratic Party a loyal and tireless worker, and I have lost a close friend. To Mrs. Sullivan, the two daughters and two sons, I express deepest sympathy.

For the past 2 years Mr. Sullivan had served as vice president of the Magna Theater Corporation of New York, but the major portion of his career was centered around the Federal Government and the Democratic Party.

Gael Sullivan has been called "a philosopher in Government and politics." One of his favorite phrases emphasized "the dignity of the individual." He believed that the dignity of the individual concerned opportunity of education and the right to earn a living without oppression from either extreme conservatism or illogical liberalism. His vibrant personality contributed much to the welfare and success of the Democratic Party. His clear thinking is typified in one of his frequently used quotations:

> We cannot move forward * * * by the kind of tax cutting and halting of Government spending that will liquidate adequate safeguards in housing, health, education, working conditions, recreation, and old-age pensions.

Gael Sullivan was born on November 28, 1904, in Providence, R. I., and there received his education. He was graduated from Providence College in 1926. Four years later he received the master of arts degree from Thomas Aquinas University, River Forest, Ill. Subsequently, he was associate professor and lecturer in political economics and ethics at DePaul University, Chicago, before joining in 1932, the staff of B. A. Holway & Associates, an advertising firm, as contract executive.

From 1933 to 1935 Mr. Sullivan was a liaison officer with the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago. In 1935 he entered government service when he accepted the post of associate State director of the Federal Housing Administration for Illinois, with which he remained for 4 years. During this same period he lectured at Loyola University in Chicago on a part-time basis, in the field of public administration. On the invitation of Mayor Kelly, he served in the Chicago mayor's office for 2 years, beginning in 1939 as an administrative assistant. He returned to the employment of the Federal Government in 1941, being promoted in the Federal Housing Administration, to Illinois State Director. At the same time, he lectured at Northwestern University on mortgage financing.

Entering the United States Army in 1943, Sullivan was appointed executive officer to the Deputy Quartermaster. Subsequently he received a citation from the Quartermaster General for his contributions to methods of procurement and control. Eighteen months of his Army service were spent overseas in North Africa and Italy. He served as port officer for Cagliari, Sardinia, third largest port in the Mediterranean for Allied shipping. He was also chief of labor relations for the Detroit Service Command of the Army Service Force. He held the rank of major.

Upon his release from the Army in September 1945, Gael Sullivan accepted appointment as Second Assistant Postmaster General under Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan. In this position he was responsible for all airmail, and for international postal matters handled by the Post Office Department. Under his direction the Postal Transport Bureau of the Department was reorganized. He inaugurated the use of helicopters for delivering mail in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. He also first proposed the use of mobile post office units for rural delivery.

Under Sullivan's enthusiastic and wise guidance airmail pickup feeder service was expanded; this followed development of the "air letter"—similar in form to the V-mail used during World War II—for worldwide distribution. He conducted the first nationwide Railway Mail Conference in 1946 and initiated studies for the improvement of railway mail cars.

With a constant desire to initiate modern and efficient methods in our postal service, Sullivan made two transatlantic flights and one global flight in the interests of international postal matters. On the latter trip His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, made him a Knight Commander of the Order of Saint Gregory, an unusual honor.

In February 1947, he resigned from the Post Office Department to become executive director of the Democratic National Committee; 1 month later he became vice chairman. He served in this capacity until 1949.

It has been said that when Gael Sullivan's name was announced as heir to the top Democratic administrative job in the Nation, it was almost unknown to official and social Washington. The reason for any anonymity was work. He toiled early and late in his office, and when he was not working there, he was working in his hotel room. But Gael Sullivan lost no time in making his presence felt as executive director of the Democratic National Committee.

To increase the Democratic majority in the 1948 election, Sullivan sponsored a series of conferences between Democratic State and National leaders in an effort to bring the voters to the polls. The results of his efforts are history.

On one occasion when he turned down a high-paid position in private business to continue his service to the Democratic Party, Sullivan told a friend, and I quote: "I wouldn't be happy if I couldn't fight actively for the liberal political causes I believe in."

It is characteristic that practically every picture of Gael Sullivan which has appeared in newspapers or magazines shows his genuine straightforward nature and this ever-present smile.

He was deeply devoted to his family, his country, his church, and his party. He never sought office but was ever ready to contribute his time and talents to advancing this Nation's progress. He lived his belief that "government cannot be static in this dynamic world." But perhaps what was even more important about Gael Sullivan was his profound personal belief in every task he undertook. He will always be remembered by those who were privileged to know him.

INCREASED BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIRED BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, by halfway legislation, whereby we increased benefits for civil servants of the Federal Government who retired on and after October 1, 1956, while ignoring the overwhelming majority who had retired in the years before that date, we have added discrimination to neglect.

Not that this was done with deliberate intent. Far from it. But the present situation accents the fact that we must finish the job by passing legislation to compensate for the loss in purchasing power suffered by those who retired from the civil service on rates that were frozen many years ago.

Due to changing economic conditions, the employee who retired with some feeling of security 2, 5, and 10 years ago, now finds that his "retirement dollar" is not what it used to be. This shrinkage in purchasing power is causing real distress in a number of cases. The natural

reaction of a retired civil servant is a feeling of bitterness toward a retirement system in which he had invested a lifetime of loyal service confident that he could depend upon his annuity to provide for his simple wants.

Now, due to circumstances beyond his control, he is forced to go without some of the necessities that his annuity was once able to provide for him.

The man who retired in 1946 cannot buy food or shelter or clothing at 1946 prices. His fixed retirement has been outstripped by the steady rise in the cost of living.

The purpose of the legislation that I and many of my colleagues propose is to compensate for this loss in purchasing power and to restore the confidence of retired civil servants in the good faith of their Government.

Our bill would provide:

That section (8) (d) (I) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by Public Law 369, 84th Congress, 1st session, is amended by adding the following paragraphs:

"In addition to the increase provided by paragraph (d) (I), the annuity of any person, who before October 1, 1956, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund, shall be increased in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commenced on or after—	Annuity not in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—	Annuity in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—
Oct. 1, 1955, and prior to Oct. 1, 1956.	25 percent...	10 percent.
Oct. 1, 1954, and prior to Oct. 1, 1955.	26 percent...	Do.
Oct. 1, 1953, and prior to Oct. 1, 1954.	27 percent...	Do.
Oct. 1, 1952, and prior to Oct. 1, 1953.	28 percent...	Do.
Oct. 1, 1951, and prior to Oct. 1, 1952.	29 percent...	Do.
Aug. 20, 1920, and prior to Oct. 1, 1951.	30 percent...	Do.

"The maximum increase provided herein for any one annuitant shall not be in excess of $750 per annum and shall not apply to any part of the annuity purchased by voluntary contributions."

There are other amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act included in this bill concerning eligibility of certain widows, elimination of the prevailing ceiling on annuities, and the method of financing increased annuities, but the table I have just quoted is the heart of this legislation.

We can attract and hold the best qualified personnel as Federal employees only if we offer adequate pay and the security of eventual retirement at rates that will not fall behind the increasing cost of living.

This legislation will compensate in part for the loss they have suffered in recent years.

Our retired civil servants look to us for a deserved increase in their annuities.

BILL RELATING TO THE SENDING OF OBSCENE AND CRIME-INCITING MATERIAL THROUGH THE MAIL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will make the transmission of obscene or crime-inciting matter continuing offenses. This is distinguished from the present law which makes the offense the depositing of such matter in the postal service. This limits jurisdiction for prosecution of such crimes to the place where mailed.

The effect of my bill will be that prosecution against violators of the law prohibiting the sending of obscene mail or crime-inciting matter through the mail may be made at any point through which the mail has traveled.

In my judgment, the real crime involved is committed at the point of receipt of the mail rather than at the point of mailing. It is at this point of receipt where the actual damage to morals is done, and the adverse effect on our young people occurs.

Studies and investigations conducted by our committee last Congress, including hearings, have demonstrated that one of the weaknesses of our law prohibiting obscene and crime-inciting matter from the mail is the inability to adequately enforce these laws in the courts. The present law, which has the effect of limiting the prosecution to the court jurisdiction where the post office of mailing is located, is weighted heavily in favor of the offender rather than the individual offended. This has caused these purveyors of filth to concentrate their mailings in jurisdictions which are more lenient to them.

Some time ago, in hearings before our committee, I made this proposal and it has subsequently been favorably recommended by the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department. For that reason, I believe my proposal will receive a favorable report from the administration and should have good prospects of passage.

RT. REV. MSGR. HENRI A. HAMEL

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the honors being paid today in Louisiana to a beloved religious leader, the Right Reverend Monsignor Henri A. Hamel, pastor of St. Martin Catholic Church at St. Martinville, La., my home town. The occasion marks the 25th anniversary of Monsignor Hamel in the priesthood and is being appropriately observed with both religious and public ceremonies.

During his 23 years of residence at St. Martinville, Monsignor Hamel has endeared himself not only to his parishioners, of whom I am one, but to the whole community and to a wide area in southwest Louisiana, where he is well known.

As pastor of the Mother Church of the Acadians, erected in 1765, and located in the heart of the Evangeline country of Louisiana, Monsignor Hamel has kept this historic building in perfect repair and in its original form. Nearby is a statue of Evangeline, heroine of Longfellow's epic poem, and within the shadow of the church stands the famed and majestic Evangeline oak.

A native of Canada where he studied for the priesthood, Monsignor Hamel also attended Notre Dame Seminary in New Orleans. On January 10, 1932, he was ordained as priest in St. John's Cathedral at Lafayette, La., and was named assistant pastor at Abbeville, La. The following year, on July 6, he was assigned to similar duties at St. Martinville, where he became pastor May 14, 1941. On April 17, 1956, he was elevated as domestic prelate by Pope Pius with the title of right reverend monsignor.

Among the many outstanding accomplishments which are tributes to the devotion, energy, and leadership of Monsignor Hamel is the expansion of Catholic educational facilities, in which connection he has headed a program for enlargement of the Convent of Mercy at St. Martinville, and the addition of a modern new building for the school. He has been active in civic projects and his interest extends to all matters for the general welfare and progress of the community he loves and serves so well.

Today's events honoring Monsignor Hamel were arranged to open with a procession from the rectory to St. Martin Catholic Church for high Mass, of which he was celebrant, with the Reverend Eugene LeGros, of Baldwin, La., as deacon of the Mass, and the Reverend Rapheal Gauthier, of Delcambre, La., as subdeacon. Father LeGros was ordained at the same time as Monsignor Hamel, and Father Gauthier is another longtime friend. The Most Reverend Maurice Schexnayder, bishop of Lafayette, was in the sanctuary, and many members of the Catholic clergy from throughout the diocese of Lafayette were in attendance.

The Mass was followed by a reception and dinner for the clergy, and tonight Monsignor Hamel will be tendered a civic reception in the Catholic school gymnasium, to which the public is invited. Sponsors of this event include many religions, fraternal, and civic groups.

Adding greatly to the happiness of Monsignor Hamel is the presence of his sister, Miss Rose Hilda Hamel, of Windsor Mills, Canada; a cousin, Miss Jeanette Gervais, of Lewiston, Maine; and Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Boutin, also cousins, from Chicopee Falls, Mass., who are enjoying with him this memorable day.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for which a great American deserves the credit. During the 2d session of the 84th Congress the senior Senator from New York, the Honorable Herbert Lehman, introduced a bill to tackle the urgent and deplorable problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States. This bill, S. 4267, passed the Senate on July 27, 1956, but time did not permit its consideration by the House and it, therefore, died.

Senator Lehman chose to retire from the Senate, but this, as well as so many of his other good works, continues to live on. I am, therefore, introducing Senator Lehman's bill in the firm conviction that it represents the soundest approach to a problem which must be solved if our country is not to be seriously weakened of its most important reservoir of future citizens.

Specifically, the bill calls for Federal leadership and funds to stimulate and promote the training of specialized personnel and to supplement State and local resources and programs, as well as coordinate public and private nonprofit agencies already active in this work.

The bill calls for (a) establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, (b) provides for grants to States to strengthen and improve local programs, (c) authorizes the appropriation of $5 million for each of 7 fiscal years for the purpose of training personnel to properly service juvenile delinquency programs, and (d) authorizes the sum of $1 million for the ensuing fiscal year and such sums as the Congress shall determine for each of the following 6 fiscal years for the development and demonstration of special projects embodying improved techniques and practices for the control, treatment, and lessening of juvenile delinquency.

It is my sincere hope that the committee will schedule early hearings on the bill and that early action may follow so that the House may give consideration to this most fundamental and important legislation.

LEGISLATION TO CURB EXCESSIVE SPEEDS ON HIGHWAYS SUPPORTED WITH FEDERAL AID

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to bar Federal aid for building highways where speed limits exceed 65 miles an hour on limited-access dual highways, and 60 miles an hour by day, and 55 miles an hour by night on other highways.

The toll of traffic dead and maimed in 1956 is a gruesome reminder that wild driving and break-neck speeds have turned our highways into the most vicious killers in history. Last year's record 40,200 deaths and nearly one and one-half million injured was capped by over 700 killed in the recent holiday season—a frightful gift to the American public. The National Safety Council has declared the situation a national emergency.

The murderous accidents are the ones on the open road, where high speeds have come to prevail. This is not necessarily confined to the main highways. Death and destruction have grown apace on secondary roads, where too many drivers go hurtling through the countryside without regard to life or property, lulled by the false impression they are the only ones on the road.

The Nation averaged 56.6 traffic fatalities for 100,000 population in 1955. The 22 States west of the Mississippi averaged 73.1. Twelve of these, in the plains and mountain area, averaged 89.5. The average in the 6 most sparsely populated States was over 100. Great stretches of open highway encourage excessive speeds in the States with the worst averages.

Many States now have speed limits equal to or lower than the maximums in my bill, but others do not. Several have no fixed speed limit. Admittedly my proposal is lenient, but it will serve three valuable purposes. It will clamp a curb on unlimited speeds on federally aided highways. It will serve as a warning to all State and local authorities that the American people will not countenance murder on their highways. And finally, I believe it will be a strong influence in reversing the upward trend in traffic deaths.

THE LATE HONORABLE CARL HINSHAW, OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include additional material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to memoralize appropriately our departed Member from the California delegation, CARL HINSHAW, who died on August 5, shortly after the 84th Congress adjourned. I am sure that I do not have to elaborate on the great services he rendered to the Nation and the great esteem in which he was held by all Members of the House.

He was an unusually alert, well educated and capable Member of Congress. He assumed some heavy duties and performed them well. I recall, in the last few days of the last Congress, when he was managing some bills on the floor of the House, his health seemed to be not too good. We urged him to take a little time and rest.

Unfortunately, he is not with us today. His sudden passing occurred, as I have said, on August 5. On August 9, we conducted memorial services for him in absentia at the Scottish Rite Cathedral in Pasadena. I made some remarks at that time and I shall ask unanimous consent that the remarks made at those memorial services then be included as a part of my remarks.

MEMORIAL SERVICES, CARL HINSHAW, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SCOTTISH RITE CATHEDRAL, PASADENA, CALIF., AUGUST 9, 1956, 4 P. M.—OFFICIATING, REV. EDWARD EVERETT HAILWOOD; GORDON L. McDONOUGH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS; LEWIS K. GOUGH

Reverend HAILWOOD. Let us stand for the opening word of the Scripture.

"I am the Resurrection and the Life, sayeth the Lord: He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

"I know that my redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though this body be destroyed, yet shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold, and not as a stranger."

We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.

"My help cometh even from the Lord, who hath made Heaven and earth.

"He will not suffer thy foot to be moved; and he that keepeth thee will not sleep.

"Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep.

"The Lord himself is thy keeper; the Lord is thy defense upon thy right hand;

"So that the sun shall not burn thee by day, neither the moon by night.

"The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil; yea, it is even He that shall keep thy soul.

"The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth forever more."

Be seated.

A portion of the Scripture that has been selected to be read at this memorial service is taken from the Sermon on the Mount, and it was a favorite text of Congressman HINSHAW, especially the last verse, that I shall read, which served ever as an inspiration and as a motto in his life. The Scripture is taken from the fifth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew:

"And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain; and when He was set, his disciples came unto Him:

"And he opened His mouth, and taught them, saying,

"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

"Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

"Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My sake.

"Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

"Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.

"Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.

"Neither do we light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven."

Hear a reading of Holy Scripture.

Mr. LEWIS K. GOUGH. I am privileged to speak today as a fellow veteran, a fellow member of Pasadena Post, 13, of the American Legion, to pay a tribute to a comrade, CARL HINSHAW.

The preamble to the constitution of the American Legion states in part:

"We associate ourselves together to promote peace and good will on this earth; to make right the master of might."

It ends with the words "To consecrate and sacrifice our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

Comrade CARL HINSHAW was dedicated to these principles, as he was to all principles, that served God and country.

In 1917 Carl became a warrior, when his country needed him. He placed his professional services in the engineering corps to best serve his country. He became a captain of the engineers in World War I. He served with honor, with distinction.

When he returned, he became active in veterans' organizations, particularly in the American Legion, to work again collectively for the things that he had fought for collectively; and, later, to work individually as a legislator for these same ideals.

Carl was a long-time member of Pasadena Post 13. He supported all of its programs, local, State, and National, and by thus doing, he made a legion of friends.

He is best known for his efforts in behalf of adequate national security, with emphasis on airpower, as he firmly believed that airpower is peace power.

It is not so well known that he was also vitally interested—almost a fetish with him—in the conservation program, a much less glamorous but a very important program as well.

It is a happenstance, perhaps because of geographical position, perhaps because of the movement and impetus of such men as Carl, that his Legion post has a strong and active and large conservation committee. In the old days, Carl worked with these committee members for fire-protection legislation. It is interesting to note in later years that he had the opportunity to work for this same legislation and secure its passage as a legislator.

He was an advocate at all times of "control and protection laws," for the wonders that God gave us here on this earth, to preserve our national forests and our parks, our waterways. And even though Carl achieved prestige and influence as a Member of Congress, he didn't forget his members of the conservation committee. He arranged tours with them, and, when possible, he accompanied them on tours of the harbor, and ships, parks, and waterways.

He was fully devoted to the cause of mutual helpfulness; always a friend to those who sacrificed the most in World War I and II and Korea. He was a friend of the widows, orphans, and the disabled of war; his voting record is a hundred percent in their behalf.

I was told by a fellow member of our post, "I never had to worry about his vote." The chairman of our national security commission said that, "Carl will support you and rely heavily on his judgment in such matters as rehabilitation," and how right he was.

I think most of us knew Comrade Carl best, however, for his work in the interest of national defense, especially in aviation. His intense interest in furthering American aviation over the years has strengthened our Nation immeasurably in this most important part of national security.

It was indeed a tribute to CARL HINSHAW that he received the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy for "significant public service of enduring value to aviation," 3 years ago from the National Aeronautic Association; and this was presented to him personally by the President of the United States in the presence of many distinguished dignitaries.

He was also deeply interested in the development of atomic power, primarily for peacetime use, but he also recognized its importance for national defense. And, although he was not a strong advocate of the naval service, he was one of those that supported seapower with atomic power as its background in bringing about and into being the *Nautilus*, the Navy's first atomic-powered submarine, which stands as a living memorial to his memory. He worked with the same principles with his more-favored field of aviation, and I am sure that the momentum and the ability of his living work will carry on and again we will have a living memorial in aviation when atomic power is applied.

He was a member of the congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, but, further than that, he was a member of the inner circle of the classified aspects of atomic projects; and, within classified limits, advised freely with the national defense committee of the American Legion on aviation atomic power, so their resolutions would have the benefit of his sagacity and his wide knowledge to bring about better resolutions and legislation for national defense.

I had the privilege of working closely with him while I served as national commander of the American Legion, and I found that Carl's door was always open. He was always eager to bear a hand at the national level to work for the things that we believed in, the ideals for which we had fought. At the local level, he always was, frequently was in attendance at the meetings of his post; always in the blue cap of the working Legionnaire, which he was.

Although Carl became one of our most influential legislators in Congress, he was always plain "Carl" to his buddies. He was admired, respected and loved by them all as a true and a sincere comrade. All of his fellow veterans deeply regret his passing.

CARL HINSHAW was a loyal and devoted and patriotic American citizen in the fullest connotation and the fullest sense of these adjectives.

Those who knew Carl best pay him the greatest tribute, and that is the highest honor to the memory of any man, and I include his brothers in the Pasadena Masonic Lodge No. 272, the Pasadena Scottish Rite Consistory, the Al Malaikah Temple of the Shrine, the Pasadena Lodge of Elks, and his comrades in Pasadena Post, No. 13, of the American Legion.

A true brother, a true comrade has passed. We shall miss him; we shall honor his memory.

May God rest his soul.

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Member of Congress. Dear friends, it is not a pleasant task to commemorate the passing of a close, personal, intimate friend. Those of us who are assembled here today pay our last respects to a dear friend, a devoted and dedicated public servant, a gentleman, and a scholar, not an ordinary Congressman, but an extraordinary Congressman.

I had served in public office for a number of years previous to going to Congress, and I knew CARL HINSHAW, but not as intimately as I became acquainted with him after I was elected to serve with him.

I went to Washington in the 79th Congress, and Carl and I were somewhat alone in our delegation from Los Angeles County. There were only two of us of the then minority party—still the minority party—but there were two of us, and we had to associate very closely, and I became very intimately acquainted with him.

CARL HINSHAW, as I say, being an extraordinary Congressman, brought to the Congress the talents of an engineer, a graduate engineer of Princeton University. He did postgraduate work at the University of Michigan, and brought the talents of business administration with him.

He was a logical man; he was a dependable, loyal servant to his district and to the Nation. Yes, he was an extraordinary Congressman, because in his assignments as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, one of the most important committees in the Congress, having jurisdiction over such wide matters as communications, transportation, welfare funds, pensions, health matters, radio, television, and a diversification of many, many other things, it took an expert to acquire the knowledge of the legislation that came out of that committee. CARL HINSHAW was ranking member of that committee.

His abilities were also recognized when he was appointed a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and his talents were soon exhibited by his knowledge of that very complicated subject.

His advice and counsel was sought very frequently by the Members of the House, and he was beloved and had the affection and the intimate acquaintanceship of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

He not only assumed these duties in his regular capacity as a Congressman, but he assumed additional duties, such as the problem of looking after the new Members when they came. As dean of the delegation, it was his job to acquaint them with the conditions and circumstances that they may run into in connection with their work, to cool down some hotheads once in a while, to advise and counsel with the delegation on important issues that were before the Congress. He did these things with affection, with understanding, and with a feeling of loyalty to his Nation and to his delegation.

He never presumed his position, being superior because of seniority; he never presumed his position, being superior because of his knowledge that others didn't possess. He would discuss in the most intimate detail some of the simplest matters that were difficult for new Members of the Congress to understand.

He also assumed the job of congressional representation on the national committee, and that was no easy task, because that carried the responsibility of returning to the Congress, reelecting, if you please, his delegation of his party, and he had to, at the same time, be concerned about his own election in his own district. These are obligations that add to the burdens that go along with the ordinary duties that a Congressman has to perform. The mortality of Congressmen is great, and I believe that it was because of the devotion to public service, the worry and the concern for the legislation that came out of his committee, and the responsibility that he carried, that CARL HINSHAW can be considered a martyr to public service under the circumstances of his passing.

I recall in the last 2 or 3 days of this session of Congress, Carl had two very important bills on the floor, one that he fought very hard for, to provide for the use of atomic energy in free enterprise. There were other bills that came out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that he was vitally interested in. He looked a little worn and a little tired, but none of us considered that it was as serious as it has resulted in. We told him to take a little time off and rest. We spent some part of the last few days of the Congress in commemorating the passing, or the retiring, of certain Members of the Congress, those who were voluntarily resigning the Congress. And Carl participated in the commemoration to his colleagues in a very affectionate manner, not knowing that the circumstances that have since resulted in his passing were equal to those of those who were passing out of the Congress voluntarily.

The people of this district, the people of the State of California, the people of the Nation, have lost a devoted public servant.

CARL HINSHAW could have earned twice the salary that he was receiving as a Member of Congress, because of his educational background, his experience, and his logical approach to very intricate engineering problems. But he preferred to dedicate himself to public service. It is regrettable that we have to wait until these sort of things occur.

Of course, death is never ordinary in the light of anyone, but it is as ordinary as birth, because we can't avoid it, and Carl was just practical enough to understand that.

I know that the record he made in the Congress will live for many years to come. The hearings before the Atomic Energy Commission, and the knowledge that he exhibited in the questions and in the advice and counsel that he showed under many circumstances is still there. The debates he participated in in the House are a matter of record in the contemporary history of the Nation.

Carl may not be with us physically, but his advice and counsel will live as an example of the service he rendered to this Nation while he was a Member of the Congress.

Reverend HAILWOOD. Now, let us, in expressing our thanksgiving for all of his noble service before God and for us as fellow citizens, bow our heads in meditation as we hear the familiar strains of the Lord's Prayer.

(The Lord's Prayer was sung by Edward Qualen, accompanied by Clarence D. Kellogg, organist.)

Reverend HAILWOOD. Remember Thy servant Carl, O Lord, according to the favor which Thou bearest unto Thy people, and grant that, increasing in knowledge and love of Thee, he may go from strength to strength, in the life of perfect service, in Thy heavenly kingdom; grant him Thy peace; let light perpetual shine upon him; and, in Thy loving wisdom and almighty power, work in him the good purpose of Thy perfect will.

Having opened to him the gates of larger life, receive him more and more into thy joyful service, that he may win, with thee and thy servants everywhere, the eternal victory.

In Christ's name we pray.

Almighty Father, who has called us to faith in thee, and has compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, grant that we be encouraged by the good examples of thy servants, especially of thy servant whom we honor at this service, that we may persevere in running the race that is set before us, until at length, through Thy mercy, we, with all Thy servants, we maintain Thy eternal joy through Him who is the Author and Finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ Our Lord.

And, grant O Lord, to all who are bereaved, the spirit of faith and courage; especially do we pray for Mrs. Hinshaw, and other members of his family, his two sons, that they may have strength to meet the days to come with steadfastness and patience; not sorrowing as those without hope, but in thankful remembrance of Thy great goodness in past years, and in the sure expectation of a joyful reunion with those they love; and this we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Our Saviour.

Let us stand for the concluding benediction. We dedicate ourselves more and more to fulfill the good work that he helped to begin for a better world.

The Almighty God, the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man; that Christ, dwelling in your hearts by faith, ye may be filled with all the fullness of God. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], who succeeded Mr. HINSHAW.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I well realize that I could extend my remarks in the RECORD, but as Carl was my predecessor here in Congress and had been in this Chamber for some 18 years, I want to say a few words in his memory in this Chamber where he appeared so many times.

I am privileged and proud to be his successor, but I regret very much that it came about due to his untimely passing. He served our district for 18 years and although I never served in a legislative body with him, I have represented one-half of his Congressional district, the 43d Assembly District, in the State Legislature of California for the past 8 years. In that capacity Carl and I became very good friends. We worked together on matters of mutual interest to the State of California. We helped each other in our campaigns and on other matters. At all times he was most helpful, most honest and sincere in his advice to me and I will always be most appreciative of the service that he rendered me.

When I was selected as the Republican candidate, to run in his place, I campaigned mostly in Pasadena and Temple City, the other half of the 20th Congressional District in California. In Pasadena Carl was a member of the Elks; a member of the Eagles; a member of the Masonic lodge and of the Consistory; a member of the Shrine Club, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion Post No. 13 as well as many other organizations. I appeared at all of those organizations as well as at many coffee hours and other meetings throughout the district and on each and every occasion individuals would come up to me and say, "Carl was a fine man, an excellent Representative and, Mr. SMITH, you will have a tremendous job to fill his shoes in Congress." I appreciate that fact a great deal.

I want to extend my sincere congratulations to Carl and his memory for the tremendous work he did in aviation. He was known as an outstanding authority on aviation both from a commercial standpoint and a military standpoint. His record and accomplishments will long be remembered.

To his loving wife, Mrs. Hinshaw, and to his two sons, John and William, Mrs. Smith and I at this time extend the deep sympathy of the 20th Congressional District and of the State of California and the Congress of the United States. We have lost a very fine public servant.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow I rise to pay my personal tribute to a former colleague who has passed beyond. In the 18 years CARL HINSHAW was a Member of the House he won the warm approval and high regard of every Member, Democrat or Republican. Carl was a conscientious legislator. He was a man who specialized in certain fields. He was perhaps the most expert man in the House as far as aviation was concerned, having studied that problem for many years. We in leadership leaned heavily upon him for advice in this field. He possessed a wide knowledge of the atom, a field that will be of such tremendous importance in the next few years. We shall miss the knowledge and advice that he could have given us.

CARL HINSHAW was a great American. To my personal knowledge, he sacrificed several very high and lucrative positions to continue to serve his district in Congress. He made these sacrifices because he believed in America. He wanted to do his part in making this a better country.

The State of California and the country have lost a great and able legislator in the passing of CARL HINSHAW. Personally I have lost a close friend and associate, one for whom I had great regard and affection. I join the gentleman from California and his other associates in expressing my profound regret at his passing, and I express to his wife and the members of his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad occasion for me just as other similar occasions have been sad for me. CARL HINSHAW was my longtime friend, and I like to think he felt toward me as I did toward him.

We served together, some years back, on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I was always deeply impressed with his grasp of the matters before us and with the enthusiasm he displayed toward his assignments. We all looked to CARL HINSHAW as a Member who spoke with authority on the subject of aviation, which was his special concern. And that is not to say he did not have a concern regarding other fields in the public interest because he did. But aviation was his special interest.

We all know, too, the deep intensity of his labors here in the House. I cannot help but feel that, as one who was here on the occasion about which the gentleman from California has already spoken, the exhausting nature of the work he felt dutybound to pursue so relentlessly may well have contributed to his untimely passing.

It is a matter of pride to me that although CARL HINSHAW was known to us here in the House as a Member who came from California, he was, in fact, a native of the great Middle West. His parents were prominently known in my own district in Indiana. Carl himself attended Valparaiso University, which is in my district in the northern part of Indiana. There his father, the late William Wade Hinshaw, served with distinction for many years as head of the music faculty. The biography of CARL HINSHAW reveals him as a man who repeatedly rose from the ranks, under whatever sort of circumstances he found himself. He entered World War I as an enlisted man—he came out as a captain. In civilian life, he began earning a living

as a laborer and was promoted into a succession of managerial positions.

Here in the House CARL HINSHAW gained stature through his demonstrated ability, his energy, and his loyalty to the causes in which he believed so strongly. His career was in the best tradition of free Americans who achieve success because they work for it and they deserve it.

I join with my colleagues in the House in expressing my sorrow at his passing. I extend my deepest sympathy to his bereaved family. A wonderful man he was. We shall all miss him as we enter upon the duties and burdens of this Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know the late CARL HINSHAW until the first day I became a Member of this body. However, I can say that when Carl passed away, along with his many hundreds of thousands of friends I grieved the passing of a very real and a very dear friend. As I remember Carl, I cannot help but think of myself coming here as a freshman to the 83d Congress; I cannot help but gratefully remember the helpful hand that was offered by CARL HINSHAW. Whether it was for his Nation, his family, his friends, his old colleagues or a new freshman in the House of Representatives, Carl always offered the helping hand. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when one of our colleagues answers the call of the Grim Reaper, we have a feeling that is difficult to describe, especially when we have been so closely associated in the Congress, in committees, and throughout our service in this great institution.

We feel, I think, as was so well expressed in the verse of a poem I read recently:

I scooped a mound of sunny sand,
And clutched it tight within my hand.
Said I, "This is my own today."
And yet, the sand, just slipped away.

CARL HINSHAW seems to me to have just slipped away from us.

For 16 years, I had known Carl. We have worked together throughout the years on our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

Even though he was across the aisle, so to speak, we had a very close association as is usually true with those who work together in committees.

Yes, we were very close and throughout these years developed a warm friendship. Carl was my friend. He had the admiration and respect of every member of our committee and in fact, all of our colleagues.

When our beloved chairman, Percy Priest, who also passed away during the recess, called me and advised me of Carl's passing, I had an unusual feeling. It just didn't seem right, I simply could not realize it, like the sand he had just "slipped away." The last time I saw Carl was the day before Congress adjourned. We walked out of the Chamber together. When I left him outside, I knew he was not feeling well. I offered to take him home. He insisted that he was all right and had a ride. I cautioned him to take it easy. The next morning he was taken to the hospital. I went by to see him twice before I left for home and each time he was not seeing visitors.

CARL HINSHAW was a sincere man, a hard worker, devoted to service and to his country.

We had just considered a bill which many of you will remember was designed to aid the airline industry. It was highly technical and without any reflection, was not fully understood by everyone. The debate developed controversy and Carl became quite concerned. As I recall, he closed the debate on his side and did not use all of his time. He had an attack standing in the well of the House. When he walked out, he said to Mr. WOLVERTON that he was not feeling well. He went down to the doctor's office here in the Capitol.

He was so devoted to service, he insisted that he come back for the vote. He should have gone on to the hospital instead.

Carl was not only our friend and an able hard-working Member of this body but he was a good man. He was a good husband, so devoted to his home and family. Often he has talked to me about his family and how anxious he was for their welfare.

He was a good Christian and possessed the qualities of a Christian who had faith in his fellow man, his country, and believed in God.

We will miss Carl. Certainly I will miss him very much. Yes—

How like the sand is beauty's guest,
For when we feel we've found the best,
We hold it tight—it's ours today—
And, as the sand, it slips away.

In Carl's passing, we have lost another of our most able Members. The State of California has lost an outstanding servant and his district in Pasadena has lost one of the finest of its citizens and friends, whose life was devoted to their welfare.

I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of his district, to the California delegation, and certainly to his fine and devoted wife and two fine sons.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may be inserted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened by the news that our esteemed colleague, Hon. CARL HINSHAW, of the 20th Congressional District of California, had slipped from us into the Great Beyond on August 5, 1956.

Carl, as he was affectionately known, was an outstanding Member of the House from his very first election to the 76th Congress and to each succeeding Congress up to and including the 84th Congress. He was a man of outstanding ability. He brought to the Congress not only a background of education, but a varied experience that made him of unusual usefulness in the numerous and varied activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—in which he held membership—and in all the work of the House. His knowledge in the field of aviation and aeronautics was recognized and respected both in and out of Congress. He was looked upon by his colleagues as an expert in this and all other activities in the field of engineering. I know of no one in the Congress who can take his place at this time. It will be no easy task to find one comparable to him in all the work of a technical character. His judgment was always the result of complete and careful study on any subject upon which he expressed an opinion. He was a student at all times and his judgment was always sound.

CARL HINSHAW was born in Chicago, Ill., on July 28, 1894, the son of William Wade and Anna Williams Hinshaw. He was educated in the Chicago public schools. Later he attended Valparaiso University, Princeton University, where he received a degree in civil engineering in 1916, and the University of Michigan where he completed postgraduate studies in business administration. He enlisted in the United States Army on May 8, 1917, and served in the American Expeditionary Forces until September 1919, having obtained the rank of captain, Corps of Engineers. He moved from Chicago to Pasadena, Calif., in 1929, where he entered into business and became active in civic affairs and politics. He was elected to Congress on November 1, 1938, and has served continuously until his decease.

As an indication of the high regard in which our colleague was held in the field of engineering, with particular reference to aeronautics and its kindred subjects of activity, was the fact that he was awarded the citation of honor in 1948 by the Air Force Association and the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy by the National Aeronautic Association. This latter trophy was presented to him by President Eisenhower on December 17, 1953, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of powered flight.

Carl was a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Society of Automotive Engineers, the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences; and an honorary member of the Institute of Navigation; adviser to the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics; director of the National Aeronautic Association; and president of the Aero Club of Southern California, 1953–54.

He is survived by his wife, Roberta; two sons, John W. Hinshaw of New York City and William R. Hinshaw of the University of California; and his mother, Mrs. William Wade Hinshaw of Washington. I extend to them my deep and sincere sympathy and trust they have been comforted in their bereavement by the knowledge that Carl was held in high

regard by all who knew him and that a host of friends in Congress and outside of Congress mourn his passing from our midst.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on August 5 last, I learned with grief of the sudden death of our distinguished colleague, CARL HINSHAW. For 18 years he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

All who served with CARL HINSHAW in those years knew him well, I am sure. This was easy to do because he had an immense capacity for friendship. He was truly one who loved his fellow man.

CARL HINSHAW was recognized as one of Congress'—indeed one of the Nation's—foremost experts on aviation and airpower. For his contributions in this field he earned, and most deservedly, great praise. Often overlooked, however, by those on the sidelines was this: That no man worked harder, more efficiently, or with greater dedication on issues, the number and complexity of which were absolutely staggering, than CARL HINSHAW. He was not a man with but one big idea, or a few. He was a man with many. Whether investigating reasons for a plane crash or exploring peacetime uses of atomic power, his method was thorough, his mission noble. And when he spoke, he spoke incisively, decisively, and with a certain homespun conviction that made his contribution memorable.

During his lifetime, he was described by one student of politics as being "possessed of the intellectual honesty to hew the mark regardless of where the chips may fall." This is certainly true. His intellectual integrity, his unblemished honesty in public service, and his ability to chart a direct course on public matters combined to give him the qualities of true statesmanship.

Yes, CARL HINSHAW had a fine mind, a splendid mind that caused everyone to admire him; but his qualities of heart were no less admirable than his qualities of mind. As a junior member of my party's delegation from California, this was made movingly clear to me when I first entered these Chambers. CARL HINSHAW was dean of my party's delegation from California, and as such he sought in every way to explain to me the duties and perplexities of office and share with me the fruits of his vast experience.

Kindness, generosity, quiet leadership—these were hallmarks of CARL HINSHAW's conception of public service. His virtues were never reserved for a select few. To his colleagues and his constituents, to the people of his State and the people of his Nation, to men of good will in the entire world community, CARL HINSHAW's efforts were directed—capably, unselfishly, unfalteringly till death.

We shall deeply miss him. We extend to his family our sympathy. His legacy shall long remain to inspire and guide and vitalize our proceedings.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of California's most outstanding legislators, the late CARL HINSHAW. He represented the congressional district which adjoins mine in Los Angeles County, and we worked together constantly in serving the mutual interests of our two districts. He was never too busy to take the time to counsel and assist his junior colleagues on the California delegation. His advice helped me in innumerable ways as I began my service in the House.

CARL HINSHAW has left for all of us an example of dedicated service to the public. He always placed the welfare of the people of our country and of California above any personal ambitions of his own. Death has taken him from our midst but it can never take away the great contribution he made to the cause of good government.

His leadership in the aviation field had much to do with the development of southern California's great aviation center. His foresight and technical and legislative knowledge in aeronautics are responsible in great part for the fact that thousands of people in southern California enjoy the prosperity and comfort which the aviation industry has brought to them. His service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy helped to pioneer the development of this new source of power which will revolutionize and improve the standard of living of our people.

CARL HINSHAW was a truly great American and a great Californian. I shall miss his wonderful friendship and his wise counsel.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague, CARL HINSHAW, will deprive our House of the valuable experience and wise counsel of a man whose worth we all know. I recall with heartfelt thanks his most generous assistance and understanding guidance rendered so often to his younger and newer associates. Members of the California delegation and all others who served with him have suffered a great loss.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, without reiterating all that has been said, or anticipating what will be said, in respect to the memory of our departed colleague, CARL HINSHAW, I wish to associate myself with all our colleagues in paying him tribute today.

Too often, and this is one of those occasions, our love and respect for someone is not fully expressed in words until that person can no longer hear and appreciate them. CARL HINSHAW was one of those men who was consistently kind and helpful to others. He just as consistently refused to accept expressions of appreciation for these things he did for others. I believe this was due to his inherent modesty and shyness.

Those of us who knew him as junior colleagues in his California Congressional delegation knew him not only as a true and helpful associate, but as well as a wise and experienced friend to whom we were encouraged to confide not only the problems of our office but our personal problems as well. This confidence he extended to our families as well as ourselves.

So it is that his passing leaves us with the burden of a sense of personal loss added to that we bear as colleagues in the House of Representatives. So it also is that I express this sense of loss not only for myself, but for Mrs. Hosmer as well.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable that a sad note has to be injected in the early day of this 85th Congress to pay tribute to one of its distinguished deceased Members.

I served with CARL HINSHAW on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for many years. During the last years of my service my place on the committee was next to Carl.

We have had an unusually heavy toll of deaths on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House in the last year: The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Granahan; our beloved chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Priest; and the gentleman from California, Mr. Hinshaw.

Carl had been educated as a civil engineer. In addition to that he had a naturally scientific mind. On any matter of a technical nature he was one of the outstanding Members of Congress because he had not only a vast wealth of education and knowledge, but he also added to that knowledge by reason of his service in the House of Representatives and the experiences which he had as a legislator. I have often marveled at the various fields in which he was interested and the tremendous amount of work that he did as a Member of Congress. Sometimes when we sit in reflection we think perhaps certain Members overdo in the work they attempt.

CARL HINSHAW was not only a member of the exceedingly busy Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce but he also devoted a great deal of time as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to the tremendous problems of that committee.

Both in and out of Congress he was well known for the contribution which he made in the aeronautical field and in the field of electronics. He was awarded many honorary citations, including the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy presented to him by President Eisenhower on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of powered flight. Notwithstanding all these demands made upon his talents, he was, above all, devoted to his family.

To his fine wife and his two sons I want to express personally my deep sympathy.

I want also to join in the expression of loss, not only a personal loss, but loss to his district, to the State of California, and to the Nation. Carl was a devoted patriot, a great legislator, and we certainly shall miss him in the future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life of the late CARL HINSHAW.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know CARL HINSHAW well. I considered him a very able legislator and possessed of a very fine and intense loyalty to friends and to principles in which he believed.

To his wife and other loved ones I extend my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sorrow that we mark the death of CARL HINSHAW, an exceptional member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Coming to the House of Representatives in 1938, Mr. HINSHAW proved himself to be a valuable member of this committee, and was soon known to be a central figure in the development of the aviation policies of his Nation. Because of his avid interest in aeronautics, CARL HINSHAW was a valuable member of our Aviation Subcommittee. And it is with extreme pride that we recognize the truth in the statement from a New York newspaper editorial that referred to him as "the keenest student and advocate of airpower in Congress."

While I only had the pleasure of serving on the committee with Carl during the 84th Congress, I had long before learned of his many accomplishments and the great service he rendered his country.

CARL HINSHAW first entered the service of his country in World War I. He enlisted in the Army and served overseas in the 16th Engineers Corps. His noteworthy actions and capabilities earned him the promotion to the rank of captain before his discharge.

In the intervening years between World War I and his entry into Congress, CARL HINSHAW played an active role in the fields of business and State-level politics in California. As a result of his energetic political activity, his constituency sent Mr. HINSHAW to Congress in 1938.

While a Member of the House of Representatives, CARL HINSHAW'S work and contributions were marked by judicious forethought and intellectual honesty. Mr. HINSHAW was one of the Congressmen named to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study postwar domestic problems, attempting to obtain an enduring peace. Peace and its achievement was ever one of his goals. He strongly advocated the development of atomic energy for peacetime use when he was a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

We, his colleagues of this committee, perhaps are most indebted to CARL HINSHAW for his aeronautical contributions. Since 1940 he investigated every major airline crash, carefully collecting and compiling the data which was used with success in promoting air safety. He did much to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system and improve aids to air navigation and landing. All of these contributions have proved to be of great value to our Nation, our Armed Forces, our airlines, and our citizens.

Because of his broad knowledge and understanding of aviation, Mr. HINSHAW was vice chairman of the 1948 Congressional Air Policy Board and was chairman of its Combat Aircraft Subcommittee. His proficiency and competence were recognized by others than ourselves. In 1948 he received the Air Force Association's Citation of Honor. In 1953 he received the National Aeronautic Association's Wright Brothers' Memorial Trophy, which was presented to him by President Eisenhower.

CARL HINSHAW will long be remembered for his many contributions that were made through honest endeavor, faithfulness, and untiring labor. His loss is a serious one, but he will remain in our memories, respected and admired.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this memorial tribute to CARL HINSHAW. His family can well be proud of his service to our country and mankind.

One-half of my constituency was once represented by Carl. His contribution to the San Fernando Valley will stand forever. His leadership of the California Republican delegation and the entire California delegation will never be replaced.

I had a nickname for Carl—"Smiley." He enjoyed our joke and used the name himself. I think he would want it mentioned. No matter how busy he was, he was always first a human being and a servant of God and country.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of our good friend and able colleague, CARL HINSHAW, of California.

An overseas veteran in World War I, active throughout his life in community interests, a Member of this House for 18 years, he made a great contribution to his district and to the Nation.

Those of us who served with him here will recall his great ability as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

They will recall his great interest in aeronautics, evidenced by the award of the Citation of Honor by the Air Force Association in 1948, and the award of the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy by the National Aeronautic Association in 1953.

His Republican colleagues will also recall his effective work as a vice chairman of the Republican national congressional committee.

I have always admired his ability and have been grateful for his friendship. My family will always recall with appreciation and pleasure all that he and his family were good enough to do for them during the course of a visit to California several years ago.

CARL HINSHAW will be greatly missed by his colleagues in the House. I know that his wife and family have our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, a broken column, a man cut down at the peak of his effectiveness—that is all I can say for CARL HINSHAW. A man of tremendous ability, tremendous background, tremendous effectiveness, he is another of the Members for whom Congress will feel a tremendous loss. That is about all I can say. I respected and I loved CARL HINSHAW and his untimely death is a loss not only to the Congress but to the Nation. His education, his knowledge, and his complete intelligence about things of the atomic age were of superior value to those of us who have to legislate in that field. The column broken and a loss to all mankind. A column broken.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 20th District of California lost a distinguished Representative and the people of our country lost an able legislator in the passing of Congressman CARL HINSHAW.

I served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with CARL HINSHAW and came to know him well. He was a hard worker, capable, and a fine gentleman. His record of achievement in behalf of the people he represented and our Nation is outstanding. He is mourned by all who knew him and his presence is greatly missed by us.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, all of the eulogy and the abundant praise in recognition of the great work of our CARL HINSHAW, of California, is adopted by me as and for my own most sincerely, but may I also add that all during the 10 years I had the pleasure of being a member of the California delegation in this great legislative body with CARL HINSHAW, I increasingly had cause to appreciate his fine ability and willingness to share his most unusual resourcefulness in the matters of aviation and atomic energy with me whenever I asked him for information and, it so happens, that just about a week before his untimely passing he went out of his way to look me up and inform me of his further information gained on an important subject about which I had asked him 3 weeks before. In other words, he remembered my question to him made 3 weeks previously and was generous and kind enough to add to the information he had given me 3 weeks before.

This was typical of him in his treatment of me and then too I am so glad that just a few days before he passed on I went out of my way to deliberately look him up on the opposite side of the political aisle to tell him how much I appreciated being on the floor of the House when he was discussing a certain bill relating to the aviation industry. I shall always be glad that I gave him a bouquet of flowers in this connection while he could smell their fragrance. I extend to his lovely wife and family the understanding sympathy of Mrs. Doyle and myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 1956, CARL HINSHAW, an extraordinary colleague, went out from our midst. Coming to this House from the State of California in 1938, CARL HINSHAW was soon recognized as one of the key figures in the formulation of the United States aviation policy.

CARL HINSHAW'S services to his country began during World War I. He enlisted in the American Expeditionary Forces and served overseas in the 16th Engineers Corps. Because of his abilities, he attained the rank of captain before his discharge.

After leaving the Army, CARL HINSHAW became active in the world of business, attaining a success which was not unusual for a man of his exceptional capabilities. A man of many parts, he began playing an energetic role in politics. He was president of the 47th District Republican Assembly of California, the vice president of the Los Angeles County Republican Assembly, and a member of the Republican State Central Committee.

As a result of his keen political activity, Mr. HINSHAW was sent to the House

of Representatives in 1938. As a Member of Congress, he served on the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. His work was marked by keen and judicious forethought, and his ideas were "possessed of the intellectual honesty to hew the mark regardless of where the chips fell."

CARL HINSHAW was considered one of our leading experts on aviation. He had made many contributions to this field of endeavor, one of which was the minute investigation of every major plane crash since 1940. The data collected by him proved to be of considerable value in the compilation of material on air safety, which has proved beneficial to our Nation, our airline industries, and our public. Not only do we, his fellow members, recognize his great ability in the field of aeronautics: In 1948 he received the Citation of Honor from the Air Force Association, and in 1953, the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy of the National Aeronautics Association.

Peace was ever in Mr. HINSHAW's mind. While a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, he strongly advocated the promotion of atomic energy for peaceful uses. Many were the contributions made by this fine legislator—contributions that were marked by foresight and judgment. The loss of CARL HINSHAW is inded a grave one to his fellow citizens, his Government, and his Nation, and he will long be remembered with affection and very great esteem.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our colleague, the gentleman from California, CARL HINSHAW, creates a void in this body that is felt by all of us, Republican and Democrat alike. But especially is it felt by those of us who worked closely with him in his important committee assignments affecting deeply the development and application of the two great technical developments of our age—aviation and atomic energy.

It is for us who remain to see to it that in our work his spirit of selfless, nonpartisan dedication to progress in these fields is continued. By emulating his example, we shall cast a lasting monument to him, not in cold stone but in the hearts of our fellow men.

CARL HINSHAW's work in aviation and atomic energy can be epitomized in one phrase: Service above self. That is the doctrine he followed in this work, and it is because he placed service above self that he is no longer with us. As surely as those early greats of aviation died that man might know the freedom of flight, so CARL HINSHAW spent the full measure of his physical endurance that man might fly safely. He did not die in Bethesda, although that was where his last hours were spent: he died on the mountainside where two mighty airliners lay mangled and destroyed, cast down from the sky through tragic misadventure. He died striving to make flying safe for his fellow men.

In the many years I knew and worked with CARL HINSHAW my respect for him, great though it was from the start, grew deeper and stronger not just in the sense of expanding confidence that long and close association brings, but in the intellectual recognition of him as a man dedicated to the use of his many talents so that, through the miracles of two great technologies, his fellow man might live a little better, a little longer, a little freer.

Let me now speak about his work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

CARL HINSHAW's contributions to the field of atomic energy are both pervasive in scope and penetrating in vision. In the military field he was one of the first members of the joint committee to point out that this Nation's program for the development of thermonuclear weapons—a development that he deplored but thought necessary to deter the expansionist forces of the Red hordes—was insufficient and, unless strengthened, would end in "too little too late." That view was forcibly put forth by the joint committee, and the prompt development of thermonuclear weapons proceeded successfully.

So too was he among the first to realize that our national effort to develop an atomic powered aircraft was not only woefully inadequate, but doomed to failure unless pushed strongly at the highest Government levels. When the aircraft propulsion program was in all effect immobilized he continued to fight for it, in the joint committee, in the military services, and in the Atomic Energy Commission. Today, the aircraft nuclear program is gathering momentum. Though it can never regain the time lost, the efforts of CARL HINSHAW, joined by the other members of the joint committee who through his patient explanations and clear expositions came ever more clearly to see the vital national defense need for a nuclear powered aircraft, will live on as nuclear power on wings is bent to do man's bidding in peace and in defense.

But it is in the development of nuclear power for peace that CARL HINSHAW brought all his talents of engineering, investment, and statecraft to bear with greatest emphasis.

Today we are but faintly able to see the bright future that nuclear power, turning the wheels of our industry and lighting and heating our homes, will bring to mankind everywhere.

CARL HINSHAW saw and recognized perhaps more clearly than anyone else, the impact that the application of nuclear power to industrial development would have on the economic well-being of the world. His contributions to the development of nuclear reactors for peaceful purposes are beyond cataloging.

These halls shall hear CARL HINSHAW speak no more. But in a deeper sense, he shall be with us and we with him: we who still have a few moments in eternity still remaining here, and he who has already fulfilled his destiny, joined in the common purpose of service to our fellow men.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of a resolution of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expressing our deep personal loss in the death of the gentleman from California, CARL HINSHAW, and extending our sympathy to his family.

CARL HINSHAW served on the joint committee from its inception. He was one of the most valuable members ever appointed to the committee. He brought to the work in the field of atomic energy unusual intelligence, technical ability, and great vision. His invaluable service to the joint committee, to the Congress, and to his country will never be forgotten:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas CARL HINSHAW has been called by his Maker; and

Whereas we cherished him as a friend,

Whereas we cherished him as a friend, were benefited by his counsel, and valued his analytical ability; and

Whereas this Nation has lost much on his passing, but gained from his tireless work as a member of this committee; and

Whereas the people of this country and all freemen will for generations have cause to be thankful for his selfless imaginative and productive work in the field of atomic energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy assembled, That we hereby express our deep personal loss, and that we extend to his widow, his family, and loved ones our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I join most sincerely in the tributes being paid to our late distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CARL HINSHAW.

Congressman HINSHAW to some degree was my mentor in that I now have the honor of representing some several hundred thousand constituents formerly represented in this body by him. I can attest to the very, very high esteem in which he was held throughout that district by hundreds, even thousands of people there. They thought very fine things of him and he merited those good thoughts.

I shall always be grateful to him for his wise advice and counsel when I came here as a freshman and subsequently. We all regret his passing and we join in this tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of CARL HINSHAW, California has lost one of its most able Congressmen. I had the pleasure of serving with him on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 10 years, since its inception, as a matter of fact. In those 10 years CARL HINSHAW made a tremendous contribution to this new and mysterious art.

Particularly was he interested in the peacetime application of atomic energy in the field of medicine. Shortly before adjournment last year he held hearings and brought out a report almost singlehanded because of the duties of the other Members of his subcommittee who could not attend. This was one of the fine reports brought out last year by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the peacetime benefits of the atom.

He was also interested in the aircraft nuclear project which some day will give us an engine that will enable man to

circumnavigate the globe without refueling, as we can at this time with the nuclear powered submarine *Nautilus*, which he was also tremendously interested in.

In fact, in the whole field of atomic energy, as I look back at it, I remember that he was a member of the subcommittee which studied the feasability of the hydrogen bomb. I happened to be the subcommittee chairman of that particular subcommittee. We traveled together to practically all of the Atomic Energy installations. We interviewed our Nation's foremost scientists on this particular subject. He was the ranking minority member of that subcommittee. After listening to the testimony he and I both came to the conclusion this was a project that we had to enter into if we were going to maintain our leadership in the world. We brought back a unanimous report to the full committee, which was also, as I remember, unanimously or almost unanimously approved. Later on that project was started with results we are all familiar with.

If it had not been for some of CARL HINSHAW's contributions in the field of medicine, in connection with the aircraft nuclear project, and in other fields, I am sure we would not have progressed as far as we did, in taking the tremendous strides which have been taken in the last 10 years.

I had occasion, of course, sitting with Carl during the years of our membership on the committee, to get to know him well. He and I sometimes differed on legislative projects, but there was never any bitterness between us. In fact, we were close friends, both in the Congress and in a social way.

I know Mrs. Hinshaw and the boys and I feel that in the passing of CARL HINSHAW we have not only lost a member of the California delegation, and a valuable Member of Congress but that many of us have lost a close and honorable friend.

I extend to Mrs. Hinshaw, the boys and the family, my sympathy in the passing of a good husband and father.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from California and the other Members of the House who have spoken relative to the untimely and unfortunate passing of our friend and colleague, CARL HINSHAW. I think perhaps one of the outstanding memories that any Member of this body has is the memory of the first day or the first few days when he comes to what is frequently a very strange, complicated situation, involved parliamentary procedure, and finds it necessary to turn to those who are his seniors in point of membership to seek guidance, advice, and counsel. That was my experience when I came here as a freshman Congressman in January 1947.

Mr. Speaker, CARL HINSHAW was more than kind; more than gracious in understanding, in offers of assistance, in extending advice which is so sorely needed, indeed, by a new Member of this body.

I think that nothing could be added to what has already been said relative to CARL HINSHAW's professional qualifications. He was an accomplished engineer. He was, as has been pointed out, an authority in the field of commercial and military aviation. His contribution to the important, vital work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has contributed materially, I am sure, to the progress that has been made by that committee and by all of the Government agencies involved in the implementation of the atomic-energy program. He was a kind man; he was a thoughtful man; he was one who was always just in arriving at his decisions and in implementing them. As chairman of the California delegation in the House of Representatives, his tenure was marked by equity and by fairness to every member of the delegation irrespective of which side of the aisle he happened to sit on.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the others who have already spoken in extending the deep sympathy of the House to Mrs. Hinshaw and to the two boys. They have suffered the greatest loss, but other losers are this body, this country, his State, and the district which he cherished so much and which he represented so long and so faithfully in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, for some time I had the privilege of being a constituent of Mr. HINSHAW's and when I came to the 84th Congress as a new Member he was most considerate and kind in offering his friendship and in giving of his time and advice. I deem it a great privilege to join my colleagues in expressing my own sympathy to Mrs. Hinshaw and to the members of his family and to his many friends, for indeed not only all of the California delegation but all in the State of California have lost a true statesman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tributes that are being paid to CARL HINSHAW. I, too, came to the Congress 2 years ago as a new member of the California delegation, and it was an inspiration to me to find CARL HINSHAW, as the head of the California delegation, so willing to devote his time and his energy in giving us, who were new, helpful guidance whenever we needed it. He set up a standard in all of those various consultations that I shall never forget, and I would like to join with the other members of the California delegation and the other Members of this body in paying tribute to CARL HINSHAW and the work he has done here, and in expressing my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleague and the new chairman of the California delegation, Congressman GORDON MCDONOUGH, for making this special order available to us for the purpose of paying tribute to our former colleague and my personal friend, CARL HINSHAW.

Carl served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for many years and was held in the highest esteem and respect by the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle.

He became a recognized authority throughout the world on aviation matters, which came within the jurisdiction of the committee on which he served on interstate and foreign commerce.

As evidence of his high accomplishment in the field of aviation, he was awarded in 1948 a citation by the Air Force Association. And in 1953 he received the coveted Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy from the National Aeronautic Association, which was presented by President Eisenhower on the 50th anniversary of powered flight.

Aside from the extensive knowledge, experience, and ability which CARL HINSHAW brought to the Congress of the United States, he was a man who attracted friendship and admiration from those with whom he associated. He was a popular member of our delegation. Those of us who served with him for many years counted him a close personal friend, and his passing is a loss to us as well as to our State and to the Nation.

I want to join with my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a feeling of sadness that I join the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] and my other colleagues to pay tribute to the memory of our beloved friend, the late Honorable CARL HINSHAW, late a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

When I first came to this body, it was my privilege and pleasure to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives with Mr. HINSHAW. In addition to serving with him on the full committee, it was also a rare privilege for me to serve with him on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications. At all times I found him willing to give advice and counsel to me and to the other younger members of the committee upon which we served. He was a true and a loyal friend. He was a man of conviction, a man of sterling character, a man of great and unquestioned integrity. The Nation, the State, and the district which he represented are saddened indeed by the loss of this great American and this great Representative in the Congress.

I join the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] and my other colleagues in this body and on the committee on which we serve in expressing heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Hinshaw and their sons.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my tribute to CARL HINSHAW, with whom I served for 10 years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During all of that period our associations were extremely close. I was with him on all sorts of occasions, pleasant and unpleasant, in periods of relaxation and in periods of strenuous work on the most technical subjects, such as air navigation and the like. So I believe I had as good an opportunity as anybody to form an estimate of CARL HINSHAW'S character, his capacity, and his talent.

CARL HINSHAW was an engineer with a mind trained in science. In many ways he brought to our committee a more expert knowledge than any of the rest of us. In the field of aviation, his qualifications have already been mentioned. But in the field of communications he was also exceptionally well versed. I doubt if there has ever served in this Congress a man with a greater comprehension of the problems and the roles of aviation than CARL HINSHAW. When I speak of the problems of aviation, I am thinking not merely of the mechanical and technical problems, but the economic problems of commercial aviation, air routes, and all other matters that could arise in connection with this great new development in transportation.

While our committee has nothing to do with the legislative subject of atomic energy, I was glad that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] mentioned it. I am sure, knowing CARL HINSHAW as I did, that he must have been an altogether invaluable member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In talks which I had with him on that subject I found him more enlightening than anybody else I knew. I had boundless esteem for CARL HINSHAW. Also I had the greatest affection for him. I considered that he was an outstanding legislator in every way. He had a penetrating mind. He mastered any subject he had to deal with. He was a delightful companion, a warm friend, and a most attractive human being. On our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his place will never really be filled. We shall miss him enormously. I personally shall miss him as long as I live and I express my sincerest sympathy to his widow and to his two sons.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that today we do not have with us in person our beloved colleague CARL HINSHAW. His passing seems to us most untimely and has taken from us a man whose wealth of knowledge and a personality sorely needed as we face the challenges of the day.

I looked upon Carl as a veteran legislator and as a younger member looked for guidance in his opinions. He was always most kind to all younger associates and held out to them a helping hand.

Our deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Hinshaw and members of the family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, CARL HINSHAW was one of the first of the senior members of the California congressional delegation with whom I became acquainted when first I came to the House of Representatives. He became one of my finest and most valued of my legislative friends, a relationship which continued until the time of his death.

I join in the many fine tributes which have been made to his abilities. We in California and in the Nation have lost a most valuable public servant and a fine American.

May I also extend the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Allen and myself to Mrs. Hinshaw and the two sons.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, membership in this body has many compensations and also many moments of anguish. One of the great compensations is that we can and do associate with big men. I thought of Carl HINSHAW as one of those men whom we all consider big because his influence extended far beyond the halls of this Congress. The moments of anguish that we all share are those moments when people like CARL HINSHAW depart and leave us behind.

We know that his reward will be great and that his reward already has been great because he served with the satisfaction of knowing that he was rendering a service to his family, to his community, and to his Nation.

I am sure all of us from the Middle West, from Indiana especially, think of him as a Hoosier because, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] so well expressed it, he had his roots in our State, and he often talked to me about the things back home. So we feel that he had many homes, one of them being in Indiana, but we like to think of him as typically an American rather than belonging to any one section. Now he belongs to the ages, and we are happy to cherish his memory.

I join with his colleagues in expressing sympathy to his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of CARL HINSHAW. It was my pleasure to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the first 2 years I was in Congress. I found no one more able, willing, and considerate in helping new Members than was Carl.

I should like to add this little poem:

Life is like a journey on a railroad train,
With a pair of faces at each window pane.
I may sit beside you the whole journey through,
Or I may sit elsewhere, never knowing you.
But if fate should mark me to sit by your side,
Let's be pleasant travelers, for life's so short a ride.

It was my pleasure to sit by Carl. I always found Carl a very entertaining, a very considerate, and a very fine traveling companion. I shall miss him, and I want to express to his widow and to his two sons my deep sympathy in the loss of one of our truly great Congressmen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep feeling in the passing of CARL HINSHAW. It is with heavy hearts that the California delegation has taken this day to pay tribute to one of our former colleagues, CARL HINSHAW, who was taken from us last year. He served his State and Nation so well over the past several sessions in the House of Representatives. CARL HINSHAW was the ranking Member of the Republican delegation from California. He gave freely of his great knowledge and experience to those of us who came later as Representatives from California. His knowledge of engineering, aviation, and atomic energy was of great assistance and aided his colleagues in much legislation dealing with these subjects. He was always willing and able to confer with us personally and with the delegation as a whole. And we shall greatly miss him in our deliberations. His passing is a great loss to his district, our State and our Nation. I desire to express to his bereaved family my sympathy in their great loss. May they take some measure of comfort at least in the knowledge that he lived a useful life, dedicated to the service of his beloved country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be reconciled to the fact that CARL HINSHAW has gone. This House will feel his loss keenly in days to come.

I came to know CARL HINSHAW as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as a fellow member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications. To know CARL HINSHAW was to love and to respect him. I join his many, many friends in this body, in the State of California, and throughout the Nation in paying tribute to his beloved memory and in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the Members of the House who have expressed their sentiments on this occasion concerning our beloved, departed colleague from the delegation from California, CARL HINSHAW. We feel he has made a great contribution here that will be difficult to fulfill. We wish his successor, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], the best of everything, but we also realize that the services of Mr. HINSHAW were an asset to the Congress that are going to be very difficult to replace.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL BUDGET PRACTICE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing as one of my first bills in this Congress, a measure I am deeply interested in and which would further carry out legislation I introduced in the last Congress. This bill would place the entire Federal budget on an annual-accrued-expenditure basis, and would further implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for a modernization of financial management in the Federal Government. This measure would provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by the Congress and would reduce, or eliminate, the large carryover of balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to the next. It would certainly give the Congress a better yardstick for measuring Government spending, and it has been estimated to save billions of dollars annually when in full effect.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of many months of analysis and research by experienced personnel in the General Accounting Office, Department of the Treasury, and Budget Bureau. It has received vigorous bipartisan support, and has received the strongest endorsement of the highest financial officers of the Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is my earnest hope that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation.

DROUGHT AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have had the sad experience of knowing some individual who suffered with cancer or with some other incurable disease and have had to see that individual gradually waste away. We did not know, and he probably did not know, of his plight until it was far advanced. I do not know how many of us have experienced the same sort of thing as it applies to a community or a vast area dying with drought. But, just as one of these incurable diseases may gradually and imperceptibly take the strength and finally the life of an individual, so prolonged drought can take the strength and finally the economic life of any community in the world. It has been so since the beginning. There are vast areas in various sections of the world where history tells us that at one time there flourished great civilizations with fields and vineyards and pastures where today there is nothing but drifting sands and stones.

For a long time we did not realize how that situation was brought about. Today with our better knowledge of soil conservation, we know that in many cases it has taken but a very small change in the balance of things to change the land from fertile pastures to arid deserts. We know that once a land starts on that downward road that unless man is intelligent enough to interpose some obstacles, that land is likely to continue to lose its productive powers until it becomes entirely unproductive. Drought begets drought, and erosion increases erosion. I fear, my colleagues, that we are facing that situation in a vast area in America. It is especially severe in the area that I represent, but my home area is not the only area involved. My home State is not the only State involved. There are a number of States of this Union that are involved. Unfortunately there is a great area—far more States in 1956 than in 1955; more in 1955 than in 1954.

Do you realize that in some areas this thing has been going on for 9 long years? In my hometown, Waco, Tex., the rainfall records show that without exception for the last 9 years—for 9 consecutive years—we have had less than normal rainfall; and in this last year of 1956 we had only 45 percent of normal rainfall. And our normal is going down. I can remember when we had a normal rainfall of 35 inches at Waco. The Weather Bureau gave me these figures just this morning, which show that our normal rainfall is now only 32.90 inches, because 8 of these last 9 years are added into the years from which our average is figured, thereby bringing down our normal figure.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. A farmer told me in Utah that we had not had a normal year of precipitation in 40 years. I do not know what you call normal.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. IKARD. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas for bringing to the attention of the House this truly national problem. None of the great national disasters, in my judgment, are any more devastating than that of the drought. It may not strike with the suddenness of a storm or a flood or a tornado, but the end result is many more times disastrous. It is a creeping thing that slips up on you. Sometimes you realize that you are in the middle of a drought vacuum.

I think it might be of interest, since you say this is not confined to any one State but to a very great southwestern area and regions of the Midwest and Far West, to give you some figures I have.

In Texas our rainfall has been subnormal for 8 of the last 10 years. In 1956 it was a little over 5 inches below normal. In 1951 it was 6.61 inches below normal. In 1952 it was 4.76 inches below normal. In 1953 it was 3.98 inches below normal. In 1954 it was 9½ inches below normal. And in 1955 it was 4.85 inches below normal. And in 1956 it was a little over 11½ inches below normal.

So it has been getting progressively worse, to the point where it is spelling out real disaster.

We are all interested in our own districts, of course, but if the gentleman would allow me I would like to put in some figures about the counties in my district.

In Wichita County the rainfall normally is 26.64 inches. It was 21.31 inches in 1956, which is a deficiency of 5.33 inches, or 20 percent.

Mr. POAGE. And I am sure that Wichita County probably has the best record of any county in the gentleman's district. I know that his home town happens to be in the best shape of any of the major towns in Texas as far as 1956 rainfall is concerned, although it is suffering very materially at the present time.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman. I was going to make that point. But even though we are off over 20 percent, we are in better shape than in much of the area around us. In other counties, Montague was 49 percent below normal. In Cooke County, 41 percent. Wise County, 42 percent; Denton County, 51 percent; Hardeman County, 52 percent; Wilbarger County, 50 percent; Throckmorton, 58 percent; Young County, 50 percent; Archer, I do not have the figure. Baylor, 51 percent below normal. Jack County, 44 percent below; Foard County, 58 percent below, and Knox County, 62 percent below.

So you can see at the end of a 10-year period many counties in this area—and there are many other areas in Texas—who have been living with this thing much longer than I have, like the district represented by Mr. FISHER, that even now we are getting about 50 percent of our normal rainfall.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman very much for those illuminating figures. I hope to be able to give a few more general figures that will show something of the extent of this drought.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are the rainfall figures for a number of scattered Texas points for the past 10 years:

City	Normal annual rainfall (1921–50)	Actual annual rainfall									
		1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Abilene	22.55	20.02	13.94	28.37	26.30	14.83	13.88	19.75	16.02	22.68	9.78
Fort Worth	32.29	30.20	20.11	43.65	34.22	23.37	22.69	24.74	19.55	25.16	18.55
Laredo	19.49	23.61	14.19	20.08	10.63	15.48	10.54	16.66	13.50	9.61	9.95
Lubbock	18.89	13.93	11.86	29.36	15.09	15.53	13.76	12.31	13.99	16.84	10.83
Lufkin	[1] 45.93	[2]	[2]	55.15	48.45	34.48	40.57	51.53	35.47	33.05	[2]
San Angelo	19.83	13.46	12.51	24.51	15.27	12.00	9.01	21.06	9.92	12.87	7.41
Waco	32.95	33.79	24.41	31.49	27.68	20.12	27.25	32.03	14.92	20.18	15.15
Wichita Falls	26.64	23.63	21.85	28.72	30.25	22.71	16.36	21.40	21.14	28.63	21.31

[1] Average 46 years.
[2] Incomplete.
[3] No data.

This shows, as I stated awhile ago, that Waco has had 9 consecutive years of less than normal rainfall and that last year we received only 45.97 percent of normal.

Here are the percentage figures for Texas cities:

Texas

City	Percentage of normal rainfall during 1956	Number of years short out of last 10 years
	Percent	
Abilene	43.37	7
Ft. Worth	57.44	8
Laredo	50.53	8
Lubbock	57.27	9
Lufkin	[1] 71.95	[2] 4
San Angelo	37.36	8
Waco	45.97	[3] 9
Wichita Falls	79.99	7

[1] 1955.
[2] Out of last 5 for which records are available.
[3] Consecutive years.

I have found it impossible to get accurate rainfall figures for many out of Texas points. However, the Weather Bureau was able to give us figures on a few points with 1955 as the last year of record. These show that the drought is widespread.

Here is the record for a few points:

City	Normal annual rainfall (1921–50)	1955
Blanding, Utah	[1] 12.77	8.02
Clayton, N. Mex	15.42	12.82
La Junta, Colo	14.05	11.14
Woodward, Okla	[2] 25.07	17.07

[1] Average 47 years.
[2] Average 64 years.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is certainly rendering a fine service by bringing the attention of the Congress and the country to this disastrous situation which exists in Texas, the Southwest, and a good part of the Middle West, too, for that matter.

Probably the most understandable test of when a drought condition has reached disaster proportions is the designation by the Secretary of Agriculture of a county as being of disaster status. My able colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD] has just given figures showing the widespread abnormal rainfall condition in his district. As the gentleman knows, every county in Texas except 6 out of 254 are now officially designated as disaster area counties, and many of those, certainly many in the area I represent in southwest Texas, have been so designated repeatedly, for as many as 5 or even 6 or 7 years. As the gentleman has so well pointed out, that carries with it a terrific toll in terms of economic loss to farmers, ranchmen, and to business as well. It has played havoc with topsoil in many places and much of the normal cover for grazing has been reduced or lost on the ranges.

I think for the purpose of underscoring the extent and the seriousness of this disaster, if the gentleman will yield to me for just a minute——

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, I yield. I recognize the gentleman is deeply concerned over this situation and I value his suggestions.

Mr. FISHER. I will quote from some national publications that have taken notice of this condition. I assume, of course, that my distinguished colleague from Texas will follow later in his remarks with a discussion of legislation which he and a number of the rest of us have offered which we think would help alleviate or at least provide a means of helping restore the country to normalcy once the rain begins to fall. So, on the question of the seriousness and the extent of this disaster to which the gentleman has referred, I think it appropriate to quote from a few of these statements that have been made in recent months by nationally recognized publications. One that I have before me, Mr. Speaker, is from the U. S. News & World Report, dated October 12, 1956, and I will quote the first two paragraphs. Here is what it says:

The worst drought in living memory, far more widespread than the Dust Bowl drought of the 1930's, is searing the Great Plains and the vast cattle ranches of the Southwest. In the States that are hit hardest farmers have just gone through another year of burned-out crops. Many are going broke. Businessmen in the drought areas are hurt, some in small towns are folding up.

I call attention now to a quotation from the December 17, 1956, issue of Time magazine made after a thorough survey in respect to this matter, with a very good map from the Department of Agriculture showing the extent in color of this devastating drought. This statement is made after referring to the disastrous drought:

In 5 years the drought has stolen an estimated $2.7 billion from the pockets of Texas farmers and ranchers alone. Over this entire area the total is many times higher. Too frequently those hit hardest have been those least able to resist.

Then I quote from a recent feature story in the Saturday Evening Post published within the past month, I believe; this statement is found at the beginning of the story:

To a great number of Texans 1957 will be a year of crisis. They need rain to survive. For 7 long years they have endured a drought that has scorched a vast area in southern Texas and dried up wells, springs, and rivers. Weather Bureau records going back to 1884 tell of nothing so disastrous as this. The siege in this area is judged to be the worst in at least 300 years.

One other quotation, then I will conclude. I appreciate the patience of the gentleman in yielding to me.

In the current issue of Newsweek, dated January 14, 1957, is contained this paragraph which is pertinent to the subject:

During the yast 5 years, drought has been creeping up on the American Southwest. Farmers complained about bad years, cattlemen moved their herds to new pictures, weather bureaus worriedly measured the rainfall. But only in recent months has the existence of drought, on a broad and destructive scale, become a grim reality. As the new year began, the Department of Agriculture announced that about 760 counties in 15 States were classified as drought-disaster areas. A total of some 29 million acres, in the West and Southwest, are affected—or almost half a million square miles. Conditions in some areas, the Department said, are "the worst in recorded history." Losses have run to the billions.

I mention these, Mr. Speaker, because I think they serve to dramatize and to point out the extent of the seriousness of one of the most disastrous things that has overtaken the southwestern part of the United States in recorded history, as confirmed by the Weather Bureau and as confirmed by the Department of Agriculture itself.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] can confirm it from his own experience because he lives in that area.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed; as the gentleman knows, I represent a vast stock-farming and ranching district which has been fighting this disaster for up to 7 years. I have seen it and lived with it, as the gentleman who is addressing us has done, during these long, depressing years.

I know it is most encouraging to the people in southwest Texas to know that President Eisenhower is taking time out from his very busy life to make a personal visit to the area on an inspection tour. He will spend a night in my hometown of San Angelo, and will see and fly over much of that parched area. That interest on the part of the President is most gratifying and appreciated.

The gentleman from Waco, now addressing us, has spearheaded many legislative drives for governmental aid, where it can be appropriately applied, to the victims and to the area. And he is doing that very thing now in the form of a proposed deferred-grazing plan for rangelands and a protein-feed program which is so badly needed during the coming months for breeding stock. These programs, along with stepped-up dam construction to retain floodwaters, will help to alleviate the suffering and contribute to rehabilitation and stability.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. May I say that we recognize Texans as authorities on drought because, from all reports, Texas has one of the worst droughts this year that has ever been experienced anywhere. But if I may, let me add a word on this subject as a Missourian.

We, too, have been wrestling with droughts for the last 5 years ourselves. I come from a section in south Missouri where 60 to 75 cents out of every dollar we handle originates with the meat, milk, and eggs produced on our Ozark farms. This year, in spite of the grasshoppers, we thought we had enough feed to get us through the winter. But in August and September we got barely enough rain to measure. We lost our fall pasture. And where we would ordinarily start feeding December 1, most of our farmers began using their winter supplies as early as the first day of August. This abnormally long feeding season plus a subnormal crop to begin with have brought disaster to many counties of Missouri. Fifty to seventy-five percent of our farmers are

out of hay and grain. Alfalfa hay is selling for $52 a ton—prairie hay for $35. Our people cannot buy it and stay in business. So the newspaper want ad sections are filled with notices of auction sales.

The drought hit us late this year, but the effect was just as disastrous as it has been in previous years when it hit us early.

The people of Missouri are grateful, indeed, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for bringing this drought situation to the Nation's attention. And may I add that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], in my opinion, has one of the finest grasps of the farm situation of any man I have met since I arrived in Washington. So I am eager to hear any suggestion he might have on this problem.

Let me point out that legislation is already on the books which would help the Missouri farmers who have been affected by the drought this year; but, as yet, we cannot get the Secretary of Agriculture to designate our section as a disaster area under Public Law 875 so we may receive its benefits. As far as the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned, we have no drought in southwest Missouri, in spite of the fact that the county agents say we have a drought, the State FHA Administrator says we have a drought, the State ASC administrator says we have a drought, and the two representatives who came from the Department of Agriculture to south Missouri and held hearings on the ground must have seen that we have a drought. But as yet, Governor Donnelly's two requests have fallen on deaf ears.

Now, I am in hopes that we can extend drought legislation to cover these serious problems that are affecting the farmers in so many States, and I am in hopes, too, that, in the administration of those proposals, they will not be lost by arbitrary administrative neglect.

I thank you very much.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Missouri, and I can only suggest to him that certainly he has convinced me that they do have drought in southwestern Missouri. He has been most attentive to the problems of his district. I think he convinced the Committee on Agriculture, and the committee, through our chairman, did ask the Secretary of Agriculture who promised that he would make a resurvey of the Missouri situation immediately. I think that the gentleman is to be congratulated on his industry and his ability.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, for his initiative in bringing the serious problem of the drought areas to the attention of the Congress. I also appreciate his willingness to give me some of his time.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Christian nation, and consequently it is quite natural that when disaster strikes the hearts of all Americans go out in sympathetic aid to their stricken neighbors. Our response to flood, earthquake, and hurricane disasters and massacre, such as we have in Hungary, is usually dramatic and immediate.

Today you have given me the privilege of telling you briefly about a disaster that is not as sudden, not as dramatic, and not as appealing to the sympathies of the American people as the disasters of flood, earthquake, hurricane, or massacre; yet, at the same time, it is a slow-working disaster that bids well to become a disaster that is far more extensive and possibly just as brutal. It is the disaster of drought.

In the great State of Utah, it is not a sudden drought but, what is worse, a drought of 3 years' standing, growing in intensity and cumulative in its devastating effects.

The drought-stricken area in Utah covers 19 counties, largely in the south and southeastern portions in the State. All of these counties have been declared eligible for drought relief. This area depends upon the livestock industry almost entirely as its chief source of income. The situation has now become so critical that families who before the drought were well to do are now being forced to abandon their homes and ranches, to dispose of even their foundation herds of livestock, and to move or commute to industrial centers to find work.

Once the foundation herds are lost, the basis of the agricultural economy in the entire southern portion of the State is materially impaired and will require years to restore, if it is possible to completely restore it at all.

Both the drought and the overgrazing of the lands under the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have caused serious erosion in most of the Utah watersheds. As a result of poor cover, what snow there is melts and rushes down the slopes sweeping the topsoil with it instead of soaking into the ground and coming out later in the summer in the form of springs and streams as it used to do. So the drought is more than a threat to the livestock industry alone; it is a threat to industry and community life. Definite and unusual steps must be taken to correct the situation and to avert further disaster.

To illustrate the extent of damage, Mr. Royal K. Pierson, of the Bureau of Land Management, has estimated that throughout the southern third of the State of Utah the average reduction in cattle and sheep on Taylor grazing lands is 50 percent. This reduction was not forced by the Bureau of Land Management but was accepted voluntarily by the stockmen because they knew that there was insufficient feed to sustain their flocks.

Utah's livestock in the southern area are wintered largely on lands controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. In many large sections there is virtually no winter range. This confronts the livestock people with the alternative of feeding their cattle on the ranches all winter at high cost or disposing of their livestock entirely. The drought has not only paralyzed the ranges but dried up the irrigation streams which were used to grow feed grains and hay.

The dilemma of having little range and very little, if any, feed, has caused the livestock people by the hundreds to dump their entire herds on the market; and, of course, this dumping of thin livestock has helped to depress the market.

Congress has passed laws which are giving considerable help, but livestock people are extremely reticent to accept the help; and when it is accepted, it is still difficult to even begin to make up for the extensive ravages of drought.

The Department of Agriculture is paying $7.50 per ton toward the hay which livestock people in drought countries must purchase. The Department has also succeeded in securing reduced freight rates on this hay. But most of the worst sufferers are so remote from centers where hay is available that transportation costs are high. The scarcity of feed in the State has also greatly increased the cost of hay.

The Department also reimburses livestock people at the extent of $1.50 per hundred weight on feed grains and protein concentrates. This is tending to help many of the livestock people to preserve their foundation herds.

Over the past 3½-year period, producers in Utah have received almost $4,600,000, and over the past 6 months' period nearly $1 million from the Government for drought relief loans and assistance. In addition to these measures, we have the Government purchase of grass fed livestock for the school-lunch program, the liberalization of credit, which is giving great assistance, also some easing of Forest Service restrictions on grazing. The latter will only postpone the day of reckoning, because when livestock are fed cottonseed cakes and protein concentrates and deprived of bulk feeds, they are so ravenous for the latter that they practically destroy the browse and forage that is left. This creates even a worse threat to the watersheds of the State.

I have gone on record with extensive statements to the effect that the support prices on the basic commodities have done much to injure the livestock industry, and that the livestock man is a "forgotten man." For example, today the price on wheat is 84 percent of parity; cotton is 87 percent of parity; rice is 82 percent of parity; peanuts 82 percent of parity; yet, poultry is 55 percent of parity; sheep 52 percent of parity; wool 74 percent of parity; beef 65 percent of parity; and calves 64 percent of parity. And now livestock has the drought situation to cope with as well as the competition of the basic commodities under price support. Surely it is time for us to take almost radical steps to overcome these disparities. Possible sources of help might be found in the following measures which Senator WATKINS and I are introducing in the Senate and House:

First, the Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly asked for authority to use low-quality Government storage wheat as feed grain. I intend to submit a bill which would give him the authority to dispose of 100 million bushels annually for this purpose; especially in consideration of the desperate situation of the live-

stock people in the drought and deficient feed areas.

Second, exempt livestock and poultry people from marketing quota penalties on wheat if fed on their own farm.

Third, inasmuch as the acreage reserve portion and even the conservation portion of the soil-bank legislation were geared to benefit the basic commodities and give very little immediate assistance to the livestock industry, I implore Congress to give careful consideration to a program of deferred grazing on the watershed lands under the control of the Forest Service, some of the public domain controlled by the Bureau of Land Management, and some of the private range lands that are being seriously eroded and depleted. The situation of the Utah livestock people is a case in point and illustrates the needs for this latter suggestion:

Seventy-two percent of the entire area of the State of Utah is owned by the Federal Government. Fifty percent of the livestock is being forced off Taylor grazing lands this year. Twenty to thirty percent of the livestock is being forced off the national forests in some large areas.

Now if the drought continues the forage on public domain will continue to decrease and the number of permits will continue to be reduced.

I recommend that the deferred grazing idea be applied to the public domain and some small payment be made to the permit holders to induce them to withdraw part of their livestock permanently or until such a time as their ranges could be restored by the Forest Service or the Soil Conservation Service. By this means many of these permit holders, livestock producers, could be saved from financial ruin, the marketing of livestock would be more orderly and profitable, and our precious watersheds be protected from further damage.

What other major industry in America has been so seriously hit, and what cause deserves more of our immediate attention?

The honorable chairman of our subcommittee on livestock on the House Agricultural Committee who has been speaking on this same subject announced yesterday that his subcommittee will start immediately to seek ways and means to help the livestock situation. I welcome these meetings.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] for his kind remarks. I hope it will be possible for him to work out such amendments or variation from what is being proposed today as will take care of the situation in his part of the country; because I confess very readily that the bill that I have introduced with many others today, was not drawn with his problems primarily in mind because, after all, we all try to write bills to take care of the situation with which we are most familiar. I confess I am not familiar with the intermountain situation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a brief comment?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an important speech, and at the moment I do not think I should take time to do more than express my greatest appreciation and admiration for the gentleman for dramatizing this desperate situation, and to try to encourage him to go ahead with his presentation. I should like to pledge my very best efforts in behalf of the program which we are sponsoring here today. I hope that his committee, the House Committee on Agriculture, can get going with the hearings and that we will be able to take quick and effective action.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and to point out that I am not presenting simply my own views, but those of a number of us who are involved in this, because there were actually some 17 Members from my own State who introduced a bill this morning. Those Members are WRIGHT PATMAN, GEORGE MAHON, O. C. FISHER, OLIN TEAGUE, OMAR BURLESON, CLARK W. THOMPSON, HOMER THORNBERRY, WALTER ROGERS, FRANK IKARD, JOHN DOWDY, MARTIN DIES, JACK BROOKS, JOE KILGORE, J. T. RUTHERFORD, JIM WRIGHT, and JOHN YOUNG, along with myself. If there were others of my own delegation, I would be delighted to have it called to my attention now. I know there have been several from other States who have today introduced this or a similar bill. I would not undertake to name all of them, because, frankly, I do not have all their names, but I do know that several others have introduced legislation.

The legislation that we have proposed is legislation falling into two parts—first, what I conceive to be immediate and palliative relief by providing for the inclusion of protein supplements or concentrates—cottonseed or soybean cake—along with and on the same terms as other feeds for which the Government provides assistance. At the present time the drought-relief program provides not only assistance in the purchase of cereal grains, of which the Government does hold a surplus which is used for this purpose, but also $7.50 a ton in connection with hay that is purchased. I think those are worthy programs, and I certainly find no fault with them. However, there is a vast range area throughout the Southwest on which historically we have depended for protein supplements to carry us through the worst months of the winter. We believe that it is the most economical method of carrying livestock in that range area, where even during this terrible drought there is some browsing on live oak bushes and some mesquite leaves, which alone will not support anything, but which with protein supplements provide some filling and make it more economical than to buy hay, particularly when you have to ship hay as we do now.

I would point out to my colleague from Utah that personally I have been buying hay from Idaho and shipping through his State to Texas. If you have any conception of the distance between central Texas and Idaho you know what the freight rate is, even with a considerable reduction which is being given by the railroads. But that is the cheapest hay we can get, and of course that is what we are buying.

We believe it would be a saving to the industry and a saving to the Government to assist in providing protein supplement on a program similar to that which is now used in connection with hay. So the last section of the bill which a number of us have introduced simply provides for the inclusion of protein supplements in the formula. The Department thinks they have the authority now, and they probably have, but they have felt some hesitancy about embarking on a program on which they had no specific instructions from the Congress. This bill would give them specific instructions in that respect, and I think would remove any reluctance there may now exist.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I would like to explain the other section of the bill but I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I am most reluctant to interrupt the gentleman's chain of thought and his dissertation to the House, but the questions I have are directed right to the remarks the gentleman is making at this time. I have two questions I should like to ask.

Mr. POAGE. Go ahead. I will do my best to answer.

Mr. AVERY. On this hay program, did the $7.50 that was provided by the Department of Agriculture in Texas actually make cheaper feed for the cattlemen down there or did it just automatically raise the price of hay?

Mr. POAGE. A great many will tell you it automatically raised the price of hay. I do not think that was exactly the situation. The price of hay was going up. The program did not stop the price of hay from going up at all. The price of hay continued to go up. I understand that is true whether you are in a disaster area or not. The price of hay is going up all over the country steadily, week by week.

When our people found that it continued to go up, and it actually went up more than the $7.50, many of them, I think without adequate thought about the matter, simply said, "Oh, the program caused the price of hay to go up." The program did not stop the increase in the price of hay but it at least helped to the extent of $7.50 a ton.

Individually I was not eligible for that $7.50 aid because I do not make the major portion of my income from agricultural pursuits, but those who were eligible certainly are in a better shape when they have to buy hay that costs them $52 a ton laid down in Waco to get $7.50 off it and make it $44.50 than if they had to pay the extra $7.50. So I think the program has been of help.

Mr. AVERY. I am glad to hear the gentleman's comment on that subject. As I understand, all of Texas is in a drought area.

Mr. POAGE. All but about 12 counties, I believe.

Mr. AVERY. Where just a portion of a State is in a drought area, the people in that portion which is not in the drought area feel there is a gross discrimination against them because they

also have to buy some hay and they feel the subsidy which is placed on it automatically makes it cost $7.50 a ton more than it would have cost them.

Mr. POAGE. The only effect that I can see that it had on the price of hay is this: Obviously, when people could buy hay for $7.50 a ton less than they otherwise could have bought it, more people would buy the hay. That is what the program was intended to do—make hay available to more producers. Therefore, it stimulated the demand for hay. To the extent that it stimulated the demand for hay, of course, it raised the price of hay all over the Nation, in and outside of the disaster area, but not to the full extent of the Government aid.

Mr. AVERY. If I may ask the gentleman one more question, and then I will not ask him to yield further. I believe I heard the gentleman say a while ago that this was the fourth or fifth consecutive year of drought in Texas?

Mr. POAGE. This is the ninth consecutive year in my hometown. This is the ninth consecutive year in which we have had less than the normal rainfall, and we only had 45 percent of the normal rainfall this year.

Mr. AVERY. Can the gentleman tell me what effect that has had on the calf crop of Texas?

Mr. POAGE. No; I cannot. It has had an adverse effect, but it has not had as much adverse effect as many of us expected it would have. I do not know how long it takes to show up, but we do know that inevitably it shows up. But, we have not had as much reduction in the calf crop as we had feared that we would although there is in 1956 a definite reduction.

Mr. AVERY. That is, there has been a reduction in the herd.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain the other phases of this bill which I conceive to be even more important than the protein food provision. I do not want to minimize the importance of giving some immediate relief because remember this is January, and in January, February and March we are likely to have our most critical time so far as livestock is concerned. Even if it does not rain, it is better to have warm weather than it is to have freezing weather. A dry, cold norther can hurt you worse than dry, warm winds, at least as far as the livestock industry is concerned. So, regardless of what happens in the way of rain, we have to have help now because in a few months there is not going to be anything left to help in the way of livestock.

Of course, the land will still be there. Now I want to talk about the land and what we can, and what I think we must do to preserve our soil, if we are going to maintain a great grazing industry in America rather than become simply an area of nomadic tribes shifting from one place to the other even as the sands of the earth shift. Today, great portions of the southwestern United States are almost denuded of all grass, particularly out in the short-grass country, which is entirely a bunch-grass country. Some of the people in the eastern part of the United States do not understand what we mean by that. This country never has the kind of turf that you get in Bermuda grass or carpet grass. But in the best years, our mesquite and our buffalo and our grama grasses and other bunch grasses produce bunches so large and so numerous that they appear to cover the whole surface. Most of that grass is now dead. It does not renew by vines and runners—at least most of it does not renew by running—such as Bermuda grass does—it renews from seed. It will make seed rather rapidly if it gets rain and gets proper temperatures. Some of the grama grasses of New Mexico may get up and seed in 1 month's time and that seed will, given a good season and given good treatment, restore that land to its productivity. But, if as each bunch of grass grows up there are two cows standing there to grab that blade of grass as it appears out of the ground, that grass will never seed and next year instead of having more grass, you will have less and on and on ad infinitum until the time when you have absolutely none.

There are areas out there that look as if it had absolutely none, but we are hopeful that there may be some seed still in the ground. But it will not be any good if there are animals there to grab that sprout before it has time to get up. Yet what is the situation with the landowner?

Let us assume that a landowner has three sections of land out in that grass country. He has not any grass on his land today, but if he is like most of his neighbors he owes debts. He will owe money on his land, owe money to his bank, and he will probably owe for his grocery bill. Let us assume that it begins before the rain. Then what happens? Too many of our colleagues are prone to say, "Oh, but it rained, and therefore the drought is over." My friends, rain today will not cure our situation. If it rains 2 inches every 2 days for the next 2 months, we are still in bad shape. It is going to require several years. If we allow this to go on, that man who owns three sections of land will find irresistible pressure applied to stock that land, because that is the only way in the world he can make anything from it. You do not make a living off of the land simply by riding over it and taking pictures. You have to put livestock on it to make something off of the land. His creditors will demand that he put something on it.

If we allow this to occur we reverse the process that we wanted to put into effect to rehabilitate that grass, so we ask, "How can we minimize the time needed to restore the turf?" That is what this bill tries to do. It occurred to a number of us who introduced identical bills today that the Department, under the terms of Public Law 875, which is the disaster bill, should provide a program that would pay that man the normal rental of that land for not to exceed 3 years. The exact time is up to the Secretary of Agriculture. If he finds 1 year will restore the land, he does not have to make it longer. But he can continue it for 3 years after the termination of the drought. He starts it immediately and continues it until such time as the drought is broken, and for 3 years thereafter, if necessary.

Some of you will say, "Why did you not put that program in the soil bank bill?" Some will say, "That is the Albert amendment." So it is. At least it has many similarities to that amendment, but there was serious argument about placing the Albert amendment in the soil bank bill. There is an honest difference of opinion as to whether we should place it in the soil bank bill or not. Just this week the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our committee and told us he did not think it would be well to place that in the soil bank bill. It seems to me that if we want results, the only logical thing to do is to try to ccmpromise our differences and try to get together on ground where we can all agree. I hope we can all agree. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will agree. I sincerely say that I have reason to believe that they will agree with this program if we can provide this program of soil conservation separate from the soil bank program.

So we have completely segregated it from the soil bank, and we do not amend the soil bank bill at all. The bill that we amend is the disaster bill. This program that we bring you this afternoon is merely an addition to the disaster program, and is not an amendment to the soil bank bill in any respect. Whether that is the proper approach or not, I would not argue with anyone, yet I tell you the Department of Agriculture expressed itself as believing that if we are given relief it should be separate from the soil bank bill. So we have separated it.

We believe we have brought a bill that cannot be properly criticized by anyone, no matter what his viewpoint on the Albert amendment may be. Yet at the same time we believe that this bill will give not only immediate assistance to those who have stock that need protein to keep alive during the remainder of the winter, but that will also bring a large measure of protection to the denuded grasslands of a vast area of America. This is far more than merely a bill to give some temporary assistance to the people whose herds are immediately in trouble.

It is a bill that at least gives us an opportunity to reverse the unhappy forces of nature and to tend to restore the fertility of a once very productive area. So some 17 Members from my own State have all joined in presenting this legislation. We hope that the membership of the House from all States will feel that it is worthy, that it is entitled to your consideration, not simply because it may give some relief to some hard-pressed cowmen in Texas, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Kansas, but also because it will tend to maintain the productivity of a large area of the United States which this country simply cannot afford to lose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague not only for his remarkably coherent statement of the problems of the drought-stricken area which many of us represent, but also for the effort and tedious application on his part which largely produced these measures that have been introduced today.

I think it is a realistic approach to a very real problem. The farmers and stockmen in our drought-smitten areas in Texas and elsewhere throughout the country have gone through very rugged experiences. They have practically exhausted not only their resources, but in many cases their credit as well.

There is one additional feature of the legislation which I think should be stressed and that is the protection they are afforded in the bills presented giving them long-range benefits that will flow from the long-range grazing features. I call attention to it:

No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for the period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-grazing non-deferred areas.

A second feature which I should like to emphasize is that for the first time machinery is provided for the Department of Agriculture to furnish some needed help to dirt farmers who are as badly hurt by the drought as are the stockmen, in that it authorizes the Secretary to furnish feed for livestock or seeds for planting in this area.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman in introducing this legislation and I do now join with him in urging its early adoption.

Mr. POAGE. I am very pleased to have the help of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing up at this early period of the session this very perplexing problem. Further, I should like to congratulate him for his decision to hold hearings before the Livestock Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of which he is chairman.

Different parts of our State has at different times been affected by this drought condition. I know the conditions have been much more severe over a much larger area in the Southwest. But I think all the Members from the drought area concede that we must be ever mindful of the effect of some of these programs on prices in the livestock industry. I have thought about this problem. I think the principal problem is one of too many cattle. And I think this drought aid has contributed to this increase in numbers. The livestock people are hurting, both in and out of the drought areas.

It seems to me that the first part of the bill referring to deferred grazing, as I have heard it explained here has a great deal to commend it. I voted for and supported the Albert amendment. On the other hand, it seems to me that perhaps the second part pertaining to further Government assistance in purchasing protein feeds tends to undo some of the things in the first part in that it tends to keep numbers up and thereby keep prices down. In my State, and I think the same thing is true in other parts of the drought area, through the drought programs and some other programs, I think we have maybe done something to the livestock producer instead of doing something for the livestock producer, because we are encouraging him to put money that he does not have into producing a cow that probably should not be there. Therefore, he gets in debt to the bank to the tune of about $20 per year even with the aid we give him. After 3 years of buying feed even with the aid, the banker owns the cow, he has the debt. Better off he would have been if he had sold her and spent the winter down around Brownsville or down in Florida for those 3 years.

I thought I was really asking for trouble when I took the floor and addressed the executive committee of the Wyoming Cattlemen's Association on December 7 last, and told them exactly that and a few other things. I was surprised to find that they agreed with me. The head of the drought committee said: "We are going into this year with more cattle in Wyoming with the drought than we had last year."

I want to commend the gentleman for going into this problem. I just throw out the idea, however, that we should proceed with the thought of doing something that is really helpful. I know the gentleman is sincere in that desire, as are all of the gentlemen who have introduced this bill for an industry whose problems demand attention and have not been getting it. I will follow the committee hearings carefully, will expect to appear before the committee and assure my colleagues of my eagerness to work with you in developing and implementing any sound action that will tend to solve the problems of the livestock industry both within and without the drought area.

Mr. POAGE. I could not agree with anyone more than I agree with the gentleman when he points out that many of us would be better off if we had sold out in 1950 and got out of the cow business when it was good. Our hindsight is so much better than our foresight. We have officially applied exactly the same kind of formula that as individuals we apply. I guess that we will have to live under that kind of situation. We cannot tell. If the situation gets worse next year—it is a mistake to have any kind of assistance program, if we know the situation is going to get worse in the coming years. But, if perchance, as every farmer and every livestock man always hopes and believes, next year is going to be that good year we have been looking for, then, of course, it would be a cruel and a tragic thing to say to the people who have suffered 9 years of drought: "You are out," but to the fellow who has been fortunate and has not had a drought, "You are in for the kill."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this bill before the House. I joined him as cosponsor of the legislation. I can appreciate that there may be some objection to this program being in the soil bank. Personally, I think it would have been better in the soil bank than as a part of the drought-relief program because I do not think the whole problem of deferred grazing or deferred planning should be a part of the relief program. It should be a part of the surplus-reduction program which the Soil Bank Act contemplates. I can appreciate the fact there is a practical objection to the approach which I suggested. If we can get this program moving under the present bill, I certainly will support my colleague in every particular. I congratulate him for bringing the matter to the attention of the House and I do hope we will not limit it when it is all over just to the drought stricken areas of the country. I think it should be of general application.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot say I would feel that we ought to make the full rental payment applicable to the Nation over. I think we should have a general deferred grazing program the Nation over, for which we do have authority now. But the payments are so low it cannot keep a man in business. Only when he is making money can he afford to participate in the general program. I doubt that we should apply rates as high as we have suggested on a nationwide basis.

Mr. ALBERT. That may be true, and I respect the gentleman's judgment on that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks, and that all Members who have spoken on the subject I have been discussing may have the right to revise their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the work he has done on the drought situation in Texas. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to place in the RECORD at this point an exchange of correspondence concerning the use of protein concentrates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DECEMBER 18, 1956.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The drought condition in most of Texas continues. My own district, the Sixth Congressional District, is in a critical condition. It has been necessary for many farmers and ranchers to reduce their breeding herds; and most of these ranchers and farmers, who are continuing to

hold their breeding herds together, are doing so under the most adverse weather and price conditions and are utilizing the emergency feed grain program.

I am very pleased to see that the President will tour the drought area personally, and I am confident that the administration will find it necessary to recommend a continuation of the emergency programs. I believe that the emergency feed grain program can be made to function more effectively if it can be altered to include protein supplements, such as cottonseed and soybean meal. I am of the opinion that authority exists for administrative action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to include these products.

Reference is made to section 301, Public Law 480, 83d Congress. This section contains the following pertinent statement concerning the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in making agricultural commodities available for distress areas:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relief disaster."

Since cotton is a farm commodity controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and cottonseed meal is a product thereof, I believe that the Secretary would be acting within the authority granted him by section 301, if he included cottonseed meal as one of the feeds available for farmers under the emergency feed program.

Farmers and ranchers in my area have complained that the grains now included in the emergency-feed program, namely, corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghum, are inadequate in themselves for efficient and economical maintenance of cattle; and that the efficiency of these grains can be greatly increased by the addition of a small amount of protein supplement, such as cottonseed or soybean meal. Many farmers in the drought area have available supplies of low-quality roughage, such as corncobs, baled corn shucks, cotton burrs, and feed by-products. There is also available on some pastures and ranches low-quality dry grass, weeds, stubble, and other roughages. In some areas prickly pear can be utilized by burning. Cattle can be wintered successfully on these types of feeds, if a limited amount of protein supplement is available.

It has been suggested that the farmers receiving emergency-feed certificates should be permitted to exercise some latitude in the choice of feeds which he buys; and that he should be permitted to use part of his emergency-feed certificates for the purchase of protein supplements to be used, either with the grain he obtains through the use of emergency-feed certificates or in connection with other feeds and roughage available to him.

In view of the emergency of the situation, it will be appreciated if this matter can receive immediate attention, and appropriate changes to the existing program made.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 8, 1957.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Your letter of January 2 and the accompanying letter signed by Mr. Frazee concerning cottonseed meal has been referred to me for reply.

Mr. Frazee was correct when he stated that legal authority does exist within the Department to include cottonseed meal, soybean and linseed meal in our drought-assistance program. However, the Department has decided not to include these items as a matter of policy. These concentrates are at this time available at a relatively low price in Texas, while hay is expensive. It seemed best to use our limited funds to assist drought-stricken farmers in the purchase of hay. None of these high-protein concentrates are held in surplus by the Department. Inclusion of them in our assistance program would unquestionably limit the use of surplus grains. We, of course, could not include cottonseed meal without also including soybean and linseed meal, none of which are presently surplus in Department supplies. We realize that many stockmen in the Southwest would like to have these high concentrates included in our program, but the Department officials feel that we can best serve drought-stricken farmers with our limited funds by assisting them with roughage, permitting them to use their own funds in the purchase of concentrates.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the opportunity which our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has given us in this review of this very serious situation. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I want to assure these interested colleagues of mine, although I come from an area which seldom experiences a drought, that I am very sympathetic to this problem and will give it my closest attention.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate that very much.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important and helpful that the gentleman from Texas has brought this extremely serious situation to our attention. While I, like the gentleman from Maine, have not experienced anything of this kind in my area, I have heard of the great suffering which has resulted from the drought conditions in the West and Southwest particularly. I feel, certainly, that the President and the administration are acutely conscious of this situation and will welcome the aid of the gentleman from Texas who is so well qualified in this field. It seems to me that the evidence of interest of the administration is dramatically shown by the fact that the President is planning on next Monday to make a tour of the affected areas including, I believe, the State of Texas.

Mr. POAGE. He is to be in San Angelo on Monday.

Mr. KEATING. He will make brief stops to talk to the people and see with his own eyes this very serious situation. I hope that that action, together with the fine work which the gentleman from Texas and his committee will do, will help alleviate this very serious situation.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express to the gentleman my deep and sincere appreciation for the fine leadership shown relative to this most important matter. All of the State of Oklahoma is affected, and particularly my great district, the Sixth District, which is the western district in our great State. And, I want to say to you that I recognize the gentleman as one of the real authorities in this House on this subject matter. There are others that are far better authority than I. I want to offer you my cooperation in every way as a Member of this body in furtherance of this most vital and important subject matter.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for the very lucid explanation he has given this body on the legislation many of us introduced today, and to further express my appreciation for his having taken this time to acquaint the many Members of this House with this condition which exists all over our country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] came down into my district during this last fall and saw at first hand some of the conditions existing in the very southern part of the State, a situation which not only has affected the rangeland, a situation which has affected the underground water, with a consequent drop of water table, a situation which has affected irrigation from the Falcon reservoir, which has brought irrigation to a halt for some 6 or 7 months. The people in my section of the country are very appreciative of the interest you have taken and that this body has taken in proposing future legislation, and I hope that this legislation will result in restoring their pastureland and conserving their rainfall.

Mr. POAGE. Nobody, save the people in my section and your section, appreciates the real situation that exists, but I believe the legislation will be helpful.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that the American people are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for the great interest he has shown in the agricultural problems throughout the years. Since I have been in Congress I have noticed that he has always been a leader in these programs to help work out these problems, and no one knows better the situation faced by the people of our section than the ranking member on the Agriculture Committee. I think that the Members of the Congress who are not familiar with the particular drought situation to which this legislation is directed would do themselves a great thing if they would go into this matter and study it and realize that all of the stories that have come out of the Southwest to the effect that these programs are many times designed to help the big raisers are not true. It is the little people in the cattle business that are being hurt when something is not done to bring them relief. There is one thing that this bill brings them that is most important, and the gentleman has given an excellent explanation of it, and that is this, that it is the land itself that belongs to every American in this country upon which our future must depend that is at stake.

And if we do not do something about it now, we should be called upon if we are alive to answer to the future generations that will suffer by our failure to act at this time.

Mr. POAGE. I especially appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas because his district is one of the few that is entirely within that area covered by the Great Plains program which helps to do exactly what we are proposing here. But that Great Plains program is not applicable to a vast part of the area involved. If everybody were as fortunately situated as the gentleman from the Panhandle, we might not need this legislation, but he has not taken a narrow view of it and has supported the legislation for all the rest of us as well as for his own people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this problem to us. I have appreciated very much this very informative discussion. I might just sit here and be a recipient of the good that this bill will do and not even let those who have proposed it know that I am interested in it. However, I do want to say that I am behind the gentleman in every way, that I am in a part of this drought area and understand the problem; and I know that something must be done about it.

Mr. POAGE. I deeply appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a copy of the bill and certain tables that I have not had time to refer to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. The bill which I introduced this afternoon, and which is identical with bills introduced by many other Members of this House and by the senior Senator from Texas, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, in the other House, is as follows:

A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas, under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected by such disaster in which such grazing is determined to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program shall be applicable only to land which is normally used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land. Such program in any county shall be made available to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain available for a period of not less than 3 years after the termination of such county as a major disaster area.

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed $5,000 for any one year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State extension service which, with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the fact that the history of drought relief thus far can be summed up in the phrase, "too little and too late."

Hundreds of thousands of farmers and stockmen have already gone to the wall in this great national disaster, and many more thousands stand today at the brink of financial ruin.

It is a privilege to join my colleagues from Texas in this effort to save our cattlemen, and to save millions of acres of grazing land from disastrous overgrazing. Already, in Oklahoma, terrible damage has been done to our fine cattle country by overgrazing practices brought on by the combination of drought and economic adversity.

I have introduced an identical bill and earnestly hope this needed legislation will receive early committee and House consideration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COOPER for 1 hour on Monday next.

Mr. FEIGHAN for 1 hour on February 14.

Mr. KEATING, on Monday next, for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY, on Tuesday next, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a speech he made in Boston.

Mr. CELLER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include a letter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. BERRY).

Mr. HORAN and to include a speech made at Spokane on November 13.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota) and to include a letter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

254. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 29th

annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended on June 30, 1956, and the report of audit covering the same period, made by the United States General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

256. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

257. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal certain provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

259. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the transfer of commissioned officers between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

260. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowances for quarters"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

261. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

262. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

263. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide authority for the reassignment of officers of the naval service restricted in the performance of duty to an unrestricted status, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

264. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area,' approved October 11, 1951"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

266. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of major in the Army and lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

268. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize repayment to the Treasury of amounts paid to the Federal Reserve banks for making industrial loans"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

269. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

270. A letter from Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1956, pursuant to the act approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

271. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1956; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

272. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

273. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone, President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

274. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of this Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

275. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

276. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

277. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

279. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

280. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

281. A letter from the Chief Deputy Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting relative to the case of *West Coast Meat Company of Hayward, California* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 14–54 to the United States Court of Claims, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 637, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

282. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

285. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain Territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

288. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

290. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a list of cases involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and requesting the return of the cases to the jurisdiction of the Justice Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of aliens where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act has been exercised, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2357. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2358. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 2359. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 2360. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 2361. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 2362. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2363. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 2364. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2365. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 2366. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2367. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 2368. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 2369. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 2370. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 2371. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2372. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2373. A bill to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes in the case of scoutmasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2374. A bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to provide that the Public Health Service shall furnish medical and other care to seamen becoming permanently disabled while on active service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2375. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2376. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2377. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2378. A bill to designate the building to be constructed as the principal office of the Atomic Energy Commission under the act of May 6, 1955, as the "Enrico Fermi Building," to provide for the establishment therein of an appropriate memorial to Dr. Fermi, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 2379. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 2380. A bill to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals; to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2381. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2382. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit the retirement on full annuities, without regard to age, of those officers and employees with 30 years or more of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2383. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2384. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that retired pay, disability retirement pay, or disability severance pay shall be granted to certain disabled former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2385. A bill to amend Public Law 650, 83d Congress, to provide benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 2387. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide that the level of price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities shall be related to the units of production produced on the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2388. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2389. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2390. A bill to deny social security benefits to employees of the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2391. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the allowance of percentage depletion in the case of sand and gravel extracted from navigable waters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 2392. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to grants for maintenance and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, to correct an inequity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2393. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2394. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tin in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2395. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 2396. A bill to extend further the periods during which elections may be made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 by active members of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 2397. A bill to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconditioning, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in the continental United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2398. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide additional Federal support to States and certain nongovernmental agencies to enable them to carry out adequate demonstration programs for the vocational rehabilitation of the homebound; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2399. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2400. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2401. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain land to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for persons whose real property is taken from them by condemnation or who are forced to dispose of such property because of the imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2403. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2404. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2405. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use receipts from lands being administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to maintain and improve such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2406. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum amount of the deduction for medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2408. A bill to define service as a member of the Woman's Army Auxiliary Corps as active service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2409. A bill to authorize the commandant of The Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 2410. A bill to incorporate the Foundation for Community Aid to Mental Patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2411. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 2412. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 2413. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2414. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2415. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2416. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 2417. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2418. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2419. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 2420. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort De Soto as a national memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2421. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2422. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 2423. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2424. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage-board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2425. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage-board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2426. A bill to relieve citizens of the United States of liability to repay to the United States amounts of money advanced to them to enable them to evacuate foreign zones of war or civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 2427. A bill to amend the act pertaining to the establishment of a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2428. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that an employee who has received compensation for total disability continuously for 20 years shall thereafter be paid compensation for total disability for the remainder of his life; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2429. A bill to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2430. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO (by request):

H. R. 2431. A bill to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2432. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2433. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2434. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination survey of San Felipi Creek, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2435. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2436. A bill to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum wage determinations and other interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2437. A bill to provide for registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2438. A bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 2439. A bill to create a corporation to restore normal employment in labor surplus

areas of group IV classification and produce industrial development in such areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2440. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2441. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2442. A bill to promote the dispersal of industrial facilities in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2443. A bill to fix responsibility in the American Battle Monuments Commission for the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree Site in Santiago, Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2444. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2445. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2446. A bill to amend section 5703 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the payment of tobacco taxes by the return method; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2447. A bill to exempt the tax on sightseeing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2448. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2449. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 2450. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to encourage the training of additional engineers and the expansion of facilities for engineering education by providing supplementary salary grants for engineering teachers and scholarships and fellowships for engineering students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2451. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct cloud-seeding experiments in the Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2452. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the State of California in the construction of the San Luis unit of the Feather River project, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate an agreement therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2453. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River Development Fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2454. A bill to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2455. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2456. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, so as to require insurance to protect customers' funds entrusted to persons doing business as brokers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2457. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2458. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2459. A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy, to fix the compensation of civilian clergymen appointed as chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof, and for certain other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2460. A bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2461. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2462. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2463. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 2464. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2465. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 2467. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2469. A bill to provide revenue from an excise tax uniformly applied to end products of manufacture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 2470. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2471. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2472. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2473. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2474. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2475. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2476. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2477. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2478. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from consolidating any offices under his jurisdiction, or directing reductions in force of Veterans' Administration personnel, without notifying the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2479. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to review all cases in which the employment of a Federal employee has been suspended or terminated under any loyalty or security program of the United States, including any summary suspension or termination of employment permitted by law to protect the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2480. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2481. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E United States savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2482. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 2483. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 2484. A bill to amend the act pertaining to the establishment of a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 2485. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage-board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2486. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2487. A bill to prohibit Federal aid for the construction of highways on which excessive speeds are permitted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2488. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2489. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses for the care of certain dependents where his wife is hospitalized or permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2490. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 2491. A bill to amend section 443 (b) (2) (C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to computation of tax on change of annual accounting period) to extend the period during which application for the benefits of such provisions may be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 2492. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Yorktown battlefield area, Colonial National Historical Park, Va., certain howitzers surrendered by the British at Yorktown; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2493. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the construction of a bridge and road across Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2494. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2495. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H .R. 2496. A bill to provide for the increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2497. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 2498. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2499. A bill to provide for the holding of terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut at Bridgeport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2500. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 2501. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2502. A bill to establish Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2503. A bill to repeal section 5 of Public Law 887, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2504. A bill to provide that Government surplus property may be donated to 4–H Clubs for the construction, equipment, and operation of camps and centers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 2505. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2506. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2507. A bill to amend section 5703 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to persons liable to make return and pay tobacco tax); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2508. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to permit the determination of different kinds or qualities of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2509. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2510. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 2511. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 2512. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2513. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to abolish the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2514. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2515. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of about 37.75 acres of land comprising a part of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 2516. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain civil actions only if the amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, and to provide that their jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship shall not extend to actions in which corporations are parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2517. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall make certain payments to the counties of Mecklenburg, Halifax, and Charlotte, State of Virginia, from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 2518. A bill to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2519. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain surplus property of the United States situated in the County of Orange, State of California, to the former owners thereof, Richared Haster and Esther Haster, his wife, or their legal representatives; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend section 721 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2521. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the State of California in the construction of the San Luis unit of the Feather River project, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate an agreement therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2522. A bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2524. A bill to authorize an extension of the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors breakwater; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2525. A bill to amend section 1014 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 2526. A bill to authorize the improvement of Port Washington Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2527. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2528. A bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 2529. A bill to remove inequities created by and to avoid discrimination resulting from administrative practices and enforcement of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2530. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2531. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2532. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2533. A bill to provide additional cotton acreage for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2534. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1957 and subsequent crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2535. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 2537. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2538. A bill to make the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, Brooklyn, N. Y., a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2539. A bill to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2540. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas, to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount of the exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 2542. A bill to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code to make applicable with respect thereto the venue provisions of section 1327 of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 2543. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2544. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2546. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 2547. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2548. A bill to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of the construction area of the New Cumberland Dam project by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of New Cumberland Dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2549. A bill to facilitate the administration and development of the Whitman National Monument, in the State of Washington, by authorizing the acquisition of additional land for the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2550. A bill to amend the name and corporate purposes of the Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2551. A bill to advance officers on the retired list of the Army to the highest general officer grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2552. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2553. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2554. A bill to provide an active duty status for a limited period following discharge from service for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2555. A bill to grant pension to certain persons who served in campaigns or expeditions after July 15, 1903; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 2556. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2557. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2558. A bill to amend tittle 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2559. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide that boards for the correction of military or naval records shall take into account evidence relating to the character and conduct of persons subsequent to their discharge from the service in determining whether their records should be corrected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2560. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 20 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 2561. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with public and private agencies in the development and maintenance of recreational facilities on the national forests and other lands administered in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 2562. A bill to provide equal pension or compensation benefits to all veterans disabled in the military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2563. A bill to amend section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2564. A bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging when employed away from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2565. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2566. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2567. A bill providing for a survey of all streams flowing into Lake St. Clair and

Detroit Rivers in Oakland and Wayne Counties, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2568. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the present ceiling on the total amount of benefits otherwise payable thereunder which may be received by members of the same family; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2569. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2570. A bill to rehabilitate and stabilize labor conditions in the textile industry of the United States; to prevent unemployment; to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce; to regulate wages and hours in said industry; to protect and foster the defense effort; to safeguard and promote the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2571. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2572. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2573. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 2574. A bill to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial in the city of Newport News, Va., in honor of certain individuals who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2575. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2576. A bill to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 2577. A bill to provide for temporary suspension, with respect to casein or lactarine, of the import duties imposed under paragraph 19 of section 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2578. A bill to provide benefits under all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to certain persons who graduated from Air Force ROTC training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2579. A bill to eliminate from section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 the requirement that the Secretary of Defense acquire all Wherry Act housing located at military installations where armed-services housing is to be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2580. A bill to increase the storage capacity of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir and to make available 50,000 acre-feet of water from the reservoir for domestic and industrial use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2581. A bill to amend section 605 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that the current receipts of the national service life-insurance fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2582. A bill to reduce the local contributions required for construction of the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., from 36 percent to 25 percent of the total cost of the project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2583. A bill to amend section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to provide a new and more liberal housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2584. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide a new housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2585. A bill to provide additional cotton acreage for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2586. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1957 and subsequent crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board to procure an amendment to the Warsaw Convention with reference to limitation or liability on oversea travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Labor Racketeering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representatives of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte, Luzon, and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection, and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an annual National Forgiveness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the status of forces agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution calling for the publication and reexamination of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be urged to withdraw recognition of the U. S. S. R., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to mem-

bership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution relating to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report 2966, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 92. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the organization of standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 93. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 94. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 95. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate the Latest Acts of Communist Aggression in Hungary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 96. Resolution to create select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a full study and investigation of traffic safety in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 97. Resolution authorizing the printing of the United States defense policies since World War II as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bill and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of Francesco Masini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2588. A bill for the relief of Magoji and Eiju Nakashima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Jana Maria Svidenska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2590. A bill for the relief of Ilmar Harald Kert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Joseph T. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2592. A bill for the relief of Lucy Rolandone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of Celia Estebanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Maria Pastorelli Magnaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Jose Ochoa Jiminez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Genser Tritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Maurillo Gonzales Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Luis Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Miss Pina Shlapak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Eva Nagalhaes y Aguirre, alias Eva Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Riza G. Blum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Antonio Kasikci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Butcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of James Kanji Hoskins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Su-Ying Wong Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria, Filippo, and Francesco Strati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Ciro Nardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2608. A bill for the relief of Umberto Inneguale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2609. A bill for the relief of John Russell Sinclair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 2610. A bill for the relief of Patrick Brendan Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 2611. A bill for the relief of Ursula Anna Peterich von Rekowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2612. A bill for the relief of Mona Margrethe Clemens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2613. A bill for the relief of Anna Janina Byczko-Maszko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2614. A bill for the relief of Cynthia W. Y. Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 2615. A bill for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2616. A bill for the relief of Rena Schindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 2617. A bill for the relief of Mary Arce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Sook Chur Chiang, alias Sook Chur York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2619. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosalia Dato Mateo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kame Gusukuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Chong Hyun Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Yu Siu Liang Kou Shimogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Maria Softerios Sergiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Kyu Yawp Lee and Mrs. Hyung Sook Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Maria and Amelia Ciccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2626. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Tejima Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Mr. Petar Miljenovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Carlo DiMarzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2629. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed land by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiGioia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2631. A bill for the relief of Remo Riccardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 2632. A bill for the relief of Karimeh Ajjuni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2633. A bill for the relief of Joseph Jonghwan Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sai Ip Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2635. A bill for the relief of William Winter and Mrs. Regina Winter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2636. A bill for the relief of Manuel Barrior Toscano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Soterios Mallios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 2638. A bill for the relief of Willem Fransen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2640. A bill for the relief of Garifalia Keluge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2641. A bill for the relief of Maria Hubertina Wilhelmina Dresen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Nicola Parente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2643. A bill for the relief of Evangelos and Niki Valassidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Magdalena Tukiendorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2645. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Gebauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of Peder Strand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2647. A bill for the relief of D. S. and Elizabeth Laney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 2648. A bill for the relief of the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2649. A bill for the relief of Jan Maszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2650. A bill for the relief of Stanley Dusza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2651. A bill for the relief of On Low Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Antoni Kopystynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2653. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2654. A bill for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H. R. 2655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Violet Burtt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 2656. A bill for the relief of Demetrios George Florakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2657. A bill for the relief of Maria Leister De Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 2658. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Haim Zeliek Kemmelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2659. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki A. Kassa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2660. A bill for the relief of Robert Wong and Faith Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutchess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2662. A bill for the relief of Petros Ioannou Calengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2663. A bill for the relief of Efmorphia Nikolaidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 2664. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Domenico Bruno Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Frascari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Aristides Kritikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2668. A bill for the relief of Donata Di Girolamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Vardra H. Cameron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2670. A bill for relief of Strategical Demolition Torpedo Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mellie C. Pierce; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 2672. A bill for the relief of Haseep Milhem Esper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Persfoni Pritsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Morris B. Wallach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2675. A bill for the relief of Julian H. McWhorter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Kwen Fang Sun, his wife, and his minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2677. A bill for the relief of former S. Sgt. Edward R. Stouffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Leona C. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2679. A bill for the relief of Romans Malitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2680. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Gertrud Ilse Vest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2681. A bill for the relief of Sophie K. Valmas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2682. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Bartlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2683. A bill for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 2684. A bill for the relief of Silvio Dario Durante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2685. A bill for the relief of Jose Joao Santo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Bronislawa Francuz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2687. A bill for the relief of Maria Maver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Miss Latifa Ibrahim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2689. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property to Stella Vusich; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 2690. A bill for the relief of Catherine Nappert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2692. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Duratti Stithan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2693. A bill for the relief of Charles Grant John Giles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 2694. A bill for the relief of Gianbattista Grosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2695. A bill for the relief of Caecilia Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adele Merlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of Herbert Otto Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva Neves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Maria do Santo Christo Amaral Moniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Irma Kochendorfer Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Gisela Ilse Beyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Nino H. Treichler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Neves da Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 2705. A bill for the relief of William F. Kempe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Heather Ah-Nam Hsu Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Ottilie Trout, nee Zirkenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Jan Baginski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2709. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain lands by the United States to W. M. Fricks and J. F. Fricks; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Ardelia Parsons, Billy Mac Parsons, Danny Leroy Parsons, Charles Ray Parsons, and Marilyn Ann Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Angeline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Libero Ridolfi and Mrs. Luigia Belardi Ridolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nokoleta C. Alexopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabet Matajac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Ferrara and his wife and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Wiche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of June Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Dennis McGill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of Pietro Di Filippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Alexei Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Mahla Avram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Ikuko Ohno Devadas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Mirko Uglesic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of Raymond Perez Boulion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Aston Willis Waite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Pietro Manzo, also known as Giovanni Girardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Rasma Laila Eiksnis (Rasma Mirdza Eiksnis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Adrian H. Manzano and Mrs. Rosario Barrios Manzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Yang Sin Djen Dao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Braun Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegarde Weber Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Ton Shun Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Solomon Joseph Sadakne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Basilio Rus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Federico Maniga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Ivan Mrvica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Greta Priester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. R. 2740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2741. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands of the United States to the Hermann Hospital Estate, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2742. A bill for the relief of the Miami Corp., the Paggi-Streator Co., Winfield S. Streator, the North American Land Co., and the Humble Oil & Refining Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bronislawa Marini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2744. A bill for the relief of Paolo Lo Cascio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2745. A bill for the relief of the estate of Barney Isabel, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Maj. Philip J. Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Herman Adams, Charleston, Ark., doing business as the Adams Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 2749. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Elefantis Kritselis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alicia Romero de Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2751. A bill for the relief of Juan Perez-Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2752. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Simmons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2754. A bill for the relief of Mariano Santana Llamas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Antonio Contreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Ahm Me Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Bildli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Valente Hernandez-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Josephine Shelby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Claudio Vargas Gonzalez (alias Jose Ramirez Orozco); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Sho Ging Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Anders Ellingsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Hong-to Dew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Keller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Ohan Evrenian and Mrs. Vehanoush Evrenian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Miss Etsuko Yamada Hartwig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

30. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution approved by the New Jersey State Bar Association at its midyear meeting on December 15, 1956, concerning the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

31. Also, resolutions adopted by the New Jersey State League of Municipalities Conference in Atlantic City, N. J., opposing any proposal by Congress to tax the income of municipal and other local public agency bonds, and supporting the stand of the American Municipal Association in urging Congress to enact legislation permitting the sale to States and local governments of Federal surplus property at private or negotiated sale and at the same prices as such properties are offered to other Federal agencies, such sales having priority after the needs of Federal agencies and the donable programs for health, educational, and civil defense purpoes have been met; supporting legislation to provide payments to municipalities in lieu of taxes on federally owned property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

32. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Resolution adopted by the Warren County Bar Association of Monmouth, Ill., in support of H. R. 9 and 10; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

33. By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Petition adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Trenton, N. J., December 17, 1956, urging assistance to Hungarian refugees; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

34. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Knights of Equity Supreme Council, Buffalo, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to declaring that ending the partition of Ireland advances world peace, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

35. Also, petition of J. S. Curtis and others, Burbank, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Continuing Antitrust Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced 4 bills as part of a continuing program to increase effective enforcement of the antitrust laws and to assure the maximum realization of a competitive free-enterprise system. These bills result from investigations by the Antitrust Subcommittee during the 84th Congress into the enforcement of the antimerger provisions of the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, the investigation into antitrust problems existing in industries regulated by Federal commissions and boards, and the investigation into the operations of Government advisory groups.

The first bill, the premerger notification bill, combines substantially the provisions of H. R. 5948 and H. R. 9424, both of which passed the House of Representatives unanimously in the 84th Congress and were pending in the Senate when Congress adjourned. It has three purposes.

The first purpose is to prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, now covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions but fails to include bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. This bill will close the gap in existing law and will provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

The second objective of the bill is to require parties to a proposed merger to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate board 60 days in advance of the transaction. Under the bill, parties to a proposed merger where the combined capital structure would exceed $10 million, cannot consummate the transaction until 60 days after notice is given to enforcement officials. With the notice, merging corporations would be required to furnish to the Government specifically enumerated information to enable the Attorney General or the appropriate agency to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. Willful failure to submit the notification or to furnish the required information would be subject to a penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

The bill sets forth 10 categories of corporate transactions which are exempt from the notification and waiting provisions of the bill. In addition, the bill requires the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate Government agency, upon approval of the Attorney General, to establish procedures for waiving all or part of the notification of waiting requirements in categories of cases where notification and a waiting period is deemed unnecessary to effectuate enforcement of the antimerger law.

The premerger notification provisions of the bill are procedural amendments to the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, which prohibits corporate mergers, regardless of how accomplished, where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any section

of the country. These amendments are necessary in order to avoid the considerable time, effort and expense now required by the enforcement officers in searching out newspapers and trade publications to discover proposed mergers, and in collecting economic data needed to determine whether a full-scale investigation is warranted.

Under the bill, failure by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission to bring suit within the 60-day waiting period does not constitute approval of the transaction or prejudice the Government's right to institute proceedings at a later date to challenge the legality of the merger. The bill does not establish advance agency approval of mergers.

The third purpose of the bill is to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a court order to prevent consummation of a merger pending the issuance of a complaint and the completion of the Commission's administrative proceedings. This amendment would give the Federal Trade Commission, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the Attorney General to enforce the merger provisions of the Clayton Act, authority similar to that now possessed by the Attorney General to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining consummation of a merger while adjudication of its legality is pending.

The second bill, the Primacy of Free Enterprise bill, amends the Sherman Act by having Congress declare that it is the policy of the United States to maintain to the maximum extent practicable the American system of free competitive enterprise embodied in the antitrust laws. Its purpose is to establish a guide for administrative agencies, regulatory bodies and the courts in the exercise of their powers over business and arrangements involving exemptions from the antitrust laws. It creates a presumption in favor of free enterprise which will assure that our antitrust policy favoring competition is not subordinated unless this is found necessary to attain other objectives established by Congress. The bill makes it clear that Congress, in authorizing administrative bodies to regulate business and industry, intended such regulation to supplement and not to supersede our system of free competitive enterprise.

Rulings by administrative bodies and judicial decisions have unduly expanded authorized exemptions from the antitrust laws. Regulatory bodies and the courts have vacillated in the weight required to be afforded to antitrust objectives in determining the public interest. This bill establishes a guide so that there will be greater consistency in administrative and judicial action in this area. This bill is a recognition that it is time for Congress to reassert positively its belief that while it recognizes that competition alone will not always protect the public interest adequately, departures from antitrust norms should be kept to a minimum and that competition shall be preserved and encouraged in the regulated industries except where it appears that over-riding statutory objectives cannot be achieved under competitive conditions.

Under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, the courts of the United States have declined to give relief against allegedly unlawful restraints of trade if it appeared that administrative agencies have been vested with authority to approve some or all of the activities challenged as illegal. The courts have withheld their powers in these cases out of deference to superior technical experience, commonly referred to as expertise of the regulatory agencies. One result of the application of this doctrine of primary jurisdiction, however, has been that the Attorney General has been ousted from his prescribed duty to enforce the antitrust laws and, in regulated industries, business firms involved in activities illegal under the antitrust laws have been granted a greater immunity than intended by Congress.

As this doctrine of primary jurisdiction has been construed by the courts, the Attorney General appearing for the United States in its sovereign capacity to prevent and restrain violations of its criminal laws has been relegated to the position of a supplicant before regulatory bodies. Moreover, under existing judicial decisions, the Attorney General must go to the administrative agency even if that body has never approved the activities being attacked by the United States and no exemption from the antitrust laws has been obtained.

This bill would make it clear to the courts that it is the intention of Congress that suits brought by the United States to prevent or punish activities declared to be illegal by the antitrust laws should not be stayed or barred on the ground that any other agency of the Government also has jurisdiction over the activities challenged by the Attorney General.

The third bill would add a new section to the Clayton Act to make the advisory group criteria promulgated by the Department of Justice mandatory in the organization and operation of any Government sponsored advisory organization which brings competitors together. These criteria are that meetings must be called by and be under the chairmanship of full-time salaried Government officials, that agenda for meetings must be initiated and formulated by the Government, that full and complete minutes of all committee and subcommittee meetings must be kept and that the group's function must be purely advisory.

While it is essential that Government officials secure the advice from industry necessary for them to discharge intelligently their administrative responsibilities, it is equally important that procedural safeguards be erected to prevent abuses which have been shown to exist in the operation of advisory groups. The Antitrust Subcommittee's investigations have demonstrated that in practice, the activities of some advisory groups have involved delegations to private parties of functions which properly should reside exclusively in Government officials.

An advisory group ordinarily consists of a combination of competing business interests. As such, meetings provide an opportunity for agreements among the participants unrelated to their advisory functions. Consequently, procedures regulating advisory groups are needed to provide safeguards that reduce opportunity for concerted industry action detrimental to completion or beyond the scope of advisory functions requested by the Government.

Since participants in advisory groups meet and take concerted action to some degree at the request of the Government, advisory group procedures must contain methods by which the limits of activity requested by the Government may be ascertained accurately. Without such delineation, the Government may be embarrased in subsequent attempts to prosecute participants in advisory groups for unauthorized acts.

Advisory groups operate under and to a certain extent exercise authority from the Government. Unless responsible officials retain control of the advisory group, this mantle of Government authority is subject to abuse by the participants and the Government used as a vehicle for private gain. Such abuses include the extraction of competitive information not desired by the Government and the compelling of conformance to policies of a segment of industry.

The operation of some advisory groups has resulted in the creation of administrative lobbies within the executive branch of the Government and has placed the interests represented on the group in a favored and influential position in the routine operations of Government and the solution of public problems. From the standpoint of the public policy enunciated in the antitrust laws and the enforcement of those laws, there is not only the danger that these private organizations may abuse the circumstances which caused the Government to authorize meetings together of the competitors and use such meetings to commence or continue overt antitrust violations. There is also the effect that the activities of these private groups have on governmental decisions which have a direct bearing on industrial growth and concentration of economic power.

Any organization created by a Government official to assist him by furnishing advice and information necessarily must be conceived in the context that the organization is to be a governmental body. This bill would establish procedures regulating the conduct of Government created advisory groups to assure that all of their operations are those appropriate to governmental bodies.

The fourth bill amends the Clayton Act to exclude from taxable income two-thirds of the treble damages awarded private litigants who have been injured in their business or property by any other person or company as the result of violation of the antitrust laws.

Treble damages are presently awarded under the antitrust laws as an incentive to injured persons to appear before the courts when antitrust violations affecting them have occurred. Private antitrust suits are complex, lengthy, and expensive, and small companies especially are under a handicap in protecting themselves from antitrust law violators. Treble damages compensate them for the risk to their businesses as well as the

time and expense to which they are subject in these suits.

Private treble damage antitrust actions have a twofold purpose: First, they operate a deterrent to antitrust violations; and second, they are a significant aid to the Government in its enforcement program. It is important to encourage those injured to seek redress resulting from antitrust violations inasmuch as the Government cannot singlehandedly detect and arrest all antitrust violations.

The Supreme Court has held (*Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.*, decided March 28, 1955) that, under present law, the amount of the treble damages that exceeds the plaintiffs actual damages awarded under the antitrust laws falls within the compass of gross income, and is, therefore, taxable. This upset the previous rule that only the actual damages awarded in these suits was taxable.

As an inducement to injured persons or companies to press their own suits against antitrust violators, and to insure adequate compensation for the risks and expense involved, it is desirable to have the two-thirds damages treated as nontaxable income. This bill would accomplish that purpose.

Need for Scientific and Technical Education in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] delivered a most excellent, stimulating, and timely address when he spoke before the American Vocational Association at its meeting in St. Louis on December 6. The address is filled with much valuable information on advances in science and scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union as compared to our own efforts in this important field. The Senator from Missouri speaks with great authority on the significance and the challenge of the shortage of trained scientific and technical personnel and how this endangers our national security.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address delivered by the Senator from Missouri printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

Thank you for the honor of letting me present some of my views to this convention of the American Vocational Association. It is a privilege to have your distinguished organization convene in St. Louis.

For 50 years Americans have watched with interest and appreciation the growth and achievements of what is today the AVA—a great national education association.

Your organization and its predecessors have furnished the stimulus and much of the organized support for every Federal program that has been designed to promote vocational instruction.

Each year the continued growth of our economy demands more trained and educated people.

The opportunity to learn conforms to one of the important aims of our way of life—the desire to give each child a chance.

Today your work to that end is more important than ever before in our history, because the United States is now suffering from a shortage of trained scientific and technical personnel to the point where our national security is endangered.

That is the record, based on recent sworn testimony before the United States Senate from national leaders in the field of education.

Security now depends upon highly complex instruments—atomic reactors, electronic brains, radar warning nets, thermonuclear developments, supersonic missiles, latest model jet planes, etc.

In order to develop, produce, and maintain such items, it is, of course, essential that we have highly trained scientists, engineers, and technologists. Upon their shoulders rests the responsibility for keeping America abreast of the startling technological advances made by the possible enemy.

We also want a constantly higher standard of living. To that end, technological advances started originally in the interest of national defense almost invariably aid in further development of the civilian economy.

As example, the great stride made during World War II in electronics was one of the chief reasons television promptly left the laboratory for the home, creating our greatest postwar industry.

If we arrive at the ultimate goal of permanent world peace through universal disarmament, we can, nevertheless, be sure that we would still be involved in an extensive economic race.

Through technological developments, America could maintain its position in world markets without being forced to exploit labor in order to meet foreign competition.

Therefore, much of our future prosperity as well as our security is being decided in today's schoolrooms.

This educational battle, part of the current cold war, is one we cannot afford to lose.

But the facts show we are losing it.

Last year the Soviet Communists graduated over twice as many engineers and scientists as were graduated in the United States. This is a complete reversal of the figures of only 6 years ago.

As illustration of what this means to all industry, including defense industry, the President of MIT testified before the Senate that 800 companies were competing for 700 of his students—and that this year the situation would be worse.

In 1955, 420 men graduated from the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Each of these graduates had from 6 to 10 job offers.

Last year, a company seeking 30 aircraft designers spent $30,000 advertising for them in 1 month.

In January 1956, President Eisenhower himself reported to the Congress that the United States had an inadequate supply of scientists, particularly in the field of research.

In support of that position, Dr. Willard Libby, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, later testified before the Congress:

"In our own field of atomic energy, the lack of scientific and technical personnel is considerably more serious than money or raw materials as a limiting factor for the future."

Dr. Libby added that the AEC has been able to hire only a fourth of the trained people required by its program.

Recently, Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, said:

"It is entirely possible that if we cannot get enough qualified men to operate and maintain the increasingly complex equipment of this jet-electronic-nuclear air age, the Air Force could be forced into a technological retreat.

"In this technical age the military effectiveness of equipment seems to increase in direct proportion to its complexity. If we are forced into less complex equipment, we are forced to be less effective. Thus, our skilled manpower shortage could, in effect, force us to surrender to the Soviets advantages that would be equivalent to technological breakthroughs on their part."

So goes this buildup of evidence. Only last summer General LeMay testified before the Senate that the serious lack of trained people in his command had resulted in more accidents, and more deaths.

The Soviet Union is now our greatest economic and technological competitor. They have launched what is probably the most ambitious technical educational program ever undertaken by any country in the history of the world.

This Russian program is designed specifically to overcome the industrial and scientific lead of the West. When our military experts visited Moscow last June, Khrushchev emphasized and reemphasized that fact to them.

Current statistics show that this objective of the Kremlin is being realized.

The Communists are now our rivals in the development of atomic energy. They are ahead in some phases of missile research and production, in jet-engine development, and in certain modern combat planes.

This growing Communist superiority in part of the qualitative defense race becomes even more serious when we realize they are already far ahead of us in nearly all fields in the quantitative race—such fields as trained military manpower, mechanized divisions, submarines, and modern combat airplanes.

One of the reasons for this dangerous condition is that the Soviet Union has now built up the world's largest reserve of trained scientific and technical personnel.

A recent report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy states Russia now has an estimated 890,000 trained scientists and engineers, whereas the United States has some 760,000.

Based on the present programs of each country, the prospects for the years ahead are even less encouraging.

In 1954, the latest year of available figures, the United States granted preliminary scientific and engineering degrees to 53,507 graduates. This number is less than 50 percent of the number of similar degrees awarded in 1950.

By way of contrast, in 1954 the Soviets conferred some 104,000 preliminary scientific and engineering degrees, an increase for them of approximately 150 percent in 4 years.

Here are some illustrations of this startling trend: Only about 15 percent, or approximately 375,000, of college students presently enrolled in this country are in the scientific and engineering fields. In Russia, some 50 percent, or approximately 543,000 college students, are now studying in these fields.

We can see the justification behind Premier Bulganin's recent statement, when he asserted that by 1960 the Soviet Union would have nearly doubled its scientific personnel.

In an address last year at Columbia University, Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, stated:

"In round numbers the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000."

At the Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva, for the first time in many years, some of our leading scientists met and talked with scientists from the Soviet Union.

After this conference, Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated:

"What we learned was enough to shatter any complacency we may have in regard to our own imagination and ability."

In further confirmation of that position, Dr. John Dunnings, World War II director of research for atomic development at Columbia University, said recently of the Soviets:

"Those of us who have come up against them in competition have had the utmost respect for the quality of their scientific and engineering achievements.

"In the guided-missile field, both short-range and intercontinental weapons able to carry thermonuclear warheads, they have done exceedingly well. Some estimates put us several years behind them in certain areas. If we fall behind in this competition as we are in grave danger of doing, we lay ourselves wide open for the most fantastic international holdup."

In that connection, did you notice how quickly England and France agreed to a cease-fire in Egypt after Premier Bulganin threatened rocket warfare unless they stopped fighting.

This only confirms General Spaatz' recent warning to the effect that if the Russians were first with the intermediate-range missile—as is now probable—they could blackmail all Europe.

Each month that goes by furnishes additional evidence that any nation which developed atomic and hydrogen bombs so soon after our own successful efforts, can never again be described as scientifically retarded.

Nor is there any evidence whatever that the present quality of Soviet science will diminish. In fact, a report last March from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy stated:

"The training given Soviet engineers and scientists is of a high order and compares favorably with the best in the United States and Europe. Soviet universities, colleges, and technical institutes have achieved a helpful combination of formal education with guided industrial practice and research."

And so it would appear obvious that unless our present educational policies and programs are changed quickly and radically, any scientific lead we may have vis-a-vis the Communists will soon vanish.

To avoid that tragedy if possible, we must first analyze why the United States is suffering from such a shortage of trained people; and then seek the best means for correction.

The chief reason for the present short supply of scientists, engineers, and technicians is failure to develop our available potential brainpower.

As example, the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, previously referred to, states that 8 out of every 10 potential engineer-science students in this country never receive a college degree.

Two of these 10 potentials do not take college preparatory courses; in other words, they have the ability, but do not use it.

Three more of the 10 do not go to college because they cannot afford the cost.

As illustration of this latter problem, only last month the St. Louis Globe-Democrat published two case histories which illustrate what America is losing.

These histories were described as follows:

"Lost: One potentially fine engineer. A boy who ranked fifth in a class of 200. IQ, 120. He easily handled, in high school, mathematics, English, and social studies. Instead of going to engineering school as he yearned to do, he had to go to work.

"The youth is 1 of 7 children in the family. The father, uneducated, earns $300 a month. So the boy works as a draftsman (very junior grade) to bring money into the house. Although he has been out of school for 2 years, the youth is still available for scholarship."

The second case.

"Lost, irretrievably lost: One brilliant research chemist, a girl who ranked first in her class. Her mother, a widow, was supporting the girl and two other children on pay of $200 a month.

"The girl tried for 6 scholarships, won 1 paying one-half tuition at a local university. Financially, she wasn't able to accept it. She is working as a secretary and is helping the family. After 18 months of office work she is not interested in returning to classes—not even if she were given a full scholarship."

These cases are but typical of the problem of many other gifted high school students—young people who want to obtain the training, but haven't got the money.

Of the qualified men and women who do enter college, only a relatively small number study in technological fields.

One reason for this fact is the lack of engineering and science scholarships.

Most young people believe also that the road to an engineering or science degree is too long, too hard, and too costly for the eventual benefits derived, because they must face 6 to 10 years of expensive schooling, induction into the armed services somewhere along the way, and therefore a good chance of graduating in debt.

Of those who do go to college, about one-half are girls. Very few of the latter have the mathematical training necessary to pursue engineering or scientific work.

To complete the picture, the record shows that but two of the originally qualified 10 actually receive an engineering or scientific degree.

There are some other reasons for this unfortunate condition.

One is the inadequate high school curriculum now prevalent all over America.

In some States, one-fourth of the high schools teach no mathematics whatever.

In many high schools the athletic coach teaches the sciences as a secondary duty.

Only a few of our largest high schools have really adequate science or shop facilities.

These inadequacies are further emphasized by the almost universal lack of qualified teachers.

The reasons for this latter situation are well known to most of you. In practically no community does the modern teacher, whether his field be science or English, enjoy the respect afforded the local doctor, lawyer, banker or businessman.

Instead, the teacher is often viewed as the time-worn, absent-minded professor, content to be relegated to a world of books, blackboards and chalk dust.

As a result, his salary is low, and a subject of debate in the local school board. Often the best qualified man is not hired, rather the one who will accept the job for the least pay.

The Nation's potential brainpower is in the hands of those who train our youth. They therefore control much of the future of our country.

But because of low pay, lack of community standing, and the general apathy of our citizenry, fewer qualified people are now joining the teaching profession.

This is particularly true in the fields of engineering and science.

In the some fifty-four colleges and universities of Missouri, last year we graduated 3 people trained to teach chemistry, and 2 trained to teach physics. In fact, in the entire United States, only 228 students were graduated to teach physics, an appalling condition if one faces up to what is going on in the world today.

These are but some of the reasons we would appear to be passing over to the Communists superiority in trained technical people.

Now, how are we going to break through this brainpower bottleneck?

No piece-meal approach can longer suffice. It is with that premise that we present the following seven-point plan:

1. National educational associations such as AVA should go all out in their encouragement of educational authorities in every State to adopt, as a requirement, the study of mathematics; plus some science and some technical vocational training.

No group is better suited to work on this job than your own.

There will be objections, but they are more than counterbalanced by the growing peril.

2. In cooperation with State associations, national associations should recommend some form of testing program in the elementary schools. In this way we could discover, at a relatively early age, those students capable of doing college work.

As early as the 6th or 7th grade, and constantly thereafter, students should be informed of the type and amount of all college scholarships available, of the job opportunities in various engineering and scientific fields, and of the great and growing need for skilled people in these areas.

3. The problem of inadequate laboratory and shop facilities must be faced in conjunction with efforts to correct the growing lack of schoolrooms. Funds should be earmarked for the former as well as the latter.

In this connection, all educational associations should take every possible step to show industry and business why it is in their own interest to help in the training programs of those they are bound to need.

4. We must face up to the growing problem of inadequate teachers, and take the necessary steps to correct this condition. This will require more recognition and better salaries. Even so, their service cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Like the air we breathe, they are essential to our continued existence.

5. In order to make it possible to train students who want to teach mathematics, science, and vocational training, the Federal Government should establish scholarships in qualified colleges and universities.

Here is another field where, in its own interest, private industry should be encouraged to provide scholarships in areas of its own choosing.

6. There should be Federal scholarship programs at the college and graduate school level. They likewise should be supported as much as possible by business and industry.

7. The selective-service program should be revised so that students with extraordinary aptitude in engineering and the sciences could either complete their active-duty requirements during the summers between terms, or join a special scientific reserve corps comparable to ROTC, but one embodying a specialized training program.

Upon graduation, the young men involved would serve their remaining military obligation in military jobs requiring technical training; perhaps even in such vital agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission.

In summary, this 7-point program seeks the education of those qualified young people who are now being lost to advanced learning.

They are prerequisites to our goal for a better life.

But they are also needed to maintain our freedom.

To our youth, therefore, it is our duty to pass on the torch of liberty.

Given the opportunity, they will accept, with eager hands.

"So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
When duty whispers low, 'Thou must,'
The youth replies, 'I can.'"

Egypt's Defiance of United Nations Intolerable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Nasser's arrogance has grown to the point where submission to it becomes a matter of grave consequences. Seven weeks have passed since the cease fire took place, but Egypt has taken upon herself to impose condition upon condition before meeting the terms of the resolution. Steps were to have been taken to reopen the canal as soon as the cease fire had been negotiated. This has been done. Where there seems today to be some agreement on the Suez Canal clearance, every sign points to the fact that new and further conditions will be imposed.

The cease fire was to apply to all nations concerned, including Egypt. But Egypt today still continues her fedayeen raids against Israel. This obstructionism must be recognized for what it is, a threat to the peace, a blow against the authority of the United Nations.

The administration has not hesitated to bring pressure to bear against England, France, and Israel in the recent occurrence in the Middle East. We are aware of no such pressure upon the Egyptian Government to completely comply forthwith with the resolution of the United Nations. The resolution called for effective steps to reopen the Suez Canal and to restore "secure freedom of navigation" through it and to impose a cease fire upon all parties. The resolution never called for the reopening of the canal to await upon the withdrawal of England, France, and Israel.

Egypt's treatment of nationals of British and French residents in Egypt and her ignominious treatment of nationals of Jewish faith must surely arouse the indignation of the civilized countries of the world. To all of this has the administration been silent except for mere expression of "concern." There is a firm road to peace with honor. Moral indignation expressed against some offenders and withheld from others is the setting up of a dual standard. We have allowed much too much time to elapse awaiting Nasser's compliance. We have permitted too much dictation by Mr. Nasser of the terms which suit him best. We have taken the lead in the United Nations against England, France, and Israel for their activities in the Middle East. Do not the arrogant tactics of Egypt call for our taking leadership in the United Nations to the end that Egypt comply not only in the matter of the complete clearance of the canal, but permitting accessibility of the canal to all countries once cleared?

Moreover, must not now the United Nations insist upon United States leadership that Egypt cease its maltreatment of Jews and other nationals within its borders? Must we not likewise at this point insist that Egypt cooperate in the establishment of a permanent peace in the Middle East ceasing her raids against Israel and recognize the existence of Israel as an independent, solvent state in the Middle East?

With Russia as a Member the United Nations Is Powerless To Secure World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been trying to convince the American people that the United Nations as now constituted can never obtain peace in the world.

Right at the very beginning a member was taken in that should not have been allowed to even associate with decent governments. This Nation was not only taken in, but it was one of the builders of the United Nations. It will be remembered that Molotov, Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and other friends of communism were the ringleaders in creating this organization. It was propagandized from one end of the world to the other as a great world peace organization. We were taken in by this propaganda, and the Senate approved this Russian-created organization, with the power lodged in the United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and France to veto, through the Security Council, any move the United Nations might make.

Now look at the record. Sixty-four times Russia has exercised her veto and stopped any move for world peace that we or other nations have suggested. Not only that, but the Russians have violated every section of the heralded charter. They have not only aided and abetted other nations in aggression, but have engaged in inhuman aggression themselves, in clear and unequivocal violation of the charter which they were pledged to support.

Recently the President leveled an indictment of 11 separate counts against the dictators of Russia, all of which were true.

The invasion of Hungary has aroused the world to the menace of the dictators of Russia. Their deeds in Hungary brand them as unworthy of associating with just governments, and ought to convince the world that the ideology the Russians have propagandized throughout the world is not at all what communism is. At this juncture, and with the President's indictment clearly in mind, what are we to do? Giving the President a blank declaration of war to carry around in his pocket to be used whenever he thinks it should be used will not settle the matter, nor will it be a substitute for what we can do without granting this power of Congress to one man, however popular or however able he may be.

Let us do first things first. For years I have been trying to get this country to understand that with Russia in the United Nations, the organization can do nothing. That is about all this organization has done to date. It did set up Israel by its own resolution, and that is the only machinery of international law or treaties that did set it up. War has been going on between Israel and the Arab States ever since. Even now, with United Nations guards along the border between Israel and the Arab States, sniping is in progress, just like it will always be, with Russia smashing all attempts to bring about peace. In this location the Russians will carry on their propaganda and give aid and comfort to any agency that will keep up the war.

Now, what should we do? First, if we want a United Nations capable of bringing about world peace, the Russians should be expelled from the organization. Our representative in the United Nations should be instructed to introduce and work for the passage of a resclution to that effect. The evidence is overwhelming that Russia has violated the charter, not only once, but repeatedly and arrogantly, from the day she first took her seat.

Secondly, this Government should immediately withdraw recognition of this dictator government, and show the Hungarians and the rest of the world that we wash our hands of this nefarious power. That would demonstrate to the people who are struggling for freedom that the United States abhors the atrocities committed against liberty-loving people who are now in the clutches of the Russian dictators.

Third, the United Nations should reorganize, and accept as members only those nations which are not afraid to stand up for liberty and freedom, regardless of the Kremlin. Forty nations united in purpose would be better than 90 nations, with a great many of them afraid of Russia and who will not take action against this cruel military government.

Fourth, we should aid only those countries which are loyal to freedom, and omit those which are not.

Fifth, we should keep right on arming this country, for "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Do not let any Bulganin try to stop the development of our defenses. Do not go to sleep while on guard. Isolate the Russians and quarantine them, and the public opinion of the world will support that procedure.

Sixth, have nothing to do with any nations that trade with the Russians. That would include England, for that country has never stopped trading with them. If England wants money to protect her widespread empire, or to start a war she cannot finish, let her get her money from Russia.

Eighth, banish the fear of Russia that has permeated this country for several years. Russia is too weak to risk a war because of conditions in her own country and the feeling of the people who have been subjugated by her. Banish appeasement. In that respect, the occasion of the President's message was the first time this country ever stood up on its hind legs and told the Russians

what they should have been told when we let them into Berlin.

In any armed conflict with any nation I think Congress should pass on the situation and not leave it to any one person to do what only Congress is authorized to do under the terms of the Constitution.

To carry out the views I have taken of this situation I am reintroducing in this session resolutions I have had before Congress for the past several years.

Should the steps be taken that I have outlined, I do not believe any war will break out. In the Middle East there is only one question involved and that is oil. Take away the oil and the intense scramble for it will end. We want to make sure that in this area we take no action to protect the big oil moguls who are there draining off the oil. If American capital wants to invest in this troubled area the United States should not be called upon to protect that capital.

If we cannot expel Russia we should withdraw from the United Nations and set up another organization for world peace, even if we do not have half the nations with us who are in the United Nations today. Those nations which now vote against us or hide in the closets of abstentions should be left out.

Thirty-ninth Anniversary of Ukraine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic, which was founded in 1918, occurs today, Tuesday, January 22. It was on January 22, 1918, that the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly met and adopted a proclamation establishing the independence of the Ukraine.

For many centuries the Ukrainian people were subservient to Russian domination. The freedom gained by the Ukrainians was shortlived, however, since in 1920 the country was overrun by Russian Communist imperialism and its freedom was destroyed. Since then the 40 million people of the Ukraine have been enslaved as a captive nation of the Kremlin rulers.

The Ukraine was one of the first victims of Communist aggression. Its people have paid a tremendous toll in human suffering, including the deportation of some 6 million Ukrainians to the Russian slave-labor camps. During all these years, the Ukrainians have waged a ceaseless and unrelenting fight for their freedom, perhaps not as spectacular and dramatic as is the fight of the Hungarian people, but it must be remembered that the Ukraine is under Russian domination for a longer period and is geographically closer to Russia.

Nevertheless, their struggle for their national liberation has never stopped. The indomitable desire of the Ukrainian people for national freedom has not been extinguished. The annual observance of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence is one way of keeping alive this desire for freedom and the spiritual affinity of the Ukrainian people with all other freedom fighters and with all nations enjoying the fruits of freedom.

I am proud to know that Americans of Ukrainian descent have not forgotten their kinsmen abroad and are giving them all possible moral encouragement. On this occasion of the anniversary of their independence, we send our heartfelt greetings. We pray that the hope for a better day when the Communist nightmare will meet its ignominious end will be realized soon and the people of the Ukraine will know the true meaning of national independence and freedom.

A Tribute to Clark Gable, a Great Example of Americana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the State of Ohio, I wish to pay tribute to one of Ohio's proud sons, Mr. Clark Gable.

In his lengthy career, Mr. Gable contributed much to the enjoyment of millions. At all times he was ready to fight for the principles which have made this country great. Modest and conservative, he is also one of the friendliest and approachable of all Hollywood stars, and the personification of all that is best in American manhood. He is the example of how a young American lad can advance himself and become famous.

In the continuing scramble for recognition as king of Hollywood, Mr. Clark Gable is still the winner—and king. Even his rivals, pretenders to the throne, readily grant that, after a quarter of a century, Mr. Gable still reigns unchallenged as one of the world's most popular and best known movie personalities.

He was born William Clark Gable near Cadiz, Ohio, son of the late William H. Gable an oilfield worker, and Adeline Hershelman Gable. His mother died when he was a baby and he was raised by his stepmother, Jennie Dunlap Gable. He first went to work as a timekeeper for a rubber factory in Akron when he was 15. From these modest beginnings, he progressed until he obtained his fabulous world-recognition and accolade.

Time cannot wither nor custom stale "King" Gable's infinite appeal. Mr. Clark Gable recently completed his 56th starring role in a motion picture, The King and Four Queens, for United Artists release, which has already received wide reception wherever shown and continues to make him the idol of millions.

It's just a quarter of a century since he first achieved stardom, and ever since he has been at or near the top of the annual popularity lists compiled by theater exhibitors and critics. His films have been consistent box-office successes, and he is the one star whom visitors to Hollywood most often ask to meet.

Even a partial list of Mr. Gable's movies reads like an all-time ten-best, and his leading ladies constitute an aristocracy of present and past Hollywood. Among the King's queens have been Norma Shearer, Joan Crawford, Jean Harlow, Greta Garbo, Vivien Leigh, Ava Gardner, Deborah Kerr, Grace Kelly, who is now Her Serene Highness of Monaco, and many others.

In addition to his achievement as king of the motion-picture industry, Mr. Gable has a strong sense of duty to his country. During World War II, Mr. Gable enlisted in the Army Air Corps as a private.

After serving as an enlisted man, he qualified for officer candidate school, from which he was graduated and commissioned a second lieutenant and was sent to England with a bomber group. He served with distinction for 2 years with the Eighth Air Force in Europe. He took part in the raid on the bombing run that blasted the Ruhr Valley and became one of three "prizes" for whom Hermann Goering offered a price dead or alive. Gable won the Air Medal for five combat missions, and he was separated from the service with rank of major. On returning to civilian life, Mr. Gable resumed his film acting career as the reigning star of Hollywood.

Long live the king.

Representative Wayne Hays Elected President of NATO Parliamentary Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I had the high honor to be one of the delegates from the House of Representatives to the Conference of Parliamentarians of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization held in Paris in November. There were nine delegates from the House of Representatives, along with a distinguished group from the Senate.

The 250 delegates at the Conference, representing each of the NATO countries, chose as president one of our own Members, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, chairman of the House delegation. Mr. HAYS presided over the deliberations of the Conference with great skill and tact. His choice as presiding officer was a great honor to the United States and to the House of Representatives.

There was a general consensus of all delegates that the Conference was a valuable contribution to the strength of the entire NATO program. We met at a time of grave misunderstandings among

the principal NATO powers. The exchange of views about common problems will contribute greatly to the elimination of some of these misunderstandings.

The President's Warning About Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the year 1956 just ended was the most prosperous in the Nation's history.

The year 1956 saw 65 million Americans, 2 million more than ever before, gainfully employed, and at wages which, on the average, were 7 percent higher than ever had been paid heretofore. The gross national output of goods and services in 1956 was $412 billion, or a gain of $21 billion over the previous all-time high attained in 1955. The gross national output of $412 billion compares with $345 billion in the last year—1952—of the Truman administration.

The Prudential Insurance Co.'s Business Forecast for 1957 anticipates a further increase this year of $20 billion in the Nation's total output of goods and services.

The high level of prosperity of the recent past and the prospects that it will continue is most encouraging but not without its dangers.

More buying means more demand for goods. Heavy demand often stimulates price advances. Too rapid advances in prices can fan the fires of a dangerous inflation which, if unchecked, can grow into an economic disaster. President Eisenhower, therefore, in my opinion, did well to devote a major part of his state-of-the-Union message this year to warning Congress and the country of the dangers of inflation and to suggesting preventive measures which might avoid it. History—ancient, medieval, and modern—is filled with examples of how runaway inflation has ruined the security and well-being of many nations. The President's warnings against inflation were timely, constructive, and commendable.

The Eisenhower administration during the past 4 years has been quite successful in keeping prosperity at an all-time high and at the same time holding in check inflationary forces.

During President Truman's last 4 years as Chief Executive prices went up, up, and up. During his administration prices went up almost as fast as wages increased, thereby depriving workers of benefits of pay increases.

During the first year of the Eisenhower administration prices advanced only about 2 percent in 3 years, while during the same period wages and income of citizens increased several times that fast. During the past year, however, fanned by booming prosperity, prices have increased, on an average, 2 percent, or about as much as in the 3 preceding years. This is a danger sign, and the President acted forthrightly in calling the country's attention to it, and in proposing remedies to checkrein too rapid price increases.

Coupled with his warnings against inflationary dangers, the President, in his state-of-the-Union message, proposed a study be made of the Nation's financial system, obviously including a study of control of credit and credit agencies. Such a study might prove extremely useful by providing committees with factual information on which future wise legislation can be based. What the Nation needs in its fight against inflation is well-thought-out, long-range, sound policies, not newly hatched panaceas to please voters rather than be of enduring long-range benefit to them.

The Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration Should Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to abolish the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration and to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government.

The Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives recommended elimination of the Loan Policy Board, and also declared the continuation of SBA was a necessity. These recommendations were contained in House Report No. 1045, 84th Congress, 1st session. Members of the subcommittee were Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman; Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, and Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, of New York.

My bill is designed to carry out the recommendations of the subcommittee. In addition, my bill, if it is adopted, will indicate to the 4 million or more small-business men in our country that the Congress is well aware of the plight they are facing when they are confronted with the need for financial assistance where such assistance is not available through private banking institutions.

I include here excerpts from the report of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Disposal, and Loan Activities to the Select Committee on Small Business. I also include a letter I have received from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president in charge of the legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. Included here too is the text of my measure:

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED ACTIVITIES—A PRELIMINARY REPORT

(A report of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Disposal, and Loan Activities to the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 1st Sess., pursuant to H. Res. 114, a resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business)

LENDING POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Loan Policy Board

Section 204 (d) of the act creates a Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, consisting of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration as Chairman, and Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, as members of such Board. The act by its language, created the Board to establish general policies which shall govern the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Administration.

Section 204 (a) of the act states:

"In order to carry out the policies of this title there is hereby created an agency under the name of Small Business Administration * * * and it shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

It is clear from the evidence adduced at the hearings that the Small Business Administration, in order to perform the function for which it was created, should be charged with the duty and responsibility of formulating loan policy. As an independent, unaffiliated agency, the Administration should be responsible only to the President and to the Congress for its actions. The evidence indicates that the Loan Policy Board makes no substantial contribution in carrying out the intent of Congress with respect to providing assistance for small business.

The Board has met approximately once a month since its inception and, although it has issued a loan-policy statement, the record is clear that the determinations were always unanimous and the Board merely followed the recommendations of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified:

"Sometimes the Loan Policy Board considers something for a month or two before we move into it. * * * I have prepared most of the changes in the policy myself. * * * There has been uniformity, or at least an agreement, in the changes that have taken place. * * * We [Small Business Administration] felt that a change should be made and they should all be put on the same basis. The Loan Policy Board concurred."

The record is clear that the determinations of the Loan Policy Board were based on recommendations of the Administrator and were always unanimously passed by the Board. Mr. Robbins, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, testified:

"Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say that in my recollection there has never been a decision of the Policy Board arrived at in any way except by unanimous agreement. There has been no attempt to override the Administrator on the part of other members of the Policy Board. He is the Chairman of the Board and his recommendations are received sympathetically and almost without exception they are adopted."

Consequently, the procedure of the Loan Policy Board appears to delay important decisions and hampers efficient administration rather than serving to expedite the important lending functions of the act. In view of the foregoing experience, this subcommittee recommends that section 204 (d)

of the act be repealed. The subcommittee feels that the responsibility and jurisdiction for the policies, as well as the operations, of the Small Business Administration should lie solely within the administration of the agency. It is clearly the intent of the Congress that the Administrator be responsible for the activities and functions of the agency and that the agency be wholly independent and unaffiliated as provided in section 204 (a) of the act.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. JOE L. EVINS ON SBA LOAN POLICY AND PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

I agree with much of what my colleagues have said in their report, and any dissent which I may have is based on the view that certain matters have not been touched upon and certain things have not been said which, I strongly feel, should be said.

My colleagues place too much hope in their proposals for making SBA an independent agency responsible only to the President and to Congress. SBA is not an independent agency. Such independent Federal agencies as exist are conceived by law to be independent of the President, the Congress, and the judiciary, except of course the laws under which they operate are subject to review by Congress, as their actions are subject to review by the courts. SBA was not so conceived. It is responsible to the President, and its policies are made by the President, or by those to whom the President delegates his authority. Changing the law to remove the Secretaries of Commerce and the Treasury from SBA's Loan Policy Board will not transform SBA into an effective agency for making business credit available to small firms; nor will changing the law to direct other executive agencies and departments to cooperate and consult with SBA obtain for small business a fair share of Government purchases and contracts. These things will be achieved only when the policymakers of the executive branch of the Government determine that these things shall be achieved.

I agree, however, with my colleagues' recommendations for removing the Secretaries of Commerce and the Treasury from the SBA Loan Policy Board.

As for the Secretary of Commerce, Congress considered the question of making SBA a part of the Department of Commerce at the time its basic law was passed. And Congress considered this question earlier when the Small Defense Plants Administration, SBA's predecessor agency, was created. On both occasions Congress rejected this idea, and for reasons which are perhaps sounder today than they were on those occasions. It was decided to make the small-business agency separate from the Department of Commerce for the reason that it was widely believed that the Department of Commerce is essentially a big business agency, formulating policies for the benefit of big business. The commercial interests of big business are not always in harmony with the commercial interests of small business. If it is sound policy to have a separate agency for small business, then I question the propriety of having the Secretary of Commerce making policy for the small-business agency. The Secretary of Commerce should be removed from SBA's Loan Policy Board.

If the amount of SBA's lending were large enough to have any appreciable effect upon the Nation's money supply, or upon the national debt, then there might be an argument for having the Secretary of the Treasury on the SBA's Loan Policy Board. At least I would agree that money and debt management should be coordinated. But the amount of SBA's prospective lending is too small to be a significant factor in such coordination. The Secretary of the Treasury should also be removed from SBA's Loan Policy Board.

As I have indicated, these recommended changes will not make SBA an independent agency; but they should at least give SBA a more independent voice, and they should tend to fix responsibility upon the SBA Administrator. It is my opinion that responsibility for SBA's conduct is too widely diffused.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1957.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your action, which is continuing action to help small business, in the introduction of your bill which provides that the Small Business Administration be made a permanent agency and, more important, your bill providing for the elimination of the policymaking board, is a very forward step and will be welcomed by small business throughout this Nation.

Furthermore, your action I believe will be welcomed by the entire personnel of the Small Business Administration, which, in itself, will place the responsibility on the Administrator in carrying out the intent of Congress for needed financial relief for efficient independent business.

The action you have taken, in substance, is what we in the federation by direct nationwide vote of our members took in our personal appearances before the respective platform committees of both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions in Chicago and San Francisco. We recommended "continuation of Small Business Administration as a fully independent agency, with control solely in the administration responsible only to Congress."

It will be found also that the federation in its many appearances before respective congressional committees, from the very first instance and continuing on, recommended the elimination of this policy board, as it was our opinion from our daily experience in the small-business activity that the sole responsibility, as to this needed helpful act to assist small business, should rest entirely exclusively with the Administrator as to its overall policy, of course, always being subject to review by the Congress.

It is our hope that the Congress will act on your bill immediately and this, in itself, will be a definite indication of the respective party platforms that they intend to keep their pledges to aid small business of this Nation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to abolish the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration is abolished.

(b) Subsection (d) of section 204 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Administrator shall establish general policies (particularly with reference to the public interest involved in the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Administrator and with reference to the coordination of the functions of the Administration with other activities and policies of the Government) which shall govern the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Administration."

(c) Any reference to the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration in any other law, Executive order, delegation, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, or other official action in force on the date of enactment of this act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 217 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "which occurs while this title is in effect."

(b) Section 221 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is hereby repealed.

An Evil Lobbying Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been addressed to me a letter from the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis.

The use of public advertising mediums for political propaganda has been on the increase in recent years. This practice is inherently a vicious one, for not only has it been allowed to become a legitimate tax deductible item at the expense of all the taxpayers, but it is a use by management of stockholders' equity which has not been authorized by them, and which, in many instances, does not represent the views of the stockholders or owners of the business.

The use of this lobbying program by the private utility companies has become more and more widespread, and the letter which Mr. Ellis has written to me draws attention to what seems to be a particularly flagrant example.

I insert it in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues, with the hope that they will consider ways and means to remedy an increasingly evil practice:

JANUARY 3, 1957.

Mr. CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: Thank you for your letter and enclosures of December 31.

As I am not a member of the committee which considers this legislation, perhaps the best thing that I can do to call it to the attention of my colleagues is to see that it is entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I shall do at an early date, provided that some other member of the proper committee has not already done so.

With all good wishes to you in your efforts to defeat this pernicious propaganda, I am

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1956.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Enclosed for your information and study is a copy of an advertisement appearing in Look magazine on

November 13, 1956. It may have appeared in several other publications simultaneously, as has been the custom with such ads.

This advertisement is not sales advertising. It is not goodwill advertising. It is propaganda advertising, designed to convey a completely false picture, and for lobbying purposes. There can be little doubt that it is carefully designed to poison the minds of the American people and their public officials against rural electric cooperatives and public agencies such as municipalities, public power districts, and the Federal power program.

The advertisement is part of a lobbying program that has been carried on through national magazines, daily newspapers, radio, TV, and other media for several years, with the tempo greatly increased over the past few years. The cost of this propaganda campaign unquestionably runs into many millions of dollars a year.

The total cost of this program of misrepresentation and political pressure is paid by those who must of necessity buy electricity from the companies who sponsor these ads, for they are monopolies within their respective areas. In addition, since the costs of such ads and other manipulations of the public mind are deductible expenses for tax purposes, 52 percent of the cost of this propaganda comes out of the Federal Treasury. We do not believe that it was the intent of Congress for consumers and taxpayers to pay the cost of their own misinformation.

The attached ad alleges that there is a privileged class of people in this country who pay little or no taxes in their electric bills. This privileged class, according to the ad, is made up of those people who secure their electricity from Government wholesale power sources.

The rural electric cooperatives purchased during the year ending June 30, 1956, only 6 percent of all federally generated power, whereas private power companies secured 10 percent and private industry 20 percent. Obviously, the implications with respect to taxes are false.

We could go on criticizing this particular ad and others, but we are sure you will recognize these and the other misleading and the categorically false statements contained in this and similar ads.

It seems to us that the time has long passed when the Congress should take legislative notice of the use of tax-free funds for propaganda purposes by so-called regulated monopolies and enact statutes to place the cost of these programs on those who really sponsor them. For, under the law of the land as interpreted by the highest courts, in handling funds collected for the privileged conduct of a public service, they are in the same position as agents of the State engaged in a public business.

In this connection, the full House Committee on Government Operations, 84th Congress, has at least recognized the problem. In House Report No. 2279, the committee made this recommendation:

"(6) Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation by both Houses to determine whether or not there is an organized effort of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States, and the political life of the Nation."

Many of these ads have in the past branded as socialistic programs of the Federal Government, such as Rural Electrification Administration, TVA, Bonneville, Southwestern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, etc. In so doing the authors of these ads are apparently endeavoring to cast serious doubts on the intelligence, and judgment of the Members of Congress in passing legislation which they regard as vital to the welfare of the Nation.

We recognize the right of free speech, including the right of the capital stockowners of privately owned electric companies to use such propaganda advertisements to place their views on current issues before the public, provided the owners do it at their own expense. But, we are convinced that remedial legislation is today necessary to close the door to the use of ratepayers' money collected to pay the cost of a public service for their own private purposes.

We further question whether as a matter of policy a democracy can afford to permit privately owned public-service monopolies—monopolies licensed to provide the public with a basic service and authorized by the legislature and public courts to engage in public-service business—to engage in unlimited propaganda activities.

And if, and to whatever extent such propaganda spending is tolerated, the cost of it, we insist, should be borne by the owner-stockholders and not by the ratepayers.

The farmers' rural electric systems of the country have a direct interest in these propaganda expenditures for two reasons:

1. Nearly two-thirds of the rural electrics are purchasing their wholesale power requirements from the privately owned public utilities—for which they paid them $59,449,112 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and

2. Nearly one-third of the rural electrics are purchasing all or part of their wholesale power requirements from the Federal wholesale power agencies under laws being attacked by these ads—and for which the rural electrics paid the Government $26,844,795 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

Congressman William T. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the eulogy we pay our late colleague, Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of the Second Pennsylvania District, comes as something of an anticlimax.

For the people of his own district have expressed the perfect tribute by electing his widow to fill the vacancy that resulted when Bill was called to his Maker.

Bill always carried more than his share of responsibility as a Member of Congress, and never claimed any special credit for it. But to those who knew him, he had a profound knowledge of human nature, and a grasp of complex issues, that strengthened the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he was a member.

His word was his bond.

He was dependable—all the way.

His constituents had a high regard for him, and to continue the Granahan tradition of fine public service, they elected his widow to carry on in the post that he had ably filled for many years.

We welcome Kathryn as his replacement, for her presence will always remind us of her late husband, and our good friend.

That is the way that Bill would want it.

For all we know, his life may have been shortened by the conscientious devotion to his public duties that characterized our departed colleague.

That was BILL GRANAHAN; who never reckoned the cost to himself, when he was engaged in helping others.

That was his sublime faith in his God and in his country.

Today and every day we pay tribute to the memory of Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, an exemplary American.

Celler Seeks Antitrust Enforcement Action by Justice Department Following Latest Concerted Hike in Newsprint Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and also chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, today issued the following statement concerning the recent announcement by the Bowater Paper Co. of a prospective $4 per ton increase in the price of newsprint, the ordinary paper on which newspapers are printed:

"We are again confronted with a course of conduct which those who must depend upon newsprint suppliers have seen repeated with monotonous regularity and frequency over the years. The familiar pattern here presented was clearly etched upon the record of our Antitrust Subcommittee when it completed its extensive investigation of this problem in 1950.

"The current round of price increases was set off initially by the Abitibi Power & Paper Corp., Ltd. Two other major Canadian producers besides the giant Bowater international paper organization promptly fell in line in a process sometimes politely referred to as price leadership.

"The millions of Americans in urban or rural life who take for granted the regular appearance of their newspaper have a compelling interest in this issue. A spokesman for the American Newspaper Publishers Association asserts that, in view of the chronic newsprint shortage, publishers are in a straitjacket and at the mercy of the first mill which decides to raise the price. Similar price increases a year ago likewise touched off a series of sharp protests by both American and Canadian publishers and by public officials who contended then that the profits of the papermakers were more than adequate even at the old prices. They further point out that newsprint prices have risen further and faster than the general level of wholesale commodity prices.

"The country's newspaper publishers, both large and small, may well ask if collusive pricing by newsprint manufacturers exists in the year 1957 when newsprint prices rise to the same level at about the same time, and remain identical for almost all producers; when interlocking contracts of a long-term nature still relate the price charged by many newsprint mills to that established by their competitors; and when the so-called 'zone system' is still generally adhered to in quoting newsprint prices in the United States.

"The zone system, to single out only one of these factors, underscores the extent to which the newsprint producing concerns may have departed from accepted principles of free and open competition. The map of the United States has been sectioned into 10 different pricing zones by the major newsprint producers. Under this arrangement, prices for each zone are identical for almost all producers, regardless of how far each is located from the point where the newsprint is to be received and used. This system makes no allowance for the varying freight rates which would ordinarily be applicable between different plants and the point of consumption. The proof of the pudding is that 'phantom freight' must be paid to certain producers in those instances where the charge for freight included in the predetermined zone price is greater than the actual freight costs from the mill to the destination point.

"The continuing trend in this industry is cause for serious concern. Monopoly here would pose a threat to a free and healthy press, which is one of the cornerstones of our representative form of government. The freedom to write, to report news, to express ideas, to differ—all these become meaningless if the materials for mass communication are lacking, whether because of insufficient supplies of newsprint paper or because of prices beyond a newspaper's ability to pay.

"In this connection I am particularly disturbed by the fact that the hardest hit are the publishers of small dailies and weeklies as well as the newspapers of civic groups, labor unions, religious organizations, and cooperative movements—to mention a few of the chief victims, who are sometimes forced to pay exorbitant prices for this vital commodity on the gray or black market.

"Moreover, the past two decades have witnessed the disappearance of hundreds of daily newspapers in the United States through merger, consolidation or failure. The danger is real that the increased price of newsprint may accelerate this trend, particularly by driving small papers out of business.

"The time is ripe for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to take a 'new look' at the newsprint problem which has been under investigation in every session of Congress since 1943. The story of this industry has already been fully developed; the pertinent facts are spread upon the congressional records for all to see.

"Admittedly, the tactical obstacles that would face the antitrust enforcement officers of the Government cannot be minimized, but neither can the good that would result from successful legal action in this long-neglected area.

"Painstaking examination of key witnesses by our Antitrust Subcommittee brought out these highlights in the newsprint picture: For at least 15 years newsprint has risen steadily in cost and has been generally scarce, with requirements of American publishers mounting each year to a new high. The booming demand coupled with a tightness of supply has inflated the price to $134 a ton, in terms of the current increase, a figure that is more than double the price at the end of World War II.

"Nearly 80 percent of the newsprint used in this country now comes from Canada, where the relative handful of producers enjoy low-cost facilities, to say nothing of duty-free entry for their product into the United States, and the additional advantage that accrues from the exchange rate between the two countries. Efforts to open up and develop additional production sources in this country, which our Antitrust Subcommittee and other congressional committees have sought to promote in cooperation with Department of Commerce experts, have a long way to go.

"From the viewpoint of antitrust enforcement, this situation calls attention to the rebuff which the Deparment of Justice met in 1947, when one of the Canadian provinces where most of the mills are located, enacted a statute in effect barring the Justice Department from utilizing essential corporate records of Canadian firms. While this still serves to impede the orderly functioning of American law-enforcement agencies, a possible solution may be found by vigorous application of the provisions of the Sherman Act authorizing seizures of property owned by antitrust violators shipped in United States commerce.

"I would hasten to emphasize that the significance of newsprint transcends national boundaries and that responsible Canadian officials and publishers are no less distressed than their American counterparts by the apparent failure of the large producers to exercise reasonable self-restraint in the public interest."

Storage Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted me to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a speech which I delivered November 13 in Spokane, Wash., on the subject of Upstream Storage to the region 9 meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS BY HON. WALT HORAN, OF WASHINGTON

I was born on the banks of the Wenatchee River, a very short mile from its confluence with the Columbia. As a boy I used to search for arrowheads along that great river and watch the stern-wheelers churn upstream from Wenatchee to Riverside, in high water and sail downstream from Pateros to Wenatchee in low water. Even then we used to talk of the high water of 1894—which came "clear up to Jones' doorknob." The Jones family lived in a house near the Columbia.

Floodwise we have had some recent experiences that have come close to "Jones' doorknob"—that have caused death and destruction of major importance. The terrible flood of 1948 and the flood last summer have focused our attention anew on flood control and have accented our observations and our efforts on those developments that will help us to avoid the devastations of extreme high water.

My assignment today is very fortunate. The things ahead of us in power development are the same things we need to do for flood control.

It is my opinion that all of us should be thinking together, planning together, and acting together in the development of upstream storage. It is my intention to prepare a bill to give the Army engineers and other Interstate agencies a clear mandate and a full congressional authorization to store water as stored water. At first glance this might seem superfluous since upstream developments with power, reclamation, domestic water, navigation, flood control, recreation, and wildlife all may, and usually do, add some storage water to our Columbia River system. But storage, up to now, has been merely incidental. It has not been the initial and, therefore, the prior consideration.

Today it should be for stored water is the key. Stored water means flood control and water stored during the runoff is the simple key to our future power development here in the Columbia River drainage basin. The Army engineers should be given a clear mandate, as should other interstate agencies, to undertake studies with storage first in mind. We should know the potential in the light of the newest knowledge and procedures—and we should know the other problems involved and be about the working out of their solution.

Stored water should be the main accent on our plans for future power development and future power supply.

The statistics are relatively simple: To contain floods, we planned projects that would reduce the 1894 flood from 1,230,000 acre-feet to 800,000 acre-feet at the Dalles Passage. This plan, completed in the year 1948, called for 27 million acre-feet of usable storage—21 million of which would have been particularly effective in controlling such a flood as 1894—or 1948—the flood year in which this main control plan came out. Such a plan, it is claimed, would have eliminated 90 percent of the damage suffered in 1948.

The plan was well distributed over the Columbia system. It included among many other dams and sites: Hungry Horse, Grand Coulee, Libby (future), Priest Rapids, John Day, Hells Canyon.

And on the upper Snake: Palisades, Cascade, Garden Valley, Anderson Ranch, Arrow Rock, and Lucky Peak.

Since 1948 we have effected only 5 million acre-feet of effective storage—sufficient to reduce the 1894 flood from 1,230,000 to 1,100,000 acre-feet. We still need at least 16 million acre-feet of stored water.

It seems to me that we are at a point, now, in the overall developemnt of the Columbia when we must make the storage, as stored water, the first and primary consideration in any part of that development, and the farther we go up the system toward the Great Divide, the more important that fact should be. Aside from the problems of fish, which problem we all want fully met, storing water is now, more than ever, the very crux of our striving for more power, more flood control, better navigation, better reservoir level control, adequate water for irrigation and domestic uses.

In our rush for installed generators, we should not make an inadequate use of a dam site that might yield even more benefits if a proper evaluation of the storage potential were considered first and of first importance. My own position on the very controversial high dam at Hells Canyon was persuaded by this fact of greater storage—with greater benefits, therefore, at a dozen sites downstream.

The very naive lady who asked: "What do you do with the water after you get the electricity out of it?"—brought forth the well-known fact that you never get the electricity out of water as long as it is falling. The same bucketful, stored, if possible, at Glacier View, could have its electricity removed a score of times before it joined the Pacific.

In planning to place the emphasis on storage, as stored water, we are beginning to place new emphasis on the potentials of the important but lesser tributaries. In many cases these have been made feasible by other developments, as in the case of the Omak-Goose Lake possibilities which I had checked first in 1946. Possible combinations with Chief Joseph dam and power now make this a project worthy of full study. Another possibility in my district is "Wenatchee-Hydro" which would store water in the Lake Wenatchee area and, I believe, sometimes referred to as the "Chiwawa."

This discussion must be brief. Let us sum up by saying that as long as we have mountain ranges, and canyons with water flowing

down them, we will have the responsibility of harnessing that water for progress and against the damage of floods. Those mountains and those canyons also give us the God-given opportunity to make the most of our storage potential with a minimum of cost.

We do not lack the vision either as the interest here attests.

We must place special emphasis on sites with special circumstances surrounding them, such as those involving Canada at Libby and the ultimate at Mica and Arrow Lakes.

Meanwhile, we are making new starts for immediate promise to our power needs, and some multiple benefits. Preparations and actual work is underway on the three low dams on the Snake, at Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep, Noxon Rapids, Wells, Rocky Reach, and Priest Rapids. Ice Harbor is starting, the Dalles near completion and there are others.

But the need is for the much broader view—stored water, during the spring runoff that can be regulated to supply the benefits of maximum flow the year around. The promise of escape from interruptible power, the elimination of floods and their damage, the realization, at least, of the full value of this mighty river asset—these are within our grasp.

The key, as I have said, is storage. Storage first, and the others will be added unto it.

United States Department of Agriculture Should Reinstate Egg Buying Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the bottom has all but fallen out of the egg market in the Midwest. It was bad enough in Baltimore when farmers yesterday received 34 to 36 cents for their top eggs, but in my district the top price was no more than 24 cents. It takes the same capital investment, the same amount of feed, and just as much farm family labor to produce a dozen eggs in the Seventh District of Minnesota as it does in Maryland, and I am sure the Maryland farmers are not at all happy with their egg market.

Some farm enterprises produce only poultry and eggs. They are especially hard hit by this depressed market condition. Other farm families produce eggs for current cash income on a year-round basis and they, too, are suffering.

When you compare Washington, D. C., egg prices around 69 cents for top eggs last week with the price of no more than 24 cents paid to my Minnesota neighbors and constituents, you can see the gross inequity of this market condition. There may be some inflation when the consumer goes to market, but there is nothing but deflation when the farmer takes his eggs to his market for sale.

I deeply regret that the United States Department of Agriculture suspended its egg-purchase program early last month. At this season, egg prices should be up—not down—and seasonal trends in the next few months will surely be down unless checked by appropriate action. I have urgently recommended such action to the Secretary of Agriculture in a letter sent him today. I am including that letter in my remarks in the hope that other Members will join me in my efforts to bolster this market. At least, my colleagues from the consumer districts will see a concrete example of what we are up against in the agriculture producing areas of this Nation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1957.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: A press release by your Department dated December 31, 1956, for release January 6, indicated that the egg-purchase program was suspended in early December.

According to the Crop Reporting Board statement on Agricultural Prices, December 1956, the average price received by farmers for eggs was 37.1 cents on December 15, 1956. The average price was 47.1 cents on December 15, 1955. The general depression in the egg market is of serious concern to me, but of even greater concern is the disadvantage marketwise to the egg producers in my area. I have before me a transactions slip dated January 5, 1957, showing that at Edgerton, Minn., a farmer on that date was paid 24 cents per dozen for grade A Large eggs; 21 cents for B Medium; 21 cents for B grade; and 16 cents for C grade. I am reliably informed that prices are even lower at other points in Minnesota. The effective parity price for all eggs was 46.8 cents per dozen on December 15, 1956.

The relative market position of Minnesota producers of agricultural commodities has disturbed me in recent years. As you know, my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture has repeatedly asked for intensified study of marketing margins and other differentials between the producers and the consumers. In addition, about a year ago I asked Dr. O. V. Wells, Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, to make some special studies relative to the marketing position in our general area.

Late last Spring, Dr. Wells furnished me some preliminary reports in accordance with my request. His study on eggs, for example, showed that in Minnesota our differential had averaged 6.7 cents below the national average price on eggs from 1950–54, when the United States average price was 42 cents. In 1955, when the United States average price was 38.9 cents, the Minnesota differential dropped to −6.3 cents. However, there is evidence at this time that the differential is even greater—somewhere in the neighborhood of 15 cents.

Looking at it another way, the AMS report entitled "Marketing Margins for Poultry and Eggs" dated January 1956, shows that the farmer's share of the retail egg price ranged from 68 percent in 1952 to 73 percent in 1953. In 1955, the preliminary estimate was 69 percent. Last week, top eggs retailed at 69 cents per dozen in Washington Safeway stores. Applying the farmer's lower share of 68 percent would mean that producers should have received about 47.61 cents per dozen. Subtracting from that the usual Minnesota differential of about 6.7 cents should mean a price in Minnesota of about 41 cents a dozen for top-grade eggs, instead of the present top price of 24 cents.

I note from the above-mentioned press release that from September 25 through December 6 last year your Department paid an average of 37.81 cents for eggs. This does not appear to be an unrealistic figure under present market conditions, assuming that prices received by farmers maintained a proper relationship.

It should be obvious to you, as it is to me and the producers of eggs in my district, that Minnesota farmers are in a critical market condition insofar as eggs are concerned. When you add this to the over-all depressed market conditions in our area you can see the very real hardship our people are suffering because of the present egg market.

I, therefore, urgently recommend that the Department reenter the egg market without delay with an egg-purchase program of sufficient scope to assure raising of the market to a realistic level. I further request that other interested Departments and agencies in a position to do so be urged to expand their purchases of eggs to bolster the market. Advice as to your position on this will be appreciated at your earliest opportunity, as I do not believe that egg producers in my district and in that general area should be permitted to suffer this condition any longer than is absolutely necessary.

With best personal wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

H. CARL ANDERSEN.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack Before Temple B'Nai Moshe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the members of the Brotherhood Temple B'Nai Moshe, in Boston, Mass., on November 25, 1956:

The period in which we are living, covering the past 25 years, is one of the most trying and challenging in the known history of man. It is the forces of dictatorship in its most vicious form determined to dominate not only the body, but the will and the spirit of man; and to force that will and spirit to submit their belief and faith in God and His law, or to be remolded, to the image and likeness of atheistic communism.

This trying and challenging period is one that tests our faith, our courage and our strength.

We hear and live again the clarion call of men and women who want freedom. "Where law ceases, tyranny starts," or as as Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." There are many Patrick Henry's in the world of today. In recent months, Poland, East Prussia, Hungary, Israel, and other places give powerful evidence to this fact.

The courage of those who have fought and died for liberty, and others who in the future will be martyrs on the altar of liberty—shows conclusively that the desire for liberty is not manmade but come to mankind from God himself through his natural law. And it shows that dictators may suppress temporarily but can never destroy that God-given desire for liberty. And in the world of today, this is an important fact to remember.

We saw under Hitler and nazism, the illegitimate offspring of communism—the failure to dominate body and mind. The world underwent great pain and suffering, but Hitler and nazism could not destroy the will of men and women to be free. But to prevent Hitler from obtaining his evil designs, we had to have great thinking and courageous leadership—leadership that made and carried out policies that led to success.

And, in the world of today, we need here and abroad the same type of leadership. And this is particularly applicable to our own country, the leader of the free world and of the forces of decency.

For Chamberlain showed that the policy of appeasement—or peace at any price—is the road to war.

We know now from the records of Nazi Germany that firmness on the part of Great Britain and France and particularly Great Britain, prior to Munich and the invasion of Poland, might have averted World War II.

And firmness today by those in position of leadership might avert another world conflict.

For the past year and a half, we have been living in a dream world—a world of hope. The realities of current world history and events are now catching up with us, and our people are having a rude awakening.

During our blissful period of complacency few persons gave thought to the importance to our own national interest of countries and peoples thousands of miles away from us. Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, Israel, Egypt, the Middle East, and other nations were names of countries, or an area of the world about which we read when we studied geography in our school days or read about in the newspapers of today. They are away off, and what do they mean to us?

But our people, now—the hard way—are commencing to realize that in the hands of, or under the control or domination of the Soviet Union, they do mean a great deal to the United States; and, in the hands of a hostile government, they would be adverse to our best interest. To the contrary, in the hands of a government friendly to us, they are of great importance, particularly in case of war, to our country and its national interest.

There has been too much loose thinking in the minds of many Americans of the importance to use of countries thousands of miles away from our shores. And, among the main reasons for this is the feeling of false security, resulting in complacency that responsible leadership in our country has created during the past year and a half—coupled with the withholding of information from our people that should have been made public.

For example, slowly but surely, there is creeping into the minds of our people the importance of Indonesia in connection with the defense of our country. For, Indonesia in the hands of a hostile government in time of war would outflank our entire far eastern defenses and compel us to draw back in the Pacific over 2,000 miles to our continental defenses of Hawaii and Alaska.

Our people are commencing to realize the importance of the Middle East—of the Suez Canal—and of Israel in terms of the American national interest. They are commencing to realize that the Soviet Union in control of the Middle East would be a disastrous blow to the free world, and dangerous to our own best interest.

We have seen the myth of peaceful coexistence exposed by the ruthless actions of the Soviet Union in Hungary.

We see the actual threat of another world war by the actions of the Kremlin and Nasser in the Middle East.

And, in our own country, we see leadership that with firmness could probably have averted these conditions, just the same as Chamberlain could probably have averted World War II if he had followed the policy of firmness.

We see our leadership, in desperation, acting with a lack of policy and in a confused state of mind, which may contribute to greater danger.

It is essential that we immediately get back to sound thinking, to firmness and consistency in our foregn policy, and in regaining the confidence of our friends throughout the world.

The two countries most prominent in the news of today are Israel and Hungary. The problems confronting the people of both of these countries are basically the same—their desire for liberty and independence.

In the case of Israel, that little country is confronted with the problem and duty of preserving and retaining liberty and independence. In the case of Hungary, of regaining liberty and independence. But the basic objective of both countries is liberty and independence.

In Hungary, we witness Communist Russia sending in its forces of killers to suppress the fight for liberty. The reason they moved in to Hungary is because the uprising was against any or all forms of Communistic government. We witness the Soviet Union establishing the Kadar regime, which is not a legitimate government.

We have heard the pleas of the fighting and dying Hungarians falling on ears of inaction. Action that the United States and the United Nations could have taken and failed to take has played into the Kremlin's hands in Hungary and elsewhere.

For we know that there are millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who hate all forms of Communistic government; and that they are watching events in Hungary. Like the people of Hungary, they want their own free government. When they see inaction in the case of Hungary, it deters their determination and action for any similar uprising.

Now, what can we do?

In addition to the sending of medicines and foods, which has been done to some extent, the United States could announce its refusal to recognize the Soviet puppet government of Hungary, at least until all Soviet troops are withdrawn, and these Hungarians forcibly deported to Siberia are returned to their homes.

The United Nations has finally adopted over Soviet opposition a resolution to send United Nations observers to Hungary. The present nonlegitimate regime in Hungary has announced its refusal to permit their entry.

An announcement that the United Nations observers were going into Hungary could be made and the attempt made. Or, better still, if the United Nations observers were to fly to the Budapest airport in a United Nations marked plane, the Soviet Union could only do 1 of 2 things—admit them and thus weaken their position, or arrest and expel them, which would also weaken their position. The burden then would be upon the Soviet Union and the present nonlegitimate regime in Hungary to forcibly deny their admission. This action would show to the world what the Soviets are, and open the way to genuine diplomatic and economic action. This action would also convey a message of action and real hope to the patriots in Hungary. It would be a stimulating action to millions of others behind the Iron Curtain who are longing for freedom from any kind of Communist domination.

The forcible denial of the entry of the United Nations observers into Hungary would arouse world public opinion that the Soviet Union and the present Hungarian regime could not withstand.

We will remember that not so long ago they had to bend to world public opinion where Red Cross trucks with food and medicines were denied admission. As a result of that world public opinion was aroused, and within 24 hours they permitted them to enter Hungary to bring relief to the suffering people.

And, I might say, that over 2 weeks ago I suggested to a high official of our State Department that such action be taken, as well as sending over the United Nations observers and compelling the Communists to refuse their admission. I also suggested that our country announce that it would not recognize the present Soviet puppet regime in Hungary.

The United Nations has acted, whether wisely or not, in the Middle East by sending a United Nations force into the Suez Canal area.

But nothing has been done with reference to observers or a United Nations force in Hungary.

If the United Nations cannot act, or fails or fears to act where the Communists are the aggressors, then its future existence is imperiled.

What we need is deeds, not words.

In Israel we witness the determination of Nasser—backed by the Soviet Union—to destroy that brave little country. That is a well-known fact. It is also a well-known fact that Soviet arms are going into Algeria by way of Egypt, and that the whole unrest in the Middle East and Mediterranean area has its origin in the Kremlin.

It is a historical fact that for over 200 years Russia, under the Czars and the Communists, have tried to penetrate the Middle East to gain domination in that important area. In this area in the past 2 years the Soviet Union has been able to accomplish what Russia could not accomplish for over 200 years.

We know of the Soviet sale, or giving, of arms to Egypt, which brought about a military imbalance in that area harmful to the existence of Israel. Farseeing and courageous leadership on our part would have offset that imbalance by the sale of arms to Israel for defensive purposes. If that had been done, Nasser would probably not have carried out his raids on Israel. Nasser might then have realized that the 8-year offer of Israel to negotiate peace terms should be accepted. In any event, such action would have shown firm leadership on our part that might well have stayed the action of Nasser in the seizing of the Suez Canal.

For men like Nasser and the Communist leaders thrive on uncertain, vacillating and weak leadership. To them, that is weakness, which gives them courage to take action that might bring about more serious results.

The important question, coming down to conditions as they exist at the present time, is what course of action should be taken now.

It is very evident that the restoration of peace in the Middle East will not be brought about by the mere withdrawal of the British-French forces from the Suez and the withdrawal of the forces of Israel from the area occupied by them—unless a new satisfactory international agreement is reached in relation to the Suez and peace negotiated and a peace treaty signed between Israel and the Arab countries. Such action alone will strengthen Nasser's hand, make him more formidable, and consolidate the position and power of Communist Russia in this vital area and increase the danger of another world war.

I think it can be safely said that a truce that avoids fighting and settles nothing is not peace.

To the dictator, particularly the Communist type, this is a sign of weakness, leading him to greater boldness, greater danger, and, ultimately, war.

As we read the newspapers of the past few days it is apparent that Nasser is seeking terms which, if agreed to, will be a great victory for him and the Soviet Union.

If the United Nations agrees to his terms, and particularly if the United Nations forces withdraw from the Suez Canal after the withdrawal of the British-French forces, that will be capitulation on the part of the free world.

If, in addition, United Nations forces are used to police Israel for the benefit of Egypt, the capitulation will be indescribably harmful to not only the free world but to our own country.

Even those who oppose the recent action of Great Britain, France, and Israel should realize that this should not be done. They should realize that Nasser is a constant menace to peace. They should realize that the Kremlin is still bent on world revolution and world domination. They should realize that Communist domination in the Middle East will give the Soviet Union a decided advantage that will be most harmful to our national interest and the national interests of the free nations of the world. They should realize that the United Nations forces should remain at the Suez Canal until another fair international agreement has been made with reference to the Suez and with the vessels of Israel, or those going to or from Israel, having full rights. And that the United Nations forces should remain until Nasser and the heads of the other Arab countries sit around the peace table with Israel and negotiate and make a peace treaty.

The sending of United Nations forces is to meet the present emergency, and is temporary action. It will be in vain unless the chronic condition is healed, and that can only be done by a peace treaty entered into good faith. And the responsibility for the chronic condition—the armistice of the past 8 years, the failure to negotiate peace—rests upon Nasser. For it is well known that he has constantly refused to even try and make peace terms. It is well known that he will not do so. Israel for 8 years, and today, is willing to negotiate peace terms.

We read in the papers of the return of Secretary General Hammarskjold of the United Nations from his conferences with Nasser. He has made his reports to the General Assembly. While the same are preliminary and incomplete, it does show what Nasser's demands are. It also shows Hammarskjold's thinking. His reports, if accepted, would leave the presence, deployment, and tasks of the United Nations forces subject to the grace and consent of Nasser. If that is agreed to, there will only be a temporary truce. If that is agreed to, it will constitute a great victory for Nasser and the Soviet Union. If that is agreed to, it will be a capitulation on our part that could lead to disastrous results.

The withdrawal of the United Nations forces from the Suez should be dependent upon (1) another fair international agreement for the use of the Suez being negotiated; and (2) the making of peace between the Arab nations and Israel.

The position of Israel is only fair that guaranties should be exacted from Nasser against further Egyptian suicide squad raids on Israel and its people.

To permit Egypt to dominate politically the Suez Canal would be not only unwise, but dangerous.

We must not overlook the fact that—

1. Egypt declared war on Israel.

2. It is Nasser who refuses to talk and negotiate peace terms.

3. Nasser has repeatedly stated his avowed intention to destroy Israel.

4. Nasser is giving aid to the Algerian rebels with Communist arms coming from the Soviet Union.

5. Nasser is determined to drive the Western Powers out of the Middle East.

6. It was Nasser who purchased or obtained arms from the Soviet Union to use to destroy Israel.

7. It was Nasser who enabled the Soviet Union to gain their strong foothold in the Middle East.

8. It is Nasser who is the man who seized the Suez Canal last July.

9. It is Nasser who orders the suicide squad raids to be carried on against the people of Israel.

There are some in the world of today who ask the question, "What can we do?" or, "There is nothing that can be done."

There were the same type of persons in the 1930's when Hitler and Mussolini engaged in aggression. There were those who then said, "There is nothing that can be done." But, we found out that this was nothing but the policy of appeasement. And, as I have said before, appeasement for democracies leads to war. For Chamberlain showed this.

What the United States should do is get back to the basic policy of firmness in foreign affairs. For the very fate of the free world might be involved if we do not devise and follow correct policies.

It is the inactivity of the United States—its attitude of an aggrieved but thoroughly passive spectator, which creates doubts in the minds of other free nations, and which gives the Kremlin and men like Nasser and Kadar courage to proceed further.

To stop further deterioration of the nations of the free world, sound policies must be devised, with firmness of leadership, as well as consistency of leadership.

This is a matter of paramount immediate importance.

And in the position of leadership our country occupies, with the influence and power we possess, that task falls primarily upon our shoulders.

We should not—we cannot afford to fail.

Persecution of Egyptian Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very much perturbed over the reports concerning the harsh treatment of Jews in Egypt. Already several thousand Jewish refugees from Egypt have reached European ports with tales of horror of the inhumanities being perpetrated by the Egyptian authorities against a peaceful community. It appears that a veritable reign of terror against Jews is being pursued on a scale which is reminiscent of the Hitler methods in Nazi Germany.

Reports out of Egypt indicate that several thousand Jews have been incarcerated, about 4,000 Jews have been able to leave or were deported from Egypt after all their belongings and property were confiscated, and the remainder of the 50,000 Jewish souls in that country are said to be under house arrest. Jewish-owned businesses have been taken over by the authorities and bank accounts were frozen.

This brutal and inhumane treatment of the Jews by the Nasser regime in Egypt is a challenge to the moral conscience of the world. It is clear that Egypt's ruling clique is determined to wipe out an ancient Jewish community by sheer acts of terror and violence, just as the Nazis did in Germany and other European countries. These barbaric tactics of an evil dictator must surely arouse the indignation of the civilized world, and most especially our own Government.

The treatment of Egyptian Jews is a matter of concern to all freedom-loving people and to all those who are interested in preserving human rights. As such it is of deep interest and great concern to the American people. As an American, I am proud of our country's history in defending human rights in the past in every part of the globe, and most recently in the case of the Hungarian people whose human rights and liberties have been trampled upon by the ruthless tyrants of the Kremlin.

I should like to see our country take several steps in dealing with this unfortunate situation:

First, that President Eisenhower make a personal appeal to the head of the Egyptian Government to abide by the Charter of the United Nations, which guarantees human rights and to request that these rights be applied to the Jews of Egypt.

Second, that the United States should ask the United Nations to undertake an investigation of the violations of human rights in Egypt.

Third, that United Nations observers report their findings to the U. N. General Assembly at an early date so that the necessary steps may be taken to halt the terror against the Jews in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the United States would raise its voice and lend its vigor to see that justice and humane treatment are afforded to these people much could be accomplished in that direction. We cannot sit idly by while Egypt becomes a slaughterhouse for the innocent. We must respond to the call of the oppressed everywhere. That has been our traditional way in the past. That should be our response today.

Banking Concentration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the Joint Legislative Committee to revise the banking law of the State of New York, at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street, New York City, January 7, 1957:

BANKING CONCENTRATION

The hearings which this very distinguished committee begins today on the subject of possible bank holding legislation and the effects of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 are vitally important and timely indeed. They are being held at a time when the entire banking structure of this State is threatened by a holding company proposal which is not only competitively abhorrent in itself, but even more important, could start a chain reaction by giant financial institutions in this city that might ultimately wreck the entire banking structure of this State.

In considering the problem of bank holding companies, this committee is, I know, well aware that the banking system of the United States traditionally has relied for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Unlike other countries such as Great

Britain and France, where a few giant institutions control nearly all the banking facilities, the American system is based on unit banking—that is, strong, growing community banks which provide a wide range of financial services to the people in the area. I think it is fair to say that our unit banking system has played a most important role in the economic development of this country.

The committee is also aware, I am sure, that there has been in recent years a discernible trend toward concentration of the Nation's banking business into fewer and larger hands. This trend presents a serious danger to the independent banking system; permitted to continue unchecked, it could have the most dangerous consequences for the entire competitive economy which depends for its lifeblood upon banking credit.

Illustrating the extent of concentration in the present-day banking system, consider that the 100 largest banks in the Nation now control over 46 percent of all the commercial banks in the country and more than 48 percent of the Nation's commercial bank deposits. More than that, in each of a majority of the leading financial centers of this Nation, a handful of banks control a predominant share of all the commercial bank assets of the area. Thus, here in New York City, the financial center of the Nation, the 4 largest banks control over 60 percent of all commercial bank assets while the 2 largest alone control almost 42 percent of the city's banking assets.

Principally responsible in my judgment for the present degree of concentration has been a spate of mergers accomplished through acquisitions of banks by holding companies and by other banks which are in many instances themselves part of a holding company system. From 1950 to the present date some 1,008 banks—most of them growing, efficient, and profitable institutions—have disappeared through merger activity. Merger activity has been particularly acute here in New York City where in 1955 there occurred the three largest bank mergers in the history of the country. These involved the consolidation of Chase National Bank with the Bank of Manhattan Co. and the Bronx County Trust Co.; acquisition by the National City Bank of New York of First National Bank of New York; and acquisition by the Bankers Trust Co. of the Public National Bank & Trust Company of New York.[1]

[1] In March 1955, the Chase National Bank with total assets of $5.7 billion merged with the Bank of Manhattan Co. with assets of $1.6 billion and the Bronx County Trust Co. with assets of $76 million. This merger provided the new entity, the Chase Manhattan Bank, with total assets of $7.4 billion or 21.7 percent of the total assets of all banks in New York City. The merger also jumped Chase Manhattan to first place in New York City and second place in the Nation.

Also in March 1955 the National City Bank of New York, previously the second largest bank in the United States with assets of $5.7 billion, took over the First National Bank of New York, which had total assets of $713 million. The new combination, the First National City Bank, now ranks second in the area with present aggregate assets of $7.1 billion, or 19 percent of the total.

Less than a month later the Bankers Trust Co. with assets of $2.7 billion acquired the Public National Bank & Trust Co., of New York, which controlled assets comprising some $562 million. This was only the last of a series of acquisitions by Bankers Trust Co. which has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate for the last several years. Indeed, since 1950 Bankers Trust has absorbed such substantial banking institutions as the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In large part because of this merger activity, New York City today has only 60 commercial banks whereas at the opening of the century it had 127. Today the city's 4 largest banks control 61 percent of all deposits, whereas in 1900 the 4 largest had only 21 percent of the total deposits.[2]

To combat this trend toward increasing concentration of banking facilities, additional action is imperative both at the Federal and State level. At the Federal level, legislation is urgently required to plug a loophole in the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950 [3] which amended section 7 of the Clayton Act and prohibits bank mergers accomplished by stock acquisition where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country, but fails to cover bank mergers having the same anticompetitive effects accomplished by asset acquisition. Result is to hamper efforts of Federal enforcement agencies to stop bank mergers having potentially serious competitive implications. I am introducing a bill tomorrow to plug this loophole and enable Federal enforcement agencies to proceed under the Celler-Kefauver Act against bank mergers regardless of how accomplished. A similar bill which I introduced during the last Congress passed the House without dissent, but failed of final Senate action. Let me make it clear that I shall redouble my efforts in the immediate months ahead to obtain speedy enactment of this vitally needed legislation.

Action is equally necessary at the State level to prevent, via the holding company device, circumvention of branch district lines designed to safeguard against banking monopoly in this State.[4] Indeed the original

In December 1954, the Chemical Bank & Trust Co., with assets of $2 billion, combined with the Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., which had assets of $821 million, to form the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank, which has total assets of about $3 billion. See Corporate and Bank Mergers Interim Report of the Antintrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 28–30.

[2] Id., p. 29.

[3] Public Law 899, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950); 15 U. S. C., sec. 18.

[4] Section 105 of the New York banking law provides, with two exceptions, that no bank or trust company shall transact any of its usual business of banking elsewhere than its principal office. The exceptions are:

(a) If the principal office is in a city with population in excess of 30,000, branches may be opened in that city, irrespective of whether it is located entirely within 1 banking district, and

(b) A bank or trust company may open branches within any city or village within the banking district within which its principal office is located, but not (except for the purpose of acquisition, by merger or otherwise, of the property and business of an existing bank) in competition with another bank, trust company, or national banking association which already has a principal office there.

Section 3 of the banking law divides the State of New York into nine banking districts.

Discussing the statute in its present form in *Hudson-Harlem Valley Title and Mortgage Co.* v. *White* (164 Misc. 47, 298 NYS 652, rev'd on other grounds, 251 App. Div. 1, 296 NYS 424) the Supreme Court said that "the territorial limitation upon the exercise of the business of a trust company imposed by * * * the banking law seems to find its reason in the general policy of the State in reference to the banking business and corporations subject to the banking law, among other things, 'to eliminate unsound and destructive competition.'"

and major purpose of drawing these lines was to protect independent banks in areas beyond New York City limits from encroachment by the giant banking institutions in this city. However, in the absence of effective State or Federal bank holding company legislation in the past, these geographic limitations could be avoided by the simple expedient of forming a holding company to acquire control of banks throughout the State without regard to district lines.[5] To illustrate, the Marine Midland Corp., which was organized in 1929 and is presently this State's leading holding company, felt itself "compelled to carry out [its] plans by the method of 'group' banking because the laws of New York State and the National Banking Act both prohibit branch banking beyond city limits." [6]

Beyond that, failure of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to limit acquisition of banks by holding companies to the geographic area of the State within which branches are authorized, permits continued circumvention of State branch-banking laws.

This whole issue, long virtually dormant, has come dramatically to life in New York State now that the First National City Bank has applied to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to form a bank holding company with the initial objective of acquiring control of the County Trust Company of White Plains, N. Y., the dominant commercial bank in Westchester County. That entire transaction is to take place subject to the provisions of the recently passed Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 under which the Federal Reserve Board has final jurisdiction.

Before discussing this proposal in greater detail, I should like to review briefly the salient provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act in order to place this matter in proper perspective. My plan is then to discuss (1) the First National City Bank proposal; (2) State authority to adopt remedial bank holding-company legislation; and (3) recommendations for State action to prevent violation of statutory branch district lines in order to curb undue holding-company expansion.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956

Many leading holding companies in the banking field were organized during the years 1927–29 to bypass State statutory limitations on, or prohibitions against, branch banking. These State limitations were made applicable to national banks under the Banking Acts of 1927 and 1933 which authorize the Comptroller of the Currency to approve branches for a national bank only within State boundaries and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by State laws dealing with State banks.[7]

Moreover, establishment of holding companies served as a useful mechanism for bringing banking facilities under common control with a wide variety of businesses totally unrelated to the banking field. In contrast State and Federal laws prohibited banks from engaging in nonbanking businesses.

Beginning in 1938 repeated efforts were made to enact adequate legislation to safeguard against undue concentration of control of banking resulting from the activities

[5] From a practical standpoint a bank holding company is a corporation chartered under the general incorporation laws of the State to acquire an interest in State or National banks.

[6] See hearings before House Committee on Banking and Currency on H. R. 2764 to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 171 (hereinafter referred to as "House hearings").

[7] Prior to 1927 national banks were precluded from opening branch offices.

of bank holding companies.[9] Necessity for such legislation was underscored by inadequate holding company control under existing law. The Banking Act of 1933 provided a degree of regulation by the Federal Reserve System limited to protecting the soundness of the member banks in the group. Even this restricted supervision was applicable only if the holding company controlled a Federal Reserve member bank and wished to vote the stock it owned in that bank. Consequently Federal regulation, in effect, was optional on the part of the bank holding company and could be avoided if the group decided not to vote its shares in the subsidiary member banks. In all, 18 holding companies subjected themselves to Federal supervision.[9]

In these circumstances, holding company control of branches grew to extremely large proportions. For example, as of December 31, 1954, in this State, 14 holding companies controlled banks having deposits of $7.2 billion, amounting to 19.5 percent of all commercial bank deposits in the State.[10] As of the end of 1954, in Arizona, 2 holding companies controlled over 80 percent of all commercial bank deposits; in Minnesota 2 companies held 45 percent of the State's commercial deposits; in Montana the same 2 holding companies controlled over 44 percent of the commercial deposits; in North Dakota 29 percent, and in South Dakota 37 percent of the commercial bank deposits. One holding company controlled 42 percent of Oregon's bank deposits and the same company in Nevada held 78 percent of the commercial bank deposits.[11] Reflecting concern with holding company control of banking facilities was the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 1943 report, which pointed out that: "Holding companies not only tend to become monopolistic but increase the problem of supervision. The ease with which assets may be transferred from one affiliated corporate unit to another and the possibility of the manipulation of the accounts of these enterprises make adequate examination of affiliated banks and the appraisal of their condition and capital position extremely difficult.[12] These considerations led the FDIC to recommend enactment of legislation by the Congress prohibiting the future creation of holding companies and requiring the liquidation of existing holding companies.[13]

Against this background the Bank Holding Company Act was adopted to maintain competition among banks and minimize the dangers inherent in concentration of economic power through centralized banking control. In outline, the act prohibits any company[14] from becoming a bank holding company[15] except after prior approval by the Federal Reserve Board. It also prohibits bank holding companies from acquiring additional bank stock or assets without prior Board approval. Future interstate expansion is barred by a provision prohibiting a bank holding company from purchasing voting shares in any bank located in a State other than the State where the holding company maintains its principal office or conducts its principal operations, unless the transaction is expressly permitted by the statute laws of the State where the bank is located.[16]

In considering an application for approval the Board is required to seek the views and recommendations of the Comptroller of the Currency or the State bank supervisor, depending on whether the bank involved is a National or State bank.[17] It must also take into consideration a number of factors, including the convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities in the area concerned and whether or not the effect of the acquisition would be to expand the size or extent of the holding-company system involved beyond limits consistent with the principles of sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. More important, since the act, under the express provision of section 11, does not supersede the antitrust laws to any extent, the bank-merger provisions of the Celler-Kefauver Act are fully applicable. This means that the Federal Reserve Board has a mandate to forbid any stock acquisition by bank holding company where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

Another important provision of the Bank Holding Act requires existing bank holding companies to divest themselves of nonrelated banking businesses and denies groups the right to acquire nonrelated business henceforth. Special tax-relief provisions are incorporated to obviate tax hardships resulting from nonbank asset divestiture.

THE FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK PROPOSAL

Under the act, Federal Reserve Board approval is sought for the First New York Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, to become a bank holding company which would have 100 percent stock control of the First National City Bank of New York, its affiliate, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. (a New York State-chartered bank owned by the same shareholders), and the County Trust Company of White Plains, N. Y., also a State bank. Board approval would make the First New York Co. the Nation's largest bank holding company.

The First National City Bank is now the second largest banking institution in this city. As previously noted, it was created in March 1955 as a result of the merger of the National City Bank and the First National City Bank of New York, a transaction readily approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Ray M. Gidney, notwithstanding its anticompetitive implications. The First National City Bank and the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. have aggregate assets of $7.1 billion, comprising 19 percent of total commercial banking assets in this city. First National City Bank presently operates 74 domestic branch offices in New York City and 65 foreign branches located in 22 foreign countries.

The County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y., is by far the largest bank in Westchester County. It has total assets of approximately $375 million comprising 48 percent of all banking resources in Westchester County. By way of comparison, its nearest competitor has assets approximating $138 million representing 18.6 percent of the commercial bank assets of the county. The County Trust Co. has 38 branch offices or 46.5 percent in number of all commercial bank offices in Westchester County.

Parenthetically I note that last year the County Trust Co. sought to acquire through merger the Ramapo Trust Co., of Rockland County. That proposal was blocked by Mr. George A. Mooney, superintendent of banks of New York State as contrary to competitive principles. I would add that in this as in other instances Mr. Mooney has demonstrated his courage and dedication to the public interest. We here in New York should applaud his exceptionally devoted service.

Returning to the First National City Bank proposal, it contemplates the chartering of three phantom national banks into which would be consolidated the First National City Bank, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. and the County Trust Co., the latter two, as previously indicated, being State-chartered institutions. Whether charter for these new national banks is sought before, after, or simultaneous with a Board decision is not clear. It is clear, however, that proper procedure would require chartering of these new national banks by the Comptroller of the Currency before the proposal was entertained by the Federal Reserve Board. Whatever the reason for the extraordinary procedure in this matter, one result was that the Board apparently felt itself obliged as a matter of statutory requirement to consult with the Comptroller of the Currency rather than the State superintendent even though national bank charters had not yet been issued. I can hardly think of a more obvious subterfuge or one better calculated to undermine the dual banking system.

Perhaps the parties to this plan had confidence that the Comptroller, Mr. Gidney, would not deviate from his normal practice of rubberstamping any monopolistic proposal and would recommend Board approval as a matter of routine. If this were in the contemplation of the parties they certainly were accurate prophets. I can tell this committee that on December 13, 1956, Mr. Gidney without delay and without investigation of the economic aspects or social consequences inherent in this proposal, but with utter disregard of the public interest, cheerfully advised the Board of his unhesitating approval of the transaction. That came as no surprise. Mr. Gidney in his concept of the public interest identifies the functions of his office with the private interests of the banks he is supposed to regulate. It is this same Mr. Gidney who repeatedly assured our Antitrust Subcommittee that he would not approve any bank transaction that was inconsistent with antitrust objectives. Yet in the 4 years he has occupied this important

---

[9] The President in a special message to the Congress in 1938 recommended legislation to control the operation of bank holding companies; prevent them from acquiring control of further banks; and prevent banks controlled by holding companies from establishing further branches. Bills to regulate bank holding companies were introduced in 1938, 1941, 1945, 1947, 1949, and 1950.

[10] As of December 31, 1954, these 18 holding companies operating from 22 States, controlled 832 banking offices (including branches) with total deposits of $10.8 billion.

[11] See hearings before subcommittee of Senate Committee on Bankin and Currency on S. 880, S. 2350, and H. R. 6227 to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies and require divestment of their nonbanking interests (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 59 (hereinafter referred to as "Senate hearings.")

[12] See House hearings, p. 167.

[13] Senate hearings, p. 360.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Under the act a company is defined as a corporation, business, trust association or similar organization. Only a company can become a bank holding company.

[16] A bank holding company is defined as a company controlling 25 percent or more of the voting stock of 2 or more banks. About 47 bank holding companies with deposits of $14.2 billion are covered by the act as contrasted with an estimated 163 bank holding groups having 25 percent or more control of 1 or more banks.

[17] No State has such permissive legislation.

[18] The bill as passed by the House provided that disapproval by the Comptroller of the Currency or State bank supervisor, as the case might be, was final. See H. R. 2674 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), sec. 5 (b). The Senate deleted this provision on the basis of Federal Reserve Board contention that it would have the effect of diffusing responsibility for administration of the legislation; involve duplication of effort; and give rise to administrative difficulties. Another key provision of the House-passed bill, deleted by the Senate, prohibited holding company expansion of banks within a State except in accordance with the branch bank laws of that State. Enactment of the latter provision would, of course, have forestalled present attempts to pierce branch lines through the holding company device.

post in Government he has blithely approved over 350 mergers, without once turning down a merger application on the ground it would injure competition. Even one or two such refusals would have given Mr. Gidney some right to argue that he actually was considering competitive aspects. No such refusal has ever emerged from his office.

The inescapable conclusion is that if the present proposal should be approved by the Federal Reserve Board, the First National City Bank of New York would have not only a powerful position in New York City but a dominant position in Westchester County. There is little doubt that other giant banking institutions in New York City would be forced in self-defense to utilize the same subterfuge and swallow up other banks in this State. Experience in the bank merger field proves that one acquisition inexorably leads to another. The prospect is, therefore, that the First National City plan would initiate a chain reaction until ultimately a handful of giant New York City banks, through the holding-company device, would be in control of nearly every sizable commercial bank in the State of New York. This would mean that the day of independent unit and regional banking would have passed and that money and credit in New York State would be largely controlled by a few mammoth banking institutions.

I think it is fair to say that the effectuation of the First National City plan could mean the end of branch district lines in New York State. It could mean basic alteration of the present bank structure of New York State, completely without the approval of the State legislature. In cases where holding companies first sought conversions to national bank charters, the entire development could be set in motion without the consent, and even against the wishes of the duly constituted authorities of this State. Clearly the efforts of this committee to legislate concerning the future banking structure of this State would be gravely hampered. What about other competing banks in Westchester County? It would be reasonable to conclude that their life expectancy would be considerably shorter. And what about new bank charters? At the present time obstacles to such charters are especially serious in Westchester County since the County Trust Co. controls about one-half of all bank resources. With First National City Bank taking over, there is little doubt that new chartering in that area would be further discouraged.

THE STATE HAS POWER TO ADOPT APPROPRIATE BANK HOLDING LEGISLATION

In light of these developments a major question confronting this committee is whether the Bank Holding Company Act has preempted the field or whether there is an area for permissible State action. The provisions of that act, coupled with its legislative history make it crystal clear that there has been reserved to the Statewide latitude to adopt appropriate bank holding legislation. Thus, section 7 of the Bank Holding Act specifies that "The enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof."

I turn to legislative history which explains in detail what that section means. The report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee makes this comment: "* * * another provision of this bill expressly preserves to the States a right to be more restrictive regarding the formation or operation of bank holding companies within their respective borders than the Federal authorities can be or are under this bill. Under such a grant of authority, each State may, within the limits of its proper jurisdictional authority, be more severe on bank holding companies as a class than (1) this bill empowers the Federal authorities to be or (2) such Federal authorities actually are in their administration of the provisions of this bill. In the opinion of the committee this provision adequately safeguards State rights as to bank holding companies." [18]

Beyond that, Senator ROBERTSON, sponsor of the legislation in the Senate and chairman of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee which considered the measure, pointed out in Senate debate that "each State may * * * enact legislation to regulate bank holding companies." [19] As an example of the type of legislation States were empowered to enact, Senator ROBERTSON inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a bank holding bill recently passed by the Georgia Legislature,[20] preventing any bank holding company incorporated under State law or doing business in the State, from acquiring 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of 2 or more banks. Illinois enacted similar legislation.[21]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE ACTION

These considerations make it evident that this committee could recommend a number of alternative measures to prevent holding company circumvention of State's branch district lines. Most drastic, of course, would be complete prohibition against bank holding organizations or 15 percent stock limitation similar to that adopted in Illinois. Either alternative is, in my opinion, unnecessary at the present time. I do not believe that bank holding company operations are bad per se. In a number of cases such companies have gone into areas where banking facilities were not available and provided needed financial services. As the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, testified in 1950 "* * * in some instances (bank holding companies) have been helpful in providing better management for banks, in assisting them financially, and in encouraging improved banking service. * * * [I]n certain areas of the country where the bank holding groups have gone in they have provided a good banking service in areas where it was needed and was not formerly available. I think also they have improved efficiency. They have attained economies in bank operations. * * * In the early 1930's when some of the individual banks needed help the holding companies applied their reserves to the help of their individual banks. That I think was beneficial." [22]

What I recommend is that the banking laws of this State be amended to prohibit any bank holding company from acquiring in the future any bank located outside the district prescribed for branch banks. Stated otherwise, I propose that future bank holding company expansion conform to the statutory district lines drawn for State banks; in short, that expansion within this State be permitted only in accordance with the branch banking laws of this State.

This purpose could be accomplished by a provision making it unlawful for any company, whether organized under the laws of this State or having its principal office and place of business in this State, to acquire 25 percent or more of the voting stock of each of two or more banks, except within geographic limitations that would apply to the establishment of branches of banks under the banking laws of this State.[23]

Such legislation would mean that the holding company device like the one proposed by First National City Bank no longer could be used in this State to circumvent statutory district lines. It would stop in its tracks the current attempt by the same management which is restricted in its operation under a bank charter, to acquire through a holding company a unit bank, operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated and flout the expressed will of the legislative body of this State regarding the establishment of branches.[24] And it would put an end to possible evasion of State laws designed to forestall undue concentration of banking facilities in the hands of a few banking institutions.

Whether or not such legislation should apply to existing subsidiaries bank holding companies is a troublesome question indeed. On the one hand, it can be argued with some force that unless such coverage were applicable, the effect would be to freeze the statewide status of systems such as the Marine Midland group while denying new organizations the right to compete on a similar basis. On the other hand, there is the equally cogent argument that extension of legislation to existing bank holding subsidiaries would cause an unnecessary hardship not justified by the operation of these companies. I would recommend against such extension unless this committee determines that the operations of the Marine Midland group and other holding company systems in this State constitute a serious danger to the competitive banking structure.[25]

In the last analysis it is evident that practically speaking a holding company system is a substitute for a branch system.[26] Nevertheless it will probably be argued here as before the House Banking and Currency Committee considering the bank holding bill that "to base holding company legislation on branch banking is wrong, because there is a difference between branches and affiliated, or subsidiary, bank." [27] It seems to me that the answer of that committee is equally applicable here. "Great stress has been placed on their difference in form, which everyone, of course, recognizes. * * * [H]owever, in a large measure they are differences without a distinction. Other than in form, what is the practical difference between a branch and a bank the stock of which is owned by a holding company that

---

[18] S. Rept. No. 1095 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 11. See also Senate hearings, p. 48; House hearings, p. 98.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 4, page 6752.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Mississippi outlaws bank holding companies while Vermont bars any corporation whose primary business is the holding of stock in other corporations. Wisconsin law provides that any corporation controlling a majority of stock in a State bank is to be deemed engaged in the business of banking and subject to supervision of the State banking department.

[22] Cited in Senate hearings, p. 344.

[23] A perplexing question is whether a foreign holding company whose sole activity in stock is engaged in doing business in this this State involves the purchase of bank State. See 75 ALR 1242, 1250; 18 ALR 2d 195; 40 Yale L. J. 1242, 1250. It is unnecessary to consider this question since section 3 (d) of the Bank Holding Company Act prohibits such out-of-State bank holding company from making further bank acquisitions in the State.

[24] Cf. Annual Report of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for 1943 cited in House hearings, p. 169.

[25] The Congress was faced with an essentially similar problem in connection with a provision in the bank holding bill prohibiting further interstate expansion by bank holding groups. That act, it will be noted, does not affect interstate acquisition of banks by holding companies prior to passage of the bill.

[26] See Concentration of Banking in the United States, Staff Report of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (1952), p. 7.

[27] H. Rept. No. 609, 48th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.

can select the bank's directors and change them at its pleasure, even holding repurchase rights to the directors' qualifying shares; that can hire and fire the bank's personnel and otherwise supervise its operations; that can make its investments, handle its insurance, buy its supplies, originate and place its advertising; can pass on its loans to local firms and individuals, usually receiving a fee for services performed?" The fact is that "as each new bank is * * * added to those already a part of the holding company system, such bank automatically becomes in effect, though not in name, a branch of that banking system."[28]

To my mind the conclusion is inescapable that "despite all that has been said about the distinction between bank holding company groups and branch banking systems * * * both accomplish the same thing—the operation of a number of banking units under one control and management."[29]

Through the corporate device, holding companies still can be used to evade branch banking laws and thus defeat the declared policies of this State regarding branch banking.[30] This cannot be tolerated.

The consequences of banking monopoly are ominous, indeed. It is my hope that this committee and the House Committee on the Judiciary, each will take prompt, effective, and appropriate action to help insure that that condition will never come to pass.

[28] Statement of Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, cited in House hearings, p. 212.

[29] Statement of R. M. Evans, former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1952, cited in House hearings, p. 169.

[30] Ibid.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and as a Republican, I have during all of my service in Congress supported statehood for Alaska.

I have done so with the expectation that Alaska, after being granted statehood, would send Democrat Senators and a Democrat House Member to Washington. I have also sponsored legislation to permit Alaska to elect its own governor with the knowledge that this too would mean that a member of the Democratic Party would in all probability become Alaska's first elected chief executive.

The issue of statehood—the question of whether residents of Alaska should be represented in Congress by voting members—should, I feel, be above politics. I have so conducted myself in supporting this legislation.

For this reason, I am greatly disturbed by some newspaper accounts of the action of the Democrat-controlled Alaskan Territorial Legislature. The headline story of the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily Times of February 5, 1957, reads as follows:

THIRTY-SIX TURNED DOWN BY LEGISLATURE—POLICE BOARD HIT HARDEST BY SOLONS

JUNEAU.—Acting Gov. Waino Hendrickson was faced today with the task of nominating 36 persons to 28 Territorial agencies who will be more acceptable to the Democratic majorities in the legislature than his original choices.

The heaviest shucking came on Hendrickson's nomination to the Territorial board of police commissioners. The senate and house—in voice votes—refused to confirm any of Hendrickson's nominations to the commission which sets the policy for the Territorial police.

Here is another story from the same newspaper:

CURB ON POWERS OF NEW GOVERNOR URGED BY KAY

JUNEAU.—Wendell Kay, Anchorage, retiring speaker of the house, has called for the stripping of the appointive governor's patronage powers in order to frustrate the aims of Republican leaders in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know to whom he refers when he says "Republican leaders in Washington." I certainly know of no Member of Congress who has plans afoot to build a Republican machine in Alaska. I suspect that the Democrat leader is trying to justify actions taken by his party to embarrass the appointees of our Republican President, actions that are clearly political in intention and scope. I am perfectly willing to recognize the Alaskan Legislature's right to object to some nominees for State positions submitted to it by acting Governor Hendrickson. But for the members of the legislature to reject, in sweeping voice votes, 36 nominees to almost all of the Alaska governing boards is nothing but politics and politics at its vindictive worst.

In supporting statehood for Alaska, I have assumed that the residents of that State had achieved the political maturity to govern their own affairs wisely and well. The actions of the Democrat majority of the Alaskan Legislature have shaken this assumption. As a Member of Congress who must vote on the issue of statehood, both in committee and on the floor of the House, I intend to keep a close watch on the developments in Alaska. As a Republican, I deeply resent political reprisals against duly constituted authority in the Territory of Alaska, solely because the authority happens to be a Republican also. Let the Democrat members of the Alaskan Legislature weigh this observation while they are passing resolutions urging me and other Republican Members of Congress to vote them statehood.

General Pulaski—Poland—and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program, together with my remarks as principal speaker, covering the General Casimir Pulaski Day exercises held at Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday, October 7, 1956.

The population of Chelsea contains a large number of people who are justifiably proud of their Polish origin. Annually, and without fail, the commemoration of Pulaski Day is an outstanding event in the life of the community.

It gives me pleasure to participate in this observance, because of the genuine patriotism, and the spirit of independence, that is always in evidence. And to reaffirm our obligation as Americans, to do everything possible under the circumstances, to encourage the people in Poland to win permanent independence. Their long and heroic struggle against tyranny, epitomized by General Pulaski, who also helped our forefathers to win freedom for us, is the quality that we admire most in the Polish people.

Pulaski Day is both an American and a Polish holiday, uniting us in the fraternity of those to whom freedom is the breath of life.

[From the Chelsea (Mass.) Record of October 8, 1956]

POLAND'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IS KEYNOTE OF GENERAL PULASKI DAY PARADE AND EXERCISES

Tribute was paid the memory of one of Poland's greatest patriots and America's Revolutionary War heroes, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, yesterday when the Polish United Societies, with the cooperation of the St. Stanislaus Parish, local and out-of-town veteran posts and auxiliaries, National Guard unit, and residents, participated in a parade and a speaking program at the Pulaski monument in Chelsea Square.

More than 5,000 persons participated in the imposing parade, a highlight of the celebration, with marchers, including schoolchildren and youngsters from the greater Boston area, following a course along Chestnut Street, Armory Street, and Broadway to the monument.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE was the principal speaker during the 25th local celebration sponsored jointly by the city's Polish United Societies and the St. Stanislaus parish. Other notables who spoke at the monument included Rev. Anthony Konieczny, curate of the St. Stanislaus parish; Mayor Hugh J. McLaughlin, Karol Jasholski, editor of the Polish Daily News; Attorney Stanislaus Suchecki, president of the Polish American Congress, eastern Massachusetts district, and chairman of the observance, Willard Jagolta and Roman F. Pucko.

In a stirring address Congressman LANE pointed out that Americans are proud of the faith and courage of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, father of the American cavalry, and Revolutionary War hero, and to the people of Poland and the people of the United States his name is immortal, and as time goes on his fame will become universal.

General Pulaski knew that freedom and tyranny can never live together. One, or the other, must prevail. We know that communism will destroy itself, eventually, but only after it has brought much suffering to the world.

"From every community where this day is honored, we send a message to the people of Poland and every captive country telling them that the spirit of Pulaski lives on in every true American. We have not forgotten those who yearn for liberation. We shall bring public opinion to bear so that the United States shall speak up, time and again, for the emancipation of all who are enslaved.

This is our duty as free men," the speaker said in part.

The Pulaski Day program began at 10 a. m. when military units and civic organizations from Chelsea, Metropolitan Boston, and the North Shore paraded into St. Stanislaus Church for the celebration of a military mass offered by Rev. Felician Plichta.

Very Reverend Szpara, pastor of the St. Stanislaus Church preached the sermon and spoke briefly of the deeds of Pulaski and recalled the miracles at Czestochowa when 300 years ago the Polish Nation was invaded by the Russians, Turks, and Swedes and through the faith of their religion were able to defeat the enemy and so today through their continued faith and prayer will soon, once again help to destroy communism and enjoy freedom, a God-given human right.

The senior girl's choir and the St. Stanislaus Holy Name Society choir rendered specially arranged selections under the direction of the church organist, Edmund Jagielski.

At the close of the services the military units, bands, flagbearers, societies, and schoolchildren formed for the parade to the monument.

Lt. Stanley Trocki was in charge of the police auxiliary unit. State commander of the Polish American Veterans, Inc., of Massachusetts, served as chief marshal of the parade, assisted by Commander Henry Owocki of Post 13, PAV; Joseph J. Naroski, senior vice commander of the Coast Guard League, District 10; Edward Smigielski, past commander of the Chelsea Lyons Post; and Boleslaw Czyzewski, former member of the Chelsea Park Commission.

GENERAL PULASKI—POLAND—AND FREEDOM

A great man never dies.

His spirit lives on as an example to the generations that follow him.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, father of the American cavalry, was a Revolutionary War hero.

We are proud of his faith and his courage.

To the people of Poland, and the people of the United States, his name is immortal.

As time goes on, his fame will become universal.

Other men have fought for the independence of their own native lands, but General Pulaski is outstanding because he fought for the freedom of humanity. He knew—far ahead of his time—that a world divided, half-slave, and half-free, cannot endure.

That is the truth he pointed out to us so long ago.

That is the message he would tell us today.

In 1956—even as in 1776—there are people who care not about those who suffer under tyranny, as long as they themselves are untouched by it.

They talk about communism and its crimes, as if this terror were taking place on some far-distant planet and not on their own earth. As if it were happening to strange creatures on Mars instead of their fellow human beings in every captive country, including Russia.

General Pulaski knew that freedom and tyranny can never live together. One, or the other, must prevail.

We know that communism will destroy itself, eventually, but only after it has brought much suffering to the world.

The tragedy is that its evil career is prolonged because free governments turn their backs on the peoples of those nations that have been enslaved by communism, and refuse to offer them one word of encouragement.

In one respect, freedom is like the air we breathe, because it is necessary to life.

But we Americans, having enjoyed it for so long, assume that it comes "ready-made," provided by nature, and requiring no work on our part to produce it or maintain it.

No one—I repeat—no one advocates that we go to war in order to liberate the captive nations.

Avoidance of war, however, does not mean that we must become silent, inactive, and spineless.

Suppose Pulaski had said to himself, as some American leaders do today, "Why should I bother myself with happenings in another country thousands of miles away?"

If he and other fighters for freedom had not come to our aid, the American Revolution might well have failed.

At the head of the Pulaski Legion, he gave his life in battle to help win the war for our independence.

In return, he did not ask much of us. Only that we should not forget the struggles of other peoples for their freedom and give them at least our moral support.

If General Pulaski were alive today, he would have been thrilled by the spirit of the people in Poznan, Poland, who rose up against their Communist oppressors. These brave people knew that they did not have a chance, but they dared to fight and die for a principle. Their heroic example will strengthen the Polish resistance, and unnerve the Communists.

But General Pulaski would have been dismayed by the silence of the American Government.

Not one word of tribute for these courageous people of Poznan.

Not one indication that our Government sympathized with their revolt against tyranny.

Only the moderation of complete silence.

On this observance of Pulaski Day, we want to make clear that the strange indifference of the present administration does not represent the true sentiments of the American people.

We have not forgotten the example of General Pulaski.

His courage.

His generosity.

His regard for other people.

In his memory we have a debt of gratitude to pay.

From every community where this day is honored, we send a message to the people of Poland and every captive country telling them that the spirit of Pulaski lives on in every true American.

We have not forgotten those who yearn for liberation.

We shall bring public opinion to bear so that the United States shall speak up, time and again, for the emancipation of all who are enslaved.

This is our duty as free men.

And as "patriots for humanity," guided by the faith and example of great men like Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Senator John Stennis' Address Before the Memphis Commercial Appeal Plant-To-Prosper Forum

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a very thoughtful speech delivered before the Memphis Commercial Appeal plant-to-prosper forum by Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, at Memphis, Tenn., on December 21.

Mr. Kermit H. Hansen, Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, was also on the program, and Senator STENNIS was introduced by Frank Ahlgren, editor of the Commercial Appeal, and the enthusiastic sponsor of the plant-to-prosper annual competition.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ahlgren, distinguished guests and friends of the plant-to-prosper audience, I first want to thank Mr. Ahlgren for his very generous introduction. I am delighted to be vouched for by this great news editor and splendid leader in our Mid-south.

I want to express also my appreciation to Mr. Hansen for coming here today and joining in this program and to congratulate him for his fine knowledge and understanding of the people and the problems of our area. I predict for him that which has already started—an outstanding administration by an understanding and able man who has a big heart for the farm people.

READS OF PROGRAM

Friends, you know, when we go to Washington we have to give up a great deal of our home things, but happily for me there is one thing that I have never given up yet, and that is reading the Memphis Commercial Appeal, and I read it every day—the old reliable—take it along with me. Among other things that I thoroughly enjoy during the course of the year is reading about this wonderful plant-to-prosper program.

I am deeply honored to be here today with the leaders, Mr. Ahlgren and his fine staff, the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, the other sponsors of this wonderful program, but more particularly with the participants, the people that live out on the land and love the land.

The great appeal the program has to me is that it reaches not only the large landowner, but the middle group landowner, the very small landowner, and not only that—those that do not yet own land but have visions of it, dreams of it, and have plans about it, and are striving to bring those plans about.

Now I want to emphasize in the very beginning that there is not now, and there won't be, in my opinion, any kind of a Government program that will be a substitute for the necessary qualities and virtues of individual self-reliance represented by grit and determination and a willingness to make a start at the bottom if necessary and build upward from year to year. I don't think there will ever be a substitute for that in American life and I hope there will never be.

SEEK BETTER WAYS

Also, we must always be willing to look for better uses and better methods of farming and be willing to carry them out—better seed, better fertilizers, better uses of our land, and take advantage of all advancement that agricultural research and agricultural planning may do. But in addition we are entitled to the assistance of our great Government when the individual farmer cannot go all the way.

And, by the way, friends, there's a great deal of current thought now that the small farmer is on the way out. We are talking now of a matter of business instead of a way of life. We are talking about it being solely a matter of efficiency. Well, let me tell you one thing: We must always look to those of efficiency, but I totally disagree with any kind of philosophy, be it found in government, be it found in business, or in agencies or associations or any group, that family life on the farm is solely a matter of efficiency or is a business proposition.

I believe that the greatest asset the American Government has today is the way of old-fashioned Americanism, thought and habits and conduct and ideals of our people that live on the land, the family-sized farm.

I believe it is the greatest asset in our political thought and that people reared

there come nearer thinking and acting and voting the old-fashioned Americanism than any one other group. And I believe further that it is the great spiritual reservoir of this Nation as it has been for many decades past. And I pray and hope that it will be for many, many years to come.

A WAY OF LIFE

It is not necessarily an economic unit; it is a way of life. I think one of the primary functions of our Government is to make it possible for that group, those who live on the land as a way of life and rear their families there, to make it possible for that group to survive and they will survive as long as the cards are not marked against them and as long as the avenue for development is left open.

And that is one of the great goals and one of the great contributions that this great plant-to-prosper program is doing. And in that connection, that brings up the question of what we are going to do with our land in years to come. Who is going to own the land in Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, and southeast Missouri? I hope we will go very slowly, my friends, in selling and disposing of our land. It should be put to constructive uses, of course, and I am not in sympathy with absentee ownership of land. But those of you who have your land or are planning to buy some, let's continue to put that high value on it.

Those who are thinking of selling, be sure you get value if you have to sell, but let's keep the land within the ownership of the people who live here and love that land. We now have 168 million people in the United States. It is estimated that by 1965 we will have almost 200 million people, and that's not too long off. But there's not going to be any more land. Let's think a long time before we thoughtlessly or carelessly dispose of our land.

OUTSTANDING FACTOR

Now may I briefly mention what I believe is one of the outstanding contributions of this plant-to-prosper program and the great host of agricultural agents, technicians of the Department of Agriculture, both men and women, that we have throughout the great Midsouth area. I deeply appreciate their fine leadership over the years. I think perhaps the greatest contribution they have made and this program has made are the great strides forward in diversification—the diversification of the use of our lands plus improved methods.

I shall not stop to relate here the details now but it shows what can be done by the people who have the grit and the determination and want to improve their land and their place, led by technicians and agricultural leaders through new methods, shows what vast opportunities lie before us and what real achievement and accomplishments can be done. I refer briefly to the cattle industry that's doubling, tripling, and quadrupling by the decades in our great era—the growing of rice, the growing of soy beans, the growing of more corn, and, of course, greatly increasing the production of the old reliable cut which has already been mentioned.

May I mention, too, very briefly, the great possibilities, as I see it, that lie before your group and development further of our forestry possibilities. Maybe not so much in this immediate area here of Memphis but throughout the Midsouth. I was called on recently to give a summary of our major agricultural problems in Mississippi and I said I believed I could sum it up generally in two words, and that was "idle acres." And that summary applies in a great measure to the areas of other States represented here today.

REFORESTATION NEEDED

Those areas have more than 8½ million acres now that need reforestation and only 11 percent of that need has been met. Income from forest products from the area represented here today represents more than $1 billion per year.

I understand from reliable sources that income could almost be doubled within less than 10 years. The major part of the great manufacturing development, industrial development, for this area lies in the future of the raw product, the forest product that we are learning better how to grow.

TELLS OF FOREST TRIP

Why, when I recently went through northern Minnesota at the request of the National Forestry Commission where they showed me their model 2,000-acre forest, we marched through the great land there and saw 16-inch trees on the average. They told me all the good things about the magnificent forest except one thing, that I was primarily interested to know, and that was the age of those 16-inch trees.

I asked that question and was amazed at the answer, when he told me the average age was 100 years. One hundred years to grow a 16-inch tree that those of us in this area can grow in 18–20–25 years. Our long growing season, our great rainfall points out the possibilities especially in view of the great pulpwood industries, that's just beginning to grow, offering an actual income and an actual market here only 8 years after pine seedlings are planted in soil that is now largely going to waste.

NEED FOR FARM CREDIT

May I mention quite briefly the continuing need for farm credit, on a sound basis, of course. It must always be made available and offered by the Government to supplement local lending agents—longtime loans for the growth of these pine seedlings that I have mentioned. I think that, without anyone being at fault particularly, it has been one of the great drawbacks for our area of the country for many, many decades—our lack of adequate farm credit on a longtime basis.

And I pledge you so far as I am concerned a continuation of what I believe now is a sound program.

And may I mention our research program? Although I went to an agricultural college and I have been connected with agriculture and agricultural people all my life, it took the editor of the Commercial Appeal to fully awaken my realization for the need of long-term research. He was one of those who contributed greatly to my thinking as well as inspired me.

We now have a program of research. I am embarrassed in a way to mention the figures that we spend for military research, but without elaboration, you might be surprised to know that last year we spent almost $2 billion for military research.

So, the few million dollars that we spend for agricultural research you readily see is not what is a threat to the balancing of the budget, nor a threat to cause your income tax to go up.

TELLS OF RESEARCH

And when I say "research," I'm not talking about just producing more on the same ground. Someone said we have a surplus now.

Agricultural research now is going into the fields of reducing the cost of production, reducing the cost of processing the agricultural product, increasing the quality of growth, trying to find new crops to grow on our land that we already have and new uses and additional uses for old crops, experiments with reference to new equipment and new ideas for the farm, extending all this into livestock, diseases of livestock, parasites, more products for the same feed and better pastures, great experiments going on in the field of irrigation, the methods to use, the cost of applying the water, and the extension of service it takes this research product and tries it out on the people that live on the land.

A striking illustration I found in my home State—a young dairyman with a very small herd. An agricultural agent came along and made some suggestions to him about feeding his cows and he actually doubled his milk production within less than 60 days without additional cost for feed, either in money cost or in amount of feed, by changing the formula of the mixture. This shows the tremendous possibilities that lie ahead in research and the application of that research, and I pledge to continue to fight for a long-range program. The necessary money, as I see it, is relatively small after all, to carry on those far-reaching programs, because I believe that, after all is said and done, the gateway to the future of farming is the long-range fundamental development; and what farming is going to mean to our area is determined more by this long-range program of research than any other one thing.

COTTON PROGRAM CITED

May I mention, in passing, that which is of vital importance to our area and that is the cotton program. I hope and I think that we will always have to have a cotton program and I don't believe that the 90-percent support price nor the sliding support price on the Government loan for cotton is the answer. I do not believe either one of those systems serves the purpose.

Why, we had 3 years of acreage reduction that has already reduced the parity support on the basis of 1953 to only 54 percent of parity. We cannot stand to continue devastating acreage reduction like we have been subjected to. I think a more realistic program will have to fundamentally meet the competitions of cotton, the competition at home with synthetics, and the competition abroad from foreign growers.

We are going to have to have a price to keep us in the market. There must also be a protection to farm income and there must be a program that will keep in balance the supply and demand on a more uniform basis, not a great surplus 1 year, and 2 years later, the surplus all gone and unusual acres again. I think that program must necessarily carry a finer measure of protection for the small- and family-size farm.

CAN'T CARRY LOAD

I am sure the farmers cannot carry the entire load of a cotton program along those lines, but with the wage-and-hour law as it is, with industry having the protection that it does from the tariffs, I feel like the Government, of necessity, will have to carry part of the load of adjustments. And I have authored the resolution now in the Appropriations Committee calling for a special study of the effect of these various price supports on the consumption of cotton.

That's what we must have. And I hope that with the study completed and more facts before us and with reference to the effect of these different programs, that we will be able to work out a more balanced program, that may have to surrender something in the way of price support in order to get more acres that we can produce on and work on our farm.

Now, I have given you the highlights of some of the things that I think may affect you in our future and you can rightly say to yourself: "Well, STENNIS, you're talking about all those fine things, what kind of a world are we going to have to live in and work in, anyway?"

What about the threatening war clouds in the Middle East. Our boys still are having to answer the selective-service call, the people subjected to this enormous taxation to take care of the tremendous military program.

Perhaps, I should take a few minutes along that line of thought.

Things do not look good. There's troublesome times in the Middle East. I think there is going to be troublesome times at any places in the world that Russia can stir up trouble.

SAW OPPORTUNITY

I'm not basing my remarks upon the long-time enmity, and it is almost hatred, between the Jewish people in Israel and the Arabian people represented by Egypt and other nations. I am not referring to the difference between France and England on one side and the United States on the other, and leaders in the Western World. I am referring to the role that Russia is trying to play in coming in and taking over the Middle East. And I think that is invasion. I think, friends, that when the British pulled out of the Suez area in 1954 they left a possible trouble spot and Nasser tried to move in and take it over and couldn't.

Russia saw her opportunity. I think that unless we let Russia know in no uncertain terms that we are going to stop her, I believe that she will eventually move into the Middle East, perhaps through Syria, and eventually take over that area by force. Now what is their objective? Do they want the Suez Canal? Those nations over there know Russia wants one thing and that one thing is the necessary to complete her war machine. Without it, she will not be able to carry on a major war and that's a three-letter word—oil.

Russia is trying to move in and take over the oil of that great Middle Eastern area. Now who can stop her? Can those Arabian nations stop her? Not if they want to, but they can be pushed aside like a straw. Their per capita income is only $81 per year in Egypt, not per month, per year. Countries like that cannot stop a formidable power in these days of force and military might. Is there anyone that can stop her except us? No, unfortunately, the answer is "No." So I think we are faced with the proposition that within the next few months, and we have been burning daylight already, we are going to have to let Russia know in unmistakable terms with a direct message that we are not going to let her come in and take over that area and we ought to be mobilizing now the entire free world to protect ourselves from that position, continuing to make clear that we have no desires on that area and do not want to take it over. As I say, all these other questions you read so much about in the paper fade into insignificance by the side of this major one and that is that Russia wants and must have oil, to carry out any appreciable large-scale war.

WAITED TOO LONG

Well, you asked me the question, and I want to say this further: I think that we waited too long in taking, we waited longer than we should in taking a firm position like that.

We have a military striking power now, a military force and strength that is greater than any nation has ever had in the history of the world. Far greater—far greater than we had at the end of World War II. We say that humbly. We do not want to use it, and I pray that we will never use it; but if we have to, you rest assured that we have it. It cost you a lot of money, it has been costing your boys something in service, and some sacrifice, but we have it, and, if need be, it's ready to go—not tomorrow, but today.

Our strategic air arm, with long-range bombers and with all kinds of bombs is ready to go now on the order of the President of the United States, the only person in the world who can order it into action.

COULD DROP BOMBS

We never surrendered any control over that strategic air force that Churchill calls the policemen of the world. We have never surrendered any of it to any of the nations, and do not expect to. If the President should give the order for that force to move into action, there are certain bombers who will be on their way in 5 minutes. There are others who would be on their way in 10 minutes, others in an hour, and others in 3 hours—from places all over the world.

But, you say, what about the other side; what do they have?

They have a striking power that could come, and some of them could reach us, even though we have all the defenses science knows about, and nothing has been spared to make them the very best.

But I think they have the striking power to come here, and some of them would get through and drop their bombs.

But I feel certain that if they did, if they ever did get back to Russia, there wouldn't be any landing fields to land on when they got there, because our strategic air force would have already been able to take them off the map.

I say that as I say humbly, with a prayer, that the command to go will never be made. We have the men; we have the bombers; we have the bombs.

Men have already made trial runs over a great deal of the area. They would go toward a target that perhaps has already been assigned to them.

I am not trying to give you a scare talk. That's a part of a picture that you must live and your children must live. And I think that we have many uncertain years ahead, but I actually think that on the whole we are going to avoid world war III. And if we do, I believe we are standing at a threshold of a great new era of development that will almost be worldwide. We will be right at the head of it. We have the chance to be. A great deal of it will be based on atomic energy.

My friends, do you know that this new power that God has leashed and given to mankind already has given us a submarine that will go all the way around the world submerged and has never had to refuel yet? It is still running on the original power that they put in it when they launched it.

AIRPLANE PLANNED

And that same force is being coupled with an airplane. When it is completed it will be able to fly around the world without having to refuel. Think of that. While the great tremendous constructive possibilities of this atomic power tie in with the mechanical, scientific ingenuity, people of our country and other countries think of the great possibilities of development for increased production—a great chance for exchange of goods between nations.

We are standing on the threshold of a great era politically—in the politics of the world, so to speak. I believe in the United Nations, believe we have more at stake than any other nation on the globe. We must continue to back it to the limit, not in the idea of any world government—far from it—the very opposite. United Nations is a united effort, a united effort to preserve the peace. And right now, today, for the first time in the history of the world, armed forces representing the United Nations of the world are moving into Egypt and are actually taking over a trouble spot where the shooting has already started in a war, and the troops from both sides are moving out, and a police force, so to speak, is moving in.

I don't know if it will be successful or not, but it's on its way. And if it is, as a monumental precedent that's been established by mankind in his long, hard struggle forward, toward moving into an area and taking away a trouble spot before it develops into an all-out war.

NOW ON THE THRESHOLD

I believe also that if we can have those things, we are standing on the threshold of a great era of spiritual development. We will make the worst mistake any people ever made if we put all our faith in the formula, the part of the formula I have been talking about in force and might and money, if we overlook the necessary ingredient of spiritual power as a part of a formula for peace for our Nation and our world. At another great critical time in history during our own Constitutional Convention, when the delegates were deadlocked and it seemed that nothing would be accomplished, Benjamin Franklin addressed the Chair one morning with these remarks. With George Washington in the chair, he said: "Mr. President, I have lived a long, long time. The longer I live, the more certain I am that God does govern in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that a nation can rise without His aid?"

And with that, he made the motion that they open their future sessions with prayer, and they did. And in less than a week, the mist had disappeared, the obstacles had been removed, and those men came out with the Constitution of the United States. It has been our safeguard and our model, not only for us, but for freedom-loving people around the world.

A POWERFUL NATION

We have grown to be the most powerful nation in the world and I believe that those of us living now have opportunity far greater than those men who wrote the Constitution of the United States. And I hope with them, that we will rise to the occasion and with them will look to the High Power for light and for guidance. When we make up our minds to do our part, and look to the High Power for that light, we will find our way.

As we go, God gives us strength and courage to face responsibilities and opportunities rather than turn our backs on them. And as we go, may God bless you and may God bless America. I thank you.

The Small-Business Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the National Association of Independent Business on October 11, 1956:

THE SMALL-BUSINESS DILEMMA

(Address by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives, before the National Association of Independent Business, October 11, 1956)

Tonight I should like to discuss with you some of the questions which are perhaps uppermost in your minds as representatives of the small-business community of this Nation.

Have President Eisenhower and his subordinates faced up to their responsibilities in dealing with the essential problems of small business?

Have the vital needs of small business been met or does the situation demand corrective action?

The antitrust laws of this Nation were adopted because of a deeply rooted faith in a free-enterprise system that relies upon vigorous competition; a system where economic activity is controlled, so far as pos-

sible, by the market and not manipulated by a handful of men; a system in which prices, output, wages, and other rewards depend, not on the decisions of a few big-business executives, but on the independent actions of competing business firms.

The reaffirmation of these fundamental principles in the present Democratic platform is particularly significant in light of the growing economic control of the marketplace by big corporations during the Eisenhower administration. The major trend in industry after industry is in the direction of fewer companies of greater size. In the most important half of American industry today there continues to be a pattern of oligopoly where not less than 2, or more than 5, large corporations have 50 percent or more of the volume of that industry between them. Three companies control 100 percent of the aluminum output of the United States; 3 companies make 95 percent of all our automobiles; 3 companies make 95 percent of our tin cans and tinware; 3 companies make 90 percent of our linoleum; and 3 companies virtually control cigarette manufacture.

Small business has been caught in a squeeze and within the past 3 years finds itself with a rapidly diminishing share of the Nation's market. By 1955, firms with assets of $250,000 or less, had suffered a 26 percent loss in their share of the market as compared to 1952. This while the share of the industrial giants rose 15 percent. Also in 1955, corporations with assets of $100 million and over accounted for 60 percent of the total increase in manufacturing sales.

During 1955 the biggest corporations had a profit rate of 14.4 percent, while the smallest group reported earnings of but 4.45 percent. What is more, between 1952 and 1955, the earnings of the small concerns fell off 27.4 percent while the earnings of the large concerns increased by 58.5 percent. In short, while the earnings of the giant companies reached new highs, profits of the smallest manufacturing plants kept falling.

It is characteristic for the Eisenhower administration to point with pride to an economic atmosphere which makes it possible for the big corporations of this Nation to reap record profits while small enterprises are worse off than they were 3 years ago.

Another indication of this attitude has been the equanimity with which the administration has viewed the growing spate of corporate mergers. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five set a 25-year record with 846 mergers consummated. Furthermore, in the 3-year period ending in 1955, the number of mergers was 64 percent greater than in the preceding 3-year period. Even the Wall Street Journal was constrained to remark in 1955 that "company mergers and acquisitions are taking place at an astonishing rate."

Many of these mergers have injured small firms by making it increasingly difficult for them to compete with newly consolidated mammoth corporations. In a number of instances, small-business customers of the acquired enterprises have found their sources of supply cut off. And frequently small suppliers have found that the merged corporation no longer needed their products and services because the merged corporation itself has become a fabricator.

The Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act was adopted by the Congress on December 29, 1950, to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers. However, as the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee found last year after extensive hearings, merger enforcement activity by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice has been negligible. Both, in fact, failed to enforce the antimerger law promptly, vigorously, or effectively.

In the banking field, a similar merger trend is concentrating control of the Nation's financial interests in fewer and fewer hands. In 1955 alone, 250 mergers have occurred—a 24-year record.

The administration's record in dealing with bank mergers is, if anything, even worse than its record in dealing with corporate mergers. The Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, Ray M. Gidney, is vested by Federal statute with the responsibility for approving or disapproving every bank merger where the resulting entity is a national bank. Mr. Gidney has repeatedly assured our Antitrust Subcommittee that he would not approve any bank merger which would be contrary to the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

What are the facts? The facts are that Mr. Gidney, during the 3½ years he has been in office, has rubberstamped over 300 bank mergers throughout the country. Many of these bank mergers have had extremely damaging consequences. But in no instance has Mr. Gidney disapproved a bank merger on the basis that it might substantially lessen competition. How can small business find comfort in such a record?

To cope with this merger trend, I introduced H. R. 5948 to plug a loophole in existing law pertaining to bank mergers, and H. R. 9424, the premerger notification bill. Both bills were regarded by small-business organizations as of utmost importance. Both bills were adopted by the House without dissent. But in the Senate, the story was different. There, consideration of these bills was delayed repeatedly by the Senate Judiciary Committee owing to obstructionist and delaying tactics by three Republican members of that committee. True, President Eisenhower gave lipservice to these proposals. But apparently General Eisenhower is not master in his own house, for the fact is that top-ranking officials of his administration lobbied actively and vigorously to get these two bills killed.

In the final week of this congressional session, the premerger notification bill which also contained a provision closing the bank-merger loophole, was finally reported out favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee. However, because of the delay that had taken place, the bill could not be taken up by the full Senate except on unanimous consent. The coup de grace was formally administered by Senator BRICKER of Ohio, whose objection prevented passage.

I would state at this point that one of the first bills to come before the Congress during the next session will be a bank merger and premerger notification bill which I shall again introduce. Furthermore, I shall redouble my efforts to see to it that this measure becomes law.

Merger enforcement activity is only one part of the responsibility of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice. There are many other areas where vigilant, hard-hitting antitrust enforcement is of vital importance to small business. I am referring to prosecutions to end monopolies, restraints of trade, price discriminations, tie-in sales, and other unfair methods of competition.

How has the Federal Trade Commission exercised its responsibilities in these areas? I observe that in 1953, Mr. Edward F. Howrey, a Washington attorney who for many years had represented defendant corporations in proceedings initiated by the Federal Trade Commission, was appointed chairman of the FTC by President Eisenhower to fill a 6-year unexpired term of a former commissioner. Following his resignation after 2½ years in office, Mr. Howrey when asked what he considered his major achievement as chairman of the Commission replied, "I am very proud to say that I reorganized it from top to bottom."

This reorganization shows a very interesting pattern. It shows that the same number of complaints were issued and the same number of companies were charged by the Federal Trade Commission with violations under the Clayton Act during Mr. Howrey's 33 months in office as in the preceding 33 months under his predecessor, former Democratic Senator James M. Mead.

But there was one major difference—the size of the companies against whom the Commission instituted proceedings under Mr. Howrey dropped very appreciably indeed.

During the 33 months, June 1950 to March 1953, the companies charged by the Federal Trade Commission with violating the antitrust laws were, on the average, approximately eight times as big as the companies charged with such law violations during the 33 months under Chairman Howrey. In the 1950–1953 period average asset size of the companies charged was $256.2 million. In the 1953–1955 period it dropped to $32.5 million.

It would appear that the giant corporations are the ones who had less to fear from antitrust prosecution by the "reorganized" Federal Trade Commission, while it engaged in a search for smaller game.

The antitrust enforcement record of the Department of Justice does not present a brighter picture. Increasing resort to consent decrees by the administration's antitrust officials has prejudiced small business. While in certain circumstances the consent decree may provide a useful technique, it is another matter to make promiscuous use of the consent decree to wipe out pending suits regardless of the harm to the small business victims of antitrust violators. The issuance of a consent decree places an impossible litigation burden upon the injured small businessman seeking court damages for his losses. Moreover, the antitrust violator is frequently permitted illegal gains. Finally, the appropriate Congressional committees and the public are not permitted to know what has transpired in the secret negotiations leading to settlement.

The 1955 consent decree in the American Telephone & Telegraph case illustrates the dangers of the consent decree procedure. The A. T. & T. decree represents one of the worst antitrust dispositions I have ever seen.

The complaint in this case was filed in 1949 after years of investigation. It charged that the Western Electric Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of A. T. & T., manufactures and sells more than 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States and that a substantial part of the remaining 10 percent is produced under the control of Western Electric.

The complaint further charged that Western Electric and A. T. & T. combined with each other to monopolize the United States telephone manufacturing and telephone service industries. To correct this monopoly, the complaint requested the court to force A. T. & T. to sell all of its interest in Western Electric so that the business of manufacturing telephones would be divorced from the business of operating telephone service.

This was the heart of the suit—to break up the combination of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Yet, the consent decree does nothing to carry out this most important objective. The corporate structure of this combination not only remains unchanged but is fused even closer together. The manufacturing and telephone service monopoly is still concentrated in the same hands.

The complaint asked that Western Electric be required to sell to A. T. & T. its 50 percent ownership of Bell Laboratories so that research and experimentation by other and small manufacturers would be encouraged. The decree requires no transfer of ownership in Bell Laboratories.

In this and other vital respects the settlement left this monopoly as is, except that A. T. & T. now has the added advantage of the Government's seal of approval and

immunity from further monopoly prosecution in the foreseeable future.

Considering all the circumstances, I am not surprised that Attorney General Brownell has refused to comply with our subcommittee's request to make available for examination the Department of Justice files relating to settlement of the A. T. & T. case in order that a determination might be made by the subcommittee as to the propriety of the decree.

Contrast this antitrust enforcement record of the Republican administration, which has allowed giant corporate organizations to dominate our economy, with the record of the Democratic 84th Congress. For example, the 84th Congress enacted the O'Mahoney-Celler bill to give the 40,000 automobile dealers of this Nation economic freedom. These dealers had found that they were incapable of asserting their rights against General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler.

Did the administration request this legislation? Did it exercise any effort to have it passed?

The fact is that the Eisenhower administration refused to recognize the plight of the automobile dealers. Indeed, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, along with General Motors and Ford, spearheaded the opposition to any attempt to enact corrective legislation which would protect the dealer against manufacturer coercion and intimidation.

True, President Eisenhower signed the bill, but only with the greatest reluctance and misgivings. And in keeping with Republican dogma Mr. Eisenhower implied that the bill was an intrusion by the Government into private enterprise. He said the bill probably should be replaced or repealed by the next Congress. The Democratic Party pledges that this law shall be retained upon the statute books as a monument to its concern for small business.

The Democratic Congress also endeavored to close the loophole in the Robinson-Patman antiprice discrimination act created by a Supreme Court interpretation. Under the Court's interpretation a price discrimination, regardless of its effect on competition, was immune from prosecution if made in good faith. As a result, small buyers were subjected to many of the same competitive disadvantages as existed prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936.

The equality of opportunity bills were designed to prohibit all price discriminations substantially affecting competition or tending to create a monopoly, whether or not good faith was involved.

Virtually every small-business organization wanted this legislation passed. But again Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, this time joined by Attorney General Brownell, was opposed, as were representatives of big-business organizations, including the National Association of Manufacturers. The Federal Trade Commission first opposed the bill, then reversed its position.

The administration's attitude was demonstrated by the position taken on this bill by Wendell Barnes, Republican head of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Barnes, when he appeared before our committee, testified that the Small Business Administration did not support the bill but deferred to the views of the Attorney General who was opposed. But Mr. Barnes admitted to our committee that he did not even understand the bill. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House I have rarely resorted to admonishing a witness. In this instance, however, I felt compelled to tell Mr. Barnes:

"In all fairness, I will say this: I think you ought to exercise independence, but you should correlate your opinion, as far as practicable, with the views of small business * * * First, you run athwart the views of small business, and you have given us nothing except a bare conclusion, sort of a self-serving declaration, that small business is wrong * * * I do not think you have analyzed this bill very carefully and comprehensively * * * I think you render your administration a disservice by this kind of a statement * * * Yours is the Small Business Administration. Now I do not say this bill should be passed right out of hand because some small-business organization wants it. * * * We ask you to give us help; but we get no help from you."

The equality of opportunity bill passed the House with only three dissenting votes. However, in the Senate, several Republican Senators coordinated their efforts to filibuster the bill in committee. And in a familiar exhibition of team play, Senator BRICKER succeeded in blocking last minute consideration of the measure by the full Senate, despite the strenuous efforts of its supporters on the Democratic side to get by this roadblock.

The result is that the small business proponents have been frustrated in their efforts to eliminate the harassments of price discrimination from the national scene and must begin all over again at the next session of Congress.

Let me also make brief reference to several other policy areas where small business has been shunted aside.

Take military procurement. There is no doubt that policies adopted by the top officials of this administration in this field have favored General Motors and other large corporations. This alters a historic economic pattern. For years prior to the advent of this administration special programs had been in effect to help small business firms obtain a fair share of Government contracts. By way of contrast, in 1955, 100 large United States corporations and their subsidiaries were awarded a record share of 69 percent of all defense contracts. This took place despite the fact that the small business share of defense contracts fell about $1 billion below its production potential.

Furthermore, defense contracts are now being let largely by negotiation rather than by competitive bidding. The Democratic platform is emphatic on this score—it favors the award of a substantially higher proportion of Government contracts to independent small businesses and, particularly, the award of a far larger percentage of military procurement, by value, through competitive bidding procedures rather than by negotiation behind closed doors.

Beyond that, I believe that the present corporate income tax structure discriminates against new and small business and restricts the internal financing necessary for growth of small firms much more severely than that of large corporations. Our excise tax structure also bears more heavily on the small company. Therefore, it is time to consider changes in our overall tax policies which now penalize small business and prevent its expansion, while promoting concentration and the increase of economic power in the hands of a few corporations. In other words, I believe that as a corollary to our traditional policy in the antitrust field, we need a policy which recognizes the impact of taxes on the competitive structure.

Time does not permit a discussion of the fiscal activities of this administration which have placed small business in a credit squeeze. Here as in the field of tax relief, it is crystal clear that the hard-money policies have been and are being shaped on the basis of the trickle-down theory.

I am aware that the panacea for all the problems that beset small business is now supposed to be contained in the so-called progress report of the administration's Cabinet Committee on Small Business. This document issued about 2 months ago, on August 7, immediately after Congress adjourned, is replete with self-serving statements and promises for relief for small business. Unfortunately this document is just so much campaign propaganda. There was ample opportunity for this administration to take prompt and effective action on behalf of small business during the last 3½ years. The device of a so-called progress report fools no one.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, amid the darkness in which our sad and mad world lieth, where entrenched hatred and tyranny contend with good will and decency for the mastery, may we still believe in the purple splendor of the dawning and that the morning of a better day cometh. Replenish with new hope all who are discouraged about the sorry state of the world because of today's harvest of evil and because of the terror visited by cruel masters upon those whose only crime is the desire to be rid of their chains. Stretch out wide horizons for our vision and illumine for us the fairer earth of the redemption when at last the wilderness will blossom as the rose.

For light enough to walk by through perplexing days, for inner strength to carry heavy burdens, for uncompromised courage to dare policies with no partisan advantage, for eyes to see the truth, and for the will to follow it fearlessly, we pray to Thee, who alone art our refuge and our strength. Breathe upon us now in this quiet moment Thy benediction, that we may march on as valiant pilgrims, sustained by the confident assurance that the kingdoms of this world shall yet become the kingdom of Thy radiant love.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 10, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 49)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying

report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Sixth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802 (a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Ninth Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifth semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on January 10, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may now present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit other resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that the Senate will hold a brief session on Thursday, and then go over until 11:30 on Monday, Inauguration Day. The committee has announced that we plan to meet here at that time, when we shall have a very brief session, beginning at 11:30, if the wishes of the leadership are followed.

JEROME N. FRANK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the State of New York and the Second Circuit United States Court of Appeals encompassing it have lost a distinguished jurist in Judge Jerome N. Frank. In an article published this morning, the New York Times calls him—and quite properly, in my opintion—an independent thinker.

Mr. President, it was not necessary to agree with every one of Judge Frank's views, to appreciate the lucidity of his mind and the fine and sterling quality of his character.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEROME N. FRANK, UNITED STATES JUDGE, DEAD—MEMBER OF APPEALS BENCH IN SECOND CIRCUIT HAD BEEN CHAIRMAN OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—ACTIVE IN "BRAIN TRUST"—EARLY PROPONENT OF NEW DEAL WAS PHILOSOPHER OF LAW—WROTE COURTS ON TRIAL

NEW HAVEN, January 13.—Judge Jerome N. Frank, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, died today at Grace-New Haven Community Hospital. His age was 67. He suffered a heart attack last night at his home.

Judge Frank was a graduate of the University of Chicago, which later gave him an honorary degree. He was a visiting lecturer at the Yale University Law School and a fellow of Jonathan Edwards College, one of the residential colleges at Yale.

Surviving are his widow, the former Miss Florence Kiper, and a daughter, Miss Barbara Frank, of New Haven.

AN INDEPENDENT THINKER

Judge Frank, a corporation lawyer of erudition both inside and outside his professional field, was at home in the heady atmosphere of Washington in the early days of the New Deal.

An independent and original thinker, he relished the controversy within President Roosevelt's Brain Trust as persons and policies were shuffled and reshuffleld.

The economic philosophy he brought to his duties as general counsel to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was evident in an address in Chicago on December 30, 1933. He accused the old dealers who opposed President Roosevelt's recovery program of being the real radicals. He said:

"Although the profit system, as it has worked recently, seems to have worked poorly, most Americans believe that, properly controlled, it can work well. As long as the majority of the American people continue to cherish that system, it would be impossible, even if it were desirable, to abandon it completely."

He defended the New Deal as an elaborate series of experiments, indispensable in the crisis of those days. He said that the "rock-ribbed standpatters" seemed to have forgotten the bank closings and unemployment that accompanied the old system of "drunken prosperity leading inevitably to a prolonged morning after."

Judge Frank did not sulk in his tent when he was ousted from the AAA early in 1935. He became special counsel to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in railroad reorganization.

In December 1935, he became associated with the New York law firm of Greenbaum, Wolff & Ernst. Two years later he returned to Federal service as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Judge Frank headed the Commission for nearly 2 years until his elevation to the Federal bench here in May 1941, by appointment of President Roosevelt.

He found his new duties as congenial as the cut-and-thrust of the executive branch of the Government. For all his love of controversy, his friends recognized in him the rare and judicious quality of being willing to admit that he had been wrong and had changed his mind on an issue.

Perhaps the outstanding example of this was in foreign policy. In June 1938, he published a book, Save America First, urging isolation for the United States in the Western Hemisphere. He abandoned it after Hitler defeated France in the spring of 1940.

In the issue of the Saturday Evening Post that appeared December 6, 1941—the day before Pearl Harbor—Judge Frank candidly wrote:

"As a matter of hindsight, many of us now regret our opposition to collective security."

METROPOLITAN LOCATION

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit sits in Foley Square and embraces Connecticut, New York, and Vermont. Because of its metropolitan location, its decisions in many cases determine the business law of the country, short of the rare case that is heard by the Supreme Court.

It has long been a bench of great distinction. For Judge Frank, it meant nearly 16 years of happy fulfillment of his sense of duty to the law and to the general public.

His first book, Law and the Modern Mind, was published in 1930; his last, Courts on Trial, appeared in 1949. In it he argued the weaknesses of trial by jury and urged that the Government should make sure that all important evidence in a case was introduced. He also suggested that trial judges should play a more active role and that examination of witnesses should be more humane.

His philosophy of the law and his turn of phrase are apparent in a unanimous decision of the court he wrote last September. It reversed the conviction of a union official for contempt of court. "An overzealous prosecutor's heaven may be everyone else's hell," he warned.

"We are committed," Judge Frank declared, referring to the fourth and fifth amendments, "to the principle that any method of pursuing suspected criminals must give way when it clashes with these constitutional guaranties."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay for certain officers of the Army, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FURNISHING CERTAIN SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, SAN JUAN, P. R.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACETIME LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF NEW YORK CERTAIN RIGHTS OF ACCESS IN AND TO MARSHALL, JOHN, AND LITTLE STREETS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

OCCUPATION OF INADEQUATE QUARTERS ON A RENTAL BASIS WITHOUT LOSS OF BASIC ALLOWANCES FOR QUARTERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority for the reassignment of officers of the naval service restricted in the performance of duty to an unrestricted duty status, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENLARGEMENT OF EXISTING WATER-SUPPLY FACILITIES FOR THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area", approved October 11, 1951 (with an accompany paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces) reporting, pursuant to law, the average monthly flight pay of certain officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy and above the rank of major in the Marine Corps, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS OF MEDICAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO TRANSFER OF OFFICERS BETWEEN THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the transfer of commissioned officers between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949 AND DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a regular component of a uniformed service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS IN SETTLEMENT OF UNUSED ACCRUED LEAVE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPAYMENT TO THE TREASURY CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize repayment to the Treasury of amounts paid to Federal Reserve banks for making industrial loans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, during the fiscal year 1956, and the first 4 months of fiscal year 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 204 of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to increase the legislative limitation on business loans outstanding (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the United States General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SALINE WATER CONVERSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on saline water conversion, for the year 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN DELINQUENT IRRIGATION OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order canceling certain delinquent irrigation operation and maintenance assessments against 91 tracts of Indian lands and eliminating 210.30 acres of land from the Wapato Indian Irrigation Project, Washington (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CREDIT REPORT, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION, BRANCH OF CREDIT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on credit by the Bureau of Indian

Affairs, Division of Administration, Branch of Credit, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TERMINATING FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER THE KLAMATH INDIAN TRIBE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EDUCATION LEAVE TO EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RATIFICATION OF CONVEYANCES OF ALLOTTED LAND, WHITE EARTH RESERVATION, MINN., BY FULLBLOOD INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to ratify and confirm conveyances of allotted land on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota by fullblood Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1157, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN DEBTS OF INDIVIDUAL INDIANS AND INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF MAINTENANCE OF INDIAN IRRIGATION OR POWER PROJECT WORKS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of Indian irrigation or power project works to water users' associations or irrigation districts organized under State law, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES FOR WELFARE OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF AIR COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO SALE OF GOODS AND SERVICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, RELATING TO REPLACEMENT OF OLD VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of November 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Intersate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Frantisek and Pon Yung Yang from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Tudorachi Sava aka Tony Sava from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 15, 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF FALSE ADVERTISING RELATING TO EXCHANGE SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN RETIRED JUDGES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain Territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FEMALE MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VALIDATION OF OVERPAYMENTS MADE TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO USE OF CERTIFIED MAIL IN SUMMONING JURORS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN ALLOWANCES OF JURORS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN CIVIL CASES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JURY COMMISSION FOR EACH DISTRICT COURT

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency containing a list of all employees and officers in the employ of that Agency for the year ended June 30, 1956; a list of all cases heard during the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956; and a summary of the Agency's obligations and expenditures for fiscal year 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 14 OF ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879, RELATING TO CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 14 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended, to permit publications printed in imitation of typewriting to be accepted as second-class matter, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTRACTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF CONTRACT POSTAL STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REVISION OF LAW RELATING TO DISPATCH OF MAIL FROM POST OFFICES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the law relating to the dispatch of mail from post offices, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ESTABLISH CERTAIN POSTAL STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTINUATION OF ACCOUNTS WHEN VACANCY OCCURS IN OFFICE OF DISBURSING OFFICER FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the Disbursing Officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil-service retirement and disability fund to be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purposes of establishing postal rates, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF LOCAL PARTICIPATION ON FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Review of Local Participation on Flood Control and Navigation Projects, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the commander, Veterans of A. E. F. Siberia Central Western Division No. 2, Martinez, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the issuance of a campaign medal to the members of the Armed Forces who served in Siberia from November 12, 1918, to April 20, 1920, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the chancellor of the University of the Americas, Jacksonville, Fla., relating to that university (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEHOOD FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have long supported statehood for the Territory of Alaska, and shall continue my active efforts in that behalf. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], has likewise taken that position, and he asked me to express regret that he could not be here this morning and to announce his complete concurrence with the remarks I am about to make for myself and for him.

We are pleased and proud to advise the Senate that the people of Alaska held a constitutional convention last year and adopted a constitution, and likewise elected two Senators and one Representative to serve in the Congress of the United States when Alaska shall become a State of the Union, which I hope will be within the next few months.

At the proper time, in complete accord with the clear precedent established May 23, 1796, in the Tennessee case and followed by the Senate with regard to representatives of the proposed State of Michigan on December 22, 1835, the Senate of the United States will be requested to admit the two "Senators-elect" from Alaska to the floor of the Senate as spectators, in order that they may be present with Members of the Senate during the debate on Statehood for Alaska.

However, at this time, for the information of the Senate, I send to the desk and ask to have read by the clerk, a memorial dated December 9, 1956, from the Alaska Constitutional Convention, signed by the Honorable William A. Egan, president of the convention, and attested by the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska, and the Honorable Waino E. Hendrickson, Secretary of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask that my time may be extended 5 minutes, so that I may yield at the appropriate time to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction of the matter, to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Territories of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who wishes to be heard briefly on the subject, and likewise to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], so that he may make brief remarks. I ask the indulgence of the Senate for 5 minutes, if that time may be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the memorial be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be read.

The legislative clerk read the memorial, as follows:

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

The people of Alaska, in that same tradition of freedom and self-reliance from which our beloved Nation has sprung and prospered, have adopted a Constitution of the State of Alaska.

In the example of the States of Tennessee, Michigan, Oregon, California, Iowa, Minnesota, and Kansas, that Constitution makes a provision for a delegation to represent Alaskans in the Congress.

As president of the Alaska Constitutional Convention and by its direction, I hereby certify the election of three citizens of Alaska who will present themselves to the Congress for that purpose.

On the 9th day of October 1956, by a majority vote of the qualified electors of the Territory of Alaska, the following persons were chosen:

As United States Senator for the regular term expiring on January 3, 1963, or on such date as the Senate may prescribe, Ernest Gruening, of Juneau, Alaska, elected by a vote of 14,169 of 27,470 voting;

As United States Senator for a short term expiring on January 3, 1961, or on such other date as the Senate may prescribe, William A. Egan, of Valdez, Alaska, elected by a vote of 15,634 of 27,222 voting;

As United States Representative for the regular term expiring on January 3, 1959, Ralph J. Rivers, of Fairbanks, Alaska, elected by a vote of 15,569 of 26,914.

By referendum, by repeated memorials adopted unanimously by our Territorial legislature, and by acclamation, Alaskans have declared their desire for statehood at the earliest possible moment and for the enjoyment of the right of freemen to govern themselves.

Alaskans have demonstrated throughout their long period of tutelage in Territorial status their adherence to the principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded. Our population, resources, wealth, and will are sufficient to support and merit statehood. We have demonstrated our ability to govern ourselves by excellent administration of limited powers that have been given to us * * * and by writing a State constitution which has been unanimously praised as a model document by all authorities who have studied it.

As Alaskans, we point out that citizens of our Territory carry the full Federal tax burden without enjoying voting representation in Congress. Therefore, we are inflicted with taxation without representation, which our forefathers found so distasteful.

We point out that our Governor is appointed by the President of the United States, and members of the President's Cabinet control land, resources, law enforcement and important governmental functions in Alaska. Alaskans have no vote in presidential elections. Therefore, we are being administered as a colony, and we have been so administered for 89 years.

We point out that our citizens have proven themselves to be loyal Americans by reason of their unswerving devotion to the United States, their willingness to meet all Federal tax obligations and their eagerness to offer their blood in America's wars. Citizens of Alaska are, in the main, United States born people who have migrated north to help conquer a frontier * * * and by so doing have lost the precious rights of American citizenship.

We submit that it is against the principles of democracy and the spirit of our Federal Constitution for the United States to maintain a people in a permanent colonial status.

Therefore, we petition and pray that you seat our duly-elected representatives and that you enact legislation enabling the admission of Alaska to the union of States.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
President, Alaska Constitutional Convention.

Attest: At the University of Alaska, this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States, the 180th.

B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska.
WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we are pleased to announce to the Senate that seated in the diplomatic gallery today are the two distinguished gentlemen who were chosen on October 9, 1956, by the people of Alaska to represent them in this body as Senators of the United States when Alaska shall become a State. With them is the distinguished gentleman chosen by the people of Alaska to represent them in the House of Representatives. With these three gentlemen are their families.

I ask at this time that the three gentlemen mentioned, the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953, Senator-elect; the Honorable William E. Egan, president of the Alaska Constitutional Convention, Senator-elect; and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, Representative-elect, may stand in order that the Members of the Senate may extend to them a warm welcome.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the statesmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in presenting to this body the memorial of the American citizens of Alaska. His introduction of the outstanding Americans chosen by the people of Alaska is wholly in keeping with the traditions and precedents of the Senate, as well as the able Senator's own spirit of graciousness and courtesy.

At the same time, I believe the people of Alaska should be complimented on their initiative in going ahead and drawing up a proposed State constitution and electing certain provisional officers under it, two of whom are in the Senate Chamber at this time.

Mr. President, it is highly significant and particularly gratifying to note that while our fellow American citizens in Alaska have displayed such initiative, energy, and foresight, in this seeking to further their cause, they have at the same time carefully stayed within the bounds of tradition and precedent—precedent and tradition running back to the very beginnings of our Union of States. As has been pointed out so ably by the Senator from Florida, the action taken by the people of Alaska, and by the distinguished Americans they sent here, is squarely on all fours with that taken by the people of Tennessee in 1796. The precedent thus established by Tennessee in writing their own constitution and electing officers under it was followed by the peoples of Territories that have become five other great States of the United States. These are Michigan, California, Oregon, Kansas, and Iowa. It should be pointed out that these areas were at that time far more remote from Washington than is Alaska today with respect to communications and accessibility.

This great tradition and this well-established precedent has now been followed by the people of Alaska, and the action taken by the distinguished Senator from Florida here today is but the latest step in the historic tradition.

I am proud to associate myself with the Senator in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the kind words of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I have been glad to join with him previously, and am pleased to join again in the introduction in this session of a bill to give statehood to the Territory of Alaska.

I now should like to yield, if I may, to the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Territories of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my kind friend from Florida.

This is an historic occasion. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida has presented a memorial from the people of the Territory of Alaska, which has been read to the Senate.

All of us will now look forward to an early opportunity, through the legislative process, of considering the petition which the memorial represents.

I join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], in congratulating my friend from Florida.

I believe that the people of Alaska and, I will add, the people of Hawaii, will look forward to having their Territories, during this Congress, join the 48 States of the American Union as the 49th and 50th States.

It is rather interesting to note that the State which I have the honor in part to represent, California, similarly, through representatives, came to the Capitol in 1850 and asked Congress to permit the Republic of California to become a member of the American Union. Congress in that year acceded to the request of the representatives of the Republic of California.

Therefore I say to my good friend from Florida, "You are, in my opinion, speeding along the day when the people of the Territory of Alaska will be represented in the Senate and in the House of Representatives by men or women not from a Territory, but from the new State of Alaska, in the Government of the United States."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from California. I now ask that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in commending the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for the action he has taken here today, and to say that I wholeheartedly join with him and with the senior Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and other Senators, in presenting the cause of Alaska for admission as a State of the Union.

As a Senator from Tennessee I should like to review briefly the "Tennessee plan" and express the hope that Alaska, which I have visited often and which in all justice and fairness should be granted statehood, will be successful in being admitted into the Union as a State under the plan proposed as was my own State of Tennessee.

Angered and impatient over the failure of the Nation's first three Congresses to award them statehood, the rugged frontiersmen of the Tennessee area held a constitutional convention in 1796. The historic document drafted by that body was highly praised by Thomas Jefferson. He described it as "the least imperfect and most republican of any state." Into it was written a simple clause that fixed a date on which all Federal and State officials were to be elected.

Because the Federal Constitution at that time provided for the choosing of United States Senators by the State legislatures, Tennessee's Senators were selected by the Tennessee General Assembly on March 28, 1796.

The Tennessee Legislature elected William Cocke and William Blount, and shortly after their designation as Senators-elect they departed for Washington with their credentials. The United States Senate, as is the practice today, refused to seat them prior to Tennessee's formal admission to the Union, but the two "Senators-elect" presented their State's cause so well that Congress, which previously had refused to consider an enabling act for the Territory of Tennessee, completed passage of an admission bill on May 31, 1796; and the Senators-elect were given the privileges of the floor during the debate. President Washington signed the bill the following day, and thus my home State of Tennessee became the 16th State, less than 4 months following the spirited action of these pioneer Americans who themselves set into motion the events that brought them statehood.

Among the delegates to the Tennessee constitutional convention of 1796 which blazed this trail was a spirited young lawyer, who later became the State's first Representative in Congress and the Nation's seventh President, Andrew Jackson.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senators-elect from Alaska today. They are able men, worthy to be Members of the United States Senate. The Representative-elect is an able man, who will make a very good Representative from his State.

Although these gentlemen have not yet been granted the privilege of the floor, I hope that we can give speedy

consideration to the bill making Alaska a State, and that, before many days, as in the case of Tennessee, these gentlemen will join us here in the Chamber as Senators.

I hope that, following the Tennessee plan, the Senators-elect from Alaska may have the privilege of the floor of the Senate until the statehood bill shall be acted on.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very thankful to the senior Senator from Florida for permitting me to associate myself with him in the welcome we are extending to the gentlemen who have been elected by the people of the Territory of Alaska to submit to the Congress their petition that the Territory of Alaska be admitted to the Union as a State.

Mr. President, several years ago, when I had the privilege to serve as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the effort to bring Alaska into the Union as a State came within an ace of success. The bill, H. R. 331—as I remember the number—of the 81st Congress, introduced by the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, who was then and still is the Delegate from the Territory of Alaska, was passed in the House of Representatives on the 3d of March 1950. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Dr. Gruening, now Senator-elect from the State of Alaska—if I may use that term—was then Governor of Alaska. He gave us the invaluable support of his great abilities and his widespread knowledge of the facts upon which the petition of the people of the Territory of Alaska to be admitted to the Union as a State was based.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held open hearings over a considerable period of time, but not overly long, and in June 1950—the exact date, if I recall correctly, was June 29—I had the honor of reporting to this body the first bill ever reported to the Senate of the United States advocating the admission of Alaska to statehood.

Because of certain circumstances which developed later in that session of the Congress and because some Members of the Senate then had differing opinions, it was impossible for us to bring that bill to a vote.

I should like to say, in associating myself with the gracious and able Senator from Florida, that the prospective Senators and Representatives now seated in the gallery may hope to see the time speedily arrive when BOB BARTLETT's bill shall pass both the House and the Senate and become a law.

Mr. President, I cannot take my seat without complimenting Mr. BARTLETT for the magnificent work he has done in and out of Congress to make statehood a reality for Alaska. Alaska is the outpost of continental America. It is separated from Siberia by scarcely 50 miles. Not only as a matter of justice to the people of Alaska, but as a matter of defense for the people of the United States we should place Alaska upon the map as a sovereign State of the United States.

Let us pass the Alaska statehood bill. I shall do my part to bring about that desirable result.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to be equally considerate to all the distinguished Senators who wish to speak on this matter. I have been requested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to yield to them briefly in this same connection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I shall be very glad to yield to all the Senators who wish to speak on this subject, but I ask permission now to yield to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who, I understand, is the ranking majority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am merely one of the majority members of that committee. The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is likewise an ardent advocate of statehood for Alaska, is the ranking majority member.

Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Florida in urging that the Senate consider favorably statehood for Alaska.

Today the United States is doing a great deal of preaching about democracy to the people overseas. Some of our preachment has been directed to the British Empire, urging that it grant dominion status or self-government to some of its possessions.

On several occasions I have been in the vast Yukon Territory. On one of those occasions, Mrs. Neuberger and I were in the company of a famous officer of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He mentioned to us the fact that we Americans talk a great deal of democracy. He told us that only 15,000 persons in the Yukon Territory have full voting representation in the House of Commons of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa. Then he called attention to the fact that just across the line, in Alaska, 200,000 Americans did not have any actual voting representation at all in the Capital at Washington, D. C. Then he said, "What do you Americans have to say about that?"

Of course, we had very little to say about it, because the facts were accurately stated.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives and the distinguished President of the United States will give that brave Canadian mounted policeman the answer in the very near future by making Alaska a State of the Union.

I wish to thank the able Senator from Florida for taking the lead on this historic occasion, and I desire to join in the tribute which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] paid to Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, who has been a leader in the cause of statehood and who unselfishly stepped aside for this delegation of two Senators and one Representative to come to Washington if and when Alaska becomes a State. I believe Delegate BARTLETT, when Alaska becomes a State—as I am confident it will—will share a great deal of the credit which is due to all who have worked in this cause. Delegate BARTLETT has been a valiant and pioneer advocate of statehood under the dome of our United States Capitol.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Oregon. Now I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Florida not only for his courtesy in yielding to me, but more importantly for what he has done here today to focus public attention, and particularly the attention of the Congress of the United States, on the urgent importance of the consideration of statehood for Alaska.

The Senator from Florida has stated his deep concern in this matter on previous occasions, and today he has had associated with him the good friend of the people of Alaska and of the people of the United States, the able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY], the former distinguished chairman of that committee [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and our friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and other Senators who will speak.

I wish to associate myself with the desire for statehood for Alaska. I think it is long overdue. I desire to commend those who have carried on the battle over the years. I could not help but remember, as I looked to the galleries and saw our friend, Governor Gruening, that year in and year out he has fought the good fight for statehood for Alaska, and I join in paying tribute to him, as I do to Delegate BARTLETT, who has been with us in connection with every one of the efforts for statehood for the great Territory of Alaska. When that event finally takes place it will be an advancement not only of our own democracy but of our objectives in our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place the address delivered by Governor Gruening at the last constitutional convention in Alaska.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the document mentioned by my distinguished friend from Minnesota may appear at the end of the discussion on Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I take pleasure in joining with other Senators in their efforts looking to the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I simply desire to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and other Senators, because, dating back to 1949, when I was privileged to become a member of the National Governors Conference and had the pleasure of sitting with my friend, the Governor of Alaska, I have had occasion to support consistently the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as States of the Union.

Maine is very much pleased indeed at the recognition which has been given to Ernest Gruening, because he was once one of our most distinguished citizens whom Maine gave up so that he could go to the great northwestern section of North America. Even though we come from the northeastern section, we are certainly going to look forward to the day when Alaska will achieve full statehood, when the Representatives she has elected may have an opportunity to sit upon the floor of this body as well as of the House of Representatives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield in order that I may speak briefly on the subject of statehood for Alaska?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida, and I also wish to associate myself with his remarks and with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken on the same subject.

I believe Alaska should be granted statehood. That objective has had my support in years past, and I shall continue to give it my support. I shall continue to urge that Alaska as well as the Hawaiian Islands be given their position as States in the American Union.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wisconsin wish me to yield on this matter?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have a number of matters which I wish to discuss, but at this time I am very happy to associate myself with the very sane and sensible remarks made by my colleagues with reference to the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union. Because of its significance to the defense of America, it seems to me the proper thing to do is to permit Alaska to have representation in the Congress of the United States by admitting it as a State of the Union.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the question of statehood for Alaska.

I highly commend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for taking the leadership today in presenting the memorial from the Alaska constitutional convention, which I sincerely trust will lead to the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the Union as a State.

Mr. President, I commend also the people of Alaska for the policy they have followed in seeking to obtain for themselves statehood, and I compliment them on the election of the Honorable Ernest Gruening, and the Honorable William E. Egan, as Senators-elect, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers as Representative-elect.

Mr. President, in 1950, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I participated over a period of time in some investigations and studies in Alaska. Although I was in favor of Alaskan statehood prior to that investigation, I came away from my stay in Alaska an ardent supporter of Alaskan statehood.

Mr. President, I not only wish to pay tribute to Ernest Gruening for his great work in behalf of the Territory of Alaska at the time of his governorship, and since then in his work in the committee rooms of Congress on behalf of statehood for Alaska, but I wish also to pay tribute to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who year in and year out has worked conscientiously and ably in behalf of the people of Alaska in connection with the statehood issue, and also in connection with many other Alaskan problems which have confronted Congress.

Today I say to the people of Alaska: "You have been ably represented by Delegate BARTLETT. Without his services you would not be in as good a position as you are today, which I hope will lead in this session of Congress to statehood for Alaska."

Mr. President, having mentioned Alaska, I wish to say a word also in behalf of Hawaii. The people of Hawaii are likewise and equally entitled to statehood. I certainly hope that before this session of Congress is over we will add not 1 star but 2 stars to our flag, and not 2 Senators but 4 Senators to the United States Senate.

I say that because I am convinced that Hawaii likewise is entitled to statehood. As a Representative of a great State on the Pacific coast, and keeping in mind the concern of our country about Middle East problems—and very properly so—I believe we should also be concerned about Pacific problems. I happen to believe that probably nothing we could do would contribute more to strengthen American interests in the Pacific than would statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. President, I also wish to point out, as was stated earlier today, that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii would be a very good answer to some of the vicious propaganda we hear from the Communist segment of the world with regard to our allegedly not living up to our professions about first-class citizenship. I believe that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood would answer that kind of vicious propaganda which Russia so improperly spreads in those areas of the world where the fight for freedom must still be won.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first instance, I deeply appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators in allowing time for the completion of this series of statements.

In concluding these remarks, which I have made for myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I ask that the text of the certificates of election of the Honorable Ernest Gruening and the Honorable William A. Egan be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the certificates of election were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Juneau.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye that, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 46, Session Laws of Alaska 1955, which provide for the holding of a constitutional convention to prepare a constitution for the State of Alaska and the submission of such constitution and any accompanying ordinances to the voters of Alaska for adoption or rejection; and in accordance with Ordinance No. 2, ratified by election on April 24, 1956, providing for the election of two United States Senators and one United States Representative, we, the undersigned, the regular Territorial canvassing board charged with the duty of canvassing and compiling in writing the results of the vote in the general election held in the Territory of Alaska on October 9, 1956, do hereby find that—

Ernest Gruening, of Juneau, Alaska, was elected to the United States Senate from the Territory of Alaska for the regular term ending January 3, 1963, and the election of said Ernest Gruening for said regular term expiring January 3, 1963, is hereby certified.

In testimony thereof, we have hereunto set our hands and affixed our seals at Juneau, Alaska, the capital of Alaska, this 10th day of December, A. D. 1956.

[SEAL] B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska.
WALTER B. HEISEL,
Collector of Customs for Alaska.
WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

Attest: WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Juneau.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye that, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 46, Session Laws of Alaska 1955, which provide for the holding of a constitutional convention to prepare a constitution for the State, Alaska and the submission of such constitution and any accompanying ordinances to the voters of Alaska for adoption or rejection; and in accordance with Ordinance No. 2, ratified by election on April 24, 1956, providing for the election of two United States Senators and one United States Representative, we, the undersigned, the regular Territorial canvassing board charged with the duty of canvassing and compiling in writing the results of the vote in the general election held in the Territory of Alaska on October 9, 1956, do hereby find that—

William A. Egan, of Valdez, Alaska, was elected to the United States Senate from the Territory of Alaska for an initial short term expiring on January 3, 1961, and the election of said William A. Egan for said term expiring January 3, 1961, is hereby certified.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and affixed our seals at Juneau, Alaska, the capital of Alaska, this 10th day of December, A. D. 1956.

[SEAL] B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska.
WALTER B. HEISEL,
Collector of Customs for Alaska.
WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

Attest: WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

Let Us End American Colonialism

(By Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, 1939–53, keynote address Alaska Constitutional Convention, University of Alaska, College, Alaska, November 9, 1955)

(The convention was established by enactment by the 22d Alaska Territorial Legislature of chapter 46, approved March 19, 1955. The act provided for the election by the people of Alaska of 55 delegates who would meet on November 8, 1955, for not more than 75 days, to draft a constitution for the State of Alaska. The constitution would thereafter be submitted to the people of Alaska for their approval or disapproval.)

We meet to validate the most basic of American principles, the principle of "Government by consent of the governed." We take this historic step because the people of Alaska who elected you have come to see that their longstanding and unceasing protests against the restrictions, discriminations, and exclusions to which we are subject have been unheeded by the colonialism that has ruled Alaska for 88 years. The people of Alaska have never ceased to object to these impositions even though they may not have realized that such were part and parcel of their colonial status. Indeed, the full realization that Alaska is a colony may not yet have come to many Alaskans, nor may it be even faintly appreciated by those in power who perpetuate our colonial servitude.

Half a century ago, a Governor of Alaska, John Green Brady, contemplating the vain efforts of Alaskans for nearly 40 years to secure even a modicum of workable self-government, declared:

"We are graduates of the school of patience."

Since that time Alaskans have continued to take postgraduate courses. Today, in 1955, sorely tried through 88 years of step-childhood, and matured to step-adulthood, Alaskans have come to the time when patience has ceased to be a virtue. But our faith in American institutions, our reverence for American traditions, are not only undimmed but intensified by our continuing deprivation of them. Our cause is not merely Alaskan; it is the cause of all Americans. So, we are gathered here, following action by our elected representatives who provide this constitutional convention, to do our part to "show the world that America practices what it preaches."[1]

These words are not original with me. But they remain as valued and as valid as when they were uttered 5 years ago. They remain no less valid even if their noble purpose is as yet unfulfilled. We are here to do what lies within our power to hasten their fulfillment.

We meet in a time singularly appropriate. Not that there is ever a greater or lesser timeliness for the application by Americans of American principles. Those principles are as enduring and as eternally timely as the Golden Rule. Indeed democracy is nothing less than the application of the Golden Rule to the great society. I mean, of course, democracy of deeds, not of lip-service; democracy that is faithful to its professions; democracy that matches its pledges with its performance. But there is, nevertheless, a peculiar timeliness to this Alaskans' enterprise to keep our Nation's democracy true to its ideals. For right now that the United States has assumed world leadership, it has shown through the expressions of its leaders its distaste for colonialism. And this antipathy to colonialism—wherever such colonialism may be found—reflects a deep-seated sentiment among Americans.

For our Nation was born of revolt against colonialism. Our charters of liberty—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—embody America's opposition to colonialism and to colonialism's inevitable abuses. It is therefore natural and proper that American leadership should set its face against the absenteeism, the discriminations and the oppressions of colonialism. It is natural and proper that American leadership should lend such aid and comfort as it may to other peoples striving for self-determination and for that universally applicable tenet of American faith—government by consent of the governed. Indeed, as we shall see, we are pledged to do this by recent treaty commitments.

What more ironical, then, what more paradoxical, than that that very same leadership maintains Alaska as a colony?

What could be more destructive of American purpose in the world? And what could be more helpful to that mission of our Nation than to rid America of its last blot of colonialism by admitting our only two incorporated Territories—Alaska and Hawaii—to the equality they seek, the equality provided by the long-established and only possible formula, namely statehood?

America does not, alas, practice what it preaches, as long as it retains Alaska in colonial vassalage.

Is there any doubt that Alaska is a colony? Is there any question that in its maintenance of Alaska as a territory against the expressed will of its inhabitants, and subject to the accompanying political and economic disadvantages, the United States has been and is guilty of colonialism?

Lest there be such doubt, lest there be those who would deny this indictment, let the facts be submitted to a candid world.

You will note that this last sentence is borrowed from that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence. It is wholly appropriate to do this. For, in relation to their time, viewed in the light of mankind's progress in the 180 years since the revolt of the 13 original American colonies, the "abuses and usurpations"—to use again the language of the Declaration—against which we protest today, are as great, if not greater, than those our revolutionary forbears suffered and against which they revolted.

Let us recall the first item of grievance in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has refused assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good."

"He," of course, was King George the Third. Put in his place, in place of the "he," his contemporary equivalent, our ruler, the Federal Government.

Has it, or has it not, "refused assent to laws most wholesome and necessary for the public good?

We Alaskans know that the answer is emphatically, "Yes, it has."

He, or for the purpose of 1955, it, the Federal Government, has "refused assent," although requested to do so for some 40 years, to the following "most wholesome and necessary laws:"

First. A law transferring the control and management of Alaska's greatest natural resource, the fisheries, to the Territory of Alaska, as it transferred the corresponding resources to all other Territories in the past.

Second. It has "refused assent" to a law repealing the 35-year-old discrimination in the maritime law of 1920, the Jones Act, a discrimination uniquely against Alaska.

Third. It has "refused assent" to a reform of our obsolete and unworkable land laws, which would assist and speed population growth, settlement and development of Alaska. It alone is responsible for over 99 percent of Alaska being still public domain.

Fourth. It has "refused assent" to a law including Alaska in Federal-aid highway legislation.

Fifth. It has "refused assent" to a law abolishing the barbarous commitment procedure of Alaska's insane which treats them like criminals and confines them in a distant institution in the States.

Sixth. It has "refused assent" to placing our Federal lower court judges, the United States commissioners, on salary, and paying them a living wage.

One could cite other examples of such refusal of assent to "laws most wholesome and necessary for the public good."

But let us instead pass on to the second item of complaint, which is similar to the first, in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has forbidden his Governors to pass laws of immediate and growing importance * * *."

Substitute for the "He," then the British royal executive, the present American Federal executive, and substitute for "his governors," his party leaders in Congress, and recall their vote in the House of Representatives last May 10, killing a law "of immediate and growing importance"—the statehood bill.

Let us go still further down the list of our revolutionary forefathers' expressed grievances, again quoting the Declaration of Independence:

"He has obstructed the administration of Justice, by refusing his assent to laws establishing judiciary powers."

"He," is today the whole Federal Government. It has for a decade "obstructed the administration of justice" in Alaska by refusing assent to establishing additional judiciary powers, where they were needed, namely in the third judicial division, while repeatedly increasing the number of judges in the "mother country," the 48 States. And although the population of Alaska has more than tripled in the last 46 years, the number of Federal judges established in Alaska in 1909 remains unchanged. And Federal judges are the only judges this colony is permitted to have.

Let us look still further in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has affected to render the military independent and superior to the civil power."

Is there much difference between this and the recent Presidential declaration that the defense of Alaska, that is to say the rule of the military here, could be better carried out if Alaska remains a Territory?

One could go on at length drawing the deadly parallels which caused our revolutionary forefathers to raise the standard of freedom, although, clearly, some of the other abuses complained of in that distant day no longer exist.

But Alaska is no less a colony than were those Thirteen Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard in 1775. The colonialism which the United States imposes on us and which we have suffered for 88 years, is no less burdensome, no less unjust, than that against which they poured out their blood and treasure. And while most Alaskans know that full well, we repeat:

"To prove this let the facts be submitted to a candid world."

To begin at the beginning, the Treaty of Cession by which Alaska was annexed, contained a solemn and specific commitment:

"The inhabitants of the ceded Territory * * * shall be admitted to all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States * * *."

That was the pledge. The United States has not kept that pledge. Yet a treaty is the highest law of the land. And it is made in the clear view of all mankind.

The United States has broken that pledge for 88 years. It has not admitted the inhabitants of Alaska to "all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

"All the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States" would entitle us to vote for President and Vice President, to representation in the Congress by two Senators and a Representative with a vote, and would free us from the restric-

---

[1] In a public address at Denver, September 16, 1950, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower declared: "Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches."

tions imposed by the Organic Act of 1912, and the act of Congress of July 30, 1886. Obviously we have neither the vote, nor the representation, nor the freedom from restrictions.

We suffer taxation without representation, which is no less tyranny in 1955 than it was in 1775. Actually it is much worse in 1955 than in 1775 because the idea that it was tyranny was then new. Since the Revolutionaries abolished it for the States a century and three-quarters ago, it has become a national synonym for something repulsive and intolerable.

We are subject to military service for the Nation—a privilege and obligation we accept gladly—yet have no voice in the making and ending of the wars into which our young men are drafted.

In this respect we are worse off than our colonial forefathers. King George III did not impose conscription upon them. They were not drafted to fight for the mother country. Therefore there was no revolutionary slogan "no conscription without representation." But it is a valid slogan for Alaskans today.

The treaty obligation of 1867 is an obligation to grant us the full equality of statehood, for which Alaskans did not press in the first 80 years of their subordination, but which now, overdue, they demand as their right.

But that is only a small part of the evidence of our colonialism under the American flag. Let us submit more facts to a candid world.

First, let us ask, what is a colony? And let us answer that question.

A colony has been defined in a standard college text-book by a Columbia University professor as "a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage."

That, as the facts will show, is precisely what the Territory of Alaska is—"a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage."

The maintenance and exploitation of those political, strategic, and economic advantages by the holding power is colonialism.

The United States is that holding power.

Inherent in colonialism is an inferior political status.

Inherent in colonialism is an inferior economic status.

The inferior economic status is a consequence of the inferior political status.

The inferior economic status results from discriminatory laws and practices imposed upon the colonials through the superior political strength of the colonial power in the interest of its own noncolonial citizens.

The economic disadvantages of Alaskans which in consequence of such laws and practices redound to the advantage of others living in the States who prosper at the expense of Alaskans—these are the hallmarks of colonialism

Let us take a look at these hallmarks of colonialism deeply engraved on the policies of the United States in Alaska in the field of transportation. Transportation is the key to almost all development. None have demonstrated this better than have the Americans within the noncolonial areas of their 48 States where transportation of every kind—railways, highways, airways—have linked, built, and developed a dynamic domain of continental dimensions.

First, let us scrutinize seaborne transportation. It was, for 73 years, until 1940, the only form of transportation between Alaska and the States. Alaska suffers a unique discrimination in maritime law.

Thirty-five years ago the Congress passed a merchant marine act which is known officially as the Maritime Act of 1920. In Alaska it is referred to as the Jones Act, after its sponsor, the late Senator Wesley L. Jones of the State of Washington. The act embodied a substantial modification of existing maritime law. It provided that goods shipped across the United States, destined either for the coastal ports of the Atlantic or Pacific or for shipment across those oceans to Europe or to Asia, could use either American or foreign carriers. The foreign carriers principally involved were Canadian.

For example, a shipper from the Atlantic seaboard or from the industrial cities of the Middle West of products destined for points to the West could ship these across the country wholly on American railroads or on Canadian railroads, or partly on either.

And when these goods arrived at their coast destination, he could send them across the Pacific in either American or foreign vessels, or southward in either. But at that point in the legislation, creating this new beneficial arrangement, two words had been inserted in article 27 of the act. Those two words were, "excluding Alaska."

Now, what did those two words signify? They signified that Alaska, alone among the nations, or possessives of nations, on earth, was denied the advantages afforded all other areas. The same discrimination, obviously, applies to products shipped from Alaska.

What was the purpose of this discrimination? Its purpose was to subject Alaska to steamship service owned in the city of Seattle. Senator Jones no doubt assumed, and correctly, that this would be most helpful to some of his constituents there, as indeed it proved to be, but at the expense, the heavy expense, from that time on, of our voteless citizens of Alaska.

This was in 1920. Under the limited self-government which Congress had granted Alaska through the Organic Act of 1912, more limited than had been granted any other Territory, Alaska was still a youngster. Nevertheless, the fifth Territorial legislature meeting the next year, 1921, protested strenuously against this specific and flagrant discrimination, and ordered the Territorial attorney general to take the matter to court. The Territorial legislators believed, and so expressed themselves, that this new legislation enacted by Congress at the behest of Senator Jones, of Seattle, was in violation of the commerce clause of the Constitution, which forbids discrimination against any port of the United States.

The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States on an appeal from a decree of the United States district court dismissing the suit brought by the Territory and by an Alaskan shipper, the Juneau Hardware Co., which sought to restrain the collector of customs in Alaska from confiscating merchandise ordered by the hardware company and others in Alaska from points in the United States shipped over Canadian railroads, through Canadian ports and thence to Alaska by Canadian vessels, or merchandise to be shipped from Alaska to the United States in like manner.

In pleading the cause of the Territory, Alaska's Attorney General John Rustgard argued that both the treaty provisions and the specific extension of the Constitution to Alaska by the Organic Act of 1912 rendered the discriminatory clause unconstitutional. It looked like a clear case.

The Government—our Government—which was defending this discriminatory maritime act, was represented by the Solicitor General of the United States, the Honorable James M. Beck, of Pennsylvaina.

Let the candid world note well the language of his argument:

"The immunity from discrimination is a reserved right on the part of the constituent States * * *. The clear distinction of governmental power between States and Territories must be constantly borne in mind * * *. If the Fathers had anticipated the control of the United States over the far-distant Philippine Islands, would they, whose concern was the reserved rights of the States, have considered for a moment a project that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require for the ports of entry of the several States should by compulsion be extended to the ports of entry of the colonial dependencies * * *?"

Let the candid world note that the case for the United States was presented on the basis that discrimination against a colonial dependency was proper and legitimate and that any special privilege required in the United States would supersede any obligation to a colonial dependency. The colonial dependency involved was and is Alaska.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, in rendering the decision of the Court, declared:

"The act does give preference to the ports of the States over those of the Territories," but, he added, the Court could "find nothing in the Constitution itself or its history which compels the conclusion that it was intended to deprive Congress of the power so to act."

So it was definitely established by the highest court of the land that Congress had discriminated against Alaska, but that, since Alaska was a colonial dependency, such discrimination was permissible and legal.

Every plea by our Alaska legislatures over a period of 35 years to rectify this grave and unjust discrimination has been ignored by successive Congresses. They have refused assent to every attempt by Alaska's Delegates to secure remedial legislation.

Now the question naturally arises whether this discrimination imposed by the legislative branch of the Federal Government, approved by the executive branch, and sanctified by the judicial branch, was to prove to be more than a mere statement of the legality of such discrimination. Was it more than a mere affirmation of the subordinate and inferior status of Alaska's colonials as compared with the dominating and superior status of the American citizens of the States? Did this discrimination also carry with it economic disadvantages? Indeed it did.

Several private enterprises in Alaska were immediately put out of business by the action of Congress in 1920 even before the Supreme Court upheld the legality of that congressional action.

A resident of Juneau had established a mill to process Sitka spruce. He was paying the required fees to the Forest Service and had developed a market for his product in the Middle West where it was used in airplane manufacture. He was shipping it through Vancouver, where it cost him $5 a thousand to ship by rail to his customers.

The Jones Act automatically compelled him to ship his spruce boards by way of Seattle. Here he was charged $11 a thousand, as against the $5 he had been paying, plus some additional charges, which totaled more than his profit. In consequence his mill was shut down and a promising infant industry, utilizing an abundant but little used Alaskan resource was extinguished. Not only did the Jones Act destroy this and other enterprises, but prevented still others from starting and has prevented them ever since. If anyone doubts that political control of the Territory through remote forces and absentee interests does not cause economic damage to the people of Alaska he need but look at the workings of the maritime legislation directed against Alaska and Alaska only.

Its immediate effects were to more than triple the cost of handling Alaska freight in Seattle on purchases made in Seattle as compared with Seattle-bought cargoes destined for the Orient. Alaska's delegate, at that time, the late Dan Sutherland, testified that the Seattle terminal charges on shipments to Hawaii or Asia were only 30 cents a ton, and all handling charges were absorbed by the steamship lines, the result of competition between Canadian and American railways and steamship lines. But for Alaska, where congressional legislation had eliminated competition, the Seattle terminal

charges on local shipments, that is to say, on goods bought in Seattle destined for Alaska, were 100 percent higher, or 60 cents a ton against 30 cents a ton, plus 50 cents a ton wharfage. So Alaskans paid $1.10 a ton for what cost Hawaiians and Asiatics 30 cents a ton—nearly 4 times as much.

This was by no means all. On shipments anywhere in the United States through Seattle, and destined for points in the Pacific other than Alaska, the total handling charges were only 30 cents a ton wharfage, and all other costs were absorbed by railroad and steamship lines. But for identical shipments consigned to Alaska, an unloading charge of 65 cents a ton was imposed, plus a wharfage charge of 50 cents a ton, plus a handling charge from wharf to ship of 60 cents a ton. These charges aggregated over five times the cost to a shipper to other points in the Pacific, and had to be paid by the Alaska consignee or shipper, and of course ultimately by the Alaska consumer.

These damaging figures were presented by Delegate Sutherland at a public congressional committee hearing and made part of the official printed record. No attempt was made by the representatives of the benefiting stateside interests, either then or later, to explain, to justify, to palliate, to challenge, to refute, or to deny his facts.

If there is a clearer and cruder example a colonialism anywhere let it be produced. Here is a clear case where the Government of the United States—through its legislative branch which enacted the legislation, the executive branch, through the President, who signed it, and the judicial branch, which through its courts upheld it—imposed a heavy financial burden on Alaskans exclusively, for the advantage of private business interests in the mother country.

Nor is even this by any means all on the subject of railroad and steamship discrimination against Alaska, and Alaska alone. In addition to all the above extortions against Alaska's shippers, suppliers, and consumers—the direct result of discriminatory legislation—all the railroads of the United States charge a higher rate, sometimes as much as 100 percent higher for shipping goods across the continent, if these goods are destined for Alaska.

There is a so-called rail export tariff and a rail import tariff, which apply to a defined geographic area with exceptions made for other areas, which penalizes Alaska and Alaska alone.

Please note that the service rendered by those railroads, for the same articles transported, and for the same distance, is exactly the same, whether the article to be shipped goes ultimately to Alaska or elsewhere in the Pacific or whether it stays on the mainland of the United States. But the charges for Alaska, and Alaska only, on that identical article, for identical mileage, and identical service, are specifically higher, sometimes up to 100 percent higher.

This abuse, as well as the others dating from the Jones Act have been the subject of unceasing protest from Alaskans. Alaska's legislatures have repeatedly memorialized the Congress and the Federal executive agencies asking for equal treatment. Again and again have Alaska's delegates sought to have the discriminatory clause in the maritime law repealed. But each time the lobbies of the benefitting stateside interests have been successful in preventing any relief action.

How powerful these lobbies are and how successful they have been in maintaining these burdensome manifestations of colonialism may be judged from the unsuccessful efforts of the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska to get the discriminatory words "excluding Alaska" stricken from the act. He introduced a bill for that purpose.

In a speech on the Senate floor on December 4, 1947, he denounced "the discrimination against the Territory in the present law," that is the Maritime Act of 1920, and urged that there was "need for the prompt removal of that discrimination if we are to demonstrate that we are in earnest in our determination to promote the development of Alaska."

In a subsequent communication to Senator HOMER CAPEHART, who was then chairman of a subcommittee on Alaska matters of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which Senator Butler's bill was referred, Senator Butler specified the character and extent of the abuse which Alaska was suffering saying:

"Today after 27 years of operation under the Jones Act of 1920, the carriers have failed to establish satisfactory service * * *. The Territory is still without adequate transportation to meet its needs. * * * Most Alaskan coastal towns are not connected with the continental United States, or with each other, by highway or rail. Accordingly they have been at the mercy of a steamship monopoly of long duration. There could be no competition from rail or bus lines which would compel better services or lower rates. American steamship lines have not been able or willing to meet Alaska's transportation requirements. The service has been infrequent and the rates exorbitant."

This caustic language was Senator Butler's. And his testimony and vigorous denunciation are highly significant, not merely because he was very conservative, but because for the first 14 years of his senatorial service he was a bitter opponent of statehood for Alaska, a stand which made him the beau ideal of the antistatehood elements within and without the Territory. He professed conversion to statehood for Alaska in 1954 only a few months before his death. He was still an unqualified opponent of Alaskan statehood when he issued this devastating indictment of the maritime transportation in 1947 and 1948.

After going into further detail on the injurious effects on Alaska of the Jones Act, and the fact that most of the "merchandise * * * food products * * * and other commodities" shipped to Alaska were "an exclusive Seattle prerogative," Senator Butler continued:

"The passage of this amendment to the Jones Act could well mean the difference between the slow, continued strangulation of Alaska's economy, and the full development of the Territory's vast potentialities."

Senator Butler then spoke of the discriminatory rates in favor of canned salmon, which industry, he pointed out, likewise centered in and around Seattle, saying:

"The people of Alaska have long been subject to higher rates than has the salmon industry, for general cargo. These higher rates are, in fact, a decree penalizing the resident Alaskan for living in Alaska; the lower rates are, in effect, a decree requiring the Alaska resident to make up for whatever deficits accrue from the costs of shipping canned salmon and salmon-cannery needs * * * The strangling provisions of the present laws would be eliminated by the enactment of S. 1834."

S. 1834 was Senator Butler's bill to remove this manifestation of colonialism.

And Senator Butler concluded:

"The development of Alaska would be accelerated, and justice would be done to those permanent residents of our northwestern frontier, who have, for so many years, struggled valiantly against discouraging circumstances to develop that area."

Despite Senator Butler's powerful position as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when his party controlled the Congress, this legislation failed. It did not even come out of committee. Eight more years have passed since that time; the tragic situation as far as Alaska is concerned, in its key transportation, has further deteriorated. Steamship freight rates have continued to go up and up, far above the levels that Senator Butler termed "exorbitant."

Invariably, whenever the operators announced another rate increase, the Alaska territorial authorities used to request the maritime regulatory agency to secure an audit of the company's books in order to demonstrate that the increases requested were justified. But almost invariably the increases were granted without such audit and often without question. It may well be asked whether, if Alaska were not a colony, but a State, its two Senators might not be reasonably effective in at least securing a demonstration from the carrier that its financial situation justified the rate increases demanded and promptly acceded to by the Federal maritime bureau.

But actually, if Alaska were a State, the whole discrimination in the Jones Act would go out of the porthole. Alaska would then get the same treatment in the transportation of freight that is accorded every other area under the flag and to foreign countries. But as a colony it gets no consideration in this matter either from the legislative branch, the Congress, or from the executive branch, in this instance the Federal Maritime Board, successor to other agencies similarly subservient to the vested interests within the colonial power.

The net result of those cumulative charges—50 to 100 percent higher railroad freight rates to Seattle, higher unloading and transfer charges in Seattle, higher wharfage and higher longshoring charges, and finally higher maritime freight rates to Alaska ports—all higher than anywhere else for any but Alaskans, has been and is greatly to increase the cost of living in Alaska. This in itself has been and continues to be a great hindrance to settlement and permanent residence in Alaska, a heavy burden on private enterprise in Alaska, a forecloser of new enterprise, and obviously a great obstacle to development.

How absurd in the light of these facts—and others similar to be submitted to our candid world—is the allegation of the small minority of Alaskans and of others "outside" that we are not ready for statehood. How shall we get readier with these handicaps? How can we cope with what conservative Senator Butler described as "the slow, continued strangulation of Alaska's economy," if the throttling grip of colonialism is not loosened?

To complete the maritime picture, beginning last year all passenger travel on American boats has ceased. The Alaska Steamship Line has eliminated it. This is a blow to an infant and potentially great industry in Alaska, the tourist industry, which 4 years ago the Alaska 1951 legislature sought to develop by establishing the Alaska Visitor's Association, financed jointly by territorially appropriated and publicly subscribed funds.

One postscript remains on the subject of maritime transportation before we pass on to other of Alaska's colonial disadvantages. Though it is invariably pointed out by congressional opponents of statehood that Alaska is a noncontiguous area, separated from the main body of the 48 States by some 700 miles of foreign territory, or 700 miles of either international or foreign coastal waters, the United States persists in maintaining the coastwise shipping laws against Alaska. Their removal would make a steamship line eligible for the subsidies which American-flag ships in the European, African, or Asiatic trade receive. That might, were Congress sufficiently interested, induce some competition in the Alaska steamship trade from other American carriers. That the imposition of the coastwise shipping laws is not a necessary corollary to being a colony, it proved by the fact that the United States has suspended the coastwise shipping laws for the Virgin Islands. But it has declined to do so for Alaska.

Let us now turn to a third form of transportation: highways. These catchwords of colonialism, "excluding Alaska," likewise apply to our highway transportation. For Alaska is denied inclusion in the Federal Aid Highway Act. From this beneficent legislation enacted in 1916, and repeatedly amended and amplified, Alaska, alone among the States and incorporated Territories, is excluded. Even Puerto Rico, which pays no Federal taxes whatever, is included. Yet Alaskans pay all taxes, including the Federal gas tax.

The congressionally wrought substitute—annual appropriation—is a witness to colonialism expressed in cold figures. The results are visible in the lack of an adequate Alaskan highway system. After 88 years of colonialism and 40 years after the enactment by Congress of the join Federal aid and State highway program, Alaska has only some 3,500 miles of highway. This is a negligible amount for an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States and with only 1 railroad.

For the first 38 years after the cession of Alaska no roads were built by any government agency. With Alaska almost totally public domain, highway construction was clearly a Federal responsibility. In the next 36 years beginning with the first Federal construction in 1905 and the outbreak of World War II, in 1941, the Federal Government appropriated about $19½ million, an average of a trifle over half a million dollars a year—a pittance. During that same period Alaska contributed some $9 million. Thus the Federal contribution was 68.4 percent of the total of $28½ million, and Alaska's was 31.6 percent, a far greater proportion than Alaska with its virtual totality of public domain would have had to pay under the Federal Aid Highway Act. It is fair to say, however, that under the Highway Act, Federal funds go for construction and not for maintenance.

After road construction had been transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior in 1930, for the next decade or more throughout the 1930's, when the Federal Government and the States were jointly expanding the nationay highway network, Alaska was given no new highway construction. Maintenance only was granted. Military requirements brought the Alaska Highway and the Glenn Highway, and in the later 1940's a highway program to satisfy defense needs was begun and carried out for 5 years. But even that has been brought to a virtual halt. For the past 3 years the Federal program has contained no new highway project. This year a token appropriation was included for the desirable Fairbanks-Nenana road, but at the price of halting construction of the important Copper River Highway. In fact the present greatly reduced programs spells little more than slow completion and paving of the military highways begun 8 years ago. The Federal Government seems to be heading us back to mere maintenance.

In contrast, the Federal-aid program in the mother country is being handsomely increased, reaching the largest sums in its history in the current biennial appropriation enacted in the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

If Alaska were a State it would be automatically included in the expanding highway program. But as a colony it continues to be discriminated against, and that discrimination, instead of lessening, is being aggravated.

By the same token, Alaska has been excluded from the administration's $101 billion Federal highway program. One of its principal justifications, perhaps the principal justification, for this lavish, yet important and valuable proposal, is that it is, in part, a civilian defense measure to aid evacuation and dispersal in the event of a shooting war with atomic weapons. Yet, the same administration that excludes Alaska from this defense measure wishes to keep Alaska in colonial bondage because of alleged national defense reasons.

The enactment of this multibillion-dollar program was deferred in the last session of Congress because of differences of opinion on how to finance it. But in one respect there was no difference of opinion: Alaska would be taxed for the program even if not included in it. The Eisenhower program, presented by Gen. Lucius Clay, called for long-term bonding to be repaid out of general funds. Congressional substitutes, on a more nearly pay-as-you-go basis, called for increased taxes on gasoline, tires, and other automobile accessories. Efforts to include Alaska in both programs failed, as did subsequent efforts to exclude Alaska from the tax provisions. So, Alaskans will be taxed for benefits accruing solely to the residents of the mother country. What else is this but colonialism, crude, stark, undisguised, and unashamed?

When both the presidential and congressional drafts failed of passage, President Eisenhower declared he was "deeply disappointed" and added:

"The Nation badly needs good roads. The good of our people, of our economy, and of our defense requires that the construction of these highways be undertaken at once."

As colonials we can merely note that Alaskans are, in the consideration of our President, apparently not part of "our people, our economy and our defense."

There is yet more of humiliating disregard. The Federal administration while patently uninterested in developing Alaska through its highways is strongly in favor of completing the Inter-American Highway.

On March 31 last, President Eisenhower in a letter to Vice President NIXON requested an increase in the current appropriation for the Central American portion from $5 million to $75 million, a more than thirteenfold increase. The President gave several reasons for this massive amplification. Three of them emphasized the important economic contribution to the countries through which this highway passes, and a fourth stressed the security aspects of the road.

We may applaud the purpose to complete the Inter-American Highway, with its economic benefits to Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Panama. We may even enjoy our participation in this philanthropy to these good neighbors, remembering that it is more blessed to give than to receive, and that every Alaskan is paying his share of that $75 million. Still, some of us may wonder why similar consideration is not vouchsafed to Alaska, whose highway and economic needs are great, whose trade is almost exclusively with the United States, and whose relation to national security is certainly much closer than that of the Central American republics. This wonder on our part would be particularly natural since President Eisenhower seems to exhibit concern about Alaska's defense in connection with statehood.

We have now viewed 3 flagrant examples of colonialism in 3 of the major means of transportation, shipping, railways and highways. Let us now look at the fourth—airways.

It is superfluous to signalize our air-mindedness to any group of Alaskans. But the candid world should know that Alaskans fly 30 to 40 times more than other Americans, and starting with our bush pilots, early developed a fine system of intra-Alaskan aviation. It was almost wholly an Alaskan enterprise—flown and financed by Alaskans—though for a time without airports, aids to avigation and other assistance provided in the mother country. The Air Commerce Act of 1926—a sort of Federal-aid act for air—did not supply any of these aids to Alaska, although Alaska was included in the legislation. Nevertheless Alaska again suffered the penalty of being a colony, this time at the hands of the Federal executive agency entrusted with administration of the act. This time it was the bureaucrats who excluded Alaska. But the Alaskan bush pilots flew anyhow and what we have in the way of airways in Alaska is largely due to their courageous and skillful pioneering.

However, air service between Alaska and the States, which required the approval of Federal bureaus and investment of outside capital, lagged far behind. The first commercial service connecting Alaska with the mother country did not take place till 1940 long after American commercial air carriers had spanned the rest of the Hemisphere and had established regular service across the Pacific.

Meanwhile the newly created bureaucracies of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration moved into Alaska. They began restricting local enterprise. In the late 1940's, over the widespread protests of Alaskans, the CAB began cracking down on nonscheduled operations, and finally eliminated the nonscheds completely. It did not do so in the 48 States. Alaska was again the victim of its colonial status. We had no Senators or voting representatives to fend for us.

The successive certification cases which for over a decade have dealt with transportation between the States and Alaska, have been desperate, and not wholly successful. Struggles by Alaskans to overcome the inadequate understanding of the Civil Aeronautics Board that air transportation is relatively much more important in Alaska than in the States with their well-established alternative forms of transportation, by railways and highways. Five years ago interior Alaska was saved from insufficient service only by President Truman's overruling the Board and granting certification to one of the two Alaskan carriers which the Board had denied.

For the last 2 years our two Alaskan carriers, in the face of steadily mounting traffic, have managed by heroic, all-out effort at least to retain what they had. But it is noteworthy that while the two international carriers serving Alaska—both mother country enterprises—have been granted permanent certificates, the certificates for our two Alaskan carriers are only temporary—a handicap to their financing and to their ability to expand.

Alaska's statehood case could rest here. Yet no account of its 88 years of territorialism would be complete without some notice of the salmon fishery. It comes, this year, pretty close to being an obituary notice.

Here was Alaska's greatest natural resource.

Here was the Nation's greatest fishery resource.

For nearly half a century, the Federal Government has totally ignored, has refused assent to the petitions, pleas, prayers, memorials, of legislatures, delegates, governors, and of the whole Alaskan people for measures that would conserve that resource.

The result is written in figures that spell tragedy for Alaska's fishermen and for many others in Alaska's coastal communities whose economy has long depended on the fisheries. The tragedy has deepened year after year. So grave has become the plight that the administration found it necessary to proclaim the fishing villages to be disaster areas. It is a disaster caused by colonialism, and the Federal Government may charge the costs of disaster relief and loss of Federal tax income to its own policies.

From over 8 million cases 20 years ago the salmon pack has fallen year by year until in 1955 it has reached the incredible low of 2,382,131 cases, the lowest in 46 years.

Nowhere, as in the Alaska fisheries fiasco, is the lesson clearer of the superiority, in purely material terms, of self-government to colonialism. In neighboring British Columbia and Washington State, where the fisheries are under home rule, and where fish traps

have been abolished, the identical resource has not only been conserved but augmented.

It is colonialism that has both disregarded the interest of the Alaskan people and caused the failure of the prescribed Federal conservation function. Colonialism has preferred to conserve the power and perquisites of a distant bureaucracy and the control and special privileges—the fish traps—of a politically potent absentee industry. Alaska has been the victim, but the entire Nation has also lost heavily.

Let us by way of a footnote make crystal clear how and why this is colonialism—because some defenders of the status quo may deny it is, and we don't want the candid world to be confused.

The people of Alaska have repeatedly and unchangingly manifested their overwhelming opposition to fish traps. It isn't necessary to rehearse all their reasons—the results have amply justified the Alaskans' position. But fish trap beneficiaries, residents of the mother country, want to retain their Alaska traps. So the traps are retained. And it is the power and authority of the Federal Government which retains them. In a clear-cut issue between the few, profiting, noncolonial American and the many, seriously damaged, colonial Alaskans, the state-side interest wins hands down. And it wins because the Government, which is also supposed to be our Government, throws its full weight on their side and against us. That is colonialism.

It would be impossible in any one address, even one that assumed the length of a Senate filibuster, to list all the wrongs, disadvantages, and lack of immunities that Alaska has endured in its 88 years as a Territory. They constitute an incredible story. Even for those who know it, it is hard to believe. It is hard for us as Americans who long ago established our faith in American intelligence, competence, good sense, and above all in American fair play, to contemplate the story of American colonialism in Alaska. It has been part of our faith, an abiding faith, that to right deep-seated wrongs in America, one but had to make them sufficiently widely known. And our best hope, does lie, I am convinced, in making the facts known widely—and especially the overshadowing fact of our colonialism—to our fellow-Americans and to the rest of the candid world. They should know that what progress has been made in Alaska, and it has been substantial and praiseworthy, has been made in spite of these colonial impositions, and largely because of the character and fiber of the colonials themselves. Coming here from the 48 States, following the most cherished American trend, the westward march in search of greater freedom and greater opportunity, they brought to the last frontier and to its friendly native population, the very qualities that have made America. Only distantly man-made problems, the problems created by a remote, often unseen officialdom and its beneficiaries in the mother country, have remained unresolved.

Alaskans have striven consistently to resolve them. Let it be recorded that for 43 years, since the first legislature, and before that by individuals and groups, they have pleaded for relief from the abuses a part of which have been detailed.

Yet after two generations not a single one of these pleas, all of them fair and reasonable, has been granted.

How applicable to Alaska's plight the words of the Declaration of Independence:

"In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions have been answered by repeated injury."

Lest these frequent citations from the Declaration of Independence lead anyone to the conclusion that there are any among us who now desire our independence, let such a totally erroneous assumption be promptly corrected. We desire and demand an end to our colonialism. But we seek it through a reaffirmation in deeds for Alaska of the principles which launched the American experiment and reapplication of the practice that has been followed in 35 States.

We Alaskans believe—passionately—that American citizenship is the most precious possession in the world. Hence we want it in full measure; full citizenship instead of half-citizenship; first-class instead of second-class citizenship. We demand equality with all other Americans, and the liberties, long denied us, that go with it. To adapt Daniel Webster's famous phrase uttered as a peroration against impending separatism, we Alaskans want "liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

But the keepers of Alaska's colonial status should be reminded that the 18th century colonials for long years sought merely to obtain relief from abuses, for which they—like us—vainly pleaded, before finally resolving that only independence would secure for them the "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness," which they felt was their natural right.

We trust that the United States will not by similar blindness to our rights and deafness to our pleas drive Alaskans from patient hope to desperation.

We have been challenged in the course of congressional debates to show as a prerequisite that admission of Alaska to statehood would be beneficial to the Nation. That test was never applied to earlier Territories seeking and securing statehood. But we gladly accept that challenge and willingly subscribe to it as a condition.

The development of Alaska, the fulfillment of its great destiny, cannot be achieved under colonialism. The whole Nation will profit by an Alaska that is populous, prosperous, strong, self-reliant—a great northern and western citadel of the American idea. Statehood would automatically bring us far along that high road.

Nothing could more pathetically reveal the lack of understanding regarding Alaska, and the poor advice concerning Alaska that is given and accepted in the highest places, than the presidential pronouncement in the last state of the Union message:

"As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved that Territory should expect to achieve statehood."

Bless us! The complex problems of Alaska are inherent in its Territorial status; they are derived from its colonial status; they will be largely resolved by statehood and only by statehood.

As was promptly called to President Eisenhower's attention this was like the old story of telling a youngster he must learn to swim before going into the water.

So we return to the proposition that America can scarcely afford to perpetuate its colonialism. Our Nation is attempting to lead the world into the pathway of peace. No goal could be more worthy. But to lead effectively, it must not only practice what it preaches. It must carry out its solemn commitments. It can scarcely be critical of nations that break their pledges and break its own. It must first cast the beam out of its own eye before attempting to pull the motes of its neighbors' eyes.

For the United States has pledged its good name and good faith in treaties and agreements far more recent than the Treaty of Cession of 1867. Not that our Nation's responsibility for not carrying out those original pledges in regard to Alaska is diminished by the passage of time. But there are recent and even contemporary commitments which demand fulfillment.

Article 73 of the United Nations Charter, dealing with non-self-governing territories—and that includes Alaska which must make annual reports to the U. N.—pledges the signatories:

"To the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories is paramount," and further pledges them—

"To insure * * * their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses," said, finally, and this is most pertinent, it pledges them—

"To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. * * *"

The United States pledged itself to that 10 years ago. If the English language has not lost its meaning and the United States its integrity, it should some time ago have, and should now, in any event, "take due account of the political aspirations" of Alaskans and enable them to develop the self-government which they seek.

There is an even more recent commitment—the Pacific charter—signed a year ago, in which the signatory nations, including the United States, pledged themselves "to uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," and to reenforce that principle the signatories further pledged that they were "prepared to continue taking effective practical measures to insure conditions favorable to orderly achievement of the foregoing purposes," namely self-government.

We are agreed that there is only one form of self-government that is possible for Alaska. And so we are drawing up the constitution for the State that we fervently hope will soon come to be. That hope, it is encouraging to note, is shared by the great majority of Americans. If our 88-year experience inevitably leads to strictures of the colonialism that has ruled us, let us remember that it is a course not sanctioned by American public opinion. The Gallup polls, which last recorded an 82 percent support of Alaskan statehood, the endorsement of virtually every important national organization, demonstrate clearly that the forces in and out of government which would deny Alaska statehood—in fact the Government itself—do not represent prevailing American sentiment.

But while we may derive satisfaction and hope therefrom, let us not delude ourselves that victory is at hand. It ought to be. But too many solemn pledges to Alaska have been honored in the breach to assure what ought to be will be.

It may be regrettable—or not—but every generation must fight to preserve its freedoms. We have twice in a lifetime participated in our nation's fight to preserve them. In Alaska we still have to win them.

This constitutional convention is an important mobilization. But the battle still lies ahead, and it will require all our fortitude, audacity, resoluteness—and maybe something more—to achieve victory. When the need for that something more comes, if we have the courage—the guts—to do whatever is necessary, we shall not fail. That the victory will be the Nation's as well as Alaska's—and the world's—should deepen our determination to end American colonialism.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when the Senators-elect and the Representative-elect from Alaska were on their way from Alaska to Washington, they stopped in Tennessee, for a celebration which was held for them there. The Governor of Tennessee participated. Various Tennessee newspapers editorialized in favor of the admission of Alaska as a State. I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], there be printed in the body

of the RECORD editorials from the Chattanooga Times, the Knoxville Tennessean, and the Nashville Banner.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of December 26, 1956]

ALASKAN CARAVAN

The statehood for Alaska caravan is scheduled to visit Nashville Friday on its tour of the Nation. Tennesseans will welcome the two white automobiles, bearing the blue-gold flag of Alaska and the words "Alaska—the 49th State," with great interest.

In 1796, just 160 years ago, Tennessee "legislators" made an arduous, 2-week journey to Philadelphia on horseback. Tennessee, taking its battle for statehood into its own hands, elected congressional representatives and then sought to have them recognized by Congress. There was an uncertain interval, but the plan worked and Tennessee was the first Territory to achieve statehood through this method.

Californians did the same thing in 1850, striking out for Washington by stagecoach. Michigan, Iowa, Oregon, Minnesota, and Kansas used the same method.

Now Alaska, after long years of frustration, has adopted the Tennessee plan. "Senator-Elect" Ernest Gruening, Alaska's most articulate spokesman for statehood and "Representative-Elect" Ralph J. Rivers, will be in the caravan arriving in Nashville Friday.

Actually, prospects this year seem better than at any time in the past. The administration which has seesawed remarkably on the statehood issue, is reported ready to recommend in January a bill granting statehood to both Alaska and Hawaii.

The measure was defeated badly last year in the House, 218 to 170, after President Eisenhower said of Alaska: "I am in doubt that any form of legislation can wholly remove my apprehensions about granting statehood immediately."

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson had stated that "it would be in the interest of the national security that Alaska remain a Federal Territory for the present."

But A. Robert Smith points out in the Reporter magazine that Gen. Nathan Twining, former Chief of the Alaskan Defense Command; Gen. Douglas MacArthur; the late Air Force Gen. Hap Arnold; Adm. Chester Nimitz; and Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd all have supported statehood for Alaska.

And last year Under Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas testified: "Perhaps the military is a little conservative in its approaches to changes. It finds it gets along well in the present situation. To say that the military cannot operate with State organizations would be ridiculous."

President Eisenhower himself, in 1950, while president of Columbia University, said that prompt admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood would show the world that "America practices what it preaches."

One by one, the arguments against Alaskan statehood, many of them advanced by fishing, shipping, and other interests that enjoy profitable advantages while Alaska remains a Territory, are wearing thin. We welcome the statehood caravan to Nashville, and we hope that Alaska's time of victory is near.

[From the Chattanooga Times of January 7, 1957]

HOW THE BOLD BECAME STATES

Two senators and a representative from Alaska have shown up in Congress, but have not yet been seated. They will stay around, however, for they were elected by Alaskans to dramatize that Territory's right to statehood.

The Washington Post suggests that Tennessee's Senators and Congressman should support Alaska's move, since the appearance of the Alaskan senators follows exactly the plan which won statehood for Tennessee in 1796. Three Congresses had denied statehood, and Tennessee's pioneers were completely fed up with all of this dilly-dallying in Washington. They set up a legislature, drafted a constitution and sent William Cocke and William Blount to Washington as senators.

They were refused seats, of course, but they did a grand job of lobbying and Congress, 2 months after their appearance, completed passage of a bill admitting Tennessee as the 16th State. President George Washington signed the bill on the following day.

The Tennessee plan worked for Michigan, Oregon, California, Minnesota, Iowa, and Kansas. We hope it works for Alaska, not only because we are grateful for the recognition given our bold pioneer statesmen but because Alaska deserves statehood.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of December 29, 1956]

GOOD LUCK, ALASKA

This city and this State can bid the statehood for Alaska caravan "godspeed and good luck" as it continues on to Washington in quest of being the 49th State of the Nation.

Just 160 years ago the "legislators" of Tennessee made their long journey to Philadelphia with just such hopes as the Alaska group which visited here. Tennessee, in its battle for statehood, elected congressional representatives and then sought to have them recognized by Congress. Although plagued by uncertainty and delay, the plan finally worked and Tennessee became the first Territory to achieve statehood by this method.

Since that time six others have used the plan to attain the status of statehood. They are Michigan, Iowa, California, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas. But it bears the name of the "Tennessee Plan."

The Alaskan legislators visiting here were optimistic over their chances this year despite the fact that the Eisenhower administration has given their efforts the runaround. The measure was defeated badly last year in the House, 218–170 after Mr. Eisenhower commented that "I am in doubt that any form of legislation can wholly remove my apprehensions about granting statehood immediately." The feeling is that he has changed his mind now, however.

Some of the top military brass, notably Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, have opposed the action in fear that there would be more difficulty for the military in operating with a State organization.

More practical defense leaders have backed the idea, among them Gen. Nathan Twining, Adm. Chester Nimitz, and the late Gen. Hap Arnold of the Air Force.

Many business and financial interests in Alaska have opposed statehood on grounds of fearing extra taxation from the new State. Most of the arguments against its admission have worn a little frayed.

Alaska is vital to national defense. Its northern stretches put our fighter planes almost eyeball to eyeball with fast new super jets of the Russians just across the Bering Strait. Statehood doesn't erect any barriers to defense.

Its admission will add strength to the other 48. This time we hope Alaska makes it.

[From the Nashville Banner of December 27, 1956]

ALASKA STATEHOOD BOOSTERS DUE HERE

An optimistic caravan of wandering minstrels singing the praises of Alaskan statehood will reach Nashville Friday noon.

Appropriately, Tennessee will roll out the carpet for the visiting officials. Alaska has followed the so-called Tennessee plan in its drive for statehood by electing its 2 Senators and 1 Representative, adopting a constitution, and readying a State government which can be admitted to the Union without legal preliminaries if statehood becomes a reality.

Among those in the party will be "Senators-elect" Ernest Gruening, William Egan, and their wives, and "Representative-elect" Ralph Rivers and his wife.

The three officials have been visiting with governors throughout their trip from Alaska, which will terminate in Washington Sunday. All have expressed optimism over chances that Alaska will be granted statehood by the 85th Congress.

Tennessee highway patrolmen will meet Egan and Rivers at the State line near Paducah, Ky., and escort them to Nashville. Gruening, now in Washington, will rendezvous with his fellow Alaskans here.

Gov. Frank G. Clement will receive the group at 2:45 p. m. Friday at the capitol and later will entertain them at the mansion. They also will be taken on a guided tour of the capitol and the Hermitage. They will stay at the Andrew Jackson Hotel overnight, departing Nashville Saturday.

"Senator-elect" Gruening, long prominent in Alaskan affairs, is a former governor of that Territory. The other two officials also have served in the Alaskan Territorial government.

Platforms of both parties contained language favorable to Alaskan statehood.

[From the Memphis Appeal of December 29, 1956]

ALASKA STATESMAN SURE OF STATEHOOD—FORMER GOVERNOR IS GUEST OF CLEMENT IN CAPITOL

NASHVILLE, December 28.—A former governor of Alaska said Friday he was "confident" that the next session of Congress will grant statehood to the Territory.

Ernest Gruening, a "Senator elect' from Alaska came here with two Representatives, William Egan and Ralph Rivers.

They have been touring the United States and will go from here to Washington to press for legislation making Alaska the 49th State.

Mr. Gruening said he and his companions didn't profess to be prophets but that they were confident Congress would approve statehood.

The Alaskans were guests at a reception given by Gov. Frank Clement at the capitol.

The group said Alaska is using the same plan Tennessee did when it gained admission to the Union, that of adopting a State constitution and electing national officials ahead of congressional action.

Governor Clement made the group honorary citizens of Tennessee.

[From the New York Times of September 23, 1956]

ALASKA TO ELECT STATEHOOD LOBBY—HOPES TO APPLY APPROACH TENNESSEE USED IN 1796 TO GAIN ADMISSION

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, September 22.—A Louisiana businessman's dream will be fulfilled on October 9 when the voters of Alaska elect two United States Senators and a United States Representative.

The winning candidates are not expected to obtain seats in Congress, but it is anticipated that they will be the most effective lobbyists for Alaskan statehood since the Territory was purchased from Russia in 1867. Whether or not they will be required to register as lobbyists when they reach Washington in January is another matter. Their salaries and expenses will be paid by the Alaskan Territorial Legislature.

The election of the statehood lobbyists has been called the Alaska-Tennessee plan. Tennessee was the first Territory to use successfully this approach to obtain statehood, which came in 1796. Subsequently, six other Territories elected senators and representatives as a method of dramatizing their fight for self-government. These were Michigan, California, Oregon, Iowa, Minnesota and Kansas.

As applied to Alaska the plan was the brainchild of George H. Lehleitner, a New Orleans wholesale merchant who has devoted much of his time and money to promoting statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

During World War II, while he was stationed in Hawaii he attempted to sell Hawaiian statehood backers on the merits of a Tennessee plan.

HAWAIIANS NOT CONVINCED

Unable to convince the Hawaiians, Mr. Lehleitner undertook to persuade Alaskans of the need for such a move. In letters to delegates to the Alaskan Constitutional Convention (November 8, 1955 to February 6, 1956) he outlined arguments for an Alaska-Tennessee plan.

The delegates were moved by his argument that the plan is a forthright, positive, and logical form in which to petition the Government for the redress of monstrous grievance. They approved the Alaska-Tennessee plan and it was ratified, with the constitution, by the voters in April 1956.

Alaska's approximately 200,000 residents are officially represented as a territory in Congress by voteless delegate, E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, a Democrat. A longtime champion of statehood, Mr. BARTLETT declined to be a candidate under the Alaska-Tennessee plan. He maintains that Alaskan statehood prospects will be enhanced by having four voteless representatives in Washington. He is a candidate for a seventh term as Delegate with his Republican opponent being Byron Gilliam, former Fairbanks grocer, and now of Juneau.

Candidates under the Alaska-Tennessee plan on the Republican ticket for the Senate are: Robert B. Atwood, 49-year-old (4-year term), publisher of the Anchorage Daily Times; and John Butrovich, Jr., 46 (6-year term), territorial senator, and Fairbanks insurance man. The Republican candidate for the House of Representatives under the plan is Charles G. Burdick, 62, Juneau investment salesman, and former assistant regional forester.

On the Democratic side, the Alaska-Tennessee plan senatorial candidates are former territorial governor Ernest Gruening, 69, of Juneau (6-year term), now a writer and lecturer; and William Egan, 42 (4-year term), Valdez food merchant, who served as president of the Alaskan Constitutional Convention. Ralph J. Rivers, 53, Fairbanks attorney, is the Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives under the plan.

Most prominent in relation to the national scene has been Dr. Gruening. A graduate of Harvard University and of the Harvard Medical School, he shifted his interest early in his career from medicine to journalism.

He has been managing editor of the New York Tribune, the Boston Traveler, and the Boston Journal, and was editor of the old New York Evening Post. Dr. Gruening also was managing editor of The Nation.

Between 1935 and 1939 he was director of the division of territories and island possessions, United States Department of the Interior. In 1939, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him Governor of Alaska. He held that position until 1952, when he was succeeded by Republican B. Frank Heintzleman.

Since leaving the governorship, Dr. Gruening has continued his fight for statehood and published a book, The State of Alaska, on the subject.

Predictions as to the outcome of the Alaska-Tennessee plan election are difficult to make. Both parties have put up strong tickets. Alaska voters also do not hesitate to split their paper ballots. A slight edge might be given to the Democrats in view of the continued popularity of Mr. BARTLETT, the only national candidate picked by Alaska voters over the years.

INCREASED AIR NAVIGATION AIDS FOR WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all aware in this aviation age that a tremendous amount of modernization, technical improvement, and research are essential in our United States air facilities.

We need to have these facilities expanded for a great many purposes—for speed, for efficiency, for safety, for development of the United States domestic economy.

I was pleased, therefore, to hear the other day from the Honorable T. K. Jordan, Director of the Aeronautics Commission of the State of Wisconsin.

On behalf of the Commission, Mr. Jordan conveyed to me the text of a most significant resolution requesting an increase in Federal air navigation aids for our State.

The reasons presented in the course of this resolution are so impressive that they speak for themselves.

I am, of course, taking this matter up directly with the CAA. However, I feel that this issue is of sufficient importance as to merit its attention by Members of the Senate as a whole, and particularly of Members of the Senate Committee on Apppropriations which will be considering the 1958 fiscal year request for an increase in the CAA budget.

A lack of adequate air navigation aids represents extremely poor economy. It is self-defeating economy, and therefore it should be corrected.

Naturally, I am especially interested in adequate aids for visual and instrumental flights throughout Wisconsin, but I realize full well that the problem is not limited to my own State.

I present Mr. Jordan's letter, together with the resolution which the Commission has forwarded to me. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
Madison, Wis., January 10, 1957.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission has requested the Civil Aeronautics Administration to increase the number of Federal air navigation aids in Wisconsin. A copy of the commission's request to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is attached.

The lack of Federal air navigation aids in Wisconsin is a long-standing deficiency that has been hampering the development of air transportation in our State for a number of years. From past experience we believe that our needs will best be considered if we make a specific issue of our deficiencies, since Wisconsin for the most part is off the major air routes across the country. In the most recently published statement of the Civil Aeronautics Administration relative to expanding navigational aids across the country, Wisconsin has received very limited consideration.

In order to implement the Commission's resolution, we have been making a survey of VFR and IFR flights in Wisconsin during June and July 1956, and a report of the results of the survey will be available about the first of February. The report, together with the data from which it was prepared, will be supplied the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Copies of the report will be forwarded to you for your use.

Very truly yours,
WISCONSIN STATE AERONAUTICS COMMISSION,
T. D. JORDAN, *Director.*

WISCONSIN STATE AERONAUTICS COMMISSION—RESOLUTION ADDRESSED TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION REQUESTING THE INCREASE OF FEDERAL AIR NAVIGATION AIDS IN WISCONSIN

An adequate number of properly placed Federal air navigation aids is essential to the sound development of air transportation. Unfortunately, the installation of air navigation aids in Wisconsin has not been keeping abreast with the growth of air transportation in this region.

Because of the very limited number (8) of air navigation aids in Wisconsin, large areas in northern and central Wisconsin are beyond the reach of existing radio aids, and the greatest portion of the State is off Federal airways.

This situation limits the utility of aircraft in Wisconsin, both for VFR and IFR flight and so causes substantial areas of the State to be more or less isolated insofar as air transportation is concerned.

Air navigation aids are extremely important to visual flight (VFR) as well as instrument flight in Wisconsin, and particularly the northern and central parts, because of the very extensive and remote wooded areas that exist in these regions, varying weather conditions, general similar appearance of the areas from the air, and lack of airports, all of which make VFR flight difficult without the help of air navigation aids. Also, the lack of aids results in dangerous conflicts in the use of the airspace at times under certain weather conditions.

Wisconsin has a substantial local service air route system and needs Federal air navigation aids for its operation in the interest of safety and dependability.

The State is one of the most important recreational areas in the country and generates a large amount of airplane traffic from all parts of the Nation which needs Federal air navigation aids for its guidance.

The State is traversed by a substantial amount of airplane traffic between points in Eastern, Southern, and Southeastern United States and central Canada on business and pleasure trips that are in need of Federal air navigation aids and particularly in northern Wisconsin.

Wisconsin is an important manufacturing State with industries of various kinds located throughout the entire State. Navigation aids are needed in the State to make use of aircraft by business and industry safe, reliable and efficient.

The establishment of Federal air navigation aids is the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government, and since the installation of these facilities has not been keeping abreast of the needs of air transportation in the State, and the lack of which is affecting the movement of both local and interstate traffic in the State, such deficiency should be corrected without delay: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics be and is hereby respectfully petitioned to establish such air navigation aids in the State as are needed to adequately serve various air transportation needs of the people of all parts of the State: And be it further

Resolved, That the director of aeronautics be and is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and take such other action as may be appropriate and in the State's best interests.

Adopted by the Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission, meeting in regular session at Madison, Wis., on December 6, 1956.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN'S STATE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive the other day from Charles M. Schultz, president of the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council, two resolutions which were adopted by the 19th annual constitutional convention of that organization.

The first resolution conveys the State's CIO's opposition to a proposal for an annual tax on the use and ownership of automobiles.

I particularly invite attention to the second phase of the resolution, which urges that in lieu of any such tax consideration be given to additional help to the Nation's cities to meet the increasing burdens of the operation and building of schools and the maintenance of streets, roads, and highways.

We are all well aware that the Nation's municipalities are indeed extremely hard-pressed to find revenue with which to modernize these and other overburdened facilities.

The second resolution turns to the field of international affairs. It urges, as thinking people throughout the United States urge, the strengthening of the United Nations Charter, so as to provide for more effective peaceful settlement of disputes.

It urges, as well, that funds which might be saved from an armaments race be expended in the interest of combatting mankind's age old enemies of poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, and related evils.

I know that the council's expression on this subject will strike a respondent chord in many hearts. I send both of these resolutions to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"AUTO SALES TAX

"Whereas proposals for legislative action have been publicly announced calling for a 2½ percent annual tax on the use and ownership of automobiles as a means of providing additional revenue for cities and other municipalities; and

"Whereas such a tax would tend to burden the average worker and discourage the purchase and ownership of automobiles, which in turn would materially affect their manufacturer; and

"Whereas the use and ownership of an automobile in our country today is an everyday necessity and not a luxury; and

"Whereas such tax would impinge upon the manufacture of automobiles, particularly by the independent companies who concentrate on the building and manufacture of smaller automobiles, thus causing layoffs among our members and employees in the automobile industry; and

"Whereas it is a known fact that municipalities are particularly in need for funds to meet school and road expenses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* (1) That we oppose the adoption of any law calling for a State tax upon the use and ownership of automobiles.

"(2) That we call upon the Congress of the United States to adopt measures giving cities and other municipalities proper financial aid and assistance to meet the increasing burden of the operation and building of schools and of the maintenance of streets, roads, and highways; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copy of this resolution be sent to the mayor of the city of Milwaukee, the Congressmen of the State, and the United States Senators of the State of Wisconsin."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PEACE THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

"Whereas modern war is a form of mutual suicide; and

"Whereas history has known that treaties and covenants do not prevent wars; and

"Whereas the world is again engaged in a feverish arms race, and arms races have throughout history always ended in war; and

"Whereas the simple desire to keep the peace is not enough to keep the peace; and

"Whereas little wars—which have so often led to big wars—are smoldering now in the Middle East, and Africa: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this 19th Constitutional Convention of the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council, CIO, go on record supporting the necessary changes needed in the United Nations Charter to make the U. N. more effective for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations and for the reduction of arms, while safeguarding the freedom of every nation to govern its own international affairs; and we further support the contributions by our Nation of a substantial part of any moneys saved in disarmament, and used through the United Nations in a world economic development program for attacking poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance throughout the world; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council request other councils and other labor bodies in all other parts of the State to take similar action, and that copies of this resolution be also sent to President Meany of the AFL–CIO; to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; to all Wisconsin Congressmen and Senators; and to the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America.

"Submitted by Local 180, UAW. Amended by the resolutions committee."

MILWAUKEE REQUESTS CONTINUED FEDERAL CONTROL OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President it appears that once again this year, the Congress may be confronted by legislation which would attempt to remove from the Federal Power Commission necessary authority, in the public interest, to regulate natural gas.

In my judgment, Congress should reject any such legislation attempt. I feel that if we are to effectively control inflationary forces in our country, we dare not deny to the Power Commission the indispensible legal authority to protect consumers from being gouged.

I am proud that the State of Wisconsin has always been in the forefront of the effort to maintain on the statute books the powers under the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Once more, it is my pleasure, to record for my colleagues, the official expression on behalf of the largest city in Wisconsin renewing its appeal for maintenance of Federal control.

I present the resolution forwarded to me by the Common Council of Milwaukee opposing deregulation of natural gas. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING IN ACTIONS TO OPPOSE THE EXEMPTION OF NATURAL GAS PRODUCERS FROM REGULATION DURING THE YEAR 1957

Whereas the city of Milwaukee historically has registered its opposition to legislation which would free from necessary regulation independent producers of natural gas from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas it appears likely according to recent press reports that an attempt will once more be made to press for the enactment of legislation by Congress during 1957 which would free independent producers of natural gas from necessary regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the mayor, the deputy city attorney, and such members of the committee on public utilities as may be designated by the president of the common council, be and they are hereby authorized to appear and testify on behalf of the city of Milwaukee before congressional committees holding hearings on legislation which has for its objective the freeing of independent producers of natural gas from regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor and the deputy city attorney be and they are hereby authorized to take all steps within their power to oppose the passage of legislation which would have for its objective the freeing of independent producers from regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor and the city attorney's office be and they are hereby authorized to confer with other municipal and State officials in cooperating in opposing legislation which would free independent producers of natural gas from regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the city of Milwaukee be on record in opposition to legislation which would free independent producers from regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act, and that a certified copy of this resolution may be presented by the mayor and the city attorney's office to congressional committees, and for such other purposes as may be required, evidencing the city's official position with respect to legislation which would attempt to free from regulation under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act independent producers of natural gas.

RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, adopted at a meeting held September 24, 1956, relating to a modification of the Federal standards for water resources projects.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Whereas Federal rules and standards for estimating and determining the economic feasibility of proposed projects for the development of water resources have, during the past 8 years, been made increasingly restrictive and difficult to comply with; and

Whereas administrative directives, Circular A–47 issued by the Bureau of the Budget under date of December 31, 1952, and more recently recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on "Water Resources Policy" transmitted to Congress on January 17, 1956, impose more rigid standards for measuring the utility and feasibility of proposed water resource projects than appears justifiable; and

Whereas the development of our water resources for various beneficial uses is becoming increasingly important in promoting public welfare while at the same time the cost of establishing such projects is increasing to such an extent that the condition created thereby requires a new and more realistic approach in estimating the economic feasibility of such proposed projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission in meeting regularly assembled this 24th day of September, 1956, That Federal rules, regulations and standards with reference to determining the feasibility of proposed water-resource-development projects should be modified so that such projects, deemed necessary for the economic welfare of the areas affected by establishment thereof, will be submitted to Congress for consideration and not arbitrarily withheld from study and review by appropriate congressional committees by veto of some administrative agency or department; and be it further

Resolved, That this Commission approves the action of the United States Senate in connection with S. Res. 281, 84th Congress, and favors enactment of legislation proposed therein; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works.

EGYPT'S TERROR AGAINST EGYPTIAN JEWRY—RESOLUTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the 7th day of January there was a public meeting held at the Statler Hotel called for the purpose of protesting against the action of Egypt in expelling the Jewish population of that country. At that time there was unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the action referred to. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED AT PUBLIC MEETING ON "EGYPT'S TERROR AGAINST EGYPTIAN JEWRY," MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1957, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas during the past few weeks authoritative and alarming reports from Egypt have indicated that the Egyptian authorities have instituted a program of terror against the Egyptian Jewish community; and

Whereas deportations, arrests, seizure of heads of families as hostages, internment under concentration-camp conditions, deprivation of citizenship, and confiscation of property, are among the kinds of brutal treatment to which Egyptian officials have subjected thousands of innocent men, women, and children only because they are of the Jewish faith; and

Whereas Egypt's program of persecution and terror bears a frightening resemblance to the anti-Jewish program of the Nazis during the early years of their regime; and

Whereas such wholesale violations of human rights by dictatorial governments, if unchallenged have been shown by history to lead to greater and more brutal inhumanities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, who are assembled this evening, Monday, January 7, 1957, at a public meeting in the Statler Hotel, in Washington, D. C., mindful as we are of the teachings of our respective religions concerning the sanctity of human life and human dignity, and of the traditional American concern about violations of human rights, do express our condemnation of Egypt's terror against Egyptian Jewry; and respectfully urge the President of the United States to convey to the Government of Egypt our country's sense of outrage at Egypt's violations of elementary human rights; and also urge that our Government's moral prestige be brought to bear in the United Nations toward a United Nations investigation of Egypt's anti-Jewish program, and a United Nations warning to Egypt that the civilized world will not tolerate such reigns of terror; and urge further, that our Government give serious consideration to emergency immigration measures which would make available on our shores asylum for some of the refugees from Egypt's reign of terror.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution, and I submit a report (No. 2) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, created by Senate Resolution 285, agreed to July 11, 1956, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1957, through June 30, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. The chairman may designate one or more members who may act for him for the purpose of this resolution.

SEC. 3. The committee shall transmit to the Senate not later than June 30, 1957, the results of the study herein and previously authorized together with such recommendations as may at the time be found desirable. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on June 30, 1957.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 546. A bill to establish an immediate program to aid in reducing the public debt by providing that certain receipts from the sale of capital assets of the Government shall be used for such purpose; and

S. 547. A bill to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 548. A bill to provide for a new third division of the Northern Judicial District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 549. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Transportation World's Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 550. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to State tax authorities with respect to certain real property subject at the time of its acquisition by the United States to real property tax committed to the discharge of bonded indebtedness for any public improvement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 551. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 552. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.;

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Aleg Antonowycz; and

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Giordanella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 555. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 556. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Nevada State Board of Fish and Game Commissioners; and

S. 557. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 558. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 559. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act with respect to transfer of unused allotments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Alec Ernest Sales; and

S. 561. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to include in the definition of the term "nonquota immigrant" minor children of alien parents issued immigrant visas under paragraph (2) of section 203 (a) of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Hideko Takiguchi Pulaski;

S. 563. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni;

S. 564. A bill for the relief of Vera Wisner; and

S. 565. A bill for the relief of Louis & Thomas and D. Grace Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 566. A bill providing for acreage allotments for the 1957 and subsequent crops of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 567. A bill for the relief of Vida Djenich; and

S. 568. A bill for the relief of Maj. Don M. Forrester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.;

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Jeannine Therriaud Grantham;

S. 571. A bill for the relief of George P. E. Caesar, Jr.;

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Strong; and

S. 573. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 574. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 575. A bill to provide for the establishment of four soil and water conservation laboratories; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 576. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of Stave Island, Maine, in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 577. A bill to repeal section 5 of Public Law 887, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 578. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of service which were not covered by a Federal appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 579. A bill to amend section 16 (a) of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to permit loans insured thereunder to be insured for the full value of the farm, less any prior lien indebtedness; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 580. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 581. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of a certain Government-owned alcohol plant; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 582. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 583. A bill for the relief of Stanislav Maglica; and

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Victor Franz Pullwitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 585. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, N. Dak.; and

S. 586. A bill to extend the time for filing of claims under section 6420 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for refund of taxes on gasoline used on farms between January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 587. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to require the sale abroad at world market prices of 150 million pounds of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. THYE):

S. 588. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Margaret Kwei Chang (Margaret Hau-Chen Kwei); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 590. A bill to establish Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Seol Bong Ryu; and

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Anton Revak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 593. A bill to prevent the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft used in air commerce and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 594. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to increase public disclosure of security ownership; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 595. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 596. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Medical Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 597. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 598. A bill to provide medals of honor for persons who perform heroic acts in preventing serious accidents on the highways, or in saving lives endangered as a result of any such accidents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 599. A bill to establish a National Monetary and Financial Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 600. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and to provide for the payment of certain American war damage claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 601. A bill relating to the charging of interest on deposits to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 602. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battleground Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 603. A bill to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 60 days after the execution thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 604. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the Southern District of California, and to redesignate the present Southern District of California as the Central District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 605. A bill relative to price support for whole milk, butterfat, and their products;

to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 606. A bill to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or any other agency having the right of eminent domain; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 607. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 608. A bill to establish a national grazing reserve by providing assistance to livestock producers who carry out certain range conserving practices on privately owned grazing lands or on grazing lands under jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 609. A bill to amend the act of June 24, 1936, as amended (relating to the collection and publication of peanut statistics), to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seyre Odichou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 611. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Transportation World's Fair to be held in Chicago, Ill., in May of 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the Transportation World's Fair to be held in Chicago, Ill., in May of 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to effect a Study of Federal Airspace Reservations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS, when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, presented by the State of Louisiana, 3,000 copies, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House, and for the use and distribution by the Representatives in Congress from Louisiana; and the remaining 1,000 copies shall be for the use of and the distribution by the Senators from the State of Louisiana.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. POTTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Effective for the remainder of the 85th Congress, section (4) of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (a) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on three standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 85th Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 30 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats:

"Majority	*Minority*
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"Third-committee assignments:

"Majority	*Minority*
23	7
21	9
19	11
17	13"

SEC. 3. Effective at the beginning of the 86th Congress, section (4) rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on three standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization to confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 85th Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS AND TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $225,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 38), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 154, 84th Congress, agreed to February 20, 1956, as amended (authorizing a study of the administration of the Government employees security program), is amended by striking

out "January 31, 1957" wherever it appears in such resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 153, 84th Congress, agreed to February 20, 1956 (authorizing an investigation of the administration of the civil service system and the postal service), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1957" wherever it appears in such resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

EFFECTIVE DATE OF WITHDRAWALS OR RESERVATIONS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to recapture for the Congress the exercise of some of its constitutional responsibility for the regulation of the public lands—responsibility that has not been specifically delegated but which has been acquired by the executive branch, over a long period of years, through the silence or acquiescence of the legislative branch. At the same time this bill would correct a situation that has been causing an unfortunate amount of public resentment against the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. President, the natural resources of our public lands are vital to the welfare and security of the Nation. The multiple use of those resources through mining, mineral leasing, grazing, forestry, wildlife management and public recreation, is especially important to the economy of the Western States. In the conservation and administration of these lands and resources, we simply cannot afford the luxury of a lack of adequate controls.

One major section of this bill spells out business-like procedures for the preparation and consideration of applications for military withdrawals. It would encourage and authorize the continued multiple use of the withdrawn lands by the public where and when feasible and consistent with the military purposes.

The 5,000-acre limitation would permit sufficient area for the rapid installation of needed facilities in any emergency without the delay of legislative action. The provisions of the bill would not apply in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or by Congress.

I want to elaborate briefly, Mr. President, on another important objective of this bill. It will solve a problem that has long plagued the State agencies whose constitutional and legal duty it is to manage and regulate the fish and game resources on both private and public lands. It will remove a source of irritation to the sportsmen of the Nation who believe with good reason that conservation laws should apply equally to all citizens, including those who wear the revered uniforms of the armed services.

Although this has by no means been universally true, there have been numerous and repeated instances of abuse and disregard of State conservation laws by highly placed military personnel hunting on military areas. The result has been a tremendous volume of bad publicity for the armed services, which deserve and need the respect of all the people. If this proposed legislation accomplishes nothing else, it will represent a great service to the military departments by solving one of their most troublesome public-relations problems.

Briefly, this bill, if evaluated, will solve the hunting and fishing headache by requiring, first, that all hunting, trapping, and fishing on military lands be in accordance with State or Territorial laws; and second, that if they are going to hunt, trap, or fish on military areas, members of the Armed Forces must secure proper State licenses. Provision is made for recognition of resident status if a member of the Armed Forces is on bona fide duty for at least 30 days at the military area where he does the hunting or fishing. As another important conservation step the bill requires cooperation with State officials in the management and harvesting of fish and game resources, including procedures which will grant access to such State officials subject to safety and security considerations.

This bill, Mr. President, grew out of prolonged hearings and searching studies conducted last year by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was disclosed that for many years the Army, Navy, and the Air Force have been securing the withdrawal or reservation of excessive areas of the public domain without having to justify the need to any authority, and indeed without any attempt to coordinate, or jointly use, their separate acquisitions. It was shown that the machinery for such coordination, and for the joint use or multiple use of an area where feasible, was lacking.

A similar bill, H. R. 12185, was passed by the House by unanimous consent 2 days before the adjournment of the 84th Congress. This of course was too late for adequate consideration by this body. I shall request a thorough study of the proposal by the appropriate committee of the Senate at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 557) to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FOUR-STATE INDIAN WELFARE BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a more equitable apportionment between the Federal Government and the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians. This proposal would also provide that the United States pay the actual cost of certain welfare services contracted for Indians in these States.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the North Central States Indian Policy Declaration be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that the bill itself be held at the desk until the close of business on Thursday next so that my fellow colleagues from these four States may join me in its introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota, and the declaration will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 574) to provide, first, that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and second, for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The declaration, presented by Mr. THYE, is as follows:

NORTH CENTRAL STATES INDIAN POLICY DECLARATION

1. The scope of this proposed joint action and program is not to solve all Indian problems, but to crystallize intergovernmental relationships between the Federal Government on one hand and the States and political subdivisions on the other, an essential first and necessary step to solving Indian problems.

2. Basic premise is that Indian welfare is a Federal responsibility. Indians are located where they are as a result of Federal Government action and for this reason some States do not have an Indian problem. It is, therefore, unfair that certain States should be forced to assume large financial outlays for proper and necessary Indian services.

3. The Federal Government is not meeting its total responsibility in providing services for Indian people.

4. The States and political subdivisions in many instances have established facilities that can be made available on a nonprofit cost basis to the Federal Government to assist it in adequately and economically meeting its legal and moral responsibilities.

5. The Federal Government has failed to provide necessary services; therefore, the States and political subdivisions have, on the basis of humanitarianism, been forced to provide certain vital services to sustain minimum levels of health, education, and welfare for Indian people.

6. The policy of special privilege, crisis, and expediency as a necessary basis of negotiation in forcing the Federal Government to provide for the needs of Indian people is not

conducive to the solution of Indian problems or to orderly intergovernmental State-Federal relationships.

7. There is no uniform, logical, or understandable Federal plan or pattern among the various States and even within States for providing such services to Indians, or for reimbursing States or political subdivisions for services provided by States or subdivisions.

8. There should be uniformity among the various States in the provision of services by the Federal Government, or in the full reimbursement to the States or political subdivisions for providing such services.

9. To correct existing discrimination between and within States and present deficencies, it is manifestly necessary that the States take concerted action before the Congress and in securing uniform and equal administrative consideration from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

10. Unless the existing deficiencies and practices are corrected the present discrimination against the Indian people and certain States will continue and our Indian citizens will be prevented from achieving their rightful place in our society.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION LABORATORIES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for additional research facilities in water and soil conservation.

We all know, Mr. President, that our Nation's soil represents the most valuable natural resource with which we have been blessed, and that not only the future welfare and strength of this country, but also the well-being of many thousands of the world's population in overpopulated regions depend on our recognizing the responsibility which we have toward protecting and further developing our soil resources.

Consider for a moment the great advances which have been made in the field of agriculture in the past few decades. We accept now as being commonplace the increased resistance of plants to insects and diseases, the improved quality of farm products and feed efficiency for all classes of livestock, and the greater adaptability of more crops over a wider range of conditions. All these progress signposts have been established through research.

Mr. President, I realize that the Senate is in the morning hour, and that would foreclose my speaking more than 2 minutes, but I have an explanation in connection with the bill that would take more time than that. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed. It will take me only about 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Much has been done already toward improving methods for the protection of our soil and water resources by such means as strip cropping, terracing, and proper crop rotation practices, but much more is yet to be done. The Soil and Water Conservation Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service conducts research in the field of soil chemistry, water, hydrology, fertilizers, and the effect on soils of various irrigation and dry-farming practices. Soil-management studies are carried out on major soils in the humid regions, and in the dryland areas with regard to broad problems of leeching, soil breakdown, and tendencies toward saline and alkaline development.

The headquarters for soil- and water-conservation research are located at Beltsville, Md. I want to emphasize, however, that research in soils and water should be conducted in areas with similar soils and soil problems. For that reason, and to facilitate the work of Research Service, I am proposing that funds be made available for the construction and operation of four research laboratories, each to be located in a major soil region of the Nation.

Soil-moisture management is one of the most important problems with which we are confronted. This involves getting better moisture conservation on the rolling upland soils, and also removing excess moisture from cultivated flatlands during periods of high rainfall. Much information is needed concerning water-intake rates and water-storage capacities of our major soils and the effectiveness of various conservation practices such as mulch tillage, contouring, stripcropping, crop rotation, and so forth. We need to know more about the water needs of the different crops and the moisture-extraction patterns of crops.

The long-term benefits which can be gained from soil and water research prove that we can make a small investment which will bring amazing gains in years to come. Consider, for instance, the savings to our farmers which can result from research in cultivation methods. If we conservatively estimate savings of $1 per acre for each secondary tillage operation that is eliminated on the row and grain crops, this would amount to an annual savings of about $60 million to farmers in one region alone. Even greater benefits would result if we could save or otherwise use even 25 percent of the rainfall now lost through runoff or evaporation.

Mr. President, it is my hope that prompt and favorable action will be taken to implement these much-needed advances in soil- and water-conservation research. If we are to maintain our position as the breadbasket of the world, in the face of not only our own increasing population, but also the rapidly expanding population of the world, we must exert our greatest efforts to carry out the fundamental research work necessary for the protection of our life-giving soil resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 575) to provide for the establishment of four soil- and water-conservation laboratories, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES RELATING TO THE PLACING OF MINOR CHILDREN FOR ADOPTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or adoption.

The instant bill is the result of a 2-year investigation conducted by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman. It was estimated that $15 million changes hands each year in the interstate baby-selling business. At this very moment, children are being transported from State to State, to be sold for adoption for prices varying from $500 to $10,000.

The tremendous upsurge of interest and desire to receive children for adoption is a healthy and happy development. There are many more couples anxious to adopt than there are children available. This disparity between supply and demand has opened the door to exploitation by unscrupulous and sometimes misguided persons who make a profitable business out of placing children for adoption. The black-market operator deviously conceals from the authorities the substantial amounts of money involved. He induces the adoptive parents to misrepresent the circumstances under which they received the child. He claims to be motivated by devotion to a humanitarian cause. For these reasons, until the subcommittee's recent investigation, the scope and magnitude of the operations have been hidden from the public. These remarks naturally do not apply to the outstanding work being done by licensed social agencies throughout the United States engaged in placing children for adoption or to the many well-meaning but sometimes unwise individuals who have assisted in arranging private placements.

A recent development has been the disclosure through hearings of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of an invasion of the interstate baby-selling business by elements of the organized underworld. In one situation William Manella, a known muscle man closely associated with and working for the Chicago crime syndicate, was found to be actively soliciting unmarried mothers from all parts of the country to come to Chicago to give birth. After delivery, Manella arranged for the children to be turned over to a small group of unscrupulous attorneys, who sold them in New York, Los Angeles, and other cities of the United States for $3,000. The tentacles of this group reach all over the Nation. Manella and his associates had the criminal brazenness to descend on a reputable Lakeland, Fla., family who had just received a child for adoption locally, in a completely legitimate manner. By the use of strong-arm methods and threats, Manella was able to gain possession of the child for the use

of the baby-selling group with which he was identified. This underworld ring made a practice of approaching truck-drivers in Chicago and other parts of the Midwest and offering them $600 for arranging contact with any mother whose child they could secure.

Although the facts have been thoroughly developed in this situation, the amounts of money paid for the children fully established, and many details of this group's operation completely disclosed, the Federal Government is powerless to act because there is no Federal law making interstate baby-selling a crime. In fact, 33 States have no criminal prohibition against the sale for adoption of children. Even the State of Illinois, which in the past year has enacted a law against baby-selling, and has made a strong effort to rectify a critical illicit adoption situation, is helpless to act when a child sold in Illinois is taken out of the State, if the adoptive couple are not willing to return voluntarily as witnesses. Illinois does not have a statute that provides for the bringing of out-of-State witnesses into Illinois. The children of this country are entitled to at least the same measure of protection that we give to a second-hand car.

At the subcommittee's hearings testimony was given with respect to an Oklahoma woman with a criminal record of 27 arrests and 7 felony convictions who was operating a large-scale interstate baby-selling business. Her operations were stopped after two automatic pistols were discovered in her north Texas home. The only penalty imposed upon her was a $50 fine for operating an unlicensed maternity home.

In another situation a New York attorney was found to have accumulated over $200,000 from operating an assembly-line type of baby-selling business from Maine to Florida. This operation was professionally organized, and involved the use of couriers to carry the children, newspaper advertisement to solicit the mothers, and even an operational headquarters.

It is vital to the welfare of the 90,000 children who are placed for adoption each year that they have the benefit of the fullest protection that our laws can give them. It is for this reason that this measure to combat the interstate baby-selling racket is being introduced.

Some of the most tragic situations in the adoption field result from irresponsible and careless placements made by persons who obtained no gain or profit. Despite the absence of greed or avarice, the impact on the child, the mother, and the prospective adoptive couple when the placement blows up and the baby must be returned, is the same regardless of whether profit is involved.

A flagrant example of this type of reckless interstate child-placement practice exists in the District of Columbia, where a local physician for many years has been conducting a large-scale interstate baby-brokerage operation. Children have been placed by this physician in many parts of the East and Midwest, from the District of Columbia without adequate protection, and without disregard for the child-welfare laws of the various States. Despite the vigilance of the local authorities, this physician has been able to avoid conforming to the District of Columbia child-placement laws. Although there is no clear evidence of his obtaining a profit, his careless practices create a great hazard to the children involved.

To meet this type of case, the bill provides that in all cases where children are placed for adoption across State lines, a study or investigation must be made prior to the placement and transfer of the child to the second State. At present, these studies, except where the placement is made by an agency, are conducted from 3 months to 1 year after the baby has been living in its new adoptive home. This is far too late to remedy an unwise or undesirable placement.

The subcommittee learned of a case in which a notorious swindler and confidence man secured a child in the East and then moved to Los Angeles, where he was able to obtain an adoption decree. The court felt that although the adoptive father had a major criminal record, the child had been in his home too long to be removed without creating great emotional distress. The proposed legislation would prevent this type of case, by advancing the time of the investigation to before the physical transfer of the infant across State lines.

The study or investigation would be made by the department of public welfare of the State in which the child would reside. This department would determine, after study, whether the proposed placement would be in the best interests of the child. If the answer was in the affirmative, the department would approve the baby's admission into the State for adoption.

Already over 70 percent of the States have in operation laws regulating and controlling in some manner the impact and admission into their States of children for adoption and care. The proposed legislation does not remove from the States the basic responsibility for dealing with adoption matters. It is, rather, directed at interstate situations which are beyond the reach and control of the States.

The same bill with several minor changes was passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress. The bill was received by the House on the last day of the session, too late for consideration. The changes incorporated in the bill are designed to protect both doctors and lawyers who are not in any way engaged in any illicit adoption practices from any adverse impact of the bill. It is an attorney's proper function to assist an adoptive parent to secure an adoption decree. It is a proper function of a doctor to care for an unmarried mother durthe prenatal period and to deliver her child. In both cases the doctor and the attorney are entitled to receive a professional fee for their services. The bill as now introduced plainly states this fact.

This measure is necessary for the protection of the more than 160,000 children who each year are born out of wedlock, and represent a human reservoir for the baby seller to prey on. To safeguard these children as well as others, it is mandatory that the tragic and sordid intrastate traffic in children be eliminated by means of forceful legislation.

Mr. President, I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 588) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. THYE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREVENTION OF CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ABOARD CERTAIN AIRCRAFT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the 84th Congress I introduced a bill, S. 3039, to prevent the consumption of alcohol on commercial and military airplanes. This bill was not enacted, but the problem at which it was directed still remains, and I am, therefore, reintroducing it at this time in the hope that it will be considered during the present session of Congress.

The purpose of this bill is simple and obvious. It is to assure the safety of air traffic against the risk that any occupant of an airplane, whether a crew member or a passenger, may endanger the lives and property of others by the effects of intoxication.

In view of the finality of even the slightest accident in the air and the vast damage which is caused not only to airplanes and their occupants but also to persons and property on the ground in case of a crash, it is self-evident that no safety measure should be omitted to make sure that the occupants of airplanes, as well as the equipment itself, be in the safest possible condition for air travel. What is true of the effects of alcohol on our highways is certainly even more true of traffic in the air, with its much higher speed and demands of judgment and undivided attention on the part of operating personnel. This rule must apply to commercial, private, and military airplanes alike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I am introducing be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 593) to prevent the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft used in air commerce and military aircraft, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 601 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the word "and" following the semicolon at the end of clause (6), by striking out the period at the end of clause

(7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by inserting after clause (7) the following new clause:

"(8) such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary to prevent the consumption at any time of alcoholic beverages aboard any aircraft used in air commerce."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense shall establish such regulations as may be necessary to prevent the consumption at any time of alcoholic beverages aboard military aircraft.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF SECURITY OWNERSHIP

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill similar to one which I introduced at the last session of Congress. The bill amends the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 by requiring an increase in the public disclosure of securities ownership. In my opinion, legislation of this type is very urgently needed, because as we all read in the newspapers from time to time there are many persons who are trying to control, through a small minority ownership, some of America's fine old corporations. It is a bill to which I believe the Senate should give careful consideration and which should be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 594) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to increase public disclosure of security ownership, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN HONOR OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I am certain will meet with the unanimous support of every Senator. The bill provides that the Postmaster General shall issue a special postage stamp to honor the late Senator Robert A. Taft. I feel certain that the bill will meet with the unanimous approval of every Member of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 595) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AWARD OF MEDALS AS AN INCENTIVE FOR SAFE DRIVING

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill known as the safe-driving incentive bill. The bill provides for the awarding of medals to those who help to save lives on the highways of the Nation. As we all know, more persons lose their lives in motor vehicle accidents than lose their lives in wars.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] wishes to join with me in the introduction of the bill providing for medals as an incentive for safe driving on the highways.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 598) to provide medals of honor for persons who perform heroic acts in preventing serious accidents on the highways, or in saving lives endangered as a result of any such accidents, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL COMMISSION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Monetary and Financial Commission.

The bill is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President in his state of the Union message for a national inquiry into the nature, performance, and adequacy of our financial system. I believe that everyone agrees that such a study is needed, and I hope that prompt action will be taken on this proposed legislation.

It is my understanding that this project is regarded by the President as an important one that can be productive of great good in evaluating how fully and well the various elements of our financial system are meeting the needs of a stable and growing economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business on January 15, 1957, so that Senators who are interested may add their names as additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 599) to establish National Monetary and Financial Commission, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

SECTION 1. During the past half century major changes have occurred in the financial system of the United States. Long established institutions have added new functions, while new lending institutions, private and public, have grown rapidly in size and significance. During the same period increasing reliance has been placed upon monetary, credit and fiscal measures to foster expansion in production, employment and income and to combat inflationary or deflationary pressures. The Congress, therefore, declares that a comprehensive and objective review is necessary to appraise the nature, performance and adequacy of existing financial institutions and monetary and other financial measures in meeting present and future needs of our growing economy.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established on a nonpartisan basis a Commission to be known as the National Monetary and Financial Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission. The Commission shall be composed of nine citizens, each of whom shall be qualified for the duties to be performed and shall be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) The President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission from among the members thereof.

(c) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(d) Any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission, or as the Director provided for in section 5 (e) hereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18, United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

SEC. 3. The Commission shall make such studies and investigations as it may deem necessary to appraise the nature, performance, and adequacy of existing financial institutions and monetary and other financial measures in meeting the needs of our changing economy. These shall include, but need not be limited to, the following:

(a) A survey of major developments in recent decades in the financial structure of the United States.

(b) An appraisal of the relative powers, advantages, privileges and limitations of the various classes of financial institutions.

(c) A survey and appraisal of the role played by Government and quasi-Government lending agencies and agencies guaranteeing and insuring private loans.

(d) An evaluation of the growth in public and private debt, including consideration of the several major components of the debt, and the impact of the management of the Federal debt.

(e) A comparative review and appraisal of the Federal and State laws and practices governing the chartering, examination, supervision and regulation of financial institutions, and the insurance of deposits in, or shares of, any such institutions, including study of:

(1) The uniformity and adequacy of the standards applied in chartering such institutions;

(2) The adequacy of examination and supervisory laws and practices to assure the continuing soundness of the institutions examined and supervised and the adequacy and distribution of the responsibilities and powers now vested in the various supervisory agencies;

(3) The consistency of the policies followed in chartering new institutions, authorizing branches and controlling mergers and other combinations with the maintenance of effective competition and the avoidance of monopolistic restraints; and

(4) The effectiveness and scope of Federal insurance of bank deposits and of share accounts in savings and loan associations, the adequacy of the reserves of the insured institutions and the insuring agencies, and the impact of such insurance on the competitive relationships among financial institutions.

(f) An evaluation of the existing means for adapting the volume of money and credit to the needs of the economy, including review of:

(1) The effectiveness of monetary and credit policy as a means of stabilizing the

economy, the impact of changes in policy on differents parts of the economy;

(2) The adequacy of existing instruments of credit control including their coverage over types of institutions and transactions;

(3) The organizational structure and powers of the Federal Reserve System, and its relationship to other agencies of the Federal Government; and

(4) The coordination of credit controls and other Government measures designed to promote economic growth and stability.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194, inclusive) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any executive department, agency, corporation or independent establishment of the Government of any information deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency, corporation, and establishment is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriate such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, and may be allowed travel expenses in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), as the said provisions relate to persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(c) The Chairman of the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as he deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) The Chairman of the Commission may procure, without regard to civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

(e) Without regard to the civil service and classifications laws, the Chairman of the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director at a rate not exceeding $20,000 per annum, who shall perform such duties as the Chairman shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission, not later than December 1, 1958, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including findings and recommendations, and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the Commission shall cease to exist.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN AMERICAN WAR-DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, I reported from the Judiciary Committee an original bill, S. 4205, which provided for full payment of American war-damage claims and the return of German, Japanese, and neutral privately owned assets which had been vested by our Government during and after World War II. No properties were to be returned to the countries behind the Iron Curtain until the United States was assured that the owner of those properties would receive the benefit from them. That bill proposed certain amendments to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

After the adjournment of the 84th Congress and a further study of the problems involved, I have made certain modifications of the provisions of S. 4205, although none of its principles have been altered. I now introduce this revised bill, with the request that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill provides for the payment of substantial American war damages, not otherwise provided for by law or international agreement, and the return, as did S. 4205, of vested assets formerly belonging to private individual neutral, Japanese, and German citizens. The administration of its provisions will not require additional direct appropriations. I believe that the bill I am introducing is timely, essential, and is in furtherance of our own interests as a Nation. It is comparable in some respects to S. 3423, a bill pending before the Senate in the 83d Congress. It projects the proposals heretofore submitted by the administration in S. 2227, of the 84th Congress, so as to do complete justice to both American and foreign claimants.

I ask unanimous consent that a detailed memorandum or summary in explanation of this bill be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 600) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and to provide for the payment of certain American war damage claims, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT AND ANALYSIS

PRELIMINARY

Despite all assertions, arguments, and innuendoes to the contrary, the administration of the provisions of this bill will not require additional direct appropriations. Nor will its enactment infringe upon the moral or legal obligations already expressed in existing legislation in reference to the payment of war damage claims. On the contrary, its provisions will restore the United States to its former position of moral leadership in the world in our opposition to nationalization, or confiscation, the dual evils which retard our American foreign-trade policies and render our vast American investments abroad insecure and unstable.

The United States has too large a stake in the peace of the world to expose itself to the charge of even partial confiscation.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

S. 4205, in three parts, contains a series of amendments to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. These amendments would authorize (1) the settlement by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of three types of World War II claims against the Governments of Japan and Germany, (2) the return, with certain limitations, of German and Japanese assets vested by the United States, and (3) a transfer from the Office of Alien Property, in the Department of Justice, to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, of jurisdiction over such returns and the settlement of all debt claims filed against any vested properties.

All vested properties (going or operated concerns) not liquidated would continue to be administered by the Office of Alien Property. Liquidated assets will be transferred to the Treasury.

The War Claims Act amendments would provide for the following types of claims against Germany and Japan:

1. Physical damage or physical loss or destruction of American-owned property located within the prewar boundaries of Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Poland, or Yugoslavia in the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending August 14, 1945, or in Japanese-occupied territory in the period beginning July 1, 1937, and ending September 2, 1945. Such damage or loss must have occurred as a result of direct military action or of special measures directed against such property because of the enemy or alleged enemy character of the owner of such property.

2. Damage to, or the loss or destruction of, ships or ship cargoes, directly or indirectly owned by the claimant, lost or destroyed as a direct consequence of military action by Germany or Japan in the same two periods respectively.

3. Loss or damage on account of the death or injury of any American civilian passenger on any vessel engaged in commerce on the high seas which was damaged or destroyed by direct military action of Germany or Japan in the same two periods respectively.

The bill would further provide, in section 212, for payment of these claims under a system of priorities, from amounts received by the United States from the Federal Republic of Germany in repayment of amounts advanced to that country for postwar economic assistance as required by article I of the agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany dated February 27, 1953. Similar repayments by Japan or any other countries can also be devoted under provisions of the bill to the payment of the claims authorized, if and when similar agreements between the United States and other countries are entered into. First priority is given to death and disability claims. Property claims and returns will be paid in full, up to $10,000 with unpaid balances of the awards prorated from remaining available assets in the fund if such assets are insufficient to complete the payments in full. It is believed such remaining assets will be adqeuate to permit eventual payment of remaining balances in full. It has been estimated that upwards of 25,000 American claimants will benefit from enactment of this legislation to the extent of roughly $300 million expected to be paid out under these three categories of claims.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: This section provides merely that, upon enactment, the bill may be cited by its short title as the "World War II Damage Claims Settlement Act."

Section 2: This section contains a declaration of the policies underlying the bill. It points out the desirability of a coordinated claims payment program, as well as a vested property return program, without direct Congressional appropriations which will, at the same time, provide for a speedy and less costly termination of the custody, administration and management of privately owned former enemy or neutral vested properties. It is then the declared policy of the United States to provide for such a dual program.

Section 3: This section designates the present provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, as title I of such act.

Section 4: This is a technical amendment to the act substituting the word "title" for the word "act" wherever the latter word appears in title I.

Section 5: This section would further amend the act by adding new title II containing new sections 201 through 221 as follows:

Section 201: This section defines the terms "Albania", "Austria", "Czechoslovakia", "Germany", "Greece", "Poland", and "Yugoslavia", when used in their geographical sense, to mean the prewar boundaries of these countries in continental Europe as they existed on December 1, 1937.

The term "Commission" is defined to mean the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The term "national of the United States" is defined so as to include only citizens of the United States; or individuals owing permanent allegiance to the United States; or to include a woman who, though having lost her American citizenship by marriage, reacquired it before the date of enactment of this title. Eligible claimants are required to be nationals of the United States on the date of the loss for which a claim is filed and continuously thereafter until the date of filing of such claim. In the case of a person who may have lost citizenship through marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country, such person would be an eligible claimant if citizenship is reacquired prior to the date of enactment of this bill, and if such person would have been a national of the United States at all times on or after the date of such loss provided such marriage had not taken place. Aliens are expressly excluded.

Section 202: This section contains the basic authorization for the receipt and settlement by the Commission of the three categories of claims, previously described in the summary of the bill, and filed by a "national of the United States" as defined in section 201. The essential requirements of a valid claim under this section are:

1. Property loss, other than Maritime: (a) The property must have been located within the geographic boundaries of the countries named in section 201 in the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending August 14, 1945, or in Japanese occupied territory, exclusive of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, in the period beginning July 1, 1937, and ending September 2, 1945. Property in the Philippines is excluded because its loss or damage has been largely compensated for under other acts. (b) The property must have been owned by a national of the United States at the time of loss, and (c) the property must have been lost or destroyed as a consequence of military operations of war or special measures directed against it as enemy-owned. Assignees are recognized as eligible claimants if they can satisfy other requirements of eligibility. Certain items of personal property are expressly made ineligible as the basis of a claim under section 205.

2. Ship and Cargo Loss Claims: (a) The same general rules apply as outlined above with respect to property loss, other than maritime, and, in addition, (b) no award may be made in favor of any hull or cargo insurer or reinsurer as successor in interest to the rights of the insured.

3. Death, Disability and Property Losses at Sea: (a) The death, disability or property loss must have been suffered by a civilian American passenger on any vessel engaged in commerce on the high seas, and (b) as a consequence of enemy military action by Germany or Japan during the period July 1, 1937 and December 11, 1941. Awards on account of the death of any such passenger killed at sea or to any such passenger disabled or injured, cannot exceed $10,000 and become payable, in such event to the person disabled or to the surviving spouse, children or parents, if any, in that order, where the claim is based either upon the death of such passenger or upon the death of one disabled.

Section 203: This section would prohibit double benefits by requiring awards to be reduced by the amount any claimant has received, or is entitled to receive, from any other source as compensation for the same loss, damage, death, or disability.

Section 204: This section specifically excludes certain items of personal property, including intangible property, from the types of property the loss, damage, destruction of which forms the subject matter of any claim authorized under section 202. In general only the loss or damage of identifiable, tangible items of personal property is compensable under the bill. Typical of the items excluded are accounts receivable, currency, records, files, furs, jewelry, and books. If, however, excluded items were held as inventories, supplies or equipment for carrying on a trade or business their loss may become compensable.

Section 205: This section prohibits allowance of any claim unless the claimant and all predecessors in interest were nationals of the United States continuously from the date of loss to the date of filing the claim except in the case of certain married American women. Similarly, it restricts allowances to corporations, partnerships, or other entities in which more than 50 percent of the capital stock, or other proprietary interest, was owned directly or indirectly, at all such times, by nationals of the United States, and further, that it was organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof or the District of Columbia.

Section 206: This section relates to claims, principally by stockholders, based upon their indirect ownership of property or assets of a corporation or other entity which was lost, damaged or destroyed by military action. To qualify as such a claimant it must be shown (1) that the American ownership in such corporation or entity was insufficient (less than 50 percent) to qualify such corporation or entity as an eligible claimant in its own right, and (2) that at least 25 percent of the ownership or proprietary interest in such corporation or entity was vested in nationals of the United States at the time the loss arose and continuously to the date of the presentation of the claim.

The amount of any award on a section 206 claim would be limited to an amount which would not exceed that proportion of the total loss which the proprietary interest of the claimant bears to the total of the capital stock or other proprietary interest in such corporation or entity. In other words, an American stockholder owning 10 percent of the capital stock of a corporation in which 25 to 50 percent of such stock was owned by other Americans could not recover more than 10 percent of the total loss.

It is further provided, in this section, that any nationalization or seizure of corporation or entity subsequent to the loss shall not be deemed to have affected the claimant's ownership of such capital stock or other proprietary interest.

Section 207: This section requires the Commission to give public notice in the Federal Register, within 60 days after enactment of the proposed bill, of the time limit for filing claims, and permits a maximum of 2 years after such publication within which claims may be filed.

Section 208: This section restricts recoveries under any claim which accrued to a national of the United States and purchased by a national of the United States to the amount of the actual consideration last paid for such claim. In other words, this section is designed to prevent unconscionable gains as a result of purchases motivated by this legislation.

Section 209: This section requires the certification of claims by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment.

Section 210: This section requires all awards to be paid from the German and Japanese Claims Fund and permanently appropriates the money in such fund for the making of payments on all certified awards.

Section 211: Subsection (a) of this section established the following order of priority for the payment, by the Secretary of the Treasury, of awards certified by the Commission:

(1) Death and disability claims would be paid in the full amount of each award certified but not to exceed $10,000 on account of the death or disability of any one person.

(2) Payments of up to $1,000 would then be made on awards certified for all other (property) claims. Thus if the award is for $1,000 or less the full amount certified would be paid.

(3) Thereafter, payments would be made from time to time on the unpaid principal of awards in equal amounts on each award or in the total amount of the remaining unpaid principal amount whichever is less up to $10,000.

(4) Within the limits of any remaining funds available for payment of awards, and after satisfying the requirements of priorities (1), (2), and (3) in that order, any remaining unpaid principal of an award would be paid on a prorated basis or in full if sufficient funds were available to pay any remaining balances in full. If the funds remaining available for payment of awards, for example, amounted to 10 percent of the aggregate of such unpaid awards, each such unpaid award could be paid to the extent of 10 percent of the unpaid balance of such award.

Subsection (b) requires payments on certified awards to be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Subsection (c) provides that the term "award" shall mean the aggregate of all awards certified in favor of the same claimant except awards made with respect to death or disability claims where the basis of the claim would not consist of a series of losses by the same claimant.

Subsection (d) authorizes the issuance of a consolidated award in favor of several claimants having an interest in the subject matter of the claim and provides that such awards shall indicate the respective interests of such claimants therein. For example, where the original owner of destroyed property, who would have been an eligible claimant, dies either before or after filing a claim, the heirs of such deceased original owner would be entitled to a consolidated award based upon such loss to the extent of their respective fractional interests therein.

Section 212: This section provides that the payment of any award unless in the full amount of the claim shall not divest the claimant, or the United States in his behalf, of the right to assert a claim against any foreign government for the unpaid balance of his claim filed with the Commission.

This means simply, that any remaining unpaid balance of an award would continue to be a valid claim against the Government in question to the extent of such unpaid balance.

Section 213: This section provides that the decisions of the Commission in the settlement of claims shall be final and conclusive without recourse to review in any court. It contains, further, the usual provision authorizing the Comptroller General to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with the decisions of the Commission.

It is most essential, in claims legislation of this nature, where a time limit is placed on the completion of the program, to bar litigation based upon mere dissatisfaction over an award. This is particularly true where, as in the case of the claims that would be authorized by this legislation, no vested right to an award in any particular amount is involved. The rights of any claimant under this legislation would be purely statutory in nature—a right which the Congress may modify or remove entirely at will. If in the administration of the program any constitutional rights are violated, redress could be found in the courts. Ample provision is made in the bill for hearings and appeals for claimants but to permit recourse to the courts or to other Government agencies for the correction of awards could well operate not only to prolong the program indefinitely but impair the assets available for payment of undisputed awards.

Section 214: This section authorizes payment of certified awards to the legal representative of a deceased person or of persons under legal disability except where such payments will not exceed $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, and except in those cases involving the death of a person entitled to an award for disability compensation under section 203 (c), (death and disability claims). Where the amount involved is less than $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, the Commission would be authorized to determine who is entitled to such payment. In other words, where the payment does not exceed $1,000, the expense of obtaining the appointment of administrators or guardians or of probating a will, will not be required. This provision is obviously in the best interests of the recipients of relatively small awards who will probably constitute the majority of all claimants.

Section 215: This section prevents payments to any person found guilty of treason or other crime involving disloyalty to the United States.

Section 216: This section provides that any payment on a claim under the bill shall operate as an automatic assignment to the United States of the amount so paid.

Section 217: This section makes applicable to title II the following provisions of the original War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (title I) and of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949:

First sentence, subsection (b), section 2, War Claims Act of 1948, as amended: This sentence authorizes the Commission to prescribe "such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions," and to delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission.

First sentence, subsection (c), same section: This sentence authorizes the issuance of subpenas requiring attendance of witnesses or production of documents for the purpose of any hearing, examination, or investigation at any place designated for such hearing, examination, or investigation.

First three sentences, section 11: These sentences require, (1) notification to any claimant of the decision on his claim, (2) that any claimant not satisfied with the decision shall be entitled to a hearing, under regulations prescribed therefor, before the Commission or its representatives, and (3) authorize the Commission to affirm, modify, or revise its former action including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed.

The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), of subsection (c) of section 7, of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the payment of claims, and made applicable to proposed title II of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, provide as follows:

Paragraph (2) authorizes the Comptroller General to determine to whom an award shall be paid which is made in favor of a dissolved partnership or corporation except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), subsection (c) of section 7.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (c), provides that where a receiver or trustee of such partnership or corporation duly appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction and currently acting, payment of any award shall be made to him in accordance with an appropriate court order.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (c), provides that where any such receiver or trustee assigns the claim or any part thereof or makes an assignment of the award, payment shall be made to the assignee as his interest may appear.

Paragraph (5) of subsection (c), provides that where any other assignment of an award or any part thereof, is made in writing, duly acknowledged and filed with the Secretary of the Treasury after it is certified for payment, the Secretary may, in his discretion, make payment thereof to such assignee.

Subsection (d) of section 7, in effect, bars a recovery by any person against the United States, its officers, agents, or employees after payment of an award is made in accordance with the determination of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Comptroller General, as the case may be.

Subsection (e) of section 7, provides that any person applying for payment to him as an assignee shall be deemed to have consented to all the provisions of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

Subsection (f) of section 7 provides that the act shall not be construed as imposing any liability upon the United States for the payment or satisfaction of any claim by any national of the United States against any foreign government. This provision is designed, primarily, as a precautionary device to forestall suits against the United States by such claimants. With respect to claims authorized by title II of the War Claims Act, subsection (f) would, in effect, prevent the circumvention of such act by the claimant in settling such claims.

All of the foregoing provisions of the War Claims Act and the International Claims Settlement Act are necessary administrative measures or safeguards for the benefit of the claimants, the Commission, and the United States. They are comparable, in general, to similar provisions in other acts. Their incorporation by reference in title II makes their repetition unnecessary and removes any doubt that they apply exclusively to the particular parts of the two acts in which they are found.

TITLE II—RETURN OF VESTED ASSETS

Title II of this bill recognizes this Government's continued adherence to the principle of the sanctity and inviolability of private property, by calling for a full return of all property vested after December 7, 1941, to nationals of Germany and Japan, and corporations, organizations, or associations organized under the laws thereof. The procedures set forth are in accord with the return heretofore authorized by the Congress in the case of Italy, in that it utilizes the precedent and implementation of language for returns as contained in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Despite the fact that a complete return of all vested property or the liquidated proceeds thereof is authorized hereunder, it is to be accomplished without the use of appropriated funds which would constitute an additional burden on the American taxpayer. All such moneys needed for return in accordance with the intent of Congress are to be forthcoming under payments to be made by Germany or other countries, including those expected from Japan, under any future economic aid repayment agreements, and the use of funds now on hand.

In order to provide that the administration of returns may be executed in an effective and expeditious manner, the responsibility of the program has been vested in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Section 6 of the bill provides for a sectional amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act in order to effectuate the true intent of Congress. The said section is comprised of seven specific amendments to the law as it now exists.

Section 6 (a) provides that returns in section 32 of the act be made in conformity with the language of the amendment provided for in section 10, which amends section 39 of the act.

Section 6 (b) provides for language changes for procedural purposes.

Section 6 (c) deletes the words "Germany and Japan" and thus allows returns to the nationals thereof, as, for example, in the case of Italian returns.

Section 6 (d) amends existing provisions of the act to remove provisions inconsistent with the general return purposes of the act.

Section 6 (e), (f), and (g) likewise bring the language of the bill in line with its general purposes.

Section 7 permits extension of time in the filing of property return claims until July 30, 1959, or 2 years from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, for any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941.

Section 8 amends section 34 (a) so as to include debt claims of any person who is a citizen or subject of any nation which was associated with the United States in the prosecution of the war, provided such a nation on or before January 1, 1954, in a like case extended reciprocal rights to citizens of the United States, thus affording additional funds for claimants.

Section 9 adds subsection (j) to section 34 of the act so as to provide for facilitating the processing and settlement of debt claims.

Section 10 amends section 39 of the said act and section 12 of the War Claims Act by deleting these prohibitive sections in their entirety, and providing instead for a full return of all German and Japanese property vested after December 17, 1941. However, there are enumerated classes, both as to persons and property, which are specifically excluded from the return program, as follows:

(1) All persons and entities under Soviet domination and control. This property is to be liquidated and held in trust until the Secretary of State certifies that such a return will prove beneficial to the interests of the United States.

(2) Those natural persons convicted of war crimes, as well as any member of a promilitaristic Japanese group ordered disbanded by the supreme commander of the allied powers.

(3) Those owners, under the jurisdiction of foreign governments which persist in a policy of confiscation, and consequently would vest any returned property. However, it may be returned to such owners whenever

the Department of State certifies that it has obtained proper assurances that such property will not be confiscated or treated as enemy property by such foreign governments having jurisdiction over the owner of the property.

(4) Property which is subject to transfer to the Philippine Government under the Philippine Property Act of 1946.

(5) That property which our Government is obligated to release to foreign governments, under agreements resolving intercustodial conflicts of enemy property previously concluded by the United States with other governments in accordance with Public Law 857, 81st Congress, and property which the United States has received or may be entitled to retain or receive from a foreign government pursuant to such agreements.

(6) That property owned by the former governments of Germany and Japan; however, in accordance with recognized principles of international law, diplomatic, and consular property specifically excluded from such prohibition.

(7) Property or interest included in specific vesting orders set forth therein which generally relate to property of certain war criminals.

(8) Prevents return of royalties or other income violative of our antitrust laws and in patent-licensing contracts.

Paragraph (b) substitutes a new provision to protect the national interest in lieu of the provisions of section 32 (a) 5 of the present act. Under it, the President is authorized, when he finds it of benefit to this country's national defense and upon certification by the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce, to adjudge whether certain vested property should best be sold to American interests. In the event such a determination is made it is provided that the property shall be returned, encumbered with the stipulation that the owners divest themselves of all proprietary interest and sell their interests to United States citizens wihin a 24-month period from the date of return. In such instances, appropriate procedures are provided so that until the time such property passes into the hands of American ownership, American trustees are appointed to safeguard all secret, technical, and research data incidental to and inherent in the said property.

Paragraph (c) in keeping with the general return provisions of this act, provides that any vested property, which has not been liquidated, shall be returned in kind forthwith, after making the necessary deductions authorized by sections 32 and 36. In relation to that confiscated property already liquidated, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, after making the aforementioned deductions, shall return the cash proceeds to the former owners in the following order of priority: (1) Full payment to an owner whose claim is $10,000 or less, with simultaneous payments to all other owners up to a maximum of $10,000; and (2) thereafter, semiannual payments on a pro rata basis to former owners for the entire value of their property, the proportion of which is to be determined by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. It is recognized at the outset, that there will not be sufficient moneys to pay all claims immediately. Therefore, under this system of priority, payments will be made to the small owners which constitute most of the hardship cases. Simultaneously, however, payments up to $10,000 will be made to all other claimants, so that fair and equitable treatment will be accorded every claimant irrespective of the amount of the claim. Thereafter, pro rata payments are to be made to all remaining claimants until the full value of their property has been returned.

Paragraph (d) defines owner and protects contesting owners.

Section 11 (a) adds a new section to the act which prevents returns where the owner has assigned, released, or compromised his claim with the United States unless and until the owner makes restitution commensurate with the intent of the act.

(b) Preserves existing licenses of inventions, etc., theretofore made by the Alien Property Custodian.

(c) Protects option purchasers of stock of corporations whose properties are within the United States.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 12 creates in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Japanese and German Claims Fund and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to cover into this fund certain receipts from the Federal Republic of Germany representing repayments for economic assistance, and from Japan in the event an agreement is later reached with such country providing for such repayments. Into this fund all liquid assets now under the jurisdiction of the Office of Alien Property are to be transferred.

In addition, section 12 requires the deduction from such fund of an amount equal to 5 percent thereof as reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the Commission and the Treasury Department in the administration of the program authorized. It is further provided that such fund shall be devoted equally both to the payment of claims and the making of returns of vested properties under proposed amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and as provided in the bill.

Section 13 provides for a transfer of the functions in respect to returns, adjudication, and settlement of American claims and such of the personnel as may be necessary together with the records, etc., to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Unliquidated properties are retained by the Office of Alien Property subject to adjudication and order of the Commission.

Section 14 limits attorneys', etc., fees for those who file claims for American war damage claimants under title I and those who render services in connection with returns of vested properties under title II to 10 percent of the amount recovered except where exceptional services are rendered and in which event the same must be approved by order of court. The statutes in reference to the limitation of fees under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, have been consolidated so as to make them applicable to a violation of this act.

Section 15 provides that the payments of damage claims and returns be effected within 5 years.

Section 16 contains the usual separability clause.

Section 17 provides for an annual report to the Congress with recommendations from the Commission.

GENERAL

With the liquid assets (cash) now held by the Office of Alien Property and the payment of interests being made under the London Debt Settlement Agreement, together with the payments of principal commencing in 1958, and such other repayments from other countries authorized to be made available, the program envisaged by this act can go forward immediately and it is believed it can be accomplished within 5 years. The payment of American claims ought not to be further delayed.

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR COWPENS NATIONAL BATTLEGROUND SITE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battleground site, which is located in Spartanburg County, S. C.

This proposed legislation will allow the Federal Government to accept without any charge a small plot of ground adjacent to the Cowpens Battleground Monument. It will be used as parking facilities for persons visiting this historic area. The original act, approved March 4, 1929, provided that the Federal Government could accept not more than 1 acre. Because of the large number of visitors each year, it is felt that a parking area should be provided. However, it is necessary that this bill be approved before the additional land can be made available to the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 602) to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battleground site, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STABILIZATION OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to keep dairy support prices from being further reduced this year, and to avoid in the future downward manipulation of the formula upon which the dairy support level is based.

The bill would require the Department of Agriculture to use the 30-month period of July 1946 to December 1948 as the base period for computing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk.

Mr. President, this body adopted this provision in the last session, but in conference it was changed so as to specify a fixed dollar support level for the marketing year ending March 31, 1957. Unless we can again act before that time, there will be nothing to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from again juggling downward the dairy support levels.

This is a complex issue on which there has been considerable misunderstanding, as I declared in remarks on this floor on January 7, when I announced my intention of seeking this change once again. At that time I had printed in the body of the RECORD an article from Hoard's Dairyman, which is perhaps the best explanation I have seen of the need for this action. For the benefit of my colleagues who are interested in understanding this measure, I should like to have them refer to that article, on page 287 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 7.

As a result of annual administrative changes in the base period used by the Department of Agriculture, the dairy situation has been confronted with parity prices resting on quicksand. As a result, the Secretary now has it in his power to keep the appearance of supporting dairy products at the same percentage of parity while providing a constantly lower dollar level. And even if by administrative act he keeps the same dol-

lar level, the base period changes give the false impression of dairy farmers getting a higher percentage of parity. As a result, references to percentage of parity at which manufacturing milk is supported are entirely meaningless. They will remain meaningless, until we establish a firm base period on which the parity equivalent is computed.

While my new measure would allow the Secretary to keep the dollar support level at the same figure for this year, it writes into the law a base period to guide the Secretary in computing the price in future years, so dairy farmers will have some firm standard by which to measure it.

Any simple extension of present support levels for dairy products, either by law or administrative action, would still leave us confronted with the same problem, year after year. For that reason, action is necessary on writing the base period into law.

Without this protection, Secretary Benson could lower the dollar levels of support for manufacturing milk to $2.90 this year, and to $2.87 for the marketing year starting April 1, 1958, and still claim he was keeping support at the 75 percent of parity required by law.

By comparison, under my bill the lowest support Benson could invoke for the coming year would be $3.25, with it moving up to $3.31 on April 1, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the bill I am introducing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 605) relative to price support for whole milk, butterfat, and their products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive.": *Provided*, That for the marketing year ending March 31, 1958, the Secretary of Agriculture may support the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively.

TRANSFER OF WHEAT-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the transfer of feed-acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain.

A similar bill was introduced in the Senate at the last session and was approved in purpose by the Department of Agriculture, which, however, sent with the report on the bill some proposed modifications of it. I am now introducing the bill as recommended to be modified by the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a copy of the brief report by the Department of Agriculture favoring the principle of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 606) to permit the transfer of wheat-acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or any other agency having the right of eminent domain, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 334 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the allotments established, or which would have been established, for any farm (1) acquired in 1950 or thereafter by the United States for national-defense purposes, or (2) removed from agricultural production in 1956 or thereafter because of acquisition by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain shall be placed in an allotment pool and shall be used only to establish equitable allotments for other farms owned or acquired by the owner of the farm so acquired by any such agency: *Provided*, That no allotment be established for any farm from such pool unless application therefor is filed within 3 years after acquisition of such farm by such agency or within 3 years after the enactment of this act, whichever period is longer."

The report, presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., June 13, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of February 2, 1956, for a report on S. 3099, a bill "to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by the United States Government for Federal dam construction purposes."

The Department recommends enactment of the bill with the amendment discussed below.

The bill would increase the scope of the allotment pool provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so that the wheat acreage allotments for farms acquired in 1956 or thereafter by the United States for Federal dam construction purposes would also be placed in an allotment pool and used to establish allotments for other farms owned or acquired by the owners being displaced. The present law provides for use of the allotment pool only in cases of acquisition in 1950 or thereafter by the Federal Government for national defense purposes.

We believe the scope of the bill should be expanded so as to include all lands acquired by agencies having the right of eminent domain. Enclosed for your consideration is a revised draft of the bill including such an amendment.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

RETIREMENT, CLERICAL ASSISTANTS, AND FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES TO FORMER PRESIDENTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for compensation for ex-Presidents of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each former President of the United States shall be entitled, as long as he shall live, to receive a monetary allowance at the rate of $25,000 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, provide for each former President a staff consisting of an administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants. Persons employed under this subsection shall be selected by the former President and shall be responsible only to him for the performance of their duties. Each former President shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for him under this paragraph which in the aggregate shall not exceed the aggregate amount provided by law for the basic compensation of the administrative assistant, secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants authorized for a Senator from the least populous State of the Union; and the persons so employed shall also receive additional compensation at the rates provided by law for employees in the offices of Senators.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall furnish for each former President suitable office space appropriately furnished and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, located in a Federal building at such place within the United States as the former President shall specify.

(d) Each former President shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its Territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him under his written autograph signature. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year out of the general funds of the Treasury in an amount equivalent to the postage which would otherwise be payable on such mail matter.

(e) The widow of any former President of the United States shall be entitled to receive a pension at the rate of $10,000 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury, if such widow shall waive the right to any annuity or pension under any other act of Congress.

(f) As used in this section, the term "former President" means an individual who shall have held the office of President of the United States, and whose service in such office shall have been terminated other than by removal pursuant to section 4, article II, of the Constitution.

ELIMINATION OF HAZARDS WITHIN CITY OF KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., CAUSED BY A CANAL UNDER FEDERAL JURISDICTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution aimed at correcting a hazardous condition resulting from operation of a swift and treacherous irrigation canal in the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg. The resolution authorizes appropriation of $5,000 for the Secretary of the Interior to study the best means of eliminating this menace within the city limits.

During recent months, I have visited the city of Klamath Falls on several occasions. On each visit, I have heard the repeated complaints and warnings of residents about the threat to life which is posed by the deep waters of the canal winding through thickly populated residential areas. Parents are particularly conscious of this problem because the open canal passes through areas which are adjacent to backyards and school playgrounds. During the past 31 years, a total of 25 lives have been lost in the canal.

The canal is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, and because of conflicting views on methods for eliminating the canal hazard, the resolution authorizes a study of the best and most feasible plan. The small expenditure approved for this study is a pittance compared to the stakes involved in human terms. Reduction of the toll taken by the open canal would be ample reimbursement for the small sum to be spent.

There are some 5 miles of open irrigation ditches in the city of Klamath Falls. Little wonder that the citizens of Klamath Falls—particularly parents—have been outraged by existence of this open deathtrap within the city limits. As a result of population growth, the menace grows greater with the passage of time. At the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the Senate approved a resolution identical to the one which I introduce today.

Because there has been no lessening in the need for corrective measures to eliminate the canal hazard in the city of Klamath Falls, I am again seeking approval of the necessary study. I am hopeful that the Congress may act speedily to set in motion the planning of methods for eliminating this grave problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STUDY OF FEDERAL AIR SPACE RESTRICTIONS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a joint Senate resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study of Federal air space restrictions. My resolution also directs that the Secretary study the effect of future air space restrictions upon economic growth and aviation development in the respective States, and upon State rights.

This resolution is prompted by two recent developments:

First. Approval by the Los Angeles Regional Air Space Subcommittee of a request by the Navy Department for additional restrictions in the already-congested air space above the Great Salt Lake in my home State. A review of this decision and a public hearing in Salt Lake City have been requested by the Utah congressional delegation, but the subcommittee ruled favorably on this request last fall and only confirmatory action by the parent Air Coordinating Committee here in Washington is needed to make this airspace allocation final.

Second. Introduction in the House of Representatives of bills to provide for an extensive system of tightly closed and federally dominated wilderness areas, essentially concentrated in the 17 public lands States of the West. These bills, which are under acute study by the land and resource officials of the 17 public-land States, contain a reference to airspace reservations, which will prove alarming to officials of those States and will indicate that Federal inroads upon the already limited open airspace of the western States are now destined to become commonplace.

Section 2 of the wilderness bill (H. R. 500), introduced by Congressman SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, has the following language:

> The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this section as the System) shall comprise (subject to preexisting private rights, if any) the federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section and the related airspace reservations."

The full import of this language cannot be deduced from a study of the bill itself and undoubtedly its true meaning and impact will be reviewed in hearings on the legislation. However, I felt obligated to bring up the matter at this time for the two reasons mentioned and to request this study because of the urgency of the airspace problem in my State.

The principal reason, of course, that Utah has 7,440 square miles of restricted airspace is because my State is included in the five western public-land States which have more than 2 million acres of public lands owned or controlled by the military. The other four States with the multi-million-acre military real estate holdings are: California, with 6 million acres; Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico.

However, it is also true that most of the public lands that would be embraced in the National Wilderness System and its related airspace reservations would be in the 17 public-lands States of the West. A hasty computation indicates that there are roughly 100 million acres of public lands in the Nation—essentially in the West and Alaska—that can be considered for inclusion within the proposed National Wilderness System. The major acreage blocks in the West of areas susceptible for inclusion in the proposed System, by executive and congressional edict, are:

Indian lands: 55,663,797 acres in the West (1,615,932 acres in other States).

National Parks and Monuments: 12,551,122 acres (1,404,516 acres in other States).

Wildlife refuges: 17,300,000 acres nationally (most of it in the West and Canada).

Forest Primitive Areas: 14,280,776 acres (7,610 acres in other States).

In view of these tremendous potentialities for restriction of the airspace above our States, and in view of the West's continuing fight against Federal encroachments of authority over our natural resources and our fish and wildlife, I am asking that the Congress direct such an investigative study by the Department of Commerce to provide facts to guide us in future legislative actions.

On January 7, I received the following telegram relative to the Navy Department's request for reservation of the airspace above a 15,000-acre area in Utah proposed for a Navy bombing range:

> Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> Representatives of following groups met this morning: Salt Lake City Corporation, Utah State Aeronautics Commission, State Fish and Game Commission, Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake Airport Council, Western Airlines, United Airlines, Frontier Airlines, and Utah Wildlife Federation. Following resolution adopted: We vigorously protest proposed Navy restricted area over Great Salt Lake or any other airspace encroachments which may be requested in Utah. We believe 7,440 square miles of presently restricted area sufficient if Navy and Air Force will cooperate. We respectfully request your cooperation in eliminating once and for all such unnecessary hazards and hinderances to air navigation, wildlife conservation, recreation, and full development of Hill Field and air transport economic possibilities in our area.
>
> JOE BERGIN,
> *Manager, Salt Lake Airport No. 1.*
> HARLAN W. BEMENT,
> *Director, Utah State Aeronautics Commission.*

The telegram was signed by the present and the former directors of the Utah State Aeronautics Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) to effect a study of Federal airspace reservations, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 7th instant.

The names of Senators MORSE, THYE, SCHOEPPEL, KUCHEL, NEUBERGER and KENNEDY were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr.

HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER) on January 7, 1957:

S. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the payment of the estate tax in installments;

S. 349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships;

S. 350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plan; and

S. 351. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of certain methods and rates of depreciation for used property acquired after 1956.

The names of Senators NEUBERGER, KENNEDY, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 352) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER) on January 7, 1957.

The names of Mr. CARROLL, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. KENNEDY were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced on January 7, 1957 by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULES

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1957,

The names of Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. GREEN were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 30) to amend the Senate rules, submitted on January 9, 1957, by Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. KERR, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GORE, Mr. JENNER, Mr. BUTLER, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 500) to protect the right to political participation, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE) on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 501) to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 502) to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 503) providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GREEN were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 504) to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 505) to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL, were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 506) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 507) outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE), on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added to the following bills, which were introduced on January 9, 1957, by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 508. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes;

S. 509. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; and

S. 510. A bill to secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The names of Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. MAGNUSON were added as additional cosponsors to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on January 9, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) establishing a joint congressional committee on civil rights, submitted on January 9, 1957, by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PASTORE).

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, introduced by me (for myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be listed as cosponsors of the bill (S. 21) to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was introduced by me on Monday, January 7. It is a bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States sundry nominations, a number of which were referred to that committee.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to these nominations.

(For nominations this day referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, see end of Senate proceedings of today.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address concerning relationship of Congress to military strategy, delivered by Senator CHAVEZ to the Air War College.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by him at the 42d annual meeting of American Association of State Highway Officials, at Atlantic City, N. J., on November 27, 1956.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

News article relating to retirement of David Robinson, published in the Oregonian (Portland, Oreg.) of December 16, 1956.

THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as I have previously announced, it was my intention to introduce today the so-called school-construction bill, following the President's message on the state of the Union. However, inasmuch as the White House has informed me that sometime during the week following his inauguration, the President will address to Congress a special message on education. I shall postpone introduction of the bill until after the receipt of that message.

I understand that the President's message will underscore the critical and immediate need of emergency Federal assistance in eradicating the classroom shortage, and that it will also outline other administration proposals in the field of education, stressing the urgency of specific planning for the expansion of education beyond the high school.

Mr. President, I have talked with Mr. Folsom, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, about the bearing of the President's special education message on the introduction of the administration's school construction bill. After conferring about the matter, we feel that it would be inappropriate to introduce the bill before the President's message has been submitted. Accordingly, I plan to introduce the bill shortly after that message is delivered, and I am hopeful that the bill will be introduced under bipartisan auspices.

I may say that the bill will be introduced by me, on behalf of myself and, I hope, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. However, I shall request that the bill lie at the desk for 24 hours, in order to make it possible for other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill. It is our hope that many other Senators will join in sponsoring this vital school construction legislation.

UNITED NATIONS AID FOR A UNITED NATIONS JOB—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a splendid editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Thursday, January 3. The editorial is entitled "U. N. Aid for a U. N. Job." Its subject matter relates to the recent proposal of President Eisenhower concerning the Middle East.

This editorial column is worthy of the attention and careful study of every Member of Congress. It raises important questions concerning the so-called Eisenhower declaration, and it provides constructive answers.

I took the liberty of addressing to the editor a letter concerning the editorial. I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and my reply be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. AID FOR A U. N. JOB

It would be undesirable in several ways for Congress to withhold from President Eisenhower the declaration he seeks that this country would resist Communist aggression in the Middle East. But it would also be undesirable for either Congress or the administration to mistake the declaration for a policy. Much more will be needed if a strong and positive Middle East policy is to be fashioned, to take advantage of what the President rightly calls a "great opportunity for world leadership."

Congress cannot afford to turn the President down, even though some Members may question the need for the declaration, because the consequence might well be to encourage further Communist intervention. And though it may be said that the President as commander in chief already possesses the power which he asks Congress to vest him with, still a plain public notice, concurred in by both legislative and executive branches, undoubtedly would carry some added force among people overseas not familiar with our Constitution.

No new commitment would be involved. We are already bound by the United Nations Charter to resist armed aggression anywhere. We are morally bound by the Truman doctrine for defense of Greece and Turkey to resist Soviet intervention in the eastern Mediterranean. As cosponsor and backer though not a full member of the Baghdad Pact, we have another moral commitment to do the same.

What must be kept in mind is that despite all these declarations which the administration now proposes to reiterate, Soviet influence has definitely penetrated the eastern Mediterranean. All the military barriers have been leapfrogged simply because the barriers alone were not appropriate to the kind of game Moscow has been playing. To draw one more military line may have a favorable effect among some European allies and anti-Communist elements in the Middle East, but by itself can do little to meet the real Soviet threat there. As the Post-Dispatch military analyst writes, that threat is 10 percent military, 90 percent political and economic.

This is apparently why the President also intends to ask for an enlarged program of economic aid, to be administered under his personal emergency authority. But Congress should ask whether it is going to be enough simply to step up the dollars for old assistance programs which did not prevent the Soviet penetration of Egypt and Syria that has already taken place, and did not prevent the Israeli-British-French attack that brought the world so close to general war.

Specifically the question to be asked is why more of our economic aid to the Middle East cannot be channeled at once through the United Nations. Just as the President should make indubitably clear our intention to use military force in fullest collaboration with and support of the U. N., so he should do everything possible to demonstrate that we are not seeking merely to replace a waning British and French colonial influence with national power of our own.

The much discussed vacuum in the Middle East need not and perhaps cannot be filled by American strength as the only alternative to Soviet domination. It can be filled by genuinely independent Middle Eastern nations, supported by the collective power of the U. N.

This ought to be the American objective and it should be declared at every opportunity. One of the best ways to do it would be through an expanded U. N. assistance program.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

The EDITOR,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
1111 Olive Street,
St. Louis 1, Mo.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have read with considerable interest your splendid editorial of Thursday, January 3, entitled "U. N. Aid for a U. N. Job." I am taking the liberty of bringing your editorial to the attention of every Member of the Congress by having it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Indeed the United States is pledged to a policy of resistance of Communist aggression. I am rather surprised that anyone would think that it would require a special declaration of Congress to make this clear to either the American people or people in other lands. The tremendous expenditures for our military forces, along with the establishment of military bases throughout the world, should be ample evidence that we are dedicated to a program of resisting Communist aggression. Add to this the many treaties and regional pacts of which we are a principal member, and it seems inconceivable to me that anyone should ever doubt that the policy of the United States is one of unqualified resistance to the Communist military aggression.

As your editorial has so appropriately noted, Soviet influence in the Middle East is not due to her military aggression, but rather to her political, economic, and cultural penetration, plus the sale of arms. To draw a military line may have a favorable psychological effect on our friends and allies, but it does not meet the problems of the Middle East.

The major problem in the Middle East is one of political and social unrest, passionate nationalism, compounded by the bitterness between the Arab states and Israel—yes, between the Arab states themselves.

Then add to this problem the collapse of British influence and power, the revolts in North Africa against French control, along with the Soviet exploitation of all of these developments, and it becomes quite obvious that the mere declaration of military resistance to Soviet Communist military aggression is not the answer.

This is not to say that a restatement of our determination to resist Communist military aggression should not be made. It may very well be helpful. However, the real tough problems to which our policy should be directed are the Suez Canal, the Arab-Israel issue, the plight of the Arab refugees and their resettlement, and, to be sure, the economic needs of the people of the area.

I concur with your view that many of these problems can best be attacked working through the United Nations. Surely economic development in the Middle East

is one that requires regional planning and the use of regional resources. Some of the Arab States have vast resources of oil that produce literally hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue. Surely we are not going to ask the United States to underwrite an economic aid program in the Middle East without some participation by the oil-rich states. I have proposed a Middle East Development Authority, under U. N. auspices, to which the nation states in the area will contribute and to which other U. N. members will contribute, including the United States.

I further suggested that we sponsor the establishment of the U. N. Good Offices Commission for the Middle East, this Commission to be composed of highly respected persons who would dedicate their time and talents to promoting political settlements between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Our Government should openly support such a Good Offices Commission and take the leadership in encouraging the settling of political differences; in fact, insisting upon it. The Arab States must be brought to realize in no uncertain terms, that the State of Israel is here to stay; that any talk about extermination of Israel is not only a violation of responsibilities under the United Nations, but also a challenge to American policy.

Indeed, the so-called vacuum in the Middle East can be filled with genuinely independent Middle Eastern nations. It should be our policy to encourage growth and strength of those independent nations.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

GAS PRICE BOOST INQUIRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the state of the Union message the President said that—

Business leaders must, in the national interest, studiously avoid those price rises that are possible only because of vital or unusual needs of the whole Nation.

Mr. President, recent increases in gasoline and oil prices appear to be completely unjustified, and contrary to the standard urged by the President to restrain against taking advantage of an exceptional situation for unwarranted profits.

I have asked the Attorney General to conduct a thorough inquiry into this situation for the protection of the Nation's consumers, and I have asked the Senate Small Business Committee to conduct its own inquiry into the adverse effects of such price boosts upon small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, copies of my letters to the Attorney General and to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
January 11, 1957.

The Honorable HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Once again, the major oil companies have initiated a general increase in domestic petroleum prices, this time on the pretext that the critical situation in the Middle East fully justifies their action. The play was worked like this:

When the closing of the Suez Canal prevented the movement of Middle East petroleum to England and Europe, the major oil companies began to supply such markets with American crude oil. The resulting pressure on American crude production was then held to warrant an average increase of 35 cents a barrel on crude oil. Next an increase in crude costs was deemed justification for a corresponding increase in the price of finished petroleum products. Accordingly, gasoline prices were raised by 1 cent and proportionate increases have been reflected in such other essential commodities as fuel oil.

That the sharp price increase effected in petroleum prices at this time constitute irresponsible action by the leadership of the petroleum industry seems to have been recognized yesterday by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address where he stated: "Business leaders must, in the national interest, studiously avoid those price rises that are possible only because of vital or unusual needs of the whole Nation."

With these sentiments of the President, I am certain the American consuming public fully agrees. And, I am equally certain that the American consuming public will agree that only rank opportunism could impose a substantial price increase upon an essential commodity at a time when the Nation, already beset by inflation, is striving to relieve the economic plight of our friends and allies abroad.

Does it not strike you as paradoxical that these petroleum price increases should take place even as the American Petroleum Institute reports that United States oil production and refinery runs have hit all-time high levels? From this it would appear that the economic law of supply and demand has no pertinence to the pricing of petroleum products. An explanation of this phenomenon certainly seems to be indicated.

It should also be made clear in this letter that the bulk of the benefits to accrue from these petroleum price increases will be received by the major oil companies. Only slightly, will the independent crude producer be aided. Similarly, in the case of the small independent refiners, the relief will be insignificant. To the largest small business segment of the industry, the 200,000 gasoline retailers and 15,000 jobbers, there will be no benefits at all. However, to the latter group will fall the duty of braving the wrath of consumers outraged by the price increases.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that petroleum prices have been raised by the major oil companies without justification. Another such example occurred in early 1953, when the removal of Government price controls occasioned a material increase in petroleum prices. At that time, as you will recall, I wrote you urging that the matter be thoroughly investigated by your antitrust division. While the reply of your then antitrust chief was that such a study would be undertaken, my recollection is that no formal report on the matter was ever issued. Perhaps, if your antitrust division had been more diligent in its exploration of the antitrust implications of the 1953 rise in petroleum products, the necessity for vigorous action now would never have arisen.

Under the antitrust laws, the responsibility for investigation of the present petroleum price increases is primarily that of your Department. It is a responsibility which I am hopeful you will discharge promptly and with painstaking care. The consuming public of this Nation deserves no less than your best efforts in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator.

JANUARY 11, 1957.

The Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: The enclosed letter to the Attorney General emphasizes my deep concern over what I feel are unwarranted price increases being imposed by the gas and oil industry.

Because of the squeeze this imposes upon thousands of small businessmen, including jobbers and retailers who face the wrath of outraged consumers without benefitting by the price raises, I feel our committee has a responsibility of its own to institute a careful inquiry into the present situation.

Such an inquiry could be aimed particularly at the adverse effects of this unjustified price boost upon small-business men, and could also serve as a double-check on what the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is doing about it.

I would like to suggest that this situation be placed high on the agenda of our committee for consideration at our first meeting.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed at this point copies of letters on this subject, written to the President of the United States and to the Attorney General. The letters were written by Paul E. Hadlick, general counsel for the National Oil Marketers Association.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL OIL MARKETERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In 1935 the Congress enacted a statute covering the interstate transportation of petroleum products (49 Stat. 33) following a finding by the Supreme Court that section 9 (c) of the National Industrial Recovery Act was unconstitutional. This statute covered a 2-year period and was subsequently extended for 2-year periods in 1937 and 1939. On June 22, 1942, the statute was made permanent.

This Interstate Transportation of Petroleum Products Act (commonly referred to as the Connally Act) contained in section 3 (title 15, U. S. C. annotated, sec. 715b) a prohibition against the shipment or transportation in interstate commerce from any State oil produced in such State in excess of amounts permitted by State law.

An important provision of this Interstate Transportation of Petroleum Products Act, insisted upon by the Congress, was section 4 which reads in part as follows:

"Whenever the President finds that the amount of petroleum and petroleum products moving in interstate commerce is so limited as to be the cause, in whole or in part, of a lack of parity between supply (including imports and reasonable withdrawals from storage) and consumptive demand (including exports and reasonable additions to storage) resulting in an undue burden on or restriction of interstate commerce in petroleum and petroleum products, he shall by proclamation declare such finding, and thereupon the provisions of 715b shall be inoperative until such time as the President shall find and by proclamation declare that the conditions which gave rise to the suspension of the operation of the provisions of such section no longer exist."

In explaining this act to the Congress when it was up for extension in 1937 one of the

members of the House subcommittee recommending passage of the legislation, Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 7, 1937, Appendix) in answer to a question as to the powers of the President under section 4 above quoted, said:

"He has the power to suspend the operation of the Connally bill if he finds that the oil-producing States which do prorate production are limiting production below national demand and thus unjustly enhancing the price."

I believe that even a casual investigation will disclose that Texas and other oil-producing States are deliberately holding back the production of crude oil much below the demand for domestic and export of same. Standard Oil's subsidiary, Humble Oil, started a movement to increase the prices of crude oil and passing similar increases along to the public. A United Press dispatch from Houston, Texas, of January 3, quoted the president of this subsidiary as saying the increase was made because they were unable to secure requirements at former prices.

It seems that this is exactly the situation the Congress had in mind when it provided your office with the authority to suspend the Connally Act.

As counsel for a group of independent oil jobbers who endeavor to protect their consumers from inordinate advances in prices I urge you to have the necessary investigation conducted and a proclamation issued suspending the operation of the Interstate Transportation of Petroleum Products Act.

Sincerely,

[Signed] PAUL E. HADLICK,
Counsel.

NATIONAL OIL MARKETERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1957.

The Honorable HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNELL: On June 22, 1953, at the time the integrated oil companies raised the price of crude oil I conferred with the then Acting Chief of the Antitrust Division and confirmed this interview to Mr. Stanley N. Barnes who then headed the Antitrust Division, saying:

"Raises in the price of gasoline a week ago followed later last week by advances in crude-oil prices and again today by additional increases in all grades of refined petroleum products indicates clearly that there is collusion among the large oil companies controlling the oil markets. Stocks of petroleum products are about the highest in history and can be amply added to by simply lifting of oil State's rationing schedules.

"It is respectfully requested that your Department promptly institute an investigation of the current price advance in petroleum to determine if the antitrust laws have been violated, and, if our suspicions are justified by the facts that they be placed before a Federal grand jury."

Today a similar situation faces the Nation. As of December 29, 1956, crude-oil stocks nationwide stood at 264,241,000 barrels as against 262,033,000 barrels on December 30, 1955. Gasoline stocks on December 28, 1956, were 185,796,000 barrels compared to 165,268,000 barrels on December 30, 1955.

Last week Standard Oil's subsidiary, Humble Oil & Refining Co., initiated an advance of 35 cents a barrel for crude oil and a 1-cent-per-gallon increase on refined products. The advances are being instituted by other integrated companies almost daily. And each in turn is tagging the 1-cent-per-gallon increase onto the price of gasoline, fuel oil, and other refined petroleum products.

When you realize that the price of crude oil has almost tripled in price since the end of World War II one must be very gullible to believe that such increases can be blamed on inflation, added costs, or competition between crude-oil buyers.

I am sure you understand what this increase of 35 cents per barrel means to our dollar-short allies who are suffering because of the Suez crisis. Also what the 1-cent-per-gallon increases in the price of fuel oil mean to the American consumer.

Small-business concerns in the oil industry, like those which I have the honor to represent, namely, independent oil jobbers, can be and are suspicious of the circumstances surrounding these price increases without having any definite evidence of collusion. Your Department with its far-flung FBI offices, district attorney staffs, and the staff of the Antitrust Division are the only ones that can make the proper investigation and determine if the antitrust laws are being violated through a conspiracy to raise the price of crude oil and refined petroleum products.

May I respectfully request on behalf not only of the people I represent, but on behalf of all the consumers of petroleum products in America, that you order an immediate investigation of the circumstances surrounding the current increases in the prices of crude oil and refined petroleum products, and, if the facts thus developed warrant, that you place them before a Federal grand jury for action.

Prompt action is essential if this additional gouging of the American consumer of gasoline and fuel oil is to be prevented.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. HADLICK,
Counsel.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was with profound regret that I learned of the death of former Senator C. Wayland—better known to his friends as "Curley"—Brooks, in Chicago.

Former Senator Brooks was a distinguished Member of this body. Recently he has been serving as Republican national committeeman for the State of Illinois. I know that many of us on both sides of the aisle, who had served with him, will regret the passing of this distinguished American, one who devotedly many years of his life to the public service of his own State of Illinois, as well as to the Nation. Our sympathy goes to his widow and the other members of his family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the press dispatch relating to his death.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO.—Former Senator C. Wayland (Curley) Brooks, of Chicago, died today at Passavant Hospital following a heart attack. He was 59 years old.

Brooks, who was Illinois Republican national committeeman at the time of his death, entered the hospital January 8 after an attack of chest pains.

His illness was diagnosed as a dissecting aneurism of the aorta, or a tear in an artery of his heart. A hospital spokesman said death was attributed to the heart condition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask that a brief biographical sketch of the late Senator Brooks be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY

C. Wayland Brooks, Republican, of Chicago, was born in West Bureau, Ill., son of the Rev. Jonas Gardner Brooks, an ordained minister of the Congregational Church, and Ida Nora Bickford Brooks; while Reverend Mr. Brooks held pastorates in various cities of Illinois, his son attended public schools of Dixon, Peoria, Kewanee, and Neposet; graduated from Wheaton (Ill.) High School; entered University of Illinois in 1916; enlisted in the United States Marine Corps, April 1917, when the United States entered the World War; served in the 6th regiment, United States Marines, 2d division, overseas; was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, American Navy Cross, Croix de Guerre, and Purple Heart; commissioned a second lieutenant in the front line and advanced to first lieutenant in the front line; wounded 7 times in action and invalided home; his father and older brother served overseas, the older brother dying in service there; a younger brother also served in the Marine Corps during the war; returned to University of Illinois after the war and later was graduated from Northwestern University, where he subsequently lectured on Illinois law for 2 years; admitted to bar in 1926; served as assistant State's attorney for 7 years and was commended by the bar, press, and civic organizations for this aggressive fight against organized crime; delegate to 1940 and 1944 Republican National Conventions and member of convention resolutions and platform-drafting committees; past commander, Marine Post, American Legion; member Army and Navy Legion of Valor; Purple Heart Association; A. F. and A. M.; Phi Delta Phi law fraternity; Delta Sigma Phi fraternity; Chicago, Ill., and American Bar Associations; Order of Moose; Elks Lodge; owns and operates farm in La Salle County, Ill.; has 1 son, Russell; elected to the United States Senate November 5, 1940, to fill a vacancy, reelected November 3, 1942, for 6-year term ending January 3, 1949.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the late Senator Brooks, but I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said by the able minority leader, and to extend to the family of Senator Brooks the sympathy of all Senators on this side of the aisle.

SUBJECTION OF FUEL OIL CONSUMERS TO PRICE GOUGE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have long favored helping our allies, because of their strength for our country in collective and mutual security, for if any one or more of our allies weakens, then surely does our collective strength suffer.

In the realism of this fact, I have supported programs of aid to our allies, to help them remain strong enough to resist and withstand the aggressive onslaught of spreading communism.

The American people have done this digging down very deep in their pockets to pay taxes to provide billions of dollars for foreign aid to friendly countries, and to stop communism from taking those countries over. They have done it at considerable sacrifice in the additional heavy tax burden they have been carrying.

Even when part of the weakness of some of our allies stems directly from mistakes and bad judgment, our country and our people have shown a rare tolerance of such mistakes, and a truly magnanimous attitude.

But there is a breaking point on such tolerance and such magnanimity, and, if

certain reports and rumors are accurate, I think that breaking point has been reached.

The rumors, reports, and predictions I speak of are those to the effect that prices of fuel oil are going to rise in the very near future, and that the consumers of fuel oil are going to be subjected to a price gouge in the very middle of a cold winter.

I want to read from the January 10, 1957, Washington Daily News, which states in part:

Esso said the price hike was forced by a 25 to 45 cent a barrel increase in the crude-oil price by Humble Oil and Refining Co., of Texas. Humble blamed emergency shipments to Europe. * * * Previously, Texas refiners were reported to be anxious to begin the shipments in order to justify a general refinery level price advance. Officials said the rise in product prices may be difficult to enforce during the winter months, since industry stocks and production of motor fuel are at an all-time high. Gasoline stored up in this country now amounts to 186,800,600 barrels, an increase of nearly 18 million over 1956. Heating oil supplies are also above last year's.

I am disturbed at the further report that this is coming not only as a result of agreement within the oil industry, but also with the sanction of the Federal Government. This, I find very hard to believe—and I certainly hope the rumors, reports, and predictions are in error and without foundation.

While I can fully appreciate the difficulty of the oil shortage in Britain and France, and Europe generally, and while I believe it wise for our country to assist as much as it can in supplying oil to our allies in Europe to help the people there, I surely condemn any attempt to use it as an excuse or justification for a price gouge to be inflicted upon fuel-oil consumers in our own country.

Perhaps because this is winter and the winters are cold in my home State of Maine, and the people of Maine are so dependent upon fuel oil during the winter, I am more sensitive than most people on this.

But of this I am sure—that there are many, many Americans living in cold, winter areas, who would resent and protest such a price gouge based upon such an excuse. And I am sure that Americans living in warmer areas of our country, where fuel oil is not so desperately needed at this time of year, also rebel at such prospect of exploiting such a situation, even though they are not victims of it.

For some time I have been disappointed at the indicated attitude of fuel-oil producers. It has been too much of an attitude emphasizing profits and showing too little consideration for fuel-oil consumers. The oil producers have tried for some time now to restrict fuel-oil imports—apparently trying to restrict such imports so that our own fuel-oil producers could get higher prices from fuel-oil consumers, especially fuel-oil consumers in New England.

Then there was the natural-gas bill last year, which, if passed, threatened to cause an increase in the price of fuel oil.

And now, because Britain and France in disastrous folly invaded Egypt and started an armed conflict that resulted in the Suez Canal being blocked with sunken ships, and oil pipelines in the Middle East being blown up, not only has the flow of oil from the Middle East to Britain, France, and Europe been shut off by such folly of Britain and France, an act in which those countries defied and broke with our country, but also Americans are reportedly going to be faced with a hike in fuel-oil prices because our country is going to meet the oil emergency needs of a foolish Britain and France, and ship oil in great quantities from here.

Thus, the reported justification for a predicted hike in fuel-oil prices—an alleged oil shortage that forces the price of fuel oil up—is a shortage caused by the folly of Britain and France, who defied us, but who now seek our help and our oil, and to whom we are responding.

I do not take issue with our response and help to them, in spite of the fact that they made their own mess. But I do take issue with this international mess being used as an excuse for inflicting a fuel oil price gouge on Americans in the bitter cold of winter.

This is a situation in which I do not believe our Federal Government should stand idly by. I believe our Federal Government should, if necessary, step in to prevent a fuel oil price gouge—for the simple reason that one function of the Government is to take steps for the protection of its people.

In taking this position, I realize that I shall be condemned by some of the oil industry and accused of being an opponent of free enterprise. Such a charge would be false, but I will take any such abuse and misrepresentation, because I would rather be a champion for the people, for the little people who hover around a fuel oil stove in the cold of winter, after spending the precious, small amount of money they have for fuel oil to keep warm and to survive the winter. They come first in my heart—ahead of those who would inflict a fuel oil price gouge, exploiting an international situation—ahead of those who have so much money they don't know what to do with it, so they spend some of it trying to buy elections in States thousands of miles from their own State.

Of course, they are entitled to full consideration. But full consideration does not mean preferential treatment; it does not mean priority in treatment; it does not mean discrimination in their favor. Instead, full consideration means consideration of the little fellow as well—the fuel oil consumer—the elderly couple eking out an existence in which their life earnings and savings have been decimated by the rise in the cost of living, by the rise of prices, by a rise in prices of such bare necessities as heat; the young married couples with their little babies. These are the people I think of when I express my personal protest against any fuel oil price gouge.

I only hope that the rumors, reports, and predictions are false. But if they should be accurate, then I believe that the Federal Government has a solemn obligation to its people to intervene in the cause of public decency and humaneness.

TRIBAL PROBLEMS OF INDIANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a telegram which I have received from Peter N. Chumbris, on behalf of 120 Indian chiefs who recently met at Dallas, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *December 5, 1956.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Conference of 120 Indian chiefs representing 40 tribes in Oklahoma, Kansas, and Mississippi is doing excellently, with Indian leaders laying their specific tribal problems on the line without pulling punches; they tell Commissioner Emmons the hard facts. Indian chiefs appreciate subcommittee sending me to the conference and are most appreciative of you, Senator LANGER and Senator KEFAUVER, of subcommittee hearings and activities on Indians' behalf. They are asking that subcommittee hold proposed hearings as soon as possible early next year.

PETER N. CHUMBRIS.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say, in connection with the telegram, that the Indian Bureau was established in 1824. Today there are want, misery, and suffering on the part of a great many Indians in the various tribes.

At a meeting of some 20 Senators in my office last week, it was agreed that a bill would be introduced to provide for point 4 relief for the Indian tribes of this country. That bill will be introduced sometime this week.

I may say we have the active support of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, and the active support of Mr. Glenn Emmons, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. I think the bill is one of the best ever introduced on behalf of the Indians of this country. While we are sending billions of dollars to foreign countries, our Indians have been neglected.

The bill will be introduced this week. If it is passed and is enacted into law, it will go far toward alleviating the hunger, suffering, and starvation on the part of Indians all over the United States.

DR. P. P. CLAXTON

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sorrow at the death of a distinguished Tennessean and educator, Dr. P. P. Claxton, who served as United States Commissioner of Education under Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Harding, and who died on Saturday at Knoxville.

I knew Dr. Claxton as a professor when I was a student at the University of Tennessee. Dr. Claxton, who was 94 at the time of his death, was born in a 1-room cabin in Tennessee, while that State still had many of the characteristics of the frontier.

He entered the University of Tennessee, as a student, with money earned hauling timber. He worked his way through the university, and graduated a Phi Beta Kappa at the age of 19. Dr. Claxton later did graduate work at Johns Hopkins and in Germany. He taught in the public schools of North Carolina and

at the North Carolina State Normal and Industrial College, before returning to the University of Tennessee, as a professor. He organized and became head of the department of Education at the University of Tennessee, and fought for many years to bring State aid for Tennessee public schools.

In 1911, Dr. Claxton became head of what then was known as the Bureau of Education, in Washington. He traveled extensively, preaching the need for better public education. Throughout his life he was a crusader also for world peace.

After leaving the Government, Dr. Claxton was a provost of the University of Alabama; superintendent of schools in Tulsa, Okla.; and president of Austin Peay State College, in Clarksville, Tenn.

Many Members of this body know his son, Phil Claxton, who is doing a fine job with the State Department.

In the death of Dr. P. P. Claxton, the country has lost one of the pioneers in the field of public education.

SENATOR KNOWLAND OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present at the recent session when my colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressed their high regard and admiration for the distinguished minority leader, BILL KNOWLAND.

The announcement of his retirement from the Senate at the end of his present term was received with deep regret by all of us in this Chamber and by the Nation.

The many tributes which were paid to his able and courageous leadership were richly deserved. I wish to state that I am in complete accord with the high praise that honored the senior Senator from California as a great patriot, a great statesman, and a great American.

Senator KNOWLAND reached greatness as a Senator and as a leader, through sincere devotion to duty. He has been unexcelled as a worker. Despite the great burdens under which he labored, he has always been willing to discuss our legislative problems with all of us. Those who sought his advice and counsel received the full benefit of his sound judgment, his unfailing courtesy, his sincerity, his honesty, and his dedication to the highest principles of patriotic Americanism.

That is one reason why he has been such a fine and outstanding leader.

I join with my colleagues in the hope that the future may be bright in health and happiness for the distinguished minority leader and for his loved ones.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to concur in and endorse the high praise that has been accorded on this floor to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He is deserving of every fine thing that has been said about him, and more, too.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article about Senator KNOWLAND, as published in Time magazine on January 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS—DYNASTY AND DESTINY

Twenty minutes before the rapping of gavels convened the 85th Congress, a massive, bull-shouldered man entered the empty Senate Chamber and moved with long strides to his desk in the front row, right side. For a few moments he sat alone among the curving rows, rustling through the pile of documents he had brought with him. Then one by one, two by two, his colleagues began drifting in through the swinging doors. The man leaped to his feet, began greeting each and every one with booming-voiced gladness, in the manner of one who truly loves his club and its members—not for what they may be individually, but simply because they are members of the club. WILLIAM FIFE KNOWLAND, 48, Republican from California, minority leader of the Senate, was back in his element, pleased with his lot, and eager to come to grips with the conflicts facing a party that has just triumphantly won the White House, and lost control of the Congress.

Already BILL KNOWLAND had met with fellow Republican congressional leaders at a 9-hour White House session, lunched with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, attended a bipartisan legislative conference at the White House, worked at reshuffling the Senate's Republican high command, helped draft a unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate would debate a change in its rules, and assisted in wrting a resolution paving the way for President Eisenhower's Middle East message to a joint session of Congress. All this was part of KNOWLAND's job as leader of a Senate minority that represents a party in executive power. It was also prolog to a political challenge that has no precedent in United States history.

As leader of the GOP Senate forces, BILL KNOWLAND's job is to transmit the plans and attitudes of a majority President to the minority party in the Senate, to seize the initiative, where possible, in a Chamber balanced at 49 Democrats and 47 Republicans. As the most spotlighted Republican on Capitol Hill, KNOWLAND's responsibility (which he shares with House minority leader JOE MARTIN) is to see to it that the Republican congressional record will contribute to Republican congressional victory in a 1958 that looks all too shaky. Moreover, if the United States is to get value received for its national electoral choice, BILL KNOWLAND and his Republican colleagues must give legislative expression to the mandate awarded Dwight Eisenhower.

Under these compelling terms, the job of leading the Senate Republicans is not one for a wire-pulling maneuverer, an obstructionist or, in the proud United States Senate, a White House errand boy.

Qualities of leadership: The United States Senate respects only those who respect it; no man has a deeper feeling for the Senate than KNOWLAND. A party leader, by definition, must be a party man; KNOWLAND has been a Republican from birth, and his attachment is to the party itself, not to any of its factions. "I consider myself," he says, putting first things first, "a member of the Republican team, and the President certainly would be the leader of that team."

Above all else, KNOWLAND brings to his leadership post an absolute, unflinching integrity that rises above politics. It inspires faith in his motives and gives weight to his words. Says Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON: "Any time BILL KNOWLAND tells you something, you can believe it." In 1949 KNOWLAND voted against the confirmation of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State in the Truman administration, and he was the leading Senate critic of Acheson's Far Eastern policies. But he did not hesitate to stand on the Senate floor and pay tribute to Acheson's handling of the Japanese peace treaty. When Harry Truman was subjected to a below-the-belt attack by Idaho's pink-tinged Democratic Senator Glen Taylor, it was Republican KNOWLAND who arose roaring in wrath. "As long as he sits in the White House," said KNOWLAND, "President Truman is my President."

Such behavior is strange in the political rough-and-tumble. But KNOWLAND has never known any other way to act. The essential to understanding WILLIAM FIFE KNOWLAND is that although he is driven furiously by a sense of destiny, he is always controlled by the traditions of dynasty.

First family: BILLY KNOWLAND was no ordinary kid growing up around Alameda; he was a KNOWLAND of California. His grandfather had come West from New York to dig for gold, instead found wealth in an empire of lumber, shipping, mining and banking interests. Billy's father, Joseph Russell Knowland ("J. R." to most of California and "Papoo" to his now-adult grandchildren), served in the State assembly, State senate, and was elected 5 times to the United States House of Representatives. Defeated as the Republican candidate for the United States Senate in 1914, J. R. bought into the Oakland Tribune (1956 circulation 208,000), assumed complete control, and turned it into one of the State's most formidable political powers. Of his 3 children, Billy, whose mother had died of an embolism following his birth, was J. R.'s great pride.

While his father was still in Congress, Billy lived part time in Washington, became a familiar sight in the Capitol corridors. He was a political prodigy. "His idea of a game," recalls J. R., still alive and alert at 83, "was to get a box to stand on and make a speech." With a lisp caused by two widely separated front teeth, BILLY KNOWLAND would get up on his box and proclaim: "Wepwethentative government ith the way we do thingth in thith country." The inscription on his grammar-school graduation program read: "Appearance—politician. Besetting sin—politics." At 12 he spoke for the Harding-Coolidge ticket. He thrilled to the drama of his first national convention in 1924, returned to take over the chairmanship, from an adult who had fallen ill, of the finance committee of Alameda's Coolidge-Dawes Republican Club. Billy raised funds, paid bills, and shared in the credit for Alameda's thumping Republican majority. His age: 16.

No sooner did BILLY KNOWLAND arrive at Alameda High School than he set about organizing a student conservative party (Economy But Not False Economy). He held nearly every school office, graduated as president of his class and of the student body. His rival candidate has a rueful memory of the occasion: "I was an athlete and a popular guy. Billy didn't play anything. But he knew how to make other kids take him seriously."

YOU HAD TO ADMIRE HIM

KNOWLAND attended the University of California, came home after 3½ years with an A. B., an executive job with the Tribune, and a wife. Characteristically, he had known Helen Herrick since the sixth grade, had gone with her for 8 years, bought a ring, made careful arrangements and then—on New Year's Eve, 1926—eloped.

Young Bill (made the Tribune's assistant publisher in 1933) had always had a sort of proprietary relationship with the newspaper. As a boy he decided he did not like its Sunday comics and demanded—unsuccessfully—that J. R. fire the managing editor. During his school years he had sometimes worked summers and weekends at the Tribune, at one time conducted a children's column called Aunt Elsie. One of his efforts began:

"Heidieho, kiddies, this is BILLY KNOWLAND with another story." Now, however, his duties were vague. He put in some time on the Tribune's business side, helped streamline the logotype—and feverishly pursued his political career.

That career was soon linked, in a way that made political history, to the career of another fast-rising California Republican: Alameda County district attorney Earl Warren. Old J. R. always had been a stanch backer of young Earl Warren. Warren and Billy first met about the time Herbert Hoover was campaigning against Al Smith in 1928. Warren was struck by the political skill and vigor of the man 17 years his junior. Says Warren: "You had to admire him." The admiration was mutual. KNOWLAND became a leading spirit among the young California Republicans who were later Warren's greatest political strength. There is a California legend that Warren, repaying his debt to Joe Knowland, lifted Bill to political prominence. Actually, Earl and Bill helped each other in near-equal degree. Explains Warren: "It was a friendship of honorable men." For more than 2 decades, Earl Warren and BILL KNOWLAND fought side by side in California's bloody political wars.

"Billy's done it." Bill's first try for public office came in 1932, when he ran for State assemblyman in the same district his father had represented. In Republican Alameda, the payoff was in the primary, and it was a hard four-way fight. On election night tough old J. R., weeping tears of delight, went around to all his friends to boast: "Billy's done it." As the youngest (25) member of the State assembly, Billy sponsored successful legislation that ranged from an antilynching bill to one that protected caucus. Two years later, again following after his father, he entered the State senate. Named chairman of the finance committee, he authored the personal-income-tax law that still remains on California's books.

When his first senate term expired, Billy quit. His ambition was pointing to Washington, where California's aging Senator Hiram Johnson was living his last years.

Succeeding Earl Warren as California's Republican national committeeman (Warren resigned to become State attorney general), KNOWLAND used the post to travel the length and breadth of the State, getting to know people and letting them know him. He made news on being elected chairman of the Republican National Committee's executive committee, posed for pictures with every leading GOP candidate who came through town, including Republican leaders Tom Dewey and Wendell Willkie. He was, in fact, carefully preparing for the day when Hiram Johnson's Senate place would become vacant.

His strenuous efforts were interrupted. On the morning of December 7, 1941, KNOWLAND was having his breakfast in bed when Tribune City Editor Al Reck called with the news of Pearl Harbor. Scrambling out of bed, KNOWLAND sent his breakfast dishes flying in all directions. Six months later he was off to the Army, soon was bound for Europe as a public information and military government officer. It was in the summer of 1945 when Maj. WILLIAM KNOWLAND, drinking coffee in an Army cafeteria in Paris, picked up a copy of Stars and Stripes and read that he had been appointed by Gov. Earl Warren to succeed the late Hiram Johnson in the United States Senate.

Busting his britches: The new Senator hustled himself onto the first plane to Washington, received his Army discharge there in a single afternoon. He was a strange sight. He had put on weight in the Army (the harder he works, the more he eats and the rounder he gets), and now, with no time to waste on clothes buying, he tried to stuff himself back into his prewar civies. For months, until Helen Knowland finally took charge and ordered him some new suits, Washington held its breath in anticipation of the occasion when California's young Republican Senator WILLIAM FIFE KNOWLAND would literally bust his britches.

KNOWLAND was a britches-buster in other ways to the august United States Senate. In a forum where youngsters are supposed to be seen but not heard, KNOWLAND set out by tackling—and tumbling—none other than Mr. Republican, Ohio's Bob Taft, on an issue of budget policy. In an institution where seniority is the road to prominence, KNOWLAND leaped to the forefront before his first full term was half over. He became the Senate's leading Republican spokesman on the utmost acrimonious issue of the day: United States policy toward Asia. How it happened is typical of BILL KNOWLAND.

In the winter of 1945–46, KNOWLAND made his first trip to the Far East with a Senate committee investigating the disposal of surplus war properties. In Tokyo he met Gen. Douglas MacArthur and was enormously impressed, but not overwhelmed (KNOWLAND is a hard man to overwhelm). He was fascinated by Asia's political and economic problems and, once back in Washington, began studying them. After hours and weeks and months of concentrated self-education, he came to an unshakable conviction; in its preoccupation with Europe, the United States was disastrously neglecting Asia.

Making the issue: With a single exception (a 1946 loan to Britain), KNOWLAND has supported every proposal to bolster Europe. But his studies convinced him that the United States was failing badly in its far eastern policies. While the State Department was enamored with the Chinese Communists, KNOWLAND saw Asia as the vital back door through which the Communists could get to Europe, often cites Lenin's thesis that "the road to Paris lies through Peking."

In 1948 KNOWLAND succeeded in getting $400 million into the Marshall plan appropriations for the general area of China, because he was convinced that Nationalist Leader Chiang Kai-shek had not received sufficient support, both moral and material, from the United States. In 1949, KNOWLAND fought Dean Acheson's confirmation as Secretary of State, partly because Acheson—as Under Secretary—had had much to do with a United States policy that pressured Chiang to make peace with the Chinese Communists.

KNOWLAND thundered warnings day after day on the Senate floor as Acheson wrote off Formosa and Korea as beyond the areas of United States vital interest. He later leaped again to the attack when congressional investigators discovered that the State Department was distributing to United States Embassies and Consulates in the Far East copies of an issue of the Reporter magazine with articles and editorial highly sympathic to Red China. Sure that he saw signs that the United States was getting ready to recognize Red Peking, KNOWLAND planted himself solidly in the path of recognition—and from that position he has never budged. Always a stout anti-Communist—even in the days when many of his colleagues still thought warmly of Russia as a trusted wartime ally—KNOWLAND sensed accurately that the Communist struggle for Asia was as desperate and critical as the struggle for Europe. In 1950 he spoke 115 times in the Senate on Far Eastern policy. His voice carried the authority of careful preparation, and other Republican Senators took up the cry, making BILL KNOWLAND's Asia issue one of their basic articles of faith in the 1952 elections.

Up for reelection himself that year, KNOWLAND was overwhelmingly vindicated by both parties. His opponent under California's cross-filing system sneered at him as the Senator from Formosa. KNOWLAND had only three set speeches. One took 5 minutes, one took 15 minutes, and one half an hour, but each said the same thing: the Truman-Acheson Far East policy was catastrophic. KNOWLAND won both the Republican and Democratic nominations and stood as a political power of the first magnitude.

The unbreakable: Selected to lead the California delegation to the Republican National Convention, KNOWLAND was avidly wooed by presidential hopefuls. From the Eisenhower camp came strong hints that the vice-presidental nomination could be his. From the Taft forces (but not from Taft himself) came a direct promise that support for the Ohioan would give KNOWLAND second place on the national ticket. But KNOWLAND and his delegation were pledged to back Earl Warren for President—and BILL KNOWLAND has never broken his word. At Chicago, disturbed by reports that his Senate colleague RICHARD NIXON was trying to get the California delegation to defect to Ike, KNOWLAND called a secret caucus and faced his delegation shaking with anger. "I just want everyone in this room to know," he rumbled, "that never in history has any delegate ever violated his pledge and been respected again." There were no defections: California stayed solid for Warren through the first (and only) ballot. Then BILL KNOWLAND saw DICK NIXON nominated for Vice President of the United States.

With his own reelection just a formality, KNOWLAND rode the 1952 Eisenhower campaign train all fall, and it was on Bill's broad shoulder that NIXON fell sobbing in Wheeling, W. Va., when Ike declared his running mate guiltless in the campaign-fund uproar. The elections were barely over when KNOWLAND announced that he was a candidate for majority leader of the 83d Congress against anybody except STYLES BRIDGES, the Senate's senior Republican and one of KNOWLAND's closest Washington friends. By mid-December, it was obvious that Bob Taft also wanted to be majority leader, and a first-class fight appeared to be shaping up. In the end, a slate was worked out: Taft for majority leader; KNOWLAND, just beginning his second full term, for chairman of the powerful Republican Policy Committee; BRIDGES for President pro tempore.

If Taft had been one to harbor grudges, there were plenty he could have harbored against BILL KNOWLAND, who had challenged him in the Senate and refused to deal with him for the presidency. But Taft was perfectly aware of BILL KNOWLAND's basic quality. Late on the afternoon of June 9, 1953, Bob Taft, fatally ill, entered STYLES BRIDGES' office, dropped heavily into a chair and said quietly: "I'm going to be away and I've asked Bill to carry on for me. Nobody can push him around."

The unpushable: Taft was all too right. Nobody could push Bill around and, elected majority leader in his own right after Taft's death. KNOWLAND soon ran into trouble trying to push the unpushable Senate around. In his rush to political power, KNOWLAND had learned how to handle issues—but not men. Senior Republicans began grumbling: "He treats us like kids." Once KNOWLAND called for a night session without consulting Minority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. JOHNSON rounded up enough Senators to hand KNOWLAND one of the worst indignities that can be inflicted on a majority leader; he adjourned the Senate right out from under Bill's nose. Again, KNOWLAND's impatient ways led him to try to cut off debate on a bill to revise the Atomic Energy Act. His move so irritated a minority of liberals that they launched into a 13-day filibuster. KNOWLAND, who loves a good fight, was unbothered. One morning during the filibuster he arose from his office couch after a few hours' sleep and rushed forth announcing happily: "Boy, will we give 'em a fight today." In the end, the filibuster was broken—but the Senate had wasted a lot of time.

KNOWLAND also had some rough sailing in his relations with the White House. He is proud of his voting record of support (88 percent in the 83d Congress, 91 percent in the 84th) for the Eisenhower administration, but he has made some of his biggest, blackest headlines breaking with the administration. Perhaps the low point, in the administration's eyes, came during the 1954 debate on the Bricker admendment, designed to dilute the President's treatymaking power. Just when Senate leadership was needed most, KNOWLAND abandoned his majority leader's desk, walked to the rear of the Senate, announced that he was speaking as a rank-and-file Senator, and argued in favor of the amendment.

Thus, BILL KNOWLAND's first years of leadership were disappointing to both the administration and the Senate. He has since come a long way.

Unrequited love: The White House knows that it still cannot depend on KNOWLAND for down-the-line support, but it respects his sincerity of purpose and—because they are always the result of careful thought—his opinions. Ike, carefully cordial toward KNOWLAND, unfailingly calls him "Bill." KNOWLAND, carefully correct, unfailingly calls Ike "Mr. President." In the privacy of his office Ike sometimes grows hot under the collar when KNOWLAND challenges a cherished White House plan, but the President is a confirmed Constitutionalist and neither asks—nor expects—KNOWLAND to toe the executive line. On one vital point Ike has no worries: He knows that honest BILL KNOWLAND whatever his personal stand on an issue, will report the Eisenhower views to the Senate faithfully, accurately, and dispassionately.

In the Senate, KNOWLAND has won the regard of the old Taft loyalists. He publicly urged the Republican National Committee to give them responsible assignments during the 1956 campaign. Although he followed his considered judgment of the merits in each case, his votes for the Bricker amendment and against the censure of JOE MCCARTHY (even the club's pariahs have their rights, reasoned KNOWLAND) further endeared him to the Republican right wing. But there is a wide gulf between KNOWLAND and the Neanderthals—the McCarthys, the Bill Jenners and the "Molly" Malones. The gulf was widened considerably last fall when KNOWLAND campaigned 25,000 miles for Eisenhower and NIXON—and especially when he accepted appointment as a United States delegate to the UN. KNOWLAND owes the Neanderthals nothing; it is they who want the favors from him.

Time for a drink: The Senate's close party balance requires a harmonious relationship between the Democratic and Republican leaders. After a cool start, KNOWLAND and LYNDON JOHNSON have become warm friends. When Lyndon was convalescing from his heart attack, Bill twice weekly wrote long, gossipy letters with news of the Senate and its Members. He also assured JOHNSON that he would work to prevent anyone from taking political advantage of Lyndon's absence—and he did.

The most valuable lesson KNOWLAND has learned is that a leader must generally ease his way through the Senate, that the Senate cannot be battered into submission. The Senate's informal life can be as important as its parliamentary procedures. When KNOWLAND first became majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON once dropped by his office for a drink and a chat. KNOWLAND had one bottle on hand, which he kept in a refrigerator. He had no corkscrew, and his ice trays were frozen fast from long disuse. Bill struggled futilely for 15 minutes, trying to get the cork out of the bottle. Lyndon finally dragged him upstairs to his own office—"where we know how to open bottles." Now KNOWLAND keeps a well-stocked refrigerator for thirsty colleagues. Such concessions to Senate society have helped him in his work—but they have not slowed his man-killing pace.

Wed to a whirlwind: In his two-bedroom, $175-a-month Berkshire Hotel apartment, KNOWLAND is up six mornings a week by 7 o'clock, reads the Washington Post and Times Herald and the New York Times in his official limousine (a perquisite of his position as minority leader) on his way to the Capitol. The Senate restaurant normally opens at 8:15, but one waiter comes regularly at 8 to serve KNOWLAND his orange juice, eggs, toast, and coffee. It is always a working breakfast, once a week with White House Legislative Aide Jerry Persons, other mornings with Cabinet officers or sleepy-eyed Senators. Then, with the giant stride that often forces his companions to a dogtrot, KNOWLAND plunges onward into his day. That day continues even after he arrives home with what Helen Knowland calls his "bulging 20-pound briefcase." Says she: "He opens that old briefcase, spreads papers all over the place, gets on the telephone and in minutes the room looks as if a whirlwind had struck."

Living with BILL KNOWLAND may be like living with a whirlwind but, as their son Joe, an Oakland Tribune deskman, remarks: "Mother knows how to handle him." She handles by helping. In his earliest California campaigns she worked night after night addressing campaign literature and copyreading speeches. When Bill went into the Army, Helen took over his job, but not his title, assisting J. R. at the Tribune. Bill rarely spares more than 15 minutes apiece for visiting California constituents (he eases them out of the office by rising, walking to his window, remarking on the beauty of the view and, when they come to admire, shaking hands in farewell), so Helen lunches with visiting firemen 3 or 4 times a week in the Senate restaurant.

BILL KNOWLAND is a tireless public speaker, but strains painfully in his attempts at casual conversation, even with his family (the Knowlands have 2 daughters, 1 son). But Helen says: "But we know he loves us. * * * It's Billy's way, and it's all right with me." Bill once reprimanded her for jaywalking on the grounds that the wife of a lawmaker should avoid even the slightest infraction of law. But Helen merely says, half facetiously: "His high principles can be almost a nuisance at times." She encourages him in his only real hobby: pasting items about the life and times of BILL KNOWLAND into scrapbooks. Begun when he was 9 years old, the scrapbooks now number 41, increasing at a current rate of 4 a year, with entries ranging from college dance programs (filled out mostly by Helen) to some of the press' sharpest jabs, e. g., KNOWLAND is an "old man's young man," a "young fogy," etc.

The critical test: Despite KNOWLAND's devotion to the Senate, it does not fully satisfy his sense of destiny. When nobody was certain whether the 1955 heart attack would keep Ike from running, KNOWLAND began making presidential noises. Recalls young Joe Knowland (who is devoted to his father but somewhat awestruck): "The hardest thing I have to do is carry on a conversation with my father. Everything has to be just right or he won't talk. But he was so happy when he was getting ready to run for President that he was bubbling. He could talk about anything. He was relaxed and gay." KNOWLAND never did announce his candidacy, but he kept hinting strongly that Ike should reveal his intentions to throw open the lists. After Ike's announcement KNOWLAND gave up.

Some KNOWLAND associates believe that his political destiny, as well as the responsibilities of dynasty, may take him back to California after his Senate term expires January 3, 1959. This week KNOWLAND confirmed this speculation, announced that he would not run for reelection to the Senate. Back in California he would be on hand for the inevitable day when J. R. Knowland leaves the management of family interests in his hands. There too, he could run for governor on the theory that Senators rarely get presidential nominations.[1] California's present Republican Governor Goodwin J. Knight might have plenty to say about that. Although a Knight-Knowland battle would be a historic political struggle, KNOWLAND is in a strategic position. Goodie Knight and DICK NIXON are longtime fuedists. KNOWLAND has maintained cordial relations with both, taken sides only when he thought one clearly right and the other clearly wrong, and he is generally conceded to hold the balance of California's political power.

Even though his Senate career is coming to an end, he has cause for concern with the events at hand. For the session of the 85th Congress that began last week is the critical test of KNOWLAND'S leadership. And the record written by the 85th may decide once and for all the ultimate political future of WILLIAM FIFE KNOWLAND.

PAUL G. HOFFMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during my current appointment as a Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, I have enjoyed the experience of a friendly and cooperative relationship with Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, who is also a member of the United States Delegation.

He has a splendid record of unselfish, dedicated, and patriotic service to our country. With his usual imagination and farsightedness, Mr. Hoffman has given us a review of the current world situation which should attract widespread attention. The article, entitled "Three Omens of a Peaceful World," appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Times Magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE OMENS OF A PEACEFUL WORLD—SATELLITE UPRISINGS, THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE'S UNREST AND UNITED NATIONS MOBILIZATION OF WORLD OPINION, HOFFMAN DECLARES, MAY YET FORCE THE KREMLIN TO ADOPT A LIVE-AND-LET-LIVE POLICY

In the past 3 months we have seen one of the greatest eruptions of violence in our world since the end of World War II.

We have seen 1 nation—Hungary—butchered and almost destroyed by a calculated ferocity unknown since the days of Hitler; we have seen another nation—Poland—come to the edge of a similar disaster; we have seen Britain, France, Israel, and Egypt shed each other's blood and strangle world commerce in a dispute that none of the machinery of diplomacy could avoid; all over North Africa, ambuscade and guerrilla war kill people; armed conflict sputters on the borders of Red China; within the past 10 days the United States has pledged its armed might against the encroachments of new despotism in the Middle East.

It is against this background that, paradoxical as it may seem, I have come to the belief that peace—as I shall define it—is closer to being attainable than it has been for the past 10 years.

[1] The last was Warren G. Harding in 1920. Since then, Al Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Alf Landon, Tom Dewey, and Adlai Stevenson have demonstrated the affinity of governors for top place on the ticket.

Peace is an abstract word. For the purpose of this discussion, I define peace as a state in which problems exist, but exist in an absence of tensions so explosive and unmanageable that world war III is a hovering and active threat.

We have not known this kind of peace since the end of World War II. The reason we have not known such a peace is that, by an accident of history, two great sources of disturbance, independent in origin, were artificially married in what appeared to be an assault on the law and order of international affairs. The first of these sources was the seething unrest of that half of the globe emerging from colonial control and tutelage, bitter and angry at the white men of the West, seeking by every means and with any ally to gain the equality and independence to which it is entitled.

The second source of disturbance was the calculated, persistent, relentless determination of the leaders of Communist Russia to force their system on other nations, whether those nations wanted it or not, by any means, fair or foul.

The marriage of these two forces in the world, a marriage skillfully and artfully pursued by the leaders of the Kremlin, has not once, but many times, brought the world uncomfortably close to world war III.

Today, it seems to me, this situation is changing and changing fundamentally. From where I sit, as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, I have a vantage point of a global nature. Eighty nations gather in the great buildings by the East River in closer and more intimate contact than in any other forum the world has ever known. In our lounge all the problems of the world are the daily stuff of business. I know that the Middle East is still explosive; that the present leaders of the Soviet Union are still desperately trying to subvert every community of freedom or democracy in the world; that tempers between the Atlantic world and the undeveloped world are strained; that people still bleed in Hungary.

But other developments, of the most hopeful character, are equally apparent.

First, the rhythm of Russian imperial expansion in the satellite world of Eastern Europe has been broken; its grip and control are receding.

Second, within Russia itself, the present leadership is in deep trouble and unrest bubbles.

Third, the United Nations has demonstrated the power of world opinion, and by mobilizing world opinion has, for the first time since the war, separated the former colonial and undeveloped peoples of the world from Soviet influence. In the long run, this third factor may prove the most important of all.

Let us look at each of these three developments.

In the strict Communist empire of East European satellites, first Titoism and then outright rebellion have profoundly disturbed, and possibly shattered, the dream of empire cherished by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev. Trustworthy and subservient satellites were essential to a realization of their ambition to communize the world.

In the long decade after World War II, Russian policy rested on the Stalinist postulate that it would be possible through brainwashing to turn most of the adults of Eastern Europe—Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, East Germans, and the rest—into completely loyal Communists. Those Stalin couldn't convert, he planned to purge. But it was the communizing of the children and the young people which interested him most. On their plastic and fragile minds he trained his batteries of state education and propaganda, to bring forth such lyrical passages as this from a Polish third-grade school book published in 1951:

"Joseph Stalin—you already know the name.
"He is a friend of our People's Poland.
"His army and his will
"Have brought us liberation. * * *
"Schools and factories are built in our country,
"Socialism and happiness grow.
"And the name of the leader of peace: Stalin,
"People pronounce with love."

To give this propaganda a clear field every effort was made to insulate the satellite mind from non-Communist thought. In 1948 in Rumania, for example, an official guide of "forbidden publications" listed these categories, among others:

All pre-1947 school textbooks.

All maps of Rumania showing "territories no longer belonging to us."

All books dealing with Russian affairs in a critical manner.

All books dealing with religious matters.

All books complimentary to any regime or government except that of the Soviet Union.

In addition to this schooling for the mass of children, Stalin set up a program in 1946 under which hundreds, perhaps thousands, of the brightest young people of the satellite countries were brought to Moscow for intensified training to qualify them for Communist leadership. The idea was that by this kind of hothouse education the children and the youth of the satellites could be made immune to the infection of liberal ideas.

This did not happen. The Budapest Freedom Fighters of 1956, most of whom were in their teens or early twenties, gave a dramatic demonstration of the futility of that absurd experiment in human conditioning. Particularly interesting was the fact that many of the leaders among the Freedom Fighters were those bright young Hungarians who had been given special training in Moscow. Apparently the more they learned about communism the less they liked it. It seems quite clear that a foreign ideology which has to be imposed upon people at the point of a bayonet will not be accepted; it will be rejected and despised.

When Tito first proclaimed his independence of the Stalinist regime, it looked as though he were signing his own death warrant. However, with the help of almost a billion dollars' worth of Western aid, he has not only survived but has, by his example, helped leaders in other satellite countries to find the courage to assert their independence. For a time it looked as though Khrushchev and Bulganin might work out a friendly alliance with Tito, thus adjusting to the new situation. That opportunity is no longer present. By one act of duplicity after another—notably the abduction of Imre Nagy—Khrushchev and Bulganin have provoked the further distrust of Tito. Today he is more secure than ever in his independence. His position dramatizes the fact that if the Russian people desire friendly relations with their neighbors they must get a new leadership dedicated honestly to a live-and-let-live policy.

Within Russia, the situation is far from happy for the present leadership. There is no doubt that its present top leaders, trained in Stalin's bloody political academy, are men of brutality, malice, and violence. But their Government, even though less responsive than any other in the world, is still subject to profound internal pressures. We at the United Nations hear with increasing frequency and substance that among the younger leaders there grows an abhorrence of these old revolutionaries, whose hands are covered with the blood of a dozen purges, and who took a leading part in the frightful crimes which they now attribute to Stalin. Perhaps there is a growing idea that the purgers ought to be purged.

There is a new attitude also among the people of Russia—an attitude of increased freedom from fear which I believe is a big factor in strengthening the outlook for peace. I make no claim to being an expert on Russia, but I have had an opportunity to talk to many knowledgeable people, including some who have recently spent months inside Russia. It is their unanimous testimony that the people of Russia are much more interested in a better life for themselves than they are in communizing the rest of the world. Furthermore, the people do not share the hostility of their leaders toward the Western World, particularly toward America. They are friendly to American visitors.

Also, they are no longer frightened about that old bugaboo "capitalist encirclement." They feel confident the Soviet Union is now strong enough to defend herself against all comers.

Probably this change comes partly from a sense of security that goes with having nuclear weapons. Partly also it results from the post-Stalin propaganda line of peaceful coexistence, which pictured the free countries in a friendly light rather than as greedy warmongers. Of course, the party line has changed recently and we are once more greedy warmongers, bent on destroying Russia, but it is doubtful if the Russian people have faith in this new line. In any case, the fact that fear has largely given way to confidence is of telling importance because it means that the people cannot easily be panicked by their leaders.

There is a further change taking place inside Russia which may be of profound significance. In order to industrialize and modernize the country, Lenin and Stalin were compelled greatly to expand the professional and managerial group. There are present today in Russia in the body politic millions of professional people—teachers, lawyers, and doctors—and more millions of managers, supervisors, and technicians. They are a well-educated group. In all but name they are a new middle class, a class which resents being pushed around by dictators whether they be czars or commissars. It is in this group that our best hope lies in the long run.

As yet, this new middle class is not organized; its members do not act as a group; in fact, they are not even class-conscious. Their influence is passive. It stems from their awareness, and that of the party bosses, that they are needed. How quickly, or to what extent, a real class consciousness may develop, no one knows. If the members of this new class should become a cohesive group, they could exert great pressure for a basic change of policy.

Still more acute are the outbursts of independent thought and expression reported among university students in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities in the Soviet Union. It is as if these young men and women, having seen their own leaders deny the divinity of Stalin, were prepared to question authority openly for the first time. Such a thing has not happened since the earliest days of the Soviet Union. When these students graduate into the professional and managerial class, the results may be far reaching.

It is at least plausible that the present leadership in Russia could stave off for some years the defection of the satellites and the stirrings within Russia as well. How long they could go on, rigid, obdurate, inflexible against every human pressure of their own people, is a matter of conjecture. But they are now faced with another and, I believe, more potent pressure—a shocked and indignant world opinion, expressed most powerfully through the United Nations.

When the United Nations first started to function it was all too often thought of as a debating society, the implication being that debate is futile. How an American could hold this view is incomprehensible to me.

Our more than 175 years of history show that out of such debates, whether they be bitter or friendly, reasoned or filled with nonsense, have come decisions by the people which in the long view of history have turned out to be right.

Now on the world scene, thanks to the forum of the United Nations—which is, in effect, a world town meeting—it is possible to mobilize world opinion to support what is true and denounce what is false. I am not being naive when I say the truth is mighty; it can overcome falsehood, and, furthermore, men have the ability to discern the difference between truth and falsehood when free discussion takes place. This has been proved again and again as a result of the debates in the General Assembly of the United Nations in the past few weeks.

Some people contend that Moscow, being a dictatorship, is totally unmoved by such expressions of the free world's conscience. Far from it. Though it is quite true that in moments of physical emergency they will show that "callous indifference" to the respect of the world which President Eisenhower noted, it is equally true that so long as their goal remains world conquest, these Communist leaders must try to "look good" in the eyes of free countries. Tactically, they have on several occasions bowed to world opinion rather than see their reputation suffer. This happened, most recently, in the United Nations after President Eisenhower proposed a world agency for peaceful use of the atom—a proposal which the Kremlin leaders first greeted with cynical derision, but to which they finally agreed when they realized how high the idea stood in world opinion.

As a mobilizer of world opinion, moreover, the United Nations has acquired new status as a result of its response to the Israeli attack upon Egypt and to the Anglo-French military action which followed. The General Assembly by an overwhelming vote made it clear that it would not ignore or condone these actions, and resolutions were passed urging an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all troops. Most important of all, these resolutions were complied with.

The prompt action of the United States in this emergency has had a result which is awesome in its significance. The peoples of the Asian and African nations had firmly imbedded in their minds the belief that the nations of North and South America and Europe have always acted in concert. They felt it was the case with all Western nations—that they were for the West, right or wrong. We in the United States were suspected of favoring colonialism. As a consequence, there developed in the United Nations an Asian-African bloc which often has voted as a unit, and all too frequently with the Soviet Union, even when common regional interests were not at stake.

Now that has begun to change. By its stand on the Egyptian question the United States made it clear that the key words in our minds today are not West and East, but right and wrong. There is increasing evidence that the Asian nations are approaching moral issues, like that of Hungary, in this same manner. Among the 55 nations voting to condemn Moscow's action in Hungary were such generally uncommitted countries as Cambodia, Ceylon, Lebanon, Libya and Nepal. Thus the mobilization of world opinion on the crisis in the Middle East had a direct bearing upon the problem of mobilizing world opinion against Russia because of the aggression in Hungary. Having seen the United Nations act effectively against the injustice that mattered most to them, the Asian leaders were in a mood to condemn injustice elsewhere. When the evidence began piling up, contrary to Soviet talk about fascist plots, that the revolt in Hungary was a revolt of peasants and workers, of young heroes and not old Fascists, the Arab and Asian delegates no longer avoided the facts but looked them squarely in the eye.

The events which took place in Hungary are, of course, stark tragedy, but the men and women who fought and died for freedom have not died in vain. Not only have the Soviet leaders who ordered this savagery been unmasked, but an opportunity has been created within the United Nations to mobilize world opinion so quickly and with such unanimity among the nations, Asiatic, African, European, and American, that the Russian leaders will never dare order similar action again.

And the United Nations is far from through with the Hungarian situation. As Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has said: "World opinion may not develop quite as quickly as national opinion in the United States. But it does develop and it is real and potent. It is a force to which no nation is indifferent, and which has often been heeded—on occasion, even by the Soviet Union."

I believe we are going to surmount the present crisis. We can, if we act wisely, take full advantage of the fact that Egypt, Great Britain, France, and Israel have accepted the good offices of the United Nations and moved toward a just and humane solution of the problems of the Middle East. In the situation in Hungary we can, despite the fact that the United Nations has been flouted, continue to take those actions in the General Assembly which will make it clear once and for all that decent people everywhere condemn brutality. We can, by standing on high principle, help create those conditions which will bring about a new leadership in Russia which will be willing to live and let live. Once this comes to pass, the foundation will have been laid for the first enduring peace with honor and justice that this world has ever known.

COOPERATION BETWEEN UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA AND SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, IN KOREA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the University of Minnesota currently has an International Cooperation Administration contract which enables the university to work cooperatively with Seoul National University, in Korea. Observers of this program both at the University of Minnesota and elsewhere in my State are convinced that this project is highly significant educationally, as well as in the broader context of international understanding.

The magazine Korean Survey for June–July 1956, contained an article on this progress entitled "The Korean-Minnesota Bridge."

The December 1956 issue of the Minnesotan, the university staff magazine, also has an interesting article on this project.

I ask unanimous consent to have both of these articles printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Korean Survey of June–July 1956]

THE KOREA-MINNESOTA BRIDGE

(By Tracy F. Tyler)

The University of Minnesota and Seoul National University of Korea have reached the midpoint in a contract with the International Cooperation Administration designed to strengthen and develop the educational and research programs of the Korean university in the broad fields of agriculture, engineering, and medicine (including nursing). This contract, signed on September 28, 1954, was written for an initial period of 3 years. It involved an estimated expenditure, during the 3 years of $1,800,000. Already officials of Seoul National University have indicated informally that it is their desire to extend the original contract when it expires at the end of the 3-year period.

TWO OPERATIONS

There are two basic operations involved in the original contract. One is to bring to the United States for graduate study faculty members from the three Korean colleges referred to previously. The first of these Koreans arrived in early April of 1955. Forty-seven faculty members are studying in this country under the contract. Of this total, 44 are at the University of Minnesota; 2 are at Lowell Technological Institute in Massachusetts, studying textile engineering; and 1 is at the Ohio State University, studying ceramic engineering. Of those at the University of Minnesota, 20 are studying in the college of medical sciences, 14 in the institute of technology, and 10 in the institute of Agriculture. Five others, who studied under contract support for varying periods, have returned to their posts in Korea.

The second operation involves sending faculty members from Minnesota to Korea to render assistance in improving administration, teaching, curricula, research projects, and extension and demonstration programs in the three fields covered by the contract. A permanent Minnesota staff in Korea consists of a chief adviser, an engineering adviser, and an administrative secretary. Five faculty members from Minnesota served in Korea during the fall quarter, 1955. The assistant dean of Minnesota's College of Medical Sciences is spending April, May, and June there. Others are scheduled for later service including a professor of mining engineering who begins service June 15 for a period of 15 months.

OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES

A third responsibility, not originally contemplated by the contract, but undertaken with some reluctance on the urging of ICA officials, was the screening and procurement of a substantial amount of books, equipment, and supplies for the three colleges of Seoul National University named above. The first procurement under this arrangement is presently going forward with a sum of $1,150,000 provided by ICA. It appears that the University of Minnesota will be asked also to procure 2 additional orders of equipment—1 from funds to be set aside from fiscal year 1956 and 1 from fiscal year 1957. These lists, originally prepared by the officials of Seoul National University, will also have to be screened by staff members from the University of Minnesota prior to procurement.

A fourth responsibility, not originally contemplated in the contract, concerns recommendations involving building construction and building rehabilitation. Such activities, necessarily, have had to depend on the judgment of University of Minnesota staff members serving in Korea, together with such assistance as could be secured from various United States Government personnel stationed there.

An earlier issue of Korean Survey (February 1955) carried a brief account of this important sister relationship. It noted the visit in December 1954 of President Kyu Nam Choi and two other Korean educators. Since that time 2 deans of Seoul National University have spent tours of some 6 months each at the University of Minnesota and in trips to other institutions. They were Dr. Lee Chai Koo, dean, college of medicine; and Cho Baik Hyun, dean, college of agriculture.

Evidence indicates satisfaction with operations under the contract by the Korean authorities and pleasure on the part of the faculty and administration of the University of

Minnesota that they could render such an important service to a country so devastated by war and so deserving of assistance in building solidly for its future.

[From the Minnesotan of December 1956]

HOW THE "U" HELPS SEOUL UNIVERSITY REBUILD AFTER THE RAVAGES OF WAR

Since the fall of 1954, University of Minnesota faculty and civil service staff members have been participating in a cooperative relationship with Seoul National University to help strengthen and develop the educational and research programs in the fields of agriculture, medical sciences, and engineering. In the past 3 years, many university people have served in Korea. To begin the story of their part in helping to rebuild Seoul University, let's see what some of them have to say about the Korea of today.

"Food is the major concern in every village," reports Dorothy Simmons, State leader of the home program of agricultural extension here at the university. "Many families are actually short of food in the spring months before the new crop is harvested," she explained.

Skull Rutford, professor and director of agricultural extension, has written that "At the present rate of population increase, the problem of total food supply will continue to be acute. Even superficial observation reveals that standards of living, as reflected in housing, health, and sanitation conditions and similar measures, are very low. So that * * * it must be accepted that there is much need for improvement."

"There is approximately only 1 doctor for each 6,000 people in the Republic of Korea," noted Dr. William F. Maloney, assistant dean of the College of Medical Sciences. "The Communist invasion of June 1950 forced evacuation of the Seoul College of Medical Sciences. Many staff members and students were abducted, all furniture and equipment—including sinks, cabinets, tables, and scientific apparatus—were removed from the buildings," he observed.

"All of this tangible misery is evidence of the gigantic task * * * that lies ahead—a task in which education, and notably higher education, must inevitably play a major role," emphasized Malcolm M. Willey, academic vice president. "Clearly a strong university, training technicians, providing professional education, studying the problems peculiar to the local conditions, forwarding the solution of these problems by research, developing new standards of health and sanitation—a university doing these things is indubitably central in any scheme," he explains.

It was after the withdrawal of the Japanese in 1945 after 40 years of control and after the subsequent ravages of successive invasions by the Communist forces of Red China that the University of Minnesota was asked by the Foreign Operations Administration of the Federal Government, to assist Seoul National University. It was more fortunate than most of the other Korean universities and colleges because not as many of its buildings were destroyed. The 700,000 volumes of its books—60 percent in Japanese—were left intact. There are now 13,412 students, and 868 persons on the faculty.

In October 1954, the University of Minnesota signed the reconstruction contract with the Foreign Operations Administration, now renamed the International Cooperation Administration. Tracy F. Tyler, professor of general education, was named as campus coordinator of the Foreign Operations Administration contract for Seoul University. Soon, Arthur E. Schneider, professor of forestry, was appointed chief adviser in Korea and associated with him as secretary is Gertrude Koll, for many years in the office of the business vice president.

President J. L. Morrill appointed a Korean advisory committee consisting of Harold S. Diehl, dean of the College of Medical Sciences; John C. Kidneigh, director, School of Social Work; Laurence R. Lunden, treasurer and comptroller; Harold Macy, dean of the Institute of Agriculture; William T. Middlebrook, vice president, business administration; Athelstan F. Spilhaus, dean of the Institute of Technology, and Malcolm M. Willey, vice president, academic administration, chairman. Later, Dr. Gaylord Anderson, director of the School of Public Health, also became a member of this committee, and now Lloyd M. Short, chairman of the department of political science, has been appointed since there is a probability that public administration will soon be included.

Before the university signed the contract, Anderson, Macy, and Spilhaus took a preliminary tour of the Seoul National University, as special representatives of the University of Minnesota. They studied conditions there and then reported back to university authorities.

The program resulting from the contract is divided into three areas:

First, that the University of Minnesota provide a team in residence at the University of Korea, and special consultants be sent to Korea for brief periods of time to assist and advise in the planning of courses and teaching methods.

Second, that Seoul University send a number of its younger faculty members, men who show great promise in their respective fields, men who will be future educational leaders of their country, to study at the University of Minnesota for periods, in general, of a year or more.

And third, that the university will advise the Seoul National University on what equipment and supplies are needed, and will act as procuring agent.

Two Institute of Agriculture men, Dean Emeritus Clyde H. Bailey and Philip W. Manson, professor of agricultural engineering, went over in the fall of 1955. Manson described the Seoul National University College of Agriculture campus at Suwon as "all but ruined by two major Chinese Communist battles. There was virtually no equipment left on the campus," he continued, explaining that there were few textbooks and that most students have only a pad of paper and a pencil. Teachers were often forced to dictate textbook material in class.

Manson also told of the lack of heat in the classrooms, the cold winter temperatures, strong winds, and courageous students, who often arrived at class early in order to sit on the sunny side of an unheated room and who sometimes had to contend with frozen ink.

Manson worked at Suwon, 30 miles from Seoul, at the College of Agriculture campus, to improve teaching methods and facilities. He cooperated with the Koreans to help to determine new building needs, suggested methods for getting more and better textbooks, and selected and ordered the essential equipment necessary for administrative offices, for lecture demonstrations in the classrooms, and for student labs. He also formulated recommendations for the student library, and outlined an improved course of study in agricultural engineering, in cooperation with Korean faculty members, and planned a faculty exchange program between Seoul National University and Minnesota.

Bailey traveled and worked with Manson at Suwon, processing orders for 1,400 new books for the agricultural college library and requests for new equipment for the college as well as preparing sketches of plans for a new classroom-auditorium building on the agricultural college campus. The new 3-story building plans call for heat, he emphasizes. He also interviewed members of the Suwon school faculty who were prospective students at Minnesota's Institute of Agriculture.

Next to arrive in Korea in the fall of 1955 were 3 representatives of the institute of technology: Carl Graffunder, lecturer in architecture; Sidney C. Larson, associate professor of electrical engineering; and C. E. Lund, professor of mechanical engineering

Graffunder served as adviser to the school of architecture of Seoul University, working to improve the curriculum. He recommended that equipment be ordered so that laboratory courses could be taught, and that architectural design courses be added to the schedule of construction, materials, and architectural history courses that are being taught.

"Korean architecture," he explains, "has a fine traditional way of building palaces, temples, and homes that are well suited to their needs * * * and are beautiful. Now, the need has arisen for larger, more complex buildings such as college halls, shopping centers, and city administration buildings," he observed. As a result of his recommendations, 3 prominent Korean architects are now studying design at Minnesota.

Lund coordinated the selection and procurement of a half million dollars worth of equipment with the assistance of university staff members and Korean faculty members for the undergraduate laboratory courses which are now being set up in the college of engineering. He also served as adviser to the mechanical engineering department regarding mechanical improvements and the introduction of laboratory courses. Lund is now in the process of coordinating the procurement of another $230,000 worth of equipment to be sent. He was impressed with the ambition of the Koreans who are appreciative, eager to work, and willing to bear extreme hardships in the hope of a better future.

Sidney C. Larson, associate professor of electrical engineering, helped the Koreans set up courses for future electrical engineers. He also worked with them on plans for ordering equipment for the labs that were practically destroyed during the war. "Power is desperately short," he remarked. "Factories run only part-time, and homes have lights only for an hour or two in the evening. There is a crying need for roads, bridges, buildings, and other capital construction," he continued.

The next group to go to Korea consisted of Macy, Rutford, and Miss Simmons. They went last spring—on a special ICA assignment—as consultants to the United Nations Command Economic Coordinator. They surveyed agricultural research and extension programs in Korea and recommended a program for the organization and administration. They also found time to work with representatives of the University of Minnesota serving in Korea.

As Dean Macy explained the situation "Korea depends upon agriculture as the major source of the country's income and for the employment of the majority of its people. The education of Korean young people for future service to the nation, the constant search for new facts through scientific research agencies, and the dissemination of the latest knowledge about the art and science of agriculture * * * are absolute requirements for the present and the future. A well-integrated program of teaching, research, and extension will do much to promote the best interests of agriculture and, inevitably, the welfare of the Republic of Korea."

His report specifically cites the great need for work in soils, the reforestation of the denuded hills and mountainsides, soil conservation, development of a swine and poultry industry, the control of animal and plant diseases, farm produce utilization and marketing, and improved seed and seed distribution.

Rutford comments, "The problems are real: It is variously estimated that upwards of 70 percent of the people get their living directly from farming and an additional percentage are engaged in the handling, merchandising, and distribution of farm

products. This attests to its importance to the country.

"Agricultural extension is an out-of-school educational program directed toward the needs of rural people and built around problems of production and marketing, but including the home, youth, and most of the problems of rural life." As a result of his trip, he prepared a report stressing the need for and opportunities for service of an agricultural extension program.

Miss Simmons stressed the need for a strong home economics program and outlined a program to include home economics activities in the proposed agricultural extension service. During her trip, she noticed many of the household chores were sheer drudgery. For instance, clothes are usually washed in streams and beaten on the rocks until they are clean. Then, they are beaten again to remove the wrinkles. The typical Korean woman carries water from a central well, often unprotected from contamination, to her home where she prepares meals with the simplest of stoves, several pots set over a small fire. Because of the lack of better transportation and the expense involved, workloads are carried on the Koreans' backs and the country people walk miles between their homes and market places. In many places, sanitation facilities are very poor.

Miss Simmons speaks of the need to increase family income (the average farm is 2½ acres in size), to improve health, reduce work drudgery, and improve the status of women. "The most obvious contribution to increasing family income is by more efficient production and processing of food," she states. But some home industries can also be developed for income purposes. There is great need for improved sanitary practices including the better handling of food and water supplies, protection of wells from contamination, and a general improvement of cleanliness. Other specific problems that need attention are improvement of diet which consists mainly of rice; better use of public services contributing to health and welfare; and improved farming, village home life, and family care methods.

After it was translated into Korean, the report of the team was made directly to the Government of the Republic of Korea. "Generally," Macy says, "the plans incorporate the land-grant principles by which the university's institute of agriculture functions. That is, extension service, research, and teaching."

Following Macy, Rutford, and Miss Simmons was Dr. William F. Maloney, assistant dean of the college of medical sciences, who went under the university's ICA contract, in March for 3 months. Dr. Maloney's mission was to plan an appropriate program aimed at strengthening and developing medical education and research.

"Essential to this development is the establishment of minimum standards in medical education as well as rehabilitation of physical plant, teaching materials, and clinical facilities of the medical school," Dr. Maloney observed.

He points out that centuries-old beliefs and customs and almost total lack of health education of the population are common problems confronting all efforts at medical education and care in Korea. Also, "Medical progress has been so rapid and so sweeping in the past 10 years that many basic concepts and principles have undergone some alteration. The doctors of Korea have been denied by the circumstances of war and unrest * * * the opportunity to absorb recent basic developments in medicine. This kind of rehabilitation of the foundation is necessary before sound educational and research effort can subsequently be undertaken. Equipment such as microscopes, teaching tools, and textbooks, is, of course, absolutely essential," he emphasizes.

Medical equipment ordered under the Minnesota contract started to arrive in the fall to provide adequate basic teaching aids, hospital and outpatient clinic technical facilities, and the first equipment for research laboratories for faculty members.

Others serving in Korea recently include Harald Ostvold, assistant professor and agricultural librarian, who returned in mid-September after 3 months as visiting library specialist. He helped organize the agricultural, engineering, and medical publications which have been sent as part of the ICA contract. Ostvold also taught basic western library classification and cataloging. "The staff here is unusually interested," he wrote while there. "It's the most rewarding teaching experience I've ever had," he stated. He recommended that a new building be constructed for the central library.

This summer Paul Andersen, professor of civil engineering; Paul M. Burson, professor of soils; Andrew Hustrulid, agricultural engineering professor, and Frank H. Kaufert, director of the School of Forestry, left for Korea. To date 94 Koreans have come to the university to study under the contract.

Early in August, William T. Middlebrook, vice president of business administration, and Malcolm M. Willey, vice president of academic administration, visited Korea for a first-hand look at the progress being made. "We conferred with Choi, Kyu Nam, minister of education; Yun, Il Sun, president of Seoul National University; the deans, and some department heads; William E. Warne, UNC economic coordinator, and Arthur E. Schneider, chief adviser in Korea, and toured the entire physical plant," explains Middlebrook. "As a result of our visit, we agree that the program, from the University of Minnesota's point of view, is successful. We agree to continue for another 2 years after the conclusion of the present contract in the fall of 1957, provided the program can continue to be carried out with Federal funds, without the use of the State of Minnesota's tax funds.

Two things especially impressed him. First, the great need for improvement of the physical plant. He saw a 400-bed hospital, for instance, that was without heat, except for some stoves that are set up in the corridors during the winter. Because of the fuel shortage, about half of the hospital is closed during the winter. When I asked, "What about the ill people who can't get in?" the Koreans replied, "They have to wait until spring," he explains.

Second, he was impressed by the ability of the Koreans, their keenness and their eagerness to learn. "They asked question after question," he reports, "wanting to know our attitude on this, on that. And, in spite of the poverty, the Korean people are cheerful."

Commenting about the results of the work, as seen in Korea, Willey said, "It is a most significant undertaking, not only because of its educatonal implications, but because of what it can mean—if only in a small way—in the terrible struggle for freedom to which we as a nation are so deeply committed. We are making a patriotic and positive contribution in the defense of freemen.

"Despite the scenic beauty, the fact remains that Korea is a country struggling for its existence. It is a country beset oy problems of infinite complexity in every aspect of life * * * of people of wonderful qualities. As one who knows them well has said, 'Koreans are likable people, good natured, shrewd, and kindly. They can be extremely fierce in pride and in action. But in the end, the Korean knows there is work to do, and his strong, plodding diligence and his admirable forbearance in the face of troubles that would break lesser people, manage to help him exist and even flourish.' Perhaps the two things which best symbolize Korea are the thoroughly worked paddy fields at the foot of the rounded hills and the graceful pavilion which graces the top, from whose steps the Korean can look over a land cumbered with troublesome history, yet not without burgeoning hope.

"That's the kind of people I sense them to be, and that's the kind of people that deserve the help that the United States can well afford to give. In the giving the university of Minnesota is playing its part, and I for one am proud that this is so."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because the Minnesota-Korean program has been so successful, Mr. President, I am all the more disturbed to learn that difficulties have begun to arise in other contracts let under this ICA program. As the contracts program has developed, apparently there has been an increasing tendency to write into the contracts themselves manifold details, exceptions to which must be approved by ICA. The hands of so many people—lawyers, accountants, security officers, and so forth—have gradually become involved in contract details that the interest of the program itself has not always been preserved. My information leads me to think that ICA lacks the staff to pass upon the hundreds of details which, according to the contracts, it must pass upon if the college finds they will not work. Delays, mounting pressures, crisis decisions, and relapses into inertia seem to have typified the implementation of some of these contracts in recent months.

In some cases there is no doubt that the situation is critical and that as contracts expire, there will be withdrawals from the program, including withdrawals even by institutions unquestionably qualified to handle the program. Yet, Mr. President, some of the Asian attachés here in Washington have told me that this whole ICA contract effort is one of the best ones we have, and that from the viewpoint of their nations, it is one of the programs which most definitely should be expanded.

The situation has seemed to be so serious that I have just written a letter to Mr. John B. Hollister, Director of ICA. I ask unanimous consent that the substance of my letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1957.

Mr. JOHN B. HOLLISTER,
Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLLISTER: As you may recall, I have commented favorably to you on occasion upon the existing program of cooperation between the University of Minnesota and Seoul University in Korea. Because of my deep interest in the continuance of this program I have tried to gather together as much information about the whole institutional projects abroad system as I could.

It has become very apparent that there is wide agreement among participating American colleges and universities concerning the need to centralize under your general supervision, and at a high level in the International Cooperation Administration, the responsibility for the university contract program.

I am told on good authority that many colleges and universities are considering withdrawing from this program simply because of the present system of divided and diffused responsibility for dealing with the universities, and delays and frustrations which such a system almost inevitably entails. In fact the situation, from the point of view of many of the institutions, has reached the critical point.

Yet again and again I have heard from the representatives of other nations joining in this program that it is doing a very great deal to win friends for the United States and to help in the constructive efforts of the foreign governments concerned. The consensus is that the program ought to be expanded. Certainly I would advocate an expansion.

Therefore I should appreciate your informing me as to what may be anticipated in the way of centralizing responsibility for the ongoing of the university-contract program. I am keenly interested in this program, and I do want to see it go forward rather than backward.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we simply cannot afford to let programs of such value and magnitude risk frustration and disillusion for bureaucratic reasons. If these programs need new life, I hope that it will be quickly injected by the proper administrative authorities. The programs deserve the support of Congress and the country. I am confident that they will have such support if their operate in the manner intended when they were devised.

INFLATION AND THE COST OF MONEY TO THE TREASURY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on yesterday the newspapers announced that the President will soon submit a budget message calling for approximately $72 billion. In anticipation of this request for a vastly increased budget, I took occasion on January 1 to take some clippings from the New York Times, to indicate the factual status of the finances of the Government of the United States.

From the New York Times of January 1, 1957, I submit a short table, headed "One Year Maturities Are $72,976,172,154."

Mr. President, this means that during the calendar year 1957, beginning on the first of January, the Treasury Department will have to pay or refinance securities having a total value of in excess of $72,976,000,000. Let it be remembered that this is not the national debt, but only that part of it coming due this year. The total national debt for the first 4 months of fiscal 1957 was running at $275.4 billion.

In the same newspaper there was printed on January 1 a list of the market prices of United States Government and agency bonds, including the long-term bonds, the Treasury bills, the Treasury notes, the certificates of indebtedness, Federal Land Bank bonds, Federal National Mortgage Association bonds, and International Bank bonds. The notable fact about the list is that all of the long-term bonds of the Treasury of the United States were, at the end of the calendar year 1956, selling below par.

Even the 30-year 3¼-percent bonds issued by the Treasury in 1953, the first act of the new Secretary of the Treasury, were quoted by the New York Times, on Tuesday, January 1, 1957, as selling for 96.18. In other words, at the end of the year, every long-term bond of the United States was selling at below par, including even the two bonds issues the income of which is exempted from taxation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the matter from the New York Times to which I have been making reference printed in the RECORD. It is important to know that the cost of money to the Treasury has been rising—that is inflation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Government and agency bonds

BONDS

Treasury		1 p. m. Bid	1 p. m. Asked	Change in bid
2½s	1958–57 March	98.26	98.28	----------
2¼s	1959–57 September	96.18	96.20	----------
2¾s	1959–57 March	97.18	97.22	----------
2¾s	1958 June	98.3	98.5	----------
*2¾s	1963–58 June	99.22	99.26	----------
2½s	1958 December	97.30	98.0	----------
2¼s	1962–59 June	93.16	93.20	−.6
2¼s	1962–59 December	93.16	93.20	−.6
2½s	1960 November	94.22	94.26	−.4
*2¾s	1965–60 December	99.20	99.28	−.2
2¾s	1961 September	96.4	96.8	−.6
2½s	1961 November	94.20	94.24	−.4
2½s	1967–62 June	90.16	90.20	−.8
2½s	1963 August	93.14	93.18	−.4
2½s	1968–63 December	89.18	89.22	−.8
2½s	1969–64 June	88.20	88.24	−.8
2½s	1969–64 December	88.18	88.24	−.6
2½s	1970–65 March	88.16	88.20	−.8
2½s	1971–66 March	88.14	88.18	−.8
2½s	1972–67 June	87.22	87.26	−.10
2½s	1972–67 September	87.18	87.22	−.6
2½s	1972–67 December	87.20	87.24	−.8
3¼s	1983–78 June	96.10	96.18	−.10
3s	1995 February	91.2	91.6	−.12

*Not subject to Federal taxes. Figures after a period represent 32ds of a point.

TREASURY BILLS

		Percent	Percent
1,600	Jan. 10	2.80	2.50
1,602	Jan. 16	3.16	3.04
1,600	Jan. 17	3.02	2.90
1,600	Jan. 24	3.02	2.90
1,601	Jan. 31	3.05	2.94
1,600	Feb. 7	3.12	3.02
1,601	Feb. 14	3.14	3.04
1,750	Feb. 15	3.24	3.14
1,600	Feb. 21	3.15	3.07
1,600	Feb. 28	3.15	3.07
1,600	Mar. 7	3.17	3.09
1,600	Mar. 14	3.17	3.09
1,600	Mar. 21	3.18	3.12
1,000	Mar. 22	3.10	3.05
1,600	Mar. 28	3.21	3.17
1,600	Apr. 4	3.25	3.22

TREASURY NOTES

Outstanding (millions)		Rate	Bid	Ask	Yield
2,996	March 1957	2⅞	99.28	99.30	3.16
531	April 1957	1½	99.12	99.20	3.03
4,155	May 1957	1⅝	99.8	99.10	3.51
12,056	August 1957	2¾	99.20	99.22	3.28
3,792	August 1957	2	99.4	99.6	3.33
824	October 1957	1½	98.24	99.0	2.86
382	April 1958	1½	97.16	97.24	3.36
4,391	June 1958	2⅞	98.26	98.28	3.68
121	October 1958	1½	96.16	96.24	3.44
5,102	February 1959	1⅞	96.11	96.13	3.66
118	April 1959	1½	95.12	95.20	3.51
99	October 1959	1½	94.14	94.22	3.52
198	April 1960	1½	93.20	93.28	3.48
277	October 1960	1½	92.24	93.0	3.50
144	April 1961	1½	92.0	92.8	3.47
32	October 1961	1½	91.4	91.12	3.45

CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

7,219	February 1957	2⅝	99.28	99.30	3.07
3,220	March 1957	2¾	99.18	99.30	3.01
1,312	June 1957	3¼	100.2	100.4	2.98
7,271	October 1957	3¼	100.0	100.2	3.17

U. S. Government and agency bonds—Con.

FEDERAL LAND BANK BONDS

Outstanding (millions)		Rate	Bid	Ask	Yield
130.0	February 1957	3	99.26	99.30	3.46
170.0	May 1957	3.30	99.26	99.30	3.49
135.0	July 1957	3¾	99.31	100.3	3.53
214.9	October 1957	1¾	98.8	98.16	3.69
131.1	May 1958	2¾	98.0	98.10	4.04
184.1	November 1958	2¼	96.16	96.24	4.09
124.0	February 1960	2¼	94.14	94.24	4.05
71.0	May 1959	2¼	95.22	96.0	4.05
106.5	June 1960	2½	95.2	95.12	3.98
60.3	May 1971	3½	96.0	97.0	3.75
110.0	September 1972	3⅞	99.0	100.0	3.86

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

100	May 1957	3.35	99.24	99.28	3.61
100	August 1957	3.90	100.0	100.3	3.84
570	January 1958	2¼	98.2	98.10	4.14

INTERNATIONAL BANK BONDS

		Bid	Asked
2⅛s	Sept. 15, 1957	98.0	99.0
3s	July 15, 1972	84.0	86.0
3s	Mar. 1, 1976	83.0	85.0
3¼s	Oct. 1, 1981	86.0	88.0
3⅜s	May 15, 1975	90.0	92.0
3⅛s	Oct. 1, 1958	100.16	101.0
3⅛s	Jan. 1, 1969	93.0	95.0
3⅛s	Oct. 15, 1971	92.16	94.16

The following quotation for the IB serial issues represents the highest and lowest yields for all maturities:

2s, 1957–62	3.75	3.00

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $72,976,172,154

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $72,976,172,154. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

1957:		
Jan.	1—Ser. E sav. bonds*	$2,222,346,303
Jan.	1—Ser. F sav. bonds*	450,026,951
Jan.	1—Ser. G sav. bonds*	1,679,725,900
Jan.	3—Discount bills	1,601,247,000
Jan.	10—Discount bills	1,600,272,000
Jan.	16—Discount bills	1,602,748,000
Jan.	17—Discount bills	1,600,740,000
Jan.	24—Discount bills	1,600,142,000
Jan.	31—Discount bills	1,601,624,000
Feb.	7—Discount bills	1,600,725,000
Feb.	14—Discount bills	1,601,029,000
Feb.	15—2⅝% ctfs. of ind	7,219,479,000
Feb.	15—Discount bills	1,749,900,000
Feb.	21—Discount bills	1,599,827,000
Feb.	28—Discount bills	1,600,093,000
Mar.	7—Discount bills	1,600,088,000
Mar.	14—Discount bills	1,600,218,000
Mar.	15—2⅞% Treas. notes	2,996,574,000
Mar.	21—Discount bills	1,600,125,000
Mar.	22—Tax antic. bills	1,086,000,000
Mar.	22—Tax antic. ctfs	3,220,612,000
1957:		
Mar.	28—Discount bills	1,601,089,000
Apr.	1—1½% Treas. notes	531,296,000
May	15—1⅝% Treas. notes	4,154,930,000
June	24—3¼% tax antic. ctfs	1,312,000,000
Aug.	1—2¾% Treas. notes	12,056,091,000
Aug.	15—2% Treas. notes	3,792,028,000
Oct.	1—1½% Treas. notes	824,196,000
Oct.	1—3¼% ctfs. of ind	7,271,000,000
Total		72,976,172,154
Week ago		72,975,598,154
Year ago		69,786,768,348

*Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, following the printing of that material, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement taken from the New York Times of January 14, 1957—that is this morning's New York Times—the same list of calendar year maturities which the New York Times

prints Monday morning. These are the borrowings of the Government which must be refinanced during the following 12 months. The list I presented a few moments ago begins with January 1, 1957. The one I now present begins with January 16, 1957. It covers every type of debt, bonds, notes, discount bills, all securities the Government must pay or refinance. It will be noted that yields on short-term obligations have been rising, and the market value of long-term bonds declining.

I call attention to the fact that the 1 year maturities beginning January 16, 1957, and ending on January 15, 1958, are now recorded as amounting to $77,141,448,074, as compared to $72.9 billion on December 31 last.

At the same time, in the New York Times, under the dateline Washington, January 13, 1957, there is a story with the heading "Sales and Earnings Dip. Government Agencies Show Loss in 1956 Third Quarter."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two clippings from today's New York Times printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $77,141,448,074

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $77,141,448,074. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills and notes as follows:

1957:	
Jan. 16—Discount bills	$1,602,748,000
Jan. 17—Discount bills	1,600,740,000
Jan. 24—Discount bills	1,600,142,000
Jan. 31—Discount bills	1,601,624,000
Feb. 1—Ser. E sav. bonds*	2,223,334,663
Feb. 1—Ser. F sav. bonds*	451,548,938
Feb. 1—Ser. G sav. bonds*	1,667,765,300
Feb. 7—Discount bills	1,600,725,000
Feb. 14—Discount bills	1,601,029,000
Feb. 15—2¾% ctfs. of ind	7,219,479,000
Feb. 15—Discount bills	1,749,900,000
Feb. 21—Discount bills	1,599,827,000
Feb. 28—Discount bills	1,600,093,000
Mar. 7—Discount bills	1,600,005,000
Mar. 14—Discount bills	1,599,968,000
Mar. 14—2⅞% Treas. notes	2,996,574,000
Mar. 21—Discount bills	1,600,310,000
Mar. 22—Tax antic. bills	1,005,647,000
Mar. 28—Discount bills	1,614,593,000
Apr. 1—1½% Treas. notes	531,296,000
Apr. 4—Discount bills	1,600,348,000
Apr. 11—Discount bills	1,600,105,000
May 15—1⅝% Treas. notes	4,154,930,000
June 24—3¼% tax antic. ctfs	1,311,980,000
Aug. 1—2¾% Treas. notes	12,056,091,000
Aug. 15—2% Treas. notes	3,792,028,000
Oct. 1—1½% Treas. notes	824,196,000
Oct. 1—3¼% ctfs. of ind	7,270,942,000
1958:	
Jan. 1—Ser. E sav. bonds	2,341,864,249
Jan. 1—Ser. F sav. bonds	211,157,624
Jan. 1—Ser. G sav. bonds	1,689,845,300
Total	77,141,448,074
Week ago	77,234,071,808
Year ago	69,785,676,215

*Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

SALES AND EARNINGS DIP—GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SHOW LOSS IN 1956 THIRD QUARTER

WASHINGTON, January 13.—The Government reported today that sales and earnings of all United States manufacturing corporations declined during the third quarter of 1956, largely because of the steel strike and lower auto production.

In a joint report, the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission said third quarter sales were estimated at $74,600,000,000, down 3 percent from the second quarter figure of $76,900,000,000. The lower figure still topped that for sales in the third quarter of 1955, which was $69,200,000,000.

Net earnings after taxes amounted to $3,600,000,000 compared with $4,200,000,000 in the second quarter, the report said. In this case the July–September figure was lower than the $3,700,000,000 total for a year earlier.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times list of United States Government and agency bonds, the last list published as of January 12, 1957.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Government and agency bonds

BONDS

Treasury	3:30 P. M. Bid	3:30 P. M. Asked	Change in bid
2½s '58–57 March	99.11	99.13	+0.1
2¼s '59–57 September	97.2	97.4	+.2
2⅜s '59–57 March	98.2	98.10	+.2
2⅜s '58 June	98.21	98.23	
*2¾s '63–58 June	100.0	100.8	−.4
2½s '58 December	98.12	98.14	−.1
2¼s '62–59 June	94.12	94.18	+.8
2¼s '62–59 December	94.16	94.24	+.12
2½s '60 November	95.84	96.0	+.8
*2¾s '65–60 December	100.0	100.8	−.4
2¾s '61 September	97.12	97.20	+.8
2½s '61 November	95.24	96.0	+.8
2½s '67–62 June	91.24	92.0	+.8
2½s '63 August	94.12	94.20	+.4
2½s '68–63 December	91.4	91.12	+.16
2½s '69–64 June	90.8	90.16	+.20
2½s '69–64 December	90.4	90.12	+.16
2½s '70–65 March	90.0	90.8	+.12
2½s '71–66 March	90.0	90.8	+.16
2½s '72–67 June	89.24	90.4	+.12
2½s '72–67 September	89.24	90.0	+.28
2½s '72–67 December	89.28	9.04	+.16
3¼s '83–78 June	97.12	97.20	+.8
3s '95 February	91.24	92.0	+.12

*Exempt from normal income tax. Figures after a period represent 32ds of a point.

TREASURY BILLS

		Percent	Percent
1,602	Jan. 16	3.25	2.70
1,600	Jan. 17	3.10	2.80
1,600	Jan. 24	3.05	2.75
1,601	Jan. 31	3.05	2.80
1,600	Feb. 7	3.05	2.85
1,601	Feb. 14	3.05	2.90
1,750	Feb. 15	3.08	2.98
1,600	Feb. 21	3.08	2.98
1,600	Feb. 28	3.06	2.96
1,600	Mar. 7	3.08	2.98
1,600	Mar. 14	3.02	2.92
1,600	Mar. 21	3.10	3.00
1,000	Mar. 22	3.10	3.02
1,601	Mar. 28	3.08	2.98
1,600	Apr. 4	3.04	2.96
1,600	Apr. 11	3.05	2.98

TREASURY NOTES

Outstanding (millions)		Rate	Bid	Ask	Yield
2,996	March 1957	2⅞	99.30	100	2.85
531	April 1957	1½	99.16	99.24	2.69
4,155	May 1957	1⅝	99.14	99.16	3.14
12,056	August 1957	2¾	99.25	99.27	3.03
3,792	do	2	99.10	99.12	3.09
824	October 1957	1½	98.28	94.0	2.75
382	April 1958	1½	98.0	98.8	2.98
4,391	June 1958	2⅞	99.11	99.13	3.30
121	October 1958	1½	97.0	97.8	3.16
5,102	February 1959	1½	96.31	97.1	3.36
118	April 1959	1½	95.24	96.4	3.36
99	October 1959	1½	94.30	95.6	3.39
198	April 1960	1½	94.6	94.14	3.36
277	October 1960	1½	93.10	93.18	3.38
144	April 1961	1½	92.14	92.22	3.39
103	October 1961	1½	91.18	91.26	3.40

U. S. Government and agency bonds—Con.

CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

Outstanding (millions)		Rate	Bid	Ask	Yield
7,219	February 1957	2⅝	99.30	100.0	2.38
3,220	March 1957	2⅝	99.29	99.31	2.90
1,312	June 1957	3¼	100.0	100.2	3.10
7,271	October 1957	3¼	100.2	100.5	3.04

FEDERAL LAND BANK BONDS

130.0	February 1957	3	99.27	99.31	3.29
70.0	May 1957	3.30	99.26	99.30	3.48
135.0	July 1957	3¾	100.0	100.4	3.50
214.9	October 1957	1¾	98.16	98.24	3.68
131.1	May 1958	2¾	98.16	98.24	3.84
184.1	November 1958	2¼	96.23	97.4	3.91
71.0	May 1959	2¼	95.28	96.6	3.94
124.0	February 1960	2¼	94.24	95.2	4.07
106.5	June 1960	2½	95.4	95.14	3.95
60.3	May 1971	3½	96.0	97.0	3.77
110.0	September 1972	3⅞	99.8	100.8	3.86

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

100	May 1957	3.35	99.26	99.30	3.49
100	August 1957	3.90	100.0	100.3	3.68
	September 1957	4⅛	100.1	100.3	3.93
570	January 1968	2¼	98.10	98.18	4.07

INTERNATIONAL BANK BONDS

		Bid	Asked
2½s	Sept. 15, 1959	98.0	99.0
3s	July 15, 1972	84.0	86.0
3s	Mar. 1, 1976	83.0	85.0
3¼s	Oct. 1, 1981	85.0	87.0
3⅜s	May 15, 1975	99.0	92.0
3⅛s	Oct. 1, 1958	100.16	101.0
3½s	Jan. 1, 1969	93.0	95.0
3½s	Oct. 15, 1971	93.16	95.16
4½s	Jan. 1, 1977	101.12	101.24

The following quotation for the IB serial issues represents the highest and lowest yields for all maturities:

INTERNATIONAL BANK BONDS

		Bid	Asked
2s	1957–62	3.75	3.00

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the list shows that some of these bonds have increased slightly in price, but they are still selling below par, and the bills and notes for the most part are yielding to the purchasers in excess of 3 percent interest.

Thus, while the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, expresses the desire that inflation be controlled, the fiscal facts show that the cost of money borrowed by the Government of the United States has been steadily rising. I think these are important facts which must be taken into consideration when the budget is presented, and must be borne in mind whenever we are told that the budget is in balance. I think it might be more appropriately said that the budget is dangerously balancing.

IMPROVED METHODS OF STATING BUDGET ESTIMATES AND ESTIMATES FOR DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was happy to join with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from

Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and many other distinguished Members of this body, in sponsoring the bill (S. 434) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. Prompt action would seem to be in order for this vital legislation. As a cosponsor of S. 3199 during the last session, I was disappointed that the provisions relating to appropriation estimates had to be stricken in conference. In the interest of a more effective and more efficiently operated Government, I hope that this situation will not long continue, and that the provisions of this measure, which are so overwhelmingly approved by both private and governmental fiscal experts, will shortly become law.

One of the main purposes of this bill is to provide more effective control by the Congress of governmental expenditures. This is a difficult objective, and will not be entirely achieved by this bill. Control generally is more difficult in Government than in private business, because in most areas the Government has no competitor with which to compare its product, which is often an intangible, such as service or preparedness. But I am convinced that the statement of expenditures on an annual basis, as opposed to the present confusing obligation system, will be a great aid in that direction.

Much has already been done in recent years to modernize the budget and accounting procedures and thereby increase the citizens' control of the Federal purse strings. The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, based on the first Hoover Commission report, redesigned the budget so that money needs were related to specific Government programs, and permitted more flexible performance by the General Accounting Office. The Budget Bureau was reorganized in 1952 along functional lines as recommended by the first Hoover report. Since 1950 the Comptroller General has issued statements of accounting principles and standards which are sound and permit flexibility in application. And the Budget Bureau, in 1954, called for cost-based budget data from executive agencies wherever the information was available from an integrated—cost and accrual—accounting system.

The Payne-Kennedy bill (S. 3897), which was approved and became Public Law 863, 84th Congress, 2d session, provides some very real and important improvements in the budgeting, accounting, and allotment system of the Government. Its provisions requiring that agency budgets be determined on a cost basis and that agency accounts be maintained on an accrual basis are unquestionably steps in the right direction. But the Government financial structure will not be converted to a real accrued expenditures basis until the provisions of this bill that appropriations be made on an annual accrued expenditures basis are adopted.

Consequently, the objectives of the Hoover Commission report, namely, more effective executive and legislative control, will not be realized until budget estimates and appropriations are stated on an annual accrued expenditures basis. Until then the Government will be maintaining two separate accounting systems—agency accounts on an accrual basis and appropriations on an obligation basis. The basic objectives of the Hoover recommendations require this final step. It is the key to any significant change.

In terms of congressional control of Federal expenditures, one of the principal advantages of the changes provided by this bill (S. 434) will be its reduction of the tremendous carryover balances of appropriations, which now amount to nearly $75 million. Over sums previously appropriated but not yet spent, the Congress exercises virtually no control. There would seem to be a reasonable doubt as to how far the provisions of this proposed legislation can be applied in the area of capital expenditures, or what are referred to by the Budget Bureau as long lead time programs. But to a certain extent, in this area and without question in the area of operating expenses, Senate bill 434, so strongly recommended by the Hoover Commission, will serve to reduce the large carryover balances and produce better control of expenditures.

To the extent that the effect of the bill is to complete the shift of congressional appropriations away from the obligation basis and to an accrued expenditure basis, it utilizes an approach which private business has found most useful. Since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was enacted, there have been not only significant changes in the size and scope of Government services, but much progress in the skills of accounting. One of the notable aspects of this change in the private-business field has been to focus more closely on consumption, that is, on the receipt of goods and services. More effective control in Government must follow the same principle. That is the objective of the bill—to relate more directly congressional appropriations to actual spending.

I am convinced that the effect of the bill will be to produce substantial savings for the taxpayer. This is the ultimate objective. The Task Force of voluntary experts who made the study on which the Commission based its report to Congress saw opportunities for great economies through modern budgeting and accounting. "The benefits which would result from improved financial management cannot be calculated with any degree of precision," said the Task Force, "but we believe the resultant dollar savings could reasonably be expected to amount to $4 billion which is approximately 8.5 percent of the controllable expenditures."

This statement applied to the entire reorganization provided in the original bill last year and, moreover, may actually duplicate economies spelled out in other parts of the Hoover report. No matter. Our citizens will welcome savings of half or even a quarter of the estimated amount—coupled with greater efficiency, and a return of the purse strings to the hands in which, traditionally, they have been held since the days of Runnymede.

I therefore strongly urge prompt consideration of S. 434, and approval, with such changes as may be found necessary, so that we may start making headway in the direction so ably outlined by the Hoover Commission, the administration, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and all of my many distinguished colleagues and friends who have developed this proposed legislation in the interest of better government at a better price.

PRESS AND RADIO SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO JANUARY 20 INAUGURAL FOR COVERAGE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, reduction of the Presidency to a ceremonial office is threatened by exclusion of the press and radio and television from coverage of the taking of the inaugural oath by President Eisenhower at the White House on January 20. As a former journalist and writer, it is my fervent hope that White House press attachés will think through the full implications of their present decision, and thus determine to abandon it.

It is a highly dangerous precedent, in my opinion, for the press to be excluded from the taking of the official oath which will make a man the Chief Executive of a Government of 169 million people for the next 4 years—and then to exploit with great fanfare and pageantry a mere phantom oath-taking a day later, which will have no legal force and effect whatsoever, but will be merely ceremonial.

Let me emphasize this point. The oath-taking held behind closed doors will make Dwight D. Eisenhower President of the United States until January of 1961. The oath-taking staged with immense panoply and heraldry will be only for public relations purposes; it will not be the official oath, which is required by the Constitution to be taken on January 20.

The American Presidency is not some dukedom or kingship in the mythical land of Graustark or the tiny principality of Monaco, to be ruled by ceremonial trappings. It is the living, breathing fountainhead of government for a vast and vital democratic Nation. It is diminished in status and prestige when the actual oath-taking is held in virtual secret, without coverage by the press, while a ceremonial duplication receives an immense buildup.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that even emergency oath-takings, such as those of Calvin Coolidge and Harry Truman, have been covered by the press at a time of national tragedy. Yet now an oath-taking known far in advance is to be barred to the press, and to be held only in the presence of the President's family and his political associates. As a journalist, I am particularly distressed. President Eisenhower has able press advisors. I hope they will allow press coverage of the January 20 inaugural, which is the official inaugural. Perhaps the

President's advisors will reverse the unwise ban which now forbids such press coverage.

THE HELLS CANYON HIGH DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to turn my attention to the introduction of a new Hells Canyon Dam bill. On behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] who now occupies the Chair and presides over the Senate and Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY. I am proud to introduce a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

For the benefit of the press, I should like to say that there are several former sponsors of a similar bill who are not cosponsoring this bill but who will vote for the bill. They are Senators who since the last session of Congress have adopted the policy of not cosponsoring any bills. However, they will be heard from in due course of time, they have assured me, and they will make clear that they are as enthusiastic in support of the passage of a Hells Canyon Dam bill at this session of Congress as they were in the last session.

I am also privileged to make an announcement on behalf of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. He has asked me to notify the Senate that he considers the Hells Canyon bill to be an exceedingly important bill, and that, as majority leader, he intends to do everything possible, consistent with his duties as majority leader, to expedite the earliest possible passage of the bill at this session of Congress.

HIGH HELLS CANYON REMAINS INDISPENSABLE DAM

Speaking of the bill, Mr. President, I wish to say that in my judgment the Hells Canyon Dam remains the most indispensable dam on the American Continent. The people of the Pacific Northwest—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, alike—have spoken in the recent election at a crucial turning point in the history of our great region. Our fellow citizens in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, need and must have a full, comprehensive, and integrated development of the water resources of the Columbia River; and it is only that kind of development which will give them adequate protection from the floods which periodically ravage the region.

FULL FLOOD CONTROL IMPERATIVE

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of a full and comprehensive river basin development from the standpoint of flood control. When I speak of flood control, Mr. President, I am raising my voice in a plea for the protection of future generations of Americans. I say that because we cannot justify the further continuance of a shortsighted policy which does not do in our generation all that it is possible and within our power to do toward developing the maximum flood control possible in areas of our country where great damage is being done and precious topsoil is being washed into the sea.

Therefore I wish again to urge the Hells Canyon Dam because of its flood control features, which make the dam stand out as the most adequate flood control dam that can be built in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, since the election last fall it has been interesting to listen to some of the spokesmen for the administration, particularly the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, talking about high dams. They have caught the word. They have finally, though belatedly, come to recognize the importance of the word "high" in speaking about the development of our river resources.

They now talk about a high dam at Pleasant Valley. However, when they talk about a high dam at Pleasant Valley, they are not talking about the type of high dam the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I talked about up and down the State of Oregon in the historic campaign just concluded. The people of our State and its neighbors know what is meant by a high dam. I hope that, with further education, the Secretary of the Interior will finally come to understand what is meant by a high dam. To use the word "high" in connection with a dam does not make it a high dam in the sense of developing the maximum flood control potential and power potential and irrigation potential of the great river basins of the Pacific Northwest.

I speak very respectfully when I say that when Mr. Seaton talks about a high dam at Pleasant Valley he is talking about a grossly inadequate dam from the standpoint of the development of flood control, power, and irrigation potentials. He is using a word which he now recognizes has great political meaning, because on November 6 the people of the Pacific Northwest registered very clearly their insistence upon high dams in the true meaning of the terms. The allegedly high dam at Pleasant Valley will not provide maximum flood control, will not afford maximum power development, and will not produce maximum reclamation development. I shall have something to say about reclamation development before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, I will tell the Senate what that dam will do. It will take the Idaho Power Co. off the hook. That is what it will do. Mr. Seaton knows it. The administration knows it.

The present Presiding Officer of the Senate joined me many times on the floor of the Senate in the statement that originally the Idaho Power Co. obviously never intended to build three dams. I repeat that statement today. I say that they added the third dam to their paper program only because it would help them make a little better paper case with respect to the cost-ratio problem which is involved in this great natural resource program.

As we read the report of the Federal Power Commission, it is very interesting to note that when the license was granted there was included in it no mandatory requirement that the third dam be built. In fact, there was great doubt even as to whether the second dam would be built.

Now the Secretary of the Interior is heard talking about a high dam at Pleasant Valley. Of course, if we build at Pleasant Valley, the kind of dam the Secretary of the Interior calls a high dam, it will wash out the site for the proposed third dam of the Idaho Power Co., and in that way will take the Idaho Power Co. off the hook.

In that connection, Mr. President, I warn today that if that is done, if we take away their paper right to build a third dam, we will hear talk about the taxpayers compensating the Idaho Power Co. for its alleged losses.

The time has come to issue some forewarnings to the Senate of the United States, because the advocates of private utility low dams have been routed in the Pacific Northwest, and those who, after all, control our Government, the voters at the ballot boxes of a great free Republic, have made very clear, in my judgment, that they want high dams, not political dams; not dams devised to serve private utilities and their various nefarious schemes, and to enable them to engage in what I consider to be an unjustifiable holdup of the economic interests of future generations of American boys and girls. The people have made very clear that they want full and comprehensive development of our rivers.

It is very interesting to note that a very distinguished Republican of my State, the former Governor of the State, the editor of the Salem Statesman, who is not a supporter of the senior Senator from Oregon, as he made very clear during the campaign, after the campaign was over engaged in a little retrospection and introspection, and, on November 11, wrote a very interesting column in his newspaper in which he sought to set forth his analysis of what happened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, certain excerpts from that column. They are excerpts, Mr. President, because I always try to be very sportsmanlike and fair in my references to my political opposition, and I shall not include those comments in Governor Sprague's column which deal with anything other than his analysis of the river development program.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Saturday's Statesman carried an Associated Press dispatch from Washington saying that the Eisenhower administration "has started a complete review of its natural resource and power policies as a result of setbacks the Republican Party suffered in Midwest and Western States."

An unidentified official was quoted as saying "the machinery has already been set in motion at the Vice Presidential and Cabinet level to take a long, hard look at the natural resource and power policies."

This is like locking the barn door after thieves had visited it twice. If Republican leaders in Washington had been alert they would have launched this study after the defeat of Cordon in 1954.

The administration's partnership power program simply didn't prove popular. The visible and tangible benefits of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams converted all but anti-Government ownership people to public power development.

Dissatisfaction with Idaho Power Co.'s three-dam development of Snake River power stemmed as much over fear that the Northwest would lose a substantial number of kilowatts in perpetuity, and water storage for flood control, as over distrust of private development.

Had Republicans held to the program of Federal development of the Columbia and its main tributaries, leaving other power sites for local or private development, they would have held public confidence in greater degree.

Other instances, such as the D'Ewart grazing bill in 1953 and the inclusion of Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument in a proposed reservoir—while neither prevailed—helped to weaken faith of dedicated conservationists in the administration program, and the Davis ruling on Al Serena mining claim patents, relatively trivial in themselves, was used as a red rag to alarm them further.

Finally, when the administration threw Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, into the senatorial battle against MORSE, it really joined the issue—with the result already recorded by voters on Tuesday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate read Editor Sprague's column they will see that he warned the Republicans of my State—that is, the Republican organization, not the Republican voters, because the Republican voters went to the polls by the thousands and endorsed the position I had taken concerning Hells Canyon Dam and the whole matter of river development.

Governor Sprague pointed out that the Eisenhower administration had better reappraise and reevaluate its whole river development program. As will be seen, he respectfully suggested to the present administration that it had better take a second look, and he suggested that it should have taken it immediately after the present Presiding Officer of the Senate was elected to the Senate of the United States because in the column it is pointed out that the same issue was fought out in the Cordon-Neuberger race, and that the people of the State indicated very clearly in 1954 that they were not going along with the Eisenhower administration's program in regard to river development. He pointed out that that was the time to have locked the stable door. Now it had better take another look at it and see to it that the program is reappraised and reevaluated.

When I read that column by Governor Sprague, Mr. President, I wrote him a letter in which I expressed my complete agreement with a suggestion he made in his column. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain excerpts from the letter which I wrote Governor Sprague in which I told him, in effect, that I thought it was important that we have a bipartisan foreign policy from the standpoint of the security of our country in the field of foreign affairs, and I also thought we should have a bipartisan domestic policy in regard to conserving the natural resources of our country for the benefit of future generations of Americans.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE,
Editor and Publisher,
The Oregon Statesman,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I want you to know that I appreciate very much your thoughtfulness in sending to me your congratulatory note of November 8.

I have just finished reading your column of November 11, 1956, in which you say many things with which I agree. Particularly do I wish to express the hope that both major political parties in Oregon could join forces in unified action on a "program of Federal development of the Columbia and its main tributaries, leaving other power sites for local or private development * * *." Your comments in regard to such a program describe the very essence of the power program for which I have been working. What I fear most in the development of our natural resources is the danger of segmentizing our river basins. I think we are bound to lose the maximum development of the potentialities of our river basins if we do not stand firm in support of a comprehensive, full development program, such as the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have recommended in the past. I know of no evidence that justifies a change in that concept, and it has its roots in the natural resource development program envisioned by Theodore Roosevelt and brought within our reach by bipartisan public officials over the intervening years.

We speak so frequently about the constant need of the two major parties uniting on a bipartisan foreign policy, there is also a great need before it is too late for the two parties to unite on a bipartisan natural resource program that will guarantee to future generations that our generation will not take steps that will destroy for all time the opportunity for full development of our river basins. I have always been willing to try to work out on a bipartsan basis such a program and I am very hopeful that the point of view so ably expressed in your column will be shared by the leaders of the Eisenhower administration to the end that a bipartisan natural resource program can be agreed upon in this next session of Congress. I shall do my very best to make clear that I stand ready to cooperate in bringing about such an objective.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pointed out to Mr. Sprague that I had fought for such a program on both sides of the aisle in the Senate of the United States. I fought for it while I was a Republican, and I am fighting for it now that I am a Democrat; and I wish to say that so long as the people of my State repose in me the great trust as one of their Senators I shall continue in the direction of Theodore Roosevelt, Pinchot, Norris, La Follette, Dill, McNary, and those who are still serving in the Senate of the United States in the fight to preserve the Nation's natural resources for the benefit of the people of the Nation and not for selfish private interests who have no right to take profits from the rivers at the expense of full development. The rivers are for the benefit of all the people. It is an issue that is joined, Mr. President.

NEED RETURN TO BIPARTISAN PROGRAM

I wish to say to the Secretary of the Interior and to the President of the United States that I would welcome sitting down with spokesmen of the administration and trying to work out a bipartisan natural resource program of conserving these gifts of God for our generation and for the benefit of future generations.

So I say, Mr. President, that the Hells Canyon Dam issue ought to be taken up not in the realm of partisan politics, but treated by Republicans and Democrats alike as the great symbol, indicative of whether we are going to develop these river basins for the benefit of all rather than for the profit of a selfish few.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, that certain reactionary spokesmen in this country, such as Moley of Newsweek, who spat his reactionary venon throughout my campaign, will say, "Creeping socialism."

But if it be creeping socialism to fight to preserve and conserve the natural resources of this country for the benefit of all the people, I shall take the name calling with a smile, because I took the issue up and down the State of Oregon for months. I averaged from 5 to 10 speeches a day for 3 months, and much of the time I talked about natural resources. I am proud to say that not once did I speak for myself. In that campaign I never made a single speech for myself alone, but I spoke for a Democratic ticket that was pledged to the great conservation ideal for which I once more raise my voice on the floor of the Senate today.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GOVERNOR HOLMES, OF OREGON

Mr. President, today is a great occasion in Oregon, because a new Governor is being inaugurated, and I wish to digress just long enough to extend in the RECORD my congratulations to the new Democratic Governor of Oregon who, shoulder to shoulder with me, day in and day out, up and down the State, helped me to carry this great natural resource issue to the people of our State. The people spoke as they did on November 6 because the Democrats of Oregon were running against a Republican ticket that was representing the interests of private utilities and not the interest of the people of the State of Oregon. And the people answered. We elected not only a governor, not only a substantial majority in the House of Representatives of the State legislature, we not only increased our membership in the State senate from a very small number to a number that equaled the Republicans, so that it now stands 15 to 15, but we elected 3 of the 4 Reperesentatives in the Congress of the United States.

ISSUE IS ECONOMIC POTENTIAL OF AMERICA

I wish the RECORD to show that there is no question as to what the dominant issue was. It was whether or not the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest should be and would be developed for the benefit of the people of the Nation. When I make the fight for Hells

Canyon again at this session I am going to fight also for the economic interests of the people of Maine, of Florida, of Michigan, of Ohio, and every other State, because I recognize, Mr. President, that in our era economics do not stop at State lines. What we are fighting for here is the development of the economic potential of America. We cannot do that without a full development of the great river basins of the country.

So I say, Mr. President, we need adequate protection from floods, which periodically ravage the region. We need a high dam at Hells Canyon to provide abundant low-cost power as the only economic source of energy to stimulate industrial expansion and firm year-around employment, and to turn more arid acres into fertile farmland for the food needs of our children.

THE NEED FOR FUTURE FOOD PRODUCTION

As we read the advertisements of the private utilities against the full development of our river basins—because that is what they amount to—we see statements which would lead the American people to believe that we do not have to keep our eyes constantly looking forward to the future needs of our country. We encounter private utility propaganda deprecating the need for irrigation and alleging the futility of growing more so-called surplus crops.

Let me say once again that the population experts of this country are concerned about America's food supply for the year 1985 and for the year 2000. Their testimony is to the effect that they doubt whether we will be then self-sustaining from the standpoint of our own food supply.

The Senate has heard me say before, but the statement needs to be constantly repeated, that civilizations climb on their surplus food supplies. If they reach a break-even point, they begin to go static. When they go below the break-even point, they become decadent.

So I am proud of what I think time will prove to be a precedent-making piece of legislation, namely, the law enacted at the last session of Congress, known as the Morse-Neuberger Crooked River project law, which deals with a reclamation project in the Prineville, Oreg., area. It is a project which is greatly needed by the people of that area, but a substantial cost of the project will be paid out of the power revenues of the Dalles Dam.

That is why I have always been such an ardent advocate of the so-called river basin account program for the development of all the resources of a river basin. That is why I think it is so important that we keep in mind the fact that under the phony partnership scheme of this administration, the opportunity for a sound river basin account system will be scuttled. What will be done will be to turn over the profits to selfish, monopolistic interests, and to take away from the people the opportunity to pay for the full development of reclamation projects, for example, out of the profits of the people's dams, because the private utilities will not pay for them; the private utilities will simply "pocket the dough."

That is why I think, as was pointed out by Mr. Sprague in the editorial column previously referred to, that the Government ought to build the great multiple-purpose dams, and leave the non-multiplepurpose dams for private development. No Member of the Senate will work harder to help the private utilities build dams at low-head sites than will the senior Senator from Oregon. But that is quite different from this administration's program, whereby the power facilities will be turned over to the private interests, under the scheme of partnership, while the taxpayers will assume the rest of the bill. The taxpayers will then lose the chance to develop, out of power revenues, projects of the type which will be developed and built, under the Morse-Neuberger law, in the Crooked River area. The profits from mutiplepurpose dams ought to go into the Treasury of the United States and the reclamation fund for the benefit of the people of the United States, to be used to pay for full river basin development projects which will benefit the people of the United States.

This is a great issue, Mr. President. It is difficult to dramatize it. Millions of people, in their busy, work-a-day lives, troubled with their own individual economic problems, do not understand the significance of this challenge of statesmanship for the future. But as a student of the Senate of the United States long before I ever came to this body, I always thought, and I still believe, that the primary duty of a United States Senator is to work on the basis of the doctrine of trusteeship; to work for legislation which will help future generations to take care of themselves.

One of the temptations is for us to yield to the expediencies and the political advantages of the moment, and to forget that if we support something less than adequate legislation, which may serve the selfish interests of some group in our time, although it may accrue to our political advantage, we nevertheless, by doing so, betray the trust we owe the desk and chair we occupy in the Senate of the United States.

So with the use of whatever ability I may have in trying to make this issue clear to the American people, I give notice today that so long as I shall serve in the Senate I shall continue to raise my voice in challenging the American people to stand up to the citizen-statesmanship responsibility which is theirs and to make certain that we do not sacrifice and plunder the natural resources of our country in our time to the detriment of future generations.

Thus I make the point that we need the high Hells Canyon dam, and other dams like it, so that more arid acres may be turned into fertile farm land for the food needs of our children yet to come.

Mr. President, the year 1985 is not a long way off. The year 2000 is right ahead of us. Yet the population experts tell us that unless we do the conservation job which needs to be done in our generation, we may deny an adequate food supply to future generations of American boys and girls.

In this brief speech of mine today I would stress the point that we keep our eyes on the water table. The President is on a very significant trip to those arid acres of our country which have become a dust bowl; the areas of the country where for some years past thousands upon thousands of our fellow citizens have suffered great hardship at the hands of the weather. One of the problems is water. One of the facets of that problem is the falling water table in America.

How shall we get the American people to see the significance of this physical fact in time? All across the country, in area after area, the table line of water is dropping. Unless the water be conserved, and those things done which are necessary to protect the water supply of the American people, history will record that our civilization went down with the table line of water.

Why was I a strong advocate of the Upper Colorado River Basin project, expensive as it was—so many times more expensive, as the Presiding Officer [Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair] pointed out time and time again in his great speeches—so many more times expensive than the Hells Canyon project? I was one of the ardent advocates of the Upper Colorado River Basin project because I became convinced that it was necessary to protect the water table in the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin. That is why I fought for it. I would never want a boy or a girl 300 years from now to turn the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find that I failed to protect them from thirst, or that I failed to do all in my power to protect them in their right to the maximum water supply which sound legislation could help them obtain. That is why I fought for the Upper Colorado River Basin project.

Oh, I know there were some power features in that project, but they were such expensive ones that the private utilities were perfectly willing to have Uncle Sam pick up the check for them. The private utilities could see no profit in those power facilities.

But we in the Pacific Northwest have at present an abundance of water, and profit can be obtained from multiple-purpose dams if they are built by the people for the people. I shall continue to make the fight to make certain that that is done, if it is legislatively possible, and I am confident it is.

The administration has abandoned to private interests the water and the rich profits which can come from the multiple-purpose dams, a part of which should be used for the development of reclamation projects. For example, we find the private utilities seeking to scuttle the program by running full-page, expensive advertisements in the periodicals of the Nation. The advertisements are paid for out of the rates charged the users of the power. The private utilities' program adds up, not to the full development, but to the underdevelopment of our river basins.

As more and more people in the Nation come to understand the issue, as the people of the Pacific Northwest made it clear on November 6, 1956, that they understand it, I think we shall have handed to the representatives from other sections of the country mandates of the same kind as that which, I am satisfied,

was handed once again to me on November 6.

We need the Hells Canyon Dam also for expanded recreation, for phosphatic fertilizer development, and for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.

During the 1956 election campaign the issue on Hells Canyon was drawn plainly. Now the verdict on Hells Canyon is in. The people of the area want the dam built. After an exhaustive debate that has gone on for several years, that decision remains as firm as the mighty basalt rock of the great gorge in which the dam will be built. High Hells Canyon remains the "more nearly ideal development" of the middle Snake River resource—the indispensable dam, the symbol of an epic struggle of plain people to guard their river against underdevelopment and monopoly.

Working men and women, farm families, the rural electric cooperative members, public-utility district members, and the ordinary unorganized citizens in every walk of life have written an epic page in our region's history. Against heavy odds, against the most relentless pressure and propaganda of selfish reactionary interests, they have held firm. They continue to hold firm for full river development which requires the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. President, rivers do not respect State lines. There is just one test: How fully does a plan for development harness a river system for all of its various uses, and how fully are the benefits flowing from those uses made available to all of the people?

That is why the people of my region have made their choice. By every measurement, the Federal high dam at Hells Canyon is the proper means of development for the Middle Snake River, the principal tributary of the Columbia River. By every measurement, the 1948 comprehensive plan of the Corps of Army Engineers sets the goals to which we must now wholeheartedly rededicate ourselves, if the bright promise carried on the surging Columbia River is not to be lost forever.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ENGINEERS' 308 REPORT

Mr. President, the Army engineers made the scientific report which is known as the 308 report. That report was made by them in 1948 without political interference or restrictions. Unfortunately, I understand that under the Eisenhower administration, the Army engineers are now reviewing the report, but under the restriction of eliminating from study projects which are considered controversial.

I wish to say, as I said during the campaign in Oregon, that all the taxpayers in the United States are entitled to receive from the Army engineers an impartial and scientific report on the river resources of the Pacific Northwest, without any political instructions or restrictions whatever. The policy decisions should be made by the Congress of the United States. But, Mr. President, when the Army engineers submit their review report, I do not wish to be told that some potential project was eliminated because certain forces were in controversy about it. I wish to know—as I knew when I read the 308 report of 1948—that I am receiving from the Army engineers an impartial, nonpolitical report. Therefore, Mr. President, I await with great interest the review of the 308 report by the Army engineers; but today, here on the floor of the United States Senate, I serve notice to the head of the Army engineers that I will not accept any inadequate report, any report which does not cover all the river resources of the Pacific Northwest, insofar as their economic potentials are concerned and insofar as their desirability for full river-basin development is concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may join the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in the introduction of the Hells Canyon bill, which I believe was introduced earlier today.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much, and I am honored to have him as an associate in introducing the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the last session I heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon explain the bill. It seems to me that maximum development of our natural resources is required in this day and age of shortage of resources and hydroelectric power.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oregon upon the great speech he is making; and I desire to congratulate him also on the great fight which he and his colleague from Oregon, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] waged in Oregon.

As the Senator from Oregon well knows, it was my pleasure to join enthusiastically in that fight; and I wish him to count me again as a soldier in the ranks.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much. He has been of great assistance as an associate of mine in regard to this natural-resource problem. I wish to say that I look to him, as one of his students, for leadership in this matter, because of the contributions he has made in regard to the TVA and in regard to project after project that have sought to do what I am pleading for today, namely, to carry out the doctrine of trusteeship in regard to our natural resources. Mr. President, the activities of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in that field have redounded to his great credit.

I wish to make the following personal comment: I am very thankful to him, and I am proud to thank him here on the floor of the Senate, for the great assistance he was to me in my campaign in Oregon, in discussing there, before the people of my State, this program of natural-resource development, because it helped answer an interesting argument which was made against me, namely, that on this issue I stood alone in the Senate of the United States. The great speeches the Senator from Tennessee made were unanswerable rebuttal to that kind of personal attack which was made.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I am very grateful for the comment he has made, and I am also grateful for his very generous references to my efforts in his State. It was my real pleasure to undertake to be of assistance in the reelection of the great senior Senator from Oregon. I may say, however, that I found that he needed no assistance, nor do I think I provided him with any, other than perhaps some occasion for speaking.

Oregon was one State in which I campaigned in which I found the voters in no doubt; all of them seemed to have their minds made up earlier for either one candidate or another; and, as it turned out on election day, a great majority favored the reelection of the senior Senator from Oregon. It was my finding when I visited Oregon that a great majority of the voters had already decided that they would vote to reelect him to the United States Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much, indeed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho has listened with a great deal of interest to the very pertinent and persuasive comments of the senior Senator from Oregon. It is apparent that there is interest on the part of Senators from other States in the proposal the Senator from Oregon is submitting today.

In view of the fact that most of the water involved in this unfortunate and rather tragic controversy involving the high Hells Canyon dam originates in the State of Idaho, which I have the privilege and the pleasure of representing with my junior colleague in the United States Senate, I would be remiss if I did not interject a few remarks or ask a few questions at this point.

Certainly, there can be no opposition to the comments of the Senator from Oregon in favoring basin-wide development in the Columbia River Basin, especially in the upper watershed of the Columbia River. So the Senator from Idaho would like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he will join with the people of the State of Idaho and with me in sponsoring a bill to authorize construction of Bruces Eddy Dam, on the north fork of the Clearwater River?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Idaho knows that in the closing days of the last session of Congress, he and I enjoyed in the Senate a very interesting debate in which I opposed Bruces Eddy Dam. I wish to state to him that I shall continue to oppose Bruces Eddy Dam until the fish and wildlife problem is solved better than it would be solved if Bruces Eddy Dam were built at the present time. In the closing paragraphs of my speech, I shall have a few things to say about Bruces Eddy Dam.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then I shall wait until that time to ask some questions.

Mr. MORSE. Briefly, Mr. President, I have said that the record in regard to

Hells Canyon Dam is clear. It is contained in the hearings on the Hells Canyon bill, which last year was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Briefly, that record shows that only with a high dam at Hells Canyon can we obtain the water storage needed for maximum flood control and low-cost power. Only with this keystone dam can there be full development for irrigation to meet future needs for food. Only with Hells Canyon can we achieve the full recreation potential of the Middle Snake, and avert other projects which, like Bruces Eddy, will damage conservation of fish, wildlife, and wilderness resources.

Mr. President, if and when we can solve these conservation problems, involving fish and wildlife, in other dam proposals in the Pacific Northwest, I shall be found seeking to help the construction of those dams as well.

Politicians cannot gerrymander a great river basin. There are no effective, economical substitutes for the 3,800,000 acre-feet of water storage which Hells Canyon can provide at the best remaining dam site in the country.

It is not too late for the Congress and it is not too late for the administration to change the course of action heretofore expressed, and to proceed to authorize the construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

The election results throughout the Pacific Northwest show that the present administration misjudged the temper of the people on this issue. For 4 years the administration spokesmen have said the people of the area should be free to decide how their resources are to be developed. That decision on Hells Canyon should be honored by the President, Secretary of Interior Seaton, and their supporters in Congress. It is time for a fresh start, a new beginning, to develop this matchless natural resource to the full, for the common good of the region and the Nation.

WATER RIGHTS PROVISION CLARIFIED

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am exceedingly proud to have associated with me, as a cosponsor of the bill, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. To the people of Idaho I wish to say that he met with the authors of the bill. He presented to us his concern—as it was our concern—about seeing to it that the water rights of the people who live on the banks of the river are protected. Upon his urging, Mr. President—and credit is due him—I was proud to modify section 2 of the bill, although I do not think the modification changes its meaning or effect at all. However, I think the modification helps by way of clarification. As modified, section 2 of the bill will now read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall not conflict with, and shall be subordinate to, present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the waters of the Snake River, and its tributaries upstream from the dam and downstream.

I think, Mr. President, that clarification will be very helpful in the debate which will take place in the weeks ahead.

Mr. President, that completes my formal statement in presenting the bill today. I now ask unanimous consent to offer the bill out of order, and I ask consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 555) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to foster comprehensive development of the resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for the purposes, among others, of controlling and utilizing the Snake River and its tributaries for beneficial objects, including generation of hydroelectric power and energy for the national defense and other purposes, irrigation of lands, navigation and flood control, and for purposes incidental to any of the foregoing, including providing financial assistance to Federal reclamation projects, the Department of the Interior, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to construct, substantially in accordance with the physical plans set out in the reports referred to hereinafter as—

(a) the Hells Canyon Dam, as described in volume 2 of House Document No. 473, 81st Congress, and as modified by the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation, approved by the Secretary on May 11, 1951; and

(b) the Scriver Creek power facilities of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home division, as described in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation, approved by the Secretary on May 11, 1951.

The Secretary in prosecuting his activities under this section and in operating and maintaining said projects shall, except as is otherwise provided in this act, be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall not conflict with, and shall be subordinate to, present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries upstream from the dam and downstream.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to facilitate the development of the central and upper Snake River Basin, and also that of downstream areas, the Hells Canyon Dam and powerplant and the Federal Columbia River power system shall be interconnected, and 500,000 kilowatts of firm power attributable to the Hells Canyon project, or such portion thereof as is required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in central and upper Snake River Basin and to all other parts of Idaho lying outside the central and upper Snake River Basin.

(b) Electric energy available from Hells Canyon Dam and powerplant and the Scriver Creek power facilities not required for the operation thereof shall be marketed by the Secretary in accordance particularly with sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Bonneville Project Act of 1937, as amended (50 Stat. 731), dealing with transmission, distribution, sale and rate schedules.

(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed to supply and transmit from the McNary Dam the necessary construction power for the Hells Canyon Dam.

SEC. 4. (a) The initial works of the projects authorized by section 1 of this act and any additional works or division, including the irrigation features of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home division, that may be authorized as hereinafter provided shall be treated as one project for the purpose, among others, of providing for the application of project revenues to the return of reimbursable costs in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. Federal reclamation developments proposed to be constructed in the central and upper Snake River Basin may be authorized as works of divisions of these projects but only if such authorization is specifically provided by an act of Congress. Recommendations by the Secretary with respect to such authorizations shall be made in connection with the Secretary's report and findings under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), which report shall include findings as to the costs and benefits of the proposed developments and as to the effect of such authorization on the project's power rate structure. In the case of the irrigation features of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home division, such a report shall be made and transmitted to the Congress not later than during the term of the 85th Congress.

(b) The term "central and upper Snake River Basin" as used in this act shall mean the area comprising the drainage basin of the Snake River and its tributaries down to and including the Clearwater River.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator from Oregon give us assurances that he will utilize all of his influence with the political leaders of his great State to insure early approval of the interstate compact which would deal with the allocation and use of the water resources of the Columbia River basin?

Mr. MORSE. I give to my friend from Idaho assurance that I will do everything I can to defeat the compact. I think it is a private utility compact. I think it has been dominated and controlled by the private utilities. The whole movement has been. It will not serve the interests of the people of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, or Montana, in my judgment, and I shall oppose the compact.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, the Senator from Oregon, well informed as he is, is aware of the fact that in other river basins there have been compacts entered into to provide for the equitable distribution of water resource benefits.

Mr. MORSE. I know of the other compacts. I do not think the cases are even analagous. The bill we have proposed is in no way dependent upon a compact governing the multipurpose development of this interstate stream.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly, the Senator from Oregon is entitled to his opinion and to reach the conclusion that there is no need for the compact; but certainly the Senator is aware of the fact that the representatives appointed

by the governors of seven States in the Columbia Basin have been endeavoring to work out a plausible, feasible plan for the distribution of the water-resource benefits to the people living in the basin. Certainly when the Senator from Oregon makes the charge that any particular economic group or association, or even any individual, has completely dominated and influenced the deliberations and the conclusions of the particular group representing seven States, he is inviting some very caustic criticism.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make two points in reply. The Republican legislature in Oregon at its last session tabled the proposal. I also wish to point out that the Democratic Governor of Oregon being inaugurated today was one of the members representing Oregon in the so-called negotiations. He thought it was so bad that he would not be a party to signing it. I want to say that the Governor of Oregon, who takes office today, will not support any such compact. The Senator from Idaho and I are in irreconcilable conflict on the matter.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I hope that is not true.

Mr. MORSE. We are not going to agree on the question of the compact. I think a compact would not be in the interest of my State or the Pacific Northwest, and I shall oppose it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly the Senator from Oregon does not want us to believe that he is impugning the motives of the reclamation leaders in six other States in the Columbia Basin who take the position they have taken. If the representatives of the State of Idaho, where most of the water which flows down the Snake River to the Columbia River originates, and the representatives of the other States except Oregon in the basin think that there should not be comprehensive development until there is a compact signed and approved by the Congress, providing for equitable distribution, surely the Senator from Oregon is not justified in prejudging, one might say, the potential results of having a compact, which procedure has been followed in other river basins.

Mr. MORSE. May I say goodnaturedly the Senator from Idaho makes an interesting argument? If I disagree with the advocates of a compact, according to the Senator from Idaho, I put myself in an untenable position and I am challenging the motives of those who advocate a compact. I think they are dead wrong. I think their judgment is unsound. I think a good many of them follow a natural resource program that so closely resembles that of the private utilities that I call them political bedfellows.

I do not know how I can be any clearer in my view about it. I want to say that in the State of Oregon the compact does not have the chance of a snowball in a hot oven. I am not going to sit in the Senate and support a program which I am satisfied the people of my State would want me to reject. The Senator from Idaho has his responsibilities. If he thinks the compact is a good idea, he can advance and defend it. He and I will engage, as we always do, in a goodnatured, but conflicting, debate on the matter, and we shall let the Senate then decide.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly the Senator, who is a very tolerant legislator, wants to understand the motives of the water users in the great Snake River Valley, where they believe sincerely that their water rights may be placed in jeopardy. We have four great watersheds coursing through the State of Idaho. The Snake River, to which the Senator from Oregon alludes, is the only one on which there is any reclamation. We have three other great rivers, the Salmon, the Clearwater, and the Kootenai, on which there is not any reclamation. Yet the Senator from Oregon contends we cannot have a comprehensive river development unless we can engage in a debate on whether or not we should have a high dam on the only river drainage system in the State of Idaho in which the water users have a definite interest.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon, as a reasonable man, will not close the door to the possibilities of working out a comprehensive plan for the development of river resources in the upper watershed, instead of taking an adamant position that the other States in the basin must agree with the State represented by the Senator from Oregon, in reflecting the thinking that we shall have to accept comprehensive development such as Oregon wants or none at all. Surely he does not take that position.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Idaho reads into my language meanings that could not possibly be read into it if he would pause for reflection. I am for comprehensive river development. The compact which the Senator advocates is not necessarily for comprehensive river development.

I am a little gun shy when I know that one Pat Parry, attorney for the Idaho Power Co., was one of the representatives of Idaho in drawing the compact. I am a little gun shy when I see who the personnel are who had something to do with the compact, particularly when I am satisfied that a compact is not necessary for comprehensive river development, when I am satisfied that a compact is not necessary for a reclamation project, when I am satisfied that a compact will not do the job which I think ought to be done in comprehensive river development in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Surely the Senator from Oregon is not contending that one representative from the State of Idaho on the 7-State compact commission has the great influence and the persuasive ability to dominate the entire deliberations and to force the representatives of the other 6 States to do something they should not do.

Mr. MORSE. I just named one. The Senator from Idaho raised the point. I want to say that, in my judgment, the private utilities dominate the majority of the Commission.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Would that be true so far as the representatives from the State of Oregon who are on that Commission are concerned?

Mr. MORSE. I am clear that the Republican Representatives did not represent the interests of the people of my State, but represented the interest of private utilities, save and except for the present governor. Apparently our State legislature thought it was so bad that they tabled it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho has engaged in the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon because he thinks if he failed to do so he would be charged with being remiss in his duty.

I should like to ask whether the Senator would yield again. He spoke about the political mandates which stem from the results of the election in the Northwest in November. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator said that the results are a very conclusive and decisive mandate to the representatives of the Northwestern States to utilize their influence in authorizing the high Hells Canyon Dam. The Senator from Idaho has no desire to engage in debate at this time concerning an analysis of the votes in other States, not even in his own State of Idaho. However, if the Senator from Oregon wishes to lay down the broad principle that we can analyze the results on a single issue, and in this case on the Hells Canyon issue, then can it not be pointed out that in the election of 1954 the Democratic senatorial nominee, who based most of his campaign upon that issue was overwhelmingly defeated? In other words, would that be a justification for claiming that the people of Idaho in 1954 took a very definite position against a high Hells Canyon Dam, if the Senator were to use the same formula that he proposes to use in analyzing the results of the 1956 election.

Mr. MORSE. I wish only to say that I believe the results in the 1954 campaign indicated very clearly a growing support for full river basin development, and that we saw opponents of Hells Canyon in my State reelected by much smaller majorities than theretofore. We also found that my junior colleague was elected in that year, and that the Hells Canyon issue probably contributed more to his election than any other single issue. This last time the opponents went down to defeat completely.

In all fairness I should say that this was not the sole issue involved. However, I believe it was the one great symbol issue that was involved. I was very much interested in the campaign in Idaho. I was not very close to it; I only read about it in the newspapers. However, the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] did very well.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The election results indicate that fact.

Mr. MORSE. I am also very glad to point out that he is one of the cosponsors of the Hells Canyon bill. Representative GRACIE PFOST, who is sponsoring the companion bill in the House, did very well in that election. Even some of the Senator's friends in Idaho since the election have been writing to that same effect. I quoted from what Mr. Sprague said, that perhaps it would

be better to reappraise this whole issue. I am willing to engage in a completely nonpartisan, nonpolitical reappraisal, and to that end I would be very glad to sit down with the Senator from Idaho and endeavor to bring about a nonpartisan solution of the problem.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the Senator from Oregon referring to the 308 report, or its revision?

Mr. MORSE. No; I am referring to the natural-resources program of the administration. If he can bring in the administration spokesmen—as I am quite sure he can—I, for one, shall be delighted to sit down in any number of conferences or series of conferences to see if we cannot go ahead with a completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical program which will look toward the full development of the river basin.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator from Oregon does not wish the Members of the Senate to be so naive as to believe that the senior Senator from Oregon won his reelection to the Senate over his Republican opponent in November 1956 solely because his opponent was opposed to the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. MORSE. I should be very glad to have the Senator from Idaho analyze the reasons for my success in the election.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to have the Senator answer that question. I should like to have him tell me—of course he got more votes than his opponent—whether he defeated his opponent only because his opponent was opposed to the high dam.

Mr. MORSE. I believe it was the major issue in the campaign. The major issue was my position on the development of our natural resources, in contrast with my opponent's position on that issue.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to yield to my colleague. Then I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Utah, who has been patiently waiting.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one or two questions of my distinguished colleague, who has again introduced the high Hells Canyon dam bill, to authorize the key Hells Canyon project in the development of the Columbia River Basin. First, I should like to ask him if it is not true that during the discussion of the Hells Canyon issue in 1956 in the Senate a major point was made of the fact that the Governors of the States of Oregon and Washington were opposed to the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That fact was cited as an indication that the grass roots sentiment in the States of Oregon and Washington was opposed to the Hells Canyon project. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not correct to say that this week there is being inaugurated a Governor at Olympia and a Governor at Salem, both of whom are in favor of the Hells Canyon project?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Bruces Eddy project on the north fork of the Clearwater River was mentioned a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Is it not correct to say that the Bruces Eddy project is opposed by virtually every wildlife, recreational, and outdoor national organization in the United States?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not also true that the Bruces Eddy project would develop at the most only about 20 percent or 25 percent as much hydroelectricity as would be available at Hells Canyon?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not also true that the great Hells Canyon project not only lacks opposition on the part of outdoor organizations, but that one of the country's most distinguished biologists and conservationists and fisheries experts, Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson, the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, has stated definitely that the Hells Canyon project would have no adverse impact on migratory fish, outdoor recreation, wildlife, or scenery?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and the reliability of the statement by Dr. Gabrielson is attested to by his long years of unselfish public service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon one further question. Is it not true that in the Pacific Northwest there has been generated in the great Columbia River power system, sometimes called the Bonneville Power System, more waterpower than is generated in any other system in the world, and that that has been done in the States of Oregon and Washington without the existence of any interstate compact between those two States?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Utah, and I apologize to him for not yielding the floor to him sooner.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not engage in the colloquy between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Oregon with reference to Hells Canyon Dam. However, I do not wish the RECORD to show that I am not interested in that subject.

I heard the speech of the Senator from Oregon. It sounded very familiar. I had heard it many times during the past session. And, as one who is very much interested in the comprehensive development of river systems, I thought his stand on that aspect of the subject was substantially sound, and I am in full agreement.

But I am not in full agreement with respect to the claim that the Hells Canyon bill seeks to follow that program in the State of Idaho and in the Columbia River Basin. There is another principle which is very important, namely, that the Federal Government should not step in and do things for the people which they can do for themselves. I am speaking, now, of necessary things.

We have a situation in the Hells Canyon area where there is very little difference between the actual effect of the program which has been undertaken by a private utility—made up of citizens of the United States, by the way—and the proposed high Hells Canyon Dam. I have gone over both of these proposals very carefully. And I have had some experience in the field of reclamation over a period of approximately 24 years. In fact, reclamation development has been one of my principal activities during that period of time.

I very frankly disagree with the so-called facts which have been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Oregon, and at the proper time I think I shall enter into the discussion. But I have seen nothing in what he has presented today which would lead me to change my mind as to the merits of the decision which the Senate reached a year ago on the same kind of a bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that, unfortunately, I was not present when the Senator from Oregon was making his speech. I was, however, present in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when the general problem was there discussed, as the Senator from Utah was, also, and I am very hopeful that those who then sided with the Senator from Oregon, who since then has received the overwhelming approval of his constituents against the candidacy of the former Secretary of the Interior, have made it possible to swing the Senator from Utah over to our side.

Mr. WATKINS. There was another gentleman in the campaign, one of the principal proponents of this kind of a program, who won an overwhelming victory in all those States. Whom are we going to follow? Did the people actually approve one or the other, or did one cancel the other and leave it as it was in the beginning?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There might be some debate on the question as to whether or not the gentleman to whom the Senator from Utah refers, without using his name, is really the author of the program——

Mr. WATKINS. I was referring to the President of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I knew that. It was the adoption of a part of the New Deal.

Mr. WATKINS. The partnership program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The President has adopted a modernization program, and he has announced his purpose of modernizing the Republican Party. I hope he will succeed in modernizing it.

Mr. WATKINS. I hope it will never be modernized to the point of state socialism.

Mr. President, I desire to refer to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Utah has the floor.

NATIONAL GRAZING RESERVE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for proper reference, a bill to establish a national grazing reserve. Specifically, the bill would provide assistance to livestock producers who carry out certain range conserving practices on privately owned grazing lands, or on grazing lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

As you know, beef cattle and calves provide United States farmers and ranchers with about 17 percent of their incomes, yet producers receive no price support as such. Once in awhile, during the heavy marketing season, the USDA undertakes a direct purchase program, thus relieving processors of substantial amounts of low-grade beef in the form of hamburger. Such programs usually have had little effect upon prices received by producers.

For example, last September the USDA began buying hamburger. As of September 15, the average price received for beef cattle as a percentage of the parity price was 75 percent, and for calves, 69 percent. Yet as of November 15, after the Government had spent approximately $24.6 million, these prices had dropped to 67 percent and 64 percent of parity, respectively.

In terms of public assistance, the beef cattle industry is truly the forgotten segment of American Agriculture.

On the other hand, Congress has developed elaborate price support programs for wheat, which provides only 5.7 percent of United States farm income; cotton which provides 9 percent of farm income; corn, which provides only 4.2 percent; tobacco, which provides about another 4.2 percent; rice, which provides nine-tenths of 1 percent; and peanuts, which provide six-tenths of 1 percent. Programs primarily for the stabilization of prices and incomes of these basic commodities during the fiscal years 1932–55 resulted in a net realized loss of $5.6 billion. In addition, the Congress enacted last year the soil-bank program, the acreage reserve feature of which provided payments to producers of these commodities to reduce their plantings below their acreage allotments. Payments to farmers participating in the 1956 program totaled $233.4 million through November 30, 1956. And only recently the USDA announced allocations of 1957 acreage reserve funds to these 6 so-called basic commodities totaling $750.6 million.

Increases also were made in the national average rates of payment per acre, which in the case of wheat and cotton are more than doubled, with substantial increases being made for corn, rice, and tobacco.

Mr. President, I have introduced this bill because, in all fairness, it is time that the Congress consider adoption of a stabilizing program for the American beef cattle industry, and especially for those producers living in the great range States. Why? Because both the price support programs on the basic commodities and feed grains, as well as the soil bank, operate in such a manner as to place beef cattle producers at a serious disadvantage—in fact, to put many of them out of business.

For example, in spite of the drought, the lowering of price supports on the 1956 corn crop from 87 percent of parity in 1955 to 86.2 percent, and the placing of about 5.4 million acres of allotment land in the acreage reserve, "corn topped all yield per acre records this year and made a 3.5 billion bushel crop—second largest of record," Crop Production, 1956 Annual Summary, December 17, 1956.

Supports on wheat were increased from 82.5 percent of parity on the 1955 crop to 83.7 on the 1956 crop, some 5.6 million acres were put in the acreage reserve, drought prevailed in many areas, yet wheat was harvested for grain from nearly 50 million acres, and made a 7 percent larger crop at 997 million bushels than last year from 5 percent more acreage.

It seems safe to conclude that the 1956 acreage reserve program and price support program failed to curtail production of these basic commodities. In fact, just the opposite seems to have been the case. Abundant stocks are available, not only of these two crops but also other feed grains as well. Livestock production in the Midwest remains high; prices received are way below parity.

It is equally clear that the 1957 acreage reserve program will fail to accomplish the objective of reducing production of these basic commodities and the feed grains, unless the higher rates of payment can induce more extensive farmer participation than was the case in 1956. The number of harvested acres must be cut, and this cannot be accomplished if farmers put only their marginal lands, or lands on which they could not get a crop because of drought, in the acreage reserve. If not, Midwest livestock production will, in all probability, increase substantially with low prices resulting.

In light of these facts, I feel compelled to call to your attention the plight this program, and price supports on the basics and feed grains in general, have placed upon the western beef cattle industry. Beef producers do not get price support, and they cannot participate in the acreage reserve program because grazing lands are not eligible. Nationally, from the standpoint of cash receipts not only is beef cattle the most basic of all farm commodities, but also it is the very foundation of agriculture in the range-grazing States of the Rocky Mountain and western-slope area of this country.

Whereas the basic commodities provide Utah farmers with only 7 percent of their income, beef cattle provides 22.5 percent. In Nevada, less than 1 percent of farm income is derived from the so-called basic commodities, while beef cattle provide 56.5 percent. In Wyoming, basic commodities yield about 8 percent of farm income, while beef cattle produce 51.8 percent. Colorado farmers derived 44.9 percent of their 1955 income from beef cattle, whereas the basic commodities, mostly wheat, provided 8.2 percent.

I could go on and make similar comparisons for other Western States, but I believe it will be sufficient for our purpose to merely note that in Arizona, beef cattle provide 18.6 percent of farm income; 15 percent in Idaho; 25.2 percent in Montana; 36.6 percent in New Mexico; 14 percent in Oregon. Even in California, the greatest diversified agricultural State we have, beef cattle provide over 10 percent of farm income.

It is true that indirectly the soil bank in 3 or 4 years might improve beef cattle prices, providing that it succeeds in reducing the production of feed grains, and thereby the supplies of not only beef cattle, but also hogs in the Midwest since, as Secretary Benson recently told members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, "Cheap feed grains mean more and cheaper livestock"—press release, January 2, 1957.

This seems to be the promise the soil bank ultimately holds for raising beef cattle prices. It is revealed in a letter to Congressman HENRY A. DIXON, of Utah, from Mr. D. M. Paarlberg, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 10, 1956. The pertinent facts of this letter I have received permission to quote. They are as follows:

> This is in reply to your telephone request for materials concerning the implications of the proposed soil bank program for western cattlemen. * * *
>
> The soil bank program is not designed merely as a means of alleviating distressed conditions for particular commodities, but attacks the overall problem of surplus production and stocks that is having an adverse effect on agriculture as a whole. Hence, it is intended eventually to improve the price and income position of livestock producers, as well as the producers of the basic storable commodities.
>
> Burdensome surpluses of crops have borne upon livestock producers, as well as on farmers producing these crops. In the attempt to control crop output, extensive acreages have been released from the production of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and rice. In turn, these acreages have been largely directed to the production of feeds for livestock, both grain and forage. While an abundant livestock production is in the national interest, there is clearly a limit to the ability of even our strong consumer market to absorb sharply rising supplies of livestock products without severe declines in prices. Hence, the proposed program which aims to reduce surpluses, and more significantly, to prevent their increase or reappearance, would clearly benefit livestock producers by tending to keep feed supplies at levels which would prevent livestock production from seriously outrunning increases in the demand for meat and other livestock products.

Certainly, it is desirable that the soil bank should operate in such a manner as to decrease feed grain production and thus reduce livestock numbers as well in the Midwest. However, a sound agricultural policy requires that such a program as the soil bank, which has little applicability elsewhere than the Midwest and the South, should not be permitted to reduce livestock numbers through increasing feed costs in the major livestock producing areas of the Western range States and thus force western producers to assume, without compensation, the major burden of adjustment.

Unless the Congress provides an effective incentive program to help them reduce their livestock numbers, however, this will be the case.

Otherwise, if the soil bank actually succeeds in reducing feed grain production, it could well prove disastrous to western livestock producers. Why? Because the western range States are deficit feed producing States and a great deal of the feed consumed must be imported. The seriousness of this economic fact of life has been compounded by the drought, which, in turn, has made natural range feed very scarce and required the feeding of greater amounts of imported feed grains. In light of this situation, the the low prevailing prices being received by ranchers for beef cattle as of December 15, 1956, prices received for beef cattle stood at 65—percent of parity and calves at 64 percent—most ranchers cannot absorb additional price increases for feed, and remain in business.

The special livestock loan and feed program, operative in drought disaster areas, has enabled some ranchers to hang on to small foundation herds. Yet, it seems rather inconsistent to appropriate money for such a purpose on the one hand, and, then, on the other hand to pass legislation like the Soil Bank Act, which has as its objective the reduction of the supply of feed grains. The regional inconsistency is emphasized when it is considered that western beef cattle producers are denied an opportunity to participate in the soil bank in some way, to the end that they can be compensated for reducing cattle numbers and/or deferring grazing on lands they are entitled to graze.

As part of the USDA's drought relief program, it should be noted that in the 11 Western States the Department of Agriculture has, during fiscal years 1953–54, 1954–55, and 1955–56, to date:

First. Made 2,060 special livestock loans amounting to $28,871,173.

Second. Subsidizes the purchase of 763,855 tons of feed grains and concentrates at a cost of $16,532,832.

Third. Subsidized the purchase of hay to the extent of $2,782,500.

So that we may have all the facts before us on this matter, I ask unanimous consent that three tables prepared by the Department of Agriculture on these programs, setting forth totals for the 11 Western States, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Special livestock loans made by fiscal year

State	Fiscal year 1954		Fiscal year 1955		Fiscal year 1956 through May 4, 1956		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Arizona	21	$642,350	7	$115,040	7	$159,425	35	$916,815
California	15	563,807	5	161,910	3	55,490	23	781,207
Colorado	232	3,752,328	236	2,556,830	138	1,504,030	606	7,813,188
Idaho	28	865,210	15	321,630	6	136,405	49	1,323,245
Montana	121	3,091,798	113	1,369,380	100	1,044,170	334	5,505,348
Nevada	46	860,740	14	416,745	9	217,785	69	1,495,270
New Mexico	334	3,765,280	284	2,205,150	112	1,112,600	730	7,083,030
Oregon	9	364,420	9	138,115	10	184,540	28	687,075
Utah	39	569,707	31	472,930	23	419,490	93	1,462,127
Washington	0	0	1	47,455	1	37,650	2	85,105
Wyoming	42	969,163	32	429,380	17	320,220	91	1,718,763
Total	887	15,444,803	747	8,234,565	426	5,191,805	2,060	28,871,173

Emergency feed grain program

State	1953–54		1954–55		1955–56		Total	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
Arizona	None	None	21,372,700	$42,628	None	None	21,372,700	$42,628
California	None	None	None	None	5,364,300	$24,098	5,364,300	24,098
Colorado	72,916,000	$1,300,700	248,509,200	2,009,201	50,429,800	324,553	371,855,000	3,634,454
Idaho	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Montana	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Nevada	37,816,000	722,600	20,032,100	171,164	4,520,400	29,748	62,368,500	923,512
New Mexico	380,780,000	7,353,700	222,353,500	1,419,768	26,406,500	50,589	629,540,000	8,824,057
Oregon	None	None	None	None	25,425,400	106,262	25,425,400	106,262
Utah	10,006,600	174,300	22,961,400	218,365	10,230,100	70,478	43,197,500	463,143
Washington	None	None	None	None	102,816,900	430,356	102,816,900	430,356
Wyoming	17,190,000	266,900	183,293,200	1,346,673	65,287,800	460,749	265,771,000	2,084,322
Total	518,708,000	9,818,200	718,522,100	5,207,799	290,681,200	1,496,833	1,527,711,300	16,532,832

Hay allocations

State	1953–54	1954–55	1955–56	Total
Arizona	None	$500,000	None	$500,000
California	None	None	None	None
Colorado	None	500,000	None	500,000
Idaho	None	None	None	None
Montana	None	None	None	None
Nevada	$82,500	500,000	None	582,500
New Mexico	None	500,000	None	500,000
Oregon	None	None	None	None
Utah	None	None	None	None
Washington	None	None	None	None
Wyoming	None	700,000	None	700,000
Total	82,500	2,700,000	None	2,782,500

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, not only will increased prices of feed grains in the Midwest be higher if the soil bank succeeds as expected, but when shipping costs to points in these 11 Western States are added to feed prices many beef-cattle producers may be forced out of business by the increased operating costs.

Mr. President, in this connection, it should be noted that in its publication, the Marketing and Transportation Situation, dated October 1956, the Department of Agriculture announced that increases in freight rates on agricultural commodities averaged over 71 percent above the levels prevailing in 1945. In January 1956, the Interstate Commerce Commission made permanent previous general increases which it had granted on a temporary basis in 1951 and 1952. On March 7, 1956, only 3 months later, it authorized another increase of 5 percent on feed grains and livestock shipments, and on December 28, 1956, another increase of 5 percent on western rates became effective.

Between higher feed costs and higher freight rates—applicable to the inshipment of feed and outshipment of feeder livestock—and relatively lower prices received for their animals, producers simply cannot continue in business and compete with other areas producing feed on acreage diverted from wheat and cotton production, and in sections relatively closer to the consuming centers.

But, Mr. President, adding insult to injury, so far as the beef-cattle producers of the West are concerned, are these facts:

Although the 6 so-called basic commodities, which provided only 26 percent of farm income, were all supported at over 80 percent in 1956, the basic commodities are also favored with respect to the soil bank's acreage reserve feature. In a few words, the Congress gave mandatory price support at 80 percent of parity on these so-called basics—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—in 1956, and then still held out additional financial inducement to their producers through the soil bank. Yet, the producers of beef cattle get neither price support, nor can they participate, as such, in the soil bank; rather, they face only the prospect of a discrimination which will force many of them into bankruptcy, unless this Congress provides a workable program.

Mr. President, in 1954, the latest year for which data are available, farm cash marketing receipts totaled $30,203,000,000. Of this amount, $5,113,000,000—one-sixth—was derived from the sale of beef cattle and calves. On the other hand, the food grains, primarily wheat and corn, accounted to only $2,243,000,000. Who, therefore, can say that wheat and corn are more basic commodities than beef cattle and calves, and as such are entitled to preferential treatment in the form of mandatory price support and eligibility for the lion's share of the 1956 soil bank money? This disparity is heightened when one considers that under the 1956 acreage-reserve program corn producers could earn $180 million of the $260 million made available for

payments. In 1957, corn producers can earn $217 million.

In 1954, the sale of hogs brought farmers $3,650,000,000; some $1,463,000,000 less than did beef cattle. In light of this, can it be said that hogs are more basic to American agriculture than beef cattle?

Farm cash receipts from marketing cotton lint and seed in 1954 amounted to $2,706,000,000. Cotton is a so-called basic commodity, and in 1956 was supported at about 84 percent of parity. Yet, in that year cotton gave farmers just a little over one-half as much in cash returns as did beef cattle. But the fact remains that beef-cattle producers neither get price support nor are they eligible to participate as such in soil-bank programs.

Tobacco and peanuts are also favored so-called basic commodities, but tobacco and all oil-bearing crops, not just peanuts, returned to producers only $3,806,000,000 in 1954—some $1,147,000,000 less than beef cattle.

Feed crops netted farmers $2,355,000,000, but beef cattle returned to them some $2,758,000,000 over this amount. Yet feed grains came in for special price-support assistance under soil-bank legislation as follows:

First. Producers were guaranteed 76 percent of parity in 1956, without the requirement that such producers participate in the soil bank.

Second. Feed prices will be supported in 1957 at 5 percentage points below the $1.36 per bushel level at which corn is supported in the commercial area.

Western beef-cattle producers, without doubt, are the forgotten segment of American agriculture so far as the soil bank is concerned. What does the act contain which is of benefit to them? Only a provision that diverted acres shall not be grazed, with little in the way of possible sanctions to deter such activity. Under emergency drought conditions such lands can be grazed, but in most of the western range States there is very little of such lands in the first place, and in the second place, not many ranchers have land devoted to the production of basic commodities.

Mr. President, it seems that only the producers of the basic commodities, feed grains, and hogs stand to benefit directly from the soil bank. As this legislation came from the Agricultural Committee during the last Congress, certain provisions which would have enabled beef-cattle producers to participate were eliminated, and the same is true with respect to other nonbasic commodities. This in spite of the fact that the average market prices as a percentage of the parity price received for the basic commodities exceeded at that time, as they nearly all do now, those received for beef cattle and calves. According to the USDA publication, Agricultural Prices, as of April 15, 1956, the prices received for the basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton and rice—upon which price support was mandatory and which were eligible for the acreage reserve, stood at 85, 76, 92, and 81 percent of parity. What by comparision, were the prices of beef cattle and calves? Respectively, they stood at only 70 and 71 percent of parity as of the same date.

The same publication for December 1956 indicates that the prices received as of December 15 for wheat, corn, cotton, and rice stood at 84, 68, 87, and 82 percent of parity. On the other hand, the prices of beef cattle and calves stood at only 65 and 64 percent of parity, respectively.

In the light of these facts, Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a bill which, if enacted, would:

First, Direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national grazing reserve by formulating and carrying out a grazing lands conservation program on public lands under which holders of permits to graze livestock on such lands would be compensated for—

(a) Voluntarily reducing below the numbers allowed under their respective permits the numbers of livestock grazed by them on such lands.

(b) Voluntarily reducing grazing periods below the periods for which livestock may be grazed under such permits.

(c) Carrying out other soil, water, forage, or other conservation measures on such lands as may be specified by the Secretary.

Second. Direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for inclusion under the agricultural conservation program for payments to livestock producers who—

(a) Reduce below such numbers as may be established by the Secretary for such purposes the numbers of livestock grazed by them on privately owned grazing lands.

(b) Reduce grazing periods on such lands below such periods as may be specified by the Secretary for such purposes.

(c) Carry out such other soil, water, forage, or other conservation measures on such lands as may be specified by the Secretary.

As you know, Mr. President, most of the Western States, particularly the intermountain States, are "range" States. By that I mean that a large percentage of the total land area is classified as rangeland. In Utah, for example, 88 percent of the land is rangeland. On this land, forage production is very small per acre, and although the area is large in total acreage, it produces normally only about one-half of the required livestock forage.

On the other hand, the acreage of irrigated lands is small. On these lands are produced a wide variety of cultivated crops including forage crops (grasses, wild hay, pasture and alfalfa, and feed grains such as barley, oats, and corn). These crops are used to provide feed during the winter when rangelands cannot sustain the animal population.

In these States, climatic conditions dictate a seasonal use of different types of rangelands and, as a result, the movement of livestock over long distances is necessary. This has resulted in a scattered pattern of private land ownership and permit rights to graze livestock on public lands, for a stated fee.

During the summer months, the rangelands of the mountain and plateau areas, which are primarily lands in national forests, serve as "summer range." These Federal forest lands are used under livestock grazing permits issued by the Forest Service.

In 1954, for example, some 1,092,052 head of cattle and horses were grazed on National Forest land in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Fifteen thousand and twenty-four cattle and horse permits were issued to livestock producers in these States, providing 5,527,067 animal months of grazing.

These Forest Service lands totaled 63,045,000 acres in 1954 and livestock producers in these 11 States paid $3,030,829 in grazing fees. The significance of these lands to western agriculture was well stated by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Ervin L. Peterson, at the 1956 annual convention of the American Society of Range Management at Denver, Colo., as follows:

> The forage produced on these lands strongly buttresses the Nation's livestock industry, particularly in the West.
>
> The effective use of much of our cropland, again especially in the western area, is dependent upon the contribution of these lands as watersheds and as producers of forage. Because such a considerable portion of our range lands are in public ownership and under private management, those of us responsible for the formulation and application of management policies needed to understand to the fullest possible extent the significance of these lands to the agricultural economy of the country and as importantly their significance as a part of our total natural resources.

On the other hand, the winter-range land consists mostly of desert lands which cannot be used in the summer because of drought, but which can be used when light snows provide stock water. The Federal public lands in these areas, by and large, are the so-called Taylor grazing lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

In 1955, the Bureau of Land Management was responsible for 159,347,598 acres of grazing lands in the 11 States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Permit holders in these States paid $1,471,112 for grazing over 2,500,000 head of cattle and horses and other livestock on these lands in 1955.

Located between the high mountain and desert rangelands are the foothill and bottom valley rangelands, most of which are privately owned. These lands constitute the spring and fall rangelands. They are used primarily as a means of providing temporary grazing in the movement of cattle to and from the summer and winter rangelands. Some of these lands, however, are grazed the year around by cattle.

Thus, Mr. President, two types of public lands—Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands—together with private lands and some leased State lands in these States are used in rotation by livestock producers. Any public management policies of these public lands must contribute as fully as possible toward the stability of independent

livestock producers. As Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson put it in the talk I have already referred to:

> After all, these Federal ranges, in most cases, form only a seasonal link in the yearly forage and feed supply on which the livestock operator depends. Problems of the national forests affect management, improvement, and use of other publicly or privately owned rangelands used by an operator and vice versa.

Mr. President, it has come to my attention that certain objections, which have been raised with respect to the type of program provided in this bill, warrant comment.

It has been said that to compensate livestock producers for reducing below the numbers they are authorized to graze on public lands would be paying producers for doing what the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management ought to do anyway as a good management practice. This simply is not so, since stockmen would be compensated only for reducing below the number authorized for grazing purposes on such public lands. This bill will not interfere with the responsibility this public agency has for maintaining a sound management program geared to the public interest. For example, in my own State of Utah, the Forest Service currently is engaged in the process of reducing permit numbers on several national forests, including the Dixie and Uintah.

Since these lands must serve other public uses as well, it will facilitate the maintenance of such a program by relieving grazing pressures before these lands reach a condition which requires decreased grazing and curtailment of public utilization in other forms. For example, recreation, wildlife, mineral prospecting, and flood control are among the multiple uses made of public lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. City dwellers likewise, who may never venture onto these lands have an interest in their use, since they constitute the watersheds which provide the water supply for municipal and industrial uses. "Land use," as former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart, indicated in his 1956 talk to the American Society of Range Management at Denver—

> is a dynamic thing. There is an increasing number of competitors for the privilege of this use. Growth in population and a rise in per capita income, currently at an all-time high, have contributed greatly to the pressures upon our land revenues. This pressure is certain to grow and the use conflicts are sure to multiply.

This bill is designed to enhance our policy of multiple use of the public domain. It is designed to facilitate sound range management, and at the same time to provide financial assistance to western livestock producers.

Many of these people cannot continue in business or make the necessary adjustment in their operations without great financial losses, unless financial assistance from their Government is forthcoming. To this they are as much entitled as corn-hog producers, wheat, cotton, and tobacco growers. Their plight was well depicted by Secretary Benson at their 1956 convention when he told the Western States Meat Packers Association:

> Farmers and ranchers who supply your raw material have a double dilemma. Their prices have declined under the influence of excessive volume. Yet the great majority of them—at least those with full-time operations—cannot improve their circumstances by reducing their individual volume of output.
>
> On the other side of the coin, their costs have risen, and there is a fundamental difference between agriculture and other business.
>
> They cannot pass on their increased costs.

From what I have said, it should be evident the bill would not compensate stockmen for doing what the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management ought to do anyway. But by comparison, it would do for the western beef cattle producers exactly what the soil bank does with respect to the mid-western and southern producers of the so-called basic commodities. In their cases, the Congress, instead of removing the minimum national acreage allotment or marketing quota on wheat, cotton, corn, and rice, and setting such allotments or quotas at levels which will bring supply in line with demand, has offered farmers an inducement to cut plantings below their individual allotments. This it has done in the hope that by the use of direct benefit payments farmers will plant less than they are legally entitled to, and thus bring supplies more in line with demand.

By this means, Congress escapes the unpleasant task of relying entirely upon the commerce clause to arbitrarily bring supplies of these so-called basic commodities in line with demand. If it is good public policy to pay wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco growers to take land out of production below their legal allotments, then, by the same token, it would seem fair to pay livestock producers to curtail both their cattle numbers and periods of grazing on public lands below those to which they also are legally entitled to graze.

In some quarters, also, it has been contended that this proposal would result in forced cattle sales and thereby would depress cattle prices. Of course, any such overnight reduction is not contemplated nor would be necessary. This bill would provide financial assistance to livestock producers who voluntarily reduce their cattle numbers and decrease grazing on private as well as public range lands, which their permits entitle them to graze. The soil bank, however, if it accomplishes its purpose, will force them out of business by raising feed grain prices. If disorderly marketing takes place, this will be the cause of it. Especially will this be the effect in the western range States, since most of them are deficit feed-producing States.

This bill would merely permit livestock producers to participate on a voluntary basis in a grazing reserve program similar to the acreage and conservation reserve programs established by the Soil Bank Act for the producers of basic commodities and feed grains and other row crops. Most of the reduction in numbers under such a program could be made during periods other than the normal heavy marketing season.

The argument also has been made that the bill would work counter to our wool program, which the Congress enacted to increase wool production. A moment's reflection, I believe, will reveal the shallowness of this argument, since wool growers who are going to get 101 percent of parity under the National Wool Act for the 1957 crop, and who got 106 percent for the 1956 crop, are not likely to participate in this proposed program, when the rate of payment would probably be between one-half and two-thirds, at the most, of this support level. As an afterthought, Mr. President, I am much more concerned that future cuts in sheep grazing permits by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management will prevent the sheep industry from obtaining the necessary expansion in sheep number which will guarantee an annual production of 300 million pounds of wool than I am that this bill will do it.

Also, it has been said that the proposed program would be difficult to administer because most of the range area is not fenced, because base numbers of livestock are not available, and because extensive checking would be necessary to determine that cattle numbers were reduced. In order to carry out the objectives of this bill, with respect to public lands, fencing is not particularly needed. The mere reduction in the number of herd a permittee can graze on such lands does not require any more fencing than the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have available at present, since the check on the number of animals grazed is made at the time the animals enter and leave the public lands.

Concerning private lands, the cost-sharing feature of deferred grazing practices now authorized under the agricultural-conservation program in several States, including Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah, should adequately meet this aspect of the problem. In Utah, for example, the Federal Government shares in the cost of fence construction. So that Members of the Senate may have before them the details of such a presently operative deferred grazing practice, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service to the chairman, Utah ASC Committee, dated March 1, 1956, approving such a plan for Utah, together with a copy of the practice and necessary forms, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Nor should it be too difficult to determine base numbers, or compliance with the deferred grazing requirements on private land. All that is required is to have participants certify the number of head which they own. Spot checks can be made by employees of county ASC committees, or by community committeemen. In fact, Mr. President, just such a system is now utilized by the Department of Agriculture to check compliance with referred grazing practices now authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 under the agricultural-conservation program.

In this connection, Mr. President, it should be noted that, at one time or another, since 1936, 18 States have had such a practice included in their agricultural-conservation program. For example, in 1938 payments were made on over 32,342,000 acres which program participants had agreed not to graze. In 1954, the Agricultural Conservation Program Service paid out $232,203 to cooperators for compliance with this practice. At the present time, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming have such a practice in operation under the ACP.

In this respect, the bill merely provides for the increased use of deferred-grazing payments on private lands, as part of the agricultural-conservation program. Due to lack of funds, however, present payments are very modest and far below those needed to induce very extensive participation. For example, the Utah program provides for a mere 35 cents per acre for participation.

So that the Senate may have before it a complete picture of the extent to which such a practice has been operative, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing both the acreage of deferred-grazing practice performed during 1936–54 and the estimated net payments to cooperatives during 1949–54 as part of the agricultural-conservation program, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. This table was prepared by the Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture. Simply put, if the Department of Agriculture can determine compliance in the States where the deferred-grazing practice is now operative, then there is no valid reason why it cannot determine compliance with the similar provisions of this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage of deferred grazing practice performed under the agricultural conservation program, by States, 1936–54

LISTING SHEET

[Thousand acres]

State	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
North Dakota	2	130	1,157	832	110	143	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	3,842	4,736	2,866	1,063	1,481	1,460	1,538	1,253	1,212	199	363	2	12	2	(1)	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	1,285	2,439	2,641	2,137	694	667	2,161	1,879	1,780	1,595	1,394	785	976	953	714	463	370	61
Kansas	0	214	1,519	1,150	128	254	69	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	12	0
Oklahoma	0	503	903	987	938	1,117	683	435	419	337	245	239	109	136	107	6	22	0	20
Texas	0	3,715	5,224	5,519	5,545	5,743	4,474	3,333	2,783	3,008	1,178	1,352	581	1,195	837	497	599	1,205	1,262
Montana	9	1,090	4,932	3,944	2,561	2,615	2,162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	3	39	435	742	643	992	395	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wyoming	2	828	1,658	1,271	2,353	2,003	1,886	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	1	357	2,318	1,814	2,332	2,443	2,311	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	0	1,003	3,377	4,412	3,371	3,808	1,679	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0
Arizona	0	89	673	1,069	1,777	1,377	782	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	1	30	265	404	644	818	531	0	0	0	0	129	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	(1)	33	265	394	608	400	296	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	10	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	114	617	752	789	531	313	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	153	905	1,325	1,814	1,602	913	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	15	5	16	2	0
California	18	174	919	1,051	1,177	1,501	615	0	0	0	0	217	14	17	44	51	18	20	0
Hawaii	0	0	(1)	80	24	45	30	31	12	22	55	24	6	5	2	1	1	1	0
Total	37	13,599	32,342	31,253	28,014	27,267	19,422	7,498	6,346	6,361	3,272	3,718	1,520	2,367	1,971	1,274	1,130	1,651	1,343

[1] 500 acres or less.

Estimated net assistance to farmers for performing the deferred grazing practice, by States, 1949–54 [1]

State	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	$1,233	$182	$41	0	0	0
Nebraska	92,363	85,347	76,833	$41,380	$38,682	$7,303
Kansas	0	0	0	2,515	2,771	0
Oklahoma	15,841	12,011	924	3,105	0	5,938
Texas	125,648	89,058	108,893	129,326	254,128	218,962
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	0	76	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	9,643	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	4	474	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	1,883	1,130	396	1,741	424	0
California	1,283	4,336	9,489	2,885	3,102	0
Hawaii	753	454	113	526	437	0
Total	239,008	193,068	196,689	181,478	309,187	232,203

[1] Assistance data prior to 1949 are not available.
Agricultural Conservation Program Service, May 7, 1956.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in this regard, a statement, sent me by Mr. Paul M. Koger, present Administrator, Agricultural Conservation Program Service, outlines the present method of determining compliance. It reads as follows:

Compliance with the specifications of the deferred grazing practice is determined on the basis, as provided by law, of the farmer's certification that the practice has been performed in accordance with the prescribed specifications. In addition, administratively we provide for spot checks to be made by county office representatives of a representative number of farmers' certifications of performance to assure that farmers generally are making correct certifications.

I might add that the law now contains adequate sanctions to deal with individuals who file false certifications with the United States Government concerning the number of livestock grazed on private lands. Section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code provides, upon conviction in such instances, for either a maximum fine of $10,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both. With respect to public lands, however, no such problem is involved, since the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management for years have had the problem of enforcing reductions in the number of head grazed, and the time periods authorized animal numbers can be grazed in specific areas.

In a few words, Mr. President, the objections which I have heard raised to this proposed program are found upon examination to be without substantial merit. They merely represent problems which the personnel of the Department of Agriculture are currently dealing with and which they have met, in my opinion, in a creditable manner.

In all fairness to the livestock industry, I hope the Congress will give this bill serious consideration. The present condition of the beef cattle industry warrants its immediate enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 608) to establish a national grazing reserve by providing assistance to livestock producers who carry out certain range conserving practices on privately owned grazing lands or on grazing lands under jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, introduced by Mr. Watkins, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RECESS TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1957

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there be no further business, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, to Thursday, January 17, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14 (legislative day of January 3), 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert V. Prochnow, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Carter Lane Burgess.

Col. Carey A. Randall, O-5132, United States Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, to hold such grade while he is assigned as Military Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION FOR EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration for Evaluation, in the Department of State.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER GENERAL, BRUSSELS UNIVERSITY

Howard S. Cullman, of New York, to be United States Commissioner General, Brussels Universal and International Exhibition, 1958.

MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1959:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut.
Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

William Joseph Brennan, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

J. Lee Rankin, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

MEMBER, SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Oregon, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring August 9, 1961.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF PAROLE

Eva Kelly Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1958.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

M. Hepburn Many, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana for a term of 4 years.

Albert M. Morgan, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia for a term of 4 years.

Chester A. Weidenburner, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the District of New Jersey for a term of 4 years.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate to the office indicated:

Elliott Lee Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Parke Monroe Banta, of Missouri, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Arthur R. Campbell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

Leslie A. Blake, of Maine, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

Aims Chamberlain McGuinness, of Pennsylvania, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Ross L. Leffler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

Frederick C. Nash, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Edward T. Tait, of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

Brig. Gen. Paul D. Berrigan (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Leroy E. Burney, of Indiana, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

Lawrence Gridley Derthick, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of Education.

Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1957.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Richard Barrett Lowe, of South Dakota, to be Governor of Guam.

E. Perkins McGuire, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Paul W. McCracken, of Michigan, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Albert James Robertson, of Iowa, to be a members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1957.

Robert L. Farrington, of Oklahoma, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1, and to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
James Frederick Green, of Maryland.
Paul T. Meyer, of New Jersey.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Louis Mason Drury, of Maryland.
Roy L. Wade, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Willis C. Armstrong, of Maine.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry C. Boudreau, of Maine.
Harvey A. Buffalo, of Arkansas.
Joseph Carwell, of New York.
Roger Dow, of Virginia.
John T. Fishburn, of Maryland.
Richard Friedman, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph Godson, of New York.
Herbert N. Higgins, of Texas.
Mrs. Margaret H. Potter, of the District of Columbia.
Gordon B. Strong, of Virginia.
George A. Tesoro, of Maryland.
Kenneth J. Yearns, of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles Bridgett, of Connecticut.
Aaron R. Coleman, of Washington.
Dennis A. Collins, of Ohio.
Frank D. Collins, of Kansas.
Walter J. Marx, of Maryland.
Christopher A. Norred, Jr., of Maryland.
Edwy L. Reeves, of Virginia.
Herbert Reiner, Jr., of Vermont.
Morris Rothenberg, of Maryland.
Joseph S. Sagona, of Maryland.
Simon N. Wilson, of Maryland.
Hugh W. Wolff, of Maryland.
Carroll H. Woods, of Massachusetts.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Hilda M. Anderson, of New York.
Norman J. Bentley, of California.

William F. Courtney, of Michigan.
Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.
Virgil M. Elliott, of Florida.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.
Miss Elizabeth G. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Natalie Grant, of California.
Mrs. Helen A. Gray, of Massachusetts.
Richard V. Hennes, of Illinois.
Benjamin F. Houck, of Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth N. Landeau, of New York.
Allen H. Lester, of Massachusetts.
Bernard W. Lewis, of Utah.
Donald A. Lewis, of New York.
Herman Lindstrom, of Florida.
Miss Mary E. Lyddane, of Maryland.
Samuel A. McIlhenny, Jr., of Texas.
Miss Roberta McKay, of Michigan.
Basil F. Macgowan, of Tennessee.
Mrs. Andrée P. Maddox, of the District of Columbia.
Robert H. Marsh, of California.
George E. Palmer, of California.
George E. Ranslow, of California.
Irvin C. Scarbeck, of California.
Max L. Shimp, of Ohio.
Robert Gill Walker, of Maryland.
Mrs. C. Carey White, of Arizona.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 6, and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Edgar F. Garwood, Jr., of Florida.
Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Jane S. Abell, of New Hampshire.
Miss Leona M. Anderson, of Iowa.
Miss Ruth S. Anderson, of Connecticut.
Melvin J. Anthony, of Illinois.
Robert S. Ashford, of Virginia.
Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
Miss Helen M. Bailey, of Virginia.
Miss Eleanor Bello, of New York.
Jack Beni, of West Virginia.
Philip B. Bergfield, of California.
Dale K. Betts, of California.
Miss Helen Biggane, of California.
Miss Helen M. Bonnell, of Michigan.
Norman L. Cansler, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph D. Capri, of California.
John S. Connolly, Jr., of Virginia.
John J. Degan, Jr., of New York.
Gilda R. Duly, of New York.
Henry E. Dumas, of California.
Paul S. Dwyer, of Ohio.
Miss Imogene E. Ellis, of Washington.
Miss Marybel Eversole, of Illinois.
Robert E. Ferris, of Oregon.
Gordon R. Firth, of New York.
Miss Edele P. Hauber, of Minnesota.
Mrs. Hallye A. Heiland, of California.
Frederick A. Hill, of California.
Paul J. Hoylon, of Maryland.
George O. Huey, of Illinois.
Mrs. Ellen C. Johnson, of Missouri.
Miss Bernice T. Jones, of California.
Thomas A. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Katherine Lee Kemp, of Maryland.
Miss Madeline R. Kernen, of Colorado.
Miss Alice E. Kinnars, of Illinois.
Miss Inez E. Larson, of Minnesota.
David E. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
Eric G. Lindahl, of Michigan.
Miss Ingeborg M. Lueders, of Virginia.
Miss Helen K. Lyons, of California.
Francis P. McCormick, of Massachusetts.
Miss Clorene A. Miller, of Texas.
Robert H. Miller, of Washington.
Miss Marion K. Mitchell, of New York.
Kiyonao Okami, of Maryland.
Miss Nancy Ostrander, of Indiana.
Miss Eleanor R. Paulson, of Washington.
Miss Marjorie L. Pea, of Indiana.
Ernest O. Pederson, of New Hampshire.
George W. Phillips, of Florida.
Miss Brynhild C. Rowberg, of Virginia.
James T. Rush, of Rhode Island.
Goodwin Shapiro, of Maryland.
Miss Jean V. Smith, of Minnesota.
Edward D. Sokol, of New Hampshire.
Miss Cecil Sporn, of New York.
Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.
Mrs. Edith A. Stensby, of Tennessee.
George H. Strunz, of Arizona.
Raymond J. Swanson, of California.
Miss Theresa M. Takacs, of New York.
Miss Tomena Jo Thoreson, of North Dakota.
Carl I. von Hellens, of Washington.
Mrs. Marjory M. Wallis, of California.
Frank J. Walters, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Dorothy H. Webb, of California.
Miss Jessie L. Webb, of Tennessee.
Miss Joanne V. Winn, of New Hampshire.
Hubert L. Zwald, of Pennsylvania.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Anthony C. Albrecht, of New York.
Philip M. Allen, of Virginia.
J. Bruce Amstutz, of Massachusetts.
Robert G. Anders, of Wisconsin.
Bryan H. Baas, of Texas.
Benjamin W. Bacon, of New York.
William R. Baker, of Tennessee.
Oler A. Bartley, Jr., of Delaware.
William M. Beck, of Illinois.
Frank C. Bennett, Jr., of California.
Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
David A. Betts, of New York.
Howard I. Blutstein, of New Jersey.
H. Eugene Bovis, of Florida.
Everett E. Briggs, of Maine.
Bazil W. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William A. Brown, of Massachusetts.
John R. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Harry A. Cahill, of New York.
Richard F. Calhoun, of Illinois.
Miss Martha C. Carbone, of Washington.
Charles R. Carlisle, of Florida.
Miss Mary Ann Casey, of New Jersey.
Gordon Chase, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Collins, of California.
Richard T. Conroy, of Tennessee.
Goodwin Cooke, of New York.
Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California.
Walter L. Cutler, of Maine.
Richard S. Dawson, Jr., of California.
Miss Stella M. Deinzer, of New York.
Robert P. DeVecchi, of Pennsylvania.
Lloyd L. DeWitt, of California.
William C. Dixon, of California.
Maurice A. Dopp, Jr., of New York.
Robert W. Drexler, of Wisconsin.
Miss Regina Marie Eltz, of Alabama.
Martin Ewenstein, of New York.
Roy S. Ference, of Indiana.
Miss Jeannette M. French, of Rhode Island.
Bruce A. Flatin, of Minnesota.
Robert L. Fonner, of Illinois.
Robert L. Funseth, of New York.
Milton E. Ganger, Jr., of Ohio.
Paul F. Gardner, of Texas.
Richard J. Gibson, of Michigan.
Marion L. Gribble, of New York.
John B. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Hannaher, of Minnesota.
Alan M. Hardy, of New Jersey.
Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
Charles R. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Douglas G. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Maxwell S. Heigho, of California.
John J. Helble, of Wisconsin.
Gerald B. Helman, of Michigan.
Edgar P. Henderson, Jr., of Indiana.
Thomas J. Hill, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Roger P. Hipskind, of Illinois.
Thomas J. Hirschfeld, of New York.
Herbert Eugene Horowitz, of New York.
Michael P. E. Hoyt, of Illinois.
Edward Hurwitz, of New York.
George W. Jaeger, of Missouri.
Robert E. Jelley, of California.
James T. Johnson, of Montana.
Donald R. Jones, of Alabama.
Edson W. Kempe, of California.
Walter F. Keville II, of Florida.
John W. Kimball, of California.
Barrington King, Jr., of South Carolina.
Robert M. Kline, of Connecticut.
Tadao Kobayashi, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Roy E. Koch, of New York.
Sam E. Lesher, of Colorado.
Miss Joan Evelyn Lewis, of Ohio.
Gerald Floyd Linderman, of Ohio.
Robert Gerald Livingston, of Connecticut.
Richard J. Loosbrock, of Indiana.
Peter P. Lord, of Massachusetts.
Roger S. Lowen, of New York.
James Gordon Lowenstein, of Connecticut.
Arthur L. Lovrie, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary E. McDonnell, of Massachusetts.
Francis Terry McNamara, of New York.
Francis J. McNeil III, of Florida.
Melvin M. Marcus, of Michigan.
Edward Marks, of California.
John W. March, of Illinois.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
James K. Matter, Jr., of Michigan.
Frank A. Mau, of Wyoming.
Miss Mary L. Merges, of Pennsylvania.
Jay P. Moffat, of New Hampshire.
Richard B. Moon, of Missouri.
Richard M. Moose, of Arkansas.
Minot P. Nettleton, of New Jersey.
John L. Offner, of Pennsylvania.
Lancelot P. Olinde, of Louisiana.
Russell E. Olson, of Illinois.
Theodore K. Osgood, of Massachusetts.
George A. Pavlik, of Iowa.
John G. Peebles, of Texas.
Miss Emily Perreault, of Illinois.
John G. Peters, of Maryland.
Mark S. Pratt, of Rhode Island.
Charles T. Prindeville, Jr., of Illinois.
Datus Proper, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick D. Purdy, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia.
Cecil S. Richardson, of New York.
Miss Ann C. Roper, of Ohio.
Orville H. Schmidt, of Minnesota.
Stephen E. Schneider, of California.
Eugene L. Schou, of New York.
Glenn E. Schweitzer, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Nancy L. Sells, of Michigan.
Arthur P. Shankle, Jr., of Texas.
Robert Lee Shuler, of Virginia.
David E. Simcox, of Kentucky.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph L. Smith, of Indiana.
R. Peter Spicer, of Ohio.
Michael Sterner, of New York.
Joseph O. Streicher, of Illinois.
Miss Joanne Sugnet, of New York.
Daniel P. Sullivan, of Virginia.
John J. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Roger W. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Gerald M. Sutton, of California.
Francis J. Tatu, of California.
Thurston F. Teele, of Massachusetts.
Harry E. T. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Thurston Thomas Thurber, Jr., of New York.
D. Dean Tyler, of California.
Robert von Pagenhardt, of California.
Edwin Lee Wade, of New York.
William Watts, of New York.
Benjamin Weiner, of New York.
Harry Weiner, of New York.
Miss Winifred S. Weislogel, of New Jersey.
Miss Duane White, of Colorado.

James P. Willis, Jr., of California.
William M. Woessner, of New York.
Brooks Wrampelmeier, of Ohio.
William B. Young, of New Hampshire.
Albert L. Zucca, of New York.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Royal D. Bisbee, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Darrell I. Drucker, Jr., of Minnesota.
James A. Elliot, of New York.
Allan J. Funch, of Maryland.
Miss Nona L. Gardiner, of Louisiana.
John S. Getchell, of California.
William M. Harrison, of Missouri.
Joyce R. Herrmann, of Indiana.
Erich W. A. Hoffmann, of Wisconsin.
Arthur H. Hopkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Emile W. Juhasz, of New Jersey.
Alfred J. Pedersen, of Massachusetts.
Edward E. Post, Jr., of North Carolina.
Heinrich B. Siemer, of the District of Columbia.
John H. Stumpf, of the District of Columbia.
Angus MacLean Thuermer, of Illinois.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Edward B. Beidleman, of Maryland.
John S. Farrington, of Oregon.
Roy L. Malcolm, of California.
John C. Stoddard, of Connecticut.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Einar T. Anderson, of Illinois.
Richard W. Barry, of Virginia.
William R. Freeman, of Illinois.
Valentine O. Goodell, of New York.
John L. Hart, of Illinois.
William F. Rowland, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Howland Bancroft, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Thomas P. Carney, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Cicala, of Connecticut.
Herbert A. Erf, Jr., of Ohio.
Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.
Robert H. Heron, of Maryland.
John H. Hoskins, of Maryland.
C. Oliver Iselin III, of Virginia.
Andrew J. Molnar, of Illinois.
John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.
Richard F. Simpson, of Maryland.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

F. Kinloch Bull, Jr., of Illinois.
John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut.
Frederick W. Latrash, of California.
Michael C. Sednaoui, of Colorado.
Roger W. Severt, of Iowa.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

W. Kenneth Bunce, of Ohio.
Walter L. Campbell, of California.
Harry S. Casler, of Maryland.
Leo F. Gentner, of California.
Rolfe Kingsley, of Maryland.
Oscar M. Powell, of California.
Alfonso Rodriguez, of Michigan.
G. Lewis Schmidt, of California.
William H. Weathersby, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America.

Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

LaVerne Baldwin, of New York.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of the District of Columbia.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
William P. Maddox, of the District of Columbia.
David M. Maynard, of California.
Gerald A. Mokma, of Iowa.
T. Eliot Weil, of California.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Willard F. Barber, of Maryland.
John O. Bell, of Florida.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Clarence E. Birgfeld, of the District of Columbia.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
Edward G. Cale, of Maryland.
Robert M. Carr, of California.
Andrew V. Corry, of Montana.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
Jerome T. Gaspard, of Virginia.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
Owen T. Jones, of Ohio.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Ridgway B. Knight, of New York.
William C. Ockey, of California.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Gardner E. Palmer, of Michigan.
Andreas G. Ronhovde, of Montana.
Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas.
Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Edward G. Trueblood, of Wisconsin.
Harry R. Turkel, of California.
John W. Tuthill, of Illinois.
Laurence C. Vass, of Maryland.
Harold C. Vedeler, of the District of Columbia.
Eric C. Wendelin, of Massachusetts.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

Sidney K. Lafoon, of Indiana, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.
Milton Barall, of New York.
Herman H. Barger, of Virginia.
John A. Birch, of Maryland.
V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William L. Blue, of Tennessee.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
Turner P. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
Robert G. Cleveland, of New York.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of Washington.
Harry Conover, of New Jersey.
Raymond F. Courtney, of Delaware.
William J. Crockett, of Nebraska.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
William N. Dale, of New York.
John Dorman, of the District of Columbia.
Robert Eisenberg, of Virginia.
Arthur B. Emmons, 3d., of Massachusetts.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Russell Fessenden, of Virginia.
Dennis A. Flinn, of Illinois.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
G. McMurtrie Godley, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
John C. Guthrie, of Virginia.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Francis W. Herron, of Iowa.
John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Henry A. Hoyt, of California.
Philip W. Ireland, of California.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.
Charles J. Little, of New Mexico.
Robert C. Martindale, of California.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John Gordon Mein, of Kentucky.
Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois.
Charles K. Moffly, of Michigan.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
Bolard More, of Ohio.
David G. Nes, of Maryland.
Charles H. Owsley, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Plakias, of Illinois.
John C. Pool, of Delaware.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Charles E. Rogers, of Connecticut.
Claude G. Ross, of California.
Alexander Schnee, of New York.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Frank G. Siscoe, of New Jersey.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
Francis L. Spalding, of Massachusetts.
Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph Sweeney, of California.
Edward J. Thomas, of Ohio.
Irwin M. Tobin, of Maryland.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Robert E. Wilson, of Arizona.

The following-named persons for appointment at Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Bruce Buttles, of California.
Donald G. Schuler, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Francis O. Allen, of Maryland.
Sverre M. Backe, of California.
Douglass K. Ballentine, of Texas.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
William L. Brewster, of Texas.
Gene F. Caprio, of New Jersey.
Stanley S. Carpenter, of Massachusetts.
Albert E. Carter, of Tennessee.
Antonio Certosimo, of California.
Arthur A. Compton, of Missouri.
William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Wendell B. Coote, of Virginia.
James N. Cortada, of Florida.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
Thomas R. Favell, of Wisconsin.
William Dale Fisher, of California.
Julian P. Fromer, of New York.
Joseph A. Greenwald, of Illinois.
Harold E. Hall, Utah.
L. Douglas Heck, of Maryland.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
Charles E. Higdon, of Tennessee.
J. Roland Jacobs, of California.
Valdemar N. L. Johnson, of Florida.
William Kelley, of Florida.
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Lacey, of Maryland.
George T. Lister, of New York.
Donald S. Macdonald, of Massachusetts.
David E. Mark, of New York.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
John A. McKesson 3d, of New York.
Edward W. Mulcahy, of Arizona.
Miss Helen R. Nicholl, of New York.
David L. Osborn, of Arkansas.
Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.
Alexander L. Peaslee, of Ohio.
Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.
William E. Price, of Arkansas.
Earle J. Richey, of Kansas.
John Frick Root, of Pennsylvania.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Richard L. Sneider, of New York.
Donald S. Spigler, of Pennsylvania.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
James S. Sutterlin, of Kentucky.
Charles W. Thomas, of Illinois.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.
Oliver L. Troxeel, Jr., of Colorado.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
William L. Wight, Jr., of Virginia.
Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 3:

John E. Crawford, of Minnestota.
Kennedy M. Crockett, of Texas.
Juan L. Gorrell, of New Hampshire.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
Herbert B. Leggett, of Ohio.
Vernon L. Merrill, of West Virginia.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Malcolm Toon, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Dodderidge, of Kansas.
Richard C. Hagan, of Illinois.
Harold W. Jacobson, of Illinois.
Carroll M. Meigs, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Shaw, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Rodger C. Abraham, of Maryland.
Charles C. Adams, of New York.
Theo C. Adams, of Texas.
Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.
Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
William O. Anderson, of Indiana.
John A. Armitage, of Tennessee.
Laurin B. Askew, of Tennessee.
Powhatan M. Baber, of West Virginia.
Clifford O. Barker, of Virginia.
William J. Barnsdale, of California.
Frederic H. Behr, of New Jersey.
H. Reid Bird, of Utah.
James J. Blake, of New York.
George F. Bogardus, of Iowa.
Davis Eugene Boster, of Ohio.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Delmar R. Carlson, of Colorado.
Paul B. Carr, of California.
William B. Cobb, Jr., of North Carolina.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
Oliver S. Crosby, of Washington.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
Anthony Cuomo, of California.
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Donald M. Davis, of Virginia.
Jonathan Dean, of New York.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
Robert B. Dreessen, of Missouri.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
David H. Ernst, of Massachusetts.
Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of Minnesota.
Asa L. Evans, of South Carolina.
Charles C. Finch, of Kansas.
Mrs. Florance H. Finne, of California.
John W. Fisher, of Montana.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Arthur D. Foley, of Michigan.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr., of Ohio.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Robert C. F. Gordon, of California.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Philip C. Rabib, of California.
John K. Hagemann, of Maryland.
Arnlioth G. Heltberg, of California.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Converse Hettinger, of Wisconsin.
Thomas F. Foctor, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
Edward W. Holmes, of Washington.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Rogers B. Horgan, of Massachusetts.
John M. Howison, of Texas.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
John J. Ingersoll, of Illinois.
Allan G. James, of the District of Columbia.
Walter E. Jenkins, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
William M. Johnson, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Thomas G. Karis, of Virginia.
Miss Sofia P. Kearney, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Joseph T. Kendrick, Jr., of Oklahoma.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
Walter E. Kneeland, of Texas.
Miss Francis H. Lafferty, of Delaware.
J. Alfred LaFrenière, of Massachusetts.
Francis X. Lambert, of Massachusetts.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Miss Anita C. Lauve, of Maryland.
Frederick D. Leatherman, of Ohio.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Seymour Levenson, of California.
Robert S. Lindquist, of Michigan.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Guy O. Long, of Pennsylvania.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Frederic K. Lundy, Jr., of Virginia.
Michael B. Lustgarten, of New York.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
David J. S. Manbey, of California.
Allen F. Manning, of Maryland.
Eugene C. Martinson, of Michigan.
Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.
Paul D. McCusker, of Colorado.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.
Neil C. McManus, of New Jersey.
Sanford Menter, of Texas.
G. E. Robert Meyer, of Ohio.
Bruce H. Millen, of Louisiana.
John H. Morris, of Arizona.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
John G. Oliver, of California.
Lynn H. Olson, of Minnesota.
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.
James P. Parker, of Connecticut.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
G. Etzel Pearcy, of California.
Harold D. Pease, of California.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr. ,of Connecticut.
David Post, of Pennsylvania.
Edward P. Prince, of New Hampshire.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Miss Françoise G. Queneau, of the District of Columbia.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
Robert J. Redington, of Connecticut.
Edwin C. Rendall, of Illinois.
Miss Marie E. Richardson, of Arkansas.
Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
William A. Root, of Maryland.
J. Philip Rourk, of California.
Kenneth J. Ruch, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor W. Sandford, of Massachusetts.
Cecil B. Sanner, of Florida.
Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Miss Louise Schaffner, of Pennsylvania.
Robert R. Schott, of Oregon.
Norman V. Schute, of California.
Ray Sena, Jr., of New Mexico.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.
Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.
W. Angie Smith III, of Texas.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.
Mrs. Lucille M. Snyder, of Missouri.
Sidney Sober, of New York.
G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
Charles J. Stanley, of Ohio.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
William N. Stokes, of North Carolina.
William J. Supple, of Kansas.
Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina.
Charles H. Taliaferro, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Tambone, of New York.
Henry L. Taylor, of Washington.
Mrs. Musedorah W. Thoreson, of Tennessee.
Edward J. Thrasher, of New York.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Charles M. Urruela, of Ohio.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
William H. Wade, of California.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Rollie H. White, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
George D. Whittinghill, of New York.
Louis A. Wiesner, of Michigan.
Miss Jean M. Wilkowski, of Florida.
Elbert R. Williams, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.
Park F. Wollam, of California.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.
Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.
Donald L. Woolf, of California.
Parker D. Wyman, of Illinois.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Mrs. Montana W. Zbinden, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

A. José DeSeabra, of the District of Columbia.
William B. Hussey, of California.
James W. Kelly, of Maryland.
Stuart D. Nelson, of Virginia.
M. Gordon Tiger, of Virginia.
Orson W. Trueworthy, of Virginia.
Charles W. Wonder, of Utah.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois.
Wallace Clarke, of California.
Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.
Gordon D. King, of Texas.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.
Daniel J. Meloy, of Maryland.
J. H. Cameron Peake, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
Elwood B. Acker, of Connecticut.
James E. Akins, of Ohio.
Robert Anderson, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas G. Andrews, of New Jersey.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
John G. Bacon, of Washington.
Michael P. Balla, of Pennsylvania.
William R. Beckett, of Michigan.
William E. Berry, Jr., of Virginia.
S. Cole Blasier, of Michigan.
David B. Bolen, of Colorado.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
William G. Bowdler, of Virginia.
William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
Robert A. Brown, of California.
North C. Burn, of Washington.
William J. Bushwaller, of Iowa.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.
William D. Calderhead, of Texas.
John P. Call, of California.
Frederic L. Chapin, of the District of Columbia.
Elwyn F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Marjorie L. Cheatham, of Washington.
Edward R. Cheney, of Vermont.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
Miss Alice W. Clement, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Marian C. Conroy, of Pennsylvania.
Carleton S. Coon, Jr., of Massachusetts.
M. Lee Cotterman, of Ohio.
Franklin J. Crawford, of Ohio.
William R. Crawford, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
Miss Virginia I. Cullen, of Pennsylvania.
John E. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary W. Cutler, of the District of Columbia.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
Robert W. Day, of Maryland.
Rudolph Days, of Maryland.
David Dean, of New York.
Francois M. Dickman, of Wyoming.
John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
Arthur R. Dornheim, of Maryland.
Richard E. Dove, of Maryland.

Robert E. Dowland, of Tennessee.
William B. Dozier, of South Carolina.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Miss Ollie G. Edmundson, of Missouri.
Xavier W. Eilers, of Minnesota.
Athol H. Ellis, of Maryland.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
James J. Ferretti, of Connecticut.
Guy Ferri, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Weikko A. Forsten, of Washington.
Theodore R. Frye, of Ohio.
Jack B. Gabbert, of Missouri.
Richard D. Geppert, of New Jersey.
Robert J. Gibbons, of Ohio.
Ramon M. Gibson, of Missouri.
Wayne R. Gilchrist, of Missouri.
William H. Gleysteen, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Gerald Goldstein, of New York.
John W. Gordhamer, of California.
Robert F. Griggs, of New York.
Ernest S. Guaderrama, of California.
William C. Hamilton, of Connecticut.
Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.
Gordon G. Heiner 3d, of Maryland.
Theron S. Henderson, of Massachusetts.
John H. Hermanson, of Massachusetts.
Gerrit J. W. Heyneker, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Hodgson, of Michigan.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
Robert C. Huffman, of Washington.
Leaman R. Hunt, of Oklahoma.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Miss Margaret Hussman, of Idaho.
Borrie I. Hyman, of California.
Miss Helen Jean Imrie, of Rhode Island.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Miss Olive M. Jensen, of Iowa.
Miss Thelma M. Jenssen, of Minnesota.
Miss Marie A. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Richard E. Johnson, of Illinois.
William C. Jones III, of Texas.
Wesley E. Jorgensen, of Washington.
Herbert Kaiser, of Maryland.
Andrew John Kauffman II, of Maine.
George R. Kenney, of Illinois.
Miss Virginia L. King, of Nebraska.
Donald E. Larimone, of Illinois.
Raymond W. Laugel, of Ohio.
John C. Leary, of Massachusetts.
Henry Lee, Jr., of Massachusetts.
William W. Lehfeldt, of California.
Arthur C. Lillig, of Oregon.
Kenneth W. Linde, of Connecticut.
Philip M. Lindsay, of California.
John L. Loughran, of Pennsylvania.
Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.
Robert J. MacQuaid, of Pennsylvania.
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.
Robert J. Martens, of California
Parke D. Massey, Jr., of New York.
Edward E. Masters, of Ohio.
H. Freeman Matthews, Jr., of Virginia.
John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
Allan F. McLean, Jr., of Texas.
Warren H. McMurray, of Georgia.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
John A. Moran III, of New Jersey.
James F. Moriarty, of Massachusetts.
Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.
Albert D. Moscotti, of New Jersey.
Miss Alice G. Mulhern, of Massachusetts.
Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
Howard F. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
Edward P. Noziglia, of New York.
Anton N. Nyerges, of Indiana.
Harry I. Odell, of New York.
Glen S. Olsen, of Utah.
David B. Ortman, of Maryland.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.
Lyle R. Piepenburg, of Wisconsin.
Onesime L. Piette, of Virginia.
Miss Janice Plowman, of Missouri.
Virgil E. Prichard, of Oklahoma.
Joseph H. Quintanilla, of Texas.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
Lloyd M. Rivers, of New Jersey.
Miss M. Adelaide Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
Woodward Romine, of Maryland.
William R. Roof, of South Carolina.
Kenneth F. Rose, of Florida.
Arthur H. Rosen, of Missouri.
H. Earle Russell, Jr., of Michigan.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
Stanley D. Schiff, of New Jersey.
Irving I. Schiffman, of Virginia.
David Scott, of Maryland.
Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
Edwin E. Segall, of Nebraska.
William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
Robert K. Sherwood, of Nebraska.
Thomas P. Shoesmith, of Pennsylvania.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Richard G. Smith, of Florida.
J. Harlan Southerland, of the District of Columbia.
Christopher A. Squire, of Virginia.
Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
Andrew Stalder, of New York.
Monteagle Stearns, of New York.
Robert A. Stein, of New Jersey.
Mrs. Virginia C. Stryker, of Washington.
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.
Michael H. Styles, of Virginia.
Sidney V. Suhler, of Texas.
Joseph M. Swing, of Washington.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Miss LaVerne L. Thomsen, of Washington.
Raymond Thomsen, of Colorado.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.
Chares P. Torrey, of California.
Miss Irene Toth, of California.
Vladimir I. Toumanoff, of New Hampshire.
Philip F. Vandivier, of Indiana.
August Velletri, of Maryland.
Harold C. Voorhees, of New Jersey.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Aloysius J. Warnecki, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.
Merrill A. White, of Massachusetts.
Miss Bernadine Whitfield, of Oregon.
Frank S. Wile, of Michigan.
Robert B. Williams, of Kentucky.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
William D. Wolle, of Iowa.
Robert A. Wooldridge, of Indiana.
Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert R. Bliss, of the District of Columbia.

Philip Ernst, of New York.
Dale E. Good, of Ohio.
Robert W. Harding, of Florida.
Nicholas Hardy, of Pennsylvania.
Johannes V. Imhof, of California.
Miss Virginia E. Massey, of Ohio.
Charles W. Russell, of Maryland.

Benjamin L. Sowell, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Laurence E. Ainsworth, of California.
Robert B. Allen, of Virginia.
Robert J. Allen, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Dwight R. Ambach, of Rhode Island.
Robert F. Andrew, of California.
George R. Andrews, of Maryland.
Sam G. Armstrong, of Texas.
Marion Augustus Baldwin, of Alabama.
John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
S. Morey Bell, of Virginia.
John T. Bennett, of California.
Roger N. Benson, of Wisconsin.
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
C. Arthur Borg, of New York.
Robert B. Borin, of Nebraska.
A. Dane Bowen, Jr., of Texas.
Roger C. Brewin, of Ohio.
Edward W. M. Bryant, of Massachusetts.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
James L. Carson, of Oregon.
Harvey J. Cash, of Texas.
Miss Katharine S. Chase, of Connecticut.
Robert W. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Ward Lee Christensen, of Oregon.
Douglas McCord Cochran, of Pennsylvania.
Theodore M. Collier, of California.
Walter F. X. Collopy, of Connecticut.
John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
James C. Curran, of Virginia.
Martin A. Dale, of New Jersey.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
Harold L. Davey, of Nebraska.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Thomas W. Davis, Jr., of California.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Anton W. DePorte, of Oklahoma.
Morris Draper, Jr., of California.
John T. Dreyfuss, of California.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
Harold F. Eberle, Jr., of California.
Raymond W. Eiselt, of California.
Michael E. Ely, of New York.
Hunter L. Estep, of New Mexico.
Stockwell Everts, of New York.
James D. Farrell, of Kansas.
Harvey J. Feldman, of Illinois.
Richard W. Finch, of Ohio.
Robert H. Flenner, of Pennsylvania.
Arva C. Floyd, Jr., of Georgia.
Francis L. Foley, of Colorado.
G. Ryder Forbes, of Virgina.
C. Jefferson Frederick, of Washington.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Mark J. Garrison, of Indiana.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Harry B. Glazer, of the District of Columbia.
Dirk Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
David R. Gottlieb, of New York.
Robert P. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.
Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
C. Norman Hanley, of Washington.
Miss Elizabeth J. Harper, of Missouri.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
John J. Harter, of California.
James D. Hataway, Jr., of Georgia.
William A. Hayne, of California.
Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.
Erland H. Heginbotham, of Utah.
Brewster R. Hemenway, of New York.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Robert C. Herber, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Herdeck, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Johnsen, of California.
Chadwick Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Richard C. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Ellis O. Jones III, of Connecticut.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Roger Kirk, of the District of Columbia.
Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
P. Wesley Kriebel, of Pennsylvania.
Elmer G. Kryza, of Michigan.
Owen B. Lee, of Massachusetts.
John Donnelly Leonard, of Michigan.
Burton Levin, of New York.
Jack Liebof, of New York.
Joe Lill, of Kansas.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
J. Daniel Loubert, of Maine.
John W. MacDonald, Jr., of New York.
Miss Mary Manchester, of Texas.
William G. Marvin, Jr., of California.
James D. Mason, of Indiana.
Hugh J. McCall, of New York.
John M. McIntyre, of Illinois.
William H. McLean, of Kentucky.

William F. McRory, of the District of Columbia.
Calvin E. Mehlert, of California.
Miss Alethea Mitchell, of Tennessee.
Leo J. Moser, of California.
Carsten D. Muller, of New York.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Philip C. Narten, of Ohio.
Miss Marian L. Nash, of Louisiana.
Leonardo Neher, of Illinois.
Joseph B. Norbury, Jr., of New York.
A. Gregory Nowakoski, Jr., of New Jersey.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
J. Theodore Papendorp, of New Jersey.
James A. Parker, of Maryland.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Raymond L. Perkins, Jr., of Colorado.
Paul J. Pienni, of West Virginia.
Arthur L. Price, of Illinois.
Harry A. Quinn, of California.
Kenneth M. Rabin, of Massachusetts.
Virgil P. Randolph III, of Virginia.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nancy V. Rawls, of Georgia.
John Reed, of California.
Miss Elizabeth J. Rex, of Pennsylvania.
Edward B. Rosenthal, of New York.
Richard Rueda, Jr., of New Jersey.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
Howard B. Schaffer, of New York.
Frank E. Schmelzer, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Carl G. Seasword, Jr., of Michigan.
Harry W. Shlaudeman, of California.
Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur M. Stillman, of Illinois.
Yancey M. Taylor, of Tennessee.
Edward H. Thomas, of New Jersey.
John Means Thompson, of New York.
Ross P. Titus, of Illinois.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.
Nicholas A. Veliotes, of California.
Peter F. Warker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John P. Wentworth, of Washington.
Samuel G. Wise, Jr. of New York.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.
William Marshall Wright, of Arkansas.
Charles T. York, of New York.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Sara L. Andren, of Michigan.
Patrick H. Armijo, of New Mexico.
Miss Elinor L. Campbell, of California.
Miss Mary T. Chiavarini, of Massachusetts.
J. Stewart Cottman, Jr., of Maryland.
Bryan N. Cowherd, of Kentucky.
Mrs. Betty Ann Craig, of Illinois.
William J. Cunningham, of California.
William E. Dwyer, of New Mexico.
Edward B. Fenstermacher, of Pennsylvania.
John R. Ferchak, of Virginia.
Miss Helen E. Geen, of Texas.
Miss Jane E. Grunwell, of the District of Columbia.
Frank J. Haughey, of California.
Miss Viola Johnson, of Indiana.
Munro P. Jones, of North Carolina.
Richard W. Kautsky, of Arkansas.
Miss Gladys Knutzen, of Washington.
Charles J. Konya, of Pennsylvania.
Miss M. Margaret McCoy, of Colorado.
Allen P. McNeill, Jr., of California.
Henry J. Manning, of Colorado.
Mrs. Margaret I. Niles, of Maryland.
Miss Maxine Phillips, of Kansas.
Sol Polansky, of California.
Leslie D. Polk, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Lois J. Roork, of Oklahoma.
Miss Marjorie L. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Charles F. Stoppani, of California.
Miss Maida F. Stotts, of California.
Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands.
Miss Corabelle Tolin, of Kansas.
Gabriel Urgarte, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry M. Angelus, of Massachusetts.
John M. Barta, of California.
Norman E. Barth, of Virginia.
Gordon R. Beyer, of Virginia.
John P. Blane, of Alabama.
Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Michael Calingaert, of New York.
Jack M. Carle, of Colorado.
William P. Deary, of New York.
Theodore B. Dobbs, of Virginia.
James T. Doyle, of Florida.
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, of Wisconsin.
Alan A. Gise, of Indiana.
Donald H. Habbe, of Wisconsin.
Frederick T. Kelley, of the District of Columbia.
Raoul Kulberg, of the District of Columbia.
Sherrod B. McCall, of Illinois.
Miss Eleanore Joan McGroarty, of New York.
Robert S. McLellan, of New York.
Richard C. Matheron, of California.
Stanley R. Miller, Jr., of Florida.
Theodore C. Nelson, of Connecticut.
Allen G. Noble, of New York.
Richard F. Nyrop, of Minnesota.
Alver R. Roan, Jr., of Georgia.
J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania.
Gilbert H. Sheinbaum, of New York.
Miss Elaine Diana Smith, of Illinois.
James W. White, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Rudolf E. Cahn, of New York.
Louis L. Kirley, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

J. Foster Collins, of Virginia.
Arthur F. Rall, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Nicholas Andronovitch, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Donohoe III, of California.
Edward D. Goloway, of New York.
Robert E. Haynes, of Virginia.
Harry G. Jacobson, of Nebraska.
George A. Rady, Jr., of Maryland.
Joseph W. Smith, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Howard T. Bane, of Virginia.
Stephen Duncan-Peters, of New York.
Joseph F. McManus, of Massachusetts.
Jerry C. Rucker, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

John C. Murray, of Pennsylvania.
Clifton R. Strathern, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert H. Cunningham, of Ohio.
Stannard K. Short, of Virginia.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be surgeon

Stanley J. Sarnoff

To be assistant surgeon

Walter R. Stahl

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be dental surgeon

Lawrence J. Stanwich

To be sanitary engineer

Robert L. Stenburg

FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Bruce Underwood
Marvin S. Cashion
Harry A. Sauberli
John D. Porterfield

To be surgeons

Paul G. Becker
Wilfred D. David
LeRoy Garbe
Stephen Hajdu
G. Donald Whedon
Milton Zises

To be senior assistant surgeons

Robert M. Allman, Jr.
Roger W. Grummel
Richard P. Reinertson
Bruce B. Bellomy
James A. Kemp
Louis Levy
Richard J. Bouchard
K. Lemone Yielding
Marcus M. Key
Frank E. Lundin, Jr.
John L. Fahey
William P. Johnson
John E. Manire
Montague Lane
Thomas F. Dutcher
Tom D. Y. Chin
Alfred D. Weiss
W. K. Long, Jr.
William S. Richards, Jr.
Ernest Epstein
Donald A. Henderson
John E. Applen
Edward J. Waits
William S. Dunford, Jr.
Carl L. Davis
Leonard Brown
Richard E. Zellmer
Reuben J. Burkman
Heyman Tetewsky
Harold S. Frederiksen
Robert T. Scholes
Donald S. Fredrickson
Donald L. Fry
Winthrop E. Hoyle
Samuel Baron
Benjamin M. Primer, Jr.
Lowell R. Hughes
William Richard King
John D. Davidson
Carlton E. Swett
Robert S. Gordon, Jr.
John W. Severinghaus
Robert W. Prichard
Emil Frei III
Joaquin Martinez-Oramas
David P. Rall
Leonard J. Duhl
Richard H. Thurm
Franz W. Rosa
Charles A. Monroe
Horatio C. Wood IV
David J. Sencer
Frederick Dykstra
Peter Hamill
Howard W. Kopping
John H. Cooper
Kenneth H. Hyatt
Michael Potter
David C. Poskanzer
Kopel Burk
Louis A. Gaul
Randolph A. Frank
Donald P. Tschudy
John M. Lynch
Orlando L. Clark
John L. Stephenson
Charles H. Boettner
Richard C. Reynolds
Ted L. Welton
James W. Mosley
Charles A. Petersen
Donald E. Kayhoe
Homer L. Twigg, Jr.
John R. McKenna
William C. Brown
Robert C. Bullers
Thomas F. Flynn
Richard N. Matzen

To be assistant surgeons

William B. Furguson, Jr.
James A. Richardson, Jr.
George C. Hottinger
Emery A. Johnson
Elbert E. Hines
Gilbert G. Tobler
L. Bruce Bachman
Anthony J. Federico
Robert R. Fletcher
Edward J. Hinman
Waldo Cook
Jerry W. Crabtree
Paul A. Asper
Arnold R. Haugen
Donald C. Reifel
Herschel C. Gore, Jr.
Stephen R. Dunphy
George E. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. McGandy
George G. Meyer
Richard J. Eliason
Maurice F. Goldman
Robert C. Geiger
Donald E. Poage
Conrad E. Herr
John F. Kelly, Jr.

To be dental surgeons

Harry W. Bruce, Jr.
William J. Putnam

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Kenneth C. Potter

To be assistant dental surgeons

Clair L. Gardner
Arnold K. Webster
Robert G. Hansen
George A. Galiber
Russell O. Glauser

To be sanitary engineer

Alfred E. Williamson, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Joseph M. Dennis
William H. Megonell
Bernd Kahn
Ralph I. Larsen
Charles C. Johnson, Jr.

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Paul E. Langdon, Jr.
Gene B. Welsh

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Norman J. Petersen
George I. Johnston
Archie E. Becher, Jr.

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Felix A. Conte

To be assistant pharmacist

James E. Bleadingheiser

To be junior assistant pharmacists

William H. Briner
Paul O. Fehnel, Jr.
Robert E. McKay

To be senior scientist

Arthur L. Schade

To be scientists

Richard A. Ormsbee
Sanford M. Birnbaum
William H. Ewing

To be senior assistant scientists

John F. Sherman
Frank P. Brancato
Myron J. Willis
John W. McDowell
Aubrey P. Altshuller
Louis A. Cohen
James B. Longley

To be assistant scientists

George P. Kubica
Kenneth W. Walls

To be veterinarian

Francis R. Abinanti

To be assistant veterinarians

Douglas M. Hawkins
Robert L. Watson
Anton M. Allen

To be nurse officers

Elinor D. Stanford
Elsie E. Richardson
Maria B. Rementeria

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Marie M. Ceglarek
Violet C. Ryb
Mabel N. Hay
Helen M. Hanlon
Janet L. Fitzwater
M. Argenta Geist

To be assistant nurse officer

Arthur R. Barth

To be senior assistant dietitian

Marjorie A. Emidy

FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior surgeons

Richard H. Linn
Clark W. Mangun, Jr.
Louis C. Floyd
Ardell B. Colyar
Warfield Garson
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
R. Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Rikli
C. Dudley Miller

To be surgeon

Leon Levintow

To be senior assistant surgeons

Joseph A. Rapaport
Inez L. Ice

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Lawrence E. Van Kirk, Jr.
John H. Duffy

To be senior sanitary engineer

Paul W. Reed

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Richard D. Vaughan
Herbert A. Bevis
John E. McLean

To be senior assistant nurse officer

B. Octavia Heistad

To be assistant therapist

John L. Echternach

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for terms of 7 years expiring December 31, 1963:

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa. (Reappointment.)

Laurence Walrath, of Florida. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Bertram D. Tallamy, of New York, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1960. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Walter Yeo Weible, O11308, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306 and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16998, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, O15968, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O16196, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Howard Ker, O15518, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Donal Harkins, O17625, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Henry Tulley, O16075, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Nutter, O16095, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. John Bruce Medaris, O39554, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Parmer Wiley Edwards, O16775, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Wiley Curtis, O16784, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Gilbert Farrand, O16788, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Junior, O16830, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Earle Bell, O16897, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Alfred Disney, O17004, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore Scott Riggs, O17076, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Samuel Roberts Browning, O17081, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson, O17101, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David William Traub, O17110, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Hennig, O17122, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, O17148, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, O17174, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Southworth Upham, Jr., O17178, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Mattingly Breckinridge, O17210, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Dreyfus, O29117, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Paul Strimple Fancher, O18637, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, O18645, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Edward Jamet McNally, O17629, United States Army.

Col. Frederick James Kendall, O51236, United States Army.

Col. William Allen Harris, O18976, United States Army.

Col. William Orin Blandford, O18990, United States Army.

Col. Morris Oswald Edwards, O19041, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Herbert Beck, O19164, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, United States Army.

Col. Royal Reynolds, Jr., O19238, United States Army.

Col. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Emerson Charles Itschner, O15516, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

Maj. Gen. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

Brig. Gen. James Melvin Epperly, O16288, Dental Corps, United States Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, United States Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442, and 3447.

Maj. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., O16420, United States Army, for appointment as The Judge Advocate General of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3037.

Brig. Gen. Stanley Walker Jones, O17747, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Hugh John Carns, O17560, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Richard Barney, O16377, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. George Olaf Norman Lodoen, O16580, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Parmer Wiley Edwards, O16775, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Henry Wienecke, O41569, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Bernard Quill, O17673, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Normando Antonio Costello, O17764, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John William Bowen, O18904, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard Ker, O15518, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Vernon Lee, O28882, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Philip Ferdinand Lindeman, O272444, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army Reserve).

Brig. Gen. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Norman Edgar Youngblood, O28996, United States Army.

Col. Walter August Jensen, O19006, United States Army.

Col. Benjamin Thomas Harris, O19166, United States Army.

Col. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stephen Read Hanmer, O18348, United States Army.

Col. Andrew Joseph Adams, O18579, United States Army.

Col. Van Hugo Bond, O18601, United States Army.

Col. Donald Brooks Harriott, O29631, United States Army.

Col. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658, United States Army.

Col. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, United States Army.

Col. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, United States Army.

Col. Russell William Volckmann, O19537, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Lloyd Person, O17517, United States Army.

Col. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Patrick Elihu Seawright, O277902, Georgia National Guard, to date from August 1, 1956.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Alfred Edward Hintz, O364120, Oregon National Guard, to date from April 10, 1956.

Col. Robert Webb Kenny, O205944, Military Intelligence, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Wendell Crane Phillippi, O1288114, Indiana National Guard, to date from September 1, 1956.

Col. Donald Oliver Spoon, O401940, Washington National Guard, to date from April 10, 1956.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

TO BE MAJOR

*Phelps, Phil R., Jr., O26251.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Macklin, James E., Jr., O57225.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Graham, Raymond E., O70353.
Hemphill, James A., O70371.
Hurtt, Clarence M., O70388.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Duvall, William H., O69907.
Moody, Robert W., O70435.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Campbell, Harry G., Jr., O993995.
Cowhig, Edward D., O992335.
*Hutchins, Gordon E., O2264097.
*Kittermann, Henry O., O2021140.
*Ledebuhr, Albert F., O997454.
Malanowski, Thaddeus F., O986416.
Rockwell, Robert E., O1337892.
*Taylor, George O., O996555.
*Wilson, Robert D., O998818.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Ammerman, Elmer H., O2273956.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, title 10, United States Code, section 3291, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress, title 10, United States Code, section 3311, title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Edelman, Louis B., MC, O4023340.
Johnson, Edward M., MC, O2209660.
Stealey, Robert L., MC, O977278.
Tucker, Francis de S., Jr., DC, O1725839.
Underwood, Robert J., DC, O1934669.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

*Aaby, Gene V., MC, O4051028.
*Acevedo, Alejandro, DC, O1942207.
Aragones, Bianca A., ANC, N804029.
Barnes, Fred W., MC, O4022344.
*Barnes, Oza E., ANC, N901674.
*Barrette, William C., MC, O4051010.
*Bednar, Richard J., JAGC, O1929740.
Bell, Franklin D., DC, O984151.
Betz, Catherine T., ANC, N792410.
*Casey, Joe P., JAGC, O975130.
Clause, James D., JAGC, O1941378.
*Clement, Mary F., WAC, L1010708.
Cloon, William G., Jr., JAGC, O2279713.
Cook, Peter H., JAGC, O1882299.
Cote, Joan C., ANC, N804890.
Crowley, Francis L., Jr., JAGC, O2276844.
Daniell, Harry W., MC, O4068035.
Dito, William R., MC, O4055417.
Dixon, George L., Jr., MC, O4040476.
Dorsey, Frank J., JAGC, O1928024.
*Dossett, Thomas D., JAGC, O2277857.
Downing, David B., JAGC, O2105103.
*Emerson, Donald J., MC, O4050963.
Fehl, Merle I., DC, O4069952.
Fitzgibbon, Rodney, MC, O2207986.
Forrest, Otto N., Jr., MC, O4047086.
*Frederick, John H., MC, O4047030.
*Fuller, Richard J., DC, O4073398.
*Garman, James E., MC, O4073337.
Gasior, Edwin J., DC, O4055780.
Gimenez, Alonzo R., MC, O4056113.
Goldschmidt, Max W., MC, O4055381.
*Gorsch, Allen M., MC, O4067880.
Grillot, Florence A., ANC, N900436.
*Griswold, John D., MC, O4067933.
Groth, John F., Jr., MC, O4047049.
Gunn, Ira P., ANC, N900353.
Gunn, Walter G., MC, O4073556.
Haiken, Marvin B., JAGC, O2279933.
Haupt, Edward C., MC, O4056238.
*Heath, James W., DC, O4073218.
Hinton, Edith M., WAC, L1010560.
*Huycke, Edward J., MC, O4055729.
Inkret, William, Jr., MC.
Inouye, William Y., MC, O4035724.
Jones, Martha A., ANC, N900148.
*Jordan, Edwin C., MC, O4046932.
Keagle, James G., DC, O2274505.
Kelly, Thomas W., MC, O1942139.
Kenyon, Nathaniel C., JAGC, O2274720.
Kern, Richard P., MSC, O997590.
King, William P., MC, O4043644.
Kingsley, Leonard, MSC, O2270973.
*Kitching, Richard D., MC.
*Kontner, Rudolph J., DC, O4069845.
Kulaga, Andrew K., DC, O4045707.
*Lane, Charles E., Jr., DC, O2276999.
LaPaglia, Joseph R., Jr., MC, O4022337.
Lau, Hester, K. I., WAC, L1010389.
Lentz, Viola M., AMSC, R2568.
Locke, William E., MC, O4038710.
Lockwood, Wayne B., MC, O4055383.
Loewy, Erich H., MC, O4039314.
*London, Perry, MSC, O2273948.
Marcarelli, Joseph L., MC, O1942300.
*Melnick, Arnold I., JAGC, O2270529.
*Minard, William D., Jr., MC, O4067745.
Nelson, Harold S., MC, O4043663.
*Nichols, Robert S., MSC, O2202274.
Overley, Toner M., Jr., MC, O4069936.
Perkins, James M., MC, O4043661.
Peterson, Morris B., JAGC, O993962.
Poe, McDonald, Jr., MC, O1942192.
*Potter, James M., JAGC, O2279883.
*Robinson, Daniel J., DC, O4024741.
Roper, John W., MC, O4046845.
*Sawyer, Ben M., Jr., JAGC, O2280039.
Silverberg, Stuart O., MC, O4047027.
Sorensen, Robert J., MC, O4047101.
*Staffanou, Robert S., DC, O4073328.
*Stoker, James D., JAGC, O991298.
Taylor, Jesse K., III, JAGC, O2274696.
Theriault, Jeanette B., ANC, N901608.
Usrey, David C., MC, O1941879.
Weigel, John W., MC, O4056029.
*Wormley, John H., DC, AO3043930.
*Zeigler, William A., JAGC, O2272737.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Atchison, Juanita M., ANC, N902335.
*Austin, Audrey H., WAC, L1020450.
Berg, Ellen M., ANC, N902334.
*Bizzelle, Joanalys A., WAC, L1010867.
Capper, Edna L., ANC, N902485.
Hall, Wilma F., AMSC, M3021.
*McEvoy, Doris L., ANC, N902660.
Mimms, Barbara N., ANC, N901521.
*Purcell, Mary M., WAC, L1010745.
Pustarfi, Betty A., WAC, L1010846.
Smith, Marjorie A., ANC, N901489.
Vinson, Mildred S., ANC, N901845.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

*Allen, Donald E., O1020170.
*Jeffery, Theron E., O2208209.
*Metz, Clarence E., O2203312.
*Pue, Eddie B., O1340398.
*Sullivan, George A., O949873.
*Thome, Matthew R., O2210283.
*Will, Clement H., O2206196.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

*Akey, Charles D., O1940514.
*Anderson, Paul F., O1872565.
*Baddaker, William L., O4001392.
*Baker, John F., O2021893.
*Baker, Russell A., O2262222.
*Biggerstaff, Jack, O4012487.
*Blackwell, Paul H., Jr., O2028337.
*Blair, John M., O2030417.
*Bourne, Harold O., O1935421.
*Bradshaw, John N., O2003918.
*Bray, Gaither C., O1886324.
*Brazel, David H., O1937288.
*Brooks, Thomas V., Jr., O1887562.
*Brown, Billy R., O2002665.
*Brown, Richard W., O2028475.
*Busck, Albert A., O1890217.
*Cardinalli, Guy F., O2211890.
*Carlson, Dale L., O1935003.
*Cole, William L., O1936529.
*Cook, James R., O1885306.
*DeJarnette, Larry N., O4001226.
*Delavan, Patrick N., O2033847.
*Denton, Earle L., O1882551.
*Diamond, Eugene M., O4016292.
*Digison, Donald K., O1890005.
*Dotson, Larry D., O1880464.
*Drake, Charles F., O973303.
*Driscoll, Vedder B., O990590.
*Duffy, William D., O2211698.
*Early, Felix L., Jr., O2268161.
*Finney, Don E., O1936400.
*Gardner, Matthew L., O1926039.
*Garner, Frank R., III, O2209900.
*Gelster, Duane A., O2105069.
*Gettings, Theodore C., O4009444.
*Gill, Oather J., Jr., O1936310.
*Goetzmann, Philip A., O1877513.
*Goode, Franklyn C., O4012551.
*Gordon, Marvin E., O2028814.
*Guidroz, Evans J., O1880610.
*Hadad, Gerard A., O1931622.
*Hand, Lee M., O1932374.
*Harageones, Angelo J., O1881266.
*Harris, James E., O2207772.
*Hayes, Walter P., O4021260.
*Heard, Falkner, Jr., O2274722.
*Holmes, Arthur, Jr., O1890936.
*Huntington, Raymond F., O1892198.
*Jacquay, Louis H., O1885627.
*Johnson, Jodie, Jr., O1894040.
*Johnston, James A., O2263567.
*Komar, George, O1881659.
*Korpal, Eugene S., O1930309.
*Leer, Boyd W., O2028377.
*Lewis, Billy D., O998157.
*Lewis, Grover H., Jr., O1931772.
*Lindsay, James J., O4005314.
*Lockrem, Dale A., O1876459.
*Loutzenhiser, Richard H., O2102233.
*Loy, William M., O2003473.
*Luck, Robert H., O1876727.
*Lusby, Harold L., O2028419.
*MacNeill, Rohry O., O2263620.
*Males, William R., O4018672.
*Manbert, Rush M., O1889367.
*McCormick, George R., O2021838.
*McGillicuddy, Cornelius F., Jr., O1936690.
McMahon, Patrick B., O1923514.
*Mehl, Walter J., O1888946.
*Murphy, Donald G., O2266950.
*O'Kane, George M., Jr., O4003751.
*Patton, Eugene H., O1887758.
*Perry, William R., O1935313.
*Peugh, Frank J., O1922539.
*Pickett, Gene G., O1877181.
*Poulos, Frank S., O2265575.
*Primm, Charles F., Jr., O1820981.
*Randall, Douglas A., O1882852.
*Robinson, Robert E., O4015626.
Rogers, Jefferson K., O1332643.
*Rumsey, Frank A., Jr., O4019081.
*Sanders, Connelly, Jr., O1929182.
*Scalise, James J., O1891118.
*Scanlon, Andrew J., O2268162.
*Schludecker, Otto A., O4006193.
*Scibilia, Anthony J., O4013456.
*Scott, Thomas L., O2004712.
*Sesslar, James R., Jr., O4005618.
*Sheets, Phil K., Jr., O968931.
*Smith, Thomas R., O2263372.
*Smoyer, Raymond E., O1924549.
*Stewart, Bradley A., O976931.
*Stewart, Donald B., O1931913.
*Teague, Jerry L., O971394.
*Thompson, Roy, Jr., O1342132.
*Van Camp, Joseph L., O4000020.
*Waldron, Edward E., II, O997285.
*Wardinski, Michael L., O1925581.
*Weaver, Clarence S., O2041669.
*Wild, John E., O4005284.
*Wild, Julian S., O1932502.
*Williams, Edmund R., O4023577.
*Williamson, John A., O1881185.
*Wisdom, Donald A., O1937458.
*Wood, Harold G., O1885511.
*Woodroof, Robert R., O2263589.
*Yancey, Truman E., O2028654.
*Zeller, Leonard J., O1932360.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

*Ackerman, Albert A., O4038813.
*Alexander, John R., O4010545.
*Babers, Donald M., O4024689.
*Baldwin, Noland Y., O4031640.
*Bales, Donald G., O4010549.
Bennett, Donald P., O4010470.
Bissell, Keith, Jr., O4031260.
*Boyer, Robert L., O4001334.
*Breithaupt, Marvin P., O4040578.
*Brooks, Leo A., O4032167.
*Brown, Raymond V., O4024744.
*Cauthen, Lewis J., Jr., O4033859.
Chandler, Richard L., W2206430.
*Cooley, Andrew L., Jr., O4031044.
*Crouch, Harry C., O4000565.
*Davis, Billy E., O4013371.
*Dearborn, William H., O4040774.
*Drexler, Charles H., O4028937.
*Granger, Donald J., O4038498.
Grier, William C., O4010843.
*Guffey, Howard R., O4009606.
*Harber, Gerald J., O4006902.
*Haywood, Willie M., Jr., O4004766.
Hill, Donald L., O4031474.
*Hrncir, Oran T., O4024538.
*Jacobson, Jon A., Jr., O4010975.
*Jones, Thomas S., O4018508.
Kershner, Clark L., O4010580.
*Komornik, Ronald G., O4006841.
*Kurdziolek, Fred W.
*Lea, W. J., Jr., O4063686.

*Lovato, Lawrence, O4026541.
*Mackintosh, Robert H., O4003404.
Malone, Howard E., Jr., O4010510.
Matheson, Robert G., O4031333.
*McCord, John S., O1880861.
McLay, Orville K., O4010469.
Michola, Daniel S., O4010762.
*Miller, Carl S., Jr., O4010983.
*Momeier, John L., O4044656.
*Neroutsos, George H., O4030680.
*Nicoson, William J., O4025326.
*Niemi, John A., O4026400.
*Owel, William R., O4029693.
Perla, George G.
*Perrin, Everett I., Jr., O4017380.
*Phillips, Clyde W., O4031697.
*Quinn, James R., O1941137.
*Reding, Charles H., O1881068.
*Richey, Eugene C., O4009427.
*Roberts, William P., O4010031.
*Rose, Ronald J., O4009672.
*Ryan, Dennis W., Jr., O4006772.
*Savoldi, William R., O4017866.
Schmid, Robert M., O4031365.
*Schneider, Robert L., O4025469.
*Stone, George J., O4038886.
*Swanson, Robert L., O4026947.
*Thomas, David L., O4032448.
*Wallace, Danny C., O4009678.
Watson, Arthur L., O4010965.
*White-Spunner, Kenneth P., Jr., O4004080.
*Wilks, Clarence D., O4019478.
Wilson, Carl A., Jr., O4031381.
Woodmansee, Donald R., W2203872.

The following-named person for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Brown, Willard J., Jr., O4069843.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Betts, Stanley L., O2275412.
Close, James M., O1873251.
Dotson, Christopher C., Jr., O2275357.
Freeman, Mahlon V. R., O4047084.
Garcia-Gonzalez, Efrain, O2034138.
Gottheil, Edward, O4070044.
Hebertson, Leon M., O1341426.
Hernandez, Manuel.
Hertzman, Carl A., O4051125.
Howbert, James P.
Ionno, Joseph A., O4067285.
Kaljot, Victor.
King, Edgar W., Jr.
Lahoda, Joseph G., O4070104.
MacGregor, Robert J.
Madison, Vincent J., O4067292.
McGahee, Carl L., Jr., O4043552.
Means, Myron A., O4070071.
Miller, William M., O4069960.
Neill, Robert A., Jr., O2275437.
North, Robert L., O2275355.
Pettit, Paul D.
Price, Charles H.
Sickel, Hugh V., O4050972.
Stanek, Robert G.
Treat, Robert G., O4051032.
Troske, Robert L., O4056259.
Westfall, Arlie H., O4070042.
Williams, Henry S., O2275351.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Davis, Robert W.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Allan, Richard, O4066571.
Andrews, Robert H.
Bready, Robert J., O4047466.
Britton, John A.
Carucci, Raymond A., O4075983.
Castelli, Joseph G., O4060085.
Castle, Edward R., Jr., O4071817.
Chin, Thomas, O4064913.
Cook, John E., O4083454.
Counts, Perry L., O4063174.
*Covington, George V.
Cowles, Phillip R., O4061818.
Dawes, Robert C., O4083209.
Denmark, Sumner J., Jr.
Gentry, Roy C., O4049029.
Gereau, Richard N., O4061197.
Gomon, Charles W., O4060498.
Harris, Bill B., O4071627.
Hearne, William D., Jr., O4075887.
Henry, Ronald W., O4069687.
Hettinger, John R., O4076620.
Holladay, Van D., O4068445.
Hosmer, William, O4083360.
Hubbard, Darryl F.
Huddle, Charles E., Jr., O4069359.
Hurbis, John J., O4060240.
Ingman, John F.
Kessinger, John M., O4049419.
Kircher, Jacob F., III, O4059695.
Kobayashi, Bert N.
Lanham, Michael C., O4076483.
Lofton, Marvin, O4063263.
Luhman, Frederick A.
McAfee, Floyd H., O4061448.
McCabe, Edward J., Jr., O4066420.
Milan, Richard L., O4060571.
Moxley, Thomas T., O4064989.
Patte, Chris, O4075839.
Petko, Edward, O4076628.
Prichard, Alvin L., Jr., O4069380.
Rahm, Richard R., Jr., O4075438.
Rhodes, Howard E.
Richardson, Herman E., O4060288.
Roberts, Donald A., O4083398.
Rodnite, Andrew J., O4064997.
Ruggiero, Rocco R., O4065417.
Salonen, William L.
Schroeder, Eldon K.
Seeley, James L., O4058343.
Spears, Joseph M., Jr., O4047530.
Stamps, John R., O4076500.
Stewart, John P.
Stoddard, Timothy D., O4065472.
Stycos, John S.
Swayne, Charles J., O4061558.
Tettelbach, Donald C., O4076065.
Tilly, Clyde C., Jr., O4071872.
*Toolson, John M., Jr.
*Vancini, Arthur J., O4070485.
Van Houten, Peter F., O4076844.

NOTE: Those officers whose names are not preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were not appointed or promoted during the recess of the Senate.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 8298, 8299, and 8304, title 10, United States Code. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Line of the Air Force

Huggard, Peter John, Jr., 11306A.
Neie, Reuben William, 11439A.
Howe, Charles Elbridge, Jr., 11479A.
Simmons, Harlan Gilliam, 11551A.
Ingalls, Murray Harold, 11599A.
Hinton, Jay Stephen, 11602A.
Hurt, Charles Clyde, 11614A.
Holt, Warner Jenella, 10428A.
Livingston, Clyde McRay, 11657A.
Bender, Carroll Joseph, 11685A.
Broach, William Gardner, Jr., 11820A.
Jones, Dean A., 11893A.
Fayman, Edward Aaron, 12064A.
Mills, Joe Rose, 12101A.
Harris, Carll Truett, 12102A.
Hicks, Charles Kimball, 12130A.
Ott, George Joseph, 12133A.
Edwards, Elmer Thomas, Jr., 12613A.
Bell, John Arnold, 12627A.
Zelenka, Raymond Emil, 12701A.
Seifert, Henry Lee, 12702A.
Dean, Preston Minor, 12703A.
Harris, Robert Wilson, 12704A.
Godbey, Donald Edward, 12705A.
Gentry, James Elbert, 12706A.
Clements, Lawson Woodrow, 12707A.
Rockey, Carlton George, Jr., 12708A.
Abbott, Edmond Hoyet, 12709A.
Symmes, Roderick Ormsby, 12710A.
Perkins, Donald Foss, 12711A.
Fitschen, Iver Clarence, 12712A.
Vanbruggen, Richard, 12713A.
Horn, John David, 12714A.
Allen, Donald Wellington, 12715A.
Guerrein, Carl Joseph, 12716A.
Black, Jim, 12717A.
Miller, Richmond Lee, Jr., 12718A.
Meacham, Gerard Stewart, 12719A.
Yochim, Frederick Anthony, 12720A.
Reed, Charles William, 12722A.
Kennedy, Thomas Barrett, 12723A.
Buffenbarger, Harold Lee, 12724A.
Moelich, William Edward, Jr., 12725A.
Masonheimer, Robert Harvey, 12727A.
Kelly, James Douglas, 12728A.
Charbonneaux, Dorwin Douglas, 12731A.
Lewis, Jack Miller, 12732A.
Kinchla, Edward Francis, Jr., 12735A.
Price, Robert Doyle, 12736A.
Keish, Frederick Charles, 12738A.
Duke, Robert Harold, 12739A.
Karnezis, Demetrios, 12740A.
Warner, James Aldo, 12741A.
Brooks, James Bruce, 12742A.
Carter, James Barney, 12743A.
Black, William Talbott, Jr., 12744A.
Greene, Clarence Raymond, 12745A.
Gallerani, Alterio, 12746A.
Singleton, Floyd Edwards, 12748A.
Clark, Waymon D., 12749A.
Kessler, Donald Lee, 12750A.
Robertson, Thomas Dillon, 12751A.
Anderson, Edgar Harold, Jr., 12752A.
Miele, Alfonse Ralph, 12754A.
Penton, Austin Douglas, 12755A.
Long, Clifford George, 12756A.
Dawson, Albert Eugene, 12757A.
Murray, William Marvin, 12758A.
Lyle, Vernon John, 12759A.
Niersbach, Norman George, 12760A.
Russell, Norman, 12761A.
Abbott, Woodrow Acton, 12763A.
Weed, John Barton, 12765A.
Hughes, John Francis, 12766A.
Carey, Constantine George, 12767A.
Grosse, William Richard, 12768A.
Combs, Edward Emmerson, 12769A.
Collier, Robert Edward, 12770A.
Wolfe, Roland L., 12771A.
Erickson, Orin Horgan, 12772A.
Holley, Roy Lamar, 12773A.
Rountree, Malcolm Stuart, 12774A.
Chandley, Sherley Sevier, 12775A.
Grottle, George Tibor, 12776A.
Cheatham, Richard Blake, 12777A.
Beeson, Jack Toll, 12778A.
Moore, Herbert Warren, Jr., 12779A.
Cloud, Carl Everett, 12780A.
Beveridge, Andrew Lowman, 12781A.
Stevenson, William Leroy, 12782A.
Clark, Wayne Elmus, 12783A.
Peightel, James Lloyd, 12784A.
Dietrich, Leroy Schantz, 12785A.
Lackey, James Clifton, 12786A.
Wilson, Woodrow William, 12788A.
Thompson, Allen Wesley, 12789A.
Fritsch, Edward Martin, 12790A.
Fikes, Charles Wilson, 12791A.
Johnston, Ben Doom, Jr., 12792A.
Weigle, Vincent Joseph, 12793A.
Meyers, Oliver Harold, 12794A.
Andrew, James Ward, 12795A.
Bigum, Alfred Clark, 12796A.

Wise, Billie Reford, 12798A.
McBride, Elmer Thomas, 12799A.
Erdman, John Muttart, 12800A.
Peattie, Harry Andrew, Jr., 12801A.
Neal, Harold Lord, Jr., 12802A.
Livingood, Galen Aldo, 12803A.
Kerr, Robert Augustus, 12804A.
McMahon, James Joseph, Jr., 12805A.
Wheeler, Kenneth Robert, 12806A.
Woods, Roy Douglas, 12808A.
Chapman, George Wesley, 12809A.
Miller, Robert Thorn, 12810A.
Tammenga, Henry Lubertus, 12811A.
Jonas, Gordon E. Lester, 12812A.
McGrew, Kenneth Gordon, 12813A.
Carter, Frank Maynard, Jr., 12815A.
Smithwick, Fred Barksdale, Jr., 12816A.
Timmermans, Henry Louis, 12817A.
Roberts, Harry Warren, 12818A.
Mickish, William Jack, 12819A.
Stabler, Tarlton Brooke, 12820A.
Freas, Luther Wayne, 12821A.
Kelso, William Robert, 12822A.
Steen, Clarence Herbert, 12823A.
Welch, Norman Ernest, 12824A.
Wakefield, Harry Adams, 12825A.
Chavez, Manuel Jose, Jr., 12828A.
Keator, John Elmer, 12830A.
Newsom, B. W., 12831A.
Apgar, Paul Donald, 12832A.
Fisher, Earl, Jr., 12833A.
Gerdes, Donald Richard, 12834A.
Grubb, Royal Harwood, 12835A.
Fisher, Thurman Danton, 12836A.
Remick, John Henry, 12838A.
Dyas, David Dean, 12840A.
Bare, Harold Francis, 12841A.
Bormann, Frederick Eugene, 12842A.
Langford, Floyd J., 12844A.
Jones, William Aubrey, 12846A.
Porter, Frederick Sherwood, Jr., 12848A.
Dover, Joseph Harrison, 12850A.
King, Frederick Martin, 12852A.
Smith, William Bernard, Jr., 12853A.
Marston, Arthur Anson, 12854A.
Netherwood, Douglas Blakeshaw, 12857A.
Stoll, Albert Earl, Jr., 12860A.
Fisher, Roger Louis, 12861A.
Linn, Howard Anthony, 12862A.
Danforth, George Luck, Jr., 12863A.
Lutrey, Theodore Thomas, 12865A.
Meltzer, Lester, 12867A.
Thaler, Melvin Sidney, 12870A.
Wink, Eugene August, Jr., 12871A.
Janek, Lewis Frank, 12872A.
Benedict, Paul Miller, 12874A.
Pollen, Milton Thomas, 12875A.
Oswald, Garth Barnes, 12876A.
Kettler, William Herman, 12877A.
Dunn, Donald Wayne, 12879A.
Smith, Robert London, 12880A.
Molloy, Paul Francis, 12882A.
Pullen, Howard Vere, 12884A.
Ryan, Neil Brammer, 12885A.
Masters, Edgar James, 12886A.
Fristoe, James Poor, 12887A.
Eiser, John Leigh, 12889A.
Tucker, Charles Lewis, 12890A.
Jones, Henry Lee, 12891A.
Nowlin, David McBroom, 12892A.
Adams, James Addison, 12893A.
Cooper, Harold Myron, 12894A.
Littleton, Franklin Walter, Jr., 12896A.
Jerman, Charles Edwood, 12897A.
Middleton, George Alvin, 12899A.
Masterson, Robert James, 12901A.
Harbula, Edward Albert, 12902A.
Tucker, Claude Jordan, 12903A.
Barton, Roger Darl, 12904A.
Scott, Robert Isham, Jr., 12905A.
Williams, Irwin Lynn, 12906A.
Harris, Willie Marvin, 12907A.
Cummings, Jesse Milburn, 12908A.
Reavis, Cecil Leon, Jr., 12909A.
Piggott, Myron George, 12911A.
McGrain, Thomas Wood, 12912A.
Shuck, John Flory, 12913A.
Donnelly, James Edward, Jr., 12914A.
Barnidge, William Hall, 12915A.
Bailey, Gordon Anderson, 12918A.
Wells, Charles Brinton, Jr., 12919A.
Green, Joseph, 12921A.
Miller, Monroe Marchbank, 12922A.
McCann, James Joseph, 12924A.
Logan, Douglas Harold, 12925A.
Klonowski, Joseph James, 12926A.
Way, Jack, 12928A.
Korbol, Clifford Oscar, 12929A.
Meyer, Gilbert Edgar, 12930A.
Heslep, Alvin Ray, 12931A.
Hodkins, Chester Allen, 12932A.
Howell, James Robert, 12933A.
Welsh, James Harry, 12935A.
Ascherfeld, Karl Cousins, Jr., 12936A.
Ballie, Irwin Levi, 12937A.
Cavanaugh, William Daniel, 12938A.
McKown, Robert Emery, 12939A.
Halpin, Edward Vincent, 12940A.
Bennett, Walter Wilson, 12942A.
Wells, Harold Eugene, 12943A.
Hughes, Robert Lee, 12944A.
Stewart, Thomas Earl, 12945A.
Scurlock, James Gordon, 12946A.
Armstead, Seth Abraham, Jr., 12947A.
Roberts, Charles Anthony, 12948A.
Helms, Willard Bryce, 12949A.
Cherry, Clyde Stephen, 12952A.
Back, John Verdell, 12953A.
Finnerty, William Joseph, 12957A.
Williams, Donald Elmer, 12958A.
Cox, Samuel Jack, Jr., 12960A.
Brown, Robert Curtis, 12961A.
Schmidt, Robert Charles, 12962A.
Williams, Lewis Harris, 12963A.
Anderson, John Burton, 12964A.
Jones, Melbern Robert, 12965A.
Talbot, Philip Burne, 12966A.
Green, Robert Vestry, 12967A.
Sanderson, Duncan McAuley, 12970A.
Coursey, Robert Joseph, 12971A.
Allen, Frank Wynter, 12972A.
Parsonson, Ernest Charles, 12973A.
Carpenter, Dustin Edward, 12974A.
Voss, Kenneth William, 12976A.
Beighley, Joe Willard, 12977A.
O'Hearn, Daniel Robert, 12978A.
Coble, Walter Monroe, 12979A.
Smith, Eldon Vernon, 12980A.
Vaughan, Thomas Wallace, 12981A.
Willis, W. B., 12982A.
Krause, Francis Raymond, 12983A.
Prochoroff, George, 12984A.
Sutton, Robert Clifton, 12985A.
Neal, Robert Eugene, 12987A.
DeLoughary, Robert David, 12989A.
Little, Homer Francis, 12990A.
Gradel, George Anthony, 12991A.
Arneson, Kenneth Lincoln, 12992A.
Hogan, Miller E., 12993A.
Berkstrom, John Arthur, 12994A.
Grey, Walter Forrest, 12995A.
Chesser, Alvin James, 12996A.
Burke, John Francis, 12997A.
Carmack, Harold Horton, 12998A.
Sommers, Harold Lee, 12999A.
Sullivan, Charles Luther, 13000A.
Kille, Wesley Grant, 13001A.
Armstrong, George Valentine, Jr., 13002A.
Lux, Frank Orf, 13004A.
Mattson, Joseph Albert, 13006A.
Hotard, Ernest Lee, 13007A.
O'Leary, John David, 13010A.
Weaver, Carl Turner, Jr., 13011A.
Horton, Jack O'Quin, 13012A.
Simmons, Malcolm Clifford, 13013A.
Smith, Willard Edward, 13014A.
Withers, Raymond Rankin, 13015A.
Corn, Cecil Paul, 13016A.
Kirby, Julian Benton, 13017A.
Hargett, Joe Thurman, 13018A.
Ridenour, Paul Wesley, 13019A.
Beck, Howard George, 13020A.
Shaber, Bert, Jr., 13021A.
Reilley, Robert John, 13022A.
McFarland, Kenneth Thomas, Jr., 13023A.
Boaz, Reynolds Ollie, 13024A.
Hodges, Millard Upton, 13025A.
Morel, Raymond Ernest, 13026A.
Price, Leroy Burroughs, 13027A.
Wywal, Felix Benard, 13028A.
Arey, Warren Fredrick, 13029A.
Handy, Paul, 13031A.
Page, Jack Clifford, 13032A.
Henley, Robert Max, 13033A.
Partrick, Richard Harding, 13034A.
Leaser, Earl Robert, 13036A.
Janssen, Carl Andrew, 13038A.
Jackson, Earl E., Jr., 13040A.
Bevard, Franklin Blake, 13041A.
Hamilton, Richard Louis, 13042A.
Vansickle, Philip Hugh, 13043A.
Wood, Thomas Walley, 13044A.
Mouat, John Charles, 13045A.
Johnson, Jack Dewey, 13047A.
Liniger, Vaun Neal, 13048A.
Lowman, Raymond Paul, 13049A.
Jacobs, William Paul, 13052A.
Carpenter, Claude S., 13054A.
Murray, Loren Purdy, Jr., 13055A.
Simmons, Willis Madison, 13057A.
Haggerty, Frank Richard, 13058A.
Recher, John Henry, 13059A.
Britt, Daniel Turner, Jr., 13061A.
Frederick, Paul Alphonse, 3d, 13062A.
French, George Edward, Jr., 13063A.
Degroat, Russell Ellsworth, 13064A.
Ottaway, Harold Edward, 13065A.
Gettelfinger, Robert Jerome, 13066A.
Welch, Eugene Clair, 13068A.
Kuldau, Parker Charles, 13069A.
Rorrer, Marvin Thomas, 13070A.
Horrigan, Robert James, 13071A.
Crone, Douglas Arthur, 13072A.
Wolfe, Lawrence John, 13073A.
Caudill, Orley Brandt, 13074A.
Boyd, Robert Richardson, 13075A.
Wood, Horace Dula, 13076A.
Smith, Jack Arthur, 13078A.
Hanner, Charles Kirkman, Jr., 13079A
Sullivan, Robert, 13081A.
Sherman, Ocea D., Jr., 13082A.
Meibohm, Winfred Herbert, 13083A.
Hill, John Francis, 13077A.
Newton, James Harold, 13084A.
Jane, Edwin George, Jr., 13085A.
Zimmerman, Max George, 13087A.
Bellows, Clyde Lee, 13088A.
Leary, Dodge Edwin, 13089A.
Orme, Griffith, 13090A.
Bohart, Chester Herbert, 13091A.
Zigrang, William John, 13095A.
Mitchell, Ralph Waymon, Jr., 13096A.
Halliday, Robert Wallace, 13098A.
Vanderbeek, Louis Marshall, 13099A.
Owens, Melvin O'Dell, 13100A.
Grabowski, Francis Theodore, 13101A.
Vocke, Robert Donald, 13102A.
Leeds, John Corbett, Jr., 13103A.
Carey, George Francis, Jr., 13104A.
Bradshaw, Morris Harold, 13105A.
Horton, William Joseph, 13107A.
Davis, Montie Alius, Jr., 13108A.
Stanley, Marvin Miles, 13109A.
Quinones, Alphonse Diaz, 13110A.
Todd, Raymond, Victor, 13112A.
Dawson, Theodore Estel, 13113A.
Lanphere, Jean Wilberger, 13115A.
Vacanti, Charles Louis, 13116A.
Stevens, Charles Albert, Jr., 13117A.
Reilly, Alvin Edmond, 13118A.
Covell, Frank Dustin, 13119A.
Jones, Ellis Madison, Jr. 13120A.
Jenson, Harris Lyle, 13121A.
Gregory, Fountain Leverne, Jr., 13122A.
Renken, Fred Phillip, 13123A.
Sitler, Fred Harry, 13124A.
Pidgeon, Charles Henry, 13125A.
Corcoran, Joseph Bernard, 13126A.
Amundson, Floyd Allen, 13127A.
Crandall, Fred, 13129A.
Mullin, Robert Edward, 13130A.
Terrien, John Curry, 13131A.
Alukonis, Stanley, 13132A.
Siebern, Vincent Peter, 13133A.
Terrell, James Henry, Jr., 13134A.
Anderson, Curtis Alloyes, 13136A.
Widney, Ellis Verne, 13137A.
Holder, Glendi Craig, 13138A.
Norton, William Ray, 13140A.
Porter, Ernest James, 13141A.
Sprague, Robert Leroy, 13142A.
Liptak, James Steber, 13143A.
Wilson, Morris Francis, 13144A.

Yeoman, Bill Lee, 13146A.
Mayhew, John Frank, 13147A.
Hansen, Harold Christian, 13149A.
Seymour, Charles Patrick, 13150A.
Hooper, William Duncan, 13151A.
Serafin, John Lawrence, 13153A.
Friedrich, Roy Edward, Sr., 13154A.
Bennett, Eddie Lowell, 13155A.
Savage, Robert Berl, 13156A.
Romo, Peter, Edward, 13157A.
Chinnock, Earl Howard, 13158A.
Murray, Richard Earl, 13161A.
Good, Marvin Harold, 13162A.
Ross, Richard Harold, 13163A.
Blanchard, Jerome Louis, 13164A.
Johnson, George William S., 13165A.
Sorbo, Albert Richard, 13166A.
Fisher, Charles Ira, 13169A.
Yarbrough, Leonard Harold, 13172A.
Lockwood, Harold Keller, 13173A.
French, Russell Aaron, 13174A.
Shook, Fredric Warden, 13175A.
Moon, Jack F., 13176A.
Musgrave, Howard James, 13178A.
Brown, Walter James, 13179A.
Galbraith, Charles Leland, 13181A.
Irwin, James Richard, 13182A.
Neil, John Gillespie, 13183A.
McKenzie, Byron Ernest, 13184A.
Grotenstein, Morton, 13185A.
Looney, John Preston, 13186A.
Hale, Benjamin Lyle, 13188A.
Hartley, Frank William, Jr., 13189A.
Jordan, Arthur Cleveland, 13190A.
Cowan, Burl, 13191A.
Stein, Joe Eugene, 13192A.
Fisher, Orville Lee, Jr., 13193A.
Warehime, Forrest Everett, Jr., 13194A.
Turnquist, Roy Harris, 13195A.
Atterbury, Logan Cavanaugh, 13197A.
Lambert, Henry Read, 13199A.
Metcalf, George Nathan, 13200A.
Anderson, Richard Kenneth, 13201A.
Behrens, William Chesly, 13202A.
Menza, Dominic Frank, 13204A.
McCabe, Charles James, 13205A.
Corritore, Pascal Joseph, 13207A.
Gauvin, Francis Roland, 13208A.
Tyson, Houston Carroll, 13210A.
Harper, Cecil Leo, 13211A.
Cox, Claude Wright, 13212A.
Allen, John Richard, 13213A.
Swap, Arthur Merrill, 13214A.
Wood, William Dean, 13215A.
Kocel, Edward Peter, 13216A.
Henke, Arnold William, 13217A.
Morgan, Joseph Pierpont, 13218A.
Johnson, Howard Carrol, 13219A.
Collver, Robert Cecil, 13221A.
Dietrich, Clair McAlister, 13222A.
Edwards, Gerald Brinton, 13224A.
Staley, Charles Walter, 13225A.
George, Richard Pierce, 13226A.
Ness, Patrick James, 13227A.
White, William, 13228A.
McClement, Robert Lloyd, 13236A.
Spencer, Robert Vernon, 13230A.
Ostrem, Roy Ebert, 13233A.
Long, Lewis Frank, 13234A.
Ebelke, William Henry, 13235A.
Foster, John Phillip, 13237A.
Ainsworth, Jess Willard, 13238A.
Houser, Patrick Byron, 13239A.
Nebughr, Raymond Laverne, 13241A.
Foss, Robert John, 13243A.
Harris, Charles William, 13245A.
VanRope, Roy Wilson, 13246A.
Faziollah, Maurice John, 13247A.
Roberts, Ray Oliver, 13248A.
Mikkelsen, Albert Hansen, 13250A.
Jones, Robert Louis, 13251A.
Langworthy, Everett Walter, 13253A.
Crockett, Woodrow Wilson, 13254A.
Stewart, Dale Fenton, 13255A.
Lyman, Edward McLean, 13256A.
Laws, Warren Porter, 13257A.
Randels, James Bennett, 13258A.
Hall, Felton William, 13259A.
Kennedy, Jerome Michael, 13260A.
Blake, Clifford Hubert, 13261A.
Caldwell, Joel Blackwell, Jr., 13263A.
Brown, Joseph, Jr., 13264A.
Whalen, Daniel Joseph, 13265A.
Pascoe, Harry, 13266A.
Sams, Richard Henry, Jr., 13267A.
Fruit, Firman Harley, 13269A.
Wimberly, Wesley Forres, 13270A.
Driscoll, Kenneth Lloyd, Jr., 13273A.
Gassler, John, 13274A.
Smitherman, Julian Edward, 13276A.
Ports, Robert Alton, 13277A.
Christopher, Albert McAdams, 13278A.
Lane, Ralph Hodgdon, Jr., 13279A.
Moses, Larrie Ellis, 13280A.
Taylor, Roland Howard, 13282A.
Coleman, Thomas Philip, 13283A.
Wright, Charles Franklin, 13284A.
Smith, Ralph Lindley, 13285A.
Mulanax, Robert Verdell, 13286A.
Smith, Clyde Henry, 13287A.
Paulsel, Donald Quentin, 13288A.
Bohling, Charles Frederick, 13289A.
Tift, Ralph E., 13292A.
Keema, John Milford, 13293A.
Johnson, Kenneth Alfred, 13294A.
Larson, Loren Melvin, 13295A.
Bouchard, Charles Chester, 13298A.
Lupa, Henry Joseph, 13299A.
Dayton, Steward Ray, 13300A.
Kleine, James Dallas, Jr., 13301A.
Schooley, Jim Corbett, 13302A.
Morgan, Noland Juul, 13303A.
Gillaspie, Mark Wolford, 13305A.
Crisman, Harry Bruce, 13306A.
Stonis, Peter Casimer, 13307A.
Culbertson, William R., 13308A.
Andrae, Paul Herman, 2d, 13309A.
Bilson, John Gilbert, 13310A.
Ledbetter, Lamar Edward, 13312A.
Goodreau, James Joseph, 13313A.
Territo, Vincent Anthony, 13314A.
Dieck, Theodore Francis, 13315A.
Gallagher, John Joseph, 13318A.
Haan, Carl Joseph, 13320A.
Purdy, Douglas Chester, 13322A.
Curd, James Loyd, 13327A.
Hinnant, Robert Earle, 13329A.
Ford, Ernest C., 13330A.
Stroud, William Paul, Jr., 13331A.
Margison, Robert Louis, 13332A.
Richardson, Sidney Kenneth, 13333A.
Gregory, Benjamin Francis, 13334A.
Assimotos, Samuel Anthony, 13335A.
McClure, Samuel Sidney, 13336A.
Fjeseth, Harold Edwin, 13338A.
Carlson, Donald Charlie, 13339A.
Maitland, William Ward, 13341A.
Eilar, Norman Woodrow, 13342A.
Michael, Edward Stanley, 13343A.
Shafer, Guy Leslie, Jr., 13344A.
Scudder, Robert Kelso, 13345A.
Thornton, Charles Hampton, 13346A.
Johnson, William Thomas, 13347A.
Davis, Onner Duncan, 2d, 13348A.
Johnson, Edward Lee, 13349A.
Brown, John Wright, 13350A.
Cadwallader, John Stephen, 13351A.
Rentmeester, Lester Francis, 13352A.
Richie, Frank Gilbert, 13353A.
Woodward, John Luther, Jr., 13354A.
Starmer, Glenn Allen, 13356A.
Mayfield, Darrell Ware, 13358A.
Dessert, Donald Mark, 13359A.
Barber, James Barton, 13360A.
Rochlin, Arthur William, 13361A.
Richards, Donald William, 13362A.
Williams, Cyril Evan, 13363A.
Greene, Melvin Leslie, 13364A.
Knowles, Edward, Jr., 13365A.
Nichols, Malcolm George, 13366A.
Balliet, Byron Fredrick, 13367A.
Combs, John Harley, Jr., 13368A.
Benbow, John Warren, 13369A.
Spofford, James Russell, 13371A.
Carlyle, James Howard, 13373A.
James, Clifton Eugene, 13374A.
Adams, Carl Russell, 13375A.
Gamelin, Aime Joseph, 13376A.
Murray, Charles Bernard, 13377A.
Moon, Bryden Earl, 13378A.
Moore, George Manley, 13379A.
Capps, Paul Willard, 13380A.
Davis, Wilbert Eugene, 13381A.
Pettit, Roy Francis, 13328A.
Sorenson, Bernard Ramon, 13383A.
Harms, Thomas Hershal, 13384A.
Lober, Richard Hatz, 13385A.
Petree, William Lloyd, 13386A.
Hovey, Harold Gordon, 13387A.
Lutz, George Willard, 13388A.
Burton, Ernest Lyle, 13389A.
Heaviside, Robert William, 13390A.
Henry, Russell Frank, 13391A.
Green, Jimmie Lee, 13392A.
Burget, Carl Edward, 13393A.
Lane, Edward Erie, Jr., 13394A.
Bockelman, Frederick, Jr., 13396A.
Seliga, Edward Joseph, 13397A.
McMinn, Truman Lee, 13400A.
Avery, Charles Malcolm, 13399A.
Baker, Gordon, 13402A.
Lindgren, John Rudolph, 13403A.
Weitzel, Donald Leo, 13404A.
Arlington, Matthew Thomas, 13405A.
Williams, James Edwin, 13406A.
Smith, Wayne, 13407A.
Loflin, William Albert, 13408A.
Welch, Chester Colvin, 13409A.
Hanna, Ross Pershing, 13410A.
Hartzell, Connett Foster, 13411A.
Thompson, William Marvin, 13412A.
Merrill, Robert Taylor, 3d., 13413A.
Lee, Richard Daniel, 13414A.
Waterman, Leroy Richard, 13415A.
Horn, Willard Lee, 13416A.
Heberling, Raymond Lee, 13417A.
Hoerler, Walter, 13418A.
Walsh, James, Jr., 13419A.
Howard, Pat Neff, 13420A.
Vantrease, Hubert Clyde, 13422A.
Blitch, Norman Henry, 3d, 13423A.
Weyant, Jack Areties, 13424A.
Bynum, Willis Allan, 13425A.
Martin, Herbert Wayne, 13426A.
Hardman, John Wesley, 13428A.
Dusenberry, Robert Kelly, 13429A.
VanName, Edward Ephraim, 13430A.
Harrold, Paul Custer, 13431A.
Hart, Francis Joseph, 13432A.
Pope, Kermit Rudolph, 13433A.
Schindler, Joe Thomas, 13434A.
Richardson, Bill Mack, 13435A.
Petersen, Warren Jay, 13436A.
Sandbach, John Oscar, 13437A.
Wear, Thomas Orval, 13438A.
Wathen, Roy Dolph, 13439A.
Carney, Francis Melvin, 13440A.
Hunter, Trymon Winfred, 13442A.
Babb, Robert Gordon, 13443A.
Martell, Donald Joseph, 13444A.
Webb, Richard Leslie, 13446A.
Carlson, Roy Duane, 13447A.
Ethridge, Floyd Charles, 13448A.
Sparks, Earl Edwin, 13449A.
Sundeen, William Erhard, 13451A.
Nicholson, Clifton Leonidus, 13452A.
Smith, Warren Hutchinson, Jr., 13453A.
Smith, Robert William, 13454A.
Mohr, Homer Hirst, 13455A.
Council, Robert Enloe, 13456A.
Flannigan, William Chisholm, 13457A.
Donohue, John Earl, 13458A.
Cook, Eugene Dalton, 13459A.
Smith, Lewis Curtis, 13462A.
McPherson, Samuel Oscar, Jr., 13463A.
Cashman, William James, 13464A.
Mallard, Thurston Nathaniel, 13467A.
Sneed, William Osborne, 13468A.
Voigtmann, Frank Leslie, 13469A.
Kaufman, Richard Herbert, 13471A.
Fantone, William Herbert, Jr., 13472A.
Williams, James Benjamin, Jr., 13473A.
McDonell, Charles Edmond, 13475A.
Shultz, Charles Yandell, Jr., 13476A.
Phillips, William Lloyd, 13478A.
Bachmann, Frederick Emil, Jr., 13479A.
Benne, Louis, 13480A.
Cook, Charles Evans, Jr., 13481A.
Mason, John Jesse, 13482A.
Fowler, James Furman, 13483A.
King, William Harrison, Jr., 13484A.
Stotts, Allan Herbert, 13486A.
Rawls, Don Molton, 13487A.

Wesley, James Richard, 13488A.
Riggs, Francis Hutton, 13489A.
Dodson, Claude Bolen, 13492A.
Frey, George Joseph, 13494A.
Canestrari, Gisto, 13495A.
Holcomb, Robert Joseph, 13496A.
Brooks, James Gordon, 13497A.
McFann, H. Miles, 13499A.
Newell, Jamieson Harper Bryden, 13501A.
Conklin, Edmund Holbrook, 13502A.
Berg, Howard Lysle, 13503A.
Martin, Thomas Sutton, Jr., 13504A.
Bailey, Joseph Aaron, 13505A.
Douglas, Louis Robert, 13506A.
Smith, Robert Eugene, 13507A.
Partridge, Charles Henry, 13508A.
McCain, Earl Schisler, 13510A.
Miller, Nathan Wendell, 13511A.
Bollard, Donald Wilbur, 13512A.
Crose, Leonard, 13513A.
Goodfellow, Alford Joseph, 13514A.
Paradise, Charles Howard, 13515A.
Rogers, Odie Floyd, Jr., 13516A.
Hurley, John Robert, 13517A.
Jacobs, Michael Collins, 13518A.
Ullmann, Gilbert, 13519A.
Wagnon, Harry Tidwell, 13520A.
Crozier, Roswell Lamont, Jr., 13521A.
Bailey, William Douglas, 13522A.
Williams, Ogg Lemuel, Jr., 13523A.
Smith, Wayne Elwood, Jr., 13524A.
Wright, Russell Edward, 13526A.
Spiva, Thurman, 13527A.
Sproul, Matthew, Jr., 13528A.
Armstrong, Jack Rutherford, 13529A.
Barker, Havelock William, 13530A.
Palmer, Carl Goodwin, 13531A.
Schnabel, Robert Emmett, 13532A.
Lindsay, Robert Alfred, 13533A.
King, Paul Simpson, 13534A.
Simon, John James, 13535A.
Framsted, Kenneth Gerald, 13536A.
Hillen, John William, Jr., 13537A.
Bennett, Frenchy Dumont, 13538A.
Border, Jean Stambach, 13539A.
Long, Raymond Willis, 13541A.
Miller, Richard Franklin, 13542A.
Schlueter, Edward Arthur, 13543A.
Imhoff, Harold Louis, 13544A.
Townsend, George Erwin, 13545A.
Schoonvel, John, 13546A.
Scurzi, Joseph Ralph, 13547A.
Brown, Ben Russell, 13548A.
Milburn, Charles Albert, 13549A.
Welden, Robert Dexter, 13550A.
Stacey, Walter, 13551A.
Knott, Clarence William, 13552A.
Buhler, Lloyd Patrick, 13553A.
Lehner, Albert Michael, 13554A.
Overton, William Wesley, 13555A.
Hodgins, Lawrence Judson, Jr., 13558A.
Burk, Clarence Gordon, 13560A.
Amundson, Lowell O'Dell, 13561A.
Robinson, Charles Joseph, 13562A.
Duffus, John David, 13563A.
Sporer, Fred, Jr., 13564A.
Smith, John Merle, 13567A.
Moorhead, Robert Blair, 13568A.
Ingram, Vernon John, 13570A.
Reid, Alva Russell, 13571A.
Curtis, Ralph Russell, 13573A.
Aagaard, Emmert Mortensen, 13574A.
Fowle, Herbert Lester, Jr., 13575A.
Smith, Paul Allen, 13576A.
Meade, Elmer Charles, 13577A.
Shero, Victor Kimball, 13578A.
Wald, Elwood John, 13579A.
Norman, Harry Edward, 13580A.
Stephens, Robert Luther, 13581A.
Gallagher, James, 13582A.
Forbragd, Maurice Harlin, 13583A.
Marohl, Hugh Phillip, 13584A.
Hill, George William, Jr., 13585A.
Stuyvesant, Ernest Derverd, 13586A.
Cloninger, Charles Reid, 13587A.
Stout, Robert Archibald, 13588A.
Donaldson, Glenn Hubert, 13589A.
Dyer, Eugene Nicholas, 13590A.
Daniel, Garland Simon, 13591A.
Aderholt, Harry Clay, 13592A.
Zuber, Richard Stanley, 13593A.
Lighter, Homer Ernest, Jr., 13595A.
Daniel, Robert Edward, 13596A.
Lane, Joseph Anthony, 13597A.
Bell, David Harold, 13598A.
Long, Carlton Harry, Jr., 13599A.
Fairbanks, Gerald Delmar, 13600A.
Conklin, Clifford Edward, 13602A.
Jones, Albert Wilson, 13603A.
Herman, Donald Luther, 13604A.
Williams, James Alfred, 13605A.
Boggs, Wallace Milton, 13606A.
Kinny, Archer Warren, Jr., 13607A.
Clark, William Thomas, Jr., 13611A.
Fisher, James Robert, 13612A.
Pierce, Milton Ralph, 13613A.
Reynolds, Walker Russell, Jr., 13614A.
Smith, Vander Lee, 13615A.
Whitaker, Thompson Stout, Jr., 13616A.
Morrison, Robert Edward, 13617A.
Taylor, David Marvin, 13618A.
Williams, Herndon Fauntleroy, 13619A.
Collier, Milton, 13620A.
Cecil, Walter McKinley, Jr., 13621A.
McKinney, Russell Morris, 13622A.
Abels, Erich Tommy, 13624A.
Patton, Roderick Richard, 13625A.
Stull, Grafton William, 13627A.
Barouch, Robert, 13628A.
Dague, Maxwell Horton, 13629A.
Thomas, Leo Ernest, 13630A.
Barr, Thomas Gilbert, 13631A.
Markham, Vernon Clayborn, 13633A.
Martin, Jack Talbert, 13634A.
Jarrett, David Duvall, 13636A.
Egan, James Cronin, Jr., 13638A.
Smith, Mance Clayton, 13639A.
McClure, William Clark, 13640A.
Sabine, George Edward, 13641A.
Aamodt, Duane Ardell, 13643A.
Belue, Fred Wayne, Jr., 13644A.
Downing, Edgar Clarence, 13645A.
Williams, Burl Ray, 13646A.
Van Cleef, Paul Leroy, 13647A.
Ferguson, Richard Thomas, Jr., 13649A.
Davis, Vincent Earl, 13650A.
Underwood, William Surel, 13651A.
Wilkerson, Sam Charles, Jr., 13652A.
Lannon, James Joseph, 13653A.
Jones, Richard Francis, 13654A.
Weinmeister, Carl John, 3d, 13655A.
Johnson, John Riley, Jr., 13656A.
Barr, Richard Eugene, 13657A.
Tarr, Milton Fernando, 13658A.
Plentl, Willard Gathings, 13659A.
MacDonald, Douglas Leo, 13660A.
McKinzie, William Morgan, 13661A.
Park, Paul Leonard, 13662A.
Hughes, Paul Addison, 13663A.
DeLosier, Bernard Clayton, 13664A.
Bradbury, Jack Edson, 13665A.
Easley, Charles Delane, 13666A.
Reagle, Robert Carroll, 13668A.
Hammack, Charles Ray, 13669A.
Geller, Ulrich Aloysius, 13670A.
Dietrich, Fred Herman, 13671A.
Clark, James Kurns, 13673A.
Garvin, John Thomas, 13674A.
Saltzman, Ernest Clifford, Jr., 13675A.
Woodyard, Jean Karl, Jr., 13676A.
Oliver, Thomas Kilbury, 13677A.
Knowles, Harold Ferguson, 13678A.
McAdam, Richard Curry, 13679A.
McMullen, Frank McCoy, 13681A.
Martin, William Wintle, 13682A.
Snyder, Richard Concklin, 13684A.
Parker, Richard Henry, 13678A.
Taylor, Franklin Woody, 13689A.
Naylor, William Edward, Jr., 13690A.
Fletcher, Henry Merritt, Jr., 13693A.
Philpott, Jammie Mendal, 13694A.
Galas, David Emanuel, 13695A.
MacMullin, Robert John, 13696A.
Schramm, Ned, Jr., 13697A.
Heintzelman, Harry Ludwick, 3d, 13700A.
Price, Ernest Collier, 13701A.
Wheeler, Richard Vincent, 13702A.
Brake, William Jasper, 13707A.
Novak, Jack Conrad, 13708A.
Watson, William Glenn, 13709A.
Smith, Hubert, Jr., 13710A.
Pugh, James Rival, Jr., 13711A.
Walsh, Edward Joseph, Jr., 13712A.
McClure, Robert Dugald, 13714A.
Gorelangton, Eaton Arthur, 13715A.
Jackson, Thomas Terrell, 13716A.
McGregor, Jack Kenneth, 13717A.
Frisbie, Norman Horace, 13722A.
Steele, Gordon Hall, Jr., 13723A.
Renth, Edward Julius, Jr., 13724A.
Gullion, Allen Wyant, 13726A.
Dargue, Donald Salmon, 13727A.
Fisher, Alfred Kremer, 13729A.
Young, Earle Harrison, 13730A.
Colson, Carl Clayton, 13731A.
O'Toole, Jerome Thomas, 13732A.
Sarrett, Dale Thomas, 13734A.
Melvin, Robert Tolar, Jr., 13735A.
Bertholf, Donald Forrest, 13737A.
Bussell, Chatham Preston, 13738A.
McLaren, John Paterson, 13741A.
Pachl, Ruel John, 13742A.
Fry, Wallace Jiles, Jr., 13743A.
Buersmeyer, Wilfred Charles, 13745A.
Estes, Melvin Anderson, 13746A.
Smith, James Bascom, 13747A.
Buck, Robert Earl, 13748A.
Carr, William Francis, 13749A.
Pennstrom, John Howard, Jr., 13751A.
Jones, Joseph Wester, Jr., 18094A.
Pamperien, Roka Doyal, 13752A.
Williamson, Thomas Wilbur, 13753A.
Green, James Allen, 13754A.
Peebles, Farley Edward, 13756A.
McIntyre, Donald Edwin, 13757A.
Beauregard, Frank Raymond, 13758A.
Jacobs, Dan Jean, 13760A.
Cunningham, Donal Blair, 13761A.
Anderson, John Richard, 13762A.
Struble, Raymond Harlan, 13763A.
Dunn, William Edward, 13764A.
Kuertz, Robert Richard, 13765A.
Hill, Kenneth Douglas, 13766A.
McIntyre, Brandt, 13767A.
Trail, Reo Clinton, 13768A.
Scarborough, Hayward Earl, 13769A.
Roberts, Benjamin Arthur, 13770A.
Zweifel, Harold John, 13773A.
MacDougall, Joseph Elbert, 13775A.
Hamilton, Richard Edelen, Jr., 13776A.
Mann, William Latimer, 13777A.
Tisdale, James William, Jr., 13778A.
MacKenzie, Robert Francis, 13779A.
Ogle, Sherman Levi, 13780A.
Moore, Robert Bruce, 13781A.
Brown, Charles Wesely, 13783A.
O'Brien, Lawrence George, 13784A.
Wilson, Mathew Robert, 13785A.
Sparrow, Harry Ira, 13787A.
Patterson, John Vance, Jr., 13788A.
Ward, John Davis, 13790A.
Ziegelgruber, Lee Roy, 13791A.
Thompson, Walter Reedy, 13792A.
Gay, Greenwood George, 13794A.
Benevent, Foch Joseph, 13796A.
White, William Ted, 13798A.
Biedul, Chester Anthony, 13799A.
Fitzwater, Charles Edward, 13800A.
Ferguson, James Harvey, 13801A.
Robson, Brian Peart, 13802A.
Fielder, Benton, Jr., 13803A.
Prahler, Robert Henry, 13806A.
Nutting, Elmer Wharton, 13807A.
Dauteuil, Donat Francois, 13809A.
Vance, Lewis Ingram, 13811A.
Swaim, Howard Lee, 13812A.
Stein, Winfield Marshall, 13813A.
Beall, Max Thompson, 13814A.
Kammerlohr, Morton Albert, 13815A.
McKinney, Walter Allen, 13816A.
Opper, Leroy Charles, 13817A.
Dowell, Ralph Harrison, Jr., 13818A.
MacCauley, Hugh Bournonville, 13819A.
Lawson, Delbert Romang, 13820A.
Dugi, August Henry, 13821A.
Culp, Charles Henry, 13822A.
Jackson, Glen Eugene, 13823A.
Hall, Zane Grey, 13824A.
Lindberg, Carl Albert, 13826A.
Mish, Charles Clarke, 13828A.
Phillips, Maurice Francis, 13830A.
Scott, Charles Elliott, Jr., 13831A.
Edwards, Paul Hartley, 13832A.

Garlitz, William Bryan, Jr., 13837A.
Lawrence, Ralph Brown, 13838A.
Shively, George Knox, 13839A.
Falk, David Mortimer, 13841A.
Boulineau, Donald H., 13842A.
Jennings, William Morris, 13843A.
Osborn, Carlos Ralph, 13844A.
Patterson, Edward Horace, 13845A.
Porter, Jack Victor, 13846A.
Ritter, Henry William, 13847A.
Mansfield, Cliff DeForrest, 13849A.
Morgan, Thomas Elder, Jr., 13840A.
Lewis, Howard Jackson, 13851A.
Dent, Richard Emil, Jr., 13854A.
Hojnacki, Joseph, 13855A.
Bradley, Clyde William, Jr., 13856A.
Aumer, Thurman Donald, 13857A.
Rhodes, Bernard Clair, 13858A.
Sherrill, Estes Bailey, 13859A.
Jacobs, Eugene Warren, 13860A.
White, James Henry, 13861A.
Meline, Ralph Edwin, 13848A.
Hambrick, George Oakie, 13866A.
Craig, Charles White, 13867A.
Taylor, Vernon Johnson, 13868A.
Zukerberg, Harry, 13869A.
Stanfield, Donald Neil, 13870A.
Bashor, Owen Hale, 13871A.
Conklin, William David, 13873A.
Boyles, Dixon Raymond, Jr., 13874A.
Weil, Frank Phillip, 13875A.
Mayo, William Everett, 13876A.
Marsh, Franklin Charles, 13877A.
Brose, Herbert Eric, 13878A.
Myrick, Jesse Lee, 13880A.
Heath, Robert Handley, 13881A.
Lewis, Melford Walter, 13882A.
Wilson, Stephen Cheney, 13883A.
Waage, Amos Ernest, 13887A.
Wilson, Theodore Allen, 13888A.
Laedtke, Elmer Carl, 13890A.
Gaither, John Martin, 13892A.
Kangas, John Francis, 13893A.
Riser, William Wallace, Jr., 13894A.
Stewart, Dana Woodfin, Jr., 13895A.
Morfit, Charles Beverly, 13896A.
Savuto, Joseph Anthony, 13897A.
Keeling, David Woodrow, 13898A.
Condon, Robert William, 13899A.
Humphrey, Lee, Jr., 13900A.
Oldfield, Charles Sheldon, 13901A.
Smith, Larry Wendell, 13902A.
Walsh, Roy Michael, 13903A.
Porter, George Erskin, 13904A.
Walls, L. E., 13905A.
Bailey, James Monroe, Jr., 13906A.
Duval, Don Woods, 13910A.
Holland, Clark Othell, 13911A.
Lackens, Edwin Barger, 13912A.
Ruby, Vincent Miller, 13913A.
Stephens, William Loyd, 13914A.
Freeman, Elmer Clayton, 13915A.
Peck, Warren Kay, 13916A.
Gifford, William Edward, 13918A.
Lemak, Frank, 13919A.
Stevens, Blythe Elmo, 13920A.
Yockey, Richard Jay, 13921A.
Yoder, Richard Allen, 13922A.
Barnett, James Willis, 13924A.
Mullen, John Thomas, 13925A.
Quisenberry, George Burnell, 13926A.
Govednik, Martin James, 13927A.
McGinnies, Robert Hudson, 11624A.
Wiggins, Leland Roy, 11625A.
Bolint, Michael John, Jr., 11636A.
Fleak, Dennis Logan, 11643A.
Hugo, Frederick John, Jr., 11656A.
Thompson, Lassiter, 11664A.
Bonnett, Charles Daniel, 11683A.
Lutz, Raymond Koliaokalani, 11691A.
White, Robert Golson, 11712A.
McKay, Calvin Robert, 11775A.
King, Homer James, Jr., 11796A.
Williams, Hubert Swan, 11797A.
Crozier, Gordon Wilson, 11830A.
Smith, William Richard, 11849A.
Bogan, Harry David, 11854A.
Bryan, Donald Septimus, 11869A.
Franck, Lewis Sandlin, 11876A.
Dykes, Leo Maurice, Jr., 11877A.
Mullen, Bernard Neil, 11890A.
Kelly, Joseph Douglas, 11903A.
Currie, Alexander Duncan, 11925A.
McCoy, Clifford Jack, 11936A.
Alven, Harold Fritz, 11965A.
Hilbert, Faye Wilmarth, 12036A.
Stark, Louis Kenneth, 12067A.
Finklea, Raymond Archer, Jr., 12077A.
Webb, Bert Harry, Jr., 12132A.
Williams, Robert George, 12139A.
Esh, Norman Richard, 12142A.
Steinberger, Alfred Charles, 12146A.
Estes, Eldridge, 12147A.
Sharp, Edward Elias, 12152A.
Hartley, James Richard, 12160A.
Ricci, Vincent Francis, 12211A.
Marcum, Robert Stanley, 12212A.
Brown, Uleces Lamar, 12236A.
Hamill, Jimmy Mearl, 12243A.
Williams, Evan Edward, 12249A.
Mize, Grover Cleveland, Jr., 12290A.
Thompson, Douglas William, 12324A.
Verhulst, Florent Joseph, Jr., 12328A.
Proulx, Lionel Antonio, 12392A.
Hollis, William Nick, 12349A.
Lyons, Horace Clayton, 12354A.
Ward, Robert William, 12386A.
Fitzpatrick, Arthur, 12403A.
Wills, Robert Martin, 12405A.
Janssen, Jan Walter, Jr., 12426A.
Duncan, John Dean, 12429A.
Disbrow, Lorin C., 12436A.
Zedler, Donald Louis, 12438A.
Chiodo, Vincent Russell, 12440A.
Davis, Clayton Eugene, 12451A.
McCormick, Raymond Charles, 12457A.
Herbert, Donald Joseph, 12461A.
Bradley, Charles Hunter, 12480A.
Miller, Robert Lee, 12494A.
Marshall, Wofford Elbert, Jr., 12502A.
Kelley, George John, Jr., 12519A.
Saunders, Jackson, 12541A.
Hirsch, Henry R., 12566A.
Fory, Garland Vallard, 12612A.
Reynolds, Joseph Francis, 12617A.
Young, Barnett Braswell, 12637A.
Wilkowski, Ernie William, Jr., 12685A.
Segler, Thomas Franklin, Jr., 12696A.
Looker, Carl Satterly, 12721A.
Ferguson, Clyde Alvin, 12737A.
Cooper, Millard Von Cassell, 12753A.
Bragg, Wallace Simeon, 12762A.
Stanton, Charles Richard, 12797A.
Suprenant, Charles Edward, 12829A.
Hornick, George, Jr., 12845A.
Cary, Thomas Isaac, 12851A.
Lane, Warren Joseph, 12859A.
Klerk, Jacob Whitman, 12866A.
Mosby, Milledge James, 12873A.
Killeavy, Francis Thomas, 12878A.
Rodriguez, Edward Frederick, 12881A.
Wampler, Louis Clinton, 12883A.
Lewis, Lynn Merrill, 12888A.
Osborne, William Finis, 12900A.
Flynn, Norman Charles, 12916A.
Smith, Richard Henry, 16603A.
Wirt, Robert Eliot, 12920A.
Fitch, Edward Benjamin, 12941A.
King, Lonnie Tildon, 12950A.
Fender, Guy Dale, 12951A.
Pierce, Harry Francis, 12956A.
Denison, George Fernie, 12969A.
Penton, Gordon Kenneth, 13039A.
Conrad, Henry Ward, Jr., 13056A.
Price, Joe Carroll, 13067A.
New, Alvin Raymond, 13092A.
Taft, William Bert, 13094A.
Warren, Johnnie J., 13097A.
Miller, Robert Andrew, 13106A.
Russell, Herbert, 13114A.
Kleinhelter, Robert W., 13128A.
Nunneley, Clarance Malcom, 13145A.
Pitt, Earl Stellman, 13148A.
Youngs, James Roy, Jr., 13159A.
Jones, Billy Jack, 13160A.
Wilson, Homer Henry, 13168A.
Scuro, Vito Morris, 13170A.
Lange, Edward James, 13196A.
Smailes, Arja, 13198A.
Eldridge, Truman Kermit, 13203A.
Rounds, Kenneth George, 13229A.
Holsclaw, Jack Daniels, 13242A.
Boyer, Joseph Maria, Jr., 13252A.
Spann, Henry Hal, 13262A.
Johns, Mervyn Thomas, 12268A.
Lewis, James Maybury, 13281A.
Kontur, William John, 13290A.
Price, Robert Young, 13297A.
Sprinkel, Milton Drake, 13304A.
Kepler, Paul Hospe, 13311A.
Pool, Fain Hulen, 13324A.
Ireland, Paul Joseph, 13326A.
Carder, Orval Burton, 13355A.
Kinsella, William Edward, 13357A.
Reiley, Philip Francis, Jr., 13398A.
Cadenhead, John Orville, Jr., 13445A.
Bailer, Harold Walter, 13460A.
Taylor, Ulysses Samuel, Jr., 13465A.
Dyer, John C., 13466A.
Benedict, Robert Delp, 13474A.
Haywood, Vernon Vincent, 13477A.
McDaniel, Henry Byrne, Jr., 13485A.
Howse, Benjamin McCausland, 13498A.
Bell, Robert Benjamin, 13569A.
Forbes, Brown Coleman, 13594A.
Evans, Richard Newton, 13608A.
Menninger, Charles Joseph, 13609A.
McLean, Richard Quentin, 13648A.
Gipson, Guy Maurice, 13667A.
Hancock, Robert Maxwell, Jr., 13683A.
Sullivan, Richard Donald, 13686A.
Durante, Anthony Raymond, 13688A.
Bower, James Alfred, 13691A.
Waller, Charles Skillman, 13692A.
Maughan, Weston Fisher, 13698A.
McCord, Richard David, 13703A.
Bowley, Freeman Wate, Jr., 13705A.
Richmond, Clarence Walter, Jr., 13713A.
Easley, Preston Warham, 13719A.
Street, Marion Scott, 13720A.
Hersberger, Robert Alvin, 13728A.
Sullivan, Robert Francis, 13733A.
Bischoff, Hans Martin, 13774A.
Arrington, Henry Thomas, 13786A.
Ward, John Rowland, 13789A.
Malone, Sam, 13793A.
Finley, Charles Buford, 13795A.
O'Leary, Francis Anthony, 13827A.
Pearce, Robert Charles, 13833A.
Pritchard, James Benard, 13836A.
Payne, Joe Winfred, 13852A.
Lee, Zaden Oliver, 13862A.
Blackwell, Frank Bain, 13864A.
Ward, Albert Thomas, 13889A.
Culver, Douglas Eugene, 13891A.
Hughey, Marvin Hutchison, 13917A.
Lowell, Charles Luther, 13928A.
Gunn, Charles Daniels, Jr., 13929A.
Stockton, Floyd Calvin, 13930A.
Hutchinson, Tom, 13932A.
Sykes, Thomas McQuiston, 13933A.
Clarke, Russell Coen, 13934A.
Duncan, Wayne Melvin, 13935A.
Mayer, Donald Victor, 13936A.
LaSalle, Harry Stephen, Jr., 13937A.
Whalley, William Louis, 13939A.
Johnson, Carl Herbert, 13940A.
Sullivan, Roy Marcus, Jr., 13942A.
Rodgers, James William, 13943A.
Mahon, Keith, 13945A.
Bates, Walter Laverne, 13946A.
Hrkach, John James, 13947A.
Rhodes, Donald Frederick, 13948A.
Dowdell, James Nicholas, 13949A.
Kolvas, Stephen Foster, 13950A.
Rhodes, Edwin, 13951A.
Howard, Wilson Wayne, 13952A.
Newman, James Edmund, 13953A.
Anderson, Russell George, 13954A.
Sheehan, Joseph Berchman, 13956A.
Simmons, Alfred Clyde, 13957A.
Curran, Francis Eugene, 13958A.
Cook, Robert Milton, 13959A.
Adams, John Bosier, 13962A.
Taylor, Liston Talbott, 13963A.
Morgan, Thomas Wendell, 13964A.
Scott, Leonard Bittle, Jr., 13966A.
Sauers, Dale Edward, 13967A.
Angus, Ralph Howe, 13968A.
Schuler, Jaul Joseph, 13970A.
Stroud, Joe Forrest, 13971A.
Pusko, Stanley Joseph, 13972A.
Boone, Herbert Daniel, 13975A.
Burnett, William Howard, 13976A.

Chapman, Harman Eugene, 13978A.
Brazie, Charles Leonard, 13979A.
Heltsley, Charles Morris, 13980A.
Gibbs, Gordon Meade, Jr., 13981A.
Adler, Bernard Raymond, 13982A.
Lynn, Mary Cecile, 21387W.
Norwood, James Pleasant, 13983A.
Apperson, Edward Barbour, 13984A.
Sparrevohn, Frederic Durand Reidtz, 13985A.
Meacham, Chauncey Wayne, 13986A.
Vaughan, Harry Hallmon, Jr., 13988A.
Kelley, Charles Augustus, 13989A.
Pullen, John Lee, 13990A.
Johnson, Conrad Leroy, 13992A.
Russell, Lloyd George, 13993A.
Prewitt, Ernest Lensy, 13994A.
Bradley, Lewis Lawson, Jr., 13995A.
Hodges, Hubert Byron, 13996A.
Kaiuta, William Roman, 13997A.
Horton, John Nairn, 13998A.
Ogozaly, Leo Edmund, 13999A.
Irons, Victor Earl, Jr., 14000A.
King, Myles Anthony, 14001A.
Scott, Richard Esker Jackson, 14002A.
Biondet, Jose, 14003A.
Alvestad, Russell Carlton, 14004A.
Walker, John David, 14005A.
Leigon, Charles William, 14006A.
Jacobs, Robert Arthur, 14007A.
Sahl, Frederick Hubert George, 14008A.
Mackie, Richard Gavin, 14009A.
Norman, James Sidney, 14010A.
Reynolds, Richard Franklin, 14011A.
Treadway, John Earl, 14012A.
Schenker, Edward Richard, 14013A.
Raisor, Clifford Eugene, 14015A.
Thompson, John, 14016A.
Clemence, Charles James, Jr., 14017A.
Collinson, Newton Brewer, Jr., 14019A.
Findlay, Clayton, 14020A.
Pennington, Alvin Lee, 14021A.
Early, John Stokes, 14022A.
Mahoney, John Jacob, 18068A.
Bossa, Amos Loutelle, 14023A.
Hughes, Claude Allen, Jr., 14024A.
Rowland, Richard George, 14025A.
Gamble, Jack Kenneth, 14026A.
Burton, Carmen Wayne, 14027A.
Mozley, Claude Daniel, Jr., 14028A.
Cash, Hugh Pfohl, 14029A.
Kost, Stephen Delmarth, 14030A.
Mott, Maurice Kent, 14032A.
Thomas, William Herbert, 14033A.
Wilson, Francis Earl, 14035A.
Shamblin, Richard Roy, 14036A.
Stuckey, Norman Dale, 14037A.
Myers, Bill Eugene, 14038A.
Dale, Manley Hovey, Jr., 14039A.
Archer, Lee Andrew, 14040A.
Baydala, Edward Thomas, 14091A.
Perbetsky, George, 14041A.
Aswad, Saleem, 14042A.
Elliott, William Petigrew, 14043A.
Slupe, Harold Dwain, 14044A.
Cameron, Murray, 14045A.
Nurnberg, Malcolm Lloyd, 14046A.
Waggener, Herman Alpheus, Jr., 14047A.
Messer, Frank Albert, 14048A.
Jones, Troy Homer, Jr., 14049A.
Bridges, Wyman Mayo, 14050A.
Cope, Stanley Smith, 14051A.
Grosshuesch, Leroy Victor, 14052A.
Hoenselaar, Floyd Joseph, 14053A.
Heiney, Robert Alan, 14054A.
Wine, Paul Harvey, 14055A.
Gallagher, James George, 14056A.
Richmond, Joe Frank, 14057A.
Sarter, Lee Andrew, Jr., 14058A.
Stoeppelwerth, Earl, 14059A.
Carter, Howard Koehler, 14060A.
Gravenstine, Donald Joseph, 14062A.
Conner, Preston E., 14063A.
Kaufman, Glenn Oliver, 14064A.
Anthony, Richard Price, 14065A.
Nixon, Stanley Jones, 14066A.
Smith, James Harrison, 14067A.
Simpson, Robert Franklin, Jr., 14068A.
DeLong, Robert Fredrick, 14069A.
Gibson, Billy Payne, 14070A.
Bolyard, John Wesley, 14071A.
Crosland, Daniel, 14072A.
Tabor, Raleigh Emerson, Jr., 14073A.
White, Robert Charles, 14074A.
Williams, Paul Ray, 14075A.
Evans, William Robert, 14076A.
Hundley, Charles Proctor, 14077A.
Cathey, John William, 14078A.
Kelley, Frank Robert, 14079A.
Thomas, John Howe, Jr., 14080A.
Beaver, Earl Locksley, 14081A.
Stallsmith, Donald Levi, 14082A.
Coats, Wilbur Leroy, 14083A.
Brown, Fountain Laroy, Jr., 14084A.
DeSutter, Ralph Bernard, 14085A.
Brass, Ernest Herman, 14086A.
Kavanagh, Robert James, 14087A.
Miller, Clarence Montgomery, Jr., 14088A.
Bertza, Emil, 14089A.
Gaines, Edwin Francis, 14090A.
Hepler, Jesse Benjamin, 14092A.
Hughes, Alfred Aubrey, 14093A.
Carkin, Vernon Eugene, 14094A.
Carey, Russell John, Jr., 14095A.
Bruce, Joe Ben, 14096A.
Marsden, William Floyd, 14097A.
Fieker, Virgil Edward, 14098A.
Cowart, Robert Page, 14100A.
Altman, Roger Gene, 14101A.
Gabrielson, Roy Leonard, 14102A.
Walker, Stewart Burgess, 14103A.
Trumbo, Charles E., Jr., 14104A.
Smith, William Stanley, 14105A.
McKinney, Fred Dobyns, 14106A.
Hughes, Robert Earle, 14107A.
Warner, Richard James, 14108A.
Pedigo, William Edward, 14109A.
Fasolas, James Eugene, 14110A.
Maggio, Charles Ignatius, 14112A.
Fowler, Walter Melville, 14113A.
Kropenicki, John Joseph, 14115A.
Fairburn, Craig Hamilton, 14116A.
Wood, Edwin Arthur, 14117A.
Wilson, Clifford Allen, 14118A.
Cottingham, Jack, 14119A.
Casey, George William, 14120A.
Webster, Fredrick Leonard, Jr., 14121A.
Cotton, Allen Beeson, 14124A.
Moore, Howard Marshall, 14125A.
Louden, James Leslie, 14126A.
Carson, Clarence Lester, 14127A.
McCormick, Robert Russell, 14128A.
Killian, Oliver Marshall, 14129A.
Crego, John Carl, 14130A.
Neiswender, Van Arman, 14131A.
Galarneau, Francis Ellsworth, 14132A.
Ware, Samuel Houston, 14133A.
Webster, John Andrew, 14134A.
Siebert, Raymond Andrew, 14135A.
Davis, Lavoi Blackham, 14136A.
Marcum, Everette Lance, 14137A.
Raschke, Wendell Maurice, 14138A.
Dick, Wagner Warner, 14139A.
Hendrickson, Oscar Stansmore, 14140A.
Price, Harry Marcus, Jr., 14141A.
Christensen, Richard Dean, 14142A.
Gearhart, Fred Zurmehly, 14143A.
Carlson, R. Barney, 14144A.
Riseden, Jack Wiley, 14145A.
Clark, Don Omar, 14147A.
Robertson, Hugh William, 14148A.
Karschner, Donald Frank, 14149A.
Callahan, John Arthur, 14150A.
Cahelo, George, Jr., 14152A.
Berry, James Edward, 14153A.
Buckley, Cornelius Erin, 14154A.
Ferguson, Howard Gillespie, Jr., 14155A.
Lukeman, Robert Patrick, 14156A.
Garlick, Roy Daniel, 14157A.
Mitchell, John Wilmot, 14159A.
Wertz, John Charles, 14160A.
Lewis, William, 14161A.
Richards, William Wallace, Jr., 14162A.
Moyle, Bennett Oliver, 14163A.
Hassel, Robert Kenneth, 14164A.
Strange, Russell Paddock, 14165A.
Parsons, Edward Budd, 14166A.
Walker, Charles Lynn, 14167A.
Gilmartin, William Patrick, 14168A.
Murphy, John Edwin, 14169A.
Kravchonok, Peter, 14170A.
Mitchell, Maurice Scott, 14171A.
Sloboda, Walter Joseph, 14172A.
Buls, Milton Richard, 14173A.
Stone, Leon, 14174A.
Jabbour, Nicholas, 14175A.
Bullinger, Rollin Richard, 14177A.
Wehrman, Kenneth Edward, 14178A.
Spindler, Walter Elwood, Jr., 14179A.
Finnan, George Alexander, Jr., 14176A.
Wilton, David Nichols, 14180A.
Wilhelm, Andrew Carl, 14181A.
Beckman, Kenneth Norman, 14183A.
Bryan, Howard Youe, 14184A.
Keeling, Rufus Kermit, 14185A.
Bradford, Leo Galen, 14186A.
Bryson, Eddie, 14187A.
Lillard, David Carter, Jr., 14188A.
Ingham, John Stanley, 14189A.
MacLaughlin, John Thomson, 14190A.
Connally, Hulon Lloyd, 14191A.
Dahly, Ronald Norman, 14193A.
North, William Herbert, 14194A.
Smith, Arthur William, 14195A.
Stephens, Bert Dwight, 14197A.
Grundmann, William Joseph, 14198A.
Mitchell, Robert Jouett, 14200A.
Bowden, William Woodrow, 14201A.
Wagner, James Mark, 14199A.
West, Sammy Abner, 14202A.
Williams, Arthur Franklin, 14203A.
Edwards, Leland Vernon, 14204A.
Mumbower, Wilbur Eugene, 14205A.
McHugh, John Francis, Jr., 14206A.
Petrul, Paul Joseph, 14207A.
Harris, Harvey James, 14208A.
Walsh, Edward Francis, 14209A.
Chaffee, William Arthur, 14210A.
Smith, Wylie Arthur, 14211A.
McIsaac, Lewis Gibson, 14212A.
Evans, Jack Tharp, 14215A.
Parrish, James Murrell, 14217A.
Groom, John Frederick, 14218A.
Mendenhall, George Warren, 14219A.
Gordon, John Henry, 14220A.
Thompson, Cary Anderson, Jr., 14221A.
Porter, Lester Forrest, 14222A.
Meagher, Robert Bruce, 14223A.
Dowis, Kendal Burton, 14224A.
Wylie, Billy Clifford, 14225A.
Ambrecht, John Flagg, 14226A.
Rogers, Ray Warren, 14227A.
Stanfield, Louis Paul, 14228A.
Garrison, Vernon Wayne, 14230A.
Halsey, George Edward, Jr., 14231A.
Sher, Harry Lewis, 14232A.
Walker, Lawrence Davenport, 14233A.
Cather, Robert Montgomery, 14234A.
Schardong, John George, 14235A.
Boggs, Kenneth Stratiff, 14236A.
Duff, Robert Thomas, 14238A.
McCarty, Harold Henry, 14239A.
Brannon, Raymond Terrill, 14240A.
Bryant, Ralph Wilber, 14244A.
Davis, Eddy Donald, 14245A.
Todd, Vernon Richard, 14246A.
Walker, Barton Fellows, Jr., 14249A.
Shelly, James Ellis, 14250A.
Sheidow, Robert Grant, 14251A.
Petersen, Nelson Louie, 14252A.
Singleton, Earl Hallard, 14253A.
Miller, Paul Randolph, 14254A.
Collins, Glenn Richmond, 14255A.
Chambers, Thomas Lee, 14256A.
Nash, Charles Ellis, 14257A.
Dethman, Ivan Harry, 14258A.
Wright, Noble Dean, 14259A.
Rosser, Samuel Eugene, 14260A.
Procopio, Bernardo Joseph, 14261A.
Alden, John Emerson, 14262A.
Gill, Robert Edward, 14263A.
Tarwater, Benjamin Wylie, 14264A.
Robinett, Russell Norman, 14265A.
Fisher, David Glen, 14266A.
DesVoigne, Melvin Charles, 14267A.
Leavitt, Roy Delanson, 14268A.
Martin, Thomas Wesley, 14269A.
Silva, Theodore Deane, 14270A.
Fish, Jules Verne, 14271A.
Byrd, Neal Archie, 14272A.
Carey, Gates Chapman, 14273A.
McCarty, Benjamin Frederick, 14274A.
Swanberg, Sigvard Christ, 14275A.
Westermark, Robert Valdemar, 14276A.

Edge, William Cowan, 14277A.
Scott, Robert Adair, 14278A.
Burch, Nolan Edward, 14279A.
Broughton, Thomas Elbert, 14280A.
Pesacreta, Samuel, 14281A.
Nelson, Hal Junior, 14282A.
Suther, Fred Lee, Jr., 14283A.
Lawrence, Norman Taylor, 14284A.
Jackson, William Charles, 14285A.
Manning, Simon Wilson, Jr., 14286A.
Holman, Jack Wesley, 14287A.
Wilson, Roy Edwin, 14288A.
Eversole, James William, Jr., 14289A.
Hamby, Jesse Mellar, 14290A.
Thompson, Edward Leigh, 14291A.
Ecelbarger, Paul Richard, 14292A.
Forman, Richard Joseph, 14293A.
Cormier, Emery Oscar, 14294A.
Webster, Noble Leo, Jr., 14295A.
Wozniak, Stanley Edmund, 14296A.
Carter, Robert Francis, 14297A.
Marlin, Roger Thomas, 14298A.
Luckey, William John, Jr., 14299A.
Nickerson, Richard Lawrence, 14300A.
Bowland, Orrin Thomas, 14301A.
Bosworth, Wallace Clay, Jr., 14302A.
Merrill, Edward Grosvenor, 14303A.
Fox, Roland George, 14304A.
White, Harry Alexander, Jr., 14305A.
Davidson, Ross, 14306A.
Manor, Leroy Joseph, 14307A.
Gotto, George Swift, Jr., 14309A.
Reed, Charles Donald, 14310A.
Patterson, Alfred King, 14311A.
Alger, Leroy, 14312A.
Boston, Joseph Hartsel, 14313A.
Fitch, Arthur Joseph, 14314A.
Johns, Gordon Howard, 14315A.
Arbogast, Filbert Eugene, 14316A.
Skinner, Ernest Charles, 14317A.
Moench, John Otto, 14318A.
Dyke, Samuel Eugene, 14319A.
White, Morris Douglas, 14320A.
Lamb, Bennett Graham, 14321A.
Brownlee, Gordon Lawrence, Jr., 14322A.
Everett, Hal William, 14323A.
Stump, Charles Fay, Jr., 14324A.
Gurd, Stephen John, 14325A.
Barzee, Kenneth Gregory, 14326A.
Riemensnider, Robert Howard, 14327A.
Gray, Lawrence Ulysses, 14329A.
Williams, Thomas Ferdinand, 14330A.
Lindley, Wesley Ladell, 14331A.
Brofft, Robert Eugene, 14332A.
Covell, Dwight Wayne, 14333A.
Denman, John Ludlow, 14334A.
Titsworth, James Henry, Jr., 14335A.
Wiedenmann, Neal Louis, 14336A.
Curton, Warren Donald, 14337A.
Blair, James Warren, 14338A.
Loney, George Alva, 14339A.
Wise, John Warren, 14340A.
Hinckley, Ralph Edward, 14341A.
Budnik, Eugene Joseph, 14344A.
Saunders, Earl Robert, 14342A.
Richardson, Howard, 14345A.
Gryskiewicz, Lawrence Rodney, 14346A.
McGehee, Harold Fisher, 14347A.
Steelman, William Dale, 14349A.
Tate, Leroy Dale, 14350A.
Campbell, Norman Marshall, 14351A.
Stahle, Paul Joseph, 14353A.
Mitchell, Daniel Boone, 14354A.
Kupersmith, Louis William, Jr., 14355A.
Hanks, Dale, Jr., 14356A.
Saunders, Maurice Edward, 14357A.
Morison, Thomas Orville, 14359A.
Auer, John Richard, 14360A.
Butler, James Joseph, Jr., 14361A.
Sokay, Leslie William, 14362A.
Strong, Roy Lyle, 14364A.
Ryan, Thomas Donald, 14365A.
Martin, Edward Otis, 14366A.
Casey, Florence Broderick, 21301W.
Ostrowski, Laura Adele, 21302W.
Sewell, Jane, 21342W.
Knight, Carolyn G., 21344W.
Severson, Ione Cornelia, 21388W.
Berry, Margaret Virginia, 21352W.
Goldin, Sarah, 21349W.
Watson, Gwendolyn Josephine, 21343W.
McAmis, Agnes West, 21350W.
Starbuck, Virginia Jane, 21351W.
Lucas, Ruth Alice, 21391W.
Wier, Peggy Jane, 21394W.
Holm, Jeanne Marjorie, 21395W.
Griffin, Fannie Ada, 21390W.
Curtin, Kathleen Joan, 21392W.
Johnson, Warren Donald, 14367A.
Huyett, Helen Rittenhouse, 21356W.
Evans, J. L., 14368A.
Patterson, Joseph Bland, 14369A.
Stooksberry, Sam Davis, 14370A.
Waterfill, Eugene Allen, 14371A.
Gilmore, Charles James, 14372A.
DeCamp, Virgil Young, 14373A.
Metheney, Frank Walker, 14374A.
Parker, William Crego, 14375A.
Downie, Currie Stevenson, 14376A.
Quinn, William Hewes, 14377A.
Nesley, William Lewis, 14378A.
Tibbets, Oscar Judson, 14379A.
Shaffner, Douglass Dewitt, 14380A.
Weidler, Roy Clyde, Jr., 14381A.
Scanlon, Thomas Sylvester, Jr., 14382A.
Best, William Henry, Jr., 14383A.
Trakowski, Albert Clarence, Jr., 14384A.
Heft, Robert Edwin, 14385A.
Buck, Alvin Bernard, 14386A.
Neyland, Lewis James, 14387A.
Steele, Ralph James, 14388A.
Thompson, Philip Duncan, 14390A.
Roberton, Harold Edward, Jr., 14391A.
Hoyle, Charles Robert, Jr., 14392A.
Krug, Frederick Charles, 14393A.
Cowan, Leslie Warren, 14394A.
McGrew, Russell Gerald, 14395A.
Mitchell, William Lowery, 14397A.
Valentine, James Walter, 14398A.
Rackham, Edwin Julius, 14399A.
Smith, Kenneth Earl, 14400A.
Johnson, Richard Melvin, 14401A.
Mosier, Walter Martin, 14402A.
Loudermilk, James Arville, 14403A.
Ballinger, Philip Robert, 14404A.
Emde, Sherill William, 14405A.
Woodworth, William Corlis, 14406A.
Borchert, David William, 14407A.
Rowland, Keith Cornell, 14408A.
Miller, Roy Anthony, 14409A.
Rogers, Joseph Reginald, 14410A.
Hall, Glen Roland, 14411A.
Roth, Martin Edward, 14412A.
Chacey, David Donald, 14413A.
Lynch, Nicholas Michael, 14414A.
Blackburn, Thomas Welch, Jr., 14415A.
Gilman, Jack Peirpont, 14416A.
Mason, George Isaac, Jr., 14417A.
Price, Howard Irving, 14418A.
Mann, Edwin, 14419A.
Miller, Roger Herman, 14421A.
Clark, Melvin Edgar, 14422A.
Simpson, Thomas Leslie, 14423A.
McKeag, Charles Marshall, 14425A.
Montoya, Patrick Edmund, 14426A.
Morrison, Manley James, 14427A.
Kenney, William Richardson, 14428A.
Jewell, Forrest Wentworth, 14429A.
Culet, Ralph Sidney, 14430A.
Dion, Lucille Berthe, 21357W.
Andrews, Gordon James, 14431A.
Walker, Harold Edward, 14432A.
Livers, George Morison, 14433A.
Zimmerman, Pershing Gordon, 14434A.
Ramer, Richard Lee, 14436A.
Hackett, Wilbur Mose, Jr., 14437A.
Thompson, Harold Cecil, 14438A.
Pierce, Sammy Alpheus, 14439A.
Hayen, Bernard Nelson, 14440A.
Harris, Daniel Blaine, 14441A.
Askelson, Howard Samson, 14442A.
Bomar, William Byron, 14443A.
Stephens, Joseph Walter, Jr., 14444A.
Meholic, James John, 14445A.
Williams, Hubert Lee, 14446A.
Martin, James Frederick, 14447A.
Swisher, Keith Devone, 14448A.
Foreman, Charles Arthur, 14449A.
Buringham, Haven Ralph, 14450A.
Resch, Harold Edward, 14451A.
Phifer, James Hyram, Jr., 14453A.
Bullen, Howard Reeve, Jr., 14454A.
Pelletier, Robert Vincent, 14455A.
Verhagen, Kenneth William, 14456A.
Faron, Jack, 14457A.
Frailey, Homer Frederick, 14458A.
Harte, Allan Swinton, Jr., 14459A.
Rose, John Gee, 14460A.
Lauder, Edmund, 14461A.
Dixon, Robert James, 14462A.
Moody, Robert Phelps, 14464A.
Simmons, Roy D., Jr., 14465A.
Brown, Russell Stewart, 14466A.
Mitchell, Jacklin Wilton, 14467A.
Rosengrants, David Earl, 14468A.
Nelson, Richard Gasser, 14684A.
Richey, Albert Lebert, 14469A.
Truitt, Robert Glenn, 14685A.
Hewatt, Aubrey Edward, 14470A.
Davis, James Alford, 14471A.
Finlayson, James Carlyle, 14472A.
Toler, Harold Morton, 14473A.
Gutekunst, Charles Joseph, 14474A.
Anderson, John J., 14475A.
Klentzman, James Finley, 14476A.
Dunaway, Kennieth Donald, 14478A.
Ackerman, Clifford Bernard, 14479A.
Cutler, William Morton, 14481A.
Joley, Jack Douglas, 14482A.
Fowler, Robert Rex., 14686A.
Riggle, Donald Ellwood, 14484A.
Kirberger, Myron Frederick, Jr., 14485A.
Smith, Russell H., 14486A.
Adams, John Hardin, 14487A.
Wagner, Kermit Allan, 14687A.
Peterson, Richard Burton, 14488A.
Walsh, Edward Michael, Jr., 14688A.
Cross, Richard Grenville, Jr., 14492A.
Stoker, Norman, Pierre, 14493A.
Cobery, Francis Foster, 14494A.
Allen, Kenneth Leon, 14495A.
Hancock, John Jeremiah, 14496A.
Mealka, John Charles, 14497A.
Hurley, Richard Munro, 14498A.
Navarro, Michael, 14499A.
Rayborn, Garland, 14500A.
Hollis, Medford Eugene, 14501A.
Addis, Darwin Romaine, 14502A.
McDonell, Roger William, 14503A.
Mims, Edwin Thomas, 14505A.
Mayo, William Charles, 14506A.
Russell, James Wright, Jr., 14507A.
Cartwright, Richard Harold, Jr., 14508A.
Barr, Thomas Anthony, 14509A.
Shannon, James Alvin, 14510A.
Gleason, Robert Leo, 14512A.
Blaha, Roy Charles, 14513A.
Gerber, Norris Hobart, 14514A.
McLaughlin, William Allen, 14515A.
Randle, Robert John, 14516A.
Rogers, William Troy, Jr., 14518A.
Hathaway, Frank A., Jr., 14519A.
Goodlad, Harold George, 14520A.
Wardner, Robert Sewell, 14522A.
Franklin, Louie, 14523A.
Herrmann, Joseph Francis, Jr., 14524A.
Atherton, Jack, 14525A.
Kemper, Othmar Arthur John, 14526A.
George, Robert Leonard, 14527A.
Caulfield, John Gregory, 14528A.
Davis, Beverly Early, Jr., 14529A.
Wiechert, Stanley Joseph, 14530A.
Carter, Wilbur Denver, 14531A.
Henderson, Jack Jasper, 14532A.
Buckingham, Kent Oakley, 14533A.
Lynn, Alfred Joseph, 14534A.
Ludwig, Charles Andrew, Jr., 14536A.
Grimes, John Parker, 14537A.
Meyer, Lloyd Francis, 14538A.
Grunig, David Boyd, 14539A.
Rippy, James Vale, 14540A.
Voss, Clyde Kellam, 14541A.
Weir, Gerald Clyde, 14542A.
Smith, Harry Edward, Jr., 14543A.
Goff, Theodore Bernard, 14544A.
Brower, Charles Ford, 3d, 14545A.
Henry, Patrick Homer, 14548A.
Kitchings, Wilbur Bernard, 14550A.
Deane, William Wallace, 14551A.
Goade, William Richard, 14552A.
Hermann, Wayne Eugene, 14553A.
Hannon, James Daniel, 14554A.
Shatts, Garvin Phillip, 14555A.

Ong, Dong, 14556A.
Fitzpatrick, John Francis, Jr., 14557A.
Coleman, Patrick Edward, 14558A.
Williams, Richard Francis, 14559A.
Wright, Albert William, 14560A.
Thomas, William Carl, 14561A.
Bathurst, Raymond Joseph, 14562A.
Reeves, Horace Bickley, 14564A.
Palmer, Garth Clare, 14565A.
Smith, Thomas William, Jr., 14566A.
Glass, Robert George, 14567A.
Unger, Edward Collins, 14491A.
Evans, Glenn Walton, 14568A.
Engelbreit, Joseph Carroll, 14569A.
Broughton, Richard Norton, 14570A.
Will, William Frederick, Jr., 14571A.
Lacagnin, Leonard James, 14574A.
Defoe, Donald Ross, 14575A.
Smith, Donavon Francis, 14577A.
Dougherty, John Edson, 14578A.
Penhall, Raymond Donald, 14579A.
Childress, Rollin Dudley, 14580A.
Pierson, William Marvin, 14581A.
Ferguson, Robert Lawrence, 14583A.
Craft, Jacob Frederick, 14584A.
Bryant, James Arnold, 14585A.
Coon, Robert Erwin, 14586A.
Holmberg, Herbert August, 14587A.
Sheehan, Douglas Martin, 14588A.
Walker, Richard Ivey, 14589A.
Pennock, Paul Warren, 14590A.
Holtmann, Harrold Luther, 14591A.
Stauff, Oscar Brent, Jr., 14592A.
Bonitz, George Edward, 14593A.
White, Victor Mayo, 14594A.
Trimble, George Layton, Jr., 14595A.
Campbell, Earl James, 14596A.
DeMott, Donald Ellsworth, 14598A.
Tatsios, Theodore George, 14599A.
Maggert, Donald Wilson, 14600A.
Eaglen, James Albert, 14601A.
Markel, Carroll Beverly, 14602A.
Watson, Paul Cooper, 14603A.
Browne, Donald Vincent, 14604A.
Tallent, Girard Sullivan, 14605A.
O'Dwyer, Phillip Winslow, 14606A.
Matlick, Benjamin Maurice, Jr., 14607A.
Deel, Ollie Ivan, 14608A.
Greene, Julius Phillip, 14609A.
Peterson, Eugene Franklin, 14611A.
Collette, Robert William, 14612A.
Cochrane, Robert Gardner, 14614A.
Jaeger, Frank John, 14615A.
Wells, MacColbert, 14616A.
Westerman, Raymond Spires, 14617A.
McCormack, Robert, 14618A.
Walker, James Carleton, 14619A.
Haupt, Fred James, 3d, 14620A.
Holland, Gould Kingery, 14621A.
Murray, Arthur, 14622A.
Allen, Robert Clyde, 14624A.
Cummings, Robert Donavan, 14625A.
Inks, Howard Russel, 14626A.
Cook, Walter Edward, 14627A.
Vizi, Joseph Charles, 14628A.
VanHoy, Lonnie Elliott, 14629A.
Cunningham, Bruce, 14630A.
Susong, Charles Joseph, Jr., 14631A.
Schaaf, Robert Andrew, 14632A.
Hervey, Robert Earl, 14633A.
Myers, Russell William, 14634A.
Waldrop, Ramon Allen, 14635A.
Sommers, William Joseph, 14636A.
Foster, Charles Richard, 14637A.
Miller, Clair Richard, 14638A.
Stowell, Lester Drew, 14639A.
Calkins, Radford Chamberlin, 14640A.
Hiltenbrand, John Robert, 14641A.
Remmele, Frank Mikell, 14642A.
Hodges, Robert Mack, 14643A.
Peck, Donald Arthur, 14644A.
Hodges, Julian Oswald, 14645A.
Moore, Jerry Porter, 14646A.
Kimball, John Gordon, 14647A.
Wennergren, William Archie, Jr., 14648A.
Hensarling, Arthur Lee, 14649A.
Schmid, Donald Ernest, 14652A.
Fitzhugh, Richard Edwin, 14653A.
Dunn, John Henry, 14656A.
Stobie, William Henry, 14658A.
Cordes, Harry Nation, 14659A.
Hovey, Marsh, 14660A.
Ashton, Alfred Jackson, Jr., 14661A.
Campbell, David Day, 14663A.
Cassady, Richard Harold, 14664A.
Chenault, Charles Joseph, 14665A.
Crowe, Donald Allen, 14666A.
Wilkins, Paul Harry, 14667A.
Pawlowski, Edward John, 14668A.
Simon, Bernard Robert, 14670A.
Button, Louis Hamilton, 14671A.
Garden, Francis, 19904A.
Christensen, Douglas Helmer, 14672A.
Hemphill, Mac C., 14673A.
Stone, Francis Arthur, 14674A.
Orton, George Wandell, 14675A.
McKendrick, Howard Raymond, 14676A.
Miller, Earl Detrick, 14677A.
Buerger, Delbert Eugene, 14678A.
Murphy, Louis Francis, 14679A.
Shotts, Bryan Meeks, 14680A.
Mullins, Arnold, 14681A.
Hutchins, Alfred Gordon, 14682A.
Brandt, George W. A., Jr., 14689A.
Freer, Romeo Henry, Jr., 14690A.
Thompson, Brian Chandler, 14691A.
Sims, Lewis Parry, 14692A.
Darby, Dale Leray, 14693A.
Thresher, Robert Douglas, 14694A.
King, Charles Albert, 14696A.
Tatchio, Orrin R., 14697A.
Grant, Archie William, 14698A.
Franklin, George Walton, 14699A.
McVey, William Hugh, 14700A.
Grove, Harry James, 14701A.
Cook, Warren Glenn, 14702A.
Lewis, Charles Howard, 14703A.
Schuth, Richard Ernest, 14704A.
Younger, John Patrick, 14705A.
Struby, Joseph Riley, 14707A.
O'Connor, Walter B., 14708A.
Burgdorf, Paul Joseph, 14709A.
Stone, Carroll Mitchell, 14710A.
Johnson, Alfred Edgar, 14711A.
Brooks, William Delance, Jr., 14712A.
Neumann, Howard Glenn, 14713A.
Hill, Harold Irvin, 14714A.
Prather, Jack Fletcher, 14715A.
Wilson, John Edward, Jr., 14716A.
Hoey, William Kenneth, 14717A.
Wood, Denver Jeff, 14718A.
Coleman, Robert George, 14719A.
Laird, Henry Lee, 14720A.
Bauman, Ray Wilbur, 14721A.
Morgan, Wayne D., 14722A.
Thoms, James Cain, Jr., 14723A.
Kregloh, Edwin Robert, 14724A.
Haskett, Harry Estil, 14725A.
Heintz, James Edward, 14726A.
Hurlbut, Byron, Almeron, 14727A.
Zimmermann, Hugo, 14728A.
Maurer, Homer Franklin, 14729A.
Kekoa, Curtis, 14730A.
Jorgensen, Kenneth Buford, 14732A.
Kaurin, Robert Helman, 14733A.
Galentine, Paul Guy, Jr., 14734A.
Wilson, William, 14735A.
Guffey, Herman Findley, 14736A.
Rice, Edward Andrew, 14737A.
Culbertson, William Westly, 14738A.
Grantham, Douglas Lawrence, Jr., 14739A.
Mitchell, Howard Chester, 14740A.
Youngblood, Joe Taylor, 14741A.
Douglass, Walter Alexander, 14742A.
Donnelly, Leonard Francis, 14743A.
Woda, Robert George, 14744A.
Sloan, Howard Melville, 14745A.
Bright, William, 14746A.
Downey, Russell Alfred, 14747A.
Scurlock, Frank Lyle, 14748A.
Legge, Leonard Maurice, 14749A.
Schlipf, Harold Anthony, 14750A.
Sweeney, Frank Carrol, Jr., 14751A.
Ostendorf, Ted Harry, 14752A.
Cleveland, Lewis Alman, Jr., 14753A.
Bush, Cecil Thornton, 14754A.
Shipley, Fred Donald, 14755A.
Johnson, Maurice Ledgerwood, 14756A.
Kozina, Joseph James, 14757A.
Priest, Royce Whitman, 14758A.
Crans, Robert Edward, 14759A.
Goss, Donald Kenneth, 14760A.
Maher, Philip Joseph, Jr., 14761A.
Keith, Jack Bernard, 14763A.
Dunmire, Floyd Theodore, 14764A.
Nutt, Joseph Eugene, 14765A.
Weyle, Lowell Felix, 14766A.
Hosford, Lynn Harris, Jr., 14767A.
Gleason, George Wilson, 14768A.
Murray, Raymond Clifford, 14769A.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, 14770A.
Casto, Lloyd Lee, 14771A.
Story, Harvey Lain, 14772A.
Fox, Edward John, 14773A.
Jacobs, John Weldon, 14774A.
Taylor, Hubert James, 147776A.
Alexander, Glenn Ross, 14777A.
Vowinkel, Merlin Jacob, 14778A.
Schmerbeck, David John, 14781A.
Berodt, Howard Herman, 14782A.
Kelley, Earnest Earl, 14783A.
Erickson, Donald Henry, 14784A.
Garlock, Karl Herbert, 14785A.
Teague, Homer Franklin, 14786A.
Acre, John Pleasent, 14788A.
Heyroth, James William, 14789A.
Carmichael, Donald Leroy, 14790A.
Holden, Lloyd Blaine, 14791A.
Iles, George Jewell, 14792A.
Brown, Robert Cassel, 14793A.
O'Connor, Ellen Gilbert, 21358W.
Nolan, Bernard Thomas, Jr., 14794A.
Daly, Robert Paul, 14795A.
Distler, Jack Louis, 14796A.
Dow, Hugh Delaney, 14797A.
Holman, Averill Francis, 14798A.
Gatling, William David, 14799A.
Dukes, Ernest Franklin, Jr., 14801A.
Dreesen, Victor Laverne, 14802A.
Rose, Frank Lyons, Jr., 14803A.
Herbert, Floyd, 14804A.
Seaver, Owen L., 14805A.
Langley, Edwin William, 14806A.
Schmidt, Fred John, 14807A.
Hays, Raymond Francis, 14808A.
Metcalf, John Cleo, 14809A.
Light, Clifton Floyd, 14810A.
Dotson, Verl Dewain, 14811A.
Cooperman, Harold, 14812A.
Weaver, William Henry, Jr., 14813A.
Daus, Nelson Carl, 14814A.
Cartmill, John Bruce, 14815A.
Miller, Frederick William, 14816A.
Tychsen, Charles Ernest, 14817A.
Svenson, Wesley Winfield, 14818A.
Rufener, Kenneth Edward, 14819A.
Reger, Ted Eugene, 14820A.
Shook, Abraham Edward, 14821A.
Trout, Darvin Lee, 14822A.
Amos, William John, 14823A.
Crews, Sidney Walker, 14824A.
Nelson, Carl Amos, 14825A.
Pierson, Robert Edwin, 14826A.
Lindquester, David Martin, 14827A.
Bush, William Boyd, Jr., 14828A.
Hall, Hubert Edell, 14830A.
O'Connell, William Andrews Clark, 14831A.
Beavers, James Litchfield, 2d, 14832A.
McAllister, John George, 14833A.
McKenney, Earl Franklin, 14834A.
Harden, Charles Reynolds, 14835A.
Glommen, Martell Johaness, 14836A.
Morton, William Grover, 14838A.
Johnson, Walter Eliot, 14839A.
Trevisani, John James, 14840A.
Vella, Vito Thomas, 14841A.
Grimes, Robert Zeno, 14842A.
Leighty, Robert Marquis, 14843A.
Simmons, John Calloway, 14844A.
Pascoe, Herschel Thomas, 14845A.
Larsen, Lauritz Solberg, 14846A.
Steinkrauss, Lawrence William, 14847A.
Trueblood, Roger William, 14848A.
Farmer, Marion Lee, 14849A.
Dodge, William Louis, 14850A.
Leach, Wayne, 14851A.
Tinsley, Marcus Flannery, 14853A.
Claybaugh, K. Wayne, 14854A.
Blakeney, Charles Mack, 174855A.
Dow, Norman Clifton, 14856A.
Casbeer, Roy Newton, 14858A.
MacGregor, Jack Marvin, 14859A.
Beaty, Edward Emmett, 14860A.

Guinn, Euin Nickel, 14861A.
Hessler, Elmo Basil, 14862A.
Perfetto, Albert Joseph, 14863A.
Hodges, Hubert Wayne, 14864A.
Whye, Harry Donald, 14865A.
Obus, Louis Jack, 14866A.
Stein, David Meyer, 14867A.
Flaherty, William Francis, 14868A.
Ryan, John James, 14869A.
Strand, George Edward, 14870A.
Pennell, Charlie Andrew, 14871A.
Julin, Donald David, 14872A.
Carris, Roy Burman, 14874A.
Callahan, Ellsworth Deardorff, 14875A
Junker, Harold Robert, 14876A.
Blessing, Samuel Ervin, 14877A.
Bracha, Vincent John, 14878A.
Twedt, Orlean Lincoln Jerome, 14879A
Shaw, Dan Lester, 14881A.
Scherberger, Joseph Matthew, 14883A.
Lindsey, John Edwin, 14884A.
Lyall, John Richard, 14885A.
Tabor, William Justin, 14886A.
Hershberger, George A., 14887A.
Clark, John Buren, Jr., 144888A.
Knight, William Travis, 14889A.
Harper, Flamm D., 14980A.
Haven, Donald Victor, 14891A.
Kinney, James Franklin, 14893A.
McDaniel, Robert Edward, 14894A.
Loob, Frank Andrew, 14895A.
Neu, John Joseph, 14896A.
Baumgardner, Haynes Madden, 14897A.
DeMorest, John Nichols, 14898A.
DeZonia, Lawrence Edward, 14899A.
Howard, Ronald Mitchell, 14900A.
Welborn, James Edward, Jr., 14901A.
McNary, Lawrence Burton, 14902A.
Cooper, Ernest Garfield, Jr., 14903A.
Verbeck, Ernest Leroy, 14904A.
Cushman, Gene Moore, 14905A.
Cowgill, Wayne J., 14906A.
Lang, John William, 14907A.
Gale, Louis Edward, 14908A.
Kensler, Thomas Cranston, Jr., 14909A.
Dailey, John Gregory, 14910A.
Norman, Isaac Gregory, 14911A.
Anderson, Raymond Iver, 14912A.
Nixon, Lewis Drake, 14913A.
Zimmerman, Robert Edward, 14914A.
Friend, Robert Jones, 14915A.
Brereton, Roy George, 14916A.
Rettinger, Henry Paul, 14917A.
Tarasko, Frank Edward, 14918A.
Palmos, Peter George, 14919A.
Copeland, Phillips Jerome, 14920A.
Skoglund, Peter John, 14921A.
Schindler, Tobias, 14922A.
Deckert, George Franklin, Jr., 14923A.
Tully, Edward Frederick, 14924A.
Mann, Gerald Eugene, 14925A.
Faustman, David Herman, 14926A.
Larson, Oliver Buford, 14927A.
Rowe, Mayron Hall, 14928A.
Mitchell, Clarence David, Jr., 14929A.
Ridgway, Guy Edward, Jr., 14930A.
Robinson, Robert Archibald, 14931A.
Dunlap, Glen Randolph, 14932A.
Rolin, Mitchell Albert, 14933A.
Porter, Clifford Lee, 14935A.
Sullivan, James Erwin, 14936A.
Havard, David James, 14937A.
Shelton, Melvin Dewey, Jr., 14938A.
Collings, Kenneth Leroy, 14939A.
Grace, Gerald Joseph, 14940A.
Mosher, Francis Leo, 14942A.
Hull, Carl Victor, 14943A.
Arnold, William Alfred, Jr., 14944A.
Britting, Wesley Elmer, 14945A.
Davis, Ruby Earl, Jr., 14946A.
Stillie, Edward Oliver, 14947A.
Moats, Sanford Kenneth, 14948A.
Johnson, Gordon Melville, 14949A.
Shea, Robert Bradley, 14950A.
Dixon, Dick, 14952A.
Norris, Loy Ringo, 14953A.
Nordgren, Orville John, 14956A.
Tull, Gordon Frederick, 14957A.
Evans, Wilbur Lee, 14958A.
Smallfield, George Blair, 14959A.
Wenzel, Lloyd Marvin Norman, 14960A.
Butler, John Elzie, Jr., 14961A.
Hoskins, Robert Owen, 14962A.
Clarke, John Scott, Jr., 14963A.
Bulli, Dante Eugene, 14964A.
Jones, Howard Austin, 14965A.
Tyler, Loren Spencer, 14966A.
Stenger, Edward John, 14967A.
Dennis, Gordon Alfred, 14968A.
Bowers, Hal Gregory, 14969A.
Spiker, William Owen, 14970A.
Mersereau, Robert Thomas, 14971A.
Cotton, J. W., Jr., 14972A.
Stokes, Arthur Jackson, 14973A.
Dyer, James T., Jr., 14974A.
Klingler, D'Jack, 14975A.
Newman, John Charles, 14976A.
Malkiewicz, Frank Joseph, 14978A.
Fetty, Randall Lyle, 14979A.
Wurth, Herbert Louis, 14980A.
Long, Philip Lowell, 14981A.
Bridgman, Paul West, 14982A.
Hansen, Homer Kermit, 14983A.
McLendon, Robert Aids, 14984A.
Downey, Frank Alden, 14986A.
Dale, Howard Haines, 14987A.
Schreiber, Joseph, 14988A.
Versurah, Vincent Victor, 14989A.
Johnson, Charles Gay, 14992A.
Griffis, John William, Jr., 14993A.
Brown, Donald Gilbert, 14994A.
O'Toole, Lawrence Anthony, 14995A.
Thomas, John Barnes, 14996A.
Mowat, John Jacob, 14991A.
King, John Franklin, 14997A.
Grier, Robert Kenneth, 14999A.
Spencer, Horace Lee, 15000A.
Millikin, Eugene James, 15001A.
Jamison, Forrest Bedford, Jr., 15003A.
Hudelson, Wesley Lorimor, 15004A.
Fernley, Aaron Robert, 15005A.
Caldwell, George Philip, 15006A.
Taylor, Kenneth Baker, 15007A.
Stowell, Frederick Robert, 15008A.
Hudson, Dale Gene, 15011A.
Rehbein, Norman William, 15012A.
Mucha, Robert Henry, 15009A.
Simokaitis, Frank J., 15013A.
Cusic, William Downs, Jr., 15014A.
Jones, Donald Odell, 15016A.
Carroll, Thomas Patrick, 15017A.
Harmon, George Littler, 15018A.
Stuber, Harold Britton, 15019A.
Kennedy, William Edward, 15021A.
Bennett, Charles Iverson, Jr., 16442A.
Lampert, Francis Gerald, 15023A.
Wiese, Frank Edward, 15024A.
Stanton, Frank Goodnow, 15025A.
Harkins, Walter Clyde, 15026A.
Vanderveer, John David, 15027A.
Tennyson, Allen Romady, 15028A.
Pawlowski, Thomas, 15029A.
Hansen, Paul Kjelgard, 15030A.
Lively, James Robert, 15031A.
Campbell, Warren Edmond, 15032A.
Brame, George Frederick, 15033A.
Brinkman, Edward Albert, 15034A.
Gillespie, George Field, 15035A.
Edmonson, Richard Warren, 15037A.
Smith, Orrin Richard, Jr., 15038A.
Elder, James Albert, Jr., 15039A.
Roberts, Earl Ray, 15041A.
Tyldesley, Robert Harry, 15043A.
Hoover, Ferris Edward, 15044A.
Sumner, Charles Dewey, Jr., 15045A.
McFarland, Charles M., 15046A.

Medical Service Corps

Morgan, Floyd Edward, Jr., 19512A.
Burke, Charles Samuel, 19514A.
Carter, Russell Joseph, 19515A.
Hill, Leonard D., 19516A.
Reilly, Thomas James, 22464A.
Henry, James Edgar, 19517A.
Salvo, Joseph Peter, 22391A.
Sterzinger, Morris Matthew, 19594A.
Schwartz, Seymour, 19518A.
Willett, Joseph Earl, 19520A.
Cooper, Nathan, 19521A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Line of the Air Force

VanHorn, Carl Eugene, 23752A.
Peterson, Ralph Thomas, Jr., 18036A.
Wheat, James Weldon, 19691A.
Gleason, Joseph Parmelee, 21519A.
Mann, Howard Paul, 26480A.
Bissell, Robert Joseph, 22835A.
Hale, Verne Dale, 21520A.
Eden, James Irven, 22836A.
Labar, James, 28171A.
Robinson, Jack Kermit, 19977A.
Lawrence, Louis Irving, 26481A.
Davis, Howard Stanton, 21521A.
Rawson, William Charles, 21522A.
Balega, John Lewis, 24396A.
Kendall, Gilbert Lonnie, 19941A.
Harris, William E., 19942A.
Harvey, William Marion, Jr., 21549A.
Flake, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., 22837A.
Kaufman, William Carl, 22838A.
Pratt, Clifford Lamar, 19946A.
Ettredge, Victor Lloyd, 23792A.
Parrish, Henry Grady, Jr., 22839A.
Oram, Norman Edward, 26825A.
Patterson, Edward Chaloner, 26758A.
Thompson, John Davis, 26770A.
Eastman, Loren Starke, Jr., 26793A.
Kuzma, Myron Leo, 26822A.
Buckner, James Clarence, 26763A.
Minter, Charles Floyd, 26836A.
Eaton, Warren Byron, 26769A.
Kimble, Robert Charles, 26784A.
Haugen, Warren George, 26786A.
King, Roy William, 26780A.
Grunzke, Marvin Elwood, 26759A.
Parnelle, Robert Eustice, Jr., 26833A.
Clark, Eubert William, 26775A.
Nelson, Milton Eugene, 26782A.
Liotis, George John, 26766A.
Brockman, Robert Otto, 26760A.
McGuire, Ivan Lester, 26776A.
Harrison, Thomas Pilcher, 26832A.
Amos, Leon William, 26830A.
Swisher, Kenneth Clay, 26834A.
Hale, Carl Frank, Jr., 26787A.
Heffernan, Frank John, 26790A.
Palmore, Wilson Vaughan, 26785A.
Neyhart, Charles Amos, 26778A.
Hopple, Victor Harlan, 26839A.
Secrest, James Keith, 16791A.
Potts, Joseph Martin, 26801A.
Kollman, Robert Leo, Jr., 26827A.
Kuritzky, Clarence Samuel, 26805A.
Ladou, Edward Maurice, 26807A.
Landers, William Henry, Jr., 26810A.
Vonwiedenfield, Paul William, 26808A.
Mitchell, Glenn Lowry, 26802A.
Fagner, J. Logan, 26818A.
Nichols, Tom Henry, 26798A.
Fitzgerald, Francis Paul, 26765A.
Wilkie, Charles William, 26828A.
Taylor, Robert Warren, 26838A.
Dempsey, Peter Eugene, 26835A.
Twitchell, Alvin, 26841A.
Hoffman, Robert William, 26840A.
Barr, Carl Aaron, 26823A.
Forbes, Myron Durvall, 26783A.
Suhar, Walter, 26788A.
Johnson, Lloyd Francis, 26792A.
Griswold, Truman Lewis, 26777A.
Arquilla, Oliver Patrick, 26804A.
Svendsen, Leroy William, Jr., 26806A.
Sill, Kenneth Darrell, 26814A.
Perekslis, Leon, 26803A.
Kelly, John Linus, 2d, 26816A.
Linscomb, Horace Greely, Jr., 26820A.
Slagle, Warren Lance, 26768A.
Drake, Flavious Flemings, 26773A.
Gaddis, Norman Carl, 26772A.
Huxley, William Jared, 26812A.
Kees, Elwood Alford, Jr., 26819A.
Polezoes, Stanley, 26762A.
Griffith, Harold Lloyd, 26794A.
Dugan, Obadiah Asbury, 26837A.
Messerli, Charles Edward, 26811A.
Martin, Shirrel Glen, 26817A.
Day, Robert Edward Lee, 26797A.
Bruning, Deane Bernard, 26800A.
Horton, Charles Edwin, 26831A.
Savage, James Leo, 26824A.
Kellogg, Burton Moir, 26815A.
Vanmeter, William Lannas, 26774A.
Underwood, Lawrence Douglas, 26761A.
Sullivan, Joseph Vincent, 26796A.

Arnold, Tom More, Jr., 26799A.
Clancey, Harrison Beasley, Jr., 26789A.
Donohue, Robert Francis, 26826A.
Petermann, Melvin Francis, 26781A.
Hammer, Theodore, Jr., 26771A.
Odenthal, Warren Michael, 26764A.
Kinnikin, William Edward, 26795A.
Miller, James Warner, 26813A.
Evans, Charles Ewart, Jr., 26829A.
Wootten, Edward, 26779A.
Delaney, Harry Clifton, Jr., 26809A.
Grahl, Charles Phillips, 28172A.
Roark, Bob, 23794A.
Colvin, Wilton Louis, 21523A.
Thompson, Melvin Clyde, 26687A.
Benefield, Thommie Douglas, 25545A.
Perrine, Walton Francis, Jr., 19984A.
Hamilton, Darwin Roger, 19985A.
Ginn, William Arthur, 19978A.
Adams, Lester Morgan, Jr., 19980A.
Helms, John David, 19982A.
Tomb, Glen Charles, 19979A.
Alden, George Bernard, 19986A.
Cole, Dorsey Eugene, 19983A.
Retallack, William Glen, 20419A.
Wason, Charles Plumer, 20047A.
Tringas, Constantine James, 25546A.
Burrow, Henry Wayne, 26482A.
Bryant, Thomas Lee, 19992A.
Ferriter, John Joseph, 24397A.
Dowdy, Bert, Eugene, 26483A.
Jakes, Julian Eugene, 20053A.
Sinclair, Richard Rue, 20426A
Gordon, Henry Charles, 21650A.
Cameron, Robert MacNair, 21663A.
Peede, Floyd Appling, Jr., 22840A.
Thompson, James Wilkinson, Jr., 22841A.
Street, James Arthur, 19994A.
Lewis, Mortimer Joseph, 19998A.
Gray, Robert Asa, 19996A.
Alvord, Ray Warren, 19995A.
Hopkins, Arthur Paschal, 19997A.
Elliott, Michael Bernard, 23796A.
Clifford, Thomas Edward, 20048A.
Rippetoe, David Emmett, Jr., 24755A.
Potter, William Midgley, Jr., 26484A.
Connor, William McDavid, 26485A.
Greenspan, Franklin Roland, 24756A.
McCarthy, Charles John, 19999A.
Colaianni, Paul Vernon, 23798A.
Taylor, Abbott Lawrence, 23799A.
Uzelac, Milton John, 20080A.
Bryant, Duane Kelley, 20065A.
Hill, Edgar Hunter, 20071A.
Detlie, Martin Oliver, 20079A.
O'Connell, Kenneth Brotnov, 20064A.
Heyboer, Jay, 20076A.
Rascoe, Robert Leonard, 20077A.
Abbott, Richard Leon, 20074A.
Beaman, James Addison, Jr., 20070A.
Darden, Oliver Caldwell, 20081A.
Beall, James Robert, 20073A.
Goldsmith, Lawrence Donald, 20066A.
Corley, Melvin Vardal, Jr., 20072A.
Gallaher, Bernard Arthur, 20078A.
Harrison, Stephen E., 23800A.
Rose, John Milton, Jr., 24398A.
Cranford, Elwyn Lyles, Jr., 26487A.
Byron, Lucien, Jr., 26486A.
Holder, Wallace Glenn, 26844A.
Barone, Ben Augustus, 26843A.
Epperson, Roscoe Franklin, 26842A.
Hungerford, John Dent, 26845A.
Collier, James Carlton, Jr., 20050A.
Refson, Jacob Spencer, 20049A.
Oles, Francis John, 20051A.
Woods, John Paul, 23802A.
Stevens, Patrick Roy, 21550A.
Courlas, John George, 23803A.
Schumann, Richard Paul, 24402A.
Bock, Charles Cornelius, Jr., 24404A.
Ryland, Russell Steger, 24758A.
Lawry, Raymond Gordon, 24757A.
Mansfield, Donald William, 26488A.
Withers, James Henry, 25847A.
Barrett, Michael James, Jr., 28173A.
Duncan, Kenneth James, 20427A.
Yingling, John Wright, 20428A.
Geil, William Clinton, 23805A.
Moorman, Alvin Robert, 24760A.
Coward, Roderick William, 22842A.
Papin, Warren Jean, 23807A.
Palmgren, Edwin David, 20429A.
Zeitz, Frederick H., Jr., 24405A.
Smith, Donald Carl, 26526A.
Goebel, Robert John, 22843A.
Thatcher, Frederick Shaw, 20558A.
Taylor, Lloyd Debo, 20563A.
Torres, Donald Joseph, 20559A.
Thompson, Lloyd John, 20565A.
Swartz, Francis Aubrey, 20555A.
Balke, Arthur Charles, Jr., 20556A.
Baugh, William Joel, 20568A.
Hain, Russel Edward, 20564A.
Scannell, Wallace Allan, 20567A.
McKernan, Thomas James, 20566A.
Stoneking, Carl Lee, 20562A.
Pinner, William Weatherly, 23808A.
Nelson, Alan Gordon, 24406A.
Everton, Myron Mitchell, 24762A.
Rowe, James Artin, 24761A.
Slattery, William Charles, 25547A.
White, Billy Paul, 25848A.
Bowden, Hugh Smith, 26846A.
Woelke, Joe Edward, 26847A.
Guerra, Cipriano Felix, Jr., 26848A.
Blackley, Peter Paul, 20430A.
Holt, Carl Harry, 23810A.
Andersen, David Odell, 20420A.
Bacot, Edward Leon, 20421A.
Spears, Donald Edward, 20431A.
Lorenz, J. Edward, 25849A.
Hemphill, Richard David, 25850A.
Truver, Curtis Clifford, 20422A.
Baughn, Richard Manford, 25705A.
Cravens, Kenneth Francis, 26489A.
Coffin, Monty Dale, 20146A.
Borman, Frank, 20116A.
Greenley, Rob Roy, 20201A.
Manci, Orlando J., Jr., 20271A.
Estes, Howard Mitchell, Jr., 20180A.
Clement, Robert William, 20143A.
Prosser, Harvey William, Jr., 20317A.
Drury, Richard Taylor, 20168A.
Stange, Laverne G., 20362A.
Boyle, Edmund James, 20121A.
Moll, Kenneth Lee, 20291A.
Allbaugh, Charles Edgar, 20086A.
Schwoob, William Hayward, 20340A.
Tandler, Tyler Winslow, 20372A.
Liechty, Herschel Herbert, Jr., 20261A.
Hanks, Norris Jay, 20211A.
Smith, Robert G., 20356A.
Sieg, John S., 20346A.
Hoover, Robert Milton, 20225A.
Mendel, Edward, 20286A.
Bowers, Ray Landis, Jr., 20118A.
Coffin, Sherman Leroy, 20147A.
Harrison, Lloyd Elkins, Jr., 20214A.
Patterson, George Kenneth, 20311A.
Ryan, Malcolm Edward, Jr., 20333A.
Rollins, Wells Proctor, 20330A.
Strickland, Harold Wade, 20369A.
Saunders, Joedan Judd, 20336A.
Mitchell, Carl Berg, 20290A.
Babbe, Robert Henry, 20096A.
Johnston, Earl, 20240A.
Leiser, Louis Gene, 20259A.
Magee, John Arthur, Jr., 20269A.
Thomas, Ernest Collins, 20377A.
Ingram, Paul Mason, 20232A.
Aman, William George, Jr., 20088A
Hirsch, Charles Olaf, 20221A.
Beal, Frank Stuart, 3d, 20104A.
Streit, John Paul, 20368A.
Flint, Walter Howard, 20186A.
Anderson, Joe Emory, Jr., 20090A.
Bulita, Arthur Glen, 20129A.
Miller, William Robert, 20289A.
Hammond, Charles Wilbur, 20209A.
Monson, Gerald Harry, 20292A.
Bonanno, Frederick Ramon, 20114A.
Griffin, Carroll Riggs, Jr., 20202A.
Payne, Don Howard, 20312A.
Zagorski, Frank John, 20417A.
Faurer, Lincoln David, 20184A.
Dungan, Frank Edward, 20172A.
Palmerton, Leighton Robert, 20309A.
Rapp, William Arthur, 20219A.
Reinsch, Howard Frank, 20325A.
Hall, James Horace, 20205A.
Gray, Gordon Miles, 20200A.
Haidler, William Bernard, 20204A.
Sullivan, Dennis Bernard, 20370A.
Thompson, Francis Eugene, 20378A.
Young, Frank Levi, 20414A.
Braybrooke, Christopher, 20123A.
Cody, Richard Neal, 20145A.
Willerford, Robert Dale, 20405A.
McCutchen, Robert Kirtland, 20280A.
Innerbichler, Leo Joseph, 20233A.
Wood, Archie Lee, 20409A.
Buchler, Harold Roger, 20128A.
Caldwell, James Hamilton, 20136A.
Crichton, Theodore Pyle, 20153A.
Buck, Guy Phil, 20127A.
Vinson, Bobby Gene, 20388A.
Conley, Philip James, Jr., 20149A.
Rogers, Daniel Lindsey, 20329A.
Cannon, George Curtis, Jr., 20140A.
Moore, George Donald, Jr., 20293A.
Loar, Warren Nelson, 3d, 20262A.
Golding, Edwin Irwin, 20197A.
Baxter, Walter Hope, 3d, 20103A.
Brunson, Carl Locklin, 20126A.
Nelson, Richard Whittier, 20300A.
Reitz, William Gilmore, 20326A.
McCauley, Cleyburn Lycurgus, 20276A
Anderson, Thomas Albert, 20091A.
Novak, Don Gerald, 20304A.
Kammerer, Martin Laverne, 20242A.
Mauzy, Edwin Lamar, 20273A.
Reid, John E., 20323A.
Slay, James Richard, 20350A.
Dunbar, Donald Foster, 20169A.
Cronin, James, 20154A.
Wallace, James, Jr., 20393A.
Speaker, Edwin Ellis, 20360A.
Henry, Robert Frew, 20218A.
Burns, Kenneth Robinson, 20133A.
Gabriel, Charles Alvin, 20191A.
Durham, Samuel Carr, 20175A.
Vlisides, George Frederick, 20389A.
Weight, Clay Deck, 20400A.
Smedes, Norman Richard, 20351A.
Walsh, Harold V., Jr., 20394A.
Kulpa, John Edward, Jr., 20252A.
MacLachlan, William Irving, 20268A
Stone, Carl Evold, 20367A.
Ameen, David Adel, 20089A.
Halpern, Earl, 20207A.
Newton, Richard Yates, Jr., 20301A.
Boyd, Roger Earl, 20120A.
Smith, Richard M., 20354A.
Ransom, Louis T., Jr., 20318A.
Aton, Bert Benton, 20094A.
Booth, John Edward, 20115A.
Davidson, Charles Anthony, 20158A.
Trompeter, Arthur Francis, 20384A.
Leavitt, Lloyd Richardson, Jr., 20257A.
Scofield, Thomas David, 20341A.
Batchelor, Edward, 20100A.
Loomis, William H., 20264A.
McMullen, Malcolm, 20284A.
Bolger, John McCaffney, 20113A.
Henrikson, Matthew Thomas, 20217A.
Bixby, Kenneth Edward, Jr., 20112A.
Kuyk, Charles Frederick Goodwyn, Jr., 20253A.
Tripp, Daryle E., 20383A.
Howard, Charles Thomas, 20229A.
Saltsman, Thomas Haley, 20334A.
Bier, James Sparks, 20110A.
Stephenson, Ralph Wilson, Jr., 20364A.
Walecka, Norbert J., 20391A.
Nibley, Owen Smoot, 20302A.
Dearmond, Michael Edward, 20161A.
Weedlun, Russell D., 20399A.
Cooley, Kenton Parkes, Jr., 20150A.
Duncan, J. Clark, 20171A.
Michie, George D., 20287A.
Young, Joseph M., Jr., 20415A.
Harrell, Richard Dewitt, 20213A.
Loye, John Francis, Jr., 20266A.
True, Everett Lee, 20385A.
Arvidson, Carl Henry, 20092A.
Laccetti, Joseph Nicholas, 20255A.
Barry, Jack, Jr., 20098A.
McGee, Arthur Alten, 20282A.
Fishbein, Seymour, 20185A.
Gallagher, Nathaniel Ambrose, 20192A.
Rusch, Gerald Archie, 20331A.
Whiting, Robert Edward, 20412A.

Abercrombie, William Robert, Jr., 20083A.
Maresca, Mauro Elasio, 20272A.
Bretting, Martin McDermott, 20124A.
Todsen, Peter Blain, 20381A.
Nicholson, Samuel Newton, Jr., 20303A.
Weber, Robert Irven, 20398A.
Hobson, John Jacob, 20222A.
Smith, Ronald Robert, 20357A.
Kirk, John Miller, 20248A.
Goodman, Tyler Greene, 20198A.
Morrissey, George Edward, Jr., 20295A.
Magee, Lawton W., 20270A.
Hammett, Floyd Edward, 20208A.
Scott, Winfield Wayne, Jr., 20342A.
Collin, Henry Arthur, Jr., 20148A.
McGill, Patrick Edmund, 20283A.
Murphy, George James, 20299A.
Hodnette, Lovic Pierce, Jr., 20223A.
Avery, Bobby Roger, 20095A.
Parmer, John Raymond, 20310A.
Horsley, James Clarence, Jr., 20227A.
Kaseman, Ralph David, Jr., 20244A.
Hemenway, Ward Wertman, 20216A.
Davis, Bennie Luke, 20159A.
Moxley, Frank H., Jr., 20296A.
McCormick, John Wade, Jr., 20277A.
Smith, Donald Sprague, 20352A.
Lockerman, Samuel Whittingham, 20263A.
Pettigrew, Merlin Ernest, 20315A.
Keebler, Richard Ernest, 20245A.
McCoy, Harold Eugene, 20278A.
Smith, Robert Eugene, 20355A.
Dunning, Ernest Cook, Jr., 20174A.
White, Allie Bryce, Jr., 20403A.
Steffensen, Harry Raymond, 20363A.
Horner, Robert Anthony, 20226A.
Lorette, Richard John, 20265A.
Allison, Clark Hickmott, 20087A.
Wood, Paul Saxton, 20410A.
Jennings, Bruce Merlin, 20237A.
Riddle, William Morris, 20327A.
Curry, William Donald, Jr., 20156A.
Deranian, George Gregory, 20164A.
Pennekamp, John David, Jr., 20313A.
Earnhart, George Norman, Jr., 20177A.
Burke, William James, 20131A.
Cloar, Clyde Ross, 20144A.
Groseclose, Robert Pettigrew, 20203A.
Taylor, Daniel D., 20373A.
Munroe, Kenneth Harris, 20297A.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, 20396A.
German, James S., 20195A.
Calhoun, Joseph William, 20137A.
Hogue, Harvey Hamilton, 20224A.
Shero, Ronald David, 20345A.
Fuller, William Goodjohn, 20190A.
Murdock, Robert H., 20298A.
Ritteman, Ralph Allan, 20328A.
Bell, George Wardman, 20106A.
Abelman, Robert Milton, 20082A.
York, Theodore Robert, 20413A.
Bush, Richard William, 20134A.
Coscarelli, Donald Anthony, 20151A.
Morgan, Warren Lee, Jr., 20294A.
Jackson, Jack Coleman, 20236A.
Scatterlee, Richard Westlake, 20335A.
Williams, Ishman Rowland, Jr., 20406A.
Knapp, Budd Frederick, 20249A.
Kimes, Ira Lafayette, Jr., 19573A.
Simons, William Edward, 20347A.
May Gayle Lynwood, 20274A.
Sacone, Francis Joseph, 20142A.
Bradford, Daniel Wayne, 20122A.
Walker, Robert W., 20392A.
Johnson, Frederick Welter, 20239A.
Dixon, Brewer, Jr., 20166A.
O'Malley, John Francis, 20305A.
Fairbank, Carl Sherwyn, Jr., 20163A.
Stinson, John G., 20366A.
Erickson, Harold Frederick, 20179A.
Butler, Tommy Francis, 20791A.
Vielhauer, Harold George, 20792A.
Robinson, William Clifton, 23811A.
Reeves, Ernest Jesse, 24407A.
Zavitz, Paul Ray, 26849A.
Partt, Laurence Charles, Jr., 24408A.
Townes, Thomas Overton, 20432A.
Steiner, Philip, 22844A.
Betzer, Forrest Frank, 23812A.
Sherman, Fred Miles, 24409A.
Nickerson, Alvin Gardner, 26490A.
Cameron, James Lowe, Jr., 25548A.
Jones, Donald Bliss, 24763A.
Jones, John Edward, 26850A.
Bunn, Russell Ayres, 20433A.
Schaumburg, Fred William, Jr., 20793A.
Moran, Joseph Robert, 23813A.
Kirk, Thomas Henry, Jr., 20794A.
Rankin, James Cyrus, 24410A.
McClurg, Eugene Eldon, 26851A.
Ong, Augie Thomas, 24765A.
Kieffer, William Lewis, Jr., 26852A.
Joyner, Joseph Mayo, Jr., 20804A.
Coupland, Richard Cox, Jr., 20499A.
Nolan, Lawrence Schaeffer, 20434A.
Moore, Clyde Wilbur, 20445A.
Phillips, Thomas Jay, 20477A.
Meek, Robert Adamson, 20453A.
Merritt, Clements Bobby, 20440A.
Brown, David Linson, 20487A.
Benoit, Donald Guy, 20490A.
Hale, Roy Edward, Jr., 20497A.
Black, Harold Hill, 20504A.
Carey, Charles Donald, 20446A.
Gilliam, John Robert, 20460A.
Cooper, Rene Victor, 20465A.
Roos, Alfred Lowell, Jr., 20466A.
Fernandez, Joseph, 20467A.
Hughes, Nolan Stephens, 20436A.
Pardo, Peter Robert, 20471A.
Lockley, James Leroy, 20473A.
McConnell, Massey Douglas, 20438A.
Scrivner, John Henry, Jr., 20482A.
Cochran, Drexel Barney, 20483A.
Bishop, Winston Howard, 20489A.
Cummins, William Edward, 2d, 20494A.
Huber, Vernon Richard, 20506A.
Williams, Irvin Leroy, 20509A.
Larsen, Phillip Nelson, 20515A.
Jackson, Billy Jones, 20488A.
Hughes, Richard James, 20459A.
Albrecht, Walter Henry, 20463A.
Russell, Jack Edwin, 20464A.
Ragen, Arthur Stephen, 20470A.
Johnson, John Ed, 20439A.
Whipple, Loris Dale, 20478A.
Wheeler, Alan Dexter, 20481A.
Nelson, Keith Jacob, 20484A.
Smith, Curtis Nolan, 20493A.
Scott, Jesse Harold, Jr., 20441A.
Ulrich, Lloyd Charles, 20510A.
Coy, Donald Earl, 20447A.
Holiman, Ralph Donald, 20452A.
Kaylor, Paul Alfred, Jr., 20458A.
Tormey, William Frederick, Jr., 20468A.
Hayes, Richard Dewey, Jr., 20476A.
Ritter, Robert Edward, 20505A.
DeMoss, Louis William, 20508A.
Jensen, Bruce Allen, 20442A.
Pennington, Bob Marvin, 20514A.
Magruder, Jimmie George, 20516A.
Casebier, Dale Calvin, 20462A.
Russell, Forrest Vernon, 20437A.
Springer, Leonidas Keeth, 20469A.
Tobey, Richard Norman, 20451A.
Kennedy, Lloyd, 20457A.
Beeson, John D., 20475A.
Schmidt, Wayne Joseph, 20512A.
Rogers, Jake, 20472A.
Gunter, Richard Russell, 20795A.
Smith, Robert Thompson, Jr., 20449A.
Cline, Wilmer Frederick, 24412A.
Keyes, Arthur Lynn, 20863A.
Wyatt, Elvin Orville, 20870A.
Mulligan, James Leonard, 20862A.
Carter, Warren Rice, Jr., 20872A.
Godwin, Orgie Dene, 20875A.
Mulhern, Paul Garrett, 20877A.
Bean, Thomas Robert, 20873A.
Mitson, Claude Charles, 20866A.
Christison Charles Bernard, 20874A.
Beck, Garold Raymond, 20883A.
Dehosse, Harry Victor, 20864A.
Falls, Harry, Jr., 20871A.
Schmitz, Walter Henry, 20879A.
Wilke, Robert Frederick, 20868A.
Peck, Earl Goodwin, 20876A.
White, George Sidney, 20880A.
Smith, Robert Wilson, 20881A.
Green, Lawrence Elston, 21898A.
Stancil, Harold Lloyd, 21901A.
Shaw, Jack Brisley, 21900A.
Washmond, Lee Roy, 21902A.
Gordon, Harry Arthur, Jr., 21897A.
Gehle, Richard Lee, 21896A.
Nell, Varney Reed, 21899A.
Bond, Robert William, Jr., 23815A.
Roby, Charles Donald, 23816A.
Madden, Joseph Bernard, 23814A.
Fink, Vera Henrietta, 24413W.
Thompson, Gordon Ward, 24767A.
Rogers, Merrill Allen, 24766A.
Pringle, Andrew, Jr., 25456A.
Bach, Maurice David, 25549A.
Crane, Emery, Jr., 25551A.
Carson, William Edward, 25550A.
Wheeler, Bruce Hanson, 25852A.
Johnson, Robert Edward, 25851A.
MacDonald, John William, 26491A.
Anderson, Robert Stanley, 26855A.
Byron, Milton M., 26857A.
Anderson, John Edward, 26854A.
Hitt, Franklin James, 26853A.
Wilson, James Lewis, 26856A.
Cooper, Arthur Sheldon, 22845A.
Posner, Jack Isador, 22846A.
Sexton, Jack Gale, 23817A.
Champagne, Edward Conrad, Jr., 25706A.
Canfield, John Oren, 24415A.
Bunker, Herbert, Jr., 26858A.
Schoning, William Max, 23819A.
Branan, William Columbus, 23820A.
Cleland, David Ira, 24768A.
Hepler, Robert Glen, 23821A.
Curtis, Andrew Dolphus, 26492A.
Norton, Charles Wesley, Jr., 24416A.
Skelton, Richard Eugene, 20786A.
Larsson, Alfred John, Jr., 20772A.
Bloss, Stuart Marens, 20787A.
Wead, Arthur Denice, 20773A.
Clendening, Roger Dell, 20776A.
Wise, Harvey Earl, 20778A.
Clark, Virgil Scoville, 20779A.
Styron, Hilton Gray, 20780A.
Murphy, Cecil Ray, 20775A.
Crabbe, William Merwin, Jr., 20781A.
Merkling, Richard Edwin, 20782A.
Miller, Edward Anthony, Jr., 20785A.
Daniel, Plummer Alston, 20774A.
Old, Robert Quentin, 24417A.
Peterson, Carl Douglas, 26859A.
Threlkeld, Richard James, 26860A.
Hart, Allen Christopher, 24418A.
Hunter, John Franklin, 24419A.
Cunnion, Francis Joseph, 20805A.
Massoni, Robert Jules, 26861A.
Restum, A. Albert, 21586A.
Smithson, Clyde Spruill, Jr., 24769A.
Rozner, Maurice, 25853A.
Chard, Hobart T., 20788A.
Primrose, Robert Lloyd, 20790A.
McKnight, Kenneth Andrew, Jr., 25854A.
Smothers, Robert William, 22849A.
Gibbs, Henry Lee, 26862A.
Ace, Robert Kent, 26863A.
Chavarrie, Edgar Anthony, 25855A.
Ryder, Dale Delbert, 23823A.
Dukes, Sterling Walter, 24420A.
Henry, Andrew, 24771A.
Watry, Charles Andrew, 24770A.
Buchanan, John Ewing, 25856A.
Johnson, Carl Henry, 26493A.
Davis, John Gregory, 26864A.
Hollway, Donald Wilson, 21674A.
Bachelder, Donald Richard, 25857A.
Hare, Warren John, 26865A.
Hammock, Frank Marlin, 23824A.
Dickinson, Joe Thomas, 24421A.
Ogan, Russell Griffith, 25880A.
Kemp, Bertram, 22850A.
Burke, Walter Hubert, 23825A.
Thorp, Howard Richard, 24422A.
Poston, George Preston, 24423A.
Russell, Floyd Herold, 24772A.
Backes, Ralph Gordon, 25858A.
Toomay, John Crawford, 23826A.
Mebane, Robert McNair, 20799A.
Snavely, Ralph Albert, Jr., 20800A.
Postero, Howard Frank, 23827A.
Robinson, Ray Albert, Jr., 23828A.
Williams, Robert Edwin, 26866A.
Goodrich, John Winston, 21525A.
Nielsen, James Richard, 26494A.

Livesay, Crawford Patterson, Jr., 21531A.
Robinson, Wallace Noble, 3d, 21546A.
Maglione, Ralph John, Jr., 21535A.
Prince, Robert Eugene, 21536A.
Adams, James Asa, Jr., 21537A.
Dennerlein, Kenneth Neil, 21548A.
Gleoggler, James Kremer, 21544A.
Davey, John James, 21527A.
Wilke, Robert Arthur, 21545A.
Reinker, George Richard, 21539A.
Clark, Ralph Peter, 21540A.
Frye, Eugene, 21530A.
Anna, Lloyd Peter, 21528A.
Kulaas, Robert Henning, 21529A.
Nuchols, James Fleming, 21538A.
Fetzer, William McKinnon, 21533A.
Smith, Frederick Harold, 23832A.
Jolley, John Elonzo, Jr., 23829A.
Francis, Albert Hall, 24424A.
Copp, William Hamilton, 24773A.
Tourtellot, George Platt, 24775A.
Saye, Robert Newton, Jr., 24774A.
Cunningham, Joe Clinton, 25859A.
Cooper, Roger Lee, 26496A.
Jones, Gay Edward, 26495A.
Clark, Stanley Scott, 26867A.
Jones, Bruce Donald, 26868A.
Sexton, Norman Glen, 26869A.
Truett, Herbert Winters, 24446A.
Hines, Thomas Frazer, 24425A.
Showers, Clarence Ellsworth, 24776A.
Johnson, Marvin Wayne, 22848A.
Shoemaker, Robert Charles, 24777A.
Arpke, Charles Kenneth, 23834A.
Lobell, Alfred Zeb, 24778A.
Word, Charles Elwood, 26497A.
Barnes, William Earl, 26870A.
Richards, Frederick Charles, 25707A.
Swenson, Homer Wessel, 21653A.
Britton, Thomas Craig, 23835A.
Sehon, Raymond Neil, 24779A.
McKee, Thomas Matthew, Jr., 25860A.
Boehne, Gerald Paul, 23837A.
Spalding, Thomas Benedict, 24449A.
Benigno, Benjamin Benedict, 24780A.
Eck, Raymond Otto, 20809A.
Seymour, Robert Louis, 20813A.
Anderson, Joe, 20814A.
Ogle, Quintin John, 20808A.
Giddings, Charles Robert, 3d, 20807A.
Coyle, Robert Charles, 20815A.
Clauson, Curtis Sutherland, 20812A.
MacFarren, Donald James, 23838A.
Wheeler, Lewis Edgar, Jr., 23839A.
Pipher, Robert Wilson, 24426A.
Chu, Earl Massey, 23841A.
Miller, Bernard Paul, 23842A.
Gardner, G. C., Jr., 23844A.
Hickson, Dick, Jr., 24427A.
Holland, Charles Duke, 24781A.
Belinski, Edward Joseph, 21721A.
Cronin, John Bernard, 23845A.
Stearns, Allan Julius, 26498A.
Weston, William Alexander, Jr., 26871A.
Alderman, James Othell, 21526A.
Bolt, Thomas Bruce, 23847A.
Corbett, Richard Marvin, 25861A.
Bayer, Oscar, 26499A.
Smiley, Kennard Raymond, 26872A.
Holaway, Robert Owen, 21587A.
Modisette, James Oliver, Jr., 23849A.
Davison, Peter Hal, 23848A.
Moyle, Thomas Dowling, 24782A.
Underwood, Elbert Maurice, 24783A.
Looney, William Robert, 25708A.
Long, Joseph Hampton, 25862A.
Andrews, Jean Jackson, 26501A.
Hamilton, Isaac Madison, 26500A.
Jiggetts, Charles Brandon, 26873A.
Barrentine, Emmett Shipman, Jr., 27679A.
Eklund, Robert Gerald, 27700A.
Swaim, Raymond Jack, 27697A.
Miller, John Thomas, 27686A.
Guthrie, Bobbie Gerald, 27683A.
Chason, Robert Leonard, 27680A.
Benagh, Thomas Madison, 27689A.
Bee, Thomas George, 27684A.
Jones, James Edward, 27672A.
Smith, Robert George, 27673A.
Broughton, Roy James, Jr., 27677A.
Radick, Ross Mitchell, 27696A.
Almquist, Adolph Spencer, 27688A.
Jones, Robert Lewis, 27681A.
McCanlies, John Lock, 27692A.
Bishop, Russell, 27678A.
Quirk, William Thomas, 27698A.
Dedecker, Charles Conrad, 27675A.
Ramsey, Gerald Arthur, 27687A.
Sullivan, Marvin Baird, 27695A.
Casey, Joseph Thomas, 27690A.
Falkenstein, Donald Lee, 27671A.
Preble, William Edmund, 27674A.
Davis, William Ellesworth, 27701A.
Beebe, Robert Gustabus, 27694A.
McClain, Howard Edward, 27685A.
Austin, Coy Lee, 27693A.
Carter, Frederic Leon, 27676A.
Bekius, Joseph Edward, 27699A.
Myers, Edwin Nelson, 27682A.
Treankler, Lester Earl, 27691A.
Hatcher, Dwight Joel, 21654A.
Pishney, John Carl, 23851A.
Ford, Jack Bayliss, 26874A.
Box, Moses Richard, 21746A.
Brewington, Russell Dumas, 23852A.
Kirkpatrick, Herman Leonard, 23853A.
Wright, Robert Craig, 24428A.
Rogers, Arthur Doyle, 26502A.
Urie, Thomas Eugene, 20885A.
Plant, Kenneth Albert, 23855A.
Reed, William, 23854A.
Koller, John Henry, 26503A.
Millspaugh, Robert Edward, 20887A.
Mook, William Rouch, 20888A.
Esser, George Edward, 24785A.
Kimbrough, Duke Shouse, 24784A.
Anderson, James Carl, 25709A.
Voudouris, Arthur Costas, 24786A.
Carter, Billy Jack, 26875A.
Poston, Freddie Lee, 26876A.
Pinson, Jay Dee, 21665A.
Dunn, Charles Malcolm, Jr., 26996A.
Gabriels, Alexander, Jr., 24429A.
Priestley, Gilbert Alden, 23856A.
Billie, James Louis, 27702A.
Kavanaugh, Dudley Gordon, 26877A.
Keen, Robert Harley, 20889A.
McConnell, Carlton Harper, 22853A.
Beard, William Joseph, 24787A.
Coen, Charles Clair, 24788A.
Faustman, Donald Milton, 25710A.
Pichon, Delphin Joseph, 26878A.
Miller, William Stanley, 22854A.
Hayes, Jack Austin, 22429A.
Washington, Miles Standish, Jr., 22433A.
Torraco, Pasquale, 22432A.
Watts, William George, Jr., 23857A.
Egginton, Jack Hardy, 24430A.
Davis, Albert Paul, 24432A.
Risner, Hurl, 24789A.
Lastrapes, James Allan, 25865A.
Harrison, Albert Willard, Jr., 25863A.
Komstedt, William Andrew, Jr., 25864A.
Parker, Norman Andrew, 25866A.
Glassmeyer, James Milton, 26879A.
Wood, Hubbard Lee, Jr., 27703A.
Schoppe, John Cushman, 23858A.
Casey, Robert William, 26880A.
Brady, Eugene Lorne, 22855A.
Brown, William Randall, 20890A.
Keleher, Robert Jerome, 20891A.
Nunnally, Frank Warren, 24433A.
Ford, Francis Meredith, 23860A.
Lanham, William Taylor, 23861A.
Woldt, Willard Emerson, 24434A.
Houser, Paul Raymond, 25867A.
Campbell, Stanley Jean, 23862A.
Eanes, Edwin Coley, 24435A.
Johnson, James Gordon, 24436A.
Walker, Clarence William, Jr., 24437A.
Temple, Thomas Hickman, Jr., 25868A.
Coffman, Ray Browne, 26881A.
Brock, Thomas Reeves, 26882A.
Enright, Joseph Kenneth, 24790A.
Risley, Guy Herbert, Jr., 27704A.
Boyer, Kenneth Guy, 21571A.
Pawelek, Edmund Theodore, 21576A.
Schmidt, Paul Phillip, 21581A.
Bretzius, William Franklin, 3d, 21585A.
Scarff, Edwin Jerome, 21578A.
Deldo, Louis Joseph, 21572A.
Rabbitt, Kent William, 21573A.
Podoll, William Gene, 21575A.
Bancroft, Earl Frank, 21583A.
Simons, Walter, Jr., 21577A.
Hills, John Russell, 21579A.
Davis, Harry Bazelle, 21570A.
Head, Edward Martin, 24438A.
Brunsman, George Edward, 24439A.
Mace, Theodore Nelson, 24792A.
Matecko, George, 24791A.
VanHuss, George Dewey, Jr., 24794A.
Humphreys, Francis Aldridge, Jr., 24793A.
Morris, Robert Paul, 25711A.
Liotta, Robert Gasper, 25873A.
Colgan, Robert Gregory, 25871A.
Tittle, David Holcomb, 25870A.
Carter, James Louis, 25869A.
VonHaven, Ellis Jean, Jr., 26506A.
Johnson, Harold Elwood, 26505A.
Crowley, Eugene Newman, 26504A.
Spell, Joseph Quintin, 26884A.
Cherney, John Paul, 26883A.
Wollmers, John Anthony, 26886A.
Ramsey, James Basil, 26885A.
Crumpler, Carl Boyette, 27705A.
McClurkin, Samuel Preston, 23863A.
Reaver, William Paul, 24440A.
Baker, Henry Daniel, Jr., 23864A.
Harpster, John Stanley, 24441A.
Goldfogle, Richard Arnold, 24442A.
Ponti, Gaetano Carlos, Jr., 27706A.
Martin, Baird Mankin, 21664A.
Luttrell, Donald Allen, 24443A.
Smith, John Richard, 24444A.
Messick, Donald Alfred, 25713A.
Ward, Marion Haggard, 23865A.
Bergstrom, Airus Evan, 23866A.
Guzak, Frank Sylvester, 26890A.
O'Kane, Robert Waxon, 27707A.
Mixson, Donald McRae, 21551A.
Clark, William Ainsworth, 21554A.
Luke, William Thomas, 19888A.
Laski, Joseph Stanley, 23869A.
Gluck, Fred, 25714A.
Yates, James Kammerer, 27708A.
Tuten, Raphael Oregon, Jr., 26887A.
Clouse, James Buchanan, 23870A.
Underkofler, Donald Bruce, 26509A.
Blair, Charles Edward, 26888A.
Clithero, Robert Graham, 27709A.
Hawk, Robert Gordon, 21598A.
Conner, Henry Hoop, Jr., 21590A.
Michaud, Richard Earl, 21588A.
Nicholson, William Lloyd, 3d, 24447A.
Boyd, John Graham, 25716A.
Preuss, Carl Louis, 25715A.
Dowling, Robert Charles, 25875A.
Adams, William Edgar, 25874A.
Jarrell, John Eben, 26889A.
Waters, William Forrest, 21668A.
Graham, Irwin Patton, 23871A.
Sleeman, John Blythe, 25717A.
Anderson, Robert Haralson, 24448A.
Kidner, John Powell, 21656A.
Curtis, Edward Harold, 21655A.
Petrie, James Waite, 21659A.
Wayne, John William, 3d, 21658A.
Mullins, Jack Colvard, 21660A.
Chambless, Rubyen Martin, 25876A.
Dekeyser, William Richard, 26510A.
Wall, James Smith, 24450A.
Bates, Randolph Clark, Jr., 23874A.
Bradbury, James William, 25877A.
Gaskins, Calvin Coolidge, 24796A.
Rodriguez, Rigoberto, 24797A.
Schropp, George Edward, 21695A.
Glasgow, Joseph Magoffin, Jr., 21697A.
Jenista, Charles Otto, Jr., 23876A.
Egbert, Darrell Howard, 24453A.
Schneider, Calvin Chris, 24452A.
Beaulieu, Joseph Paul, Jr., 26891A.
Scott, Eugene Dyer, 26892A.
Andrew, Hugh Samuel, 23877A.
King, Bruce Francis, 24454A.
Hamilton, Robert George, 26893A.
Smith, Kenneth Richard, 21671A.
Edwards, Boyd Hunt, 21669A.
Krekelberg, Donald Leo, 21672A.
Ambrose, Robert Fred, 21666A.
Christensen, Grant S., 21673A.
Dowdy, Derrell Coolidge, 21667A.
Mills, Edward Kenneth, Jr., 21670A.

DuBois, Joseph Mortimer, 24455A.
Wellinghurst, Jack Moreman, 24799A.
Hopkins, Alfred Huse, Jr., 25878A.
Clinger, Bordean Wardell, 23878A.
Barker, William Robert, 23880A.
Atkins, Herbert Leroy, 25879A.
Druckenbrodt, Kenneth Edgar, 26894A.
Erdmann, Robert Lewis, 24800A.
Mauro, Louis Salvatore, 24802A.
Robinson, Victor Russell, Jr., 24801A.
Madden, Robert Arthur, 24457A.
Blodgett, Dolphus Ernest, 21698A.
Webber, Byron Lewis, 21701A.
Carey, Carl Henry, Jr., 21702A.
Pitts, Earl Wayne, 21703A.
Heyde, Richard Reimers, 21704A.
Beyer, Richard Scott, 21699A.
Koernig, Robert Walter, 21700A.
Voigt, William Frederick, 21705A.
Vastine, John Edward, 24458A.
Asseo, Sam, 24803A.
Ryan, Thomas Martin, Jr., 24804A.
Tave, Arthur, 25881A.
Neuendorf, Charles Albert, 26895A.
Nolter, Charles Robert, 27710A.
Kirsch, Donald David, 24459A.
Dove, Leo Mathias, 26511A.
Henderson, Thomas Frederick, Jr., 27711A.
Matthews, George Dale, 21676A.
Newsom, Thomas Louis, 23882A.
Yerg, Kenneth Gideon, 21708A.
Bahl, James Frederick, 21706A.
Huggins, Earl Leroy, 21707A.
Martin, Francis Thomas, Jr., 21709A.
Runnels, Charles C., Jr., 25552A.
Humme, Carel Tracy, 25882A.
Coy, Edwin Alexander, 21679A.
Woods, Charles Ellerbe, 25883A.
Maddox, Notley Gwynn, 26512A.
Lamont, James Nicholson, 24806A.
Coubrough, John, Jr., 25884A.
Hill, Ployer Peter, 24807A.
Schifferdecker, Charles Ray, 25553A.
Downing, Dale Edwin, 25554A.
Behnke, Paul Joseph, 25885A.
Nelson, James Toy, Jr., 24460A.
Duryea, Cecil Paul, Jr., 25886A.
Clark, John Morris, 26513A.
Tuxhorn, William Ross, 26514A.
Innis, John Woodson, 21770A.
Matthews, Harry Hargan, 24461A.
Steadman, Freddy Lee, 25887A.
Iddings, Archie Tibbs, Jr., 26515A.
Holt, Robert Terrence, 28174A.
Meux, William Leigh, Jr., 23883A.
Mitchell, Robert Fred, 21774A.
Bayliss, Charles Edward, 27712A.
Rader, Norvin Elwood, 23884A.
Jordon, Harold Kenneth, 24462A.
McEachron, Edward Harvey, 23885A.
Darr, John Wade, 25888A.
Ransford, Francis Eugene, 25889A.
Galvin, Donald William, 23886A.
Lee, Wilson, 26688A.
Hackett, James W., 24808A.
Fenell, Clifford Leroy, Jr., 26896A.
Cox, George Rogers, 21744A.
Bigelow, Robert Berle, 21745A.
Polhemus, William Leroy, 24463A.
Nelson, Robert Tyson, 26517A.
Mudle, John Walter, 26516A.
Bunker, Gerald Byron, 21824A.
Stephens, William Richard, 23887A.
McKenzie, Frank B., 26897A.
Kincaid, William Leo, 24464A.
Wade, Thomas Dell, 24809A.
Clarke, Roderick William, 24810A.
Bayer, Edwin Ralph, 24811A.
Eichhorn, Jerome James, 26898A.
Gordon, Paul Kelly, 24812A.
Boyer, Joseph Alexander, Jr., 25890A.
Kuchta, Daniel John, 24465A.
Lucia, Norman Rowland, 24813A.
Simpson, Charles James, Jr., 23085A.
Wagner, Richard Edwin, 23088A.
Thomas, John Joseph, 23086A.
Julian, Elton, 23081A.
Prescott, Lester Albert, 23083A.
Turregano, John Edwin, 23087A.
Sayers, Merl Edward, 24815A.
Hays, Robert Earl, Jr., 24814A.
Rathburn, Virginia Ransom, 25556W.
Leatherby, Harold Franklin, 25555A.
Pollock, William John, 21813A.
Clark, Lynwood Edgerton, 21812A.
Starke, Eugene Raleigh, 21814A.
Kirk, Leland Richard, 21810A.
Allen, Alfred Stanley, 21805A.
Dudley, William Ewart, Jr., 21809A.
Yary, William Whytle, 21806A.
Darlington, Robert Edwin, 21811A.
Diaz, Robert, Jr., 24468A.
Weber, Lawrence Wayne, 24467A.
Thomas, Maurice Charles, 24817A.
VanCleave, Walter Shelby, 24818A.
Kitchens, Grady Eugene, 26900A.
Baker, Frank Davis, Jr., 26902A.
Bath, Frank Joseph, Jr., 26899A.
Spilseth, Sidney Milo, 26901A.
Eckweiler, John Andrew, 26821A.
Bugg, Robert Martin, 26518A.
Brazill, William Robert, 26903A.
Eyer, Howard Ralph, 26904A.
Johnson, Robert Edward, Jr., 23890A.
Thompson, George Charles, 26519A.
Sprankle, Robert LaFayette, 23891A.
Borders, Robert Henderson, 3d, 23892A.
Risner, Robinson, 26905A.
Brown, Allan Lee, 21905A.
Heard, Robert Jewel, Jr., 24469A.
Jones, Henry Lewis, 25557A.
Sturmthal, Emil, 21825A.

Medical Corps

McGary, Lester Eugene, Jr., 25733A.
Barrett, John Albert, Jr., 26743A.
Bausman, Charles Henry, Jr., 26375A.
Denny, William F., 26378A.
Crawford, Perry Franklin, 26376A.
Smoak, Hubert Wiley, Jr., 26379A.
Teagle, Ernest Howard, 26382A.
Houle, Dudley Benningfield, 26377A.
Finlay, William Carroll, 26380A.
Wiese, Frederick William, 26383A.
Malachowsky, Martin Norman, 26381A.
Pierard, Albert Alexander, 27611A.
Barnes, William Byron, 27501A.
Genner, Byron A., 3d, 27612A.
Hinds, William Lawyer, 27502A.
Moore, Tom Dickson, 27614A.
Koster, Charles Kenneth, 27615A.
Kemmerer, William Taylor, 27503A.
Wright, Allen Russell, 27617A.
Adamson, John Brian, 27616A.
Boese, Robert James, 27504A.
Ramos, Harold Smith, 27618A.
Turner, Robert Joseph, 3d, 27619A.
Seeger, Joseph Gregory, 27620A.
Bowers, David Garwood, Jr., 27621A.
Whitehurst, Walter Raleigh, Jr., 27622A.
Stagg, Paul Albert, 26638A.
Capps, William Francis, Jr., 27623A.
Fitzsimons, Louis Elwood, Jr., 26639A.
Dominy, Dale Edwin, 26706A.
Shaw, John Lester, 26641A.
Wilhite, Glenn Eugene, 26640A.
Small, Harvey Caldon, 27624A.
Talley, William Clinton, 27625A.
Penner, Clyde Eugene, 27993A.
Steck, Willard Duewell, 27626A.
Krecke, Charles Francis, 26642A.
Rosenow, Kenneth Grant, 26643A.
Anderson, Robert William, 26644A.
Waters, Raymond Oliver, 26385A.
Akers, Dwight Malcolm, 27505A.
Gritti, Emil John, 27627A.
Sadin, Harold Charles, 26708A.
Collins, George Posey, 26709A.
Newquist, Richard Erickson, 27628A.
Taylor, Ellis Reneau, 27630A.
Hartley, Lawrence Justice, 27629A.
Chase, Ned Baker, Jr., 26711A.
Jones, Carlton Edward, 26710A.
Pezanoski, Edward Joseph, 27631A.
Smith, Robert Eugene, 27633A.
Susat, George Gustave, 26712A.
Poppell, Jay Harris, 26716A.
Dinmore, Richard Clayton, 26713A.
Silvernail, William Irving, Jr., 26714A.
Clay, James Reuben, 26715A.
Little, Bruce Raymond, 26717A.
Pollack, Howard Martin, 26744A.
Williams, Marion Jack, 28136A.
Dean, Gordon Edward, 27635A.
Franks, John Julian, 27636A.

Dental Corps

Jenkins, Charles Albert, Jr., 26388A.
Stansbury, Bruce Eugene, 27525A.
Hicks, Rodeheaver Halsey, 25703A.
Tindall, Leroy Everet, 25718A.
Miller, Edward Francis, 26390A.
Keefer, William Lewis, Jr., 26389A.
Cornyn, John, 27632A.
Smart, Elliott Archibald, 27634A.
Pavlikowski, Fred Lewis, 28130A.
Klaeser, Ray Lewis, 28131A.

Veterinary Corps

Holk, Herbert Christian, 26648A.
Strandberg, Hilding Mimer, 27532A.
Lashua, Elmer Lester, 27533A.
Ganaway, James Rives, 28002A.
Cook, James Ellsworth, 27534A.

Medical Service Corps

Alder, Albert Vernon, 21880A.
Sparling, Kenneth Gray, 21881A.
Weiss, Frank, 23078A.
Kelly, John Allen, 23225A.
Stauch, John Edward, 23079A.
Jonas, Ralph Buel, 23226A.
Kelley, Robert Gerard, 23227A.
Ansley, Ben Aubrey, 23080A.
Shaw, Emil Gilbert, 27481A.
Gray, Hollis Burdette, 25335A.
Burge, Charles Howard, 25738A.
Spaur, Carl Leroy, 23228A.
Hansen, Ronald Gordon, 26653A.
Dibona, Joseph, 23229A.
Quenk, Joseph John, 23230A.
Schofield, James Bernie, Jr., 23231A.
Covell, Donald Edward, 23232A.
Bitzko, Joseph Thomas, 23233A.
Krakauer, Hans Anatol, 23235A.
Martin, Robert Peter, 23234A.
Perkins, Arthur Hewett, 25336A.
Price, William Bew, Jr., 28003A.

Nurse Corps

Schooley, Mildred Frances, 24257W.
Pelchat, Doris Marie Jeanne, 27543W.
James, Marian Burnette, 27551W.
Glenos, Nena Suzan, 25762W.
Combes, Mary Alice, 25748W.
Wells, Helen, 23247W.
Shiflett, Billie Loree, 25750W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Manor, Filomena Roberta, 21894W.
Hodgkins, Barbara Merle, 21895W.
Ridenour, Olive Justine, 23248W.

Chaplain

Hass, Donald James, 28157A.
Schoning, John Ballou, 26753A.
Youngblood, Angus O'Neal, 27667A.
McDuffy, Walter Nathaniel, Jr., 27668A.
Weber, Irvin John, 27669A.
Turner, Warren Hudson, 27670A.
Taylor, Christy Mathewson, 28001A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Lauten, Wayne George, 28805A.
Bain, Hubert Linwood, 28806A.
Tarnow, Lawrence Millard, 27968A.
Fross, Leonard Lyle, 28808A.
Catlett, Louis Eldon, 28809A.
O'Neal, Joe Roberts, 28810A.
McClintock, Earl Dwight, 28811A.
Erchinger, Ralph Christian, 28812A.
Smith, James Charles, 28815A.
Stack, Maurice George, 28816A.
Van Lierde, Frank Thomas, 28813A.
Allen, Fred Rex, 28814A.
Balfe, Paul John, 28817A.
Antoszek, Henry Thaddeus, 28818A.
Fronk, Gene Allen, 28819A.
Sweet, Floyd Blue, Jr., 28820A.
Scott, Russell James, 28821A.
Brooks, Irwin, 28822A.
Voss, Henry Daniel, Jr., 28824A.
Garrett, John William, 3d, 28823A.
Branz, Michael Henry, 28825A.

Furlong, Arnold Edward, 28827A.
Stuckey, Russell Dwight, 28826A.
Lee, Jack Guilford, Jr., 28828A.
Johnson, Henry Richard, 28829A.
Freeman, Jack E., 28830A.
Porter, Carl Freel, 27969A.
Norby, Charles Edwin, 28831A.
Gray, Campbell Watkins, 28832A.
Williams, Roger Lee, 28833A.
Brittain, Charles, Jr., 27970A.
Sparkman, William, Jr., 28834A.
Sizer, Frank Elmer, 28835A.
Moore, Richard Arnold, 28836A.
Cunningham, Hugh Jerald, 28837A.
Simmons, Joseph Calvin, 28840A.
Eddins, Neil Lavell, 28841A.
Workman, Theodore Edward, 28846A.
Chasse, Albert Joseph, 28844A.
Matthews, Harrison William, 28842A.
Kaplan, Brent, 28838A.
Eliopoulos, Andrew James, 28839A.
Wilson, Lewis Raymond, 28843A.
Ott, John Vail, 28845A.
Pugh, Charles Edward, 28847A.
Mishou, Leighton Noyles, 28855A.
Shanks, James Lee, 28857A.
Smith, Harold Francis, 28858A.
Spinner, Richard Alaiman, 28859A.
Davis, James Roy, 28852A.
McKinney, Ivan Lee, 28854A.
Bell, Edward Janes, 3d, 28849A.
Belford, Willis Addison, Jr., 28848A.
Sather, Robert Maynard, 28856A.
Brown, Bill Vernon, 28850A.
Catlett, Albert Whitby, 28851A.
Hawkins, John Victor, 28853A.
Vaughan, James Edward, 28861A.
Palumbo, William Charles, 28860A.
Fluck, Roland Frank, 28862A.
Allen, Owen Woodruff, Jr., 28863A.
Gunderson, Lindy Charles, 28864A.
Hascall, William Theodore, 28865A.

Medical Service Corps

Finn, Joseph Julius, 28006A.
Bousser, James Edward, 29338A.
Peterson, Dean LeRoy, 29512A.
Newton, William Howell, 29339A.
Fisher, Jackie Vance, 28007A.
Schiefer, Alfred Carl, 28008A.
Myers, Charles Gaylord, 28009A.
Hodges, James Milton, 28010A.
William, Walter Harold, 29340A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment as lieutenant general, United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066:

Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, 591A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., 427A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Samford, 377A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of sections 8306 and 8307, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William Maurice Morgan, 439A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Samford, 377A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr., 547A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Merrill Lee, 590A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Walker Sessums, Jr., 489A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leland Samuel Stranathan, 406A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United S .tes Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howard Graham Bunker, 376A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Jensen Dau, 834A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Oliver Kunze Niess, 19022A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Wilford F. Hall, 19026A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Leroy Kennedy, 517A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Webster Jenkins, 528A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., 587A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David William Hutchison, 601A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Stone Campbell, 615A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hardin Anderson, 623A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Olin Foster McIlnay, 19029A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Otis Otto Benson, Jr., 19046A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, 884A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Karl Truesdell, Jr., 1023A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard Mattern Montgomery, 1025A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Sebastian Stone, 1059A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles John Bondley, Jr., 1073A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Raymond Judson Reeves, 1082A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harvey Thompson Alness, 1085A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, 1117A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell Lee Waldron, 1164A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Brooke Emple Allen, 1287A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Alvin Roubal Luedecke, 1486A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bernard Adolf Schriever, 1519A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Albert George Hewitt, 396A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Leonard Grills, 432A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., 619A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Porter Farnsworth, A0922626, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hardin Anderson, 623A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Olin Foster McIlnay, 19029A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Otis Otto Benson, Jr., 19046A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles John Bondley, Jr., 1073A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harvey Thompson Alness, 1085A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell Lee Waldron, 1164A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Louis Pachynski, 325A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James Hubert Davies, 537A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard Joseph O'Keefe, 566A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., 644A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold Roth Maddux, 650A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Burroughs Cary, 1055A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Leighton Ira Davis, 1111A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James Howard Walsh, 1120A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., 1129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Thomas Hudnell, 1171A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., 1211A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard Henry Carmichael, 1214A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph James Nazzaro, 1241A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, 1261A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Parker Fisher, 1294A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Dudley Stevenson, 1320A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Dale Ryan, 1418A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Hugh Blanchard, 1445A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry Russell Spicer, 1487A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Richard David Wentworth, 451A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ezekiel Wimberly Napier, 468A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Stephen B. Mack, 658A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Victor Allen Byrnes, 19042A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. John Randolph Copenhaver, 19050A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. William John Bell, 930A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Allen Wood Rigsby, 943A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Christian Frederick Dreyer, 2072A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph Edward Gill, 2071A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry Cecil Porter, 976A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Cecil Parker Lessig, 1001A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Loveland Rogers, 1060A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawson S. Noseley, Jr., 1062A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Albert Patton Clark, Jr., 1218A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Von Roy Shores, 1236A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Herman Alfred Schmid, 1260A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Allen Hilger, 1274A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Windeck Hall, 1295A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul William Scheidecker, 1354A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul Theodore Preuss, 1407A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald Ward Saunders, 1432A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Waymond Austin Davis, 1470A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., 1684A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Marvin Leonard McNickle, 1721A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Osmond Jay Ritland, 1731A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul Stanley Emrick, 1801A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Frank B. James, 1837A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Glen Webster Martin, 1955A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Walter Wilson, 1711A, Regular Air Force.

The following-named officers for appointment as Reserves of the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 8351, title 10 of the United States Code and Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harry Crutcher, Jr., AO300841, Texas Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Stanford Willis Gregory, AO331838, Colorado Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Cady Richmond Bullock, AO326260, Texas Air National Guard.

Col. Howard Franklin Butler, AO403692, Tennessee Air National Guard.

Col. Collins Hakes Ferris, AO411820, Wisconsin Air National Guard.

Col. Donald Jackson Strait, AO796042, New Jersey Air National Guard.

Col. William Willing Spruance, AO374099, Delaware Air National Guard.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Roddee Edward Lord, 29404A.
Henry Ernest Lincoln Luhrs, 28730A.
Harris Jay Taylor, 28731A.
Fredrick William Wendt, 27945A.
John Albert Owens, Jr., 27944A.
Joe Thomas Fox, 28733A.
Russell Lynn Peate, 28732A.
Robert Duane Johnson, 28734A.
Norman Bradford Davis, 28735A.
Glenn Harry McFadden, 28736A.
George Anderson Nial, 28738A.
James Donald Gormley, 28737A.
Herbert Eugene Larson, 28740A.
Bruce Robert Rauhe, 28741A.
Jack Bath, Jr., 28742A.
Richard Franklin Nelson, 28739A.
Robert Ball, 28743A.
Armen Dermen, 28744A.
Howard David Ortel, 28745A.
James Oliver Hays, 27946A.
Robert William Curry, 27947A.
Robert William Bleier, 28746A.
James Louis Earl, Jr., 28747A.
Robert Raymond Barker, 27949A.
James Donohue Green, 27950A.
Carlton Ray Virden, 27952A.
Thomas George Leydon, 27948A.
Donald Koren Artean, 28760A.
James Richard Griffin, 28759A.
Saul Waxman, 28761A.
Roland Martin Larsen, 28750A.
Omer Herman Liefer, 28756A.
Donald Gene Zumstein, 28758A.
Chester John Gaseor, 28748A.
Leonard Stanley Czarnecki, 28757A.
William Compton Dunn, 28753A.
Coe Finch Gordon, Jr., 28755A.
Sheldon Harris Slater, 28749A.
Francis George Halturewicz, 28752A.
Thomas Michael O'Shaughnessy, 28751A.
Howard Bruce Mall, 28754A.
Robert Joseph Jay, 27951A.
Roy Edward Shy, 28762A.
Gerald Wayne Anderson, 28763A.
David Jerome Vanyo, 28764A.
Sterling Doug Goode, 28765A.
Samuel Charles Pennington 3d, 28768A.
Ray Dudley McLaughlin, 28767A.
Gerald Waltman, 28766A.
Darr Lee Goss, 28769A.
David Victor Pearson, 28770A.
George Cotchett Lynch, 27953A.
Henry Fillmore Hartsell, 28772A.
James Douglas Butt, 28771A.
John Albert Mason, 28774A.
Donald Jerome Waldron, 28773A.
Marc Stanley Barthello, Jr., 28775A.
Nicholas Henry Howell, 28776A.
John Marshall Blake, 28777A.
Willie Allen Knight, Jr., 28778A.
Alvin Edgar Gilless, 27954A.
John David Tabor, 27955A.
Leonard Alvin Perlich, 28779A.
Jerry Dee Oberhelman, 27957A.
John Jerrold Collier, Jr., 27956A.
George Lamont Von Tersch, 28781A.
Donald Nelson Benbow, 28780A.
Herbert Arthur Million, 27960A.
Robert Lewis LaPenta, 27959A.
Rex William Bennett, 27958A.
Gordon Rees Williams, 27961A.
Lowell Lee Crawford, 27962A.
Billy James King, 28796A.
Robert James Powers, 28794A.
Billy James Kittrell, 28789A.
Thomas Michael Oakes, 28792A.
Dwight Ernest Bigelow, Jr., 28783A.
William David Hughes, 28787A.
Thomas Kevin Gallagher, 28786A.
Karl Stanley Karrenbrock, 28788A.
William James Cullen, Jr., 28784A.
John Gilbert Eklund, 28785A.
Kenneth Milford Knox, 28790A.
Virgil Clifford McAmis, 28791A.
Daniel Andrew Ball, 28782A.
Ruric Herschel Wester, Jr., 28795A.
James George Macoubray, Jr., 27963A.
Samuel Ernest Fields, 27964A.
Warren E. Beaumont, 27965A.
Richard David Boswell, 28800A.
Albert Joseph DeGroote, 28799A.
James Alpheus Scott, 28797A.
Robert Perry Wakefield, 28798A.
Morton Richard Jacobs, 27966A.
Donald James Pfannenstiel, 28801A.
Donald Sherwin Goodrich, Jr., 28802A.
John Kenneth Mooney, 28803A.
Marvin Lewis Montgomery, 28804A.
Clifford Otto Carl Henning, Jr., 27967A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Joseph Arthur Baird, Jr., 28005A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 1211, title 10, United States Code:

To be captains

Stephen M. Bandorsky, 14243A.
Bushnell N. Welch, 16721A.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 8294, title 10, United States Code, as modified by the act of April 30, 1956 (70 Stat. 119), and section 8067, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be majors, USAF (Medical)

Max J. Nareff, AO2260971.
Charles L. Willmarth, AO1714842.

To be majors, USAF (Dental)

Richard L. Kienholz, AO1787126.
James M. Strickland, AO3002221.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

James M. Bacos, AO3002361.
Murphy A. Chesney, AO3002388.
Lewis E. Curlee, AO3001197.
Gerald Davis
Robert M. Dean. AO2089204.
William A. Dunnagan, AO2087436.
Donald H. Ferguson, AO2240748.
William V. Fitzsimmons, AO733550.
John S. Forrest, AO3042448.
Bowie L. Grant, AO3001769.
Quitman W. Jones, O2269201.
Strother B. Marshall, AO1912580.
Joseph F. McNally, AO3001377.
Jesse W. Paul, Jr., AO2202166.
John H. Powers, AO4013828.
Michael I. Rehmar, AO2260798.
Eldred T. Richey, Jr., O1941930.
Robert M. Rouse, AO3001820.
Carlos D. Rul-Lan, AO2213419.
Revelle Russell, AO3042040.
Arthur E. Ryan, AO1718245.
Thomas B. Sharp, Jr., O1878056.
William H. H. Shea, AO2238756.
Albert G. Shoptaugh, Jr., AO2261688
Milton J. Smith, O975698.
Charles G. Spivey, Jr.
William N. Stecher, AO3000163.
Dennis J. Sullivan, AO428530.
Howard R. Unger, AO3000006.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Charles A. Allman, Jr., AO2011404.
Bill R. Baker, O1941667.

Robert N. Best
Frank H. Cooley
Harold O. Hanson, AO2241148.
Paul J. Johnson, AO2261597.
Milton J. Kobler, AO1906569.
Ovide R. Leonard
Joseph P. Nicoletti, AO969341.
Donald D. Rose, AO3000345.
J. Martin Snider, AO663787.
Roger O. Stern, O982138.
Maurice R. Wilson, Jr.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Wallace R. Alexander
Albert S. Anderson, AO3044795.
Dewey J. Bailey, Jr.
Laurence T. Beahan
Edwin A. Bowman
Lawrence O. Broussard, Jr., AO3044055.
Kenneth P. Carlson, O1342240.
Elwyn C. Cook, O2275439.
David W. Croft
James L. Cross
James P. Demetry, AO2065912.
James A. Gorman, Jr., AO667284.
Jere D. Guin, AO2230913.
Richard D. Hansen, AO3000305.
John L. Jackson, AO2205038.
Edward A. Karl, AO3000054.
John H. Koning
Frank R. Lecocq, AO3041649.
John B. Longenhagen
Donald E. McNealy
Jesse A. Miller, Jr., AO3043753.
Francis C. Null, Jr., O2003481.
Miguel Perez-Arzola
Paul J. Radlet, O2208758.
William W. Rueve
W. T. Snodgrass, AO3044668.
Richard H. Weatherall, AO2216490.
Eugene O. Wiggs
Jack H. Wilson, AO1856520.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Richard W. Hungerford, AO3001320.
Robert G. Leitzel, AO3043601.
Thomas P. Logan
Robert M. Morrow, AO3001211.
James R. Smith, AO3001430.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 8291, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation for the performance of duty as indicated under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code:

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Nurse)

Marilyn L. Steffel, AN2243729.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

To be second lieutenants

Robert G. Applebaugh, AO3064327.
David L. Aufderstrasse, AO3064457.
Billy J. Beasley, AO3064486.
David L. Belden, AO3064475.
Donald D. Bendell, AO3064487.
Myron B. Boucher, Jr., AO3056334.
Thomas E. Boyle, AO3064179.
Walter J. Brug, Jr., AO3064621.
Richard W. Burton, AO3065432.
Dennis P. Cannon, AO3065016.
John L. Chambers, AO3065055.
Stuart E. Cleveland, AO3064867.
Clifford R. Crooker, AO3065106.
James H. Daily, AO3064540.
Frank R. Davis, AO3064733.
Paul B. Davis, AO3064869.
Robert F. Davis, AO3064836.
Edward P. Dopler, Jr., AO3064834.
Russell D. Everman, AO3064757.
Thomas C. Freund, AO3064634.
Daniel T. Gilman, Jr., AO3064893.
Benoyne S. Greseth, AO3064426.
Hugh T. Gunn, AO3065265.
Thomas E. Hatch, AO3064942.
Robert A. Hensel, AO3065276.
Billie L. Hensley, AO3065177.
David J. Hering, AO3064717.
George G. Jackson, AO3064558.
Franklin E. Jassmann, AO3064637.
George A. Kersey, Jr., AO3058867.
Charles P. Land, AO3064719.
Charles Loucks, AO3058618.
Jarmon A. Lynch, Jr., AO3058619.
Harold C. Maggard, AO3056309.
Terry L. Malkiewicz, AO3065269.
Harold Mandell, AO3064776.
Robert O. Maxwell, AO3065245.
Leo E. McCoomb, AO3064435.
Edward D. Miller, AO3064687.
Joseph D. Moore, AO3064847.
Robert E. Nolan, Jr., AO3056437.
Neils Peak, AO3064474.
Edmund C. Perkins, AO3056440.
Allen B. Peterson, AO3064492.
Ralph D. Poe, AO3056441.
Harold M. Reece, AO3065452.
Harry E. Rice, Jr., AO3065066.
Warren Y. Riggs, AO3065041.
Richard W. Schoonmaker, AO3064913.
Raymond A. Seaman, AO3064914.
Donald A. Sibson, AO3064647.
David A. Slater, AO3064483.
Billy R. Smith, AO3065204.
Clarence T. Smith, AO3056352.
David L. Stockbridge, AO3056460.
James E. Sweeney, AO3064646.
Donald D. Thompson, AO3058266.
Gerald F. Thompson, AO3065207.
Eric F. Trupp, AO3065046.
James C. Underhill, AO3065102.
Alan B. Walters, AO3064885.
Donald L. Weibel, AO3064703.
George A. Wiltse, AO3064706.
Ernest E. Wolfe, AO3056474.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

Philip J. Anderson	James G. Jones
Richard N. Brodie	Joseph P. Keck, Jr.
Leo L. Carney	Everett D. Laird
Alan R. Cole	William N. McKinney
Lawrence R. Cotter	Ronald J. Morgan
Yale R. Davis, Jr.	Glen D. Montgomery
C. Neale Elsby	Furney Powell
William G. Gibson	Robert M. Stimac
Reginald S. Goodwin, Jr.	James A. Stockton
James L. Griggs, Jr.	Savery G. Stuckey
Glen R. Horton	Thomas D. Tedrick
Lloyd K. Houchin	Joseph M. Tvardzik
James E. Hulley	Paul E. Vining
	Edward F. Williams III

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Robert Goldthwaite, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Frank T. Watkins, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Wallace M. Beakley, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Ingolf N. Kiland, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Richard H. Phillips	Goldsborough S. Patrick
Jack P. Monroe	Roy S. Benson
Robert H. Speck	David J. Welsh
Arnold W. McKechnie	Donald T. Eller
Arthur H. Taylor	Almon E. Loomis
William O. Burch, Jr.	Edward C. Stephan
William E. Howard, Jr.	Whitmore S. Butts
Ralph K. James	Frank A. Brandley
Thomas A. Ahroon	William E. Gentner, Jr.
Michael F. D. Flaherty	Leonidas D. Coates, Jr.
Edward A. Hannegan	Ephraim P. Holmes
Robert T. S. Keith	John T. Hayward
Basil N. Rittenhouse, Jr.	Lynne C. Quiggle
John F. Davidson	Joseph E. Dodson
Charles O. Triebel	Vernon L. Lowrance
Reynold D. Hogle	Charles C. Kirkpatrick
	Alfred G. Ward

MEDICAL CORPS

Frank P. Gilmore

SUPPLY CORPS

Aubrey J. Bourgeois
Leland P. Kimball, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Martin W. Kehart
Albert J. Fay
Horace B. Jones

DENTAL CORPS

Clifford C. De Ford

The following-named officer for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Naval Reserve:

William H. Christensen

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

REAR ADMIRAL, LINE

Harold M. Briggs	Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr.
William E. Ferrall	Eugene B. McKinney
William M. Nation	George F. Beardsley
Walter H. Price	Wellington T. Hines
Harold T. Deutermann	William R. Sheeley
Charles L. Melson	William E. Howard, Jr.
Charles K. Bergin	Ralph K. James
Robert E. Dixon	Leonidas D. Coates, Jr.

REAR ADMIRAL, MEDICAL CORPS

French R. Moore
Walter F. James
Bruce E. Bradley

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS

John W. Crumpacker
Aubrey J. Bourgeois
Leland P. Kimball, Jr.

REAR ADMIRAL, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Wallace B. Short	Albert J. Fay
Martin W. Kehart	Horace B. Jones

REAR ADMIRAL, DENTAL CORPS

Clifford C. De Ford

The following-named officer for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Leon J. Jacobi

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general:

Schilt, Christian F.
Pepper, Robert H.

Maj. Gen. Ion M. Bethel, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major

general, for a period of 2 years from the 1st day of January 1957.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

McCaul, Verne J.
Snedeker, Edward W.
Wornham, Thomas A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Shapley, Alan
Luckey, Robert B.
Binney, Arthur F.
Ennis, Thomas G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Wirsig, Frank H.
Luckey, Robert B.
Binney, Arthur F.
Ennis, Thomas G.
Croft, Frank C.
Dyer, Edward C.
DeWitt, Ralph B.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Battell, William P.
Cloud, George H.
Brunelli, Austin R.
Bowser, Alpha L.
Tschirgi, Harvey C.
Kier, Avery R.
Wade, Sidney S.
Masters, James M., Sr.
Rottet, Ralph K.
Shaw, Samuel R.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Howarth, James E., Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abercrombie, Theodore J.
Akers, Charles O.
Albin, George W.
Alford, Lodwick H.
Allen, Charles L. D.
Alley, Murlin W.
Arbes, James D.
Aymond, John P.
Bacon, Noel R.
Bagby, Oliver W.
Ballentyne, Robert D., Jr.
Bampton, Frank W.
Bardshar, Frederic A.
Barnes, Jess W.
Barr, Capers G., Jr.
Bell, Clarence E., Jr.
Berg, Alvin C.
Bergman, Howard J.
Bernard, William B.
Berthrong, Raymond
Bettinger, Joe L., Jr.
Beveridge, Richard A.
Blackwood, Herbert B.
Bland, John T., III
Bogart, Frank L.
Bogley, John A.
Bowdey, George W.
Bower, Carl R.
Boyd, James A.
Boyd, Robert G.
Brassfield, Arthur J.
Brown, Frederick W., Jr.
Brown, Gaylord B.
Brown, Ira W., Jr.
Broyles, Ned L.
Bruning, Robert M., Jr.
Buass, Marion H.
Burgess, Andrew L.
Burke, Edmund, Jr.
Butler, Glen B.
Byrnes, Robert B.
Calhoun, Charles R.
Callahan, Cornelius P., Jr.
Cameron, Gerald L.
Campbell, Duncan A.
Carrison, Daniel J.
Centner, Richard L.
Chalmers, George E.
Christie, William F.
Clark, Alto B.
Collins, Thomas W., Jr.
Collum, William J., Jr.
Conrad, Homer E.
Conroy, Thomas L.
Corcoran, Daniel J.
Court, John M.
Cox, Robert D., Jr.
Crabill, Charles H., Jr.
Crews, Howard W.
Crowley, Roger J., Jr.
Cunha, George D. M.
Curran, James H.
Dalton, George F.
Dare, James A.
Davis, Jack C.
Davis, Lewis F.
Davis, Nathaniel B., Jr.
Davis, Richard J.
Davis, Will J., Jr.
Davison, William H.
DeLaureal, Henry H.
DeVico, Anthony J.
Diekhoff, Arold H.
Dimpfel, Emerson H.
Dinsmore, John R.
DiPirro, Charles
Doughty, Morris R.
Downing, Arthur L.
Duffy, Gerald H.
Duncan, Richard L.
Egbert, Gordon R.
Eisenhart, George N.
Fagan, Robert H.
Fairfax, Eugene G.
Farmer, Claude S.
Farwell, Arthur F., Jr.
Ferriter, John B.
Finn, William S.
Fisher, Guin M.
Foster, Thomas M.
Fryer, Norman E., Jr.
Funk, Harold N.
Furlong, Donald
Ganyard, Bricker M.
Gavitt, Severance W.
Geis, Lawrence R.
Gerdon, Harold P.
Gordon, Charles V.
Graves, Herbert S.
Grell, Theodore A.
Griffin, Donald
Gugliotta, Guy F.
Guinan, Timothy J.
Haines, John L.
Halloran, Edward R.
Hance, Kenneth P.
Harbert, Charles W.
Harding, Edwin T.
Hardy, Leonard R.
Hargreaves, James C.
Harper, Robert M.
Harrington, Daniel J., III
Harris, David L.
Harris, Thomas D.
Hart, Charles S.
Hart, Joseph E.
Hartigan, Charles C., Jr.
Harty, Harry L., Jr.
Haselton, Henry T.
Hayes, Richard M.
Healy, Charles E.
Helfrich, Harry D., Jr.
Hermanson, Joseph M.
Heyer, Frank D.
Hilgedick, Winfred C.
Hillis, Thomas W.
Hilton, John J. Jr.
Hizer, DeVon M.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Holt, Alexander C., Jr.
Honan, John B.
Hoolhorst, Robert A.
Hooper, Frederic A.
Hubbell, Lester E.
Hughes, Jack J.
Humphreys, George C.
Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
Hushing, William C.
Hutchins, Robert B.
Ingham, Thomas R.
Jackson, Andrew D., Jr.
Jarvis, Benjamin, C.
Jennings, Verne A.
Johnson, Cevil V.
Johnston, Charles H. Jr.
Johnston, Means, Jr.
Kellogg, Frederic D.
Kenny, Edward T.
Kiem, Edwin L.
Kinsella, Charles W.
Kipp, John M.
Kitch, William L.
Klein, Doyen
Kleiss, Norman J.
Kroeger, Edwin J.
Lafferty, Kenneth F.
Lambing, Charles L.
Lancaster, Norman G.
Lavery, Richard J.
Lawler, Joseph T.
Lefever, Robert C.
Leon, Strauss S.
Levy, Donald R.
Lindsey, Robin M.
Lloyd, Henry F.
Lockwood, Ralph H.
Lyngby, Alfred R.
Mackroth, John R.
Magennis, Edward G.
Mandel, Herbert I.
Manown, Edward S.
Manser, Burton R.
Marinke, Charles A.
Mather, Lee W.
McAllister, Joseph D.
McCurtain, James H.
McDonald, Lucien B.
McDowell, Joseph M.
McManus, John W.
McQuiston, Lionel T.
Meyer, Otto F., Jr.
Michael, Willard D. L.
Millard, Robert C.
Miller, Hugh B., Jr.
Miller, Jim D.
Miller, Walter B.
Minner, Delbert M.
Moffett, Charles S.
Moore, Frederick T., Jr.
Morrison, Charles H., Jr.
Morse, Walter H.
Munson, William H.
Nace, Charles D.
Oldfield, James C.
Olson, Clarence E.
O'Malley, George F.
Onstott, Jacob W.
Palmer, James M.
Parker, James F.
Parker, Oscar B.
Pawka, Edward J.
Pear, John F.
Peters, Maurice A.
Peterson, Dale K.
Pew, Leslie A.
Pond, Charles E.
Powell, Ward F.
Quense, John A.
Ramage, James D.
Ratliff, William "K"
Rawie, Wilmer E.
Read, Samuel H. P., Jr.
Refo, Miles P., III
Reigart, John M.
Rhodemyre, John L.
Rice, Richard H.
Rigg, James F.
Robertson, Charles M.
Robinson, Kenneth G.
Robinson, Thomas
Roemer, Charles E.
Rogozienski, Frank E.
Romberger, William M.
Rommel, Herbert F., Jr.
Rudden, Thomas J., Jr.
Rynd, Robert W.
Saunders, Thomas F., Jr.
Savage, Arthur M.
Sawyer, William T.
Schlegel, Rowland F.
Schreiter, Ernest F.
Schroeder, Fred J.
Schuyler, Irving J.
Schwartz, John R.
Scott, Albert Peter
Scott, George W., Jr.
Semmes, Raphael, Jr.
Shoenhair, Jack L.
Short, Norman S.
Shuman, Edwin A., Jr.
Silk, Francis W.
Sinnott, Robert E.
Skuzinski, Charles F.
Smith, Ellsworth N.
Smith, Emory C.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Millard J.
Snider, George W.
Snipes, Beecher
Snow, Franklin C.
Spencer, Frank A.
Stanley, Onia B., Jr.
Stay, Charles A.
Steigelman, Edward T.
Suddath, Thomas H.
Sullivan, Eugene T. B.
Superfine, Irving J.
Swanson, Chandler W.
Swanson, Leroy V.
Syverson, Douglas N.
Taylor, Edward J.
Teich, Richard J.
Vannoy, Frank W.
Verbrycke, "J" Russell III
Vinock, Eli
Wallace, William E.
Washington, Thomas, Jr.
Wedell, Edward V.
Wehmeyer, Wilber J.
Weiler, Herold J., Jr.
Welden, Frederick
Wells, Wade C.
Whitby, Frank R., Jr.
White, Thomas S.
Whiteman, Armand D.
Whitney, Laurens A.
Whittier, Mark T.
Williams, Gordon B.
Wood, Robert H.
Woodfin, Richard H.
Wootton, James C.
Wright, James D.

MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, Jesse F.
Bachman, Kenneth P.
Banks, Lawrence E.
Beckman, Edward L.
Bond, Sidney D., Jr.
Brooks, Ralph K.
Callagan, Dwight A.
Canfield, Earle G.
Cheffey, John H.
Childs, Donald R.
Clare, Frank B.
Clark, Gale G.
Courtney, Marvin D.
Cronemiller, Philip D.
Cunningham, James K.
Dewilton, Edward L.
Dobos, Nicholas E.
Dominey, Joseph B., Jr.
Doolittle, Robert C.
Faaland, Halvdan G. K.
Faucett, Ralph E.
Goebel, John E.
Hall, Clifford R.
Hill, Howard W.
Kaufman, James A.
McArtor, James R.
McCabe, John F.
McMahon, Francis J.
Nadbath, Rudolph P.
Neikirk, William I.
Newton, Charles B.
Osborne, David P.
Pino, Daniel M.
Price, John J., Jr.
Rusher, Merrill W.
Sarkisian, Sarkis S.
Smith, Bruce H., Jr.
Smith, William L.
Stalter, Robert A.
Stoecklein, Herbert G.
Stover, John H., Jr.
Stryker, William S.
Tarr, George H., Jr.
True, Dewitt S.
Vaupel, George E.
Walker, Granville I.
Watkins, Dale B.
Weiss, Harry A.
Wineinger, Gerald E.
Zuska, Albert J.
Whipple, Robert J.
Standard, Roger A.
Morris, Mason, Jr.
Hunter, Henry J.
Meador, George E.
Kaess, Karl V.
McDonough, Oscar T., Jr.
Streit, Harold A.
Olson, Nelse O.
Arje, Sidney L.
Armington, Fred W.
Messersmith, John L.
Voris, Frank B.
Tyburczy, Joseph A.
Stocker, George E. F.
Lawrence, Richard, Jr.
Mills, Dawson A.
Engle, Paul R.
Moeller, Ernst R.
Moran, Charles E.
Mugrage, Ralph M.
Sill, John T.
Penington, Robert, Jr.
Shaul, John F.
Hersh, David H.
Norris, Neal
Beuerman, Virgil A.
Stutsman, Robert E.
Hawks, Byron L.
Hutchinson, Glenn D.
Conley, John L.
Peabody, Sherman M.
Fuller, Roger H.
Kelley, Richard E.
Stroud, Clyde S., Jr.
Kwiatkowski, Peter S.
Hall, William J.
Ballenger, Felix P.
Nay, Newell
Dillon, James R., Jr.
Roy, Gustave A.
Boland, John D.
Waters, Wayne W.
Hottenstein, David F.
Murphy, John M.
Carlson, Frederick B.
Watkins, George S.
Turney, William B.
Berry, Reginald V.
Shepard, Bruce M.
Duffy, Thomas L.
Riddle, Lindsay R.
Lummis, Wilbur S.
Seal, John R.
Christensen, Roland A.
Moore, Jerome A.
Russell, George W.
Morris, Albert E.
Bierley, John R.
Virgilio, Frank D.
King, James D.
Bradshaw, Robert H.
Connelly, Joseph R.
Lawson, William G.
Jaruszewski, Edward J.
Goldthwaite, Dana D.
Deen, Robert R.
Boyers, James H.
Mullin, Charles S., Jr.
O'Donoghue, John A.

Brimson, James A.
Chace, John F.
Hague, James D.
Meadows, Henry H., Jr.
Pearson, Rufus J., Jr.
Firoved, James W.
Saraniero, Gioconda R.
Robinson, William C.
Huston, J. Wilson
Lockwood, James H.
Tebow, Louis E.
Wurzel, Edward M.
Ballenberger, Lovis P.
Ennis, Henry R.
Holler, Moffitt K.
Scanlin, Harold R.
Senter, Vance E.
Duffner, Gerald J.
Phillips, Philip B.
Christoph, Robert F.
Talbot, Blake S.
King, Elmer R.
Horton, Samuel H., Jr.
McCurdy, Jack C.
Nova, Philip L.
Jahnke, Leonard P.
Brody, Sidney I.
Patterson, Walter
Tucker, Wilson D.
Norman, Clyde W.
Casteel, Byron D.
Schugmann, Robert F.
Hallborg, Robert B.
Gerber, Marvin L.
Vogel, Joseph
Thompson, Samuel V.
Canaga, Bruce L., Jr.
Bundens, Warner D., Jr.
Bassham, Byron E.
Crafft, William M.
Hansen, Wayne S.
Pinto, Joseph C.
Ross, Ralph D.
Wulfman, William A.
Miller, Arthur V., Jr.
Addison, James A.
Robie, William A.
Cantrell, William C.
Wilbur, Carl E.
Wertheimer, Haskell
Errion, Arthur R.
Rieder, John J.
Allis, Edward K., Jr.
Humphries, Joseph E.
Henderson, William W.
Livingood, William C.
Christy, Ralph L., Jr.
Wallace, Raymond A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adams, Henry P.
Allis, Frederick A.
Atkinson, Wallace L., Jr.
Brighton, Edward E.
Bush, William J.
Cherry, Jerome
Cope, Raymond W.
Coutu, Louis A.
Davis, James J., Jr.
Durham, Henry O., Jr.
Frampton, Woodley E.
Fuller, Thomas
Glocheski, Virgil R.
Grahn, Karl A., Jr.
Greenhalgh, William T.
Heck, Charles B.
Hoard, Douglas H.
Lee, Curtis J.
Letterman, Lincoln L.
Lovig, Lawrence, Jr.
Martin, Fowler W.
Millson, Wallace F.
Morrison, William C., Jr.
Muller, William F.
Neel, Daniel O.
Norton, David C.
Peckham, Charles W.
Rice, Gilbert M.
Robertson, John B.
Sims, Marion D., Jr.
Smith, Franklin D.
Stafford, Otis W.
Stewart, Fred B.
Stokes, Maynard G.
Tolbert, Harmon S.
Twitchell, William A.
Van Donge, Charles J.
Waite, George T.
Webster, James K.
Wheeler, Kenneth R.
Whittemore, Robert M.
Willis, Enos H.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barnes, Ernest R.
Cook, Abner R.
McGann, Francis L.
Shilling, John H.

DENTAL CORPS

Aldridge, William A.
Bonnette, Paul C.
Cathcart, John H.
Cermak, George L.
Conant, Julian R.
Cooper, Richard G.
Edwards, Irwin G.
Eubank, Dillard P., Jr.
Gray, Gus W.
Hass, Albert P.
Hedman, Warren J., Jr.
Joseph, Robert L.
Kaires, Anthony K.
Keener, John L.
Manke, Wilbert C.
Marking, William M.
Mosson, Lester H.
Oesterle, Albert R.
Pruitt, Charles C., Jr.
Reilly, John V.
Richardson, Glenn D.
Rudolph, Charles E., Jr.
Rupp, Nelson W.
Tande, Syrus E.
Van Damm, Vincent W.
White, Dan B.
Williams, Robert M.
Bercier, Charles H.
Etter, Frank K.
Leisz, Albert P.
Thomas, William M.
Schindler, Robert D.
Ohl, Richard W.
Frizzell, Edmund H.
Nielsen, Arne G.
Eastman, Arthur D.
King, William D.
Hogan, John A.
Kleinman, Max W.
Sorensen, John T.
Barker, Irvin R.
Burnett, Robert F.
Goldhaber, Samuel
Smith, Cyrus D.
Gelb, Martin J.
Secrest, Robert H.
Tuma, Richard F.
McClellan, Willard R.
Siemer, Harold N.
Hanley, Walter F.
Rhen, Louis J.
Young, Robert B.
Shiffert, Duane R.
Wiseman, John E.
Miller, Gordon L.
Cunningham, Silas D.
Bohn, Clayton L.
Vogel, Albert L., Jr.
McAtee, Von Rue
Peat, Walter H.
Wozniak, Frank S., Jr.
Crolius, William E., Jr.
Ralston, Harold J.
Hodge, Ferris G.
Riney, Lyman H.
Gullett, William I.
McInturff, Allen L.
Levitz, Oliver S.
Leberman, Odin F.
Carney, Bruce H.
Jakubs, Stanley
Couvillon, Wade E., Jr.
Lang, Paul G.
Gallegher, Walter N.
Kops, Eugene J.
Madden, Edwin J.
Felcyn, Walter V.
Superko, Harold R.
Scola, Francis P.
Murff, Clarence Y., Jr.
Reader, James C.
Graves, Raymond J.
Pepper, John W., Jr.
Towle, Herbert J., Jr.
Miller, Charles W.
Collins, Robert S.
Brandon, William C., Jr.
Jerkofsky, Gus J.
Sandman, George H.
Frantz, Leroy R.
Dwyer, William D.
Thayer, Ernest A.
Kelly, Jack J.
Bradshaw, Frederick H.
Lukins, Frederick B.
Lofgreen, Eugene J.
Gleisten, Howard P.
Sample, Theodore C.
Parker, John A.
Jones, John P.
Stewart, Craig A.
Ferris, John B.
Robie, John C.
Walsh, Eugene A.
Loring, Arthur J.
Sheppard, Furman L.
Harrison, William J.
King, Jan F.
Smith, George M.
Friesz, Raymond H.
Leonard, Melvin R.
Missman, Byrnes E.
Fridley, Harry H.
Miller, John W.
Rubba, Anthony
Nutting, Edwin B.
Tessman, Clarence C.
Moore, Edward W.
Curreri, Rosolino J.
Schneider, John J.
Trick, Wilbur A.
Blackwood, Robert M.
Phillips, Robert D.
Scott, Ralph H. S.
Peterson, Richard V.
Loving, Robert H.
Dobyns, Frank D.
Mead, Meredith H.
Ryan, Hugh D.
Huebsch, Raymond F.
Brenning, Leo E.
Hansen, Louis S.
Leclaire, George J.
Atkins, John H.
Bernard, Damon E.
Shipley, Norman B.
Morgan, Wade H., Jr.
Costa, Angelo B.
Madden, George E.
Gargiulo, Edward A. H.
Hildreth, Edward R.
Bowman, John F.
Moore, George T., Jr.
Morgan, Kenneth L.
Rusk, William S.
Howell, Sidney R.
Pierce, Howard W.
Johnson, Harvey S.
Luallen, Leslie J.
Heck, Charles M.
Weaver, Walter A.
Moore, Paul A.
Wallace, Allen L.
Dierker, Wilbert M.
Rogers, James G., Jr.
Dudley, George E.
McGonnell, Joseph P.
Walter, George W., Jr.
Feder, Harold W.
Scherer, George F.
Losee, Fred L.
Middleton, Robert A.
Young, Lawrence
Flocken, John E.
Thomlinson, Christopher E., Jr.
Stoopack, Jerome C.
Cook, Francis W.
Hall, J. Kenneth
McKinney, Jackson F.
Chapman, Judge C.
Walker, Rupert S.
Fernandez, Sergio
Ashwell, James T.
Ostrom, Carl A.
Gerry, Roger G.
Stoll, John B.
Koonce, Glen
Lytle, Robert B.
Gardner, Edward N.
Lange, Ronald W.
Hopfer, Lorenz G.
Parker, Mack L.
Hill, David A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Grinsted, Alan D.
Ruebush, Trenton K.
Sullivan, Raymond R.
Taylor, Russell L.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Thomas H.
Ackerman, John F.
Adair, Robert F.
Adams, Loraine S.
Adams, Thomas H.
Ady, Joseph W.
Alexander, Kent
Anderson, Jack D.
Andrews, Carroll C.
Andrews, William G., Jr.
Appleton, Woodbury
Bachman, Julius J. T.
Baird, Lawrence I.
Baker, Alex
Balestri, William L.
Barden, Kenneth P.
Barron, William B., Jr.
Barton, Elbert M., Jr.
Bates, William C.
Berger, Eugene B.
Berriman, Joseph C.
Biedebach, Herbert E.
Birdsong, "D" John
Black, James B.
Blakely, Silas M.
Bloom, Paul J.
Bogdanovitch, Philip "M"
Boice, Grant
Bolt, William H., Jr.
Braithwaite, John T.
Brown, Leslie E.
Bryant, Carleton F., Jr.
Bryant, Harold V.
Bucklew, Oscar T.
Buxton, Elliott A.
Carman, Charles W.
Cassidy, Richard M.
Caton, Jessie L., Jr.
Charles, John F.
Chesky, Kaz P.
Chimiak, Walter
Cochran, Elvin P., Jr.
Colkitt, Benjamin E.
Coldewelh, Irwin R.
Collins, Vincent W.
Cook, William E.
Cormack, John G.
Cornie, Lynn J.
Courtin, Robert E., Jr.
Cox, Robert F.
Cox, William R.
Craw, Nelson W.
Cruse, Carl Mann
Cummins, Hersch M., Jr.
Cummins, LaVerne W.
Cummins, William E.
Curley, Clyde W.
Davis, Darrell D.
Davis, John K., Jr.
Dennis, Michael P.
Devoid, Thorpe G.
Dibrell, David M.
Dixon, William C.
Doering, Wallace S.
Donahue, Conrad
Douglas, Daniel E.
Douglas, John T.
Doyle, William J.
Dresel, Robert F.
Duke, Gus G.
Dunham, Frank C., Jr.
Durna, Gordon A.
Edgerton, Stuart T., Jr.
Edwards, Robert E.
Engelman, Ralph
Estes, Leland E., Jr.
Everett, William H.
Feliz, Jack M.
Fern, Benjamin
Fifield, John G.
Fitzgerald, Mark E.
Flournoy, Richard, Jr.
Foltz, Frank E.
Ford, Orin N.
Fox, John E.
Franco, Thomas E.
Frankiewicz, Edward J.
Freer, Charles H.
Frey, Gordon J.
Frick, Whitman H.
Fruin, Jack L.
Frye, Robert M.
Gardella, Albert E.
Gaston, James Otis
Giamotti, Robert
Gieszl, Carl R.
Gillette, Keith P.
Gimpel, Herbert J.
Gleeson, Richard G.
Gormsen, James H.
Graffy, Richard
Graham, Robert E.
Gray, John A., Jr.
Grazda, Melvin G.
Griffin, James T.
Hacker, Arthur E.
Hagadorn, Steven B.
Hahn, William R.
Haithcock, June D
Haley, Herbert O.
Hall, George M.
Hamby, William M.
Hansen, Howard C.
Hansen, John L.
Hardy, Thomas H.
Hartman, Raymond G.
Hartman, William F.
Hathaway, George C., Jr.
Hazelton, Dewitt W.
Heflin, Edward A.
Heidt, Webster B., Jr.
Heising, Kenneth W.
Henning, Richard E.
Hickman, Berton H.
Hill, Hubert D.
Hitchins, William S.
Hodgson, Gordon S.
Hoffman, Richard L.
Hopkins, William A.
Hoppe, Robert T.
Huber, Robert L., Jr.
Hudeck, Raymond W.
Huestis, Gerald S.
Hufstedler, Edward F.
Hughes, Albert "G", Jr.
Iler, John Robert
Ireland, Warren H.
Izac, E. V. M., Jr.
Jacobs, Ralph, Jr.
Jeffers, William
Jester, Walter H.
Johnson, Ivar A.
Jones, Edward H.
Judith, Joseph H.
Kalstad, Henry M.
Kanapicki, Kasimir
Kelsey, John W., Jr.
Kenton, Howard B.
Kiernan, William A.
Kimbrel, Robert W.
Kimener, Robert A.
Kincaid, John R.
Knoche, John H.
Koch, Donald R.
Kozak, Norbert John
Kuhn, Melvin M., Jr.
Kuntz, Robert E.
Lancaster, William W.
Lang, Marvin H.
Langer, Chester R.
Langford, Newell N.
Langford, James R.
Larkin, Edward J.
Larsen, Orrin K.
Larson, Rueben D.
Larson, Richard
Laubach, Eugene K.
Lavelle, James V.
Lemly, Frederick H., Jr.
Lindstrom, Leonard L.
Livingston, Robert L.
Lorentson, Adrian V.
Love, John J. Jr.
Lovett, John F.
Mancini, Armido E.
Mayo, Frank V.
McCarroll, Arthur O.
McCarthy, Cornelius A.
McDaniel, Jerry F.
McGhee, James H.
McGuire, Clair A.
McKee, Robert L. J.
McKenzie, Frank E.
McLane, Alpine W.
Mead, Robert J.
Mereness, Robert H.
Metze, George M.
Meyer, John W.
Meyer, John M.
Middagh, William F.
Miller, Myrl R.
Miller, Winston L.

Mills, Charles A., Jr.
Misner, Chester C.
Monahan, John J.
Monger, Ralph F.
Morse, John S.
Myles, Harley D.
Nagle, Charles L., Jr.
Nall, Royce Lowell
Naureckas, John M.
Nelson, Arthur A.
Nelson, Loren E.
Nelson, Leo W.
Nicholas, Lester J.
Now, John G.
Oakley, Robert D Jr.
Oglesby, Earl V.
Oller, John S., Jr.
Pahl, Herschel A.
Payne, Paul E.
Peale, William T.
Perkins, Tom A.
Peterson, Harry W.
Pickler, David A.
Pitcher, William A.
Pulford, Stafford S.
Rains, David C.
Reddy, Thomas F.
Reeves, George J.
Reeves, Goodwyn G.
Regester, Richard P.
Remillard, Lafayette W.
Reynolds, Thomas E.
Rian, Gerald R.
Richardson, Dean C.
Richey, Maurice H.
Ricks, Robert
Robinson, Evans J.
Robison, Bob John
Rogers, Robert A., III
Romaine, Robert R.
Rosen, Ralph J.
Ryner, Evan H.
Sampson, Richard A. H.
Sanborn, Richard W.
Sarno, Joseph J.
Sayner, Donald K.
Schaefer, William W., II
Scheid, Waldo W.
Scholes, James A.
Sears, Ferrell D.
Seelinger, Robert A.
Setser, Lester E. G.
Shackford, Robert W.
Shanks, Lawrence B.
Sharp, George H.
Shawcross, William H.
Shelton, William T.
Shofner, Orville W.
Shuff, John W., Jr.
Sims, Russell W., Jr.
Singletary, William C.
Skon, Warren A.
Smith, Thomas Bowden
Solomon, Harry L.
Speicher, Paul E., Jr.
Spenser, Ray Arden
Spooner, William A.
Spuhler, Ralph W.
Staeheli, George W.
Stanford, Vernon D.
Stevenson, Nevin J., Jr.
Stinemates, Daniel H.
Stinson, John F. J.
Stock, Glenn C.
Stronski, Edmund J.
Struthers, Frederick E.
Sudduth, Roy Martin
Sullivan, Thomas J.
Sullivan, Philip H.
Taddeo, Alfred S.
Tate, Ben R., Jr.
Taylor, Sidney E.
Tayoun, George K., Jr.
Ternasky, Eugene F.
Thiele, Ray F.
Tompkins, John D.
Unruh, Robert D.
Volpi, Ray A.
Voorhees, Louis E.
Walker, Donald P.
Wallace, Robert Q.
Weber, Boyd Y.
Webster, Harvey O., Jr.
Weible, Robert C.
Weller, Richard H.
Westray, William H.
Whitmore, Quentin R.
Whitworth, Billis L.
Wiesemann, Arthur C., Jr.
Williams, Edward A.
Winner, Hal M.
Wood, Edward E.
Woodall, John W., Jr.
Wright, Graydon D.
Yesensky, Albert S.
Young, Neil W.
Yount, Robert R.
Ziegler, William F.
Zimdars, Roy W. R.
Zimmer, David W.
Zinn, Charles S.

MEDICAL CORPS

Benavides, Jaime M., Jr.
Bryan, Frank M.
Byrd, Jack E.
Callis, Charles M.
Cunningham, Lowell K.
Curts, Calvin J.
Davis, Robert L.
Dobbie, Robert P., Jr.
Doohen, Donald J.
Erdbrink, Wayne L.
Fox, Samuel M., III
George, Frederick W., III
Hosp, David H.
Loweecey, Edward D.
Margileth, Andrew M.
McClenathan, James E.
Millar, Jack W.
Mills, Stephen R., Jr.
Montgomery, Duncan O.
Moore, William R.
Parmelee, Kenneth A.
Poitras, Jean M.
Spicer, Donald W.
Wells, Peter F., II
Wiley, Homer P.
Hall, Clifford R.
Climie, Charles F., Jr.
Fleischaker, Robert J.
Wilson, Jay D.
Turville, William C.
Knudhansen, John I. P.
Schlang, Henry A.
Helgerson, Arthur A.
Mackie, Robert W.
Fraser, William E.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Rush, Anthony P.
Jones, Peter H.
Brown, Robert H.
Baker, Howard A.
Anthony, Lynn E.
Willard, Burton
Spicher, Robert W.
Rogers, Charles E.
Semmens, James P.
Deas, Thomas C.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.
Howard, John W.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Dineen, James R.
Burdick, Robert L.
Nauman, Richard D.
Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Brown, Carleton J.
Lewis, Garner L.
Connor, Richard B.
Honsik, Cyril J.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Rowand, Robert E.
Loeffler, Robert A.
VanPetten, George T.
Baisch, Bruce F.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Esswein, John G.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
Martin, Richard J.
Valusek, Fred A.
Kelley, Kenneth J.
Geib, Philip O.
Muehe, Charles C.
Osborne, Frank G., Jr.
Davis, Harold A.
Fuller, Frank D.
Zarriello, Jerry J.
Schmoyer, Maurice R., Jr.
Krasno, Louis R.
Tratar, Anton A.
Brown, Loy T.
Pennypacker, Paul H.
Holmes, Alden V.
Tyler, Lockland V., Jr.
Becker, Frederick B.
McCarthy, Robert J.
Featherston, John S.
Smith, Edward M., Jr.
Park, William F.
Wilson, Theodore H., Jr.
O'Brien, Robert W.
Fultz, Robert E.
Watters, Lorrain E., Jr.
Taylor, George J., III
Stonestreet, Marshall P.
Moschella, Samuel L.
Morrell, James F.
Schwenker, Harry F., Jr.
Wallner, Ernest F., Jr.
Lloyd, Donald E.
Foulk, Richard
Lebherz, Thomas B.
Williams, Robert G. W. Jr.
Wiegand, Frederick G. F.
Steele, Marshall K., Jr.
Arentzen, Willard P.
Sederstrom, Leslie W.
Greaney, Martin O., Jr.
Strunk, William M.
Luehrs, Richard E.
Poynter, James M.
Lewis, Thomas H.
Hamilton, James R.
Greer, James W.
Parker, Edward E.
Zorn, George G., Jr.
Rulon, David B.
Ingram, William B.
Krech, William G.
Hansen, Walter F.
Walter, Herbert L.
Diklich, Milan, Jr.
Dixon, David C.
Houghton, Charles C., Jr.
Taylor, George W., Jr.
Thorn, James I.
Shook, Daniel M.
Lieurance, Richard E.
Hodges, James C., Jr.
Hood, Raleigh M.
Country, John C.
Holmes, James H.
Jenkins, Judson, H.
Whiteside, James E.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Cecil C.
Barensfield, Paul L., Jr.
Berning, John R.
Bishoff, Jack T.
Breen, Owen J., Jr.
Brickley, George R.
Brooks, Marvin L.
Brosseau, Oswald J.
Burns, Robert S.
Colby, Arden K.
Crawford, Grover W.
Cummings, Newell J.
D'Amico, Joseph
Dye, Kenneth R.
French, Ferris L., Jr.
Gavey, Harry E.
Grimes, John
Hanson, Harvey E.
Harvey, Clinton D.
Hays, George O., Jr.
Hasen, Ralph E.
Johnson, Carl P.
Jones, Everett H.
Jones, Harris P.
Kenyon, Lawrence H.
Kiosterud, Viggo H.
Kovar, Isadore M.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Law, Kenneth S.
Lee, Charles R.
Lemmon, Gerald C.
Maiden, Robert W.
Mason, Stanley R.
Miller, John D.
Moore, Donald L.
Moore, Hoyde D.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neely, Joe B.
Nelson, George C.
Oesterich, Lawrence C.
Olsen, Kenneth H.
Owen, Charles S.
Rawson, George S.
Reid, Donald P.
Roberts, Giles H.
Saling, Frederick E.
Scott, Walter E., Jr.
Selden, Doyle W.
Smith, Ira, Jr.
Smith, Joe G., Jr.
Starr, Donald A.
Stonum, Robert H.
Strebel, Kermit W.
Sullivan, John J., Jr.
Thompson, Oscar D.
Walsh, Robert J.
Warren, James A.
Wick, Milton H.
Wieseke, Edward M.
Williams, Earl O.
Williams, Sidney W., Jr.
Wilson, James D.
Woodard, William K.
Wright, John E. C.
York, Edward S.
Powell, Robert C., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Cassady, Florian W.
Cleaves, Richard D.
Lloyd, Paul A.
Marley, Cecil V.
Paul, James W.
Walsh, William J.
Wheeler, George H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Beaver, John P.
Herbert, Edgar, Jr.
Jackson, Norman M.
McCrorey, Charles E.
Mobley, Clarence F.
Terry, Alfred G.

DENTAL CORPS

Batchelder, Richard M.
Boyne, Philip J.
Courage, Guy R.
Evans, Floyd G.
Fairchild, Robert E.
Fedi, Peter F., Jr.
Hay, Richard S.
Hernsmeyer, Melvin L.
Jones, Everard F., Jr.
Kratochvil, Frank J., Jr.
Marble, Howard B., Jr.
Nystul, Oliver G.
Peterson, William A.
Quilter, Ward E., Jr.
Rigterink, Ray A.
Smith, John H.
Stanford, Walter O.
Spann, Sylvester E. W., Jr.
Guay, Edward T.
Gustavson, Arthur E.
Hughes, Francis W.
Sullivan, John E.
Tippin, Joseph G., Jr.
Stolitsky, Justin P.
Hawkins, Donald C.
Rives, Robert G.
Sturm, George, Jr.
Brigance, Frederick W.
Crossmire, George B.
Maxfield, Don L.
Sancier, Henry J.
Hughes, Richard W., Jr.
Pund, Harry C., Jr.
Nickell, Raymond O.
Hancock, Joseph G.
Ogden, Ingram W.
Funk, Russell R., Jr.
Wood, Quentin L.
Dobronte, Frank
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Conglis, Peter C.
Doyle, Eymard L.
Pfaffmann, George A.
Hillis, Walter G.
Rhobotham, Frank B.
Ralls, Walter E.
Riesenberg, William C.
Carmen, Marvin
Castner, David V., Jr.
Bishop, Ralph M.
McGee, Glen H.
Mueller, Ray B.
Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Steinauer, Jerome J.
Anderson, Robert A.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
Ruff, Henry J.
Sheppard, John R.
Lyon, Harvey W.
Newman, Dwight W.
Thimes, Carl B.
Sochowski, Richard T.
Enke, Loren F.
Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
Scofield, Henry H.
Kailer, Charles E.
Suehs, Leon G.
Pape, Thomas J.
Mayo, Thomas H.
Elder, Stewart T.
Sedlacek, James W.
McNett, Roy C.
Valentin, Enrique, Jr.
Beauvais, Hewitt J., Jr.
Bucher, John F.
Mumme, Henry T., Jr.
Brown, James J., Jr.
Nelson, Wayne A.
Wilhelm, Carl L.
Hoffman, Seymour
Scott, Marvin H.
Hutton, Edward G.
Gunther, Lewis L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bartolomei, Aldo
Gade, Robert L.
Goldman, David E.
Hall, Arthur L.
Heison, Walter J.
Herrmann, Robert S.
Jacobs, Joseph J.
Lewis, Shelley L.
Madden, William F.
McGehee, William G.
Weatherby, August B.

NURSE CORPS

O'Neill, Rita V.
Richards, Margaret
Samonski, Helen
Seidl, Elizabeth B.
Shurr, Agnes G.
Thompson, Ida K.
Williams, Nell R.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abel, Samuel J.
Absher, George W., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, Lynn "W"
Addy, Alfred M.
Ahearn, Joseph F.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
Albert, Thomas F.
Albright, John J., Jr.
Alexander, Aaron G.
Alexander, Clifford F.
Alexander, Murray C., Jr.
Allard, Laurence P.
Alleman, Lee E.
Allen, Harry, III
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
Allen, Harvey S.
Allen, Philip H.
Allison, Cecil G.
Allred, Jimmie "B", Jr.
Alotis, John
Alsover, James E.
Althoff, William B.
Amos, James W.
Anderson, Leo J.
Anderson, Paul E.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Raymond V.
Andreason, Raymond R.
Arnett, "A" "B", Jr.
Arthur, Malcolm B., II
Ashley, Courtland L.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Ashman, Richard C.

Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Atkinson, Edward C.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Aulick, Donald M.
Averett, Rufus M.
Babbitt, Franklin G.
Bacchus, Robert E.
Bachert, John O.
Bagley, Worth H.
Bailey, John B.
Bailey, John D.
Baker, Granville M.
Bakle, George F.
Baldwin, Lawrence C.
Ball, Edwin L.
Bard, Rudolph T., Jr.
Barfield, Norwood R.
Barksdale, David A.
Barlow, John F.
Barnes, Jerald D.
Barnes, William B.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnes, Robert O.
Barnum, Ralph L.
Bartholomew, Barton W.
Barton, Charles A.
Baskin, Donald
Bassett, Ormon E.
Bastin, Max D.
Baughman, Robert F.
Bauman, Kenneth E.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
Bean, Francis T.
Beck, Charles E.
Becker, Karl E.
Becker, Arvade L.
Beeland, Cecil H.
Behre, Herbert A., Jr.
Beliah, James C.
Belman, Kenneth B.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, William O.
Bennett, Jack W.
Benson, William D.
Bent, Jack
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bergs, Robert A.
Betcher, Arnold E.
Bettis, Alfred M.
Beumer, Everett H.
Beutler, Albert G.
Beyer, Stuart E.
Bigham, Harry
Biltz, Sylvain F., Jr.
Bird, George W.
Bischof, William W.
Bivins, William "F"
Blackwelder, Buren L.
Blades, Jehu L.
Blair, John A.
Blair, Donald D.
Blake, John S.
Blake, Gordon
Blanchard, Glendon F.
Blanks, Alva L.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Blondin, John L.
Bly, Theodore S.
Boland, Paul
Boland, Joseph P.
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Boller, Jack W.
Bolles, Robert R.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bond, William L.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boniface, John G.
Bonner, James F.
Booker, Thomas F.
Borgerding, Howard A.
Borgstedt, Forrest C.
Bossert, John W., Jr.
Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Bouveron, Ernest A.
Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Carl J.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branton, Richard C.
Branum, Rudolph
Breen, Charles E., Jr.
Brett, Robert P.
Brite, Murrel C.
Broadfield, Ward H., Jr.
Brouillette, Robert R.
Broun, LeRoy R.
Brown, Robert J.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Lewis C.
Brown, Irwin M., Jr.
Brown, Jack, Jr.
Brown, Francis T.
Brown, Russell D.
Brown, Keith F.
Brown, Kenneth
Browne, Herschel M.
Brozo, John G.
Brubaker, Donald E.
Brumbaugh, Jack R.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryan, George S., Jr.
Bryant, Bobby D.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Bucolo, Mariano J.
Burdon, Bernard F.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgin, Wilbur J.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, Lester H.
Butler, Frank J., Jr.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Callahan, Francis J., Jr.
Camp, Herbert E.
Campbell, Leonard A.
Campbell, Joseph W.
Cannon, Charles W.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Carlisle, Charles S.
Carlson, Robert L.
Carnahan, Ralph H.
Carneighi, Albert J.
Carper, John E.
Carroll, Thomas F.
Carter, Jack L.
Cartmell, James P.
Cartwright, Harold J.
Casaletti, Joe, Jr.
Casey, Robert M.
Cashwell, Billie T.
Casseday, Jack N.
Casson, Robert M.
Castillo, Edmund L.
Causey, Robert W.
Cavanaugh, Joseph J.
Chambers, Lloyd S., Jr.
Chamberlain, Charles H.
Chaney, Robert S.
Chaudoin, Harry D.
Chokas, Nicholas P.
Christensen, Morris A.
Chute, Charles L.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James H.
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Clarke, John L., Jr.
Clarkson, Junius J., Jr.
Clausen, Paul K.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Cleland, William H.
Clemmons, Robert H.
Clifton, Autry W.
Cobean, Warren R., Jr.
Coder, Jay L.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M., Jr.
Coleman, Yale
Colley, Edward L.
Collins, Wayne D.
Collins, John T.
Comer, Paul R.
Comet, Robert E.
Cone, Warren M.
Constantine, James R.
Cooke, Robert H.
Coope, Peter M.
Corbett, Kenneth G., Jr.
Cordell, Curtis C.
Cordell, John R.
Cottingham, Donald R.
Coulbourne, Thomas E.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Cowell, Robert E.
Cox, Harry W.
Crandall, Jack C.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Robert E.
Crawford, Francis G.
Critchley, John P.
Cronander, James H.
Cronemiller, Carl F., Jr.
Cronk, Henry V.
Crooks, Thomas L.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crowe, Thomas H.
Crozier, Francis J.
Cuccias, Robert F.
Culwell, Jackson P.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
Curry, James G.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Daly, Richard H.
Damon, William Q.
Darby, Joseph M.
Davis, William R.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Davis, William R.
Davis, Harry O.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Davison, Richard R.
Davison, Morgan L.
Deacon, William, III
DeBold, Joseph F.
DeCamp, Edgar A.
Decker, Walter C.
Decker, Edward A.
Decker, Glenn F.
DeHart, Turner
Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
Deitz, Charles J.
Delorenzi, Robert M.
Demas, George K.
DeMayo, John J. Jr.
Deney, Leonard J., Jr.
Denny, James T., Jr.
Dente, Eugene
Dew, Carols, Jr.
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dickson, George A., Jr.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
Di Matteo, Dominic J.
Dise, Robert L.
Doles, Thomas K.
Dorman, Alvin E.
Doss, Robert F.
Doty, William K.
Dougherty, John J.
Douglas, Robert D.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Dowling, Jerome M.
Doyle, James H., Jr.
Doyle, Luther W.
Dozier, James H.
Drinkwater, Eugene E.
Duacsek, Anthony W.
Duberg, Carl N.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dudley, Sherman F.
Dugger, John A.
Dukin, William
Duncan, Marvin H.
Durbin, Stephen F.
Dunning, Richard A.
Dutra, John E.
Duval, Robert E.
Eagan, Bryan R.
Ebel, Stanley T.
Eckert, George J.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
Edmonds, John W. C.
Edmundson, Harry E.
Edwards, John A., Jr.
Eells, John P.
Eger, Frank A., Jr.
Egert, Marlin V.
Elliott, Homan O.
Elliott, Chester E.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Ellis, William H.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
Elizey, Daniel W.
Emerson, Allan L.
Endacott, Jack A.
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
Engelmann, Henry A.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Enyart, John W.
Erickson, John W.
Esch, William S.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr.
Evans, James G.
Exum, John D.
Fader, Kenneth B.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Fagan, Philip J.
Farmer, Harry C.
Farrell, John E.
Faucett, William "A"
Faughman, Franklin P.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
Faulkner, James H.
Faull, Joe D.
Fellers, Howell E.
Ferguson, James C.
Ferrante, John M.
Ferree, Richard J.
Field, Francis E.
Finkel, Herman C., Jr.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Finley, Robert N.
Finnigan, Robert J.
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, Lee W.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Donald L.
Fitzgerald, Thomas R.
Fitzgerald, Carl S.
Fitzgerel, John H., Jr.
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Fluhart, James H.
Folop, Albert A.
Ford, Frank W.
Forrester, John J.
Forson, Roy E., Jr.
Forsyth, William D.
Forys, Victor S.
Foust, James W.
Fox, Francis M., Jr.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Francis, Samuel
Fransen, Arnold J.
Fridge, Herbert E.
Frink, Bill B.
Fromknecht, George W.
Fuller, Robert C.
Furland, Fred W.
Furse, George P.
Gaehler, Alfred H.
Gallup, Frederick S., Jr.
Galt, Robert W.
Gammill, James L.
Gard, John G.
Gardner, George H., Jr.
Garland, Earl E.
Garodz, Leo J.
Garrison, Robert G.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gaul, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
Geary, Mervyn O.
Gee, Harry C.
Gee, Robert D.
Gerecke, Thomas F.
Gerhard, Harry "E," Jr.
Gernert, Harold F.
Geroy, Francis O.
Gibbons, James G.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Gibson, John S., Jr.
Giedt, John G.
Gilles, Donald A.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
Ginn, John O.
Glaser, William R.
Glauser, Clarence J.
Glennon, Allan N.
Gless, Richard D.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glover, George W.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Gorder, Merle H.
Gordon, Jack G.
Gorman, John V.
Gorski, Joseph J.
Gortney, William M.
Gorton, Robert J.
Goure, James "V"
Graham, Martin C., Jr.
Grantham, Robert D.
Graves, Jack C.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Greathouse, Eugene V.
Greene, Joseph M.
Gregory, Grover K., Jr.
Griest, Hadley C.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullette, John G.
Gunter, Monchie M.
Gunther, Ernest H.
Guthrie, Charles A.
Haak, Frank S.
Hagler, Billy E.
Hahs, Orrie A.
Hall, Henry L.
Hall, Ray E.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
Hallstead, Jesse W.
Hamaker, William R.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hamblin, Robert N.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hannah, Glyde B.
Hardy, Willis A.
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harmer, Frank D., Jr.
Harper, George A.
Harris, Gilbert W.
Harrison, Glenn C.
Harris, Eli P., Jr.
Harris, "S" "J"
Harshman, Glenn W.
Hart, John E.
Hart, Robert R.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Hartley, Theodore R.
Haselton, Frederick R., Jr.
Hauser, William F.
Havlin, Ernest M.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Hayes, Kent W.
Hayward, Thomas B.
Hayward, John L.
Hazen, Alan M.
Heberling, Donald A.
Heesacker, Bernard A.
Helle, Donald H.
Henderson, Jerome E.
Henningsen, William J.
Henriques, Davis N., Jr.
Herbert, Edward D.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heuer, Edward H.
Hicks, Thomas E.
Highsmith, William N.
Higley, Warren A.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
Hill, James R.
Hilton, Jack
Hinchliff, Lester G., Jr.
Hippe, Leroy
Hnatek, John, Jr.
Hoffman, Raymond L.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holden, John J.
Holmes, Robert E.
Holt, Joseph E., Jr.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Hopkins, Francis D.
Hopp, Frederick H.
Horn, Francis R.
Horn, Maurice A.
Horner, Walter R.
Horton, William P.
Hoskins, Thomas H.
Hoskinson, Elijah P.
Houston, Willard S., Jr.
Howard, George D.
Howard, William D.
Howard, Carl L.
Howe, Raymond E.
Howser, Howard M.
Hoy, Hugh A.
Huddleston, William E.
Huff, Andrew F.
Huffnagle, Norman
Hughes, Arthur J.
Hughes, Thomas J., Jr.
Hugus, James E.
Hume, David M.
Hurst, Howard B.
Hutches, Robert S.
Hutchinson, Thomas H., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold R.
Hutton, William L.
Huval, Willard R.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Iacobelli, Rocco F.
Ideker, Donald E.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Ingram, Jack R.
Irish, Edelbert E.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jack, Earl
Jackson, Joseph A.

Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jacobsen, John H.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Jeffes, Edward W. B., Jr.
Jenkins, Glen E.
Jennings, Gerald W.
Jensen, Duane L.
Johnson, Wallace J.
Johnson, Frank E., Jr.
Johnson, Allen R.
Johnson, Dean R.
Johnson, Charles M., Jr.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Walter P.
Johnson, Donald W.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnson, Harold E.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, William F.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Francis F., Jr.
Jones, Donald P.
Jones, Thomas J.
Jones, Theodore R.
Jordan, James, Jr.
Jordan, Edward V.
Jorgensen, George D.
Joy, Harmon R.
Joyce, Franklyn W.
Junod, Louis L.
Kahler, Russell A.
Kahre, Edward L.
Kallies, Richard H.
Kaltreider, Daniel R.
Kasner, Edmund B.
Kaufman, John
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Keene, Warren E.
Keiser, George R.
Keller, Thomas D.
Kelley, Albert J.
Kenefick, James P.
Kennedy, James R.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kent, John "L"
Kent, Robert B.
Kenworthy, Arthur R.
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kerfoot, Dale L.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kessing, Oliver O., Jr.
Kibler, Robert L.
Kiefer, Gordon L.
Kiehl, Elmer H.
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
King, John M.
King, William D.
Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kinney, Grayson C.
Kirklighter, James F., Jr.
Kirley, Thomas J.
Klein, George R.
Klentz, Augusta C.
Klibbe, Orville O.
Kline, Edward C., Jr.
Klug, George J.
Knapton, Richard P.
Knox, Gordon L.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Koepcke, William W.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Krieter, Richard C.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Lambert, Carl R.
Landtroop, Joe M.
Lane, Dwight A.
Langille, Justin E., III
Languedoc, Arthur J.
Lassiter, "A" "C", Jr.
Lavelle, Francis M.
Lawson, Harvey W.
Lawson, Bernie A.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Bud A.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Lee, John W.
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leib, James M.
Leighninger, Max H.
Leist, Frederick, Jr.
Lemeshewsky, Andrew A.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Leutz, Leon H.
Levine, Saul
Lewis, Charles S.
Lewis, George H.
Lewis, John H.
Lichtenberg, Robert S.
Light, Robert G.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindberg, Charles H.
Lindner, Isham W.
Lindsay, John R.
Little, John B.
Loader, Harold W.
Lococo, Salvadore
Longton, William F.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Loper, Jack E.
Loritsch, Richard H.
Loveland, Edward C.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
Lucas, William E., III
Luckenbach, Lovine B.
Lumsden, David, Jr.
Lund, Howard R.
Lutz, Guy E.
Lynch, Richard J.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Richard T.
Mackay, Robert T.
Mackintosh, Robert C.
Macon, Glen G.
Madill, William G., Jr.
Maginnis, Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Maier, Frederick L., III
Malone, Roy B.
Malone, Walter J.
Mannschreck, Chris, Jr.
Manring, Alvin B.
Maple, Charles J.
Marsh, John C.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Martin, Curtis C.
Martin, Lealyn E.
Martin, Joseph R.
Martz, David J.
Mason, George E.
Matejceck, John F.
Matthews, Walter L., III
Matthews, William R.
Mattson, Kenneth B.
Maupin, Elwin C.
Maxey, Pearle K.
May, Robert C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
McAdams, Lee T.
McCallum, John F., Jr.
McCall, Robert E.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McClelland, Robert A., III
McClendon, Hoyt
McClintock, William W., Jr.
McCluskey, Paul M.
McConnel, Joseph L.
McDonald, Walter B.
McDonnel, James L.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
McGaw, Donald A.
McGee, Daniel, Jr.
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
McGrath, Charles T.
McGraw, Donald L.
McIntosh, Fred E.
McJunkin, William F.
McKee, David A.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McKenzie, Robert P.
McMahon, Joseph D.
McMillan, Leo D., Jr.
McMullen, Frank D., Jr.
McNeil, Richard S.
McNeill, Howard G.
McRostie, Richard J.
Mealy, John K., Jr.
Meenen, Henry R.
Melick, Roger E.
Merrell, Chandler V.
Metschl, John J.
Metzel, Jeffrey C., Jr.
Metzger, Robert L.
Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
Miechurski, Thomas A.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miles, Kenneth N.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
Miller, Charles R., Jr.
Miller, John W.
Miller, William A., Jr.
Miller, John X., Jr.
Miller, Donald G.
Mills, William P.
Mills, Jack O.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Millsaps, Lewis M.
Minton, Don R.
Miskill, Donald K.
Miskinis, William
Moll, Kenneth E.
Monthan, George R.
Mooney, Francis E., Jr.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, James A.
Moore, James I.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
Moore, Oswald M.
Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Moran, Thomas L.
Morey, William C., Jr.
Morgan, Robert L.
Morgan, Joseph L., Jr.
Morgan, Horace H.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Moro, Albert J.
Morris, James W.
Morrison, James W.
Morrison, John L., Jr.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Mowrer, Robert A.
Mulholland, William P.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murdock, John E., Jr.
Murphy, Thomas J., Jr.
Murphy, Francis J.
Murray, Harrison C.
Muschick, Paul E., Jr.
Myers, Robert W.
Naffah, Ned
Nagler, Gordon R.
Nelson, Albert N., Jr.
Nelson, Gerard L.
Nemoff, Alfred J.
Nesbitt, James O.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
Newbern, Robert O.
Newell, Walter E.
Newman, Dale E.
Newsome, William R.
Newton, Daniel D.
Ney, Kenneth C.
Nicholson, John H.
Nichols, Robert L.
Nickerson, Jerome W.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Nilson, Clifford E.
Noble, Guy E.
Noble, Lee V.
Noble, Walton B.
Nolta, Cornelius V., Jr.
Norman, James H.
Norris, Crackett J.
Norville, Robert W.
Nugent, Corliss R.
Odell, John D., Jr.
Oechslin, Robert E.
Ogle, Robert J.
Ohsiek, Robert R.
Oliver, Daniel A., Jr.
Oliver, Stephen
Olson, Edwin G.
Olson, Edward C.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
O'Neil, Timothy R.
O'Neill, Thomas H. R.
Ortland, Henry, III
Orton, Robert D.
Otten, Vincent B.
Owen, Marler W.
Owens, Hayden, Jr.
Oyer, John L.
Packer, Samuel H., II
Page, Robert A.
Paige, Robert W.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Palmer, John G.
Parks, Larry G.
Parr, Charles W.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Parry, Loren C.
Parsons, Robert C.
Paterson, Donald P.
Patterson, William C., Jr.
Paules, Gardiner C.
Pavis, George P.
Paxson, Roy H., Jr.
Pearson, Francis E., III
Peek, Charlie
Peeler, James C.
Pennington, Philip B.
Penny, Harmon C.
Perez, Raul B.
Perkins, Jack B.
Perkins, Carl R.
Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.
Petersen, Richard L.
Peters, Bernard
Petre, Gabriel L.
Petricka, Robert P.
Pfefferkorn, William R.
Phares, John V.
Phelps, Henry E.
Phillips, Harvey R.
Phillips, Billy
Phillips, Chester G.
Phillips, Robert G.
Piatek, John A.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Picton, Richard E.
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Pilmer, Edwin H., Jr.
Pittman, Shelly B.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plaut, Arthur, Jr.
Plummer, Philip F.
Podhradsky, Henry B.
Pohrman, David C.
Pole, Thomas M.
Polgar, Paul S.
Pond, Robert B.
Poplin, Glenn O.
Porter, William R.
Poss, Clarence L.
Potter, Horace S.
Powell, Edwin H.
Powell, Thomas J.
Premselaar, Seymour J.
Pringle, Robert C.
Probyn, Robert W.
Punch, Robert P.
Putman, Orlin N.
Putnam, Earl B.
Quisenberry, William R.
Rabe, Richard D.
Radloff, Fred H.
Ragland, Roy J.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Rambur, William M.
Randle, David D.
Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Charles E.
Ray, Troy G.
Raymer, Francis M.
Rayner, Donald E.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Reed, Robert E.
Reese, John W., Jr.
Reiff, Glenn A.
Renn, John E.
Reynolds, George R.
Reynolds, Allan J.
Rice, Thomas G.
Richardson, Richard P., Jr.
Richelieu, Charles F.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Rieke, Norbert A.
Riggs, Wallace M.
Riley, Jack
Rives, James D., Jr.
Roberts, Levi J., Jr.
Roberts, John
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robertson, Chaytor L., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Robinson, Gordon E.
Robinson, Jackson R.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Rock, Clifford T.
Rockett, Charles W.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roe, Philip A.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rogers, Frank W.
Rogers, David A.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
Ross, Albert P.
Rothwell, James G.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
Rushin, Thomas E.
Rusling, John A., III
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
Sabota, Leo M.
Samota, Frank
Sandeford, William H.
Sanderson, James R.
Sanders, Rodney D.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Saylor, Beverly
Scallorn, Cecil D.
Scanzillo, Arnold J.
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schaefer, John E., Jr.
Schaffer, Donald R.
Schetky, Malcolm O.
Scheuhing, Robert E.
Schindler, Clyde H.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schmieder, Arthur H.
Schneider, Frank J., Jr.
Schoultz, Robert F.
Schultz, Henry
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Clyde L.
Scott, Norvell O., Jr.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Scripp, John L., III
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seargeant, John A.
Searl, Floyd C.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seay, George W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
Sentman, Albert G.
Shane, Elbert B.
Sharer, Keith W.
Shea, Stephen J.
Sheehy, Edward J.
Shepard, Everett G. Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Shipman, James L.
Shonk, William H., Jr
Short, Merton D.
Shrake, Francis B.
Sidenberg, George M., III
Sigafoos, John J.
Sigler, Edward E., Jr.
Simmons, Robert L.
Simon, Harold W.
Simons, Minot, II
Simpson, William E.
Sims, Clifford L., Jr.
Sindell, Leroy J. E.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Smiglewski, John J.
Smith, Lowell H.
Smith, Henry L.
Smith, Rush S.
Smith, Donald L.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Floyd L.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
Smith, Emory P.
Smith, Bruce K., Jr.
Smith, Frederick N.
Smith, Wallace E.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, Macon S.
Snowden, John W.
Sommers, Clarence G.
Speed, Harvey G.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Spoerri, Charles E.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Sproul, William C.
Stadter, George B.
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stanley, Earl W.
Starr, Mark R.
Staveley, Ernest
St. Clair, William F.
Steedle, George D., Jr.
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
Stephens, Alvis H.
Stephenson, Marion G.
Sternberg, William G.
Stevens, Mortimer, Jr.
St. George, William R.
Stiegelmar, Loren R.
Still, Raymond G.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Stose, John F.
Stout, Cecil C.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Stroux, Peter M.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sturdevant, Harvey W.
Sullivan, John T., Jr.
Sullivan, Robert M.
Sullivan, Joseph J.
Sullivan, Russell H., Jr.
Sullivan, William P.
Summitt, Charles D.
Sumney, Frank F.
Swanson, Karl T.
Sweeney, James R.
Swope, John R.
Sylva, Gerald
Taft, Jesse W.
Tarwater, Jack C.
Taylor, James D.
Taylor, John L.
Taylor, Perry R., Jr.
Taylor, William E.
Taylor, Waymon
Ten Eyck, Hubert A., Jr.
Terry, Charles F.
Tesh, Charles P.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Robert H.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
Thompson, William
Thompson, Robert D.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thompson, Dale "J"
Thompson, Lewayne
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thorndyke, John R.
Thurman, Russell, Jr.
Tice, John J., III
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tiderman, Otto D.
Tiemann, Wilbur F., Jr.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tilghman, Walter W., Jr.
Tipping, William L.
Tisdale, Robert S.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Trahan, Paul K.
Trapp, Bill C.
Trask, George H.
Travers, Edward P.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Treadwell, Archie B.
Treiber, Franklin A. E.
Tribble, Gordon B.
Tribble, Robert J.
Trip, Rudolph E.
Trott, Robert J.
Tucker, Alfred C.
Tucker, William W.
Tull, John L. D.
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turner, Stansfield
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Untiedt, Hugh D., Jr.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Urban, Carl F.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Valentine, Andrew J.
Valley, James R.
Van Train, William A., Jr.
Van Winkle, Oscar L.
Vardy, Richard S.
Vaughn, William W., Jr.
Vaught, Thomas B.
Vereen, Jackson E.
Viele, John W.
Voorhees, Jack R.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Wade, Felix W.
Wagner, Paul R.
Wahl, Clyde F.
Walden, Walter A.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Walsh, John A.
Walters, Quinton O.
Walters, Charles A.
Ward, Xenophon C.
Warmath, Martin C.
Warren, Burtis W.
Warren, Bascom H.
Wasdin, James R.
Wash, John L.
Watkins, Bernard R.
Watson, Donald F.
Watson, Gerald M.
Watt, Jesse R.
Wattle, Thomas F.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter C.
Webb, Babe W.
Weber, William J., Jr.
Wedding, Edwin G.
Weidner, Robert E.
Weigle, Howard L.
Weirich, James E.
Weixler, Herman J.
Welander, Robert O.
Welty, Wayne J.
Wencker, Donald P.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wesper, Willis H.
Wessinger, William D.
West, Earle L.
West, Jack
West, Richard E.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheat, Elwood C.
Wheatley, Chester H.
Wheeler, William L.
White, Allan E.
White, Ray B.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ira R.
White, Floyd L.
Whitehead, Andrew D.
Whitlock, Eldred L.
Whitmire, Donald B.
Whitney, William J.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
Whitwell, Luther T. F.
Wible, Lester C.
Wieland, Daniel T., Jr.
Wilcox, Burr C., Jr.
Wilder, James H.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Wilkinson, Roland F.
Williams, Joseph N., Jr.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, James E.
Williams, Dwight L.
Williams, John H. D.
Williamson, Robert, II
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, William H.
Williams, Joseph B.
Williams, Samuel W.
Willis, Charles H.
Wilson, Phillip A.
Wilson, Hugh L., Jr.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
Wilson, James B.
Wilson, Richard H.
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Charles D.
Wine, Chester A.
Wineman, Glenn W.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
Wise, Maurice H., Jr.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, George M.
Wolfe, John M.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
Woolums, Charles R.
Wright, Leonard K.
Wyand, Donald M.
Yerbury, Robert H.
Yerly, Harold J.
Young, William B.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zavoy, Andrew J.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zimmerman, George G.
Zimmerman, Wayne L.
Zowarka, James G.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Dobbie, Robert P., Jr.
Gadd, Duwayne D.
Callis, Charles M.
Hosp, David H.
Poitras, Jean M.
Bryan, Frank M.
Davis, Robert L.
Moore, William R.
George, Frederick W., III
Benavides, Jaime M., Jr.
Wiley, Homer P.
Alsobrook, Harold K.
Troy, John W.
Doolan, Paul D.
Trier, William C.
Peters, Earl R.
Bamberg, Paul G.
Golbranson, Frank L.
Witt, Joseph A.
Kent, Donald C.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Thomas, Edgar E., Jr.
Davis, William C.
Gray, Charles H.
Schulte, John H.
Barton, Robert K.
Randel, Harvey O.
Morris, David P., Jr.
Sarver, Richard B.
Arnold, Homer S.
Crue, Benjamin L., Jr.
Penka, Ernest J.
Rohrs, Lloyd C.
Bird, Edward W.
Rupnik, Edward J.
Ostapowicz, Frank
Browne, Howard S., Jr.
Howell, William H., Jr.
Pfischner, William C. E., Jr.
Willis, Stanley E., II
Hines, Larry J.
Merkle, Vernon J.
Cales, Robert J.
Guida, Anthony J.
Adams, William C., Jr.
Humes, James J.
Hastedt, Robert C.
Bealer, John D.
Hughes, William F.
Snyder, William A.
Beer, David C.
Austin, Frank H., Jr.
Blakey, Ernest A.
Klein, Chester L., Jr.
Watten, Raymond H.
Sparks, Henry A.
McLeod, Deane E.
Smith, Thomas W. D.
Pascoe, Delmer J.
Chandler, Deck E.
Dykhuizen, Robert F.
Ebersole, John H.
Ketcham, James S.
Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
Delaney, Thomas B.
Pollock, James L., Jr.
Ireland, Roger G.
Sweeney, Francis J.
Downey, John J.
James, Philip R.
Dinsmore, Harry H.
Paul, Jed
Dempsey, John J.
Cummings, Ronald A.
Keeler, Clifford E.
Webb, Martin G., Jr.
Klein, Martin H.
Allen, Frank F.
MacPherson, Donald J.
Speaker, Richard B.
Laning, Robert C.
Johnson, Burt C.
Bernard, Donald P.
Lonergan, Walter M.
Trummer, Max J.
Moorman, Lemuel T.

DENTAL CORPS

Smith, Roland C.
Peterson, William A.
Nystul, Oliver G.
Quilter, Ward E., Jr.
Hay, Richard S.
Fedi, Peter F., Jr.
Rigterink, Ray A.
Marble, Howard B., Jr.
Boyne, Philip J.
Fairchild, Robert E.
Heyen, Aloys D.
Prince, Clifford H., Jr.
Marmarose, Frank A.
Calton, Melvin L.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Gossom, John N.
Bassett, Donald R.
Besbekos, George A.
Peachey, James B.
Pentecost, John W.
Shaw, Jay D.
Alexander, Perry C.
Bursey, Don C.
Sharp, Ben C.
Hoerman, Kirk C.
Rogers, William J., Jr.
Perkins, Robert R.
Smith, Allan E.
Selfridge, George D.
Green, George H.
Kohler, Milton C.
Koester, Frederick W., III
Kennedy, William J.
Howard, Robert A.
Cuprak, Lucian J.
Hardwick, John W.
Silberstein, Victor H.
Donnenfeld, Oscar W.
Sobieski, Edward F.
Kramer, Howard S., Jr.
Delaurentis, Carlo A.
Koppes, Paul A.
Didion, Robert W.
Englander, Harold R.
Lynch, James P.
Chap, Bernard
Davies, Ernest E.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Medical Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stader, Richard O.
Mabie, Paul D.
Delaney, Lawrence J.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Dental Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albers, Delmar D.
Baker, Ronald D.
Braswell, Jack G.
Brown, Kenneth E.
Coombs, Paul S.
Deitch, Joseph E.
Delgrande, Patrick A.
Dowling, William F., Jr.
Eckstein, Walter P.
Egli, Ray E.
Eichel, Frederick P.
Gordon, Jim D.
Grieco, Michael F., Jr.
Hughes, John M.
Jenkins, Robert L.
Kieney, Richard J.
King, Gordon E.
Lattner, Richard A.
Micka, Joseph E.
Mainous, Elgene G.
Marsalek, Daniel E.
McLeod, Carlton J.
Miller, Harold F.
Moffitt, William C.
Oliver, William K., Jr.
Parent, Clarence B., Jr.
Perlitsh, Max J.
Reid, Thomas B., Jr.
Rosdahl, Gerald A.
Riddle, William F.
Schaeffer, Peter K.
Scharpf, Herbert O.
Selesnick, Edwin R.
Tramontana, Joseph S.
Upshaw, Charles C.
Valasek, Arden D.
Studdard, Jerry M.
Tugwell, Howard S.
Weikert, Donald C.
Williams, Sherman L.
Wirthlin, Milton R., Jr.
Wyne, Gene K.
Hyman, Stanley "C"
King, Max C.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Sowers, Eleanor J.
Love, Winifred
Biadasz, Frances E.
Davis, Almira B.
Ellis, Alma G.
McGroarty, Margaret C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Schopfer, Jane E.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Angas, Mary M.
Barber, Quana E.
Bellas, Mary C.
Boyd, Lucy E.
Brackett, Alice W.
Cobb, Laura C.
Fell, Josephine
Hanson, Elsie R.
Homan, Eleanor R.
Maraspin, Dorothy L.
Morgan, Louise A. P.
Potter, Erma J.
Seielstad, Lucile A.
Steevse, Doris E.
Thompson, Lucile S.
Walker, Jean F.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bachtel, Mary A.
Boss, Jo E.
Bradford, Alice V.
Bradley, Nancy M.
Breen, Clare M.
Brooks, Irma J.
Brown, Julia A.
Brown, Mary L.
Buckner, Janet L.
Buss, Jeanne C.
Cass, Sylvia S.
Chapman, Jean L.
Clark, Marion J.
Dale, Pauline A.
Dantley, Audrey D.
Deerkop, Barbara J.
Dewitt, Lois V.
Dickey, Barbara J.
Donovan, Patricia R.
Dunham, Dixie L.
Ebeling, Mary S.
Erhart, Dorothy L.
Felton, Elizabeth C.
Field, Elizabeth H.
Frawley, Mildred J.
Garoutte, Joan
Gilbert, Amarette N.
Gorsuch, Estelle B.
Haas, Joan M.
Hallaron, Helen G.
Haugen, Sylvia N.
Higgins, Sarah P.
Hollenbeck, Nancy G.
Hoy, Barbara J.
Hunn, Eleanor K.
Kenney, Lois J.
Kiley, Patricia E.
Knoph, Madella L.
Kunce, Genevieve D.
Labonte, Nadene B.
Lewis, Nancy A.
Lotspeich, Mary J.
Lowrimore, Earlene
Mader, Barbara A.
Mandt, Maxine A.
Marshall, Alice C.
Masback, Margery E.
McKearney, Lucille R.
Meadow, Jane
Miller, Nancy J.
Morel, Mary M.
Nardi, Rosemarie L.
Nyman, Louise F.
Phillips, Elizabeth C.
Radyx, Sylvia G.
Robnett, Martha L.
Savage, Peggy A.
Screws, Margie A.
Shapland, Georgia L.
Smith, Claire L.
Sullivan, Barbara T.
Team, Mary J.
Thompson, Lloyda L.
Tullar, Jean L

Voltaire, Nell V.
Wagner, Dorothy J.
Watkins, Joann E.
Way, Evelyn D.
Weiss, Barbara W.
Wier, Mary L.
Williamson, Mary L.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Arrott, Reed T.
Bailey, George T.
Banks, Bruce R.
Barnes, John B.
Beaumont, Eugene A. G.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berry, William H.
Burriss, John R.
Canfield, Gerald I.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Day, Arthur R.
Dietz, Richard J.
Evans, Thomas B.
Feeks, Edmond M.
Finneran, William J.
Friese, George A.
Gioganetti, William C.
Holbert, William H., Jr.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Ortega, Joseph J.
Paul, David L.
Rorie, "C" "J"
Ruhsenberger, Roger H.
Smevog, Herbert W.
Stevens, Jack D.
Waite, Charles E.
Zirkle, Forrest E.
Ebeling, Mary S.
Voltaire, Nell V.
Way, Evelyn D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Joseph P.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Davis, William W.
Greer, Merwyn C.
Long, Charles W.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Yakopin, William R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barber, Horace M.
Bischof, Ernest J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Smith, Robert L.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abel, Burton C.
Ager, George H.
Alexander, Clifford F.
Allaire, David G.
Allen, John W.
Allen, Morrow J.
Allers, Paul L.
Alsey, Howard M.
Armstrong, Harry R.
Arthur, Earl Z.
Averill, Francis C.
Bagley, Amos D.
Bailey, Ira V.
Baker, Otho M.
Baker, Sharitt E.
Banes, George W.
Baran, Sylvester F.
Baran, Alfred
Barbee, James W.
Barbee, Forrest C.
Bartlett, Bernard W.
Barton, Blake M.
Bauer, Albert
Beal, Ralph W.
Beattie, Robert E.
Beer, James H.
Berning, Raymond A.
Berube, Herve J.
Bess, Rendall
Betcher, Arnold E.
Betleyoun, Charles A.
Biggerstaff, Wendell E.
Black, Thomas B.
Black, Lawrence E.
Blain, Earle J.
Blair, Loren E.
Bonner, Helmuth R.
Bossert, John W., Jr.
Boyd, George A.
Bradberry, Julian H.
Bradford, Cecil E.
Bradley, Harold B.
Bray, Harrison W.
Brooks, Lawrence W.
Brown, Charles N.
Brown, Robert J.
Bufkin, Ellis H.
Byrne, Robert H.
Cain, Howard A.
Calhoun, Oren K.
Calhoun, Raymond E.
Callaghan, Robert W.
Camblin, Wilbur J.
Carter, Robert M.
Carter, Paul R.
Caslow, Leonard A.
Cates, Waldo S.
Cavanaugh, Joseph J.
Charlesworth, George T.
Cherry, Frank L.
Ciccone, Anthony S.
Clark, Haskell
Clark, Lemuel J.
Coffland, Albert E.
Colt, Herbert W.
Colvin, Lloyd A. D.
Comorat, Vincent J.
Cook, George W.
Cornic, Cleo R.
Craft, William P., Jr.
Crary, Howard
Culp, Robert S.
Daughtry, Clyde
Davis, Albert
Davis, Carl, Jr.
Davis, Elbert L.
Deloach, Silas W., Jr.
Denton, Larry V.
Devine, Augustine J.
Digonno, Theodore
Dille, George A.
Dipboye, Jesse J.
Dooley, Francis H.
Dorr, Theodore P.
Dotzenrod, Edwin M.
Doyle, George N.
Ducoing, William F.
Dunbar, Carl F.
Dunn, Paul K.
Eisen, Oscar E.
Ely, Richard C.
English, Oscar L.
Engstrom, Vernon T.
Eslinger, Walter A.
Esbenyi, Stephen J.
Ferguson, Hugh A.
Fewell, Earl H.
Fleming, Shannon E.
Flowerree, Carl R.
Foster, Alfred L.
Francis, Ermon E.
Frey, Herman S.
Frey, Charles T.
Gajdostik, Joseph A.
Gamble, William J.
Gandolfi, Peter F.
Gardner, Aubrey R.
Garton, Thomas
Gaulter, Kenneth W.
Gertiser, Paul
Girard, Leo P.
Glanz, Conrad
Goodell, Manford C.
Goodwin, Raymond J.
Grace, William E.
Graham, William A.
Gray, Martin E.
Greathouse, Eugene V.
Greene, Russell E.
Griebel, Raymond L.
Griffiths, Arth H., Jr.
Griffith, James H.
Griffin, Charles E.
Griswell, Hollis A.
Groman, John M.
Guglietti, James R.
Gustafson, Harry W.
Halentic, Walter M.
Haley, Warren J.
Hall, Howard C.
Hamel, Frank K.
Hancuff, Ray L.
Harke, William F.
Harris, Lyman C.
Harrington, Miles W.
Harrison, Cecil M.
Harvey, Chester L.
Hathaway, Harry R.
Higgins, Guy L.
Hill, Leroy
Hill, Edward L.
Hoffman, Laurence N.
Holloway, Huel S.
Holmes, William G.
Howard, Kenneth R.
Howard, William M.
Howell, Roy A.
Hubbell, William H., Jr.
Huddleston, Albert E.
Hughes, John A., Jr.
Humphreys, Robert C.
Hunt, Bernard H.
Hurry, Paul S.
Hutchcraft, James R.
Ingalls, James W.
Ingram, Charles C.
Jackson, Hal E.
Johnson, Kenneth C.
Johnson, William R.
Jones, Charles D.
Jones, Robert E. L.
Jones, Redden P.
Judash, Joseph
Judkins, Woodrow W.
Justyn, George W.
Kaiser, Wayne L.
Keenan, John T.
Keller, Rudolph J.
Kile, Richard L.
Kimble, Hiram M.
Kowalchyk, Peter
Kurz, William
LaBouy, Robert P.
Ladley, George J. M.
Lange, Harry D.
Layman, Leonard M.
LeBlanc, Harold
Lee, Leo Abraham
Lembeck, Arthur C.
Lemons, Joseph L.
Lenz, Sylvan E.
Little, Charles H.
Ludington, John C.
Lunde, Norman C.
MacDonough, Robert S.
Manson, James E.
Marcello, James, Jr.
Marcom, Tillman M.
Martin, Ralph A.
Martin, Millerd E.
May, Einer A.
McLawhorn, Bruce A.
McWeeny, Jack D.
Miller, Junice W.
Miller, Lyle N.
Moller, Ralph L.
Monroe, Buster
Moody, Earl R.
Morgan, Lindsay E.
Morley, William E.
Morris, Warden T.
Morrison, John M., Jr.
Murphy, Karl P.
Muzleski, Vincent J.
Nelson, Albert E.
Nevins, Clifford R.
Newberry, Denny A.
Nix, Joe R.
Ogborn, Harold E.
Olson, Lloyd A.
Olson, Oliver E.
Omang, Boyd A.
Osteen, Haskell A.
Parker, Austin T.
Parks, Henry B.
Pattee, Richard M.
Peek, Charlie
Perkins, James J.
Peterson, John E.
Phelps, John E.
Pinkos, Stanislaus J.
Platz, Edward D.
Pristach, Milton R.
Punch, Robert P.
Quinlan, O'Neill P.
Raney, Chester O.
Rankin, Leonard G.
Rath, George W.
Reese, William A.
Reid, Clarence B.
Reynolds, Roy A.
Rice, Myron K.
Rice, Francis W.
Rice, Jay W.
Richardson, Stuart E.
Richter, John E.
Robinson, Guy W.
Robinson, Robert
Rodems, Charles R.
Runnels, Lloyd R.
Russell, Raymond E.
Russell, Otha K.
Salassa, Francis A.
Sandifer, Peter H.
Sarver, Armel R.
Schaefer, Elmer H.
Scheile, Ottice R.
Schmidt, Edward M.
Schooling, Ralph L.
Scott, William M.
Selman, Alpha M.
Seymour, Horatio, Jr.
Shaw, Frank K.
Shaw, Charles A.
Sheets, Clarence
Shepherd, Joseph W.
Short, David T.
Simon, Edwin L.
Simpson, Martin E.
Skaggs, Carl L.
Skillman, Edgar H., Jr.
Skonberg, Albert W.
Smith, Arthur
Snider, Herbert H.
Snyder, Willis G.
Sommers, Clarence G.
Sonner, Harry M.
Spangler, Henry J.
Stankiewicz, John J.
Stearns, William
Steele, Roy M.
Stegall, Robert L.
Stensler, Gustav G. M.
Stephens, John W.
Stephenson, Joseph E.
Stevens, Elvin L.
Stevens, Baxter C.
Stilwell, Louis C.
Stohler, Homer R.
Strauss, Stuart
Stright, Stephen A., Jr.
Stuart, James T.
Sutton, Joseph C.
Swanner, Linden R.
Swarts, Richard A.
Sylvester, Harold J.
Taliferro, Richard B., Jr.
Teague, Cecil
Tharp, Smith
Thompson, John F., Jr.
Toczko, Edward A.
Tracey, Don M.
Trahan, James J.
Treiber, Franklin A. E.
Ulen, Fred M.
VanRheeden, Frederick D.
Vezetinski, Anthony J.
Vitlip, Joseph J.
Walker, Ned H.
Walker, Charles H.
Weaver, Richard H.
Weixler, Herman J.
Whaley, Richard V.
White, Gordon C.
Whitlock, Vernon R.
Wilcox, Earl E.
Wilkinson, Iva I.
Williams, Horace R.
Williams, Harold J.
Williams, Kenneth J.
Williams, Herman C.
Wilson, Leslie D., Jr.
Wilson, James W.
Wilson, Donald D.
Wittenberg, Rudolph P.
Wittig, George W., Jr.
Woods, Arthur W.
Woods, Vernon A.
Woolyhand, James R.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Alexander, Silas R.
Baker, Millard T.
Belcoe, Melbert V.
Blanchard, Stewart K.
Bond, Walter J.
Borgens, John
Boyer, Millard L.
Brecker, Owen R.
Byrd, Raymond R.
Cannon, Jesse D.
Carleton, Jack E. L.
Castelli, Ramon P.
Christiansen, Arno M.
Clooney, William T.
Copeland, Gayland M.
Covington, John R.
Crouch, Kenneth L.
Devlin, James J.
Donnelly, Robert F.
Dooren, Leonard W.
Doud, Robert H.
Dunnigan, George J.
Egger, Wayne I.
Ennis, Marvin A.
Fagan, Thomas G.
Foster, Orlon C.
Fuller, Edgar E.
Gibson, Fred Q.
Giunta, Raymond N.
Goerner, Ralph T., Jr.
Good, Adolph
Gordon, William L.
Griffith, Calvin L.
Hall, Jimmie C.
Hanson, Harley C.
Hardin, Jasper S.
Harris, Robert S.
Hayes, Jack E.
Hewitt, Albert L.
Hicks, Jeptha B.
Hoenscheidt, Robert F.
Holdgrafer, Ambrose H.
Holmes, Herbert M.
Hubbard, Frank J.
Hunter, Clifford D.
Jennings, Belton E.
Kasprzak, Edward G.
Keefe, Clellan K.
Kurz, Walter C.
Lee, Curtis M.
Locker, John C.
Long, Paul
Mathews, Kenneth C.
Mauldin, William L.
Maxwell, Frank L.
Mayle, Arthur E.
McCurdy, Norton J.
McGinley, James P., Jr.
McGuire, James J.
McKamey, Robert W.
McKim, Mark E.
Meyers, Richard C., Jr.
Miller, Claude W.
Miller, Bernard F.
Mitchell, "G" "C"
Mitchell, Walter I.
Mulkins, Blair D.
Mumford, Lloyd K.
Nichols, Bernard G.
Okeneske, Philip G.
O'Leary, Robert P.
Peart, Cecil J.
Phelps, Lloyd L., Jr.
Ricker, Richard W.
Saunders, William M.
Seigler, Richard A.
Smith, Paul J.
Snyder, David W.
Stafford, Ronald J.
Stradley, Bernard T.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Summers, John E.
Swartz, Lowell W.
Tamez, Roy C.
Thompson, John E.
Tiffin, Horace W.
Tinnell, Eldridge G.
Tuma, August P.
Turnipseed, Mike W.
Tye, Litton E.
Waits, Chester L.
Wilson, Reid
Wolf, Kenneth R.
Woods, James W.
Woods, Norman G.
Yorden, Stephen P.
Young, Howard C.
Young, Leroy
Youtz, Arthur M.
Zakotnik, Guedon E.
Zatorski, John F.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

Cornelius P. Brogan
Clay W. G. Fulcher
John W. Hauck
Neil L. MacFarlane
William J. Mebes
Russell Myers, Jr.
John P. Rasmusson
Lowell H. Ruff, Jr.
Vincent M. Skrinsk
Charles B. Uber

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Merritt F. Armatrout, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

George L. Smith, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

James C. Oliver, Jr., United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James W. Adolphson
Brooks L. Ambos, Jr.
Richard B. Anderson
Charles W. Barnes
Frank H. Bauer, Jr.
Jeffrey H. Beeman
Byron C. Benson
Arnold E. Black, Jr.
Richard C. Borr
David M. Brant
Richard L. Breckon
Richard K. Burke
Waldon G. Carlson
Robert C. Cole
William H. Collins, Jr.
Eldred H. Comstock, Jr.
Roger W. Comstock
Jackson K. Davis, Jr.
James F. Davis
Horace W. Diamond, Jr.
John W. Donahue
Ward R. Eason
Gordon E. Fales
Stanley R. Felderman
David L. Graf
William F. Gilchrist
James E. Hayford
Neal H. Hillerman
William E. Hegarty
John W. Holtzclaw
Allyn E. Johnson
Monte L. Killingsworth
David Kramer
Alfred W. Krause
Dickson E. Krebs
Richard F. Kruppa
Willis E. Kuhns
William G. Landis
George S. Langford, Jr.
William C. Love
William M. Lucas, Jr.
William L. Mason
Robert M. Norrish
Charles A. Omarzu
Charles W. Quantock
Gerald T. Rosenlund
Roy Shank
Robert S. Stipanov
Melvin E. Taunt
Peter H. Turner
Joseph A. Uzabel
Ben B. West
Doyle Wilhite
James M. Williams

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CAPTAIN

Benedict R. Walske

COMMANDER

Donald L. Custis
Fred W. Kehr
James H. Lee, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CAPTAIN

Jerome F. Smith

COMMANDER

Paul E. Black
Oscar Gray, Jr.
William McFarland
Karl C. Weidemann

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lay M. Fox
Roger F. Reinhardt
Robert D. Workman

LIEUTENANT

Ransom J. Arthur
Harijs T. Azeris
Stephen Barchet
Richard L. Bernstine
James W. Bickerstaff, Jr.
John F. Burns, Jr.
Patrick J. Concannon, Jr.
Jay A. Desjardins
Richard E. Donahue
Henry T. Edmondson, Jr.
Lawrence D. Egbert, Jr.
Charles A. Ellis, Jr.
Richard E. Frates
Seymour M. Freiman
James E. Glenn
George L. Johnson, Jr.
Glenn F. Kelly
Arthur S. Kern
James C. King
Edward H. Lanphier
Laudie E. McHenry, Jr.
Edmund B. McMahon
Henry J. McVeety
John D. Manhart
William A. Manson, Jr.
Leslie M. Morrisset
Max E. Musgrave
Arthur W. Nunnery
Winston B. Odland
James C. Parke, Jr.
Clement J. Philbrick, Jr.
Peter Pleotis
James L. Reeder
Everett L. Roley
Joseph G. Rossi
Richard C. Sowell
Andrew W. Stevenson, Jr.
Blair M. Webb
Richard A. Wetzel
David Q. Wilson
James E. Wilson, Jr.
Franklin M. Wolfe

Roy G. Brown (Naval Reserve officer) to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant commander as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Edwin "R" Black
Esthel D. K. Ikenberry
Bernard F. Kresl

LIEUTENANT

Roger H. Howard

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CAPTAIN

Donald W. Dodds
Sidney Gemson
Albert J. Lilly
Joseph W. McAleer
Dexter R. MacDonald
Alan L. Teitel

COMMANDER

Sun Ray Cloud
Charles W. Folkers
Fiore A. Papera
Clyde R. Parks
Robert T. Salandi
Edwin M. Sherwood
Ernest W. Small
Ralph H. Stowell
Simon W. Susewind
Alva A. Wheat

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Robert Cohen
Joseph R. Evans

LIEUTENANT

Frank P. Beall, Jr.
Gerald M. Bowers
James E. Corthay
Herbert C. Deaton
James R. Elliott
Walter J. Gorman
William J. Greek
Dean L. Johnson
Harris J. Keene
Wallace D. Loo
Jack E. McLenaghan
Wallace V. Mann, Jr.
Virgil A. Pinkley
Ralph W. Pruden
James H. Stanley
William S. Swift, Jr.
Robert A. Vessey

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joseph E. Deitch
Stanley "C" Hyman

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold J. Boudreau
Harry M. Boone, Jr.
James L. Clark
Thomas G. Cooper
William P. Davis
Ephraim E. Fowler, Jr.
William E. Fletcher
John D. Gillenwaters
Kenneth L. Hawkins
George D. Jones
Joseph T. Karr
Philip H. Mobbs
John R. Moody, Jr.
James I. Myers
Jack J. Palmer
Billy D. Roberts
Billie C. Roberts
William A. Ryan
Donald E. Shuler
Forman J. Sickels
Glen R. Smith
John R. Soliman
Richard G. Tuttle
Russell P. Van Hooser
Harry F. Ziegler, Jr.

Robert V. Fultyn (ensign, line, U. S. Navy) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named United States Navy retired officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 37 United States Code 275, 276, 277; sections 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CAPTAIN

DeWitt C. E. Hamberger

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Kester M. Roberts

LIEUTENANT

James P. Richardson

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Carl B. Pearlston, Jr.

The following-named United States retired officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 37, United States Code 275, 276, 277; sections 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Jack P. Ramsey

LIEUTENANT

Edward G. Dorsey

The following-named for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, in the United States Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ace
Gordon K. Ayres
William H. Brown
James Carpenter
Richard W. Carter
Francis L. Gilmore
Billy M. Harkins
William B. James
James R. Kay
Norman O. Keesling
William R. Lander
William J. Mitchell
Francis C. Norris, Jr.
Jacob W. Pangle
James C. Petersen
Charles M. Quinlin
Charles E. Savo
Anthony J. Schiavone
Robert F. Tucker

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Benjamin C. Amick, Jr.
Carl F. Bachle, Jr.
Thomas J. Bigley
Albert L. Bolst
Foy H. Bouknight
Henry H. Bowers
Gordon R. Bryan, Jr.
John F. Callan
Philip H. Edmunds
Charles L. Elliott
Philip W. Everist
George C. Gatje
Gene P. Gray
Timothy K. Hall
John D. Hallaron
Ronald R. Hansen
Charles W. Hare
William K. Hatcher
Richard D. Heenan
Charles R. Helme
Richard B. Howe
Paul J. Jenkins
Forrest R. Johns
Martin Katz
Ralph W. Kausch
Burton J. Larkins
Martin M. Leibowitz
Charles M. Lentz
Robert W. Leonard
Paul L. Litchfield, Jr.
John C. Loucks
John D. Lovvorn
Albert J. McFadden, Jr.
Robert F. Massimi
George W. Mau
Patrick J. Maveety
Robert L. Newlund
Robert B. Newton
Dwight G. Osborne
John P. Papuga
David C. Parkhurst
Donald E. Prisby
John S. Rawlins
Michael E. Ruggiero
Ralph B. Rutherford
James E. Service
Howard W. Smith
Paul D. Smith
Jack E. Varney
Robert H. Weeks
Robert L. Williams
Lewis I. Wood

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Raymond Atherton
Robert L. Brace
William R. Chapman
Richard G. Clark
Richard E. Daubenspeck
Vincent A. DiCarlo
Edward A. Grouby, Jr.
Herbert M. Lachut
Will T. Lynch
Stephen J. McArdle, Jr.
William F. MacAdam
Everett F. Rollins, Jr.
Thomas H. Starbuck
Jack W. Stone, Jr.
Warren H. Winchester
George H. Yenowine

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

"A" "J" Martin Atkins
Robert E. Cayce
Richard P. Cordray
Willard H. McDaniel
Robert E. Pray
James D. Smith
John T. Waterman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Henry H. Abe
William J. Alford
Benjamin C. Amick, Jr.
Robert P. Anderson
Carl F. Bachle, Jr.
Halbert E. Baker
Robert Banta
Glynn R. Becker
Thomas J. Bigley

Bertram N. Blount
Albert L. Bolst
Foy H. Bouknight
Henry H. Bowers
Robert B. Bristol
John F. Callan
Kenneth R. Cameron
Charles L. Cook
Paul J. Cotugno
Nace B. Crawford, Jr.
James J. Dagdigian
Harlan K. Dillon
Dallas R. Divelbiss
Philip H. Edmunds
Charles L. Elliott
Richard J. Espling
Philip W. Everist
Joseph A. Felt
Robert R. Gavazzi
Vernon D. Goldston
Gene P. Gray
William H. Greiwe
Donald H. Gress
Timothy K. Hall
John W. Hammock
Ronald R. Hansen
Charles W. Hare
Richard D. Heenan
Charles R. Helme
Paul J. Jenkins
George T. Johnston
Donald W. Jones
Martin Katz
Kevin Krigbaum
Burton J. Larkins
Martin M. Leibowitz
Robert W. Leonard
Paul L. Litchfield, Jr.
Billy E. McCabe
Albert J. McFadden, Jr.
William W. MacKenzie
Clarence W. Miller
Roger F Moury
Joseph O. Moore
Marvin J. Naschek
Robert L. Newlund
Philip J. Nordmeyer
Dwight G. Osborne
John P. Papuga
David C. Parkhurst
Peter W. Patton
Fred D. Petersen
Norman L. Pickell
Charles E. Pifer
George W. Porter, Jr.
John S. Rawlins
Dean T. Rodgers
Thomas A. Rodgers
Michael E. Ruggiero
Ralph B. Rutherford
John R. Shufflebarger
Olin J. Shuler
Brian W. Smith
Paul D. Smith
Robert M. Smith
David S. Tips
Jack E. Varney
David E. Wayham
Lloyd M. Westphal, Jr.
Robert L. Williams
Lewis I. Wood
Paul G. Woods

ENSIGN

Raymond Atherton
Robert L. Brace
William R. Chapman
Richard G. Clark
Richard E. Daubenspeck
Vincent A. DiCarlo
Lawrence J. Farrell
James N. Ford
Edward A. Grouby, Jr.
Herbert M. Lachut
James B. LeBlanc
Robert H. Lundy
Will T. Lynch
Stephen J. McArdle, Jr.
William F. MacAdam
Dale B. Petty
Everett F. Rollins, Jr.
Thomas H. Starbuck
Jack W. Stone, Jr.
Richard M. Weinfeld
George H. Yenowine

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy (engineering duty), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles R. Fullmer

The following named for permanent appointment:

ENSIGN

Charles R. Fullmer

Irwin M. Brown, Jr., Reserve officer, for permanent appointment to be a lieutenant in the line of the Navy (aeronautical engineering duty), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty, communications), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jack O. Walker

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Conrad R. Cormier
Gerald W. Cox

ENSIGN

Jack O. Walker

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty, law), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Clinton K. Higgins, Jr.
Thomas J. Jimmerson
Nicholas Sabalos

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Carl S. Fitzgerald

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Clinton K. Higgins, Jr.
Thomas J. Jimmerson
Nicholas Sabalos

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty, intelligence), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

George P. Humphries

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

George P. Humphries

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty, public information), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John C. MacKercher

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John C. MacKercher

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Dorothy L. McCoury

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Patricia A. Comer

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jeanne C. Buss
Elizabeth C. Felton
Dorothy L. McCoury
Joan E. McSweeney
Joan M. Wood

ENSIGN

Patricia A. Comer

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Edward M. Flaherty

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joan M. Beckwith

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Joseph W. Benedict
Norman L. Cloutier
William H. Dickey
Goodwin Donnelly III
Graydon M. Durham, Jr.
Emerson M. Harris
George A. Jackson
Frederick H. Keefer
Jacob D. Kohl
Eric H. Miller, Jr.
Donald G. Morgan
James V. Mullen
Charles G. Neelley
Paul Perritt
Frank J. Pokorny, Jr.
John F. Raven
Joseph Shisko
Charles E. Smith
Magnus R. Thomas

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Samuel B. Allen, Jr.
Irving G. Briggs
Jack E. Gray
Millard J. Johnson
Glendon R. Mantlo
Frank Pavlisin
John A. Walker

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Roger S. Clark
Norman L. Cloutier
William O. Eastwood, Jr.
Edward J. Garabedian
Jacob D. Kohl
Robert H. Mahaffy
Donald G. Morgan
James V. Mullen
Raymond L. O'Neil
Donald R. Palmer
Paul Perritt
John F. Raven
Charles E. Smith
Joseph Shisko
Magnus R. Thomas
Elbridge Walker III
Robert G. White

ENSIGN

Samuel B. Allen, Jr.
Irving G. Briggs
Jack E. Gray
Millard J. Johnson
Glendon R. Mantlo
Frank Pavlisin
John A. Walker

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John P. X. Bergeur
John W. Cohill
Calvin J. Croston
Peter J. Ferreri
Eugene A. Garvens
Robert L. Mole
Robert P. O'Brien
James D. Reid

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Raymond E. Jackson
Roger K. McClone
Vincent J. Mahoney

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John P. X. Bergeur
John W. Cohill
Calvin J. Croston
Peter J. Ferreri
Eugene A. Garvens
Harry D. Johns
Robert L. Mole
Robert P. O'Brien
James D. Reid
Calvin F. Schmid

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Jack C. Biederman
Lawrence J. Green
John H. Seites
Lowell T. Thorpe

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Clark H. Scherer, Jr.
John P. Sylva, Jr.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Lawrence J. Green
Nicholas C. Hrnjez
John H. Seites
Lowell T. Thorpe
John A. Witkowski, Jr.

ENSIGN

Clark H. Scherer, Jr.
John P. Sylva, Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Regina B. Humphreys

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Margaret A. Barnhart
Evelyn P. Gum
Dorothy M. Hendricks
Isabelle Katool
Margaret M. McCarthy

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Regina B. Humphreys

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Edward B. Carlson
Jack S. Stewart
Herbert C. Ferguson
James G. Sliney
Kerfoot B. Smith
Francis R. Drake
William B. Porter
Clarence M. White, Jr.
Seth S. Searcy, Jr.
Russell Kefauver
Philip K. Sherman
William C. P. Bellinger, Jr.
Frank B. Herold
Grafton B. Campbell
John D. Stevens
Walker A. Settle, Jr.
Joseph E. Dougherty
Joe H. Munster, Jr.
Herbert S. Schwab
Matthew V. Carson, Jr.
James C. Radford
Wallace H. Howe
Raymond J. Toner
Erik A. Johnson
Richard D. White
Kenneth E. Meneke
Edward F. Steffanides, Jr.
Robert H. Wanless
Peter V. Dabbieri
Melvin C. Torian
James A. Brown
Allan F. Fleming
Frederic A. Chenault
Joseph E. Rice
James H. Terry, Jr.
John B. Rawlings
Henry A. Arnold
Robert E. Odening
Alexander K. Tyree
Chester W. Nimitz, Jr.
William B. Thomas
Robert A. Thacher
Frank G. Springer
William N. Price
Edmund J. Hoffman
Fred G. Bennett
John D. Blitch
Walter V. Combs, Jr.
John M. Alford
Charles R. Eisenbach
John M. Oseth
Earl R. Crawford
Carl H. Amme, Jr.
Floyd T. Thompson
Willard M. Hanger
John H. Turner
Ovid M. Butler
Clinton McKellar, Jr.
Robert J. Williams
James C. Shaw
William T. Groner
Harry B. Stark
Philip E. Shetenhelm
James L. Semmes
John P. Preston
Donald E. Willman
Robert C. Sleight
Allen R. Faust
Jonathan L. W. Woodville, Jr.
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.
Robert L. Neyman
Albert B. Furer
Dallas M. Laizure
Jewett O. Phillips, Jr.
William G. Holman
Henry C. Schwaner, Jr.
Thomas S. King, Jr.
James S. Gray, Jr.
John F. Ryder
Donald W. Wilson
William B. Parham
David C. Richardson
Thomas K. Kimmel
Sydney S. Sherby
Ellis B. Orr
William Blenman
Otis R. Cole, Jr.
Robert "W" McElrath
Thomas B. Dabney
Richard R. Bradley, Jr.
James H. Barnard II
Warfield C. Bennett, Jr.
Parker L. Folsom
Joseph A. Coppola
Henry A. Romberg
James R. Hansen
Fitzhugh L. Palmer, Jr.
Bennett C. Oelheim
John V. Noel, Jr.
Hoyt D. Mann
George H. Whiting
Frank G. Law
Paul E. Summers
Gilven M. Slonim
William A. Ellis
Donald G. Gumz
Paul C. Stimson
Everett M. Link, Jr.
Charles E. Houston
Marshall F. Thompson
Richard R. Pratt
Joseph B. Icenhower
Gordon Fowler
Frank E. Hayler
John K. Fyfe
James W. McCauley
Edward R. King
Bruce R. Ware
Robert H. Caldwell, Jr.
James B. Rutter, Jr.
John H. Carmichael
James W. O'Grady
Harlan G. Kirkpatrick
Robert C. Morton
Harry F. Holmshaw
Fred D. Michael
Donald G. Dockum
William H. Shea, Jr.
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
Richard L. Fowler
Renfro Turner, Jr.
William J. Lederer, Jr.
Richard A. Teel
Paul H. Bjarnason
Thomas W. Samuel
Jasper N. McDonald, Jr.
John J. Kircher
Ralph R. Humes
Elliott M. West
Vincent F. Casey
John J. Lynch
Edgar E. Stebbins
Jack B. Dawley
Harry E. Cook, Jr.
Joseph A. Gage, Jr.
James O. Taylor
Forrest A. Roby, Jr.
Brendan J. Moynahan
William R. Staggs
Ben Moore, Jr.
John P. Sager
William H. Hilands
Hawley Russell
Pliny G. Holt
Paul C. Griggs
John H. Pennoyer
Charles J. Eastman
Aram Y. Parunak
Alfred L. Gurney
Glenn W. Okerson
James W. Klopp
William C. Dunn
Howard M. Avery
Robert L. Eldridge
William G. VonBracht
Richard L. Friede
Alfred I. Boyd, Jr.
Ernest L. Simpson, Jr.
Richard G. Touart
Jack A. Obermeyer
William P. Mack
Paul E. Hartmann
Terrell H. W. Connor
David B. Bell
Harvey P. Lanham
Thomas D. Davies
William F. Bringle
John B. Hess
George L. Street III
Prescott H. Currier
Joe M. Alexander
Richard S. Stuart
Frederic W. Brooks
Albert L. Carlson
Russell H. Smith
Dale E. Cochran
John N. Ferguson, Jr.
William E. Gaillard
Kenneth L. Gage
Alfred L. MacCubbin
Arthur H. Ashton
William M. Kaufman
Sherman "E" Wright
William H. Wright
Walter W. Boyd
Paul B. Ryan
Edward E. Hoffman
Charles M. Holcombe
Oliver N. Fowler
Francis A. Klaveness
Eugene R. Dare
Gordon R. Fiss
George F. Stearns, Jr.
Clarence F. Clark
Donald I. Mather
Donald W. Seiler
William A. Collier
Roger F. Miller
Richard K. Cockey
Thomas H. Humphreys, Jr.
Edwin H. Nichols
Charles T. Cole
Albert L. O'Bannon
Richard E. Ryan
Ralph T. Moloney
Frederick S. Albrink
Edmund J. Bodziak
Cecil R. Harrison
George M. Winne
Mack K. Greenberg
Carl W. Heywood
Ernest W. Humphrey
Ralph W. Arndt
Julian T. Bollinger
Warren C. Boles
Glendon D. Williams
Peter Belin
Henry C. Bridgers, Jr.
William C. Howes
Raymond A. Kotrla
Floyd F. Miller
Russell H. Wallace
Emery A. Grantham
Roger B. Woodhull
Richard E. Ball
Charles E. Gibson
John M. Ballinger
Parkman B. Moore
Ralph Kissinger, Jr.
Newell E. Thomas
Ralph A. Smith
Richard P. Nicholson
William D. Brinckloe, Jr.
Lewis A. Rupp
Walter H. Keen, Jr.
Frank N. Shamer
Charles H. Meigs
Henry A. Rowe
Frank W. Taylor
Carl R. Hirschberger
Warren W. Ford
Lawrence V. Julihn
Paul K. Taylor
John L. Kelley, Jr.
Carl R. Doerflinger
Harry B. Hahn
Saverio Filippone
Falkland M. Lansdowne
William M. Stevens
Hubert B. Reece
Donald M. White
Gerald P. Joyce
Edward D. Spruance
Victor H. Wildt
Thomas M. Adams
Archie "H" Soucek
Morton H. Lytle
Harmon B. Sherry
David E. Dressendorfer
Richard A. Waugh
Roger W. Mehle
Albert S. Freedman, Jr.
John S. Slaughter
Widmer C. Hansen
Vincent F. McCormack
Dwight L. Johnson
William R. Stevens
James B. Denton
Frederick E. Daily
Fillmore B. Gilkeson
Jesse P. Robinson, Jr.
Theophilus H. Moore
Joseph F. Dalton
John C. Dyson
James H. Cruse
William R. Smith, Jr.
James B. Cresap
Walter L. Phaler
Peter G. Molteni, Jr.
Charles A. Burch
Byron D. Voegelin
Theodore Peterson
Donald L. Mehlhop
Frederick H. Schneider, Jr.
Guy J. Anderson
Nelson P. Watkins
Charles F. Putman
Talbot E. Harper
Robert F. Farrington
Ralph H. Benson, Jr.
Stockton B. Strong
Anthony P. Zavadil, Jr.
Kenneth E. Hanson
Robert B. Lander
Warren C. Hall, Jr.
Ralph W. Cousins
Leonard E. Ewoldt
Francis C. Rydeen
Lawrence G. Bernard
John R. Wadleigh
Henry D. Sipple
Donald "G" Baer
Thomas D. Cunningham
Richard G. Colbert
Fletcher Hale
John S. Schmidt
John L. Nielsen
John F. Morse
Harry H. Barton
Robert L. Savage, Jr.
Frank A. Patriarca
Richard Holden
Ellis H. McDowell
Alfred F. Gerken
Guy E. O'Neil, Jr.
Donald Gay, Jr.
William R. Crenshaw
Berton H. Shupper
Edward W. Hessel
Henry F. Burfeind
Harold S. Bottomley, Jr.
Albert O. Vorse, Jr.
Leonce A. Lajaunie, Jr.
Clifton W. Flenniken, Jr.
John E. Pace
Charles S. Minter, Jr.
Everett G. Sanderson
John R. Madison
John M. DeVane, Jr.
Howard W. Baker
Maurice W. Shea
Walter J. Stencil
John E. Pond, Jr.
John C. Kelly
Rexford V. Wheeler, Jr.
Walter J. Barry
Joseph T. Yavorsky
William S. Stewart
John B. Carroll
Robert M. Ware
Franklin S. Rixey
Francis W. Ingling
Alfred W. Gardes, Jr.
Sanford E. Woodard
Jack E. Gibson
Walter S. Reid
Eugene P. Rankin
Fay E. Wilsie
Frederick E. Janney
James G. Ross

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Walter G. Bacon
Glenn F. Brewton
Charles K. Phillips
Richard L. Myers
Randolph Meade, Jr.
William J. Johnston
Edgar D. Vestel, Jr.
Billy Johnson
William M. Huey, Jr.
Elton W. Sutherling
Norbert C. Brady
Marcus A. Peel, Jr.
Irwin S. Moore
William A. Evans
Charles L. Harris, Jr.
Charles Fadem
Charles H. McCarthy, Jr.
Allen B. Reed, Jr.
Martin Miller
John D. Hyerle
Avery A. Pabst
Donnelley S. Embree
Pierre D. Collins
Robert F. Lynch
Frederick F. Fallis
Bernhard H. Bieri, Jr.
Raymond F. Parker
Robert H. Northwood
William M. Porter
Charles Stein, Jr.
John W. Neel
Clifford A. Messenheimer
Edward K. Scofield
John B. Kackley
Phillip D. Chubb
James T. Mathews, Jr.
George L. Bennett
Robert A. Williams
Portus D. Boyce
Boyd Shafsky
Lawrence V. Hallberg
Max Schliewe
Bert S. Beasley
Oswald B. Porter, Jr.
John Vinn, Jr.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Harry C. Wood
Raymond C. Hohenstein
Daniel F. Meehan
Edgar C. Andrews, Jr.
Francis A. Burke
John P. Murphy
Irving W. Stultz
Walter S. Peck, Jr.
Merle N. Young

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ira N. Curtis
Charles H. Neel
James A. Coddington
Joseph H. Barker, Jr.
Kenneth C. Lovell
Raymond B. Krum
John W. Gordanier
Richard E. Harris
Jack G. Dodd
Roscoe A. Davidson
Clemens E. Spellman
John C. Sease
George M. Gans
Samuel K. Wilson
John P. Roulett, Jr.
Robert B. Morris
James F. Cunniff
Weston M. Johnson
Frank C. Tyrrell
James T. Riordan
Frank L. Endebrock
Lattimer W. Reeder
Roscoe E. Van Liew
Harrison P. Thrapp
Richard E. Slattery
Lloyd E. Root
William M. Gordon
Robert S. Stewart
Garland M. Inscoe
Carl H. Plumlee
Deane E. Carberry
Palmer W. Roberts
Harry C. Rowe
Joseph C. Luppens
Arthur P. Gardiner
Bernhard O. Roessler
Mark H. Jordan
Herbert J. Hartman
Perry M. Boothe
Howard F. Curren
Thomas J. White
Wilfred J. Williams
William F. Weaver
John J. Albers
Norman M. Martinsen
Frank E. Swanson
Charles G. Prahl
Harry N. Wallin
William J. Thompson
Martin L. Rutter
Kenneth C. Abplanalp
Ralph C. MacDonald
Harry F. MacKay

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Richard H. Lee
John J. Engelfried

COMMANDER, LINE

Francis Tofalo
Henry C. Field, Jr.
John W. Crawford, Jr.
Maximilian W. Munk
Frank A. Andrews
William P. Willis, Jr.
William R. Kurtz
Theodore E. Gerber
William E. Betzer
John S. Bowen
Vernon E. Binion
William L. Newton
William A. Schoenfeld
Richard Riley
William E. Heronemus
James F. McGuire

Robert D. McWethy
Robert C. Gooding
William M. Montgomery
William R. Werner
Edwin E. Kintner
John G. Osborn, Jr.
John J. Hinchey
John G. Wallace
William W. Ennis
William H. Cross
Frank S. Quinn, Jr.
Kenneth E. Gulledge
Robert R. Brafford
Lewis J. Stecher, Jr.
Charles N. Payne, Jr.
Wallace H. Garrett, Jr.
Charles B. Momsen, Jr.
Robert G. Mills
William C. Bender
Raymond A. Boyd
George G. Halvorson
Ariel L. Lane
Francis S. Knight
Richard W. Arey
Alfred B. MacKown
Robert F. Sweek
Charles J. Burton
Crawford D. Winner
William F. Vose
William D. Spiegel
Richard B. L. Creecy
Garrison Brown
George F. Britner, Jr.
Leslie R. Olsen
Cecil D. Kephart
Mark W. Woods
Thomas N. Coppedge, Jr.
Arthur G. Hamilton, Jr.
Richard B. Varley, Jr.
Charles B. Bishop
Robert A. Martin
James B. Osborn
Charles N. McKenna
Christian Fink
John P. Hobson III
Francis E. Rich
Donald T. Holmes
John R. Strane
Alfred D. Garvin
Owen L. Maupin
Eugene I. Malone
Leonard M. Culjat
Angus J. Knudson
Joy E. Brown
Walter B. Brandon
Carl E. Olson
Thomas W. Kennedy
Edward F. Gallagher
Thomas Turner
Edwin M. Rosenberg
Leonard Erb
Walter P. Robinson, Jr.
William A. Arthur
Robert H. Harwood, Jr.
John A. Morrison
Charles W. Pittman, Jr.
Claude L. Reeves
Richard L. Corkran, Jr.
Philip P. Cole
Mervin O. Slater
William J. Rusch, Jr.
James D. Hazard
George L. Bliss, Jr.
David G. Adams, Jr.
John L. Marocchi
William M. Pugh II
Robert J. Thompson
Roy W. F. Werthmuller
William E. Sims
Horace P. McNeal
Arthur W. Jones
John P. Fox, Jr.
Robert C. Knight
Charles C. Senn
Harold E. Rice
David C. Peto
Ward W. Griffith III
Charles A. Pierce, Jr.
Gerald E. Miller
James F. Schremp
Claude B. Shaw
John B. Davis, Jr.
Max H. Ostrander
Maddox N. P. Hinkamp
Howard L. Stone, Jr.
Henry B. Sweitzer
Oliver H. Landua
Charles E. Smith
Richard D. King
Douglas A. Powell, Jr.
Harry E. Hill
Gerald E. Peddicord
Robert E. Mottern
Jerome A. Rapp, Jr.
William T. O'Bryant
Theodore L. Balis
Wallace B. Auckland
Joseph D. Jeffrey
Leo W. Early
Emil P. Schuld
Robert B. Stahl
James D. Small
Leon W. Westcott
Ronald P. Gift
Joseph M. Parsons
Max C. Duncan
George H. Mahler III
Kevin E. Byrne
Frank M. Blanchard
John C. Hill II
Kendall W. Simmons
John W. Maddex
Armistead Dennett
Harold E. Fry
William B. Hosey
Alexander D. C. Byers
Robert R. Stoinoff
Parker B. Armstrong
Howard Cole
Richard L. Evans
Davis E. Bunting
Lindsay C. McCarty
Roy J. Robison
William J. Hurst
William H. Young
John A. Miller
George S. Bennett, Jr.
John D. H. Kane, Jr.
Robert G. Brown
George W. Folta, Jr.
Eugene C. Barnhardt III
William E. Griffin, Jr.
Stephen J. Riordan, Jr.
Richard H. Buck
Harry M. Brinser
Ernest L. McClintock, Jr.
Jack M. James
Harry M. Thompson
Richard M. Sewall
James W. Conger
Leo A. Garland
Griffith P. Stokes
William F. Farrell, Jr.
Arthur C. Mullen
Ray F. Smith
Gordon A. Miller
James D. W. Borop
Raymond W. Baker
Gerald J. Scott
William S. Brown
Allen B. Catlin
LeRoy W. Vance
Leopold Weidlein
Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.
Kenneth W. Miller
Marcy M. Dupre III
Edwin T. Osler
Raymond Wiggins
Frank G. Scarborough
James T. Alexander, Jr.
Charles A. Alisopp
Robert S. Eastman
Robert S. Day
Harold E. Shear
Thomas C. Harbert, Jr.
Harold S. Howard
Walter B. Woodson, Jr.
Raymond C. McGrath
John R. Welsh
Arthur H. Warner, Jr.
William D. Houser
Paul H. Durand
Lewis B. Jennings
John H. Burt
John N. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Robert D. Nye
Eric E. Hopley
Paul L. Ruehrmund, Jr.
Daniel E. Bergin, Jr.
Alden W. Whitney
Ross A. Knight
Edward H. Winslow
Ralph G. Johns, Jr.
Samuel G. Jones
Roland G. Mayer, Jr.
George O. Atkinson, Jr.
Edward B. Herndon III
James D. Nickerson
Carol A. Turner
Joseph A. Bachhuber
Ward S. Miller
Robert B. Poage
David L. House, Jr.
Peter S. Smith
Willard L. Nyburg
Clifford P. Mason
Francis J. Berry
William M. Robinson
Kenneth B. Brown
William E. Carver
Thomas E. Williamson, Jr.
William C. Dozier, Jr.
Robert J. Knox
Gordon C. Buhrer
William A. Robie
Reginald L. Workman
Albert G. Hillberg, Jr.
Robert J. Hanson
Alton B. Grimes
Lewis W. Squires
Robert F. Reilly
Milton E. Stewart
Roland J. Obey
Travis O. Tabor III
Norman C. Nash
William E. Simmons
John A. Gommengenger
Albert F. Betzel
William G. Weber
Andrew J. Rucker
Chester M. Lee
Charles M. Young
John M. Rickabaugh
John A. Lindbeck
William H. Pellett
John J. Rowan
Ivan W. Sturgis
Richard E. Curtis
Walter H. Esworthy, Jr.
Laurence B. Green
Norman L. Tate
John P. Gutting
Drewery R. Wilhite
Perry W. Johnson, Jr.
Donald C. Richards
Robert E. Doherty
Walter W. Price, Jr.
Douglas C. Plate
Harry C. Allendorfer, Jr.
James M. Ashley, Jr.
George T. Boland
Joseph M. Tully, Jr.
Justin A. O'Neil
Robert R. Carter
Guilford D. Acker
Russell D. Ward
Maino des Granges
Willard O. Backus
William W. Stetson
Lars Wanggaard, Jr.
Henry L. Grant III
Clifford M. Esler, Jr.
David H. Green
Charles B. Reinhardt
William B. Morrow
Ernest P. Smith
Silvio DeCristofaro
Edward G. Fitzpatrick
Paul B. Smith
John S. Leffen
Robert S. Rankin
Robert S. Froude
Arthur F. Rawson, Jr.
Dale C. Reed
Ray H. Miller
Hal G. Wynne
Louis L. Meier, Jr.
Frank H. O'Brien
Ralph L. Porter
Rufus C. Porter, Jr.
Francis E. Kinne
Stephen H. Walsh
George A. Gardes
George W. McFetridge
Eugene H. Farrell
Harry J. Kelley
Robert L. Lowell
Judson C. Doyle
John D. Patterson
Thomas R. Pearson
James W. Emmons
John G. Drew II
Richard L. Lowe
Fred Laing
John J. Haffey, Jr.
Cedric B. Bergquist
Joseph N. Behan, Jr.
Donald A. Henning
Thomas H. Williams
William A. Morgan
William R. Barnett
Robert I. Langlois
Russell F. Flynn
Robert M. Armstrong
Jared E. Clarke III
Robert E. Muller
John J. Mitchell
William H. Crawford, Jr.
Wesley R. Gebert, Jr.
Walter R. Fraser
Clarence J. Bannowsky, Jr.
Hal E. Copple
James H. Copple
Wiley B. Howell
Joseph P. Rizza
Dalton C. Mounts
Floyd J. David
Drexel E. Poynter
Alvah V. Mills, Jr.
Wilton S. Mize
John C. McCauley, Jr.
Fordyce R. Downs, Jr.
Charles B. Barry
Stirling W. Bass, Jr.
Richard E. Forman
Benjamin H. Berry
Richardson W. Sayler
Jacques E. Vroom
Frank H. Savio
Walter R. Gover
Robert A. Dowd
Kenneth J. Mathis
Fred W. Frank, Jr.
Frank Bigham, Jr.
Robert W. Christians
Gustave W. Binnebose
Herbert T. Fichman
Willard H. Davidson
William Schubert
Charles U. Walkley
Richard H. Hart
Edmund W. Creekmore
James A. Downs
Marvin L. Ramsey
Elbert O. Berns
Roy S. Reeves
Phillip G. Marquart
Orville W. J. Dryer
Nathan P. Waters
William C. Adler, Jr.
James W. Guy
Edward S. Buchanan
Robert D. Flynn
Richard G. Augenblick
Richard P. Howe
George A. Hall
Marcel N. Piller
Delmar Walker, Jr.
John A. H. Torry, Jr.
Theodore L. Appelquist
George E. Kemper
Jonathan A. Barker
Arthur D. Sullivan
Aarne J. Tervo
John T. Oleksy
Corliss W. Adams
Henry C. Turner
John L. Neff
Jay W. Land
Louis H. Jullien
Buford D. Abernathy
Donald L. Creed
Anthony O. Jonassen
Thomas E. Russell
Richard K. Margetts
Walter W. Jones, Jr.
Clyde C. Sapp
Elmer L. Prescott
Wesley L. Larson
Marion C. Kelly
Kenneth F. Shiffer
William J. Foley, Jr.
Burton C. Hallett
Wayne Hoof
John W. Murph
Raymond I. Clayton
Pierre N. Sands
Hollis C. Rawls, Jr.
Vincent M. Greene
Leo Meacher
John G. Thompson
Robert L. Gates
Robert L. Ashcraft
Roy H. Tabeling, Jr.
John L. McMahon, Jr.
Roman Kolakowsky
Grange B. McKinney
Jean B. Stevens
Travis L. Imus
Russell Turner
Daniel G. Helms
Steve G. Kona
William C. Wilburn, Jr.
Carlton F. Naumann
Edward B. Holley, Jr.
Jamie "B" Stewart
Thomas C. Deans
Arthur D. Nicholson
Bernard N. Gockel
Louis F. Knight
Wayne D. Robinson
Thomas H. York
Ernest W. Steffen, Jr.
Frederic M. Lloyd III
William Dubyk
Clarence F. Mazurkiewicz
Galen C. Brown
David F. Stiling
David Bryan, Jr.
Thomas C. Jones, Jr.
George F. Morin
George R. Greeley
Juel D. Johnston
Harry J. Brown, Jr.
Wilfred M. Howerton
Robert T. Hanley
James F. Hill
Charles B. Wall, Jr.
Ben H. Stough, Jr.
John T. Law
Oscar J. Beavers
Norton R. Girault
Charles P. Sheppard
Jack L. Eubanks
Robert N. Lyberg
Wilson G. Puryear
Charles Sanders
George R. Moran
Vance A. Schweitzer
Ivan J. Scott
Floyd F. Reck
Charles M. Tuggle, Jr.
Byron G. Shepple
Robert F. Peterson
Leonard Robinson
Andrew B. Conner, Jr.
Robert F. Woolling
William R. Austin
Roy E. Reed
Robert M. Cawthorne
Garland B. Bryan
Lawrence W. Bunce
William A. Jernigan, Jr.
Gale L. Bergey
Lowell F. W. Duell
Russell F. Craig
John M. Richards
Merwin G. Emrick
John P. Wheatley
Conrad G. Welling
Robert A. Clarke
Frank E. Miller
Hamilton McWhorter III
James F. Sands
Joseph R. Rees
Richard A. Haase
Milton K. Dennis
William C. Smith
James A. Shirley
Willis B. Reding
Dixon B. Rice
Wallace J. Ottomeyer
Robert J. Ney
Vincent Deitchman
John G. Baker, Jr.
Eugene A. Valencia
Lewis B. Sanders
William Ambrosio
Marvin B. Harper
John F. Wunderlich
Darold W. Davis
Harold E. Myers
Charles W. Rich
Raymond W. Luke
John W. Ramsey
Pickett Lumpkins
George P. McGinnis
James M. Shoemaker
Ira M. Rowell, Jr.
Lallance A. Adair
Rogers L. Black
Robert P. Benz
Julian A. Torrey
William J. Kotsch
Robert B. Johnston
Douglas "M" Birdsall
Carl A. Brown, Jr.
Edwin C. Ensley
Marvin J. Franger
Richard D. Chamberlain
Burton R. Trexler
Alfred E. Brown
James K. Alleman
William K. Keller
Walter G. Shuttleworth, Jr.
Raleigh E. Rhodes
Robert W. Drewelow
Donald Gordon
Robert E. Taylor
Philip E. Souza
Ralph W. Hart, Jr.
Louis A. Menard, Jr.
William Schroeder
Frank C. Hearrell, Jr.
Robert G. Nester
Robert F. Bergeron
Robert T. Tolleson
William J. Rivers
Albert H. Magie, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Samuel L. Lanier
John E. Porter, Jr.
Norman D. Champlin
Ralph E. Hoskins
Freal J. Gibson
Howard B. Shively
George L. Cassell
Joseph V. Meigs, Jr.
Lawrence R. Yarnell
Hollis H. Hills
Vernon L. Pendergraft
Charles D. Webb
William S. Dunham
Harry J. Dobbs
George M. Harlan
Nelson R. Charles
Robert C. Wright, Jr.
Caesar Fernandez, Jr.
William R. McClendon
Elmer W. Dailey, Jr.
John C. McCollum, Jr.
William W. Lamar, Jr.
Buster E. Toon
Micajah R. Wyatt
Stanley L. Stanczyk
Harry E. Butterfield, Jr.
Michael F. Wasco
Earle B. Abrams
John M. Wesolowski
George E. Ford
Thomas M. Campbell
Uncas L. Fretwell
Chester E. Ruffin
James C. Sutton, Jr.
Harry S. Graves
Howard S. Young, Jr.
John E. Calhoun
Donald F. Walton
Arne W. Havu
Perry Roberts
Bernard G. Fold
Donald F. Helm
Richard H. Bradley, Jr.
Harold G. Bradshaw
Gale E. Burkey
Walter L. Marshall
Ivan L. Trittipo
Ferdinand L. Brand
Clarence M. Brooks, Jr.
Robert W. Labyak
Roy A. Evans
Buryl C. Kay
Robert J. Watkins
William C. Reinhardt
Thomas L. Hine
Kenneth T. Sanders
Kyle H. Morris
Glenn E. Simmons
Archibald J. McEwan
Glenn E. Phillips
Hugh M. Nelson
Robert O. Boe
Joseph J. Paskoski
Dwight F. Johnson
Clarence K. Miller
Ronald K. McGregor
Berendt E. Johnson, Jr.
Gene C. Anderson
Edward H. Potter, Jr.
Frederick C. Moyers
William T. Cain
John J. Coonan
James H. Todd
John L. Burge
Clifford A. McDougal
Ray K. Giffin
William H. Huff
Robert J. Connolly
Herbert V. Ladley
George T. Maxwell
Hubert F. Newman
Dallas E. Runion
Jefferson H. Carroum
Richard K. Brown
Edgar T. Edmonson
Bernard E. Hackett
Robert E. Pine
Frederick C. Kidd
Benjamin D. Gaw
Walter Stephens
Jacque W. Lorch
Dean E. Kelly
George Harper, Jr.
Willard D. Hoot
Robert R. Kemp
Melvin E. Bustard, Jr.
William W. Boyd, Jr.
Frank R. Hartin
Albert W. Mott
Harold R. Megrew
Richard L. Cormier
Roy F. Gallon
Paul Haas, Jr.
Edward L. Feightner
Albert W. Hayward
Merle M. Hershey
Charles A. Wentz
Joseph M. Reigher
Charles N. McCauley
William H. Anderson, Jr.
Robert J. Haggerton
Frank M. McLinn
Herman Evans, Jr.
William T. Henderson
Herbert C. Hollandsworth
James M. Johnson
Leo B. McCuddin
Hugh M. Gray
Fred W. Holcomb, Jr.
Roy Anderson
Edward J. Winter
James S. Brown
Thomas J. Kelly
Carl Santti
Donald C. Staley
Hugh B. Burris
Edwin C. Griffin
Leon T. Raynor
Charles H. Jaep III
M. Vance Dawkins
Guacomo A. Bostenero
Omer J. Donahoe
Morton A. Prager
Andrew M. Sinclair
James B. McCormick
Richard S. Heady
John G. Armstrong
Patrick Doyle
John B. Meehan
Robert C. Hoffman
Robert N. Flath
Eugene E. Rodenburg
James F. Doherty, Jr.
Paul H. McGinnis
George H. Fuller
Harry C. McClaugherty
Richard V. Donahue
Cyrus S. Lee
Henry E. Clark
James S. Swope
Howard B. Eddy
James A. Brownsberger
Flatus W. Crook
Thomas A. Turner
Prentis R. Ray
Frank J. Shaw
"C" "L" Keedy, Jr.
Huston B. McClure
Thomas "J" Whitlow
Clarence F. Frossard
Floyd L. Harris
Paul H. Simdars
Arthur P. Pomatti
Eugene C. Dixon
Robert M. Witme
John Paradiso
Howard S. Bayes
Herbert W. Pickering
Caleb M. Lemaster
Charles W. Johnson
John A. Cork, Jr.
John F. Hutto
James N. Martin
Ernest P. Mittenmaier
Ernest C. Harris, Jr.
Harry V. Weldon
Robert B. Toof
Robert G. Wissman
John R. Rutledge
John H. Gullett
Wilbur M. Fowden, Jr.
Donald H. Kern
Richard G. Redmond
Walter C. Klein
Maurice B. Jackson
Joseph E. Haines
Carl C. Heidel
Robert L. Moyer
Lewis C. Bartlett
Adolphus B. Cosby
Howard L. Kubel
Paul A. Tickle
Thomas P. Connell
John J. Skahill
John E. Downin
John L. Thom
John L. Nuttall, Jr.
James K. Wills
James G. Whiteaker
Marshall J. Gates
Lawrence M. Smith
James S. Spielman
Dalton E. Lackey
Sam H. Moore
William E. Fogarty
Horace C. Page
Carl B. Hibben
Edward W. Donnally
Alex F. Hancock
William J. Hussong, Jr.
Benjamin C. Cooley, Jr.
Neil L. Ellis, Jr.
Eugene Pridonoff
Albert G. Fenley

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Robert E. Leonard
William C. Richardson
Austin J. Kennedy, Jr.
Eugene T. MacDonald
Sherwood H. Werner
James A. Corrick, Jr.
Clarence W. Linden
Robert H. Wilson
Fred C. Culver
Lewis E. Dreyfous
John K. Walker
Frank A. Whitaker
Sewell T. Kauffman
Frank M. Morton, Jr.
Arthur A. Shawkey
Lamar D. Whitcher
Woodford L. Flowers
Henry R. Johnson
Oscar W. Leidel, Jr.
Lawrence A. Wheeler
Earl V. Lanes
Frank W. Smith
William G. McWilliams, Jr.
William J. McKenna
Walter H. Kosky
James D. Colquhoun
Michael F. X. Bellew
Eugene F. Anderson, Jr.
Robert C. Beasten
Henry T. Adams, Jr.
James E. Raynes
Vincent P. Giuli
Thomas C. Farrell
Joseph E. Sanders
Robert C. Simmons, Jr.
Thomas E. Foster, Jr.
Paul B. Nicks
Albert M. MacDonald
William O. Gilbert
George J. Findlay
George C. Waters, Jr.
Edward A. Sanford, Jr.
Frederick W. Weatherson
Gerald L. Griffin II
Ralph H. Jack
Robert F. Newsome, Jr.
Pierre H. Gueliff
Douglas O. Williams
Dale D. Dinsmore
George F. Halla
Robert J. Gerhardt
John C. Moore
Daniel L. Martin
Elwin O. Swint
John W. Haskell
Leo E. Furtwangler
Elwin O. Swint
Augustus P. Hughes, Jr.
Jack L. Wright
Claude I. Carroll, Jr.
Joseph C. Jones
John M. Lewis, Jr.
Russell K. Wood, Jr.
William B. Jones
Clyde C. Barnhard
William A. Rye
Richard A. Lindsey
Robert W. Zivnuska
John F. Sieck
Stuart R. Allen
Bernard A. Mago
George E. Hauge
Stephen L. Kasprzak
Robert E. Whelan
Arthur W. Sirginson
James E. Corcoran

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Seth E. Anderson
John H. Craven
Elmer E. Bosserman
Lawrence C. M. Vosseler
Orlando Ingvoldstad, Jr.
Matthew A. Curry
Otto E. Sporrer
Thomas J. Mullins
Warren L. Wolf
Carl A. Herold
William E. Brooks, Jr.
Henry J. Beukema
Edward C. Helmich
Edmund J. Ford
Robert S. Sassaman
John H. Markley
Hugh T. McManus
Anthony L. Gendron
Joseph J. Tubbs
Oliver F. L. Wiese
William S. Noce
John E. Hollingsworth, III
Harold A. MacNeill
Loren M. Lindquist

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Robert B. Childers
Robert R. Graham, Jr.
Griswold L. Moeller
Edward C. Bamberg
Lawrence P. Frate
Edmund R. Foster, Jr.
Norman L. Martinson
Edward G. Underhill
Ewing L. Avera
James E. McPhillips
Harold E. Hobson
Woodrow M. Brown
Zbyszko C. Trzyna
Jack P. Pollock
Joseph W. Gorman
Eugene A. Lakos
Eugene F. Martiny

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

John M. Hirst
Leon P. Eisman
Thomas E. Shea, Jr.
Royce K. Skow
Thomas M. Floyd, Jr.
Paul R. Kent
Robert L. Henry
George S. Stains
Frederick J. Lewis, Jr.
Bernard F. Duwel
John E. Kelley
Erwin W. White
Wayne W. Willgrube
George A. L. Johnson
Ralph L. Vasa
Harry H. Linder
George A. Barunas

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Gertrude H. Nelson
Alberta S. Burk
Ruth A. Erickson
Myrtle M. Warner
Rosemary Shavia
Anna Danyo

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Homer D. Savage
Marvin J. Nelson
James B. Doster
Francis F. Johnson
John T. Freeman
John F. Davis
Roy P. McCloskey
Norbert P. Vegelahn
Richard M. Hopfinger
Mitchell L. Udick
Maurice O. Rishel
Lewis G. Gifford
Charles L. Duss
Lester Morris
Andrew R. Smith
Charles H. Carroll
James H. Crawford, Jr.
Joseph McNaughton
Clarence H. Howard
Samuel J. Miller
Raymond M. Chester
Charles C. O'Hearn
Vincent D. Maynard, Jr.
Michael F. Rogus
William D. Acton
Joseph Bigger
Clifford I. Nettleton
William G. Whisler
John R. Kersey
Elmer C. Fry
Lewis M. Moore
Ezra R. Bennett
Howard C. Zangel
Arthur R. W. Thomas
Jack L. Erickson
Clifford S. Tomlinson
Robert J. Barnes
Paul E. Krebs
Harry E. Johns
Leonard R. Laughlin
John T. Gordon
William B. Moore
Fonville Kelley
Walter E. Constance
Elliott E. Okins
"J" "F" Branson, Jr.
Clyde C. McPherson
Charles W. Busey
Ralph S. Cerney
Berthel L. Roberts
Jack G. Kaye
Ralph F. Stoll
Paul C. Stadler
Lawrence A. Farquhar
John R. Bohlken
Joseph Boriotti
Lauren M. Johnson
Melvin H. Brantley
Ellis E. Lee
Arthur J. Manger
James E. Ivy
George H. Winslow
James B. Morris
Richard G. Tobin
Clarence L. Lambing
Frederick E. Berg
Larry E. Dunlap
Clarke B. Walbridge
Richard W. Mann
Ivol E. Hansen
John J. Foley
Norman P. Currin
David M. Jeter
Joseph H. Fisher
Francis M. Guttenberger
Robert H. Johnson
Lee R. Thompson
John K. Freeman
Thomas E. Greenwood
Bernard L. Zentz
Stephen F. Kelley
Bert R. McClelland, Jr.
Melvin E. Call
Garvis D. Johnson
Victor J. Sibert
Leahman J. Holt
Herbert E. Duquette, Jr.
Arden P. Bonner, Jr.
John A. Delaney
William L. Thede
Richard J. Mumford
Walter I. Perry
William B. Kurlak
John E. Echterling
Robert E. Anglemyer
Paul D. Davidson
Andrew Serrell
Henry H. Henderson
Harry K. Hoch, Jr.
Victor B. Rink
Lewis C. Ihrig
Alphonse G. Goodberlet
William R. Wilson
William E. H. Feichner
David P. Parks
Joseph J. Cote
Arthur D. Ronimus, Jr.
John L. Koch
Raymond V. Raehn
Melvin W. Cassidy
Carl C. Dace
John R. Miller, Jr.
Jerome O. Hovland
Roy S. Johnston
Arthur W. Motley, Jr.
David D. Harris
Wilfred G. Chartier
Milton B. Moreland
Daniel A. York
Paul Roth
Robert "H" Ebersole
Elmer "P" Carlson
Inslee E. Grainger
John R. Atkins
Charles H. Hoar, Jr.
Theodore Hladik
James E. Jenkins
David Miller
William M. A. Greene
James W. Bowen
Newel W. Smith, Jr.
William I. Brewington
Theodore L. Morgan
Walter R. Smith
James E. Tanner
Henry E. Ethier
Richard M. Davis
Clayton C. Windsor
William J. J. Heffernan
Derrill P. Crosby
Aloysius Sally
John B. Pruden
Luther G. Bearden

George W. Stubblefield, Jr.
John W. Casey, Jr.
William S. Rhymes
Thomas Fields
Emerick S. Kelone
Billie L. Perkins
Walter W. Johns
Henry W. Hague
Alonza B. McKeel, Jr.
Willis C. McClelland
Keith N. Sargent
Philip H. Klepak
Stephen R. Woolard
John A. D'Zamba
Frederick P. McDermott
Kermit H. Bonner
Thomas E. Butler
Arthur B. Baribault
Edward A. Riley
Charles M. Itte
John K. Leslie
Marvin V. Weaver
Clifford L. Frink
John C. Powell
John L. Mikulich
Alfred W. Harmon
Cornelius S. Howard, Jr.
Robert J. Moloney
"J" "D" Ford
Joseph F. Sowar
Ernest E. Smith
Adolph P. Czerwenka
William B. Murray, Jr.
Allen W. Slifer
Robert Gordon
Charles B. Hamilton, Jr.
Donald E. Guhse
Andrew R. Setzer
Lewis T. Farmer, Jr.
Benjamin F. Scott, Jr.
William A. Schwem
Horace N. Moore, Jr.
Franklin H. Alden
Charles W. Gibbs
Ward L. Berkey
Herbert D. Hoyt, Jr.
Robert E. Osterholm
Owen R. Toon
Earle B. Young
Michael Skees
Robert C. Downing
Paul A. Dilgren
Clifford C. Walstrom
Eugene W. Bauder
Edward Falkowski
Jack H. Hawkins
William J. Walsh
Theodore E. Curtis
Richard W. Buxton
Donald F. Flathers
Elmer M. Fischer
Charles Neal
William A. Stone
Emmett B. Boutwell
James C. Russell
Guy E. Thompson
William H. Rippey
Joseph W. Janecky
Roger J. Koch
George A. Mitchell
Robert J. Stevenson, Jr.
John T. Lyons
Robert T. Lundy
Robert C. Light
James D. Carson
Marshall D. Ward
William F. Feely
Leonard G. Bryan
Harvey E. Toponce
B. Russell Dooge, Jr.
Henry J. Williams
Samuel B. Jensen
Cecil L. Haverty
Donald P. Lanaghan
William R. Bloom
Vernon C. Bono
William Masek, Jr.
Elbert B. Johnson
Philip R. Lauriat
Andrew Bodnaruk
Robert B. Ambrose
William L. Webb
Richard L. Underwood
Samuel D. Seay
Jack B. Dunn
Robert F. Kenney
Clayton G. Lawrence
Adrian D. Wagner
James B. MacKenzie
George A. Schaedler
Charles F. Merrill, Jr.
Vie J. Vaughan
Ellery E. Tyler
Raymond S. Howell, Jr.
Robert W. Lowman
Edward D. Franz
James R. Collier
James R. Craig
Willis L. Somervell, Jr.
Robert W. Millar
Charles F. Harding, Jr.
Frank G. Reese
Bernard W. Brender
Patrick F. Hussey
Thomas D. Hawkinson
Victor L. McCallon
Eugene Schlaack
Donald L. Campbell
Fred C. Satterthwaite
Arthur J. Vanek
Barclay W. Smith
Leslie O. Fortner
Bain S. Allen
Edward L. Hutcheson
Charles C. Jones
LeRoy E. Irvin
Peter V. A. Agur
John N. White
Roy T. Higgins
Frank E. Blackman
John Shea
Robert H. Grant
Jack R. Eberley
Joseph H. Wilberding
Albert M. Sackett
Charles O. Anderson
Franklin B. Moore
Daniel J. Diana
Harry C. Dittler, Jr.
William H. Hibbs
Ralph E. Newberry
Burton G. Lockwood
Horace C. Holley
Howard B. Kushman
Percy W. Rairden, Jr.
John O. Stull
Harry E. Jackson
Bradford J. DeCoux
Roy E. Farmer
Franklyn M. Comstock
Raymond D. Smith
Howard G. Goben
Chester H. Dorchester
James T. Parady
John Morris
Eugene R. Wiseman
Zebulon V. Knott, Jr.
Glen M. Even
Robert G. McCollough
Daniel S. Capozzalo
William W. Elam
Richard A. Harris
Donald A. MacGillivray
Paul O'Connor
Arthur W. Buell
Forester, W. Isen
Richard L. Hall
Norman O. Adelfson
Philip W. Koehler
James "A" Grant
Duan W. Linker
Carl W. Coe
Claude "M" Briggs III
Donald E. Packard
Gilbert L. Tracy
Melvin W. Dize
Joseph F. Walters
Donald E. McKinley
William C. Murphy
Alfred G. Trube, Jr.
Jerome S. Roth
Michael O'Hopp
Donald L. Briggs
John H. Sieckenius
Hugh K. Staiger
Eugene F. Arnold
Cyril L. Imming
Harold B. J. Barnes
Theodore W. Hansen
William R. Preston
Joachim P. Speciale
Ralph E. Herrick, Jr.
Bobby S. Macklin
Neil H. Richardson
Milton D. George
Ezekiel H. Daughtrey
Julian S. Lake
William "L" Aydelott
Richard A. Eldridge
Royal C. Murray, Jr.
John A. Davenport
Philip Baker
Jack W. Weidner
Hubert Glenzer, Jr.
Raymond F. Curry
Frederick Blaser
George E. Callahan
John E. di Pretoro, Jr.
Robert F. Hostutler
Thomas L. Dwyer
Robert J. Brazzell
James A. Paulick
David D. Lewis
Clarence O. Ryce
Harold L. Eberly
Fred G. Barham, Jr.
Herbert T. Lake
William A. Simcox
Anthony J. Kodis
Robert J. Agness
Lioneli H. Nelson
"J" "W" Perkins, Jr.
Ernest J. Korte
Lloyd C. Morris
Ernest L. Stewart
Walter F. Hoffland
William W. Turner
"L" "B" Loudermilk
Walter J. Czerwinski
William R. Johnson
Terrance F. Perkins
Francis Heffernan
Herbert C. Braid
Jerrold W. Thompson
Leo Krupp
Clyde H. Campbell
Emmett M. Cooke, Jr.
Richard H. Jester
Harold W. Hampton
Cedric M. Hansen
Robert E. Atkins
George A. Bane
Morris K. Spiess
Mitchell C. Griffin
James F. Lloyd
George E. Humphries
Ted L. Farrell
Embree D. Wilson, Jr.
Thomas R. Jones III
James F. McGarvey, Jr.
Robert V. Eckert
Robert A. Nelson
Carroll B. Keck
Stanley E. Smith
Russell Sampson
Erwin J. Spencer
William J. Koressel
Paul M. Gallagher
Joseph W. Entrikin
William F. Tobin, Jr.
William D. Ellis
Reginald S. Fogg
Arthur E. Gargas
Albert A. Steinbeck
Charles Sherwood
William C. Sadler
George F. Kube
John H. Henson
Joe Williams, Jr.
Charles R. Robertson
John Price
Joseph W. Sullivan
Barton Irby
William B. Ecker
Herbert R. Hynson, Jr.
Norwald R. Quiel
Donald B. Brady
John D. Collins
Jack L. Twedell
Richard P. McHugh
Harry R. Padbury
Melvin C. Keebaugh
Edward P. Davis
Ralph R. Rasmussen
Charles E. Martin
Dale O. Blade
Bobbie E. Boney
Melvin W. Lee
John F. Walker
Vernon Thompson
Jordan P. Onorato
Clinton H. Mundt
John R. Pounds
Stanley P. Krolczyk
Warren M. Boozer
Charles R. Bishop
Eugene J. Weinbeck
Sidney Edelman
Harold R. Heagerty
Earl J. Robb
Thomas W. Lyons
Murray A. Moyce
Herman J. Stansell, Jr.
Dee L. Leland
Kenneth W. Wade
Lewis O. Smith
William E. Keeler
Robert I. Marr
Charles C. Henderson
Vinton C. Vint
Joseph E. Kington, Jr.
James O. Bess
William H. Simpson, Jr.
Rupert W. Legare, Jr.
Richard H. Spindler
Wilson R. Gawthrop
Fred K. Woodburn
Charles R. Leonard
Howard H. Harrison
Jack L. Moore
Joe "E" Chambliss
Leon E. L. Mathwick
Robert E. Custer
Charles F. Poenicke, Jr.
Paul Johnson
Russell L. Smith
Jack Harris
Carl F. Wiesendanger
Bernard M. McClaugherty
Jennings B. Wilson, Jr.
Irl J. Allison
Minor F. Abel, Jr.
James H. Keating
Albert L. Moore
Frank Aponowich
Lionel J. Goulet
Arthur E. Hammarlund
William J. Hart III
Alexander N. Dussel
Clifford L. Stewart
Charles E. Delaney
Joseph R. E. Le Tourneau
James H. Wirth
Ervin "F" Hodge
Howard "T" Webb, Jr.
Carl H. Yeagle
Walter Hurst
Edward Snicer
Leonard M. Nearman
Ralph R. Lang
Rollin W. Brigham, Jr.
Billy L. Havron
Louis B. Clayton, Jr.
Frederick W. Hartson
Patrick F. Cunningham
Donald W. Taylor
Lyle H. Sette
Edward D. Jones
Robertson L. Miller
Robert L. Ammidown
Charles N. Frisbie
John E. Ford
Austin G. Karnes
Earl L. Robinson
Charles D. Grimmett
Gerard M. Donovan
Harry J. Klein
Philip N. Searles
Robert A. Koch
Robert E. Swigart
Robert L. Warner
Walter D. Roll
Lewis W. Rambo
Alexander Julian, Jr.
Willis C. Barnes
David M. Saunders
Warren Taylor
LaVerne W. Brown, Jr.
Robert D. Donavan
Daniel E. Chesler III
Carvel H. Blair
Donald H. Ziebell
Richard H. Lee
Henry A. R. Peyton
William C. Kistler
Peter G. Beieri
Frederick H. Lamartin, Jr.
James A. Reid
Chandler E. Swallow, Jr.
Will M. Adams, Jr.
John D. Eaton
Francis M. Holmes
Lloyd F. Bell
Donald C. Curran
Richard E. Jortberg
Walter W. Schwartz, Jr.
Scott C. Daubin
Allen M. Dame
Joseph E. Schwager
Lyle A. Cox
Joseph E. Snyder, Jr.
Alvin L. Meints
Edward A. Christofferson, Jr.
John P. Wise
Robert B. Baldwin
Douglas S. Mackay
Henry L. Bagby
Charles E. W. Dobbs
Homer R. Adrianse
Dean L. Axene
Crumpton Farrell
Samuel M. Cooley, Jr.
Luther B. Wallace
Theodore R. Fick
Richard D. Hertzig
Norman B. Bessac
Edward P. Coleman
Thomas A. Bush, Jr.
Orville B. Karge
Robert B. Gohr
Alexander K. Rentschler
Lyle D. Oder
Charles F. Donaghy
Frank B. Correia
John M. Charles
William J. Beardsley
Max R. Rush
Ted H. Colvin
Anthony J. DiVito
Everett A. Parke
Robert G. Newby
Jack A. Pate
Robert H. Watson, Jr.
Eben Leavitt, Jr.
William V. Steuteville
Walter R. Gerich
Robert E. May
William P. Crenshaw
Robert A. Hogsed
James G. Gallemore
John N. Longfield
Robert Delgado
Dick G. Wilson
Joe L. Midgett
Joseph F. Bolger, Jr.
Forrest S. Petersen
Joseph E. Bonds
William S. Stewart III
Warren R. Colegrove
Pierce A. Jensen, Jr.
Clarence R. Bryan
Thomas F. Utegaard
Edward W. Behm
Frank W. Ewald
Arnett B. Taylor
Nelson J. Gambrill
Robert A. Eidson
Charles Priest, Jr.
William D. Counts
Robert D. McCrary
Merton D. VanOrden
Patrick "J" Hannifin
Walter Dedrick
Thaddeus M. Taylor
Herbert "R" Poorman
Roland T. E. Bowler, Jr.
Gustav F. Swainson, Jr.
John F. Kurfess
Alfred C. Bessette
Frederick J. Kelley
Alex A. Kerr
"W" Loron Cranney, Jr.
Francis A. Packer, Jr.
Richard J. Dzikowski
John B. Haines
Willis B. Van Oss
James C. Matheson
Joe P. Moorer
Arthur G. Red
Bernard B. Forbes, Jr.
Merrill E. Kelly, Jr.
Hassell L. Norton
John K. Kalina
Richard J. Cooke
George F. Ellis, Jr.
Fred C. Watson
John V. Peters
George H. Webster
Kenneth W. Chambers
Harry L. Milhan
Franklynn R. Sperberg
William H. McLaughlin, Jr.
Olney J. Bryant
Fred T. Berry
Floyd K. Lissy
Robert Kirk
Wade R. Bascom
James B. Hennegan
Benjamin C. Rogers, Jr.
Quinley R. Schulz
Phaon B. Derr, Jr.
Gerald G. O'Rourke
Jens B. Hansen
Philip D. Johnston, Jr.
Willis I. Brown
Burris D. LaMar
Ernest R. Barrett
Bobby C. Brogoitti
William P. Ferguson
James K. Boak
Cleo N. Mitchell, Jr.
Philip M. Erickson, Jr.
Jean L. Leslie
Francis T. Kleber
Roy K. Jones II
Joe "W" Watts
Henry O. Anson, Jr.
James F. O'Neil
Richard C. Fay
Roy Riser

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Wayne S. Nelson
Samuel W. Selfridge, Jr.
David M. Longton
Charles F. Fadeley
Lawrence N. Smith
Edward F. McCartan
Thomas W. Madigan
Robert C. Wood
William E. Fannin
Clark L. Beck
John F. Wester
Richard W. Mansfield
John N. Price
Theodore A. Wagner, Jr.
Alexander A. Padis
Clarence B. Stephenson
John R. North
Daniel C. Clements
John K. Allison
Wilton L. Atkinson
Robert J. Clancey
Benton W. Decker, Jr.
Roy G. Davis
Morris A. Esmiol, Jr.
James M. Faddis
William C. Lewis
Robert S. Hayes
Rudolph V. Biordi
Robert R. Hale
Robert O. Sherman
William W. Strong
Paul L. Nuschke
William W. K. Miller, Jr.
Douglas E. McIntyre
Edwin C. Bain, Jr.
Donald W. Kennedy
Ralph G. Lipfert
Robert M. Waters
James R. Wiggins
Lando W. Zech, Jr.
Howard J. Ursettie
Royal T. Daniel, Jr.
John Mullen, Jr.
John W. Farley
George A. Hamilton
Charles H. Boldt, Jr.
Doniphan B. Shelton
William B. Shepard, Jr.
Alfred R. Olsen, Jr.
Paul A. Adams
Randell H. Prothro
Allen J. Gilmore
Richard M. McCool, Jr.
Stanley R. McCord
John B. Padgett, Jr.
Hugh C. Mason
Herbert L. Ogier, Jr.
Howard Bucknell III
Paul V. Converse
John R. Chappell
Carson R. Worley
George A. O'Shea, Jr.
Homer B. Thomas, Jr.
Frederick S. Gore
William D. Brotherton, Jr.
George P. Steele, II
Robert H. Merrick, Jr.
James T. Cockrill II
George M. Hecker
Alan B. Shepard, Jr.
William R. Chester
Edward F. Zenisek
LeRoy S. Edmonds
Wilbur C. Trautman, Jr.
Robert H. Ewing
Charles K. Moore
Harlan D. Williams
John A. Gilcrist
Victor M. Vissering, Jr.
William Carrier, Jr.
Robert F. Stanton
Mark G. Tremaine
Lawrence A. Wilder
Allan P. Slaff
Loyd J. Kiernan, Jr.
Robert M. Fortson, Jr.
Walter H. Godshall
James F. Bradley, Jr.
Julien J. LeBourgeois
John F. Gillooly
Kester M. Roberts
Frank F. Clifford, Jr.
Eugene F. Deems
John K. McAdams
Robert O. Coulthard
Hubbell Y. Davidson
Thomas K. Ives
Edward H. Doolin, Jr.
Donald R. Richards
Joseph J. Doak, Jr.
Paul V. Purkrabek
Tracy H. Wilder, Jr.
Carl W. Gronemann, Jr.
Walter N. Dietzen, Jr.
Gilbert C. Gayler
Irving H. Knudson, Jr.
Samuel G. Gorsline, Jr.
Edward C. White
John F. Riley
John C. Loveday
William J. McGarry, Jr.
Peter R. Perkins
George R. Froyd
Donald T. Poe
Thomas H. Polk
Donald B. Carpenter
John Duff, Jr.
Arthur D. Heinze
Robert T. Kavanagh
Beverly deP. Staser
Joseph M. Snyder, Jr.
Edward P. Hermann
John W. Miller
Clifford E. Hunter
William P. Page
Dickson W. Alderton
Harold A. Taylor
Frank L. Haines
Hugh D. Murphree
Jack M. Manherz
James W. Montgomery
Harvey C. Hartzel
Robert W. Herrick
Robert G. Douglas
Samuel T. Bussey
Ralph W. Stell, Jr.
Robert C. Barnhart, Jr.
Craig E. Randall
Robert A. Swensen
Searle J. Barry
Richard E. Rumble
William H. Hoover
Steven W. Callaway, Jr.
John R. Gilbert
Walter J. Brauer
William C. Lewis
Robert A. Close
Clyde O. Morrison
Cornelius F. Moul
George P. Peed
Robert B. Mack
James I. Hemphill
Benjamin H. Dean
Wilbur N. Sims
Ralph A. Hilson
James T. Ingram
Richard G. Alexander
William F. Chaires
John F. Hill
Ronald O. Wilson
Theodore L. Johnson
Warren H. O'Neil
Gordon T. Randall
John R. Johnson
William J. Traynor
Frank T. Rawlings, Jr.
William A. Bowes
Lucius E. Steere III
Lowell F. Fitch
James F. Braun
John E. Pearce, Jr.
Henderson G. Silliman
John E. Brown, Jr.
Joseph Colton
Robert A. Scherrer
Howard E. Blum
Gordon R. Hopwood
John A. Swank
Anson D. Geiger
Gerald M. Johnson
Edward L. Cochrane, Jr.
Merlin D. Becker
Vernon F. Anderson
Robert W. Ferrin
Josiah Henson
Ralph R. Riley
Emil Saroch, Jr.
Vincent J. Anania
William A. Doubt
William T. Zeigler
Tom E. Sulick
Louis B. Schmeltzer
William J. Flynn
Edward H. Loftin, Jr.
Arthur K. Keevil
Donald B. Edge
James S. Kennedy
Edward S. Caple, Jr.
James C. Masters, Jr.
Edward A. Hall
Phillip S. Harward
John W. Chapman
Robert D. Steele
Ernest J. King, Jr.
Robert I. Kasten
Edward E. Hastings II
Evans P. K. King
Ted S. Johnson
Graydon T. Stout
George W. Cogswell
James W. Nance
Toria J. Bratten, Jr.
David A. Kribs, Jr.
Victor R. Knick
John D. Kidd
Grady R. Gay
William B. Hayler
Scott E. Peck, Jr.
John R. Potter
Charles S. Bowcock, Jr.
Walter N. Temple
John C. Eakin
Roger H. Mullins
Lee B. Findly
James M. McCaskill
Lawrence R. Crum
Jesse B. Cobb
Robert J. Tartre
John T. Knudsen
Walter S. DeLany, Jr.
Raymond M. Roland, Jr.
Kenneth C. Foote
Arthur Wachtel
Donald E. McGrath
Frederick D. Knoche
Howard E. Lee
John F. Mayer
Edward F. Weeks
Herbert H. Fielder
Guy P. Bordelon, Jr.
Robert L. Harvey
William T. Wootton
Walter A. Helm, Jr.
Bill B. Parks
Robert S. Wright
Hayes A. Dorr
Robert E. McCloskey
Richard P. Slaymaker
Gordon R. Boyes
Prescott W. Palmer, Jr.
Guy V. Padgett
Thomas F. Reddington, Jr.
Leslie A. Welge
Robert F. Steed
Paul D. Marr
Francis J. Gist, Jr.
Jack L. Webb
Frank P. Swan, Jr.
Fred B. Newton, Jr.
Josey L. Martin, Jr.
William T. Reilly
Horace B. Walton
Eric H. Weiland
Robert F. Harrison
Jack W. Redmond
Moxie Craus
Eugene E. Ordway
Albert A. Degennaro
Roby A. Beal
Oliver W. H. Robertson Jr.
Earl C. Bell
Eldon E. Achberger, Jr.
John D. Yarbrough
Paul A. Coari
Earl P. Walker
Earl J. Turner
Kenneth H. Eaton
Walter Marusa
Jack A. Turner
Francis A. Stark
George G. Andrews
George T. Walker, Jr.
Byron S. Marshall
Francis J. Cronin
George W. Snediker
Christopher S. Thompson
Charles E. Guthrie
Joseph M. Scarborough
George B. Hargan, Jr.
Charles E. Davis
Carl E. Ellis
George Cole
James H. Agles
Milton L. Elchinger
Norman W. Spurgeon
Leo V. Andrecht
Robert R. Kidwell
Franklin C. Northrup
James D. Ackerman
Arthur E. Thompson
Irving T. Gumb, Jr.
John M. Suddreth
Benedict J. Scott
Wilbur E. N. Keil
Gerard P. Zornow
Robert B. Linn
Edward O. Crosby
Truman F. Grubl
George T. Hamilton
Royal D. Berg
Warren B. Brann
Carl B. Kole
David L. Miller
John E. Nichols
Hugh A. Cleveland
John F. Rule
LeRoy Perkins
Eugene R. Forsht
Harry E. Weber
Herbert A. Franck
Clayton F. Johnson
Willie W. Harris
Robert H. Armour
Rudolf M. Buselmeier
Nathan H. King
Charles C. Allen
Laurence G. Brooks
Warren "L" Clary
Donald D. Dunton
Clayton W. Merrill
Francis G. Moses
John T. Baker
Frank W. Warrick
Lawrence L. Beese
Harry E. Ramsey, Jr.
Howard W. Jones
Will L. Stalnaker
Wilbur E. Reed
Kenneth L. Shurtleff
Kenneth W. Scott
Adolph J. Furtek
Robert M. Beckley
Paul Stjerne
Edwin R. Jenks
Harvey B. Jones
Anderson V. Showen
Robert F. Jones
Harry D. Hall
Anthony S. Creider
Robert Gilmour, Jr.
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
John L. Minnick
Gilbert W. Rappelt
Elmer H. Earnhardt
Joseph E. Codemo
Irvin W. Reed
Joseph E. Sullivan
Robert G. Langland
Harry R. Ridge
Fred W. Davenport
Robert B. Stickles
James D. Dodge
Edward J. Kratochvil
Harry W. Enabnit
Robert F. Reed
Raymond K. Marker
Eugene A. O'Brien
Alfred V. Boutin
Howard W. Carr
David E. Hilton
Elton E. Flowers
James D. Moore
John L. Murphy
Jesse W. Dunwoody
Charles W. Combs, Jr.
Herbert W. McGuire
Joe H. Hunt
Donald D. Stone
George A. Ales
Thomas E. Acton
Howard W. Masterman
Lewis J. Polansky
Russell D. Rider
Donnie W. Huckaby
Edward G. Jones
William H. Lobb
Floyd Robertson
Charles R. Sullenger
Elroy J. Shafer
Alfred F. Norwood
Llewellyn E. Jalbert
Gerald W. Wilson
Gordon W. Jones
John S. Tuttle
John S. Walden
Louis C. Hambley
Carl O. Quarterman
Woodson P. Bremer
Chesley W. Richey
James D. March
Kenneth S. Dick
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Charles M. Dorris
John C. Arthur
Theodore C. Gavett
John A. Tennant
Edwin P. Smith
James M. Parnell
Abraham H. Brower
Frederick J. Hicken
Lawrence O. Nasset
William F. Harris
Elsworth C. Reynolds
Helmuth A. Ludwig
Benjamin G. Sailors
Reid E. Coble
Paul A. Smith
Ray W. Seiwert
George S. Schlemmer
Leonard W. Cushing
Harry R. Kohler
Donald Gaither
Charles J. Barr
John Kriss
Charles J. Fox
Paul H. Williams
John E. Russ, Jr.
Charles F. Yarbrough
Robert E. Tyler
Alvin K. Fentress, Jr.
Hubert D. Gano
Nels E. Brugman
James B. Taylor
Leonard F. Bathel
Douglas G. Christy

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

John H. Nuck
Richard Bergen
Robert A. Wells
Conway C. Baker
Dewayne C. Miller
Wendell McCrory
Paul B. Fitch
Alfred V. B. Marrin
Eugene L. Tucker
Merlyn A. Nelson
Earl F. Hilderbrant
John W. Clift
Edward J. Daley
Edward J. Miller
Robert B. Webster
Roy M. McDaniel
Earl G. Clement
Charles P. Ramsey
Paul N. Bentley
Whitney A. Chamberlain
Karl N. Keever
Edward L. Kurek
Thomas A. Cassin
Franklyn L. Clark
Jack J. Moore
William H. Yarborough
Carl M. Johnson
Dan P. Appleby
Thomas E. Stevenson
Harry J. Halley
Charles M. Mason
Clyde D. Killion
Willard N. Schneider
George H. Treece, Jr.
Paul C. Shumaker
Noble "T" Hawkins
William M. Poulson
John J. Wohlschlaeger
Conrad A. Barger
Richard L. McNutt
Donald D. Stumm
Roland H. Bouchard
Lloyd E. Sellman
James H. Ard
Foster F. Comstock
Alton W. Barton
William O. Foulkes
Douglas G. Aitken
John C. Kelleher
John J. Casey
Paul W. Hebert
David G. Lamborne
Milton W. Harvey
James E. Laney
Matthew Mackey, Jr.
Donald W. Bahl
Carl W. Utterback
Bert E. Smith
Paul "D" O'Keefe
George E. Bell
William E. Sigman
William N. Haddock
Glen L. Dunlap
Alvin H. Rampey
Hugh A. McManus
William W. Fink, Jr.
George P. Hoffman
William A. Novak
Paul W. Woodhead
Murry Cohn
Francis W. Moseley
James W. Herb
Charles Daniel, Jr.
Archie B. Meihls, Jr.
Howard L. Madden
Keith Bennett
William J. Robinson
Vernon G. Rivers
Wilbur A. G. Wilson
John L. Adams
Gerry N. McLeod
William H. Johnson
Philip Crosby
Samuel R. Simpson, Jr.
Wesley J. McClaren
John W. Lipscomb, Jr.
Sherman W. Blandin, Jr.

Robert J. McCormick
Edward S. Ruete
Charles F. Grad
Herbert H. Aull
James A. Smith
Clarence A. Creel
William S. Berkshire, Jr.
John M. Smith
Joe J. Wilcox
Elmon A. Geneste, Jr.
William W. Collier
Kenneth L. Woodfin
George L. Fitchett
Robert C. Porter
Robert A. Schauffler
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.
Kenneth W. Longnecker
Louie B. Knudsen, Jr.
Zack F. Brown, Jr.
Lester G. Maxwell
Carl J. Stringer, Jr.
Charles E. Whiteside
James I. Hightower, Jr.
Howard D. McPike
Gerald J. Patton
Oscar N. Dale
Richard K. M. Bridges, Jr.
Charles E. Kridle
Charles A. Gardner, Jr.
William L. Bryson
Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.
Howard L. Rezner
John F. Paolantonio
Frank L. Spillman, Jr.
Raymond H. Bates
William E. Stephens
David E. Ward
Edward M. McDonough
Russell A. Jones
Carl L. Henn, Jr.
John W. Holmes
Frederick D. Schaer
Joseph E. Bulfer
Martti O. Mattila
Charles C. Alexander
Adolph Mathews
Joseph J. Snapp
Robert W. H. Darrow
George L. Owen
James F. Simpson
John M. Dunn
George Lott
William D. Little
Byron Uskievich
Paul L. Anderson
Robyn H. Henderson
James F. Armlin
Edmund J. Prosch
William W. Statia
Loyd Goolsby
William D. Wright
Lawrence O. Purkaple
William R. Whitney
Andrew F. Bevill
James W. Post

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

George L. Martin
Malcolm A. Carpenter
Carl Elwood
Andrew J. Grygiel
Harold H. Cummings
Ernest W. Metzger
Samuel Sobel
Edwin R. Weidler
Deane W. Kennedy
Robert F. Lang
Eugene S. Swanson
Robert M. Harrison
John M. Danielsen
Glynn A. Oglesby
Peter H. Brewerton

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Leo Liberman
Cushing Phillips, Jr.
John M. Bannister, Jr.
John M. Daniels
George R. Shepard
Robert B. Jarvis
Henry C. Besmen
Edward T. Diberto
John J. Manning, Jr.
Charles W. Graff
Custer F. Krickenberger, Jr.
Albert R. Marschall
Sidney J. Wynne, Jr.
Russell J. Rowson
John P. Williams
Foster M. Lalor, Jr.
Henry E. Stephens
Joe R. Wilson
William B. Stephenson
Allen S. Waters
Ralph B. Grahl, Jr.
Vern E. Atwater
Robert W. Marshall
Harlan L. Bowman
Johnnie C. Dennis

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Emmett L. VanLandingham, Jr.
Clinton H. Dutcher
James W. Kinder
Clair L. Patterson
Robert F. Rigg
Chester D. Worthen
Albert L. Andersen
James E. Thompson
Ernest N. Grover
Richard C. Richardson
Guy H. Morgan
Albert E. Mibeck
Guy A. Richard
Philip M. Griffith
Solomon C. Pflagg
Ned B. Curtis

LIEUTENANT, LINE

William B. Cobb, Jr.
Frank E. Sherman
Frederick C. Marshall
Delbert E. Brandenburg
Donald Henderson
William H. Hamilton, Jr.
John M. Wolff
James C. Clarke
Albert J. Frainier, Jr.
Carl H. Sebenius, Jr.
William A. Ellsworth
Coleman "T" Brown, Jr.
William W. Bowers
Clarence W. Stoddard, Jr.
David L. Gunckel
William L. Burgess, Jr.
Milton O. Paul
Robert L. Smith
Francis M. Adams, Jr.
John M. Luykx
Roy W. McLain, Jr.
Richard E. Whiteside
James C. Wilson
Herman J. Bushman, Jr.
Marcus A. Zettel
Franklin O. Ritter
John F. Danis
John W. Brannon, Jr.
Robert Barden
Joseph E. Bores
Clinton D. MacDonald
John M. Andersen
Richard R. Allmann
William D. Bourne
Lucien Capone, Jr.
Karl J. Bernstein
Richard E. Sander
Walter A. White
Donald M. Cherno
Wesley E. Lindsey, Jr.
James E. Patton
John H. Koach
Arthur B. Forrest, Jr.
Lee M. Ramsey
Jack E. Everling
Milton J. Chewning
Robert F. Smith, Jr.
Earl M. Stein
Bernard Tesch, Jr.
William T. Eaton
John A. Demasters
William M. Ratliff
Gerald W. Dyer
Robert E. Brady
Thomas C. Stephenson
Donald E. Sparks
James R. Williford III
Earl L. Carter
James H. B. Smith
Thomas E. McDonald
Charles W. Cates
Roy E. Goldman
Henry T. White, Jr.
Robert L. Walters
Vincent A. Dauro
Carl B. Wilson
Bruce A. Nystrom
Stuckey D. Willson
Robert D. Norman
William M. Coldwell
John B. Hawkins, Jr.
Robert E. Allard
Russell F. Goodacre, Jr.
William E. Jennings
Charles L. Stiles
Royce C. Dreyer
James L. Furrh, Jr.
John C. Duck
David E. Dearolph
Harold F. Tipton, Jr.
Stanford C. Balmforth
Dale P. Helmer
Warren H. Merrill
Bertie G. Homan
Richard E. Galloway
Edmond A. Chevalier
Karl F. Cook
Robert A. Guyer
Francis E. Cornett
Kenneth W. Atkinson
Albert T. Buckmaster
Chandler G. Smith
High W. Albers
Thomas C. Clay
Wilfred A. Bacchus
George D. Florence
Robert P. Smith
Leonard J. Owen
James V. Burton
Philip H. Thom, Jr.
John H. Sullivan
Howard R. Edwards, Jr.
Junius H. Arnold, Jr.
Wayne D. Smith
William H. Birk
James E. Kneale
Paul T. Karschnia
James R. Roney
Horace D. Clarke, Jr.
Meredith W. Nicholson
Gilbert J. Kirk, Jr.
Donald "H" Mayo
John A. Oesterreicher
Gordon H. Smith
Malcolm H. Thiele
Harold A. Riedl
Charles H. Peters
William C. Haskell
Edwin E. Woods, Jr.
Oliver S. Mollison
Richard W. Kelly
Robert C. Hendrickson, Jr.
Richard S. Wolford
Russell F. Wilson
Jack D. Riley
Kenneth V. McArthur
Glenn E. Skinner, Jr.
Robert E. Morgan
Robert G. Kuhne
Robert K. Ripley
Donald A. Dahlman
Joseph C. McCoy, Jr.
Edward I. McQuiston, Jr.
Donald E. Moore
Matthew J. Gauss, Jr.
James B. Linder
George E. Jacobssen, Jr.
Bobby L. Potts
Albert T. Barr, Jr.
Lundi A. Moore
Benjamin E. Spence
James H. Scott
James L. McVoy
Lewis A. Shea, Jr.
Jack Scoville
Edwin E. Williams
Neal J. Johnson
Edwin S. Wallace, Jr.
Frank P. Brown, Jr.
John E. Majesky
Jack E. Magee
Albert G. Kuehnapfel
James B. Brown
Charles F. Schied
James A. White
Walter A. Schriefer
Charles F. Hickey
Edward F. Striegel
Jerome E. Hamill
Stanley G. Cooper
Ralph G. Spencer
Adair Miller
Frank D. Whiteman
James R. Edixon
Allan F. Bacon
Arthur K. Knoizen
Malcolm S. Carpenter
George M. Benas, Jr.
Benjamin J. Brzenski, Jr.
Robert W. Titus
Raymond G. Chote
George G. Russell
John H. Carroll, Jr.
Richard T. Bailey
Reaves H. Baysinger, Jr.
Herman M. Bading
John D. Middleton
Gerald G. Roberts
Ralph J. Touch
John L. Hofford
James S. Orloff
Hugh E. Longino, Jr.
Downing L. Jewell
Carlyle "C" Merkley, Jr.
Francis R. Hibbard
James A. Carmack, Jr.
Charles H. Mohr
William A. Finlay, Jr.
Marvin H. Warner
Stephen R. Krause
Lowry W. Norris
Henry C. White
John D. Lund
David H. Blalock, Jr.
Preston Luke
Jesse E. Sampson
Arthur H. Mikles
Robert "C" Brown, Jr.
George M. Kling
Robert E. Stewart
Charles M. Woodworth
Robert S. Blake
Robert A. Holden
Leo P. Bauerlein
Harry M. Parker, Jr.
Gerlous G. Miller, Jr.
Cornelius S. Snodgrass, Jr.
George E. Burgi
Charles F. Jesson
Theodore E. Daum
George L. Page
Arthur L. Moberly
Wilmer R. Gilbert
Joyce M. Frazee
Frank Messenger III
Frank A. Rockwell
John C. Holz
Frank C. Sain
Donald M. Harlan
William E. Dewey
Jack D. Venable
Dallas D. Johnson
Richard S. Agnew
Robert H. Ardinger
Thomas N. Porter
Alfred G. Kreinberg
Eugene A. Pelton
Curtis R. Norton, Jr.
John W. Hemann
Don L. Braddy, Jr.
Richard W. Hanson
John R. Winton, Jr.
Robert W. Hayes
Eddie T. Coleman, Jr.
Merritt R. Wright
James C. Bowley
Harold D. Hall
Vivien C. Whitmire
Joseph E. McConnel
David L. Tobias
Thomas R. Allen
Robert A. Schroeder
Richard G. Delozier
John W. Robertson
John R. Kearney
Franklin L. Bowersox
William L. Richards, Jr.
James A. Forsyth
John F. White, Jr.
Warren W. Barker
William W. Lewis, Jr.
William S. M. Arnold
Justus A. Muller
Walter M. DeLoach
Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
James J. Thompson
Earl Mann
Ernest Burks, Jr.
Donald R. Morris
Leland F. Estes
John E. Vinsel
Lester N. Hill
Dillan W. Taff
Daniel T. Deibler
Byron Price
Ronald R. Oberle
William E. Willingham, Jr.
Michael J. J. Fleming
Robert B. McKay
Roger T. Burson
James N. Comerford
Charles A. Sheehan
George E. Goodwin
Warren W. Lord
Edmund I. Rosendahl
Howard B. Moore
Benjamin H. Pester
Bruce F. Kelley
John D. Clithero
Donald E. Petersen
Robert E. Taylor
Frank D. Riggs
Adolphus F. Jaeger
Joseph P. Fleming
Charles L. Mann, Jr.
James B. Risser
John A. Wamsley
Merwin Sacarob
Wayne F. Smith
Benjamin P. Dillahunty
Theodore J. Hammer, Jr.
William F. Hubbard, Jr.
William J. Balko
Jackson D. Hill
Sydney E. Foscato, Jr.
Richard E. Pond
James K. Keihner
David J. Spowart, Jr.
Angelo P. Semeraro
Raymond L. Miller
William C. McMurray
James A. Howe
William G. Lawler, Jr.
James P. McCarthy, Jr.
Frank G. Ziegler
William D. Campbell
John A. Tinkham
Harry J. Nelson, Jr.
Ernest B. Brown
Talmadge S. Baggett
Richard B. Doyle
Paul A. Brandorff
Leslie R. Downs
Allan R. Smith
Charles W. Maier, Jr.
Eric N. Fenno
George Kramer
Robert A. Buck
Robert M. McAnulty, Jr.
Henry E. Hohn
William F. Marr
Robert G. Anderson
James P. Reddick, Jr
Robert S. Collins
John W. Wood
Gilliam M. Bailey
Edward J. Casey, Jr.
Oscar J. Vogel, Jr.
Robert E. Vaughn
Charles E. Boeing
Ramon W. Leary
Emil F. Wasniewski
John A. Miesner, Jr.
James R. Switzer
David R. Freytag
Lloyd M. Seawell
Lawrence E. Traynor
William B. Shields
James Bradfield
Jean R. Pouliot
Warren C. Hamm, Jr
Clifford R. Cameron
Sherwin J. Sleeper
Robert L. Thompson
Joseph M. McNabb
Daniel A. Lewis
Edward W. Molzan
Jack C. Sandsberry
Albert V. Milani
Albert S. McLemore
Norman F. Daly
Richard D. Duncan
Dwight G. Osborne
George A. Sorg
Richard E. Flynn
Donald S. May
Gerald P. Timoney
Eugene B. Ackerman
Richard A. Dickins
George L. Skirm, Jr.
Grover C. White, Jr.
Edward A. Lipchak
Robert W. Bennett
James B. Acton
Daniel N. Mealy
Martin H. Henry
James A. Bortner
George E. Gaddis
Steve C. Charnas
Charles H. Whiteleather, Jr.
Will E. Lassiter
Nicholas Sabalos
John E. Ambrose
David L. Hardin
Herbert E. Robisch
William K. Lally, Jr.
Frank S. Coleman
Paul Allison

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Harry L. Benson
Gordon H. Wiram
Robert C. Mason
Robert L. Nelson
Stephen R. Odrobina
Keith K. Stroupe
James B. Hardgrave
Robert L. Thomas
James C. Burnett
Leland J. Underwood
Maurice E. Smith
Theodore E. Newark
Carl C. Hilscher
Robert T. Lemon
Fred W. Wilder
Harry B. Knecht
Neville D. Dunnan
Lyle R. Peters
Leslie A. Taylor, Jr.
John Harris
Robert R. Monroe
Robert H. Belter
David S. Boyd
John E. Jenista
Clifford A. Skinner, Jr.
Richard M. Cook
Donald G. Fears
Lealand P. Hage
William E. Todd
John W. Harvey
Richard A. Foucht
Robert L. Krag
William P. Hugo
Aron L. Stapp
Daniel J. Sliwinski
Richard C. Pickering
Ralph E. Nieger
Ronald T. Kelly
Donald L. Jarrell
David T. Wallace
Don M. Sullivan
Raymond E. Engle
Cornell C. Angleman
Robert M. Lynch
Richard F. Bradberry
Frank R. Fahland
Harley D. Wilbur
Robert T. Weatherly
Raymond H. Oakes
Donald G. Fraasa
Edward K. Trzcinski
Thomas H. Ross
William G. Forster
Henry G. Bailey
Frank M. Perry, Jr.
Burton H. Gilpin
Byron A. Lee
Donald R. Hornbeck
John H. Billings
Rudolph F. Falkenstein
Arthur D. Neustel
Richard F. Woodruff
William A. Miller
John B. Cogdell
Roy D. Snyder, Jr.
Franklin H. Barker
Harold A. Laque
Harlan D. Parode
Cutlar J. Nordyke
Donald L. Jensen
Frank H. Featherston
John Murdock
Eugene M. Wisenbaker
Richard D. Haynes
Roy T. Mantz
Gene D. Morin
Clifford D. Hopkins
John F. Kropf
Robert D. Skorheim
Donald K. Forbes
Edwin D. Kimball
Roland E. Aslund
David D. Heerwagen
Frank J. Bardecki
Marion L. Minnis, Jr.
Ray S. Hughes
Fred P. Clark, Jr.
James L. Fletcher
Thomas S. Rogers, Jr.
Carl T. Hanson
Allen E. Hill
Cecil J. Kempf
Raymond H. Barker
Peter W. Wood
Frank W. Preston
Stanley W. Krohn
Paul R. Streich
Thomas D. Fritsch
Sherman C. Reed
Henry K. Wylie
Charles J. Reichl
Howard A. Shartel
Gilbert L. Summers
Bernard L. Buteau
Francis L. Fleming, Jr.
Rockwell Holman
Charles L. Axell
Fred J. Bellar, Jr.
James P. Rasmussen, Jr.
Alden G. Finley
Robert R. Worchesek
Stanley W. Henderson
David J. Space
William F. Moore
Robert A. Michaud
Stewart T. Zink
John T. Coughlin
William R. Sheridan
Frederick K. Rubins
Richard L. Baker
John W. O'Brien
William J. Maier, Jr.
William M. Cossaboom II
Dale E. Barck
Robert D. Kaiser
William F. Diehl
George A. Carlton
Edward M. Baty
William M. Stollenwerck
Derald Z. Skalla
John A. Thompson, Jr.
William F. Rau
Alexander E. Waller, Jr.
Samuel G. Kingery
David F. Emerson
Robert A. Beavers
Virgil R. Hancock
Monte B. Nichol
Brooks F. Warner
John M. Herbst
Peter D. Kjeldgaard
Francis W. Bustard
Julian M. Arnold
John R. Leser
Ian J. Johnson
Hugh D. Finley
Gilbert A. Boggs
Francis E. O'Connor
John G. Redmond
Lee Baggett, Jr.
Martin Goode
Jack D. Sirrine
King W. Pfeiffer
Grover M. Yowell
Henry D. Arnold
Lewis E. Morrison
William J. Cowhill
George W. East
James R. Parce
James R. Harrison
Donald B. Hunt, Jr.
Junious E. Shipman
Niles R. Gooding, Jr.
Robert S. Satre
William J. Ricci
Carl J. Burnett, Jr.
Robert W. Schwab
Allan K. Cameron, Jr.
Martin J. Twite, Jr.
Joseph P. Smolinski, Jr.
Thomas H. McGlaughlin
Windom L. Estes
Mahlon S. Huff
Carl W. Swanson, Jr.
James W. Lisanby
Walter E. Ohlrich, Jr.
Vinton O. Harkness, Jr.
John P. Cady, Jr.
Robert W. Barnhart
Roy M. Bigenho
James K. Noble, Jr.
James W. Roebuck
Ralph F. Bennie
Donald P. Hall
William A. Gureck
John W. Bradford, Jr.
Norman R. Thom
Burton Henderson
Robert J. Vollmer
Peter M. Costello, Jr.
John R. Palmquist
Earl K. Dille
Ronald L. Johns
James D. Tregurtha, Jr.
James R. Wilkins, Jr.
Henry E. Otten
Willis A. Matson II
Daniel C. Johnson
William N. Smoot
William W. Wilson
Richard B. Mahon
James H. Lytle
Robert F. Dreesen
Eugene L. Reid
Thomas M. Smith
John J. Ryan, Jr.
John C. Snyder
Donald A. Becker
John W. Petrick
Ellegood V. Griffin, Jr.
William A. Williams III
George E. Jessen
Charles V. Choyce
Fuller A. Austin
Frederick A. Prehn, Jr.
Edward R. Bristol, Jr.
Frederick S. Dunning, Jr.
Eric H. Steentofte
Robert D. French
Charles M. Conlon, Jr.
William H. Ayres, Jr.
Frank D. Melton
James P. O'Reilly, Jr.
Maurice W. Rumble
Wallace D. Arbuckle, Jr.
Lewis H. Goldbeck, Jr.
Walter R. Shafer
Paul H. Engel
George B. Shick, Jr.
Leon W. Smith
Robert E. Babcock
Donald M. Lynam
Edward C. Stella
Ronald N. Andresen
Merlin L. Johnson
James E. Kaune
Herbert W. Kiker, Jr.
Richard J. Prescott
Samuel F. Powel III
Jess L. Cariker, Jr.
Lawrence A. Schoelen
Joseph J. Molnar
Joseph M. Barron
Alfred M. Pride
Donald B. Dellinger
Neal R. Wooden
Richard W. McKee
Thomas W. Robinson, Jr.
Virgil T. Faulkenberry
Thomas L. Moore
Michael Hollack
William K. Sharpe
Richard L. Johnson
Howard E. Rutledge
Frank R. Cassilly
Hughie D. Sheffield
John N. Morrissey
Joseph C. Grote
Walter E. Southall, Jr.
Charles R. MacDowell
Leslie G. Bramley
Wayne L. Hughes
Max L. Slankard
William E. McGarrah, Jr.
William B. Warwick
James E. Wille
Robert C. Thompson
George W. Myer
Richard W. Martin
Norman R. Campbell
Leonard B. Greene
James M. Dennis
Huby A. Jones, Jr.
James K. Gaddy
Casanave H. Young, Jr.
Rickard W. Shannon
William B. Thompson, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Holton C. Dickson, Jr.
Edward M. Kocher
Horace P. Fishman
Elvin L. VanZee
Calvin W. Roberts
Rex S. Coryell
William L. Gary
Harold E. Haas
John F. Knudson
Neil K. Hansen
Thomas J. Piazza
James J. Garibaldi
Dominic V. Cefalu
Danforth Clement
William W. Coons
Richard W. Ridenour
Andrew J. Owens
Robert M. Brown
Robert T. Carter
Alfred F. Simcich
Richard W. Haley
Paul M. Gralton
James G. Tapp
Dorsey W. Daniel
Richard H. Hauck
Hugh K. Fraley
Leary B. Kreissl
Dan Noble
Grenes J. Lennox
Lyle E. Thomas
Robert J. DeVilbiss
William T. Emery
William G. Vroman
Ernie F. Johnson
Frederick W. Lewis
Everett G. Brown
Raymond G. Gunn
Mitchell C. Liska
Raymond C. Stubbs
Charles B. Paul III
William N. Leonard, Jr.
Louis A. Janezic
"H" "L" Sumner, Jr.
John E. Bozewicz
Fred Wolter
Herbert S. Goldfield
John F. Raven
James E. Riley
Clifford L. Crook, Jr.
Norman L. Cloutier
Albert A. Arcand
Louis M. Sappanos
Gerald M. Robison
Robert B. Graham
Carl M. Dughi
Thomas E. Killebrew
Robert F. Bauer
Paul Colen
James W. Lynn
Theodore J. Fussell
Francis J. Sterner
Samuel Katz
William B. Ely, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Robert W. Odell
Preston C. Oliver
Robert E. Osman
Eugene M. Smith
Gordon H. Griffin
Jack B. Griffin
Hal R. Sessions, Jr.
Calvin J. Croston
Theodore E. Schultz
George T. Boyd
Hal H. Eaton
Victor J. Ivers
John H. Carnes
William L. Jones, Jr.
John D. Gould
Paul F. W. Pieper
Edward L. Richardson
Joseph A. Frank
Henry W. Stroman
Everett B. Nelson
Eugene A. Garvens
Charles W. Solomon
John W. Cohill
Martin J. Doermann
Albert J. Otto
Dempsey G. Salter
Guy M. Leonard, Jr.
Walter C. Hitchens

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William L. Collins
Donald W. Wittschiebe
William C. Hall
Paul G. LeGros
Irving Bobrick
Philip G. Belcher
William A. Bourne
Louis H. Clerc
Raymond W. Loomis
Lewis B. Taylor, Jr.
Richard E. Anderson
Leo L. Baton
Arthur W. Berger
Caryll R. Whipple
Walter R. Wagner
Bruce G. Austin
Pharo A. Phelps
John B. Stetson
Paul W. Forehand

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Harold R. Bower
Donald E. Still
John P. Charles
Dennie L. Briggs
Louis R. Kaufman
Allen E. McMichael
Lucien E. Puckett
John P. Quinn
Andrew J. Gasper
Michele J. Testa
Calman Levich
Walter E. Beam, Jr.
Noel L. Freeman
Francis E. McGuire
Godfrey S. Huber
Edgard G. Waggoner
John A. Moody
Bradley B. Ridge
William H. Wells
Thomas E. Wheeler
Robert Sharp
Daniel F. McCarthy
Neil E. Goodrich, Jr.
Martin Gellman
Paul "D" Grossnickle
James D. Kelly
Milton E. Koepke
George A. Boone
Barney O. Green

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Faye J. Slate
Gwendolyn L. Beretta
Marchetta Harper
Louise K. Scanlon
Mary T. Kelly
Margaret L. Le Croy
Lorraine C. Schuh
Dolores G. Irion
Lola C. Bull
Ella Barber
Helen M. Balashek
Betty J. Lewis
Audrey M. Devaney
Bernice E. Fenn
Pauline J. Kuenzi
Johnanna Reid
Rose A. Kirsch
Ruth M. Pojeky
Kathleen M. Laughlin
Catherine M. Glynn
Grace O. Fisk
Goldie D. Greer
Rose M. Clemens
Mildred M. Smith
Vivian E. Smith
Anne M. Sheridan
Lois T. Carpenter
Nancy L. Harrigan
Waunie L. Shelton
Florence V. Craig
Anna E. Oxendine
Thelma P. Dial
Doris T. Fuller

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the Civil Engineer Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Swiggum, George T.
Dominy, John A.
Beaman, James H.
Brown, Wallace M.
Johnson, Tom R.
Grohs, Conrad E.
Simmons, Paul J.
Burke, Jasper R.
Wilson, John W.
Seufer, Paul E.
Morris, Albert C.
Boyer, William R.
Chilton, Arthur B., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Baker, Robert L.
Boswell, "J" Thornton
Brennan, George A., Jr.
Buechel, Donald R.
Cannon, Albert
Craighead, John T.
Deeks, Charles K.
Drips, Robert C.
Dunn, Seldon C.
Durden, Charles S., Jr.
Egan, John F.
Garrett, Robert I.
Gaylor, Donald H.
Gill, John E.
Herlihy, Charles E.
Lagerquist, Howard W.
McGreevy, John J.
Nelson, Bentley A.
Neptune, Edgar M., Jr.
Olson, Marshall W.

Palmer, Robert H., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Risi, George F.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Sanderlin, Joseph M.
Smitley, Roger P.
Sullivan, Melvin B., Jr.
Welch, Elbert S.
Wiebenga, Ned H.
Wilber, Martin C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adrian, Rodger J.
Ainlay, Henry L., Jr.
Albea, John P.
Allen, Paul M.
Applegate, Richard C.
Avellone, Francis P.
Bailey, Edward F.
Bain, Louis E.
Baird, Richard S.
Baker, William R.
Barron, Willard D.
Benson, John A.
Blick, Johnnie Y.
Bond, Calvin C.
Bower, Edward R.
Britt, Ernest R.
Brooks, Carol H.
Buchanan, Richard W.
Buck, Walter J.
Burkholder, Arthur W., Jr.
Cagle, Harry
Canalejo, Armando, Jr.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chance, Carl
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Cherney, Boris E.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Clifton, Emory V.
Collins, James H.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Conard, Melvin L.
Conover, Donald T.
Corley, James O.
Crain, Harold
Creekman, Charles T.
Criner, Eugene F.
Crook, Lewis J.
Crowder, Norman M.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Dester, John M.
Dorion, William E.
Duncan, Bryan L.
Effner, James E.
Elkins, Robert H.
Ewing, Paul C.
Fay, John F., Jr.
Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Fisher, Robert D.
Forrest, James E.
Gallup, Mearl
Gillis, Charles L.
Gobel, Carl F.
Gralla, Eugene
Griffith, Stephen S. D.
Haberlin, William E.
Hair, Maurice E.
Haley, Robert S.
Hanson, Ever L.
Harper, John G.
Harris, Robert B.
Hart, Carten M.
Harvey, Hobart D.
Haslett, Robert H.
Hassenger, William E.
Hawley, William F.
Hay, Patrick M.
Henker, Donald E.
Hill, Roger E.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Irwin, Harry E.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Jones, Joe L.
Jones, Joseph B.
Jones, Thomas W.
Keidel, Charles J.
Kephart, Norman R.
King, Edward D.
Knight, Richard H.
Knobel, Roland J., Jr.
Kornfeld, Leo L.
Larson, Albert G.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
LeCiert, Arthur C.
Leish, Calvin R.
Locke, Frank E.
Lucand, Dale C.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
MacEwan, Clarence L., Jr.
Manore, Thomas E.
Maragides, Harry M.
McDaniel, John M.
McGill, Willis L.
McGlaun, Albert L., Jr.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
McKee, Richard N.
McKenzie, Harry F., Jr.
McLean, James P.
Meng, Edwin L., Jr.
Mercadante, James A.
Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Miller, David E.
Miller, John C.
Moore, Alvin
Mulholland, Donald E.
Neighbors, Milton L.
Nelson, Warren F.
Nichols, Horace E.
Nuernberger, Gale W.
Olson, Robert S.
Petro, John G.
Philion, Thomas F.
Pierson, Percy A.
Pilgrim, Orvill L.
Pollitt, Ernest A.
Reese, Lawrence W.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rigg, Donald C.
Rinetti, Edward J.
Ristan, Albert G., Jr.
Robinson, James A.
Salmon, Douglas A.
Schanze, Fred, Jr.
Schar, Kenneth A.
Sloan, Dale F.
Small, Joseph T.
Smith, Courtenay A.
Smith, Howard W.
Smith, Joseph F.
Spargo, Robert A.
Sprague, Raymond E.
Stabe, Robert W.
Steele, James H.
Sueur, Charles A.
Sumrell, Guy H., Jr.
Surran, Charles R.
Sylvest, Robert S.
Symonds, William T.
Taylor, Albert T., Jr.
Thompson, Woodrow W.
Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Tinney, Richard T.
Toomey, John F.
Travers, Sumter L.
Valentine, Gordon K.
Victor, William V.
Weir, Robert A.
West, John E.
Wingo, Rodney K.
Woolard, Kenneth A.
Worden, Frank N.
York, Arthur A.
Zenk, Lawrence P.
Breeden, Robert L.
Jones, Robert L.
Mandeville, Don C.
McCormick, John A.
McElhanon, Byron F.
Pavelka, Albert K.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Abucewicz, John A.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Fay, John P.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J. N.
Hayes, Jack W.
Herrmann, Theodore C.
Hopkins, Ralph W.
Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
Keaney, Kevin J.
Lavin, Henry T.
Maguire, Connell J.
Mahoney, Vincent J.
Mershon, Carroll M.
Morgan, Raymond
Power, Joseph G.
Rademacher, Glen A.
Rossbach, George F.
Sullivan, Mark
Szczesny, Charles A.
Vincer, John D.
Webb, Charles E.
Widman, John A., Jr.
Zoller, John E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Max H.
Arn, John A. M.
Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Boyd, Earl I.
Brantner, William B.
Briggs, Fred M.
Burkman, Eugene E.
Burton, George W.
Colbert, Raymond D.
Dalton, Donald F.
Daub, Leland A.
Dearth, Keith H.
Devlin, John G.
Diehl, Charles E.
Doyle, Paul J., Jr.
Farley, Robert J.
Fisher, John R.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Heglund, Robert Q.
Heuston, Robert H.
Hill, James M., Jr.
Hudson, Richard I.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jasper, Paul R.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Klingenmeier, Russell J., Jr.
Koonce, Stephen J.
LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Mabbitt, Robert C.
Magneson, Norman J.
Merritt, Harold W., Jr.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
More, David C.
Morgan, Joseph E.
Mueller, William A.
O'Neill, Lawrence F.
Patrick, Donald A.
Paul, Edwin C.
Petersen, John H
Powell, Joseph E.
Reeve, John J., Jr.
Roy, Vershall A.
Saunder, Edward M.
Seitz, Carl R.
Snyder, Donald C.
Spangler, William S.
Stiffler, Lloyd E., Jr.
Sturman, William H.
Van Leer, Blake W.
Vaughan, James H., Jr.
Vivoli, Pierre L.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Whyte, David P.
Yount, George R.
Zirzow, Charles F.
Lemmon, William R.

DENTAL CORPS

Bartlett, Stephen O.
Counsell, Lee A.
Dunn, John J.
Echols, Archie D., Jr.
Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Holmes, Corey H.
Jasper, William J.
Lehmann, William G.
Mahoney, Jack D.
Nelson, Jack D.
O'Malley, John E.
Samuels, Homer S.
Stephenson, Thomas D.
Swanson, Carl J.
Taber, Donald S.
Timberlake, Robert W.
Woodworth, George K.
Wortham, Maury E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Cleo R.
Allen, Robert V.
Anderson, William S.
Armitage, Horace G.
Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
Bean, Joshua "S", Jr.
Bohannan, Ray
Borja, Arthur
Brooks, Lawrence W.
Broulik, Frank
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
Carter, Charles H.
Cartier, William L. G., Jr.
Chapman, William H.
Chambliss, Jesse R.
Civiello, Harold J.
Clauss, Edward L.
Coburn, Kenneth R.
Coffield, Rolland L.
Colman, Frederick R.
Combs, Harrison T.
Comstock, Melvin A.
Cox, Walter R.
Crawford, Thomas L.
Deadwyler, Robert E.
Dean, Louis E.
Deriso, Dominic J.
Dunn, Reedy F.
Dyches, Kenelm O.
Edlund, Raymond A.
Eisen, Oscar E.
Ervin, Francis A.
Eslinger, Walter A.
Ethridge, John W.
Garrett, John L.
Gault, John W.
Gilbody, Foster F.
Griswell, Hollis A.
Helms, Vester J.
Henry, Girton H.
Herndon, Glen A.
Hise, Theodore R.
Hunt, Bernard H.
Hunter, Russell E.
Jackson, Carl E.
Johnston, Major L.
Joslin, Leslie H.
Keck, Truman W.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Klostermann, Wolfgang E.
Lang, Wesley M.
Lanning, John R.
Lasco, John, Jr.
Lee, Ulyses O.
Littlejohn, James H.
Long, Marion W.
Long, Thomas H., Jr.
Mason, Edwin R.
Mason, Anderson T.
Mason, Kenneth C.
McAllister, Damon O.
McDonald, John P.
McMillin, Charles R.
Meade, Charles D.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moore, James K.
Moore, Daniel D.
Nix, Joe R.
Nooney, Thomas W., Jr.
Parker, James H.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
Ricker, Robert E.
Riley, William E.
Rowe, Abner P., Jr.
Shaw, Gilbert J.
Silliman, Ivan W.
Smith, Forbes H.
Smith, Orville E.
Sorger, Frank J.
Stutler, David R.
Sullivan, John J.
Taliaferro, Richard B., Jr.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
Thorsell, George E.
Tompkins, Franklin H.
Traxler, James A.
Vickroy, Robert K.
Vitlip, Joseph J.
Von Radesky, Horace
Whaley, Richard V.
Young, John L.
Zellmann, Earl G.

NURSE CORPS

Maguire, Eleanor J.
Mentzer, Romaine M.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abele, Henry F.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Abrahams, Thomas P.
Addams, John F.
Adkins, Kenneth G.
Adler, Ronald E.
Adorney, Frank
Ahlquist, Stanley W.
Aiau, Harvey C. K.
Albers, William P.
Albright, Richard K.
Alexander, Robert C.
Alldredge, Donald L.
Allen, William D.
Altee, Thomas M.
Amendt, John H.
Ammerman, Don J.
Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Robert C.
Anderson, Curtis O.
Anderson, Robert N.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Robert P.
Andrews, Frederick C.
Apted, George L.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Philip M., Jr.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, John E.
Arrington, Robert A.
Arrott, Reed T.
Ash, Leonard C.
Ashley, Bruce H.
Aucoin, Leonard L.
Aumuller, Richard W.
Avary, James C., Jr.
Avrit, Richard C.
Ayers, David W.
Babcock, Donald E.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Backes, Ronald J.
Bagby, Hallam O.
Bailey, George T.
Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
Ball, Courtland D., III
Banta, Robert
Barke, Arthur R.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, John B.
Baron, Charles R.
Barry, Thomas M.
Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Bates, David H., Jr.
Bauchspies, Rollin L.
Baxter, Robert C.
Beard, Donald W.
Beat, Robert O.
Beaulieu, Reo A.
Beaumont, Eugene A. G.
Becker, Glynn R.
Bedworth, Wilfrid J.
Beers, Robert C.
Bein, George E.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gershom R.
Bell, William R.
Belton, Jack G.
Benero, Manuel A., Jr.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
Bennett, Richard L.
Bennett, Richard W.
Bennie, Donald B.
Benning, Carl J., Jr.
Bentley, William C.
Benton, Jerry S.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Norman K.
Berger, James K.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berry, William H.
Best, Eddie F.
Best, Robert P.
Betsworth, Brian C.
Bierer, Bion B., Jr.
Bird, Charles F.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bivens, Arthur C.
Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blanchard, Robert C.
Blandine, Robert E.
Blaczak, Walter J.
Blaseck, Walter H.
Blum, Frederick J., III
Blundell, Peveril
Bocock, Kenneth S.
Bodling, Paul F., Jr.
Boggs, Steve V.
Bohannan, William L.
Bolster, Harry E.
Boncer, Lawrence
Booth, Roger G.
Booth, Theodore W.
Borthwick, Robert B.
Botten, James R.
Botula, Bernard C.
Bowen, John H., Jr.
Boyd, John H., Jr.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyett, Stephen G.
Boyle, Darrell D.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Bozeman, Henry G.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Bradshaw, Donald R.
Brady, Francis T.
Bristol, Robert B.
Britton, William L.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brown, Kenneth R.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.
Browning, Siras D.
Broz, George A.
Brummage, Richard L.
Bruning, Richard A.
Brunskill, Robert J.
Brunson, Wright A., Jr.
Buchanan, James W.
Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bull, Joseph L., III
Bullard, John R.
Bullock, William A.
Burgess, James A.
Burke, William C.
Burris, John R.
Burt, Thomas E.
Bushong, Brent
Butcher, Paul D.
Butcher, Nathan T.
Butler, Charles T.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Buys, Jay R.
Byrd, Sam R.
Byrnes, Robert E.
Caines, Robert H.
Callaghan, Joseph M.
Callicott, Jack D.
Calnan, Eugene T.
Cameron, Kenneth R.
Cameron, Norman A.
Campbell, William N.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, Henry G., Jr.
Campbell, John A.
Canfield, Gerald I.
Cann, Tedford J.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, Leo J.
Cannon, David E.
Canon, George A., III
Cardwell, John J.
Carl, William T.
Carlin, Robert J.
Carlson, Olef M., Jr.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Carnevale, Angelo M.
Caron, Robert R.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevin P.
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carter, Robert D.
Carter, James D.
Carterette, Robert T.
Carter, Charles C.
Cassell, Dean G.
Catlett, Jack C.
Cauble, Donald K.
Causey, Donald F.
Chadbourne, Harland A., Jr.
Chadwick, John K.
Chalmers, Fred T.
Champlin, Gerald B.
Chapman, Frederick L.
Charest, Philip G.
Charest, Alexis N.
Chase, Warren A.
Check, Robert T.
Chesley, James F.
Chewning, Robert W.
Chisum, Albert, Jr.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Clare, James S.
Clark, David P.
Clark, Charles R.
Clark, William B., Jr.
Clark, Lynn R.
Clark, Edwin B.
Clarkin, James J.
Clements, Billy R.
Clew, William M.
Clinton, Thomas G.
Coe, David C., Jr.
Cole, Edgar E.
Cole, William S., Jr.
Cole, William F., Jr.
Coleman, James O.
Collier, Larry D.
Colligan, Thomas R.
Collins, Philip K.
Conolly, Robert D.
Conrad, Peter C.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Converse, Douglas
Coogan, Richard D.
Cook, Charles L.
Cooke, Donald L.
Cooley, Arthur W.
Corbett, Eugene A.
Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
Corboy, Michael R.
Cormier, Conrad R.
Cornell, Arthur F.
Coscina, Michael A., Jr.
Coskey, Kenneth L.
Cotugno, Paul J.
Coughlin, Eugene F.
Coughlin, Paul G.
Cour, Edward E.
Crader, Clifford L.
Craig, Earl C.
Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
Crater, Ray F.
Crawford, Nace B., Jr.
Crepeau, George A.
Cricchi, John V.
Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Cross, Charles H.
Cross, Lorin R.
Crouch, Michael B.
Cruden, David S.
Crum, Paul M.
Cuccias, Leo P.
Culver, Eugene A.
Cunningham, Edward P.
Curl, Kent W.
Curry, Thomas E.
Curtis, Fayne E.
Daily, David F.
Dalton, Richard V.
Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Daly, Richard G.
Daniels, James M.
Darville, Edmond J.
Davidson, Robert P.
Davis, John B.
Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Bill N.
Davis, Walter J.
Davison, John W., Jr.
Day, Arthur R.
Deal, Walter C., Jr.
Dearborn, Richard E.
Dearman, Kermit E.
Debit, Dion G. B.
Dehart, William
De Lamar, Dean O.
Delaney, William E.
DeMartini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Depew, Wilson E.
Derby, Arthur E., Jr.
DeSaulles, George A.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Dickson, William T.
Diesel, Charles N.
Dietz, Richard J.
Di Giacomo, Joseph G.
Dillon, Harlan K.
Di Nola, Michael J.
Dixon, Norval W., Jr.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dixon, Osmund W., Jr.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, John G.
Dolan, William R.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donnelly, Raymond D., Jr.
Donovan, James F.
Donovan, Daniel D., Jr.
Douglas, Jack R.
Douglass, James G., Jr.
Dowds, Donald H.
Dowe, Robert M., Jr.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Doyle, Ingell H.
Doyle, William J.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Drew, Russell C.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Paul G.
Duffy, Bernard A.
Duhrkopf, Don J.
Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunn, Charles B.
Durbin, Peter
Eckhouse, Morton A.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, John A.
Edwards, Forrest L.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Edwards, William R., Jr.
Eibert, Don C.
Ellis, Donald F.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, John H., Jr.
Elmore, John F., Jr.
Elster, James M.
Emmerling, Henry C., Jr.
Endlich, John
English, Edward V.
Espling, Richard J.
Evans, Ralph M.
Evans, Gordon A.
Evans, David W.
Evans, Thomas B.
Evans, Boyce D.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Fagan, Donald F.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Farber, Karl H.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis M.
Feeks, Edmond M.
Feeney, Richard L.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Felt, Donald L.
Felt, Joseph A.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Fenn, Dan E.
Ferguson, William W.
Fergusson, Ernest W.
Ferguson, Albert E.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Fink, Edward R.
Finn, John F. X., Jr.
Finneran, William J.
Finney, Jack L.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fisher, John C.
Fisher, Russell H.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W., Jr.
Fitzpatrick, Edward C.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Flood, Francis A., Jr.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Flynn, Michael D.
Flynn, Francis P.
Foley, John E.
Foley, Edmund F.
Fong, Chong S.
Font, Carlos G.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert E.
Frederick, Donald R.
Freeman, Robert W.
French, Fred H.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friese, George A.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F., III
Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
Fudge, David A.
Furey, Laurence T.
Furgerson, John A.
Furmanski, John A.
Gall, Duane M.
Gallagher, Hugh L.
Gallagher, Robert S.
Gallipeau, Richard W.
Gantt, Richard G.
Gardner, Harvey E.
Gardner, Louis J.
Gardner, Millard T., III
Gardner, Kenneth R.
Garnett, Walter W.
Gavazzi, Robert R.
Gennette, Robert L.
Gibbs, Charles E., Jr.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Giles, Thomas N.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gilmore, Arthur H.
Giovanetti, William C.
Glaves, Robert H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
Gleim, Ernest H.
Godek, John
Godfrey, Forrest J.
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goodreau, Robert W.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, William D.
Goodwin, Frank O., Jr.
Gordon, Bruce J.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gordon, Ralph L.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Graveson, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Thomas B.
Green, Harry J.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Gress, Donald H.
Griffith, Webster
Griggs, Norman E.
Groenert, Frederick E.
Groff, Peter F.
Gross, Donald E.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gruber, Robert A.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Thomas M.
Hackney, Benjamin F., III
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Haig, Robert B.
Haight, Gardiner M.
Haley, Robert J.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, James N.
Hall, John P.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Hammock, John W.
Hammond, Kenneth E.
Handford, Richard C.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hansard, Stonewall
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Harney, Russell F.
Harns, John H.
Harrison, Donald K.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Walter B.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harrop, Robert D.
Harter, Raymond B.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatfield, William R.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hawkins, Richard M.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helmandollar, Allen W.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Helvey, Julius L., II
Hempel, Robert E., III
Hendrick, David R.
Henley, John R.
Henson, John M.
Herkner, Richard T.
Herring, "E" Belmont
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Raymond F.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgs, Jay D.
Hill, Earl E., Jr.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hiller, Melvin L.
Hincks, Herbert A.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hocking, James R.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hoffman, Harley E.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Hoge, James H.
Holbert, William H., Jr.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Hollan, James J.
Holland, William A.
Holland, Elbert R.
Hollen, Frederick M.
Hollenbach, William T.
Holley, Melvin M., Jr.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holt, Kenneth N.
Holway, Nathan C.
Hoover, John S.
Hopkins, Daniel J.
Hopkins, David F.
Horton, Edward R.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howell, Harry E.
Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter B.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Humber, Marcel B.
Humphreys, Felton "M", Jr.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hutchinson, Kenneth F.
Ingraham, Talcott L., Jr.
Inskeep, William F.
Jacobs, Edward J.
Jacobs, Edward J., Jr.
James, Joe M.
Jamison, Billy D.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferis, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Jenkins, Burris, III
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Allen L.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, James I.
Johnston, George T.
Johnston, John M.
Jones, Henry R.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Donald S.
Jordan, James S.
Judd, Roy L.
Judd, Wesley G.
Kaai, Samuel W.
Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Karpaitis, Anthony J.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Kaye, Michael C.
Keefe, Jerome M.
Keester, Louis J.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kelly, John S.
Kelt, William N.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William E.
Ketzner, Harry T.
Killian, Donald J.
Klee, Robert E.
Kleeman, Leonard
Kling, William T.
Kloepping, Herbert E.
Knapp, William R.
Knight, Robert H.
Knight, Charles H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.

Knotts, Philip L.
Koch, Donald F.
Koch, James R.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kotick, Robert E.
Kowalski, Robert J.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles H., Jr.
Krusi, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
Kutzleb, Robert E.
Labeau, Thomas J.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
LaLonde, William F.
Lamm, William A.
Lammers, Francis E., Jr.
Langer, Donald A.
Lanier, Robert J.
Lanphear, Roy E.
Lardis, Christopher S.
Larrew, Marvin F.
Larsen, John H.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Latta, Robert L.
Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
Leblanc, George E., Jr.
Lemmon, Virgil J.
Lenihan, Edward L., Jr.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Lepper, James R.
Levey, Sanford N.
Lewis, Robert
Lichlyter, Stanford E.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Frank B.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Loftus, Robert M.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Low, Frederick M.
Lucas, Milton A.
Lundin, George S.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lyon, Peter W.
MacGregor, John
Mackenzie, William W., Jr.
Madden, Patrick J.
Mahoney, Wilbur J.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Manion, James H.
Markham, Lewis M., III
Markley, Edward K.
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, Lawrence J.
Martin, Robert C.
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, James K.
Martin, Donald E.
Martin, Frank L., Jr.
Maser, Walther G.
Mason, Sidney F.
Mason, Wesley R.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Matteson, Max R.
Matthews, William B., Jr.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Mauthe, Benjamin C.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAllaster, Archie F.
McBrayer, John E., Jr.
McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
McCardell, James E., Jr.
McCarty, Charles M.
McClellan, Lewis R.
McComb, Robert B.
McCormick, Daniel G.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCurdy, William E., Jr.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Clovis K.
McGathy, Charles L., Jr.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGreevy, Walter J., Jr.
McKay, John H.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McKeown, William G., Jr.
McLaughlin, Bernard R.
McLuckie, James D.
McNaughton, James M.
McQuesten, John T., Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
Meacham, Arthur J.
Mead, George R.
Meador, William A.
Melchers, Arthur C.
Melton, Edward C., Jr.
Mercer, Donald M.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Merritt, William E., III
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Miale, Robert E.
Middleton, Charles O., III
Milano, Vito R.
Millard, Grant A.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, Clarence W.
Miller, Blount R., Jr.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, Grant "W"
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Evan K.
Mills, James R.
Mills, Merle E.
Miner, Jack B.
Mitchell, Carroll K.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mittell, David P.
Mock, Roy L.
Monroe, William D., III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Joseph O.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moran, Clifford D.
Moran, Thomas M.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morelli, Frank P.
Morford, Dean R.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Morgan, James D.
Moriarty, Edwin S.
Morin, Ronald D.
Morrison, John H., Jr.
Morris, Robert D.
Morse, Edward A.
Morton, Charles B., III
Moss, Irvin R.
Moulton, Daniel B.
Moury, Roger F.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mullender, Thomas J., Jr.
Mumford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murphy, Gordon F.
Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
Murtagh, Thomas J.
Musorrafiti, Francis A.
Naschek, Marvin J.
Nason, Charles F., Jr.
Naylor, Frankie L.
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Keith
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevare, Antonio
Newcomb, James A.
Nichols, John F.
Nichols, Richard L.
Nicholson, John L., Jr.
Nielsen, Donald E.
Nolan, Richard W.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nordmeyer, Philip J.
North, Robert R.
Northrop, Robert E.
Nunnally, Edward H., Jr.
Nutter, Andrew T. J.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Brien, Leo F.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Connor, Joseph E.
O'Der, John T.
Ogle, William J.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
O'Leary, John B., Jr.
Oliver, Perry S., Jr.
Olsen, Harold L.
Olson, Richard S.
Olson, John R.
Olson, John S.
Olson, Conrad B.
O'Rourke, Bernard J.
Ortega, Joseph J.
Osborne, Charles N.
O'Shea, John A., Jr.
Ostronic, Francis J.
Padgett, Harry E.
Painter, George V.
Pajak, Michael M.
Palmieri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Pape, William J., II
Park, Carroll W.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parks, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Pattridge, Roger H.
Paul, David L.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Pearson, Charles T., Jr.
Pearson, William A.
Peckworth, Dana
Pedersen, Alton A.
Perkins, Richard L.
Perot, Henry R.
Perrault, Mark E.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, James W., Jr.
Perry, David L.
Perry, Lowell E.
Person, Ross H.
Personette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Pestcoe, Joseph
Peters, Edward R.
Peters, William J.
Peterson, George E., Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Fred D.
Petry, William A.
Pettit, Thomas E.
Pfromer, Robert A.
Phillips, Lawrence, Jr.
Phillips, Lawrence E.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Phillips, Charles A.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Alvin W.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Podaras, Nicholas C.
Poland, James B.
Polium, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K., IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, Julian B.
Prell, Raymond B.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, Edgar H.
Preston, John L.
Price, Walter P.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Prieb, Charles R.
Profilet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Jack M.
Purdum, William H.
Purser, Fred O., Jr.
Purvis, Ronald S.
Quirk, William J.
Quirk, John T.
Radeff, Lewis J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ramsey, William E.
Ramsey, Gayle
Randall, Howard W.
Randall, Howard F., Jr.
Rasmussen, Robert L.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Rayder, Daniel F.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Reffitt, Raymond E.
Reid, Jack M.
Reilly, William F.
Reith, George, Jr.
Renshaw, John R.
Reynolds, James H.
Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rich, Gerald "B"
Rich, Robert T.
Richardson, Harold M.
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richard, Harold G.
Rieken, Richard G.
Riley, Raymond T.
Rinne, Keith D.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Ritzman, Robert R.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Robertson, Coll E.
Robinson, William A.
Robson, Harry E.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rodgers, Dean T.
Rodgers, Thomas A.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr.
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rorie, "C" "J"
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rosson, James W.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Ruddick, George R., Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Ruhsenberger, Roger H.
Rusch, John M.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sacks, Harold H.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanks, David R., III
Sargent, Richard E.
Sassano, John P.
Saunders, Thomas J.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schaller, Robert A.
Schasteen, James C.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schimansky, John A.
Schmid, Herbert H.
Schmidt, Walter P.
Schmitz, Richard J.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schuster, Dale G.
Scichili, Carl J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Frank P.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seitz, Richard L.
Selby, Donald E.
Self, David L.
Selz, George O.
Semple, William C., III
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shakespeare, Frank B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shaw, Warren L.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheehy, Eugene E.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Roger E.
Shelley, Leon R.
Shilling, John D.
Shirley, William B.
Shoopman, Bertram H., Jr.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shuck, Thomas L.
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.
Shuler, Olin J.
Signor, Philip W., Jr.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simpkins, George C.
Simpson, Bryan L., Jr.
Sink, James M.
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skillman, Charles F.
Skomsky, Louis J.
Sladky, James A.
Slater, Donald L.
Small, Joseph F.
Smevog, Herbert W.
Smiley, Douglas I.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Donald B.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Smith, Jason J.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Robert M.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smith, William L.
Smitter, Clarence H.
Snee, John J.
Snelgrove, Edward R.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Fred D.
Snyder, Ned "C"
Sokol, John
Solan, Thomas V.
Sonnenburg, Paul N.
Southerland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spanagel, Herman A., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Spear, Willard W., Jr.
Spencer, Roy S., Jr.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stafford, Frank R.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Starnes, Billy G.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stevens, Jack D.
Stewart, David H.
Stillwell, Robert L., Jr.
Stoner, John W., Jr.
Storm, Richard E.
Strange, William M.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stride, William F. A., Jr.
Strohecker, Franklin M.
Stromme, Donald J.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L
Stubbs, Robert C.
Studebaker, Clayton A
Stuntz, John R.
Sturgeon, William J., III
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Sweeney, John F.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tally, Billy F.
Tarlton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thies, Walter L.
Thomas, Clifford C., Jr
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Donald P.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederick J.
Thomas, John D.
Thomas, John C.
Thompson, Guy L.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, William M
Thompson, William W
Thompson, George I.
Thoreston, Glyn T.
Throop, James R.
Toadvine, Stephen P., III
Tobias, Robert E.
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr
Tolman, Milton H.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweek, Billy B.
Trawick, Charles V.
Trebor-MacConnell, Barrie K.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Tuttle, John R.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Vaden, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Vail, Joseph L.
Vandergoore, Jacob L.
Van Hoof, Eugene R.
Van Horssen, David A.
Van Westendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Vaughan, Edgar, III
Velasquez Suarez, Francis A.
Vining, Albert D., Jr.
Voelker, Donald C.
Volatile, Thomas M.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wagner, David F.
Wahler, Joseph L.
Waite, Charles E.
Walker, Charles S.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, Henry M.
Walker, James B., Jr.
Walker, Peter R.
Walker, Wilmer E.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wallace, Thomas M.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wallner, Michael P.
Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
Walters, Harold L., Jr.
Wanamaker, John F.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, Thomas C.
Wasson, John E.
Waters, George H.
Watson, Lawrence H., Jr.
Wayham, David E.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, Charles Z.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James M.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
Wehrman, Philip W.
Weissman, Marvin M.
Wellings, John F.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetz, James E.
Wheeler, James B.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, Frank L.
White, John E.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Williams, David W.
Williams, Frank C.
Williams, James B.
Williams, James G., III
Williams, Kenneth A.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williams, Randall L.
Williamson, Harry H., Jr.
Williamson, Robert L.
Willis, Jack R.
Wills, Doyne R., Jr.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Harry A.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Samuel B.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Winfield, Gordon T., Jr.
Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Wise, Peyton R., II
Wise, Richards S.
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Wittrock, Henry L.
Wolff, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wong, Raymond W. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
Woodberry, Earle B.
Woodburn, Craig E.
Woods, Paul G.
Woods, Robert C.
Woodyard, Jon C.
Word, Jimmie A.
Workman, Harry E.
Worth, Edward R.
Wray, Walter D., Jr.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William W.
Wright, William F., Jr.
Wyatt, Charles M.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Young, Alfred A., III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zahn, Raymond C.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zirkle, Forrest E.
Zirps, Christos

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Joseph P.
Alderman, Charles B.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Almen, Richard E.
Baker, Ernest L.
Bogorowski, Robert J.
Boyer, Charles L.
Brain, George W.
Brainard, John W.
Briggs, Irving G.
Brown, Russell M.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Burlingham, Nathan N.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Carberry, Raymund G., Jr.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Christopher, Robert N.
Clark, Roger S.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Connelly, Charles T.
Conner, Walter E.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Davis, William W.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Donzell, Richard J.
Earl, Bobby J.
Eastwood, William O., Jr.
Ebert, Scott W.
Fishback, Burney L., Jr.
French, Robert C.
Freese, Ralph F.
Frost, Shirley D.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Giagni, Vincent J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Govan, David M.
Greer, Merwyn C.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hemmert, George V.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hennessy, William J.
Hodges, William J.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Howe, Donald K., Jr.
Hubbard, Charles C.
Jackson, Reuben J.
Johnson, Jerry D.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
Kenealy, William E., Jr.
Kenny, John F.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kling, Fred A.
Knox, Arthur F., Jr.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Larson, Nelson S.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lemly, William D.
Lenderman, James L.
Lenz, Allen J.
Livermore, Robert E.
Long, Charles W.
Lovell, Donald E.
Maldonado, Teodosio
Malone, Joseph L., Jr.
Marek, Gardiner
Massie, Samuel P.
McCandless, Clarance C., Jr.
McGee, James E.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Miller, Richard K.
Morehouse, Charles W.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
O'Neil, Raymond L.
Osborn, Robert H.
Palmer, Donald R.
Pavlisin, Frank
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Russell, Frederick R.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sankey, Harry W.
Schwenz, Richard W.
Schucker, Robert M.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Scolpino, Frank J., Jr.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, George W., III
Sullivan, Joseph P.
Temte, Knute P.
Van Scoyoc, James S.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waid, Stanley B.
Waldvogel, Henry J.
Walker, John A.
Weber, Robert J.
Weisend, John G.
White, Robert G.
White, Frank L.
Wiliczynski, Jeremiah
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wolfe, William D.
Wong, Ronald M.
Woodward, Ralph C.
Woolley, Herbert T.
Yakopin, William R.
Vogel, Ralph H.
Avary, James L.
Collicott, Purnel L.
Davidson, William I.
Faust, Delbert L.
Furnweger, Alfred J.
Merrick, Walter F.
Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
Wood, Lee, Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Dillard, Donald H.
Feagins, Walter B., Jr.
Gillis, Edward F.
Hershberger, John R., Jr.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Johns, Harry D.
Keen, Homer E., Jr.
Reagan, Ernest M., Jr.
Roberson, Ronald L.
Samuel, William R.
Schmid, Calvin F.
Van Beck, Alfred F.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Agee, Aaron B.
Allen, Roy L.
Barber, Horace M.
Bigelow, David S.
Bischof, Ernest J.
Bowers, Richard A.
Carlstrom, Richard H.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gates, Charles W.
Gates, Paul R.
Hartell, William K.
Hines, John C.
Hoffner, Carleton C.
Hrnjez, Nicholas C.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Huston, Robert J.
Johnson, Clarence B.
Johnson, Durrell A.
Jones, Horace B., Jr.
Jones, Thomas K.
Koblos, Michael C.
Lapolla, Joseph
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Mathews, Charles J.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
Paulson, Raymond E.
Reese, Joseph L., Jr.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Robinson, Charles F.
Schellhardt, Richard H.
Scherer, Clark H., Jr.
Smith, Matthias, J.
Stultz, Bobby E.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Van Belkum, Kenneth D.
Wear, John R.
White, Robert K.
Wilson, Dean G.
Woodring, John W.
Yoshihara, Takeshi
Blough, Loney L.
Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
Pinch, William C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Campbell, Howard B.
Cook, Paul E.
DeGrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diaz, Gilbert A.
Dobbs, George I.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Howard, John E.
Howard, Vaughn
Jordan, Ray D.
Nyman, George A.
Pribnow, James F.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Robert L.
Smith, Bill J.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
Wimberly, Clyde O.

NURSE CORPS

Belair, Dayne A. B.
Dauntler, Marjorie D.
Hockenberger, Charlotte E.
Mueller, Dona D.
O'Loughlin, Dorothy F.
Peterson, Eleanor V.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Edwards, Jean R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Grafius, Melba A.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Nellie K.
Antolowitz, Gertrude M.
Dunne, Cynthia C.
Tomsuden, Ruth M.
White, Joan L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

De Berry, Patricia.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert E. Blue, Jr.
Donald B. Clauson, Jr.
Arthur A. Dobson
Roger D. Jesse
John W. Lundstrom
Charles P. McCleskey
David F. Nelson
Robert A. Thygeson
James C. Rydzewski

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence H. Marten, Jr.
John Shroeder, Jr.
Frank E. Webb

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert R. Champion
Edward T. Chimenti
John R. Dewane
Rossell A. Earnst
Curtis S. Gabbard
Noel "A" Grady, Jr.
Don W. Martens
Jerome R. Quinn
Norman A. Stewart
Thomas A. Winkel

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER

Arthur J. Draper
Francis L. Giknis
Charles E. Kee
Roger Stevenson

LIEUTENANT

Joseph A. Bettencourt, Jr.
Leo R. Brown
Richard A. Burningham
John R. Coates
Donald C. Colter
William C. Cooper, Jr.
Leon K. Cowan
Warren J. Jones, Jr.
Warren R. Jones
Robert W. Maher
Robert G. Muth
Vincent S. Oliva
Albert M. Rogers
William A. Schrader, Jr.
Laurence H. Snow
John P. Sweeny
Enrique Velez-Villarini

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Donald E. Duncan
Lloyd E. Hembre
John T. Janus
Franklin R. Ruliffson
Robert G. Thompson

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jerry G. Brewster

Ivan C. Floerchinger, United States Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy (Aviation Ordnance), pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John M. Altmeyer
Fred J. Barto
Henry Bippus
Henry C. Boschen, Jr.
Donald C. Brouillard
William F. Burke
John R. Burley
William R. Carey
Francis W. Cronin
Douglas E. Cross
Casimo J. Cush
William C. Darwin
Sidney P. Dumont, Jr.
George J. Evans
David R. Fall, Jr.
James E. Fernandes
Jaime Garcia
James K. Hamel
Bobby R. Inman
Thomas R. Kehoe
Byron C. Kelley
Walter F. Kimzey
Walter Kohler, Jr.
James M. McGowan
William D. McGrath
Kenneth M. McLeod
William T. McNett
John R. Miller
Charles J. Moore
Daniel J. Moss
Claude E. Mounce
Ernest A. Munro
Joseph E. Murray, Jr.
James M. Nelson
Richard J. Norton
Howard "A" Ogden, Jr.
Carl R. Pendell
Richard W. Reed
Stanley G. Rice
James L. Roberton
Nevin L. Rockwell
Raymond C. Shaw, Jr.
Sayre A. Swarztrauber
Charles H. Temple
Leonard E. Tillerson
"G" "E" Townsend
Robert A. VanArsdol
Alan D. Watt
William A. Wenker

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Harold C. Albin, Jr.
John F. Arvay
William R. Curtis
Clarence D. Ives
George H. Krag
Peter Maytham
Richard L. Mudgett
Malcolm H. Munsey
Arie C. A. Sigmond
Arnold L. Trygsland
Benny R. Walker
Gunnar F. Wilster

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas C. Bryan
James J. McGrath

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

James R. Adcox
John M. Altmeyer
Fred Baldwin, Jr.
Sammy E. Barber
Lee G. Barnes
Fred J. Barto
Ronald A. Berger
Richard C. Berry
Henry Bippus
Hollis F. Blodgett
Henry C. Boschen, Jr.
Donald C. Brouillard
Reginald D. Burgert
William F. Burke
John R. Burley
Richard W. Burnett
Robert C. Byberg
James B. Cagle
William R. Carey
Perry Carvellas
Eugene J. Cash
Thomas J. Cassidy, Jr.
William M. Cavitt
Charles F. Clark, Jr.
Alfred L. Clavel
Samuel W. Clayman
Richard Cobb
Eugene V. Crabb
James D. Crain
Francis W. Cronin
Douglas E. Cross
Casimo J. Cush
William C. Darwin
Orson R. Dee
Edward G. Deibert
Marvin P. Desrocher
Arthur E. DeTonnancourt
Joseph L. Dick
Joseph V. DiPace
Donald W. Duckering
Sidney P. Dumont, Jr.
Robert S. Eberhart
George J. Evans
David R. Fall, Jr.
Charles G. Farnham
James E. Fernandes
Thomas F. Flavin, Jr.
Jaime Garcia
Bernard D. Garrett
Osby Z. Gentry, Jr.
Ronald R. Griffith
Herbert "M" Halverson
James K. Hamel
Richard L. Hellinger
Willard D. Holmstrom
Benjamin F. Hooper
Earl E. Hopkins
Samuel W. Hubbard, Jr.
Bobby R. Inman
Arthur W. Jahns
Robert P. John
Bert W. Johnson
Edward D. Johnson
Oren D. Johnson
Robert L. Jones
Thomas R. Kehoe
Byron C. Kelley
Walter F. Kimzey
Robert E. Kirksey
Walter Kohler, Jr.
Spencer C. Lawless
Burt L. Levin
Wilbur Lilling
George E. Ludwig
Lucius P. Manns
Donald W. Mathews
Lawrence L. Mayhew
Raymond T. McDonald
James M. McGowan
William D. McGrath
Kenneth M. McLeod
Robert A. McMurtray, Jr.
William T. McNett
James F. McNulty
John R. Miller
Lewis N. Mitchell, Jr.
Charles J. Moore
Earle G. Moore
Thomas J. Morey
Daniel J. Moss
Claude E. Mounce
William J. Mulcahy, Jr.
Ernest A. Munro
Joseph E. Murray, Jr.
James M. Nelson
Richard J. Norton
Howard "A" Ogden, Jr.
Carl R. Pendell
Deane G. Peters
Lyle D. Quamme
Steve Ralph, Jr.
Richard W. Reed
Robert D. Reymond
Stanley G. Rice
James L. Roberton
Nevin L. Rockwell
Jimmie L. Rupp
Roger P. Ryan
James R. Seifert
Carl G. Sempier
Raymond C. Shaw, Jr.
William F. Sherwood
John D. Shields
Peter K. Stevenson
Wendell L. Strahan
Sayre A. Swarztrauber
Richard F. Taylor
Charles H. Temple
Leonard E. Tillerson
David R. Tinkler
Joseph E. Tondora
"G" "E" Townsend
Robert A. VanArsdol
Max H. Watson
Alan D. Watt
Lawrence K. Weber, Jr.
William A. Wenker
Joseph D. Whalen
Aarion Willhauck
John R. Wunsch

ENSIGN

Harold C. Albin, Jr.
John F. Arvay
Gerard R. Baumann
William A. Coll
William R. Curtis
Clarence D. Ives
George H. Krag
Peter Maytham
Richard L. Mudgett
Malcolm H. Munsey
Arie C. A. Sigmond
Arnold L. Trygsland
Benny R. Walker
Gunnar F. Wilster

The following-named women officers for permanent appointment to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marvel I. Cowling
Clara L. Daniel
Nancy J. Ellifrit
Betty J. Hill
Beverly C. L. Jiskra
Mary C. Reynolds

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Gordon W. Werner

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Stanley H. Kramer

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

George F. Borbidge
Willard R. Crabtree
Francis A. Derby
George H. Eckert, Jr.
Jack E. Gove
Donald J. Griffiths
Thomas J. May
Eugene M. Riddick
Carlyle V. Thorup

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

William H. Matthews

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles B. Alderman
George F. Borbidge
Willard R. Crabtree
Francis A. Derby
George H. Eckert, Jr.
William C. Forrey
Jack E. Gove
Donald J. Griffiths
Robert E. Holl
Reuben J. Jackson
John H. Lannen, Jr.
"W" "B" Lovell
Thomas J. May
John F. Newman
Eugene M. Riddick
Carlyle V. Thorup
Preston J. Tillery
Philip Trimble
Ralph H. Vogel
Henry J. Waldvogel

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Nick S. Karras
Vernon J. Ramsey

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Connell J. Maguire
James T. McDonnell

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John T. Beck
Nick S. Karras
Lloyd W. Letten, Jr.
Vernon J. Ramsey
David E. Simmons

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Richard L. Foley
John A. Wright

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

George H. Brown

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Henry K. Burger
Walter J. Eager, Jr.
Richard L. Foley
LeRoy D. Lawson
John R. O'Laughlin
John A. Wright

ENSIGN

George H. Brown

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Ellen G. W. Houston
Maria O. Siqueiros
Patricia J. Stack

The following named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Margie L. Carter
Jean E. Davis
Georgia A. Jones
Sara T. Reed
Alice C. VanGundy

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Danya A. B. Belair
Ellen G. W. Houston
Maria O. Siqueiros
Patricia J. Stack
Katherine Wilson

ENSIGN

Anne M. Tierney

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Christensen, James R.
Stallings, Randall L.
Power, Roger C., Jr.
Heinl, Robert D., Jr.
McDonough, Robert C.
Strickler, Richard D.
Keene, James W.
Kinney, John F.
Benson, Francis W.
Stallings, George R.
McKennan, William J.
Sanders, Claude S., Jr.
Stephens, Walter H.
Schwenke, Clarence R.
Mallard, John F.
Thomas, George B.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Rentsch, John E.
Hodges, Charles T.
Black, Kenneth H.
Humberd, William C.
Burns, Robert R.
Carl, Marion E.
Somers, Charles W., Jr.
Adams, Arthur H.
Fraser, Angus M.
Hall, Robert
Robinson, Donald J.
Mahoney, Alfred M.
Ritzau, Erik W.
Brewer, John C.
Watkins, James M., Jr.
Clasen, William E.
Cole, J. Frank
Hutchinson, Homer G., Jr.
Anderson, Allen H.
Dew, Elkin S.
Wann, Erwin F., Jr.
Calhoun, Otis V., Jr.
Collins, Talbott F.
Partridge, John H.
Karch, Frederick J.
Fox, Lawrence F.
Figuers, Horace H.
Skoczylas, Joseph S.
Antonelli, John W.
Herring, George W.
Wolfe, David C.
Martin, Kenneth E.
Sisak, Nicholas A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Voss, William G.
Mann, Thomas H., Jr.
Leppig, George E.
Wojcik, Michael F.
Peterson, Donald M.
Parker, George K.
Kaenzig, William W.
Bishop, Tillman E.
Strohmenger, Andrew J.
Fields, John R.
Faw, Duane L.
Morehead, Robert A.
McLeod, Stanley N.
Valente, Raymond L.
Noren, Wesley C.
Graham, Lawrence L.
Pomerleau, Donald D.
Stankus, Henry W.
Kuhn, Richard C.
Birmingham, Hudson G.
Ferguson, Glenn E.
Daddazio, Armand G.
Bosshard, Lawrence H.
Reid, George K.
Sitter, Carl L.
Roach, Richard E.
Flake, Keigler E.
Miller, Walter R.
Jeffcoat, Cyril D.
Holmgrain, Eric S.
McLellan, Paul F.
Gunther, Albert J.
Petrosky, Joseph A., Jr.
Rottenberg, Aaron M.
Steman, Louis H.
Moret, Alfred T., Jr.
Daniel, Homer L.
Lemarie, Paul A., Jr.
Jacobi, H. Leverett
Morton, Richard
Williamson, Harold P.
Parker, Tom S.
Flynn, Maurice E.
Allen, Paul L.
Kovich, George J., Jr.
Remington, Richard M.
O'Donnell, John J.
Benda, Michael D.
Boress, Bernard M.
Hunt, Richard M.
Jeter, Robert B.
Spuhler, Raymond H.
Leitner, Warren A.
Mentzer, John F.
Schumaker, David W.
Jerue, George E.
Manion, Thomas A.
Galbreaith, Don W.
Hammerbeck, Edward E.
Sadler, Mitchell O.
Fening, Raymond J.
LeMay, John, Jr.
Perkins, Thurman L.
Staples, Murray M.
West, Corbin L.
Peck, Richard C.
Motelewski, Joseph R.
Fenton, Francis I., Jr.
Paige, Mitchell
Hensen, Neil M.
Fegan, Joseph C., Jr.
Butler, Neely D., Jr.
Foxworth, Robert F.
Boutwell, Theodore R.
Anglin, Emmett O., Jr.
Carey, Earl P.
Brant, Robert E.
Hiller, Emmett R.
Shinn, Leo B.
Dodson, Frederick C.
VanBuren, Werner J.
Corey, Russell E.
Scarborough, John M.
Ball, Louis L.
Banks, David W.
Smith, Richard C.
Pesely, Edward H.
Anderson, Nels E.
Cain, William O., Jr.
Moore, Richard L.
Brown, Leslie E.
Hubbard, Jay W.
Lane, William F.
Bryson, Richard C.
Williams, Bruce F.
Stuenkel, Walter E.
Zaro, William J.
Thompson, Rufus B., Jr.
Graham, William M., Jr.
Nesbit, William P.
Makowski, Roland H.
Greason, Edward H.
Clark, William H.
Givens, Harry L., Jr.
Zawasky, George E.
Berrar, Frank R.
Greene, Charles H., Jr.
Fossum, Edward L.
Honeycutt, Adolph J.
Gibson, Gale B.
LaPlant, Claude R.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Woodruff, William L.
Straine, Robert G.
Williams, Lloyd O.
Bozarth, Hubert G.
Paquin, Paul R.
Sutts, Ben
Parker, Howard H.
Cermak, Frank J.
Richards, William B.
Eargle, George R.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Fees, Fred J., Jr.
McColm, Harry A., Jr.
Dant, James K.
Walton, Leo E., Jr.
Johnson, Robert T.
Buchanan, Fitzhugh L., Jr.
Meeker, Ermine L.
Wachter, John A.
Dlugos, Thomas S.
Showalter, Charles E.
Santee, Robert E.
Ambrosia, Eugene J.
Butler, Harrison M.
Mackey, Harold R.
Good, George P., III
Reid, Ernest R., Jr.
Shepherd, Lemuel C., III
Stephens, Reuel W., Jr.
Blagg, Russell E.
Eschholz, Theodore S.
Gover, Robert L., Jr.
Blough, Foster W.
Babe, George A.
Koler, Joseph, Jr.
Young, William F.
Bradley, Lawrence J.
Shanahan, Thomas C.
Coon, Elvin R., Jr.
Hillmer, Donald F.
Vom Orde, Ewald A., Jr.
Foyle, Robert A.
Rump, William S.
VanZuyen, William M.
Lerond, Jack M.
Hall, Donald L.
Munn, Charles R., Jr.
Beverly, Arthur C.
Reese, Howard E.
Smith, Donald H.
McNicholas, Robert J.
Baeriswyl, Louis, Jr.
Taylor, Wilber F.
Taylor, Roma T., Jr.
Macklin, William H.
King, Charles F., Jr.
Pryor, Bertram H.
Kurowski, Anthony R.
Heffernan, Neal E.
Davis, Joseph L.
Hansen, Jack R.
DeLong, Earl R.
Snyder, Joris J.
Webb, Lewis R.
Miniclier, John F.
Langley, Charles F.
McClelland, William A.
Hickman, William T.
Horn, James A.
Barde, Robert E.
Flood, James H. A.
Runyan, Clair F.
Anderson, Robert V.
Selmyhr, Garlen L.
Magruder, Bruce, Jr.
Martin, Lee D.
Blyth, Charles W.
Yingling, James M.
Gately, William F., Jr.
Bentley, Loren D.
Barry, Richard S.
Scharnberg, George R.
Montague, Paul B.
Ludwig, Verle E.
Robinson, Dayton, Jr.
Bennett, Nalton M.
Stavridis, Paul G.
Barr, John F., Jr.
Owens, Owen L.
Wildey, Robert L.
Coffman, John W.
Wessel, Wallace
Fegley, James E.
Pearcy, Eddie E.
Stowers, Robert M.
Corn, Clifford D.
Courchesne, Burton Y.
Grier, Samuel L.
Witkowski, Henry J.
Kessler, Paul
Keating, Weldon L.
Leidy, Alfred L.
McCain, Gene M.
Vrabel, Michael J.
Brent, Joseph M.
Miller, Richard R.
DuPuy, Robert M. H.
Barnard, John R.
Harris, William A.
Alexander, John C.
Elledge, Raymond J.
Tucker, Chester E.
Palmer, Kenny C.
Emma, Carl J.
Marusak, Andrew V., Jr.
Nilsen, George H.
O'Connell, John P.
Redman, Charles B.
Perrich, Robert J.
Carpenter, Stanley H.
Wilson, Harold B.
Stephenson, Charles R., III
Gilman, Donald E.
Blaha, Herbert J.
Patton, William C.
Moak, Stanley T.
McNulty, John S., Jr.
Rodes, Nye G., Jr.
Rapp, David A.
Sloan, James A.
Walker, William T.
Coffman, Raymond P., Jr.
Wilson, Robert H.
Eastman, Robert E.
Edwards, Roy J.
McGrail, Arthur F., Jr.
Erbland, Robert M.
Savage, Richard A.
Woodruff, Paden E., Jr.
Ives, Merton R.
Weiler, Paul
Peabody, Clifford J.
Eagle, Joseph N.
Middleton, Austin B., Jr.
Hunter, Daniel B.
Brier, George R.
Rogers, Harry L., Jr.
Hall, William D.
Markham, Edward J., Jr.
Spark, Michael M.
Richards, Wayne E.
Meyer, Edward B.
Parrott, Robert E.
Arford, Jack O.
Parnell, Edward A.
Heinemann, Hermann
Swanda, Donald F.
Plaskett, William, Jr.
Green, Thomas N.
Schimmenti, Joseph A.
McCarty, Stewart B., Jr.
Dowlearn, Donald W.
Steinway, Robert A.
Dicus, William A., Jr.
Ziegler, Leland E.
Piedmont, Joseph A., Jr.
Curwen, Bertram H., Jr.
Norfolk, Ira P.
Hanifin, Robert T., Jr.
Mazzuca, Paul, Jr.
Hecker, James S.
Segner, Donald R.
Whitebread, Robert C.
Reed, Jack L.
Schreier, William J.
White, William J.
Miller, Robert T.
Bousquet, Arthur R.
New, Noah C.
Pytko, Albert R.
Lillich, Gerald L.
Tooker, Donald K.
Morgan, James L.
Drury, John W.
Fredericks, Harold D.
Morrison, Karl D.
Davis, William J.
Dawson, Thomas E.
Fox, George C.
Hunt, Forest J.
Shutler, Philip D.
Izzo, Robert E.
Galbraith, Thomas H.
Arkland, Ezra H.
Walsh, David W.
Bacas, George A.
Jesse, William L.
Kliefoth, George C.
Messina, Anthony V.
Belbusti, Albert F.
Castro, Frank M.
Timmes, Edward A.
Simpson, Parks H.
Steed, Robert E.
Buck, John A.
Pieti, Jerome N.
Walsh, John J.
Henry, Kenneth W.
Tardif, Donald W.
Lucy, Robert M.
Snow, Melvin W.
Crowley, Richard W.
Waldrop, Floyd H.
Cothran, Charles A.
Vernon, Thomas E.
Harris, Jack W.
Bunnell, Charles P., Jr.
Pearson, Martin
Holt, Edward Y., Jr.
Evans, Donald L., Jr.
Murphree, Thomas E.
Flores, James R.
Jaworski, Edmund W.
Puckett, Eugene R.
Petska, Jack J.
Westerman, Jack
Schneeman, Charles J., Jr.
Young, Edwin M.
Kohl, Carlisle G., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Leader, Samuel F.
Davis, Merle C.
Neef, Robert L.
Powell, J. B.
McKean, Edgar A.
Vroegindewey, Robert J.
Grimes, Doyle
Youngs, Clifford A.
Schrier, Harold G.
Taylor, James G. G.
Allen, Wilburn C.
Bishop, Ray H.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Kleberger, Doris V.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Benz, James F., Jr.
Bradford, Samuel W., Jr.
Updegrave, Maurice S.
Hosey, Mansell E.
Dolman, Brynley W.
Lundgren, Darrell Q.
May, Kenneth F.
Gilrselli, Roland F.
Stice, Frederick D.
Gray, James C., III
Howarth, Darrell L.
Dolan, Eugene T.
VanGaasbeek, Leonard S.
Regan, Edmund J., Jr.
Fein, Louis I.
Gamble, Ross M.
Abernathy, Thomas R.
Schroering, Charles J., Jr.
Douglas, Arthur E.
Groff, John L.
Comer, Andrew G.
Shore, Bruce J.
Gartrell, Craig B.
Perry, Victor A.
Tucker, Leland W.
Illg, Harvey G.
Delaine, Louis, Jr.
Wiita, John W.
Perry, Aydlette H., Jr.
Buckley, John D., Jr.
Zarkos, Tom A., Jr.
Gerichten, William S.
Brownell, Richard L.
Phillips, Bernard P.
Badamo, Frank J.
Ballek, Fred J.
Cheatham, Willard E.
DeLong, George J.
Booth, Charles L.
McCormick, James G.
O'Rourke, William T., Jr.
Cull, Albert L.
Thornbury, Billy D.
Harris, James B.
Madera, Leroy A.
Trebon, Iver W.
Robertson, Duncan J.
Florence, John W.
Ostlund, Donald P.
Keller, Albert W.
King, Charles A., Jr.
Skagerberg, Alan E.
Schlarp, Jack E.
Roque, Ilow M.
Graney, Thomas E.
Woodring, Willard J., Jr.
Butler, Larry R.
Pullar, Walter S., Jr.
DeLong, Clyde S., Jr.
Willcox, Clair E.
Kramer, Milton C.
George, Gus J.
Gott, Michael J.
Townsend, Donald B.
Brennan, James J.
Jellison, Harold M., Jr.
McKay, Conrad L.
Henderson, Walter J.
O'Rourke, James K.
Boles, Robert D.
Riseley, James P., Jr.
Whitmer, James A.
Hawkins, David H.
Fenenga, Gerit L.
Robbins, Morris G.
Como, Joseph A.
Charon, Larry P.
McCann, Henry J.

Coughlin, Richard L.
Vanek, Kenneth D.
Cable, Wiley R.
Gillen, John P.
McCarthy, Theodore C., Jr.
Baldwin, William T.
Sutter, Rudolf S.
Rasdal, Robert W.
Robinson, James C.
Willis, Lawrence J.
Tilly, Robert C.
Battistone, Carl L.
Young, Earnest G.
Mason, William P., III
Ashby, William C., Jr.
Mais, Raymond S.
Crawford, John M.
Lenihan, John D.
Luckett, Jackson R.
Andrews, Clifton B.
Thornton, Bozzie F., Jr.
Dawson, Carl F.
Rexroad, Donald N.
Barker, Warren H.
Dowd, John A.
Gubany, Michael W.
Joy, Lester H.
Owens, Hosea
Hite, Harry W.
Downs, Roy
Goodale, Richard W.
Jackson, Edwin F.
Fojtlin, Louis
Huizenga, Elmer F.
Lumpkin, Aubrey L.
Friedman, Arthur D.
Bradley, Thomas E.
Bancroft, Richard A.
Boynton, Robert H.
Cooper, Francis W.
Vitali, Henry R.
Dunn, John H.
Wright, Dennis W.
Taylor, Joseph F., Jr.
Morrow, Thomas E.
Shaffer, John C.
Dawson, Forest G.
Mills, Lewis L.
Beno, Joseph P.
Munter, Weldon R.
Newbill, Merrill S.
Clark, Merideth M.
Stevens, Marvin B.
Ditch, Winfield S., III
Blair, Anthony L.
Crosby, Donald A.
Muth, Harold F.
Modzelewski, Edward R.
Mertz, Edward P.
Thompson, Joseph H.
Disher, William H.
Hudson, Jack J.
Cummings, John M.
Sallade, Paul H.
Austin, John H.
Cottrell, Johnnie C.
Scyphers, Ruel T.
Carroll, Charles W.
MacDonald, Glenn A.
Smith, Buck D.
Troupe, Ralph J.
Gaffney, Joseph I.
Conroy, Eugene L.
Wawrzyniak, Stanley
Lubin, Irvin
Shimanoff, Morris S.
Anderton, George T., Jr.
Pence, Clarence J.
Seaman, George W.
Hedloff, Richard J.
Axton, Robert H.
Clemens, Glenwood A.
Tremblay, Laurier J.
Blankenship, Leroy I.
Keyes, Gerald W.
Cribb, George F.
Stewart, James H.
Rush, Wesley M.
Windsor, Billie W.
Edwards, Charles
Maxwell, Glenn K.
Germagian, Barker P.
Read, William A.
Cassedy, Logan
Tull, James R.
Matheson, John R.
Allweiler, Joseph O.
Werz, Francis J.
Morrow, Gene S.
Myers, Donald A.
Schremp, George R., Jr.
Berglund, Warren T.
Miller, Robert B.
Creekmore, Gregory, Jr.
Gormley, John D.
Normandeau, Joseph P.
Vey, Willis D.
Smith, Frank R.
Shoemake, Loyd R.
Carothers, James H., Jr.
Throckmorton, Roger R.
Henson, William E.
Piontek, Edward
Stouch, Raymond E.
James, John H.
Shaffer, Raymond A.
Harris, George C., Jr.
Phillips, Jimmie R.
Humphrey, Donald L.
Toms, Edward H.
Kain, Edward W.
Sanborn, Earle L., Jr.
Soper, Melvin A., Jr.
Rutherford, Robert J.
Spencer, Ralph B.
Stein, Alfred F.
Consodine, Thomas J., Jr.
Kelly, Edwin F.
Lincoln, Thomas G., Jr.
Little, Jack L.
McCarty, Howard J.
Gile, Robert N.
Allen, Clyde E.
VanFossen, Harry E.
Rogers, George F., Jr.
Russell, Robert A.
Brassfield, John T.
Sloan, Richard E.
Gregory, Malcome G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Eugene D.
Cunha, Ulysses P.
Coffey, Samuel R.
Frank Everett W.
Swisher, Claud R.
Lamoureux, Wesley D.
Fleetwood, Walter W.
Persons, Harry D.
Bittick, William C., Jr.
Lancaster, James F.
Smith, Kenneth D.
Sedora, Stephen
Menjes, John H.
Thomas, Waldron E.
Swindells, Walter R.
Gardner, William E.
Clegg, Francis X.
Buskirk, William K.
Schmidt, Charles M.
Wilson, James W.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Parker, Eileen F.
Hilgart, Valeria F.
Baker, Constance
Curran, Elena B.
Hajek, Virginia A.
Johancen, Mary G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adamczuk, Russell W.
Ahearn, James P.
Alger, Richard J.
Alison, Jefferson, III
Allen, Joseph N., III
Allison, Richard L.
Alter, Louis W., Jr.
Anderson, Arthur R., Jr.
Anderson, Richard J.
Androlewicz, Aloysius A., Jr.
Angelo, Leon N.
Anslow, James W.
Arnold, John D. P., Jr.
Aronson, Howard A.
Ashlock, Thomas E.
Asper, Merle W., Jr.
Asperheim, David B.
Augee, Hollis L.
Augustine, Paul C., Jr.
Avant, Grady, Jr.
Avignone, John J.
Badeker, Roger W.
Bain, Robert A.
Bainbridge, Robert L.
Baker, Ray L.
Baker, Richard F.
Ball, Kenneth J.
Barr, Charles R.
Barstow, Charles A.
Bartels, Roger J.
Baukus, Duane A.
Bayless, Freddie P.
Beason, Lawrence L.
Beatty, Richard A.
Benstead, Daryl E.
Berdanier, Francis N.
Bergstrom, Carl F., Jr.
Bibb, William J.
Bickerstaff, Robert D.
Bicknel, William V.
Biegler, James L.
Bischoff, Joseph J.
Bittner, Barry N.
Bjorlykke, Arthur, Jr.
Blanc, Richard J.
Bliesener, Carl B.
Blocker, Joseph W.
Bond, Henry J.
Bond, Thomas G.
Boozman, Paul G.
Borlan, Albert G.
Bowen, Dale J., Jr.
Bowen, Donald P.
Bowling, Thomas B.
Bradshaw, Harvey D.
Brandes, Norman J.
Brandon, Jack A.
Brookshire, Phil E.
Brown, Jerome W.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Walter R.
Brunner, Michael M.
Bryson, William C., Jr.
Buckner, Gordon H., II
Buehl, Louis H., III
Burd, Robert S.
Burke, Raymond G.
Buttolph, Richard D.
Byrd, James C.
Cacace, Pasquale L.
Caldwell, Harvey H., Jr.
Cale, John J., Jr.
Campbell, Ralph L.
Candea, George A.
Canfield, Norman E.
Carlisle, Robert L.
Carlow, Sterling K.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carr, Gerald P.
Carr, Richard D.
Carroll, Daniel I.
Carter, George F.
Carter, Sterling W.
Casada, Howard O., Jr.
Cates, Leroy R.
Chambless, Burr T.
Charlton, Albert K.
Cheripka, Michael R.
Childress, Richard H.
Chittenden, Duane J.
Christensen, Keith L.
Christman, Karl F.
Clark, Julian H., Jr.
Clark, Ronald A.
Clewes, John E.
Coates, William D.
Cochran, John K.
Coit, Francis E.
Coleman, Charles P.
Coleman, Elisworth P.
Connor, Michael J.
Cook, Philip B.
Cornish, John F., Jr.
Correnti, Anthony R.
Cousland, John P.
Cowden, Joseph M., Jr.
Crumback, Willard I.
Crumbley, Walter S.
Cuozzo, Robert J.
Curtis, Jack O.
Czubai, Stanley J.
Danielson, Andrew W.
Davinroy, Thomas B.
Davis, Walter H.
Day, Douglas T., III
Deakin, Richard W.
Dean, Clyde D.
DeCota, Walter J.
De Grandpre, David O.
Delaney, James J., II
Delehanty, Gregory J.
DeLoach, James D.
Dennis, Richard L.
Diaz, Odilio M.
Dickerson, John A.
Dillow, Walter R.
Dilworth, Clarence W.
Dirlam, James E.
Dittmeier, Arthur A., Jr.
Dorsey, Frank J.
Dougherty, Hugh L., Jr.
Dow, George E., Jr.
Draayer, Lloyd J.
Drebushenko, William
Driefer, John L.
Dunn, George H., II
Dunn, John D.
Dunn, Russell M., Jr.
Durham, Donald D.
Eastland, Thomas A.
Ebbitt, George F., Jr.
Eckhardt, William E.
Edmondson, Orville R.
Edwards, Thomas L.
Egan, Martin J., Jr.
Eisenhauer, Stephen S.
Eldridge, Robert B.
Ellison, George H.
Elms, Richard A.
Engelhardt, John W.
Ertimeier, George J.
Escalera, Daniel C.
Evans, Ernest E., Jr.
Evans, George G., Jr.
Everett, John W.
Fails, William R.
Fant, John E.
Felter, Joseph L.
Field, Roland B.
Fifield, John G.
Finch, Kenneth P.
Fischer, John L.
Flint, Robert D.
Flynn, John J.
Fogo, Wallace E.
Folks, Tommy I.
Ford, Jeremiah, III
Forhan, James F.
Forte, James R.
Fortune, William F. J.
Franco, Frederick J., Jr.
Frank, M. P., III
Frank, William C.
Friedrichs, Phillip B.
Fullam, Donald M.
Furstenberg, Lawrence
Gallagher, Patrick K.
Galligan, Pat S.
Gannan, Henry R., Jr.
Garbee, Edmund G., Jr.
Garner, William D.
Garner, William G.
Geisler, Richard M.
Gerber, Donald R.
Gibson, Robert E.
Gilbert, Donald C.
Gildersleeve, Leo A.
Gillman, John C.
Gipson, Sam M., Jr.
Godby, Lawrence J.
Godfrey, Edwin J.
Golden, Joseph F.
Golla, Harold G., Jr.
Goller, Winston O.
Goodall, George E., Jr.
Goodman, Edward C., Jr.
Goodwine, Lloyd E.
Gore, Robert F.
Gott, Michael J.
Graves, Arthur L.
Greek, Donald D.
Green, Robert E.
Green, Robert P.
Greene, James C., Jr.
Greer, Jesse R.
Grey, Clearence B.
Griffin, William J.
Grimm, Jimmie D.
Gromme, Robert W.
Guinee, Vincent J., Jr.
Gutknecht, John E.
Hadden, Don H.
Hadley, Hunter B., Jr.
Hagan, Donald F.
Hagerty, Roger C.
Haight, William P.
Haines, Frederick S., III
Haislip, Richard E.
Hale, Robert O.
Haley, Edward D.
Hallam, William J.
Hamber, John W.
Hamlin, Thomas M.
Hand, Edward P.
Hanneman, Richard W.
Harrison, Jerry M.
Harrison, Wentworth T.
Hart, Franklin A., Jr.
Hart, Vincent P., Jr.
Harvey, John A., III
Hatfield, Milton A.
Hatlestad, Leif E.
Hawkins, Dale C.
Healey, Robert J.
Heesch, Robert W.
Heflin, James R.
Helsing, Duffern H.
Henderson, Ted R.
Herrera, Wilfred
Hess, Andrew C.
Hess, David L.
Heyl, Royle J.
Hickle, Arthur R.
Hilbert, James R.
Hill, Harold H.
Hitt, Joe S.
Hitz, James C.
Hobbs, Edward J.
Hogan, Theodore T., Jr.
Holles, David V. V.
Holmes, Henry A.
Honsaker, William G.
Hopkins, Richard L.
Horn, Francis M.
Horton, Egbert, Jr.
Hotis, John B.
Hull, Robert R.
Hull, Walter D., Jr.
Humphreys, Donald H.
Hunt, Earl B.
Hurley, John E., Jr.
Ingram, James M., Jr.
Ingram, Samuel W., Jr.
Isbell, Charles M.
Isbill, James B., Jr.
Isherwood, Charles S.
Jansen, George A.
Jasper, John G.
Jaycox, Warren I.
Jenkins, David C.
Jenkins, Robert L.
Jensen, Arthur E.
Johnson, Clifford B.
Johnson, Leroy E.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Russell E.
Jones, Paul R., Jr.
Jones, Robert
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Vaughn A.
Jordan, Michael
Jorgenson, Conrad A.
Kane, Francis J.
Kaufman, Clarence E., Jr.
Keenan, John J.
Kehrle, Jerry E.
Kendig, William F.
Kern, Richard J.
Ketch, Clair V.
Kimbrell, Harrison W.
King, Homer L. P.
King, Robert A.
Kirby, Robert W.
Klopp, David A.
Knitz, Walter W.
Kocornik, Richard W.
Kops, Myron S.
Kostelecky, John R.
Kramer, Russell, I.
Kress, Herbert W.
Krogius, Tristan E. G.
Kurber, Larry L.
Kussmann, John E., Jr.
Lacey, Fred E., Jr.
Laidman, Daniel H.
Langford, Ted L., Jr.
Lardner, John J.
Larsen, Ronald L.
Larson, Donald E.
Laster, Robert E.
Law, John J., Jr.
Lawson, Curtis G.
Layton, Willard T., III
LeDeaux, John K. B.
Lee, Stimson S. T.
Lerps, David A.
Leslie, Robert P.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Levin, Arthur D.
Lewis, Kenneth E.
Lewis, Robert E., Jr.
Lewis, Stanley P.
Lindsley, Charles H., Jr.
Lloyd, Russell, Jr.
Lofroos, William N.
Long, Bobby F.
Lottsfeldt, Peter F.
Loughry, Arthur S.
Lowe, Willie L., Jr.
Lucero, Candido H.
Lukeman, Anthony
Luther, Ronald B.
Lyons, Peter H.
Lyttle, Dan J. C.
Maag, Eddie R.
MacLaren, Bruce M.
MacPherson, Robert T.
Marfia, Samuel J.
Marquardt, Richard E.
Marshall, Floyd F., Jr.
Marshall, Robert R.
Martin, Thomas
Marushok, Andrew G.
Mathews, Frederick A.
Mathieu, Leo G
Mattmiller, Willard L.
Matz, Franklin P., III
Maxwell, Jack L.
May, David B.
McCann, Lewis R.
McCarthy, Donald C.
McCarthy, John H.
McCluskey, Charles A.
McCombs, Richard L.
McCormick, William C., Jr.
McCoury, Melvin W., Jr.
McCulloch, Richard K.
McDonald, Robert L.
McFerren, Kent A.
McGinn, William P.
McJunkin, Kenneth M., Jr.
McKenna, George X.
McKenna, John T.
McKinstry, William E.
Medina, Thomas J.
Melhuish, Peter W.
Michael, Stanley J., Jr.
Milone, Edward G.
Mitrione, Robert F.
Modjeski, Robert L.
Montgomery, Charles W.
Moon, Robert L.
Moore, Austin F.
Moore, Murl B.
Moore, Neil E.
Morgan, Donald R.
Morgan, Jimmie G.
Morgan, William E.
Morgan, William I., Jr.
Morgan, William S., Jr.
Moriarty, James F., Jr.
Morris, Gene S.
Mowbray, John F.
Moynahan, Bartholomew J.
Mueller, John H.
Munger, Bruce U.
Murphy, Edmond J.
Murray, Gerald H.
Murray, Joseph M.
Murray, Max D.
Mutch, Bryce A., Jr.
Myers, Louis B.
Nachazel, James W.
Nelson, Thomas, Jr.
Newell, James F.
Norris, Donald J.
Norton, Jerome L.
Oakes, Robert C.
O'Beirne, Patrick G.
Olander, Carl H.
O'Leary, Thomas H.
Olsen, Carl B., Jr.
Ortman, Thomas J.
O'Sullivan, Jerome M.
Otis, Paul J.
Owens, James L.
Page, James C.
Paige, Eddie C., Jr.
Pappas, Jimmy L.
Parker, William H., III
Parrish, Darold D.
Patrick, Robert J.
Pattee, Donald P.
Patterson, Kenneth G.
Pavey, Ronald A.
Pease, David L.
Pepperdine, James
Pesce, Augustus J.
Peterson, James R.
Peterson, Karl E., Jr.
Peterson, Perry M.
Peterson, Russell P.
Pfeifer, John A.
Phelps, George A., Jr.
Phillips, Charles L.
Pierce, William H.
Pisaturo, Charles A.
Pitts, Charles O., Jr.
Powell, Raymond R.
Prather, Richard L.
Prestridge, James A., Jr.
Price, Robert E.
Proctor, Ralph D.
Prudhomme, Daniel
Pugh, Robert L.
Pyeatt, Frederick E., III
Quinn, Joseph J.
Raleigh, John T.
Raphael, Thomas W.
Rash, Kenneth A.
Raymond, Richard, III
Ready, Bobby J.
Reed, John A.
Reed, Van S.
Reid, Robert D.
Reister, Henry C., III
Remley, Richard Y.
Reschar, John V.
Reynolds, Andrew J.
Riddell, William R., Jr.
Ring, Duane J.
Riordan, Edward J.
Roos, Donald A.
Rosandich, Thomas P.
Rose, Robert P.
Rourke, James P.
Rowe, Donald L.
Rowe, Evan W., Jr.
Rubrecht, William W.
Runyan, Richard D.
Russell, Ronald G.
Ryan, Paul M.
Ryder, James N.
Ryder, Norman E.
Salesses, John J.
Salley, Richard J.
Sands, Benjamin F., Jr.
Sanford, Glen
Sayes, Davis
Schell, Lawrence H.
Schlesinger, Norton J.
Schmitt, Peter E.
Schoenhardt, Richard E.
Schoenlein, Henry W., Jr.
Schofield, Harold
Schreiner, Charles W., Jr.
Schubmehl, William P.
Schuster, Howard L., Jr.
Scofield, Gerald A.
Scott, Hugh L., III
Scott, Oswald V., Jr.
Scott, Robert C.
Scullion, William, Jr.
Seabrook, Charles C.
Self, William R.
Sellers, Jay G.
Service, Walter C., III
Shantz, Thomas A.
Shiffler, George M., Jr.
Shore, Harold E., Jr.
Siler, Joseph A.
Sizelove, Jerry L.
Slade, George P.
Slepicka, Alois A.
Smith, Donald G.
Smith, Jack P.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Lloyd W., Jr.
Smith, Roland E.
Soden, William G.
Southgate, Robert H.
Spencer, Noel W., Jr.
Spreitzer, Richard L.
Stashis, Alfred J.
Stendahl, Walter R., Jr.
Stephani, William D.
Stephens, Arthur C., Jr.
Stephens, Willard M.
Sterzing, Carl B., Jr.
Stewart, James R., Jr.
Stewart, John D.
Stoddart, Edgar R., Jr.
Stokes, Thomas M., Jr.
Stolfi, Russel H.
Stratford, William K.
Sutton, Charles J., III
Suwalsky, Adelbert L., Jr.
Sweeney, Robert M.
Swigert, William G.
Terwilliger, John W.
Theriault, Neyle C.
Thomas, Robert D.
Thomas, William R.
Thomley, Robert R.
Thompson, Arthur B., Jr.
Thompson, Charles E.
Thompson, Roy L., Jr.
Thorfinnson, Romaine D.
Thorkelson, Thomas L.
Thursby, William G.
Tinnon, Carl U.
Tipshus, Edward C.
Tirk, Eugene R.
Toalson, Robert F.
Todd, Larrance M.
Topping, Robert W.
Townsend, Thomas A.
VanHatten, Hugh J.
Van Ness, John N.
Vass, Richard G.
Wagner, Edward R., Jr.
Walker, Richard W.
Walsh, Thomas M., III
Walters, John K., Jr.
Walters, Richard L.
Ward, Charles
Warren, Daniel E.
Weiler, Frank V.
Wells, Thomas C.
Wentz, Robert W.
Wester, Joseph R.
Weston, Bruce L.
Whelan, Richard V., Jr.
Whipple, Earle F., Jr.
White, Henry G., Jr.
Widick, Lester D., Jr.
Wieland, Richard A.
Wight, Daniel E., Jr.
Wiles, Harry W.
Wilkins, Maurice G., Jr.
Williams, Clifton C., Jr.
Williams, Russell O.
Wilson, Paul A., Jr.
Wilson, Willis E., Jr.
Wislar, George R.
Witt, John W.
Woodrow, Fitz W. M., Jr.
Wootten, Rike D.
Yadlowsky, Peter
Yanochik, Walter N.
Yates, John R., Jr.
York, Thomas O.
Young, Martin V., Jr.
Zangas, Charles L.
Zay, Thomas C.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Anderton, Ann C.
Berube, Claudette Y.
Callahan, Mary J.
Cox, Martha A.
Donohoe, Katherine M.
Grundy, Jane P.
Harris, Ada J.
Land, Florence E.
Lowell, Natalie H.
Phillips, Patricia A.
Strand, Elizabeth M.
Wallis, Jane L.
Willard, Antoinette S.
Yoyos, Catherine

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abrahamson, Dennis P.
Ackerman, Robert K.
Adamo, Nicholas J.
Adams, Robert T.
Aitchison, Don E.
Alton, James D., Jr.
Anderson, Kenneth F., Jr.
Anderson, Neil P.
Andrews, Charles T.
Andrews, William D.
Angle, Harold L.
Apple, Richard K.
Auer, William C., Jr.
Baggett, Robert L.
Ball, George M.
Baranski, Leonard S.
Barnard, William H.
Barnes, Harry F.
Barnhardt, Richard H.
Barr, Victor M.
Barwick, Hugh B., Jr.
Bath, Thomas J.
Beagle, Ronald G.
Beckman, Norbert J.
Beggin, John P.
Bench, Dan A.
Benson, James W.
Berry, Roy L.
Bickel, Robert F.
Billips, Charles E.
Bittner, Robert B.
Blair, Lynde D.
Blasingame, Ben C.
Bocklund, Daniel D.
Boggs, James C., Jr.
Boswell, James M.
Bower, William E.
Boyd, Edward H.
Brandt, Loren A.
Braun, Richard G.
Brokaw, James C.
Brower, George H.
Brown, Bruce L.
Brown, Robert S., Jr.
Bruce, Frank H., Jr.
Bur, Arnold J.
Burger, John C.
Burnaman, Phillip R.
Burnham, Robert G.
Burr, Robert H.
Burroughs, Franklin D.
Calfee, Richard W.
Calleton, Theodore E.
Campbell, Joseph G., Jr.
Cannon, Floyd E.
Carbonar, Vincent A.
Carlton, John D.
Carney, Robert T.
Carroll, Harry D., Jr.
Carter, Jared G.
Castonguay, Roger T.
Chapman, Harlan P.
Clapp, James L.
Clark, Dale H.
Clark, George
Cobb, Westray S.
Cody, Joseph F., Jr.
Collins, Garrett L.
Cone, Fred J.
Conway, Charles G.
Cooley, James C.
Crone, Forrest W.
Cronin, Timothy J., Jr.
Crudup, Dempsey B.
Dailey, John R.
Davenport, Thomas F., Jr.
Davisson, Elden R.
Dettle, Christian J.
Dick, Jerry A.
Dixon, John A.
Doerner, William C.
Dolson, Thomas C.
Douglas, Donald M.
Dowling, William P.
Dubac, Carl H.
Ebner, Thomas J.
Edgar, Thomas R.
Edwards, Fred L., Jr.
Egan, Donald E.
Egan, John J.
Eskam, John A.
Evans, John S.
Evans, William T.
Ewoldsen, Hans M.
Fazekas, Alex E.
Felker, James E.
Fentriss, James F.
Ferree, Charles R.
Firing, Fritz
Ford, Pat D.
Formanek, Robert L.
Forsyth, Otis F.
Fox, Clifford G.
Francis, Peter D.
Frank, Armin H.
Franklin, Carroll R.
Franklin, Ray M.
Fraser, Donald R.
Frasier, Joseph A., III
Freeman, Larry W.
Friske, John D.
Fudge, Robert J.
Gazzaniga, Donald A.
Geddes, Donald P., Jr.
Gerleman, Loren D.
Giles, William G.
Gillespie, Thomas E., Jr.
Gillette, Earle P., Jr.
Glaser, Ronald R.
Gonzales, Cyril E.
Goodman, John C.
Granger, Albert L.
Griffin, John L.
Griffin, Warren L., Jr.
Gulick, Roy M., Jr.
Hager, George F., Jr.
Hamilton, George S.
Hammes, John K.
Hampton, Charles T.
Harman, John R.
Harrity, Peter C.
Hart, James B.
Hart, Milledge A., III
Hayden, Francis M.
Haymond, Phillip M.
Henry, John W., Jr.
Henry, Richard T.
Herndon, Dale C.
Hey, John M.
Hickox, Dean C.
Hill, Donald P.
Hinds, William R.
Hoffman, Russell E.
Holiday, William G.
Holmes, Lee B.
Hook, Kenneth R.
Hopkins, John I.
Houder, Charles H., Jr.
Hovell, Peter F.
Hughes, Guy D.
Hughes, Richard D., Jr.
Hunt, Harry A., Jr.
Hunt, Theodore E.
Hurbis, Charles J.
Huston, Ralph S.
Jackson, William D.
Jastrzemski, Walter M.
Johnson, Bruce W.
Johnson, Gordon E., III
Johnson, Gunnar A.
Jones, Paul D.
Kaaa, Edmund W., Jr.
Kent, James J.
King, Paul D., Jr.
Kingree, Ben, III
Kish, Joseph A.
Kisker, George W.
Klingensmith, Cloyd H.
Klosak, Eugene J.
Knettles, Charles E.
Knobloch, Eugene W.
Koehler, Clement J.
Koester, Charles T.
Kosmata, Alan R.
Kostesky, Raymond M.
Kraemer, Aaron
Krauss, Walter J., Jr.
Krop, Eugene D.
Kropp, Ronald G.
Kugler, Ernest R.
Kuttner, Ludwig G.
LaBonte, Jovite, Jr.
Lamb, Robert S.
Landis, John L.
Lane, James H.
Laue, John F.
Lawrence, Richard J.
Lay, Bobby A.
Lee, Alex
Leonard, Clark M.
Lethin, Ronald R.
Lewis, Franklin J.
Livingston, Henry S.
Llewellyn, John S., Jr.
Loring, Arthur P., Jr.
Lowrie, James F.
Luedke, Bruce D.
Lugannani, Robert
Lundberg, Darwin D.
Lutes, Edmund M., Jr.
Lynch, Bruce G.
Lynch, Jarvis D., Jr.
Lynn, Chester V., Jr.
MacFarlane, John L.
MacLeay, Donald L., Jr.
Maddox, Robert T.
Maeser, Earl S.
Manke, John A.
Markello, Charles A.
Marshall, John T.
Martin, Delbert M.
Martin, Joel A.
Martin, Robert S., Jr.
Massey, James L.
Massey, Schamyl C.
Matthews, Harris E.
Mavretic, Josephus L.
McAlister, Robert H.
McCloskey, Peter F.
McClung, Conrad O.
McClure, George M., III
McFadden, Dudley E., Jr.
McGrath, Daniel R.

McGregor, Jack E.
McKellar, Charles W. F.
McManus, Edward P.
McMillin, Theodore R., Jr.
McPhillips, John J.
Mears, Leon G.
Meiners, Joseph B., Jr.
Meister, George F., Jr.
Melton, Howard I., Jr.
Memmer, George V.
Menton, James P.
Mercier, Lawrence E.
Merline, David A.
Miller, Michael
Miller, Neil P.
Milligan, Robert F.
Millington, Seth F.
Moe, Frederick J.
Monson, Charles L., Jr.
Moore, William B.
Moreton, James C.
Motherway, Robert T.
Movich, Richard C.
Munro, Robert G.
Murtland, James B., III
Necco, Charles R.
Nelson, William O., Jr.
Newman, Dewey L.
Nist, James S.
O'Brien, Richard J.
Ogden, Don J.
O'Malley, James P.
O'Neal, Robert P.
Orio, Carl D.
Ortman, Herman W.
O'Shea, Cornelius J., Jr.
Palmer, John K.
Pappas, Delos S.
Park, Blaine R.
Parke, Charles F.
Patterson, Richard A.
Paulson, Theodore R., Jr.
Penland, Richard K.
Perkins, Dayle M.
Perry, Clarence R.
Peterson, Richard I.
Phillips, Keith E.
Phillips, Reed, Jr.
Poche, Adolph J., Jr.
Porter, Charles R.
Porter, Leonard E.
Porter, Robert R.
Pottratz, Floyd T.
Powers, Robert A.
Pratt, David T.
Rackham, Robert N.
Raitt, George D.
Rapp, John T.
Reed, James P.
Reed, Ralph L.
Regan, Frank C., Jr.
Reilly, James K.
Reinecke, Frank M., Jr.
Reinke, Milton A.
Rice, James F.
Roach, James L.
Rogler, John E.
Rohloff, Carl A.
Rourke, William B., Jr.
Russell, Eugene B.
Ryan, Edward F.
Rychlik, Robert W.
Sanchez, David A.
Sanders, Joe P.
Sargeant, Robert A.
Sasso, Louis G.
Schaet, Donald E.
Schaffer, William A.
Schneider, Lawrence A.
Schoen, William A.
Schoon, John E.
Schroeder, Rolf R.
Schultz, Jack T.
Schweri, Philip A.
Searle, Henry L.
Shank, Paul J., Jr.
Sheridan, Lawrence D.
Shigley, Richard T.
Shillinglaw, James S.
Shortt, Harry R.
Skelton, Richard J.
Slider, William P.
Slough, Phillip G.
Smallman, John
Smith, Donald D.
Smith, James W.
Smith, John D.
Solomonson, Carl, Jr.
Sonnen, Charles J., II
Spooner, Richard T.
Stableford, Richard H.
Stannard, Robert A.
Stapleton, Gerald F.
Stauffer, Robert M.
Stein, Michael E.
Stith, Edward E.
Stoddart, George A.
Stone, Rodney L.
Suhre, Walter A., Jr.
Sullivan, Daniel L.
Sullivan, John A.
Sumrall, Haskell H., Jr.
Svec, M. Ronald
Swab, James E.
Swartz, William J.
Swenson, Carter P.
Tatum, Ronald E.
Taylor, George H., III
Taylor, Richard B.
Taylor, Theodore W.
Tesarek, Dennis G.
Thompson, Jack C.
Thompson, Milton S.
Throm, Robert B.
Thullen, Edward J.
Toben, Theodore J., Jr.
Tonini, Franklin J.
Townley, Edward F., Jr.
Townsend, James B.
Treat, Raymond C.
Trent, Anthony
True, Robert H.
Tully, Thomas J.
Ullom, Thomas H.
Ultsch, Harold E.
VanGorder, Jan H.
Varney, Richard S.
Vesely, Richard J.
Wagenhals, Walter L.
Wagner, Robert C., Jr.
Weidler, Jay B., Jr.
Weinerth, Stuart L., Jr.
Weld, Wayne C.
Williams, James P.
Williams, John C., III
Williams, Robert W.
Wills, Wayne M.
Wilson, Donald B.
Wuertz, Joseph B.
Wynn, Anthony M.
Young, Melvin B., III
Beers, Thomas G.
Bergman, Arthur A.
Blanchard, Ronald E.
Christy, Howard A.
Clemente, Philip E.
Coykendall, John W.
Crampton, Ervin "J"
Finn, Robert C.
Higginbotham, Robert S.
Kahler, Billy J.
Kelly, Francis J.
Macha, Benjamin E.
Maher, Robert G.
Mason, Robert B.
McGuire, Carl B.
McInroe, Jimmy B.
McKenna, William E.
McManus, William J.
Melchert, Warren L.
Murch, David H.
Odom, David L.
Peterson, George E.
Prescott, Sherwood F., Jr.
Roberts, Stanton H., Jr.
Rogers, Marcus B.
Schafer, John B.
Sheenan, James F.
Shelton, Jerry L.
Smaldone, Sylvester D., Jr.
Steffey, Richard G.
Stewart, Arthur L., Jr.
Uthe, Marvin V.
Voorhees, Gerald E.
Wheeler, Thomas M.
Widener, William W.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jeffers, Laury
Fevurly, Cederic A.
Hines, Robert W.
Eley, Thomas J.
Tate, Walter L.
Deason, Alvin J.
Elliott, James F.
Reynolds, Maurice V.
Gray, Harris D.
Clark, George V.
Walbrown, Oris D.
Raper, Clarence H.
Cook, Andrew N., Jr.
Harris, Dawson
Keith, Cyrus W.
Eggers, Harold B.
Lanham, Julius H.
Thompson, Charles W.
Thomas, Hubert N., Jr.
Kraay, Ernest W.
Sparks, Purvis
Withey, Harold E.
Opittek, Wilfred J.
Graham, James I., Jr.
Smith, Marion E.
Pratt, Fred E.
Coho, John W.
Richardson, Clarence W.
Osborne, Benjamin F.
Gray, Ruben W.
Kohler, Alfred G.
Allen, Frank T.
Glanzer, Calvin R.
Slocum, Philip W.
Bingham, Jack A.
Edwards, Clarence M., Jr.
Lendo, Henry J.
VanZant, Samuel E.
Knott, James L.
Franzen, Henry L.
Doxey, Oliver E.
Hansberry, Dean R.
Dilberger, Louis P., Jr.
Essko, Charles E., Jr.
Watwood, Marshall
Blankenship, Thomas P.
Slavin, Leo F.
Davies, Evan D., Jr.
Hohlt, Ernest C., Jr.
Herbert, Frank E.
Colwell, Jess R.
Mason, Taylor P.
Raymond, George
Harrison, Willie S.
Nelson, Jack I.
Engesser, Robert A.
Goodall, Jack W.
Schroeder, Edward J.
Davis, Perry W.
Killens, Luther E.
Betts, Lawrence
Schutte, Robert C.
Lee, Joseph O.
Werthwein, Dwight B.
Wesson, Walter T.
Seyler, Eugene E.
Abbott, William H.
Oakes, Ralph C.
Sutton, Bynum W.
Needham, Ernest W.
Fiori, Dominic F.
Farley, James T.
Tennyson, Everett L.
Reed, Henry B.
McLeod, George R.
Mitchell, Henry L.
McCulley, Harley F.
Sumners, Pat L.
Cowsert, Max J.
Young, George A.
Hamilton, Hilton
Taylor, Francis I.
McKay, Charles I.
Mills, Agge V.
Beard, Herbert W.
Franzen, Lloyd T.
Lane, William F.
Alexander, Lewis R.
Pearson, Howard W.
Chapel, Raymond L.
McCree, James B.
Lane, Cecil F.
Murphy, Philip A.
Elliott, George F.
Cross, William J.
Smith, Percy L.
Wulk, John J., Jr.
Lord, Arthur W.
Farmer, Claude U.
Hill, Ivan C.
Timms, Joseph H.
Merica, Don B.
Millican, Porter F.
Dill, William W.
Angers, Charles J.
Sorley, Elmer H.
Miller, Lawrence E.
Wheeler, John F.
Davis, Joseph E.
Bishop, Jack R.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harrington, James H.
Hunter, George C.
Sparks, Thomas, Jr.
Anderson, Thomas E.
Follendorf, Robert E.
Trumble, Frank C.
Brown, John H.
Bradley, Bobbie B.
Weitekamp, Lawrence E.
Stewart, Kenneth R.
Hubbs, Howard L.
Rice, Keith M.
Haslam, Charles B.
Winters, James E.
Prater, William T.
John, Edward S.
Hoffman, Robert C.
Willis, Maxey A.
Munsell, Vernon S.
Gustafson, Warren H.
Patrick, Charles E.
Trowbridge, Clyde A.
Tillis, James G.
McFarland, Robert L.
Smith, Robert E.
Friend, Victor S., Jr.
Giesel, Joseph R.
Blandy, John F.
Breeze, John R.
McLendon, Luther A., Jr.
Robinson, Frank C., Jr.
Miller, Edward A.
Anderson, Earl R.
Cutler, Jesse T.
Milless, Elmer W.
McCluskey, William T.
Tilton, Robert C.
Lilley, James W.
Massey, Lonnie M.
Bickley, Roy W.
Palmer, Charles W.
Fowler, Charles C.
Garlick, Ewing D.
Tallentire, Gilson A.
Craumer, Luther C.
Pollak, William F.
Baldwin, Benjamin H., Jr.
Alexander, George M., Jr.
Marafine, Victor
Cormier, Clifton J.
Swann, Clarence R.
Sharp, William T.
Dodson, Melvin C.
Haring, Robert A.
Reilly, Walter J.
Anderson, Wallace E.
Baranski, Walter J.
Loesch, Robert J.
MacDonald, Wilbur L.
Adams, Carl C.
Dorgan, Alfred V., Jr.
Hancock, Fairley A.
Dailey, Leroy E.
Connell, Richard F.
Bunker, Wallace B.
Bean, Paul C.
Maranville, Evan H.
Laskowski, Charles J.
Does, William B.
Miller, Harold C.
Reogas, Wylie W.
Yoder, Walter A.
Patterson, Ray W.
Keeton, Charles W.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Holden, Howard
Cinotti, William J.
Gonzalez, Frederick A., Jr.
Lesem, Henry F., Jr.
Leahy, Paul H.
Campbell, Jesse E.
Conner, Terrance A.
Sue, Albert W.
Goeke, Henry K.
Gould, George F.
Speer, Emery
Clement, Robert A.
Jenkins, J. T.
Colglazier, Richard B.
Williams, Rex G., Jr.
Hyder, Luther E.
Darr, Charles H.
Schaeffer, Floyd D.
Addington, William P.
Coburn, Lonice E.
Sparling, Joe W.
Huntley, William R.
Bullock, Harry F., Jr.
Shisler, Fred J.
Walter, Elwin M.
Huber, Walter L.
Pettley, Walter F.
Servis, Charles W.
Mills, Harmon V.
Smith, Olen E.
Pasley, Randolph E.
Slavin, Patrick L.
Koontz, William O.
Pollock, James H.
Buron, John J.
Butler, George H.
Ruhberg, George T.
Vanover, Thomas C.
Gill, James S.
Lynn, Clyde C.
Hollingsworth, James R.
Westenberg, John C.
Fensler, Roger K.
Long, Wellington B., Jr.
Bigelow, George H.
Shul, Victor
Reynolds, Leo E.
Burks, Billy
Boston, Kenneth C.
Hollingshead, Larry M.
Hill, Elmer D.
Franks, Frederick R.
Mercer, William R.
Shaw, Stewart J., Jr.
Terry, Arthur F.
Pearman, Frank L.
Wolford, Leonard S.
Woodward, Merlin D.
Sullivan, William J.
Meadows, Emmett L.
Jackson, Lauris W.
Crawford, Thomas C.
Morgan, Max M.
Judson, Franklin F.
Ferguson, Thomas V.
Cotham, Robert B., Jr.
Lachow, Martin
Nahhas, George A.
Wood, Ruth L.
Hartley, Lillian M.
LaRocca, Bartholomew
Becker, Alfred E.
Marshall, Kenneth J.
Vandoren, Howard W.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James L. Altman
Edward A. Buckley
Gene P. Burch
Edwin G. Corr
Ethelbert L. Corr
Robert M. Hoff
Delbert J. Howerton
Jerry L. Kindig
James M. Kruthers
Donald D. Martin
Ronald L. Murray
John S. Newton
Thomas L. Ruck
Ronald W. Waggener

The following named (civilian college graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard I Adams	Joseph V. Osterman, Jr.
Robert E. Ades III	Timothy M. Ryder
Alton L. Amidon	James H. Sanderford
Robert M. Black	Dudley M. Shreve
Allan J. Burnes	Ronald A. Frederick-sen
Francis M. Corrigan	Paul A. Hahn
James E. Crocker	Eugene N. Halladay
Leonard S. De Palma	Emmett S. Huff, Jr.
John T. Easley	Jim R. Joy
Jimmy L. Ellis	John A. Linnemann
James F. Farber	Ethan A. Steinger, Jr.
Stanley G. Fitzgerald	Ralph J. Straley
Joseph V. Manzo	Bruce E. Townsend
John L. Mason, Jr.	Richard J. Webb
Wilbur N. Moore, Jr.	James H. Westmore-land
James E. Mora	Benjamin D. Williams
Daniel E. Mullally, Jr.	
Carl E. Mundy, Jr.	
William J. O'Connor	
James H. Ohman	

The following named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frank B. Faust, Jr.

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Bartsch	James L. Ludlow
Wallace J. Butler	William E. McKenna, Jr.
John M. Coykendall	William J. McManus
Frank T. Crews, Jr.	James F. Sheehan
Robert C. Finn	James A. Schumacher
Perry L. James	Edwin H. Walker IV
Lester E. Johnson	

The following-named women Reserve officers for permanent appointment to second lieutenant in the Marine Corps subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Patricia A. Colmer	Dorothy A. Olds
Shirley J. Gifford	Claire A. Pinney
Louise E. Kuttel	Patsy A. Twilley
Betty L. Leonard	Mary L. Vertalino

The following-named woman Reserve officer for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dorothy A. Olds

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of captain as director of the Marine Corps Band, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert F. Schoepper

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant as Assistant Directors of the Marine Corps Band, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dale L. Harpham
James B. King, Jr.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to chief warrant officer (W-2) in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William H. Dodds.

The following-named personnel for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lawerence Beeunas	Arthur C. Katen
James R. Drake	Earl G. Trapp
Frank P. Elardo, Jr.	Haines D. Waite
James H. Fraser	Aden D. Windham
Barker P. Germagian	

The following-named officer from the temporary disability retired list for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert C. Sebilian

The following-named officer from the temporary disability retired list for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert C. Sebilian

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast endowed and entrusted us with the power of choice, inspire us this day with a desire to choose the true and higher values and to serve them with unwavering fidelity.

May we covet more earnestly that finer spirit which can transform the inner life and the intractable heart of humanity, changing it from hatred to love, from selfishness to sympathy.

Whatever the differences and distinctions among the members of the human family may be, help us to discover and emphasize our oneness and the things we have in common.

Constrain us to be willing to identify ourselves more closely with our fellow men in their struggles and sorrows and may we strive to make life less difficult for the poor and the needy.

Show us how we may build a nobler civilization and may we never be tempted to feel that the spirit of man has expended itself and is incapable of ascending to loftier heights.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 10, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

BILL TO PROVIDE REASONABLE LIMITATION OF IMPORTS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that provides for the reasonable limitation of imports of any product when its importation causes serious injury to our own producers of the same or directly competitive products. The bill is intended to correct actual and potential economic evils that affect commerce in my own district and in many other districts of this country.

The need for such limitations has become more evident from year to year as the existing remedies, including particularly the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, have failed to work satisfactorily. We need a system of import regulation that will be fair both to foreign countries that look to our market for an outlet for their products and to our own industries and workers.

The bill makes provision for upholding the national security by requiring conformity with findings under existing law, that is, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 which authorizes the President to limit imports of any product that would injure a domestic industry that is vital to the national security.

To make sure that there will be no conflict between this bill and defense needs, the bill further provides that if a finding has been made by the National Defense Establishment or any other duly authorized body or person, that a minimum supply of any given product should be produced by domestic producers or that imports of the product in question should not exceed a specified volume, the Tariff Commission shall adjust any absolute quota calculated under the other provisions of the bill into conformity with the findings of the National Defense Establishment or other duly authorized body or person.

This provision establishes the priority of national defense needs as defined by competent authority over any other method of establishing import quotas. Also it does not repeal any existing law relating to the national defense. As the provision just cited demonstrates, the bill would not disturb existing statutes on national defense materials but would extend coverage to cases in which the national defense may be an element but not the controlling one, sometimes called borderline cases.

There is no necessary conflict between healthy commerce with friendly nations and a prosperous condition in our own industries, upon which our own workers depend for their livelihood and well-being. The ends of a lively foreign trade can be served without sacrificing the wholly legitimate needs of our own industries. They too need a market; and they have their most important market here in the United States. Nevertheless they can share this market quite generously with imports if such sharing does not, as it need not, lead to the disruption of the very market to which both we and foreign countries look so anxiously. It is a matter of regulating the competition.

Almost any industry can withstand foreign competition and share the market with it if it can be sure of two things: first, that no matter how great the wage-cost advantage of the foreign competitor the imported product cannot absorb more than a predetermined, even if liberal, share of our market and, second, if when the domestic producer improves and expands his facilities and promotes consumption of his product he is sure of enjoying a fair share of any increased market that may result. This simply means holding on to the usual incentive to efficiency rather than destroying it as happens under the present system of regulation that permits foreign producers to reap the benefit of advertising, product

improvement and sales promotion campaigns financed by our domestic producers.

The bill that I have introduced together with other Members is designed to provide these two assurances. It will grant a reasonable share of the market to imports but it will not allow them to run rampant. It will hold a leash on imports to prevent distress and ruin of domestic industries that, while operating under the average standard of American industrial efficiency, are generally burdened with higher wages and other costs than their foreign competitors. The bill thus recognizes what has too long been overlooked, namely, that our producers are no longer free competitively to meet the lower prices offered to our consumers by importers. The main elements of their costs have been made quite inflexible by law and public policy.

The bill is based on the concept of restraining imports only as they would upset orderly marketing, orderly competition and the conditions conducive to healthy growth and expansion of production and consumption. Therefore, it would measure import competition, not by millions of dollars or similar yardsticks, but by both the share of the market already captured by imports and the trend of this share. If this trend is upward and thus outruns our own producers there is evidence of a competitive advantage on the side of imports. A mere increase in imports as such is not considered by itself; the increase must be judged against the market. If imports expand with the market no harm is considered as having been done, unless indeed a heavy share of the market has already been captured by imports. What counts is evidence of a one-sided competitive advantage. Such an advantage will reveal itself when imports outstrip domestic producers to the extent of taking a larger share of the market.

The question may be asked whether this system would not freeze imports in their pattern as of a given time. The fear is a justifiable one and it would be a strong point against the bill if it permitted such freezing. It would, however, not countenance such a result, except in extreme cases, such as those involving the national defense. The bill recognizes the need for flexibility to accommodate long-range developments no less than short-term emergencies. It has been prepared in full recognition of the justified objections to rigid import quotas.

The bill introduces all necessary flexibility by providing a number of built-in escapes from the unyielding rigidity that is usually but not necessarily associated with import quotas.

First, the bill would employ a tariff quota as the only permissible quota in all cases in which imports supply less than 25 percent of the domestic market. It would next provide a tariff quota as the preferred type of quota in all cases in which imports supply from 25 percent to 50 percent of the domestic market; and finally it would provide for a tariff quota as an alternative to an absolute quota if imports supply 50 percent or more of the market.

This means that a tariff quota rather than an absolute quota would be mandatory when imports supplied less than 25 percent of the market; that either a tariff quota or an absolute quota could be established if imports supplied from 25 percent to 50 percent of the market, but that under such circumstances the tariff quota would be preferred; while if imports have taken 50 percent or more of the market, again either of the two quotas could be established but the absolute quota would be preferred.

Second, the bill would provide for a system of primary and secondary tariff quotas. This is to say, it might provide that 1 million units of a given product might be imported, equal to, say, 20 percent of the domestic market of 5 million units, before a specified higher rate of duty were applied. Actual imports might be at a level of, say, 800,000 units. Thus there would be room for some expansion, that is, from 800,000 units to 1 million units before the higher rate took effect; and such higher rate would apply only to the imports in excess of the 1 million units. Should imports still encroach on the market, however, that is, take a still larger share, a second higher rate of duty would be applied to any imports that crossed the 25 percent line, that is, to all imports that would exceed 25 percent of the market. This duty rate would be in the form of a 50 percent surcharge on the first higher rate and would be expected to hold imports in bounds.

The third point of flexibility would come from the power of the Tariff Commission, after hearings, to allot a higher share of the market to imports of a particular product if in its judgment no serious injury would be caused by such liberalization. A practice similar to this has been carried on in the administration of the sugar quota under the Sugar Act.

Fourth, another feature of flexibility would allow imports of a particular product from a particular country to increase if the average wages paid in the foreign industry should increase a specified percentage in relation to our own wages. In other words, foreign countries could become entitled to a larger share of our market for particular products if by increasing their wages in relation to our own they narrowed the competitive gap.

This proviso in the bill throws a revealing light on the whole competitive trouble. It comes with few exceptions from the lower wages paid in other countries.

By offering other countries a larger share in our market it would show them the way to improve their wage and living standards. It would also tell them that the depression of wages as a means of lowering costs in order to sell at lower prices in this country would do them no good. They would not sell more goods here simply by lowering their wages. Their share of the market on the contrary could be increased more certainly by raising their wages.

There are still other provisions designed to assure flexibility of any import quota imposed. One provides for enlarging the quota if the domestic supply should fail to supply the market demand and thus cause a rise in prices. Another provides for cutting back the quota if a burdensome surplus develops in any product, leading to a decline in prices and a mounting inventory.

All these provisions would make for a fair and effective means of regulating imports without subjecting our trade to rigid controls.

Besides providing for a flexible control of imports as described above, the bill would change the present administrative machinery. The imposition of quotas would become a function of the Tariff Commission rather than lodging ultimate and actual powers of regulating our foreign commerce in the Chief Executive and the executive departments, or more particularly in the Department of State, as is the case today.

The Tariff Commission in turn would be guided by the provisions of the bill that spell out the conditions under which a product would become eligible for a quota. If the conditions set forth were found to be present, a presumption of serious injury would be created; that is, a prescribed quota—tariff or absolute quota—would be imposed unless opponents could satisfy a majority of the Tariff Commission in a public hearing that no such limitation was justified.

There would be no Presidential veto. Indeed, there would be no occasion for such a veto. Except in those cases in which imports have already absorbed 33⅓ percent or more of the market, there would seldom be a cutback in the level of imports. This would happen only if in the most recent year imports had jumped considerably above previous levels. Even then the imports would be cut back less than half way to the previous level.

This proposal is a far cry from the manner in which quotas are used by other countries, often apparently arbitrarily. Its adoption would rob quotas of the objections usually leveled at them. At the same time the system would offer domestic producers a fair share of the market and free them of the ever-present fear that imports will shrink the market, undermine prices, cause unemployment, and rob domestic producers of the fruits of their efforts.

The proposed quota system would be free of sudden and unjustified trade blockages. It would assure a highly responsible and reasonable type of regulation; and would be free of most of the weaknesses of the tariff system alone. It would in fact retain the better features of the tariff system as well as the quota system without retaining their weaknesses and objectionable features.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about civil rights but very little about States rights. The President's message emphasized civil rights, but said little or nothing about

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States rights. Our Founding Fathers emphasized States rights in writing the Constitution as much, if not more so, than civil rights. In my special order today, I expect to throw the spotlight on States rights, and I feel that it is very timely.

HOLDING DOWN INFLATION

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President in his State of the Union Message asked Congress and the country to hold back the forces of inflation. Some, since then, have said that price advances have been going on for some years. That is true. In the first 4 years of the Truman administration, the cost-of-living index, according to the Library of Congress, increased 32.3 percent. In the second 4 years of President Truman's administration, the cost-of-living index increased another 12.4 percent, according to the Library of Congress. In the 4 years of the Eisenhower administration, the cost-of-living index increased only 3 percent, says the Library of Congress. These figures indicate the Eisenhower administration has been doing a better job than preceding administrations in holding back the forces of inflation.

The gross national output of goods and services increased from $345 billion in 1952, the last year of the Truman administration, to $412 billion in 1956 under Eisenhower.

That the Eisenhower administration during a period of unprecedented prosperity held the cost-of-living increases to a mere 3 percent while the Nation's gross product increased $67 billion is proof that the Eisenhower fiscal policies have been sound and statesmanlike. Congress should continue to follow President Eisenhower's leadership in the fight against inflation.

FIFTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 5th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 49)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 6th annual report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802 (a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the ninth annual report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1957.*

IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I introduced a bill providing for the establishment of import quotas on products that were being imported to the detriment of American industry and labor.

That bill called for the establishment of absolute but flexible quotas after determination of the supporting facts by the United States Tariff Commission.

This year I am again introducing a general import quota bill but it differs in some important respects from the previous one. Instead of relying on absolute quotas alone more emphasis is placed in the new bill on tariff quotas.

Let me explain the difference. The "absolute quota" sets a definite or definable limit on the volume or amount of imports of a particular product that may be imported during a given year or a part of such year. A tariff quota, on the other hand, offers a means of restricting imports without cutting them off completely at a given level. A stated volume of imports would be permitted to come in at a low rate of duty. Imports beyond that level would be subject to a duty high enough to have a restrictive effect.

As in the case of an absolute quota, the limit line must be set somewhere, and the new bill provides as did the previous one that a certain share of the market be recognized as earmarked for supply by imports. Where the line would be drawn in the case of any particular product would be determined by the share of the market already captured by imports together with the trend of imports in recent years. Such determination would be made by the Tariff Commission. In the present bill this would be done very much as in the previous one and the guide would be the same, namely, the share of the market that could be supplied by imports in keeping with postwar performance of imports. However, instead of cutting off imports at a predetermined point, a higher and restrictive rate of duty would go into effect at that point.

In establishing the share-of-the-market and the trend-of-imports as measures of the importance or impact of import competition, the bill recognizes precisely those elements of injury inherent in some forms of import competition that domestic producers most fear and in the face of which they are most helpless.

The impact of such competition cannot be measured by a simple recitation of import figures. These must be related to the magnitude of the market and the volume of domestic output. What share of the market is being supplied by imports has some meaning in itself but in order to get the complete picture still more has to be known. For example it is important to know whether the share has increased in the past year or two. What is the trend? Is the share supplied by imports still increasing? How significant or heavy is this share?

Obviously if imports have been gaining on domestic production in recent years the reason must lie in some competitive advantage enjoyed by imports. Usually this will be found to reside in lower prices; and usually the lower prices reflect lower wage levels.

The effect on domestic industry as it sees an increasing share of the market supplied by imports is not difficult to picture. As imports gain, that is, as they not only increase if the market expands but rise faster than domestic production, or as they gain while domestic production stands still or declines, domestic producers are confronted with a gloomy outlook. Any plans looking toward plant expansion, product improvement, consumer advertising, sales promotion, and so forth, will have to be revised and perhaps even dropped. There is no point in expanding demand if imports will benefit more from the expansion in consumption than those who finance the campaign.

Also as imports begin to supply a greater share of the market stocks will

begin to accumulate in the warehouses of the domestic manufacturers and on the shelves of retailers unless the domestic producer reduces his production. In order to do the latter, that is, cut back his output, he will find it necessary to reduce the workweek of his employees or perhaps lay off some of them. If he does not do this, he will risk heavy inventory losses through falling prices. It would be unwise to keep producing at the same level if sales have declined as a result of rising imports. If sales could be maintained by cutting prices, it would still be necessary to curtail output in order to work off the high-cost inventory.

However, the result of doing the only thing that can be done in order to avoid heavy losses from price cutting, that is, curtailment of production, means unemployment or underemployment and a shrinkage of consumer purchasing power. The effects of this will not be confined to the plants where the layoffs occur but will spread to the entire community and will shrink every conceivable line of trade or service that sells food, clothing, medicines, or the like to the employees or equipment, supplies, repairs or other goods to the plants themselves. Thus the injury spreads to virtually every form of business or professional service found in a community; and as communities themselves are not economically isolated the distress extends far beyond their own confines.

And that is why rising imports that displace products of domestic origin are feared; that is why they cast a pall of gloom over the whole community and that is also why they prevent the kind of economic expansion that is necessary to keep workers employed and to make room for the additional work force that appears on the scene each succeeding year.

The best way to regulate imports is to shape the instrument to the ends that are to be accomplished. In my view these ends are two in the case of import competition. One is to prevent or remedy injury of the kind just described, caused by competitive imports. The other is to avoid restricting trade more than is absolutely necessary in the process of accomplishing this.

Import injury could easily be stopped either by throwing up a prohibitive tariff, by imposing an embargo, or by establishing a highly restrictive absolute quota. It is, however, not my purpose to stop imports any more than it is my purpose to interfere more than necessary with trade.

On the other hand I do place a great deal of store by the health of our own economy and this includes a healthy market for the goods produced in our factories and mills. I place the health of this market above the right to ruin it by unrestricted imports. This means simply that when or where the line has to be drawn I will be found on the side of our own producers and our own workers as against foreign interests.

But as I have indicated, I not only have nothing against imports or foreign interests as such. I would let them enjoy as large a share of our market as can be done without undermining our own industry and agriculture.

The present bill is designed to accomplish just this. While it is aimed at limiting imports where this is necessary and only where it is necessary, it is not intended as limiting them more than is necessary to assure the domestic producers a fair share of the market and freedom from open-end or unlimited destructive competition.

There would be nothing automatic about the administration of the bill. Its application would go through Tariff Commission procedures. The bill provides the guide lines for the Commission, to be sure; but individual industries would have to go before the Commission to make their case. Therefore there could be no stampede for quotas, but any industry that is or that would become hard pressed by import competition would be eligible to go before the Commission.

The present bill retains the feature of the original bill that offered to foreign countries an enlarged quota if the wages in the industry producing any product on which a quota has been imposed should rise significantly in relation to the wages paid in the American industry producing the same or directly competitive product. Much has been heard in recent years about the failure of our foreign aid to get down to the people in the plants and factories that have benefited from such aid. This legislation, while not making higher wages abroad a condition of selling in this market, does offer recognition to higher wages abroad and offers a bonus in the form of a higher quota when wages are raised in relation to ours. If nothing else were accomplished, it would at least make it clear that depressing of wages as a means of selling more goods in this country at lower prices would be of no avail.

No larger share of the market could be gained by lowering wages and prices.

It might be asked how this bill, if enacted, would overcome the aspects of import competition that do the most damage. It would do this by providing assurance that after a given share of the market had been absorbed by imports additional imports would be severely restricted or stopped, depending on how high a share of the market they had already captured.

If the share of the market already supplied by imports is less than 25 percent only a tariff quota could be established under the bill. No absolute quota could be imposed but the rate of duty could be raised to the 1930 rate on all imports beyond a certain level. If this did not sufficiently halt imports in excess of that level a surcharge of 50 percent could be applied to the 1930 rate on all imports in excess of a second specified level.

If, however, imports have already taken 25 percent or more of the market an absolute quota could be imposed on the product in question if in the judgment of the Tariff Commission this were necessary to overcome the injury.

We have in this bill a mechanism that would meet the problem of injury from import competition without going to extremes. The bill would, if enacted, provide sensible protection to our industry, agriculture, and labor and at the same time cause the least interference with a large volume of imports. It would provide for an expansion in trade as our own economy expanded and would not put trade into a straitjacket. It provides what in my view is the most practical and suitable method of dealing with the troublesome problem of import competition that has been devised. It provides flexibility, recognition to the value of trade, and an open door to its expansion under the only condition in which trade in any case can be justified, namely, conferring benefits upon a part of the economy without hurting others to an equal or larger extent.

I strongly and sincerely urge the adoption of this measure. I believe that we need a bill of this kind for another reason.

We need it to prevent Congress from becoming a mere satellite of the White House in the matter of regulating foreign commerce.

The manner in which the President, advised by the Department of State, has taken over virtually all regulation of our foreign commerce has become alarming. If Congress is not to lose its power irretrievably to the greed of the State Department the time has come to act.

Just recently the President has rejected two unanimous recommendations of the Tariff Commission under the escape clause. In another case, that of velveteens, he has exceeded the time limit set by Congress in which to act. It is evident that the Executive has become completely oblivious of the constitutional function and responsibility of Congress in the regulation of our foreign commerce.

We should take steps during this session of Congress to set the record straight and to keep it straight.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that there will be in this Chamber a conference of Republican Members of the House on tomorrow at 2 o'clock for the purpose of receiving a report from the committee on committees.

OUR PRESENT SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for 1 hour. I expect to use only about 20 or 25 minutes. I hope and expect that perhaps the reaction to my brief will occupy the rest of the time. I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

do not propose to yield until I have completed my brief.

Mr. Speaker, from the adoption of our Constitution in 1789 until the New Deal era, appointments to the United States Supreme Court were made on the basis of the legal and judicial experience possessed by the person appointed. This insured Court decisions based upon legal precedents, previous Court decisions, and constitutional grounds.

That is as it should be. That is what the architects of our Constitution intended.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt evidently was not too greatly impressed by the duties and responsibilities of the Supreme Court as envisioned by the makers of our Constitution. He first tried to "pack" the Court to obtain the decisions he wanted to implement his social and economic objectives. Failing in that attempt, he proceeded to "stack" the Court by appointing to every vacancy that occurred persons with social, political, and economic beliefs similar to his own—liberal ideologists who had little or no experience in legal or constitutional problems.

President Roosevelt's example was followed by President Truman, so that today a majority of the members of the Court are socially and politically minded instead of being legally experienced and judicially inclined. We therefore have Court decisions today based upon the social, economic, and political convictions of the Justices rather than upon legal precedents or constitutional grounds.

Mr. Speaker, Felix Frankfurter is an example of this new type of Supreme Court Justice. He has little respect or regard for the validity of laws enacted by Congress or by State legislatures. He is inclined to favor a strong and dominant Federal Government and to ignore or give scant attention to the rights of individuals and of the States—rights provided for and reserved to them by the Constitution.

Because the majority of our Supreme Court Justices today are of the Frankfurter school of thought, we have such decisions as the following:

First. The Steve Nelson decision:

In this decision the Supreme Court ruled that a Communist convicted and sentenced under the sedition law of Pennsylvania was—so the Court held—illegally convicted because the Smith Sedition Act passed by Congress preempted the field of sedition and deprived the States of all jurisdiction in that field.

Yet the Smith Sedition Act plainly and specifically stated the clear intent of Congress when it said:

> Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the various States under the laws thereof.

Second. The Dr. Harry Slochower decision:

In this decision the Supreme Court ruled that Dr. Slochower had been fired illegally by the Brooklyn City College Board because "the due process of law" had not been followed in his case.

The New York City Charter contains a provision for the automatic discharge of any city employee who under questioning by an official investigating committee invokes the fifth amendment in order to avoid testifying. All authority for hiring and firing city employees in New York City comes from the city charter. Dr. Slochower invoked the fifth amendment; so—as provided in the city charter—he was automatically fired by the board. Neither "life, liberty, nor property" were involved in Dr. Slochower's dismissal.

Third. Segregation outlawed on local buses:

The decision outlawing segregation on local buses is another example of the Supreme Court's interference with the police powers of the various States. We all recognize the fact that the Constitution places the power to regulate and control Interstate Commerce in the Federal Government. That power gives the Federal Government jurisdiction and control over travel by persons crossing State boundaries. However, travel by persons wholly within State boundaries, or wholly within city boundaries, by no stretch of the imagination, can be considered under Federal jurisdiction. Jurisdiction over travel within the States, under the Federal Constitution, is left entirely within the control of the police powers of the individual States.

The decision outlawing segregation on local buses, therefore, is a flagrant example of infringement upon States rights—a deliberate interference with the police powers of the States.

Fourth. Segregation in the public schools:

In this decision the Court ignored a 60-year-old ruling, previously made by the same Court, that gave approval to separate but equal educational facilities and services for white and colored pupils in the public schools.

This recent decision was issued in the form of a thesis—a thesis supported almost entirely by citations from college professors, sociologists, and psychologists; but not supported by citations from eminent lawyers nor by previous Court decisions. In fact, in this case the Court not only completely ignored previous Court decisions, but it also ignored recent Congressional legislation having a direct bearing upon this problem.

In the legislation for the school-lunch program Congress specifically acknowledged and accepted the theory of separate but equal schools for colored children. In that legislation Congress stated that in dispensing aid through the school-lunch program in States that maintained separate but equal schools for white and colored pupils the school-lunch aid should be distributed equitably as between the separate schools.

In substance, therefore, this act of Congress was both an acknowledgment of and acceptance of the separate but equal ruling the Supreme Court issued some 60 years ago—before the Court was stacked with New Deal Justices.

Mr. Speaker, under the 10th amendment to the Constitution it is the function and the responsibility of the States to provide schools, to regulate them, and to have complete jurisdiction over them. Any local justice of the peace without legal training ought to know that much.

The 14th amendment to the Constitution contains the due-process clause that protects the constitutional rights of the individual citizens. This due-process clause has become—under our present Supreme Court—a basket clause to be cited whenever the Court desires to go beyond the written wording of the Constitution and substitute so-called natural or moral law.

However, the 14th amendment also contains the following:

> The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

This clause has been ignored or deliberately overlooked by the Court in the recent segregation cases. This clause places the sole power to implement the 14th amendment in the people's representatives—the Congress; not in the Executive, not in the Judiciary, but solely in the Congress. If Congress fails to act—and so far it has failed to act in regard to segregation in the schools and in regard to bus transportation within cities and States—can the Executive or the Judiciary take the place of the Congress in the implementation of this amendment?

Mr. Speaker, commenting on the recent school fiasco at Clinton, Tenn.—a result of the Court decision on school integration—David Lawrence had these pertinent things to say:

> Is Tennessee still a State in the Union, or has it abdicated entirely to the Federal Government? Has it given up its exclusive right under the Constitution to maintain law and order, to insist upon trial by jury, and to punish through its own State courts all criminal cases of assault and battery and threats to the safety of an individual? • • •
>
> The idea that a Federal injunction has "no limits"—as stated by the county attorney of Anderson County—and that it can punish anybody for speaking or urging a course of action that a Federal judge may not like, means that the Bill of Rights—which guarantees free speech, free assembly, and trial by jury—has been torn to bits in Anderson County, Tenn. It means also that the State of Tennessee and the county of Anderson, which have the primary duty to enforce law and order, have given way to a superior power—a Federal judge's arbitrary action. It is a tragic day in American history.

Those are strong words, harsh words, but true words, nevertheless. And they come from the mouth of one of the best known and most respected editors and publishers in America.

Mr. Speaker, the September issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains a well-written and thoroughly documented article entitled "Judicial Self-Restraint." That article was written by Mr. Ralph T. Catterall, for 25 years one of the leading attorneys of Richmond, Va., and now a member of the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

In that article the learned attorney warns that lack of judicial self-restraint leads to judicial despotism. The theme of the article is that in its recent segregation decisions the Court has substituted for the provisions of the written Constitution the economic, moral, and political convictions of the Justices; and this is done under the false assumption that the so-called natural-law formula is to be considered superior to and to supersede the written Constitution.

Mr. Catterall summarizes his article by asserting:

> Never before have the personal predilections and moral convictions of the Justices ridden so roughshod over the written text of the Constitution as in these recent school segregation cases.

I am in complete accord with Mr. Catterall's position, and with the statement just quoted.

Mr. Speaker, there are today in Washington two schools of thought concerning the Constitution and the proper way to amend it or to change it to fit present-day conditions.

One school believes our Constitution has become a straitjacket that prevents Congress from doing what in its opinion should be done to improve social conditions, to take proper care of the general welfare, and to solve the industrial problems that are prevalent today. This school of thought, initiated by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, would expand and enlarge the Federal Government's powers in the field of general welfare by reading into the language of the Constitution meanings and powers that were never intended to be included—in fact, meanings and powers that were definitely excluded and very definitely left to the States.

New Deal officials—through the process of appointing their own kind to the Supreme Court as fast as vacancies occurred—have finally secured a majority on that Court who now implement their own social and welfare theories by means of Court decisions.

Mr. Speaker, the other school of thought in Washington contends that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land; that it is, if you please, a set of bylaws adopted by the people after due deliberation and debate; and that it should be used as a guide to direct, to control, and to limit the actions of each of the three separate branches of government.

This school of thought contends that whenever the Executive and the Congress may decide the Constitution should be amended to better meet present-day needs, it is the duty of the Congress to submit an amending resolution to the people for their action, as provided for in the Constitution.

This school of thought insists that the power to amend the Constitution is inherent in the people, and that it cannot nor should not be exercised by either of the three branches of Government.

Certainly it was never intended that the Constitution should be amended by so-called liberal interpretations or by liberal court decisions. Amendment by evasion or by subterfuge has become common practice by today's Supreme Court. Our present Justices are exercising powers they do not possess under the Constitution. By doing so they exalt themselves above both the people and the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we dare not sit idly by while drastic changes are being made in our Constitution by subterfuge. If we do so we will be violating our oath of office. Quoting a great Democrat, Andrew Jackson:

> Our Federal Constitution; it must be preserved.

This Congress faces trying and testing days. We would do well, therefore, to recall the words Thomas Paine uttered during the first great national crisis 175 years ago, the crisis that made necessary the historic Constitutional Convention that produced the supreme law of the land. Here are Paine's memorable words:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink from his duty; but he that stands it now deserves the love and praise of men and women.

I pray God a majority of the Members of this House—on both sides of the aisle—will not be summer soldiers or sunshine patriots when faced with today's issue: The preservation of our Constitution and the protection of States rights.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. During the long period of time the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has served in this body he has earned the reputation of being plain spoken. The address the distinguished gentleman has just delivered to the House will enhance that reputation.

I concur in what the gentleman has said. I made a speech to the Georgia Bar Association annual convention in Savannah last May along the same line, and I referred to the same decisions the gentleman has just referred to, the Steve Nelson case and the Slochower case, and I referred to some others which the gentleman has not mentioned which illustrate the pattern which the Supreme Court of the United States is now following.

I take this occasion to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Illinois on the learned, clear, and statesmanlike speech he has just delivered to us.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I join my colleague from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] in commending the gentleman from Illinois on his brilliant and very forceful presentation of the subject of States rights. He has pinpointed the very dangerous tendencies that exist in our Government today: First, the total ignoring of the rights of the States and of the people of the States; second, the assumption on the part of the Supreme Court of the powers and duties of the Congress to legislate and even, as the gentleman has said, to amend the Constitution; and last the assumption by the Chief Executive of the rights and privileges of Congress which we from time to time have, I think, surrendered without due consideration.

Again I thank the gentleman for his very splendid discussion of this most important subject.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid dissertation he has made regarding our Constitution. I am troubled about the fate of our Constitution; as a matter of fact, I think we are almost faced with constitutional bankruptcy in this country. I do not know of any higher or loftier purpose than the preservation of the Constitution of the United States. If the Constitution is saved, it is going to be because of gentlemen like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

I was forcefully impressed with the gentleman's remarks concerning the schoolteacher case in the city of New York. I think the Members of this body may be interested in knowing too that in some of the hearings concerning the Justice Department before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and particularly when there was a charge—I believe it was a charge that the Police Commissioner, or at least the head police authority in the city of New York had made a statement that civil rights were designed only against the South, and in that particular hearing it affirmatively appeared that the law and the charter of the city of New York had been upheld for a long period of time, and that whenever there was a charge made by the pressure groups that policemen had violated some defendant's civil rights, the FBI and city groups immediately went to them, to question them, and if they did not talk and if they did not answer every question, they were ipso facto fired—fired immediately. And, there is no record of any court ever coming to the relief of a police officer of this country. Their discharges stuck. The decision that said that due process of law had been denied in such instances was one which was rendered in favor of a Communist. It is time for America to wake up.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Illinois on his scholarly statement, which he has just made to the House. I am particularly pleased and gratified that there is a substantial representation of the Members of this body present to hear the gentleman's remarks.

I am sure the gentleman shares with me my love of the profession of the law. I am equally sure he shares with me my utmost, profound, and complete respect for the law and for our courts. But, when courts—when men sitting on courts from the highest to the lowest, cease to base their decisions upon what the law has been for generations, even for centuries, then it is time for the people throughout America to call attention to these derelictions which have taken place. It is, indeed, refreshing to have remarks and thoughts such as have just been presented to this great forum, perhaps the greatest parliamentary forum in the entire history of the world. I again congratulate the gentleman on his scholarly remarks to this House.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has been most refreshing to hear the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

learned dissertation that the gentleman has given this morning in defense of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I can remember when I first came to this body that there were a number of very able constitutional lawyers, and from time to time they would remind the House of some of the provisions of the Constitution and the tendency that, even then, was beginning to show its head, the wandering away from the strict interpretation of that document. We today are talking about the Constitution and I, for some time, have been wondering whether we have a Constitution. I find no tendency on the part of either the Federal judiciary or the Federal executive department to stop and pause and consider the fundamental of our constitutional system of government. The fundamental principle that yields only to this body, only to the executive and only to the Federal judiciary, such powers as the State governments have assigned to it. We have drifted a long way from that, Mr. Speaker, in the few years that I have been a Member of this body. I have seen gentlemen undertake to defend the Constitution of the United States from time to time. Generally everybody gets up and leaves. I have seen men ably discussing the Constitution of the United States, without a dozen Members present on the floor. This morning I see quite a number present, probably due much to the eloquence, the sincerity and the honesty of the gentleman from Illinois, who has made such an able speech on this subject.

There are so many things that are being ignored today, that are being done that are not countenanced nor authorized by the Constitution of the United States. Just remember that we are here representing our States. Are we expected to come here and sit idly by and see every sovereign power of the State, specifically preserved to the States in the Constitution, stripped away? It is rarely that we have had a discussion such as we have had this morning. I could name instances of departure from constitutional limitations that the gentleman in the time he has been given has not been able to mention. All of you can think of some. All of you wonder about others—things that are being done by the executive department, things that are being done by the judicial department, things that are being done by the legislative department of this United States, that the forefathers who inspired and wrote and adopted the Constitution of the United States never dreamed of. Yet we sit idly by and do nothing about it.

I am just wondering how long our people back home, our people who love and respect the Constitution, our people who think so much of the sovereignty of their own States, people who are imbued with the idea of Jefferson that the best governed people are the least governed people, those who believe in local self-government are going to stand for it. The Federal Government drags people from their homes and tries them for offenses that the forefathers never considered would ever enter into a Federal court. Where is this tendency going to stop? If we do not stop and think about some of these things and do something about some of these things, we will live to regret it. For instance, we have immigration laws. I am wondering where does the power come to admit a horde of people as parolees to this country. Where is that power derived from? I have had occasion to give very close attention to the question of Federal courts' preemption doctrine in the last 2 or 3 years. It was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois.

While I am on my feet I want to refer to the famous Steve Nelson case. That case was decided some 3 years ago. The Supreme Court of the United States held that when Congress enacted the so-called Smith Act, which provided punishment for subversive activities, although the Congress never said so and the Congress never intended so, under the so-called preemption doctrine the Congress had stripped every one of the 48 States of the Union of any power to protect themselves or the Federal Government against subversion or treason. That is the law of the land today according to the Supreme Court of the United States. If you have a law in your State—and all the States have these laws against subversives—and you undertake to prosecute somebody under it, as they did in Pennsylvania with this notorious Steve Nelson, you will find that your State has been restricted by a paragraph of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, restricted in its use of its sovereign power to protect its citizens and itself.

What are we going to do about it?

I had a letter not long ago from the medical society of one of the larger States in the Union stating that they would like to inquire whether a certain bill to correct that situation that I had introduced, known as H. R. 3, had been passed. Their problem, they said, was this: A certain drug was being sold in the State which the medical profession thought was a narcotic and under their law they had been about to inspect this medicine and find out whether certain people were selling a habit-forming narcotic to the people of their State. The manufacturers of this article came in and defended on the ground that the Pure Food and Drug Act had repealed all State laws on the subject, and the State had no right to protect itself. Back of that trouble in that State was the sale of narcotics, mind you.

This Congress last year passed an antinarcotic law and if anybody in your hometown is caught selling narcotics you will be confronted with this court-made constitutional law: That you cannot prosecute a person for violation of the narcotics law because the Congress has passed a similar law.

Back of that was the decision in a case where the State of Alabama undertook to inspect renovated butter which they thought was deleterious to the health of their people. In that case, the Supreme Court said that Congress had passed a Pure Food and Drug Act and, therefore, the States had no power to protect their citizens against it.

All of that has been presented to the Congress. I have written a speech on it and put it in the RECORD. I have been before the Judiciary Committee and gone over the subject, and yet I cannot get anything done about it. I have introduced a bill again this year. I am sure a few speeches are going to be made on the subject this year, and I think we will have some fine ones, such as the one just made by the gentleman from Illinois, but what concerns me is, What are we going to do about it? This all goes back, it is true, to the segregation case. Forget the segregation case. The South has been taking care of itself against the Federal Government for a hundred years, and I suspect they are going to prove equally able to take care of themselves this time, Supreme Court or no Supreme Court, and if that is treason, make the most of it.

But let us forget segregation for the purpose of the discussion this morning and consider the matter of the constitutional limitations on the Federal Government in its broad sense. You who today see no harm in the violation of a constitutional State right will find that what you do today may jump up and slap you in the face tomorrow on some other subject. Let us think about these things and let us do something about some of them without respect to political considerations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE LATE HONORABLE PERCY PRIEST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD during the course of the tribute being paid to the Hon. PERCY PRIEST or later in the RECORD, if they so desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret and profound sorrow that I announced to the House of Representatives on the opening day of this session of Congress that our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, had passed away. He passed away in his home city of Nashville, Tenn., on October 12. He had an emergency operation and although he lived for several days after, finally succumbed.

Mr. PRIEST served with great credit and distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives for 16 years. For many years he occupied the very important and responsible position of Democratic whip of the House and made one of the greatest records in that important position that has ever been made.

He was a valuable member of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was chairman of that committee at the time he passed away.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend his funeral along with other

Members of the Tennessee delegation and many other Members of the House in his home city of Nashville. I was impressed by the opening remark made by his pastor on that occasion when he said: "Representative PERCY PRIEST loved his Bible."

Mr. PRIEST was a great student of the Bible, one of the greatest I have ever known. He loved his church and discharged many important duties in all of the activities of his church. He was an officer of his church and taught a Sunday-school class. Regardless of how busy he might be he always found time to carry on his church activities.

Mr. PRIEST was a man who possessed the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood, a man of great ability, outstanding courage and demonstrated devotion to public service. Certainly he enjoyed the confidence, the respect and esteem of all of the Members of the House of Representatives to as great an extent as any man I have ever known. I feel confident that I express the true sentiment and feeling of all Members who knew him and served with him here when I convey to his dear wife and little daughter and members of his family our deepest sympathy in the time of their great bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to his successor in the House of Representatives, my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER].

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly grateful for the opportunity to join with other Members of the House in paying tribute to the life and character of an outstanding Tennessean.

I was privileged to know PERCY PRIEST for more than two decades. I knew him as the managing editor of a great southern newspaper, the Nashville Tennessean; I knew him as a servant in the House of the Lord; a Sunday school teacher, a layman, active in all the activities of the church of his choice in Nashville, the Park Avenue Baptist Church; and I knew him as a statesman.

The people of the Fifth District of Tennessee had complete confidence in the honor and integrity of PERCY PRIEST. He had been elected to eight successive terms as the Representative of a great people in this House. He was the nominee of his party at the time of his passing.

He was a worthy successor to those distinguished Tennesseans who preceded him as the Representative of the Hermitage district.

I have the honor and the very great privilege to succeeed him in this high office. I hope, and it is my prayer, that I may be able to measure up to the high standard of public service he has set before me.

I have a poem, by an unknown author, that seems to me to be descriptive of the life and character of PERCY PRIEST:

If I can do some good today,
If I can serve along life's way,
If I can something helpful say,
Lord, show me how.

If I can right a human wrong,
If I can help to make someone strong,
If I can cheer with smile or song,
Lord, show me how.

If I can aid one in distress,
If I can make a burden less,
If I can spread more happiness,
Lord, show me how.

If I can do a kindly deed,
If I can help a soul in need,
If I can sow a fruitful seed,
Lord, show me how.

If I can feed a hungry heart,
If I can give a better start,
If I can fill a nobler part,
Lord, show me how.

—*Unknown.*

I offer my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one returns to the Congress, this time the 85th, with a feeling of deep humility for the confidence the American people have shown for the Members of this House, and their faith in those who have been newly elected. But this thoughtful pride which fills the heart of so many of us today, is subdued by an overtone of sadness and bereavement. For one of the Americans who did so much through the years to help the House of Representatives win the confidence of the American people is not with us any more.

Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, my fellow Democrat from Tennessee, died in Nashville on October 12, 1956, and is not here to see this 85th Congress. For me his passing has a particularly personal impact not only because we were colleagues for many years, but because we fought, so to speak, in the same legislative battalions, and because, above all, J. PERCY PRIEST was my friend—not just my political copartner—but what means so much more, my close and profoundly trusted collaborator.

When I think of the prestige which the Congress has achieved between 1940 when he began his first incumbency here and the present hour, I find it impossible to conceive of this honor, this dignity, this integrity, this strength, without thinking of the prominent service this American from Tennessee performed so patriotically for his district, for his State, for his party and, outstandingly, for his country.

If I had to define what it is that makes a citizen the very best kind of legislator I would provide the perfect definition by merely pronouncing the name: J. PERCY PRIEST. His background and his personality were deeply and unmistakably American. In this essential respect, this American identity, he was not unlike that other great Tennessean—Andrew Jackson—although their talents and their careers were of course dissimilar. His life as a patriot and a legislator cannot be evaluated without reference to this beloved State of his, without reference to his loyalty to the people he represented, and without reference to his Jacksonian convictions, and his complete understanding of the dedication he owed to the Nation as a unit.

The very place, names, and incidents of his life crackle with the language and the flora and fauna of America. He was born in a town in Tennessee called Carters Creek on April 1, 1900. In his day he had been a rural school teacher and never altogether surrendered his quest for an education. Among his Alma Maters are included the elementary schools in Maury County, the Central High School in Columbia, the State Teachers College in Murfreesboro, the University of Tennessee, and the George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville. Perhaps the greatest of all the schools he attended, the school where his education proved enormously beneficial to his own growth and the growth of his country, was the Congress of the United States.

Another school that explains something of the breadth of his thinking, the tolerance, the understanding, the passion for facts and the understanding that motivated him, as his career as a first-rate newspaperman. From 1926 until 1940—14 years—he was on the staff of the Nashville Tennessean. One can only guess how much his career as a country teacher, as a formally well-educated American, as a newsman, contributed to the success he enjoyed in this House as one of its most distinguished legislators and legislative leaders.

When he took his seat for the first time in this House with the 77th Congress in January of 1941 the world was already on fire. The district he represented was the sixth, or Davidson County, which included the State capital, and while he never for an instant forgot his district or his State, his conception of his role encompassed the vast problems agitating the United States and the world in that dramatic and tragic hour. It must be a divine providence that in crisis sends men like Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the White House, and men like PERCY PRIEST to the legislative branch.

This great man from Tennessee threw himself totally into the maelstrom and helped, with every ounce of his individual strength and his leadership, to give legislative lucidity, order, and direction to the management of the great affairs that World War II developed upon the United States. Here was a strong right arm in the Nation's hour of need, an arm that contributed to unity, to solidarity to winning the war.

The imagination and the force, the genius for innovation in a perilously changing world, are illustrated by Congressman PRIEST's seizure of the right legislative weapons with which to meet the cascading series of national dangers. For example, he not only supported the war President on foreign policy, but also gave his vote to the selective service bill, the fifty-dollar-pay for servicemen, the Federal vote for soldiers, price control, and the Government reorganization bill.

There is a vast body of further legislation that illustrates the courageous and independent temper of his mind and the wisdom which for the most part, many of us will feel, supported the soundness of his views. When I speak of the wisdom of his thinking I have in mind, among other decisions, his vote with the administration on the mutual defense assistance legislation, and his votes and support for the Korean aid act,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Marshall plan extension, and the point 4 program. In a position of leadership, as I can well testify, he recognized the meaning and the weight of his responsibility.

PERCY PRIEST was a progressive and a humane legislator. As an example, it was he who guided the National Mental Health Act through Congress in 1946. Here was the first major, all-out, federally backed attack on one of the worst scourges—mental illness—afflicting mankind in our time.

Congressman PRIEST was majority whip of the House from 1949 to 1950. He could have continued in that post when his party regained control of Congress in 1953. But it was characteristic of him to decline reappointment on the ground that it would distract his attention from his duties as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This was the chairmanship he held at the time of his death. I recall also his judicial poise when in 1946 he served as chairman of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee investigating alleged violations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Here again principle, conviction, tolerance dominated the position he took. What mattered to him was the underlying law of the land and our philosophy of government and their equal application to all groups in our country. The New York Herald Tribune spoke of the Priest committee as frank and energetic. The inquiry sought information without bias or partisanship from such a divergent miscellany of factions as, for example, industry, labor, the Communist Party and the Ku Klux Klan. But, as the Herald Tribune editorial said, the investigation was, I repeat, both frank and energetic. PERCY PRIEST was like that. The current concentration of interest upon the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the demand for sharper scrutiny, the drive for reform, certainly stem in large part from Congressman's PRIEST's crusade against what he called the act's loopholes and against what the committee reported were—I quote—"widespread violations."

But the considerable talents and energy of PERCY PRIEST were not absorbed merely with the exposure of wrong and the repair of legislative damage. As in the case of the National Mental Health Act, which I have already mentioned, he gave wholly of himself in putting through the National Science Foundation when he served as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This Foundation, as you know, is an independent Government agency designed to make surveys of scientific needs. Through grants and fellowships it concentrates research projects in appropriate fields. It had the firm support of President Truman and passed both Houses in 1950. A budget of $15 million a year has since been authorized. I wish it were possible to estimate, as with a farm surplus or a figure in the budget, what inestimable results have already flowed from this federally financed attack on human suffering, on disease, and on death. Here again posterity will feel the benefit of the heart and the hand of PERCY PRIEST's leadership working within the framework of a Government created to serve the people.

PERCY PRIEST was the definition incarnate of the good legislator. I think his careers proves that this is because he exemplified the complete American. He was the complete American in terms of our own time. His beginnings were humble but not impoverished and his superior education reflected the progress of Tennessee and our country. This country schoolteacher, this newspaperman, this politician and legislator, this leader, had a mind and a heart deeply anchored in religious principle. He was, as a person, the product of democracy. That means that from the very nature of his environment through his 56 years he was independent and free. He spoke his mind. He acted finally on his own decision. He was a leader by virtue of merit and accomplishment. All these qualities were inherent in his identity as an individual; as much a part of his nature as the mechanism of walking.

PERCY PRIEST was a great man. He was also a good man.

Those of us who had the honor and pleasure of knowing PERCY PRIEST will always treasure his memory.

To Mrs. Priest I extend my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges of serving in the Congress is being brought into association with men and women, from all walks of life and all sections of the country, who by their ideas, their ideals, and their conduct enrich your mind and heart for better living. Each in his own way leaves his impression upon the others, like "footprints on the sands of time."

To have known and to have worked with PERCY PRIEST has indeed enriched my life. As the Republican whip, he was for many years my counterpart for the other side of the aisle. On many occasions we vigorously opposed each other on issues. But always he was my friend, and I say that with pride beyond measure.

At no time have I been associated with any man with higher ideals. In everything he did, in everything he said, he was motivated solely by the highest principles. He was not only a man of ability, serving with distinction as his party whip and subsequently as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He was a man whose every word and every act expressed his deep love for his fellowmen and understanding of their individual problems, seeking always to be helpful.

PERCY PRIEST was an inspiration to me. He will always be. If I were to describe him in one sentence I would say he was the outstanding example of a Christian gentleman. He is no longer with us, but his influence upon us for Christian living will be ever upon us.

There is a phrase in an old hymn which begins: "Are you ready, said the Master?" I know no one who could more truthfully say, "I am ready" than my dear friend, PERCY PRIEST.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter. I share their loss more than any words can possibly express.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our late colleague and friend, Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee and the Nation have lost one of their most useful public officials and this House, one of our most beloved and devoted Members.

As one who has known PERCY PRIEST for many years—before he came to the Congress—and who has served with him here for the past several years, I have lost a warm, personal friend.

The life of PERCY PRIEST was one truly dedicated to the public interest.

During the recess of the Congress, it was my privilege to speak last fall at Nashville in Congressman PRIEST's district, at a time when Percy was hospitalized, and I am happy that I was able to pay a tribute to him among his constituents during his lifetime. Later, I visited with Percy at the Mid-State Baptist Hospital, in Nashville. He had been listening to the World Series baseball game and his condition, at the time, was considered much improved. His untimely passing therefore was certainly unexpected and a great shock to everyone.

As one of the members of the committee attending his services, I must say that I have never witnessed such an outpouring of friends and floral expressions of sympathy as was witnessed at Nashville on this occasion. The tributes to his lifework, and his many worthwhile services, poured out from a host of friends because Percy was a friend of all.

These eulogies pointed out to everyone what we, his colleagues, knew—that PERCY PRIEST was a man of outstanding ability, unusual industry, and possessed of a warm and friendly personality. He loved his fellow man.

Among the pages of newspaper tributes to his life and memory ran one note that was outstanding which characterized PERCY PRIEST—and that was—he was a Christian gentleman—this, I am sure, was as PERCY PRIEST would have liked it for he was a devout man who lived by the Golden Rule and was motivated only by the highest principles. He had a deep and abiding faith in the goodness of the Supreme Architect and Ruler of the Universe and he endeavored to walk daily in His footsteps. I know of no man who had a more conscientious regard for the feeling of his fellow Members or who manifested a higher devotion to duty as a Representative in Congress than did Representative PRIEST, of Tennessee.

His outstanding record in this body and his service to Tennessee and the Nation earned for him the respect and admiration of all who know him, and his loss will be felt for many years to come.

As a Member of Congress he served with the highest distinction as chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His

achievements were many and remarkable. Perhaps no layman or legislator has devoted so much time and energy to the betterment of the Nation's health than did PERCY PRIEST during the time he served as chairman of this committee.

There are many laws on the statute books today for the improvement of the health and welfare of our citizens because of the sponsorship and the passage of legislation by Mr. PRIEST. The improvement of the health of the citizens of this Nation burned brightly in Congressman PRIEST's heart. He wore his mantle as chairman of his committee with respect and distinction.

As a leader who rose high in the councils of his party—the Democratic Party—he served as whip of the House for a number of years and, as always, devoted himself faithfully to the duties of his office. As assistant leader he rendered many personal kindnesses, favors, and services to his colleagues daily. His record in this post was exemplary indeed.

As has been pointed out, prior to his coming to Congress, he distinguished himself as a public-school teacher and as editor of one of the truly great newspapers of this Nation—the Nashville Tennessean. In his direction of this great journal, PERCY PRIEST utilized the wonderful human qualities which he later brought to us in the Congress. He was a friendly and kindly man who drew to him men from every walk of life—men who were duly impressed by his quiet and genial manner. There was nothing about him or his personality that was sham or imitation. Everything he did was characterized by a deep respect for his fellowman, which to him meant preserving as much liberty as possible for those whose lives we share.

I shall always remember PERCY PRIEST as a man of personal merit and rare individual charm whose sincere, Christian character served as a guiding light of inspiration. The memory of his deep principles and high resolutions will always be fresh in the minds of those who were privileged to serve with him in the Congress.

While we, his friends, are saddened by his passing, our sadness may be lightened by happy reflections of his achievements and accomplishments—they were many—accomplishments of trust and confidence kept, deeds of unselfish public service and consecrated devotion to high ideals and statesmanship.

PERCY PRIEST fought for a better America, never pausing to rest on past laurels. He was a leader among leaders and we can certainly say in all candor that our country is a better place in which to live because PERCY PRIEST lived and served so faithfully and so well.

With the poet we can say—

The finest tribute we can pay
Unto our beloved friend today
Is not a rose wreath, white and red
In memory of the blood he shed
It is to stand for principles as warriors true
To carry on the work he tried to do
It is to hold high the flag of freedom as did he
To keep our country strong and free
That freedom's flag shall bear no smear or stain
And free men wear no tyrant's chain.

To his lovely wife, Mildred, and little daughter, Miss Harriett, and other members of his family I extend my most sincere sympathy in the great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished former majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in remembering our departed colleagues there always seems to be a single trait that we recall above all others.

My memory of PERCY PRIEST will always be that he was one of the gentlest men I have ever known. With that gentleness of character went a kindness that I feel certain touched the lives of all who knew him.

I think PERCY PRIEST was a man incapable of bitterness or ill will toward any of his fellow men and I know of no Member who enjoyed more widespread affection among the membership than he.

We knew him as a public servant of unquestioned integrity, dedicated to his responsibilities.

PERCY PRIEST was a credit to the district he so ably represented in the House; a credit to the great State of Tennessee, and, may I say, a credit to the Congress of the United States.

It is not possible to fully assess the impact of his influence for good that marked the career of PERCY PRIEST in the Congress.

But all of us who knew him well, and worked with him through the years, have a conviction, I am sure, that we ourselves are the better men for having witnessed the nobility of his character.

The world can ill afford to lose men of his caliber; we will never have enough of such people among us.

With the many others who shall miss him so much, I join in expressing my deep sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the life and service of PERCY PRIEST cannot be discussed without using superlatives. Even these are inadequate. In his personal life and in his public service he was in all respects outstanding.

Of all the men I have ever known in and out of Congress, I have never known any man who was more beloved by those who knew him than PERCY PRIEST. He had rare and abundant qualities which won the affection of all his fellow men.

He was good; he was kind; he was fair; he was just; he was gentle. In many respects he was the most thoughtful and considerate person I ever knew. He always gave the benefit of the doubt to the other fellow.

PERCY PRIEST was intelligent. He was one of the ablest Members of the House. With all his gentle qualities, he was a man of tremendous courage and unwavering devotion to public service.

PERCY PRIEST was a Christian gentleman. He was devoted both to his fellow man and his Creator. He was a man of deep religious convictions.

In my opinion, PERCY PRIEST was one of the great Congressmen of our generation. He preceded me as Democratic whip of the House, in which capacity he served with rare distinction. During the 84th Congress he was my constant adviser. I leaned upon him heavily. I shall miss his wise and generous counsel. I loved PERCY PRIEST. He was indeed my friend.

The great service which Percy performed in the field of public health and elsewhere, first as a member and later as chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will remain a monument to him for generations to come.

PERCY lived the full life. Here, Mr. Speaker, was a great soul. Here was a noble man.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the present ranking minority Member, who attended Mr. PRIEST's funeral services with us in Nashville, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very real sense of inadequacy that I seek to express in words my regard for our departed colleague, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, and the high esteem in which he was held by all who knew him.

During the time that he served in the Congress of the United States he labored faithfully and well. His interest in the welfare of the constituency he had the honor to represent was exemplary and outstanding. Interested though he was at all times in the welfare of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, which he had been privileged to serve continuously from the time of his election, November 5, 1940, until his decease, yet, he also had a wider vision that enabled him to see and understand problems of national and international significance. At all times he brought to the solution of domestic and world problems a strong sense of obligation to promote the welfare of the people. He loved people. He was conscious of their needs and his responsibility to them.

The life that was lived by PERCY PRIEST has left an indelible impression upon all who had the privilege of association with him. This was made manifest not only by expressions of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States, but, was particularly manifest in large, tremendously large, number of citizens of Nashville, Tenn., his home city, at the time of the burial services in that city. The church was crowded to the doors, and the streets were lined with sorrowing constituents who were unable to gain admittance because of the crowded conditions. At the cemetery likewise great crowds were gathered to pay their last tribute to this great man who was loved by all who knew him. It has made a lasting impression upon me. The memory of this outpouring of sorrowing friends will ever remain vividly before me as an unmistakable sign of the deep and sincere regard in which PERCY PRIEST was held by those who had known him intimately in his private as well as his public life.

In an hour such as this, it is appropriate to pay tribute to him for the fine service he rendered in the Congress. It

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

was always characterized by a high degree of sincerity. In the work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which he was chairman, time and again, in fact, continuously, he gave evidence by word and deed of his great interest in the human side of the question. This was particularly evident in the great interest he took in all matters pertaining to the health of our people. His contribution to every phase of the jurisdiction of the committee dealing with health problems will ever stand forth as a tribute to his interest in the welfare of his fellow man. There is much that could be said in this respect, and, also with respect to his interest in all the other important subjects that form the legislative jurisdiction of this great committee of the House, but, the brevity of time prevents our dealing with these as fully as their importance would justify.

In conclusion of my personal remarks, may I also pay tribute to PERCY PRIEST as a Christian gentleman. In every sense of the word he was truly a Christian gentleman. At all times, in every activity and contact of his life, he exhibited those attributes that enables the characterization—"Christian gentleman"—to be applied to him with truth and honesty. Never did he make outward display by spoken words of his deeply religious inner self, but, without words it was so real that it was ever manifest in his attitude toward his colleagues in the House and to his fellow man in general. I know of no higher tribute that can be paid to him at this time than to say PERCY PRIEST was a "Christian gentleman."

I extend to his good wife and the little daughter, both of whom he loved so greatly and both of whom loved him so dearly, and to the other members of his family, my deep and sincere sympathy. In their hour of bereavement it must be comforting to them to know that he left such a host of sorrowing friends, and, died in a faith that gives assurance of life everlasting.

BIOGRAPHY

JAMES PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Nashville; born at Carters Creek, Tenn., April 1, 1900, the son of Harriet Hastings and George Madison Priest; attended the public schools in Maury County, Tenn., and Central High School, Columbia, Tenn.; attended State Teachers College at Murfreesboro, Tenn., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; taught school in Tennessee from 1920 until May 1926; member of editorial staff of the Nashville Tennessean from May 1926 until September 1940; Baptist, a Mason, and a member of the Civitan Club, National Press Club, and Elks Club; Shriner; married Miss Mildred Webster Noland on February 14, 1947; one daughter, Harriet Frances; was elected November 5, 1940, to the 77th Congress; reelected to the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses as Representative from the 5th District of Tennessee, and at the time of his decease was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Extracts from the magazine Current Biography, September 1950 issue, gives an interesting summary of the legislative activities of J. PERCY PRIEST, as follows:

An analysis of Congressman PRIEST's voting record made by the Congressional Quarterly in 1945, showed that he had voted with the Roosevelt administration on about 85 percent of the measures supporting the President in foreign policy, the selective service bill, $50 pay for servicemen (1941), the rescind salary limit (1943), the Federal vote for soldiers (1944), price control, and the Government reorganization bill. He was among the "nays" on the Smith-Connally Act veto, on the override of the tax bill veto (1944), freezing of social security taxes, and on a permanent Un-American Activities Committee.

In 1940 PRIEST voted against abolishing OPA, against nondiscrimination (amendment to H. R. 3370) on school-lunch program, but supported Federal aid for the program, against the passage of the tidewater land bill over President Truman's veto, and shelving the atomic energy control bill. He was with the "yeas" on draft extension, the passage of the Case labor bill over the President's veto, the passage of the first price-control bill over the President's veto, full employment bill, housing subsidies, and the President's strike-control bill. In the 80th Congress the Tennessean, in circumstances of a Republican majority in Congress, swung his allegiance closer to his party's line, though he voted for the passage of the Taft-Hartley labor bill over the President's veto. After becoming Democratic whip in January 1949, PRIEST supported all major measures of Truman's Fair Deal program with the exception of the anti-poll bill and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law. He voted with the administration on the mutual defense assistance legislation, the Korean Aid Act, the Marshall plan extension, and the point 4 program.

One of the first bills framed by the Tennessean proposed "mandatory civilian war service for draft-deferred men." In 1943 PRIEST authored one of several resolutions introduced in Congress for a constitutional amendment on treaty power. The Congressional Digest (October 1943) quoted him as saying it was "a paradoxical procedure wherein a majority of both Houses could begin a war but in which two-thirds of one body alone can officially end it. * * * If we can trust a body to declare war,"—argued PRIEST, "can we not with equal * * * wisdom * * * trust it to ratify a peace treaty?"

Guiding the National Mental Health Act through Congress in 1946, PRIEST shared credit with Senator Claude Pepper for its passing. Called an epochal measure by PM's Albert Deutsch, it provided for a nationwide attack on the problem of mental diseases, which previously had been handled on a State or local level. The measure authorized appropriations for a National Mental Health Institute (under the administration of the United States Public Health Service) to serve as a coordinating center for research on mental diseases. Among other provisions were Federal grants-in-aid for psychiatric research in universities, hospitals, and other institutions, and to help finance the training of psychiatrists and other personnel needed to treat mental diseases.

A supporter of the administration's program for Federal aid to education, Congressman PRIEST, a Baptist, in July 1949 coauthored with Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Catholic, a bill as a compromise to Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN's bill providing Federal aid to States for schools, exclusive of parochial and private schools. It was hoped that the Priest-McCormack bill, which called for $35 million a year from Federal funds to be spent on health aid to all schools—public, parochial, and private—would appease the opponents of the major program. The Washington Post, pointing out that it was not a substitute for the aid-to-education program, called it a health bill, since it would be concerned with school lunches and children's health rather than contribute directly to school systems.

In 1946 PRIEST was chairman of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee investigating alleged violations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Among those questioned at public hearings in the investigations were labor and industry groups, the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan.) The committee, whose investigation was praised by the New York Herald Tribune as frank and energetic, reported widespread violations of the act, which PRIEST said was full of loopholes, and recommended it be either more vigorously enforced or repealed. Under PRIEST's chairmanship, this committee investigated also alleged violations of the election laws in 1946 during the Kansas City (Mo.) Democratic primary and in New York City's 16th Congressional District. As chairman of a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—to which he was appointed in 1943—PRIEST handled the bill which proposed the establishment of a National Science Foundation, an independent Government agency designed to make surveys of scientific needs and, through grants and fellowships, concentrate research projects in appropriate fields. Proposed first in 1946—repeatedly urged upon Congress by President Truman—the bill, after many delays, was passed by both Houses in the spring of 1950, with security provisions inserted by the House to insure loyalty of all workers in the Foundation. Expenditure in 1951 for its establishment in that year was set at $500,000, and a future budget of $15 million per year was authorized.

In January 1949 the Congressman from Tennessee was designated House Democratic whip in the 81st Congress. Assessing the temper of this Democrat-controlled Congress which yet failed to enact many of the measures of President Truman's Fair Deal program, Craig Thompson, in a Collier's article—August 27, 1949—quoted PRIEST as saying: "This is the most independent-minded bunch of Representatives in my time. Lots of them are war veterans who can't be stampeded. They work hard, study the bills, and make up their own minds." The House Democratic whip suggested in the summer of 1950 that, because of world developments, Secretary of State Acheson and Secretary of Defense Johnson resign in the interest of national unity, a feeling opposed by President Truman.

As evidence of the high regard in which PERCY PRIEST was held by departments of Government with which he had contact as member and chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I present the following resolution adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission October 15, 1956:

At a general session of the Interstate Commerce Commission held at its office in Washington, D. C., on the 15th day of October, A. D. 1956—present, Anthony F. Apraia (Chairman), Commissioners Richard F. Mitchell, Owen Clarke, Howard G. Freas, Kenneth H. Tuggle, John H. Winchell, Everett Hutchinson, Rupert L. Murphy, Robert W. Minor, Laurence K. Walrath, Donald P. McPherson, Jr.—it was unanimously voted that the following resolution be entered upon the minutes of the Commission, and that suitable copies thereof be prepared and sent to Mrs. J. Percy Priest, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"With profound regret and a deep sense of personal loss, we record the death of the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST at Nashville, Tenn., on October 12, 1956. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Mr. PRIEST was in close touch with legislative matters affecting the Interstate Commerce Commission. We came to know him as a devoted public servant with a thorough knowledge and sympathetic understanding of our problems. Unfailing patience, fairness, and helpfulness characterized his every action. With

that rarest of virtues, humility, his friendliness and kindness won our warm affection and abiding regard.

"Part of his eminent record of achievement has been a notable contribution to transportation. We deplore his untimely death as a great loss, not only to the Interstate Commerce Commission but to the Nation."

Attest:

HAROLD D. McCOY,
Secretary.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is emotionally disturbing to us who have been so closely associated with PERCY PRIEST to take part in these memorial services today.

Percy was elected to the 77th Congress and both of us were assigned in the 78th Congress to service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In the 84th Congress Percy became chairman of that great committee.

We were close personal friends, and no person I know was more kindly and thoughtful and courteous to everyone in the House than was PERCY PRIEST. I am personally grateful to him for the many acts of kindness he extended to me.

The last time I saw Percy he stopped to visit me at my home, where I had been confined by reason of illness. No one was more saddened by his death than I was.

It is seldom that it could be said of one who held a position of responsibility such as whip of his party organization or as chairman of a great committee that a person charged with such responsibilities would not incur some enmity under the two-party system, but I think it could be honestly and fairly said that Percy had no enemies. His kind and generous Christian spirit never permitted him to speak or deal other than upon the highest plane.

With the multitude of responsibilities which were his, he never overlooked the fact that his colleagues were human beings sharing also grave responsibilities.

He was devoted to his country, to his family and to his church. To his wife, and daughter Harriet Frances, I extend my deepest sympathy.

The Fifth District of Tennessee and Tennessee have lost an able and distinguished representative, the country has lost a loyal, patriotic son, and an able and effective legislator, and I have lost a very dear and good friend.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with my colleagues in paying a brief tribute to a great American. As my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] said, I, too, had the experience of coming here with PERCY PRIEST some years ago. I could not agree more with his appraisal of the man, particularly his friendship and love for all of the Members of this body. I know that Percy had no enemies, because he devoted himself not only to the welfare of this great country of ours, but also to the welfare of his fellow man and the welfare of those who served with him here in the House.

He had many qualities. I think one that all of us will agree upon was that in every sense of the word he was a gentleman and he was genuine. There was not one particle of the demagog in PERCY PRIEST. He was genuine in his friendship; he was genuine in his convictions; he was genuine in his patriotism, his loyalty, and his Christianity.

I had the good fortune of having my office midway between the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee room and PERCY PRIEST'S office on the third floor of the new House Office Building. Each day as he diligently went to his meetings and as diligently returned to his office, I would almost invariably have a visit with him. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I miss those visits this year. I know that all of us who have had the rare good fortune of enjoying the warmth of his friendship, the pleasantness of his personality, the inspiration of his character share with his lovely wife and that beautiful child the great loss in the passing of PERCY PRIEST.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I have been a member for the past 10 years has sustained some cruel losses since the adjournment of the 84th Congress. Six of the ten senior members of our committee have been taken from us, two by death.

Last Thursday we spoke in this Chamber of the loss of Carl Hinshaw who was certainly one of the ablest, most experienced and valuable of our members. Today we speak of the chairman of our committee through the life of the 84th Congress, PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, who died suddenly last October. Everybody on the committee was completely devoted to Percy. The committee could not have had a better chairman. He was active, zealous, tireless and most high-minded in the discharge of his responsibilities as a legislator and as a committee chairman.

PERCY PRIEST had a remarkable mind. He was not a lawyer and the legal profession suffered on that account. He had a remarkable power of concise and lucid statement, a power that would do credit to any lawyer. I well remember his expounding the natural-gas bill before the Committee on Rules. This was a complicated, technical, and highly controversial piece of legislation. Percy's statement on the bill was a model which might have inspired the envy of any committee chairman. I can remember hearing him on other bills before the Rules Committee. I never knew him to do a job that I thought was anything less than superlative. His work for public health legislation was a major contribution to the Nation's welfare. And I mention only one of the many fields of his legislative service. The Congress and the Nation suffer a heavy loss in the death of a man like PERCY PRIEST. His personal qualities could not have been more lovable. He was devoted to his friends. Though he was a loyal Democrat he never let partisanship enter into his personal relations, a fact which I think will be acknowledged by everyone who served on the committee.

I extend to Mrs. Priest and his young daughter my utmost sympathy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished successor of Mr. PRIEST, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad and heavy heart that I join with my colleagues in an effort to express a sincere tribute and a deep feeling of our respect and esteem to the fine and outstanding Christian life and splendid character, a feeling toward his fellow man, the public service rendered to his people and his country, and the peace and understanding for the welfare of mankind, of our departed colleague and good friend, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee.

It was several hours after he slipped from this world into that external life beyond that I learned of his passing. I had been away for a couple of days and on arrival at my home that morning, I was greeted by my wife with the sad message, which grieved me beyond expression.

I do not suppose anyone was more closely identified and associated with Percy than I, outside of his own family and the Tennessee delegation. We came to Congress at the same time, 16 years ago. We had adjoining officers in the Old Building. We became good friends and neighbors.

We were assigned to the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the same time, and sat side by side and worked together on the committee for 14 years. We worked together on other committees and during the time that he was Democratic whip, he called on me as one of his assistants.

For the last 2 years I served under him as chairman of our committee. We were together in many other ways, in social life, civic, and religious activities.

We were very close friends and I learned to love and respect Percy for what he was and what he did. I shall ever cherish his friendship.

And yet, even though he has passed on from us, we cannot think of him as dead. We think of him being here with us now:

It is just a change from partial into fuller life; a grand relief from this world's cares, eternal peace succeeding strife.

It is not for us to understand the mysteries of life, no more than we can explain the beautiful fragrance of the flower under the influence of sunshine and shower. There is no limit to the power of the Almighty.

When I think of Percy, I think of the living message, as given to us by one of the great prophets:

For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts higher than your thoughts.

For as the rain cometh down and the snow from Heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater.

So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth below you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.

PERCY PRIEST was a good man of deep conviction. He was steeped in the finest traditions of a truly great American. He possessed the same kind of philosophy and thoughts as contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and even more so, the Holy Bible.

Percy was a man of abiding faith as well as a deep conviction. As I have observed him during all of these years, never has he retreated from what he believed was right and the best for his people and for his country. Never has he showed impatience or the lack of faith in his fellow man. He was always tolerant, humble, and patient, but deeply imbued with the ideals and principles which have made this country great. He was ever vigilant for the welfare of his country and of people.

PERCY PRIEST was truly a Christian man with deep religious ties. In all of his public service, in his everyday life, in his dealing with his fellow man, he demonstrated the true character of a man steeped in the Christian principles in the life of Christ and belief in his God.

Percy was devoted to his family. He was a man of deep family ties. I remember when he and Mildred were joined together for a beautiful home. He believed that the strength of America, of this great country of ours is in our home life, a Christian environment that instills in us character, faith, and confidence.

Many years ago I came to the conclusion that when I shall come to the end of what we call the journey of life, and I shall look back on those things that I cherish most, they will be the warm, personal friendships that I have made while traveling along this journey of life.

These were the words of our departed friend, PERCY PRIEST. So expressive of him and in the kind of a friend and public servant we had in him. He often quoted the Chambered Nautilus, by Oliver Wendell Holmes. He said it had been of inestimable inspiration to him in all the years since first he learned the lines in grammar school. He selected it for his contribution to the Congressional Anthology, and certainly would be most appropriate to quote here:

Thanks for the heavenly message brought by thee,
Child of the wandering sea,
Cast from her lap, forlorn.
From thy dead lips a clearer note is born
Than ever Triton blew from wreathed horn,
While on mine ear it rings,
Through the deep caves of thought I hear a voice that sings:
Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll.
Leave thy low-vaulted past,
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea.

This Congress has lost one of its most sincere and valuable members. We have lost a most devoted friend. Tennessee and our country have lost one of its most able and outstanding true public servants. As my other colleagues, I want to express my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and daughter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH.]

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to PERCY PRIEST. I was greatly shocked and saddened when I heard of his untimely passing. PERCY PRIEST and I came to the House together. I soon recognized his admirable qualities and formed a very high opinion of him. As the years went by I realized more and more that he was an outstanding Member of this body, and truly a great American. We formed a close personal friendship, and I always enjoyed a visit with him. I had the great pleasure of serving with him on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 2 years, and I know of the valuable contribution he made to the deliberations of that very important committee. I have never met a more delightful person, a finer Christian gentleman, in or out of the House of Representatives, than PERCY PRIEST. I know of no man who was more devoted and consecrated to his church. All of us are aware of the valuable contribution he made to the religious and spiritual life of Washington. He never failed to respond to calls made upon him, and I am sure at times at great personal sacrifice. I was indeed happy and proud to have PERCY PRIEST as a friend. I shall always retain happy memories of our association together, and my life has been enriched because I knew PERCY PRIEST. I extend my deep personal sympathy to his wife and the other members of his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the death of our beloved colleague, PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee.

For 16 years he had served in this body as the Representative from the Hermitage district of Tennessee. During his long and distinguished career, he had endeared himself to the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

As Democratic whip of the House he was most efficient in the performance of the arduous duties of that office and most helpful to all the Members.

As chairman of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he was fair and considerate. He was an experienced and wise legislator and a most effective and convincing speaker. He will long be missed by his colleagues. I do not believe any man ever served in the House who was more universally respected and loved.

Above all he was a grand Christian gentleman; a devoted husband and father.

He served his Nation, his State, and his district with great distinction, and his wise counsel will long be missed in this body.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his beloved wife and daughter and to his constituents whom he served so faithfully.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, loved PERCY PRIEST. Everyone who knew him loved him. When I first became a Member of this body, 6 years ago, one of the very first who offered counsel and friendship to me, a member of the opposite party, was PERCY PRIEST. Many times thereafter over the 6 years I would cross the aisle and sit with Percy and discuss legislation and ask his views. And I am proud to say that on several occasions he crossed the aisle to the Republican side and asked my advice on certain pending legislation. To me, that was a high tribute.

Many times I rode with him back and forth to work. Many times we discussed problems that had nothing whatever to do with Tennessee.

I know PERCY PRIEST today is in heaven with his Creator. There can be no question about that. He was a devout Christian gentleman and a statesman of the highest order. This Chamber does not seem the same to me without PERCY PRIEST. It is hard for me to realize that he is not here.

I attended his funeral. There were thousands and thousands of people there at the cemetery on a cold day. They stood for hours, and apparently had been standing there for hours before we got there from downtown.

There are no words in the English language that can fully state what a great man PERCY PRIEST was. He was humble. He was sincere. He was just. He was tolerant. I am proud to say that I numbered him among my dear friends.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and daughter and the other members of his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my colleagues who have talked so eloquently and so feelingly in the views they expressed about our beloved friend, PERCY PRIEST. I am sorry that the new Members of Congress will not have the opportunity of meeting this great man.

Before I came to Congress I read a book by a great columnist in America, and among other things he said that the most popular man in Congress was PERCY PRIEST of Tennessee. It was not the kind that is gained easily, it was the kind of popularity that was deserved.

PERCY PRIEST, in my opinion, was a great statesman. He was a true liberal. Sometimes I wonder if we really understand what the word "liberal" means. If my understanding is correct, it goes back to the British Parliament when a liberal was conceived to be one who did that which was right, who was not concerned about the political expediency of the moment.

In my short time in Congress I know of no Member of this great body who tried more earnestly to do that which was right than did PERCY PRIEST. He was

a great statesman, He was a great father. He was a loving husband. I hesitate to mention this, because I do not want to be accused of professional piety, but I knew him best as a member of our prayer group that meets weekly in the Vandenberg Room over in the Senate. There are 30 to 40 of us that meet there every week. Sometimes we have 50 or 60. PERCY PRIEST was one of the most consecrated members of that little group.

I remember one of the fine talks that Percy made to that group, and this was the idea that he gave us. He said,

> Quite frequently when I worry about my own problems I notice people who are passing me and I see by the expressions on their faces that their problems are much greater than mine, so I have tried to make it the rule of my life as I come to work each day to pray for the people that I pass.

So certainly a man like PERCY PRIEST will be missed by all of us. I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his loved ones, and reiterate the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], "I know that PERCY PRIEST is in Heaven with the Almighty God who created him."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the passing of few Members has drawn such deep and heartfelt tribute as the loss of our friend and colleague, PERCY PRIEST. He and I came to Congress together on the same day. It was my privilege to serve with him for some years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Like all the rest of us, I had frequent opportunities to visit with him, to be warmed by his personality, to feel a little bit better after a chance meeting and to recognize the qualities of friendship, personality, character, and piety which the presence of PERCY PRIEST embodied for all of us.

The tributes here have touched on his capacity for friendship, on the fact that he had, peculiarly in a body where controversy is so rife, such a capacity for friendship that he was one of whom it could be said he had no enemies.

In his service to the Nation, in connection with the national health bills, the National Science Foundation, and the myriad other good, substantial, and important contributions of his mind and heart, his name and his works will live forever as a Member of Congress who accomplished much.

He loved his fellow man, he was loved by him, and above all, he was one of whom it could be said that he never knew a stranger.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished and beloved Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe, with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], that it is almost impossible for me to think of the House of Representatives without thinking of PERCY PRIEST. I have heard a good many of these remarks here this afternoon, and I do not think I have ever heard in all of the talks I have heard about departed Members that there were more people who knew a man than those who knew PERCY PRIEST, really knew him. His was a gentle soul, yet a great soul. I remember when we were in some trouble here about selecting a whip of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and I sat down and went over the names of many people. When we came to the name of PERCY PRIEST we both said, "That is the man. He will do a man-sized job in a difficult position, and many times in a position that may irritate people, but he will do a great job. He will never offend anybody and nobody will dislike PERCY PRIEST because he comes and asks him to do something." I have said myself, and I have heard it echoed here this afternoon that I believe PERCY PRIEST was the best-loved man in the House of Representatives of all the 435 Members—and he deserved it because he had the elements in him of patriotism, love of mankind, and devotion to its destiny. He represented one of the most engaging communities that I have ever visited. Nashville is a beautiful, a lovely city, and the countryside around it is fertile. It grows good crops. It grows big trees—it grows big men. Every time I go to Nashville I go to the Hermitage. I see that firm, stout, strong home of the great Andrew Jackson. I see the great and strong trees that grow on its lawns and up and down the highways—strength, character—even in trees and in the countryside. That neighborhood never reared, never nurtured, or never gave to America a greater and a finer soul than that of PERCY PRIEST. I shall miss him because his friendship was an enriching treasure to everyone to whom he ever gave it. I shall, with his loved ones, miss him terribly and always.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the late and beloved PERCY PRIEST possessed all of the qualities of a godly man. Unpretentious and self-effacing, PERCY PRIEST was a man of deep religious convictions. PERCY PRIEST lived his religion, and always walked with his God.

There is little that can be said about PERCY PRIEST that has not already been said, and certainly I am at a loss for words and phrases with which to express my feeling over his loss.

But, I would like to say this—and perhaps this expresses it better than anything else that I might say—PERCY PRIEST was the kind of man that I would like to have my sons grow up to be. I shall always cherish his memory.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that we are here today talking about a man who contributed so much to this Nation, and who would have meant so much in the future. All of us are sad that he is gone.

I do not think it would be possible to talk about this situation without realizing the fact that America has produced very few men equal to PERCY PRIEST. All human beings have shortcomings, and I am sure PERCY PRIEST had some shortcomings, but the good points of that man so far overshadowed any bad points he may have had that they faded into such insignificance that I never noticed them.

The only thing that worried me about PERCY PRIEST was that he was so kind that I was afraid people were going to take advantage of him. It was my honor to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under him as chairman. I do not know of any man that I have ever taken such a liking to as I did PERCY PRIEST. Every move that he made confirmed that first decision.

I never had a family tree, but I have known that many of my ancestors came from that part of Tennessee that PERCY PRIEST came from. If I ever have a family tree developed, I shall pray to God that PERCY PRIEST turns up as one of my kinfolks. He is the kind of man I would like to be kin to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the great contributions that PERCY PRIEST made to our country through his labors here as an untiring worker in the House of Representatives for so long a time. All of us viewed him as one of the real statesmen that this body has contributed to the Nation. These tributes that have been paid this afternoon and many others that were silently or less formally voiced when we heard about his untimely death, are primarily because we all knew that he was, without pretense or self-righteousness a good man.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, as has been said this afternoon, words are very feeble instruments to use in trying to express one's appreciation for the life of PERCY PRIEST. It is hard to add much to the beautiful tributes that have been paid him this afternoon; however I am grateful for the honor of joining my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt sympathy at this loss to his family, to his State and to this great Republic.

I knew PERCY PRIEST quite well, having served on the committee with him for the past six years. He was my chairman, not only of the full committee, but he was chairman of a subcommittee on which I think he preferred to serve, because he loved the work of the Subcommittee on Health and Science.

Monuments to his memory, lasting forever, are to be found in expanded health services, medical research, a national nurses' program, the Salk vaccine, mental health legislation, and generally in every field for the prevention of disease and for improving the health and welfare of the people of America.

I have seen him in many situations which, if handled by a man of less caliber, might not have resulted in the public good that his handling brought. I have always known him to be completely fair. He was a Democrat in every sense of the word, but he was fair to our colleagues on the other side. He was a man of extremely fine character. He was friendly and courteous. I do not think he ever saw anything bad in any person. He always looked for the good.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

He will be missed as few men who have served in the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my own personal tribute on the life of PERCY PRIEST. I concur in all that has been said and am firm in the conviction that no one is more deserving of the fine tributes that have been paid to a friend this afternoon than was PERCY PRIEST. I am also convinced that no one in war or peace ever more truly gave his life in the service of his country than did PERCY PRIEST, and I just want to add that my own life is enriched by the fact that I had the pleasure of knowing him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not get to hear all that Speaker SAM RAYBURN said, but I will read it all tomorrow, because I know how he loved PERCY PRIEST.

I met Percy down in Tennessee when we met our leaders there. He was just as busy as he could be and just working for everybody, and he just looked like he owned all of Tennessee and he wanted to be sure that all of us had the best of care.

He was one of the finest men I have ever known in all my life. I think it is the worst thing that ever happened to all of us here when he left us, but I think it was the best thing that ever happened to him, for I know he is up in Heaven, where we all hope to meet him someday.

I can see Percy down here in the well of the House singing When It's Springtime in the Rockies with SAM RAYBURN sitting up there waiting to dismiss us as we were ending the session. And then we gave Sam a big party down on the river on a boat, Bud Delano's boat. He is gone and he is up there with Percy now. And I will never forget the many, many songs Percy sang and led us in. I have a recording of it, and a copy of it has been sent to SAM RAYBURN so he can hear what he had to say about one of the greatest men in the world.

There never has been and never will be a finer man in the United States or anywhere else than PERCY PRIEST. Of course, we all are going to miss him, but we will all get a chance to see him again, because we are going to work and get a little closer together here, and we will see him up there where he has gone, and we will all be praying that he is right there and will be waiting for us.

And we just want to say, "God bless his loved ones he left behind." And God bless every one of you here. You have said so many wonderful things about our beloved friend, PERCY PRIEST, one of the greatest men I have ever known. He was a thoroughbred here, and I know he will be a thoroughbred there.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it was 12 years ago this month, my first month here, that I first met PERCY PRIEST. As so many have done before and as so many did after, I went to him for assistance. He gave it freely and understandingly. He was very helpful to me then, as he was on so many occasions afterward.

PERCY PRIEST'S record as a legislator was outstanding. His contributions to his district, to his State, and to the Nation were many, and some were of a high order of importance. But, in my opinion, it was the other qualities which have been alluded to here this afternoon by other speakers which set PERCY PRIEST apart and which will cause his memory to live in the hearts of all of us who knew him. I refer to his great human qualities. He was a fine man. I admired him and I respected him. I considered him a friend.

All of us will deeply miss him. My sincerest sympathy goes to his widow and his daughter and all those close to him.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on all occasions like this it is usual to use superlatives in paying tribute to a departed colleague. We are moved to say the very best when a person whom we have known and are close to is taken from us. But the thing that troubles me today is that there are no superlatives adequate to describe this truly fine man, PERCY PRIEST. Some words have lost part of their strength by use for men who were indeed good and able, but still of lesser stature than PERCY PRIEST. Even the superlatives fail us when we try to express what we who had the privilege of working with and knowing so godly a man felt toward him. As a legislator, he was capable, smart, able to grasp difficult situations and deal with them effectively. He had no superior in this House. When it came to his ability to include within the circle of his friends and loved ones every person of whatever rank or station or color or party, I think I have never known his equal.

He was a man of kindliness and true nobility of character. Along with his steadfastness of purpose went an unfailing cheerfulness, even gaiety. He was strong, but always with gentleness. No one could talk with PERCY PRIEST, or even meet him casually, without feeling better. The flowers seemed to bloom more brightly and people smiled when Percy spoke to them as he went by.

His passing is, of course, a great loss to our country, as well as to his State and to his party. But to everyone who knew PERCY PRIEST it is, first of all, a personal loss—as if one of his own immediate loved ones had been taken.

The best tribute we can pay to his memory is not with halting words; it is to try, with our more limited capabilities, to emulate him. I think we can hear his Master saying to us, "Go and do thou likewise."

My very deepest sympathy goes to his wife and family.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished Member from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for yielding to me so that I might add a few brief words of tribute to the memory of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

It was a rather unique privilege and pleasure for me to be closely associated with PERCY PRIEST and to serve under him on the great House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which he was chairman during the 84th Congress. When I first came to Congress in the very last days of the 83d Congress, PERCY PRIEST was one of the first Members of Congress from outside my own State of Georgia whom it was my pleasure and my privilege to meet. At that time it was reasonably certain he would assume the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the 84th Congress convened. In his office I expressed to him the hope that I might be selected to serve on his committee under his chairmanship. Fortunately for me, at least, I was selected to serve on that committee. I feel I received great and wonderful benefits from my service on that committee under that great Christian man, that great American, the late Representative from the Fifth District of the State of Tennessee.

He was the most generous man in his contacts with the younger Members of Congress that I have ever known. He was indeed a source of true inspiration to every one of us, young and old alike, who were privileged to serve with him and to call him our colleague. He truly exemplified in his daily life, and a noble life it was, the thought which prompted some unknown author to write these words:

> I shall not pass this way again. Any good, therefore, that I can do, or any kindness that I may show to any human being, or any happiness that I may scatter along the road of life to my fellow men, let me do it now. Let me not defer it nor neglect it, let me not put it off until next year, next month, next week or even until tomorrow, for I shall not pass this way again.

I think that by his life and his example he made his community of Nashville, Davidson County, Tenn., his congressional district, and this body in which we served together a better place because of his having been a member of that community in which he lived and in this House of Representatives in which he served. Along with the gentleman from Tennessee and others gathered here this afternoon I journeyed to Nashville, Tenn., last fall to attend his funeral rites. I have never seen a more genuine feeling of sorrow and of respect and of love than was displayed in the capital city of Tennessee: People from all walks of life, people literally by the thousands, gathered to solemnly, respectfully, and reverently pay their respects to him whose soul had drifted to the world beyond. Everyone there was unanimous in their love and respect for him who had recently departed this life. Every one of us there, I think, took renewed hope and inspiration, indeed encouragement, for the life which remains to us here and for the eternity which is to follow in the hope that we might live our lives so as to command the respect and friendship of our fellow man as PERCY PRIEST did. I join with

the others who have preceded me this afternoon in extending my deepest and sincerest sympathies to Mrs. Priest and her little daughter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by way of preface to my own remarks, I would like to say that I have never heard more laudatory terms used about any man than I have for the hour and a half that I have been listening to my colleagues pay tribute to PERCY PRIEST. But, I do not believe that I have heard a single thing that did not come from the hearts of the people who have said them, and every one of them was true.

Mr. Speaker, the personal sadness and deep sense of deprivation which each Member of this body felt upon learning the sad news last fall of the passing of that great and humble servant, PERCY PRIEST, comes to us again today as we strive to put into words the tributes which we hold in our hearts.

I have known good men in my lifetime, Mr. Speaker, but I believe none more transcendantly captured the essence of true goodness and Christian stewardship than PERCY PRIEST. It falls within the privilege of most of us to sometime perform an act of generosity or selfless service. The privilege seemed to come to PERCY PRIEST more often than to others of his fellow men—and I have wondered if that were not because PERCY PRIEST seemed to seek out in his quiet, gentle way means of making opportunities for service come to him. I believe that it was, Mr. Speaker, such was part of his life of devoted Christian service—looking for the opportunities to serve and seeking out ways in which he could perform a helpful task.

We memorialize the great and powerful in marble. Such as PERCY PRIEST can only be enshrined in hearts.

JAMES PERCY PRIEST was born in the small community of Carter's Creek, in Maury County, in the Sixth Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent. He also lived in the small community of Theta, in Maury County, where I lived and was privileged to know him first some 25 years ago. Although I was young at the time, I learned to love PERCY PRIEST because of his complete goodness and his unselfish attitude toward his fellow. At that early time of his life his unswerving devotion to high Christian principles was already apparent to those who knew him. This lasting and growing characteristic of Percy was a thing that made people refer to him as one of God's chosen people.

He was educated in the public schools of Maury County and, later, aided by his own determined efforts, attended Tennessee State Teachers College, at Murfreesboro, and Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville, and the University of Tennessee, at Knoxville.

Six of his early years, following the completion of his education, were spent in the schoolrooms of his native State. His departure from the schoolroom, where he was a true teacher of the youth of his State, was a great loss, but it was a distinguished gain for the high profession of journalism when his path led to the hurly-burly of the city room of the Nashville Tennessean.

And while the Nation profited richly when his fellow citizens of Davidson County, Tenn., urged upon him the higher service as a Member of Congress it was journalism's loss when he laid down his pen and came to Washington.

PERCY PRIEST's service in the Nation's Capital is well known, and a repetition here would add no luster to his record. I can only say from a heart that would emulate him if it could that he served his constituency, his party, his Nation, and his God with able devotion and with a dedication which, we all recognize, contributed in great measure to the decline of his never robust health.

We loved PERCY PRIEST, we revered him, and I think we may say we envied the quiet confidence and containment which his Christian conscience and his noble spirit gave him.

This son of Tennessee has left behind him the deep respect and affection of many, many friends—many of whom he knew personally but vast thousands of whom were his friends only through admiration of his devoted service and Christian character. He was a worthy son of Tennessee and a worthy son of our Nation—the humble, Christian strength and fortitude of our pioneer fathers found a noble and worthy son in JAMES PERCY PRIEST, whom we mourn.

God's Kingdom is a richer place with PERCY PRIEST there.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for 6 years, I not only knew but respected J. PERCY PRIEST. As a chairman, he was one of the fairest and most generous men that I ever knew. On our committee, there did not seem to be a political division under his leadership. Rather, there seemed to be a desire to consider legislation on its merit and on its value to the community at large.

His Christian leadership was an inspiration to those who knew him and it also won the respect of his friends.

A long time ago, Shakespeare referred to life in the following words:

> Out, out, brief candle. Life is but a walking shadow, a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more. It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The life of PERCY PRIEST proved the fallacy of the statement of the Bard of Avon. His life was one of peace and offering. It has brought memories which are shared by his colleagues and all who knew him.

I join his many friends who today express sympathy to his family, and pay tribute to a noble character.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with all of the wonderful tributes that have been paid to our late colleague, J. PERCY PRIEST.

I wish to say that when I came here as a freshman Member of the House the beloved PERCY PRIEST helped me personally in so many, many ways. He was so rich in experience then and he was so kindly disposed that I always enjoyed asking him for help because I knew that he gave it from a contrite and humble heart and always with a desire and a disposition to help me personally and all others with whom he came in contact.

In addition to his great, outstanding and distinguished service here as a Member of this Congress and as a servant of our Nation, I wish in these few words, in this very brief statement, to point out one thing in particular that I believe has not up to this point been emphasized.

PERCY PRIEST loved to sing, as much as any person I ever knew in my life. He had a most remarkable tenor voice. His singing has been mentioned but I want to emphasize it for just a very few moments, and I shall conclude.

It was my honor, my privilege, and my great pleasure to appear with Percy Priest, the gentleman from Arkansas, Oren Harris, and the gentleman from Texas, Frank Wilson, a former Member of this House, on several occasions, two of which as I recall, were on Ted Mack's program in New York, as a public service for the blood bank and two here in Washington for similar purposes. We appeared as a quartet from this body. I want to say to you distinguished colleagues who are here today that with that wonderful voice and personality of his it was one of the most pleasurable moments of my life to see him in rare good tune on those occasions.

I have seen him doing much hard drudgery work here in Congress, and keeping a song in his heart and on his lips even then; but at the end of the day when the labors of the day had been finished and he was able to relax just a little bit and enjoy harmonizing with the rest of us, I believe I have never seen a happier man in my life.

May God rest his soul as a great Christian gentleman and as one who has enriched the lives of all of us and of this great Nation.

This little jingle I give because Percy liked it very much, and to my mind it fits Percy as well as any person I have ever known in my life.

> If a bit of sunshine hits you,
> After passing of the cloud,
> If a fit of laughter gets you
> And your spine is feeling proud;
> Don't forget to up and fling it
> At some soul who's feeling blue,
> For the minute that you fling it,
> It's a boomerang to you.

That is why, in my judgment, Percy had a song in his heart and on his lips always, because he continually was flinging sunshine on others, and it rebounded back on him.

I extend to his wife and family my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the first Members I met when I came to Congress in 1944 was PERCY PRIEST. I never served with a finer man than he. He was my friend and I enjoyed his friendship through the years.

PERCY PRIEST possessed what I consider are the essential qualifications of a good

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

public servant. First and foremost, he was honest; second, he was able; third, he had courage, and above all he was sincere.

I shall miss him, and I extend to his lovely wife my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, PERCY PRIEST was a great American and his memory will linger long in the Halls of Congress. There was not a contemptible thought in his whole makeup but he was always sincere and honest in what he thought and did. His sense of humor and his ideas of companionship were gentle but lasting and he had many friends among those he associated with. In addition he was a man of ability with a deep sense of loyalty to the highest ideals of public service.

Such a character makes life a better place for all of us. It drives away doubts and cynicism, it inspires with a new zeal for service and it strengthens and renews our faith. The times we live in demand men with the principles that PERCY PRIEST had and while he will be sorely missed he has left us the example by which we may attain the true and the good.

My sincere sympathies go out to his family and loved ones and may they be comforted by the loving thoughts and prayers of his many friends.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I returned to Washington with a saddened heart at the thought that our distinguished and beloved colleague, PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, would not be here to greet us as he used to do so faithfully at the beginning of a new session.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this Chamber for the first time on January 3, 1949. One of the very first to greet me and to offer me his assistance and help was our late friend and colleague, PERCY PRIEST. From that day onward, I regarded him as a friend in the truest sense of the word.

Until the advent of the 84th Congress, when he assumed the chairmanship of one of the great committees of this House, Percy served as whip on our side of the aisle. I worked closely with him in this respect since the leadership on our side appointed me as regional whip for the Rocky Mountain States. In his dealings with his colleagues, Percy was always most courteous, considerate, and helpful.

The State of Tennessee—indeed the Nation—has lost a great public servant—a true champion of the people's interests. He led and participated in many a legislative battle to obtain congressional approval of legislation that would enhance the health and welfare of our people.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege and the opportunity to have known him and to have worked with him are better for it and we shall always remember and cherish such memories. To his family, to his district, and to the people of his home State of Tennessee, I wish to offer my heartfelt sympathy in their and our great loss.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, PERCY PRIEST has been called to his heavenly reward.

He served in this House for close to 16 years, and so he became a part of our own lives and our own experience. Although he has gone, he lives on in our fond memories of him.

Teacher, newspaperman, Congressman.

Devoted to his State and to his country.

His conscientious dedication to his duties earned the respect of all his colleagues. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will miss its able chairman.

Our regard for him which we put off saying during his busy days among us we now express in tribute to the memory of him, and for the consolidation of those loved ones who survive him.

We who enjoyed working with him were impressed with the quality of his mind and character. And his many kindnesses to ourselves and to others.

The memory of good men comforts us with the faith that death is not an end but a beginning. As we recall PERCY PRIEST when he was active among us we know that he has just gone on ahead and that someday we will meet him again.

Meanwhile, we mourn this separation from our friend. And, in eulogizing his personal worth and his distinguished services to the Nation, we keep him close to our hearts.

May God grant him eternal peace and happiness.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives this moment in which honor is being paid to the memory of the late PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee.

Many fine and beautiful things have been said here today about our departed colleague. It would be difficult to exaggerate the virtues of PERCY PRIEST. He was fair, clean, wholesome, a Christian gentleman, truly one of God's noblemen to the marrow of his bones. We do ourselves honor when we pay tribute to the memory of our departed friend.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House of Representatives feels as I do—a very keen personal loss in the passing of PERCY PRIEST. There have been few to surpass him in ability, energy, devotion to duty, and his many contributions to his constituency, his State, our Nation, and the Congresses in which he so ably served since he was first elected in 1940 to the 77th Congress.

As an able and effective Representative of his district, he was respected and admired by all who knew him; as Democratic whip for many years, PERCY PRIEST performed outstanding service; as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, PERCY PRIEST did a wonderful job which we all recognize as outstanding in its accomplishment.

PERCY PRIEST's life was a full and generous one, marked with success all along the way. One of the greatest tributes I can say is that he will be sincerely missed by all who knew him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in deep regret in the passing of our colleague, PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee.

He served his fellow citizens as a teacher, as an editor, and as a Member of this House for 16 years.

Those who served with him will recall his ability as Democratic whip and as chairman of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I served with him at one time on a special investigating committee of this House. I have always valued his friendship.

I know that his many friends on both sides of the aisle join in deepest sympathy to his family and those close to him.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, JAMES PERCY PRIEST ranked among the best. A model of dignity and propriety, he set an example for all the Members of this body to emulate. Always courteous, kindly, and cooperative, he made one proud to be an associate of his. He was a loyal man to all his friends and associates and to his own profession in the field of journalism.

PERCY PRIEST has left us, but he left a memorial to himself and to Christianity here in the Capitol of the United States. He was a prime mover in, and probably contributed more than any other individual to the opening of the Prayer Room in order that the Christian influence, which he so well exemplified, could continue to grow. He believed deeply and sincerely that no nation of people can survive without spiritual motivation. His religion he lived from day to day. It is my fervent prayer that rising among us and coming to us here in these halls there may be many more men of the type, character, and ability of PERCY PRIEST.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the late Representative PERCY PRIEST.

It has been my privilege to serve with Mr. PRIEST since my election to the House of Representatives. He was an outstanding legislator, and a capable representative of his district and his State.

As the chairman of an important standing committee of the House, Mr. PRIEST had earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues. His judicious bearing, his wide experience, and his gentlemanly conduct served as a splendid example to his younger colleagues.

Chairman PRIEST will be missed in these halls, and I am certain that he will be missed even more by the people of the Fifth District of the State of Tennessee, who selected him for 16 years to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

I want to express my deep sympathy to his widow and his family. May they derive some consolation from the thought that we all share in their deep loss.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, all these 10 years that it was my privilege and exceeding honor to be a Member of this House with Hon. PERCY PRIEST, the late distinguished Representative from Tennessee, he was always most considerate and generous with his counsel solicited

by me; he was always square as a box on all of his dealings with me and I recognized him as a living, daily illustration of what a man could attain to as he daily sought to live a Christian life and, of course, we all knew Percy made no bones about the fact he did so endeavor to live. I concur in each and every word of praise and appreciation that has been made about him on this floor by all of you colleagues who have preceded me. I especially appreciated the appraisement of him by our distinguished Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN. It is crystal clear to me, growing out of 10 years of service with him, and now that he has been so untimely removed from our midst, that his life, and such lives as his, not only benefit those of us who have the pleasure of associating day by day, but leave an indelible print upon us after they pass on which makes us better men and truer representatives of our American way of life as a result of their having served on this earth. This is what PERCY PRIEST's life will be sure to do for me. Mrs. Doyle and I extend our understanding sympathy to his widow and daughter and those of his immediate family.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our country is stronger and better because PERCY PRIEST served it so well in Congress. His State and congressional district were helped immeasurably by his efforts. But his passing is felt by all of us not simply because of his great deeds but also because we each lost a close personal friend. The gift of friendship is a wonderful one and no one here ever blessed more of his fellows with it than PERCY PRIEST. He was an inspiration to all of us to do our very best at all times, because he set us a perfect example.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it seems that this Chamber, and indeed this historic edifice, has not been the same since the word came that our beloved colleague, PERCY PRIEST, had been called to eternal rest.

Shortly after coming to Congress I developed a close friendship for Percy, and the high regard engendered by his heartwarming personality quickly earned for him a place in my affections and esteem which has not been matched among my many valued friends in this body. PERCY PRIEST is one of the few men I have encountered who acted out his profession of service to his fellow men and who, by his daily example, taught us the practicality of the Golden Rule. Like all of those who watched Percy during floor debate or who marveled at his restraint and forbearance during that period when he fulfilled the arduous duties of majority whip, I can only say that here was a man who believed in brotherhood and who lived by his deepest convictions.

I wish that I were as sure of a place beyond the horizon as I am of that which I am persuaded the Master has reserved for this sweet and lovable friend. May an all-wise providence extend to his loved ones the strength and courage they will need so sorely as they face a future made dark by his untimely passing.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I had many special ties with our departed friend and colleague, J. PERCY PRIEST.

As has so well been said this afternoon, PERCY PRIEST was able, sincere, understanding, religious, diligent, dependable, and true. He was a leader, and yet he had the quality of making one feel that he went along as a companion rather than as being led.

When I came to the 81st Congress, PERCY PRIEST was one of the first people with whom I became acquainted. I early became his fast friend, and he mine. Throughout our 8 years of service together in the United States House of Representatives, there was never a time when I did not feel that I could consult with PERCY PRIEST as a friend.

PERCY PRIEST was a fine party leader. He was one of the great Democratic whips. He possessed the ability to reconcile conflicts in the field of the nonessentials, yet he was broad gaged enough to recognize and respect differences of viewpoint in matters of great import. I do not think I ever saw a man with a greater or more healthy respect for an opposing viewpoint than that possessed by PERCY PRIEST.

PERCY PRIEST and I often talked about my native county of Franklin in northwest Alabama. We talked about the beauty of the city of Russellville, Ala. He knew many people there, because Russellville was the home of his devoted wife, Mildred Noland Priest.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to describe the value to free people of having men like PERCY PRIEST with the ability to iron out the complexities of congressional action by personality, by persuasion, by a deep sense of what is right, and by the respect and the affection which they command from their fellows. These great qualities which PERCY PRIEST had in abundance will be sorely missed by all Members. They will be missed by all the people of our Nation.

As I contemplate the life of PERCY PRIEST, I feel the challenge of it.

Let us do our work as well,
Both the unseen and the seen;
Make the house where gods may dwell,
Beautiful, entire, and clean.
—*Longfellow.*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, for some 10 years I had the privilege of having an office across the hall from that of PERCY PRIEST.

There is a quiet eloquence in a congressional office. Somehow the very character of the Member whose name is on the door is reflected in the demeanor, the industry, the cheerfulness, the loyalty, and that inscrutable quality we sometimes call spirit of his staff. This subtle and quiet eloquence lived in and radiated from the office of PERCY PRIEST.

His devotion to his district, to the House of Representatives, and to the Nation—as all have so well attested—leave to his widow and to his family a legacy beyond price.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Nurses' Association expressing sympathy and condolence to the family of the late Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST and requesting that the resolution be made a part of the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO MR. PRIEST

RESOLUTION

The members of the Tennessee Nurses' Association, now in convention assembled, wish to pay tribute to the late Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, Congressman from the Fifth District of the State of Tennessee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Welfare of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In his death the nursing profession throughout the entire country has lost a sympathetic and understanding friend whose knowledge of the health needs of the American people was profound.

His untiring efforts in behalf of health and welfare legislation most recently culminated in passage of Public Law 911, which especially enables nurses to increase their contribution to the health of the Nation.

VIOLET M. CROOK, R. N.,
President, Tennessee Nurses' Association.
CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *October 18, 1956.*

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Democratic Women's Club of Davidson County expressing sympathy and condolence to the family of the late Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, and requesting that the resolution be made a part of the RECORD.

Whereas the untimely death of Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST shocked and grieved not only the people of his constituency, the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, but the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas Congressman PRIEST has served the people of his district and the Nation for a decade and a half as a conscientious, loyal, and dedicated Democratic Party leader; and

Whereas Congressman PRIEST's devotion to duty and service was manifested by his continuous and close interest in the welfare of the people of his district; and

Whereas this devotion and interest was manifested by his sponsoring legislation for the health and welfare of the people not only of his district but for the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas Congressman PRIEST numbered many outstanding achievements among his accomplishments such as House whip, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and numerous service committees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Democratic Women's Club of Davidson County go on record in expressing their sympathy and condolences to the family of Congressman PRIEST; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Member of Congress from this congressional district requesting that it be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when appropriate memorial services are held for Congressman PRIEST in the Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will not seem the same without the genial, gentle PERCY PRIEST among us.

His untimely passing is a great loss to all of us and to his State and the Nation.

I enjoyed his friendship and association very much and especially his jovial attitude and his vigorous leadership in the singing parties we always have on the day of adjournment.

I have never seen anyone who enjoyed singing and leading a chorus more than PERCY PRIEST.

He was a man of great spiritual vigor also. He believed in Christianity and practiced it.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

He was a fine legislator and had the courage of his convictions.

My sincere sympathy and condolence goes to his wife and family.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to PERCY PRIEST. I was greatly shocked and saddened when I heard of his untimely passing last October.

No one was more kindly and thoughtful and courteous than PERCY PRIEST. I have had the privilege of working with him for many years as my nursing bills were considered by his committee and subcommittee, and always he was very helpful and considerate, giving his time and patience unstintingly to the examination and study of the many facets of the problem of the adequate care of our sick. The Health Amendments Act of 1956—Public Law 911—is on the statute books today largely because of his love of people, his consciousness of their needs and his responsibility to them. The people of the Fifth District of Tennessee at all times claimed his special interest and he had been privileged to serve them continuously for 16 years. But he also had a wider vision, a vision that enabled him to see and understand national and international problems.

Devoted to his country, to his family, and to his church, he was in every sense a Christian gentleman. I recall how we all enjoyed Percy's singing and his rare capacity to start everyone else singing. It was my privilege to play the accompaniment for the quartet of which Percy was a member, here in the House for several memorial services. We who had the pleasure of knowing this warm, friendly man miss him very much. To his lovely wife and little daughter we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with deep appreciation to the beautiful tributes to our friend. The admiration and affection which the Members entertained for PERCY PRIEST knew no bounds. He was indeed one of the wisest and best ever to serve in these halls. The news of his death brought great personal sorrow to me. For my country I mourned the loss of his statesmanship, for myself the loss of a loved friend and trusted counselor. Anything that I might say, Mr. Speaker, in tribute to his legislative service would be repetitious. I can only attempt a sincere expression of my grief and an intention to retain in the recesses of memory the splendid example that he constantly set for us.

Undergirding his leadership was an outstanding spiritual philosophy—eloquently described by those who have spoken. It was exhibited without ostentation or display. He was one of the most modest men I ever knew. He exemplified so well the lines of Van Dyke which I heard him apply to a departed colleague that I wish to conclude with the words which Percy himself quoted:

Four things a man must learn to do,
If he would keep his purpose true;
To think without confusion clearly,
To act from honest motives purely,
To love his fellow man sincerely,
To trust in God and heaven securely.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DEMPSEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) on Wednesday next for 1 hour.

Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) on Wednesday next for 1 hour.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to have the special order assigned to him for today transferred to Wednesday of this week following special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. SISK).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York and to include a tribute to a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCRIVNER and to include a table of figures.

Mr. BOSCH (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming), and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 16, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

292. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, in the amount of $383,067,500, for various agencies (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

293. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major and listing such personnel by rank and age group, with the average monthly flight pay for the period July 1 through December 31, 1956, pursuant to the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U. S. C. 118a–1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

294. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a proposed amendment to section 204 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong.), as amended, to increase the legislative limitation on business loans outstanding from $150 million to $215 million; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

295. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

296. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

297. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report listing the names and salaries of all employees and officers of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ending June 30, 1956; a list of cases heard during the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956, and a summary of the Agency's obligations and expenditures for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

298. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on saline water conversion for the year 1956, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of revolving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

300. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

301. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

302. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to revise the law relating to the dispatch of mail from post offices, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

303. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to further amend section 14 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended, to permit publications printed in imitation of typewriting to be accepted as second-class matter, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

304. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide for amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil service retirement and disability fund to be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

305. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2767. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2769. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 2770. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2771. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to include grazing land in the soil-bank program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2772. A bill to create a distinguished decoration to be known as the Washington Order of Merit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2773. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time, during which naturalized citizens of the United States may reside in certain foreign countries without losing their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2774. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the United States Customs Port Patrol and the United States Customs Border Patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2775. A bill to place in the classified (competitive) civil service the position of deputy United States marshal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2776. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2777. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2778. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the third division of the District of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2779. A bill to include the fees for issuing money orders as a part of the gross postal receipts of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2780. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2781. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area," approved October 11, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer who sells or exchanges an automobile in connection with the acquisition of another automobile to deduct an amount equal to 25 percent of the depreciation which he has sustained on the automobile so sold or exchanged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2783. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2784. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate to Indians certain federally owned personal property no longer required by the Department of the Interior or other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2785. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of South Dakota for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2786. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1947, to grant to owners of property adjacent to lands to be leased by the Secretary of the Army for agricultural or grazing purposes, certain rights with respect to the leasing of such lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2787. A bill to alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, promote the economic use of Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2788. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. R. 2789. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 2790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income-tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 2791. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2792. A bill to provide for the appointment of two district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 2793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the States to make refunds of the Federal tax on gasoline in cases where such gasoline is used on a farm for farming purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska:

H. R. 2794. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Atkinson, Nebr., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for the taxpayer if he or his spouse has lost (or lost the use of) an arm or a leg; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 2796. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans) to authorize additional financial assistance in connection with public projects made necessary by certain activities related to the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2797. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2798. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2799. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2800. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2801. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer who sells or exchanges an automobile in connection with the acquisition of another automobile to deduct an amount equal to 25 percent of the depreciation which he has sustained on the automobile so sold or exchanged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2802. A bill to establish a program of financial assistance to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2803. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2804. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 2805. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2806. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the county of De Soto, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 2807. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

boards of medical officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2808. A bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2809. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2810. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2811. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2812. A bill to provide authority for the reassignment of officers of the naval service restricted in the performance of duty to an unrestricted duty status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2813. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President a National Freedom Board which shall direct the activities of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2814. A bill providing that the Secretary of the Army shall loan a Bailey bridge to Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2815. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2816. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Esler Field, Louisiana, to the parish of Rapides in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 2817. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of Stave Island, Maine, in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2818. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt homeworkers in rural areas from the minimum-wage and maximum-hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 2819. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2821. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2822. A bill to repeal certain provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2823. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2824. A bill to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2825. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2826. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2827. A bill to provide for increases in annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2828. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod Canal National Park, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 2829. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the exclusion of crafts, trades, and labor positions therefrom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2830. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place a maximum limitation on the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2831. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, so as to permit the off-site sale of Lanham Act housing projects under certain conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2832. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for the dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2833. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2834. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to remove a limitation on grants for construction of treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2835. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2836. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2837. A bill to authorize the preservation of the United States ship *Olympia*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 2838. A bill to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2839. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall purchase certain oil paintings of Nez Percé Indian leaders for display at the site of the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 2840. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 2841. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the upper Fox River, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2842. A bill to amend the Tariff Act by including tanning-material extracts on the duty-free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2843. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the transfer of commissioned officers between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2844. A bill creating the City of St. Francisville Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind.; to purchase and operate a ferry at such location; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to permit the inclusion, in computing Federal payments to a State under the applicable State plan, of the cost of certain services provided by an agency other than the State agency administering such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2846. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2847. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that allowances may be paid thereunder for the transportation of dependents in connection with a permanent change of station whether or not a change of residence is involved; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2848. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2849. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switch-blade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased deductions for employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 2851. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2852. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to acquire certain real property in the vicinity of Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 2854. A bill to amend section 601 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue certain regulations concerning air traffic at La Guardia and New York International (Idlewild) Airports in the State of New York and Newark Airport in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2855. A bill to amend section 902 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so that the penalties provided therein will apply to violations of civil aeronautics safety regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2856. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit jet-propelled aircraft from using airports located in densely populated areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2857. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 2858. A bill to amend section 165 of the Revised Statutes to eliminate a provision thereof which operates to discriminate against women in connection with appointments to Government positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2859. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 2860. A bill to establish a national grazing reserve by providing assistance to livestock producers who carry out certain range conserving practices on privately owned grazing lands or on grazing lands under jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2861. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2862. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 2864. A bill to establish a money credit for certain property of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico brought into the Federal service in 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2865. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 2866. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2867. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for each individual (the taxpayer, his spouse, and each child who is a dependent) who is a student and has attained the age of 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 2869. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to certain aliens born in Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2870. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2871. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to include grazing land in the soil-bank program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to permit wheat and corn producers outside the commercial areas to participate in the acreage reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2873. A bill officially designating the first earth satellite; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2874. A bill authorizing the construction of a project for improvement of Port Townsend Harbor, Wash., for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2875. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 2876. A bill to provide for a survey of feasibility for water conservation in the Etonia Creek and Rice Creek Basin and vicinity; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2877. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to make acreage removed from production by quota programs eligible for the acreage reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2879. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2880. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2881. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2882. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2883. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2884. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 2885. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purpose if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2886. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2887. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2888. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for public schoolroom construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2889. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for public schoolroom construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2891. A bill to establish a National Monetary and Financial Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 2892. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 2893. A bill relating to the income-tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:
H. R. 2894. A bill to provide domestic and community sanitation facilities and services for Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:
H. R. 2895. A bill to modify the basis upon which the Veterans' Administration benefit awards to women as widows may be made; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:
H. R. 3005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the States to make refunds of the Federal tax on gasoline in cases where such gasoline is used on a farm for farming purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to promote the economic development of the general area of the Middle East and to promote the peace and security of that area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to establish December 15 of every year as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:
H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to establish the second Friday in Ocober of every year as Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:
H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution designating the Saturday before Palm Sunday in each year as Crippled Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE (by request):
H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG:
H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:
H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to provide that Thanksgiving Day shall be the last Thursday of November in each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:
H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to create a commission to study and make recommendations for the security of American foreign investments and the prevention of claims against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:
H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on major policy objectives in the general area of the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:
H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the admission of certain Hungarian and other refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution providing for the drafting of legislation for combat pay and recognizing the importance of the frontline fighting forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:
H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS:
H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. CHURCH:
H. Res. 98. Resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the Serbian people on the death of Bishop Nicholai; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:
H. Res. 99. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAY:
H. Res. 100. Resolution for the appointment of a committee to investigate governmental contributions to the spread of communism; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTS:
H. Res. 101. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the causes of the large increase in traffic accidents in the United States during recent years; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:
H. Res. 102. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives, so as to permit two or more Members to introduce jointly any public bill, memorial, or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:
H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Anastacio de Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:
H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of Margherita Alongi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:
H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Juana Sanchez de Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2899. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Lazarides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Sally Ann Zweifel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Weeks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:
H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Harry Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREEDING:
H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Martha Hedwig Bruce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:
H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Knox Corp. of Thompson, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:
H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Chieko Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:
H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filippina Huber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:
H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia S. Politis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marina Frolov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:
H. R. 2909. A bill for the relief of Louisa Der Hacobian Bost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2910. A bill for the relief of Ching-Sheng Shen and Lee-Ming Chow Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:
H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Chow Liang Ting-Wei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2912. A bill for the relief of Maria Crocitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Dina Handlarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Rajendra Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Faraci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of Antonetta Fede Garretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Maria Rodriguez Gomez Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Khanbaba Fatouilah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Letterio Versace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Pavol Jozef Olas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Badalamente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of Illuminato Achacoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Tremul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Ng Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Harry and Sadie Woonteiler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Stephania Hnatiw and Maria Hnatiw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Beniamino Rocco Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2931. A bill for the relief of Michele Pepi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Amabile Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Philip Lee, also known as Lee Yat Hua, and Joan Lee, also known as Faung-jean Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:
H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Tomas Clemente Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Apolonia Quiles Quetglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Emiko Umedo Alonso-Virella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Clarence L. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2938. A bill for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of Finn Bache; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of Rosa Mazzolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Rafael Portugal-Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2942. A bill for the relief of Vartuhi Parsepian de Carpenter (also known as Rosa Carpenter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Victoria Medina-Vasillas vda de Viramontes, also known as Estela Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Ayala de Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eloisa Valdez-Rizo de Cervantez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Hideo Konya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of Jose Vargas-Mercado; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Arnold Franz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2949. A bill for the relief of Jessie Blake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2952. A bill for the relief of Mario Angelini and Mrs. Anna Maria Sodani Angelini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2953. A bill for the relief of Eric Forsyth Burtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Mabel Dorothy Hoffman (or Clarke); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2955. A bill for the relief of Hiroichi Hamasaki and Shizu Hamasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2956. A bill for the relief of Fethi Hepcakici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2957. A bill for the relief of Felix Zepeda Zarate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2958. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Ramirez-Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2959. A bill for the relief of Miguel Segundo-Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Josefina V. Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2962. A bill for the relief of Sarina Goldman Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2963. A bill for the relief of Edwin L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2964. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 2965. A bill for the relief of Bror Henrik Johansson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2966. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Lindall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 2967. A bill for the relief of Gray Television & Research, Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2968. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Castelli, Mrs. Francesca M. Castelli, and Angelo Castelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2969. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Donato Severino Spensieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2971. A bill for the relief of Scott-Carl Koepke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2972. A bill for the relief of Mary Derzay and Anton Derzay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 2973. A bill for the relief of the estate of William V. Stepp, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2974. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pete Haberkorn and Charles J. Haberkorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 2975. A bill for the relief of Carmen Munoz Orozco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2976. A bill for the relief of Zdenka Sneler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2977. A bill for the relief of Francisco Pena Anguiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2978. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Largiolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. R. 2979. A bill for the relief of Mary Hummel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 2980. A bill for the relief of Ryoichi Izawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2981. A bill for the relief of Lino Aguilon Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 2982. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paula Lantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2983. A bill for the relief of Miguel Barrenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2984. A bill for the relief of Pero Corak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2985. A bill for the relief of Alton B. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2986. A bill for the relief of Choong Hi Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 2987. A bill for the relief of Agatha Ecclesion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 2988. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Gluck Reuger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 2989. A bill for the relief of Cemal Guler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 2990. A bill for the relief of William N. Scocos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2991. A bill for the relief of Francisco Carapia Gaytin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2992. A bill for the relief of Maria del Socorro Garcia Ballesteros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2993. A bill for the relief of Armando Dumas Guillen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2994. A bill for the relief of Jang Ngoon Tom, also known as Doon Wee Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2995. A bill for the relief of Desmond Bryan Boylan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2996. A bill for the relief of Yuen Q. Low; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2997. A bill for the relief of Tsuruichi and Hatsu Shibata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Ermenia Pisotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Toro de Hess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Sandoval-Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Manuel Santana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Carl C. Petersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Raul Banuelos-Felix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Ismael Carrillo-Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

36. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lorena Ballard and others, Winnsboro, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to stabilizing the broiler industry on a permanent basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

37. Also, petition of M. S. Dickey and others, Sunland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

38. Also, petition of Florence M. Baird and others, Sunland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

39. Also, petition of Myrtle D. Peasley and others, Tujunga, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Subcommittee on Housing of House Banking and Currency Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote by the House on the extension of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Having been a member of this committee during the 84th Congress, I believe the committee can render a very valuable service by investigating all facets of the complex housing problems in the United States.

The pertinent investigations and studies of the committee include the following:

First, mortgage credit. Mortgage credit in the United States is in a state of near crisis. Although the full committee plans to give short-term relief to the FNMA secondary market immediately, a full and complete study on mortgage credit is essential in order that recommendations for necessary legislative relief may be presented to the full committee. Among the subjects to be considered are the use of the national service life insurance fund, possible large-scale use of the FNMA special-assistance program to support FHA and GI loans, and the advisability of liberalizing FHA downpayments to take over in place of the GI-loan program when it expires in 1958.

Other important areas which will need special study are the use of pension funds to supplement the availability of mortgage credit; and the desirability of extending the voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Second, other important areas of study:

(a) Community facilities: The development of a community facilities program to help municipalities and builders finance facilities vital to new subdivisions, such as sewer and water installations.

(b) Housing for the elderly: Further study and exploration of a program which will more effectively meet the requirements for the development of adequate housing for the elderly.

(c) Military housing: The progress and development of military housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act, including the interest rate question, and the need for more FNMA special assistance funds, and a thorough review of the Wherry acquisition program enacted in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

(d) Slum clearance and urban renewal: Continue a study on the implementation of this program, particularly in the area involving FHA insured mortgage programs. Study should also be made of the high cost of land acquisition in site clearance operations.

(e) Farm housing: A thorough study to develop an effective program which will enable farm families to acquire housing on a comparable basis with the programs available to urban families.

Ninetieth Birthday Anniversary of Dr. Francis E. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 13, Dr. Francis Townsend, the man who for many years has been espousing the cause of the Nation's older and needy folks, celebrated his 90th birthday. I know I need not remind any Member of this Congress of the hard, persistent fight carried on by Dr. Townsend throughout the years in behalf of the betterment of his fellow man. His has been a true crusade, and one which, I feel certain, will someday bear the fruits of victory.

When Dr. Townsend first started forming groups throughout the Nation to carry on the fight for his Townsend plan many considered him a mere dreamer. The Social Security System, which was as much an answer to the Townsend plan in an effort to head it off than anything else, was even being called a "cruel hoax" by some. Today social security is universally accepted on both sides of the aisle and many of the improvements made in the System, especially during the past few years, are very much like the original suggestions made by Dr. Townsend many years ago. He has seen a shift, however gradual, toward his philosophy. I know that on this, his 90th birthday, he is still working toward the day when his dream of a truly adequate, universal pension program will become a reality.

His work, and that of the many Townsend plan clubs throughout the country is more important today than ever before. The longer life spans and better health of the population has resulted in an ever greater responsibility on society and the Government than at any time in our history. The problems of the aged can no longer be ignored. They must be faced, and faced squarely. Dr. Townsend and his followers have done just that for many years. He has done more than any other single individual to help the Nation's older and needy citizens by calling attention to their problems and organizing the older people themselves to work in their own behalf. I have worked closely with Dr. Townsend on many occasions. He is an inspiration to all who come in contact with him. He does not look back—only forward to those new horizons we all dream of, that day when poverty and insecurity will be gone from the land and all people will be able to enjoy the marvels of this 20th century. I know that my colleagues here in the House as well as millions of folks throughout the country join me in wishing happy birthday to a grand gentleman—Dr. Francis Townsend.

Aid to Education—Simply and Directly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, aid to education is a local and State responsibility, a responsibility, I am sure, the States would shoulder if they were financially more able to do so.

Despite the fact that every State in the Union is far more nearly solvent than Uncle Sam, these States are "strapped" financially because of the huge amount of locally generated wealth syphoned off by Federal income taxes. There are few, if any, new sources of revenue to be tapped by the States.

The classroom and education situation is not a temporary problem. It is permanent and will continue to grow as our population grows through births and immigration.

Permanent problems need permanent solutions.

As a permanent, simple, direct solution, I have introduced legislation applicable to education and school construction. These bills are H. R. 2886, H. R. 2887, H. R. 2888, H. R. 2889, and House Joint Resolution 159.

My proposal, simply stated, provides that the collector of internal revenue in each State or Territory, shall remit, each quarter, for educational—or school construction—purpose, to the State treasurer, a sum equal to 1 percent of the personal and corporate income tax collected during that quarter—or as an alternative, but less direct, an appropriation of that amount.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal eliminates all possibility of Federal control, would call for no new Federal employees, and eliminates all elements of "share the wealth."

In substance, it merely leaves the dollars where they were earned to be used for educational purposes, or school construction, just as State funds are used, just as the people themselves, through their elected State representatives decree.

Mr. Speaker, careful analysis proves that Federal aid is a myth. It really is taking money earned in one State and

spending it in another State, quite often for things the latter State should do for itself if it is to accept State responsibility while seeking State rights.

Comparison of my proposal to the Kelley bill of the 84th Congress brings out quite startling facts, as shown by the following table of figures:

Scrivner plan—Aid to education

States	1955 Kelley bill States will pay in—	1955 Kelley bill States will get back—	Income and corporate tax collections fiscal 1956	Retained by States under Scrivner plan
Alabama	$2,172,000	$8,968,658	$428,121,000	$4,281,100
Arizona	928,000	2,537,686	174,547,000	1,745,470
Arkansas	904,000	5,313,957	168,357,000	1,683,570
California	30,480,000	27,545,819	5,255,898,000	52,558,890
Colorado	3,588,000	3,611,322	711,563,000	7,115,630
Connecticut	7,364,000	4,782,562	1,141,175,000	11,411,750
Delaware	5,152,000	835,050	790,853,000	7,908,530
Florida	3,868,000	7,623,902	799,257,000	7,992,570
Georgia	4,008,000	10,237,501	643,358,000	6,433,580
Idaho	612,000	1,691,720	114,649,000	1,146,490
Illinois	32,912,000	20,247,262	5,202,922,000	52,029,220
Indiana	9,148,000	10,226,627	1,349,669,000	13,496,690
Iowa	3,020,000	6,420,128	538,648,000	5,386,480
Kansas	2,876,000	4,750,027	450,087,000	4,500,870
Kentucky	7,600,000	8,317,970	482,227,000	4,822,270
Louisiana	3,096,000	8,090,229	513,147,000	5,131,470
Maine	976,000	2,244,876	166,309,000	1,663,090
Maryland	[1] 10,904,000	[1] 16,202,148	[1] 1,541,014,000	[1] 15,410,140
Massachusetts	10,876,000	10,573,691	1,770,309,000	17,703,090
Michigan	34,844,000	17,058,887	5,378,497,000	53,784,970
Minnesota	6,064,000	7,699,816	997,464,000	9,974,640
Mississippi	800,000	6,506,886	153,892,000	1,538,920
Missouri	10,128,000	9,174,710	1,554,304,000	15,543,040
Montana	668,000	1,594,187	120,241,000	1,202,410
Nebraska	2,340,000	3,220,909	343,254,000	3,432,540
Nevada	484,000	466,327	84,049,000	840,490
New Hampshire	712,000	1,279,688	129,216,000	1,292,160
New Jersey	11,776,000	11,343,672	1,884,102,000	18,841,020
New Mexico	608,000	2,320,790	115,786,000	1,157,860
New York	74,996,000	32,794,708	12,612,648,000	126,126,480
North Carolina	8,824,000	12,178,549	755,800,000	7,558,000
North Dakota	364,000	1,724,325	66,214,000	662,140
Ohio	26,936,000	20,236,416	4,154,769,000	41,547,690
Oklahoma	3,576,000	5,715,215	557,861,000	5,578,610
Oregon	2,444,000	3,893,287	469,421,000	4,694,210
Pennsylvania	30,448,000	25,105,737	4,627,820,000	46,278,200
Rhode Island	1,696,000	1,778,549	277,196,000	2,771,960
South Carolina	1,444,000	7,005,748	252,233,000	2,522,330
South Dakota	408,000	1,724,325	75,118,000	751,180
Tennessee	2,916,000	9,174,710	518,121,000	5,181,210
Texas	12,480,000	21,982,431	2,157,833,000	21,578,330
Utah	1,696,000	2,168,962	159,301,000	1,593,010
Vermont	432,000	965,188	65,678,000	656,780
Virginia	6,156,000	9,207,244	738,707,000	7,387,070
Washington	4,736,000	6,355,059	780,757,000	7,807,570
West Virginia	1,676,000	5,747,750	291,918,000	2,919,180
Wisconsin	7,428,000	8,740,918	1,183,119,000	11,831,190
Wyoming	324,000	780,826	52,707,000	527,070
Hawaii	776,000	1,409,825	131,466,000	1,314,660
Alaska			41,368,000	413,680
Puerto Rico			(13,648,000)	(136,480)
Total	398,664,000	400,000,000	62,972,969,000	629,729,690

[1] Figures for Maryland include those for the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—Income tax includes collections for old-age insurance. Actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown in the Scrivner plan after adjustment for that factor, an average of 7.2 percent.

It should be noticed that under the 1955 Kelley school construction bill, States must pay in their pro-rata share of the tax cost to get back part—or in some instances, more—of what must be paid in for the program. The net figures are what counts. All of the money under the Scrivner plan is net to the States for it stays right there.

Some complaint may be made that the so-called rich States will retain more. Every one of them has just as great, if not greater, school problems than the so-called poor States. For example, what State, with its unbelievable population growth has a greater school or education problem than California? It needs, deserves and must have more, and should be enabled to retain some of its wealth to solve its own problems.

Others will say this is a new departure. For the 48 States, yes, but it is substantially what is done for the government of Guam where 100 percent of the tax on incomes earned by United States citizens there is retained for use of the Island government. If 100 percent for Guam is good, why is not 1 percent for each State good?

This "Scrivner plan," Mr. Speaker, will allay the fears of those who want, and properly so desire, no Federal controls of schools. It meets the goal of those who are searching for a simple, direct plan. It satisfies those who desire that States accept and fulfill their proper responsibilities. Those who seek economy can take note of the fact that not one new Federal employee would be necessary.

It should fulfill the goal of all those who feel as Mr. Eisenhower so aptly stated:

When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this is the approach to statism.

Mr. Speaker, this program will help States and local communities help themselves in the solution of their school and education problems.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal deserves the serious study—and I hope approval—of every person who desires a simple, direct, practical program.

House Joint Resolution 159, which follows, summarizes and restates, not only the basic proposal, but also the reasons for the proposal:

Joint resolution to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and Territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes

Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, admissions, beverages, communications, gifts, luxuries, transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

Whereas, at rates approaching confiscation of property, States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purposes; and

Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or dictation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal-revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate incomes collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official.

Exempt Social Security Benefits From Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would exempt the benefits received by social security pensioners from all taxation.

The law at present is that such benefits are exempt from execution. This results

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in a rather confused tax status in that Federal, State, and local governments cannot reach the proceeds of social security payments to pensioners, but nevertheless can place social security pensioners in jail for nonpayment of taxes on these benefits. Because of this muddled status few governments attempt to tax social security benefits. Of course, with the very low level of income that social security pensioners receive the amount of tax which could be recouped by any tax on social security benefits is extremely small. In fact, so small as to be administratively hardly worth the trouble.

At the present these benefits are exempt from Federal taxation through an interpretative ruling. Since there is no specific provision in the Internal Revenue Code exempting social security benefits from taxation, it is entirely possible that a different ruling could be made at some future date.

This matter has been brought to my attention by a recent attempt by the government of the District of Columbia to tax the payments received by social security pensioners in the District of Columbia. The various inequities in the law as well as the fact that social security payments are presently so small as to verge on pauperism make me feel that introduction of such legislation as this and its passage at a very early date is necessary, not only to benefit social security pensioners but to help clarify an unclear state of law on this subject.

Legislative Proposal Encourages Industry To Employ Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, authorizing a 10-percent increase in certain employer tax deductions for trade or business expenses, as an incentive for the employment of workers over 45 years of age.

The problem of finding and retaining employment for older workers is becoming increasingly acute. This widespread industrial prejudice against the employment of people in the over-45 age group has developed a serious nationwide threat to the security of millions of workers at the peak of their job performance capacity.

In the past, we have appealed to the employer's social consciousness and to his capacity for logical thinking. In neither of these instances have we achieved any notable degree of success. A great many employers hold fast to the mistaken and disproved notion that younger people, per se, are more efficient and productive workers than those who have passed the mythical 45-year age barrier.

Since so many employers have been reluctant to use the frequently superior services of older people, I believe we can best overcome the problem by making it financially attractive for them to do so.

Whatever might be lost to the Government in taxes under this law would be saved to it by the cost of administration and payments under unemployment and social-security benefits which the employed older workers would not require.

This proposed measure would limit the maximum increase in authorized deductions to $1,000 per taxable year per employee.

I urge early action on this measure by this Congress in order to alleviate the serious problems of older people in industry before these problems reach proportions which may weaken the Nation's economic structure.

Former Congressman Frederick M. Davenport an Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, December 26, in Washington, there died one of the great public servants of our day—Frederick Morgan Davenport. I think only 18 of you were here when he was in Congress, and only 11 of you were his contemporaries during all of those 8 years of the distinguished service which he rendered in the House from 1925–33. You will remember him at that time as active on the Ways and Means Committee, wise in counsel and effective in his speaking.

It is my privilege and honor today to represent the district in central New York which he then represented, and also to come from Oneida County of which he was then a resident and in which he retained his voting residence to within a year or two of his death. To this day, the memories of him are keen and clear in the communities that heard his voice, and with thousands of our people among whom he was a born leader. We respected him and we loved him.

It is fitting that in these Halls there should be recorded a brief account of his rich and varied life.

Frederick Davenport was born August 27, 1866, in Salem, Mass., son of Mr. and Mrs. David Davenport. Soon after his birth the family moved to New Milford, Pa. While there he attended Wyoming Seminary in Kingston. After graduation he went to Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn. and was granted his A. B. degree with academic honors in 1889. He then returned to Wyoming Seminary for a few years as teacher of Greek. He was always a deeply religious man, and from teaching Greek he went into the ministry, serving pastorates in Yonkers and Kingston. When he subsequently left the active ministry, it was only because he felt that his deep Christian motives could find an even better expression in his case in teaching and public life. While at Yonkers he met and married the former Edith Jefferson Andrus, daughter of John E. Andrus—at one time also a Member of this House. Shortly thereafter he decided to become a scholar in politics. Preparatory to this, he entered Columbia University as a graduate student, specializing in law, economics, and political science, taking his doctorate in these fields. In 1904 he was appointed professor of law and political science at Hamilton College, Clinton, and from then until his resignation in 1924 he was outstanding as a teacher and effective as an inspirer of young men, moving hundreds of them to take an interest in politics and public service.

His own entry into public life dated from 1908, at which time he was elected to the New York State Senate from Oneida County. During his early years in the senate he was a vigorous supporter of Gov. Charles Evans Hughes, and as the result of the friendship then developed he later played a considerable part in the Hughes presidential campaign of 1916. During his years in the senate he was chairman of the important special commission on taxation and retrenchment which made a substantial contribution to the reorganizing of the finances of the State. He was also a leader in the fight for the adoption of the direct primary system. During these years he came to be an ardent admirer of Theodore Roosevelt, and in the campaign of 1912 he followed Roosevelt into the Progressive Party and was the party's candidate for Lieutenant Governor of New York. In 1914 he was nominated for Governor by the party. Following the dissolution of the Progressive Party he returned to the Republican Party and was again elected to the State senate. In 1924 he was elected to Congress from the then Thirty-third District. For a short time after leaving Congress he devoted himself largely to writing and speaking, but his commitment to the public service was strong. About this time interest throughout the country was growing in careers with the Government. The increased role which Government was playing was making it clear how important it was that Government should attract some of the very finest of our young men and women to its service. Dr. Davenport gave sustained attention to the problem, and founded and for fifteen years directed the National Institute of Public Affairs. This Institute brought to Washington highly selected graduate students from American colleges and universities and gave them a year of internship and training preparatory to administrative posts in the Federal Government. So successful was it in its program that its methods of recruiting and training were made a permanent part of the work of the United States Civil Service Commission.

In 1939 the Federal Personnel Council was organized. In effect this was a conference of the heads of the personnel divisions of our various departments and agencies. President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Dr. Davenport as its first Chairman. Although 73 at the time, he gave it vigorous leadership during the entire course of its existence. He re-

tired from the post in 1953 at the age of 86 when the functions of the Council were absorbed by the Civil Service Commission. During these years he worked ceaselessly for the development of an ever sounder system of personnel management in the years in which the administration of our tremendous Government establishment had become the No. 1 administrative problem of the age. From 1953 till his death in the closing day of last year he lived in retirement.

The following universities have recognized his achievements with the honorary degree of doctor of laws: Wesleyan, 1915; Hamilton, 1933; Ohio Wesleyan, 1939; Middlebury, 1943; University of Southern California, 1950; Syracuse, 1952; Cornell; Iowa. Seven in all. He served as trustee of Wesleyan University. As advisory counsel of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, he contributed greatly to the development and standing of this school. In 1951 Dr. Davenport was one of the three men of the Nation presented with the Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medal by the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association. He also was awarded, in 1950, the Stockberger award.

May I close by quoting an editorial of the Washington Post, December 28, which summarizes, better than anything I can say, his contribution to our Nation:

Frederick M. Davenport, who died Wednesday at the age of 90, left an indelible imprint on the character of the United States civil service. Most of his mature life was devoted to raising the caliber of the Government personnel and development of conditions under which Federal employees could best realize their own potentialities and most effectively contribute to the public service. A pioneer in this field, he was a founder of the National Institute of Public Affairs and served for 14 years as chairman of the Federal Personnel Council. No other individual can be said to have done so much to recruit gifted young men and women for Federal employment or to make the civil service a prized and respected career.

Dr. Davenport brought to the field of Government personnel management a rich experience in political life and a warm interest in helping young people along in life. He was a man of extraordinary gentleness and patience, tolerant of frailties in others despite his own exalted rectitude, and respectful of views that differed from his own. Yet he was a man of formidable strength, tenacity, and incisiveness, moving with a kind of single-minded devotion toward the goals he set for himself. Presidents of varying political persuasion have counted him as friend and adviser, and several generations of public employees have thought of him as kind of patron saint. The American people owe him an immeasurable debt of gratitude for lifting the civil service to a level commensurate with the needs of a great democracy.

Sportsmanship at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to call to the attention of the Members an incredible exhibition of sportsmanship in Australia last year. John Landy, the famous miler, was way ahead and on his way to another 4-minute mile. Suddenly the runner alongside of him tripped and fell. Landy stopped running and helped his fallen comrade. With the fellow up, Landy went on to win in 4 minutes, 4.2 seconds.

It would be wrong not to take note of a similar incident which occurred during the Olympic games. A member of the American team, Arne Sowell, showed the true spirit of the Olympics in the third heat of the 800 meters. He was running against Australia's Jim Bailey. Bailey had recently suffered an injury which he thought might put him out of the games, but he decided to run away. About 50 yards from the tape, Sowell, who was leading by better than 50 yards, deliberatly slowed down until Bailey came abreast, then shouted to him, "Take it, Aussie, it's your country."

Bailey went on to win the heat. Only those beside the track heard what Sowell had said but 100,000 people saw the gesture and roared their approval of Sowell's action.

Both men qualified for the semifinals and Sowell went on to take fourth place.

Here, again, is sportsmanship at its best. America is proud of Sowell. Incidentally, those urging segregation in our southland should know that sportsmanship has no color line. Sowell is a Negro.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before 42d Annual Meeting of American Association of State Highway Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the 42d annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, at Atlantic City, N. J., on Tuesday, November 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA BEFORE THE 42D ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS AT ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., NOVEMBER 27, 1956

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, I am highly honored by your invitation to come to Atlantic City, this wonderful recreational metropolis of the United States.

In my home State of Pennsylvania we are proud of our good neighbors who have made New Jersey one of the outstanding leaders among the States of the Union. New Jersey has many shrines of historic importance. Its cultural institutions are among the finest in the Nation. The diversity of its industrial and agricultural production has made the economy of New Jersey one of the strongest in the United States.

I want to take this opportunity to express my high regard for my distinguished colleagues who so ably represent New Jersey in the United States Senate, H. ALEXANDER SMITH and CLIFFORD P. CASE. I admire them greatly as sincere and patriotic American statemen.

To appear before this association is a great honor. Your membership has been placed in a position of the highest responsibility, not only for the present but for many years in the future.

Into your hands has been committed the greatest public construction program ever proposed in all history. It is the largest and costliest project, except for war, ever undertaken by any nation in the world.

In the presence of men who are qualified by training and experience to plan and execute this gigantic undertaking I feel humble indeed as I realize how little I can contribute to your vast knowledge of highway development.

One of the most gratifying achievements in recent years has been the widespread recognition of the value of a modern highway system to the future of the United States. The general public has been made aware that better and safer transportation is the key to American progress and that highways are the backbone of transportation.

We have a magnificent program, covering not only the Interstate System but providing also accelerated development of all other Federal-aid highway systems. We are off to a good start on a program that will remove one of the great barriers to progress. It will remake our cities. It will stimulate cultural development. By bringing the various sections of our country closer together it will strengthen unity and better understanding among our people. It will reduce the tragic toll of death and injury on our highways.

All the benefits I have mentioned are extra dividends. They are in addition to the direct benefits that will grow out of better and more economical access to raw materials and markets, which will mean the expansion of business and industry. They are likewise in addition to the importance of the Interstate System in terms of national defense.

It is quite likely that time and experience will bring up new difficulties—new problems to be solved. But we can arrive at the right decisions if there is cooperation among the different levels of government and the civic leaders of large and small communities.

Above all, the objectives for which we are working are too important to be made the football of selfish political advantage.

We must be constantly on guard against any attempt to play politics with the highways. It is obvious that the maximum benefits cannot be realized if highway planning and construction is brought under political influence.

As an example of what I mean I can point to something that took place during the recent national campaign in many States of the Union. Cities and towns in many parts of the Nation were promised in campaign speeches that political influence would be exerted to have their roads included in the Interstate System. They were told that Uncle Sam would pay 90 percent of the cost.

These promises were made in the hope that grateful citizens would vote for certain candidates, even though they were impossible of fulfilment.

As a matter of fact, if it were possible to make good on all the promises of interstate highways, a substantial portion of the entire 41,000-mile system would be located in a few States.

I am proud to say that political considerations were completely put aside—when the Federal-aid highway bill of 1956 was before the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Let us keep it that way.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

One of the important jobs that remain before us is educational. By that I mean a public-relations job in regard to limited or or controlled access on the Interstate System.

It appears that the advantages of limited access are not sufficiently understood in many areas.

In my opinion this is most important because experience with existing limited access highways has demonstrated that accident rates are reduced about two-thirds as compared with roads having unlimited access. Limited access makes possible the free flow of heavy traffic without congestion, and provides a safe and efficient method for vehicles entering or leaving the highway.

Among the provisions of the 1956 act which I regard very highly are those directing that certain studies be made by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the State highway departments and other agencies.

These studies when completed will guide the authorized highway program toward its completion and will give a basis for further development.

First and most important of these studies calls for revised estimates of the cost of completing the interstate system within each State. Another extremely desirable study has to do with sizes and weights of vehicles that should be permitted to operate on the Federal-aid highway system.

Another study will aid Congress in determining policy with respect to reimbursement for existing free or toll roads which meet interstate standards. The promotion of highway safety is another subject to be studied. And finally, the act direct that an analysis be made to furnish Congress with a basis upon which to determine equitable rates of taxation on all classes of highway users.

When these studies are completed Congress will have a guide for future legislation based on accurate and comprehensive information of our highway needs and how to meet the problems that are involved.

We now have in the United States almost 3½ million miles of roads. Each mile of road is of importance to a certain community. They must all have proper attention.

The interstate system now totals 41,000 miles of which 39,990 miles have been designated. The primary system consists of 234,907, including the interstate mileage. The secondary system consists of 520,371 miles. All three, as you know, are supported by both the State and Federal Government. The total mileage in which the Federal and State Governments are interested is 779,553 miles. In addition to this there are 2,638,661 miles under State and local authorities.

We have already hurriedly sketched over the magnitude of the great undertaking of the interstate and defense highway system.

What it really means to the economic strength of the Nation can be illustrated by a few figures.

It has been estimated that the highway program will create at least 300,000 new jobs on direct highway construction alone and twice as many in related industries. It will take many thousands of additional workers to produce the steel, cement, asphalt, stone, sand, and gravel that will be required. The production of road building machinery and equipment will have to be greatly expanded.

Each billion dollars worth of new highway means an additional 16 million barrels of cement, 76 million tons of sand and gravel, 510,000 tons of steel, 100,000 tons of asphalt, and $500 million outlay in new construction equipment. In a single year, the Federal highway program will require over 5 million tons of steel and 112 million barrels of cement.

These figures are most impressive, but of equal importance is the fact that the whole plan will be carried out in each State of the Union under the authority of the State and in accordance with the American plan of free enterprise.

The number of engineers and other professional men that are required is enormous. These professional men must be of the highest type. In addition, they must appreciate the importance of the job that they are undertaking. As I said before, it is the greatest project, outside of war, in the history of nations.

This great program touches so many industries.

Steel, wire, pipe, cement, bituminous material, lumber, petroleum products, and explosives are only a few of the basic materials that will be used.

The following are some of the things which I feel must be considered in carrying out this important program:

1. We must consider the interstate and defense highway system the backbone of American transportation facilities. The original plan of connecting great communities must not be deviated from. We must bypass cities and great centers of population. The urban roads will connect the cities. The other roads, including farm-to-market roads, must act as feeders to the great Interstate System.

2. Design for this great system must be adequate in the number of lanes and the strength of the base to take care of traffic needs in the foreseeable future.

3. The number of political subdivisions of government involved should be considered.

For a long time I have been convinced that the number of governmental units dealing with highways should be reduced. In the 48 States of the Union we have more than 46,000 civil subdivisions having some jurisdiction over streets and roads. These include townships, boroughs, counties, and cities.

Our first objective—one that should be a must for all government officials—should be the elimination of every needless or nonessential expenditure. We should cut away all waste, all overlapping and duplication in government. All functions and services that we can do without—even if desirable—should be wiped out.

4. For the first time in our history we have a program that points the way to orderly progress and avoids the haphazard methods by which many of our roads were developed in the past.

For many years roads were built—not where they were needed most—but where the strongest political pressure was exerted. I need not elaborate on the folly of continuing that kind of costly blundering and bungling in road construction.

5. There will be much opposition to limited-access roads. The Interstate Highway System is designed to serve traffic. It is not proposed to serve adjacent landholders. It cannot efficently serve both. It will take real courage to refuse access to an interstate highway where the applicant or group have much local influence.

6. There must be the closest cooperation between the States and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. There must not be any passing of the buck. There must be no political maneuvering in the changing of the Interstate System or adding mileage thereto.

7. There should be full and complete cooperation among State governments and the Federal Government to establish uniform regulations covering the weight and size of trucks and buses and the speed of the same.

8. Highway planning to reduce traffic congestion around our big cities should be coordinated with the needs of civilian defense. Rapid dispersion by means of an adequate system of good, wide roads is the best defense against any attack on civilian population.

9. Interstate roads should be carefully marked.

The people are behind this great road-building movement. Great men in every generation have advocated better transportation facilities. They include William Penn, Benjamin Franklin, General Washington, Colonel Roosevelt, President Eisenhower, and so many others.

An interesting editorial entitled "A Good Roads Year," was given to me recently by a great good-roads man, Paul Reinhold. It was published January 22, 1897, about 60 years ago.

It reads as follows, and I quote:

"It becomes more and more apparent that what was formerly a public request for good roads is now becoming a public demand. Where the people were once satisfied to make a suggestion, they are now disposed to dictate. What is good for everybody, nobody should oppose.

"It is now pretty well understood that good roads are the most economical investment a people can put their money in. How to improve the public highways is now the topic of discussion. There is no longer any question that they should be improved.

"There is a getting together of all the forces interested in the subject that warrants the prediction that 1897 is to be a notable year in highway improvement. The law makers and the road makers are being encouraged by all classes and ages to do something of a practical nature. Are you doing your share?"

It is our share of the job to locate and build these roads honestly and economically. The Nation is fortunate to have a group of men like yourselves to do this job.

Amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced three bills providing for amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. During the last session of Congress hearings were had on the previous bills before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on July 12, 1956, and the testimony printed. No report or action was taken on said legislation.

Briefly said bills provide as follows:

One will by amendment of section 601 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—title 49 United States Code, section 551 (a)—raise the visibility minimums now in effect for aircraft having more than 2 engines from 200 feet to 600 feet and for aircraft having 1 or 2 engines from 400 feet to 1,200 feet in their ingress and egress at the airports. I am informed that the ceilings as set forth in the bill could, depending on wind velocity and other weather conditions, permit an horizontal vision of from 3 to 6 miles. I know, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues are well aware of the tragic accidents which have occurred all over the country and that they will agree with me that many are, to a great extent, caused by flying in bad weather. In New York City, at La Guardia and Idlewild Airports, there have wrought devastation and tragedy, usually during heavy fog, when planes are on instrument flying.

Recently in testimony before a Senate committee, in answer to a question put by Senator HOLLAND, J. H. Tippets, Director of the Office of Federal Airways of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, stated:

Since 1950 instrument approaches to airports have increased 195 percent.

And the two main causes of air crashes are increased flying in bad weather and structural failures. At this same hearing Arvin O. Basnight, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, stated:

If the airlines are to meet their schedules they have to fly under weather conditions that are both good and bad.

Is it not reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to endeavor to set up the best regulations possible to prevent the increase in the number of accidents and the number of lives lost? The record is clear that the increase in instrument approaches greatly exceeds that of any other phase of air operations. It has been said that the enactment of this bill would substitute the arbitrary determination of an inflexible statute for the expert judgment of the Federal agencies responsible for regulating aviation. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what are we to do when these agencies fail to act—we have a responsibility which I trust we will not shirk for fear of offending the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Civil Aeronautics Board. I do not agree that this legislation will curtail civil air transportation but to the contrary contend that it will make for better and safer air transportation.

One will by amendment of subsection (a) of section 902 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—title 49, United States Code, section 622 (a)—provide that criminal penalties of the Civil Aeronautics Act will apply to violations of civil air safety regulations. The purpose and effect of this legislation would be to make willful violation of any provision of title VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act or of any order, rule, or regulation issued thereunder a Federal crime. This would be in addition to the sanctions currently in effect, to wit, the civil penalties. I need not point out, Mr. Speaker, that there have been in the past and undoubtedly will in the future be cases of what is commonly referred to as hedgehopping and buzzing. These acts are separate and apart from violations of flight patterns and approach landing patterns in the various airports. The record of complaints to the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee and other agencies convincingly substantiate the fact that, in spite of all assurances to the peoples affected in the areas surrounding La Guardia and Idlewood, approach patterns, directly contrary to those approved, have been and are being used. Present civil penalties are no deterrent. I believe, if criminal sanctions are imposed, they will prove helpful in avoiding cases where activities involving the operation of aircraft have been so callous and so in disregard of the rights of others as to be intentional and deliberate wrongful acts.

One will, by amendment of the first section of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—title 49, United States Code, section 401—prohibit jet-propelled aircraft from using airports located in densely populated areas and located wholly or partially within the boundaries of any city having a population of 1 million individuals, or more. This legislation does not apply to military aircraft.

I want to begin my discussion on this bill by saying that I and all who favor this legislation are well aware that jet transportation is well on the way—we make no mistake about that. The problem, however, is to manage it so that life on the ground will be undisturbed. Admittedly, the jet of today is still in its infancy as far as use in commercial air transportation is concerned. In the latter part of 1955, the Port of New York Authority denied permission for a Comet III, the British experimental jet airliner, to land in any of the New York airports, primarily because of the noise. There have been assurances that every effort will be made by the various manufacturers to meet this challenge by the time they expect to have jets in operation, in 1959. While in the experimental stage, this legislation will serve a useful purpose in preventing use of airports in defensely populated areas. It was recently admitted that jet-age planes fly too fast for the Civil Aeronautics Administration Air Control System. If this be so, and there seems to be no question but that this problem has been at least superficially studied, we should not risk the possibility of serious consequences in loss of life and property. It has also been found that hazardous noises are a new problem for Uncle Sam. Hearing loss and diseases of the ear—many caused by jet engine noises—cost the Federal Government more than $54 million last year, according to Army-Navy-Air Force Journal. To put it another way, "An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure."

Mr. Speaker, there are several motives which prompted the introduction of this legislation, and my colleagues should know of them.

First. In my congressional district is located the largest international airport in the country, to wit, Idlewild Airport. This airport is used almost exclusively for international transportation of both freight and passengers.

Second. There have been many tragic accidents all over the country which have to a great extent been caused by flying in bad weather when visibility was almost nil, but I will confine myself to those in the vicinity of the airports, to wit, La Guardia and Idlewild, in the city of New York, which bear mute evidence of the devastation and tragedy which I know these bills I have introduced will go far in correcting.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that in April 1952, 5 persons were killed and 4 houses were destroyed when a plane crashed in Jamaica, Queens County, N. Y., after it missed its landing at Idlewild Airport. Again in October 1953, two persons were killed and others injured when a plane crashed while taking off in fog at LaGuardia Airport. Then, the most tragic of all, on December 18, 1954, when an Italian DC–6–B airliner roared low over homes and densely populated areas in the vicinity of Idlewild Airport, not once but three times, and finally on a fourth approach ripped into a Jamaica Bay pier, burst into flames and sank in the water—the toll, 26 persons killed. It is not hard to imagine that this plane, lost in the fog, could just as easily have fallen and crashed into homes with all of the devastation and destruction of both people and property.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let it be distinctly understood that this legislation was not introduced to impede progress in aviation but has as its purpose, wholly and solely, the creation of greater safety for the air travelers and for the safety of men, women, and children who make their homes near airports. It is our duty to adopt this legislation.

Influence of Congress on Military Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thoughtful address delivered by the senior Senator of New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the Air War College. The address deals with the relationship of Congress to military strategy. Out of his long experience the Senator from New Mexico presents a viewpoint which should be studied carefully by those seeking to understand a complex matter.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLUENCE OF CONGRESS ON MILITARY STRATEGY

General Giffin, faculty, and members of the Air War College, I consider it a very real honor to be invited to address the members of the Air War College. In my position on the Senate Appropriations Committee, my connection with the Board of Visitors of the Air Academy, and as a private citizen I have always been an avid supporter of our Air Force and have long felt that the greatest security of this country lies in having the strongest and finest air force in the world. The select group to whom I am speaking represents, I know, the pick of the men whose ability and courage in their chosen field are unequalled in any other nation.

Thus, knowing a little about your own backgrounds, I confess I was a bit startled when asked to speak on the subject of military strategy.

But since I shall not discuss military strategy but relationship of the Congress to military strategy, perhaps I shall be on safe ground.

MILITARY STRATEGY DEFINED

When we speak of the influence of Congress on military strategy, the first question which comes to mind is what is meant by the term. Obviously, I will use it in its broadest sense. It will not mean, for example, strategy as Clausewitz defined it, "the use of battles in furtherance of war," but rather, the most effective use of our military machine for the general welfare.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The Founding Fathers of this Nation realized from the start the necessity of providing a military force sufficient to repel or

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

discourage foreign invasion and suppress possible civil insurrection. Madison pointed out that public force must be used, when resistance to the laws required it, otherwise the society itself must be destroyed. And Justice Joseph Storey was later to state that the surest means of avoiding war is to be prepared for it in peace. To these men, then, a standing military force was recognized as essential to the continued safety of our country.

At the same time, the men who wrote the Constitution were profoundly aware of the need for safeguards against the misuse of such a force once it was created. Their recent experience with the redcoats of King George reminded them, as we find in the Federalist papers, that the people might well find themselves crushed between standing armies and perpetual taxes, and that the liberties of Rome proved the final victim of her military triumphs.

With this in mind, the Constitutional Convention placed in the hands of the Congress the power to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; the power to declare war; and the power to raise and support armies and a navy.

They did this with the knowledge that the Congress was to be the expression of the will of the majority of the people. It gave them assurance to provide that one branch of the Congress and one-third of the other branch were to be elected every 2 years.

With even greater caution they provided that the President—another elected official—but separate from the Congress—shall be the commander in chief. They even added a further safeguard against the Congress itself: that no appropriation of money for the support of the Army shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Then, in article I, section 8, the Founding Fathers further stated that the Congress shall have the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

It is on these constitutional provisions, in dealing with defense matters, that the power of the Congress rests.

Obviously this is both a responsibility and a sacred trust. What is involved here are the peace and security of our country and the welfare of our people. It is no wonder, therefore, that more time is spent by Congress in dealing with matters relating to defense than with any other single problem area.

Writers on the subject of the constitutional powers of the Government agree that the power of the National Government in wartime is clear, but there is doubt as to which branch—the executive or the legislative—may exercise that power. Thus Madison found that Congress was given the right to declare war rather than to make war because the latter might be understood to conduct it, which was an executive function. And the courts have stated that "the President cannot, under the disguise of military orders, evade the legislative regulations by which he in common with the Army must be governed; and Congress cannot in the disguise of rules for the government of the Army impair the authority of the President as commander in chief."

Down through the pages of our history we will find both the executive and the legislative jealous of their prerogatives. That our Government has emerged stronger and better balanced through the years is a tribute both to the wisdom of the initial planners of the Constitution and the willingness on the part of both branches to place the welfare of the country above personal convictions.

BASIC DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

In the discharge of its constitutional responsibilities for the Armed Forces, the Congress is faced with three fundamental mandates. These are as follows:

1. To provide the basic legislation necessary for the operation of the Defense Establishment;

2. To provide adequate funds for the maintenance and operation of that establishment; and

3. To ascertain, through the investigative process, that the substantive laws and the appropriation acts are carried out according to the intent of the Congress.

The problems arising from this congressional responsibility are many and complex. Some of the major areas I have grouped for convenience sake into what may be called the four "M's." These are money, men, materiel, and management. Let us examine each briefly.

Money: For the present fiscal year the Congress appropriated for the Department of Defense a little over $36 billion dollars. This is 58 percent of the total amount appropriated for the operation of the whole Government. It is 20 times the amount appropriated for defense in the last peacetime year of 1940, and it is 40 percent of the amount appropriated in 1944, when our defense appropriations reached an all-time high. Present defense efforts and commitments from past wars take almost 90 percent of the annual budget.

To equate the needs of the military to the capacity of the Nation to absorb these vast expenditures has no easy solution. One Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated the matter simply: "If we do not have war, I am asking for too much money; if we do have war, I am not asking for nearly enough." The Congress would like nothing better than to appropriate much larger sums for defense, if needed, than it does. So would the departments, the Secretary of Defense, the President, the Bureau of the Budget. Yet each of these control groups makes reductions in worthwhile requests because, in the overall picture, the total of the requests would strain the economy of the country.

I am sure that the general public does not realize that congressional cuts of appropriations for the Armed Forces are almost negligible when compared with the reductions made by the executive branch. Furthermore, at no time in my memory has Congress cut Defense Department requests so as to impair the carrying out of the overall strategic concepts of the establishment. On the other hand, the Congress has made very sizable increases in appropriations—over and above the President's request—not once but repeatedly. Of this I shall speak later.

We believe strongly in economy, but we do not place it above national security when we vote.

2. Men: Next to the problem of adequate funds is the manpower problem. You are as familiar as I with many of its aspects.

Not only is the Congress concerned with actual levels of forces, but we are required to be intimately familiar with a myriad of details such as promotion procedures and policies, retirements, pay scales, commissaries, and exchanges, dependents schooling and a host of others.

These problems associated with manpower are frequently the most perplexing, dealing as they do with human values as well as defense objectives.

3. Materiel: Because of the tremendous advances in the sciences in recent years, this is a relatively new problem which has engrossed the Congress, along with much of the scientific brains of the country. Basically it poses the question, "Are we progressing rapidly enough in the development and procurement of modernized weapons and materiel?" This subject is probably the source of more congressional inquiries than any other.

Because of our interests, we have actually forced the acceleration in the research and development program on new weapons and weapons systems. We continue to push the production of the most modern military aircraft and are intimately concerned in assuring accelerated missiles development and production.

4. Management: Congressional problems related to this subject include most of the investigative work of congressional committees. The subject matter is varied, and includes such items as the economical and efficient use of funds, manpower, and materiel; the question as to whether the Departments are well organized and well prepared for their functions; and the problem of interservice rivalries.

It is through the search for satisfactory answers to these questions that the Congress has entered into the field of military strategy.

CAUSES OF CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST IN MILITARY STRATEGY

I believe that at no time in our history has the Congress taken as much interest in the policies of the military establishment as it has since World War II. One reason for this has been the introduction of thermonuclear weapons. Another war, if it comes, will dwarf other wars by comparison. It is the responsibility of the Congress to assure itself and the American people that we are preparing ourselves properly for our defense. If we are ever caught napping, it will be a permanent sleep for democracy.

Another reason, I believe, is the end of isolationism. In terms of heavy bomber speed, the world has shrunk to one-third its size 10 years ago. We no longer have two great oceans as bastions of defense. The safety of nautical miles has been destroyed by the supersonic power of the jet thrust.

From another viewpoint, isolationism died with the beginnings of foreign aid. The billions of dollars we have poured into friendly hands around the globe for military defense have tied our strategic concepts with those of foreign countries. The necessity for the Congress to make a thorough examination of these vast sums yearly has of itself brought about interest in our unified defense.

Still another reason is the complexity of modern warfare. You gentlemen are familiar with the mechanical labyrinth which is the foundation of the modern war machine. But its effect on the economy of the country, on the taxpayer, on a multitude of contractors and workers, on our youth and schools and universities are responsibilities of the Congress.

Congress has asserted this responsibility largely when it has believed phases of defense planning are lagging behind current military requirements, when controversies have occurred, and when weaknesses of policy or individuals have revealed soft spots which require remedy.

Gen. Omar Bradley, when he was Chief of Staff, stated, "under our form of government, the military policy of the United States is shaped by the Congress, not by the Armed Forces * * * because the Congress controls the appropriations which in the final analysis control the military policy."

The realization of this does not lie lightly on the heads of congressional leaders.

EXAMPLES OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I should like now to give you a few examples of congressional awareness of its responsibility in maintaining a strong defense.

The Armed Services Committees, which handle substantive legislation, the Appropriations Committees, the Committee on Government Operations and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have all assumed important roles.

From the Armed Services Committees came the National Security Act of 1947. This was the legislation which created the National Security council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Unified Department of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No legislation

has ever had more lasting strategic effect on military policy.

Since then the Congress has delved into the B–36 controversy, the cancellation of the 65,000-ton carrier, the question whether strategic bombing furthered the national objectives, the reduction in strength of the Marine Corps and the Marine air arm, the problem of planning for partial mobilization, the use of inactive reservists, the reasons for the ammunition shortage in Korea, procurement policies, the Nike-Talos controversy, and, of course, the adequacy of our airpower.

THE MACHINERY OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

You will note that most of the instances just referred to were either legislative or investigative in character. This brings us to the fiscal relationship of the Congress with the Defense Establishment, which is handled by the Appropriations Committees through the machinery of hearings. Despite the many commitments of Senators, hearings on the defense bill are usually long and exhaustive. This past year our Senate hearings began on May 8 and did not conclude until June 12. They ran to over 1,300 compact pages of testimony from every brancn of the services from the Secretary of Defense to the smallest of units.

Tremendous masses of material are utilized by the Members in their consideration of the defense bill. In addition to the budget itself, the Members have the testimony, including prepared statements, to refer to. Constant reference is made to the so-called justifications, the Air Force alone last year presenting over 50 volumes of these justifications which were examined by the committee and its staff.

Most of the members of the Defense Subcommittees have served for many years reviewing defense requirements. This is also true of the members of the Armed Services Committees. To give a few examples, Chairman HAYDEN of the Senate Appropriations Committee has been dealing with defense appropriations since 1927, Senator RUSSELL, also chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, since 1933, Senator BRIDGES since 1937; Senator SALTONSTALL since 1947; Chairman MAHON, of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Approriations Committee has worked on defense appropriations since 1940, Congressman CANNON, chairman of the full committee, since 1929, Congressman TABER since 1923. Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Congressman VINSON, has been studying defense legislation since 1917. I cannot equal Mr. VINSON'S long record. I have been associated with the defense budget for only 18 years.

In addition many Members of Congress have backgrounds of military service. Of the 23 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, 17 have served in the Armed Forces.

The members are constantly adding to their knowledge by visiting field installations during the time when Congress is not in session. Staff members are at work 12 months of the year reviewing defense problems and preparing information for the use of the committees.

This impressive record, I believe, speaks for itself. Certainly no stone is left unturned by the members to make themselves as well informed on defense matters as is humanly possible.

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION IN 1940

During my own congressional life I have been closely associated with the Senate Appropriations Committee and that committee's relationship to the Department of Defense. I believe that it will help provide a fuller understanding of the role of the Congress in securing a strong Defense Establishment if I recount certain highlights of those years.

I came on the Senate Appropriations Committee in January of 1939. Eight months later Hitler marched into Poland and World War II began. The following April the War Department came before our committee to defend its budget for the fiscal year 1941.

After hearing several days' testimony, the committee was not satisfied with the nominal amounts included in the additional request. As one member stated, "Anyone who reads the hearings will note that the principal discussion is not what was in the bill, but what ought to be in the bill in order properly to meet the situation which confronts us."

As a result of this committee dissatisfaction with the amounts requested, a confidential letter was sent to the War Department. Departmental officials were told that although they might feel bound by budget limitations, the committee was not. The letter requested full information as to what changes should be made in the bill to accomplish a stronger defense.

After the letter was sent, but before a reply was received, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg were invaded.

Six days after the reply was received, the Senate committee reported a bill which increased the amounts to be provided for the War Department by 100 percent. Subsequent events were ample proof of the wisdom of the Senate's position.

For the most part through the years the Congress and its committees have accepted military policies as initiated by our defense planners. But the Congress has not hesitated on occasion in voicing its doubt as to the adequacy of certain phases of our Defense posture.

SEVENTY GROUP AIR FORCE

As long ago as in April of 1948—2 years before Korea—the Congress sensed the inadequacy of our air power, and over the objections of the administration increased funds for the Air Force by over $100 million to provide for an air force of 70 groups. You will recall that these funds were subsequently impounded.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

The question often is asked, "Is the role of Congress limited to accepting or reducing Defense budget requests since it is the prerogative of the executive to impound the funds appropriated when they exceed the amount of the President's request?"

My answer to that is a vehement "No."

It is true that the President has on occasion impounded funds appropriated by the Congress. It is also true that the President has refused to obligate funds included in his own request. He impounded funds in 1948, as I mentioned, for the 70 group Air Force. He did so, in effect at least, in 1956 with funds to maintain the Marine Corps at the then present strength. I shall speak about this in a moment.

The responsibility for these reductions in potential power lies then with the Executive, and not with the Congress. And the effect of moral suasion, public pressure, and an open mind may yet bring the Executive around to the thinking of the Congress. Certainly, the Congress was proved right in regard to the need for more Air Power subsequent to 1948. We can only hope that future events will not give it further justification.

DIFFICULTY IN ELICITING WITNESSES' CONVICTIONS

When the Congress doubts that the funds requested by the Executive are sufficient to provide adequate defense, it finds most witnesses extremely reluctant to venture their own opinions.

During and after the Korean emergency, the hearings before congressional committees were replete with such questions as "do you have enough money?" Many times we have despaired when the answers have been guarded and equivocal "yesses," couched in ambiguous language. Sometimes the answer will be, "within the limits of the budgetary ceilings imposed upon us, and short of all-out war, we believe the funds to be sufficient," or more briefly: "We stand by the budget estimate." These answers are understandable, human, and predicated upon the rule that requires support of policies laid down by a higher command, but they do not ease the problems of the Congress in determining the adequacy and the correctness of the Executive's strategic concept. I might add that notable exceptions to this has been the candid and forthright testimony of Generals Vandenberg, Twining, Ridgway, and LeMay.

1956 MARINE AMENDMENTS

There are a number of recent examples of congressional action when the adequacy of the budget was questioned.

A little over a year ago, my subcommittee felt that the administration's cuts in Marine Corps strength were ill advised and untimely. As a result, funds were provided which would have maintained the Marine Corps at a constant strength. But these funds were never allocated to the Marine Corps.

1956 AIR FORCE SPENDING

In another instance, during the consideration of the 1956 budget, many Members of the Senate expressed grave doubts as to the adequacy of the Air Force production goals. These doubts became very real alarm when the Defense Department released information previously unpublished, about recent advances in the Soviet's air capabilities. The resulting furor was only quieted when the Secretary of Defense came before our committee, requested, and received increase of $356 million over the amount previously provided. This additional sum permitted the Air Force to increase the production rate of the B–52 bomber by 35 percent over the previously planned production rate, and permitted the conversion of the B–36 heavy bomber wings to B–52 jet aircraft at an earlier date than contemplated. Although it cannot be proved, there is no doubt in my mind that the grave alarm voiced by Congress over the unlooked for advances in Russian capability had a very real influence over the rightful decision of the Department to ask for additional funds immediately.

1957 BILLION-DOLLAR AMENDMENT

Again, in this past session of the Congress, I believed that the funds requested for the Air Force were far short of providing us with an air strength necessary to our needs in such troubled times. At my insistence, we invited General LeMay to testify on the requirements of the Strategic Air Command. In addition, the high-ranking officials were searchingly questioned regarding related aspects of our defense needs. As a result, I offered an amendment which added a billion dollars to the Air Force appropriation for strategic bombers, tactical aircraft, tankers, and research and development. The amendment passed and some of these funds have, I understand, been utilized.

ANOTHER BATTLE LOOMING?

And now in this coming year it looks as though another fight is shaping up. The Secretary of Defense in a memorandum to the members of the Armed Forces Policy Council on November 26, last, stated that: "It is evident that the tactical air forces programed for Army support should be reconsidered and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been requested to furnish me—the Secretary of Defense—with their recommendations for specific adjustments as to the number and types of planned Army guided missile and unguided rocket units and with the number of Air Force tactical wings which may be eliminated as a result of these decisions."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If this is another attempt to reduce the 137-wing Air Force goal, I, for one, shall do everything in my power to defeat that purpose. I do not believe that in this time of world stress it is practical to reduce production goals in this essential weapon of defense. I stated when I first learned of this proposal that Congress has a responsibility here. I think we will win out on this matter as we did before.

CONCLUSION

I and my committee know that materiel resources are not the sole determiner of military effectiveness. In the last analysis our real strength lies in the caliber of men within the services. I know of your problems in recruiting and retaining skilled manpower. Our action to provide medical care for your dependents, to improve the survivors' benefit program, to increase reenlistment bonuses, to provide for increased military housing, to authorize increased mileage and temporary duty allowances, to improve retirement benefits, just to cite a few, were all designed to improve your life in a military career. I also recognize that more must be done and I visualize the need for a readjustment in the rates of military pay for technical personnel.

This country and all the free world are today threatened by a force which is as strong as it is evil. Men like yourselves stand ready to make the necessary sacrifices so that our country and our way of life shall endure.

You are the military planners of the future. As such, you can expect the Congress to continue to play an active role in evolving those programs which so profoundly effect our daily life and our national safety.

If the efforts of the Congress at times appear laborious it is because of the complexities involved. But in our concern for effective military forces we are just as cognizant of our responsibilities to you and your families as we are of our responsibilities to the American people—those whom you serve.

Through a clearer understanding of our mutual convictions and our mutual problems we can work together toward the common goal of peace and security.

Zoological Gardens To Be Constructed in Portland, Oreg.—Suggested Animal Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, no feature of a community is more important to children than a zoo. My home city of Portland, Oreg., is soon to have magnificent zoological gardens which will be without peer in the Nation. This zoo represents what truly will be a community undertaking. Its creation was authorized by the people at the polls. New buildings are being erected at far below normal costs, because both labor and industry are offering their services and materials either for nothing or at less than going rates.

In December my wife and I toured the lovely West Side Hills, where the zoo will be located. It will be nestled among towering fir trees and green ferns and other natural shrubbery. A half-size train, much larger than the ordinary miniature, will wind and twist through ravines and dells, and it will switchback its way up slopes and hillsides. This model railroad, alone, will be a feature of national attraction. Former railroad men, now in retirement, are advising and counseling on its construction.

Mr. President, as a gesture toward international amity with other lands, I have written to the Ambassadors and Ministers who represent friendly nations in our Capital, at Washington, D. C. I have suggested to them an exchange program between their countries and ours, so that animals can be provided for Portland's new zoo. I have proposed that big game and other creatures native to those countries be traded for animals which make their habitat in the State of Oregon, such as Columbian black-tail deer, black bear, elk, cougar or mountain lion, and mule deer. Because animals are such important symbols to children, this kind of program would serve to establish bonds of understanding that might endure for decades.

Mr. President, so that Members of the Senate can appreciate the wholehearted spirit of Portland's participation in the establishment of its oustanding new zoological gardens, I ask unanimous consent that four items dealing with this zoo appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They are: my letter proposing the animal exchange program to the Ambassadors and Ministers stationed in Washington; an excerpt from the newsletter Washington Calling, prepared by Mrs. Neuberger and I for November 1956, dealing with the pioneer interest demonstrated in the Portland Zoo by the late State Senator Austin F. Flegel; an article from the Portland Oregonian, of November 25, 1956, entitled "Designs Finished for Children's Train, Railroad Through Zoo," and an article also from the Portland Oregonian, of December 9, 1956, entitled "Barn Raising Methods To Cut Museum Costs."

I believe a study and examination of this material will lead to the inevitable conclusion that the forthcoming zoo in Portland, Oreg., will be an attraction of national and even international proportions and magnitude.

There being no objection, the letter and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
December 20, 1956.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: The city of Portland, largest metropolitan center in the State which I help to represent in the United States Senate, is undertaking the construction and development of a modern zoo which will be one of the finest in North America.

This is a community undertaking, with labor and management and municipal government cooperating to create a zoological garden that will be known throughout the world. Location of the zoo will be in the beautiful West Side hills of fir and other evergreen trees, which serve to make Portland unique among cities.

As a contribution to better understanding among nations—for animals are an eternal source of interest to children, who will be the next generation of citizens in all lands—I have a suggestion to propose.

Might it not be possible for our State of Oregon to exchange some animals for placement in zoological gardens in your own nation in return for native species from your country for exhibiting in the new Portland Zoo? Such an exchange would be of mutual benefit to both nations, and particularly to children in the two nations.

The new Portland Zoo will be most in need of these animals: Sun bear, kinkajou, spider monkey, coati-mundi, maraw, caribou, musk ox, dromedary, hippopotamus, hyena, Cretian ibex, rhinoceros, European bear, giant panda, ocelot, aardvark, rhea, and many other animals, waterfowl, and birds.

Our State of Oregon can offer from its native habitat and feeding grounds such big-game animals as Columbian black-tail deer, black bear, elk, cougar, mountain lion, coyote, antelope, and many smaller animals such as beaver, fox, porcupine, and others. Should further information be desired by you or your staff at the embassy, I shall be happy to go into greater detail. The Portland Zoo Commission and the Oregon State Game Commission are sources of additional data of a technical or biological nature.

It is my hope that this suggestion of mine will meet with a favorable response.

With warm regards for the Christmas season, I am

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From Washington Calling of November 1956]

AUSTIN F. FLEGEL: 1880–1956

(By Richard and Maurine Neuberger)

In the Oregon State Senate, my desk was next to that of Austin Flegel. His sometimes brusque manner hid a warm heart and affectionate nature. He had a genuine capacity for friendship. Had he been victorious in 1950 I believe firmly he would have made one of Oregon's greatest governors.

Yet there are other ways to endure in the memory of one's community than through politics. On the day before Austin Flegel's funeral, I was taken to the site of the new Portland Zoo by Edward M. Miller of the zoo commission. We also strolled to the tiny old zoo. Most of the exhibits were empty, but one teemed with people. Above a packed throng of little boys and girls towered the gray head and trunk of a baby elephant. This was Rosie, sent from the jungles of Thailand by Austin Flegel as a gift to the children of Portland. The children squealed with pleasure as Rosie raised her long trunk in the air and begged for peanuts.

To live on in the hearts of children is perhaps the best tribute of all. I hope this can be made official by naming the new project the Austin F. Flegel Memorial Zoo.

[From the Portland Oregonian of November 25, 1956]

DESIGNS FINISHED FOR CHILDREN'S TRAIN, RAILROAD THROUGH ZOO

Design for the half-size streamline train which will travel a scenic route around Portland's new zoo has been completed and the city zoo commission has asked that the city council hasten construction of the train and its mile-and-a-quarter track system so that it may be ready for planned opening of part of the new zoo late next summer.

At the same time the zoo commission revealed a hope that the railroad system included in zoo cost estimates can later be extended an additional mile and a half to provide a rail connection between the new zoo and Washington Park.

Estimated cost of the train of a diesel locomotive and 4 cars is $64,457, but the zoo commission has a plan it hopes may cut this cost by $10,000.

On the basis of experience of zoos elsewhere, the zoo commission is confident the train—which it believes will rank "as one of

the finest recreation trains in the Nation"—will be a moneymaker and an important source of income for operation of the zoo.

REFUGEE DESIGNS TRAIN

The train was designed by John Flaschner, designer for Northwest Marine Iron Works, who before his flight from his native Hungary 12 years ago helped design full-scale trains for a great Hungarian locomotive and car works. Many of the trains he helped design are still in service on South American and African railroads.

The zoo train will be a half-size replica of regular streamline trains in almost everything except interior accommodations. Its locomotive, powered by an industrial type diesel engine, follows in general appearance the General Motors "Aero Train" locomotive. Its consist will be 3 standard cars and 1 club car. The 4 cars will seat 132 children or 99 adults.

The coaches, each 6 feet 3 inches high, 5 feet wide and 21 feet long, will be divided into compartments by the cross-car seats, each entered by separate doors. The eight doors on each car will be provided with safety latches, controlled from the engine cab, so that the doors may not be opened except when the train is stopped.

In the standard coaches all the seats face forward, but in the club car they will be arranged back to back with small tables between the facing seats. Bottled soft drinks and confections will be available in the club car.

Window openings at each side of each seat will be unglassed.

There is even provision to give children, probably at a slight increase in fares the thrill of riding in the locomotive. The locomotive design includes a premium seat compartment at the rear, giving a view into the engineroom and of the engineer at his controls in the cab.

AIR BRAKES PLANNED

The locomotive, almost 24 feet long, will weigh 12,000 pounds to develop necessary tractive effort. It is equipped with all standard and most modern features. It will have dead-man control which brings the train to a gentle stop if the engineer should faint or suffer a disabling attack. The engineer will control the locomotive with push buttons. A governor will hold speed to a 15-mile-an-hour maximum.

The diesel engine's 140-brake horsepower will be transmitted to 4 driving wheels through a hydraulic transmission and worm gear axle drive units.

A conventional automatic air brake system working on all cars and the locomotive, will provide safe and positive stops.

The train will operate on 30-inch-gage track.

COST PLAN LAID

In its letter to the council through City Commissioner Ormond R. Bean, commissioner of parks, the zoo commission urged a negotiated contract with the designing firm, Northwest Marine, for construction of the train, which is willing to accept the job on a nonprofit basis as a civic project.

The zoo commission pointed out that the firm has spent hundreds of hours of research in designing the train and has information gained from consulting scores of manufacturers in effort to include available stock parts in the specifications wherever possible.

Under the tentative plan submitted by the zoo commission Northwest Marine would do the mechanical work and the H. Hirschberger Sheet Metal Co. would do the body work under a similar nonprofit arrangement.

The zoo commission paid tribute in its letter to Harry Mendenhall, vice president, Elton Clark, chief engineer, and Flaschner, in contributing heavily of their own and the Northwest Marine Co.'s time in preparing the train design.

Herb Ketell, who heads the zoo commission's railroad committee, observed that valuable design advice was also given by L. R. Smith, division superintendent, and F. R. Olds, master mechanic, of the Southern Pacific. The Southern Pacific is also surveying the route for the proposed extension of the zoo line to Washington Park without charge.

DOME CARS DUE

The commission said it hoped also to invite suppliers to contribute materials or supply them at cost as a contribution to the civic project. It estimated that by use of the negotiated contract and anticipated donations the engineers' estimate of $64,457 for the train could be reduced by as much as $10,000.

The zoo commission is also hopeful of some donations of construction work in carrying out its tentative right-of-way extension to Washington Park.

The zoo railroad as presently planned will serve as transportation within the zoo and provide through the plastic-domed cars a variety of views of the zoo area as well as of the city and distant mountains.

The 6,460 feet of track in the system looping the zoo area will include 2 tunnels, 1 of 200 feet in length and 1 of 125 feet, a trestle of 550 feet in length, 3 overpasses crossing motor roads or walkways and 4 stations.

From the entrance station, the road descends behind the lion house into the ravine with its birdhouse and pools, landing in the midst of the wooded picnic area to the north. Returning through the aquatic bird exhibits area the road turns east through the treetops to the second station which opens into the zoo near the main concession area with the duck pond, elephants, bears, and monkeys nearby.

Continuing east with views of the city and mountains, the line turns south into a tunnel emerging near the deer paddocks along the southeast fringe of the zoo, arriving at the third station not far from the small mammals exhibits and the central paddocks area. From this point the line returns north and west over an elevated route above the bear grottos, giving broad views of the zoo to the north and south, and finally tunnels under the children's zoo, emerging at the zoo entrance for another trip.

ANIMAL LINE NAME SOUGHT

Bluebird, Zooper Chief, or Zooliner?

The Portland Zoo Commission, which has faced the problem of naming elephants, soon will have the problem of naming a train and some volunteers have already started suggesting some.

Designer John Flaschner likes Bluebird for his train and put that name on design sketches.

Others have played on the names of famous streamlined trains. The Rosy Zoophyr? Zooper Chief? Zooliner City of Portland? Or how about the Portland Rosy?

As for a line name, maybe it will be Rosy, Monk Island, and All Around Railway—the Zoo View line.

[From the Portland Oregonian of December 9, 1956]

BARN RAISING METHODS TO CUT MUSEUM COSTS

Portland will witness what probably will be the most prodigious modern version ever conceived of an old fashioned "barn raising" community enterprise when the new science center of the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry begins to take shape early next year.

Labor, management, public-spirited citizens, business firms, and professional men already have joined in the type of community action that raised new homes for burned out families in American communities and built new schoolhouses in the ashes of smoldering classrooms.

This support of Project Science, the designation the Museum of Science and Industry gave to its campaign for a new science center a year ago, may give Portland a center worth more than $500,000 for as little as one-third of its actual cost.

BOARD DATES START

Ground breaking for the science center, on a 4-acre tract donated by the city near the entrance to the new Portland zoo, has been set by the museum board of directors for February of 1957.

A résumé Saturday of the figures necessary for consideration in planning the building indicated this status. Cost of materials, approximately $303,000; cost of labor, approximately $128,000; expenses for such items as taxes, insurance, social security, and many other incidentals, $57,000; total cost, $489,000.

The museum board Friday had $137,500 in cash and pledges, of which $97,752 was in the bank and drawing interest, reported Dr. Samuel L. Diack, chairman of the board. The solicitation of funds, which never has taken the form of an aggressive drive, will continue.

MAN WAIVES FEE

The barn-raising principle of community cooperation in Project Science has had these results so far:

The assumed contractor's cost of constructing the center is approximately $579,000. The fee of the general contractor, Henry M. Mason, of the Henry M. Mason Co., Inc., an item estimated as much as $90,000, will be waived. This generous gift will reduce the overall cost figure to $489,000.

The group of subcontractors who made the estimates on the building, some of them 10 to 15 pages in length, waived their fees.

Labor unions have indicated they will participate both physically and financially, each trade union in its own field, to reduce cost of the building by a substantial amount, some by direct contribution of the unions, some of individual contribution of labor, perhaps some a combination of both.

The Oregon building congress, which is composed of management and labor, has made Project Science its own project of the year.

BIG SAVING SEEN

Counting the contribution of the general contractor, the substantial gifts from labor, the savings in material under the community enterprise project, and many other helping hands, Robert Welch, first vice president of the museum board and Project Science chairman estimates a saving of some two-thirds of the $579,000 cost.

"Project Science will bring scientific and cultural advantages to Oregon it has not possessed before. Most important is that it will be a concrete demonstration to the community of the marvelous cooperation which exists between labor and management," said Welch.

Our Constitutional Rights May Be Nullified by Foreign Treaties—Adoption of House Joint Resolution 4 Will Protect Us From Losing These Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1957

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights, is the only

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

guaranty of individual freedom and liberty that protects the rights of our citizens against any usurpation of these rights. As long as the Constitution stands as the undisputed supreme law of the land, unchallenged from any foreign or domestic authority, the rights of Americans to enjoy the full blessings of liberty and to hand these liberties to posterity will be unabridged.

But in our time, in fact since the formation of the Union, a question has been raised in the courts of our land as to whether another law, outside of the Constitution, may not be considered as the supreme law of the United States, namely, the provisions set forth in any treaty negotiated by the President and duly ratified by the Senate.

This is a matter not to be lightly brushed aside. There are those, of course, who are experts on international law who would declare without reservation that no treaty entered into by the United States could be valid if it conflicts with any provision within the Constitution and its amendments. But court decisions have challenged this interpretation of international law from 1796.

The United States of America emerged as a Nation dedicated to the freedom and independence of the individual only after the bloody and terrible struggle of the Revolutionary War. Upon winning independence the American colonists zealously labored to insure that the blessings of liberty would be preserved in our land for endless generations of the future; and before the necessary number of States would ratify the new Constitution, a solemn promise was made that the first Congress would amend the Constitution to include a bill of rights which would specifically guarantee to every citizen certain inalienable rights which would forever secure the individual liberty of Americans and would serve as a shield to protect them against any threat of tyranny and oppression.

Later when each of our 48 States drafted individual constitutions, the civil rights of United States citizens were considered so important that the bulk of the provisions guaranteeing these rights within the Federal Constitution were incorporated in some form into the constitutions of the new States.

Only the United States of America, among all the nations of the world, gave such freedom to each and every one of its citizens, and under these freedoms men from all walks of life, born in poverty and wealth but with equal opportunity, have chosen their own destiny and watched their dreams become reality as they built our mighty Nation.

Each generation of American manhood has recognized that liberty is indeed the jewel beyond price which other powers in a jealous world would envy, and that the wealth of the United States would be coveted by others. But whenever our land has been endangered and our liberty placed in jeopardy, our young men have rallied round freedom's banner, and thousands have bled and died that you and I and all other Americans, native born and naturalized citizens alike, can today enjoy life in this land as freemen.

There can never be too much protection of our freedom. No measure that will strengthen the guaranty of fundamental civil rights to our citizens should be neglected. Wherever a weak spot is found in the bulwark of our liberty, steps should and must be taken to shore it up without delay.

And today the danger signals have been raised by men of national reputation and standing in the legal profession of the United States, members of the bar, who foresee in view of United States court decisions and the present trend in international relations, that our civil rights are conceivably threatened by possible ratification of any treaty which, though apparently right in intent and desirable upon a surface examination of its contents, may after ratification be found to lend itself to legal interpretation which will shackle our freedom and limit even our most cherished rights—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

In article VI, paragraph 2, of the United States Constitution, we have the provision relating to the making of treaties which reads as follows:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The language of this provision in the Constitution has been subject to controversy among experts on international law and in the courts, and it is apparent today that this provision should be clarified by adequate constitutional amendment to reaffirm those principles of the rights of the individual upon which our Government is established. I have, therefore, introduced the following proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution which would end all controversy as to the effect of any treaty upon the civil rights of Americans as guaranteed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and will clearly state that no treaty shall ever abrogate those rights:

House Joint Resolution 4

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Treaties made under the authority of the United States and international agreements entered into by the President or by any other officer or agency of the United States shall be void to the extent that they abridge, abrogate, nullify, subordinate, or interfere with any of the rights guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Far too many of us have come to accept our constitutional rights as individual American citizens for granted. We do not realize that many peoples in other parts of the world do not enjoy such privileges of liberty. And it has been largely to enjoy these rights that so many hundreds of thousands have immigrated to our land to share our heritage and raise their families as Americans under the protection of the United States Constitution.

Here in our land, in addition to freedom of religion, speech, and the press, we are guaranteed the right of free assembly, the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, protection from illegal search and seizure, the right to public trial by jury, protection against unlawful imprisonment without a legal hearing, and the protection of private property which cannot be taken away from us even by the Federal Government without due process of law.

These rights must never be nullified. It is not enough to assume we are adequately protected as stated in the Constitution. It is imperative that any question as to interpretation of any act which might abridge these rights be removed by adequate constitutional amendment, as I have proposed.

A study of the history of court decisions relating to treaties in the United States clearly establishes the fact that the provision in the Constitution relative to treaties has been subject to continuous examination and controversy.

As early as 1796 Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Samuel Chase stated:

> It is the declared will of the people of the United States that any treaty made by the authority of the United States shall be superior to the constitution and laws of any individual State.

At a later date Secretary of State Edward Livingston, serving in the Cabinet of President Andrew Jackson, stated:

> The Government of the United States presumes that whenever a treaty has been duly concluded and ratified by the acknowledged authorities competent for that purpose, an obligation is thereby imposed upon each and every department of the Government, to carry it into complete effect, according to its terms, and that on the performance of this obligation consists the due observance of good faith among nations.

In another early decision by our Supreme Court regarding the effect of treaties, Associate Justice James Iredell said:

> The present Constitution of the United States affords the first instance of any government which, by saying treaties should be the supreme law of the land, made it indispensable that they should be published for the information of all. At the same time I admit that a treaty, when executed pursuant to full power, is valid and obligatory, in point of moral obligation, on all, as well on the legislative, executive, and judicial departments (so far as the authority of either extends, which in regard to the last, must, in this respect, be very limited) as on every individual of the Nation * * * because it is a promise in effect by the whole Nation to another nation.

In 1920, when the famous Migratory Bird case was finally decided by the Supreme Court, Associate Justice Oliver

Wendell Holmes handed down a decision which in substance proclaimed that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate, which may legally ratify a treaty by two-thirds of the Members present at the time, not two-thirds of the whole Senate. Since 1920, when the Migratory Bird case was decided, the United States Supreme Court has consistently followed this doctrine, both in the matter of the superiority of the provisions of a treaty over all State law and as to the scope of the treaty-making power being broad enough to make matters otherwise unconstitutional constitutional.

These are but a few of the examples that could be cited of court decisions and judicial opinions since the adoption of the Constitution establishing treaties as the supreme law of our land. And the question of whether or not a treaty under the present provision in our Constitution can supersede the Constitution itself is an open question.

It is important to recognize the fact that in every nation in the world with the exception of the United States—and to some extent France—a treaty, though an international agreement between the signatory nations, requires implementation before it becomes law, that is, subsequent legislation adopted and approved by the governing body.

In 1944 a prominent English lawyer, Professor Lauterpacht, pointed out to America the danger inherent in the treatymaking provision of our Constitution when he warned that there was in America a third body of law, the ratified treaty, of at least equal dignity with our Constitution, and which superseded all State constitutions, decisions, and laws covering the same subject, and was superior to all prior enacted laws of Congress on the same subject, and which dangerously approached the status of an amendment to our Federal Constitution.

If there is a trend toward using the treatymaking power to enact new local laws or nullify existing local laws and to change the relationship between the States and the Federal Government and to change even our Constitution and our form of Government, this constitutes a most serious threat to our American rights and liberties.

It is our duty as representatives of the people to guard against any threat to the basic individual rights and freedoms of Americans, and to be ever alert to the need for legislative action to strengthen the laws which guarantee these basic individual rights and freedoms.

As Alfred E. Smith once said:

I say * * * that the Bill of Rights is the soul of the Constitution, and I hope that it will forever be related to the people, to the end that if it is ever threatened, the American people will rise—as a united body—and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights against whoever threatens them * * * with the last drop of their blood.

My proposed amendment to the Constitution, House Joint Resolution 4, would not in any way limit or deter the powers or authority of the President or the Secretary of State to negotiate treaties with foreign nations, but it would protect and guarantee citizens of the United States against the abrogation or nullification of any constitutional rights guaranteed to them in the Constitution of the United States.

Adoption of the constitutional amendment which I have proposed will clearly establish forever the rights of United States citizens under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and there could be no further question as to any expressed or implied power of a treaty entered into by the United States to have any effect under any circumstances upon these basic rights.

For this reason I have introduced House Joint Resolution 4 which should have the early attention of the Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we again assemble in this Chamber, wilt Thou beget in us that more beneficent spirit which never seeks Thy blessings merely for our own personal pleasure and profit but for the welfare of all mankind.

Show us how we may give courage and consolation to all whose heads are bowed low by the blows of adversity and who mourn in secret behind a smiling face.

We pray that our minds and hearts may be filled with those higher impulses and nobler instincts that will counteract every selfish and self-centered spirit which tends to disintegrate our social order.

Grant that daily our character may resemble and grow into the likeness of our blessed Lord and bear testimony to our kinship with Him.

In His name we offer our prayers. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 14, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 103) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: August H. Andresen, Minnesota; William B. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Clifford G. McIntire, Maine; William R. Williams, New York; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Henry Aldous Dixon, Utah; Wint Smith, Kansas; Otto Krueger, North Dakota; Charles M. Teague, California; Donald E. Tewes, Wisconsin.

Committee on Appropriations: Hamer H. Budge, Idaho; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin.

Committee on Armed Services: Katharine St. George, New York; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Charles S. Gubser, California.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Henry O. Talle, Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Gordon L. McDonough, California; William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania; William E. McVey, Illinois; Edgar W. Hiestand, California; Perkins Bass, New Hampshire; Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Connecticut; Eugene Siler, Kentucky; John E. Henderson, Ohio; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan.

Committee on District of Columbia: Sid Simpson, Illinois; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland; Joe Holt, California.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Albert H. Bosch, New York; Joe Holt, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; Stuyvesant Wainwright, New York; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts; William H. Ayres, Ohio; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; Harry G. Haskell, Jr., Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; Charles B. Brownson, Indiana; George Meader, Michigan; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Victor A. Knox, Michigan; William E. Minshall, Ohio; Edwin H. May, Connecticut; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; H. Allen Smith, California; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; John H. Ray, New York.

Interior and Insular Affairs: A. L. Miller, Nebraska; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; J. Ernest Wharton, New York; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; William A. Dawson, Utah; Jack Westland, Washington; John R. Pillion, New York; Craig Hosmer, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; James B. Utt, California; E. Keith Thomson, Wyoming; Phil Weaver, Nebraska; Harold R. Collier, Illinois.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Robert Hale, Maine; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; John B. Bennett, Michigan; John V. Beamer, Indiana; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Steven B. Derounian, New York; J. Arthur Younger, California; William H. Avery, Kansas; Bruce Alger, Texas; Will E. Neal, West Virginia.

Committee on Judiciary: Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Patrick J. Hillings, California; William E. Miller, New York; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; John M. Robsion, Jr., Kentucky; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; William C. Cramer, Florida; Arch A. Moore, Jr., West Virginia;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Russell W. Keeney, Illinois; F. Jay Nimtz, Indiana.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Timothy P. Sheehan, Illinois; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; John H. Ray, New York; William S. Mailliard, California; Francis E. Dorn, New York; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; A. D. Baumhart, Jr., Ohio; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Vincent J. Dellay, New Jersey; Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania; Robert J. McIntosh, Michigan.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; August E. Johansen, Michigan; Stuyvesant Wainwright, New York; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; David S. Dennison, Jr., Ohio.

Committee on Public Works: J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Myron V. George, Kansas; Frank J. Becker, New York; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; William C. Cramer, Florida; John F. Baldwin, Jr., California; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; Walter S. Stauffer, Pennsylvania; Emmet F. Byrne, Illinois; Edwin B. Dooley, New York; William S. Broomfield, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Hugh Scott, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio; Robert J. McIntosh, Michigan.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Paul A. Fino, New York; Phil Weaver, Nebraska; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; H. Allen Smith, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, IOWA—COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk which was read, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1957.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Honorable Merwin Coad the Clerk has received a communication with reference to his election as a Member of this House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Iowa.

Questions here raised relate to the laws governing contested-election cases in the House of Representatives. Since only the House and the House alone may determine the matter here presented, this communication is transmitted herewith for consideration by the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 16)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am presenting with this message my recommended budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1958, which begins next July 1.

This is the fourth budget which I have transmitted to the Congress.

In my first budget message—that for the fiscal year 1955—I emphasized the administration's determination to chart a course toward two important fiscal goals—balanced budgets and tax reductions.

Reductions in spending evidenced in the 1955 budget made possible a large tax reduction and tax reform program.

The 1956 budget was balanced.

The 1957 budget will be balanced.

A balanced budget is proposed for 1958.

I believe this policy of fiscal integrity has contributed significantly to the soundness of our Nation's economic growth and that it will continue to do so during the coming fiscal year.

Budget totals

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Budget receipts	$68.1	$70.6	$73.6
Budget expenditures	66.5	68.9	71.8
Budget surplus	1.6	1.7	1.8

This budget is for the first fiscal year of my second term in office. In making plans for the coming year, I have been guided by the following national objectives:

1. Peace, justice, and freedom for our own and other peoples;

2. Powerful Armed Forces to deter and, if need be, to defeat aggression;

3. A healthy and growing economy with prosperity widely shared;

4. Enhancement of individual opportunity and the well-being of all our people;

5. Wise conservation, development, and use of our great natural resources;

6. Fiscal integrity;

7. A well-balanced choice of programs at home and abroad; and

8. Increasing international trade and investment essential to the growth of the economies of the United States and the rest of the free world.

We have made considerable progress toward these goals. We will continue this progress in the years ahead.

BUDGET POLICY

Today, almost 12 years after World War II, the United States has demonstrated that it is possible to sustain a high-employment economy independent of war and continually unbalanced Federal budgets. Adjustments to changing economic circumstances have been and are being made successfully. Productivity and living conditions have improved. With sound public and private policies, the prospect for continued economic growth is bright.

Attainment of that goal is possible only with prudent management of the Government's fiscal affairs. Our Federal budget must contribute to the Nation's financial stability and to the preservation of the purchasing power of the dollar. Maintaining a sound dollar requires of us both self-discipline and courage. At a time like the present when the economy is operating at a very high rate and is subject to inflationary pressures, Government clearly should seek to alleviate rather than aggravate those pressures. Government can do its part. But business and labor leadership must earnestly cooperate—or what Government can do in a free society at a time like this will not prevent inflation.

For the Government to do its part in the coming year, taxes must be retained at the present rates so that receipts will exceed budget expenditures and the public debt can be further reduced. The prospective budget surplus in the fiscal year 1958 will reinforce the restraining effect of present credit and monetary policies. The present situation also requires that less pressing expenditure programs must be held back and some meritorious proposals postponed.

Expenditure and appropriation policy: While taking present economic conditions into consideration, the budget must also reflect the general responsibilities of a Government which will be serving 172 million people in the fiscal year 1958. In the face of continuing threats to world peace, our collective security must be strengthened through alert international policies and a strong defense. Progress toward greater equality of opportunity for all of our people as well as toward a balanced development and conservation of our national resources must go forward. Emphasis must continue upon promoting, through private enterprise, the development and productivity of our economy.

We must move forward in some areas of investment while we hold back in others. For example, the needs for schools, highways, and homes are so urgent that I am proposing to move ahead with programs to help our States, cities, and people undertake such construction at a prudent rate. However, in view of the present active competition for labor, materials, and equipment, I am not recommending some other desirable construction projects, and I have asked the head of each Federal agency to watch closely the timing of construction and to postpone work which can be appropriately put off until a later date.

It is also important to hold to a minimum any increase in Government personnel in the coming period. I have directed the heads of the Federal agencies to give renewed emphasis to their efforts in this regard—efforts which have resulted in a net reduction of approximately 240,000 in the civilian work force during the past 4 years. Vacant positions are to be filled by new employment only if careful review by each agency has demonstrated that the positions cannot be abolished or filled by transfer. All proposals which might produce higher Federal payrolls in the future will be critically examined and evaluated.

Continuation of balanced budgets into the future requires that the total of new authority to incur obligations, as well as the budget expenditures for the year, should be less than the total of realistically anticipated budget receipts. This policy of controlling budget authorizations, which has been followed since the beginning of this administration, has helped us move from a budget deficit of 9.4 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1953 to balanced budgets in 1956, 1957, and 1958.

In this budget the total of new authority proposed for 1958 is 73.3 billion dollars, 279 million dollars less than estimated budget receipts. Of the total recommended new authority, specific action by this session of the Congress will be necessary for 65.3 billion dollars. Other new authority, such as that for paying interest on the public debt, will become available under previously enacted permanent authorizations.

New authority to incur obligations [1]

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956	1957	1958
Proposed for enactment in this session:			
Recommended at this time	-------	-------	$56.7
Proposed for later transmission:			
Under existing legislation	-------	$0.8	(2)
Under proposed legislation	-------	0.8	8.6
Total	-------	1.6	65.3
Enacted prior to this session:			
Current authorizations	$53.3	60.7	-------
Permanent authorizations	9.9	8.2	8.0
Total	63.2	70.5	73.3

[1] For details see table 5 in pt. I of this budget document.
[2] Less than $50,000,000.

The total amount of new obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1958 is 2.8 billion dollars greater than the present estimates for 1957. Budget expenditures are estimated to increase by 2.9 billion dollars to a total of 71.8 billion dollars in 1958. These estimates include my proposals for new legislation as well as present programs.

For both new obligational authority and expenditures, about seven-tenths of the estimated increase between 1957 and 1958 is for the military functions of the Department of Defense, reflecting the higher costs of producing, operating, and maintaining the complex new weapons and equipment being delivered in growing quantities to our Defense Establishment. Other major increases are for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including my proposal for aiding school construction, and for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The figures contained in this budget for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 are not precisely comparable to the actual figures for prior years. Under the provisions of legislation enacted last year, the financial transactions for the greatly expanded Federal-aid highway program are included in a self-liquidating trust fund and are not in the budget totals.

Revenue policy: It is my firm belief that tax rates are still too high and that we should look forward to further tax reductions as soon as they can be accomplished within a sound budget policy. Reductions in tax rates would give relief to taxpayers and would also release funds for the activity and investment necessary for sustained economic growth through private initiative. However, the reduction of tax rates must give way under present circumstances to the cost of meeting our urgent national responsibilities.

For the present, therefore, I ask for continuation for another year of the existing excise tax rates on tobacco, liquor, and automobiles, which, under present law, would be reduced next April 1. I must also recommend that the present corporate tax rates be continued for another year. It would be neither fair nor appropriate to allow excise and corporate tax reductions to be made at a time when a general tax reduction cannot be undertaken.

In the area of taxation, I am especially interested in the problems of small business. Last August the Cabinet Committee on Small Business made a series of carefully considered recommendations in this field. Some relief in the tax burden affecting small business, as recommended by that Committee, which will give help with a minimum loss of revenue, should have early consideration by the Congress. Any changes involving substantial loss of revenue should be considered at a later time when a general tax reduction is possible.

The present estimates of budget receipts for 1958 are based on the assumption that the Nation will continue to have a high level of business activity with increasing national income, and that the present tax rates will be continued. They are the best estimates we can make at this time, but, since they relate to a period 6 to 18 months away, significant changes may take place before the fiscal year 1958 is ended.

Budget receipts [1]

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Individual income taxes	$35.3	$38.5	$41.0
Corporation income taxes	21.3	21.4	22.0
Excise taxes [2]	10.0	9.2	8.9
Other taxes [2]	2.2	2.5	2.6
Miscellaneous receipts	3.0	3.0	3.3
Refunds of receipts (−)	−3.7	−3.9	−4.2
Total	68.1	70.6	73.6

[1] For details, see special analysis B in pt. IV of this budget document.
[2] Net of transfers to trust funds.

Debt policy: The budget surplus for the fiscal year 1956 of 1.6 billion dollars was used to reduce the public debt. This budget provides for further reductions in the public debt for the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1958.

The successive reductions in the debt from 1956 through 1958 are modest in relation to its total size. Nevertheless, I hope that these reductions, plus the collection of corporation-tax payments on a more nearly current basis (as provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), will make it unnecessary to ask the Congress again for a temporary increase in the legal limit of 275 billion dollars to cover seasonal borrowing during the coming fiscal year.

Public debt [1]

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Public debt at start of year	$274.4	$272.8	$270.6
Change due to budget surplus (−)	−1.6	−1.7	−1.8
Change due to other factors [1]	(2)	−.5	+.4
Public debt at close of year	272.8	270.6	269.2

[1] For details, see table 4 in pt. I of this budget document.
[2] Less than $50,000,000.

The reduction in the public debt in the fiscal year 1957 is estimated to be larger than the budget surplus for that year, mainly because it is anticipated that some expenditures during the year can be financed by drawing down the amount of cash the Government has on hand.

For the fiscal year 1958, the reduction in the public debt will not be as much as the budget surplus. This situation results primarily from the fact that, in the aggregate, the trust funds are expected to draw down the amount of uninvested cash held for them by the Treasury.

Receipts from and payments to the public: The restraint on inflationary pressures which will be exerted by the budget surplus in the fiscal year 1958 will be reinforced by net accumulations in the trust funds which the Government administers. These trust fund accumulations, such as those for highways and for old-age and survivors and disability insurance, are the excess of current receipts over current payments. They constitute reserves for future use which are invested in Government securities.

When the Government's budget transactions are consolidated with trust fund and other transactions to give a picture of the flow of money between the public and the Government as a whole, the receipts from the public are estimated to exceed payments to the public by 3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1958.

Federal Government receipts from and payments to the public [1]

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Receipts from the public	$77.1	$81.7	$85.9
Payments to the public	72.6	78.2	82.9
Excess of receipts from the public	4.5	3.5	3.0

[1] For details, see special analysis A in pt. IV of this budget document.

The decline between the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 in the excess of receipts from the public results mainly from the estimated withdrawal of cash from the Treasury by the International Monetary Fund in 1957. The cash payments are made as the Treasury redeems the notes which were part of the United States subscription to the Fund. This subscription was made in the fiscal year 1947 and is therefore not part of current budget expenditures.

The excess of receipts from the public is estimated to be still lower in 1958 mainly because of higher net payments from trust funds.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

BUDGET PROGRAMS AND PERFORMANCE

By far the largest part of the budget for the coming fiscal year, 63 percent, will be devoted to maintaining and improving our own defenses and to strengthening the defenses and economies of other nations in the interest of collective security and world peace. Civil benefits will account for 24 percent of budget expenditures; interest, 10 percent; and all other operations, administration, and contingencies, 3 percent.

Budget expenditures by purpose [1]

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Protection, including collective security	$42.4	$42.7	$45.3
Civil benefits	15.3	16.5	16.9
Interest	6.8	7.3	7.4
Civil operations and administration	2.0	2.3	1.8
Allowance for contingencies		.2	.4
Total	66.5	68.9	71.8

[1] For details, see special analysis E in pt. IV of this budget document.

Protection, including collective security: As a simple matter of self-preservation, we must maintain our own strength and promote world stability by helping to build up the strength of friendly nations. At the same time, we must actively advance our other efforts for lasting peace and inform the world in all appropriate ways of our peaceful aims.

The new and more powerful weapons which are being delivered to our Armed Forces in increasing quantities and varieties are much more costly to produce, operate, and maintain than the weapons they are replacing. Furthermore, we are now engaged in the development of a whole new family of even more advanced weapons for all the services. Large expenditures will be required to bring these weapons into use. During the transition, we must continue to purchase enough of the current types to preserve our readiness until the effectiveness of the advanced weapons is demonstrated in tests. Despite these upward pressures on expenditures, future defense costs must be held to tolerable levels. Effective action must be taken to improve efficiency and to maintain a proper balance between expenditures for future military strength and expenditures for current readiness.

Expenditures for protection, including collective security

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Major national security programs:			
Department of Defense—military functions	$35.8	$36.0	$38.0
Mutual security program—military	2.6	2.6	2.6
Atomic Energy Commission	1.7	1.9	2.3
Stockpiling and defense production expansion	.6	.4	.4
Subtotal	40.6	41.0	43.3

Expenditures for protection, including collective security—continued

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Related programs:			
Mutual security program—economic, technical, and other	$1.6	$1.5	$1.8
United States Information Agency	.1	.1	.1
Federal Civil Defense Administration	.1	.1	.1
Selective Service System	(1)	(1)	(1)
Subtotal	1.8	1.7	2.0
Total	42.4	42.7	45.3

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

The introduction of new equipment and weapons with vastly greater combat capability is also having a powerful impact on concepts of military strategy, tactics, and organization. The combat power of our divisions, wings, and warships has increased to such an extent that it is no longer valid to measure military power in terms of the number of such units.

I have given careful consideration to the many complex factors which enter into the development of a well-balanced military structure. I am convinced that the defense programs and funds for their support as recommended in this budget provide a wise and reasonable degree of protection for the Nation.

Our nuclear weapons and our ability to employ them constitute the most effective deterrent to an attack on the free nations. We shall continue to expand our nuclear arsenal until an agreement has been reached for reduction and regulation of armaments under safeguarded inspection guaranties.

At the same time, we are increasing the portion of the production of fissionable materials allocated to peaceful uses at home and abroad and we look forward to the day when all production may be used for peaceful purposes. This budget provides for increased effort on power reactor development and on new uses of atomic energy in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. It will also make possible greater sharing of our peaceful atomic energy developments with other nations through the atoms-for-peace program.

World events continue to demonstrate the value of our programs of mutual assistance. Continued assistance, both military and economic, to friendly nations will provide the essential margin beyond their own resources needed to support and strengthen their defenses and their economies. The intensified worldwide conflict of ideas also requires a further increase in our programs of international information.

Civil benefits: During the past 4 years, the Government has acted affirmatively to advance the everyday well-being of our people by helping to improve their economic opportunities, helping to provide safeguards against economic and physical hazards, and helping to build needed public assets. The Government's leadership in assisting the people to satisfy their own needs has been so exercised that steady progress has taken place without paternalistic interference.

In the fiscal year 1958 we shall continue to move forward with many civil benefit programs already established by law.

Expenditures for civil benefits

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Additions to Federal assets	$3.5	$3.0	$3.4
Long-range development	2.0	1.8	2.3
Current expense items	9.7	11.7	11.1
Total	15.2	16.5	16.8

To aid agriculture in its adjustments to new technologies and to changed world production and consumption patterns, the soil bank program will help reduce the production of surplus crops. Additional marketing research and service activities will develop new markets and new uses for our farm products. Watershed protection, aid to low-income farmers, and assistance in overcoming the problems of drought, wind erosion, and floods will be expanded.

The Federal Government is assisting the States and private enterprise to make major advances in our transportation system. Traffic control on our airways is being continually improved as new equipment is developed and becomes available. Orderly replacement by private shipping lines of the merchant ships built during World War II is underway. Through grants paid from the highway trust fund, the States, in partnership with the Federal Government, are beginning a 13-year program to complete construction of the Interstate Highway System.

Under the urban renewal program, which combines Federal, local, and private efforts, 41 urban renewal projects will have been completed by the close of the fiscal year 1958, and 531 more will be in various stages of planning or construction. Private financing of housing for military families, elderly families, cooperatives, and other groups having special difficulties in obtaining homes will be encouraged by special mortgage insurance and mortgage purchase programs.

Over the 3-year period, 1955 through 1957, nearly 400 new water-resource projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and water supply will have been started and about one-half of these projects will still be under construction in 1958. Because of the need for continued and orderly development of our resources, I recommend that construction be started at a modest rate in 1958 on some new projects for which planning is well advanced. Funds for initiating immediately the planning of new public works projects which the Congress is expected to authorize are also included in this budget.

Increased expenditures will be made for sound programs of health research and grants for hospitals, clinics, and diagnostic and rehabilitation centers.

Legislative recommendations for new civil benefits involving major expendi-

tures are being confined to needs of the highest priority and will be discussed later in this message.

Interest: Expenditures for interest are estimated to rise 100 million dollars to 7.4 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1958, despite reductions in the public debt in 1956, 1957, and 1958. The increase in interest charges is due to refinancing securities maturing during the coming year at the higher rates of interest which reflect the heavy demand for credit and capital throughout our prosperous economy.

Civil operations and administration: Expenditures for the remaining operations of the Government are estimated to be 1.8 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1958, an amount 425 million dollars less than in 1957 and 185 million dollars less than in 1956. The decreases occur primarily because certain payments heretofore made by the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Department will be charged to the appropriations of the several agencies in accordance with legislation enacted last year. These are the payments which the Government, as employer, makes to the civil service retirement fund and those which it makes for certified bills presented too late for payment in the regular way. This improved accounting procedure shows with greater accuracy the total cost of various agency programs and is responsible for part of the increase shown in the expenditures for protection and civil benefits.

Allowance for contingencies: Sound budgeting requires that some general provision be made for contingencies which may arise in the coming period. This is especially important today, in view of uncertain world conditions. The Congress is not being asked to appropriate for purposes not known. This item makes allowance in the budget totals for probable future requests, including those to cover the cost of some legislative proposals for which the timing of expenditures is uncertain. As the needs arise, and as new legislation is passed, a specific request for funds will be made in each case. The amount allowed for expenditures is 400 million dollars, slightly over one-half of 1 percent of total budget expenditures estimated for 1958.

Management improvement: The administration is constantly striving to improve the management of Government. Vigorous measures to increase efficiency have shown results in many Government operations.

In the Veterans' Administration, for example, the staff in nonmedical activities has been reduced by 10,000 in the past 4 years. Some of this reduction was made possible because of smaller numbers of insurance and readjustment payments, but most of the reduction in staff reflects better procedures, including extensive mechanization of operations.

In the overseas supply activities of the Department of Defense, new procedures employing faster communications and better transportation service have been established. These improved methods of supplying overseas units substantially reduce inventory requirements and thus save both capital investment and costs of handling.

In the Post Office Department, despite an 11 percent rise in the volume of mail in the 4 fiscal years 1954 through 1957, the average employment will have increased only a little more than 3 percent. This is concrete evidence of the value of new methods, organization, and equipment.

After intensive reviews of their real property holdings, Government agencies over the past 3 fiscal years have transferred excess property costing over 131 million dollars to other agencies, thus reducing the volume of purchases needed by those agencies to meet new requirements. In addition, surplus real property worth 366 million dollars, including almost all of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants, has been sold, thus putting most of this property on the tax rolls.

In accordance with the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, an Office of Accounting has been established in the Bureau of the Budget to help the Federal agencies to improve further their financial management and, in that connection, to put into effect the principles of accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting approved in legislation enacted last year. Modern accrual accounting will make possible better management through improved information needed to control costs.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

This year I discussed only a few of the administration's legislative recommendations in the state of the Union message. Therefore, this part of the budget message is devoted to a discussion of other major proposals for legislation on which I recommend that the Congress take action during the present session. The legislative program is one on which the Congress and the executive agencies should be able to work together successfully.

In the course of the next few months the administration will recommend to the Congress a number of important legislative proposals. In the immediate future, I shall forward a message emphasizing the urgency of enactment of an adequate program of Federal aid for school construction, and a message on my proposals for amendment of our immigration laws. In connection with the administration's proposals on education, this budget provides for the start of a 4-year program of aid for school construction.

Two areas need earnest and prompt attention with a view to determining whether new national policies should be adopted in the light of reports and recommendations now pending in the Congress. These are numerous detailed recommendations of the second Hoover Commission which the committees were unable to consider prior to adjournment of the 84th Congress and the proposals made by the Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization. Legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Committee was the subject of hearings during the last Congress. Because of the importance of strengthening our transportation system, these hearings should be completed in the present session. Proposals for legislation will again be submitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

Substantial budget increases are recommended for existing activities which will improve the health of the American people. The Congress is also urged to enact legislation under which the Federal Government can help the medical and dental schools to build more and better teaching, as well as research, facilities to prevent the already acute shortage of trained medical manpower from becoming critical. It is also time to enact the necessary statutory basis for expansion and improvement of voluntary health insurance plans under which smaller insurance companies and nonprofit associations could pool their resources and experience.

In the welfare field, additional funds are likewise provided in the budget, and the Congress is urged to enact a new program of grants to the States to help fight juvenile delinquency.

In recent years, a succession of legislative enactments has moved a long way toward the goal of universal social security coverage, but there are a number of collateral steps which will add much to the meaning of our social security system as a whole. In part, these steps can be taken by budgetary action, for example, by giving particular attention to the needs of the rapidly increasing number of older persons in our society. Other steps will require legislation. First, the unemployment insurance system should be extended and improved. Similarly, congressional action is recommended to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional workers. The Secretary of Labor will make recommendations on this act when hearings are held by the committees of the Congress. The Federal 8-hour laws should be revised and brought up to date and legislation should be enacted to assure equal pay for equal work. A modest program of grants under which the States can increase their efforts to improve occupational safety should be initiated. Likewise, legislation should be enacted to require the registration of employee pension and welfare funds to protect the interests of beneficiaries.

Of particular importance are recommendations to protect and foster the initiative of the small-business man. The Small Business Act should be extended. In order that small business may have better opportunity to secure adequate financing, issues of securities up to 500 thousand dollars should be exempted from the regular registration provisions of the Securities Act of 1933. Similarly, the Congress should enact legislation providing for notification to the Federal Government of proposed business mergers, and should amend the procedural provisions of the antitrust laws to facilitate their enforcement. Wage reporting for income tax and social security purposes should be consolidated and simplified. Other means of assisting small business will be discussed in the Economic Report.

I repeat my recommendation of last year for the prompt enactment of appropriate authority under which communities can be assisted in solving basic problems of persistent unemployment.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

At the present time, I do not contemplate proposing an extensive program of personnel legislation comparable to the numerous constructive measures enacted in the last several years. Certain needed improvements in central personnel management are discussed in the general government section of my budget analysis. All of these measures deserve early attention and enactment by the Congress. In addition, the Secretary of Defense is now studying recommendations of his Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation. Any legislative recommendations growing out of the work of this committee respecting personnel policies and compensation systems of the military services will be presented at a later time.

We should not let another year go by without taking the necessary action to place the Post Office on a pay-as-you-go fiscal basis. The case for adjusting postal rates needs no further justification. It is supported by a vast majority of the general public as well as by most of the business community. The administration has demonstrated its capacity for improving the postal service, installing new and more efficient methods and equipment, and cutting costs in accordance with good business practice. The Congress should take the further action needed to reduce the huge postal deficit. Then the further improvements needed in equipment and facilities can be made so that the American people may receive the mail service they deserve and have the right to expect.

Various agencies are being asked to review with the Congress the interest rates charged by the Government in connection with different kinds of loans, several of which have a fixed statutory maximum established when interest costs were much lower than today. It is desirable that there be more consistency and that more discretion be allowed in determining what going rates should be, dependent on the period of the loans and their conditions.

Recommendations concerned with proposed legislative changes in our housing laws will be found in the section of my budget analysis carrying the heading "Commerce and Housing."

With respect to farm legislation, certain changes are being recommended in the corn program. Farmers who use all the wheat grown on their own farms for seed, feed, or food should be exempt from marketing quotas and penalties. The basic authority for disposal of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies, title I of Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, should be extended for 1 year and an additional 1 billion dollars of authorization for losses under this title should be provided. Legislation should also be enacted authorizing the barter of nonstrategic Government-owned agricultural surpluses to the nations of Eastern Europe.

The program of the administration in the field of natural resources is fully set forth in that section of the budget analysis. It will not be repeated here, except to indicate my continuing firm support of the necessary legislative action to enable Federal agencies to participate more fully with States, local governments, and private groups in the development of partnership resources projects. I urge once again the prompt enactment of legislation which will enable the Fryingpan-Arkansas multiple-purpose project to get under way in the fiscal year 1958.

I also recommend prompt action by the Congress to decide how the Niagara power project can best be developed.

In returning the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill to the 84th Congress without my approval, I stated that legislation conforming to the basic objectives of that bill was needed. I am still of that opinion. It is essential that consumers of natural gas be protected. We must endeavor to make sure that there will be continued exploration and development of adequate field supplies of gas, and that producers' sales prices are arrived at fairly and competitively. In this way, and with authority vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate interstate pipelines as to the price at which gas may be charged as an item of cost in fixing their rates, the price to the public will be fair. Legislation freeing gas producers from public utility-type regulation is essential if the incentives to find and develop new supplies of gas are to be preserved and sales of gas to interstate markets are not to be discouraged to the detriment of both consumers and producers, as well as the national interest.

The Congress is urged to carry out the proposals of the Judicial Conference for additional Federal judges. Also, when a district or circuit court judge who is the senior judge of the district or circuit becomes 70 and chooses not to retire, he should be relieved of his administrative duties. Furthermore, whenever a district court judge reaches 70 and chooses not to retire, the Congress should provide that upon certification by the Judicial Conference of the need therefor, the President would be authorized to appoint an additional judge. When the judge who had reached 70 dies or retires, the vacancy thus created would not be filled.

Although it is not within my province to make any recommendation, I am deeply interested in the suggestion which has been made that the Congress should consider inviting the Chief Justice of the United States to address the Congress annually on the work of the judiciary and to present the recommendations of the Judicial Conference.

I recommend again that the Congress enact suitable legislation providing for home rule in the District of Columbia. Under any such system the citizens of the District should be authorized to elect local officials, to vote in Federal elections, and to have a Delegate in the House of Representatives.

I also recommend the enactment of legislation admitting Hawaii into the Union as a State, and that, subject to area limitations and other safeguards for the conduct of defense activities so vitally necessary to our national security, statehood also be conferred upon Alaska.

The platforms of both major parties have advocated an amendment of the Constitution to insure equal rights for women. I believe that the Congress should make certain that women are not denied equal rights with men. Similarly, I believe that the Congress should propose a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age in Federal elections.

As has already been indicated in the state of the Union message, continuation of military and economic assistance to the free nations of the world is a keystone of the administration's efforts to promote peace, collective security, and well-being for all peoples. Essential complements of these assistance programs are steps to increase international trade and investment. Both can be materially advanced by taking the actions necessary to avoid unfair tax duplications on business conducted overseas and by the prompt enactment of legislation approving United States membership in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. This administrative agency will greatly aid the orderly operation of existing arrangements governing multilateral trade to help prevent discrimination and restrictions against our foreign commerce.

Although necessity forces us to keep ever in mind the destructive power of nuclear weapons, it is equally essential that we keep in mind the firm determination of the United States to share the fruits of its efforts to develop the peaceful uses for atomic energy. Seventy-two nations have now signed the charter of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which was established under the auspices of the United Nations. Prompt action by the Congress is needed to authorize full participation by the United States in the work of this Agency. The United States has offered for distribution through this Agency 5,000 kilograms of fissionable uranium 235 out of the 20,000 kilograms previously offered for atomic research and power uses in other nations, as part of our atoms-for-peace program.

The analysis of the budget discusses present programs for veterans. A special message recommending changes needed in these programs will be transmitted to the Congress.

The remaining items to which special attention should be directed are (1) authorization to the President to make awards for distinguished civilian achievement, (2) establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, (3) acquisition and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President, and (4) amendment of the Government Corporation Control Act to provide for budget and audit control over Government corporations which are authorized, directly or indirectly, to obtain or utilize Federal funds. It is also recommended that the Congress give further consideration to legislation which would place Government appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis.

The other proposals which are parts of the administration's legislative program are discussed in my analysis of the budget. The fact that they are not included in this summary presentation in no way detracts from their importance or the strength of my recommendation that they be considered and enacted by the Congress in its present session.

ANALYSIS OF THE BUDGET

I am presenting my budgetary recommendations in greater detail under nine major program headings in the analysis of the budget which follows this message. The Economic Report will contain a further discussion of some of these proposals.

It is always difficult to make plans and forecast expenditures a year or more in advance. This is particularly true when historic events are taking place in Eastern Europe, when United Nations forces are deployed in the Middle East, when uncertainties abound in other parts of the world, and when in our own land economic change is continuous. This budget has taken into account present conditions and developments which today appear most likely at home and abroad. It provides funds for all necessary Government activities on a reasonable scale, and efforts will continue to be made by every executive department and agency to improve efficiency and to maintain expenditures well within the budget estimates. It is a carefully balanced budget—balanced in its receipts and expenditures, balanced in its choice of programs. I consider it well adapted to the needs of the present and the future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 16, 1957.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the budget message just read, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, last night at dinner my housekeeper said to me, "It is surprising, but everything that I priced at the supermarket today cost more money than before the holidays. It is surprising how much less your money will buy now in the stores as compared with what the same amount bought 2 or 3 years ago." She said, "I cannot understand it."

I think the people of the United States generally—the buyers in the stores—the consumers of the Nation—also fail to understand it.

They do not understand that this increase in costs—in every item in the cost of living—and this continuing and growing depreciation of the buying power of the dollar, is due solely and wholly to one thing. And that is spending made possible by the Congress under the recommendation and urgent insistence of the administration—due to spending in the appropriation bills which this message asks us to pass—and similar bills in past Congresses which similar messages have recommended.

It was a little surprising to hear in the budget message just read a statement to the effect that the increase in the cost of living has been stabilized and that the drop in the buying power of the dollar has been halted. Surely no such conclusion is borne out by the facts. It is not supported by the official reports of the Departments of the Government. It is not borne out by the experience of any man who sits in this body or anyone who goes into the market today to buy the necessities of life.

Just before I came to Washington I met a farmer and his wife whose house had burned down a few days previously. They were in great distress. They said, "When we insured our house we insured it for enough money to rebuild it, but, now that the house has burned and we try to put up another on the same foundation, we find that the cost of rebuilding—the cost of everything—has gone so high that the insurance will pay for only a small part of it."

I think many of you know families of men who have died and left insurance, which at the time it was taken out would have provided for those left behind. It is now wholly inadequate. The buying power of the dollar has dropped so low and the cost of living has climbed so high that all plans for protection of the family after the death of the father and husband are completely obsolete—the direct result of explosive spending in time of peace by this administration.

If a few years ago you bought a $1,000 bond, and you walk into the bank today to sell it, you find they will no longer pay you the face value of it. And remember it is a bond of the United States Government—the greatest Government on earth—you find it is selling below par and, if you bought that bond some years ago, the money you get for it today has only half the buying power it had when you bought it. You have lost more than $500 on that $1,000 bond because Congress has spent so much money and has paid so little on the national debt, and because the administration continues to bring in here every year steadily increasing budgets in time of peace—such a budget as we have before us this morning.

I talked only yesterday to a very prominent man in this city, a very successful man. If I should mention his name, there is not a man in this body that does not know him personally. He said, "My salary is so inadequate that I have had to borrow money to pay living expenses." That is a common experience. It is the experience of every veteran who gets a pension or compensation, of those who receive old-age pensions and those who receive social-security payments, of all on fixed salaries. Most of them are in financial distress because of the increased cost of living, because of the decreased value of the dollar.

And the cost of living continues to rise. The purchasing power of the dollar continues to shrink. Millions of American families including those with fixed income feel the effects. During the first 11 months of calendar year 1956, the cost-of-living index went from 114.6 to 117.8—an increase of 3.2 points. It reached the highest point in history in June 1956 but this was topped in July and new all-time highs were successively established in September, October, and November. In contrast, during 1952 the index rose only 1 point—from 113.1 in January to 114.1 for December.

No one denies that a dollar today is worth only about half what it used to be. One published index shows the following decline since 1952:

(1947–49=100)

1952	88.1
1953	87.4
1954	87.1
1955	87.3
1956 (6 months)	86.9

Upon careful analysis, this budget with its bleak and far-reaching implications, will be widely condemned as it so rightly should be. The Congress ought to effectively revise it so as to lead the way to sound spending and sound fiscal policies.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is the largest peacetime budget ever presented in the history of the United States. It is the largest peacetime budget ever presented in any country in the history of the world. It is $2,900,000,000 over last year's budget. As a matter of fact, when you count the highway expenditures, it is $3,500,000,000 above last year's budget.

But this is not the first year we have had a recordbreaking budget. Last year, the administration sent up here the largest peacetime budget any administration had ever presented since the administration of George Washington. And this year again the march is still upward.

Spending continues to climb even on basis of the recently revised method of reporting on the expanded highway program which resulted in omitting from budget totals the revenues and expenditures applicable thereto, now included in a separate trust fund. Valid comparison with years prior to fiscal 1957 require inclusion of such sums in 1957 and 1958 budget totals. On this basis, Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation summarizes the revenue, expenditure, deficit, and surplus situation for the 5 fiscal years.

Budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), fiscal years 1954–58

[In billions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal year 1954	$64.7	$67.8	−$3.1
2. Fiscal year 1955	60.4	64.6	−4.2
3. Fiscal year 1956	68.1	66.5	+1.6
4. Current fiscal year 1957 (estimates in 1958 budget, January 1957):			
(a) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	70.6	68.9	+1.7
(b) Including highway trust fund for comparisons with prior years	72.2	70.1	+2.1
5. Fiscal year 1958 (budget, January 1957):			
(a) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	73.6	71.8	+1.8
(b) Including highway trust fund for comparisons with prior years	75.8	[1] 73.6	+2.2
Totals, all 5 years:			
(a) Excluding highway trust fund (as per budget)	337.4	339.6	−2.2
(b) Including highway trust fund	341.2	342.6	−1.4

[1] This is only 1 percent below expenditures in fiscal 1953, which was a war year—the last fiscal year of the previous administration.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Full assessment of the projected surplus of $1.8 billions for 1958 will have to await more detailed examination, but you will note 2 items which directly affect it and which should be mentioned. It again assumes enactment of a postal rate increase, priced at $654 millions, which the Congress so rightly refused to enact last year. And it fails, without arresting reason, to include provision for adequate appropriation of the Government's share to the civil service retirement fund as seemed to be contemplated by legislation last year. The present deficit in the fund will continue to grow. One set of estimates on needed appropriation in this regard range from $600 million to $1.9 billions.

If the budget is adopted as presented, the cumulative 5-year record is a net estimated deficit of $1.4 billions counting the highway program and $2.2 billions without it.

But the message proudly claims the budget surpluses of 1956, 1957, and 1958 as achievements. They are not achievements. Practically every segment of the economy except the farmers are prospering. The ever-increasing national income mortgaged with excessively high tax rates produced these surpluses. Retrenchment in spending is not making any contribution whatever. In his budget message of a year ago, the President said:

> To reach a balanced budget in the fiscal year, 1956 and 1957, it will be necessary in addition to continuing everyday efforts to keep spending under control, to continue all the present excise taxes without any reduction and the corporation income taxes at their present rates for another year beyond April 1, 1956.

By any logical measurement, spending is not under control. In fiscal 1956, the first year of a surplus in the present administration, outlays were up $1.9 billions over 1955. The surplus was $1.6 billions. Expenditures continue to climb. And to produce a projected surplus for 1958, the President again recommends extension of the aforementioned tax rates. These are wartime tax rates, dating from the Korean war, which debate on the last rate extension bill flatly indicated would be needed to avoid continued deficits in peacetime. In today's message, we find some curious reasoning, amounting to contradiction, on this tax question. On page M8, the President says:

> It is my firm belief that tax rates are still too high and that we should look forward to further tax reductions as soon as they can be accomplished within a sound budget policy. Reductions in tax rates would give relief to taxpayers and would also release funds for the activity and investment necessary for sustained economic growth through private initiative. However, the reduction of tax rates must give way under present circumstances to the cost of meeting our urgent national responsibilities.

Previous budget messages have contained statements of similar import as regards burdensome taxes. But in a somewhat contradictory vein, on page M6, we find this language:

> Our Federal budget must contribute to the Nation's financial stability and to the preservation of the purchasing power of the dollar. Maintaining a sound dollar requires of us both self-discipline and courage. At a time like the present when the economy is operating at a very high rate and is subject to inflationary pressures, Government clearly should seek to alleviate rather than aggravate those pressures. Government can do its part. * * *
>
> For the Government to do its part in the coming year, taxes must be retained at the present rates so that receipts will exceed budget expenditures and the public debt can be further reduced.

Mr. Speaker, there is compelling basis for regarding this as tantamount to an excuse for not effectively holding Federal spending at a sensible level which would permit a balanced budget, tax relief, and significant payment on the debt. If we do not make real progress in these directions in time of record prosperity, when will we make it?

Actual spending has increased at an alarming rate, and I use the word "alarming" considerably. This administration in this budget—so far as actual spending is concerned—is only 1 percent behind that famous budget of 1953, so roundly abused on this floor at the time it was submitted. In time of peace, we are only 1 percent behind the total expenses of the Truman budget sent up here in time of war. As a matter of fact, we are now within $700 million, and that is a comparatively small matter when you consider the vast sums with which we are dealing, and which beyond peradventure of doubt, unless there is marked and drastic change in the policy of this administration, we will in the 1959 budget exceed—in time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, the most consistently accurate barometer of future spending levels is the dimensions of authority accorded to enter into obligations on behalf of the Government. No funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury save in consequence of valid authority to create the obligation. That is the key. Denial of authority to obligate precludes a subsequent expenditure. Grant authority to obligate and the expenditure inevitably will follow in due time. Many who advocate changing the basis of stating appropriation requests do not seem to fully appreciate this simple fact. At one time, all such authority was in the form of appropriations but other devices such as contract authority and public debt transaction outside the scope of appropriation bills, some in permanent law, have now come into use. No longer does the Congress have effective control over such authority exclusively in appropriation bills.

The current record on this all-important matter is anything but encouraging. It shows, for example, that in the aggregate, the 1958 budget requests $76.4 billions, an increase of $3.2 billions over total proposed for 1957. To grasp the trend compare 1958 with the actual figure for 1956—the first year the present administration shows a surplus. There is a $13.2 billion increase. It may be said that unexpended balances were drawn down in earlier years, but the bottom point on that has been reached and carryover balances are now on the upturn, so current grants of obligating authority constitute an accurate indicator of future spending. The following table also shows that from fiscal 1955, the low point in these 5 years, obligating authority as suggested in the 1958 budget would go from $57.1 billions to $76.4 billions, a $19.3 billion increase:

Appropriations and other authority to obligate

[A rearrangement of budget table 5 with certain additions]

[Figures in millions]

	Enacted, 1954	Enacted, 1955	Enacted, 1956	1957		1958 (total proposed)	Change, 1958 versus 1957
				Enacted	Total proposed		
1. Appropriations:							
Annual	$51,834	$45,774	$50,824	$56,546	$57,642	$63,907	+$6,165
Permanent	6,810	6,819	7,358	7,704	7,704	7,853	+149
Total, appropriations	58,644	52,593	58,182	64,250	65,346	71,660	+6,314
2. Authority to expend debt receipts	3,610	3,047	3,129	4,463	4,939	1,385	−3,554
3. Contract authorizations	880	960	2,406	342	342	391	+49
4. Reappropriations	412	1,207	423	70	70	23	−47
Total, all forms of authority	63,546	57,807	64,140	69,125	70,697	73,459	+2,762
5. Deduct amounts to liquidate prior contract authority	−781	−731	−942	−173	−174	−118	−56
Net new obligating authority per budget table	62,765	57,076	63,198	68,952	70,523	73,341	+2,818
6. Add highway trust fund for comparability with prior years:							
(a) New program authority (contract authority)	----------	----------	----------	2,580	2,580	2,905	+325
(b) Labor standards work	----------	----------	----------	(1)	(1)	(1)	----------
(c) Refund of gas taxes	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[2] 116	+116
Grand totals	62,765	57,076	63,198	71,532	73,103	76,362	+3,259

[1] Less than half a million.
[2] Offset in computing budget surplus by equal amount of budget receipts.

There is one amusing feature of this budget. In every budget heretofore submitted by the administration, pointed comparisons have been made with spending in fiscal year 1953 and with the last budget submitted by President Truman for fiscal 1954—comparisons favorable to the situation at the time and unfavorable to the previous administration. Fiscal 1953 was a war year and we were still at war in Korea when the 1954 budget was presented in January 1953.

The most telling admission of failure to control spending, to retrench and economize and thus enable substantial and systematic reduction of our staggering public debt, is the conspicuous absence of such pointed comparisons in the message this year. No longer is it advantageous to deprecate the fiscal 1953 and 1954 record. There is no more mileage left in such unfair comparisons. By way of summary, President Eisenhower's 1958 requests to obligate the Government exceed the comparable total in President Truman's 1954 budget (submitted when we were still at war) by $4.6 billions. The totals are: $76.4 billions for 1958, including the highway trust fund, as against $71.8 for 1954, which latter amount also included the highway program. As to actual expenditures, the 1958 peacetime budget call for $73.6 billions (again including the highway item for comparability) which is only 1 percent less than the $74.3 billions actually spent in the war year of fiscal 1953. Ever-increasing fiscal proposals being submitted by the administration appear to make it a certainty that spending in fiscal 1959 will go beyond the war year of 1953—the last wartime budget—written at the peak of devastating war.

We received many pledges of economy in 1952 and in 1956. They told us insistently and indignantly that they proposed to decrease spending; that they would retrench expenditures; that they were going to decrease the national debt and banish inflation. They were going to balance the budget.

They have not accomplished a single one of those laudable objectives. They are spending more. They are recommending in this message the expenditure of still more. There is no retrenchment. There is no economy, and the only reason the budget was balanced last year and will be balanced this year and next year is not through any action taken by this administration. It has exercised no economy. It is spending more than ever before, and it is asking more in this budget than ever before.

The balancing of the budget is due to two things. First, the enormous and unprecedented increase in the national revenue, and second to the fact that they are still levying the Korean wartime taxes. We are still paying war taxes although the war ended years ago.

So far as the debt is concerned there are several ways to measure performance against promise. One is the status of the Federal public debt—what do we owe? In times of general peacetime prosperity and peak levels of economic activity, simple prudence dictates that we should make substantial and systematic payments on our staggering debt. But instead of doing that, as promised unequivocally, we are making only token payments while consuming through ever-increasing expenditures the highest tax take in time of peace at close to the highest rates ever imposed. In consequence, during the 5 fiscal years of the present administration our national debt, as projected in the message read today, will be $3.1 billions higher than it was when the administration assumed fiscal responsibility. As the following tabulation shows:

The public debt

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
Fiscal year 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
Fiscal year 1955 (Juply 1954)	271.3
Fiscal year 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
Fiscal year 1957 (July 1956)	272.8
Fiscal year 1958, estimated (July 1957)	270.6
Fiscal year 1959, estimated (July 1958)	269.2
Increase during 5 years (July 1953–July 1958), as estimated in 1958 budget	+3.1

So, notwithstanding glittering promises, we are worse off in this respect than we were 5 years ago. And a significant but often unnoticed expenditure to carry this enormous burden is the inescapable item for interest which in 1958 is budgeted at $7,260,000,000, an increase of $100 million over 1957 and $514 million above 1956, notwithstanding slight reductions in the debt. The average interest rate has risen in the past 12 months from 2.49 percent to 2.67 percent. These facts lend additional urgency to need for making substantial reductions in the debt. At the rate recommended by this budget, it would take hundreds of years to pay it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I submit a tabulated comparison to pinpoint the trends of obligating authority in items other than defense military functions and foreign aid. All manner of increases have been and continue to be proposed in these categories. Furthermore, the import of past comparisons frequently has been that recommendations subsequent to the much abused 1954 budget have deleted those items and expenditures subjected to criticism. As will be noted, the table is replete with increases and almost totally devoid of decreases when 1958 budget proposals are compared to President Truman's 1954 budget. And lest it be assumed that 1958 requests have been held even close to the 1956 level, which is the year the administration first shows a surplus, an appropriate comparison of those 2 years is included.

New obligating authority for other than defense military functions and foreign aid, selected figures for fiscal years 1954, 1956, and 1958

[In millions of dollars]

	President Truman's budget request, 1954	Enacted 1956 (1st year showing surplus under present administration)	President Eisenhower's budget request, 1958	1958 budget request compared with—	
				President Truman's 1954 budget	Actually enacted for 1956
Legislative branch	$85	$199	$95	+$10	−$104
The Judiciary	29	37	45	+16	+8
Executive Office of the President and (other) funds appropriated to the President	8	60	47	+39	−13
Independent Offices (including GSA and HHFA)	[1] 8,271	8,344	9,995	+1,724	+1,651
Department of Agriculture	1,659	3,598	5,158	+3,499	+1,560
Department of Commerce	1,078	2,736	[2] 3,965	+2,887	+1,229
Department of Defense—civil functions	688	666	703	+15	+37
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,773	2,107	3,071	+1,298	+964
Department of the Interior	664	516	718	+54	+202
Department of Justice	187	211	235	+48	+24
Department of Labor	332	470	438	+106	−32
Department of the Post Office	669	470	[3] 67	−602	−403
Department of State	197	149	230	+33	+81
Department of Treasury	7,101	7,716	8,154	+1,053	+438
District of Columbia	12	30	42	+30	+12
Allowance for contingencies	50	----------	500	+450	+500
Totals	22,804	27,308	[2] 33,462	+10,658	+6,154

[1] Excludes $404 million, AEC appropriation, and $706 million RRB taxes, for comparability; includes $135 million for USIA.
[2] Includes, for comparability, $3,021 million under highway trust fund which beginning in 1957 is no longer included in "budget" totals.
[3] Assumes enactment of a $654 million postal rate adjustment bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the budget, and I am very much interested in balancing the budget. Last year, that is the fiscal year 1956, we balanced the budget by $2½ billion. We should, if things go along in about the same way that they went the first part of the year, balance the budget this year by at least three to four billion dollars. Our revenues have increased. The standards of living of our people have increased. It is true there has been some inflation. It is true there has been some increase in prices. On the other hand, the big increase and the big inflation came during the administration of Harry S Truman. That is when three-fourths of the inflation came, and that in spite of the fact that as the result of two Republican years during Harry Truman's administration we balanced the budget for him. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will go through the budget with a fine-tooth comb. I hope, as to each item that the committee feels, after careful hearing, should not be contained in the budget, that it will be eliminated, and they will report to the House and ask that the Committee cut down those appropriations to

what is actually needed. That is the job that stands in front of the Appropriations Committee today. Frankly, I believe there are some spots where we could make cuts, and I intend to point them out to the members of the committee as they approach their program. I hope that the appropriations that are brought in here by the committee will reflect the need of the Government, and nothing else. That is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee. When they go over it, if they find there is nothing that can be cut out, I will be disappointed. If they find something that can be, let us here in the House have the courage to make those cuts.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend him because he has made a fair statement and a true statement. I must say, as I listened to some of the arguments of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], it is difficult for me to understand where he actually stands and what he stands for. The gentleman from Missouri spoke of the 80th Congress. I was privileged to be majority leader at that time, and we took the budget then submitted by a Democratic President, Mr. Truman, and we reduced that budget by billions and billions of dollars.

The record will disclose that our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle did not give us much help. I will take that back in a measure, because there were some stalwart Democrats there who were not the free spenders some of the others were, but they did not give us the help we needed, and particularly when we had to override some vetoes.

In this Congress today the budget of a Republican President has been presented. The gentleman from Missouri says it is too big, that there is too much money in that budget. I will hazard the prediction right now that when the time comes to do something about that budget he will be lining up with those who would increase the spending rather than decrease it. I love him and respect him, but I have watched him too many times. I just hope that all of the new Members here will not be completely misled by this great show of determination and courage. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman from New York will let me go a little further——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want to call his attion to a few matters.

Mr. HALLECK. I have the floor. He has displayed apparently a new-found solicitude for the people who have invested their money only to see it consumed by the ruinous fires of inflation.

I say for the record that the gentleman from Missouri and those who have stood with him have been feeding those fires rather than trying to put them out—some of them. Some of us who through the years have known that it was illegal, that it was wrong, that it was unmoral to rob the people who bought insurance, who paid for social security, who invested in bonds. We believed it was wrong to rob them, although we sat here helpless except during that 80th Congress, and watched you chisel away some 48 percent of the value of those savings by the end of 1952. There has been an increase in the cost of living of only 4 percent in the last 4 years. That is a magnificent record of accomplishment, and a job done, if I must say so again, without the help of the gentleman from Missouri, by and large, and those who stand with him. It was accomplished with the help and the courageous action of a lot of folks in here who thought the time had come to balance the budget, which we have done, to reduce the people's taxes, which we have done, and to stop the inflationary process that was ruining our country.

I commend the budget message that we have just heard, because it moves further in that direction.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield right there?

Mr. TABER. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I am sorry the able and distinguished minority leader finds it necessary to resort to the tactics of the country lawyer who abuses his opponent when he has a bad case instead of talking about the issues. We have just received the largest peacetime budget in history. The Truman budget was a wartime budget.

I shall take advantage of the permission accorded me to extend remarks in the RECORD by including a tabulated comparison:

Net budget expenditures—in billions

[Figures from 1958 budget]

	Major national security programs	All other programs		Total net expenditures	
		As per Budget	Including highway trust fund for comparison	As per Budget	Including highway trust fund for comparison
1. Fiscal 1954	$46.9	$20.9	$20.9	$67.8	$67.8
2. Fiscal 1955	40.6	24.0	24.0	64.6	64.6
3. Fiscal 1956	40.6	25.9	25.9	66.5	66.5
4. Fiscal 1957 estimated	41.0	27.9	29.1	68.9	70.1
5. Fiscal 1958 estimated	43.3	[1] 28.5	[2] 30.3	71.8	[3] 73.6

[1] This is a 36 percent increase over 1954.
[2] This is a 45 percent increase over 1954.
[3] This is only 1 percent below expenditures in fiscal 1953, which was a war year—the last fiscal year of the previous administration.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal 1957.

I have presented a series of factual and informative tables, Mr. Speaker. I submit they hardly justify a boastful attitude on the part of the administration as regards fiscal management and direction. I do not think there is any doubt that the large size of this new budget largely results from deliberate deferments a year ago in order to make a better financial showing before the elections last autumn. But, be that as it may, we have a job cut out for us; a well reasoned cutting job. No less a person than the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury has publicly declared that there should be a stop to large Government spending; that there are a lot of places in the new 1958 budget that can be cut—some in his own Department.

Your committee will apply itself diligently to find out and cut out such unjustifiable items and others besides, for I am sure it is the aim of all of us to preserve the Nation's financial stability and guard against any further depreciation in the purchasing power of our dollar.

Mr. TABER. Still the job is on the blotter of the Appropriations Committee, and it will stay there until that committee reports. I hope and pray that their operations will result in the finding of places where we can cut. Any place that deserves to be cut ought to be cut, and we ought to bring back the saving of every possible dollar we can, because we need those savings right now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I listened with amazement to the speech of my good friend and colleague from Missouri the long-time chairman, when the Democratic Party is in control of the House Appropriations Committee.

I was unable to get time on the floor in order to express my remarks so I must insert them into the RECORD at this point as I am now doing. On the other hand, from previous experience with the speeches of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I am not at all certain that what appears in the RECORD is not an insertion, like mine, rather than the oral speech he delivered.

My remarks pertain to the oral speech delivered on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Missouri. He pointed out well and vividly what fiscal irresponsibility and its product, inflation, do to our people on fixed incomes. It robs the persons on pensions and retirements, our old people, our widows, and our orphans of purchasing power. Inflation hits the lowest income brackets the most because in these brackets all income goes into the purchase of consumers' goods and there is no chance of hedging against inflation through own-

ership of physical assets or equity securities. The case against inflation is well stated.

But have the gentlemen from Missouri, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee under Democrat control, and my worthy colleagues of the House on the Democrat side who applauded his speech so strongly made their actions suit these words of warning against the dangers of inflation? By their fruits ye shall judge them. When appropriation bills have come to the floor of the House or have been in the Appropriations Committee itself have these gentlemen tried to cut down on the amounts requested for appropriations? Or have they instead tried to increase the amounts requested? There is only one way to be for less spending and that is to study how and where appropriations may be cut. Any person can take the floor and point out the value of Federal programs. There is probably no program for which money is requested that does not have some affirmative points in its favor. Anyone can point up these affirmative features and at the same time argue that anyone opposing granting the spending of the money is "against the program."

I have many times said on the floor of the House in my endeavors to cut spending where I thought it could be safely cut, I will be accused of being against the program. But this is not necessarily so. I can be for the program, but simply feel that we cannot afford it this year with all the other things we need to spend money for. Sometime my enthusiastic friends go so far as to say I am against the people who would benefit from the program—they might be veterans, they might be farmers, they might be friends abroad, they might be children, they might be old people. This is a dastardly argument, untrue and attacking my basic Christianity. And yet it is an argument they know full well it is difficult to answer to the people involved.

Yet here we have the arch angel of these spenders taking the floor talking about economy and being applauded by those who have resisted any and every attempt to put sense into the appropriation bills we have passed.

It is time there was some accounting from those who have been responsible for this terrible inflation which has taken the money out of the pockets of the lowest income groups, the pensioners and old people. The very people who now talk about its horrors, the very people who have been promising the pie in the sky and accusing those who won't "give them that pie in the sky" as just being against them, are now brazenly trying to avoid the responsibility for their course of action.

Certainly inflationary pressures are going to be increased if this proposed budget of $72 billion is adopted. Frankly I don't see how we can withstand these pressures even though the budget presented is balanced. There is no question in my mind but that this budget must be reduced if we are to maintain the very military strength which is the main plea behind the vastness of this budget. Yet the gentleman from Missouri and his applauding cohorts are the very ones who have in the past and apparently are planning in the present to try to increase the military budget beyond the size it now is on the plea that as it presently stands it is inadequate to meet our defense needs.

I just want some consistency on the part of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Is he really concerned about inflation? If so, will he undertake to cut this budget down wherever it proves possible? And that includes foregoing the expenditure of moneys for some very worthwhile and appealing projects. Will the colleagues who applauded his remarks about the evils of inflation join him in this attempt to get the budget down to size? Will they forego their remarks about people who are trying to get the budget down that they are against the programs that will have to be delayed temporarily in some instances or eliminated in others? And that the economy bloc is not interested in the welfare of the little man and that the members of this bloc do not have the milk of human kindness within them?

Now, I would make one comment to my good friend from Louisiana who I know really is interested in getting this budget down to size. He knows the error contained in his remarks about the increase in the Federal debt from the time the Truman administration went out of power and the Eisenhower administration went into power. Being on the Appropriations Committee he knows full well that the Eisenhower administration not only inherit a $268 billion Federal debt, it also inherited some $93 billion of I. O. U.'s that would be presented for payment in the ensuing 2 years. Plus a budget prepared by the outgoing administration that would have further increased the debt by its imbalance some $14 billion.

The Republican 83d Congress with the help of my colleague from Louisiana and some others on his side of the aisle cut that Truman prepared budget over $10 billion. We need his help and the help of the people who think like him if we are to get this present budget in shape, because we must recognize that on our side of the aisle we have some followers of the philosophy of the present chairman of the Appropriations Committee. They are all for economy, balancing the budget, and preventing inflation until it comes time to vote for it, then they prefer to be the "people's friend" and vote all the money and more that any group requests. Well, they are not the peoples' friend when they do this. I only hope that the people are beginning to see through this smokescreen.

In my judgment the security of the United States is indeed at stake in this proposed budget and the security is not based upon what weapons and plans for weapons the Military Establishment gets as much as it is upon whether we are going to maintain a sound economy upon which any modern war—cold or hot—must be based if it is to be waged successfully.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. In many quarters, Mr. Speaker, there is a growing tendency nowadays to criticize Federal Government expenditures. With increasing frequency, we hear and read that those charged with the responsibility of keeping books for Uncle Sam are careless and indifferent in doling out our tax dollars.

I am not going to contend that all Federal Government spending is sound and justified. I am sure some of it is not. But I am sure that much criticism is inspired by individuals and groups who are themselves either careless or irresponsible in squaring their allegations with facts.

In connection with the mistaken inference that both the President and the Congress of the United States are bent on destroying our national monetary values, I am going to quote in full the following published articles. Allow me to explain that the first is an editorial which recently appeared in the Shelbyville (Ind.) News; the second an answer I dictated for the editor:

DESTROYING THE VALUE OF THE AMERICAN DOLLAR

A nationally known authority on constitutional government declared the other day that the primary cause of presently mounting inflation is senseless, irresponsible, ever-increasing spending by the Federal Government. He added that the Federal spenders firmly believe that since there is no limit upon their power to tax, there likewise is no limit to their available supply of spendable funds.

Before 1933, our United States currency was fully redeemable in gold. This placed a practical physical limitation upon the power of Congress to destroy the value of the American dollar by inflationary spending. If Congress pumped too much money into circulation, the citizens could protect themselves by requiring the Treasury to turn their paper dollars into gold.

But in 1933, Congress deprived Americans of this privilege. Now, all that the United States Treasury will give you for your paper dollars is more paper. But for foreigners and foreign governments, the old convertibility privilege is still preserved. Foreign depositors in American banks can demand and receive payment in gold for the full amount of their American bank balances. Every dollar that we give to foreign nations is a sight draft for this Nation's gold stored at Fort Knox. Thus foreign aid is a direct attack upon the value of our own dollar, and this spending has further depreciated the value of the unconvertible paper dollars in the hands of the American taxpayer. On December 14, U. S. News & World Report had the following to say:

"The dollar that you hold has lost two cents in value during 1956. Today's dollar has less value in terms of things it will buy than at any time in history. It is a 50-cent dollar compared with 1939 and is heading toward a further loss of value."

That dollar in our hands shrinks every time Washington politicians activate a new spending scheme. It has shrunk 3½ percent per year during the past 15 years, and at that rate it will be completely worthless 15 years from now.

It would be well to remember that as the Federal debt rises, the American dollar falls in value. On June 30, 1953, President Eisenhower's first year in office, the Federal debt was $266 billion. Now it is $276 billion. Some weeks ago, Lyle Wilson, a top-ranking

United Press reporter, wrote: "Mr. Eisenhower is the spendingest peacetime President ever. Mr. Eisenhower will have spent in the 4 years of his responsibility nearly $270 billion, which is more than the Government cost in any other 4 peacetime years." The President's proposed budget for the upcoming year will break a new peacetime record for 1 year of spending.

Let's look at some examples of what has actually happened to real dollar income. The case is cited of a schoolteacher in Rhode Island, whose salary in 1939 was $1,800 and out of which she paid $25 for Federal income tax. Her after-tax purchasing power in 1939 was $1,775. Her salary in the year just ended was $4,000, out of which Federal income taxes took $625. This left her with $3,375 in 1956 50-cent dollars. In terms of 1939 values she has $1,687.50. In 17 years of teaching experience, she has lost $87.50 in annual purchasing power. In the light of President Eisenhower's upcoming budget, that shrunken salary value is sure to shrink again.

Another case is that of a woman who is an invalid. For 20 years she has depended upon a fixed payment of $150 a month directed to her from a trust fund. This payment was quite adequate at the time the provision was made. In 1939, only $24 or $2 a month came out of her payments for Federal income tax. This year the Federal collectors took $206, or more than $17.15 a month. Her current monthly check in 1956 50-cent dollars is $132.84. Translated into 1939 purchasing value, this is $66.42 a month—nearly $60 per month less in value than she received in 1939.

The false impression has been spread by advocates of big Federal spending that most of the income taxes are paid by the rich. As a matter of fact, it is only the very rich who are able to beat the income tax with capital gains, stock options, depreciation allowances, corporate reorganizations, etc. The fact is that 83 percent of all money collected by the Government from personal income taxes is taken from people who make less than $6,000 a year.

Just as long as a grasping bureaucracy keeps its hand so deep down in everyone's pocket, we may expect more and more wasteful spending—and more shrinkage in the real value of the American dollar.

All of this actually began with adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution, which became effective in 1913. That amendment declares that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

The people of the United States have the power to repeal this amendment that may one day—and sooner than we may realize—bring about national disaster from which there can be no return.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

TO THE EDITOR: Your editorial which appeared in the News, the date of January 7, treats very realistically the value of the American dollar. It is a fact that needs to be brought to the attention of all our people frequently. It does seem to me, however, that your editorial has a tendency to impose all of the blame for loss of the purchasing value of the dollar upon the Federal Government.

Actually the Federal Government does have a certain position of responsibility with regard to stabilizing the value of the dollar but there are other factors beyond the control of the Federal Government which also exercise a very definite influence upon this value.

The Federal Reserve System, which is independent of governmental control, exercises a definite influence upon the value of the dollar. Labor organizations in cooperation with industrial management concerns, such as United Steel Workers and Steel Management in agreeing to a price and wage increase last fall, definitely had an impact upon all wages and salaries throughout our entire economic structure. Steel is the bellwether and I think your editorial does not quite accurately reflect those influences.

So far as the responsible agencies of the Government are concerned (the President and the Congress) I think a great deal of commendation should go to the present administration. I believe your editorial does not point out the fact that we have virtually stabilized the value of the dollar during these past 4 years of the Eisenhower administration. We have not been quite able to do it, but I think the important fact which is not normally recognized is that this administration inherited tremendous commitments for military defense materiel or military hardware, defense missiles, and atomic weapons of all kinds.

This came about when we found ourselves literally unprepared to meet a modern war threat in Korea and the Eisenhower administration inherited from the Truman administration long-range commitments. The Truman administration didn't have to meet those commitments for it expired before the materiel was produced, delivered and payment demanded. Of course, payment had to be made. We were able to stretch out these commitments in many cases and to reduce them in others and to take our defense program at a more moderate speed. Even so, a sizable amount of commitments had to be absorbed and the fact that we were able to virtually hold the dollar and public debt at a near-stable figure reflects far more credit than the normal person is apt to give at first thought. Moreover, a 10-percent tax reduction was granted in 1954 to all individual taxpayers (Federal) which also should be credited to the proper side of the ledger.

I am not at all unsympathetic with your editorial. I think you, by and large, have an excellent editorial policy in your paper. In a spirit of friendly cooperation I just want to point out to you the importance of recognizing the great effort that has been put forth by this administration to stabilize the value of the dollar.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH HARVEY,
United States Representative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Louisiana for a minute and then we are going to quit the budget and go to other matters.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, all of this talk about the Republicans balancing the budget is very confusing. For example, when the Democrats turned the Federal Government over to the Republicans in January, 4 years ago, the public debt stood at $266 billion. During this 4-year period, not only has the administration, under Republican leadership, spent all of the taxes and moneys accruing to the Federal Government, but it has also increased the public debt by $9 billion. Is this what you call balancing the budget?

During the 4-year period in which the Republicans claim to have balanced the budget, it actually became unbalanced to the tune of $9 billion. Would it not be better to take the full 4 years under the present administration to judge whether or not they balanced the budget, rather than to take some brief period during the 4 years? I repeat, expenditures have exceeded revenues by $9 billion during the 4 years of Republican leadership.

EXTENDING TIME FOR TRANSMITTING THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a Senate joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 2

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the President), the economic report for the first regular session of the 85th Congress shall be transmitted not later than January 23, 1957.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I understand this resolution has been requested either directly or indirectly by the President and by the Council of Economic Advisers. May I ask my friend from Massachusetts, for the record, if my understanding is correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith excerpts from the reports of the Joint Economic Committee for 1954, 1955, and 1956; also other information in connection with the delay in the submission of this report by the President to the Congress:

(3) Because the economic report was not transmitted until January 28, the committee has been burdened with the necessity for a heavily concentrated series of hearings and a limited time in which to prepare its report which, under the Employment Act, is to be submitted March 1. The act fixed this date early in the session so that the committee's report may serve as a guide to the legislative committees. The act places no similar submission date on the filing of the President's report, although it does call for its transmission at the beginning of each regular session. It may be advisable to establish in the act a fixed early date for submission. (H. Rept. 1256, 83d Cong., 2d sess. Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1954 Economic Report of the President, pp. 2 and 3. Unanimous report of the committee, Representative Jesse P. Wolcott, chairman.)

---

16. Looking to the continued improvement of the machinery contemplated in the Employment Act, we make the following comments with respect to the economic report transmitted last January. These critical comments are not intended to detract from the good qualities of the report. However, as pointed out last year, the act calls for the President to transmit his report at the beginning of each regular session. Because of the late transmittal date again this year, it was necessary to ask the Congress' permission for this committee to submit its report after the statutory deadline of March 1. We urge the President to transmit the report in the future no later than January 15. (S. Rept. 60, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1955 Economic Report of the Presi-

dent, p. 4. Unanimous report of the committee, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman.)

15. We regret that the economic report again this year was transmitted so late, January 24, thus making it difficult for the committee to meet its March 1 statutory deadline. The report should be transmitted at the beginning of each regular session, as provided by law. (S. Rept. 1606, 84th Cong., 2d sess. Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1956 Economic Report of the President, p. 6. Unanimous report of the committee, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman.)

During the 84th Congress, 2d session, Senator WATKINS and Congressman CURTIS sponsored legislation to amend the Employment Act to provide for a definite date for the submission of the President's Economic Report. Public Law No. 591, approved June 13, 1956, amended the Employment Act of 1946, and the President now is required to send his Economic Report to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year. Senators RALPH E. FLANDERS and BARRY GOLDWATER were cosponsors of the legislation in the Senate. The January 20 date also had the approval of the administration.

It should be noted that in accordance with the committee's rules—rule 21—whereby the outgoing committee shall prepare and have ready a plan for the consideration of the President's Economic Report, many arrangements have already been made this year for hearings on the assumption that the President's report would meet the statutory January 20 deadline. These plans will have to be changed if the January 20 deadline is not met.

As Senator DOUGLAS noted when Senate Joint Resolution 2 was proposed in the Senate last week, the leadership of the Joint Economic Committee has not been notified in any way of the intent to ask for an extension of time. Neither the chairman or the vice chairman of the committee nor the staff of the committee have any knowledge as to the circumstances requiring this extension or whether it is a request coming directly from the President.

Dates previous President's Economic Reports were submitted:

Eightieth Congress: 1947, January 8; 1948, January 14.

Eighty-first Congress: 1949, January 7; 1950, January 6.

Eighty-second Congress: 1951, January 12; 1952, January 16.

Eighty-third Congress: 1953, January 14—by President Truman—no report by President Eisenhower; 1954, January 28.

Eighty-fourth Congress: 1955, January 20; 1956, January 24.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to alert my colleagues that when we meet tomorrow we will adjourn to meet on Monday at 11 o'clock. I urge all the Members to be here promptly because the procession of the Members of the House will leave the Chamber promptly at 11:15. In order that the inaugural exercises might start promptly at 12 o'clock I make this announcement to alert the Members and to respectfully request their complete cooperation.

A BILL TO AMEND THE CRIMINAL CODE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which is captioned "A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes."

Its purpose is to amend the Criminal Code of the United States of America and to spell out the sacred and constitutional guarantee of the right to a jury trial in certain cases. Those cases to which I refer involve citations for contempt of court which involve acts committed outside the presence of the court by persons not parties to the litigation involved.

Nothing in this bill is designed or intended to prevent any court from summarily punishing for contempt any person guilty of a contemptuous act or otherwise creating any disorder in the courtroom or in the presence of the court.

It is fundamental that the court must have summary authority to punish such actions of contempt in order to maintain order and decorum in the court. That right has never been questioned in the history of jurisprudence and is not questioned now. Nothing in the bill which I have introduced can be so construed.

Let me also point out that nothing in this bill is designed or intended to deny to any court the right to see that its orders, writs, and decrees are enforced and carried out against whom or to whom they are directed.

Before coming to Congress I spent nearly 18 years in the active practice of law, interrupted only by World War II. My love of the profession of the law and the science of jurisprudence is well known. Since my earliest childhood I have had and still have profound and utmost respect for our system of law and our courts, and I have nothing but respect for that system. From my earliest childhood I was taught by my father, himself a lawyer and a judge, to respect our courts and our system of jurisprudence; and when I first was admitted to the bar, he counseled me and cautioned me to exercise nothing but the highest respect for courts and for the individuals presiding over those courts at all times. He even suggested that if necessary I bite off my tongue before making any utterances in the presence of the court which might possibly be construed as contemptuous.

Throughout my adult life I have sought to follow unerringly his advice. As a lawyer I respect our courts and our system of law, but as an American citizen, first, and a lawyer, second, I feel that the right of trial by jury before imprisonment is a sacred and constitutional right which must never be trespassed upon.

Until a few months ago I thought that that right was clear, and I did not think that it had to be spelled out; but in some quarters that thought apparently is not being shared.

Therefore, I deemed it necessary to spell it out and in words that all who read may understand that the sacred right of trial by jury shall not be abridged nor shall it be denied.

This bill which I have introduced is both short and simple. It reads as follows:

A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3691 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking therefrom "and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted."

SEC. 2. Section 402 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking therefrom "if the act or thing so done be of such character as to constitute also a criminal offense under any statute of the United States or under the laws of any State in which the act was committed."

SEC. 3. Section 401 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "A", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) No court of the United States shall have power to punish any person for contempt of its authority under the circumstances described in paragraph (3) of the subsection (a) unless—

"(1) Such person is a party to the proceeding before the court or the agent, attorney, or employee of a party to the proceeding out of which such alleged contempt of its authority arose; and

"(2) Such person (A) received direct and actual notice from the court, given in open court, of the contents of the writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, or (B) was validly served with such writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command.

No such writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command shall be valid unless it clearly and specifically sets forth the acts or omissions prohibited or commanded, and names or designates the person or persons to whom it applies."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to all acts or omissions, whether or not occurring before, on, or after the date of enactment of this act.

It does not take away from any court or any judge the right to maintain order

and decorum within the courtroom nor does it deny to such court or such judge the right to punish willful violations of the terms of any order, mandate, writ, process, rule, decree, or command of the court.

It does, however, provide that no American citizen shall be fined or imprisoned or both for an act of contempt of court committed outside the presence of the court and involving a proceeding to which he was not a party until a legally qualified and impartial jury passes upon the question of his guilt or his innocence.

The test of all legislation is not what a good and wise man might do with it; the necessary test to be applied is what a bad man can do with it. Absolute power whether vested in an executive officer or in a judicial officer is a dangerous thing and would most certainly destroy our framework of Government and the basic guaranties of individual liberties which are spelled out in the Constitution of the United States and I believe in the constitutions of all 48 States.

Mr. Speaker, let me call to the attention of my colleagues a time-honored statement which was foremost in the minds of the framers of our Constitution and has been predominant in the minds and hearts of generations of Americans since then who have believed in constitutional government. I do not know who gave birth to this thought; if I did, I would be glad to give this as a quotation from him and to give him credit for the statement when he said, "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

If and when the right of trial by jury and other constitutional rights of free men are abrogated by men in whatever position they may serve, then one by one they will all be stricken down and swept away; and it will toll the death knell of our constitutional form of government and our Nation, which was conceived in liberty and dedicated to freedom.

Those of you who are familiar with the history of the development of our jury system and the right of trial by jury are well aware of the historical background of this sacred guaranty of freedom. Many years ago when the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence was being developed in England, the powers of a monarch were absolute and complete, based partially on the divine right of kings. At one time the King of England had the power to take away the life, liberty, or property of any of his subjects without consulting with or obtaining the concurrence of anyone else.

That worked all right as long as the king was a good king; but kings are human, too, and a bad king had the same powers and the same autocratic authority that his predecessor, the good king, had. This right of absolute despotism under a bad king resulted in many unjust, oftentimes inhuman executions by beheading, by hanging or even by disemboweling. One king became so tyrannical and his unwarranted executions were so vicious and flagrant that the English people decided they would not put up with it any longer and that henceforth no Englishman could be executed until the question of his guilt or innocence had been passed upon by a jury of his peers.

In 1215 when the barons wrested the Magna Carta from King John at Runnymede, foremost among the rights secured by that basic instrument of the rights of man was the right of trial by jury. Centuries later when the Constitution of the United States of America became the basic and fundamental law of our land it contained the following provision:

> In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation.

The constitution of my State, the State of Georgia, contains a similar provision and provides a constitutional safeguard and guaranty of a trial by a fair and impartial jury. It is my belief that the constitutions of each of the States in this Union contain a similar safeguard and a similar guaranty.

This bill which I have introduced simply spells out that the right of jury trial shall be preserved in certain cases involving contempt of court, and that persons not parties to a previous proceeding and not having previously received any order from any court shall not be summarily sentenced to prison by the same individual who preferred the charges against them.

Let me emphasize that there is nothing in this bill to deny to any court or any judge the complete right to maintain order and decorum in his court and to force compliance with any order or decree or other mandate issued by him or his court to parties to pending litigation.

It is designed, however, to prevent one man from attempting ever again to enjoin the entire citizenry of a community, city, county or State or even a Nation. If the injunctive power of any court, either State or Federal, ever becomes so broad that it can enjoin any and everybody without naming, describing, or designating them, then each court will become a legislative body and a law unto itself without regard for either statutory or constitutional safeguards of the individual's rights to his life, his liberty, and his property, and without regard for established law and precedent.

I sincerely hope that the chairman of the committee to whom this bill is being referred will hold early hearings on it and that it will be reported out of that committee as nearly unanimously as possible and that it will be subsequently enacted into law.

I respectfully ask you to lend your support to this legislation.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I hope will be enacted into law by this Congress. The purpose of the bill is to curb some of the unbridled power of judicial tyranny that we have seen manifested recently by a small segment of the Federal judiciary, which has reflected adversely upon the good name of the entire Federal bench. Briefly, the bill will limit the power of Federal judges in the issuing of injunctions and will guarantee to the citizens of this country a trial by jury in all contempt proceedings other than misbehavior of any person in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice and misbehavior of any of the officers of the court in their official transactions. The bill also provides certain safeguards as to who is guilty of contempt.

It has become necessary that the Congress do something to protect the rights, privileges, and freedoms of the citizens of this country. We have seen some of the judiciary arrogate unto themselves authority that they never had. They have usurped power never given them by the Constitution or the law of the land. They have taken over the functions of the States and localities and endeavored to browbeat whole communities into accepting the philosophy of a particular jurist as to sociological problems. This is not an attempt to change any of the philosophy of the court, which would have to be dealt with in some other way, but it is an attempt to reclaim for our people the time-honored right of trial by jury as well as the right to be heard in open court before one can be convicted and condemned to fine and imprisonment. Unless something is done promptly and effectively we will see a dictatorship set up by the Federal judicial oligarchy of this country. Free people cannot afford, at this time, to sit idly by, if we desire to remain free, and see the rights and privileges of any person or community taken from them by a judiciary whose greed for power and thirst to rule apparently is irrepressible.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect by any manner of means but it represents the effort and work of some of us who desire to see this Government of ours continued as a republican form of government with the rights of our citizens protected and the sovereignty of our States maintained. I say to you in all seriousness that unless something is done to stop the awful trend we will soon have no liberties left to save.

This legislation is not aimed to protect any one section, class, or segment of our great Nation. On the other hand, its purpose is to protect all of our people from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to Mexico.

I hope, as time goes on, that others who are interested in this matter will work together to see that the proper legislation is enacted carrying out the principles here set out so that the people of this country will still be supreme and all-powerful and the right of the States and localities to look after the policing of their own territory is maintained.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short statement.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as everyone here knows, the House Appropriations Committee hearings are always held back of closed session. The public and the press are not invited nor do they have access to the committee, either the subcommittee or the full committee. I realize it would be almost impossible to have open public hearings before the subcommittees, but we could have open hearings of the full committee when the subcommittee reports come to the full committee. If necessary we could hold the meeting in the Old House caucus room.

We have a staggering budget. It might be that if we held public hearings we could save a few $100 million or maybe a billion or two each session if we faced the public who pay the bill—yes and the press.

I see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] agree with me that that we should hold open full Appropriations Committee hearings? We could hold such sessions in the caucus room where there is plenty of room.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] under a special order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. We have some special orders today in which Members desire to speak about deceased colleagues. The Chair does not think anyone would want to delay that. If the gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, the Chair will count.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I did not understand the gentleman made a point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio was not the only gentleman on his feet. Does the gentleman make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am trying to find out, Mr. Speaker, when the 1-minute rule comes up.

The SPEAKER. It is not coming up as far as the Chair is concerned until these memorial exercises are over.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know there were memorial exercises coming up.

The SPEAKER. There is an hour and 15 minutes of them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mine does not involve a memorial, and I would be very happy to yield to them for that purpose, if that is the wish of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 15 minutes and then we have an hour after that.

SPECIAL ORDER CANCELED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] may be canceled and put over to a date to be agreed upon hereafter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MR. TITO: STAY HOME

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was intimated last month that President Josip Broz-Tito of Yugoslavia might be invited to the United States for a state visit. No official denial of intention to extend such an invitation has been forthcoming. Although United States Embassy officials in Belgrade had known for several years that President Tito was eager to avail himself of Washington hospitality, they also understood how repugnant such a visit would prove to millions of God-loving Americans throughout the Western Hemisphere. Consequently, no move was made until last month to sound out the United States public and to see to what an extent our citizens and our taxpayers would be willing to go in order to gratify the desire of Mr. Tito.

Although the "trial balloon" has been punctured in a number of vital places, it is still a possibility that President Tito and a handful of advocates of "Titoism" in the United States may press for a renewal of an invitation that, up to the present, has not been entirely disavowed. Therefore, it is my conscientious responsibility to present for the consideration of my colleagues the record of President Tito, who, not without reason, has been described as "the Stalin of Yugoslavia."

My first witness is Mr. Reuben Henry Markham, onetime Balkan correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. What is the testimony of this good reporter?

Mr. Markham's report may be given in his own words. The testimony, in extenso, is available in a scholarly book entitled "Tito's Imperial Communism," published in 1947 at Chapel Hill, N. C., by the University of North Carolina Press. One of the most meaningful passages in this volume is found on page 185 and I quote:

> The Allies handed liberated Yugoslavia over to Tito. In view of that, it is not strange that 4 Serbs out of 5 remained sadly at home when the Communist-led partisans held their Belgrade victory parade. They felt as though some emperor was giving a living nation, as a gift, to some importunate courtier. They stayed at home, not because they didn't want liberty, but exactly because they did want it and knew they hadn't got it.
>
> What was Tito's foremost activity after he became master of Serbia and then, step by step, of all Yugoslavia? He did exactly what Adolf Hitler had done under similar circumstances; namely, he tried to exalt his name above every other name in the country. He tried to make himself appear as a god to the people.
>
> When Hitler tried to make a god of himself by terror and propaganda, the world condemned his action as tyrannical. It was considered a sign of totalitarian absolutism. The Nazis' use of the state, the army, the schools, the press, the radio, and all other institutions to exalt one man, seemed to most people the subversion of popular government. The organizing by the Nazis of little girls and boys, of youth, of women, of farmers, of workers, and of every group in such a way as to increase adoration for Hitler is generally considered an attempt to strengthen absolutism. It is held by most democratic observers to have closely resembled the practices of oriental despots. By universal agreement, kings who make themselves objects of worship are called absolutists. Yet the activity to which the partisans gave their chief attention, after they received absolute power, was to create for Tito the spiritual status of an eastern monarch.

This is the testimony, Mr. Speaker, of my first witness, a world-renowned correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor.

The value of this report consists in its important application to the current movement to exalt a totalitarian tyrant, a fanatical propagandist of Marxism-Leninism, by throwing out the red carpet for the Stalin of Yugoslavia in Washington, the home of freedom. Is further adulation for an oriental despot in harmony with the principles of our representative Government? Do we wish to contribute to a perpetuation of slavery for the Serbs, the Croatians, the Slovenes, the people of Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzogovina? How can such flattery help the south Slavs to regain their liberty?

My second witness is a former United States Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina. In his book, entitled "Speaking Frankly," published by Harper & Bros., 1947, Mr. Byrnes offers, for the record of Mr. Tito's criminal activities, the following impressive testimony, and I quote from pages 144, 145, and 146:

> The Army's Air Transport Service operating between Rome and Vienna passed through Udine in northern Italy to Klagenfurt in Austria. It was impossible for our planes to travel the 65 miles between these 2 points in a straight line because the northwest tip of Yugoslavia jutted out between them, and, because of Yugoslav protests, our planes had been ordered to stay away from that territory. The order was often difficult to obey as the territory is rugged and many navigational hazards exist. Pilots must fly through a pass where mountains are 9,000 feet high and surrounding peaks reach as high as 13,000 feet. In bad weather it was easy to get lost and in any weather it was a temptation to clip the corner. No friendly country would have complained, but the Yugoslavs charged us with 176 violations of her frontiers. Our Army denied the charges.
>
> On August 9 an Army transport, carrying 7 Americans, a Turk, and a Swiss, lost its

way, strayed over Yugoslav territory, was attacked by 2 Yugoslav planes, and was forced to make a hazardous landing in a wheat field. The Turkish Army officer was wounded. The other eight were immediately interned in a Belgrade hotel. On August 19 another transport en route to Rome radioed Udine that it was over Klagenfurt. It was never heard from again, but Klagenfurt reported it had been attacked and sent down in flames by Yugoslav fighters. The bodies of the 5 Americans were found 5 days later.

The State Department asked for information, and Marshal Tito made a belligerent speech in which he charged us with sending whole squadrons of military planes over Yugoslavia. I sent for the Vice Premier of Yugoslavia, Edward Kardelj, who headed his country's delegation to the Peace Conference. I told him the news I had received and asked for an explanation. He said he had none other than the general information that our planes had flown over his country on several occasions, although they had been told not to do so.

"Yugoslavia claims to be a friendly Government, and your planes can fly over our territory at any time," I told him. "But even if you were not friendly, and one of your planes, flying over Canada, got lost and happened to fly over the United States, and was grounded, the officials of the United States would feel it their duty to do everything in their power for the safety and comfort of the Yugoslav crew and its passengers. Any official who failed to do so would be reprimanded by our Government. The idea of a United States Army plane, under such circumstances, firing upon a plane of Yugoslavia, killing its crew and passengers, is something the American Government would never be guilty of and is something for which the American people will not forgive Yugoslavia."

There is revealing postscript to this testimony. While the pilot and copilot of the first grounded plane were kept prisoners in a hotel in Belgrade, they happened to look out the window and saw an American-made locomotive over at the railroad depot with the letters UNRRA printed on it. They knew that 70 percent of the cost of that locomotive had been furnished by the American taxpayers, and the thought contributed little to the comfort of their internment.

This is what is meant when specialists on Eastern European affairs point out that any moneys paid over to Mr. Tito are, in fact, subsidies for an avowed enemy of the American way of life.

My third body of testimony is presented by the entire editorial board of a universally respected newspaper—the New York Times. The editors of this paper, on November 9, 1956, placed their judgment before the decent people of the world. After outlining the nature of the New Stalinist Threat, the Times' editors, under the heading "Hungary and Yugoslavia," established, on the basis of their own eyewitness reports, the juridical fact that Mr. Tito, by compromising himself morally by signing a friendship agreement with the then Premier of Hungary, Mr. Erno Gero, made it perfectly clear that he—Mr. Tito—was playing his part in the Marxist-Leninist conspiracy. Mr. Gero, demonstrably, was a Soviet agent. I say "demonstrably," because it was the "Titoist" Mr. Gero who invoked the murderous fire of Soviet tanks, Soviet tommyguns, and Soviet Army divisions in Budapest. Not all the perfumes in Arabia will ever wash away the blood on the soul of Mr. Gero, the latter now in hiding either in Soviet Rumania or in the Soviet Union itself.

I now submit for a personal inspection by my colleagues a photograph of President Josip Broz-Tito, the self-styled marshal of Yugoslavia, beaming upon one of his favorite Titoist-Stalinists, Mr. Erno Gero, who for four blood-stained days reigned as the first butcher of Budapest in the brave Hungarian Nation. Mr. Gero, as becomes a sycophant, is bowing in the most deferential fashion before Mr. Tito, the Stalin of Yugoslavia and the star salesman of the new Marxist-Leninist line. This is a photograph that may properly be reproduced in millions of copies and distributed behind the Iron Curtain, in colors. It is one of the most revealing documents of our time. It is found on page 26, Time magazine, October 29, 1956.

The editors of the New York Times, continuing their valuable testimony—November 9, 1956—now present the most arresting evidence that can be found anywhere. I cite the text of this group of witnesses:

As the Soviet Army, hiding behind the Janos Kadar clique, turned with blazing guns on the Hungarian people, Yugoslavia indicated its support for that group (i. e., the Janos Kadar clique). Last Sunday (November 4, 1956: the date marking the deceitful return of the Soviet troops and tanks to Budapest) Pravda was even able to cite Borba in its editorial heralding the Soviet attack and implicitly to suggest, as has proved true, that Yugoslavia in practice supported that attack.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to have the entire testimony of the editors of the New York Times inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times of November 9, 1956]

HUNGARY AND YUGOSLAVIA

With heavy hearts and great indignation the people of the free world have watched as the Russians have drowned the Hungarian revolution in blood. They have watched, too, with horrified amazement the position of the Yugoslav Government on these tragic events.

Let us recall that there is an intimate relationship between the latest tragic events in Hungary and earlier developments in Yugoslavia. The bravery of the Yugoslav people in defying Stalinist tyranny from 1948 to Stalin's death excited the free world's admiration. When Khrushchev was forced to go to Belgrade in May 1955, and apologize for Stalin's crimes against Yugoslavia, a current of great hope went up in satellite Eastern Europe. With respect to Hungary, particularly, the Yugoslav Government and its ruling Communist alliance pushed for an end to Stalinist rule, as represented by Matyas Rakosi and Erno Gero. The Hungarian people may well be excused if they thought they had every guaranty of Yugoslav help and sympathy in their fight for freedom.

But in the past 6 weeks the situation has changed dramatically. First, Tito compromised himself morally by signing a friendship agreement with Gero in Belgrade on the eve of the Hungarian revolution. Then in the past few days, as the Soviet Army, hiding behind the Kadar clique, turned with blazing guns on the Hungarian people, Yugoslavia indicated its support for that group. Last Sunday Pravda was even able to cite Borba in its editorial heralding the Soviet attack and implicitly to suggest, as has proved true, that Yugoslavia in practice supported that attack.

At the United Nations yesterday Yugoslav Ambassador Brilej did call for the exit of Soviet troops from Hungary. But he referred only to the involvement of Soviet troops in recent Hungarian events, not to the mass murder done by those troops. Yugoslavs did not use such language when Stalinist troops killed Yugoslav border guards. Why do they use it now when Khrushchev's troops murder Hungarians?

Yugoslavia's moral and political position will be further compromised if any of the thousands of Hungarian refugees who have fled into Yugoslavia are handed over to Kadar to be imprisoned or murdered.

[From the New York Times of November 9, 1956]

THE NEW STALINIST THREAT

The resurgence of Stalinism in the Kremlin has again alarmed the free world and has transformed the whole international scene. With Soviet troops battling in Hungary and marching toward the Polish frontier, with Moscow broadcasts interpreting "softer" Soviet notes into open threats of rocket attacks on Britain and France, and with Soviet "volunteers" ready to enter the Middle East, we seem to be living again in the days of the Berlin blockade and the Korean war.

There is still the conviction in free world capitals, rapidly being modified into a hope, that the Soviets will not precipitate a major war which would inevitably turn into a suicidal atomic war. But even that possibility is no longer ignored, and the Western defense authorities, including those of the United States, are working overtime to intensify their defense preparations.

But even aside from a major war there is the more immediate fear that the Soviets, haunted by internal difficulties and the revolt of the satellites, may resort to the usual expedient of tyrants in trouble and seek to create foreign diversions in the shape of local wars to restore their hold and their prestige. They have made it bluntly plain that one area for their immediate operations is the Middle East. But it would be unwise to discount their further moves in Europe. The United States has already found it necessary to warn them against violating Austria's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

All these developments have shattered almost over night the complacency of the free world which, deluded by the Soviet "new look" policy, started to reduce its armaments and even its psychological defense readiness. In this country we even toyed with the idea of foregoing the draft and halting the development of our atomic arms.

But whether the shock of recent events will produce the same results as did the Berlin blockade and the Korean war that led to Western alliances and Western rearmament remains to be seen. That steps along similar lines are urgently necessary is evidenced by the new strain on the Western alliances, by the dispersal of Western forces and the insecurity of Western bases, and not the least by the delay in the projected German rearmament that was to fill a dangerous gap in the front line of North Atlantic defense. The speed with which these defects are remedied may decide the future of the Western World.

Following this testimony, I would like to place the testimony of one of my most loyal scholar-friends, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, Washington, D. C., because, on December 13, 1956, the editors of the New York Times saw fit to publish a letter by Dr. Thorning reviewing the whole question of "Titoism." I ask leave to insert the full text of this letter at this point.

[From the New York Times of December 13, 1956]

NATIONAL VERSUS INTERNATIONAL IN HUNGARY AND YUGOSLAVIA DISCUSSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The crisis in Eastern Europe has focused world attention upon the relationship between the national communism of Yugoslavia and international communism as exemplified by the Soviet empire.

The ideology of communism, we are told, has been "shaken to the core by a phenomenon, nationalism, which it has chosen to ignore." This is the opinion of C. L. Sulzberger, who has won an enviable reputation as foreign correspondent of the New York Times. It was to be expected therefore that Mr. Sulzberger on November 7 could relate that the administration was "prepared to go to considerable lengths in recognizing national communism as a governmental form with which we can deal on a friendly basis."

This coincides with the advice given by the Daily Worker on October 19. President Josip Broz-Tito who, prior to the demise of Joseph Stalin, had been denounced in that periodical, was pictured as a suitable candidate for continued United States aid, provided money and commodities were to be proffered, as in the past, "without any strings attached."

On the same day the Daily Worker urged support for "expanded foreign economic aid and various forms of peaceful competition with the lands of socialism." This recommendation, as students of Marxism-Leninism know, was an echo of a "draft resolution" adopted by the Communist Party in the United States of America in September 1956.

POLISH ACTION

Closely related to this viewpoint was the willingness of W. Gomulka, new head of the totalitarian Marxist regime in Poland, to accept United States dollars and food, on the terms that had been considered acceptable by President Tito, "without any strings attached."

In this connection it may be recalled that the Times proclaimed on October 17 that "President Eisenhower's decision with respect to the continuance of American aid to Yugoslavia" seemed "a sound one" and added, rather naively, that "Yugoslavia is not part of a conspiracy for Communist control of the world."

On November 9, however, the truth about this conspiracy began to dawn upon The Times' editors. Under the caption "Hungary and Yugoslavia" this great newspaper presented a totally distinct view and a conclusion perfectly in accord with the facts (i. e., the Yugoslav votes) reported from and recorded in the United Nations. The exact phrasing of this fresh approach to the issue of "national communism" vis-a-vis "international communism" may be worthy of repetition here:

"With heavy hearts and great indignation the people of the free world have watched as the Russians have drowned the Hungarian revolution in blood. They have watched, too, with horrified amazement the position of the Yugoslav Government on these tragic events. * * * The Hungarian people may well be excused if they thought they had every guaranty of Yugoslav help and sympathy in their fight for freedom."

MORAL COMPROMISE

The Times did not fail to emphasize that "Tito compromised himself morally by signing a friendship agreement with Gero in Belgrade on the eve of the Hungarian revolution."

My own comment about this editorial, excellent as the latter is, may be summarized as follows:

It was not "the Russians" who "drowned the Hungarian revolution in blood." It was the Soviet hierarchy, completely divorced from the ordinary, decent human beings in the Soviet Union, who were guilty of genocide on a scale comparable to that perpetrated by Adolf Hitler and Heinrich Himmler.

The Yugoslav people, if free of the much-vaunted "national communism" of President Tito, would have been prompt to spring to the aid of the brave Hungarian patriots. United States guns, planes, and tanks in the hands of the totalitarian Marxist-Leninist clique in Belgrade prevented any spontaneous human response on the part of the people.

In evaluating the current wordy newspaper war between Pravda and Borba, it may be prudent to observe that the debate, not without its dash of histrionics, has done nothing to turn the tide of slaughter and deportation in the Hungarian captive nation, where a notorious "Titoist," Premier Janos Kadar, is enacting his bloody role as a Soviet gauleiter.

(Rev. Dr.) JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs, Honorary Professor of International Relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a Pontifical Institution.
WASHINGTON, *December 8, 1956.*

It is not important to note, Mr. Speaker, that there has not even been an attempted refutation of one word of what my friend, Dr. Thorning, spread upon the pages of the New York Times? Nor is there likely to be any attempt at rebuttal because the principles and facts set forth in the above-mentioned analysis are unassailable from the standpoint of truth and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I now call upon my final witness for today's session, although I am holding much meaningful testimony in reserve for another occasion. The witness I would like to cite, in my summary, is Mr. Elie Abel, special correspondent of the New York Times, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

On November 7, 1956, Mr. Abel reported from Titoland the proportions of "the alarm among Western diplomats in Yugoslavia" at a moment when "the signatures were hardly dry upon the accord with the United States to provide $98,300,000 in aid" when the free world, through the votes of Mr. Tito's delegation in the United Nations, was treated to the sad spectacle of what was regarded in Belgrade as an "increasingly pro-Moscow stand."

Mr. Elie Abel supplemented his testimony on November 10, 1956, by a dispatch indicating the further treachery of "the Stalin of Yugoslavia" in shipping back to the Soviet slaughterhouse in Budapest numerous brave Hungarian patriots who had sought refuge in Titoland. The noble Hungarian freedom fighters might just as well have sought refuge in Siberia, the icebox of the Soviet Union.

The testimony of the Associated Press correspondent in Belgrade contains an equally amazing and horrifying revelation. In order to be fair to the President of Yugoslavia, Mr. Josip Broz-Tito, I believe that I ought to quote the exact text of the Associated Press report—the New York Times, December 12, 1956:

TITO NAMES ENVOY TO HUNGARY

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, December 11.—President Tito named Jovo Kapicic, a counselor in the Foreign Ministry, as Ambassador to Hungary today. The appointment puzzled western observers since the recall of the previous envoy had been interpreted as a sign of Yugoslavia's indignation over the deportation of Imre Nagy, deposed Hungarian Premier.

The significance of this Associated Press dispatch will not be lost upon any literate American from Hudson Bay to Tierra del Fuego. Mr. Tito, play-acting as he often does, simulated rage at the slaughter of brave Hungarian freedom fighters and the temporary shelving of his Titoist Gauleiter, Mr. Imre Nagy, and made a great show of his indignation by recalling his chief of diplomatic mission in Budapest. But, as a prelude to the fresh onslaught of Soviet tanks to overawe the noble Hungarian people, Mr. Tito put his seal of approval upon the re-Stalinization of an independent nation by appointing one of his most trusted confidants to represent, or rather to misrepresent, the Yugoslav people in Budapest.

Finally, may I be permitted a brief comment about Mr. Tito's recent, pretended refusal of United States military help? Having benefited to the tune of more than $1 billion, as a direct result of what we Members of the United States Congress were assured was a calculated risk, he is ready to try the familiar game of picking up his blue chips and departing from the gambling casino with his winnings. There is a word for this operation. It is a term familiar to gentlemen of the law. The game is blackmail.

Mr. Tito is confident about his usefulness to the United States Government. He has been described by his United States adherents, the never-to-be-disillusioned diplomats who advocate continued aid to Tito's tyranny, as a Beelzebub to be played off against Satan. His state visit to Washington, at the expense of the United States taxpayers, it is claimed in diplomatic circles, would occasion frowns and frustrations among the butchers in the Kremlin.

It is unthinkable that this accomplice of the butchers of Budapest who has shown his true, red colors in the past 8 weeks, should be wined and dined in the capital of the free world; that toasts should be drunk, to the health of Mr. Tito's friends, the "Titoists" dominating the Janos Kadar clique who, hiding behind the blazing guns of the Soviet army, betrayed the victory of the freedom fighters in Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to believe that, now or at any other time, a common criminal should be idolized, or lionized, in a land which, under God, pledges its allegiance to honor, freedom, and the principles of representative government.

Mr. Tito should be given to understand that, however his apologists in official circles may feel about a projected visit to this country, he is not welcomed by the people of the United States or by their elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States. If an invitation to make a state visit here has not been extended to him, the idea to do so should be immediately abandoned. If an invitation has been proffered, it should be promptly withdrawn. Mr. Tito should be advised to stay home.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman has made a very significant and a very timely statement concerning a very serious matter, to which we should give a lot of consideration. I agree wholeheartedly with all that has been said against Tito. I have on my own written a letter to the President of the United States protesting an invitation to Tito, and a copy of it has gone to the Secretary of State, expressing views similar to those the gentleman from New York expressed. I am definitely opposed to inviting Tito as an official guest to the United States.

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the gentleman I have expressed them to the Secretary of State.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With the gentleman's permission, I should like to include a copy of my letter at this point.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very happy to have the letter inserted here.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that letter at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

JANUARY 11, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In addition to my own opposition as well as the opposition of the people of my district, I feel constrained to inform you of my protest to the proposed invitation to Tito of Yugoslavia to come here as an official guest of the United States.

Despite Tito's apparent opposition to the Kremlin and his claim that he has established a form of national communism in Yugoslavia independent of the Kremlin, he is still a Communist dictator which is repugnant to the people of the United States.

In my opinion, the high position of the United States among the free nations of the world might be placed in great doubt, if such an invitation were issued by you as President of the United States.

I respectfully urge you not to extend an invitation to Tito to visit the United States.

Yours sincerely,

GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Fifteenth District of California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think we should proceed beyond the statements we have made here today and the letters we have individually written by circulating a petition to the President of the United States and obtaining the signature of each Member of the House who wants to sign it objecting to this ridiculous idea of inviting a man like Tito to be an official guest of the United States.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York on the very statesman-like statement he has made here today. It was certainly something that was needed, and particularly needed from somebody who is as highly respected as is the gentleman from New York. His are words of a statesman. Whenever he makes a statement on the floor of the House, it is weighed seriously by all who hear him.

I think that the leaders of our Government would be performing a service greater than Alger Hiss performed for the Communist cause if it entertained the idea of inviting Communist Tito to this land. As for me, I want to make it perfectly clear in the RECORD that, if that invitation is extended and if murderer Tito comes to the United States as a guest of our Government, I will resign from this body the day Tito arrives. I think a thorough investigation of the State Department should be made to learn what sources are behind this blunder. At this point I would like to insert a letter I wrote to the Secretary of State on this very subject. So far the State Department has been too busy defending Communist Tito to make a reply.

DECEMBER 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.:

The people of our Nation are seriously disturbed over news that an invitation may be extended to murderer and dictator Tito to visit our country. Such an invitation will be a stab in the back to the brave and gallant people behind the Iron Curtain risking their lives daily to overthrow their Communist murderers. Is our prestige so low and are our friends in the world so few that we have to give aid and comfort to the devil himself?

There is as much sense to such an invitation as there would be to inviting Stalin, Hitler, Khrushchev, and Bulganin. Tito condones the murder in Hungary so why not invite all the murderers together.

Would you, Mr. Secretary of State, invite the parents of the five American fliers Tito murdered in gold blood? Would you invite the hundreds of Hungarian refugees Tito murdered by sending them back to Communist Hungary? Would you invite the Hungarian hero, Nagy, who Tito betrayed to the Russian Communists? Would you invite Bishop Stepanic who is rotting in one of Tito's jails?

For the sake of consistency why not honor Communist Chou En-lai, of Red China, too? He is also an independent Communist, and agrarian reformer just like Tito. Or is he to be considered separately for such a signal honor? Since he murdered more Americans than Tito it would please his vanity more to be honored alone.

We are refugee conscious today. People are urged to give to support the Hungarian refugees. Mr. Secretary, how about the hundreds of thousands of refugees from murderer Tito? We show great concern for some refugees and hold our heads high saying "Look how humanitarian we are." Yet we are considering stabbing another group of refugees in the back by honoring their tormentor with the highest honorable invitation our Nation affords.

Such an invitation would be disastrous. There will be demonstrations in every major city of consequence. If invited I shall be tempted to lead them though there are millions more worthy than myself.

Where is the heart and conscience of a righteous America? Our prestige today in the world is at its highest in 20 years. Recent righteous actions long overdue by the State Department have given back this Nation much of the admiration we lost. Is all this to be destroyed by honoring an avowed enemy of freedom?

Has the State Department appraised the feeling of the refugee relatives in this country of the more than a quarter million Serbian people Tito murdered to remain in power? If such an appraisal were made, it would clearly indicate the possibility of assassination. We rightly glorify refugees who assassinate Communist soldiers. Would we imprison a refugee who assassinated a Communist dictator?

I feel so strongly on this matter that I for one don't want to be a party to such treachery and deception on the people of our Nation. Should the invitation be tendered, I have no course left but to seriously consider resigning my post.

A thorough investigation of the Tito invitation idea will show that it emanates from the crowd who know that Tito is on his last legs and are fearful of Hungarian and Polish-like uprisings against Tito and they want him to get the prestige of this invitation to save him.

The choice is clear and unmistakable. Either the State Department is for freedom or for murderer Tito. I plead with you to spare our Nation and freedom-loving people the world over from the tragic and deadly consequences of such an invitation.

Respectfully submitted.

ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress,
10th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin about the gentleman from New York. I feel certain that those who originated the idea of inviting him here were actuated by proper motives. I do not assign to anyone any improper motives, but I sincerely feel that to invite him here would be a gross mistake of judgment.

THE LATE T. MILLET HAND, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the course of the tribute being paid to the late Honorable T. MILLET HAND.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of the decease of our esteemed and distinguished colleague, T. MILLET HAND, on December 26, 1956.

The news of his sudden departure came as a surprise to his many friends. There had been nothing immediately preceding his demise to indicate that there was any likelihood of such a happening. It was a strange coincidence that I and many of his close personal friends received through the mail on the day following his decease cards bearing the wishes of himself and his splendid wife for each of us to enjoy a happy New Year. The postmark on these cards showed that they had left the post office in his home city of Cape May, N. J., at 12:30 p. m., on December 26, 1956. This indicated that our colleague had mailed these cards just an hour or two before he passed away. It was characteristic of the kindly feeling that was ever prevalent upon the part of Millet that in these closing moments of his life, unconscious of how close that end was

at the time, he thought in terms of the future happiness of his friends. Thus, these wishes for our future happiness came as a message from our departed colleague and friend in the great beyond.

Our colleague, MILLET HAND, during his comparative short life of 54 years, lived a life of great usefulness. Born in Cape May, N. J., July 7, 1902, son of Albert Reeves Hand and Sara Millet Hand, he was educated in the public schools of that city, graduated from Dickinson School of Law with an L. L. B. degree, in 1922. He immediately became an active practitioner. His ability and active interest in the law were recognized by his fellow practitioners who elected him president of the Cape May Bar Association. As such, and as a member of the New Jersey State Bar Association and as a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, he rendered distinguished service.

Early in life Mr. HAND became identified actively with the business, civic, and political life of his community. He became owner and publisher of the Cape May Wave, an outstanding newspaper of Cape May County, and became identified with other business interests of that locality.

After his entrance into political activity, Mr. HAND was elected clerk of the board of freeholders of Cape May County and served in that capacity during 1924–28. In this latter year he was appointed prosecutor of Cape May County and served for a period of 5 years, 1928–1933. In 1937 he was elected mayor of Cape May and served until 1944. On November 7, 1944, he was elected to the 79th Congress as Representative from the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, and was reelected to the 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. His sudden demise prevented him from assuming the duties of the 85th Congress to which he had been so recently elected.

Thus, it will be seen that from the early age of 22 years, and until his decease, MILLETT HAND had been politically active and filled many offices of a public character. In each instance he served with a fidelity and ability that won for him the approbation of the people whom he served. He was faithful and conscientious in every capacity in which he had been called to serve. His sincerity of purpose was manifest in each instance.

His record as a Member of Congress was outstanding. He had shown a deep interest in all that pertained to the welfare of the constituency he represented. He was a close student of all the problems that confronted him during his service in Congress, both domestic and foreign. He was ever intent on doing what he thought was best for the people he directly represented and for the people of our Nation as a whole. He was not swayed by expediency at any time from what he thought was right. He had strong convictions and adhered to them at all times. Thus, the service he rendered to his constituency and the people of the Nation was sincere, honest, and of distinguished character.

MILLET HAND had a host of friends among his colleagues. He was always friendly, jovial, and considerate. He was honored and respected because of his friendly personal qualities and because of his strong adherence at all times to his convictions. He was recognized by all as a man of strong character and who never deviated from the straight course of duty as he saw it. He leaves to us the inspiration that comes from association with a man of courage and devotion in the performance of public duty.

As an indication of the high regard in which he was held by those who knew his sterling qualities of mind and heart, is the fact that only a few days before his decease he had been accorded the honor of being endorsed by the Cape May County Republican executive committee as its candidate for Governor of New Jersey at the election to be held this year.

In his home life MILLET HAND was always a true and devoted husband and father; married in 1930 to Mary Mercer Worth, of Philadelphia, who died leaving one child, T. Millet Hand, Jr.; he married in 1950, Elizabeth Frost Spang, of Cape May. To his mother, son, and wife we extend our deep and sincere sympathy, trusting that they may be comforted in the knowledge that their loved one lived a useful and honorable life and died in the faith that gives assurance of life everlasting.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and distressed by the sudden and untimely death of our able colleague from New Jersey, MILLET HAND.

A lawyer and publisher; president of the Cape May County Bar Association; member of the Board of Chosen Freeholders for Cape May County; prosecuting attorney for Cape May County; mayor of the city of Cape May for 7 years; a member of this House for 12 years, his record of service to community, State, and Nation will always, I am sure, be a source of satisfaction to those close to him.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this House he showed very great ability. I enjoyed working with him as a member of that committee and greatly valued his friendship.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Hand and all those close to him.

He will be greatly missed by all his friends and colleagues.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this occasion to pass without a word of tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable T. MILLET HAND, who served so ably for the past 12 years as Representative from New Jersey's Second District. His sudden passing on December 26 was a great shock and he will be sorely missed. To his widow and son, I extend my sincere sympathy.

When I became a Member of this body and made the acquaintance of Congressman HAND, I found him—from the very outset of our association—considerate, friendly, and kind in all his dealings with his fellow Representatives. He was always fair.

MILLET HAND's devoted public service included not only his 12-year record in the United States House of Representatives, but as lawyer, newspaper publisher, county prosecutor, and mayor of Cape May, N. J., he contributed unstintingly of his time and effort to the civic growth of his community, State, and Nation. In spite of the fact that his professional duties throughout his life required close attention, he always had extra time to spend for the benefit of others.

On February 23, 1955, in a speech in Wildwood, N. J., MILLET HAND said, and I quote:

> You and all of us must continue to guard our inalienable rights, remembering that to secure them is the highest purpose of government.

His own words indicate the degree of patriotic devotion he constantly strived to reach.

Congressman HAND will be long remembered by the Members of the Congress who were privileged to know him and work with him. Somewhere I have read the following paragraph which clearly illustrates his value as an active citizen of this great Nation:

> Do good and leave behind you a monument of virtue that the storm of time can never destroy. Write your name in kindness, love, and mercy on the hearts of thousands you come in contact with, year by year; and you will never be forgotten. Your name, your deeds, will be as legible on the hearts you leave behind, as the stars on the brow of the evening. Good deeds will shine as the stars of heaven.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their expression of great personal loss on the death of our good and dear friend, MILLET HAND. All who knew him were deeply shocked at his untimely passing. Those of us who represent the great State of New Jersey in the House feel the loss in an especial manner inasmuch as he was one of our number.

Millet's passing is a loss to his district, his State, and the Nation, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and to his son.

Though we disagreed on many issues, I respected Millet for his integrity, ability, and devotion to duty. He served with competence and zeal and fulfilled his responsibilities to his constituents with a real sense of dedication. The sterling quality of his character coupled with his capacity for friendship won Millet the affection and esteem of all the Members on both sides of the aisle. His family can take pride in his splendid record of unselfish, patriotic service.

His passing leaves a great void to his countless friends. He will be sorely missed and long remembered by his colleagues in Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, MILLET HAND was not only my personal friend, but one of my close associates on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appriations. I know of no Member of that subcommittee who worked any harder or contributed any more of his time and talent than MILLET HAND. His advice, help, and good counsel will be missed by this subcommittee and by the full committee.

Even though MILLET HAND came from a different part of the country and belonged to a different political party than mine, I learned years ago to respect him.

It was my privilege to accompany this great Member of Congress on some of his inspection trips down the mighty Mississippi River and its tributaries. Those who have observed MILLET HAND in action respect him for his sincerity and fair approach to the many problems he was confronted with in his duties as a Member of Congress.

MILLET HAND was a great American and a great legislator. He served his country and his fellow man well throughout his lifetime. I am saddened by the loss of a loyal friend as well as an able colleague and I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and son in their great loss.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with great sorrow Congressman WOLVERTON and my New Jersey colleagues in expressing deep regret and sorrow over the untimely death of MILLET HAND.

MILLET HAND was a fine and patriotic legislator. He served here in Congress with a single purpose and that was to contribute to the upbuilding of this great America of ours. While here he served on the important and hard-working Committee on Appropriations. Realizing the necessity for economy in government he stoutly fought for less spending, lower taxes, and balanced budgets. He knew the desirability of a sound economy. He was a man who was devoted to his State and to the Nation. We all are much poorer for his having gone at this untimely period. MILLET HAND was a fine legislator and a great American.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I will always remember T. MILLET HAND as one of the most personable colleagues it has been my privilege and pleasure to know during my time in the Congress of the United States.

His passing has shocked and saddened all of us.

Because his high competence was recognized by Members on both sides of the aisle, MILLET HAND could and did speak with force and authority whenever he came to the well of the House to deliver remarks.

His presentations to us in connection with his work on the Appropriations Committee were always meticulous and thorough, reflecting a high degree of understanding of the subject before us.

MILLET HAND'S career in this body was the climax of many years devoted to the service of the public, both as a private citizen and as an officeholder in his home community, where he served with distinction.

I am confident that his constituents know, far better than we do, of the conscientious work he did in the interest of the district he so ably represented.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey and the other Members of the New Jersey delegation and Members of the House in paying tribute to MILLET HAND.

I came to know MILLET HAND just 2 years ago when I served on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I found him to be one of the most faithful members in attendance both at committee hearings and at the sessions of the House. He was an intelligent man, a very kindly and very courteous man, especially in the treatment of witnesses. That, I think, exemplifies the manner of man he was. No matter what the political affiliation was of the men with whom he came in contact he respected their opinions and their right to express those opinions. It is no wonder that he was uniformly successful in this very difficult political life.

I express to Betty Hand and her family my deepest sympathy, because I knew that he was a very devoted husband and a very loving father.

It was my privilege just a few weeks before he passed away to have traveled to Chicago and San Francisco and Los Angeles with Betty and MILLET HAND. I came to know both of them as a very devoted pair. I came to know them as two people who had a very magnificent sense of humor, wonderful company, and fine companions.

I am privileged to join with the gentleman and the Members of the New Jersey delegation in paying tribute to a very dedicated American and an outstanding Member of Congress—a credit to his district, State and Nation, T. MILLET HAND, of New Jersey.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that we mark the untimely passing of our colleague from New Jersey, THOMAS MILLET HAND. His career in the House of Representatives, which began in 1944, was ended abruptly and prematurely. He will be sorely missed by his fellow Members, his constituency, and the citizens throughout our Nation for whom he tirelessly labored.

Born and reared in Cape May, N. J., T. MILLET HAND was intimate with the problems of the area and the people he served so faithfully throughout his life dedicated to public service. Trained in the law, he put his broad knowledge of the subject to work serving the people. As the clerk of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Cape May County, he took his first step in his public career. Next he served as the prosecutor of pleas of Cape May County, and at a very early age was elected mayor of Cape May. A leader of his political party in the State of New Jersey, Mr. HAND was the competent vice chairman of the State Republican Committee.

While a Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. HAND wisely used his past experiences and education to the advantage of his country. He served on the congressional committee to study means of expanding the American merchant marine, and on the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee. Although he was always solicitous for his constituents, T. MILLET HAND'S outlook was never narrow in scope. He unceasingly strove for his country and fellow citizens as a whole.

Nor were Mr. HAND'S proficient services limited to governmental capacities; he was an active member in the fields of publishing and law. Following in his father's footsteps, he assumed and continued the publication of the Star and Wave, a weekly newspaper in Cape May. He was also an able editor in chief of the Law Review. In the field of law he practiced before the Supreme Courts of New Jersey and the United States.

THOMAS MILLET HAND was known as one of New Jersey's most popular Representatives, a reputation he earned through untiring work, faithfulness, and honest endeavor. He will long be remembered as a capable and earnest lawyer, publisher, mayor, and Representative in the Government of the United States, which he so faithfully served.

To his loved ones I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be poorer for the absence of MILLET HAND.

The Second District of New Jersey can ill spare his faithful service rendered over 12 critical years in our Nation's history.

Millet was a Congressman with courage.

He was hard working—he was able—his thinking was sound and he had a great love for New Jersey and for America.

First as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee and then as a member of the Appropriations Committee he rendered fine service to his district and to the Nation.

Much as he loved to spend his time in his beloved Cape May, where he was born, where he had served as mayor, where he published a newspaper and practiced law, Millet was conscientious and on the job both for committee meetings and for House sessions.

That his constituents appreciated his devotion to their welfare was shown by the increasing majorities by which they reelected him until this year when he received his greatest majority.

It is one of the rewarding experiences of serving in the Congress to have the privilege of working closely and intimately with such men as he. To his beloved wife, to his son, go out our deepest sympathy. We will miss him greatly.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and formerly its distinguished chairman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, MILLET HAND had served upon the Appropriations Committee for the last 4 years. He

was a sincere student of the work before him and he gave it the very best that he had.

He had courage enough as a member of the Appropriations Committee to stand for what he thought was the right thing to do. Always he was on the job doing his utmost. There are few who took a more active interest and met the responsibilities of citizenship as did MILLET HAND. This makes us feel extremely sorry to see him go.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to his widow and to his son my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I served on two subcommittees with our beloved deceased colleague, MILLET HAND. I learned to know his heartbeat, I learned to know him as a gentleman of the highest order who exercised the very highest type of Americanism in all his doings.

MILLET HAND had the courage of his convictions. He was a soft-spoken gentleman. There were times when someone in the committee would attempt to criticize his position, but MILLET HAND never became angry. He would answer in that soft-spoken, quiet, noble manner which characterized his whole life. He would thus unarm those who attempted to criticize him and he would gain their respect to the end that every Member on both sides loved, admired, and respected him.

My heart goes out to his widow and son in this their hour of bereavement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the many fine tributes that have been paid to MILLET HAND here today are well deserved and true. It has been my privilege to serve with him here in the House and on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for many years. I found him to be a lovable character, a fine gentleman, and a truly devoted husband. He was conscientious about all his work here in the Congress. He was loyal to the country. He was fair and dealt justly with all who had matters before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and before the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity to visit in his home and see the beautiful devotion between him and his wife, the lovely Betty. When I heard of his death it really hurt me, because I was devoted to him. I always will remember him with high regard and respect for such a wonderful character as he was. As has been said, it is hard for the country to lose such a man, and it certainly will be a loss to this House. To his wife and son I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, mourn the loss of MILLET HAND, and my heart goes out to his dear wife Betty and his fine young son, Tom.

MILLET HAND was never one to shirk a difficult or unpleasant task when it fell within the line of duty. I recall his interest in serving on the House Appropriations Committee early in his career as a legislator and of asking my opinion and advice. I tried to give him the facts—that the Appropriations Committee was one vested with the great responsibility of holding the Nation's purse-strings—but that it was a committee that called for grueling, time-consuming work with few opportunities for making headlines or political fence building back in the home district. Brushing aside the lack of glamour and the personal sacrifices it would entail, HAND determinedly set his sights on the Appropriations Committee, and, later, as a member I found him to be one of the most conscientious and capable legislators with whom I have had the opportunity to serve.

MILLET HAND had a warm, outgoing personality and a sparkling sense of humor. His was that rare quality of being able to laugh at one's self, and I will never forget how this admirable trait helped to ease the tensions of that awful day when a handful of zealous fanatics raked the House floor with a burst of pistol fire. Questioned by the press after the shooting as to his actions at the time, HAND made no pretense at heroism or bravery but freely admitted, "I dived under the seat." Then he added, "But I couldn't get under. CANFIELD was there first."

Actually, HAND was as brave as any man on the floor that day, and he lost no time in seeing what he could do to aid those who were injured.

The House has lost a fine legislator, the New Jersey delegation an outstanding member, and I have lost a good friend in the passing of MILLET HAND. May we never forget him; and may we all continue to profit by the example of humility, dignity, and dedication that in life he set before us.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to appraise the worth of a man after he is gone, especially if he has been a close and dear friend, one for whom you had respect and affection. How is one to go about such an appraisal with an unbiased mind and do real justice to the friend? It may be said he was a gentleman, devoted to the best in life; that he was a warm companion and an understanding soul. You may praise his patriotism and his loyalty to high standards of living; you may speak of his unselfishness and thoughtfulness for others; you may mention his cheerful disposition and his devotion to his family, his strong will and sound judgment, his sense of humor, and his dedication to his work. You may dwell at length on all these virtues, but you would not do full justice to MILLET HAND and the sterling character that he was.

May we who knew him, worked with him, and enjoyed his friendship rejoice in the privilege of that association and resolve to carry on with our work for our country with the same zeal and devotion as was his, so we, too, may earn the Master's "well done" and receive the same crown of glory which surely he received

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues from New Jersey and other Members of this earnest body in extending sympathy to MILLET HAND'S widow and his son. Perhaps the phrase I may use now is worn out and yet we all know that an honest man has been proven to be the noblest work of God. Those of us who are in politics, and all of us are, appreciate a man who is not a demagog. MILLET HAND was an honest man. What he said you could depend upon. You could trust him. He was constant, sincere, and courageous.

We have lost a real companion and fellow worker in this body. I want to join all of the Members in paying respect to one who served faithfully and well here amongst us.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on this sad occasion I join my colleagues in paying a tribute to that great statesman and Representative from New Jersey, T. MILLET HAND. His family has lost a fine husband and a father. We have lost a friend. His constituency has lost an able Representative. This body will find it difficult to fill the void that is here due to his passing.

As we meet today we can think back upon his wonderful qualities of humor, generosity, decency, and intelligence, remembering how often he used those wonderful qualities to advance the work of Congress and, if you will, to advance the cause of democratic government and the cause of free institutions that he loved so dearly.

I will always recall with pleasure my chance meetings with constituents from MILLET HAND'S district. At the mention of his name they were filled with pride and always gave evidence of the great respect in which he was held by those he represented.

Few men have I met in my years in Congress who so clearly understood the constitutional meaning of the office of Representative in Congress. In T. MILLET HAND this understanding was combined with warm, human qualities and the personal touch that he gave to all things.

Proud as he was of his party affiliation, he never hesitated, when conscience demanded, to cast his vote for what he considered best for his country regardless of any other consideration.

To his widow and his son we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, my heart is full today when speaking about Representative T. MILLET HAND. There are others who possibly knew him better in his home community, as a member of a congressional committee, in business, or in the practice of law, but I had the privilege of knowing him well as a friend and as a colleague, and as one with whom I shared quarters for over a year in

Washington. He was quiet, unostentatious, sincere. He had a grand sense of humor, principle, the highest integrity, and great strength of character. He was a man of purpose and determination, effective in presentation and persuasion. I know how carefully the other Members of the House listened when he took the floor to explain his position on legislation under discussion.

Millet was one who wore well. As we learned to know him better, we increasingly admired his ability and his talents. During the year that I shared quarters with him in Washington, I grew to know his great love for his wife, for his son, and for his mother, his above-average ability as a Representative, and his unswerving devotion to what he believed was right. On legislation his position was not always the popular one, but earnest conviction dominated his decision as to course.

We have lost an eminent colleague and his district has lost a Representative who has set a high standard for those who may seek to follow.

How I wish this day could be one of rejoicing and congratulation for the great victory Millet won last fall. Instead, like all of you here, I mourn a true friend and colleague. I hope with all my heart that God will bring understanding and blessing to his beloved wife and family.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues in mourning the passing of our good friend and colleague, MILLET HAND. It was almost exactly 4 years ago that as a new Member of Congress I participated in the eulogies to my predecessor, Representative Charles Eaton. Charles Eaton died at the end of a long and useful life. Today we are mourning the untimely passing of a man in the prime of his life. I think, therefore, that the sudden death of MILLET HAND at the age of 54 sharpens the keen sense of loss which we all feel.

There is much discussion about the advantage and disadvantages of a political career, and the advantages and disadvantages of being a Member of Congress. I think we can all say that one of the chief benefits of this life is the invaluable associations which we gain with our colleagues here.

MILLET HAND was certainly not a dramatic Member of Congress. He sought no headlines. He was very unassuming. But he had many invaluable qualities which endeared him to us all. He showed unfailing good judgment. His commonsense and conscientious approach to the many problems which he faced were very noticeable. His quiet sense of humor was always ready to relieve the heavier moments. He was considerate, he was intelligent, and he was above all dependable. He had that combination of a warm heart, a cool head, and a fine mind.

I certainly want to pay tribute to a real friend, and to express my deepest sympathy to his family on his sudden passing.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my very deep and profound sympathy to MILLET HAND'S beautiful widow and his very fine son. I know how proud he was of them and of their pride in him. I would also like to express my deepest sympathy for the great State of New Jersey in its tremendous loss. I know how he was regarded in New Jersey, and I know how he was regarded in the House of Representatives—admired by everybody—because his yea was yea—and his nay was nay—and he always fought for what he thought was right. He was modest and able. We all know of his very great accomplishments. I have a selfish feeling about his going also, because he was helping me, and had been helping me for the past 2 years, on a problem that is very close to me and to my district. He did it modestly and without expecting anything in return. MILLET HAND is gone. His physical being is gone but his spirit lives on, and that will be a blessing to us and to our country. We can ill spare him.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late departed friend and colleague, T. MILLET HAND, of New Jersey. This body and our Nation has lost a dedicated public servant in his passing from our midst.

It has been my good fortune to work with MILLET HAND, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations where we served together, and especially as a member of the subcommittee on public works appropriations we came to know each other more intimately. I admired his diligence and his application to duty. He was always faithful and had a conscientious regard for his responsibilities. We agreed on many matters and there were other matters, of course, on which we did not agree, but I must commend Millet for his consistency of purpose. He was always endeavoring to seek out the chaff from the wheat, so to speak, and to eliminate expenditures that he considered excessive in the budget. In matters of appropriations, he sought to practice constant economy. He was a true representative of his people of the State of New Jersey. He often spoke of the great district which he represented, and he was devoted to serving this great Atlantic City and Seaboard District. He was interested in the work of the Beach Erosion Board, and was perhaps the greatest authority and one of the most qualified Members in this body in this important field of public works. I shall miss him and I join my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Hand and the members of his family my most sincere expression of sympathy in the loss which they have sustained, and which we all have sustained in his passing.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in the last week, I rise to pay tribute to a colleague taken from us by death since the adjournment of the 84th Congress. The 5-month period between the adjournment of the 84th Congress and the convening of the 85th has taken a very heavy—an unusually heavy toll of our membership.

The sudden death last month of our colleague, T. MILLET HAND, of the State of New Jersey, while he was apparently in perfect health came as a sad shock to all of his friends. MILLET HAND had been a Member of the House since 1945. During that period, he endeared himself to all the membership of this body as well as to everyone with whom he came in contact. In the 79th Congress, I had the privilege of sitting next to Mr. HAND on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I learned then what a diligent and effective Member of the House he was. He never overlooked any interests of his constituency. And although I was not fortunate enough to serve with Mr. HAND on any committee after the 79th Congress, I know that he was equally diligent wherever he served.

Mr. HAND had a peculiarly attractive personality. He had a most lovable character and a fine intellectual endowment. He made a splendid record in Congress. No one who knew him will ever forget him. Personally, I shall miss him a great deal.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his widow, his mother, and his son.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on a personal basis, I am deeply saddened by the sudden passing of my close friend, MILLET HAND, who occupied an office just around the corner from me for several years. I looked upon him as one of my closest friends in this body. When I say that, however, I realize that his great capacity for firm and solid friendships would lead many others on both sides of the aisle to reach the same conclusion about their personal relationship with him.

On a couple of occasions, he invited me to his district to speak. There I learned that the same qualities which endeared him to us were manifest in his constituency. I have rarely visited a Congressman who seemed to have generated such genuine enthusiasm among his political associates and supporters. That situation, of course, came about not alone because of his personable qualities but because of the innate sincerity of the man and the faithfulness to his tasks which characterized his service in this House. He was a man of deep and firm convictions who was perfectly willing to stand alone or with a small group if he felt he was right. Although extremely popular in this House, he was not one to follow the crowd. He thought through for himself the great problems which we all have to face and reached his conclusion regarding them, based solely upon his conviction of what was best for the country he loved and served so ably.

To his gracious wife, Betty, and his son, and to the people of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, I join in extending deepest sympathy in their irrevocable loss.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that we contemplate the untimely passing of our good and respected friend, T. MILLET HAND, and I know that I am joined by every Member of this body in mourning this loss as irreparable.

If there was one thing that marked MILLET HAND, aside from his unquestioned talents as a distinguished legislator, it was his unfailing cheerfulness which seemed to be fed by a deep fountain of respect and regard for his fellowmen. There must have been times when troubles assailed him, as they do all of us, but there was never any indication from his bearing or manner that, so far as he was concerned, he ever doubted that "God is in his heaven and all is right with the world."

We shall miss this stalwart and warmhearted friend, and I know that I speak for many of my constituents, since he was well and favorably known in my home county, when I say that his passing constitutes a grievous loss to us. Indeed, we are all joined in prayerful solicitation of the Master that He will grant to his beloved helpmate the consolation that comes from the assurance that we mourn with her and for her.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join those here today in paying tribute to the memory of MILLET HAND, one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives.

Let me say simply and briefly that he was a man of great sincerity; of real courage and high principle.

I am sure the people of his district in New Jersey realize the loss they have sustained in his untimely death. I know that I shall miss him on the House floor.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock to me to learn that my good friend, MILLET HAND, of New Jersey, had been called to the Great Beyond. It seemed to me almost beyond understanding that a man so fine and with so much in this life to give should be taken from us. But it was our Master's will, not for me or for anyone to question. It was for a purpose which we may not today understand but which someday we will know.

We are selfish. We grieve when we find taken from us those who are our friends, who mean so much to us, and who are contributing to our enjoyment of life. In my grief for the loss of MILLET HAND I admit to my selfishness, but well knowing that he has entered into the Great Beyond of immeasurable peace and joy.

Millet was an extremely able Member of this body, who contributed much to our work. He was an accomplished lawyer and an effective legislator He was a man who sought always to serve his district and his country. I consider him one of the finest men to come to Congress, and I cannot possibly relate how much he made his influence felt upon me, and upon all of us. He will be greatly missed, not only by his family, not only by his constituents whom he so ably served, but will be greatly missed by all of us who had the privilege of being associated with him.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, while I was not privileged to serve in the Congress with Representative T. MILLET HAND, I did know of him and his good works in common with all my colleagues of the New Jersey State Legislature. We were very proud of his distinguished record of service in the House of Representatives for the past 12 years.

Mr. HAND was indeed a characterful, able, and dedicated legislator and I have been deeply impressed by the most sincere and touching tributes paid him by those who have been so close to him in the work of this great legislative body.

Mr. HAND'S untimely passing is a great loss to his district, our State, and our Nation. To Mrs. Hand and his son I extend my profound sympathy in their great sorrow.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, one is not elected, and six times reelected, to represent any district of a great State such as New Jersey unless he is endowed with personal qualities commanding the admiration, respect, and affection of people in all walks of life.

MILLET HAND, by background and education, was fitted for the high office he held, and his gentlemanly charm and simplicity endeared him to those who were permitted to know him best. The loss his wife and son have sustained we can well understand, and while our sympathy cannot lessen their sorrow, they must know that we, as his colleagues, share it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how touching may be our tribute, our words can, in no way, lessen the loss suffered by his loved ones in the passing of our friend and colleague, T. MILLET HAND.

Representative HAND was a serious, earnest, hard-working member of the Appropriations Committee. His advice, admonitions, and observations on matters before us were listened to with respect, and most often, heeded with pleasure because we knew they were sound and based on judgment derived from facts and not a preconceived idea.

There can be no doubt but that his zealous attention to the duties of his office was a contributing factor to his all too short span of life.

Though his service in the House was short, he made a record which any successor will find difficult to equal.

And, so, Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart, we extend our sympathy to his loved ones in their sorrowful hours.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of T. MILLET HAND was a shock to me and a great loss to the House and the Nation.

MILLET HAND and I came to Congress together in the 79th Congress. I learned to know and respect him by close association and frequent contact.

He was a capable, efficient, and valuable Member of the House, and of the Appropriation Committee. He was a good American and proud of his privilege to serve his country. His judgment was sound and his knowledge of legislation and his support of issues that were good for the welfare and progress of the people of this Nation was the major part of the fine record he made here.

I shall personally miss him and regret that he will not be with us to help solve the many difficult problems we face.

My sincere condolences go to his beloved wife and son.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, may I join with other Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the memory of the late T. MILLET HAND. Much has been said previously by my colleagues, but I did not want to let the opportunity pass of taking note of the life and work of this distinguished legislator. It was my honor and privilege to serve with him as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. I developed a profound respect for his objectivity and his unshakeable courage. He believed in the old-fashioned principles of American democracy, and he would not waiver from these principles by reason of political considerations or otherwise.

His congressional district and the Nation have lost a valiant friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the passing of my good friend, MILLET HAND. We were associated on the Appropriations Committee and it was my high privilege to serve with him on the Public Works Subcommittee. He was a student and a scholar who used with singular effectiveness his rich storehouse of information to advance the cause of justice and truth. He was a wise man, a man of courage and absolute integrity. It is very difficult to try to find appropriate words to say about a friend who was taken from us in the full vigor of his life, but MILLET HAND was a loyal friend, who needed no assurances and made no demands; a patriot who served his country well. He made a record of service to his country which brought distinction to himself and to his family. I join his many friends in the House in extending deepest sympathy to those left to mourn his loss.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of the House, I was truly shocked and greatly distressed, upset and grieved by the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague and my dear friend, Congressman T. MILLET HAND.

Congressman HAND'S sudden demise was a real tragedy. He was apparently in the best of health and at the peak of his powers when he was called to his Maker. I knew MILLET HAND very well and greatly admired him. During the time he was a Member of this body, I was privileged to know him as a good friend. He was devoted to his work, and assiduous and diligent in performing his duties. His background, training and experience admirably fitted him for the public service, and he was possessed of highest character, great ability and unsurpassed patriotism. To a very rare degree, he commanded the respect, confidence, esteem and affection of the Members of the House.

Always firm in his convictions, he was endowed with that somewhat unusual quality of understanding the point of view of those who held different opinions to his own, and he never permitted narrow provincialism, bias or intolerance of any kind to warp his judgments.

He was a man of humane and generous impulses, invariably considerate of his fellow Members and constituents. He was cooperative and understanding

of the special individual problems of his colleagues and willing to assist and generously give of himself regarding any cause in which he became interested. His work on the flood control panel of the important House Appropriations Committee was exceptionally noteworthy, and I will personally never forget his ready response to the plight of my own constituents, and the people of the Northeast area, when we were seeking congressional assistance following the great flood disaster of 1955.

MILLET HAND was a rugged character of broad and many interests. He had a high concept of his duty as a Member of this body and held unswervingly to his principles and ideals. He was profoundly interested in the Nation and its people and its teeming life, and he was an especially devoted follower of American sports and athletics and other activities of our younger people.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I know how keenly the House feels his loss because he leaves a void in this body and in our hearts which will be very difficult to fill. He has made a great, inspiring record as Congressman that will stand permanently for his family and the country as a measure of his devotion, ability, zeal, and love of American institutions. But even more than that, measured in terms of personal values, he leaves a proud legacy that is not too commonly found in the world of today of warm friendships, of loyalty, of unselfish regard for his associates and love of his family and his fellow man.

His gracious and loving wife who was always by his side and who was such a strong inspiration to him in his life and work has sustained a very great personal loss. My heart and, I am sure, the hearts of all of us go out to her in her most sorrowful bereavement. To her and Congressman HAND'S entire family and his people, I extend most sincere sympathy and express the hope and the prayer that the good Lord in his kindness and mercy will comfort and strengthen them to bear their irreparable loss with that measure of fortitude and courage with which MILLET HAND faced the problems of his own life.

The memory of MILLET HAND will long endure in the Halls of this great deliberative body where he served so ably and faithfully, and in the hearts of all his friends and colleagues who held for him such deep and genuine feelings of respect, esteem, and affection.

May he find peace and rest in his eternal reward.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was with heavy heart that I returned to Washington at the opening of this session of Congress because, since we had last assembled I had lost a good friend.

I was only one of a great host of persons who counted themselves friends of our late colleague, MILLET HAND. I first became associated with him in our work on the Appropriations Committee in the 83d Congress and learned to know him better as our work on that committee progressed. I admired Millet for his straight thinking, his lofty idealism, and his love of humanity. He was the type of a man a freshman Congressman would seek out if he wanted to follow in the footsteps of a legislator who held the great admiration and respect of his constituents.

I admired him for his conscientious devotion to the affairs of the people he represented and his sober approach to the business of the world's greatest government.

From him I feel I inherited an example of patriotic devotion akin to that of other great statesmen who so ably served their country in this body.

MILLET HAND will be greatly missed in New Jersey and in the Halls of Congress, I will miss him as a personal friend. I wish to convey my deepest sympathy to his widow, Betty, and to his son.

EFFICIENT UTILIZATION OF MONEY AND MANPOWER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in a recent press release the President urged that the Congress be watchful in seeking out ways to save money and manpower. This remark has more significance than many may realize. According to testimony before our Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, of which I was chairman in the 84th Congress, the Bureau of the Budget is no longer charged with the authority to search out and order inefficiencies eliminated. The President now looks to the head of each department and agency to police himself. In other words, any independent, outside auditing of the executive departments must now be done by the legislative branch. In that light, the President's call for congressional assistance makes a great deal of sense.

I would like to state for the record that the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management has in the past and, I am sure, will continue to pursue diligently the search for savings in manpower. In this search we have repeatedly called on the executive branch to join with us. In many respects we have been successful but not nearly to the extent that we could if we had full cooperation from all concerned.

Although progress has been slow, I am convinced that we have stimulated a great deal of interest and action that is leading to more economical use of manpower. With the full support of the President and the Bureau of the Budget, this interest can be turned to great advantage to the taxpayer.

We do not want to see people fired, but we are demanding that the numbers on the Federal payroll be reduced. After extensive hearings and reviewing many reports by the departments and agencies, we know that through good manpower planning and use of attrition, the Federal payroll can be reduced to around 2 million employees. This can be done without disrupting any essential services.

A bill which I introduced last session was enacted into Public Law 801. This law requires reports on manpower and dollar costs for new or expanded functions. Each committee should study and analyze these reports when they receive them. If we are to keep the size of the Federal payroll in bounds every committee must concern itself with manpower. Our committee cannot do this job alone. It must be a joint effort with each of the committees charged with a given substantive field. I urge this Congress to eliminate any increases in numbers of employees except those that can be most thoroughly documented. Even in these cases the increases can usually be more than offset by reductions elsewhere. Our hearings last year disclosed that increases were granted for new positions despite the existence of thousands of vacant authorized positions. According to one department our committee was the only one that asked about the existence of vacancies. This is an area that each committee can easily explore when requests for new positions are presented.

I would like to call your attention to another facet of our efforts. The Committee of the House Post Office and Civil Service has been faced with increasing demands for supergrades and Public Law 313 positions for engineers and scientists. We are also being asked to increase the salaries for this type of employee to prevent their loss to private industry. At the same time the Department of Defense is helping create undue competition through the high recruiting cost allowances under cost-plus defense contracts.

We have been endeavoring to get the Department of Defense to bring into reasonable bounds the competition thus being generated. I understand that, following a letter from our subcommittee requesting action, they are redrafting their regulations pertaining to contract cost allowances. I would like to point out that we have not only concerned ourselves with manpower in Government, but also about all actions taken by the executive branch that are not conducive to good manpower utilization. We cannot afford to be blind to any action or aspect of the manpower situation in this day of critical need for engineering and scientific personnel.

I can assure the President that when our subcommittee is reconstituted we will be only too glad to continue to search for manpower savings.

EXPANSION OF FOREIGN TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the expansion of foreign trade and commerce between the United States and the free

nations of the world constitutes the base and cornerstone of most of our major foreign policies. As a result of these policies, we have become not only the leader of the free world in trade and commerce, but also the largest creditor nation. In the pursuit of such a national course of action producing such obvious results, the United States has failed to devise appropriate ways and means to accompany such policies with adequate safeguards and protective assurances necessary to prevent the imminent possibilities that befall our investors, both governmental and private, from the twin evils of nationalization and confiscation. These obstacles confronting American investors are of major concern to all of us. They are of concern to the Government and to our citizens whom we have urged to invest their capital and engage in foreign commerce.

In an effort to provide more security for our American investors and, in turn, encourage foreign commerce in place of increased loans and grants from this country, I introduced on January 14 House Joint Resolution 160 to create a commission to study the problems of investments abroad. This resolution is similar in content to Senate Joint Resolution 21 which was recently introduced by the senior Senator from South Carolina, Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

The Economic Commission known as the Randall Commission made studies and recommendations concerning the economic factors relating to our foreign investments, and their conclusions were invaluable. However, it was beyond the scope of the studies of that Commission to reach conclusions or make recommendations respecting the subject matter embraced in the resolution I have introduced.

Important conclusions for the security of our foreign investments should inevitably result from concentrated studies of the interrelated questions contemplated by House Joint Resolution 160. These studies should be made at the highest echelons of our Government in cooperation with the great competence to be found in American industry, commerce, trade organizations, and among our national and international legal societies.

The United States has been generous to a point of criticism in its foreign-aid programs. We are presently being imperatively impelled to give and to do more. Our programs in the form of loans and grants are essential contributions to the relief from ever-recurring world crises, but a permanent cure cannot result from them. We are unable economically to perpetuate such a policy as a permanent remedy for the evils confronting the world. At the same time, we must realize that friendships encouraged by material aid can be short lived indeed and are undependable at best. Our enlightened self-interest demands something more for reliance than military force or financial grants. I feel that a general acceptance of moral persuasion rather than military force or financial aid will better enable us to protect our spiritual values and material possessions in foreign countries.

Treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation, while essential, do not of themselves produce favorable climates for the expansion and protection of commerce and industry. They are fundamentally the results of climates already existing. The production and introduction of conditions and relations which develop favorable climates of commerce are needed.

It is contemplated that the extensive exploration and concentrated studies resulting from the passage of House Joint Resolution 160 will produce constructive proposals for greater stability and more permanent protection of American foreign investments. Moreover, in our pursuit of peace among men and nations, the results of such studies could in the end assist materially in the reduction of the costs of armaments in time of peace and the incalculable costs resulting from armed conflicts.

OBSCENE LITERATURE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide penalties for the mailing of obscene literature to unmarried minors under 18 years of age. Our most precious possession is our children. While we spend billions of dollars annually to provide education for them, it would be foolhardy indeed to neglect protecting them from those inroads which would strike at their very moral vitals. We have read of murders and other serious crimes committed by our youth and I feel that these crimes to a great extent are motivated by misdirected and misguided energies. If we can stop the filth peddlers for profit from contributing to this breakdown of our children, Congress will have rendered outstanding public service.

I earnestly enlist the support and cooperation of every Member of the House so that this bill and further amplifying bills may be enacted into law.

SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes without monetary consideration.

No one can read the current report to the President of the United States on the Annapolis conference on the subject of fitness of American youth without realizing that it is just as important to provide recreational facilities for our youth as it is to provide educational facilities.

The Congress has now provided that surplus property may be transferred to school districts without monetary consideration, and it certainly can be just as logically argued that surplus property, where needed for recreational or park purposes, should be transferred to the proper local government agency, without payment to the Federal Government.

I trust that this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration, for it will be most helpful in determining policy in the disposal of certain surplus properties by the General Services Administration.

SMALL BUSINESS JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an unusually complete, perceptive, and informative analysis of job opportunities for college graduates in southern California small businesses has been made by the pledge research committee of the Long Beach State College chapter of Alpha Kappa Psi, national business fraternity. It is the first time, to my knowledge, that such information has been accumulated. Since college graduates from all parts of the Nation migrate to southern California in large numbers I feel that the information is of national rather than local interest. For that reason I have obtained the consent of this body to include the analysis herewith:

PREFACE

One of the principal objectives of Alpha Kappa Psi, national business fraternity, is to foster and promote research in the field of commerce. The Long Beach State College chapter of Alpha Kappa Psi recognizes the fact that most of the graduating students in the field of commerce and business generally know the opportunities for placement in the large companies, but few of them recognize the tremendous potential offered by the small companies, and this paper is therefore presented, not to sell college students on careers with small companies, but rather to indicate the vastness of small business as a possible field for employment of college graduates in the Nation's most dynamic geographical area.

Relatively little research work has been done in southern California concerning the opportunities for college graduates in small business. The research committee of the 1956 pledge class of Alpha Kappa Psi Fraternity, Delta Omicron chapter, used information from such primary sources as the Department of Commerce, Small Business Administration, and the State of California Department of Employment in the preparation of this report. The secondary sources included many of the current periodicals and reports prepared by the chambers of commerce in the Los Angeles County area.

For the purpose of this paper, we will use the same yardstick to measure as is contained in section 203 of Public Law 163. The definition was accepted by Congress in July of 1953, and describes small business as "one which is privately owned and independently

operated and not dominant in its field." Generally, this includes concerns and their affiliates that employ fewer than 500 employees. Specifically, this takes in manufacturing concerns with 250 employees or less; wholesale firms doing an annual dollar volume of business of $5 million or less; retail stores with annual sales of $1 million or less; and trucking or warehouse companies with annual receipts of $2 million or less. This classification also includes companies selling services rather than products.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN LOS ANGELES

The Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area is the most dynamic and fastest growing industrial region in the entire Nation. During 1952 and 1953, the net population gain in Los Angeles County was approximately 200,000 per year. This means that each year the area has been adding the population equivalent of a city larger than either Tulsa, Salt Lake City, Des Moines, or Nashville. From 1957 to 1960, the population should increase by approximately 150,000 per year. If Orange County continues to grow at a rate moderately below its recent growth, the population of the metropolitan area will reach 6 million by 1960, making this area second only to New York. The effect of this tremendous development is that the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is now the third largest industrial area in the Nation, and the largest manufacturing district west o. the Mississippi River. The United States Department of Labor points out, in its article, "Changing Geography of American Industry" that this is now one of the Nation's major centers for finance, insurance, and real estate; not to mention style.

This same geographic area also accounts for 22 percent of the Nation's total employment in the aircraft and parts industry. With new and expanded industrial plants, some 23,000 jobs were created in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan region in 1955 alone. The value added by manufacturing industries in the area was estimated to have increased 135 percent between the years 1947 and 1953. The following table has been included to indicate the magnitude of growth in the population of manufacturing concerns:

Growth of manufacturing firms in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area

Year	Number of firms	Wage and salary of workers	Value added by firms
1919	3,721	$77,500	$183,855,000
1929	5,029	127,881	505,380,000
1939	5,505	172,757	517,671,000
1947	9,771	358,772	2,052,671,000
1955	14,000	680,000	5,200,000,000

Source: California Department of Employment; Census of Manufacturers.

"Approximately 76 percent of the capital investments in the southern California area have gone into the expansion of already existing industries." This estimate was given by Mr. Marion Banks, chairman of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce's industrial development committee, in his article, "Industry Puts Up $190 Million," and is a definite indication of the growth of individual companies in southern California. To put a final emphasis on the importance of southern California's industries, we present the fact that the Los Angeles-Long Beach area provides more employment for women, professional and technical workers, percentagewise, than the rest of California or any other region in the United States.

DIVERSIFICATION OF INDUSTRY IN LOS ANGELES

Before accepting a permanent position, the college graduate should carefully consider such things as diversification of existing fields and possible new areas of employment that can be expected in the geographical location of his choice. If these factors are taken into consideration, it must be admitted that southern California is hard to beat. In the following list of diverse industries, it ranks third or higher on a national basis in total dollar volume:

1. Automobile assembly.
2. Aircraft production.[1]
3. Aircraft parts.
4. Automobile tires and tubes.
5. Canned seafoods.
6. Construction and mining machinery.
7. Concrete and plastics.
8. Conveyor equipment.
9. Electrical equipment.[1]
10. Household furniture.
11. Heating and plumbing equipment.[1]
12. Jewelry and silverware.
13. Millwork (wool).
14. Motion pictures.[1]
15. Newspaper publishing.
16. Nonferrous foundries.
17. Oilfield machinery and tools.
18. Petroleum refining.
19. Pottery and related products.
20. Pressed and blown glass.
21. Pumps and related products.
22. Refrigeration equipment.
23. Storage batteries.
24. Tractors and farm machinery.
25. Women's and misses' underwear.
26. Women's and misses' outerwear.
27. Miscellaneous wool products.
28. Miscellaneous fabricated products.

(Source: A State College Looks at the Business and Industrial Community It Serves, a Los Angeles State College publication.)

WHY SELECT A SMALL COMPANY?

As college graduates, the getting of a well-paying position with some security and definite advancement opportunities is no doubt one of your prime concerns. In later sections of this paper we will discuss some of the specific fields of business and commerce from the standpoint of opportunities. In this section, however, some of the advantages and disadvantages of small-business employment will be put forth for your consideration.

Mr. Saul M. Silverstein, president of the Rogers Corp., in Rogers, Conn., finds that small business is more satisfying because better esprit de corps is possible, there are fewer layers of communication with a smaller working force. In addition, he says, "Because it is easier to get executive approval, a small organization is lighter on its feet and can move faster in certain situations."

It is well known that men who start businesses have fewer personal restraints on their actions and are able to express themselves more freely. They are able to develop their creative ideas to the limit of their abilities and resources. College graduates in particular have frequently expressed too many ideas for some of the larger companies. The presence of a research division in these companies tends to further aggravate the situation because it decreases top management's emphasis on new ideas from junior executives, due to what might be called a less obvious need. Exceptions to this are in the more progressive companies that emphasize creativity through such techniques as brainstorming.

According to Theodore Beckman, economist at San Jose State College, "ownership of a company no matter the size, gives a person a chance to exercise all of his abilities, skills, knowledge, energy, and desire for creativeness. Chances for recognition are better socially, politically, and economically." Some industries lend themselves entirely to small-scale operation. Others start small and grow into gigantic corporations. It has been said that small business is a seed from which big business grows, and that it is the germination and perpetuator of cities as well as big-business units.

Small business often serves as a proving ground for new ideas and products, patented or unpatened. Many of these ideas never achieve public acceptance but must be given a trial before it is possible to know their future. Large business tends toward conservatism in this respect; many times the small business is the pioneer and provider of a major fund of new ideas and inventions. New companies have started at the rate of 140,000 per year in the United States. The mortality rate for this year is about 11,000. Dun & Bradstreet points out that the rate of failure is due to inexperience and incompetence in 90 percent of the cases. In the southern California area aproximately 200,000 people a year increases are creating greater local demands and new consumer markets. Success stories of college men that have gone into business for themselves in and around greater Los Angeles and, in a period of a few years, have their assets multiplied many times is not uncommon.

Wendell Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration finds the small business future anything but dark. Some of Barnes' optimism is psychological: "There is a growing confidence in the future of all business throughout the Nation." He can find solid facts to justify his confidence: "The size of the gross national product, the increasing birth rate produces new needs in all fields, and the prediction of economists that our standard of living will continue to rise."[2] Lastly, there are tremendous technological developments leading to new products and new markets.

At the present time, the small-business men are looking to Washington for a break on taxes (which both the Democratic and Republican platforms for 1956 have pledged). Arthur Burns, chief economic adviser to the President, is working to cut back the miles of redtape that complicate dealings with the Government. Washington is also attempting to reduce the mountains of forms and reports that weigh most heavily on the small firms' overhead.

The incomes reported by large and small corporation executives indicate a trend toward higher salaries of both top and junior executives of large corporations than to those in smaller companies. Small companies have a number of compensations to offset the salary deficiency. These advantages will be discussed further under the sections relating to opportunities in various fields of business.

LARGE COMPANIES DEPEND ON SMALL COMPANIES

Small businesses provide the backbone for many of the large manufacturing corporations. For example, during 1956 more than 12,000 firms supplied North American Aviation with the myriad of materials, parts, and services needed to build products ranging from the electronic assemblies to 10-ton Super Saber jet fighters. Approximately 11,000 of the 12,880 firms supplying North American are in the small business category, employing 500 or fewer persons.[3]

Lockheed's huge plant at Marietta, Ga., rolled out some figures to indicate the extent to which they were dependent since 1951 upon small suppliers. Of the $605 million in purchases made by this plant, $169 million and 80 percent of the subcontracting work has gone to small companies.[4] General Electric says that half of its sales dollars ($3.1 billion last year) went to its army of 42,000 suppliers, 90 percent of whom are small companies. And since 1950, this giant manufacturer adds that this army has in-

[1] Indicates first in field.

[2] Newsweek: Lots of Little Fellows, October 22, 1956, pps. 83–85.

[3] 1956 annual report to the stockholders, North American Aviation Corp.

[4] Newsweek: Lots of Little Fellows, October 22, 1956, pps. 83–85.

creased by 12,000 despite the fact that defense work undertaken and subcontracting needs have decreased materially.[5]

In Detroit, General Motors hands out half of its income to 21,000 supplying companies. Chrysler notes that 71 percent of the 12,000 firms feeding its factories employ less than 100 persons. Locally, the Long Beach assembly division of Ford Motor Co. places about 93 percent of its $1 million annual operation supplies, maintenance, and repair budget with local suppliers, most of whom are small businesses.

The little businessmen are very important not only to private firms but also to the United States Government, particularly in an election year. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded small suppliers contracts amounting to $3,556,000,000.[6]

THE COLLEGE GRADUATE'S OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

The preceding sections were included to provide the reader with some background in order that he may more easily understand the importance of small businesses to the American economy and especially that of the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area. The specific occupations discussed in the following paragraphs will represent only a small sampling of the areas open to college graduates. They will, however, help to point out some employment areas that deserve further consideration by individuals planning careers in business.

MANAGEMENT

Many of the larger companies maintain separate departments for specific areas in management, industrial engineering, production planning and control, and management or administrative analysis, among them. The college graduate entering the company is usually started in a management training program and then assigned to a specific position or department after completion of this program. The trainee may or may not be able to select his own field but all too often, after the placement is made he is doomed to that one particular area. This may be caused by the absence of a rotation program or due to the fact that he is not given the chance to gain any experience in any of the company's other operations because of the size or structure of the organization. His superior is usually the department supervisor and much of the work done by the college graduate is under the direct supervision of a senior employee.

Contrast this situation with one in which the college graduate enters the training program of a small company. It is quite often conducted informally and in most instances, the trainee is supervised by one of the company's executives, yet works on many of his assignments directly with the owner or company manager. There are fewer levels in the organizational structure and the trainee may constantly be engaged in quite a wide range of company activities.

As one of the fastest growing and most diversified economic regions, Greater Los Angeles enjoys a decentralization of industrial and shopping center areas and the emphasis placed on comfortable suburban living which has manifested itself in the growth of population and business in the Orange County, South Los Angeles and North Long Beach areas. The development of these new industrial and residential centers has sharply accelerated the demands for services and products of all kinds. Good management personnel will have to make its entrance into more small businesses and help to exploit this area to its fullest. The opportunities here are unlimited.

[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

MARKETING

Trade, including the large self-employed group, was the largest industrial division in California in 1950, employing 22 percent of all workers employed in the State. California is second in the Nation in population and area, and has led the entire Nation in population growth for the last three decades. In 1950, 81 percent of the population of California was urban. There were eight major metropolitan areas with populations in excess of 200,000. The predicted population of the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area for 1960 was estimated at 6 million. Nationally, this would put it in second place, preceded only by New York.

The population growth and suburban living are credited with the creation of many new industrial and residential areas in southern California. Many completely new industries have developed and the already existing ones have greatly expanded. Today California ranks first in such marketing fields as the retailing of motor vehicles and the wholesaling and retailing of food and related products. In 1954, the food store sales in Los Angeles amounted to over $1,570,000.

Dr. Ernest Dichter, president of the Institute of Motivational Research Foundation, stated that the need for advertising and market research is rapidly growing because American workers desire stronger family lives, better taste in economic goods, a wider variety of social experiences, and new cultural frontiers. The field of marketing is extremely varied and contains occupational positions of nearly every job description. For college graduates with general business or liberal arts training, the outlook in southern California is especially promising in all areas of wholesaling and retailing. Here again, the opportunities for advancement and financial success are unlimited. Counselors of colleges, high schools, and personnel managers of business firms generally agree that it is not always the selection of a booming of quiet occupation that is important to the individual's success but that it is the individual's ability and enthusiasm that is the real determinant.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTING

Public accounting may be broken down into two areas, i. e., self-employment and employment with a firm already established. Let us consider first a public accountant with a private practice, a field that is unusually rewarding to a CPA who is willing to put forth many hours of hard work to build a practice.

The tremendous population increases in southern California during the past few years has also increased the number of individuals, industries and small businesses that require the services of an accountant. Many of them have turned to CPA's with private practices for financial advice and the keeping of financial records in compliance with present income-tax laws. Public accountants are also helping management and individuals control costs and set accurate prices on products or services. The net result of this overwhelming demand for accounting services is that the present accountants and accounting firms are overburdened with work.

Although not quite as rewarding as a private practice from the standpoint of personal satisfaction of having one's own business, employment with an established firm must not be overlooked. Most accountants possessing their CPA license will have had some experience in this area while working on the experience requirements for their certificates. The starting salaries in local accounting firms fall between $300 and $400 per month. The opportunities in such firms are excellent. Advancement in such firms could easily lead to a partnership with salary increases to from $15,000 to $20,000 per year. The national accounting firms, on the other hand, offer the possibility to junior accountants, with proper training and better-than-average ability, advancement based on a time-increment plan for approximately 6 years, at the end of which time he would be earning about $7,000 to $10,000 annually. His next advancement or series of advancements could lead him to a position qualifying him for a managerial position. This would bring him into the $15,000 to $20,000 per year income bracket. Currently, the growth of such firms is on the upswing in the Los Angeles area due to the growth of the population and increases in economic activities.

FINANCE

The United States Department of Labor's brochure "Changing Geography of American Industry" states that Los Angeles and San Francisco are now among the Nation's largest financial centers, and are particularly important in the areas of insurance and real estate.

It has been estimated that three-fourths of the Nation's wealth is in land and its improvements. Desert development has become exceptionally pronounced in southern California in recent years. The real-estate brokers buying and selling this land and its improvements for commissions have often netted annual incomes in excess of $50,000. Areas that were once desolate or farms and orchards are now blanketed with houses and industrial sites. It was estimated that nearly 11 percent of all the homes built in the United States during 1954 and 1955 were constructed in the southern California area.[7] This is the result of population growth, better highway and freeway systems, suburban living, and decentralization of industrial and shopping centers. Considering all of these factors and the predicted continuance of the present trends, the southern California real-estate picture looks excellent.

California's savings and loan associations have surpassed those of the State of Ohio both in size and volume of business to become first in the Nation. Southern California's facilities account for two-thirds of the State's savings and loan resources; for example, one-fourth of the homes in the Los Angeles area were financed by the savings and loan associations.

An executive of one of the local savings and loan associations relates that the assets of his firm had increased from $30 million to over $175 million between 1949 and 1956, during which time 3 new branches were established. The local association employees are required to engage in a trainee program in which they work in a series of the firm's department in order to orient him on the overall activities of the local finance office. This company provides several extra fringe benefits, as well as a semiannual cash bonus, based on company profits.

An executive in another association indicates that new employees are required to attend two semesters in the savings and loan branch league, a company-sponsored school. The salary range in the local finance company's branch offices are from $225 to $800 per month.

Other areas that are well worth the trouble of looking into are opportunities as financial advisers for small companies, small banks, and investment brokers. All of these areas considered small businesses and provide outstanding employment potentials.

READY TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT?

The most important product you will ever sell, Mr. College Graduate, is yourself. Don't ever make the mistake that is most commonly made by job hunters—that of going from one company to another, filling out application blanks and answering questions

[7] Southland Industry (Special Issue): Long Beach Press-Telegram, January 3, 1956.

without first making careful preparations. Don't take the attitude that the world owes you a living, now that you have graduated from college. With the economic conditions the way they are in metropolitan Los Angeles-Long Beach, almost anyone can find a job. You don't want a job. You want a career. Haven't you just spent 4 or 5 years in study and self-discipline, preparing yourself for a productive and prosperous future? Then plan your strategy for getting this position with meticulous care.

It is only too often that persons capable of doing outstanding work are overlooked because they are not able to sell themselves on the basis of their abilities and ambitions and someone of lesser abilities chosen because he was able to do so. In order to be successful in selling yourself to the personnel man, you must recognize that he is basically the purchasing agent for his firm in the labor market and must make the wisest possible investment for his company in this market. Keeping this in mind, you must carefully analyze yourself, your economic and social goals, and the extent and limitations of your abilities. This self-analysis requires thought and honesty of the highest caliber in order to be undistorted.

After you have decided where your capabilities lie and the specific type of work you are best suited to perform, you must plan the actual campaign for getting a position. Don't forget that the whole attack will be centered around one point—that of selling yourself to the prospective employer.

The first step in formulating this plan is learning where specific opportunities lie in your chosen field. A list of local businesses can be obtained from local chambers of commerce. Other sources of information are newspaper and magazine advertisements, placement offices, and Government and private organizations, such as the United States Department of Commerce and chambers of commerce. A short list of Government and private agencies providing employment information is found in appendix A.

After you have prepared a file of prospective employers, draw up a plan of action for contacting the companies, obtaining an interview and following up the more promising leads. Many excellent suggestions concerning this subject may be found in Glenn Garners' book, How You Can Get a Job.

The most important part of selling yourself to the personnel man is the presenting of a clear picture of yourself. An excellent method is through the personal brochure. Pick Your Job and Get It, by M. G. Edlund, is strongly recommended as an aid in preparing this brochure. Other things to keep in mind are that your chances of getting the position you seek will be enhanced if you know something about the company and the position you are applying for. It has been suggested that you have at least 3 solid facts about the reasons you selected the particular company and be ready to ask at least 3 intelligent questions. If at all possible, it would be helpful to take some samples of your work with you.

Most employers seeking new employees have a more or less definite idea of the type of person they need. It is your job to convince the prospective employer that you are that person for whom he has been waiting and seeking. Remember, don't sell yourself short.

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTED SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

American Management Association, 1515 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Research Department, 404 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

National Industrial Conference Board (Personnel Studies) 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Merchants and Manufacturers Association, 725 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research, San Francisco, Calif.

Department of Employment, 1025 P Street, Sacramento, Calif.

Department of Employment, 827 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Small Business Administration, 450 Western Pacific Building, 1031 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif; 419 Customs House, 555 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Regional Office, Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Apprenticeship, Region 12, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif.

HUMANE SLAUGHTER LEGISLATION

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who would countenance wanton cruelty to animals. If any one of us were to walk out on the Capitol plaza and see an animal being tortured or beaten we would either interfere directly or call the Capitol Police to have the beating stopped. I dare say that our attitude toward cruelty to animals is shared by nearly 100 percent of the people we represent.

America is a nation of animal lovers. Hundreds of thousands of dollars annually are spent building and maintaining animal shelters. Our people back home insist that stray dogs and cats be adequately housed and fed. If it becomes necessary to dispose of them, our citizens require that they be killed rapidly and painlessly.

It is no accident that a dogcatcher usually turns out to be a villain. This is not so much a reflection of our antagonism against him as it is love for his charges.

America has a fine tradition of extending kindness to the unprotected, of exerting its strength to protect the weak. Even the most spectacular and upright of champions must always contend with our well-known sympathy for the underdog.

Despite this fine tradition, however, millions of animals annually are killed in the United States under conditions that would shock and outrage the average citizen.

Hogs are driven into a pen, shackled around one hind leg, then hoisted aloft by a mechanical pulley where, squealing with pain and fright, they sometimes fracture their own legs or pelvis in their writhings. To say that these wounded animals in their thrashing make it difficult for the slaughterer to do his job effectively and well is to understate the situation in the extreme. When the slaughtering is inefficiently done, as is occasionally and too frequently the case, the animal is automatically plunged, still living and conscious, into the scalding tank.

This is the procedure now being used in the majority of our packinghouses, large and small. Lambs and sheep are slaughtered in a similar fashion. That their collective screams of pain are heard only by the few does not lessen the general guilt once we have been made aware of the practice. What we will not condone in one cruel human against one defenseless animal, we cannot condone in an industry—however valuable and necessary—against a mass of defenseless animals.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to require humane slaughter of livestock. I have not taken this action casually. I am against requiring by law practices that should be adopted voluntarily.

The legislation I have introduced today is legislation proposed by the Humane Society of the United States. In introducing this bill, I recognize that it may try to accomplish its objectives too quickly. It may be that hearings on the measure will prove that it needs modification, that in its commendable aim to end pain it is asking the impossible.

This may be. But what I want this legislation to do, and I hope I have the support of this House, is to bring to an end—as quickly as possible—the status quo—a status quo I find indefensible, and a status quo that has been status all too long.

Similar legislation was introduced in both Houses in the 84th session of Congress. The other body held hearings on the legislation. I feel it unfortunate that no hearing was held by the Committee on Agriculture in the House to which the legislation was referred.

Since adjournment of the 84th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest the conflicting testimony given during hearings on similar legislation before a Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture. I do not intend at this time to review the testimony at those hearings. I only know that the question of the cost of installing humane slaughter facilities, the rapidity with which progress in that direction was being made and the estimate of how soon the goal could be achieved was never answered. Or rather, it was answered in two different ways: Those favoring the legislation said, in effect: "Tomorrow." Those opposing: "Maybe sometime."

There was only one area in which both sides agreed. That was that the present method of slaughtering livestock left much to be desired and that livestock should be killed in as humane a manner as is economically feasible.

What disturbed me most, however, was the lack of progress in this field.

Opponents of the legislation introduced evidence that since 1929 money had been expended in rather large amounts by the packing industry in an attempt to find a less cruel way of killing.

Yet in answering statements that humane slaughtering techniques and equipment are now economically feasible, the oppostion had to admit—hearings on S. 1636, page 171:

Accurate estimates of the cost of installation require a reasonable period of planning

and study. To date, the industry generally has not prepared such careful estimates, and hence we do not have comprehensive figures indicating costs of installation. With what information we do have, however, the cost of installation can be appreciably more than the cost of equipment.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a weak answer for an industry that maintains it has been spending appreciable sums trying to solve this problem since 1929.

I also read with interest a report of the advances made in plant, product, and equipment during the last year by one of our largest meat-packing concerns. I am proud of their accomplishments. They are a tribute to free enterprise and how it operates to make our country a better place in which to live. But I was disappointed to note that in all the new projects, the new plant improvements, there was not one mention of any effort to relieve the pain in which the incoming raw ingredients of their production breathes its last.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an exchange of letters with the Department of Agriculture. They are self-explanatory, and I hope that during this session of Congress the Department carefully reexamines its position.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1956.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Sometime ago, I contacted your office on the question of humane slaughter of livestock legislation. The position of the Department at that time was that this problem was being met voluntarily by the industry itself and that legislation was not needed.

From other sources, I have received word that the industry is making slow progress in the matter of humane slaughtering methods.

What I should like to know is what percentage of the livestock slaughter is rendered unconscious by humane means before slaughter and if this percentage has increased during the past few years. I would also like to know what leads the Department to believe that the solution to this problem will come about by the action of the meat-packing industry and when it estimates that all livestock will be slaughtered humanely.

I would appreciate an early reply to these questions.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: This has reference to your letter of June 27 concerning the question of legislation relating to humane slaughter of livestock. Your letter inquiries about livestock slaughtering practices in this country and this Department's position with respect to humane slaughter.

It has not been the practice in this country to render unconscious by any means calves, sheep, lambs, and swine before slaughter. We know of only two exceptions to this rule where the swine in two large meat packing plants are immobilized in an atmosphere of carbondioxide immediately before being slaughtered. We are not aware that a truly objective study and evaluation has been made as to whether these methods of slaughter are or are not humane. We refer to slaughter without first rendering the animal unconscious or when the animal is slaughtered after it has been immobilized by carbondioxide gas. Although there has been and still is considerable interest exhibited by meat packers in the carbondioxide gas in the immobilization method of slaughtering swine, we know of no installation in this country other than those now being used by the company that pioneered this method.

With the exception of cattle slaughtered by the kosher method in which the throat is slashed without first rendering the animal unconscious, it is the practice to stun cattle by a blow to the brain before the animal is slaughtered. The method usually used for stunning cattle is by means of an instrument called the pole ax which is a sort of modified heavy hammer with a long handle. We believe it is conceded that when this stunning device is used by a competent operator the animal is rendered unconscious humanely before slaughter. There has been criticism that in some hands this pole ax is not consistently directed toward the point in the skull where stunning is instantly accomplished. In recognition of this, the industry has participated in the development of a stunning device in which the blow is delivered mechanically rather than manually. Apparently all are in agreement that this accomplishes humane stunning of the animal with more certainty and places less reliance on the personal competency of the worker. Currently, there are a number of these mechanical stunning devices being used on a tryout basis for the purpose of detecting any flaws in the mechanism or any changes which might be made to assure efficient operation. There is every indication that once this mechanical stunning device is available it will be used generally throughout industry in this country.

This Department has had abundant opportunity to review its position in opposition to proposed mandatory legislation that has been introduced in the Congress on humane slaughter of livestock. Our position is supported by a long tradition of interest in humane handling of animals on the farm, in transit, in the markets, and in the meat packing plants.

We know that industry has real substantial reasons for wanting animals to be handled and slaughtered humanely. There are not only practical reasons but members of industry are no less sensitive to humane considerations than the rest of us. Certainly this Department would be remiss to support change merely for change's sake. We stand ready to participate in any constructive movement which is dedicated to the objective evaluation of any method of livestock handling in terms of humane considerations.

Thank you very much for your letter and the opportunity it gives us to discuss this subject with you.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1956.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in further reference to our correspondence on legislation requiring that livestock be slaughtered under humane conditions.

When first I looked into this question, my office was informed by your department, that progress toward humane slaughter was being made by meat packers on a voluntary basis. I agree that a voluntary reform is preferable to a compulsory one.

Subsequently in a letter dated June 27, I requested specific information from your department on this subject. That letter requested figures on the percentage of livestock rendered unconscious by humane means before being killed and whether the percentage was increasing year by year.

I received in answer a letter dated July 5 from E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary, a copy of which is enclosed.

The burden of Mr. Peterson's letter is as follows:

1. Calves, sheep, lambs, and swine are not rendered unconscious before slaughter because "it has not been the practice in this country."

2. There is "every indication" that a more effective stunning device will be used in the future to render cattle unconscious before slaughter.

3. The Department's continued opposition to legislation requiring humane slaughter is supported "by a long tradition of interest in humane handling of animals."

Mr. Peterson notes that 2 large meat-packing plants immobilize swine by carbondioxide before slaughtering but questions whether this method of slaughter is any more humane than the historic method. Anyone who has visited a standard packing plant and heard the animals, screaming in fright and agony, dangling from one leg, sometimes breaking their own pelvis in their writhing, could be hard put defending the present method of slaughter as humane. Comparing this method with the painless bleeding to death of an unconscious animal is like comparing death in a gas chamber with drawing and quartering, or breaking someone on the wheel.

In view of the lack of voluntary progress by the industry, the Department's continued opposition to legislation, plus its failure to put forth an alternate plan to legislation, puts it in the position of favoring the status quo. And I submit, the status quo is hard if not impossible to defend from a humane standpoint.

I can appreciate the tremendous demands these past critical months have put upon your time and energy. I do hope, however, that between now and the convening of the 85th Congress the Department will again review its opposition to this legislation. I know you agree that the needless suffering of some 100 million animals per year is a matter of concern to us all.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Agriculture to schedule early hearings on this legislation. Anything we as Members of Congress can do to hasten the end of a collective cruelty to millions of animals is well worthy of our time.

SEVENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 74th anniversary of the Civil Service Act of 1883—observed by Federal agencies and employees throughout the country as the high point of Civil Service Week. It is a privilege to join in this salute to the merit system in Government and our more than 2 million civil-service employees.

It is most fitting, also, that this week marks the closing days of the first term

of office of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose inspired leadership has immeasurably strengthened the merit system in the Federal Government. I believe this is an appropriate occasion to spread on the record the unparalleled improvement which the past 4 years have brought to the Government service. Never in our history have such great forward strides been made for Federal employees in so short a span of time.

Today the competitive civil service has grown to embrace 91 percent of Federal positions in the United States—an all-time high. For the first time in history, the competitive service has become worldwide by extension to over 20,000 American citizens engaged in our overseas programs. The great majority of noncompetitive positions are outside the United States, or in special categories such as Foreign Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery, which have merit systems of their own.

The dislocations and reductions in force following World War II and the Korean conflict have been finally settled, so that the Federal employee has greater job security and opportunity than ever before.

A new system of career-type appointments, bringing nearly 300,000 indefinite employees into the competitive service, has been a major factor in advancing the principle of merit in the civil service.

Postal and other Federal employees have received generous salary adjustments which more than compensate for increased living costs.

Civil service retirement benefits, including annuities of those already retired, have been greatly liberalized and now compare very favorably with the best plans in private industry. The retirement fund has been placed on a much sounder financial basis, to guarantee that every employee will receive the annuity benefits for which he has planned.

Vigorous measures have been taken, and others are planned, to relieve the shortage of scientific, engineering, and technological skills in Government. This shortage threatened to impede agencies charged with the vital task of maintaining a strong national defense capable of meeting the threat of any potential enemy.

Salary protection has been provided for employees whose positions are reduced in grade through no fault of their own, so long as they remain in the same positions.

A new and liberalized system of premium compensation for overtime, night and holiday work, as well as other fringe benefits, has been established for postal and other Federal workers.

Employees have been relieved of the cost of obtaining indemnity bonds and notary public commissions where such bonds and commissions are required in official duties. The Government now bears these costs.

Employees whose jobs require the wearing of uniforms have been granted allowances to cover the costs of these uniforms.

A vigorous incentive awards program is paying real dividends to both the Government and its employees. In the first year of operations over $102 million was saved by the Government through employees' suggestions. The employees making the suggestions received incentive awards totalling $2,365,000.

A very fine group life insurance program was instituted, making low-cost life insurance available to all Federal employees in amounts equal to their annual salaries carried to the next higher $1,000. The Government pays one-third of the premium cost.

These are just the highlights of advances made in the last 4 years. The President himself has taken a deep personal interest in civil service administration and a strong stand on preserving the integrity of the merit system. In his own words, "A strong and competent career civil service is the most important factor in achieving sound and efficient management in Government." He has emphasized the need for "protection of the career civil service against any encroachment of politics—personal or party."

I believe that Federal employees share my pride in this record of accomplishment—toward which they have contributed so greatly—and look forward with confidence to even greater progress under the enlightened personnel policies and able guidance of President Eisenhower when he takes office at noon on the first day after Civil Service Week.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a special order of 10 minutes for Monday next after the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair will advise the gentleman that on Monday next there will be no legislative session.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What will be the first day on which we will transact business?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Tomorrow and Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When do we meet next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On Monday and probably Tuesday, but there will be no business on Monday. That is Inauguration Day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry on that.

How do Members get from the stands out here down to see the parade? I have inquired of the Inaugural Committee, I have inquired of the Capitol Police, and no one other than the Speaker of the House seems able to advise me on that matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I am afraid the present occupant of the chair cannot enlighten the gentleman. Further, the Chair does not think the gentleman has submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the Chair is right about that. Then I had better talk with the Speaker privately.

Then upon conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders on the first day the Congress meets, I would like a special order for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Tomorrow?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the last special order of today I may address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE FOREST SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee on Forestry of the House Committee on Agriculture I want to point out the very practical and realistic budget proposals made by the President for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. These funds are to be used in managing the national forests and for other related duties of this rather unusual branch of the Federal Government. I say unusual because the Forest Service returned to the Federal Treasury last year well over $100 million from the sale of timber and other products of the national forests. While timber and the other products are important to industry—because they mean raw materials and jobs—we must also realize that proper management of these publicly owned forest lands pay big dividends to the public in other values such as watershed protection, wholesome outdoor recreation, and hunting and fishing.

Adequate financing of the various national forest activities therefore represents a sound investment on the part of the taxpayers. Over the past few years increases in appropriations for preparing additional timber sale programs and constructing additional timber access roads, have resulted in greatly increased returns of cash to the Treasury from sale of timber. Likewise, progress has been made in work with the States on better management and protection of farm woodlands and other privately owned forest land. Forest research is making great strides in such fields as improved tree strains, better utilization of forest products, and many other developments. These are all to the good, for they benefit the farmer and land-

owner right down to our congressional districts.

But today, I want to point out a real milestone in financing a long neglected part of the national forest program. That is the item on national forest recreation. This important activity touches most of the American homes sometime during the year. Today, Americans are blessed with more time to rest and relax, to travel, camp and picnic, or to just go sightseeing.

The national forests make up a big part of the Nation's outdoor playgrounds. Recreational areas developed on these publicly owned forest lands range from simple picnic spots with tables, fireplaces, and sanitary facilities to camp sites, swimming developments, fishing lakes, and certain selected areas where rustic cabins are rented. They represent the family type outdoor recreation so important to the farmer, wage earner, or small merchant, who cannot afford a trip to Europe, or even to Miami.

Some 4,000 of these recreational areas have been developed on the national forests. Most of them were constructed in the 1930's by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Most of them are just about worn out. For many years, they have been too few and too far between to meet the heavy use of our present population.

Members of my subcommittee on forestry have been greatly concerned for a number of years about the need to repair and enlarge the present areas and to build more areas to overcome the crowded conditions which exist during the vacation season. Several of the Members have introduced bills to help solve this problem. Many other Members of Congress have been concerned with the problem. The interest is very wide because in one way or another it affects every congressional district. Either you have the national forest areas in your district, or your constituents travel to the nearest area to picnic, camp, hunt, fish or ski.

Following adjournment of Congress in 1955, our subcommittee on forestry made an extensive on-the-ground inspection of national forests across the country, with special attention being given to improving the recreational and hunting and fishing benefits of these public lands. We held many hearings and met with many groups. The need for a big step forward in building up these areas was very apparent.

Since our inspection in 1955, I have held many personal conferences with top officials of the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture in an effort to arrive at a practical solution to the problem. Last fall, I was advised that the Department had started a study and would develop a 5-year plan of action which would bring national forest recreation facilities up to current needs by 1962.

Today, the Department of Agriculture released a program called Operation Outdoors, which presents this 5-year plan to accomplish the job as far as family type recreation is concerned. This program calls for $11½ million to be available by next July to start a repair and expansion program which will take care of the present overload and double the recreation capacity of the national forests by 1962 to accommodate the number of visitors expected by that time.

I want to commend the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and the administration for this sound and practical approach in meeting this problem and to give the average American family greater opportunity for healthful outdoor recreation. This means a better chance to travel a scenic road, camp on a favorite lake or fish a running stream. It will mean closer family ties and a real shot at juvenile delinquency.

I do, however, want to point out that the program released today and called Operation Outdoors, part 1, covers only the recreation or picnic and camping aspect of the national forest program. The improvement of wildlife habitat for better management of game and fish is not provided for.

The wildlife resources of the national forests constitute one of their major recreational attractions and the problem of protecting and managing cover or habitat for fish and game is closely linked to the over-all national forest recreation problem.

The national forests are important wildlife habitats. They provide homes for nearly all forms of fish, game, and non-game animals found in the United States. Within the national forests there are 81,000 miles of fishing streams and 2¼ million acres of lakes and impoundments. Much of the country's most productive trout waters are on or flow from national forest areas. Small game varieties that are common within the national forests include quail, grouse, squirrels, and rabbits. In some national forest areas wild turkeys provide fine hunting.

The national forest big game population has increased from 2,360,000 animals in 1946 to an estimated 3⅓ million in 1955. This is 35 percent of the Nation's total and includes 55 percent of all big game in the 11 Western States.

Each year the national forests accommodate a larger percentage of the country's total hunting and fishing use. It appears likely that this use will continue to increase due to mounting human populations, greater leisure, better transportation and the posting of private lands. In some sections the national forests now provide just about the only major land areas open to public hunting and fishing.

Hunting and fishing as a form of sport and recreation are of great importance to the people of my District and to the entire State of Alabama. Some of the best quail, turkey, squirrel, rabbit, and deer hunting in the country is to be found in Alabama. And some of the best hunters. One of the Nation's outstanding leaders in wildlife conservation, Mr. Claude D. Kelley, president of the National Wildlife Federation, is a resident of Alabama.

I am constantly reminded by my constituents of the need for improvement of wildlife conditions on the national forests. These areas make up the great public hunting and fishing grounds. Fences and posted signs do not bar the taxpayer, these are his lands. But the growing number of hunters and fishermen depending on national forest land and waters for their sport calls for a stepped-up program of wildlife management in cooperation with the State game departments.

I note from the printed copy of Operation Outdoors, part 1, that the Department of Agriculture plans to cover national forest wildlife under part 2 to be released later. Some 24 million licensed hunters and fishermen await this proposed part 2 of Operation Outdoors with real interest. To them, it spells the hope of better fishing and hunting in the years ahead. I hope this other part of the total program will be developed and presented without delay. Meanwhile, we do have before us a blueprint for a substantial part of this much-needed program. We have needed this a long time. I earnestly commend it to your attention.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a new provision of the Civil Service Retirement Act adopted in conference during the closing days of the 2d session of the 84th Congress is not having the result intended and is imposing a great inequity on a limited number of employees.

The problem involved is rather technical, but the issue is comparatively simple. Under the law in effect until October 1, 1955, an employee making a redeposit to the retirement fund was not charged interest for any previous separation from the Federal service. The law was changed last fall, requiring interest payments for all periods of separation. The change became effective before employees received due notice, and, in some instances, had all the aspects of a breach of contract.

The provision also had another peculiar twist. It required retroactively the collection of interest on the full amount of the original indebtedness, even though a major portion had been paid prior to the effective date of the law.

In one instance, an employee owed only $40 to the fund on October 1. He had been advised to this effect by the Civil Service Commission. Subsequently, however, he received notice that he owed the fund in the neighborhood of $1,200. This came about because, under the provision, the Commission was requiring computation of interest on sums he had previously owed the fund but which had been repaid.

Mr. Speaker, I sent to the desk a bill designed to correct this situation. Under the bill I am introducing, interest would be charged on all sums owed to the fund on or after October 1, 1955. This would

make the result prospective and not retrospective, as is the case under the provision referred to.

THE LATE HONORABLE BURTON E. SWEET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to my colleagues the passing of a former distinguished member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Burton E. Sweet, of Waverly, Iowa.

Death came to this pioneer Iowa lawyer and legislator at the age of 89 on January 3, 1957, after suffering a stroke on Christmas Day.

Burton Erwin Sweet was born near Tripoli, Bremer County, Iowa, December 10, 1867. He attended public schools in Fremont Township and Waverly, the Iowa State Normal School at Cedar Falls, and was graduated from Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, in 1893. He received his law degree from the State University of Iowa in 1895. He was admitted to the bar in 1895 and that year commenced the practice of law in Waverly.

Burton Sweet was city solicitor of Waverly, 1896–1899, and a member of the Iowa House of Representatives, 1900–1904. He was elected to the 64th and the three succeeding Congresses—March 4, 1915 to March 3, 1923—from the Third Iowa Congressional District which I now have the honor of representing.

He did not seek renomination in 1922, having become a candidate for the United States Senate. He was an unsuccessful candidate for United States Senator in the Republican primary elections of 1922 and 1924.

Throughout his lifetime, Burton Sweet was active in the Republican Party. He was a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1904; member of the Iowa Republican State Central Committee, 1902–1906, and was a delegate to all Iowa State Republican conventions since 1908.

In his passing, Iowa has lost one of its most capable leaders. He remained alert and active until he suffered a stroke on Christmas Day. At the age of 89, he was still engaged in the daily practice of his profession as senior member of the law firm of Sweet, Sager, and Engelbrecht.

During his distinguished career in this body, Burton Sweet will probably best be remembered as the author of three bills dealing with veterans' benefits. Because of his efforts in behalf of veterans, he was made an honorary member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

On June 21, 1955, Federal Judge Henry N. Graven convened a special session of the United States district court, northern division, at Waterloo, Iowa, at which many tributes were paid to Burton Sweet. It was an honor he richly deserved.

Burton Sweet was actively interested in wildlife preservation, and only recently deeded 600 acres of land near Tripoli to the State of Iowa for a game and wildlife refuge. The tract is known as Sweet Marsh.

Burton Sweet was a kindly man. His was an unusually rich and full life, and for me, personally, his death leaves a void for I counted it a privilege to visit with him and draw from his wisdom.

To Mrs. Sweet and other members of the family I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include as part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the January 6 edition of the Waterloo Daily Courier:

BURTON E. SWEET SERVED IOWA WELL

Iowa has lost one of its capable leaders in the death of Burton E. Sweet, Waverly attorney. It is such men as he, both in public office and as interested private citizens, who maintain governmental affairs at a responsible and sound level.

Sweet served 2 terms in the Iowa House of Representatives at the turn of the century and was Third District Congressman for 4 terms from 1915 to 1923. He gave distinguished service in those legislative positions; and then returned to Waverly where he practiced law and continued to take an active and influential role in public affairs.

Those who mourn his passing will nevertheless find consolation in the fact that he led a productive, useful, and happy life, remaining alert and active almost to the time of his death at the age of 89. The Iowa we have today is the product of such wise and farsighted leaders as Burton E. Sweet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members may extend their remarks in connection with the death of the Honorable Burton Sweet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HIS EMINENCE JAMES FRANCIS CARDINAL McINTYRE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre at the dedication of the new University of Dallas.

The address follows:

GI BILL OFFERS FEDERAL AID FORMULA

To dedicate a new university is at any time a distinct privilege and an occasion of special joy. To dedicate a new university in the city of Dallas, a city at once as progressive yet so conscious of our traditions, is a source of special consolation. And to your beloved bishop I am warmly grateful for this privilege, this joy and consolation.

As I utter these expressions of congratulation to the city of Dallas, to its illustrious bishop and to its beloved people, I am motivated by the realization that the establishment of the University of Dallas, under the circumstances that prevail in these our days, is most reassuring.

It tells us graphically that the American spirit of freedom of enterprise still prevails.

It reminds us forcefully that, despite some very strange and even judicial interpretations regarding public education, the liberty to choose a school for our children is one of our fundamental freedoms, and that the people of Dallas look for this freedom to continue in our land and to flourish in the State of Texas.

The dedication of this new university is a challenge to the philosophy of those educators who favor a monopoly of education under bureaucratic control, and we are happy to share in this epoch-making confirmation of truly American principles.

I shall not venture to develop further the thought that some have already noted and that others will express more eloquently. I shall confine my comments to some specific phases of our all-important educational problem.

MAN'S CURIOSITY IS INSATIABLE

Man's irresistible urge is to know what is beyond the farthest hill or the mountain that sentinels the valley or the placid mirror of familiar lake and the wide sweep of inlet bay.

Man's insatiable curiosity is to know more of the animals that roam the forest and the fish that abide in the deep. This urge and curiosity have brought him along fabulous trails of never-ending travels.

Man has forever found a restless interest in his fellows who dwell in distant lands or on remote islands, and, because nothing human is alien to him, he wants to know all about them—their ways of life, their habits, and customs, and characteristics. And, too, because every man is at least an incipient philosopher, he must know something of their languages, their histories, their literatures, and their thoughts.

No matter how wide and persistent the search, the results of his deliberations are sadly unsatisfying because the quest is so often superficial.

There is interest in the study of other lands, in the investigation of varying climates, the different composition of soils, the diversity in fertility and the consequent degrees of productivity. All these, if man would but look beyond are evidences of the wonders of creation.

But what should prove a fascinating study becomes a frustrating experience when man forgets that his absorbing interest in the world of time is urged on relentlessly by the restless will seek the basic and fundamental source of all this wonderment, to seek the Author of all this infinite variety of creation.

For there is no answer to the riddle of the universe except the answer of the first cause, the uncaused cause of all things, the cry of the psalmist: O Lord, our God, how wonderful is Thy name in all the eartn.

EDUCATION IS LIFE ITSELF

When man has been derelict in the search for the hidden intangibles of time, he has been troubled in mind, as were the Jews of old in the lament of the prophet Osee: "There is no truth and there is no mercy and there is no knowledge in the land."

For, without moorings, man wanders off into the wastelands of his own conceit and he finds, in the forgetfulness of God, neither the wisdom to solve the perplexities of his world nor the strength to pursue the ways of salvation. We have seen it happen again and again in history—when the truth that is God and His law is lacking, even the most elementary truths no longer prevail.

Education may be a science, its methods may be an art, but education is primarily life itself. There is much to be said for an edu-

cation that is life-centered provided it envisages the whole of life, provided it is education for complete living.

Education is a natural process. We learn surely by living acutely. There were times when formal schools did not exist, yet the boy on one end of the log was truly given his heritage.

Education has become a science and an art as man has standardized his knowledge, as he developed a medium of communication in language, as he divided systems and symbols of computation, and as he committed his findings to writing for the benefit of posterity. Hence, schools as we know them today exist to treasure the hard-won wisdom of the past and to push back the frontiers of knowledge in new worlds to conquer.

SPIRITUAL HUNGERS MUST BE FILLED

The author of education is the author of life itself. God has given man mind and instinct to range over and explore the riotous profusion of the world and to bend his energies, Providence concurring, for his sustenance and the provision of the neccessities of life.

The story of science is the record of man's God-given talent to harness the universe to his whim. But not by bread alone does man live.

There are spiritual hungers which must be filled up by the truths of nature and of grace as man learns God's ways from his experience and observations, and reads the story of God's love in the pages of Revelation.

It is axiomatic that always and everywhere the quest to know is never complete. It never satisfies the mind or contents the heart where the knowledge of God is absent. Man cannot be happy with but a little knowing. His mind must plunge into the deepest causes of things to find the ultimate source of the wonders all about him.

If he flaunts the guidance of his reason, the observation of his senses, the cumulative experience of the race, the example that history writes, he but kicks against the goad, in the expressive language of St. Paul.

ASIATIC ERROR BLIGHTS EDUCATION

This is why education has always been nurtured and fostered under religious auspices.

The history of education in the Western World shows that up to comparatively recent times the lamp of learning was held aglow in catechetical and monastic school, in such great universities as Oxford, Paris, Salerno, and the rest all chartered by the church in the most glorious of centuries, and later in the common schools run by her Sisters and Brothers long, long before any state thought it necessary to concern itself over much with the education of the least favored of society.

For the object of education is the knowledge of God and His law: "That they may know Thee, the one true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." It is only in this truth that all truths have meaning.

Education today is thus confronted with a monstrous and baffling contradiction. The trend of the times, as it emulates the thought and policy of Asiatic practices, which exprofesso denies the existence and the providence of God, offers no promise of prosperity, no horizon of peace, because it denies man's essential nature and the sovereign sway of an immutable law in the conduct of human affairs.

Even in these days, we witness the rejection not only of law but of the refined human impulses of justice and charity and mercy, as human beings—men, women, and even children—are being maltreated and scourged, exiled, and killed.

The carnage exceeds the slaughter that would be visited upon animals, and all because there is a philosophy of life today that recognizes no sanction beyond the power of a rifle or a machinegun.

OUR FREEDOMS ARE VIOLATED

Notwithstanding this devastating evidence of philosophical error, there prevails among our supposedly most advanced educators here in our own country, the policy of promoting a Government-controlled education that would insist on this complete omission of the knowledge of God, this neglect of His eternal law as it is written in nature and in the hearts of men.

The hue and cry everywhere in planned propaganda is for this incomplete education through the means of Federal aid to the schools, but only for those schools which the liberal wail would bring to complete unmindfulness of God and His law under the specious fear of union of church and state.

There is as yet no voice loud enough to resent the discrimination and to deplore the injustice.

In colonial days the cry was raised that taxation without representation was tyranny. We have no fear but in our day too there will be men who will stand up and say that compulsory public education without God is a violation of the freedoms guaranteed us in our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The innate sense of justice and fair play for the American people will seek a solution to the problem that is based on justice and equity. We would be untrue to our traditions if we failed the American ideal in this test of simple justice for all the children of the land.

The question of Federal aid to education has been promulgated on the basis of Government grants to each State, computed on the basis of the number of all the children of school age in the State, with the proviso that this grant will not be available for other than State-supported schools.

There is gross discrimination here which is only aggravated by the plan to count all children in the apportionment of funds, but to exclude from benefits those not enrolled in State-controlled institutions.

A SOLUTION WILL BE FOUND

There is injustice here, too, of an un-American kind that would tax the families of all children and then exclude a sizable section of the population from participation in the benefits, simply because that section chooses to exercise its constitutional privilege to send its youngsters to other than public schools.

These inequities are apparent to all men of good will, and we are confident that the tide of public opinion will mount to banish from the field of education the discrimination and injustice and compulsion that are so alien to American hearts.

We are confident that a solution will be found to bring to all our children the educational aids and advantages which will enable them to reach their full stature as responsible participants in the blessings of our society. This is the American dream, and we will not be unfaithful to it.

Perhaps a solution has already been found in the policy of our Government in the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights. This policy, which allowed our soldier-sons to select the school of their choice for their years of higher education, was, when it expired recently, widely acclaimed as a huge success. Here was aid given to the individual, irrespective of the school attended. Here was a novel and eminently successful method of educational aid, high in accord with the American spirit of justice and fair play.

AMERICA'S WEALTH IS HER CHILDREN

There are many who doubt the immediacy and question the urgency of Federal aid to education, but if Federal aid is to be a reality this aid can well come with justice in the formula of the much heralded GI bill of rights.

Here is an approach that would not involve any discrimination, for the aid would go to all children directly as it did to our returned heroes.

There would be no question of injustice, for all would receive proportional share in the distribution their taxes provided.

Neither would the subject of religion intrude itself, nor could the shibboleth of union of church and state be raised, for the allowance would not be paid to any school but to the parents of the child.

The McCollum decision would be nullified as irrelevant. And banished forever from our fears would be the element of compulsion in education that rankles the spirit of freedom.

If the boon of peace to be ours is an era of atomic plenty that staggers the imagination, our schools and our children will be our increasing concern as we strive to bring them to greater health and happiness and holiness.

America's wealth is all her children. They are her hope in the shrouded future. Who would deny any of them full participation in their patrimony? This is the American dream.

GI HOME LOANS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which I view as an emergency measure designed to breathe life into a very fine program that will soon become inactive unless prompt action is taken. I have reference to the GI home loan program. It is not only curtailment of the benefit for the veterans which concerns me, although this aspect, of course, is a predominant factor. The side effects resulting from the inability of veterans to obtain home loans are being reflected in the number of residential units being constructed, and in the related fields which are hit by a decline in the home construction activity.

As has so often been true under this administration, it is the small-business man who suffers most. It is the builder of a few houses each year whose source of funds first is cut off. It is the local suppliers of building materials who are hit the hardest by the small builder leaving the scene, since the large operators generally order direct from the factory or mill. But let me say that the problem is by no means confined to the small builder. Every manufacturer and dealer in appliances and furnishings is hit. It is being felt throughout our economy and is rapidly becoming more acute. Who is responsible for this condition, and what were the forces which have brought it about?

Throughout the campaign and in current public utterances, administration spokesmen have stressed the anti-inflationary actions which have been taken in order to maintain a sound dollar. In referring to the "sound" dollar, the spokesmen must have in mind that definition of "sound" which Mr. Webster describes as "that which is or can be heard" because there is no question but what today, money talks, and all of the concessions have been in favor of those who have it to lend.

To distort the picture even more, we are told that the cost of living has gone up about 3 percent since this administration took office. How does this figure compare with the actual increase in the cost to the home purchaser on the present market? In 1952 the average price of a new house was $9,475. Today the average price is $12,375, an increase of more than 30 percent. The argument is advanced that the average house of 1952 is far different from the 1956 model, and unquestionably there is some validity in that argument. However, the fact remains that there has been an increase of 13½ percent in construction costs during the past 4 years, and indications are that a further increase is in prospect for 1957.

What does all of this mean to the individual who hopes to house his family in a home of his own? The answer of course is obvious. All of these forces combine to increase substantially the cost to him or drive him from the home-buying market completely.

The unfortunate fact is that these conditions are not likely to improve. On the contrary, the immediate likelinood is for further worsening.

Pressure is being brought to bear to increase the rate of interest of GI loans to 5 percent. In 1952 the interest rate on GI loans was 4 percent. In May 1953 the rate was raised to 4½ percent, an increase of 12½ percent. If the rate is increased to 5 percent, that will represent a 25-percent increase in interest over 1952 levels—a far cry from the 3-percent cost-of-living increase we hear so much about. And we are told that even 5 percent will not bring in an ample supply of funds and may result only in partial or temporary relief.

I am convinced that an increase in the interest rate is not an answer to this problem. This device already has been tried and was found wanting. There seems to me to be only one reasonable solution which will have an immediate effect, and that is why I have introduced a bill to authorize $1 billion in direct loans by the Veterans' Administration. Since this is an emergency measure and in order to assure that it gets under way without delay, my bill provides that there will be no referral to any other agency of the Government or to any lending groups. Thus the voluntary home-mortgage credit program will be bypassed, since they operate only in the remote areas, and under my measure the Veterans' Administration will be authorized to make loans throughout the country if a veteran is unable to obtain a guaranteed loan for which he qualifies. For this reason also, I have proposed an increase in the maximum direct loan from $10,000 to $20,000. These loans would bear an interest rate of not more than 4½ percent.

I do not propose to substitute a direct loan program for the loan guaranty program. I am hopeful that soon adequate investment funds will become available so that private lenders again will seek VA guaranteed loans. But in the meantime something must be done quickly so that this program which has made it possible for about 5 million veterans to become homeowners will not languish. To allow that to happen would be a breach of faith with those World War II and particularly Korean veterans who have been hopeful of using their GI loan benefits. In addition, we should not overlook the support this program has given our national economy in the field of residential construction, and the consequences which must inevitably result if this support should cease.

We can ill afford to delay in meeting this problem and I urge the Congress to take favorable action promptly on the bill which I have introduced.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for an indefinite period on account of medical examination.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. WIER) for 20 minutes on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio).

Mr. WIER and include a statement by himself on legislation introduced by him.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. SELDEN), and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include an address by the President of the United States delivered yesterday at Wichita, Kans.

Mr. O'KONSKI to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include a letter he wrote to the State Department.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) in two instances.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter relating to the late Honorable C. Wayland Brooks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

306. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 513 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1513), and the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

307. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1956 (38 U. S. C. 13f) (H. Doc. 52); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

308. A letter from the manager, District of Columbia Armory Board, relative to asking for a 30-day extension of time in which to submit the Ninth Annual Report and Financial Statement of the District of Columbia Armory Board which, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605, 80th Congress, is to be presented to Congress on or before January 31, 1957; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

309. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 73 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the same, and the balance, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to title 2, United States Code 84; to the Commitee on House Administration.

310. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relative to the preparation of a report required to be submitted on or before December 31, 1956, pertaining to a county hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., which would make available facilities for the treatment of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

311. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of an order canceling $4,062.06 of delinquent operation and maintenance assessments existing as debts against Indian landowners within the Ahtanum unit of the irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, and the elimination of 93.9 acres of land from the project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

312. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone and President of the Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 831 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code to make it a felony to injure or destroy works, property, or material of communication, power, lighting, control, or signal lines, stations, or systems, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

313. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide

that certain additional categories of loans to veterans may be automatically guaranteed"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

314. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to H. R. 12080, which if signed on August 10, 1956, would have authorized appropriations totaling about $1.6 billion for 99 projects or project modifications and 14 river basin authorizations involving improvements for navigation, shore protection, flood control, and related purposes, and stating that he has been requested by the President to advise of the current recommendations of the executive branch concerning these proposed authorizations; to the Committee on Public Works.

315. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a communication from the Honorable MERWIN COAD with reference to his election as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Iowa (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

316. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Frenchman unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

317. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research to award master of science, master of public health, and doctor of science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

318. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the entitlement to reenlistment under certain circumstances of certain former officers"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

319. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 11th Annual Report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

320. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 22d Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, pursuant to Public Law 442, approved June 21, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3006. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3007. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas joint debates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 3008. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at the Birch Coulee battlefield site in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 3009. A bill to authorize improvement of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Winona, Minn., for flood control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3010. A bill for the improvement of Root River at Rushford, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3011. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3012. A bill to extend and strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by making its provisions retroactive to provide for grants for construction of certain treatment works on which construction was commenced during the period from July 9, 1954, to July 30, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 3013. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3014. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3015. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3016. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3017. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3018. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3019. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3020. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3021. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 3022. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H. R. 3023. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 3024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish new corporate tax rates by gradually decreasing the normal tax to 22 percent and increasing the surtax to 30 percent over a 5-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3026. A bill to give relief in the case of transfers to United States charities which are subjected to State and foreign death taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3027. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 3028. A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3029. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3030. A bill to provide for an annual audit of the accounts of the White County Bridge Commission; to provide a new method of appointment for the commissioners and for staggered terms of office; to exempt the income of the commission from Federal taxation; and to clarify the authority of the commission to transfer all its assets to certain public agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3031. A bill creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3032. A bill to terminate the White County Bridge Commission, to transfer its assets, liabilities, functions, and authority to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to authorize the transfer of the bridge operated by the commission to certain State agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 3033. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for the mailing of obscene literature to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3034. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3035. A bill to provide a temporary extension of certain special provisions relating to State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3036. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3037. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 3038. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3039. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3040. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 3041. A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3042. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3043. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 3044. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey certain property located in the vicinity of Montgomery, Montgomery County, Ala., to the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3045. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3046. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3047. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 3048. A bill relating to the charging of interest on deposits to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3049. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3050. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3051. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3052. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 3053. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 3054. A bill to amend section 270 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3055. A bill to amend section 270 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3056. A bill for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend paragraph 909 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to articles of corduroy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3058. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3059. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to promote the maintenance of the American fishing fleet under competitive conditions and in the interest of sustained fish food supplies in case of emergency and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3060. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3061. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3062. A bill to provide that any United States passport hereafter issued to a citizen shall not show his place of birth or contain any other information which would indicate whether he is a citizen by birth or by naturalization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3063. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain instances an interest passing to the surviving spouse within 6 months after the date of the decedent shall not be considered an interest which will terminate or fail in certain instances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3065. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3066. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building in Queens County, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3067. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3068. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 3069. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, 1954, to require the sale abroad at world market prices of 150 million pounds of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3070. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3071. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to enter into and execute amendatory contract with the Northport Irrigation District, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for increased deductions for employers who employ individuals who are 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr MOULDER:

H. R. 3073. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3074. A bill to amend section 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in order to provide direct loan funds to meet the emergency in the veterans' housing program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL (by request):

H. R. 3075. A bill to repeal the Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3076. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain real property or interests in real property heretofore acquired by the United States for the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir project, to the former owners of such property or interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. R. 3077. A bill to provide that the lake created by the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River located at the confluence of the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers be known as Lake Seminole; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 3078. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that foremen shall in certain cases be considered as employees for purposes of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 3079. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3080. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3081. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 3082. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount

of the exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3084. A bill to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3085. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida, provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 3086. A bill to provide for the labeling of ice cream, fluid milk, and fluid milk drinks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3088. A bill to provide means for further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3089. A bill to permit employees of the Panama Canal Company who are piloting vessels through the Panama Canal to retire under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, after 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3090. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3091. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3092. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3093. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3094. A bill to determine the need for improvement of the Chipola Cutoff in the Apalachicola River, Fla., via Wewahitchka; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3095. A bill to determine the need for a small-boat channel and basin in Joe's Bayou in Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3096. A bill to determine the need for modification of the St. Marks River, Fla., project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3097. A bill to provide for the modification of the Escambia River channel project in accordance with recommendations of the United States Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3098. A bill to determine the desirability of opening the channel from Lynn Haven Bayou, Fla., to North Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3099. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer of certain surplus property of the United States on Red Fish Point, Tyndall Air Force Reservation, Bay County, Fla., to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3100. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interest for such works as they may have done on the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, and the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., Channel across St. George Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3101. A bill to determine the need for boat basins in the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3102. A bill to determine the need for increasing the depth of St. Josephs Bay Channel from 32 to 35 feet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 3103. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to Federal grants for construction of hospitals to permit grants to governmental institutions only; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3104. A bill to recognize for income-tax purposes prepaid income accounting and reserves for estimated expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3105. A bill to amend section 270 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3106. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal-year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3107. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of Fresno, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3108. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of Fresno, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr, SPENCE:

H. R. 3109. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 3110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 3111. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 3112. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3114. A bill to allow additional income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3115. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3116. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the 5 highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3117. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain deductions from a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3118. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 3119. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 3120. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 3121. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (by request):

H. R. 3122. A bill to amend section 8 (b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition, preservation, maintenance, and administration of the home of John Jay as a national historical site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representatives of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to confirm the authorization of the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the centennial anniversary

of the Lincoln-Douglas debates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to punish the imparting of false information concerning bombs and to prohibit their placement in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution requesting the President, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring about the establishment of a United Nations military force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 105. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 104; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 107. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 108. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to the recent 1-cent per gallon increase in the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 109. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the service being rendered by certificated air carriers; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Lee Chong Taik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Jen Zien Huang and Ethel Chun Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Rahmi Tugrul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Misuzu Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3128. A bill for the relief of Wing Lok So; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H. R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Maria Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska:

H. R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramirez-Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donna W. Bohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Sisters Bianca Capasso, Caterine Giudice, and Giuseppa Capone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Hassan Homayssi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Itzhak Epstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adriana Maria van der Meulen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Brancato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paulette Jacqueline (Bede) Yerkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas George Stamatiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Maria Segovia de Aparicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3140. A bill for the relief of Erika Gorenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Carlito Ladores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Ada Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3143. A bill for the relief of Pearl (Pik Chun) Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3144. A bill for the relief of Ying Lun Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 3145. A bill validating a certain conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving a certain portion of right-of-way, in the city of Lodi, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway under an act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3146. A bill for the relief of Alma Goddard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3147. A bill for the relief of Friedrich A. von Hoyningen-Huene, Michael Andreas von Hoyningen-Huene, Christian Berend Johann von Hoyningen-Huene, and Brigitte Anita Peck nee von Hoyningen-Huene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3148. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Ada Malaguti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 3149. A bill for the relief of Bessie Yu (nee Huang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3150. A bill for the relief of Lucina Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3151. A bill for the relief of Nachum Pfeifenmacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Rifke Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of Domenico Busetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3154. A bill for the relief of Peter O'Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Deloris Alice Seaton Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3156. A bill for the relief of Samuel John Edgecombe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bao Jen Chern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of Jeannette J. 'Vong (also known as Tsi Ping Wang) and Kwei Yang Wang (nee Chang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Agnes Chung (nee Chan) and Chung Yin Own; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3160. A bill for the relief of Chao Lung Shi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3161. A bill for the relief of Yu Huang Teh, also known as Yu Hung Teh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3162. A bill for the relief of Fu Cheng Kiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3163. A bill for the relief of Sung Chang Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3164. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Donato Valo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 3165. A bill for the relief of William H. Lowery, executor of the estate of Minnie A. Lowery, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3166. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3167. A bill for the relief of Gerlando (Gino) Mangione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Filippo Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Rose Mary Sprouil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3170. A bill for the relief of Akiko Haraba Nickolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3171. A bill for the relief of Nada Marija Popovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3172. A bill for the relief of Frangoula Kolikias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Calabro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3174. A bill for the relief of Biyanka J. Kondrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3175. A bill for the relief of Vincente Moreno Camberos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3176. A bill for the relief of Jennie Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 3177. A bill for the relief of Norvall Arnold Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3178. A bill for the relief of Gerald Waytashek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3179. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Landi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3180. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joseph Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3181. A bill for the relief of Lars T. Radberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3182. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Vasilievna Ghermanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 3183. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stefanie Emilie Geiger Conrad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3184. A bill for the relief of Gordon Broderick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3185. A bill for the relief of Athanassios Theodore Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Kiki Monoyioudes (also known as Angelika Monoyioudes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Leopardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Lina Maria Pagnutti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Margareta Weindorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3191. A bill for the relief of Bastiaan Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 3192. A bill for the relief of Ying Kie Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3193. A bill for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Holmar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Aleks Sigus (Ludwig Sigus); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Favorito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3196. A bill for the relief of Paulette Renee Mamasian nee Postuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3197. A bill for the relief of Shigeru Gerald Nagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3198. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Balantzyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 3199. A bill for the relief of Richard Rhen-Yang Lin and his wife, Julia Lam Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 3200. A bill for the relief of Jonas Beno Linker, Mrs. Estera Idesa Linker, and their minor child, Perla Ita Linker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Alfred Hafermaas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3202. A bill for the relief of Antonio Maria de Almeida Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 3203. A bill for the relief of Pablo Humberto Horcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule 22, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Schenectady, N. Y., memorializing the President and the Congress to take all reasonable and proper measures short of outright war, to give direct assistance to the brave people of Hungary still carrying on their fight against Soviet Communist oppression within Hungary itself; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

41. Also, resolution of Community No. 53, of the Polish National Alliance of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting and condemning the inhuman and brutal treatment of the Poles by the Soviet rulers and memorializing the Congress to render every assistance to aid the people of Poland and enable the nation to take its place as an independent sovereign state among the liberty-loving nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

42. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Schenectady, N. Y., memorializing the Congress to take every proper step to support the efforts of the people of Hungary to free themselves from Soviet domination and aggression, as well as to aid and assist those Hungarians fortunate enough to have escaped across the borders out of Communist control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Ninth Anniversary of the Independence of Burma, January 4, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations on friendly terms with the United States. January 4 was the ninth anniversary of the independence of Burma, and I rise to felicitate that country.

I would like to congratulate the people of Burma, Prime Minister U Nu and His Excellency U Win, Ambassador of Burma, upon the celebration of independence day.

Determined to have their independence, the period from the end of World War II until they achieved their free status in January 1948, was one of tension and uncertainty. Then with independence came further destruction through the efforts and activities of Communist and non-Communist insurrectionists. The Government was faced with grave military and political, as well as economic, problems. There were many who despaired of the hope for stability, for any economic improvement, and for the democratic process itself.

The people of Burma love their independence. Guided by the lessons her history has taught her, Burma has pursued a course which she feels will preserve her independence. This called for nothing less than a comprehensive program of nation building that involved religion, ethics, politics, health, education, and economic betterment. Democracy was the cornerstone of the nation. In the words of Prime Minister U Nu:

> I am firmly convinced that a major contribution to * * * stability in Burma was brought about by the fact that we in the government stuck to the ways and procedures of democracy throughout. Fundamental freedoms and human rights were assured at all times.

Dedicated to the interest and welfare of the people, all these measures have combined to bring home to the people of Burma the real meaning of independence.

Believing that the best way for a nation to promote its own security is to promote the peace, the first major act of the newly independent government in the international field was to apply for membership in the United Nations. Burma has strong faith in the United Nations. Prime Minister U Nu, an ardent advocate of the principles of the United Nations, has cautioned, however, that we should make sure that those who represent member states in the world organization actually are qualified to speak for the people whom they purport to represent.

Free Burma is a young nation which has passed through many trials and tribulations during this infancy of her freedom. Burma has reason to be thankful for this achievement of freedom and for the many other accomplishments that stand to the credit of her people. Freedom brings responsibility and can only be sustained by self-discipline, hard work, and the spirit of a free people.

The progress made during Burma's brief period of independence not only justifies a sense of pride on her part, but also a high degree of confidence in her future.

A Joint Committee on Central Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which I have introduced:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House

of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency and other services engaged in foreign intelligence activities shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to their activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency and to other services engaged in foreign intelligence activities shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government on a reimbursable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $250,000 per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Brattleboro "All America City" in a Recreation Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, Vermont is proud today because a high honor has come to the citizens of one of its most progressive communities.

For their outstanding achievement in carrying out civic improvement Brattleboro has been named an "All America City" and will receive one of the annual awards cosponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

This coveted citation was given to Brattleboro on the basis of intelligent and courageous community effort in connection with the development of the Living Memorial Recreation Park.

As a result of the cooperation, gifts and labor of practically all of its 12,000 citizens Brattleboro now has a park area, ski area, skating pond, lights for night skating, and a new swimming pool. Other equally imaginative projects are now underway; they include a softball diamond, group picnic shelter, and an outdoor theater for music and drama.

All of the Living Memorial projects are in keeping with the emphasis which Vermonters place on recreation as a part of everyday living. The managements of major corporations are becoming increasingly aware that conditions of life such as those prevailing in Vermont spell high productivity and happy employer-employee relationships.

For example General Electric alone has opened three plants in Vermont since the close of World War II and its officers pointed out most strongly that the community progressiveness and good will prevailing in Vermont were significant features in these developments.

Vermont has never held out to management the backward appeal of low wage standards. But it does offer management and labor alike spacious and gracious living in a State abundant with mountains, lakes, forests, and streams.

Relaxed employes have a four-season recreation wonderland in their backyards. They can swim, hunt, fish, ski, skate, or raise a garden in their spare hours. Is it any wonder then that they come to work in a cooperative frame of mind or that management can boast of a healthy profit curve and high productivity?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for Brattleboro and all of the other progressive communities in Vermont when I say to business management, large or small, combine a business and vacation trip to our State and see for yourself the countless advantages of locating a plant in Vermont.

Hon. Herbert Hoover, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a deserved tribute to Herbert Hoover, Jr., the retiring Under Secretary of State.

Like his father before him, Mr. Hoover, Jr., is one of those men who believe in serving the Nation as a duty and not for any reward.

He was made Under Secretary of State because of his brilliant work in settling the Iranian oil dispute by setting up an international oil consortium in a form that was acceptable to the Iranians and all the other interests involved. Attempts had been made to do this for 2 years before Mr. Hoover, Jr. moved into the situation. His success still marks the greatest blow to Communist ambitions yet struck in the Middle East.

As Under Secretary of State, he has unobtrusively been responsible for many of the successful things our Department of State has done. It was he, for instance, as Acting Secretary, who insisted upon publication of Khruschev's speech to the Communist Party on de-Stalinization. World publication of this document rocked the Communist world and it is still reeling from the effects of the division and disagreement among Communists that disclosure caused.

In Secretary Dulles' frequent absences on negotiations abroad, Herbert Hoover, Jr. presided over more than 100 meetings of the State Department high command and he thus had a decided influence on policies. He also presided over the Operations Control Board as its Chairman. This Board has been responsible for executing the policies set by the National Security Council—the national foreign policies of the United States.

Since 1954, Mr. Hoover, Jr. has worked over 12 hours a day in the Department and, almost always, has carried work home at night. Weekends have scarcely existed for him.

While Herbert Hoover, Jr., has chosen to leave the Government for the moment, this brilliant young man has, I am sure, a most useful future in the Republican Party. I hope that he will be called upon for further service from time to time by the President.

On occasion, he has "taken the rap" for the mistakes of others. And, of course, the leftwing "murderers' row" of the press has from time to time attacked him. This should not be permitted to cloud a fine record in office.

Proposed Commission on Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 of this year, I introduced a bill (H. R. 41) to establish a Hoover-type commission to give consideration to the defects and inequities of the Federal tax structure, including the income tax, and to recommend constructive changes. I originally introduced this bill in 1956.

I am pleased to note that yesterday a similar bill was introduced in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

In view of the growing recognition that Federal taxes are too high, and the hope that in the not too distant future it may be possible not only to reduce them but

also to effect constructive changes and perhaps limitations, I trust that some such legislation as this may be adopted by the present Congress without delay.

Self-Help for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced again this year the same bill I introduced in the last session of Congress incorporating the essentials of what has come to be known as the Scrivner plan.

Last year I opposed the Federal grant-in-aid program for public-school construction. I did so for a number of reasons. First of all, according to the reports of the Education Study Committee of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the White House Conference on Education, there is no crisis in the school-construction program which the States individually cannot meet without Federal money gifts. Secondly, I became convinced that Federal-aid grants would delay rather than stimulate school construction by local school districts and that a Federal-grant program would penalize local school districts which have already built all of the schools they need. In a speech on the subject, I pointed out the grave policy issues with reference to private and religious schools which such a grant program would raise.

Primarily, however, my reason for opposing the program was my fear that Federal domination and control, either immediate or by progressive future steps, would follow as an unavoidable consequence of money gifts. Believing as I do that the Federal Government should not control our local school systems in any measure, I was unwilling to lend my support to such a door opener.

Entirely aside from the foregoing reasons, there is yet another compelling reason why the Federal Government should not launch itself upon this new aid-to-States program. The Federal Government can give to the States nothing which it does not first take from the citizens of the States, and the amount it gives back is the difference between what it takes and what it costs to administer the program, which cost has been estimated as high as 30 or 35 percent of total appropriations.

The bill which I have introduced would save these overhead expenses, preclude the danger of Federal control, and enable the individual States to build their own schools, according to the judgment of their own officials, with money collected from their own citizens. My bill provides, in part, as follows:

That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

My bill further instructs the Federal internal-revenue directors in each State to transfer this money to the State treasurer. Thereafter, no Federal official would have any control over it whatsoever, and it would be spent under the exclusive direction of State education officials for educational purposes only.

In fiscal year 1956 the Federal Government collected from all the States and Territories in personal and corporate income taxes a total of $62,972,969,000. Under this plan, $629,729,690 would be returned to the States for school purposes every year so long as needed. Virginia's share, based on 1956 income taxes paid, would be $7,387,070.

I understand that the principles of this bill, which were first adopted and later rejected as the subject matter of an amendment to the school-construction bill last year, have been incorporated in bills introduced, or to be introduced, by several Members of the House. I earnestly trust that the committee which has these bills in charge will give them a sympathetic hearing and that this plan will be substituted as an alternative to the proposed Federal-grant program which cannot fail to thrust our local school systems into the handcuffs of Federal control.

The Late Honorable C. Wayland Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, former Senator C. Wayland Brooks served with distinction as a member of the Senate of the United States and more recently he has been a guiding force in Republicanism as the Republican national committeeman for the State of Illinois.

Those of us who knew him in both capacities developed a deep respect for his devotion to duty to the Nation and to the State of Illinois as well as to our party.

I need not elaborate upon the late Senator Brooks' distinguished record of military service to his country. He served with the United States Marine Corps in World War I with the 6th Regiment, 2d Division overseas. He was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, American Navy Cross, Croix de Guerre, and the Purple Heart. Returning from his service in the Marine Corps, he completed his education at the University of Illinois and Northwestern University, served as assistant State's attorney for 7 years. He was highly commended by the bar association, press and civic organizations for his stalwart fight against organized crime. His later outstanding service in the Senate of the United States earned him the respect of his colleagues in the Senate of both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

The loss of former Senator C. Wayland Brooks, affectionately known to his countless friends and associates as Curley, is one of great measure. As a student of the school of forthrightness in the field of politics, as an outstanding statesman, and as a revered gentleman, we of Illinois shall miss him. And to the family of Senator Brooks, I extend a deep sympathy which I am sure is shared by his many friends in Congress and throughout the State of Illinois.

Gasoline Prices Up—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, motorists of this country are entitled to an explanation of why the big petroleum companies recently increased the price of gasoline a cent per gallon.

Thus far I have neither read nor heard a single substantial reason why this increase was put into effect.

I am advised that the American Automobile Association sent telegrams on January 11, 1957, to the major oil companies asking for the justification, if any, of the price increase. I am further advised that thus far the AAA has had no response to its telegram, a copy of which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

Reports of an increase of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline east of the Rockies raise a serious question in the minds of motorists as to the justification for this action, in view of the more-than-ample stocks on hand, and the relatively lower winter consumption of gasoline. The oil industry's own statistics show that nearly 187 million barrels of gasoline are on hand, which exceeds last year's inventory by almost 18 million barrels. This is about a 60-day supply under normal consumption. A 30-day supply is average. Moreover, stocks are rising: last week they went up more than a million barrels. These facts indicate a decrease, rather than an increase, in gasoline prices, if the law of supply and demand were applied. If there is some justification for raising gasoline prices, of which we are not aware, we should appreciate knowing about it. Otherwise, we must oppose the price increase.

Sincerely,

HARRY I. KIRK,
President,
American Automobile Association.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert at this point a timely editorial from the January 12, 1957, issue of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register:

WHY THE PRICE INCREASES?

President Eisenhower's plea that business and labor join with the Federal Government in trying to prevent inflation by not raising prices and wages unnecessarily will strike the consuming public as a timely proposal.

Commercial journals have been reporting a wave of price increases in many lines of manufactured goods during the past several months. These increases have come in some lines where sales have been declining rather than in areas where high demand might normally be expected to boost prices.

One typical illustration has been the 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the price of gasoline that has taken place in Iowa and in a number of other areas around the country.

The explanation for the increase is said to be the pressure to supply the needs of Europe while the Suez Canal has been closed. Crude-oil suppliers therefore boosted their prices and the gasoline refiners and distributors boosted their prices in turn.

However, a survey by the Wall Street Journal presents a picture of the gasoline supply and demand situation that sharply contradicts the Middle East shortage explanation.

This survey reveals that gasoline stocks are now 17 million barrels above what they were a year ago, and they are rising rather than diminishing.

At the same time that prices are being raised in some areas, price wars are breaking out in others. Motorists in Dallas, Tex., are paying as little as 20.9 cents a gallon. Price wars have broken out within the last month in New England. Many distributing companies are opening new territories in their search for larger outlets for their excess stocks.

The survey forecasts a widespread rash of price wars and price slashes next spring, unless the situation changes drastically.

The survey also points out that gasoline is the one petroleum product that Europe wants the least. The gasoline it does need is of the low-octane variety that is in little demand in this country.

Business concerns, including the gasoline refiners and distributors, claim that prices are forced up by higher wage and material costs. Doubtless these claims are correct in many instances. But it is also true that price and wage increases are like the measles: They spread from door to door and from plant to plan like an epidemic. Ultimately all wind up where they started but on a higher price level. That is inflation.

The President's plea to avoid raising prices and wages is well taken and deserves serious consideration. But words alone rarely provide much solace for the consumer. An individual business concern or labor union usually is convinced that such advice applies only to the man across the street.

It is not certain by any means that a commission to study the causes of inflation would come up with any cures. It might, however, throw a little more light on where the dollars go and why. Laying the facts on the table would be worthwhile.

A speeding motorist needs to know where the brake pedal is located before he can apply the pressure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point the resolution which I have today introduced in the House of Representatives calling for an investigation into the reasons for adding another cent per gallon to the price of gasoline at this time. With millions of gallons of this motor fuel consumed each day, the public has every right to know whether this increase is justified. And the public has every right to expect Congress to provide the facts if they cannot be obtained otherwise.

I trust that my resolution will be given immediate consideration by the proper committee to the end that an investigation can be gotten underway without loss of time. The resolution follows:

House resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to the recent 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the price of gasoline

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman, and not more than 3 of whom shall be members of the same political party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine the reasons for, and the circumstances surrounding, the recent 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the price of gasoline.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood's Statement on His Bill To Repeal the 4 Cents Per Ton Federal Transportation Excise Tax on Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 16, I reintroduced a bill calling for the removal of an old, worn-out tax of 4 cents per ton on the transportation of coal.

Historically, the reason for the existence of this tax obviously no longer exists, especially when you realize that many such taxes—and I have in mind especially the one on the motion-picture industry—are not concerned with national defense or the national economy, as is the coal industry.

I have seen various administrative officials for many years shed tears about the distressed condition of the coal industry of this Nation. Yet, for no reason at all, our requests to remove this obnoxious and unnecessary impost at this time in our history has been denied. In dollars it will amount to less than $1 million in revenue. Psychologically there is no economic or practical reason for this irritating tax during this period.

It is generally recognized that the coal industry is facing serious economic difficulties which have widespread implications throughout our national economy as well as in the anthracite region from which I am a Representative.

It is also to be noted that the anthracite industry is today a progressive, aggressive industry, facing up to its problems in realistic fashion. It is streamlining its production methods. It has developed new, modern, convenient, automatic equipment. It is now embarked on an industry program to market its product and improve its services. And it is successfully standing up to competition as never before in recent years. This is the kind of fighting American industry that is deserving of every consideration and certainly not to be subjected to unfair tax burdens.

The motion-picture industry and others have come before this body and been granted relief from wartime excise taxes which were proving a handicap to them during a period of readjustment. I am sure their need was no greater than that of the coal industry. I know that none of them is more essential to our national economy during times of peace or more vital to our national security during times of emergency.

Repeal of the 4-cent transportation tax does not mean a great deal to the Federal Government in terms of money. But it will mean a great deal to the retail fuel dealers and the coal-producing region. It will spur them on in their battle to stabilize a sound and prosperous industry. Up to now the legislative mills have ground slowly insofar as action to aid this industry is concerned. Not a single important remedial action was taken by the last Congress.

The passage of this bill to repeal the 4-cent Federal transportation tax on coal will, therefore, bring encouragement to the people of the coal industry as well as financial relief.

It will be encouraging for them to know that in this one instance, at least, the Federal Government has shown understanding and consideration in its attitude toward this deserving and loyal American industry.

The Honorable F. M. Davenport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity before my election to the Congress to learn of the notable service of the Honorable Frederick M. Davenport. His was a remarkable career. Following his splendid service in the Congress, he became identified with the National Institute of Public Affairs and made an outstanding contribution to the public service through that organization. Young men interested in Government careers found in him a wise counselor and a helpful friend. He stood for the highest standards in Government service and that service is stronger and more attractive today because of his dedicated efforts. His daughter, Mrs. Ernest S. Griffith, wife of the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, and her husband are maintaining the family tradition and can take great pride in Mr. Davenport's career. I concur in the following eloquent comment of the

Washington Post regarding this distinguished American:

Presidents of varying political persuasion have counted him as friend and adviser, and several generations of public employees have thought of him as a kind of patron saint. The American people owe him an immeasurable debt of gratitude for lifting the civil service to a level commensurate with the needs of a great democracy.

Statement of President Dwight D. Eisenhower Delivered January 15, 1957, in Wichita, Kans., at a Meeting of Representatives of the Great Plains Area Concerning the Drought-Stricken States in the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address delivered by the President of the United States on January 15, 1957, in Wichita, Kans. The address was delivered at a meeting of farmers, ranchers, and agriculture workers from what is known as the Great Plains area comprising 15 Middle Western States.

These farmers, ranchers, and other groups gathered for the purpose of planning short-range as well as long-range programs to alleviate the distress occasioned because of the drought that has stricken the Great Plains area. The meeting was also attended by approximately 10,000 additional people who gathered to hear the President.

The address was most encouraging and gave the farmers and ranchmen a real "lift" in their efforts to solve a most difficult situation. Representatives of the groups present expressed their deep appreciation for the encouraging address from the President and for his visit to the great Midwest to view the situation firsthand.

The President's address follows:

Mr. Chairman and my friends, no one need go on a 3-day trip throughout the Great Plains to know that our country is faced in this region with a very great problem. Of all the things that have happened to me on this trip, none is so inspiring and encouraging as to meet with this group of representatives from 15 States, here for a serious 3-day meeting—people contributing their time, their talents and their efforts to develop plans to help meet this problem—people that are practical farmers and ranchers—representatives of our great land grant colleges—representatives of our Governors—of business—and so on.

Now to you maybe I can bring one good message you may not have heard. This morning I was notified by Mr. Faricy, president of the American Association of Railways, that the Western Association has agreed to continue its reduced prices for feed hauling until March 31.

Incidentally, it might be a nice gesture on the part of your organization to send the railways a vote of thanks.

We have had a firsthand look at this area—Secretary Benson, Secretary Seaton, and myself. What has been most encouraging is the absence of defeatism in everybody's attitude toward the problem.

Everybody emphasizes that there are two problems: the short-range and the long-range. And the presence here today of the executive council of the Great Plains Executive Council is more than heartening, to know that we are attacking the long-range problem, in the certainty that nothing that we do about alleviating present distress can of itself prevent the recurrence of the same situation if again we have a drought.

Now I practically wanted to get up and start a cheering section of my own when I heard the remarks about the local initiative, responsibility, and direction of these programs.

I am one who fears control that is located too far from the scene of action, whether it be a commanding general operating in the field or whether it is Washington trying to produce and operate all of the programs that can affect you, the farmers in Kansas, in Montana, Arizona, and the other States.

I would feel very disappointed, so long as I were part of the Federal Government, if you did not believe that always you have there a cheerful, willing partner, ready to do its best. But Government—Federal Government—should be kept always—when it is humanly possible—as a partner, to participate in a helpful way, but to keep the maximum of responsibility and direction of action of operations in the local scene. Can we get the efficiency, the economy, that comes from someone who is spending his own time—sometimes his own money—in the project and is therefore looking for the greatest possible returns?

Now, two or three of the programs that are included in the budget—specific program—I will give just a short idea to you about them.

One, we have asked in the budget for authority to use $25 million of the disaster loan revolving fund, to provide additional emergency feed assistance to farmers and ranchers in the drought areas.

We have asked for the extension until June 30, 1958, of $25 million of the unobligated funds appropriated for agricultural conservation, to enable Secretary Benson to make payments to farmers to carry out wind-erosion and other emergency conservation measures.

And then we have asked for an additional appropriation of $26 million, under title 1 of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act, primarily for refinancing farm indebtedness by direct loans.

Now, I think it would be odd if I should come to a meeting such as this and not make some note of the satisfaction I feel in returning once again to the State where I was privileged to spend my boyhood and to grow to manhood.

I think also that the satisfaction I feel in such a return is heightened by the knowledge that so many people have gathered to help in this great problem that faces our Nation and this particular area.

And again, the fact that each person we have heard speak has emphasized the determination of his group that he represented to do their part—of each State to do its part, so that working all together we can, in the true American tradition, get something done without surrendering any of those great values for which under this Nation was founded—our private privileges and rights under the Constitution of America.

There has been some mention made of one or two of the programs to which I attach tremendous importance: Increased research, to get the knowledge from which we are going to base all of these integrated programs—business working with farmers, so as to produce a proper economy for the whole region. I was talking in several spots on this trip with people who seemed to know a little bit about the underground water tables, but as quickly as I was about to ask a question in detail, they said, "Only research will give us the real knowledge we need on underground water." And they always added, "Long, patient, exhaustive research." No get-rich-quick program will solve this one. And we need to know.

This is really one example of the kind of thing that we must do. I agree with what everybody has said about credit, the need for cheap credit—good credit—extended in such a way as to help the recipient and not ruin him. I believe in all of those other programs that have been stated here, and I am certain that when all of the reports that this body will produce are integrated with the encyclopedia of papers that I have collected on this trip, and studied in the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, in the Small Business Administration, and all the others that are interested in this great problem, we are going to come up with additional programs that the Federal Government can commend to you, to work with you in solving this problem, which I assure you we will solve.

Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to help solve one facet of the increasingly critical water problem. This bill would aid States and cities in the financing of water pipelines to serve their growing domestic, municipal, and industrial needs.

I am convinced that the most urgent domestic problem, at least in the western half of the United States, is that of developing long-range solutions to the ever-growing demand for water.

For most cities, this means piping water for relatively long distances. No longer can underground water supplies be relied upon as our primary source; and there are many areas in which surface supplies are inadequate, requiring cities to go greater and greater distances for this indispensable resource.

THE PROBLEM

In the past 5 years, more than 1,000 American communities have suffered serious water shortages. In many of these communities, this has resulted in water rationing. In at least some, it has required the hauling of water in tank cars.

The problem will inevitably grow, drought or no drought, because our civilization is using increasingly more water per capita. Where the whole Nation required only 40 billion gallons daily in 1900, we used over 260 billion gallons a day last year. The President estimates that by 1975, the daily national requirement will be 453 billion gallons.

Happily, there are amply abundant water resources flowing unused through the country. Even in the "dry" State of Texas, approximately 8 times the total annual requirement passes through the State's streams. The problem is increasingly one of finding ways to move the water from places where it is not needed to places where it is.

Most of this burgeoning need is making itself felt in our cities and towns. More and more local governments are learning that the nearest available solution to their water problem lies many miles away.

Dallas last year completed a project for piping water from the Red River, more than 50 miles distant, and its problem is still not permanently solved.

Only about 10 days ago, the Denver Water Commission filed papers calling for 37 miles of tunnels and 51 miles of connecting canals to bring more water to the city.

Oklahoma City has been exploring the possibility of a pipeline to convey water from a point in southeastern Oklahoma approximately 125 miles removed.

Fort Worth during the past year has considered three proposals, each of which involves the piping of water from relatively far distances—one from Richland Creek, one from the Brazos, and one from Oklahoma.

These are but a few random examples. Multiply this picture by several hundred smaller cities whose phenominal growth is thrusting upon them the necessity to look around for the nearest dependable water supply, and you will have a general idea of the enormity of the problem.

The time has arrived in our water planning when most western communities, and many eastern ones as well, must begin to think seriously not only of impounding water but transporting it, often over wide distances.

For most such communities, one staggering barrier looms between them and realization of the goal. This is the hurdle of financing. The unprecedented growth which most cities have encountered of recent years has forced upon them many unusual expenses and required them to assume growing obligations of bonded indebtedness.

Many communities are nearing their debt limitations for municipal bonds, and in addition the tight money squeeze has made it more and more difficult for them to finance such costly projects as lengthy pipelines, indispensable though such projects may be to their future. Clearly, the bottleneck is the problem of financing.

THE REMEDY

This bill aims at establishing machinery by which the Federal government will be able to aid States, cities, and water districts in overcoming the roadblock of financing which lies across the path to their future growth and development.

While recognizing water supply as primarily a local responsibility, this measure would permit the Federal Government to guarantee bonds for such developments. I believe this is a proper and constructive role for the national Government to assume. It is the partnership principle of "the helping hand."

Under the terms of the bill, the Corps of Army Engineers would review each proposal for building water transportation facilities. The Corps would determine, first, whether a given project is feasible; second, whether it will enhance overall water conservation in a river basin, and third, the extent to which it would affect flood control and navigation.

If a proposed development passes these criteria, the Government would be authorized to purchase up to one-third of the bonds at the going Government interest rate of 2½ percent. Assuming $2 million worth of 40-year bonds purchased, the economy in interest alone would result in a saving of approximately $240,000 to the city or water district.

In addition, when it is found that such a development would aid flood control by relieving an overabundant area of potential floodwaters, the Government could participate in the actual cost of the project to the extent of such flood-control benefits derived.

An example would be water taken from the Missouri River, where the recurrent overburden has become a curse to downstream inhabitants. For years it has been proposed that quantities of this water could be channeled to semiarid localities in the Midwest and Southwest where it would be a blessing and a boon to industry, municipal development, and agriculture.

MEETS PRESIDENT'S CRITERIA

Any project developed under the terms of this bill would be subject to the laws of the States involved or to existing Interstate Compacts in event of interstate projects.

This bill puts the emphasis upon local initiative, but permits the Government to aid in a practical and constructive way.

Thus this measure would clearly meet the requirements established by the President in his state of the Union messages of 1956 and 1957. In 1956 he recommended that action be taken "on legislation which makes provision for Federal participation in small projects under the primary sponsorship of agencies of State and local government."

In his message last week, he called attention to the need for considering each of our great river valleys as a whole and for realizing that domestic and industrial demands are growing rapidly. In this connection, he said:

> The whole matter of making the best use of each drop of water * * * for such purposes as * * * domestic and industrial uses clearly demands the closest kind of cooperation and partnership between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government.

Until such a partnership is established, the President said, our country will never have "the fully productive use of water that it so obviously needs."

THE FUTURE

We are entering an era in which we must add an entirely new dimension to our water planning. In much of the Nation, underground water tables are falling precipitately. No longer can we assure adequate supply simply by erecting dams and impoundments.

Increasingly, our water problems will be solved only by moving water from areas of comparative abundance to sections of critical scarcity.

Transporting water for relatively great distances is not new. In Rome, it was done by a series of aqueducts, running for a total of some 250 miles, which brought clear water from the Alps to cultivate a flourishing civilization. Los Angeles and the Imperial Valley of California have sparked their fantastic boom by moving water over staggering physical barriers for distances of 500 miles.

Yet it is a great engineering frontier in which lies vistas of unparalleled opportunity. Two budding scientific discoveries, the development of cheap power and the economical conversion of salt waters, lie just beyond the horizon.

With the coming realization of these scientific goals, the long-distance moving of water will become a common practice. Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton predicts that by 1990 we shall see "a network of pipelines criss-crossing America, carrying fresh and palatable water dredged from the sea."

It is certainly not too early to set up some machinery under which the Nation can be meeting its water needs before they become crises and developing the kind of experience which will equip us to cope intelligently with this growing problem of the future.

NOT A PANACEA

This bill is not a panacea for all our water ills, nor is it intended to be. It takes up where flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water pollution measures leave off. It would help to round out our national water policy.

I believe it takes a realistic view of the most critical present feature of the total problem and undertakes a realistic step in the direction of a constructive solution.

Congestion in the Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the congestion in our Federal courts and delays in the administration of justice is a vital problem. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have introduced legislation calling for a complete study of our Federal judicial system along the lines of the study made of the executive branch of our Government by the Hoover Commission.

I urge my colleagues to read the following address of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., which he delivered at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Bar Presidents on August 26, 1956, in Dallas, Tex.

The article follows:

THE PROBLEM OF BACKLOGS—A NATIONAL SHORTCOMING IN OUR COURTS—BY HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

I have been asked to discuss today what is unquestionably the most serious problem currently confronting our profession, the problem of congestion in the courts and delays in the administration of justice.

The trial of any civil case, generally speaking, should take place not later than 6 months from the time of filing of the case. In other words, if the judicial machinery was doing the job it should, and allowing a period normally needed for pretrial preparation, a case should be reached for hearing and adjudication 6 months after the complaint is filed. This situation prevails in England today, although not long ago a delay of 1 year was viewed with such alarm that steps were immediately taken to correct the situation.

Statistics recently compiled by Sheiden Elliott, the Director of the Institute of Judicial Administration, New York Law Center, disclose that in America, the nationwide average, based on findings from some 97 State courts representing all States and larger cities, is 1 year from at issue to trial for jury cases and approximately 5 months for nonjury cases. I emphasize at issue because that time often has little relation to the time of filing a suit. These statistics further show that in metropolitan areas where the courts have jurisdiction of county populations in excess of 750,000, the average time throughout the Nation from at issue to trial in jury cases is 22 months, ranging from a high of 53 months to a low of 4.5 months.

In the Federal courts, the picture was equally bad if not worse. Statistics of the administrative office of the United States courts compiled in 1955 disclosed that the median time for disposition of the normal civil case terminated by trial in the 86 districts having solely Federal jurisdiction was 14.6 months. In some districts a delay of 4 years was the norm and in others a delay of 2 or 3 years was common. However, I am glad to note that Texas, and specifically the northern district here at Dallas, has the best record in the Nation with a median interval of only 4.4 months for the trial of any civil case.

But most encouraging are the figures just compiled by the administrative office of the United States courts for the year ended June 30, 1956. The number of new civil cases filed during that period was over 62,000 but terminations totaled just under 67,000. In fact, 3,000 more cases were filed during that 12-month period than during the corresponding period a year earlier, while terminations exceeded those of fiscal 1955 by 8,000.

Of the civil cases filed during fiscal 1956, more than 21,000 involved the Federal Government, either as plaintiff or defendant. Terminations of these types of cases totaled more than 24,000. Most encouraging was the situation in the southern district of New York which accounted, according to the administrative office, for a great deal of the decrease. The number of cases filed in that district, both Government and private, totaled more than 5,000 but terminations totaled more than 7,000. Speaking solely of Government cases there, 975 were filed while 1,400 were terminated.

Nevertheless, a big job still lies ahead in the attack on backlog. Just what do the figures mean?

Every citizen is a potential litigant. Few, however, have occasion to participate in a lawsuit more than once. To that litigant his case is unique and vitally important; it may have far-reaching consequences on his life. An inordinate delay may be the decisive factor in his appraisal of the administration of justice and the faith he reposes in the law to do justice. It is therefore essential, if we are to maintain the confidence of the people in our courts, that we find the means of eliminating delay which in some cases may result in a deprivation of justice. And it must be done without sacrificing in the interests of promptness any of our procedural and substantive safeguards which are essential to our system of justice. Moreover, unless the legal profession accepts the responsibility of putting its own house in order we will find the job being done by others for us, and in a manner that may not be entirely to our liking.

The Department of Justice has been deeply concerned about the delay in getting a case disposed of in some districts. This special concern arises from the fact that the Government is a party to approximately 60 percent of all cases, civil and criminal, that are tried in the Federal district courts each year.

AN ALL-OUT DRIVE—A DOZEN MAJOR STEPS

An all-out backlog drive actually began moving under full steam in September of 1954, although plans were laid from the day we assumed responsibility for Government litigation. We have had the active cooperation of the organized bar, the Judicial Conference of the United States, Federal judges, court administrators, the Congress, and others.

First, we joined in the successful effort to secure an increase in the number of Federal judges and adequate salaries and pensions for all Federal judges. Enactment of the pay-raise bill has made it possible to interest as judges leading members of the bar, outstanding lawyers who heretofore could hardly be expected to accept appointments to the bench unless they had independent means.

Second, the prior practice of permitting United States attorneys to engage in the private practice of the law at the same time they were holding public office was abolished. Then there were recruited in the United States attorney's offices outstanding young lawyers from leading firms in their communities and top men in their law schools. Salaries of the United States attorneys and their assistants were satisfactorily increased.

Third, in order to give the same benefits to the home office in Washington, we instituted in 1954 an honor program of recruiting outstanding young law graduates from all the leading law schools in the country. Initially we made 30 positions available for this program, but it has turned out so successfully that this year we expect to employ about 50 of these young graduates.

This program has two main objectives: first, the Department needs the service of young top-flight lawyers, and we are confident that many who come with the idea of staying only a short time will recognize the importance of Government service, its many opportunities, and will elect to make a career of it. We recognized, too, that the legal profession as a whole will benefit by the intensive training and specialized knowledge of Government practices and procedure that these young people will carry with them if they elect to enter the private practice of law.

Fourth, Congress responded to our request for funds to enlarge our staffs in the United States attorneys' offices and in some of the departmental divisions.

Fifth, we created a number of so-called task forces, composed of experienced attorneys from the Department, who have been sent out to assist in those districts where the regular complement of lawyers was seriously overloaded with work. The result has been that substantial inroads have been made into the backlog problem where it was most acute.

To illustrate the effectiveness of the task force system, a special team in the Tax Division was able to terminate 442 tax refund cases during a period of 10 months ending on June 30, 1956, as compared with the termination of only 269 such cases during an equivalent 10 months' period the year before. In the Civil Division, we were able to close in the Court of Claims alone, 226 cases involving $235 million.

Sixth, we created an Executive Office of United States Attorneys which is analogous in many respects to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. By a special IBM case reporting system, each United States attorney is now provided with the current status of every item under his jurisdiction. In this way we have been able to single out for special action delinquent cases, as well as other matters which might otherwise tend to get bogged down. It has also provided us with the information necessary to determine whether additional personnel or special task forces were required. This system similarly provides the same information to each Division in the Department. For the first time in the history of the Department we now have a complete picture of where we stand and what must be done.

Seventh, in the Antitrust Division, an accelerated program is being carried forward to dispose of cases by the use of consent decrees. Literally thousands of dollars of court work is being saved by our being able to negotiate consent settlements before trial. The public interest, both in the prompt disposition of cases and in the early correction of restraints of trade, is not only fully insured by this procedure, but is promoted.

Eighth, we have greatly enlarged the discretion of the United States attorneys to settle thousands of cases without the necessity of referring the matter to Washington for approval. This has eliminated much of the redtape which contributed to delays in the disposition of cases, as well as in keeping out of court many matters which might otherwise have needlessly added to the congestion in the courts. We are currently studying to see if a further enlargement of discretion in this area would be justified.

Ninth, last fall and again this spring, the Department advised the Federal judges through the Judicial Conference that it was prepared to try cases during the summer months in those courts where the judges believed such a program would be feasible. We recognize, of course, that there are practical difficulties to be overcome. However, recent appropriations to permit the installation of air conditioning will be most helpful in this regard. Already a number of Federal courts have held summer sessions and others are planning to reconvene earlier in the fall than in the past.

Tenth, our legislative program has contained a number of proposals which would materially assist in expediting the trial and disposition of cases. I regret to report that the three principal bills were not passed by the Congress:

First, creation of a second group of additional judgeships. Second, creation of a commission to study means for the codification and unification of foreign and domestic procedures relating to the examination of witnesses, the introduction of foreign documents in evidence, and the proof of foreign law. The unprecedented flood of domestic litigation since 1945 with international ramifications has posed baffling and sometimes insoluble problems with resultant impediments in both civil and criminal cases. Third, legislation to curtail the abuse of the writ of habeas corpus by narrowing the area in which applications can be made to lower Federal courts to review commitments under final decisions of State courts.

Eleventh, improvements in the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice have been so widespread and effective as to cause a noticeable drop in

the backlog of Government cases. The chief pertinent changes are the successful drive to stop the illegal entry of wetbacks across the Mexican border to a point where a scandalous breakdown of law enforcement has been corrected; and a humane change in procedure whereby deportation inquiries are started by an order to show cause instead of arrest, and a more liberal detention policy has emptied the old detention centers such as Ellis Island of all but a handful of cases, composed chiefly of subversives and bail-jumpers and deserting seamen.

In fact, the administrative office of the United States courts reports that during fiscal 1956, the number of new criminal cases instituted totaled 28,739, as contrasted with the approximately 35,000 filed in fiscal 1955. And the administrative office says that practically the entire decrease results from the reduced number of immigration cases.

IN 22 MONTHS—A CUT OF 31 PERCENT

When we first began this all important drive on the backlog, there was a staggering total of 74,972 cases in court and legal matters not actually in court, civil and criminal, pending in the United States attorneys' offices. As of June 30, 1956, just 22 months later, this total has been cut by 23,552 cases and matters, a reduction of slightly over 31 percent. The number of civil cases actually pending in court has decreased by 6,390, or over 27 percent, leaving the offices with approximately 17,000 civil cases. This is the smallest number of pending civil cases since June 1946. Pending criminal cases, during the same period of time were reduced by 3,030 cases, approximately 29 percent. This means that as of June 30, 1956, the United States attorneys had fewer criminal cases pending in court than at any time in the last 20 years.

There has been another spectacular development which has resulted from this case backlog drive. This has been the substantial increase in the amount of money that has been collected through the United States attorneys' offices. During fiscal 1954, prior to the drive, $21,217,000 was collected. In the fiscal year just ended the figure was almost doubled, and set an all-time record for the Department of $41,785,000. In operational costs this means that for every dollar spent the return increased from $2.61 in fiscal 1954 to $3.75 in fiscal 1956.

This program which I have outlined primarily concerns steps taken within the framework of the Department of Justice with respect to Government litigation in the Federal courts. However, in searching for the solution, and as our program was being developed, it soon became apparent that the problem of delay must be attacked on all fronts if the optimum currency in litigation is to be achieved.

The basic problem is to overcome inertia. Perhaps the foremost cause of delay is a state of mind; lawyers and judges have come to expect delay; they take it for granted and have adjusted their work habits accordingly. Even clients have reluctantly resigned themselves to the situation. It is, therefore, necessary that such fundamental attitudes and concepts be changed, even though there may be some disagreement as to the means, or even the ends to be served.

A second cause for delay has been the lack of coordination and cooperation among the many groups who have been independently working on this problem for years. Sporadic efforts here and there have resulted in some good, but they have been overshadowed by the magnitude of the national shortcoming, which has become almost chronic.

A third failure has been the inability, through lack of publicity and knowledge of the facts, to solidify public opinion and to obtain public support for changes which are necessary if the problem is to be solved. I am firmly convinced that solutions would soon be forthcoming if the spotlight of public opinion, so much a part of our democratic system, was focused on the judicial branch and the legal profession so that both their accomplishments and weakness were matters of public knowledge. Once the facts and the problems were exposed, corrective action would undoubtedly follow.

In May of this year, upon my invitation, a conference on court congestion and delay was held at the Department of Justice. We invited the presidents of the bar associations of all the States and larger cities, many of whom are here today, and the heads of other bar, judicial, and research organizations. Ninety leaders of judicial, legal, and research organizations from every part of the country gathered to pool their knowledge and resources. For 2 days the subject was discussed in open forum, and a definitive program was adopted whereby the conference, operating on a continuing basis, can prosecute a nationwide, all-out attack on delays in litigation. The conference will conduct its continuing work through an executive committee to be selected by the Attorney General.

The conference is unique in that it assembles together for the first time a large segment of the bench and bar in a coordinated program aimed at eliminating delays in litigation. During the ensuing year, the conference will receive, correlate, and report on the need for uniform State and Federal judicial statistics; the possibility of rotating judges to congested areas; the extent to which discovery procedures and pretrial conferences can be employed to shorten trial time; whether maximum efficiency in calendar procedures is being employed; the extent to which the judge must exercise control over the progress of litigation; and last, but perhaps most important, the professional responsibility of the bar to assist in accomplishing these objectives.

I stress this final point because the conference, in recognition of the importance it attached to cooperative action, unanimously adopted a resolution stating in part that "a cooperative, hard-working joint venture, participated in by all members of our profession in a resolute manner, and carried forward on a day-to-day basis, can materially reduce congestion in our courts in the very near future, with substantial improvement in the administration of justice."

In a very real sense each of us plays an essential working part in the procedures by which justice is administered. Individually, and certainly as a group, by action or inaction, we greatly affect the character of the operation of the courts. Our conduct, collectively and individually, both in and out of court, must be directed to the end of expediting the disposition of cases and not to delaying or impeding their disposition.

While understandably we all have a professional pride in the cases we handle or the clients we represent, we must be ever-mindful of the fact that ours is a public-service profession and that our responsibilities as officers of the court transcend our own private or pecuniary interests. We must not condone the docketing of cases when there is no intention of ever bringing them to trial—cases which are merely filed for harassment or other obstructive reasons. Stalling tactics, such as abuse of pretrial, discovery, and motion practice and the seeking of adjournments designed solely to wear down opponents, cannot be justified. Recently a study made in the southern district of New York showed that of 10,735 cases in backlog, over 5,100 were inactive. Of 6,000 cases on the trial calendar, only in 800 did the lawyers on both sides say they were ready. This is not an isolated situation and it is only reasonable to assume that much of the backlog is attributable to dilatory tactics.

Another contributing fact has been the tendency of some lawyers or firms to assume responsibility for more litigation than they can attend to on a current basis. This problem became so acute in the District of Columbia that it became necessary for the court to pass a rule forbidding adjournment to any lawyer when it appeared that he was handling more than 25 cases on the calendar. As lawyers, we should assume the lead in cutting the backlog and should not wait to be prodded into action by the courts.

The task we have set for ourselves is by no means a simple one. Delay is not new in the law and had there been a ready solution it would undoubtedly have been adopted long ago. But just as the present system resulted in part from lack of attention, it follows that constant attention may well be an effective countermeasure. If this organization, and the others which have pledged their cooperation, will devote their time and energy, their organized skill and imaginative approach to the solution of this problem, then substantial inroads into the law's delay will inevitably follow. I am confident that this drive will accomplish its objective for as lawyers and leaders of our communities we recognize that the strength of America lies in the preservation and strengthening of our institutions of freedom of which the impartial, effective, and prompt administration of justice is the cornerstone.

Approach and Solution for One of the Nation's Major Social Problems of Today

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that has for its objective the creation of a commission or bureau to give some very needed attention to a national problem, and one that is rapidly building up in just about every area and district represented in this Congress.

My bill proposes the creation of an agency especially charged with developing a program to meet the pressing problems of our fast-growing number of older persons. It calls for planning and operation, at the State and local level, of specific programs for this purpose. It provides funds, to be matched by the States, to furnish tangible, practical benefits—specificially such things as job placement, more and better homes, more and better medical care for the aged.

The United States will spend, in the coming year, approximately $8 million for the control of disease among farm animals and nearly $8 million more for research on field crops. The first year of this older person's program calls for a budget of only $2 million. I believe that the American people consider the problems of our older citizens more important than cattle and seed corn. It is time we said so.

What we can do now is to make a beginning on this program—a beginning that cannot wait unless we are to delay disastrously the solution to problems that are already upon us with terrible urgency. Let me state what seem to me

the facts that demonstrate the urgency of action.

We are living through a quiet revolution—a revolution that is transforming our society. Its character is simple: We as a Nation are growing older. The number of Americans over 65 has quadrupled in the past 50 years; it will continue to grow at a rapid rate, thanks to the improvements in our standard of living and in our health and medical care. Indeed, the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. For more and more Americans, more and more of their lives will be lived as older people.

Yet ours is a society which is geared to youth. It is a society which has seen the city replace the countryside as home to most of its citizens, without creating, in the city, replacement for the security, the status, and the useful life that the rural community provided its older members. It is a society that has delayed too long its recognition and adjustment to the quiet revolution. As a result we, as a community, are not prepared to face the problems created by a longer life expectancy. We are not meeting our responsibility to our older citizens; and each of us, as he gets older, will himself pay the price of this social indifference. The older American today sees his problems neglected in the clamor of other public concerns. Yet there are 14 million of these forgotten men and women today—and by 1975 there will be 21 million over 65. Our obligation to them is not being met.

Far too many of these millions of older Americans are ill clothed, ill fed, ill housed. Their material wants and their spiritual wants are great. Too often they are shunted aside and ignored, exiled from their full place in the life of our communities. Job opportunities for the worker past 40 becomes fewer and poorer as his years increase. Civic activities fail to utilize fully the talents and experience of the older citizen.

The creation of an agency, charged with the responsibility and granted some funds, can begin to meet this challenge. We have bureaus for every purpose in the Government today—even statistics have their special bureaus. It really is deplorable that there is no agency of Government specifically charged with a total concern for the problems of the aged.

Now I am not proposing simply to add more desks, telephones, and offices in Washington. But I am certain of this: Unless we create a specific agency, with the power and the responsibility to get action, we will get nothing done. Somebody has to be in charge, with the full-time job, the professional knowledge and ability, and the strong desire to do something and to represent in the work of Government a group that now has no representative—our older citizens. That is the job of the agency to be created by this legislation.

Well, just what is the agency to do? There is certainly no shortage of acute needs and tough problems. The job is limited only by the present plight of our older citizens, which means it is a vast job.

We can start out, here and now, by writing a bill of rights for our senior citizens, and dedicating ourselves to seeing that those rights are respected. The most fundamental of these, of course, is the right to a decent living. Just in terms of money income, which is only part of the problem, the facts are grim. The income of the average person over 65 is less than half that of his neighbor who is between 45 and 65. Over a fourth of the older men, nearly a half of the older women, are in a really serious economic situation. Their incomes fall below the level the experts call an emergency budget; they are below not merely an adequate, but below a substandard survival income. The appalling fact is that these older people, to whom we owe so much, are in many cases living in want and in the spiritual insecurity that want breeds. This is their reward for a lifetime of useful and honorable work.

It is true, no doubt, that not all who could have done so have shown the foresight to provide for their old age. But it would be shortsighted and uncharitable for us to show indifference to any of our older citizens whether unfortunate or improvident. For all our sakes, we should lend our aid to insure, as far as is reasonably possible, that our older citizens have an income sufficient to allow a life free from want and insecurity. Our public programs, particularly social security, must be continually reappraised, their adequacy measured by the real needs and those needs met. Individual savings, the pension plans of private enterprise and of the trade unions, and our public insurance programs are the foundations on which retirement security must be built. The agency can perform a constructive service by working to insure that these foundations are well and wisely laid to support the best possible security for our older citizens. Not all of them now have ample food, decent clothing, the comforts, or even the necessities of life. It is absolutely the first and most elemental job to raise the incomes of these people to an adequate level.

But we must do more, real income is not just money income. It is not practical, for example, to expect that all the varying and often crushing burdens of medical care—a cardinal necessity for the older person—can be met out of a limited regular income. Medical care, including the true economy of preventive care; nursing care; the expenses of the hospital or the nursing home, these are costly. While long-term home care often represents an impossible financial burden, the alternative of entering an institution is often a personal tragedy. Voluntary medical plans, today, cover hardly a third of our older citizens. Facilities for their care and medical supervision are clearly inadequate. Two out of every five old people cannot, today, meet their medical bills, even for present inadequate levels of care. This is a grim picture; I think our older citizens have a right to a brighter prospect. The program I propose can help to achieve it.

Vast improvement and some new ideas are needed in housing. Our older neighbor, today, lives in a home that is, on the average, substantially inferior to the homes most of us enjoy. In few cases is his home designed for the comfort and convenience of older people. Some progress is being made in this field. In some States, public low-cost housing specially designed for older people is being built. There is a growing awareness of the special needs of the aged—for one-story housing, near ground level, perhaps with ramps in place of stairs, and with other details that can make so much difference in the comfort and pleasure of older, less-active occupants. Often, well-planned housing can provide facilities for an appropriate and richer social and recreational life for the older community, among neighbors of similar age and interests. Yet we have only begun to attack these problems. There is great need for a systematic and energetic program to improve and develop such housing. It can only be met by encouragement and leadership such as this bill would provide.

One of the most serious and pressing problems we face is widespread discrimination in employment against the older worker. While the number of older people steadily increases, their proportionate share of the labor market is steadily shrinking. Studies indicate that a great many, perhaps as many as half of all companies, set age limits for new employees—no jobs for people over 45, sometimes a bar at 35 or even 25. Compulsory retirement at 65, a sound general rule, has become an inflexible law; in some cases, it is not only wasteful but an unnecessary restriction on people who can be happiest and most useful continuing to work. Education of employers, an intensive campaign of public information to emphasize the value of older workers, increased organizational efforts in job placement—all these are sound, constructive contributions to a solution of this problem. Our efforts in this direction should be greatly increased.

Finally, in this brief survey of a vast problem, I want to mention an often-overlooked part of it. Sometimes our communities pay scant attention to the social needs and the civic value of their older members. They have a right to social opportunity—to social and recreational clubs, to a share of the community's recreational facilities. A new pattern of senior social life is developing—in such forms as the successful Golden Age Clubs—and it should have every possible help and encouragement from the community. These are practical, tangible things we can do.

But we can do more. We can make fuller use than we are doing of the skills, the energies, and the experience of our older citizens. In some communities, for example, retired businessmen have organized themselves to provide business help and advice to younger men, giving them the benefit of their own experience with gratifying results. In many cases, we could call on older people more than we do for a part in our many voluntary civic enterprises. In countless ways we can recognize and welcome their contribution, to our mutual benefit. Our older people are assets to the community, and they are people with rights

of their own. They deserve a place in the sun instead of a rocking chair in the shadows. We all gain by granting it to them.

All I have said here is based on my firm conviction that today, and even more in the future, the needs and problems of our older citizens represent one of the great challenges of our time. I could, at great length, list the inventory of our failure so far to meet it. Yet what is more important than these facts and figures is the real human predicament that lies behind the figures. These are our people, the fathers and mothers whom, in the biblical commandment, we are enjoined to honor. We have paid them scant honor. I cannot, in words, sufficiently convey my own sense of urgency about the unnecessary suffering—the humiliating want and corrosive insecurity, the demoralizing sense of not being wanted, of being cast aside and forgotten—that exist far too often now and will continue to exist until we act to eliminate their causes.

I believe that these are, too often, forgotten men and women. I do not believe that in good conscience or in commonsense we can allow this to go on. I do not pretend to know how we are to meet this problem in all the details. None of us knows all the answers in this big and difficult field. We do not know nearly as much as we should.

But I do know this: If we are going to get anything accomplished, if we are going to learn more and act wisely and do the best possible job of what must be done, then we should get started now and get started by putting some people to work on these problems, with some money to do the job. And let us get organized so that all of us—the National Government, the States, and the local communities—are working together with a common purpose and common energies, to write and realize this bill of rights for older people.

Address by Hon. Jamie L. Whitten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, generally regarded as being one of the best-informed men in the Congress, and for that matter in the Nation, on the problems of agriculture, in October of last year, at the annual convention of the National Association of Agricultural Agents, at Houston, Tex., Congressman WHITTEN presented an informative and enlightened discussion of the farm problem. I commend a careful reading of this speech to the Members of Congress, and to all people interested in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to appear on this program, at a meeting of you people who are so vitally interested in the Nation's agriculture, which I personally know is broad enough to cover farm income, soil conservation, watershed protection, and flood prevention and all other programs which count so much in the farmers' welfare, and the welfare of the Nation as well. I know of no work in which I am more interested, nor one on which I have worked harder for the many years I have been in the Congress.

In some respects you have fared well during the last few years; and my committee has approved each action taken. In other respects I believe you have not fared so well, for your future is tied to the well-being of the American farmers. The contributions your work will receive from our counties and States will be tied directly to the economic level of your local farmers. I believe strongly in research and education, your work if you please; but to say that research and education is the whole answer to the farm problem is unsound and not fair to you. The end result you seek is work done in agriculture; and there, your success is greatly dependent upon the soil-conservation programs, the ACP, and price-support programs, as I believe you will agree. In many of those fields, we in the Congress have had to save such programs over the opposition of both Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower. Now both of them claim the credit for SCS, ACP, watershed protection, and so forth. For them to claim credit is to go awfully far even for a candidate.

It reminds me of an occurrence in a campaign in my State some years ago. At that time one of our senior Members of Congress, who had worked untiringly for the TVA, made claims to authorship of the program. Incidentally, the TVA does return to the Treasury in cash each year an amount which must average 2½ percent of all the money which the Government has invested in its power generation; and I may say that all the physical properties of the TVA still belong to the Government. You may be surprised to know that the private utilities closest to the TVA have profited by TVA's example of selling more power at less markup, have increased sales more, and made more profit than any other private companies in the Nation.

At any rate, this senior Member of Congress to whom I refer claimed to be an author of the TVA program. At that time his opponent replied that he had noted the claim of his opponent of being the father of TVA, but he had also noticed where Senator McKellar of Tennessee had claimed to be the father of the TVA; that Senator Norris of Nebraska had claimed to be the father of TVA; also he had noticed that Senator HILL of Alabama had given indication he was present at the conception of this great program. Then he followed up by saying that in view of so many claims of fatherhood, it made one thing clear to him—he could now easily understand why the mother of TVA had never lifted her head or made any claims whatever of motherhood.

Take the watershed program, for instance. It was initiated in the Democratic platform of 1952. As chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I went before the Democratic convention in Chicago and we were able to get a plank in the Democratic platform urging the adoption of such a program. In January 1953, after the Republicans were elected, I was succeeded as chairman of my subcommittee by Hon. CARL ANDERSEN, an independent Republican and a real friend of American agriculture, in season and out of season, during Republican administrations and Democratic administrations. We Democrats on the committee joined with Congressman ANDERSEN in putting through the Congress a watershed program, as part of the appropriation act of that year. This was done without recommendation by the President or the President's Bureau of the Budget.

At that time I was pleased to compliment the Republican Congress on adopting my plank in the Democratic platform of 1952. However, may I say, my friend, CARL ANDERSEN, added the name "watershed protection" to that of "flood prevention," the term which I used.

Subsequently, the administration did adopt the program and the administration, including Secretary Benson, has since supported it, especially in this election year. I am pleased to have them join us, particularly since I have spent 12 years, with the help of Republican members of my subcommittee, fighting off efforts of the Republican leadership to reduce soil conservation. While I am a great believer in soil conservation and expect to continue to direct much of my attention to the needs of watershed protection and flood prevention, it is my belief that the success of this program, as with any other farm program, is largely dependent on the economic well being and sound financial status of the American farmer. After all, under the watershed program local people have to contribute their share of the cost.

I think county agents deserve a tremendous share of the credit for the success of all the work in agriculture though it be under another agency. I firmly believe our county agents have contributed as much to soil conservation as the SCS. It makes my heart sad when we are making things available on a free basis to foreign countries so they can look after their own soil, to realize that in 3 years out of 4 the executive branch of our Government has tried to cut down at home on conservation efforts. It is tragic to see us make available to foreign countries millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for reforestation and conservation and, yes, for roads; and yet the budget for the Department of Agriculture came to Congress in 1953, 1954, and 1955 recommending reduced attention to conservation in our own country, this to a greater degree leaving the job of saving the future of our country to the people least able to meet the problem because of lowered income.

I want to present to you an argument in favor of protecting the farms of this country, the farm income of this country an argument I have made to bankers and lawyers, to doctors, and to other groups. Farm income is the key to the success of your work and to the success of all other agriculture programs. I believe the soil will be saved in direct proportion to the economic well-being of the farmers of the Nation.

I grew up on a farm, but I set out to become a lawyer so I would have some returns for my efforts. Most of the young men in the country during the period when I was growing up set out to get into some more remunerative occupation. My work and my efforts have been largely in the field of law. When I came to Congress, I set out to learn something about agricultural programs, and I feel that I have.

For more than 10 years I have served as 1 of 7 members of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the United States House of Representatives. For 6 years I have served as chairman of that group. This committee reviews, each year, every activity of the Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation, Research, 4–H, REA, price supports, and all the rest. It is our duty to recommend funds and to defend these programs from attack in the Congress. It is the best place possible to learn the broad field of agriculture.

It is with this background that I speak to you today.

THE SECRETARY IS NOW ADMITTEDLY IN POLITICS

I am sure you noticed that Mr. Benson announced to the press that he has hit the political train, that now he will devote himself to winning the election in November, and that the decisions in the Department will be handled by Under Secretary True D. Morse.

I am glad to note that statement for several reasons. While Secretary Benson has always been free with his charges that others were playing politics, anyone who has attempted to criticize his handling of the Department or his decisions in connection with agricultural programs has been immediately jumped on by a large part of the press as being wholly unfair. It is a fact that it has been almost as difficult to discuss objectively the decisions of the Department of Agriculture as it has been to discuss decisions of the President himself. The press has held the President and the Secretary largely beyond the realm of public criticism.

Mr. Morse, who Secretary Benson says is now running the Department, is the Under Secretary of Agriculture who, among other things, said the answer for the small farmer was to get a job in town until he was old enough to come under social security. Mr. Morse, however, is a very farsighted man, for he seemed to know more about what was going to happen to farming under the Republican administration than most people. He quit a job with the Doane people, who built up a very profitable business managing farms for a percentage of the profits under Democratic administrations, and, as soon as possible after the 1952 election, took a salaried job with this administration.

I would be less than frank if I did not tell you that in my opinion the best thing we could do to restore the American farmer to his proper place in our economy would be to elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. I feel I should make this statement to balance the statements made by Secretary Benson. I know you would wish to keep your convention in balance.

Now, if you do not restore the Democrats to control of the Presidency and the Congress, in view of the actions of the Department of Agriculture during the first 3 years that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson were in control, I believe we might consider amending the Constitution to make every year an election year. Certainly their actions in recent months indicate that the farmers would benefit from such a constitutional amendment.

In support of this conclusion, I would point out to you the difference between the Republican promises in 1952 and again in 1956, both election years, and their actions in between.

In 1952, the Republican Party, in its platform, recommended full parity to the American farmer. In 1952, the President, speaking in your area of the country on two occasions, said he firmly believed agriculture was entitled to not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity.

Those statements were such as to reassure many farmers, not only in your section but in my section of the country as well. In my section of the country it led some individual farmers with two tractors to believe that when it was said the Republicans were lined up with big business, it meant them. Yet we find that not long after the election was over, the President and Mr. Benson came out for flexible supports and those "two-tractor" farmers in my area, at least, realized that when they talked about big business they did not mean them. The farmers of the Nation can't possibly prosper under flexible supports, since under the flexible support formula the more of the commodity we have on hand, the poorer the market and the more the need, the less the supports. On the other hand, the less the commodity on hand, the greater shortage in the market and, therefore, the better price and less need by the farmer, the higher the support under the flexible plan.

Our Republican friends would cut acreage and production or supply to the point that the farmer could get 100 percent of parity at the market place. Such a cut would reduce volume to the point of producing for the domestic market only, and would be disastrous both for the producer and consumer.

1956—ANOTHER ELECTION YEAR

In 1956, after condemning the Democrats for high fixed price supports, President Eisenhower, in his farm bill veto message, announced high, fixed support prices for most basic commodities. He fixed the price for wheat at $2 per bushel, the price of commercial corn at $1.50 a bushel, the price of rice at $4.50 a hundredweight, the price of milk at $3.25 per hundred pounds, butter at 58.6 cents per pound, and the price of cotton at 82½ percent of parity. Thus, in this time of reduced farm income, and with an election coming on, we find our President resorting to what we Democrats and our farm-minded Republican friends have continuously supported. That is, if the farmer's income is to be protected, it is necessary to give protection with regard to price.

This action resulted in an increase in the price of wheat above the market of 19 cents per bushel. It was an increase for corn of 10 cents per bushel, for rice of 46 cents, for butter of 24 cents, and 10 cents for milk. Of course, this resulted in an increase in the price of hogs and cattle, which we see today.

But, if you will read the President's speeches and announcements you will see this is a 1-year deal; for the Republican platform once again advocates flexible price supports—which provides less support when you have a large supply and greater need of aid, and higher supports when you have a short supply, a better market and less need.

Thus, it should be quite clear that if the administration of President Eisenhower and Mr. Benson is to stay in power, we should amend the Constitution and make every year an election year. The Republicans promised much in the election year of 1952. They have taken some remedial action in the election year of 1956. It was in the non-election years, 1953, 1954, 1955, when following lower prices, reduced acreage and increasing costs, the farmers received a smaller percentage of the national income than ever before in the history of this country. Next year this administration, if returned to power, would offer us more of the same, since next year is not an election year.

You will note, too, that during this election year Secretary Benson announced he will buy up $50 million worth of poultry and meat products. Yet in 1953, when prices for these items were declining and our committee and the Congress urged him to step in and buy these commodities, he refused to do so.

In this election year of 1956 we find Secretary Benson and the President advocating much larger sums for the Farmers' Home Administration. Yet in 1953, after the Congress refused to go along with drastic cuts in the FHA which were recommended by the President and Mr. Benson, the Department of Agriculture took $1 million away from the FHA and froze it for other uses.

In 1956 the President and Mr. Benson both actually recommended a $700 increase for the school lunch program, after trying to cut that program by $10 million to $15 million for each of the 3 previous years they had been in office.

We find President Eisenhower and Mr. Benson in this election year of 1956 extremely proud of efforts of the Department of Agriculture to eradicate tuberculosis and brucellosis in cattle. Yet these programs would have long since been abolished if the Congress had followed the recommendations of the President and Mr. Benson, for they recommended that disease and pest control be unloaded on the States, or abandoned.

In 1956 we find the President and Mr. Benson strongly for soil conservation, including Soil Conservation Service and ACP, the same program they tried to cut by more than one hundred million dollars in 1953 and nearly as much in 1955.

In this election year of 1956 we find the President and Mr. Benson very proud of the fact that they are offering commodities in world trade on a competitive basis that they have sold approximately $1 billion worth of commodities for dollars in the last 12 to 15 months. Yet, for almost 3 years, which were not election years, our committee tried in every way possible to get the admistration to offer these commodities in world trade as they were authorized to do by law. They refused to take action until the election was in sight. The Democratic Congress was finally forced to pass a law requiring them to use their authority to sell such commodities.

I notice where Secretary Benson condemns the Brannan Plan. I opposed that plan myself. However, it is Mr. Benson who put the Brannan plan into effect for wool. You know it, and he knows it; but that is not what his speeches say.

My friends, we find the Department of Agriculture and President Eisenhower very proud of the fact that they have made a study of where the consumer dollar goes; what part of the consumer dollar goes to the farmer; where the spread between the farmer and consumer goes. We find both of these friendly and likeable men very proud of the fact that they set up a sales manager and sales organization in the Deparment, for the purpose of selling surplus CCC commodities. Yet the records will show that both of these programs resulted from special action taken by our committee in 1955, under my chairmanship. We were forced to provide funds for these two purposes, separate and apart from other funds of the Department, to assure that they would be used for no other purpose. The Department would not do the job otherwise.

When our committee took this action, Mr. Benson went to the press and said our report and action was pure politics. Nothwithstanding his charge, our bill containing these provisions went through the House of Representatives without a single amendment being offered. Secretary Benson then went to the Senate and had these provisions eliminated from the bill. I am glad to say, however, that when we went to conference these two provisions were reinstated and the conference report was signed by all conferees, House and Senate Members, Republicans and Democrats. This year, once again, Secretary Benson tried to have these provisions eliminated. He did not succeed.

My friends, this Republican administration is very proud of having established a soil bank this year. It had opposed such a soil bank continuously until this election year. And as a major part of the soil-bank plan, the President and Secretary Benson recommended that the farmer get paid this year for land he agreed to leave out of production next year.

Now, isn't that something? It meant that the farmer would be made to feel good around election time by borrowing against next year's income. But how would he feel next year when he found he had spent a big part of next year's income this year? Fortunately, Congress caught on to that one—as I believe the farmers themselves did.

THE YEARS BETWEEN

In early 1953, shortly after Hon. Ezra T. Benson assumed office as Secretary of Agriculture, one of the first statements issued over his signature was to the effect that he had inherited a Department which was described as follows:

"The United States Department of Agriculture, largest of the Nation's civilian agencies, swollen to a high bureaucracy of 28 agencies and departments in the last 20 years."

My friends, at that time there were in the Department of Agriculture 63,928 employees. On the first of January 1956, after 3 years of

Mr. Benson's administration, there were 70,312 employees. In 1953, when Mr. Benson took over the Department he had two Assistant Secretaries. In January 1956 he had eight such assistants.

One of the first steps President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took after coming into office in 1953 was to drastically reduce the budget submitted by the outgoing Democratic administration. These reductions were aimed primarily at the Soil Conservation Service, ACP, school lunch, tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication, reforestation, and disease and pest control. In 1954, once again President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson recommended substantial cuts in these same programs, including reductions in the fund to implement the REA. In 1955, the present administration again advocated reduced funds for these programs in the Department of Agriculture.

In 1952, when Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower took over, the net farm income was $14 billion. In 1955 after 3 years of their tenure, farm income was down to approximately $10.5 billion, while income of other segments of the population had risen greatly. In 1952, when the present administration took over, wheat was selling for $2.12 a bushel. In January 1956, it was selling for $1.95 per bushel. Corn in 1952 was selling for $1.50 per bushel. In January 1956 it was selling for $1.16 per bushel. Cotton was selling in 1952 for 32 cents per pound. In December 1952, farm prices averaged about 96 percent of parity. In December 1955, after 3 years of control by flexible advocates, farm prices averaged about 80 percent of parity. During this time the farmer's costs were constantly going up.

During this same period the farmer's share of the national income decreased from 7 percent of the national income to about 5 percent. In other words, during this 3-year period of the present administration farm income dropped 24 percent, while other income increased 14 percent for the same period.

As a result, the farm debt in the period from January 1952 to January 1956 increased from $7.1 billion to $9 billion.

During this same period folks in nearly every section of the country suffered drastic reductions in acreage. From July 1952 to July 1955 cotton acreage was reduced by 35 percent and wheat acreage was reduced by 25 percent. Since farm income is price times volume less cost, is it any wonder farm income went down?

As of December 31, 1952, when President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took over, the Commodity Credit inventories totaled a little over $1 billion. On December 31, 1955, these holdings had increased to over $6 billion.

My friends, these figures come from Mr. Benson's own records in the Department of Agriculture.

While these commodities were piling up in the United States, Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower had complete authority to sell such commodities in world trade for dollars. But until late 1955 they refused to offer any of these commodities in world trade at competitive prices, thereby holding an umbrella over world markets and foreign expansion. During this period of time, hundreds of millions of dollars were spent in foreign countries to increase production of wheat, tobacco, cotton, and other products.

I note Secretary Benson is making much ado about the improvement in farm conditions in 1956. He is correct; there has been a substantial improvement in 1956; and it has come because of the high, fixed price support the President announced in his message vetoing the Democratic farm bill because the bill provided high fixed supports. The President acted by Executive order on a 1-year basis, after vetoing a bill which provided virtually the same thing on a more permanent basis.

The President gave a 1-year respite. Now Secretary Benson calls it a bid for votes, putting the farmer on the auction block for the Democrats to offer the same relief on a permanent basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture counted on these commodities, which for almost 3 years he refused to sell competitively, to reduce acreage of the American farmer, cutting the farmer's volume and income—a 25-percent reduction for wheat acreage alone.

During this time his administration was increasing foreign production by holding our commodities off foreign markets and by direct grants to expand foreign production, which the President insisted must be greatly increased this year. The Secretary was using these commodities in his arguments that the American farmer must take a reduced price. He said the farmer would have to do that, else the city consumers would rise up. He never did tell the American people he already had authority to sell these commodities in world trade for dollars, but refused to do so because he would not make the price competitive. During this period he claimed that the trouble came from the high rigid price-support levels set by the Democratic administration, the same action the President took on himself this year on a 1-year basis. Mr. Benson got most of the press and many farm leaders to go along with him in that argument.

ECONOMIC LOSS FROM REFUSAL TO SELL

The economic effect of refusing to sell and reducing United States acreage affects everyone in the Nation, as well as the farmer.

According to the national advisory committee for CARE, composed of such men as Henry A. Bullis, General Mills, chairman of the board; Roy C. Ingersoll, president of Borg-Warner; Ward Melville, Melville Shoe Corp.; H. J. Hinz, and others equally successful, such policy costs the United States $700,000 a day for storage, deprives American railroads of transportation equal to 100 transcontinental freight trains each day for a year, deprives American shipping of the equivalent of the dispatch of 10 oceangoing freighters every day for a year, not to mention the loss of labor and the effect on agriculture itself, being cut back now to absorb surplus commodities. The effect of reduced United States acreage is being held in every town and village in the Nation today. Unless foreign aid to expand foreign production is stopped, and unless we stay in world markets, the situation will continue to get worse. All this food and fiber has been held back by the Department's policy, set up by our State Department on the fallacious argument that such a course helps needy peoples of the world.

Let us pass on from the shortcomings of this administration, as I would like to prove to you the soundness of the position of the Democrats.

THE DEMOCRATIC VIEW

A friend of mine once said that all anybody wants is a fair advantage. Think of that—all he wants is a little advantage, and he wants everybody else to agree that it is fair for him to have it. Now, one of the best ways to have an advantage declared fair is to pass a law saying it is fair; and with the first session of the First Congress of this country, the fight was on to have advantages written into the law and thereby be declared fair. Check it if you do not believe that is correct. Beginning in the early days of our country, we began to write protective tariffs for industry.

A very sound reason existed for that. We were competing with the old countries where industry had been established for many, many years. We had an infant industry in the United States. Then, along about 1900, we began to see that labor, which had up until that time received a mighty small part of the national-income dollar, began to organize. Labor unions began to be felt in politics; they began to be felt in Congress. We then began to recognize the right of labor to organize.

We had the minimum-wage laws; and for about 45 or 50 years those advantages, fair from labor's viewpoint and fair according to Congress, because the laws had been passed, were written into law.

It is true, and we have heard this from those who attack the farm programs, that this country became great with agriculture just doing the best it could. But it became great at the expense of wasting 80 percent of all the timber in the United States; it became rich and powerful at the expense of the fertile soil in this Nation.

Those of you who have the background that I did, and I was much more fortunate than so many, know that conditions on the farm were such that any boy or girl who could do so got off the farm. This was not because they didn't love to live there, but was because when their efforts were made and the work was done, usually the house went unpainted and the conveniences and things other people had could not be had on the farm. It was only when the Congress began to give some equality in law, when it began to pass law giving price supports to agricultural commodities, that rural life began to offer opportunities at all comparable with those found in other sections of our economy.

There are two things involved in the protection of the national economy. As I have said, when you constantly increase costs, when you constantly increase wages, when you constantly increase returns to industry, all of which constantly increase the cost to the farmer of what he buys, these must be reflected in his price. But there is another thing involved, and that is the factor of volume. I don't care if anyone of you is paid $100 an hour, you would be in an awful fix if you were limited to 1 hour of work a month. It would not make any difference to the farmer growing cotton in the South on 1¼ acres if he were assured $1,000 a bale, which would be 600 percent of parity. He would still have an income of less than $1,000 a year. So price is one thing, but volume is another. The same applies to wheat growers and producers of all other crops.

And if we want to keep the economy of this country strong, we are going to have to regain for the American farmer the right to have his commodities move in world trade on a competitive basis continuously. The present administration has cut acreage back by holding his commodities off world markets until this election year was in sight. Now it proposes to pay the farmer to cut his acreage, while with the other hand, through foreign aid, it increases foreign acreage. If there is one thing Secretary Benson should have learned, it is that we cannot regulate world production by cutting down and out the American farmer, while increasing acreage in foreign lands.

I think the reason the American farmer did not take care of our natural resources during the earlier years of this Nation was because, after he paid his taxes and met his actual living costs, there just wasn't enough left to put back into the soil. The price of what we take out of the American soil is going to be paid either by the consumer in the price the farmer gets or by the land itself.

May I remind you that in less than 10 years we will need 115 million acres that we do not have in this country.

May I remind you that if the farmer does not make his cost of production, if his prices

and his volume do not return to him a reasonable living, all he can do is wear out his land and move to town or get in politics, like many of us. It is just that simple.

Farming today is a commercial operation; it takes money to farm. Forty years ago it took a farmer 10 years to lose his farm, whether he ever spent a nickel on it or not. Today he can lose it in 2 years, due to the outlay and the cash that it takes to get into business.

I differ with our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture. I have the highest regard for him as a person. The basic difference between us, as I see it, is that I believe price supports are essential to the American economy to offset the high cost to the farmer which is brought about by other laws.

Since 1945 there has been more than an 85-percent increase in the markup of farm commodities from the time they leave the farmer's hands until they reach the consumer, and such spread continues to increase. There have been 13 freight-rate increases since World War II. That is not a happen-so. Behind the freight-rate increases were laws which gave to the railroads and the trucking lines a fair return on their investment after they paid their costs.

Involved in their investment were the high wages that had been protected by law; involved in their cost of operations were the wages that had to be paid in accordance with the law. That has been visited upon American agriculture to the point that since 1951 agricultural gross receipts have gone down about 25 percent. The net returns to American farmers in 1955 were 30 percent less than in 1951, and during that entire period of time the farmers' costs were increasing some 14 or 16 percent.

It is my view that the price-support program should be geared to the cost to the farmer. Yet our distinguished Secretary recommended that we reduce price supports and tie price supports to the amount of production. In other words, raise the supports when you wanted the American farmers to provide more for the consumers; lower the supports when you did not. As evidence of what he meant, parity, which up until 1954 had been tied to the cost that the farmer paid, was changed.

Modern parity—and it was sold to the Congress and the American people because of the use of the word "modern"—primarily ties the parity level to the average price that farmers receive for 10 years. It means that if the price goes down each year, it will gradually pull the support price down and the ever-increasing costs will not be taken into consideration. That is the reason I say his approach is to benefit primarily the consumer by giving the farmers more if you want them to feed the rest of us better, but by giving them less if we do not need what he is producing. Whatever that does, it does not help the farmer.

In my judgment, price supports should be tied to cost, and if we are going to have a $1-an-hour minimum wage, certainly those higher costs should be reflected in the price we assure the American farmer, as it was for years.

A few years ago, I happened to handle the appropriation for the National Production Authority. As I walked over to the office after a meeting, the head of that agency said to me, "Jamie, if I were Joe Stalin and wanted to wreck the economy of the United States, do you know what I would do?"

I said "No."

He said, "I would declare 5 years of peace."

Think of it. If he wanted to wreck the economy of the United States, he would declare 5 years of peace.

I said, "Joe, what do you mean?"

He said, "I mean this. If we were to have all the young men in service coming back here looking for a job, if we were to cancel all the war contracts, and have the folks in those plants out of work; if we were to stop the movement of the excess production of the American farmer, we would wreck the economy of this country."

If you think about it, it is fearsome.

Yet, I realized at that time, and it was several years ago, that we'd had about 12 years of the greatest prosperity we had ever enjoyed in this country—more cars, more radios, more of the things we love, more of the luxuries of life. Yet, I thought, surely it does not take a war to have these things? We cannot admit that it takes a war to carry on the high level of existence which we have. Then it dawned on me that it was not war, but the extra effort we made as a people because of the war, which brought the material prosperity.

In war we spend the money to buy shells and airplanes, gasoline to burn in the airplanes we destroy—we spend the money in things that are destroyed. We dig up our minerals, destroy our timber, and end a poorer country because we have used up so much of our resources.

If we were just wise enough to put that same effort to use to improve our own country; if we were wise enough to harness our streams and reforest our lands, stop erosion, build schools, and improve our country, we would have a much richer country. We would have a finer country. We would then be doing what we are doing for nearly every other country in the world.

My best efforts have been made in the Congress to preach that doctrine, because it is the basis of our well-being today, and it is the hope of our future.

I know there are many things to be disturbed about, such as an unbalanced budget. I believe in a balanced budget because it affects our financial system. I think we ought to make every effort to keep it balanced, if we can. Anything that destroys the value of our money upsets the whole operation of our economy.

But I will say that much more important than your financial side of this great economy of ours is the real wealth, the land and its ability to produce food, the timber, the rivers, and the other natural resources. Whatever condition we might leave our finances in, even if it became as bad as the one in China when they quit printing $100 bills because it costs more to print them than the bills would buy, your children and mine could set up their own financial system. But if we leave future generations a worn-out country, if we leave eroded soil and worn-out land, if we destroy the natural resources, then we have left them nothing with which to continue their existence. If we leave them a rich country, rich in natural resources, rich in the things that provide the standard of living to which we are accustomed then we truly have left them a fine heritage.

The point I make is this: Let us put first things first. The basic thing to all of us is the ability of our country to produce the fiber, food, clothing and shelter that is essential to all of us. We must see that in the complexities of the present day, in the fight in the Congress to give equality of opportunity; in the scramble to get these fair advantages the well-being of the farmers, the caretakers of our very future, must be considered. They must be provided with enough income to put back into the land a fair share of what is taken out. In my opinion, what is done on this matter is the most vital question of the day.

In conclusion, I would like to tell you one little story, which has a serious point.

We read so much in the press last year—and it is hard to get them to tell both sides—about the cost of the farm program. We read so much about what the Government did for the farmer. We read so many times that we ought to let the farmer get what he could the best way he could. It reminded me of a story that happened down in my section back when rural living was somewhat different.

Out in the area where I grew up we had a young man named Doc Scallions. It was back in a period when we were some miles from the nearest railroad station, at a time when a country boy did not go to town very much.

When World War I came along, Doc Scallians answered the call of his country and served in France; and he served with distinction. When he came back from the war, Doc told us this story.

He said, "You know, they called me up to Charleston to go over and fight. They had a lawyer up there, Mr. John, who made a speech to us boys, telling us what a great thing we were doing for our country. Mr. John stood there before us and said, 'Young men, you are going off to fight for our side, you are going to follow in the footsteps of Washintgon, Jackson, and Robert E. Lee. Your people at home will honor you for the effort you are making, and we appreciate it. Leave here and go out with your head up and your chest thrown out, and let them know you are the proud sons of the United States of America."

And Doc said he threw his chest out and his head up, and he got on the truck and rode to Camp Pike; he was there about 30 days, then went to France.

Almost before he knew it, he was in the battle of the Marne. He said he was scared to death and worn out and tired; but he was going the best he could. He said he sat down under a tree and stayed there. As he sat, he remembered every word Mr. John had told him back in his county seat town. He could hear his voice ringing as he said he was following in the footsteps of Washington and Lee. Then he said, "Suddenly it dawned on me; Mr. John, he's not here."

My friends, when they tell you to leave the caretakers of the future of this country to look after themselves; when they propose to have minimum wages raised to $1 an hour; when you see the tremendous increases in stocks on the New York Stock Exchange going up since 1949, the 30 leading ones from $175 a share to $412 a share; when you see the cost of everything the farmer buys going up and up and up; when they tell you to let agriculture, the very basis of all our prosperity, go by the board except at election time, while your Nation and your Government, by Government policy, gives its markets to foreign countries; when they say let the farmer do the best he can at the market place, the farmers of the Nation have a right to say, "Mr. John, you come go with us and then we will go."

The Republicans were all right on the farm issue in the election year of 1952. They restored high level fixed prices during this election year of 1956 by order of President Eisenhower, himself, so they are all right this year. Yet, if you read his speeches and those of his Secretary of Agriculture, he still condemns the remedial action he has taken.

You can clearly see your relief is for 1 year only. Read the Republican platform or follow the President's speeches. After this year they plan to flex prices—more support if you don't need it, less support if you do. Truly an amendment making every year election year would help if the present administration is to remain in power.

My friends, I would like to present to you a copy of my discussion of the farm problem and the President's recommendations, based on 12 years of study, which I presented to the United States House of Representatives in February 1956. I hope you have time to read it, for I believe you will find it of interest and, I hope, convincing.

How To Make the Eisenhower Doctrine Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1957

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1957, it was my privilege to attend before the able and distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. At that time I presented to them my views on the Eisenhower doctrine and how we can implement it as a means of establishing and maintaining world peace. The questions and answers addressed to me at the end of my testimony will be submitted for the RECORD at a later date.

My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 16, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee: I am most appreciative of the opportunity you again give me to appear before your committee to present to you my views with reference to the important problem that now confronts you.

I am sure that much of the factual information at my disposal will be spread upon your record before you close these hearings.

There is no doubt in my mind, and there should be none in the minds of our allies or of our enemies, present and potential, that every member of this committee and every Member of both Houses of Congress is sincerely devoted to the establishment of world peace, and when I say world peace I mean peace in every part of the world, a peace that will prevail not only between nations but between all peoples within each nation. That being so, while we may differ in our methods of approach, we certainly should be able to agree upon the form of a resolution which will state that purpose, not only so that all will understand, but so that none can misunderstand.

In approaching this problem, we cannot overlook the fact that under our Constitution the burden, the responsibility and the leadership in making foreign policy is, in the first instance, upon our President.

If he has failed us in that respect, if indeed as many have claimed—and with some justification, that he is now, to use the vernacular, passing the buck to the Congress, then let us assume that responsibility and move forward. Let us fill the void that has existed these many years, created by a lack of foreign policy of the United States, and positively, affirmatively, and without cavil or quibble, announce such policy, in one-syllable words if necessary, so that freedom-loving people everywhere will know where we stand and, what is more important, those who would subjugate the world and enslave its people, will know that a Patrick Henry has risen among the nations, renewing the clarion call, "Give me liberty or give me death," knowing that free nations have ceased to engage in oratorical displays and are finally and at last ready to fight, if necessary, for that freedom.

It would be well if this committee, and its counterpart in the other body, could avoid the pressures being exerted upon us by the President and his Secretary of State for immediate action on the resolution you have before you, and that such action be postponed until such time as the appropriate committees of the Congress have entered upon and completed a thorough investigation of the conduct of our foreign affairs. With the election campaign behind us, and another presidential campaign 4 years away, this is the time to conduct such a study.

The American people are entitled to know why we have been repeatedly told by the highest responsible officials in our Government that all was well at home and abroad, only to have each such statement immediately followed by another crisis. We are entitled to know why the highest officials of our Government have dared to say to the American people and to the Congress that they had no advance knowledge of what our friends and allies were doing nor of what our potential enemies were doing.

You must agree with me that it was their duty to know these things. I say to you, that they had the means at hand at all times to know these things and to properly evaluate them. If you disagree with that statement then I say, conduct the investigation I suggest.

If our Secretary of State stayed at home long enough to read the reports and the dispatches that are on file in his office, he and our President would have had advance knowledge of many of the things about which they pretended ignorance. Their lack of knowledge must be attributed primarily to refusal to read and to listen and to understand.

I suggest to you that if you called upon our intelligence agencies to submit to you copies of their factual reports, if you called upon our Security Council to give you such reports, if you called upon our Joint Chiefs of Staff therefor, if you called upon our Secretary of State to submit to you the reports he has received from our embassies, you would after reading them come to the same conclusion that I do, that all of the information they needed was always at hand upon which to base firm policies and to make them known in time to have prevented trouble.

It should be unnecessary for me to remind this committee of the grand and glorious history of our country, or to point out that after our country was born out of a war of revolution, we have never hesitated to fight for liberty, not only our own liberty but for the liberty of all freedom-loving people. In that war we accepted not only the encouragement of people from outside the confines of this continent, we accepted their financial help and their military aid. We welcomed and used the Lafayettes, the Pulaskis, the Kosciuskos and all other foreigners who came to our aid.

How different from what we did when, after encouraging the Hungarians to rebel against their Communist dictators, we turned our back on them, giving them nothing but sweet, but very empty, words.

We asked no country's consent to enter the War of 1812 to fight for the freedom of the seas. That endeavor was not only for our own personal advantage but to establish an important principle of international law. We asked no country's consent when in 1898 we fought with Spain for the freedom of Cuba.

We asked no country's consent when we wiped out the pirates of Tripoli. We asked no country's consent when we sent General Pershing at the head of the United States Army into Mexico, where they stayed for some 11 months routing out Pancho Villa and his bandits who had dared to cross our border and kill six Americans.

Are we now going to rewrite history and label the United States the aggressor in all of those, and in many other instances in our history? Are there any among us who will say that those actions were not justified by moral law, as well as international law? If we follow the thinking of Mr. Dulles as applied to our friends and allies in the Middle East, we must rewrite all our traditions. If he really doesn't know the difference between self-defense and aggression; if he doesn't know the difference between self-preservation and aggression; if he doesn't know that a people or a nation which refuses to allow itself to be robbed, even if it uses force to prevent the thievery; is neither morally nor legally an aggressor; if he doesn't know that a people or a nation which will disarm its enemies who have threatened to annihilate it, is not an aggressor, then, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, this Congress cannot move fast enough to present a resolution which will clearly define the differences for him.

Obviously Mr. Dulles has not learned the lessons of history. He refuses to acknowledge that among the major mistakes we made in the recent past was standing idly by as Manchuria was conquered, as Ethiopia was ravaged, as Poland was raped, and as Hitler was appeased and even now as Hungary is destroyed. Apparently he thinks that appeasement of Nasser, of Egypt, has not brought us to the threshold of world war III.

I say to this committee that when the history of these times is written, one of the darkest blots upon its pages will be recording the shameful conduct of our country in rising up in the United Nations to join with our sworn enemy, the Communists, to denounce our sworn friends, the British, the French, and the Israelis.

I say to you that the only thing wrong about what the British and the French did was their delay. They had a right to move in and take the Suez Canal from Nasser the day he nationalized it. When they withheld such action, at the suggestion of Mr. Dulles, they did all that could be expected of them. They complied with his suggestion for a London conference. When that failed, and the United Nations failed to take positive and firm action against Nasser with reference to the Suez Canal, they had every right to move in and put Mr. Nasser in his place. I understand our President claims to have been very much annoyed by the fact that he was not consulted in advance of that action. He denied himself the right to be consulted about it.

All the world knew that Britain and France were moving planes and tanks and troops into Cyprus in preparation for moving on Nasser if he didn't live up to his international obligations. During all these long days of preparation by the British and the French, why didn't the President or his Secretary of State convene the Security Council, not for the purpose of preventing Britain and France from protecting their lifeline, but for the purpose of bringing international pressure to bear, world opinion as they say, upon the international brigand who was stealing that which belonged to the international community.

Let me recall to you the words of our President. Mr. Eisenhower said that international law must be the same for the big nation as for the little nation. International justice requires that the same rule apply to the small nation as it does to the big nation. We must agree.

The trouble with that statement is that it comes very late. Too long, have we been condoning international thievery under the euphonious title of "nationalization." Long before we wrote into our Constitution the prohibition against the taking of property, even for public purposes, all moral law, which must be considered a basis and a part of international law, prohibits such taking.

Now let's apply this doctrine which the President has so properly enunciated. What would you do if the President sent us a message stating that the Republic of Panama had nationalized the Panama Canal? I doubt whether this Congress would have waited for a message from the President before it acted. You would have acted the minute the news came to our attention. What's the difference in the two situations?

Geographically, the Suez Canal runs right through the middle of Egypt. Similarly, the Panama Canal runs right through the middle of the Republic of Panama.

The Suez Canal is an international highway, made such by the solemn obligations of duly executed treaties of many of the most important sovereign nations of the world. As a matter of fact, the state of Egypt owes its very sovereignty to the acts of most of those nations.

The Panama Canal is an international highway pursuant to the solemn obligation of a treaty entered into between the Republic of Panama and the United States of America.

No Panamanian money built the Panama Canal. No Egyptian money built the Suez Canal.

Although unilateral action of the Egyptians blockaded the Suez Canal, little or no Egyptian money will be used to clear it. And let no one say that the sinking of the ships by the Egyptians in the Suez Canal was an act of self-defense. It was a deliberate act of sabotage. It was a cold-blooded statement by Nasser to the user nations that he was taking their property and he would destroy it before he'd let them have it back.

If the Republic of Panama acted similarly with reference to the Panama Canal, is there an American anywhere in this country who would say that we should consult with any other nation before we moved in on the Republic of Panama and took the canal back? I doubt it.

What we would do with the Panama Canal, we should have done to help Britain and France and the rest of the free world do with reference to the Suez Canal, and we may yet have to do it.

To those who would say that one of the provisions in the treaty covering the Suez Canal is that title to the canal will pass in a matter of years to Egypt. I say that when the time comes, the free nations of the world will abide by that covenant. However, if they have any sense, in the meantime they will either build another canal in that area or pipelines through countries like Israel and Lebanon, supplemented with sufficient large-sized tankers so that the free world will be in a position to negotiate with a Nasser, if one still be around at that time, for the perpetual internationalization of that Canal.

In that connection, some of you may say that there were pipelines running through Syria and when this struggle started those pipelines were destroyed. Such is the fact. Whether they were destroyed by the Syrian Government, or by Communists aided and abetted by the Syrian Government, is unimportant. A Secretary of State who was alert to protect the interests of a free world should have presented that matter to the United Nations for appropriate action and, if necessary, we should have moved into Syria, yes, with armed forces, to protect that property.

This is not a new theory. Do I have to remind you that that is precisely what we did, in substance and in effect, in Guatemala? We consulted with none of our allies. We moved on Guatemala, despite the protests of Communist Russia, because we believed the Communist threat in Guatemala was an imminent danger to our security and the security of our neighbors in this hemisphere.

Let me pass on to another facet of this principle. At this very moment there is fighting in the Middle East, between Yemen and the British protectorate of Aden. Is there any doubt but that the Yemenite invasion of Aden's borders is Communist inspired, supervised by Communist "technicians," and fortified by Communist arms? Or is this another matter, knowledge of which is lacking to our Secretary of State because he hasn't had the time to read the dispatches? What are we doing about it? Why hasn't our Secretary of State instructed our delegate to the United Nations to bring the matter forthrightly before the Security Council and, if necessary, before the General Assembly? Or is this a matter to be talked about in secret executive session?

I, like some of the members of this committee, am fed up with this so-called executive session business. It is labeled "top secret" by the administration. All the world knows about it and you read it in the newspapers in the first editions on the streets after the close of the executive session. Not because of any leaks from the committee but because it is either leaked by the Department of State or it is dug out of the Department by alert reporters who will not be denied the information they have a right to present to the public, and which the public has the right to get authentically in the first instance directly from responsible Government officials.

I can understand that matters of high policy involving our national security and defense should be presented to certain congressional committees behind closed doors.

It is high time, however, that our Government officials realized that secret diplomacy as to policy affecting the attitudes and conduct of governments has long since lost its usefulness. It accomplishes nothing except to create suspicions and ill feeling and produce more grist for the false propaganda mills of the Communists.

There is no doubt in our minds about our sincerity in seeking world peace. There is no doubt in our minds that we want no colonies and that we want to subjugate no people.

Our only desire is a free and peaceful world. Any and every plan working toward that end can be freely, fully, and completely discussed in the open, without reservation. Any other approach gives the Communists the right to cry that we are being deceitful and gives the neutralist the right to suspect not only our motives but our goals. We will not gain any friends by pretending that the policy or doctrine which we intend to apply to such friends or with such friends must be negotiated secretly.

Let me assure those who are fearful that the plans of the enemy may be made known, or that the enemy may find out how much we know about his plans, the enemy knows his plans. We can talk about them publicly, first, to alert our friends, and, secondly, to let our enemy know that we are wise to him. Every last word that is uttered to any committee of the Congress with reference to the allegedly new doctrine that you are asked to endorse should be publicized so that our friends will know that we mean to help them, and so that our enemies will know that we intend to deter them.

Now, let's talk for a moment or two about the resolution and what it seeks to do. The idea seems to be to tell the Communists that we will stand for no more of their incursions upon the rights of free peoples and, at the same time, to show our friends that we are ready to help them economically. If I have read the newspaper reports correctly, our Secretary of State has conceded, at least before the committees in the other body, that the President already has the full authority to do the things asked for by this resolution. I believe that in answer to the question as to why these things have not yet been done, he says that if we have been late in doing them, let's at least do them now.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I returned from the Middle East in December of 1955, I told everybody in our Government who would listen to me about the situation as I found it there. You will find much of the story in my testimony before this committee on May 8, 1956.

There cannot be any doubt but that the authority which the President now seeks he has always had. He has merely failed to exercise it.

You remember that only a few days ago he told a joint session of Congress that this country had security pacts with 42 nations and pacts of a similar nature with three other nations. The Baghdad Pact between Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan was brought into being by the United States and at its instigation. When those countries asked the United States to join that pact, the excuse was given by our Secretary of State that to do so would antagonize some of the other Arab States, and particularly Mr. Nasser of Egypt.

The State of Israel has repeatedly asked for a security pact, indicating that she would need no additional arms if she had such a security pact. Mr. Dulles' excuse for not giving the State of Israel such a security pact was that he couldn't do that without giving a similar security pact to the other Arab States. When asked why we didn't enter into such security pacts with the other Arab States, the answer came back: They won't take such a security pact because an important feature of each such security pact is an undertaking that the country will not engage in acts of aggression against any of its neighbors. The country that will not enter into such a covenant, labels itself a potential aggressor.

Economic aid throughout the Middle East, to the Arab countries as well as to Israel, has been available for many years. It has been offered to the Arab States and to Egypt repeatedly. From 1948 to 1952 none of the Arab States would take such aid from us because, as a condition of giving such aid, we insisted upon a firm obligation being entered into by the recipient to recognize the existence of the State of Israel and to agree not to be an aggressor against it or any other neighbor.

For the last 4 years the policy of our State Department has been different. It has tried to buy the friendship of the Arabs by offering aid without insisting upon peace treaties and without insisting on covenants against aggression.

The result has been more and more and more aggression by Egypt, Syria, and Jordan against Israel. If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 84th Congress, you will find that hardly a week went by without my inserting a list of the incursions and invasions and ravagings and murderings by Arabs against Israelis on Israeli territory; the guerrillas, fedayeens and commandos being armed by the Egyptians and the Arabs and crossing from Egyptian and Arab territory into Israel and then returning home after their escapades of destruction.

Whether these were the acts of their governments is as unimportant as it is obvious. In any event those acts were the responsibility of the Arab governments. When those governments did not suppress and effectively prohibit those raids, the State of Israel had every right to use force to stop them. Israel had as much right to do that as the United States had to send General Pershing and our United States Army into Mexico to rout out the Mexican bandits when the Mexican Government either could not or would not stop their depredations.

I do not remember a single instance when our Secretary of State went before the United Nations and asked that that kind of conduct by Egypt and Syria and Jordan be stopped. I do remember how he first insisted that the Egyptians must get more arms to create a balance of power as between it and Israel. I also remember how he first urged Canada and France not to send arms to Israel, and then reversed himself and urged that they do send arms to Israel.

Any sensible person would have known that the arming of the Egyptians meant that they would use those arms and that the very type and quantity meant that they would be used for aggression. Similarly, any sensible person must know that the Israelis if pushed as hard as they were they would use their

arms in self-defense, and by self-defense I mean going into the neighboring countries and disarming those who threatened Israel with annihilation.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have a great opportunity as a result of some "buck passing." I hope you will grasp the opportunity and bring forth a resolution which will be resolute and specific. You can use some, if not most, of the language of the resolution presented to you by the State Department. You must, if you will do your full duty, make some important changes and you must add some important limitations.

I hope you won't believe me too presumptuous in submitting to you herewith the language which I think you should use in this resolution.

Permit me to summarize my changes briefly.

In the first paragraph, instead of indicating the granting of a new authorization, my resolution indicates that we are merely confirming the authority that the President already has.

In the first whereas clause, I have inserted language to show that we are not going to limit our high principles by the United Nations Charter but that we are standing firm in our principle for a just and enduring peace and will seek it by every means available, including the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

In the third whereas clause, I have made it clear that the Communist threat exists all over the world but has recently been accentuated in the Middle East.

In section 1, instead of pretending to give the President new authority, my language confirms the authority that he now has and makes it clear that such authority extends to the Middle East.

I have stricken from section 2 the words "requesting such aid."

If this resolution is to mean anything, it is essential that it be realistic and forthright. There is no longer time to hedge or doubletalk. We are either prepared to fight for our liberties or we are not. Such of us, if any there be, who think that we can any longer sit silently by and let any part of the world be enslaved by the Communists, cannot vote for any kind of a resolution on this subject, whether it be that proposed by the President or any modification thereof.

If we are to wait for a request from a country attacked, before we move in to prevent Communist aggression, the task that will confront us will not be one to prevent the aggressors from getting in but rather the almost impossible job of driving them out.

Who will make the request of us in that area?

Israel has been making similar requests and being ignored.

Syria, which is fast being completely dominated by the Communists, tells us that she will not make the request and wants no part of this resolution. There is good reason for that. Syria has never given up the idea that Lebanon has no right to be a free and independent sovereign nation. Syria insists that Lebanon must eventually be a part of Syria. She would love to have the opportunity, and is even now being urged by the Communists, to prepare for the day when Syria can incorporate within her boundaries, all of Lebanon. If Syria should decide to march on Lebanon, it will do so under the leadership of Communist technicians and by the time we receive the Lebanese request for aid, it will be necessary for us to move in to drive the Communists out of that country.

Will Egypt ask for our help when she has mortgaged her economy for the next 50 years to pay for Russian arms?

The only effective policy we can have for that area must be as firm and as definite and as precise as the Monroe Doctrine was.

We will have to make the decision of whether the Communists are the aggressors and we will have to make the decision of whether or not we will go to the aid of these countries in the Middle East, and which of them will be sincerely attempting to avoid subjugation by the Communists.

We must serve notice now that we will not permit the Communists to enslave any of those peoples or subjugate any of those countries, and we must serve notice that, if necessary, we will move our Armed Forces into those countries to prevent the Communists from taking them over. Nothing less than that will stop them. If we don't intend to do that, we should take our 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean, recall our Marines from that area, and let the world know that we do not intend to act; if we do intend to act and to use those ships and troops, we should let the Communists know in no uncertain words that an infringement upon the liberty of any people anywhere in the world is an infringement upon the liberty of all the free peoples in every part of the world.

I add a new section 3, which limits sections 1 and 2 so that no aid, military or economic, may be given to any country, except and upon condition that it first agrees:

(1) That it will not be an aggressor nation;

(2) That it will not permit its citizens or residents to engage in acts of aggression, guerrilla or otherwise, or in raids and pillaging, or in causing injury, death, or damage to any of its neighbors;

(3) That it will faithfully abide by and fulfill its international obligations and abide by the ethics and principles of international law, and will not discriminate on account of race or religion.

The one country in this world which has failed to answer the questionnaire on slavery as requested by the United Nations is Saudi Arabia. It is the one country today which is a slave nation. Its peoples are slaves in every sense of the word. It is the only country on the face of the world that has not advised the United Nations as to that condition.

It is the one country that refuses to allow an American citizen who is a Jew while wearing the uniform of our Armed Forces to enter an American base in that country. It goes further and will not let a chaplain in the Armed Forces wear the insignia of his office, the crucifix, upon his uniform when in Saudi Arabia. Yet it is the king of this country who is shortly to visit with our great President. I wonder what they will discuss.

(4) That it will negotiate in good faith, peace treaties with its neighbors; and

(5) That it will not submit to domination by any foreign nation.

It should be made crystal-clear in your report on this resolution that a nation seeking to enforce international obligations is not an aggressor; that a nation defending itself against acts of warfare, guerrilla or otherwise, is not an aggressor; that a nation which disarms a potential killer is not an aggressor; that a nation which blockades international highways is an aggressor; and that a nation which violates international law is an aggressor. Your report should also indicate, without equivocation, that negotiation in good faith of peace treaties requires the parties to meet around the peace table and confer about all of their problems with a view to settling all thereof, without either party to the controversy in advance of the meeting insisting upon an agenda which will include or exclude any parts of the controversy or delimit the extent of the negotiations with reference to any thereof.

It is utter nonsense for our Secretary of State to say that the United States is prepared to guarantee the boundaries of the countries in the Middle East if and when they will agree upon such boundaries. The requirement must be that the parties in good faith must meet in an attempt to agree upon such boundaries.

The same applies to the question of the resettlement of refugees and compensation that may be due to the parties or any of their nationals. Those are all matters about which the parties must confer and compromise between themselves, without advance commitments or limitations as to what they will or will not talk about with reference thereto.

I have changed section 4 so as to require the President to advise the Congress fully concerning any new uses as and when he approves them.

I have modified section 5 so as to provide that the resolution shall expire 2 years after its enactment unless extended by the Congress. This is a much safer way of handling the matter than continuing the authority until such time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may terminate it. A fixed termination date will require the Congress to review the entire subject matter after the program has been in operation for a fair period of time.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the courtesy of listening to me. If there are any questions you may care to address to me, I shall try to answer them.

House Joint Resolution 166

Joint resolution to confirm the authorization of the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence

Whereas a primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all, in accordance with the will of God and the desire of mankind and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek, by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

Whereas such danger now exists and has now been accentuated in the general area of the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the authority in the President, be and hereby is confirmed, to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East, as well as elsewhere, in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The authority of the President is hereby confirmed to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military-assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the au-

thority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

SEC. 3. Neither economic nor military assistance shall be given to any country except and upon condition that it first agrees:

(1) that it will not be an aggressor nation;

(2) that it will not permit its citizens or residents to engage in acts of aggression, guerrilla or otherwise, or in raids and pillaging, or in causing injury, death, or damage to any of its neighbors;

(3) that it will faithfully abide by and fulfill its international obligations and abide by the ethics and principles of international law; and will not discriminate on account of race or religion;

(4) that it will negotiate in good faith, peace treaties with its neighbors; and

(5) that it will not submit to domination by any foreign nation.

SEC. 4. The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200 million from any appropriations now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

SEC. 5. The President shall within 30 days after his approval of any new use or allocation of funds hereunder report to the Congress his action.

SEC. 6. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, but in any event 2 years after the enactment hereof, unless extended by joint resolution of the Congress.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

His Excellency Ambrose Senyshyn, Bishop of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Diocese of Stamford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Lord our God, for the mercies and blessings bestowed upon this generous and fruitful country of the United States of America; for the wisdom, forbearance, and prudence imparted to our President and to our Senate in their work for peace, prosperity, and good will among all men.

We bless Thee, Almighty Father, for keeping our country free from tribulations afflicting our less fortunate brethren; for making this country a haven for the poor, the homeless, the suffering.

We give thanks unto Thee, O Holy Mighty One, who hast made and preserved us a nation, a nation in which freedoms and opportunities are available under its banner of stars and stripes to all its members, regardless of color, creed, or station in life.

And we pray Thee, our God, that the Members of this august body, Thy servants, be given light to see and be given power to do their tasks according to Thy will. Hear, O God, the supplications of this assembly of our Nation's leaders and of its humble citizens.

May there be granted to all nations a just peace—not the deadly peace suffered by millions of Ukrainians and other peoples in prisons and slave camps, nor the peace forced upon the Hungarian people by tanks and bombs; but the peace founded upon God's laws. May no nation build its well-being upon the misfortunes and tragedies of its neighbors. May the liberty we cherish in this land be restored to those deprived of it: to the Ukrainians, who last possessed it 39 years ago; to the Hungarians, who today shed their life's blood for it; to all held helpless in bonds and chains; to all who have had to forsake their homeland, and are now scattered upon the face of the earth. May our Nation in its world leadership continue to labor for the welfare of its own citizens and for all mankind, so that every human being can enjoy his God-given rights and freely glorify Thy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 14, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) to extend the time for transmitting the Economic Report of the President for the 1st regular session of the 85th Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) to extend the time for transmitting the Economic Report of the President for the 1st regular session of the 85th Congress, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am pleased to send to the desk the certificate of appointment of the Honorable WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY as a Senator from the State of Texas, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Senator Price Daniel. I ask that the credentials be read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of appointment will be read and placed on file.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Texas, I, Allan Shivers, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Price Daniel, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Allan Shivers, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1957.

By the Governor:

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas.

[SEAL]

TOM REAVLEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have with us today a new colleague, whose credentials have just been read. He is my close, personal friend, WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY, of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. President, I need say very little about BILL BLAKLEY; but I wish to say that my colleagues will soon find out that BILL BLAKLEY is a man of great heart and great mind, a man who is modest and unassuming in his words, but forceful and very effective in his achievements.

For the information of the Senate, I should like to present an estimate of BILL BLAKLEY by one of the top community leaders of his hometown, Dallas, Tex., the city in which he has lived for so many years:

DALLAS, TEX., *January 16, 1957.*

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND LYNDON: Your new colleague in the United States Senate, WILLIAM BLAKLEY, has been a personal friend of mine for nearly two decades. I know no better way to describe him than a portion of Scripture found in the Book of Job: "I was eyes to the blind and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the needy; and the cause of him that I knew not I searched out." He is a member of the board of directors of the Community Chest, and two of its agencies to which he has been most generous, namely, the Association for the Blind, and the Salvation Army. Bill in the truest sense carries out in his philanthropy the Biblical injunction of not letting his left hand know what his right hand is doing. For a number of years I have had the high privilege of acting as his personal almoner. I am certain this great, generous, unassuming Christian gentleman will

be embarrassed about my sending this telegram, but at the same time I thought I ought to tell you something of my affection for him.

FRED M. LANGE,
Executive Vice President,
Dallas County Community Chest.

Mr. President, Mr. BLAKLEY is ready to take the oath, and I suggest that he come forward to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will come to the desk the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. BLAKLEY, escorted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed to by him in the official oath book.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

THE BUDGET—REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's budget message, which on yesterday was transmitted to the Congress, and was read and referred in the House of Representatives, be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the message will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. BLAKLEY, be assigned to service on the Committees on Government Operations and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY, AT 11:15 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11:15 a. m., on Monday next. Let me state that when the Senate convenes at 11:15, there will be a quorum call, and then the Senate will proceed to the portico on the east front of the Capitol, where the oath will be administered to the President and the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, during which Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit other resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO REENLISTMENT OF CERTAIN FORMER OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the entitlement to reenlistment under certain circumstances of certain former officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR WALTER REED ARMY INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH TO AWARD CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL DEGREES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research to award Master of Science, Master of Public Health, and Doctor of Science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the District of Columbia government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY THE D. C. ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Manager, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D. C., requesting a 30-day extension of time for that Board to file its report; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, FRENCHMAN UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, NEBRASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Frenchman Unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, the status of construction of a county hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., for which Federal assistance has been granted, and informing the Senate that a detailed report will be furnished in the near future; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION OF DELINQUENT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENTS AGAINST CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order cancelling $4,062.06 of delinquent operation and maintenance assessments existing as debts against certain Indian landowners (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIFORM QUALIFICATIONS FOR JURORS IN FEDERAL COURTS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III, SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, RELATING TO CERTAIN LOANS TO VETERANS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that certain additional categories of loans to veterans may be automatically guaranteed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH RELATIVE TO CERTAIN PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL, ETC.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, recommendations of the executive branch relating to certain project modifications and river basin authorizations involving improvements for navigation, shore protection, flood control, and related purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Student Government Association of Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa., relating to full support by the United States to the United Nations in any action that body may see fit to take with regard to the present situation of mass deportation and genocide in Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Northwest Retailers Association, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the exemption of the retail

trades from Federal wages and hours jurisdiction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Kansas, at Wichita, Kans., on December 9, 1956, favoring the establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a resolution unanimously adopted by the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. The assembly is composed of community leaders representing almost 800 communities in every section of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his resolution, which is entiled "Peace in the Middle East", be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

With the question of permanent peace in the Middle East now on the agenda of the United Nations, the nations of the world have the sacred obligation to help achieve a just and lasting peace in that crucial part of the world, which we fervently pray will be attained by mutual agreement of the parties involved. Such a peace with justice—and justice with peace—will be of momentous and enduring value to all peoples of the area—and to all mankind.

The President's declaration just being submitted to Congress has underscored strongly that peace in the Middle East is crucial to peace in the world—and to the security of the United States.

Now that Britain and France have left Suez and Israel is withdrawing its troops, it would be a tragedy of catastrophic proportions if the situation in the Middle East were permitted to return to the conditions which led to the outbreak of hostilities, and which again would bring about war. The fuse to the powder keg is still aflame—it must be put out.

The leadership of our country in the United Nations is indispensable in order to assure that the causes of war are removed. While the United Nations force still polices the critical areas, it is imperative that the United Nations itself, with our initiative, will take action to guarantee that there will be free passage through the Suez Canal for all nations, including Israel, as required by the International Convention governing the use of the Canal and as specifically called for by the Security Council but disregarded by Egypt to date; that all ships will have access through the Red Sea and Gulf of Agaba, universally recognized as an international waterway, and that the possibility of Egypt's blockade of that waterway will not be restored; that the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Desert will no longer be used to launch Fedayeen raids.

I was astonished to learn, for example, that the number killed and wounded by Fedayeen in Israel in proportion to its population would be the equivalent of more than 125,000 killed and wounded in the United States. Clearly no country can tolerate that, nor can there be any peace so long as that condition continues. The terms of the United Nations resolution of November 2 required all Fedayeen raids ended. They still continue. That United Nations resolution and the United Nations Charter, which requires all nations to maintain peaceful relations with all others, must be complied with.

The President's program for increased economic aid to all countries in the area will deal with another basic cause of instability and subversion in the Middle East. Our communities which are so fundamentally concerned with health and welfare, and which have supplied hundreds of millions of dollars for aid to refugee and destitute in the area, have long recognized the importance of such large-scale economic aid and have repeatedly urged it, so that the inhabitants of all the countries—Israel and Arab nations alike—can conquer the truly fundamental enemies: poverty and disease.

The Middle East seething with strife and continuing to feed the causes of war is a cauldron of catastrophe. May I urge you to give the full weight of your great prestige and leadership in Congress and with the State Department to bring about the initiative and action by our country now, while we have this momentous opportunity, to help achieve clear and permanent settlements for the security of the United States and the benefit of all mankind.

RESOLUTION OF HECTOR (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution which I have just received from the Hector Local Farmers Union, Hector, Minn., be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HECTOR, MINN., *December 18, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress.
Hon. EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The Hector local of the Farmers Union passed and adopted the following resolution at a meeting of the said unit of the Farmers Union on December 17, 1956, as follows:

Resolved, That price supports on basic commodities be retained at 90 percent of parity pursuant to the schedules and provisions of the old formula relative to parity schedules.

Resolved, A remodeling of present corn acreage allotments to increase acreage allotments so that a greater percentage of people engaged in agricultural persuits will be able to participate in the program.

Further Resolved, That soil-bank benefits be increased to conform to the productive earning capacity of the lands taken out of production.

HECTOR LOCAL, FARMERS UNION,
Hector, Minn.
RAYMOND PIEHL, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL 397, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a resolution from the St. Paul Council No. 397 of the Knights of Columbus, concerning the situation in Hungary.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas basic human rights guaranteed by the natural law ordained by God have been openly, wantonly, and cruelly violated by Soviet Russia and its puppet government of Hungary over a period of many years, this repression finally erupting into such violence as to draw world attention;

Whereas the recent and continuing violence in Hungary has alarmed many people and nations, largely unaware of the true state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain;

Whereas the opportunity is thus afforded to focus the pressure of world opinion through every possible channel upon the diabolic forces at work in Hungary, and thus it is hoped to ease the pressure on those heroic and suffering people;

Whereas basic human rights and national sovereignty have specifically been guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations to all people and by the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947 as ratified by the Allied Powers to Hungary;

Whereas the deportation of the flower of Hungarian youth is continuing and the systematic reduction of the will to resist is being carried forward ruthlessly at the present moment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon all such nations as subscribe to the Charter of the United Nations to deny recognition to the present Hungarian puppet government and call attention to the importance of such denial in the case of Red China;

We further urge said nations subscribing to the United Nations Charter to implement immediate and effective measures to stop the deportation of Hungarians into Soviet Russia and to restore fundamental freedom and national sovereignty in Hungary and in all Eastern European countries, and to implement said measures within the framework of the United Action for Peace plan of 1950 which enables nations within the General Assembly of the United Nations to take effective measures against aggression by the employment of an international police force, irrespective of Soviet veto, and to further implement said measures by economic pressure on Soviet Russia, severance of all cultural relations in the fields of art, science, and especially athletics, until such time as it can be demonstrated that such relations inure to the benefit of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain and not to the propaganda purposes of the Soviet masters.

Adopted by St. Paul Council, No. 397, Knights of Columbus, December 4, 1956.

LAWRENCE J. MANGAN,
Grand Knight.
Attest: FRANK R. SCHERMAN,
Recorder.

FOREIGN POLICY RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE CIO CONVENTION, AND ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 17, 1956, I had the pleasure of addressing the Wisconsin State CIO Convention, in Milwaukee, on some of the important issues we are currently facing in the field of foreign policy. We know, Mr. President, that highly intelligent, thoughtful, and constructive proposals which frequently are voiced in various communities across our Nation, are not always channeled effectively to public or congressional notice. The views of our labor organizations and the millions of American workers who make up these organizations should, I think, have a better vehicle of expression in the field of foreign policy.

Consequently, in my Milwaukee speech I recommended that our national labor organizations call a national conference representing all of their affiliated locals,

for the purpose of foreign policy discussion and the making of joint proposals.

I was delighted, therefore, to learn that the Wisconsin CIO convention later endorsed this idea, by adopting a resolution calling for a national labor conference to discuss our foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks; together with my remarks to the Wisconsin State CIO convention, in Milwaukee, on November 17, be printed in the RECORD, following the text of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution and address are as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN POLICY

Whereas our fellow trade-union members have been fighting Communist tanks with their bare hands in the streets of Budapest to gain freedom and a better way of life for the Hungarian people; and

Whereas this Hungarian uprising shows that American foreign policy is not giving leadership to the peoples of the world who hunger for bread and freedom; and

Whereas this 1956 Wisconsin CIO convention has already gone on record favoring a permanent United Nations peace army which could have been the police force to have moved in to save the Hungarian people from the Soviet invasion by troops and tanks; and

Whereas our American foreign policy is permitting the Communists to blackmail many free nations and is allowing the free world to be whittled away bit by bit; and

Whereas the Middle East is already in a state of war, with the Israeli democracy fighting to retain self-government; and

Whereas bipartisan foreign policy should give all Americans the right to be present on the takeoffs instead of the crash landings, and did in fact work successfully under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman; and

Whereas today we need to hear the voice of the people who ultimately shed their blood in wars and who make their sacrifices to save democracy at home and freedom in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recommend that the national executive board of the AFL–CIO call a national conference in Washington with delegate representation from all affiliated local unions, to hear and discuss the big issues facing the world, and to form the basis for giving enlightened bipartisanship to our foreign policy; and be it finally

Resolved, That we recommend that copies of this statement be sent to all international union presidents, George Meany, Walter Reuther, Dwight Eisenhower, Senator Hubert Humphrey, and the American delegation to the United Nations.

Submitted by resolutions committee.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

It is nothing short of incredible that a man could be elected President of the United States with a majority of 11 million, and still be unable to carry the Congress for his party. This is really a phenomenon of American politics.

I think it has happened only two times before in our national history, and I doubt that it will happen again for the next 50 years.

I said to a reporter this morning that this election proved two things: It proved that Mr. Eisenhower was popular and that the Republican Party was unpopular. I will settle for that too, because Ike can't run again. [Laughter and applause.]

Well, now, you do not want to be harangued on partisan politics this morning.

I think you are interested, however, in some of the issues that are going to be before us, and I want to concentrate my talk today on the subject of foreign policy, because I am deeply involved in it.

POLITICAL SEX APPEAL

It is not a subject, I suppose, that has political sex appeal, but it is something vital to the lives of every one of us, and vital to the very life of this Republic.

[As a picture was taken of Senator HUMPHREY, a flash bulb exploded with a loud pop.] [Laughter.]

I told these Republicans that the election was over. [Laughter and applause.] I was really surprised. I thought this was one place I could come and not be shot at. Well, I want you to know that I didn't flinch—that is, not much. [Laughter.] I just about collapsed. [Laughter.]

But to be serious with you again, as I said, there is a very vital subject, the subject of foreign policy, to which I want to direct my attention this morning, and then say just a few words to you about the legislative program before the Congress.

I made 81 speeches in 14 days, and traveled 4,900 miles just before the end of the election, and believe me, I do not think I have fully recovered from it.

ADVANCE LIBERAL PROGRAM

However, I want to see in the coming months in Congress a progressive, liberal program advanced by the liberals of that Congress, and that means, in the main, the Democratic Party Members of Congress.

I do not think it is appropriate for Democratic leadership to say that we have no program, as has been said. I believe that we should not rely entirely upon the Executive for a program.

I think we Democrats have an obligation to present our own program, and since we have been entrusted with the majority in the Congress, that program should follow the lines of our party platform.

We went out to the American people and told them to give us a vote of confidence, and they did. They gave the legislative branch of the government a vote of confidence. They gave us support and they are going to expect results.

I want to say to those gathered in this room that every effort that can be made within the bounds of reasonable politics will be made to produce a liberal, progressive program.

We intend to do something about school construction. We intend to build schools. We intend to pass legislation that will make it possible to alleviate this school shortage.

We intend to do something about taxation, instead of just talk about it. We intend to offer a tax program that will be equitable, that will provide tax relief for the American family.

CAN'T LIE DOWN

We intend not to lie down on the job when it comes to our farmers. You and I live in a great agricultural State, or States, and we have to produce on the agricultural front.

We cannot afford, may I say, to permit an agricultural depression because we know what it means to factory workers and small-business men, and all of us, all of the national economy.

We have to do something about our immigration laws. They are a disgrace to our Republic as they presently stand. We have to revise those laws and bring within them the tradition of equality and humanitarianism that is so much a part of the fabric of this Republic.

We have to do something about our labor-management relations. Our platform pledges not only revision of the Taft-Hartley law, but repeal, and the building of a sound labor-management law.

I for one am not going to be content until every effort has been made that is humanly possible to accomplish this objective, and gain it.

May I say to you, we are going to do something in the field of civil rights. We are not going to permit any delay, not 1 minute longer. This is morally unjustifiable, morally wrong to permit discrimination in our society.

Something will be done, and I ask you not to yield in your perseverence. Hold your conferences and educational meetings, and get this job underway.

Now let me go quickly to the matter of foreign policy, because presently I serve as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been a member of that committee for 5 years. I have been chairman of the Senate Committee on Disarmament, and in recent days have been serving as an American delegate to the United Nations. This is a great experience for any one.

I wish you could be there. May I personally invite you to attend at least one session of the United Nations, to visit its facilities, to visit the Assembly hall, to visit the Secretariat building, and the Security Council. Visit it and get the spirit of this great international organization.

U. N. NO CURE-ALL

Do not misunderstand me. The United Nations is not a cure-all for the world's ills. It has no magic formula. It is not necessarily going to be a success. But it offers the opportunity for successful accomplishment for peace with justice and peace with freedom.

I think it is fair to say that the United Nations is the last best hope of free people on this earth for world peace and world security, and freedom and justice for peoples everywhere.

If we cannot make this great U. N. work, then I do not know what there is left to do, except to fight it out, the law of the jungle, brutality, atomic and hydrogen war—which to me is inconceivable.

Therefore, I think we have to recognize that we have a chance for justice and peace. Just a chance, that is all. Maybe an outside chance, but it is a chance, to which we have to dedicate every possible endeavor and energy at our command and all of our talent.

U. N. BUDGET SMALL

Do you know what the budget for the U. N. is? The budget for the United Nations is less than the budget for the Sanitary District in New York. It is less per capita than 2 packages of cigarettes for each American—the cost of 2 packages of cigarettes. I mean all of the United Nations activities, all of them. All of its specialized activities.

It is incredible that we put so little into this organization and expect so much.

When you hear people say we ought to get the United Nations out of the United States, and the United States out of the United Nations, do not get angry with them. Pity them. They are misguided. They are just misinformed.

They are people who do not know we are living in the 20th century. They are to be pitied rather than chastized. Try to help them to get a better understanding of what is going on.

PHILOSOPHY OF ROOSEVELT

The United Nations is the creation of this Government, in a sense. It was born in San Francisco. The charter bears the philosophy of Franklin Roosevelt. It was literally an idea that was conceived as we were fighting the totalitarian scourges of Japanese imperialism, fascism and nazism.

It offers each nation in the world a chance to make its contribution to world peace. It offers to America an opportunity to exert our leadership for moral purposes, and for purposes of security and political freedom

throughout the world. It is an avenue, it is a means, it is a vehicle to get the job of world peace accomplished.

I guess everyone here has heard so many speeches on world peace you are sick of them, or at least saturated with them. But can I repeat something which seems to be a truism, which needs to be repeated over and over again?

We are not going to win peace any more easily than we win a war. We are not going to win peace by smooth sailing. It will be ups and downs. We do not win every battle in a war; but we seek to win the ultimate victory.

It is going to take time, money; it is going to take sacrifice, patience, and devoted patriotism to the principles of the charter of the United Nations.

NEED U. N. PATRIOTISM

Unless we are willing to give that patriotism to the principles of the charter of the United Nations, we are just not going to succeed.

I serve as one of the delegates. There are five delegates from our country, as there is from most every other country. Our delegates do not have freedom of action. We state the position of our Government and the position of our Government is made by the President of the United States and the State Department.

I say to you, now that this election is over, and I say to you in prayerful seriousness, that I hope and pray that President Eisenhower will start to lead. I hope that he will made his voice heard, and I hope that he will have something to say.

No longer can we be all things to all people. No longer can we try to have a foreign policy which is good public relations at home at the expense of sound international policy abroad.

Mr. Eisenhower has won, and these next 4 years he has an opportunity, as no other President has ever had, to do what is right, to speak out forthrightly, to say what needs to be said, and to lead this country, not just his party.

He cannot lead that party. He might just as well give that up right now. But he can have a coalition between the few in his party who believe in internationalism, and the majority of the Democratic Party, and in this sense I encourage the President of the United States to establish a true bipartisan foreign policy.

I encourage him to bring into the ranks of our Government top Democrats. I encourage him to put into the Foreign Service, into the United Nations, or into the ambasadorial service, such men as Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and Senator William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State.

We have all kinds of Democratic people that ought to be participating in our foreign policy where it is made, rather than where it is talked about after it is made.

As Arthur Vandenburg used to say, "Let's have it on the takeoffs, as well as on the crash landings." How right that is.

So I implore you, as representatives of a great labor organization, I implore you to ask of your Congress and of your President, that our foreign policy be really bipartisan—that Democrats and liberals be brought into its formulation.

CONFERENCE OF LABOR

Will you also try to put on your agenda of work this year a great national conference of all free labor, AFL, CIO and every other free labor organization—a national conference on the subject of foreign policy?

Pass your resolutions after you have listened to representatives of the State Department, and after you have interrogated them. Lay down a program of foreign policy after thoughtful consideration, and bring it to the attention of Congress, the President, and the State Department and our Foreign Service.

I appeal to you to do this. We need to have people in America today who rise up and speak their minds on this great issue before it is too late.

I have said, "before it is too late." It is not too late yet. Time is running out. The truth is that we have had politics in our foreign policy, inexcusably. We have had slogans, "Massive Retaliation," the "New Look."

We have played footloose and fancy free—when I say "we" I mean the administration—with this foreign policy. No longer can we tolerate that.

We are in trouble all over the world. America's prestige is going down. America's leadership is faltering. Respect for America, throughout the world, is fading away, and we cannot tolerate this any longer without a national catastrophe—with an international catastrophe.

NATO is weak, and into NATO we have put over $50 billion. It is beginning to crumble.

PAPER ALLIANCES

Our alliance in southeastern Asia is a paper alliance. We are not in cooperation or coordination with our allies there.

In India, the greatest republic in Asia, our relationships are at an all-time low, and even now as I speak to you there is no Ambassador even appointed in India. For 9 whole months not long ago there was none in Burma. For almost a year, none resident in Indonesia.

Incredible. We have not had effective listening posts in these countries. We have in a sense rebuked them, by not continually assigning top-grade ambassadors to Indonesia with its 90 million people, Burma with 20 million, and India with 375 million people.

Is there any reason?

In the United Nations you read in the papers that the delegates from India seem to be antagonistic to the United States. This is in a sense a fact, but it is a terrible tragedy. India today wants to be free, and free nations ought to work together—obviously having their differences, but, my friends, always having respect for one another, with those differences.

I have talked to the representatives of Burma, Indonesia, and India. They are deeply concerned about American foreign policy. They are concerned because they cannot quite understand what it is. I must confess I am somewhat dubious about it myself, as one who has been somewhat close to it.

MIDEAST TINDERBOX

Let me take you quickly into another area, the Middle East. The Middle East should have been no secret and should have been no surprise. The Middle East has been a powderbox for years—a tinderbox. In the Middle East, my friends, we have not had a policy. We have wandered.

We have been the victim of confusion and indifference. We have helped build up Mr. Nasser. Now he has put that pistol—the one that was once sent to his predecessor, General Naguib, by our President—he has put that pistol to our temple and said, "Do as I say."

It is almost unbelievable that we should find ourselves at odds with our British and French allies, but they apparently became desperate and our lines of communication broke down.

For this Government to say that it did not know what the British and French were going to do is an admission that our Central Intelligence and Secret Service are either inoperative, inadequate, or inept.

I think you, as taxpayers or fellow citizens, ought to have an explanation of this. How come, with the Government spending over a billion dollars for an intelligence service, that we did not even know what was going to happen in the capitals of our most friendly partners?

How come we did not know what the French were going to do? How come we did not know what the British were going to do? How come we did not know what the Israelis were going to do?

I wonder if we didn't know, and then almost hope that we didn't?

ARE INCHES FROM WAR

The attack upon Egypt has precipitated a crisis that I think you people really understand. We are inches from war. Every hour, every day the Soviet is becoming more belligerent. The smile of yesterday has given way to the grim face and powerful arm of Soviet arrogance.

The Soviet Union today is telling everybody where to go and what to do. They are blackmailing nation after nation, and we stand by wondering what to do.

I was pleased yesterday, at least, to hear that the President, in the message presented to the United Nations, will back up the United Nations in whatever request it makes. But even that is somewhat uncertain. People do not know what this means.

I think you as taxpayers are willing to take some risks in foreign policy. I think we have to be willing to draw the line on the Soviet Union.

WON'T BE BLACKMAILED

I do not believe that the Soviet Union wants a world war any more than we do, but if they can take this world piece by piece through threat and blackmail, they will take it.

We ought not to stand for it. We ought to make it crystal clear, as Mr. Truman did in the Berlin airlift, that we are not to be pushed out of the world. We ought to make it crystal clear, as we did in Iran in 1946, that we are not going to tolerate Russian aggression.

We ought to make it crystal clear, as we have done time after time, that the Soviet Union cannot have its way through intransigent arrogance and brute power over the weaker nations of the world. [Applause.]

If we are not willing to pay that price, my friends, then I think the jig is up.

The United Nations has sent forces into the Middle East. It is our job to see that those forces remain there, and to see that they are strong enough to do the job.

I will give you my personal opinion. I do not think that 6,000 U. N. forces in the Middle East are adequate.

I think there is a need for 25,000 as a minimum, but I am grateful for the beginning. This is a historic beginning. United Nations forces to patrol an area of violence and belligerence.

I think we ought to be willing to help pay the bill for whatever is necessary, to see that adequate United Nations forces are placed in that powderbox to prevent it from exploding right in our faces.

BACK WITH UNITED STATES POWER

We ought to make it crystal clear that those forces will be backed by American power, if there is Soviet interference.

Furthermore, may I suggest, once the forces are there, we have to seek a settlement of the issues. We have to bring the Arabs and the Israelis to the conference table, and we can do it if we exercise our prestige, our leadership.

We ought to demand that there be a settlement of the crucial problems between these countries, and to persist in the settlement until one is obtained. We ought consistently to put the Soviet Union on the spot, if it wants to be in the Middle East, to help with that settlement, rather than to antagonize and irritate.

Needless to say, it is antagonizing and irritating. It is using Mr. Nasser. You and I ought to recognize it, and recognize, as we

deal with him, that we are not dealing only with Egypt, that we are not dealing with just Mr. Nasser.

FOUND SOVIET ARMS

I hope everyone knows, in the Middle East, in Egypt, that the Soviet had stashed away huge arms, huge depots of arms, apparently as a staging area for Soviet aggression.

When the British and French and Israelis moved into Egypt, they not only found all the arms that Egypt was to obtain for her self-defense but large depots of arms, far beyond the needs of an Egyptian Army.

Apparently the arms there were to be shipped to other nations for aggressive purposes, or for a Soviet detachment or army to be brought into the area, a staging area for Soviet power, with Soviet arms available in the depots, ready to be used.

This what we have learned, even in the last few days.

Now let me move quickly to another area, the area that tugs at my heart today, and one that leaves me so frustrated and so unhappy that I scarcely know what to say about it.

SOVIETS DEPORT YOUTH

What the Soviet Union has done to Hungary is one of the most dastardly acts of the 20th century. The Soviet has crushed people by the thousands as they fought for their liberty, interfered with the sovereign rights of people in their own nation.

The Soviet Union today, as I speak, is deporting thousands of young men and women and children into the Soviet Union from Hungary. Boxcar after boxcar, sealed with boys and girls 14, 13, and 15 years of age, being shipped far back into the Soviet Union.

The Soviets thought that they had the youth of Hungary indoctrinated; they thought that they had the workers crushed. But isn't it a triumphant thing to know that young boys and girls in high schools, universities, and factories still harbored the love of freedom, and they died for it?

Twenty-eight thousand young boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 18 have already escaped into Austria. They left their homes and parents and sought refuge. They fought a good fight, and those they left behind are now being transported far back into Siberia into the slave camps of the Soviet Union.

The workers of Hungary have been on a general strike. If there is anything that the workers of America can do to fortify their morale and to give them spirit, do it. Keep pressing your contributions for voluntary relief.

PUSH TO BORDER

Keep pushing the good will of America up to the very border of Hungary. Our food, our medical supplies, our clothing, our prayers, our words of comfort and of encouragement—keep pushing these so that these people know that throughout the world there are millions like them, millions of young men and women, millions of workers who are ready and willing to do everything within their power to help them in their cause.

What they need today is our dedication to the fight that they have made, what they need today is to know that today every worker in America is with them—every worker.

They need to know that the college students, the mothers and children of America are with them in spirit and heart, in sympathy and in philosophy.

DAY OF PROTEST

I know that you have passed resolutions, and if you have not, you should, but I would like to see the AFL–CIO hold a nationwide Day of Protest against this barbarism of the Soviet Union against the Hungarian people.

Remember that sometimes resistance, peaceful resistance, is even more effective than violent resistance.

Remember Gandhi, of India. Remember the workers in Hungary in their general strike who were not working in the factories.

I know the government is bringing terrible pressure to bear upon them, starvation. But, my good friends, you would be surprised what people can do when they want to do it.

PEASANTS SMUGGLE FOOD

The people, the peasants of Hungary are smuggling food to the workers. The students are running the so-called battleline to deliver that food, losing their lives.

And the imposed Communist government of Hungary today is in trouble because even they cannot find food to eat. It is reported even Soviet troops in Hungary are on half rations.

I want to tell you something I did personally. I heard that the Hungarian Government, that is the Communist imposed government, had contracted their food brokerage for food in New York City, and they were going to our Commodity Credit Corporation asking to buy food from America for this Communist government.

BLOCKED COMMUNIST TRADE

The Commodity Credit Corporation was undecided whether or not it had the authority to sell it. Somebody in that organization, in the Commodity Credit Corporation, said maybe you better check with Senator HUMPHREY.

He is always interested in our operations, and indeed I am. So the food brokerage office checked with my office. My administrative assistant was there. I was in New York at the U. N. He called me.

I said to my assistant, whose first name is Herbert, "Herb, you tell the Commodity Credit Corporation that they know the laws as well as I do.

"You tell them that that law says we can sell only to friendly governments, and in my book, and it ought to be in their book, the Hungarian Communist government is not friendly.

"It is not even human," you tell them.

"You tell them I am not the one to make this decision. They are the ones. You tell them that is an executive responsibility.

"But then add to it, that if they sell them 1 pound, 1 ounce, I will be after them for the rest of the days of my life." [Applause.]

I am happy to report that I took this up with our delegation in the United Nations and every member of our delegation went on record asking the State Department to make no sale whatever of any food to the Hungarian Communist Government; that we would give the food to the Red Cross, CARE, the Catholic charities, and our other church organizations.

We will provide food if these organizations can distribute it, but we are not going to provide the Hungarian Communist organization with food to break a strike, with food to impose penalties on some and benefits on others, with food to be used as a political tool.

American food today can be a powerful force in this world. This great abundance of ours, which some people complain about, may do more to win the peace than almost any other one commodity we have. Thank God that we have the food.

May I say to you that thousands of tons of this food are available in Vienna. Thousands of tons are ready for shipment into Hungary, and hundreds of tons already have been brought in under the auspices of the Red Cross.

I want you, however, as workers, to make your Government understand that we want no willy-nilly attitude here.

SICK OF BLACKMAIL

Fellow Americans, we cannot walk in the specter of fear. The Soviet Union is strong, but we are stronger. [Applause.] And make no mistake about that. [Applause.]

I, as one American, am getting a little sick and tired of having them blackmail innocent people throughout the world. It is all right for us to negotiate, but negotiate from strength. The minute you show one sign of weakness with this crowd in the Kremlin you are done.

You workers know this, in a less identical pattern, may I say, but you know if you show a sign of weakness in your negotiations, after a tough strike, you know what happens.

WEAKNESS MEANS RETREAT

Well now, you are dealing with people who live in the same culture. You are dealing with people who worship in the same churches, you are dealing with people who live in the pattern of American life, and yet you and I know even then a sign of weakness is the beginning of retreat, and maybe collapse.

Now when you deal with men who do not accept our culture, when you deal with men who are atheists, when you deal with men who know only power and the use of power, to indicate that you are doubtful, that you are weak, that you are uncertain is to open up the gates of disaster and trouble.

So I say to you, as you built your own organization on the position and on the principle of solidarity and unity, of self-sacrifice, unselfish cooperation, that this is exactly the principle which we must have in our international relations.

We have to work with our allies to the best of our ability, but I warn you, fellow Americans, do not depend upon anyone else to give the leadership that is needed for the preservation of freedom.

Our British and French Allies are no longer strong enough to lead the world.

There are two great forces in this world, and they emanate from two capitals: Washington, D. C., and Moscow.

And if Washington, D. C., shows any wavering, shows an uncertainty, demonstrates any doubt, you can rest assured that the brutal forces from Moscow will march into that vacuum of leadership and stake out and preempt the rights.

The world in which we live is going to go one way or another.

TWO WORLD PATHS

It is either going to go in the paths of security and freedom as we know them—not maybe the peace we would like where everything is harmonious, but at least a peace where there is lack of violence—or it is going to go piece by piece and bit by bit and step by step into the Moscow orbit.

Communism seeks by the process of attrition to pick off areas of this world, year by year.

The present move of the Communists' forces is into Africa and into Asia. There is where they see the future, the future balance of power, and the Soviet Union has in the past 2 years made a greater infiltration into the Middle East, in the 2 years, than in the preceding 500. Next the Soviet Union will hold naval exercises in the Mediterranean.

SOVIETS STAKE EMPIRES

My friends, for 500 years, this has not happened. The Soviet today seeks to stake out an empire in Africa, the rich storehouse of natural resources.

The Soviet Union seeks a bridge into Asia Minor. It seeks to arouse Asian nationalism, to a point where it becomes irresponsible, and then use its powers, as it did in Hungary, to stabilize the situation.

The Soviet Union seeks the oil resources of the Middle East, but more than that, it seeks the avenues of commerce and then the Soviet Union intends to use its tremendous political and military power to back up its political power in Asia.

If we permit this to happen in our lifetime, we have condemned your youth, our yet unborn, to a life of insecurity, of second-class citizenship.

Well, I wish I had all the immediate answers to remedy these situations. I confess

I do not, but I know this: I know one thing, my friends; I know that America needs strong defense, that is number one.

I also know that American foreign policy must be strengthened on the economic, cultural and the political fronts.

I know that we can use our economic resources much better than we have in Africa and Asia. I know that the United Nations can be made a stronger instrumentality if we are willing to put more resources and power into it. I know we can do things in the Middle East, if we persist, and do not just look upon it as a part-time job.

Furthermore, I know that the Soviet Union respects one thing: Power—strength.

WON'T BE PUSHED

And we ought to make it crystal clear to the Soviet Union that America—the nation with the greatest industrial life in the world—has also the will to stand up and not to be pushed into the ocean wherever our interests are involved, or wherever the freedom of other people is involved. And the sooner we do this, my friends, the sooner your children are going to be able to sleep a full night of peaceful sleep.

This is not a partisan speech, because whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, these problems affect all of us. I can go back to where I started in this message.

NEWSSTAND DIPLOMACY

I implore our President to reexamine the foreign policy of this country.

I implore him to cease permitting his agents to indulge in partisan talk about our foreign policy.

No more of these nonsensical statements about "unleasing Chiang Kai-shek," massive retaliation," "new looks."

No more of this "newsstand" diplomacy, where we find out America was at the brink of war three times in one year, but we find out not from the President, not from the Committee on Foreign Relations, but from Life magazine in an interview with the Secretary of State.

No more of this vacillation where the President of the United States states on one day that neutralism is within the American concept of a successful foreign policy, and Mr. Dulles says that neutrality is immoral, and Mr. NIXON says he is both for it and against it. Three statements on neutralism in 1 week, all contradictory.

No more of this kind of foreign policy where we embrace the obsolete colonialism of Portugal, where the Secretary of State views the province of Goa in India, he said, as a "province of Portugal," at a time when Indians are on fire with the desire of uniting their country.

No more of this foreign policy, my friends, where we are not in contact with our allies, where we find the French and the British at wits' end trying to figure out what we stand for and where we are going.

How can this be remedied? By one man—by one man only. The foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President of the United States. And the President must take a firm hand.

I am pleading with him to fortify that foreign policy, as his predecessor Mr. Truman did when our own country was in peril, to bring into the counsel of government, in high places, men and women of both political parties who can advise and consult, who can bring in cooperation from every element of the American society.

I am pleading with him to assign some of our top grade people, like our own Mrs. Eugenie Anderson of Minnesota, who had such a wonderful record in the foreign service of our country, as ambassador to Denmark to put her into one of the crucial posts; to bring back into government a Chester Bowles; to bring back into government a George Kennan, who is now a professor at Princeton—one of the most outstanding experts on Russia, and yet he teaches a class when our country is in dire peril.

NEED KENNAN, REUTHER

I know the importance of academic life, but it is second to the urgent needs of this country. True, George Kennan does not get along with Mr. Dulles. If they cannot get along, maybe I say the President better examine whether we need Mr. Kennan or Mr. Dulles. (Applause.)

Yes, we need all the talent that we can bring to bear. We need men of the stature, to be blunt about it, of Walter Reuther. This man has traveled all over the world. His reports should not be listened to by merely a handful of Members of the United States Senate.

This man, after he has spent months traveling from one end of the world to another, he should be brought into the State Department as consultant. We need the ranks of labor and its intelligence in the councils of government, and we need it from business, too, from every place.

Well, that is about all I have to say to you. I am not giving you any hell-raising political speech today. I am too tired, to be honest with you. Besides that, I am kind of heartsick. I have been for a week now, with the United Nations. A wonderful experience, one that comes to only a few, but I sense there that the nations that we need the most to be with us are walking away.

I sense there, that these new countries in Africa and Asia, that should be motivated by the spirit of the American Revolution, that should be literally on fire with the kind of revolution that we had, do not sense an identity of interests between themselves and the United States.

WERE FIRST RADICALS

You know, fellow Americans, we were the first radicals on earth. We really were—we still are—but we are just ashamed to admit it.

This is a country where, even without any money, you can own a house—at least live in it.

You never think about it, when the children are born, that they cannot have all the benefits of life. They are not relegated to a station in life. This is a country where you can sit in the opera or the baseball game, alongside of the top man in town, if anyone knows who that is.

It is a nation, may I say, where we have progressively broken down barriers of class and religion and race. We are the real radicals of the 20th century, and the real revolutionists of the 20th century.

Mass production should also have mass consumption. We believe in consumer credit. We believe in public education and more and more of it. We believe in public health. We believe in elevating the standards of people, their living standards, their educational and cultural standards.

Name me any other country that is so on fire with the doctrine of liberation as the American people.

We want to liberate ourselves from unemployment. We want to liberate ourselves from intolerance and discrimination. Therefore, we work ceaselessly in the field of human relations.

EVERYBODY HIS CASTLE

We want to have it so everybody can have his own little castle, his own little home, and we work hard to accomplish it.

We have organized our workers so that they enjoy a higher standard of living, and the benefits of health and welfare funds and activities.

My friends, there is no other nation on the face of the earth that can approximate this, but for some foolish reason we parade ourselves before the world as if we were starched shirts, starched conservatives afraid of the very things we are doing.

I say to you, if we ever show the true American profile to the world, the true American countenance to the world, we would not only be respected, but in many areas we would be loved.

Because you know what people want, what we have got, and what we are aspiring for.

People want station in life. People want education. People want jobs. People want equality of treatment. People want justice under law. They want representative government. They want to be able to condemn the Government, criticize it, or praise it.

They want credit unions and trade unions. They want reclamation and irrigation. They want water for soil. They want TVA's.

AFRAID TO TELL OTHERS

These are all the things that we have, but we are just afraid of them. We like them for ourselves, but we apparently are afraid to tell other people about them, or portray to other people that we really believe in these things.

I say to you, one of the tragedies of American politics has been and is that the reactionaries have so bitterly condemned those things that have made America great. Too often people have been led to believe that we do not like what we have.

For example, we bring thousands of people to see the TVA, thousands of people all over the world. We say to them, this is what you need in the Jordan River, in Indonesia, India. This is what you need in Burma.

Then they pick up a newspaper and read where some high-powered American says "this is socialism, this is bad, this is terrible in America."

Of course, may I say that the people who live in the area of TVA, you couldn't take it away from them. I try to let them know somehow or other, inadequately, of the things that we have, that we accept, that are so much a part of our lives are the very things we do not talk about abroad.

THEY KNOW THEY ARE RICH

We constantly want to talk about we are richer and stronger than others. You do not need to tell them that; they know it. We have to live it down. This is nothing that endears us. This is something that makes for envy, this is something that makes for fear.

What the Americans need to tell other people, and what we need to live for other people to see, is that we are a nation of compassion.

We are the nation that believes in justice for all. We are a nation that believes in equality, equality under the law, and within the law. We are a nation that believes in education for everyone.

And we are a nation that wants to heal the sick, and lead the blind, and teach the illiterate.

That we are a nation that will walk the other mile to be kindly, that we are good Samaritans, rather than warriors and Spartans.

Now, my dear friends, we can still be strong enough to be warriors, and that we should be, but that we do not need to tell them. They will know it. You do not have to announce to anyone your strength, if you are strong. He senses it.

Teddy Roosevelt admonished us to speak softly and carry a big stick.

Maybe we can turn it around and say, let us build a strong shield of defense and security, and a shield not only for ourselves, but for others of like mind and of like philosophy, but once we have built that, let us not go around brandishing the sword, or waving the atomic bomb over the heads of friend and foe alike.

RIGHT HAND OF FELLOWSHIP

Let us be sure that we have the sword. Let us be sure that we have the military strength, and let us be sure, by the very

fact that we have it, that we all know about it, but more important let us put out the right hand of fellowship and good works and good deeds throughout the world.

Let us strengthen the United Nations and its agencies. Let us be willing to pool our resources with others. Let us be willing to pool our millions with someone else's hundreds and quit complaining about it.

I hear many Americans say, we pay off the bets. You bet we do, and if there is a war we will take more of the losses.

We have more chips in this game, my friends. We have more to lose than anybody else.

We have the greatest civilization that the world has ever known, the highest standard of living, the greatest opportunity.

We have everything to lose, and therefore we have to be willing to pay a bigger insurance premium to protect it.

There are no bargain-counter prices for peace and security, my friends.

Freedom is not free and every worker knows it. The more freedom you have the higher the price to keep it.

We cannot protect our own freedom by building "Fortress America," because "Fortress America" will be surrounded by vandals who are hellbent upon our destruction.

BUILD NEW AREAS OF FREEDOM

No, what we need to have is an expansion of democratic institutions throughout this world, helping to build new areas where freedom can live, and recognizing that even pipsqueak dictators are threats to the peace of the world. [Laughter.]

We must recognize that totalitarianism, wherever it is, is not conducive to a world living in peace and justice.

If we people believe this, do not worry, others will. I think anything can be done, if we will it.

I am so delighted that I can come to the great CIO, the great free American labor movement, and again state what you already believe, because it is to the eternal credit of American free labor that you have led the fight against totalitarianism, you have led the fight for enlightened foreign policy, that your resolutions and programs have constantly pointed the way, like a beacon light, a truth as to how we might better help in this world of ours.

Because the only way I know of to save ourselves now is to help save others.

It goes right back to that old Biblical story to which there is no written answer, but only an answer in thine own heart.

It is the story of Cain and Abel, and the eternal question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" And you know, the Scripture does not answer it. It leaves it for you.

OUR BROTHER'S KEEPERS

I think this morning you and I have to ask ourselves, are we Americans the keepers of others? Are we our brother's keepers?

There is no way that I can give you the answer, except my personal point of view. This is a matter of individual response, and if you respond as I think you will, and as I think you do, then I say that America is even stronger than any of us dreamed it could be, because the strength of this Nation is in its people, in the will of its people, in the moral stature of its people, in the determination of its people, because that moral stature, that will, and that determination can be translated into public policy, if you so desire it.

So make your voices heard and let those patriots in Hungary know today that in America there are tears for their travail and for their sacrifices, but also in America today there is rejoicing for their fight and their courage.

Then let us let the men of the Kremlin know that they cannot intimidate us.

Let them know that millions of American workers do not stand in awe or fear of Communist power.

Let them know that we are willing to pay the price in America to match power for power, any place in the world.

And let them know that we are willing to engage in competition, economically, politically, culturally and we will drive them off the face of the earth in a competitive struggle in these areas.

Let them know that they will not blackmail us, nor will they drive us into a cave so that we might escape their fury, but that we stand ready, strong, and brave, undaunted in the power struggle that faces each and every one of us.

Thank you very much.

RESOLUTION OF LEITH, (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION LOCAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farmers Union Local, at Leith, N. Dak., relating to the agricultural problem.

There being no objection the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of the Leith Farmers Union Local, gathered at this crucial time with agriculture standing at the crossroads. We must continue to improve and expand the position of the agricultural segment of the national economy by exerting an effort to keep the ownership of the farm and ranches in the hands of the men who operate the land. We therefore present the following resolutions:

1. We believe that present sliding scale farm programs favor large landowners over the family size farm. In order to prevent concentration of landownership in fewer and fewer hands we urge Congress to place a limit of $5,000 on the total of Government commodity loans for one operator.

2. Whereas we believe that the policies of this administration in the field of credit (the hard money policy), the proposals to raise interest rates on REA loans are attempts to destroy all progress made in the past 20 years and a blow below the belt to the farmers and entire economy who need credit and low cost REA power.

We, therefore, urge that Congress enact laws which will lower interest rates and prevent Federal employees from arbitrarily raising rates as dictated by the hard money policy.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN SERBIAN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by American Serbian organizations in the county of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the United States foreign policy.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE HONORABLE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER:

We, the undersigned, all duly authorized representatives of patriotic American Serbian organizations in the county of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, and in our individual capacities as citizens of the United States, desiring to submit our views on United States foreign policy with respect to our relations with Yugoslavia do hereby submit the following petition:

Whereas the Communist regime of Josip Broz Tito has deprived and continues to deny Serbian people of Yugoslavia of the fundamental principles of freedom of religion, press, assembly, and speech;

Whereas the Communist regime of Josip Broz Tito has established an absolute dictatorship over the Serbian people of Yugoslavia and continues a government controlled by solely one political party, to wit, the Communist Party, and governs absolutely without the consent of the people;

Whereas the Communist regime of Josip Broz Tito maintains its existence solely by the operation of a ruthless gestapo-like secret police;

Whereas the Communist regime of Josip Broz Tito continues to persecute and restrict the Serbian Orthodox Church, and the American-born Orthodox Bishop of Sarajevo, His Grace Vojislav Nastich, and hundreds of other clerics;

Whereas the Communist regime of Josip Broz Tito is part of international communism, whether of the Stalinist, Titoist, or Maoist variety, with the goal of world conquest and power, all of which is opposed to the interests of our national security;

Whereas it has been reported that sympathetic consideration has been given to the idea of having a formal invitation extended to the Communist dictator Josip Broz Tito to visit the United States of America; and

Whereas the Americans of Serbian descent have full confidence in your leadership and administration,

We therefore wish to express our most sincere opinion and request in the interests of our national security that no invitation be extended to the Communist dictator Josip Broz Tito to visit the United States of America and that he be barred from ever entering the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted.

Serbian National Defense Council of America, Milwaukee Chapter, Emil Drobac, President; Bozidar Sokolovic, Financial Secretary; Serbian Brothers' Help, Inc., Ugo Mihailovich, President; Dragoljub Djukic, Board of Trustees; Serbian Shetniks Veterans' Organization, Nikola Berich, Secretary; Nikola Milunovich, Treasurer; Serbian Cultural Club St. Sava, Isidor Stefanovich, Vice President; Milos Mihailovic, President; Association of Sombatants of Royal Yugoslav Army, Draza Mihailovich, Dusan Duvnjak, President; Jovo Ivekic, Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, WISCONSIN STATE DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Executive Council of the Wisconsin State Dental Society on December 28, 1956. I wish to make it clear, however, that a very sizable number of dentists have opposed the resolutions in their entirety. Therefore, I reserve my decision on how I shall act on the matter until after the hearings have been held and the proposed amendments are either accepted or rejected.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under present regulations of the Internal Revenue Code officials and employees of corporations enjoy substantial savings in income taxes on moneys contributed toward retirement or pension programs instituted by corporations for their employees' benefit; and

Whereas self-employed individuals do not now participate in comparable tax savings on amounts which they contribute to their own private pension or retirement programs; and

Whereas during the last several years measures to correct this tax saving inequity have been before Congress in a form now generally known as the Jenkins-Keogh bills; and

Whereas under the aforementioned proposal the self-employed would be enabled and encouraged to develop sound programs under which they could put aside funds for retirement purposes; and

Whereas all evidence submitted in regard to the Jenkins-Keogh proposal has testified to the effect that it is a logical approach to correct the present inequities suffered by the self-employed, to the extent that both political parties and the President of the United States have given it their endorsement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Dental Society through its membership heartily lends its support to the principle as advanced in the Jenkins-Keogh proposal that would enable dentists and all self-employed persons to contribute specified amounts to voluntary retirement or pension programs under conditions which would assure them tax savings equal to those now conferred on corporation officials and employees in their similar programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Dental Society through its membership urges each member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin to actively support and advance this proposal so that its objective can be achieved as soon as possible, and asks that the 85th Congress enact the measure into law.

The above resolution was adopted by the Executive Council of the Wisconsin State Dental Society on December 28, 1956.

WISCONSIN STATE DENTAL SOCIETY,
KENNETH F. CRANE,
Executive Secretary.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS IN SOUTHEAST KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution for appropriate reference, and as a part of my remarks, from the Big Hill Improvement Association in southeast Kansas, urging construction of several flood-control and water-conservation projects in that area.

The early completion of these projects is most desirable, in view of the critical water situation with respect to water supply in every city and town in that area.

It is my sincere hope that Congress will vote the funds necessary for this work.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 5 years of continuing drought in the Neosho and Verdigris River valleys of southeastern Kansas has greatly reduced farm income, severely curtailed live stock and dairy operations, restricted industrial development, and depressed the general economy of the whole area; and

Whereas there now exists a critical situation with respect to water supply in practically every city and town, complicated by the need for farmers to haul water for household and live stock use from the greatly diminished supplies; and

Whereas long-range weather forecasters are predicting a continuation of the present drought conditions; and

Whereas Toronto Dam is now under construction on the Verdigris River, and several other dams, including Strawn, on the Neosho River; Table Mound (Elk City), on the Elk River tributary of the Verdigris River; and Big Hill Dam, on Big Hill Creek, are in various stages of proposal or planning; and

Whereas there is urgent need for all of these dams to safeguard the area from recurring floods and to conserve water in periods of drought: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the officers and directors of the Big Hill Improvement Association—

1. That this situation be called to the immediate attention of the President of the United States;

2. That he be urged to take immediate steps to secure the early completion of Toronto Dam, and to direct immediate and extraordinary effort to complete studies now being made on other water-storage facilities on the Neosho and Verdigris Rivers, and their tributaries, in Kansas;

3. That it is our belief that since the Big Hill Dam is a project in which five cities have tentatively agreed to participate and share with each other and with the Federal Government in the cost thereof, top priority should be given to the early completion of studies on this dam, and that every effort should be made to rush the same through all stages of planning and provide funds for the construction thereof as soon as the necessary agreements are reached;

4. That it is our belief that Big Hill Dam can be built with greater speed and less cost than any other installation now being considered for this area; and

5. That the present situation of distress and depression in the southeastern Kansas area makes it urgent and imperative for both industry and agriculture to secure all of the above proposals and that no stone should be left unturned in bringing to a quick conclusion all plans for water storage in this area, which, unfortunately, has no adequate underground water supply, and which must rely entirely on surface storage for all water uses.

The above resolution was considered and unanimously adopted by the officers and directors of the Big Hill Improvement Association at a meeting held in Cherryvale, Kans., on the 7th day of January 1957, and was ordered to be presented with other data to the President of the United States.

CHARLES S. MCGINNESS,
President.

Attest: ROY A. WOODS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference and as a part of my remarks a resolution approved by the council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Kansas, at its regular meeting in Wichita on December 9, 1956, urging the United States Senate to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That this council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, department of Kansas, in regular session assembled at Wichita on December 9, 1956, urge that there be established in the United States Senate, a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs similar to such committee as presently exists in the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON as President of the Senate, and Kansas Senators CARLSON and SCHOEPPEL.

RESOLUTION OF FARMERS UNION LOCAL OPPOSING THE DAMAGING OF THE NATION'S COOPERATIVES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive the text of a resolution adopted by the Richland local of the Farmers Union on the important issue of protecting the cooperative movement of our country.

Having been associated with both an REA and with a dairy marketing cooperative, I know from firsthand experience the value of cooperatives to my own State—America's dairyland—and to the Nation.

Especially in this period of low and declining farm prices, cooperatives are indispensable to us in helping to protect the farmer from further damage.

I present the resolution, as forwarded to me by Leonard Gillingham, legislative director of the Richland local. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY: At a regular monthly meeting of Richland Farmers Union, local No. 264, held at the Buck Creek school Richland County, on December 13, 1956, the following resolution was offered and unanimously adopted.

Whereas we believe that levying corporate income tax on co-op refunds would be grossly unfair and would create a hardship that would cause financial failure in most of their business operations.

We believe that the cooperatives are paying their just taxes the same as other business organizations. And we hope that you will oppose any legislation that may be introduced to harm the cooperative movement which has contributed so much to the welfare of its members and our national economy in general.

Sincerely,

LEONARD GILLINGHAM,
Richland Local's Legislative Director.

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL GRANGE 61, PORT PENN, DEL.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Central Grange No. 61, Port Penn, Del., which was subsequently endorsed by the New Castle County Grange No. 1, condemning the brutal arms intervention of the Russians against the Hungarian people.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of Central Grange No. 61 of Port Penn, Del., assembled this 13th day of November 1956, do hereby go on record as condemning the brutal arms intervention of the Russians against the Hungarian people during their fight for freedom. We desire a notice of this protest be directed to the United Nations, United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, Gov. J. Caleb Boggs, and to New Castle County Pomona Grange No. 1.

Adopted by New Castle County Pomona Grange No. 1 November 29, 1956.

JOHN R. BUTLER,
Master.
ELVA D. GOODEN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF PHOENIX (ARIZ.) JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the Phoenix Jewish Community Council a resolution was adopted concerning their interest in the establishment of a real peace in the Middle East. It is timely and proper that my colleagues read this resolution at this time, so I ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. Since World War II, under the most difficult conditions Israel has been and remains the bulwark of democracy in the Middle East, and has been the salvation of over 800,000 refugees who found it necessary to flee there in search of freedom and security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Jewish community of Phoenix rededicate itself to continue and intensify its efforts to the end that the great humanitarian program of relief and rehabilitation to which we have contributed and which continues to demand our help shall go forward.

II. Now that the question of a permanent peace in the Middle East is on the agenda of the United Nations—a peace that we pray will be attained by mutual agreement of the parties concerned: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Arizona, and the United States Delegation to the United Nations be urged to exert all efforts to insure that a peace with justice be secured for the Middle East.

III. That we commend the Government of the United States for the expeditious granting of asylum to Hungarian refugees of all faiths. We are encouraged by this heart-warming demonstration of our Government's concern for refugees and displaced persons. We hope that this concern will be extended and liberalized and that other governments will follow the great principle of granting asylum to all persons fleeing from religious or political persecution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 20. Resolution to authorize one temporary additional clerk for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Rept. No. 8);

S. Res. 25. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Civil Service System and the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 7);

S. Res. 38. Resolution extending the time for a study of the administration of the Government employees security program (Rept. No. 5); and

S. Res. 39. Resolution extending the time for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission and the postal service (Rept. No. 6).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works without amendment and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 466. A bill to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, providing for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space (Rept. No. 3); and

S. Res. 34. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to employ additional temporary clerical assistants and providing additional funds for the committee (Rept. No. 9).

PRINTING OF CERTAIN DATA ON THE ARKANSAS-WHITE-RED RIVER BASINS AND REPORT ON WATER RESOURCES FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Works the amounts stated of the following reports transmitted by the Secretary of the Army from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins, Senate Document No. 13, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, and report on water resources of the New England-New York region, Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, which reports were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950.

STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING, AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS THEREFOR (S. REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule 25 (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditure as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report all its findings, together with its recommendation for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Subsequently, Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported the above resolution (S. Res. 44), without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 10) thereon and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS AND EXPENDITURES THEREFOR BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY (S. REPT. NO. 4)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45), and submitted a report thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(4) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(5) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(6) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(7) securities and exchange regulations; and

(8) disaster insurance or indemnity.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, AND FUNDS THEREFOR

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Indian Affairs;

(2) Irrigation and reclamation;

(3) Minerals, materials, and fuels;

(4) Public lands; and

(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $193,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period June–November 1956, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that the summary be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the summary and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel and pay summary, June through November 1956

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In June numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In May was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,394,333	2,384,423	+9,910	$936,717	$925,984	+$10,733
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,214,926	1,204,493	+10,433	469,338	466,038	+3,300
Department of Defense	1,179,407	1,179,930	−523	467,379	459,946	+7,433
Inside continental United States	2,186,901	2,178,938	+7,963			
Outside continental United States	207,432	205,485	+1,947			
Industrial employment	661,198	695,612	−34,414			
Foreign nationals	276,581	290,382	−13,801	[2] 28,438	28,071	+367

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Subject to revision.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956, and pay for October 1956, and comparison with May 1956*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	June	Increase	Decrease	October	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	84,078	89,419		5,341	$30,711	$29,906	$805	
Commerce [1]	46,928	47,197		269	21,022	20,457	565	
Health, Education, and Welfare	49,487	46,124	3,363		20,568	18,551	2,017	
Interior	49,628	54,171		4,543	21,942	21,360	582	
Justice	30,548	30,876		328	15,648	15,437	211	
Labor	5,929	[2] 5,803	126		2,821	2,720	101	
Post Office	521,409	[2] 508,587	12,822		185,204	188,183		$2,979
State [3]	33,089	32,418	671		12,820	12,059	761	
Treasury	78,715	77,782	933		36,386	36,638		252
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	395	378	17		236	220	16	
Bureau of the Budget	438	430	8		303	289	14	
Council of Economic Advisers	35	31	4		28	22	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70			24	26		2
National Security Council [4]	26	27		1	19	19		
Office of Defense Mobilization	251	267		16	170	172		2
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5			3	4		1
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions [4]						14		14
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	8	17		9	6	9		3
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	12	10	2		6	6		
American Battle Monuments Commission	620	718		98	97	106		9
Atomic Energy Commission	6,686	6,637	49		3,694	3,560	134	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	588	575	13		319	294	25	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	4	2	2		1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	602	600	2		356	345	11	
Civil Service Commission	4,444	4,255	189		2,261	2,110	151	
Commission of Fine Arts	11	9	2		2	1	1	
Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission [5]	3	2	1		2		2	
District of Columbia Auditorium Commission [7]	18	1	17		1		1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	182	172	10		118	108	10	
Farm Credit Administration	1,016	1,038		22	536	541		5
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,146	1,085	61		652	604	48	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,145	1,116	29		637	626	11	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,152	1,127	25		613	601	12	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	693	689	4		353	337	16	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	338	[2] 346		8	248	251		3
Federal Power Commission	703	720		17	402	395	7	
Federal Trade Commission	710	641	69		425	383	42	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	115	128		13	60	61		1
General Accounting Office	5,433	5,542		109	2,667	2,663	4	
General Services Administration	27,072	26,429	643		10,032	10,058		26
Government Contract Committee	17	23		6	10	9	1	
Government Printing Office	6,681	6,579	102		3,049	3,221		172
Housing and Home Finance Agency	9,949	10,162		213	5,089	5,062	27	
Indian Claims Commission	14	13	1		11	10	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,070	1,907	163		1,091	1,022	69	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	4	3	1		3	2	1	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,641	7,861		220	4,020	3,821	199	
National Capital Housing Authority	250	258		8	99	100		1
National Capital Planning Commission	33	34		1	19	17	2	
National Gallery of Art	335	330	5		110	113		3

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956, and pay for October 1956, and comparison with May 1956*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	June	Increase	Decrease	October	May	Increase	Decrease
Independent Agencies—Continued								
National Labor Relations Board	1,118	1,128		$10	$670	$656	$14	
National Mediation Board	105	107		2	72	76		$4
National Science Foundation	301	251	50		147	130	17	
National Security Training Commission	5	3	2		3	3		
Panama Canal	14,975	14,864	111		3,560	3,460	100	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,215	2,222		7	924	952		28
Renegotiation Board	445	469		24	300	300		
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission [8]		7		7		4		4
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	34	[2] 36		2	28	21	7	
Securities and Exchange Commission	786	734	52		460	428	32	
Selective Service System	6,918	6,860	58		1,817	1,788	29	
Small Business Administration	936	821	115		518	472	46	
Smithsonian Institution	758	768		10	306	281	25	
Soldiers' Home	1,030	1,016	14		245	248		3
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	33			25	22	3	
Tariff Commission	205	208		3	129	124	5	
Tax Court of the United States	146	146			98	95	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,857	14,708	149		7,102	6,757	345	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3			3		3	
United States Information Agency	11,319	10,831	488		3,267	3,086	181	
Veterans' Administration	178,000	176,653	1,347		64,765	64,616	149	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	3	3			1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,214,926	1,204,493	21,720	11,287	460,338	[4]66,038	6,812	3,512
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			10,433				3,300	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [9]	1,686	1,940		25	1,082	1,183		101
Department of the Army	432,032	434,716		2,684	167,537	164,081	3,456	
Department of the Navy	393,186	394,675		1,489	162,369	162,591		222
Department of the Air Force [9]	352,503	[3] 348,599	3,904		136,391	132,091	4,300	
Total, Department of Defense	1,179,407	1,179,930	3,904	4,427	467,379	459,946	7,756	323
Net change, Department of Defense			523				7,433	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,394,333	2,384,423	25,624	15,714	936,717	925,984	14,568	3,835
Net increase, including Department of Defense			9,910				10,733	

[1] November figure includes 659 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised.
[3] November figure includes 10,586 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 10,168 in June. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 2,462 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 1,428.
[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[5] Abolished May 22, 1956 by Executive Order 10588.
[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 193, 83d Cong.
[7] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 128, 84th Cong.
[8] Ceased to exist Sept. 23, 1956. Transferred to the Federal Facilities Corporation, Department of the Treasury, by Executive Order 10678, dated Sept. 20, 1956.
[9] In July, 230 employees were transferred from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956*

Department or agency	November	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	82,808	88,107		5,299
Commerce [1]	43,211	44,008		797
Health, Education, and Welfare	47,595	44,333	3,262	
Interior	45,556	48,412		2,856
Justice	30,007	30,343		336
Labor	5,788	[2] 5,659	129	
Post Office	518,926	[2] 506,134	12,792	
State [3]	8,259	8,029	230	
Treasury	77,733	76,794	939	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House office	395	378	17	
Bureau of the Budget	438	430	8	
Council of Economic Advisers	35	31	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70		
National Security Council [4]	26	27		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	251	267		16
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	8	17		9
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	12	10	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,666	6,620	46	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	588	575	13	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	4	2	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board	598	596	2	
Civil Service Commission	4,428	4,235	193	
Commission of Fine Arts	11	9	2	
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission [5]	3	2	1	
District of Columbia Auditorium Commission [6]	18	1	17	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	182	172	10	
Farm Credit Administration	1,004	1,026		22
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,146	1,085	61	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,116	1,089	27	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,150	1,126	24	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	693	689	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	338	[2] 346		8
Federal Power Commission	703	720		17
Federal Trade Commission	710	641	69	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	115	128		13
General Accounting Office	5,359	5,483		124
General Services Administration	26,968	26,321	647	
Government Contract Committee	17	23		6
Government Printing Office	6,681	6,579	102	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	9,794	10,009		215
Indian Claims Commission	14	13	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,070	1,907	163	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	4	3	1	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,641	7,861		220
National Capital Housing Authority	250	258		8
National Capital Planning Commission	33	34		1
National Gallery of Art	335	330	5	
National Labor Relations Board	1,099	1,107		8
National Mediation Board	105	107		2
National Science Foundation	301	251	50	
National Security Training Commission	5	3	2	
Panama Canal	545	557		12
Railroad Retirement Board	2,215	2,222		7
Renegotiation Board	445	469		24
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission [7]		7		7
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	34	[2] 36		2
Securities and Exchange Commission	786	734	52	
Selective Service System	6,722	6,664	58	
Small Business Administration	928	821	107	
Smithsonian Institution	756	766		10
Soldiers' Home	1,030	1,016	14	
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	33		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956*—Continued

Department or agency	November	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent Agencies—Continued				
Tariff Commission	205	208		3
Tax Court of the United States	146	146		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,857	14,708	149	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3		
United States Information Agency	2,577	2,430	147	
Veterans' Administration	176,762	175,418	1,344	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	3	3		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,149,342	1,138,669	20,696	10,023
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			10,673	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense [6]	1,632	1,879		247
Department of the Army	367,721	369,502		1,781
Department of the Navy	360,233	363,023		2,790
Department of the Air Force [8]	307,973	[2] 305,865	2,108	
Total, Department of Defense	1,037,559	1,040,269	2,108	4,818
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,710	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,186,901	2,178,938	22,804	14,841
Net increase, including Department of Defense			7,963	

[1] November figure includes 659 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised.
[3] November figure includes 1,674 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,647 in June.
[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[5] New Agency, created pursuant to Public Law 193, 83d Cong.
[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 128, 84th Cong.
[7] Ceased to exist Sept. 23, 1956. Transferred to the Federal Facilities Corporation, Department of the Treasury, by Executive Order 10678, dated Sept. 20, 1956.
[8] In July, 230 employees were transferred from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956*

Department or agency	November	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,270	1,312		42
Commerce	3,717	3,189	528	
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,892	1,791	101	
Interior	4,072	5,759		1,687
Justice	541	533	8	
Labor	141	144		3
Post Office	2,483	2,453	30	
State [1]	24,830	24,389	441	
Treasury	982	988		6
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	605	703		98
Atomic Energy Commission	20	17	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	16	20		4
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	29	27	2	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	1	1	
General Accounting Office	74	59	15	
General Services Administration	104	108		4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	155	153	2	
National Labor Relations Board	19	21		2
Panama Canal	14,430	14,307	123	
Independent Agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	196	196		
Small Business Administration	8		8	
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	8,742	8,401	341	
Veterans' Administration	1,238	1,235	3	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	65,584	65,824	1,606	1,846
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			240	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	54	61		7
Department of the Army	64,311	65,214		903
Department of the Navy	32,953	31,652	1,301	
Department of the Air Force	44,530	42,734	1,796	
Total, Department of Defense	141,848	139,661	3,097	910
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,187	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	207,432	205,485	4,703	2,756
Net increase, including Department of Defense			1,947	

[1] November figure includes 8,912 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 8,521 in June. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 2,462 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 1,428.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1956, and comparison with June 1956*

Department or agency	November	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,961	2,624	337	
Commerce	2,590	2,673		83
Interior	7,743	8,357		614
Treasury	5,615	5,473	142	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	149	159		10
Federal Communications Commission	14	13	1	
General Services Administration	1,108	1,123		15
Government Printing Office	6,681	6,579	102	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,641	7,861		220
Panama Canal	7,343	7,269	74	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,091	11,959	132	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	53,936	54,090	738	942
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			154	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 183,600	[2] 203,698		20,098
Outside continental United States	[1] 21,900	[2] 34,257		12,357
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	222,001	223,084		1,083
Outside continental United States	6,008	6,130		122
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	166,750	168,002		1,252
Outside continental United States	7,003	6,351	652	
Total, Department of Defense	607,262	641,522	652	34,912
Net decrease, Department of Defense			34,260	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	661,198	695,612	1,440	35,854
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			34,414	

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1956 and comparison with June 1956*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	June	November	June	November	June	November	June
England	7,841	7,318			35	32	7,806	7,286
France	25,629	23,698	17,548	16,307			8,081	7,391
French Morocco	6,191	6,144	278	204	975	961	4,938	4,979
Germany	98,599	106,690	82,423	84,148	590	634	15,586	21,908
Japan	131,833	139,452	69,722	[1] 78,890	19,327	18,412	42,784	42,150
Korea	5,706	5,843	5,706	5,843				
Libya		197						197
Malta	84				84			
Netherlands	40	46					40	46
Norway	21	17					21	17
Saudi Arabia		455						455
Trinidad	637	522			637	522		
Total	276,581	290,382	175,677	185,392	21,648	20,561	79,256	84,429

[1] Revised.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 9,910 during the period June through November 1956. The total in June was 2,384,423. In November there were 2,394,333 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Government showed a net increase of 10,433 during the period from June through November 1956, increasing from 1,204,493 in June to 1,214,926 in November. Civilians employed by the Department of Defense decreased 523 during the same period, dropping from 1,179,930 in June to 1,179,407 in November.

In the Department of Defense white-collar employment increased 33,737 from 538,408 in June to 572,145 in November, and industrial employment decreased 34,260 from 641,522 in June to 607,262 in November.

In May the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $11,112,000,000, and in October it was running at an annual rate of $11,241,000,000.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive branch agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In addition to this regularly reported employment, there were foreign nationals working under United States military agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 290,382 in June and 276,581 in November, a decrease of 13,801.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORTON (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 612. A bill for the relief of Licha Hanna Farah (also known as Hanna Licha); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 613. A bill for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Heui Sik Min and his wife, Mary Pu Keui Min, and their children, David Pyong Wha Min, Susan Pyong Soon Min, Sally Pyong Yun Min, George Pyong Yu Min, William Pyong Soo Min, and daughter-in-law Gloria Yong Hiu Min;

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Josephine Ray; and

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 617. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 618. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 619. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Antietam National Cemetery at Sharpsburg, Maryland; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 620. A bill to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Maryland, of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 621. A bill for the relief of the South Side Bank & Trust Co.; and

S. 622. A bill for the relief of Georgina Mercedes Llera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 623. A bill for the relief of Donini Maurizio Donato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 624. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to correct injustice and and to provide for the payment of certain amounts of compensation to officers who were found under the provisions of that act to have been removed from the active list of the Army without justification and who were subsequently restored to the active list or advanced on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 625. A bill to amend section 303 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make certain persons who were citizens of the United States on the date of the enactment of such section eligible to file claims thereunder; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Helen Dolly Argyropoulos; and

S. 627. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmine Aldridge, and her minor children, Irene S. Aldridge and Ingeborg Kathe Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 628. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located at Boston Neck, Narragansett, Washington County, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 629. A bill for the relief of John Eicherl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 630. A bill for the relief of Esther A. Leger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 631. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain land in Milford, Conn., acquired by the Department of the Army from the Quinnipiac Council, Boy Scouts of America, Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 632. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to certain lands in Hancock County, Miss., conveyed as swamp and overflowed land by the State of Mississippi to private individuals in 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 633. A bill for the relief of John R. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 634. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for flood control and related purposes on the Tombigbee River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 635. A bill to amend section 82 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States district court at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to continue for 2 years the provisions for rapid amortization of grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK (by request):

S. 637. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 638. A bill for the relief of Renee M. Dussault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 639. A bill for the relief of Wilton J. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 640. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Elvira A. Belford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 642. A bill to provide for the restoration of the stage end of the interior of Ford's Theater in the District of Columbia and for a museum in the remainder of such theater; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 643. A bill to provide price support for basic agricultural commodities at a level of 90 percent of the parity price, and to provide for price support at a lower level for wheat of below milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Anthony Agustino Scrivanich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 645. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 646. A bill amending the Packers and Stockyard Act, 1921, to permit deduction for a self-help meat promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 647. A bill for the relief of Ishikiriyama Jajime (Philip) Chachere and Tsuruta Masanobu (John Francis) Chachere; and

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Dexter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 649. A bill for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming, Yee Chung Nom Ming, and Gee Shee Ming;

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Isabella Abrahams; and

S. 651. A bill for the relief of Sister Clementine (Ilona Molnar); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 652. A bill for the relief of the Thomas Cruse Mining and Development Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIED (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsbe Hermine van Dam Hurst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 654. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 655. A bill for the relief of Brigadier General Chester W. Goble; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 656. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 657. A bill for the relief of David Y. Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 658. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 659. A bill for the relief of Annie Tymochek Porayko;

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Ursula Rosa Pazdro; and

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Marcella Ramos Fortich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 662. A bill for the relief of Howard I. Buchbinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 663. A bill to repeal all Federal retailers excise taxes, certain manufacturers excise taxes, and the excise taxes on facilities and services; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Aleks Sigus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 665. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to authorize the crediting of unused accumulated sick leave for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 666. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 667. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Isak Irving Herz; and

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Giorgio and her children, Antonio Giorgio and Menotti Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KERR):

S. 670. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 671. A bill to extend and enlarge the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended;

S. 672. A bill to provide for the control of noxious weeds on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; and

S. 673. A bill to further prevent the spread of communicable diseases of livestock and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 675. A bill to amend section 2314, United States Code, title 18, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or through any scheme or artifice to defraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 676. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 677. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington; by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Mabel Dorothy Hoffman (or Clarke); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of Vasilios A. Xerikos; his wife, Eleni Xerikos; and their three children, Nicoleta Xerikos, Constantinos Xerikos, and Andreas Xerikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 680. A bill to amend the act of February 7, 1927, so as to further provide for the disposition of rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 681. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that certain alien orphans adopted by United States citizens shall be classified as nonquota immigrants; and

S. 682. A bill to provide for observing certain legal public holidays on Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 683. A bill for the relief of Chiu-Sang Wu and his wife, Catherine Naoko Mitsuda Wu; and

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ilse Striegan Bacon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 685. A bill to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Jacques Benjamin, Esther Benjamin, Joyce Benjamin, and Saad (Felix) Benjamin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Lecomples;

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Vitalis John Molho;

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang; and

S. 690. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and his wife, Wai Tsung Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 691. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River Development Fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 692. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Indians entitled to the use thereof the lands described in the Executive order of December 16, 1882, and

for adjudicating the conflicting claims thereto of the Navaho and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 693. A bill to revise the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; and

S. 694. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Buttes Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 695. A bill providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 697. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Maryland; the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 698. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co., for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 699. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 700. A bill authorizing issuance of patent in fee to Joshua Standing Elk; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Karl Eigil Engedal Hansen and his wife, Else Viola Agnethe Hansen, and their minor child, Jessie Engeldal Hansen; and

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 703. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Saichert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 704. A bill to provide for further research and technical assistance required for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable of adversely affecting the health and welfare of man; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 705. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla.; Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 706. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Eva Ferro Pobre Reilly;

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Za Lee Moh;

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Fuyuzo Yamaguchi;

S. 710. A bill for the relief of Sui-an Fung and Shu-nung Wu Fung; and

S. 711. A bill for the relief of George S. Zarkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 712. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 713. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MAGNUSON,, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 714. A bill to extend the provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective; and to provide for payment of tuition and fees of veterans receiving educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 715. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 716. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in planning and financing the construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 717. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 718. A bill for the relief of Erwin Wiedenhofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 719. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 720. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business by insuring loans made to small business enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 721. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes; and

S. 722. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 723. A bill for the relief of Willis H. Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. JENNER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 724. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Juan Oro'-Florensa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 726. A bill to provide that 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance Fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans; to increase the maximum loan entitlement of veterans under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to expedite action on certain applications of veterans for direct home loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 727. A bill to provide for the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the use of interest from such investments for scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 728. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Nursing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of

each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. LONG):

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FREAR, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASED BUSINESS LOAN AUTHORITY OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to raise the business loan authority of the Small Business Administration from $150 million to $215 million. The Senate was advised on January 11, 1957, that this $65 million increase is necessary to permit the agency to continue approving business loans beyond February 1957. The Administrator estimates that this amount will be adequate to continue lending operations until June 30, 1957.

For the information of the Senate, Mr. President, under existing law the Small Business Administration will expire on June 30, 1957, and the continuation of this agency and its programs will be a matter for consideration by the Senate later in the session. This bill is not concerned with the larger question of the future of the agency but merely proposes an increase in lending authority to permit the approval of worthy loans which may be processed between now and the end of the current fiscal year.

The Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on this bill at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, January 22, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks there be printed in the RECORD, a letter dated January 11, 1957, addressed to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, by Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, introduced by Mr. CLARK (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter, presented by Mr. CLARK, is as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1957.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: During the hearings in January 1956, before the subcommittee on Small Business, on various bills proposing an increase in the limitation of $25 million on disaster loans outstanding, I indicated that the $150 million limitation on business loans outstanding as provided by section 204 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), as amended, probably would be adequate through June 30, 1957.

In making this estimate, I was guided largely by our past trends which reflected business loan application increases in the spring months and a drop back in the summer and fall months. While the spring increase occurred in 1956, the expected decrease after the spring rise did not develop. In fact, business loan applications reached an all-time high of 692 in October and have continued in excess of 600 since October. The following tabulation reflects this unprecedented demand for business loans.

	Applications received	Loans approved
July–December 1955 average	250	104
January–June 1956 average	430	215
July 1956	406	198
August	439	229
September	512	201
October	692	323
November	685	304
December	603	345

Consequently, the balance of the business loan limitation as of December 31, 1956, has been reduced to $12.9 million, and this amount is expected to be fully committed in February 1957. With normal spring increases in applications expected and the unlikely prospect of the credit situation improving in the next few months with respect to small business, it is estimated that loan applications will average at least 700 per month for the balance of the fiscal year. I am, therefore, recommending to the Congress to increase the present legislative limitation on business loans outstanding from $150 million to $215 million. This amount is estimated to be sufficient for loan approvals through June 30, 1957. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this amendment is in accord with the President's program.

Of the $125 million on disaster loans outstanding, about $83 million remain available as of December 31, 1956, and it is estimated that this amount will be adequate for the balance of the fiscal year.

In conjunction with the request for an increase in the business loan limitation, we have also requested a supplemental appropriation for the revolving fund, and authority to transfer additional funds from the revolving fund to the appropriation for salaries and expenses in order to provide additional staff for the increased workload.

Early approval by the Congress will be necessary to permit the agency to continue approving loans. We will be pleased to provide any additional information you may need in connection with the requests outlined in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, out of a desire to serve the public welfare through assuring the citizens of the Nation a uniformly wholesome supply of poultry products and to assist the poultry industry, at its request, to maintain by law its scrupulously high standards of quality, Senators RUSSELL, EASTLAND, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, YOUNG, and I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require Federal inspection of all commercial poultry and poultry products.

This measure has the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation and all national and regional poultry organizations represented in the associated poultry and egg industries as follows: The National Poultry Producers Federation, the American Poultry and Hatchery Federation, the National Turkey Federation, the Institute of American Poultry Industries, the National Poultry, Butter, and Egg Association, the Southeastern Poultry and Egg Association, the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council, the Pacific Dairy and Poultry Association, the North Central States Institute, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, and the Georgia Poultry Federation.

Essentially the measure, which would, if enacted, become effective January 1, 1958, and operative on a compulsory, industrywide basis the following July 1, provides for the inspection of commercial poultry and poultry products on virtually the same basis as the present program for the inspection of red meat. It vests in the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to establish reasonable criteria and procedures for effective inspection, and avoids arbitrary requirements

by granting to the Secretary sufficient discretion and latitude to revise those criteria and procedures in the light of experience and altered circumstances. It is similar to Senate bill 4243, which was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the 84th Congress.

The cost of the program, as in the case of red meat, would be borne by the Federal Government.

The introduction of this bill is not in any wise a reflection upon the poultry industry which, since World War II, has spent an estimated half billion dollars in modernizing its processing plants and facilities to make them as sanitary as the most modern kitchen, and currently is spending from its profits each year a total of $2.5 million for inspection of its products under the voluntary program presently provided by the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is in recognition of the fact that smaller processors cannot afford such outlays for inspection and out of a desire for the highest standards to prevail uniformly throughout the industry that the various poultry processors, through their organizations, have requested the enactment of a Federal inspection program. It is an evidence, I think, of the high regard which the industry has for the welfare of the consumers of the Nation.

The measure is sufficiently strict in its requirements to assure absolute protection of the consuming public, and yet reasonable enough in its restrictions as to impose no unbearable hardship on the industry. It is a bill under which the Nation's poultry industry can continue to grow while providing at the same time the fullest guarantees for the public welfare.

I am particularly interested in this measure because my State of Georgia is the Nation's leading producer of poultry. Last year Georgia farmers produced more than 200 million broilers, more than the next two leading broiler-producing States—Arkansas and Texas—combined. We, in Georgia, are proud of our poultry industry and all that it means to our State and her people both from the standpoints of economy and national prestige.

It is my opinion that under this bill, which has the wholehearted support of Georgia poultrymen and poultry processors, the industry can continue to grow and prosper with the full assurance that the interests of its customers are protected in all particulars.

A similar measure has been introduced in the House of Representatives and I have pledged my full cooperation to Representative PHIL LANDRUM, of Georgia, and its other sponsors in seeking its enactment. It is my hope that Congress will give it favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 645) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Poultry Products Inspection Act."

LEGISLATIVE FINDING

SEC. 2. Wholesome poultry products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. Such products are consumed throughout the Nation and substantial quantities thereof move in interstate and foreign commerce. Unwholesome and adulterated poultry products in the channels of interstate or foreign commerce are injurious to the public welfare, adversely affect the marketing of wholesome poultry products, result in sundry losses to producers, and destroy markets for wholesome poultry products. The marketing of wholesome poultry products is affected with the public interest and directly affects the welfare of the people. All poultry and poultry products which have or are required to have inspection under this act are either in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or directly affect such commerce. That part that enters directly into the current of interstate or foreign commerce cannot be effectively inspected and regulated without also inspecting and regulating all poultry and poultry products processed or handled in the same establishment.

The great volume of poultry products required as an article of food for the inhabitants of large centers of population may directly affect the movement of poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce. To protect interstate commerce in poultry and poultry products inspected for wholesomeness, from being adversely burdened, obstructed, or affected by uninspected poultry or poultry products, the Secretary of Agriculture upon request of the appropriate authority should hold public hearings to ascertain from time to time and to designate cities or areas where poultry or poultry products are handled or consumed in such volume as to affect the movement of inspected poultry or poultry products in interstate commerce.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide for the inspection of poultry and poultry products by the inspection service as herein provided to prevent the movement in interstate or foreign commerce or in a designated major consuming area of poultry products which are unwholesome, adulterated, or otherwise unfit for human food.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For purposes of this act, except where the context indicates otherwise—

(a) The term "commerce" means commerce between any point in any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(d) The term "poultry" means any live or slaughtered domesticated bird.

(e) The term "poultry product" means any poultry which has been slaughtered for human food from which the blood, feathers, feet, head and viscera have been removed in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, any edible part of poultry, or unless exempted by the Secretary, any human food product consisting of any edible part of poultry separately or in combination with other ingredients.

(f) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, clean and otherwise fit for human food.

(g) The term "unwholesome" means:

(1) Unsound, injurious to health or otherwise rendered unfit for human food.

(2) Consisting in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

(3) Processed, prepared, packed, or held under unsanitary conditions whereby a poultry product may have become contaminated with filth or whereby a poultry product may have been rendered injurious to health

(4) Produced in whole or in part from diseased poultry or poultry which has died otherwise than by slaughter.

(5) Packaged in a container composed of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health.

(h) The term "adulterated" shall apply to poultry and poultry products under one or more of the following circumstances:

(1) If they bear or contain any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render them injurious to health; but, in case the substance is not an added substance, such poultry and poultry products shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such poultry and poultry products does not ordinarily render them injurious to health.

(2) If they bear or contain any added poisonous or added deleterious substance, unless such substance is permitted in their production or unavoidable under good manufacturing practices as may be determined by rules and regulations hereunder prescribed by the Secretary or other provisions of Federal law limiting or tolerating the quantity of such added substance on or in such poultry and poultry products, but any quantity of such added substances exceeding the limits so fixed shall also be deemed to constitute adulteration.

(3) If any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part, therefor.

(4) If damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner.

(5) If any valuable constituent has been in whole or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom.

(6) If any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality or strength, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is.

(i) The term "inspector" means any person authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect poultry and poultry products under the authority of this act.

(j) The term "official inspection mark" means the symbol, formulated pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, stating that the product was inspected.

(k) The term "inspection service" means the official Government service within the Department of Agriculture having the responsibility for the inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products, and for carrying out the provisions of this act.

(l) The terms "container" or "package" include any box, can, tin, cloth, plastic, or any other receptacle, wrapper, or cover.

(m) The term "official establishment" means any establishment as determined by the Secretary at which inspection of the slaughter of poultry, or the processing of poultry products, is maintained under the authority of this act.

(n) The term "label" means any written, printed, or graphic material upon the shipping container or upon the individual consumer package, if any, of the poultry product, or accompanying such product.

DESIGNATION

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized, upon application of any appropriate State or local

official or of any appropriate poultry industry group to ascertain through public hearing whether the volume of poultry or poultry products marketed in a major consuming area is such as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected poultry or poultry products in commerce. If the Secreary finds after such public hearing that the inspection of all poultry marketed in such major consuming area will effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by order, designate, and define such major consuming area. Such designation shall not become effective until 6 months after notice thereof is published in the Federal Register. On and after the effective date of such designation, all poultry and poultry products processed, sold, received, or delivered in any such designated major consuming area shall be subject to the provisions of this act, except that the Secretary may grant such exemptions therefrom as he determines practicable.

INSPECTION, REINSPECTION, AND QUARANTINE

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of preventing the entry into or flow or movement in commerce or in a designated major consuming area of any poultry product which is unwholesome or adulterated, the Secretary shall, whenever processing operations are being conducted, make such examination, inspection (antemortem, postmortem, or both) as he determines necessary of poultry and poultry products in any official establishment processing such poultry or poultry products for commerce or in, or for marketing in a designated major consuming area. All carcasses and parts thereof and poultry products found to be unwholesome or adulterated shall be condemned and shall, if no appeal be taken from such determination of condemnation, be destroyed for human food purposes under the supervision of an inspector. If an appeal be taken from such determination, the product shall be appropriately marked and segregated pending completion of an appeal inspection, which appeal shall be at the cost of the appellant if the Secretary determines that the appeal is frivolous. If the determination of condemnation is sustained the product shall be destroyed for human food purposes under the supervision of an inspector.

(b) Under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, there shall be reinspection of carcasses and parts thereof at official establishments as often as may be deemed necessary to insure fitness of poultry products for human consumption. The condemnation and destruction procedures prescribed hereunder shall be applicable if necessary, upon such reinspection, notwithstanding that such poultry products had been passed and certified in the previous inspection.

(c) Under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, inspectors shall have authority to direct such quarantine or segregation of uninspected, suspect, or condemned live poultry or carcasses or parts thereof at official establishments as will prevent contamination of poultry and poultry products which may be certified as for human consumption.

SANITATION, FACILITIES, AND PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) Each official establishment slaughtering poultry or processing poultry products for commerce or in or for marketing in a designated major consuming area shall have such premises, facilities, and equipment, and be operated in accordance with such sanitary practices, as are required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary for the purpose of preventing the entry into or flow or movement in commerce or in a designated major consuming area, of poultry products which are unwholesome, adulterated, or otherwise unfit for human food.

(b) The Secretary shall refuse to render inspection to any establishment whose premises, facilities, or equipment, or the operation thereof, fail to meet the requirements of this section.

LABELING

SEC. 8. (a) Each shipping container of any poultry product inspected under the authority of this act and found to be wholesome and not adulterated, shall at the time such product leaves the official establishment bear, in distinctly legible form, the official inspection mark, the name of the product, an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure or numerical count, the name and address of the processor and the approved plant number of the official establishment in which the contents were processed. Each individual consumer package, if any, of any poultry product inspected under the authority of this act and found to be wholesome and not adulterated shall at the time such product leaves the official establishment bear, in addition to the official inspection mark, in distinctly legible form, the name of the product, a statement of ingredients if fabricated from two or more ingredients, the net weight or other appropriate measure of the contents, the name and address of the processor and the approved plant number of the official establishment in which the contents were processed. The name and address of the distributor may be used in lieu of the name and address of the processor if the approved plant number is used to identify the official establishment in which the poultry product was prepared and packed. The Secretary may permit reasonable variations and grant exemptions from the foregoing labeling requirements in any manner not in conflict with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(b) The use of any written, printed, or graphic matter upon or accompanying any poultry product inspected or required to be inspected pursuant to the provisions of this act or the container thereof which is false or misleading in any particular is prohibited. No poultry products inspected or required to be inspected pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation under any false or deceptive name; but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which shall be approved by the Secretary are permitted. If the Secretary has reason to believe that any label in use or prepared for use is false or misleading in any particular, he may direct that the use of the label be withheld unless it is modified in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe so that it will not be false or misleading. If the person using or proposing to use the label does not accept the determination of the Secretary, he may request a hearing, but the use of the label shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be conclusive unless within 30 days after the receipt of notice of such final determination the person adversely affected thereby appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which he has his principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The provisions of section 204 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 9. The following acts or the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The processing, sale or offering for sale, transportation, or delivery or receiving for transportation, in commerce or in a designated major consuming area, of any poultry product, unless such poultry product has been inspected for wholesomeness and unless the shipping container and the individual consumer package, if any, are marked in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(b) The sale or other disposition for human food of any poultry or poultry product, which has been inspected and declared to be unwholesome or adulterated under this act.

(c) Knowingly and falsely making or issuing, altering, forging, simulating, or counterfeiting any official inspection certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification, used in connection with the inspection of poultry or poultry products under this act, or knowingly causing, procuring, aiding, assisting in, or being a party to, such false making, issuing, altering, forging, simulating, or counterfeiting, or knowingly possessing, without promptly notifying the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative, uttering, publishing, or using as true, or causing to be uttered, published, or used as true, any such falsely made or issued, altered, forged, simulated, or counterfeited official inspection certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification, or knowingly representing that any poultry or poultry product has been officially inspected under the authority of this act when such poultry or poultry product has in fact not been so inspected.

(d) Knowingly using in commerce, or in a designated major consuming area, a false or misleading label on any poultry product.

(e) The use of any container bearing an official inspection mark except for the poultry product in the original form in which it was inspected and covered by said mark unless the mark is removed, obliterated, or otherwise destroyed.

(f) The refusal to permit access by any duly authorized representative of the Secretary, at all reasonable times, to the premises of an establishment engaged in processing poultry or poultry products for commerce, or in or for marketing in a designated major consuming area, upon presentation of appropriate credentials.

(g) The refusal to permit access to and the copying of any record as authorized by section 11 of this act.

(h) The using by any person to his own advantage, or revealing, other than to the authorized representatives of the Government in their official capacity, or to the courts when relevant in any judicial proceeding under this act, any information acquired under the authority of this act, concerning any matter which as a trade secret is entitled to protection.

(i) Delivering, receiving, transporting, selling, or offering for sale or transport any poultry slaughtered for human food or any part thereof, separately or in combination with other ingredients (other than poultry products as defined in this act), in commerce or in a designated major consuming area, except that such poultry may be permitted to be transported between official establishments and to foreign countries pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 10. No establishment processing poultry or poultry products for commerce or in or for marketing in a designated major consuming area shall process any poultry or poultry product except in compliance with the requirements of this act.

RECORDS OF INTERSTATE SHIPMENT

SEC. 11. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act, persons engaged in the business of processing, transporting, shipping, or receiving poultry slaughtered for human consumption or poultry products in commerce or in a designated major consuming area, or holding such products so received shall not be required to maintain records for a period of more than 2 years, showing, to the extent that they are concerned therewith, the receipt, delivery, sale, movement, or disposition of poultry and poultry products and shall, upon the request of a

duly authorized representative of the Secretary, permit him at reasonable times to have access to and to copy all such records.

INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 12. The district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain violations of this act. The remedies provided for in this section shall be in addition to, and not exclusive of, any of the remedies or penalties provided for elsewhere in this act or now or hereafter existing at law or in equity.

PENALTIES

SEC. 13. (a) Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of section 9, 10, 11, or 18, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if such violation is committed after a conviction of such person under this section has become final such person shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both such imprisonment and fine.

(b) No carrier shall be subject to the penalties of this act, other than the penalties for violation of section 11, by reason of his receipt, carriage, holding, or delivery, in the usual course of business as a carrier, of slaughtered poultry or poultry products, owned by another person unless the carrier has knowledge, or is in possession of facts which would cause a reasonable person to believe that such slaughtered poultry or poultry products were not inspected or marked in accordance with the provisions of this act or were not otherwise eligible for transportation under this act.

(c) In construing or enforcing the provisions of sections 9, 10, 11, and 18, the act, omission, or failure of any person acting for or employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the scope of his employment or office shall in every case be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such individual, partnership, corporation, or association, as well as of such person.

SEC. 14. Before any violation of this act is reported by the Secretary to any United States attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated shall be given reasonable notice of the alleged violation and opportunity to present his views orally or in writing with regard to such contemplated proceeding. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for criminal prosecution or for the institution of injunction proceedings of minor violations of this act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served and compliance with the act obtained by a suitable written notice or warning.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 15. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary is authorized, by regulation and under such conditions as to sanitary standards, practices, and procedures as he may prescribe, to exempt from specific provisions of this act—

(1) poultry producers with respect to poultry of their own raising on their own farms which they sell directly to household consumers only, if such poultry producers do not engage in the buying or selling of poultry products other than those produced from poultry raised on their own farms;

(2) retail dealers with respect to poultry products sold directly to consumers in individual retail stores, if the only processing operation performed by such retail dealers is the cutting up of poultry products on the premises where such sales to consumers are made.

(b) The Secretary may by order suspend or terminate any exemption under this section with respect to any person whenever he finds that such action will aid in effectuating the purposes of this act.

VIOLATIONS BY EXEMPTED PERSONS

SEC. 17. Any person who sells, delivers, transports or offers for sale or transportation in commerce or in a designated major consuming area any poultry products which are exempt under section 16, knowing that such products are unwholesome or adulterated, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to the penalties set forth in section 13.

IMPORTS

SEC. 18. (a) No slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, of any kind shall be imported into the United States unless they are healthful, wholesome, fit for human food and not adulterated and contain no dye, chemical, preservative, or ingredient which renders them unhealthy, unwholesome, adulterated, or unfit for human food and unless they also comply with the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure that imported poultry or poultry products comply with the standards provided for in this act. All imported slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, shall after entry into the United States in compliance with such rules and regulations be deemed and treated as domestic slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, within the meaning and subject to the provisions of this act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and acts amendatory of, supplemental to, or in substitution for such acts.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section and in such rules and regulations the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe the terms and conditions for the destruction of all slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, offered for entry and refused admission into the United States unless such slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, be exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor in such rules and regulations.

(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any product which is refused admission pursuant to this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against any other products imported thereafter by or for such owner or consignee.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 19. (a) Poultry and poultry products shall be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to the extent of the application or the extension thereto of the provisions of this act.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary may cooperate with other branches of Government and with State agencies and may conduct such examinations, investigations and inspections as he determines practicable through any officer or employee of a State commissioned by the Secretary for such purpose.

COST OF INSPECTION

SEC. 20. The cost of inspection rendered under the requirements of this act shall be borne by the United States, except the cost of overtime work performed at the processor's request. The Secretary is authorized in his discretion to pay inspectors employed in establishments subject to the provisions of this act for all overtime work performed at such establishments at such rates as he may determine, and to accept from such establishments wherein such overtime work is performed reimbursement for any sums paid out by him for such overtime work, such reimbursement to be available without fiscal-year limitation to carry out the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 21. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 22. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 23. This act shall take effect January 1, 1958, except that no person shall be subject to the provisions of this act prior to July 1, 1958, unless such person applies for and receives inspection for poultry or poultry products in accordance with the provisions of this act and pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, in any establishment processing poultry or poultry products in commerce or in a designated major consuming area. Any person who voluntarily applies for and receives such inspection prior to July 1, 1958, shall be subject, on and after the date he commences to receive such inspection, to all of the provisions and penalties provided for in this act with respect to all poultry or poultry products handled in the establishment for which said application for inspection is made.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921, RELATING TO DEDUCTIONS FOR A SELF-HELP MEAT PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deductions for a self-help meat promotion program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be left on the desk until the next session of the Senate, so that those Senators who wish to add their names may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 646) amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deductions for a self-help meat promotion program, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill cosponsored by Senators COTTON, BRICKER, MCCLELLAN, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, STENNIS, MCCARTHY, ERVIN, BARRETT, JENNER, KNOWLAND, and MARTIN of Iowa, which, if enacted into law, would authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities. As the Senate knows the Supreme Court has said in the Steve Nelson case that the Smith Act

of 1940, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954 have given the Federal Government an exclusive field in which to operate and that the States should desist from attempting to punish subversives.

I believe that the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in Commonwealth against Steve Nelson is contrary to the supreme law of the land. Nowhere can there be found in the Constitution a proviso which expressly grants to the Federal Government the right or the power to legislate exclusively in matters of subversion, sedition, or treason. Certain powers in the Constitution are expressly granted to the Federal Government in article 1, section 8. Under these powers the Supreme Court has held that Congress may preempt certain fields by exclusive legislation. Some of the decisions have rested upon the power to regulate commerce, coin money, support armies, and so forth. In those cases the Supreme Court has ruled that State legislation is superseded when it conflicts with the comprehensive regulatory scheme and purpose of a Federal plan.

I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the operation of State subversion laws in no way impedes the operation of like Federal laws. I am of the opinion that one would complement the other in attempting to prevent subversive groups from trying to overthrow the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, Unied States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Veterans Readjustment and Assistance Act of 1952, so as to extend until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. Mr. President, this bill is identical to Senate bill 1282, which I sponsored in the 84th Congress.

Mr. President, today I am also joining the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] in sponsoring a bill which is more comprehensive in nature, and would extend these educational benefits indefinitely, so long as the selective service remains in effect.

Frankly, Mr. President, I would prefer to see the benefits extended indefinitely, but I introduce this extension measure as an alternative which may be more acceptable to some Members.

American young men are still being called upon to interrupt their careers by serving in our military forces throughout the world. The demands of military service are as rigorous today as they were in January 1955. It does not seem to me to be fair or justifiable to deny to these young people benefits which have been extended to others who were inducted or who volunteered prior to February 1955. As a matter of fact, fewer young people are bearing the burden of military service today than in early 1955. There is proportionately more responsibility placed on their young shoulders.

Furthermore, the educational program for former GI's has been one of the giant steps taken by our people toward the goal of a fully informed and fully educated citizenry—the bedrock of a strong and enduring democracy. The program for World War II veterans and Korean veterans has given a tremendous impetus to the national task of providing trained young men and women for our technological and business expansion, for our expanded needs in education, and for the many posts of responsibility which must be filled by young men and women of the coming generation. Our Nation has acquired a badly needed reservoir of trained talent, drawn in many cases from families who would not otherwise have had the financial means to send their youngsters to college.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will agree with me on the importance of early reinstatement of the educational benefits under the GI bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 667) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing elgibility for educational benefits, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF ARTICLES OBTAINED BY FALSE OR FRAUDULENT PRETENSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code. This bill, by the addition of new language to section 2314, provides for the punishment of persons who transport, or receive after transportation, in interstate or foreign commerce any goods, wares, merchandise, securities, or money of the value of $1,000 or more, knowing the same to have been obtained by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or any scheme or artifice to defraud. Under the existing statute, the value of the money or property taken must exceed $5,000 before the law becomes operative.

The proposed change does not apply to the ordinary run-of-the-mill theft which can be coped with adequately at the State level and where the amount involved is less than $5,000, but it is directed at interstate organized crime.

In excess of $5 million, according to best estimates, is taken each year from the public by an interstate group of professional swindlers using a scheme known in underworld jargon as the pigeon drop. This racket is only one of a large variety of known confidence games being used at present.

To escape the impact of existing Federal criminal statutes, these operators not only attempt to keep the amount of the larceny just below $5,000, but also to avoid the use of the mails.

Despite the vigilance of local law enforcement authorities, who have succeeded in apprehending and obtaining convictions of 15 of these confidence operators in recent years, more than $60,000 has been swindled from elderly persons in the District of Columbia during the past 4 years. These criminals have descended on the District, as they have on many communities, from Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago.

In Chicago, $23,000 was taken in a recent 2-month period in just one section of the city. One suburban Ohio community has had 12 such cases in the past year. Even communities such as Tucson and Phoenix, Ariz., which had been untouched by professional swindlers, now report cases of this nature in which substantial sums of money are taken by out-of-State operators.

At the hearings of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency on the use of minors in the interstate confidence business, an 82-year-old woman described the manner in which she was duped out of $5,000, all but $120 of her life savings, by a team of these operators while shopping in the District of Columbia This is a typical example of the tremendous economic and emotional damage inflicted by these ruthless operators.

The interstate pigeon-drop racket is conducted by a group of criminals who deliberately select as victims elderly persons, who are often stripped of their entire life savings. The amounts taken vary generally from $1,000 to $5,000, and are invariably stolen from persons of limited means.

Teen-age girls and women are recruited and trained by the confidence men as field operatives to execute their swindles. They are sent by plane, car, and train from State to State and city to city for the purpose of consummating their nefarious schemes. Pursuant to instructions by their underworld employers, these female operatives use wigs and other devices to disguise their appearance, making apprehension and identification difficult.

Hearings on the confidence game conducted in New Jersey by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, developed that these girls turn over a large portion of the proceeds of their crimes to the male confidence men for whom they work. These men, at the time of the execution of the crimes, are nearly always in cities thousands of miles away from the scene. This fact makes effective local investigation and prosecution of the principals nearly impossible.

Investigation revealed that a heavy concentration of these swindlers were living in Los Angeles. However, the scene of their operations was invariably in eastern cities—New York, Washington, and Detroit. In turn, New York operators made a practice of invading southern cities and the Midwest. This technique permitted them security in the community in which they resided, since they

were very often unknown in the community in which they operated and the chances of apprehension were very small.

Absence of Federal legislation in this area is tantamount to giving the key figures who are masterminding the swindles from behind the scene a license to operate, exempt from fear of arrest and prosecution. The leader of the interstate confidence ring, "Boss" Harvey Caldwell, developed a crew of girls and women whom he sent across the country to commit swindles on his behalf. The proceeds were transferred to Caldwell who lived lavishly, maintaining two residences, one in Cleveland and one in Los Angeles. Although his operatives were sometimes arrested and imprisoned, Caldwell remained completely free from arrest on any charge relating to the pigeon-drop swindle up to the time of his death a few weeks ago.

John Freeman, a notorious New York drug pusher, with a major criminal record extending back over 30 years and presently a major numbers operator in New York, was found to be supplementing his income by sending girls on swindling missions to various parts of the Midwest and Northeastern States. Despite the magnitude of his record, not one of his arrests was in any way identified with confidence rackets, nor was his association with this activity found to be generally known to law-enforcement agencies.

Rita Thompson, a veteran confidence woman working for Charles Burnett, is at this very moment accumulating large sums of money in many parts of the country. Although subject to a series of arrests, present statutory limitations, in addition to the inability of local authorities to conduct a necessary nationwide investigation to put all the facts together, have resulted in a series of small fines, dismissals, and after a guilty plea, bail jumping. Rapid transportation and the techniques developed by these criminals in the execution of the swindles, gives them an overwhelming advantage over local law-enforcement agencies—an advantage they would not have if the proposed legislation were enacted.

The subcommittee's hearings developed that girls—sometimes as young as 16 years old—are drawn by these underworld racketeers into the web of crime by promises of expensive gifts and an alluring life of adventure. Exploiting the frailties of youth and the gullibility of the aged, these confidence men represent a new brand of 20th-century gangster, replacing the traditional use of force, violence, and fear with newer and more potent weapons: cunning, psychology, and strategy.

It is ironic that under title 18 of the United States Code, although a person who knowingly takes a stolen car ready for the junk pile or even a stolen cow across State lines may be arrested and imprisoned by the Federal Government, a racketeer professionally engaged in swindling elderly people out of their life savings is able to take $4,000 from a victim and move across State lines with the money without being subject to Federal prosecution.

The present statute was enacted in 1934. It was designed as a measure to reach the receiver of stolen property, known as a "fence." Confidence schemes, before the enactment of this measure, were on an extremely elaborate level. It was commonplace for swindlers to establish a fake brokerage office or horse room to dupe their victims, who were fleeced in amounts of rarely less than $10,000 and sometimes as much as $800,000.

A veteran confidence man, testifying at recent subcommittee hearings, admitted having taken more than $8 million before the enactment of the present statute. He further states—and the facts bear him out—that the passage of the existing statute was responsible for the substantial reduction in the number of large-scale confidence games where the amounts taken were always in excess of $5,000.

It is logical to infer that the proposed statute would be equally effective in stamping out these criminals who are operating on an interstate level in the zone between $1,000 and $5,000. There are, of course, at present many other schemes and organized swindles in which the amounts vary between $1,000 and $5,000, which will also come under the scope of the bill.

This bill is not intended to usurp in any way the functioning of local law-enforcement agencies in this area. When situations develop in which enormous human damage has been inflicted and the resources and facilities of the State or city police are unable to reach the perpetrator, it is necessary to permit the Federal Government with its resources and wider jurisdiction to come to grips with the problem. Its enactment will be an effective measure to combat these various criminal groups who in recent years have succeeded in mulcting millions of dollars from the American public.

I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 675) to amend section 2314, United States Code, title 18, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or through any scheme or artifice to defraud, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park and the adjoining Grand Canyon National Monument in Arizona. It has long been an objective of the National Park Service to establish more appropriate boundaries for both the park and the monument and the proposed legislation would accomplish this. The adjusted boundaries would facilitate better administration and protection of both areas.

The proposed boundary revisions of the park would result in three additions, nearly all of which are national forest land. The United States Forest Service has approved these transfers of jurisdiction to national park status.

The first proposed addition to the park lies along the south and west boundary and contains 11,250 acres. It would preserve portions of the interesting side canyons known as Little Coyote, Beaver and Hualapai Canyons, and, at the same time, straighten out an irregular boundary.

The second addition is a major proposal of great importance since it would place within the park the north side of the Grand Canyon between Tapeats Creek and the monument boundary and also the lower 7 or 8 miles of the spectacular Kanab Creek Canyon. This 42,265 acre addition would thus preserve the superlative scenic, scientific, and recreational features of this portion of the Grand Canyon. The third addition of 1,120 acres at the east end of the south boundary, is needed as a buffer area to protect the scenic beauty of the park road.

The proposed boundary revisions of Grand Canyon National Monument would result in two exclusions, one of the north rim and the other on the south rim. These are plateau lands covered with pinyon pine, juniper and sage brush lying back from the canyon rims and are not considered necessary for the proper development or administration of the monument.

Most of the lands are publicly owned and they will become part of the public domain upon the enactment of legislation. At present the primary use of the lands proposed for exclusion is grazing under permit from the National Park Service, and these lands will probably continue to be available for such use under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management.

The first proposed exclusion from the monument is along the north boundary on Tuckup and SB points and contains 25,440 acres. The second proposal is for the exclusion of 4,080 acres along the southern boundary and consists of the southern tier of sections on the Coconino Plateau.

Both my colleagues [Mr. HAYDEN] and I are hopeful that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 693) to revise the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUTTES DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Coolidge Dam was completed on the Gila River in 1924. One of the reasons for constructing this dam was to control the flow of the Gila so that waters would be

available for the San Carlos project below the confluence of the San Pedro and the Gila in Pinal County. Increased use of the Gila upstream and decreased runoff has resulted in a very mimimum of water being made available for the San Carlos project from this source, and because of pumping, the underground table has gone down to a dangerous level. While the San Pedro does not provide a large flow of water, nevertheless it has a consistent flow and during certain periods of the year it carries much floodwater from northern Mexico and Cochise County. Construction of the dam at the Buttes would save this water and allow it to be distributed on the lands of the San Carlos project.

I am happy to say that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is associated with me on this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 694) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RELATING TO MOSQUITO CONTROL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, last year I introduced a mosquito control bill at the request of the Florida State Board of Health and the then chairman of the legislative committee of the American Mosquito Control Association, Inc. Since that bill was not acted on in the last session of Congress, I have today introduced another mosquito control bill, which I hope will receive the early attention of the Congress.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO BEAR PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY

This proposed legislation recognizes that the control of mosquitoes "is and should be primarily the duty and responsibility of the State and local governments concerned," but establishes a policy and a program of, first, aiding and supporting by direct grants technical study and research carried on by State health departments having proper facilities and qualified personnel, and by other qualified research organizations, for the purpose of devising methods for the control of mosquitoes; second, providing grants to aid States in the conduct of demonstrations for the purpose of developing methods for the control of mosquitoes; and, third, providing Federal technical facilities and services to aid States in the formulation and execution of State and local mosquito research and control programs.

This program would be carried out by the Surgeon General, acting under the supervision and control of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this bill, there is included an authorization for an annual appropriation for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare of a sum not to exceed $3 million a year, beginning with fiscal year 1958. Not more than one-half of the amount appropriated for any fiscal year shall be available for conducting demonstration projects by States under the grants-in-aid.

Mr. President, history records the fact that during the early development of the United States, and particularly in various southern areas, epidemics of mosquito-conveyed yellow fever and malaria retarded the efforts of our forefathers, sometimes causing panic and, as a matter of fact, even wiping out some small cities. Yellow fever was eradicated in this country years ago, and malaria remained for many, many years a scourge in many areas. Now, thanks to a cooperative mosquito control program between the States and the Federal Government, available facts indicate that, for all practical purposes, malaria has been eradicated in the United States.

Some species of mosquitoes still present a public health and comfort problem in certain areas of the United States. These dreaded insects are retarding the development and expansion of industry, housing developments, farming, and recreational facilities to an astonishing degree, and the time has now come, in my judgment, to launch an all-out effort to control this pest by a Federal and State cooperative program for research and technical assistance. Many millions of dollars are spent annually in an effort to control the mosquito, and unfortunately the greater part of this is for temporary control only.

SALT-MARSH MOSQUITO

There are many types of mosquitoes found in the United States, and one of the most prevalent and most annoying is the salt-marsh mosquito, which breeds along the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific regions in the coastal marshes, swales, mangrove swamps and depressions flooded by high tides and inundated by rainfall.

Although many millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to eliminate the salt-marsh mosquito along our coasts, the problem continues unabated. It is my understanding from those who are closest to the mosquito problem in Florida that the salt-marsh mosquito problem can be expected to become much worse in the coastal areas if we do not initiate immediately an active control program because the mean sea level has been shown to be rising at the rate of three-tenths of a foot each 10 years, and a significant population migration is now underway to coastal areas of the Southern and western regions of the United States. Inland cities from 40 to 50 miles distance from the coast will also suffer because of the long-flight range of this species of mosquito. Naturally, the coastal cities are doing everything possible to help themselves because of their great importance as recreational areas for all the people of the United States, but they need assistance from the Federal Government in collecting much needed basic information.

FLOODWATER MOSQUITO

The problem of the floodwater mosquito is becoming much more critical each year because of the increasing acreage being irrigated for cultivated crops or pasture lands, especially in the Western States, and this trend will continue until a concerted effort is made to wipe out the mosquitoes. Several Western States have suffered because of epidemics of encephalitis, which is transmitted by mosquitoes, and this disease is much feared because of its high mortality rate and the permanent damage it often causes to brain cells.

Obviously this difficult problem can be expected to increase in direct proportion to the amounts of new land brought under irrigation in the coming years. Of course, we must increase this expansion, but as we do so it is imperative that we increase our efforts to control the floodwater mosquito which accompanies it.

MOSQUITOES ASSOCIATED WITH SEWAGE AND INDUSTRIAL WASTES

There are still other species of mosquitoes associated with sewage and industrial wastes which breed prolifically in contaminated waters containing organic matter from canning plants and other types of industrial wastes and the discharge waters from sewage-treatment plants.

The ever-increasing problems created by mosquitoes of various types and in various localities of the United States require an intensive and coordinated all-out attack by Federal, State, and local governments. The legislation I have introduced today is designed to provide a comprehensive program of basic and operational research, demonstrations, and technical assistance for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable to adversely affecting the health and welfare of man.

The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers on November 8, 1955, at Washington, D. C., adopted a resolution recommending—

That a comprehensive program be established in the Public Health Service on Salt Marsh Mosquito Control, including laboratory and field research, demonstrations, and technical consultation to meet the increasing salt marsh mosquito problem in many areas of the United States, including Territories and possessions.

The governing council of the American Public Health Association at its annual meeting in Kansas City on November 16, 1955, adopted the following resolution on this general subject:

Whereas increasing mosquito problem arising from the further development of resort areas, especially coastal areas affected by salt marsh mosquitoes, of irrigation and other water resource undertakings, and the suburbanization of the United States, has been a cause of important concern to many public health agencies; and

Whereas the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers has expressed concern on behalf of official health agencies by passage of a resolution requesting a comprehensive program of research, demonstration and technical consultation in salt marsh mosquito control by the United States Public Health Service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Public Health Association recommends that a program of research, demonstration, and technical consultation in control of mosquito breeding in salt marshes, irrigation systems and other

water resources developments, be undertaken by the United States Public Health Service and by State health departments.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that mosquito problems have become alarmingly serious and that they will continue to increase unless a concerted effort is made to control the various species of the mosquito. As I have stated previously, the States and local governments do not ask the Federal Government to shoulder this task alone but recognize that the primary responsibility rests with them. The suggested sum of $3 million a year is relatively small in comparison with the amounts of money spent now by the Federal Government, by individuals, industry and local governments in an effort to rid themselves of a pest which is not only annoying but which jeopardizes the health of millions of people. I sincerely hope that the Congress will recognize the urgent need for this bill and will enact it into law at an early date in order to initiate, as soon as possible, a program which those who know most about the situation feel will bring about the control of one of the greatest pests known to man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 704) to provide for further research and technical assistance required for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable of adversely affecting the health and welfare of man, introduced by Mr. Holland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FISCAL YEAR TAXPAYERS WITH RESPECT TO DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will, if enacted, bring the Federal tax code more in line with the intent of Congress. In brief, it would ease the discrimination which presently plagues many companies in the mineral and other industries.

Percentage depletion was made effective by the Congress for certain mining industries as early as 1932. This was done after comprehensive studies were made by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and full hearings before the committees in Congress. Briefly depletion allowances are based on the fact that mineral deposits require both capital and a long process of exploration to locate workable mines prior to construction of plants needed in the operation. Originally the depletion allowance was granted to metal mines, sulfur, and coal, but has now been expanded to many other mineral or mining industries.

The 82d Congress extended percentage depletion to many mineral industries by amending section 319 of the Revenue Act of 1951. Subsection (c) of section 319 provided that amendments would be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. Therefore, those taxpayers who filed returns on a calendar year basis were entitled to the depletion allowance for a full year but a taxpayer whose fiscal year began on December 1 would be denied the depletion allowance for 11 months.

When this discrimination against fiscal year companies was called to the attention of the Congress, it corrected this inequity by the passage of Public Law 594 which was approved July 21, 1952. Section 319 (c) was amended to read "Effective date—the amendments made by this section shall be effective on and after January 1, 1951."

The tax code was completely revised in 1954. Public Law 591, 83d Congress, known as the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 revised the depletion allowance rates but used the original wording as to applicability from the 1951 act without the modifying language of Public Law 594.

Therefore, the industries whose depletion allowance rates were revised by Public Law 591 are again faced with the same problem as imposed by section 319 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1951, that is—discrimination against fiscal year companies and which was corrected by Public Law 594 in 1952. This is clearly contrary to the intent of Congress. In fact, many Treasury officials thought Public Law 594 was applicable until advised to the contrary by their lawyers. It is a technicality which was overlooked at the time Public Law 591 was passed by the 83d Congress.

To again correct this inequity, subchapter I of Chapter I of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 should be amended to make the provisions of section 613 (b) effective January 1, 1954. I submit the bill to correct this inequity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 706) to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED BENEFITS FOR FORMER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR SURVIVORS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it was my pleasure in the second session of the 84th Congress to introduce S. 3725, a bill to provide increased benefits to persons on the Civil Service Retirement and Disability rolls. I was delighted to be joined in the sponsorship of that bill by the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from my own State of Orgon, [Mr. MORSE], and Senators SCOTT of North Carolina, LAIRD of West Virginia, LANGER of North Dakota, and PASTORE of Rhode Island, each of whom, at that time, was a valued member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I was pleased that the bill was scheduled for immediate public hearings and then reported favorably in a prompt manner, first by the Retirement Subcommittee and next by the full committee. I was encouraged when the bill met with quick approval in the Senate. I regret that the bill was not acted upon in the House before Congress adjourned.

The bill I am about to introduce is designed to offer equitable and necessary improvement to former Federal employees and their survivors in connection with their retirement and survivorship benefits.

It is a well-established fact that retirement benefits to a large number of our retired Civil Service employees and their survivors are grossly inadequate to meet the present high cost of living and to maintain a decent standard of living. It is a stark reality that, of the 250,000 former Federal employees on the retirement rolls, some 50,000 are today receiving approximately $50 a month. Another 50,000 receive between $50 and $100 a month, and still another 50,000 receive between $100 and $150 a month. In other words, three-fourths of the retired Federal employees receive less than $150 a month.

The plight of their survivors is even worse. Some 65,000 of the total of 75,000 survivors receive less than $100 a month. Another startling fact is that survivorship benefits to children average a little over $20 a month. I could cite other figures equally disturbing, but I am confident that the Members of the Senate are aware of the seriousness of the situation.

These facts amply demonstrate the plight in which our civil-service retirees and their survivors find themselves today. Because of the heavy toll inflation has taken on the dollar, particularly the dollar of the individual who has retired and who is primarily dependent upon the fixed income of his annuity for a livelihood, it is obvious that the retired Federal employee is in very precarious financial circumstances.

I know something of the personal problems of those who toil long and faithfully in the service of their Government. Many of them reside in Oregon, and I know how hard pressed they are, particularly those of advanced years, to maintain a decent standard of living.

The Federal Government has a direct responsibility to those former employees. It is obligated to see that the annuity it promised bears a sound relationship to the cost of living. The fact that the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased in recent years cannot be attributed to the former employees who contributed 100-cent dollars to the retirement fund and are now receiving in return dollars worth approximately one-half of that amount.

I hope that the plight of our former employees and their survivors will be sympathetically recognized by the 85th Congress at an early date.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to equate the benefits of those now on the retirement rolls with the benefits that will accrue to present employees when they retire at some future date.

Section 1 of the bill contains a formula providing for a general increase in existing annuities but with a top limit in the increase that may accrue to any one annuitant.

As a case in point, a typical annuitant, who may have been a letter carrier, retired in 1950 with 30 years' service and with a 5-year average high salary of

$3,650, would receive an increase of $500, bringing his annuity to $2,550.

Section 2 of the bill repeals an arbitrary ceiling beyond which increases could not be given imposed a number of years ago.

Section 3 of the bill corrects current laws under which surviving widows were prevented from receiving any benefit from increases in the annuities of their husbands.

Section 4 of the bill provides modest annuities for the forgotten widows of 1948.

Section 5 provides a satisfactory method of financing the increases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 713) to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, introduced today by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the greatest educational programs of all time was the veterans' readjustment legislation, generally known as the GI bill of rights, which offered the financial means of pursuing their education to millions of American servicemen after World War II and the Korean conflict. This program was of incalculable benefit directly to the ambitious and intelligent young men and women whom it enabled to develop their capacities for learning, and indirectly to the whole Nation in its need for trained and skilled personnel of all kinds. Unfortunately, the GI bill of rights was permitted to lapse. The administration has proposed no program to continue its benefits. Since January 31, 1955, the young men who are still drafted or who enlist into our armed services to devote several years of their youth to the defense of the Nation no longer earn the educational opportunities of their elder brothers.

Mr. President, I believe the GI bill should be revived. I therefore introduce today a bill to that end, which is cosponsored by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. The bill is identical with the one we introduced in the 84th Congress, but with one addition. Because of the delay in reenacting the GI bill, I have added a retroactive section which will make its benefits available to servicemen who, on its effective date, may already have entered upon a course of study for which they would have been eligible under the program, if it had remained in existence after January 31, 1955. In other words, it would extend to men and women entering military service after January 31, 1955, the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1952, with the addition of assistance toward tuition charges such as was provided under the post-World War II law.

Mr. President, I shall not repeat today all the arguments for this program which I presented to the Senate in first introducing this proposed legislation a year ago. I want to speak first, very briefly, of the equity of offering our current servicemen the same benefits extended to their predecessors in recent years.

EQUITY FOR PRESENT SERVICE PERSONNEL

Let us recall, Mr. President, that our present system of compulsory military service dates back only to 1940. The principle of general—if not universal—military service for our young men has not been thought a permanent feature of American life. I believe most of us would not like to have it accepted as such. Rather, it has been recognized as a sacrifice, in response to the wars and the continued crises of our time and threats to our Nation's security. We can never have complete equality of sacrifice as long as some go to risk their lives or health in war, while others stay at home. But in the GI bills of 1944 and 1952, the Nation found a progressive and constructive way to offset this sacrifice with opportunities for education and other readjustments, to help the serviceman to a better life upon his return.

Can we callously assume that military service since January 31, 1955, has no longer been a sacrifice, and that it is now free from risk? At this very time, the President asks us to pledge a guaranty of American armed intervention against future Soviet aggression in the Middle East. We already have treaty obligations and military personnel throughout the world which may be involved in military crises. Surely it is neither safer nor more pleasant to be a GI in North Africa or in Greenland or in Okinawa in 1957 than to have served at some base here in the United States during World War II. Prior GI bills wisely attempted no assessment of degrees of sacrifice but related the readjustment benefits offered only to the time which had been given up in the Nation's service. I believe we should continue this wise policy by reviving the GI bill for our present and future servicemen, for as long as we continue to maintain compulsory military service in this country.

GI BILL SERVES NATION'S URGENT EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Besides being fair to our service men and women, the GI bill will help to meet America's urgent and growing needs for more and better professional skills and training in the years ahead.

Mr. President, the services which our young men and women may render after gaining the education and training offered them under the GI bill may be more valuable to the Nation than their period of military service itself. Our national security depends on the strength of our whole society, not merely on our military forces in being—and in a period of life-and-death competition in weapons development, even our military strength depends directly on technical knowledge and skills.

Thus, both for security and for peaceful progress we cannot afford, for lack of financial opportunity after devoting years to military service, to waste the educational potential of any able young American. The magnitude of the need is apparent from our population figures. Since the end of World War II, America's population has increased by 25 million persons. By 1970, it is forecast to grow another 35 million. This growth has created severe shortages of skilled manpower. The accompanying technological advances of our time multiply the demand for trained and educated people.

What is the educational picture today? How are we meeting the tremendous stress placed on our educational system?

Reports indicate that we are failing in this educational race.

A study by the Chase Manhattan Bank recently reported:

> We are graduating about 23,000 engineers yearly. We need now about 40,000 a year, and our need will rise. We graduate about 400 nuclear scientists a year. We need 1,200, or more.

In 1955 more than twice as many students in science fields were graduated in the U. S. S. R. as in the United States. On this point, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, has stated:

> In 5 years our lead in the training of scientists and engineering may be wiped out, and in 10 years we could be hopelessly outstripped. Unless immediate steps are taken to correct it, a situation, already dangerous, within less than a decade could become disastrous.

Our dangerously low production of engineers and research scientists has been frequently dramatized, but shortages in other fields are no less critical. In 1965 we will need four times the number of trained nurses required annually today, yet not enough nurses are now graduated to fill the current need. From 2 to 6 technicians are needed to back up each scientist and engineer. American corporations on the average can now obtain fewer than one. The National Education Association estimates that the average annual demand for new teachers through 1965 will run from 125,000 to 150,000 for elementary and secondary schools alone. Our present annual production of teachers is about 90,000.

The bill which I introduce today is no panacea, but I believe that enactment of this proposal would be a constructive step toward solution of the critical shortage of trained manpower in the United States.

The vital educational benefits of the GI bill of rights have made a great contribution to the productive resources of this country. This program trained 180,000 doctors and registered nurses, 113,000 physical and research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers, 36,000 clergymen, 83,000 policemen and firemen, and 711,000 skilled mechanics.

Both the requirements of our national security program and our domestic needs dictate the necessity of utilizing the natural abilities of the Nation's youth. This potential must be conserved; it represents our greatest resource. Revival of the GI bill of rights would add to

the Nation's human resources the full capabilities of many of the gifted young men and women, who might otherwise be permanently lost to the college classroom.

The educational program provided for in the GI bill of rights has been tested in actual operation and found successful. No other one program in our history has done more toward expanding the educational opportunities of our youth. Its revival could be accomplished with a minimum of administrative confusion and experimentation. I urge adoption of this bill as an important step in combating our present educational crisis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 714) to extend the provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective; and to provide for payment of tuition and fees of veterans receiving educational benefits under such act, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROGRAM FOR CONSTRUCTION OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings. Congressman BROOKS HAYS is introducing a companion bill in the House.

The bill provides for Federal assistance to counties where agriculture is a predominant industry to aid in construction of buildings to centralize Federal, State, and local agricultural activities. The Administrator of the General Services Administration is authorized to provide financial assistance in the planning and construction of such buildings up to 30 percent of the construction costs. In exceptional cases when a county, because of its financial status, cannot furnish its full share, the Federal Government will be allowed to contribute up to 50 percent of the construction costs of the building. In counties where there is more than one county seat, a building may be constructed in both cities if the situation warrants.

I would like to emphasize that this is a program designed to aid the counties and the Federal Government will not dictate the use of the building. The counties will establish the policies for the buildings' use, the only requirement being that the counties must make space available for Federal agricultural agencies on a rental basis.

Representative HAYS and I first introduced this proposed legislation in the 81st Congress. The Secretary of Agriculture at that time, Mr. Charles Brannan, in his report to the Senate Agricultural Committee on the bill stated:

> This Department is in full agreement with the purposes of the bill and the general objective to facilitate the maximum coordination of all related programs at the county level where our work actually reaches the farm family. Also, we wish to encourage the greatest possible participation by farm people in the formulation and operation of the agricultural programs which will best meet the Nation's needs and at the same time be in full harmony with local requirements. The consolidated housing of all agricultural agencies in the county in one building would be an effective help toward accomplishing these objectives.

In spite of the favorable attitude of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget advised against enactment of the bill for economy reasons and because of the relatively more urgent building needs of the Federal, State, and local governments. The bill did not receive further consideration by Congress that session.

Passage of this proposed legislation would greatly aid in bringing about more efficient administration of Federal, State, and local agricultural programs. It would eliminate much confusion and duplication of functions in this area. I am sure that it would also result in closer cooperation between the various farm agencies and eventually benefit all farmers.

In view of the decline of our agricultural economy in the past few years, I feel that all proposals which would bring about better administration of the various farm programs should be given careful study. I hope that this bill will receive the serious attention of every Member of the Senate who is interested in agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 716) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in planning and financing the construction of county agricultural buildings, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EMERGENCY FOOD STOCKPILES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the stockpiling of essential foodstuffs and other essential items to sustain the civilian population in the event of enemy attack or disaster.

This bill is one effort to offset a part of our unpreparedness for what would befall the civilian population under an enemy attack. It would also strengthen our resources for combating other disaster.

We know that our civilian population and our civilian institutions must bear a major share of any future attack.

Militarily we seek to provide adequate defense through deterrent retaliatory power, along with active defensive forces. But we have failed to provide a third element of defense, passive defense; the capacity of the civilian population to undergo attack, achieve a maximum recovery, and go on to reestablish a functioning society.

If a possible enemy sees in this country a well-prepared, resilient population capable of absorbing an attack and making reasonable recovery, he will be more hesitant about his possible success.

The requirements of an effective passive defense system are numerous. This bill devotes itself to one phase—providing food for our citizens in the post-attack period. It would fulfill the same purpose during disasters designated by the President.

This bill also empowers the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to establish and maintain stockpiles of food and other essential items in readily consumable form.

Today we have no equivalent reserves of food. Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are not readily consumable, nor are they located so as to serve the general population in any major emergency.

Millions of citizens will probably be without food on D-Day plus 1, should that unfortunate day ever come.

To the extent possible, the Civil Defense Administrator would obtain foodstuffs from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or through surplus removal programs carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture, and would have them prepared for inclusion in the stockpile.

The stockpile program would thus serve to reduce any oversupply of agricultural commodities.

Foodstuffs required for the stockpiles and not available from Government sources would be purchased on a competitive basis.

While the bill contemplates food storage, it refers also to "other essential items." This would permit the inclusion of essential nonfood items, when deemed necessary, such as soap, chemicals for the purification of water, blankets and, conceivably, tobacco products.

Because of the tremendous power of thermonuclear weapons, it appears impractical to attempt to protect stored food from direct blast effects. The principal objective would be to protect foodstuffs from radioactive fallout. Many existing facilities could be used. The Administrator is authorized to determine what number and type of additional facilities are required.

Nothing in the bill would prevent the transfer of foodstuffs to such structures as we may be required to construct in the future to protect the civilian population.

Foods in stockpiles would be maintained in readily consumable form. In any other form they would be of little use in the postattack period. Some foods could be maintained in ration kits such as used by the military, insuring transportability and ease of distribution during the first hours of an emergency.

Foods removed from the stockpiles to prevent deterioration could be used to good effect in the various food distribution programs established by law.

I doubt that any bill for the stockpiling of foods can meet every contingency of disaster or attack. We cannot visualize every eventuality of disaster or attack. However, without such an effort as this bill proposes, we stand unprepared.

If it would be criminal negligence for national leaders to fail to provide adequate armed forces, it would seem just as much so to disregard the protection of the civilian population.

As conditions stand today, an attack on this Nation would result in a civilian Pearl Harbor beyond comprehension.

As example, over 20,000 tons of food move over the bridges and through the tunnels to New York every day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 717) to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Food Stockpiling Act of 1957."

ESTABLISHMENT OF EMERGENCY STOCKPILES

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal Civil Defense Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized and directed to establish and maintain emergency stockpiles of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, in the event of enemy attack or other disaster.

(b) Emergency stockpiles established under subsection (a) shall be located in strategic relationship to areas determined by the Administrator to be most probable disaster areas.

(c) Within ____ days after the date of enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, the Administrator, in cooperation with other appropriate agencies of the Government, shall determine the foodstuffs (which shall include the elements of a basic nutritional diet) and other essential items, to be stored in the emergency stockpiles established under subsection (a), and the form in which such foodstuffs and other items shall be stored. All such foodstuffs shall be stored in a readily consumable form, and there shall be included a supply of such foodstuffs and other essential items in easily transportable kits or other containers for use under such emergency circumstances as the Administrator shall determine.

(d) The Administrator is authorized and directed to determine, within ______ days after the date of enactment of this act, the types of storage facilities which offer the most reasonably adequate protection against radioactive contaminants, and to construct or acquire by condemnation, purchase, lease, or otherwise, and maintain such facilities for the storage of foodstuffs and other essential items to be placed in emergency stockpiles under this act. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the use of existing Government or privately owned facilities determined by the Administrator to be suitable for such purposes.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKPILE ITEMS

SEC. 3. (a) To the greatest extent practicable, foodstuffs to be placed in emergency stockpiles under this act shall be obtained from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain, where possible, in accord with criteria and procedures employed by the Department of Agriculture in the purchase of foodstuffs, any foodstuffs deemed by the Administrator to be necessary for the stockpiles but not available from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Foodstuffs and other essential items not obtainable in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be purchased by the Administrator on a competitive basis.

(b) The Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to perform such services in providing or arranging for the processing, packaging, transporting, storing, or placing of commodities in a form suitable for any of the foregoing, as may be requested by the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, for foodstuffs furnished by them under this section. Such reimbursement shall be made on the basis of the original cost of the foodstuffs furnished together with costs incurred in performing or arranging for services referred to in subsection (b). In making such reimbursement, the Administrator shall receive credit for any foodstuffs returned for disposition in accordance with section 4 (c).

WITHDRAWAL OF ITEMS FROM STOCKPILES

SEC. 4. (a) Foodstuffs and other essential items placed in emergency stockpiles under this act shall not be withdrawn except—

(1) for use in an emergency caused by an enemy attack upon the United States,

(2) for use in any emergency caused by a major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1855),

(3) for rotation purposes to prevent loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage, or

(4) for purposes of replacement with items determined to be more suitable for the purposes for which originally acquired.

(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to provide, to the extent possible, for the transportation and distribution of foodstuffs and other essential items removed from stockpiles under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) through such facilities as he may deem necessary to provide or as may be arranged in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, the Armed Forces of the United States, military units of the several States or such private organizations as the Administrator shall designate.

(c) Foodstuffs and other items removed from stockpiles under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a) shall be transferred to other agencies of the Government for disposition under other programs established by law.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 5. There is hereby established the Emergency Food Stockpile Board which shall advise the Administrator upon his request with respect to matters arising in the administration of this act. The Board shall consist of the Administrator, who shall be chairman of the Board, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and an Assistant Secretary of Defense to be designated for such purpose by the Secretary of Defense.

METHODS OF PRESERVATION OF FOODSTUFFS

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Administrator is directed to make appropriate use of the results of research, study, and experimentation regarding improved methods of preserving foodstuffs.

PUBLICITY

SEC. 7. To the fullest extent possible, the Administrator shall familiarize the public with the emergency food stockpile program under this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

NATIONAL INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1957 AND SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT ACT OF 1957

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday last I spoke to the Senate concerning the urgent need of speedy action by Congress to assist the small and independent concerns of our Nation. I shall not burden the Senate with a repetition of my remarks except to point out the imperative necessity of maintaining the role of independent small business in this country and to state that of the many small-business problems susceptible of legislative relief, none should take precedence over measures to improve the availability of financing. In response to the financing problems of small business I intend to introduce today two measures; first, a bill to establish privately owned and operated national investment companies to make long-range loans and equity capital available to small business and, second, a bill to insure lenders against loss on small-business loans.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the gap between credit availability and the financial requirements of small business is not a new problem. This credit gap is not capable of exact statistical measurement. As someone once said, "You cannot measure the loans that were not made," and may I add, the opportunities lost. Nonetheless this credit gap has been clearly recognized for a number of years by financial experts as a problem area for small business. As early as the Temporary National Economic Committee days the institutional nature of this problem was clearly analyzed and accepted. That is, in our complex social and economic society there is no credit institution to provide the long-range capital needs of independent, small business.

Formerly, capital for initiating and expanding small business was provided, quite naturally, from personal resources, or by relatives, friends, and neighbors of the entrepreneur. In our impersonal economic structure of today with its high personal income-tax rate, this source of small-business financing has been cut to a point where it is inadequate to fulfill the needs. Nor can a small business in our modern economic structure, with corporation taxes and limitations on depreciation reserves, hope to generate sufficient internal financing to cope with its long-range capital needs. Financial experts are nearly unanimous in agreeing that small business, unlike its larger competitor, cannot turn to the securities market for relief in this situation. The cost of marketing securities is prohibitively high and often unattainable at any price, for the small-business man. Clearly, then, what is required is a new

institutional factor to remedy this long-standing and continuing credit deficiency facing our independent, small firms.

While the TNEC monograph was perhaps the first analysis of the nature of the credit gap facing small business, many other distinguished groups and individuals have added to our understanding of this problem and recommended the creation of special institutions tailored to meet the financial requirements of small business. Especially notable was the study by a special small-business subcommittee of the Investment Banking Association of America in 1945 which recognized the inability of existing financial institutions to meet the long-range credit needs of small business and, while differing in detail from the bill I am to introduce today, recommended the establishment of new credit institutions to remedy this deficiency. The Committee for Economic Development also studied this problem and in 1947 issued a report concurring in the suggestion that special credit institutions should be established to supply independent, small business with long-range capital. Furthermore, distinguished members of this body have also analyzed this problem similarly and urged the creation of credit banks.

A similar approach has been undertaken in recent years by a number of States, including all in the New England area, on an intrastate basis. The experience of these State-chartered investment banks encourages the belief that national investment companies can meet a real need. Generally, progress of the State credit banks has been slow because of difficulties in obtaining sufficient capital to get their program moving. The monetary resources of the Federal Government and its prestige as exemplified by the Federal Reserve System, should do much to insure that the national investment companies will get off to a speedy start in meeting the credit needs of small business.

NATIONAL INVESTMENT COMPANY BILL

Mr. President, I introduce, and ask that it be referred to the proper committee, a bill to establish national investment companies. In brief, the purpose of this bill is to meet the capital needs of small and medium sized enterprises by establishing privately owned and operated investment companies chartered by approval of the Federal Reserve Board. In order to initiate this program, Federal Reserve banks are authorized to form investment companies whose stock may later be sold to private investors. The investment companies may borrow money and issue obligations in order to make secured or unsecured loans to small business or to invest in the stock or other securities of such businesses. In order to encourage this venture, investment companies are to receive certain tax deductions and credits in the handling of tax reserves and exemption from tax on dividends distributed to stockholders.

Let me emphasize that the investment companies will cooperate with private financial institutions. Existing financial institutions have no reason to fear the creation of such investment companies for they are designed to handle a different function—one not now being provided. The key to their success lies in their ability to supplement, not compete with, existing financial institutions.

INSURED LOAN BILL

Mr. President, no Member of Congress needs be reminded, I am sure, that there is also a scarcity of short and intermediate term credit. Only yesterday, a business survey report in the Wall Street Journal stated that the business expansion programs of some medium-sized and small concerns are being delayed because of tight money. While this scarcity has been accentuated by the tight-money situation, it has also been a chronic problem of small-business financing. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to insure lenders against loss on small-business loans and ask that it be referred to the proper committee.

In summary, this bill seeks to encourage credit for small business by establishing an insurance program for small-business loans made by lenders approved by the Small Business Administration. This program is to be administered by the Small Business Administration with power to delegate functions under this act to such officers, corporations or agencies as it may designate. Loans are limited to 5 years. This bill permits a maximum yearly premium of 1½ percent for each loan. Let me say that this upper limit is included as a rough estimate of the maximum that may be required. Actual experience may show a much lower premium, perhaps in the neighborhood of ½ percent, is adequate. Generally, lender's losses would be reimbursed up to 90 percent of the loan's unpaid balance. The uninsured 10 percent should serve to maintain the customary prudence of the commercial banking system.

One of the reasons that small business has difficulty in obtaining loans is the high overhead costs to the lender for investigating and processing the small loan applications. In a period such as this with large loan applications readily available to the lender, the small-business man is denied needed funds. This insurance provision should encourage commercial banks to risk the small loan. The accumulation of a number of the small loans, with this insurance feature, should provide a package at least equally attractive to the commercial banks as the larger loan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the bills entitled "The National Investment Act of 1957" and "Small Business Credit Act of 1957." I also ask that summaries of these two bills be included in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and summaries will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 719. A bill to make capital more readily available for financing small business and thus to promote, foster, and develop the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE

SEC. 1. This act may be cited as the "National Investment Company Act of 1957."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress—

(a) to foster the development and growth of independent small-business enterprises with the objective of enabling them to make their maximum contribution to productive investment and employment and to the economic stability and growth of the Nation;

(b) to make capital for such enterprises more readily available in adequate amounts and on reasonable terms;

(c) to facilitate maximum participation of private financial institutions and investors in financing these enterprises; and

(d) to supplement the existing facilities of banks and other private financial institutions by providing for the establishment of privately owned national investment companies.

Title I. National investment companies

Organization of National Investment Companies

SEC. 101. (a) National investment companies may be formed for the purpose of operating under this title by any number of persons not less than five, who shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation of any such company; except that any company in whose stock one or more Federal Reserve banks invest shall be formed by a Federal Reserve bank, which alone shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation. The total number of national investment companies formed by Federal Reserve banks pursuant thereto shall not exceed the number of Federal Reserve banks and branches thereof.

(b) The articles of incorporation of any national investment company shall specify in general terms the objects for which the company is formed, the name assumed by such company, the area or areas where its operations are to be carried on, the place where its principal office is to be located, and the amount and classes of its shares of capital stock; and the articles may contain any other provisions not inconsistent with this title that the company may see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs, including provision for cumulative voting in election of directors. Such articles and any amendments thereto adopted from time to time shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (hereinafter called the "Board").

(c) The articles of incorporation and amendments thereto shall be forwarded to the Board for consideration and approval or disapproval. In determining whether to approve the establishment of such a company and its proposed articles of incorporation, the Board shall give due regard, among other things, to the need for the financing of independent small-business enterprises in the area in which the proposed company is to commence business, the general character of the proposed management of the company, the number of such companies previously organized in the United States, and the volume of their operations. After consideration of all relevant factors, the Board may, in its discretion, approve the articles of incorporation and issue a permit to begin business.

(d) Upon issuance of such permit, the company shall become and be a body corporate, and, as such, and in the name designated in its articles, shall have power—

(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

(2) to have succession for a period of 30 years, unless extended as provided in this section, or unless sooner dissolved by the act of the shareholders owning two-thirds of the stock or by an act of Congress, or unless its franchise becomes forfeited by some violation of law or regulation issued hereunder;

(3) to make contracts;

(4) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of law or equity;

(5) by its board of directors, to appoint such officers and employees as may be deemed proper, define their authority and duties, fix their compensation, require bonds of such of them as it deems advisable and fix the penalty thereof, dismiss such officers or employees, or any thereof, at pleasure, and appoint others to fill their places;

(6) to adopt bylaws regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its officers and employees appointed, its property transferred, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed;

(7) to establish branch offices or agencies subject to the approval of the Board;

(8) to acquire, hold, operate, and dispose of any property—real, personal, or mixed—whenever necessary or appropriate to the carrying out of its lawful functions;

(9) to act as depository or fiscal agent of the United States when so designated by the Secretary of the Treasury;

(10) to operate in such Federal Reserve district or districts or Territories or possessions of the United States as may be specified in its articles of incorporation and approved by the Board; and

(11) to exercise the other powers set forth in this title and such incidental powers as may be reasonably necessary to carry on the business for which the company is established.

(e) The board of directors of each national investment company shall consist of nine members, all of whom shall be elected annually by the holders of the shares of stock of the company.

Capital-Stock Provisions

SEC. 102. (a) Each company organized under this title shall have a paid-in capital and surplus equal to at least $5 million before it shall commence business. In order to facilitate the formation of national investment companies, each Federal Reserve bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to invest in the shares of stock of one or more such companies formed by any Federal Reserve bank under section 101 hereof, but with a view to the ultimate disposal of such stock to banks and other private investors as herein provided. Each Federal Reserve bank which forms a national investment company shall invest in shares of stock of such company in an amount equal to at least $5 million, or an amount which, when added to the amounts, if any, of shares subscribed by other Federal Reserve banks, member banks, nonmember banks, financial institutions, corporations, partnerships, or other persons, shall equal the sum of $5 million. In no event shall any Federal Reserve bank invest in shares of national investment companies if as a result thereof it will hold an amount of such shares aggregating more than 2 percent of the aggregate amount of the combined capital and surplus of all its member banks or $5 million, whichever is the greater.

(b) The shares of stock in any national investment company shall be eligible for purchase by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, nonmember banks, financial institutions, corporations, partnerships, or other persons. Each member bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, to acquire and hold an amount of such shares equal to not more than 2 percent of the capital and surplus of member bank. Upon the demand of any such eligible purchaser, a Federal Reserve bank which holds shares of stock in a national investment company shall, with the approval of the Board, including approval as to price, sell to such eligible purchaser all or a portion of such shares.

(c) The aggregate amount of shares in any such company or companies which may be owned or controlled by any stockholder, or by any group or class of stockholders, may be limited by the Board; and no one stockholder, other than a Federal Reserve bank, shall at any time, without the approval of the Board, own or control more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any such company.

Borrowing Power

SEC. 103. Each national investment company shall have authority to borrow money and to issue its debentures, bonds, promissory notes, or other obligations under such general conditions and subject to such limitations and regulations as the Board may prescribe, but in no event shall any such company issue obligations which would cause the amount outstanding at any one time to exceed the amount of its capital stock and surplus.

Eligible Enterprises

SEC. 104. The Board, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall promulgate standards to determine the eligibility of business enterprises for the purposes of this title. In promulgating such standards, which may differ according to the types of financing or other relevant factors, the Board shall give consideration to—

(a) the policies set forth in section 2; and

(b) the extent to which such enterprises have reasonable access to facilities for credit and equity financing.

Loans and Investments

SEC. 105. (a) Each national investment company shall have authority to make or acquire loans with or without security to business enterprises which are eligible under this title, or to purchase obligations of such enterprises. Such loans, purchases, or other acquisitions may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions, through argeements to participate or by the purchase of participations, commitments to purchase, or otherwise, as the company may determine.

(b) Each national investment company shall have authority to acquire, and to resell to the issuer or to others the income debentures or bonds, common or preferred stocks, or other capital shares of business enterprises eligible under this title.

Aggregate Limitations

SEC. 106. Without the approval of the Board, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by any national investment company under the provisions of this title which exceed the sum of $1 million for any single enterprise shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the combined capital and surplus and maximum indebtedness of such national investment company authorized by this title.

Exemptions

SEC. 107. (a) The loans of any national banking association which are required by any national investment company, in the making of which such company participates, or for any part of which a commitment to purchase is issued hereunder shall not be subject to the limitations on real-estate loans prescribed in section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 371).

(b) Section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U. S. C. 77 C), is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The Commission may from time to time by its rules and regulations, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, add to the securities exempted as provided in this section any class of securities issued by a national investment company under the National Investment Company Act of 1957, if it finds, having regard to the purposes of that act, that the enforcement of this title with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors."

(c) Section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U. S. C. 77ddd) is hereby amended by adding the following subsection (e):

"(e) The Commission may from time to time by its rules and regulations, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, add to the securities exempted as provided in this section any class of securities issued by a national investment company under the National Investment Company Act of 1957, if it finds, having regard to the purposes of that act, that the enforcement of this title with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors."

Tax Provisions

SEC. 108. (a) Section 851 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting before the word "registered" the following: "chartered under the National Investment Company Act of 1957 as a national investment company or is".

(b) Section 851 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting immediately after the words "90 percent" the following: "(75 percent in the case of a national investment company chartered under the National Investment Company Act of 1957)".

(c) Section 851 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Exemption of national investment companies from limitations of subsection (b) (4).—If the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System determines that it is necessary and appropriate to accomplishment of the purposes of the National Investment Company Act of 1957 that any national investment company chartered under such act be exempt from the requirements of this subsection (b) (4), it shall certify such determination to the Secretary or his delegate and, in such event, the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) (4) shall not apply to such national investment company."

(d) (1) Section 852 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The investment company taxable income of a regulated investment company which is a national investment company chartered under the National Investment Company Act of 1957 shall, for purposes of paragraph (1), be increased by the amounts described in subsection (d) (3) (D) and decreased by the amounts described in subsection (d) (5) (B)."

(2) Section 852 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) National investment company reserve:

"(1) Reserve generally: A regulated investment company which is a national investment company chartered under the National Investment Company Act of 1957 may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate establish and maintain a reserve subject to the limitations provided in this subsection.

"(2) Limitation on reserve: The amount of the reserve shall not at any time exceed

the lesser of (A) 50 percent of the invested capital of the company as defined in paragraph (7), or (B) the accumulated earnings and profits determined as of the close of the taxable year.

"(3) Charges to reserve: The reserve shall be charged as of the end of the taxable year (whether or not such charge produces a minus amount in the reserve) with the following:

"(A) the net capital loss for the taxable year (as defined in sec. 1222 (10));

"(B) the net operating loss for the taxable year (as defined in sec. 172 (c));

"(C) the Federal income taxes attributable to the amount added to the reserve under paragraph (5); and

"(D) such amount as may be necessary by reason of the limitation provided in paragraph (2).

"(4) Mandatory additions to the reserve: There shall be added to the reserve as of the close of the taxable year the following:

"(A) an amount equal to the excess of the net capital gain for the taxable year computed without regard to section 1212 (relating to capital loss carryover) over the net capital gain for the taxable year; and

"(B) an amount equal to the excess of the taxable income for the taxable year computed without regard to section 172 (relating to the net operating loss deduction) over the taxable income for the taxable year.

"(5) Discretionary addition to the reserve: In any year in which an amount (other than the amount described in paragraph (4) is added to the reserve, the company shall, in the computation of its investment company taxable income be allowed—

"(A) a deduction equal to such amount of the addition to the reserve as does not cause the aggregate amount of the reserve (including such addition) to exceed 20 percent of the invested capital of the company as defined in paragraph (7); and

"(B) the dividends received credit provided in section 243 but such credit shall not exceed 85 percent of the portion of amounts added to the reserve under this subparagraph which is not deductible from investment company taxable income under subparagraph (A).

"(6) Reduction or termination of reserve: In the event of a reduction or termination of the reserve in connection with a partial or complete liquidation of the company (or of any company to which the reserve has been transferred in an exchange upon which gain was not recognized by reason of any provision of this subtitle) the gain realized by a stockholder upon any such liquidation shall, to the extent of the pro rata share of the reserve, be considered as a gain from the sale or exchange of property held for less than 6 months.

"(7) Invested capital: For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'invested capital' means the sum, determined as of the close of the taxable year, of—

"(A) the amount of money or property (included in an amount equal to its unadjusted basis without regard to the value of the property as of March 1, 1913, except that if such basis is a substituted basis, it shall be adjusted, with respect to the period before the property was paid in, by an amount equal to adjustments proper under section 312 (f) for determining earnings and profits) previously paid in for stock, or as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, reduced by the amount of distributions not out of earnings and profits in the year of distribution and not out of accumulated earnings and profits; and

"(B) the amount of the outstanding indebtedness (not including interest) of the company which is evidenced by a bond, note, bill of exchange, debenture, certificate of indebtedness, mortgage, or deed of trust, except that indebtedness not represented by a bond or debenture shall not be included in excess of an amount equal to the average daily amount of indebtedness not so represented which was outstanding during the taxable year."

(e) Each national investment company established under this title, including its franchise, capital, reserves, and surplus, its income, its real property, its tangible and intangible personal property, its obligations (both as in principal and income derived therefrom), shall be subject to taxation, in the same manner and to the same extent as a State-chartered institution of similar character by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority or by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States; and its real property shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 109. (a) Wherever practicable the operations of a national investment company shall be undertaken in cooperation with banks or other financial institutions, and any servicing or initial investigation required for loans or acquisitions of securities by the company under the provisions of this title may be handled through such banks or other financial institutions on a fee basis.

(b) Each national investment company may make use, wherever practicable, of the advisory services of the Federal Reserve System and of the Department of Commerce which are available for and useful to industrial and commercial businesses, and may provide consulting and advisory services on a fee basis and have on its staff persons competent to provide such services. Subject to the supervision and direction of the Board, any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to act as a depository or fiscal agent for any company organized under this title. Such companies may invest funds not reasonably needed for their current operations in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

(c) The Board is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the operations of national investment companies and to carry out the provisions of this title in accordance with the purposes of this act. Each national investment company shall be subject to examinations made by direction of the Board by examiners selected or approved by the Board, and the cost of such examinations, including the compensation of the examiners, may in the discretion of the Board be assessed against the company examined and when so assessed shall be paid by such company. Every such company shall make such reports to the Board at such times and such form as the Board may require.

(d) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to advise and assist in promoting national investment companies.

(e) Should any national investment company violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this title or of regulations prescribed hereunder, all of its rights, privileges, and franchises derived herefrom may thereby be forfeited. Before any such company shall be declared dissolved, or its rights, privileges, and franchises forfeited, any noncompliance with or violation of this title shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in a suit brought for that purpose in the district or territory in which the principal office of such company is located, which suit shall be brought by the United States at the instance of the Board or the Attorney General.

(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Board any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this title or of any regulation thereunder, the Board may make application to the proper district court of the United States, or the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions and upon a showing by the Board that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

(g) Any national investment company may at any time within the 2 years next previous to the date of the expiration of its corporate existence, by a vote of the shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, apply to the Board for approval to extend the period of its corporate existence for a term of not more than 30 years, and upon approval of the Board as provided in section 101 hereof such company shall have its corporate existence extended for such period unless sooner dissolved by the act of the shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, or by an act of Congress or unless its franchise becomes forfeited as herein provided.

(h) Nothing in this act or in any other provision of law shall be deemed to impose any liability on the United States or on any Federal Reserve bank with respect to any obligations entered into, or stocks issued, or commitments made, by any company organized under this title.

Title II. Changes in Federal Reserve authority

Repeal of Section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act

SEC. 201. Effective 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C. 352 (a)) is hereby repealed; but such repeal shall not affect the power of any Federal Reserve bank to carry out, or protect its interest under, any agreement theretofore made or transaction entered into in carrying on operations under that section.

Return of Funds to Treasury

SEC. 202. (a) Within 60 days after the enactment of this act, each Federal Reserve bank shall pay to the United States the aggregate amount which the Secretary of the Treasury has heretofore paid to such bank under the provisions of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act; and such payment shall constitute a full discharge of any obligation or liability of the Federal Reserve bank to the United States or to the Secretary of the Treasury arising out of subsection (e) of said section 13b or out of any agreement thereunder.

(b) The amounts repaid to the United States pursuant to section 202, and any remaining balance of the funds set aside in the Treasury for payments under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts.

Authority To Sell Assets to National Investment Companies

SEC. 203. Any national investment company organized under this act may purchase from any Federal Reserve bank, and any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to sell to any such company, at such reasonable price as may be agreed upon, any or all of the assets heretofore or hereafter acquired by such Reserve bank under the provisions of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act.

Title III. Miscellaneous provisions penalties

SEC. 301. Title 18, United States Code, section 1014, is amended by inserting the phrase "a national investment company organized under title II of the National Investment Company Act of 1957," after the words "National farm loan association,".

Geographic Applicability

SEC. 302. The authority provided in this act shall be applicable in the United States,

including the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions.

Right To Amend This Act

SEC. 303. The right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 720. A bill to make credit more readily available for financing small business by insuring loans made to small-business enterprises.

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Small Business Credit Act of 1957."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress—

(a) to foster the development and growth of independent small-business enterprises with the objective of enabling them to make their maximum contribution to productive investment and employment and to the economic stability and growth of the Nation;

(b) to make credit for such enterprises more readily available in adequate amounts and on reasonable terms; and

(c) to facilitate maximum participation of private financial institutions and investors in financing these enterprises by insuring loans which are made by private lending institutions to small business.

Title I. Insurance on loans for small business; authority to insure

SEC. 101. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration (hereinafter referred to in this act as the Administrator) is authorized upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe to insure such lenders as he finds to be qualified by experience or facilities and approves as eligible for credit insurance against loss of principal and interest which may be sustained by them as a result of loans made to small-business enterprises. Such a lender is hereinafter referred to as an "approved lender."

Overall Limit of Insurance

SEC. 102. The aggregate principal amount of loans with respect to which insurance may be granted under this title shall not exceed $250 million outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That on or after July 1, 1958, the President may increase this limit to not more than $750 million.

Scope of Insurance and Insurance Reserve

SEC. 103. The insurance granted under this title shall provide for the reimbursement of losses to any approved lender and which reimbursement shall not exceed the lesser of—

(a) 90 percent of the unpaid balance of any loan, including accrued interest at the time of default;

(b) the insurance reserve of the insured lender on the date the claim for reimbursement of loss is approved for payment.

The insurance reserve of each lender shall be initially computed as 10 percent of the total amount of loans on which premiums have been paid and shall be diminished by the amount of claims approved for payment. The insurance reserve, if any, to the credit of any lender may, from time to time, be further diminished, but only pursuant to the contract between the Administrator and such insured lender.

Maximum Premium Charge

SEC. 104. The Administrator shall fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this title in an amount not to exceed 1½ percent per annum of the principal amount of each loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as he may prescribe.

Type of Loan Covered

SEC. 105. (a) Insurance granted under this title shall provide for the reimbursement of losses only with respect to loans bearing such interest, having such maturities, and subject to such other terms and conditions as required in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator in force at the time the insurance is granted.

(b) No further insurance shall be granted under this title with respect to any borrower if the total outstanding amount of all loans of such borrower insured under this title would thereby exceed $250,000, or with respect to any loan whose maturity is in excess of 5 years and 32 days.

(c) No insurance shall be granted under this title for any loan for agricultural purposes, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or with respect to any loan which is eligible to be insured under the National Housing Act, as amended.

(d) Any loan with respect to which insurance is granted under this title may be refinanced or extended with continued protection under this title in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe: *Provided*, That the amount or unexpired term of any such loan shall not be in excess of the limitations contained in paragraph (b) of this section.

Transfer of Insurance Between Institutions

SEC. 106. The Administrator, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may permit the transfer to any approved lender any insurance in connection with loans which such lender wishes to purchase from another approved lender.

Revolving Fund

SEC. 107. (a) The premiums and other moneys received by the Administrator in the course of operations under this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. The revolving fund shall be available for defraying the operating expenses incurred under this title, and for the payment of claims in connection with the insurance granted under this title.

(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund provided in this section—

(1) the sum of $10 million for the initial establishment of the revolving fund; and

(2) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the revolving fund.

(c) The Administrator shall pay annually into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, interest on any sums appropriated to the revolving fund which have not been repaid into the Treasury as provided in subsection (d). The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance, such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its costs in connection with such appropriated funds, taking into consideration the current average interest rate which the Treasury pays upon its marketable obligations.

(d) At least annually, any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by the Administrator to be necessary for requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund, shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and any outstanding balance in the amounts appropriated to the revolving fund shall be reduced by the same amount.

(e) The Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may invest and reinvest such portions of the revolving fund as he may determine to be in excess of current needs in any interest-bearing securities of the United States or in any securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and the income therefrom shall constitute a part of the revolving fund.

(f) The financial transactions, accounts, books, and records of the Administrator pertaining to the revolving fund shall be audited on an annual basis by the General Accounting Office and a copy of each report on the audit shall be furnished to the President, the Congress, and the Administrator.

Exemption From Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act

SEC. 108. Loans made by national banks with respect to which insurance is granted under this title shall be exempt from the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C. 371) relating to real-estate loans.

Administrative Provisions

SEC. 109. In the performance of, and with respect to, functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(a) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction, or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no attachment, injunctions, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Administrator or his property;

(b) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this act, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such insurance, until such time as any such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(c) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, or rent, or sell for cash or credit upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of insurance granted under this act;

(d) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against mortgagors assigned by mortgagees to the Administrator in connection with real property by way of deficiency or otherwise. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of such property if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act may be exercised by the Administrator or by an officer or agent appointed by him without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney, in his discretion, to any officer or agent he may appoint;

(e) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary

or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in this title.

Title II. Miscellaneous provisions; delegation of authority

SEC. 201. The functions of the Administrator under this act shall be performed by him or, subject to his discretion and control, by such officers, agencies, or corporations of the Government, if any, which are under his supervision, as he may designate.

Coordination With Economic and Fiscal Policies

SEC. 202. The President may, at any time or times, reduce, for such periods as he shall specify, the maximum authorized principal amounts, maximum maturities, or maximum percentage of Federal insurance or participation of any type or types of loans for business which thereafter may be made, insured, or guaranteed by any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch, or by any wholly owned Government corporation as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act, upon a determination, after taking into consideration the effect thereof upon general economic conditions and upon the national economy, that such action is necessary or desirable to coordinate the business-aid functions and activities of the Federal Government with its general economic and fiscal policies.

Right To Amend This Act

SEC. 203. In connection with administering this act, the Administrator shall establish such classifications of small-business enterprises, for eligibility for loans with respect to which insurance under this act may be granted, as he deems appropriate. Such classifications may relate to types of business and industry groupings eligible and also as to the eligibility of borrowers to be regarded as small business. For the latter purpose, a small-business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation.

Authority To Promulgate and Waive Regulations

SEC. 204. (a) The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the authority vested in him by or pursuant to this act. Any such rule or regulation issued under this act may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the Administrator are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to waive compliance with any such rules and regulations if, in his judgment, they have been substantially complied with in good faith and where in his opinion such waiver would not be in derogation of the interest of the Government.

Administrative Provisions

SEC. 205. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(a) prepare and disseminate information concerning the activities undertaken under this act; and

(b) enter into contracts.

Reports

SEC. 206. The Administrator shall report annually to the Congress through the President on the programs authorized by this act.

Penalties

SEC. 207. (a) Title 18, United States Code, section 493, is amended by inserting the phrase "Small Business Administration," after the phrase "Federal Housing Administration."

(b) Title 18, United States Code, section 657, is amended by inserting the phrase "Small Business Administration," after the phrase "Federal Housing Administration."

(c) Title 18, United States Code, section 1006, is amended by inserting the phrase "Small Business Administration," after the phrase "Federal Housing Administration."

(d) Title 18, United States Code, section 1010, is amended by inserting the phrase "or Small Business Administration," after the phrase "Federal Housing Administration."

(e) Title 18, United States Code, section 1014, is amended by inserting the phrase "The Small Business Administration," after the words "National farm loan association."

Geographic Applicability

SEC. 208. The authority provided in this act shall be applicable in the United States, including the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions.

Right To Amend This Act

SEC. 209. The right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The summaries presented by Mr. SPARKMAN are as follows:

SUMMARY OF A BILL ENTITLED "NATIONAL INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1957"

GENERAL SUMMARY

The purpose of this bill is to meet the capital needs of small business by the establishment of private investment companies which would lend and invest money to small business enterprises.

Such investment companies may be formed by five or more persons subject to approval of the articles of incorporation by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (hereafter referred to as the Board). Federal Reserve banks may also form investment companies.

No investment company may transact business until it has obtained approval from the Board and until such company has a paid-in capital and surplus of at least $5 million. Federal Reserve banks cannot invest more than 2 percent of the combined capital and surplus of its member banks or $5 million, whichever is greater. Member banks of the Federal Reserve cannot invest more than 2 percent of their capital and surplus. Stockholders other than Federal Reserve banks cannot hold more than 10 percent of the outstanding shares in an investment company without the approval of the Board. The Board may limit the aggregate amount of shares in an investment company or companies owned by any stockholder. Federal Reserve banks are required to sell shares which they hold in an investment company upon the demand of any eligible purchaser—such sale is subject to the Board's approval.

Investment companies are authorized to borrow money, but not in excess of the amount of their capital stock and surplus.

Such companies may make loans with or without security and also invest in securities offered by eligible small business firms. Without the Board's approval, no investment company may lend and invest in one enterprise more than $1 million plus one-third of such company's combined capital and surplus and maximum indebtedness.

The Board shall set forth standards to determine what enterprises are to be considered as small business for the purposes of this act.

Because of the risks involved in such undertaking, investment companies established under this act are given certain tax advantages not available to ordinary corporations. Such investment companies are exempt from the payment of taxes on dividends distributed to their stockholders. They are allowed to retain and accumulate a substantial fund of earnings designated in the act as a "national investment company reserve" not to exceed 50 percent of a company's invested capital or its accumulated earning and profits, whichever is less. Deposits in the reserve up to 20 percent of the company's invested capital are treated as a tax deduction. Further amounts in the reserve qualify for the dividends-received tax credit of 85 percent, provided the company actually has dividend income from domestic corporations equal to the amount so deposited.

Section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, which permits Federal Reserve banks to make business loans, is repealed effective one year after passage of this act.

ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL INVESTMENT COMPANIES

National investment companies may be formed by five or more persons who shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation of such company. "Persons" as here used means banks, financial institutions, corporations, partnerships, and individuals. In the case of a Federal Reserve bank investing in such a company, such bank alone shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation.

The articles of incorporation and amendments thereto are subject to the review of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (hereinafter referred to as the Board) which shall upon approval issue a permit for such company to begin business.

Each investment company shall have a board of nine members elected annually by the stockholders of the company.

CAPITAL STOCK PROVISIONS

Each investment company organized under this act must have a paid-in capital and surplus of at least $5 million before it may commence business. Federal Reserve banks are authorized to invest in the shares of stock of such companies, but no Federal Reserve bank can invest more than 2 percent of the combined capital and surplus of its member banks or $5 million, whichever is greater.

The shares of stock in national investment companies may be purchased by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, nonmember banks, financial institutions, corporations, partnerships, or individuals. Member banks are limited to holding an amount of shares in such companies not in in excess of 2 percent of their capital and surplus.

The Board may limit the total amount of shares of stock owned by any stockholder, and no stockholder without the Board's approval may own or control more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of stock of any one company.

Upon demand of any eligible purchaser a Federal Reserve bank is required to sell its shares of stock, subject to the Board's approval which shall include the purchase price.

BORROWING POWER

National investment companies are authorized to borrow money and to issue obligations, but not in excess of the amount of their capital stock and surplus.

AUTHORITY OF NATIONAL INVESTMENT COMPANIES

National investment companies are authorized to make secured and unsecured loans and to invest in the securities of small business enterprises. Without the Board's approval, an investment company cannot lend and invest in any one enterprise more than $1 million plus one-third of such company's combined capital, surplus and maximum indebtedness.

ELIGIBLE ENTERPRISES

The Board is authorized to establish standards to determine the eligibility of business enterprises under this legislation. In the establishment of such standards the Board

is to consider the policy of the Congress under this act, i. e., "to foster the development and growth of independent small business enterprises" and "to make capital for such enterprises more readily available."

TAX PROVISIONS

National investment companies are not required to pay a tax on that portion of net income distributed to stockholders. Such companies may also establish and maintain a reserve fund on which certain tax credits and deductions shall be allowed. The amount of the reserve cannot exceed 50 percent of the invested capital of an investment company, i. e., the paid-in capital and indebtedness of such company, or the accumulated earnings and profits of such company, whichever is less. That part of the reserve fund not in excess of 20 percent of the company's invested capital may be deducted from taxable income. Of the remaining amount in the fund the dividends-received credit of 85 percent is allowed on dividends actually received from domestic corporations.

REPEAL OF SECTION 13B OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, which authorizes Federal Reserve banks to lend money to business enterprises, is repealed effective 1 year after enactment of this legislation. The funds which the Secretary of the Treasury has paid to Federal Reserve banks under section 13b are to be repaid to the Treasury.

SUMMARY OF A BILL ENTITLED THE "SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT ACT OF 1957," TO INSURE LOANS MADE BY APPROVED LENDERS TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

GENERAL SUMMARY

The purpose of this bill is to make more credit available to small business by insuring private financial institutions against loss resulting from loans made to small business enterprises.

The Small Business Administrator is authorized to administer this insurance program. The Administrator of SBA determines those private lending institutions eligible for insurance coverage and he also determines what borrowers are considered in the category of small business for purposes of this legislation.

Insured loans to any one borrower cannot exceed $250,000 outstanding and maturity cannot be more than 5 years, 32 days. The amount of the insurance premium paid by borrowers is set by the SBA Administrator, but it cannot exceed 1½ percent a year. In the case of losses suffered by lenders on insured loans, such lenders are reimbursed 90 percent of the unpaid balance, including accrued interest, but in no case more than the insurance reserve of the insured lender which is 10 percent of the total amount of loans on which such lender has paid premiums.

Insurance premiums received by the Administrator of SBA are deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. This fund is to be used to defray the costs of the insurance program and to pay claims on unpaid insured loans.

AUTHORITY OF SBA ADMINISTRATOR

The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to insure lenders against loss resulting from loans made to small business enterprises.

The Administrator shall determine those lenders eligible for such insurance. He also shall establish classifications of small business enterprises eligible for insured loans. For purposes of this act a small business concern is deemed to be "one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation."

LOAN LIMITATIONS

No one borrower can be insured for an outstanding amount of loans in excess of $250,000 or for any loan whose maturity exceeds 5 years, 32 days.

The SBA Administrator is authorized to prescribe other "terms and conditions" which must be met in order for loans to be considered as qualified insured loans under this act.

The aggregate amount of loans insured under this act cannot exceed $250 million outstanding, but the President is authorized to increase this limitation to $750 million 1 year after the act's enactment.

PREMIUM CHARGE

Borrowers are charged a premium for insurance granted under this act which is to be determined by the SBA Administrator, but it is not to exceed 1½ percent per year. Such premium charges are to be deposited by the Administrator in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. This fund is to be used to defray operating expenses of this program and for payment of insurance claims.

Ten million dollars is appropriated for the establishment of this fund.

SCOPE OF INSURANCE

Reimbursement of losses by approved lenders on insured loans cannot exceed 90 percent of the unpaid balance due, including accrued interest at the time of default. In no case can such reimbursement exceed the insurance reserve of the insured lender. The insurance reserve of each lender is computed as 10 percent of the total amount of loans on which insurance has been paid; the reserve is reduced by the amount paid out in claims to such insured lender.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, while I take pleasure in introducing these two measures in an attempt to alleviate the effects of a credit scarcity to the independent, small concern, I do not claim pride of authorship. I welcome the support and constructive suggestions of other Members of the Senate. I shall want to consult at length with experts within the executive branch and in private life. I realize, therefore, that it may be desirable to make certain procedural changes and improvements in these bills. For example, it may be necessary to spell out in more detail the responsibility of governmental agencies and it may prove desirable to add something concerning the relationship of the national investment companies to the State-chartered development corporations already inaugurated. In recognition of the dire need of small business for adequate sources of credit I offer these two bills. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues and I welcome their support to assure the passage of these measures in this session of Congress.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday of last week, I spoke here of the critical problems confronting small-business men as a result of glaring inequities in the tax laws. At that time, I also introduced five bills designed to provide appropriate tax relief for the small entrepreneur. Such long-needed legislation, I am confident, will receive the firm support of the Senate in this first session of the 85th Congress.

In the area of antitrust, the legislative needs of small business are equally pressing. These needs have long been known. Now, they must be fully met—promptly and decisively. To delay in this regard may well mean the irreplaceable loss of a substantial portion of the small-business community. Concerted action must begin at once to restore and maintain unrestricted competitive opportunity, the essential condition to the preservation of small business.

Lest my words be thought alarmist, I ask the Senate to consider the unmistakable trend toward monopoly that has been developing within recent years in our Nation's industry. I refer, of course, to the high concentration of economic power that is implicit in the almost unprecedented merger activity of the last four years. In 1952, a total of 823 corporate mergers were consummated; in 1953, 793; in 1954, 617; in 1955, 846, and for 1956, a preliminary estimate by the Federal Trade Commission discloses that over 900 mergers took place. Reasonable observers can agree that, should this merger tide continue unchecked, the source of our Nation's vitality and prosperity—the competitive character of its economy—is certain to disappear with disastrous consequences, not only to small business, but to all Americans.

Mergers in the banking field are also a cause for serious concern to small business. In 1956, at least 185 banking mergers took place, according to an initial report from the Federal Reserve Board. Although the 1956 total does reflect a decrease from the number recorded for 1955, the fact cannot be avoided that last year witnessed the disappearance, as separate entities, of some of the Nation's largest banks. The knowledge that economic concentration is proceeding at such a lively pace is extremely disturbing to the thousands of small-business men beset by formidable credit and financing problems.

Let it be clearly understood that I do not intend to see the small-business community oppressed and its ranks depleted by the economic concentration that is being produced by currently rampant merger activity. The fact cannot be ignored that empires are being ambitiously built and enlarged at the expense of small business. On the contrary, I am determined that all necessary steps shall be taken toward drastically reducing current merger activity.

To this important end, I am today introducing a bill amending the basic antitrust law, section 7 of the Clayton Act. Although the bill is similar in scope and purpose to proposed antimerger legislation which I introduced in the last Congress, and on which I testified before the Judiciary Committee of both Houses, it should be mentioned that the bill includes many perfecting features not to be found in the earlier measures. Both Representative CELLER and I are convinced that this proposed legislation is sound, constructive, and fully adequate to the crucial task of stemming the rising tide of mergers.

Briefly stated, the bill is designed to improve enforcement of section 7 of the

Clayton Act by eliminating such loopholes as now make possible the evasion and frustration of the statute's prohibitions. I shall now briefly explain the four main provisions of the bill:

First, the bill proposes to make section 7 applicable to bank mergers which may substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly, whether such merger is effected by asset or by stock acquisition. At present, a monopolistic bank merger comes within the scope of section 7 only where it has been accomplished by means of a stock transfer. Such an anomaly is manifestly absurd. Neither in logic nor as a matter of practical experience can the competitive consequences of a bank merger be distinguished by whether an acquisition of stock or of assets is involved.

The early enactment of this amendment to section 7 will be an important move forward in the offensive that must soon be launched against increasing economic concentration in our Nation's banks and banking associations. The Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Justice must be enabled to proceed aggressively against all monopolistic bank mergers without regard to whether the acquisition was by transfer of assets or of stock.

Second, the bill is designed to afford the antitrust agencies and the appropriate Government board a reasonable period of time in which to study the competitive implications of a proposed merger before having to decide whether or not to prevent its consummation. More specifically, the bill provides that the consummation of a merger between corporations having a combined capital structure in excess of $10 million is prohibited for 60 days after the merging parties have given notice of their plans to the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate board. In addition, such merger-planning parties are required to submit to the antitrust agencies and board certain relevant information concerning their companies and the markets in which they operate. A penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000 may be imposed for willful failure to comply with the requirements of giving notice and submitting relevant data.

Expressly exempted from the notification and waiting provisions of the bill are 10 enumerated categories of corporate transactions. The transactions so exempted include those which are not essentially mergers and those which would be insignificant in competitive effect. Another means of minimizing the possibility of hardship resulting from the notification and waiting requirements is the availability of waiver procedures under certain circumstances. Such procedures are to be established by the Federal Trade Commission or the appropriate board, with the approval of the Attorney General, for use in cases where notification and a waiting period are deemed unnecessary to effect enforcement of section 7.

It should also be pointed out that failure of the antitrust agencies or other appropriate board to take legal action against a proposed merger during the 60-day period following notification does not preclude the taking of such legal action at some later date. Nor is the amendment to be construed as an arrangement for advance agency approval of mergers.

Third, the bill authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining consummation of a corporate merger pending final Commission action. The Department of Justice now possesses similar premerger injunctive powers under section 15 of the Clayton Act. However, existing law does not empower the Commission to seek a court order preserving the status quo until such time as the Commission's administrative proceedings against the merging corporations are completed. This amendment will materially assist the Federal Trade Commission in realizing its full potential in the drive against anticompetitive mergers.

Fourth, the bill amends section 7 of the Clayton Act so as to make the statute applicable to monopolistic mergers where either the acquiring or the acquired corporation is engaged in interstate commerce. At present, the antimerger law is applicable only where the acquired corporation is engaged in commerce. Thus, in cases where the acquired corporation is engaged exclusively in interstate commerce, the enforcement agencies lack jurisdiction to act under section 7, no matter how seriously anticompetitive the effects of the merger may be.

By enlarging the purview of section 7 in this manner, Congress will be accomplishing more than providing an effective means for attacking anticompetitive acquisitions of intrastate corporations. It will also be making unnecessary a painstaking search for evidence of interstate transactions in the usual case where a large corporation clearly engaged in commerce has acquired a number of small companies.

Another bill which I am introducing today will enable the Federal Trade Commission to achieve speedy, effective compliance with cease and desist orders issued under the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman amendment. This measure is extremely important to the interest of small business, so frequently the victims of antitrust violations.

Furthermore, the bill protects merging companies from improper disclosure of information submitted pursuant to the notification requirement by making such disclosure a misdemeanor.

This bill strengthens the enforcement provisions of the Clayton Act in two important respects. First, the act's enforcement procedures are brought into line with those being used by the Commission to enforce orders issued under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Second, violation of Clayton Act orders is made subject to the same civil penalties now applicable to violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act orders.

As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, my attention has frequently been directed to the ineffectual manner in which the Federal Trade Commission has moved to enforce orders requiring respondents to cease and desist from violations of the Clayton Act. Study of many of these cases has convinced me that, even where the Commission has the will to enforce, action toward compliance is seriously impaired by the cumbersome procedures which must be followed and by the lack of teeth in such procedures. These procedural defects become readily apparent when the enforcement system of the Clayton Act is contrasted with that available under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

An order issued pursuant to Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act becomes final and conclusive 60 days after its issuance, unless the respondent seeks review by a United States Court of Appeals. When court review is sought, the order becomes final upon the court's affirmance of the order. Once such an order has become final, either through lapse of time or court affirmance, its violation, for each and every day, is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000.

On the other hand, Commission orders issued pursuant to the Clayton Act do not become final by a lapse of time. Nor is violation of a Clayton Act order subject to penalty until it has been adopted as a court order. Accordingly, in a case where a Clayton Act order is being flouted by the respondent, the Commission may informally attempt to obtain voluntary compliance. That course failing, the Commission is obliged to proceed to a United States Court of Appeals to prove that its order is being violated. But the court, instead of satisfying itself with proof that the order is being violated, may decide to undertake what amounts to a de novo consideration of the antitrust issued in the case. Then, the court may issue a formal decree adopting the Commission's order as its own. Even at that point, however, court enforcement of the order does not commence forthwith. Rather, enforcement requires that contempt proceedings be instituted for violation of the decree of the court. Then, should the respondent be found guilty of contempt, the court may impose an appropriate fine. All in all, the enforcement procedures applicable to Clayton Act orders are awkward, slow, and hopelessly complicated, and without meaningful sanctions.

In this light, it is readily understandable why contempt proceedings to enforce a Clayton Act order have been successful only twice since 1940. Bearing in mind that Commission orders issued pursuant to the Clayton Act and its Robinson-Patman amendment are intended to remedy such grievous antitrust wrongs as monopolistic mergers, exclusive dealing arrangements, and predatory pricing practices, such an enforcement situation is intolerable. Efforts to obtain full compliance with Clayton Act orders ought not to be hampered by legalistic difficulties. Rather, such efforts must be encouraged by the availability of streamlined enforcement procedures, suitably adapted to the important ends being sought. The guiding consideration should be that delayed justice in antitrust matters can only mean no justice at all to the small-business men who are so often the targets of the prohibited practices.

Another piece of proposed legislation which I consider extremely important to the well-being of the small-business community is the Equality of Opportunity bill. That measure, it will be recalled, makes the good faith defense unavailable to a seller charged with a price discrimination that may substantially lessen competition or which tends toward monopoly.

On Monday, I joined the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] again as a cosponsor of the Equality of Opportunity bill. The Senate may be assured that I intend to work as vigorously in this session for the enactment of the measure as I did in the last Congress. There must be no further delay in affording the small-business community maximum protection from the competitive evils of discriminatory pricing practices.

In this statement, it has been my pleasure to review the legislative needs of small business in the area of antitrust. I am confident that these needs will be met by my Senate colleagues in full and with dispatch.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 722) to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. THYE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIAL USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which can best be described as a bill to find ways and means of using farm products in industry and to find new markets for farm products.

I am introducing the bill on behalf of myself and many other Senators. I ask that the text of the bill be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 724) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATIONS AND FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the development of new and additional industrial uses for agricultural products:

(a) Current productivity of farms in the United States is substantially in excess of current markets for their products at price levels which provide fair and substantial income to farmers.

(b) National defense and the security interests of the United States require increasing and expanding agricultural productivity to meet possible emergency needs of the United States and its allies, which productivity cannot be achieved or maintained at depressed farm prices resulting from overproduction or with acreage curtailments to avoid overproduction.

(c) It is in the national interest of the United States to increase the level of farm income in order that farmers may continue to share to a greater degree in the general prosperity of the Nation.

(d) No program has been developed, and none can be foreseen, that can successfully shrink farm production for an extended period of time; but research programs provide known means potentially to increase substantially the industrial uses of agricultural products and thereby to achieve farm prosperity based on full, rather than curtailed, production.

(e) Research facilities, both private and public, including those of land-grant colleges and universities, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on the development of increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products to enlarge opportunities for increased production by farmers and to reduce Government costs for the acquisition, storage, and ultimate disposition of agricultural commodities which are now a substantial financial burden to the Government.

(f) The cost to the United States of such a research program may be expected to be more than offset by increased tax revenues resulting from increased earnings of both farmers and those who sell goods, wares, and merchandise to farmers, as well as by savings to the United States in costs of current agricultural assistance programs.

PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The purposes of this act are to find and develop through research, sponsored and financed by the United States, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products.

ADMINISTRATION CREATED

SEC. 3. There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administration), in which is vested the duties, powers, and responsibilities hereafter set out in this act. Such powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve during the pleasure of the President. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

DUTIES, POWERS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. The Administration shall conduct research, both scientific and chemical, make field studies, conduct both laboratory and field experiments, test production procedures on a commercial basis, maintain and expand pilot plants whenever necessary, maintain and operate manufacturing facilities where necessary to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and otherwise promote the finding, development, and commercial use of new, increased, extended, and perfected processes, techniques, and programs for industrial uses of greater quantities of agricultural products.

POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 5. The Administration is authorized to:

(a) Utilize such existing facilities of the United States, and such trained personnel employed by the United States, as the President finds can feasibly be transferred to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act. The President is hereby authorized to (1) transfer any such facility, facilities, or personnel to the Administration, or to (2) make any such facility, facilities, or personnel available to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) Build, purchase, or lease plant facilities, or necessary equipment, suitable for research, pilot plant, manufacturing or other needs of the Administration in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(c) Employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and all technical or scientific employees engaged for research by the Administration shall be exempt from the civil service laws and regulations.

(d) Employ or retain on a contract basis individuals, firms, institutions, and organizations, public and private, including land-grant colleges and universities, to conduct research programs for the Administration pursuant to this act.

SEC. 6. The Administration is authorized to pay incentive awards to private citizens for suitable and acceptable suggestions to implement the program established by this act, such payments to be made in accordance with previously published rules stating the amounts of, criteria for determining, and subjects of, such awards.

SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized to appoint Industry Advisory Committees and to employ consultants without compensation or at rates of compensation not to exceed $50 per diem.

SEC. 8. The Administration may make grants to accredited schools, colleges, and universities for fellowships and scholarships in research for the purposes of this act.

INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AGENCY CREATED

SEC. 9. There is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture an Industrial Agricultural Products Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency"). The duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the Agency shall be carried out by and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AGENCY

SEC. 10. Under the delegations, directives, and policy determinations of the Administrator, the Agency shall carry out all of the duties, obligations, and responsibilities imposed upon the Administration by this act, including the making of research contracts, employment of personnel, contracts for the construction, purchase, lease, or other acquisition of real or personal property, and the maintenance of all records, files, studies and other data undertaken pursuant to this act. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Administrator may delegate any power given him hereunder to the Agency, and he may control, supervise, and direct all Agency action permitted by law under this act.

SEC. 11. The Administrator shall report semiannually to the Congress progress on research programs undertaken pursuant to this act to find and develop new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products.

SEC. 12. The Agency may license, at a fair and reasonable royalty, any person, firm, or corporation to use any process developed by the Agency or to make and sell under any patent, or application for patent of the Agency. Such royalties shall be based upon fair compensation to the Government for its investment and shall be nondiscriminatory. Whenever the Administrator finds it in the public interest to do so, he may grant royalty-free licenses for processes developed under this act, including the right to make and sell under any patent or application for patent of the Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, for the Industrial Agricultural Products Agency, the sum of $100 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the same amount annually thereafter. There shall be paid out of such appropriations the salary of the Administrator as well as all other expenses of his office. The President is authorized to transfer to the Agency $1 million out of unexpended Agricultural Department funds to initiate promptly this program following the enactment of this act for and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until next Monday, so that other Senators may join with me in the introduction of the bill. Already some 30 Senators have placed their names on the bill as cosponsors. However, there are a number of other Senators, not present today, who cosponsored exactly the same bill last year, and I know that they wish their names to be placed on the bill as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of a speech I made on the same subject and on this same bill on June 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS, SCIENTISTS, ECONOMISTS, EDITORS, AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL HEADS APPROVE SENATOR CAPEHART'S FARM RESEARCH PROPOSAL AS BEST APPROACH TO PERMANENTLY SOUND AND PROSPEROUS FARM ECONOMY—ALL AGREE MORE MONEY SHOULD BE EXPENDED FOR INDUSTRIAL USE RESEARCH TO ASSURE PERMANENT AND EXPANDING MARKET, ABSORB INCREASED PRODUCTION, RAISE FARM PRICES

(Speech of Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, June 14, 1956)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes with reference to Senate bill 3503, to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products, so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

I, together with some 30 other Senators, introduced that bill on March 21 of this year. The purpose of the bill is to find, by research, new uses and markets for farm products. Many persons have referred to the bill as a research bill. It asks for $100 million to carry out its provisions.

Not many days ago Congress passed a new farm bill. The administration at this moment is putting that bill into effect. One of its purposes is to place in operation the so-called soil bank under which American farmers are asked to reduce their production, to reduce the number of acres they plant of many different grains and other products, including cotton. The purpose of that bill was to accomplish two things. One was to get rid of existing surpluses which have been breaking the backs of American farmers and likewise the backs of the American taxpayers. The other was to increase farm prices.

My best judgment is that the bill will accomplish both objectives. However, that sort of situation, in which the farmers are asked to reduce their production and the American taxpayers are asked to contribute to the income of the American farmer, is certainly not a satisfactory one over a long period of time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I heartily endorse the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I am convinced that he deserves and will receive the lasting gratitude of the farmers of Indiana and of every other agricultural State. He is putting his finger on the need for additional markets for our farm products over the long pull.

At the present time there is an agricultural surplus of only 5 percent. However, because of the great strides made in agricultural production, it is estimated that in a few years, notwithstanding the increase in population, our agricultural surpluses will represent 10 percent of our needs for food and fiber. Therefore, the salvation of the agricultural economy rests on getting new customers.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a businessman, I know of only two ways to increase business. One is to sell more goods to existing customers, and the other is to find new customers. We are selling all we possibly can to existing customers. So we must find new uses and new customers if we are going to solve permanently the farm problem.

Let me point out, if I may, what has happened during the past 50 years in the United States. I am not complaining about it. I am happy that it has occurred. But in the United States during the past 50 years, particularly—much longer than that, but we have been amplifying it during the past 50 years—as a government and as a people we have been spending millions and millions of dollars to show the farmer how to produce more and more. There is a county agent in every county in the land. There are 4–H Clubs. There are great agricultural schools. The Department of Agriculture has spent a great deal of money. Private industry has spent a great deal of money in developing new seeds and new fertilizers. By spending millions of dollars in research ways and means of killing weeds have been found, so that the farmer can grow more. Billions of dollars have been spent. Billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money have been spent in bringing into cultivation in the West, through irrigation, many acres which previously did not produce anything. The States of Arizona and California produce, I believe, or, at least, can produce, more cotton today than the original 11 cottongrowing States produce. Most of it is at the taxpayers' expense in connection with providing water to irrigate the land.

So, Mr. President, we have been spending billions upon billions of dollars to increase the farmers' production, but we have forgotten to whom the farmers would sell this increased production. So, the result is that the production is far up and the market is below the production.

What I wish to see Congress do is to spend as much time and as much money in the next few years in finding new uses for farm products and new markets for farm products as we have been spending in showing the farmers how to produce more.

In other words, Mr. President, we must do either one of two things in the United States. We must either reduce farm production or we must provide markets which will utilize the farmers' production, and then increase evenly both the farmers' production and the market.

To me, that is the only sensible way to do it. It is the only practical and sound way to do it. It simply must be done. To do otherwise will wreck the economy of America, and ruin the farmers by reducing their income.

If that should happen the income of every American would be reduced.

Mr. President, to me it is unthinkable that we should not do what I am advocating. The bill is before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Knowing of the interest which the able chairman of that committee [Mr. ELLENDER] has in agriculture, and the interest of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CLEMENTS], my hope is that the committee will report the bill promptly, and that it will be passed at this session of the Congress. I cannot help feeling that the committee will do so. Thus far, the committee has not announced any hearings. I am forced to say that if hearings are not held, the committee will have to accept the responsibility, in my opinion, for the failure to take the necessary action to cure the farm problem permanently. But I do not believe the committee will fail to take action. I think hearings will be held, and a bill will be reported, because millions of farmers are looking to the committee to take action.

Let me cite an example of what I meant when I said a moment ago that the Government has spent millions upon millions of dollars to show the farmer how to grow more and more, but that very little has been spent to find new uses and new markets for farm products. I hold in my hand a table covering the 12 years from 1946 through 1957, and including the appropriation which was recently made for the fiscal year 1957.

I find that expenditures for agricultural research for State experimental stations from non-Federal funds, primarily State funds, during the 12 years amounted to $592,050,000. Almost $600 million have been spent, not to find new uses or new markets for farm products, but to show the farmer how to grow more and more and more.

Payments to State agricultural experiment stations from Federal grant funds during the 12-year period have amounted to $172,936,000. Again, that money was spent not to find new markets or new uses for farm products, but to show the farmers how to grow more and more.

For production research in the Agricultural Research Service, the amount spent in 12 years has been $276,320,000. In this instance, again, the money was not used to find new markets or new uses for farm products, but simply for research in agricultural marketing. The Government has simply been inviting farmers—and I am not quarreling with this—to grow more and more.

For marketing research in the Agricultural Marketing Service, $57,486,000 has been spent during the period 1946 through 1957. This agency is another branch of the Department of Agriculture.

The total amount spent for these items during the 12-year period amounted to $1,098,792,000—almost $1,100,000,000. I am not quarreling about that at all. I am glad the money was spent. I think it was a worthwhile expenditure.

But during the same 12-year period, what was the amount which was spent to find new uses and new markets for farm products? From 1946 through 1957, including the appropriation for fiscal 1957, $88 million, or 8 percent of what was spent to show the farmer how to grow more and to advise him what was going on, was spent to find new uses and new markets for farm products. The $88 million was spent primarily in the four regional research laboratories which were established under the laws of 1938 and 1946.

I shall state the amount of money which was spent each year. In 1946, it was $5,117,000; in 1947, $5,766,000; in 1948, $7,675,600; in 1949, $8,053,600; in 1950, $8,686,400; in 1951, $8,122,400; in 1952, $8,002,400; in 1953, $7,713,000; in 1954, $7,956,000; in 1955, $9,047,000; in 1956, $9,575,000; and in 1957 it will be $12,488,500; a total of $88,202,900 in 12 years to find new uses and new markets for farm products. Contrast the $88 million

spent for that purpose with the more than $1 billion spent to show the farmer how to grow more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this table, which was furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of moneys appropriated for utilization research to production and marketing research

Year	Expenditure for agricultural research for State experimental stations from non-Federal funds primarily State funds	Payment to State agricultural experiment stations, Federal grant funds	Production research, Agricultural Marketing Service	Marketing research, Agricultural Marketing Service	Total per year	Utilization research Agricultural Marketing Service (research conducted by 4 regional laboratories)
1946	[1]	$7,206,000	$14,880,000	$2,000,000	$24,086,000	$5,117,000
1947	[1]	7,206,000	17,269,000	2,379,000	26,854,000	5,766,000
1948	$35,350,000	9,677,000	18,464,000	3,068,000	66,559,000	7,675,600
1949	40,305,000	10,718,000	22,285,000	4,845,000	78,153,000	8,053,600
1950	45,205,000	12,694,000	22,723,000	5,247,000	85,869,000	8,686,400
1951	50,972,000	12,712,000	21,860,000	4,712,000	90,256,000	8,122,400
1952	56,884,000	12,676,000	22,240,000	4,342,000	96,142,000	8,002,400
1953	61,971,000	12,676,000	22,804,000	4,680,000	102,131,000	7,713,000
1954	67,205,000	13,705,000	23,600,000	4,745,000	109,255,000	7,956,000
1955	72,158,000	19,408,000	25,640,000	6,104,000	123,310,000	9,047,000
1956	78,000,000	24,754,000	28,567,000	7,164,000	138,485,000	9,575,000
1957	[2] 84,000,000	29,504,000	35,988,000	8,200,000	157,692,000	[3] 12,488,500
Total	592,050,000	172,936,000	276,320,000	57,486,000	1,098,792,000	88,202,900

[1] Figures not available.
[2] Estimated figure for 1957.
[3] Present agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, does it not make sense that not less than $100 million should be appropriated to find new uses for farm products in industry? Does it not make sense that tests should be made of the new uses with which the Department of Agriculture has already been experimenting and has almost perfected in the four laboratories I have just mentioned? Pilot plants ought to be built to test the new uses. Something should be done to find new markets and new uses for the products of the farmer. What are we waiting for?

I dislike to think there is anything political about this matter. I feel certain there is not. So why are we waiting?

Many persons have reminded me of the four laboratories which are now in existence. Yes, there are four laboratories. I said that when I introduced the bill originally on March 21. I named the laboratories at that time. I stated that the laboratories were at present working on 11 new uses for farm products. I said I had been told that if those experiments were successful, and if some pilot plants could be built and some field tests made to determine whether the uses were practical, and means were developed whereby the products could be processed and marketed, the new uses might well consume more than 3 billion bushels of grain a year out of the total of 6,500 million bushels raised in the United States annually.

So I ask again, Mr. President, what are we waiting for?

The year in which the largest appropriation was made to find new uses and new markets for farm products was 1956, when $9,575,000 was provided and spent. In the same year, $300 million was spent to show the farmer how to grow more. To me, that does not make sense. There are in the United States a thousand manufacturing concerns, oil refineries, and mining companies which spend more than $9 million a year on research.

The United States has a great farming industry. The gross income of the 6 million farmers involved is from $36 billion to $38 billion a year. But only some $9 million was spent last year in what is called fundamental research in the finding of new uses and new markets for farm products.

Mr. President, I urge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, especially its chairman, to hold hearings immediately on the bill (S. 3503) and to report the bill. Let us give the four laboratories which are now in existence sufficient money to do the job. Let us provide them with money to build pilot plants in order to prove some of the uses with which they are now experimenting. Let us enable those laboratories to make field tests.

Let us solve the farm problem on a permanent basis. Let us solve it by increasing the income of farmers, rather than decreasing it. If we will increase the farmers' income and put them in a position profitably to grow more and more, we will be increasing the income of every American, because more jobs will be created, and there will be more business for the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The construction business will be increased, because it will be necessary to build new processing plants in order to manufacture the new articles which will be made from farm products.

I observe the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the floor. The citrus industry in his State has had some experience with what can be done by finding new uses for or methods of handling farm products, as was demonstrated by the processing of citrus fruit. The Department of Agriculture developed methods for the quick freezing of citrus juices. This has proved to be very beneficial to the citrus growers of Florida. New industries were developed there because new processing plants were required. So there is no limit to what can be done in the United States if only we can get our people busy at work on the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on this subject prepared for me by the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
"LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
"Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

"RESEARCH, LEGISLATION, AND PROGRAMS RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"PUBLIC LAW 733

"The current research programs relating to the utilization of farm products are operated under the provisions of Public Law 733, approved August 14, 1946, as an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, to provide for a great expansion in research programs with more emphasis on marketing and the utilization of farm products. It was recognized that the marketing and utilization research in the Department of Agriculture and in the State experiment stations should be expanded greatly in relation to production research as a means of dealing with the postwar adjustment problems.

"The Research and Marketing Act of 1946 contains three titles:

"Title I: Amends the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 to provide further research into the basic laws and principles relating to agriculture;

"Title II: May be cited as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; and

"Title III: Provides for the establishment of committees advisory to the Secretary of Agriculture in the furtherance of the research and service work authorized by the act.

"Title I

"In the statement of policy with reference to research, it is declared to be the intent of Congress 'to assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other sections of our economy.' For the attainment of this and other objectives, 'the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research into the laws and principles underlying the basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, including, but not limited to, research relating to the development of new and improved methods of production, marketing, and the utilization of agricultural products at all stages from the producer to the consumer.'

"The more specific directions with reference to utilization research include indications of the intent of Congress that it should contribute to the expansion of outlets for surplus products. In the language of the act, it is provided that the Secretary shall conduct and stimulate research 'relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses and markets for agricultural commodities and byproducts as food or in commerce, manufacturer, or trade, both at home and abroad, with particular reference to those foods and fibers for which our capacity to produce exceeds or may exceed existing economic demand.'

"This is in line with the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for 1938 for the establishment of four regional laboratories for research relating to the utilization of agricultural products. Section 202 of that act provided that the laboratories to be established were to 'develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm commodities and products and the byproducts thereof.' It is provided that 'such research and development shall be devoted primarily to those farm commodities in which there are regular or seasonal surpluses.'

"The Research and Marketing Act of 1946 provides that maximum use shall be made of existing research facilities of the Federal Government and the State experiment stations. It further provides that the research authorized is to be in addition to research provided under previous laws but should be coordinated with that research.

"Appropriations were authorized with schedules increasing from the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1947 through fiscal 1950 or 1951, as follows:

"Section 9 (a) authorizes increased appropriations for research for the State experiment stations beginning with $2,500,000 and increasing to $20 million for fiscal 1951. Section 11 provides that not less than 20 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section shall be used by State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research.

"Section 10 (a) authorizes additional expenditures for further research on utilization and associated problems, beginning with $3 million and increasing to $15 million for

fiscal 1951. This section provides that the research authorized shall be conducted so far as practicable in the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture. However, it provides also that the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with public or private organizations for research supplemental to and coordinated with the research of the laboratories.

"Section 10 (b) provides for cooperative research with the State agricultural experiment stations and other appropriate agencies in fields other than utilization. Additional appropriations were authorized to increase from $1,500,000 to $6 million per annum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

"Following each of the schedules for annual increases in appropriations, additional funds are authorized as Congress may deem necessary.

"Title II

"The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 provides for expansion of the marketing research and service work of the Department of Agriculture and cooperating agencies. The marketing research and service authorized include activities related to utilization, as follows:

" 'SEC. 203 (a). To conduct, assist, and foster research, investigation, and experimentation to determine the best methods of processing, preparation for market, packaging, handling, transporting, storing, distributing, and marketing agricultural products: *Provided*, That the results of such research shall be made available to the public for the purpose of expanding the use of American agricultural products in such manner as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine. * * *

" '(e). To foster and assist in the development of new or expanded markets (domestic and foreign) and new and expanded uses and in the moving of larger quantities of agricultural products through the private marketing system to consumers in the United States and abroad.

" '(f). To conduct and cooperate in consumer education for the more effective utilization and greater consumption of agricultural products.'

"Such activities by the agencies engaged in marketing research and service are essential to the full development and effective use of the results of the utilization research in the laboratories.

"Section 204 (a) authorized appropriations for research and service work in connection with the preparation for market, processing, packaging, handling, storing, transporting, distributing, and marketing of agricultural products. Increasing from $2,500,000 for the first fiscal year to $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. Additional funds are authorized thereafter as the Congress may deem necessary. This section also authorizes the Secretary to make funds available to State departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, agricultural experiment stations, and other appropriate State agencies for cooperative projects in marketing service and in marketing research.

"Title III

"Section 301 provides for a national advisory committee consisting of 11 members, including representatives of producers and their organizations, to make recommendations relative to research and service work and to assist in obtaining the cooperation of producers, farm organizations, industry groups, and Federal and State agencies.

"Section 302 authorizes the Secretary to establish additional appropriate committees, including representatives of producers, industry, Government, and science to assist with reference to specific research and service programs.

"The committees authorized by title III provide channels of communication for keeping the Secretary advised as to the most pressing needs for research and also contribute to maintaining good-will working relations with the trade and industry.

"ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT TO DATE

"The Department of Agriculture proceeded after the passage of the Research and Marketing Act in August 1946, to request appropriations in line with the authorizations and directions of the act. But the schedules of increased appropriations have not been carried through. No additional funds authorized for the first fiscal year ending in 1947 were appropriated. For fiscal 1950 only $19 million was appropriated whereas the authorizations provided for $48 million. The schedule of authorizations for utilization (sec. 10 (a) was to increase to $15 million in fiscal 1951, but the appropriations identifiable for this purpose in 1956 are still short of the authorization for 1951.

"The responsibility for failure to appropriate funds in accordance with the schedules in the legislation to expand research activities is chargeable to both the Congress and the administrative agencies. The administrative agencies have been restrained to some extent by (1) the shortage of available qualified personnel to staff a rapid expansion of research along the several lines provided for in the act; and (2) the pressure for economy or restraint upon increasing Government expenditures. Possibly weaknesses in organization and scarcity of dynamic leadership have been contributory factors. An evaluation of the significance of these factors could be developed through the testimony of witnesses from the Federal and State research agencies at hearings.

"The extent of the responsibility of the Congress for failure to provide the funds scheduled or requested could be checked by a review of the relation of the appropriations to the budget requests for research funds. However, it is probable that the requests by administrators are affected to some extent by known or expected attitudes of members of the Appropriations Committees of Congress."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I likewise ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a study made by the Library of Congress for me, which is headed "Research and the Utilization of Agricultural Products." There are many pages in the study, but I think it ought to be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
"LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
"Washington, D. C., May 9, 1956.

"RESEARCH AND THE UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"1. RESEARCH BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"The United States Government expenditures on research relating to the utilization of agricultural products including forestry, are small in comparison with expenditures on production. The total of the funds available for utilization research by the United States Department of Agriculture in the current fiscal year amounts to only $12,644,000 of a total of $58,614,000 available for research and development. The funds available for marketing research amount to $8 million, and the remainder, $38 million is available for research relating to production.

"The research designed directly for industrial utilization of surplus farm products is really only a small part of the funds available for utilization research. The utilization research programs included in the United States Department of Agriculture to which the funds indicated above are allocated, include research on human nutrition and home economics and the utilization of forest products. The direct obligations for utilization research to develop new and improved products, improving processing, and increasing the use of products are $9 million. A large part of this is utilized on improving feeds, foods, and clothing. Such research is directed toward improving qualities protecting the products in relation to competition of nonfarm products, and satisfying special demands. It is practically impossible to determine a definite allocation of these funds for research designed primarily to increase the industrial use of surplus farm products, but it is evidently only a small proportion of the limited funds available for utilization research.

"The State Experiment Stations and associated agricultural colleges and universities receive a substantial grant of funds from the Federal Government and a larger volume of funds from the State and other non-Federal sources for agricultural research and development, including some research on utilization.

"The Federal Government in the current fiscal year has distributed $24,754,000 to the States and it is estimated that the State research agencies receive about $78 million from other sources. Only a very small proportion, less than $2 million, of the funds distributed by the Federal Government to the States is used for utilization research. The other agencies contributing to research in the States provide about $5 million for utilization research. Adding together all funds available in the current fiscal year for utilization research totals about $20 million, with about $126 million used for production and $16 million used in marketing research. The research directed at extending industrial uses for surplus farm products in the State institutions, as in the agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, is probably only a small part of the total of the funds available for utilization research.

"Agricultural research and development funds available fiscal 1956

Federal and State Government agencies, including agricultural colleges and universities:	
U. S. Department of Agriculture	$58,614,000
States, Federal funds	24,754,000
Non-Federal funds	78,000,000
Total	161,368,000
U. S. Department of Agriculture agencies:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Production	38,257,000
Utilization	12,644,000
Marketing	7,714,000
Total	58,614,000
Agricultural Research Service payments to States:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Marketing	5,603,000
Utilization	1,658,000
Production	17,493,000
Total	24,754,000
Non-Federal funds available to State experiment stations, agricultural college and universities:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Marketing	2,730,000
Utilization	5,460,000
Production	69,810,000
Total	78,000,000

"Type of research, distribution, funds available to Federal and State agencies, 1956

Distribution to types of research:	
Utilization: [1]	
USDA agencies	$12,644,000
State agencies, Federal funds	1,658,000
State agencies, non-Federal funds	5,460,000
	19,762,000
Distribution to types of research:	
Marketing research:	
USDA agencies	7,714,000
Federal funds	5,603,000
Non-Federal funds	2,730,000
	16,047,000
Production research:	
USDA agencies	38,256,000
State agencies, Federal funds	17,493,000
State agencies, non-Federal funds	69,810,000
	125,559,000
	161,368,000

"[1] Includes forestry products, home economics research, and allocations of library and other administrative funds.

"Estimate of non-Federal funds and distribution by type of research supplied by budgetary reports, Agricultural Research Service, USDA.

"The great disparity in the Government in use of agricultural research funds between production and utilization is an historical development. The authorization of Federal research in relation to production developed from the beginnings of research in the United States Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations. Research in relation to marketing and utilization of farm products is a recent development. Recognition of the need for marketing research and services was registered in the establishment of the Office of Markets in the United States Department of Agriculture shortly before the outbreak of the First World War. The recognition of the need of utilization research as a contribution to the disposal of surplus farm products was formally recognized first in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

"Legislative provision for research on new uses and new markets for surplus farm commodities was included in title 2 section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as follows:

"'SEC. 202 (a). The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain 4 regional research laboratories, 1 in each major farm-producing area, and, at such laboratories, to conduct researches into and to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and oulets for farm commodities and products and byproducts thereof. Such research and development shall be devoted primarily to those farm commodities in which there are regular or seasonal surpluses, and their products and byproducts.'

"The Secretary was authorized and directed to cooperate with other departments, agencies, and institutions in carrying out the purposes of this legislation. An appropriation not to exceed $4 million was authorized for the first year. The four regional laboratories have become important research centers.

"However, the financial support for the development of agricultural utilization research has not kept pace with the problems to be dealt with nor with the national expenditures upon research generally. The Federal expenditures on research and development have multiplied many times within the last 15 years. Estimates of expenditures for Federal research and development indicate an increase from less than $100 million in 1940 to over $2 billion in fiscal 1955.[1] The research and development expenditures in the Department of Agriculture increased from about $28 million in 1940 to $72 million in 1955, whereas the expenditures on utilization research, initially authorized at $4 million in 1938, has increased to only $9 million for fiscal 1955.

"While there is no practical measure of funds required to deal with the problems which are dealt with in the field of ultilization research, it is obvious that expenditures are far short of what might be considered as required to deal with such problems.

"Evaluation of the results of utilization research by the United States Department of Agriculture

"The utilization research in the Department of Agriculture has contributed to a significant extent both directly and indirectly to expanding the industrial utilization and to increasing the use value and expanding the use of many farm products. Results of the utilization work of the Department were reviewed recently in an article entitled "More Dollars from New Markets," published in the March 1956 issue of Chemurgic Digest. It is quoted as follows:

"'MORE DOLLARS FROM NEW MARKETS

"'Industrial uses and new foods add millions to farm-product value.

"'The wholesale value of farm products (not including cotton and wool) used annually today for nonfood uses is about $1 billion.

"'Animal fats are used in making plasticizers—substances used to make plastics pliable and tough—at the annual rate of some $15 million pounds worth from $3 to $4 million. Stabilized fats used in feeds amounted to some 280 million pounds in 1955. Research has shown that use of inedible animal fats in the hotdip tinning of sheet steel could absorb 15 million pounds of fat annually and release the industry from dependence on imported palm oil.

"'Research to improve the quality of cotton products has helped raise cotton consumption and enabled cotton to ward off competition from other fibers. Developments by USDA's Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with industry include a cotton opener, which permits better cleaning and blending of raw cotton; a differential dye test, used to preselect cottons that will dye to a uniform shade; and new equipment that permits textile mills to handle cotton of different fiber lengths. The cotton opener alone is saving mills more than $2 million annually.

"'Cottons that are virtually new fibers have been prepared through chemical modification. One of them is partially acetylated cotton, highly resistant to rot, mildew, and heat damage. Another chemical treatment flameproofs cotton fabrics and enable it to keep its flame resistance even after many launderings. Improved surgical bandages, made by chemically treating ordinary cotton gauze to make it stretchable and self-clinging, costs less than half as much as that of other suitable bandages. They have already saved the Armed Forces several million dollars.

"'An important new use developed for corn is a fiber made from the corn protein zein. Zein fiber, used in blends with wool, cotton, and other fibers now has a market value of $5 to $6 million annually.

"'Research developed processes have made the dry grinding of such agricultural residues as corncobs, fruit pits, nut shells, and rice hulls a well established business. Much of the ground material is used for airblast cleaning and polishing. Corncobs are a source of the industrial chemical furfural, used in making nylon and other products. Waste straw is going into paper and paper products. Waste feathers are used for feeds and fertilizers.

"'Research on medicinals by agricultural scientists has been extremely rewarding. USDA investigators helped boost yields of penicillin more than a hundredfold, mainly through development of the submerged-culture method, using corn steep liquor (a byproduct of cornstarch manufacture) and lactose (milk sugar) in the culture medium. From an overripe cantaloup they isolated the mold that is the parent strain of all those now used for penicillin production. Following penicillin, a vast new era of antibiotic research and production was initiated, and a multimillion dollar antibiotics industry has been established.

"'Development of the starchlike substance dextran, a synthetic blood-plasma extender, is of incalculable value in case of a large scale catastrophe. Commercial production is now sufficient to meet military and civilian stockpiling needs.

"'Within the past 20 years, bulk groceries have been almost entirely supplanted by nationally advertised prepackaged goods. The entire retail frozen-food industry has come into being. From only 77 million pounds in 1935. United States production of frozen fruits rose to 523 million pounds in 1954. Frozen fruit-juice concentrates shot up from nothing in 1935 to 82 million gallons in 1954. Production of frozen vegetables starting from practically nothing in 1935, has reached about 1 billion pounds per year.

"'Developments in food processing have given farmers a more assured market for their crops, considerable relief from seasonably glutted markets, and more demand for products that provide better return for invested capital and labor.

"'Frozen concentrated orange juice, used by housewives the country over, returns tens of millions of extra dollars each year to orange growers and has prevented development of a glutted fresh-orange market. Orange juice, once a luxury, is now available to everyone the year round. Frozen concentrated grape juice, pineapple juice, apple juice, tomato juice are also on the market.

"'Research has increased tremendously also the outlet for dairy products. It has shown, for example, that milk solids can be used in practically any type of baked goods, making them taste, look, and keep better, as well as making them more nutritious.

"'Research conducted on dried eggs during the past 20 years has resulted in a high-quality, versatile new product. An expanding industry, now exceeding $50 million annually in volume, has been built on this research. At least 20 million pounds of dried whole egg, yolk, and white are now being used annually in candy and noodle manufacture, in commercial baking, and in prepared mixes.'

"The above statement selects for appraisal some of the most significant results of the utilization research by the Department. In addition, basis research not yet applied has laid the groundwork for tangible results not yet realized, but having great potential value. A substantial increase in funds for application and development probably could multiply the tangible results to farmers from the results of research to date. The fruitfulness of the modest expenditures to date suggest the potential value of expanding greatly the funds available for basic research and development.

[1] Federal Funds for Science, published by the National Science Foundation, 1954.

"2. UTILIZATION RESEARCH BY INDUSTRY

"The expenditures on research in the utilization of agricultural products in industry [2] are probably greater than the expenditures of the Government. Available information is not sufficient to provide a current estimate of the expenditures by industry for research relating to the utilization of farm products, but estimates of such expenditures in 1951 exceeded the total of research expenditures in the United States Department of Agriculture on all research and development in that year. Information from about 300 companies carrying on research relating to agriculture indicated that they were then spending about $90 million on the utilization of agricultural products, including forestry products. In addition, industry in 1951 was spending about $50 million on research relating to farm machinery, agricultural chemicals, feeds, etc., related to production. The total of research expenditures relating to agriculture by industry probably exceeded $140 million whereas the United States Department of Agriculture was spending only about $56 million on all research and development projects in that year.

"The recent survey of the cost of research and development in private industry indicated an expenditure in 1953 of about $3,700,000,000. Preliminary information indicates that more than one-third of the cost of research and development conducted by private industry was for work done on Government contracts. Probably not more than 5 percent of the total, if that much, was spent upon the utilization of agricultural products, including forestry. In this connection, it was estimated that the total expenditures on research by business, Government, and educational institutions probably exceeded $5 billion, with industry accounting for about two-thirds of that total.

"Examples of private industry research re industrial uses of agricultural products [3]

"The Atlas Power Co. is a pioneer in the development of new uses for agricultural products through chemistry and has long recognized the interdependence of industry and agriculture. In the early 1930's chemists of the Atlas Powder Co. developed a new process for turning corn sugar—that is, dextrose—into sugar alcohols. Up to that time, sugars, including corn sugar, had been confined in their uses almost entirely to sweetening substances; since sugar is not sufficiently heat-stable to undergo chemical reaction, it had only limited application to the chemical industry.

"By hydrogenating corn sugar, the company was able to produce heat-stable compounds which have found widespread use as a raw material in many manufacturing processes, both food and nonfood. Today, modern chemical research has made it possible to utilize corn sugar in emulsifiers for the manufacture of cosmetics, foods, medical and pharmaceutical preparations, and insecticides; also in placticizers, in industrial finishes for manufactured products, and in moisture conditioners for tobacco, textiles, paper, and other products.

"Atlas is a substantial user of farm products in virtually all its operations. In most cases farm products are used to make nonfood products. The manufacture of explosives, for example, requires large quantities of glycerin processed from livestock and vegetable oils, corn flour, nitrocotton, cane sugar, beet pulp, oat hulls, and many other products of the land. The company used some 12 million pounds of corn sugar in its manufacturing processes last year and is the Nation's largest user of corn sugar for nonsweetening purposes. More than 8 million pounds of natural fats and oils were required to make emulsifiers; and, in total, the company consumed approximately 40 million pounds of ingredients derived from farm crops.

"The E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., in addition to developing and formulating products for agricultural use, through research, has found uses for many farm products and byproducts. For example, cotton linters (short-staple fiber still adhering to cottonseed after ginning) once preferred for the production of cellulose, which Du Pont uses in very large quantities for manufacture of rayon, cellophane, finishes, explosives, and other products. In recent years, cellulose from woodpulp has been raised in standard by Du Pont scientists until it is of sufficiently high quality to be satisfactory in practically all uses.

"Farm products also enter substantially into manufacture of paints and lacquers by Du Pont. The company's finishes division uses large quantities of vegetable oils such as soya, linseed, and tung oil; butyl alcohol, which is derived from corn; and ethyl alcohol, derived from molasses which in turn is made from sugarcane.

"Ely Lily & Co. for many years has used great quantities of agricultural byproducts in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals such as insulin, liver products, and thyroid extracts. In addition, Lily uses in the making of pharmaceuticals such agricultural products as corn sugar, cane sugar, cornstarch, and oil, potato starch, soya-bean meal and oil, cider and vinegar, orange and lemon oils, beeswax, casein (curd of milk), and milk sugar.

"The Baker Castor Oil Co.'s program of research and development is concerned with vegetable oils unusual to United States agriculture, primarily castor oil, but also safflower oil and others. A spokesman for the company points out that its program is making possible higher incomes to farmers in areas where oil crops can be grown by providing new cash crops to be planted on acres retired from surplus crops, and thus permitting agricultural diversification with accompanying greater financial security.

"Baker's research chemists work constantly to develop new products made from castor beans and thus increase the market demand for castor beans and other unusual oil seeds.

"Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., deals in oil-bearing crops which are converted into oils and protein concentrates. In producing protein concentrates, which it sells to mixed feed companies, the Kellogg Co. maintains its own research laboratories in which scientists evaluate meals, for feed, from a nutritional standpoint.

"An extensive research laboratory is maintained in the company's soybean solvent extraction plant in which Kellogg scientists work continuously to improve soybean oil both for edible and for industrial purposes and thus increase consumption. For example, a method of chemically treating soybean oil to increase its drying properties and make it equal to linseed oil has been developed, and the company says, 'We have a proven record that our product can be used in outside house paints and the results are equal to linseed oil for this work.'

"The National Canners Association has played an important part in the improvement of the United States canning industry's methods and products. In the field of scientific research carried on by trade associations for the benefit of an entire industry, the Canners Association was a pioneer and steadily has broadened the scope of its work in recent years to extend it to the industry's raw products problems.

"The Gerber Products Co. has been concerned with the manufacture of baby foods since 1901. From an humble beginning this company grew into an industry which in 1954 used a tonnage of fresh fruits and vegetables which would required 8,500 railroad cars to move.

"The corn refining industry, comprised of 13 plants, has through the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., an extensive research program with projects handled by many agricultural colleges. The 13 corn-refining plants are capable of grinding 250 carloads of shelled corn daily (120 million bushels per year) and of shipping out a like amount of finished products—starch and oil, and their byproducts which principally are used by the mixed-feed industry for dairy and poultry feeds. As the result of research, practically nothing is wasted; even the steep-water in which the grain soaks before it is processed is an important nutrient for growing yeast and molds which in turn produce the antibiotics, such as penicillin, terramycin, streptomycin, and aureomycin.

"Industry research and development activities related to farm products probably would be stimulated by an expansion of the basic research program of the Government agencies. Cooperation of Government and industry in research and development of new and extended uses for farm products is essential to obtain the most significant results.

"ECONOMICS OF UTILIZATION

"The greatest interest in increasing utilization research arises from the need of finding outlets for surplus production. In working toward this objective it is necessary to give careful consideration to the significance of the results of utilization research in terms of market outlets and the volume of products which may be channeled through the new and expanded outlets.

"A recent article by K. Starr Chester published in the Chemurgic Digest, February 1955, calls attention to the tendency of industry to use substitutes for agricultural raw materials. The article is quoted in part as follows:

" 'There is a growing trend for industry to use substitute raw materials for the agricultural raw materials formerly used. As a few examples of this:

" 'Butanol and acetone, basic industrial chemicals, were formerly made from corn. Today the plants that made these chemicals from corn are idle, and the chemicals are being manufactured from petroleum or natural gas.

" 'Glycerol, another basic industrial chemical, was formerly made from tallow, and to some extent from cottonseed oil and soybean oil. Now synthetic glycerol is dominating the market.

" 'There is an extensive market for proteins in paper coatings. Either soybean protein or casein from milk can be used for this. This market is supplied from casein purchased from Argentina, which is cheaper than either domestic casein or soy protein.

" 'Furfural, which could have a major outlet in nylon manufacture, is made from grain residues, the use of which aids the economics of grain marketing. Yet cyclohexane from petroleum is used to great extent rather than furfural in nylon manufacture.

" 'Synthetic raw materials are replacing linseed oil in the drying-oil field, in numerous applications.

" 'Synthetic textiles are supplanting cotton for a number of uses including tire cords, carpeting, window curtains, and shower curtains as well as clothing.

" 'Alpha cellulose is now being made of woodpulp instead of cotton linters, as formerly.

" 'Synthetic detergents are replacing soaps which are made from natural oils and fats.

[2] Science and Engineering in American Industry, Preliminary Report on a Survey of Research and Development Costs and Personnel in 1953–54, prepared for the National Science Foundation by the U. S. Department of Labor, 1955.

[3] USA—Background, published by the United States Information Agency Rept. No. 2099, dated September 12, 1955.

"'Carboxymethycellulose, which in part has its origin in petroleum, is replacing starch as a thickening agent.

"'The reasons for this shift away from agricultural raw materials are chiefly economic ones, which might be overcome if industry had incentives to use the agricultural raw materials. Synthetic raw materials are used because they are cheaper to buy and use, and are in constant supply at relatively constant cost from year to year. In some cases, they are more uniform and of higher quality, but these advantages generally have less significance than cost and supply.

"'A great many agricultural raw materials are at a disadvantage because their cost is abnormally high; they have priced themselves out of the industrial market. Industry has no prejudice against agricultural raw materials; it simply cannot afford to use them. There is no lack of technology for producing industrial products based on such agricultural raw materials. In the fields of the Department of Agriculture, of industry, and of the Patent Office are many hundreds of processes for converting the surplus farm commodities into industrial products. These processes are scientifically sound, practical, and workable, but they lie gathering dust because their economics are not favorable. There is no economic incentive to use them.'

"Research that does not find an outlet that will increase the demand for the products will not in itself make a significant contribution to the disposal of surpluses except to the extent that it is significant to find outlets at lower value uses as relief measures to reduce losses otherwise being realized. The author cited above recognizes the problem and suggests that the Government provide incentives for the lower value use.

"With reference to economic incentives for the greater use of surpluses, he writes:

"'To ask industry to make greater use of the surpluses, which it is able to do technologically but not economically, is to ask industry to undertake operations that are economically hazardous, yet are in the national interest, and, indeed, are in the nature of an emergency. The precedents for providing industry with economic incentives, in such cases, are well established.

"'It is desirable that a thorough economic and technological study be made of the feasibility of relieving the surplus problem through providing such incentive to industry. This study should point out the industrial processes in which surplus agricultural commodities could be used to greater extent than at present, provided the economics were more favorable, and the extent to which this would relieve the surplus problem. The nature and amount of incentives that could stimulate such utilization must be determined. The cost of these must be calculated, and compared with existing costs related to the surplus problem. The study should consider the impact which such a shift in raw materials would have on other industries, and its economic and social consequences.'

"Improving the processing and the economic utility of an agricultural product resulting in a higher value use, is, of course, more to be desired than a program of incentives to permit or encourage lower value uses.

"The position of cotton in relation to synthetic fibers is a case which illustrates the problem and the possibilities of maintaining and even developing higher value uses. Improvements in the use values of the synthetics and lower costs of production have made serious inroads on the outlets for cotton. The National Cotton Council reports that the synthetics industry is now spending at least $60 million on research annually but the entire research expenditures devoted to cotton by all public and private agencies combined is probably only about $14 million annually. However, the cotton utilization research has demonstrated that the utility of the cotton fibers can be improved and the competitive position of that crop thereby strengthened.

"3. PROGRAMS FOR UTILIZATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"The research and marketing advisory committees of the United States Department of Agriculture with the assistance of members of the staff of the Department, now provide a means of keeping in touch with research needs and the industrial research programs as well as the activities and research plans of the Government agencies and other research institutions. Through the Department and these committees, it would be possible to develop information as to the programs in operation, plans for future work, and obtain evaluation of needed research and funds required for research programs which have the greatest promise of significant results."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand many editorials which have appeared in the great newspapers and magazines of the United States in respect to this matter. I have not found anyone opposed to this idea. I have not found anyone who does not feel the purpose of the bill ought to be accomplished quickly. Many people do not quite understand why we have not heretofore passed such a bill. So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, many editorials and articles from magazines and newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the South Bend Tribune of March 24, 1956]

"CAPEHART'S FARM VISION

"Senator CAPEHART'S suggestion that the Federal Government spend $100 million a year on a program for development of new uses of farm products commands serious consideration in the existing circumstances.

"Already a lot of the taxpayers' money is going into subsidies, in one form or another, which evade the basic issue. At the root of the farm problem is overproduction. Too much is being produced in view of the existing need for farm products.

"For decades this has not been given proper consideration in the much-advertised 'farm relief' laws. A series of evasive farm laws has merely aggravated the situation.

"The Eisenhower administration is trying to create a less dangerous system for service while a program going completely to the root of the problem is being devised and applied. But the administration is literally beseiged now by congressional advocates of measures that would prolong and intensify the basic trouble.

"Perhaps an efficient crop production control system cannot be created. In fact, many authorities say that it is literally impossible.

"So it is eminently sensible to consider ways and means of increasing demand for farm products. Incidentally, the remedies applied so far by the Federal Government, most notably rigid Government supports, have actually reduced demand for some farm products.

"Senator CAPEHART specifically mentions 'industrial use for agricultural products.' The potential demand in that area may be unlimited.

"The Indiana Senator thinks the markets for farm products can be increased 100 percent in the next 50 years. That could mean unprecedented prosperity for farmers.

"This is not wildly fanciful. The surface has been barely scratched where new uses for farm products are concerned."

"[From the Indianapolis Times of March 25, 1956]

"HOOSIER FARM LEADERS BACK CAPEHART'S PLAN—BUREAU, FARMERS UNION CHIEFS ENDORSE UNITED STATES RESEARCH TO INCREASE PRODUCT DEMAND

"(By Ted Knap)

"Leaders of two major farm groups in Indiana yesterday endorsed Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART'S crash program to find new uses for agricultural products.

"The Indiana Republican Senator said his $100-million-a-year research proposal would double the market for farm products. In introducing the measure last week, he said it would help solve the farm problem for all time.

"Instead of concentrating on cutting farm production in line with the reduced demands, which has been Federal policy for more than 20 years, the Capehart plan would concentrate on boosting the demand so farmers can produce all their land will yield.

"He called the plan staggering in impact.

"Hassil Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, said he is very enthusiastically in favor of the Capehart bill.

"'It is one of the soundest investments the Government could make at this time,' he said. 'It would be a major step toward the long-range solution of the farm problem. The job is a big one, and the research program should get an appropriation big enough to carry it out.'

"John Raber, president of the Indiana Farmers Union—often opposed to the Farm Bureau—said his group also favors the Capehart plan.

"Both the Farm Bureau and Farmers Union, at their recent State conventions, approved resolutions calling for more Government-sponsored research into industrial uses for farm products.

"Both Mr. Schenck and Mr. Raber predicted the Capehart bill will pass in this election year when the farmers' plight is of major political concern. Mr. Schenck said some opposition is expected from those interests with which industrialized farm products would compete, like the gasoline industry.

"'Its potential is virtually unlimited,' Senator CAPEHART said. 'I know enough about it that I have been saying to the farmers of Indiana: "Don't sell your farmland. Buy more. The next 50 years on the American farm will see unprecedented prosperity."'

"'Its results,' Senator CAPEHART said, 'would include:

"'More income for the farmer.

"'More jobs—on farms, in new industries, and in transport.

"'More retail business in farm communities and around the new industries.

"'Lower taxes for all because it would wipe out, or at least reduce, the need for Government buying of surplus.'

"Senator CAPEHART pointed out that the $100 million he urges for research is less than one-third of the $365 million Uncle Sam now spends just for storing surplus crops.

"Main points of the Capehart bill are:

"1. It creates an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration, headed by a Presidential appointee.

"2. The IAPA would conduct research and experiments on old and new farm products to explore their usefulness in industry.

"3. It would hire or contract with firms and research organizations, including universities, to conduct such study programs.

"4. It would operate pilot plants to develop manufacturing processes to the point where it will be profitable for private industry to take over.

"5. Pay private citizens for successful suggestions or inventions in this field.

"6. Expand the research and pilot plant programs now being done on a limited basis by the Agriculture Department.

"Senator CAPEHART said there are many possibilities for industrial use of crops, some of which have had preliminary exploration. For example, alcohol made from grain can be substituted for gasoline if cheaper manufacturing methods can be devised.

"There has been considerable interest in a bamboo plant to be used as raw material for making paper pulp, which is in critically short supply.

" 'Some years ago, the citrus-fruit industry was in bad shape,' Senator CAPEHART recalled. 'Then our Agriculture Department, through research, aided in the perfection of the quick-frozen food process. I am told that this virtually saved the citrus-fruit industry.'"

"[From the Hammond (Ind.) News of May 28, 1956]

"NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

"Mixing alcohol with automobile gasoline—a process used successfully in several foreign countries and which has received experimental approval in the United States—may go a long way toward solving the surplus grain problem. An estimated 2½ billion bushels of grain would be used annually in making alcohol for new uses—including 2 billion bushels for mixing with gas and 365 million bushels if alcohol can be produced economically enough to justify its use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

"Study of the alcohol-from-grain possibility is among the proposals of many Senators who are seeking new uses for farm products to bolster the agricultural economy and reduce surpluses. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana has been among the leaders in advocating the establishment of a special agency devoted to exploring new industrial uses for farm products and has introduced legislation to that effect."

"[From the Indianapolis News of March 23, 1956]

"A KEY TO FARM PROSPERITY

"Indiana Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART is to be commended for urging Congress to look beyond temporary farm relief measures toward establishment of a basis for permanent agricultural prosperity.

"We believe that he is on the right track in introducing a bill to set up a broad Government-backed program of research to find new industrial uses for farm products.

"Essentially, as the Senator explains, this is a solution of the farm problem based, not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on a positive approach of creating new markets demanding full utilization of our agricultural capacity.

"Industry in this country already has made great progress in using grain and other crop derivatives in processing rubber, plastics and other materials. But the surface has hardly been scratched.

"Agricultural research, as far as Government programs have been concerned, has been a budgetary orphan. It presently has neither the facilities nor the personnel needed to bring it to the point of a breakthrough toward major accomplishment.

"The $100 million annually to bring this about, as provided in the Capehart measure, is fractional when compared to the savings that could be made in farm subsidies and in Government storage of surpluses.

"Senator CAPEHART believes enactment of such a research program would result in the creation of a farm market at least twice as great as any we have ever known.

"Farmers could follow their natural instinct to get everything possible out of their land. Industry would profit. Doors would be opened to thousands of new jobs with the opening of plants to manufacture new products.

"Our farm economy has been based too long on the notion that farm products are meant only to be eaten.

"Research is disproving that now. But greatly expanded research is needed to bring the marketing of agricultural products for industry on a par with their marketing for grocery counters and feed mills.

"As Senator CAPEHART says, much of the program he proposes should be carried on in existing public and private laboratories, particularly through our land-grant colleges, and through private industry itself.

"The Government's role should be that of coordinator, not operator.

"The main thing is to get the program started as soon as possible. Just that much sooner will farmers be brought into equality with other segments of our economy. And just that much sooner will the taxpayers be taken off the treadmill of paying for year-to-year high-cost farm relief bills.

"When that time comes, we won't have the dismal spectacle of good Indiana corn rotting in storage."

"[From the Indianapolis Star of March 25, 1956]

"TO SEEK A PERMANENT CURE

"Hoosier Senator HOMER CAPEHART has offered to the Senate a farm proposal which may justifiably be called exciting. It is a proposal that Government research in the industrial uses of farm products, long carried out on a limited scale by the Department of Agriculture, be elevated to the status of the major phase of the farm program.

"All of American industrial experience suggests that Senator CAPEHART is merely stating a simple truth in saying that the possibilities of expanding the market for farm goods by this means are limitless.

"Expansion of the farm market is the only kind of measure which can possibly bring permanent solution of the farm problems. The opposite measure—reduction of supply—has been the objective of the present Federal program since its inception during the New Deal. To date all the effort directed at this objective over more than 20 years has not been able to bring even a single season's respite from the problem. If the program ever were successful in shrinking production to the size of the market, there could be no sense of assurance that the market would not then contract further and bring the problem back.

"If on the other hand relief from the problem can be obtained by expanding the market to absorb the existing production, even if production then expanded further, as it undoubtedly would, still there would be every possibility that a continued balance could be maintained by perpetuating the expansive trend of the market, once established.

"We hope Congress will be quick to grasp the potentialities of this proposal.

"We question the proposition that the idea should be implemented by creating a new administrative agency, and a new section in the Department of Agriculture. To be sure this has been the standard method of launching a project in Washington over the past 25 years or so. But it is not necessarily the best method.

"The establishment of new agencies would be dramatic. But it also would be time consuming. Funds and energies for a considerable period at the start of the program would be dissipated in the building of a new segment of bureaucracy. Only when it has firmly laid the groundwork for its own perpetuation and expansion is a new Federal Bureau ready to go to work at the task assigned to it.

"It might be more effective to put the funds and energy into direct expansion of the existing research program of the Department of Agriculture. Surely sufficient emphasis could be achieved in the passage of the act to give the program initial impetus equivalent to that achieved by the psychology of establishing a new agency.

"The basic proposal is a good one. The mechanics are important to the end that energy be applied as soon and as directly as possible to the achievement of the mission, with a minimum of diversion into the fields of new buildings, new plants, and new staffs.

"Senator CAPEHART has hold of something."

"[From the Indiana Farmers Guide]

"MORE USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

"One of the constructive proposals to come out of current debate on the farm problem is the bill introduced by Hoosier Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART to establish a $100 million Government research program 'to double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known.' Although some research along this line has been conducted for a number of years on a limited scale by the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant college experiment stations, this would be an intense, well-financed effort to speed up and expand such research to alleviate the farm crop surplus problem as rapidly as possible.

"Expansion of the farm market is the only real solution to our current crop surplus problems. Natural population growth and concerted efforts to find new markets for our crops as food and fiber will take care of part of the expanding production, but Senator CAPEHART'S proposal is designed to eliminate the slack entirely and to strengthen the American farmer's economic position in a constructive manner.

"We are inclined to disagree with the Senator on one provision of his bill. This would establish a new Industrial Agricultural Products Administration to conduct the program and a new agency within the Department of Agriculture to carry out the work. It might be better if this entire project were made a part of the existing research program of the Department of Agriculture, rather than creating another office.

"We hope Congress will give this program for expanded industrial uses of agricultural products serious consideration."

"[From the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News of May 2, 1956]

"FARM PROBLEM SOLUTION

"Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, has proposed a plan for the solution of the troublesome farm problem which he believes will make an unlimited market for our farm products. His plan: "A tremendous research and development program * * * to develop to the utmost the industrial uses we already know about for farm products * * * and at the same time find new uses creating a demand for at least double what we have considered normal farm production of the United States.'

"Senator CAPEHART has a big farm down near Washington, Ind., and knows something firsthand about the farmer's problems. He would have a sizable appropriation for the rapid and signal increase of research for greater and greater uses of farm products until surpluses will be a thing of the past.

"For many years the Chemurgic Council has been working on this matter of turning farm products into new uses, and considerable progress has been made. CAPEHART believes that there is no limit to the new products we can discover if we devote enough time to the subject.

"The Senator may be right about this, for scientists have done far more wonderful things than this. The time has certainly come to give this idea a thorough trial. If science can solve our critical farm problem, that is without doubt the best and surest way to do it. Politics will never solve it."

"[From the Washington Star of April 6, 1956]

"CAPEHART'S FARM PLAN WORTH LOOK

"A new line of attack on the farm problem, uniformly recognized as the number one headache in the national economy, has been proposed to Congress. It is, in brief, a greatly expanded and intensified research program to find new industrial uses for farm products. Legislation to launch the program, under a full-time administrator, has been introduced by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana.

"The idea of research in agriculture is not, of course, a new one. The Department of Agriculture, through its experimental stations and in cooperation with both public and private agencies, has engaged in research for many years. And Senator CAPEHART proposes that his vastly broader program should be built upon the foundations of this existing activity.

"To a large extent, however, past research has been directed at improving production methods and quality of crops rather than seeking new uses for the products themselves. It is in this proposed change in emphasis, perhaps, that a substantial increase in research offers its greatest promise for utilization of our continuing and costly overproduction.

"There are, in fact, certain lines of research under way—but with limited funds and attention—that might provide important new agricultural markets. One is the extraction of metallurgical oils and another of paint oils from grain. A third is the manufacture of synthetic rubber through the use of ethyl alcohol extracted from grain, or in the use of grain-derived ethyl alcohol for other industrial purposes.

"The petroleum and chemical industries, as examples have demonstrated—particularly in the last decade—the unlimited horizons that can be discovered through research. The chemical companies already are directing attention to the possibilities in agricultural products.

"The farming community itself, however, is not able, through organization, or financing to undertake research on any effective scale. The proposed program would be a long-term one and relatively costly in the first instance. It might, however, bring much greater dividends than those derived from spending money for the storage of surplus crops or for holding land out of production. The plan is worth a careful look."

"[From the Indianapolis Star of March 25, 1956]

"INDIANA FARMING: CAPEHART FARM-AID PLAN PUTS ACCENT ON GROWTH

"(By Robert Kellum)

"The United States Senate piled more confusion on the belabored farm problem last week—by passing a bill that has more pitfalls than a winter-ravaged county road.

"But, behind the fanfare over what kind of price supports to provide for commodities, there's sentiment mounting among many agricultural leaders for an entirely new approach. They think it's time to look further ahead than 1 year on this job of putting better stability into rural buying power.

"Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART'S introduction of a bill to create an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration with a $100 million annual research fund is a step in this direction. The accent is on growth, not restrictions.

"CAPEHART said:

" 'The United States must undertake at once a $100-million-a-year research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. * * *

" 'It is my opinion that the Department of Agriculture and our research and development people know enough now that, given a real opportunity to prove it, they can find industrial uses for 5 million additional bushels of grain, such as corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, rice, and sorghum grains, as well as potatoes, each year. Our total production now of these grains is only about 6,500,000,000 bushels.'

"He says that 'as fast as the Government proves practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should be turned over to private industry for production.'

"He lists 11 probable industrial uses for agricultural products 'on which best available estimates indicate likely use of 2,500,000,000 bushels a year of agricultural products.'

"Here's his lineup: High protein food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber; microbia rubber; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plans; hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn; blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

"He also cited these possible uses for grain derivatives; Smokeless powder; plastics; medicinals; toilet preparations; soaps; cleaners; anesthetics; antifreeze; dyes; varnishes; power and fuel.

"The research program, once it is given a full opportunity to work, would do these things, CAPEHART asserted:

" 'It would end our farm surplus problem, it would save the Government money, it would help relieve the tax burden, and give a chance for reduction of the national debt, it would create new industries, new jobs, stimulate sales, and provide better incomes for our people, including the Nation's 6 million farmers.' "

"Without any direct reference to Senator CAPEHART'S plan, but relating to it, nevertheless, were comments by Dr. E. T. Weiler, head of the Purdue Department of Economics, at the 12th annual Indiana Bankers Association agricultural clinic on the West Lafayette campus last week.

"Weiler stressed the fact that America doubles its output every 20 years.

"This will continue, he added. Normal is an increase in total output of goods and products of 3 to 5 percent each year. With population gaining at a rate that is equal to South Bend-Mishawaka census figures every month, growth all along the line is inevitable, the economist said.

"Commenting that '1956 may well see a record for gross national product in the United States,' Weiler asserted that 'research continues to open new frontiers for the American economy.'

"From another source, Dr. Vernon W. Ruttan, Purdue agriculture economist, writes in the Review of Economics and Statistics that:

" 'By 1975, United States food and fiber requirements can be met with approximately the same land requirements as at present with a farm-labor force at least 20 percent below present levels.'

"Actually, that's what the agricultural leaders see ahead when they say it's time for a new approach to this problem—something to replace billions of dollars worth of rotting corn or other grain that's kept off the market in an effort to bolster prices on farm products.

"Dr. Ruttan adds:

" 'The important question facing American agriculture is not that of meeting requirements of food and fiber for an increased population but what combination of expenditures for research, land, labor, and capital is needed to produce this output at the lowest cost.

" 'The Nation's needs for foods and fiber are expected to increase 60 percent above the 1950 level by 1975. If past trends continue, half of this increase will be taken care of through increased efficiency resulting from the application of new research and technology.

" 'To produce the other half of the Nation's increased need for food and fiber, additional expenditures will be required for fertilizer, tractor fuel, insecticides, and antibiotics.

" 'As a result of these changes farm output will become more sensitive to price changes and attempts to control farm output will become more difficult and costly than at present.'

"If anybody thinks Ruttan is wrong on his 1975 forecasts of farm productivity, let him look back on corn records in Indiana. Average yield per acre has about doubled in the last quarter century.

"Growth deserves more attention in farm debates."

"[From the LaPorte Herald-Argus of March 28, 1956]

"CAPEHART'S PROPOSAL

"If there is anything which should make even the experts humble it is the constantly belabored farm problem, a matter about which the layman who resides in the city admittedly knows little. And that same layman is far from convinced that the experts, or even the farmers themselves, know many of the important answers. The farm problem will keep on being that, just as it has since the first farm movements began in the 1870's and 1880's of the last century.

"There are some points on which there is agreement. The farm population continues to decline. Farm output can be stepped up constantly by improved methods and more machinery. And farm supports are a part of Government's business and will continue to be ad infinitum.

"Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, offers a suggestion looking to the future of American farming which conforms to the pattern of probable American growth in population and productivity. The Senator wants an Industrial Agriculture Products Administration with an annual $100 million research fund. The research would be to discover new uses for agricultural products so that more of them rather than less would be necessary to supply expanding demand.

"He lists some probable industrial uses for farm products, such as high-protein food for fermentation, paint from vegetable oil, synthetic rubber, increased use of starch in paper, new drug plants, hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat, blending of 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline, and others. The Senator has apparently been communing with research chemists and what he says contains lively possibilities for the future. The farm and the laboratory must work hand in hand. Demand for food and fiber will increase as our population does. And there are many potential new uses for almost everything grown domestically.

"There is no answer in this to the problem of maintaining farm prices. No matter what research shows can be made useful to man, there is always the question of how much the farmer gets for his products. His income has dropped sharply in recent years and understandably he is not happy about it. If he is able to produce more for new purposes there is no assurance his net income above expenses will be greater."

"[From the Indianapolis News of March 27, 1956]

"RESEARCH IS 'KEY' TO HEALTHY AGRICULTURE

"(By Frank Salzarulo)

"Research can be given much of the credit for converting agriculture from a one-horse industry to a mechanized monster.

"More research in the future may be the difference between doom and boom in our modern agricultural economy.

"It used to be that 80 percent of our population on the farm produced food and fiber for 20 percent in the city.

"Today, one farm worker provides enough for himself and 18 of his city cousins.

"Great results have been chalked up by researchers and farmers, to wit:

"For every 2 eggs laid by 1 hen in 1940, today's hen lays 3.

"In 1939, farmers produced 2½ billion bushels of corn on 88 million acres. In 1955 they produced 30 percent more on only 80 million acres.

"On the average, today's cow produces a half ton more milk in a year than a cow in 1940.

"There are 95 million cattle on the same pastures and rangelands today that supported 70 million head in 1940.

"There are 100 million hogs today on farms compared to the same farm plant that carried 75 million in 1940.

"So the story goes.

"In Washington, the politicians are haggling over what to do to buoy farm prices that have been sagging while prices farmers pay for things they buy continue to rise.

"SENATOR CAPEHART OFFERS SOLUTION

"One Senator, HOMER E. CAPEHART, believes he's got the answer—more research.

"In a letter to Rural Route, he writes:

" 'This just has to be the answer to the farm problem. The sooner we all get behind such a program, the better off the United States and the world will be.'

"He's introduced in the Senate a bill proposing a $100 million research program, that would, in his opinion, double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known.

"CAPEHART spells out 11 probable industrial uses for farm products, and estimates they'll use 2½ billion bushels a year of agricultural products out of 6½ billion bushels produced yearly. They are:

"High protein food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber, microbia rubber; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plants; hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn, and blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

"CAPEHART says the benefits of such a research project to the Nation would be limitless. He cites these benefits—full market for full farm production; end of farm surpluses; save Government money; relieve tax burden and reduce national debt; create new industries; create new jobs; stimulate retail sales; provided higher income for all people."

"[From the South Bend Tribune of April 2, 1956]

"NEW USAGE EXAMPLES

"When Senator CAPEHART recently suggested use of some Federal money to encourage development of new uses for farm products he undoubtedly was thinking of what has been done already in the private-enterprise area. The meatpacking industry, among others, has set an encouraging example.

"The Federal Government is already spending heavily for farmers' benefits. But the Government spending so far has not decisively reduced production or stimulated more consumption. The best approach to the overproduction problem would be promotion of greater usage of farm products.

"The American Meat Institute reported 1,000-pound steers selling on the Chicago market recently at an average $203.80 per animal or 20 cents a pound. The meat yield from a 1,000-pound steer averages 580 pounds.

"Each pound of meat sells wholesale at about 32.9 cents or $190.80 from each 1,000-pound steer. In other words, choice beef was sold wholesale for $12.98 less than was paid for the 1,000-pound animal on the hoof.

"Byproducts make the difference. 'Glue factory' is no longer the last word in animal byproducts.

"Scores of commodities are manufactured from meat products that were once considered unusable. They include drugs, medicines, fertilizer, and paint.

"These new uses had to be developed carefully. That took work—and money. But private packers and the meat institute had the foresight to see that some day the expense would be practically justified.

"It would be worthwhile to develop new uses for other farm products. Anyone paying Federal taxes would benefit because right now we are paying taxes for farm overproduction."

"[From the Oil and Gas Journal of April 2, 1956]

"GOP PUSHES PLAN TO PUT ALCOHOL IN GAS TANKS

"WASHINGTON.—The drive to put alcohol into the Nation's automobile tanks and into its tires is rolling at high speed.

"Eyeing the farm vote next November, Republicans in Congress are going all-out behind moves to develop new agriculture markets. And gasoline, they believe, offers a way, indirectly, to burn up a lot of grain.

"Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, proposes the creation of a Federal Industrial Agricultural Products Administration with a $100-million kitty. Thirty-three other Republicans immediately signed their names to his bill. A number of similar measures were introduced in the House.

"CAPEHART's bill came in a few days after the Senate adopted an amendment to the farm bill directing the President to set up a five-man commission to write legislation for industrial use of farm products. But his bill goes much further. It is a 'crash program,' the Senator said.

"IMPLICATIONS STAGGERING

"The proposed IAPA would have an almost unlimited field. It could conduct research, make field studies and experiments. It also could build pilot plants and, if necessary, operate manufacturing facilities to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production.

"Development of nonfood agricultural products would not only make acreage limitation unnecessary but would induce farmers to work every possible acre, CAPEHART told the Senate.

"It would create new industries and increased demand on present ones. Retail business would zoom billions of dollars, he said. Taxes could be eased because it no longer would be necessary to provide farm subsidies and other aids.

" 'The ramifications of such a plan are staggering,' CAPEHART said.

"Seeing an end to the surplus grain problem, CAPEHART said the Agriculture Department estimated that over 2.6 billion bushels of grain could be consumed in a mere 11 industrial products. A 10 percent blend of alcohol with gasoline would take 2 billion bushels. Another 365 to 400 million bushels would be used in synthetic rubber.

"OIL MARKET WOULD SUFFER

" 'The petroleum industry might lose 10 percent of its market,' CAPEHART admitted.

" 'However, the 90 percent in only a few years' time would be so much bigger in volume and so much more important to the industry that the two are hardly worth comparing.'

"At the moment it would cost more to produce alcohol than gasoline, CAPEHART conceded. 'But know-how in America always gets the price down.'

"The reduction in crude production resulting from the blending of alcohol with gasoline would in the long run 'be more than offset by increased consumptions in the hundreds of thousands of new tractors, trucks, transport vehicles, automobiles, and other petroleum-burning equipment in use because of this very program,' he said."

"[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 28, 1956]

"CRASH PROGRAM FOR FARMS

"(By Walker S. Buel)

"WASHINGTON, March 27.—Dawn of a new and brighter day for the American farmer, as a result of a $100 million program to multiply industrial uses of agricultural products, is foreseen by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, in introducing legislation to launch such a plan. The bill, which the author says should be enacted immediately to provide all-time solution of the farm problem, has 35 Republican cosponsors, including Ohio's Senators Bender and BRICKER.

"Although a draft was circulated among all Members of the Senate before its introduction, no Democrat signed it, which is a fair indication that it has little chance in this Congress.

"WANTS USE IN INDUSTRY STEPPED UP

"Nevertheless, CAPEHART intends to push it as vigorously as he can. Several similar bills have been presented in the House by Indiana Representatives after conference with CAPEHART. The Senator believes the huge problem can only be met on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry—that it never can be licked by production for food uses alone. His measure would create an industrial agricultural products administration as a separate executive agency, and provide also for an agency of similar title within the Department of Agriculture.

"Duties of both would be to conduct research, test commercial production procedures, maintain pilot plants, operate manufacturing facilities, and generally promote the development of processes and techniques for industrial uses of greater quantities of farm products.

"Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, New Mexico former Secretary of Agriculture, called attention to the fact that a special agricultural research administration was established in the Department of Agriculture in 1946, but that it has been difficult to push Congress to get the necessary appropriations by the Budget Bureau. CAPEHART said he thought that with a mandate from Congress such as he proposed, programs now dragging would be accomplished more quickly.

"The Indiana Senator said on many industrial uses some research already has been done. He named this list of 11 probable industrial uses for farm products, given him by the Department of Agriculture, which he said would require 2½ billion bushels annually:

"High protein cattle food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber; microbia rubber, a natural rubber produced from the gluten in grain; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plants; hardboard, boxboard and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn; and blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

" 'I think,' CAPEHART told his colleagues 'that through the proposed legislation Congress ought to mandate the administration, especially the Department of Agriculture. An administrator, whom I should like to call a czar, should be appointed to get the job done. I want to see one appointed who will start bumping heads together.'

"SENSIBLE—BUT WHAT OF ELECTION?

" 'Let us get the job done. The farmers are in a bad situation. I am trying to have Congress and the administration do for agriculture that which was done for the rubber

industry during the last world war. During the war and in a hurry, the Government developed a synthetic rubber industry to the point where today more synthetic rubber can be produced in the United States than can be used.

"'I do not want to delay the expenditure of the money. The program ought to be what might well be termed a crash program, and the administration ought to be mandated to proceed with it. It ought to be accomplished 2, 3, or 4 times as fast as any similar program that has been undertaken.'

"This all seems to make quite a lot of sense. Perhaps that militates against it on Capitol Hill in a campaign year."

"[From the Lafayette Journal and Courier of April 2, 1956]

"A NEW APPROACH

"A radically new approach to the Nation's farm problem has been proposed in a bill introduced in Congress by Indiana's Republican Senator CAPEHART. Others in Congress are giving his proposal active support.

"Senator CAPEHART would have the Government undertake a $100 million a year research program designed to find new uses for agricultural products.

"In submitting his proposal, the Indiana Senator cited other fields which have utilized research to discover new industrial and commercial uses for their products. Senator CAPEHART would do the same for agriculture.

"In a Senate speech accompanying his introduction of the bill, the Indiana Senator contended that his proposal would in a few years create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal to the amount now used for human consumption in the United States. He holds it offers a solution to the farm problem based not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on the positive approach of creating new markets demanding complete and full utilization of our total agricultural capacity. He would develop to the utmost those industrial uses of farm products which we already know about and at the same time find new uses 'creating a demand at least double what we have considered the normal farm production of the United States.' His program, he promises, will bring about 50 years of the greatest agricultural prosperity in the history of the Nation.

"Senator CAPEHART expressed the opinion that his program would end the tremendous tax burden now imposed to finance the Nation's vast agricultural assistance and storage programs. He cited the fact that present farm programs have built up surpluses costing some $9 billion, which serve to depress the market. The cost of the farm assistance program was placed at $3 to $5 billion for this year alone. The cost of the research program at $100 million a year, would be but one-third of present annual storage costs for surpluses.

"The Hoosier Senator further contends that his program would insure the American farmer his rightful share of an otherwise bountiful prosperity and at the same time put an end to the unsound practice of spending billions to preserve a bad situation when a lot less would provide a permanent cure.

"What are the other possibilities? Besides ending the farm surplus problem, saving money for the Government, relieving the tax burden and helping reduce the national debt, the Senator believes his program would create new industries and new jobs and stimulate business generally, providing better incomes for all, farmers included.

"Some research already is being conducted along the lines suggested, but at a snail's pace, the Senator holds. He would make it a crash program.

"Experience would appear to indicate that the farm problem cannot be solved permanently by curtailing production. Price supports have not worked because of the vast surpluses they encourage.

"It is apparent that the right answer has not yet been found for the agricultural problem. Certainly increased consumption and new markets for farm products would help. In this direction may lie the eventual and sole solution.

"For this reason, Senator CAPEHART'S program may offer unusual merit. Research has worked miracles in some fields of endeavor. It may provide agriculture's salvation. Under such circumstances, Senator CAPEHART'S program would appear to deserve the most serious consideration by citizens and also by the Congress."

"[From the Kokomo Tribune of May 26, 1956]

"FINALLY, A FARM BILL

"Probably no one is entirely satisfied with the farm bill that was finally passed by Congress after President Eisenhower had vetoed the first version April 16. Probably no one is entirely displeased with it, either. The bill is a compromise, an election-year compromise of the sort that results when both major parties want the farmer above all to understand that they are working for his benefit.

"The most striking new feature of farm legislation in 1956 is the soil-bank program under which farmers will receive $1,200,000,000 annually for taking land out of production. This program recognizes the essential fact that the Nation's farm plant is overexpanded for the time being. The soil-bank plan will reduce the amount of land producing crops now in surplus, and at the same time it will store fertility against the day when it will be needed for production of food. That is good.

"The measure directs Secretary of Agriculture Benson to start the soil-bank program at once. It is generally acknowledged, however, that getting such a program into full swing this late in the crop year will be all but impossible. That will have to wait until next year.

"Though the administration sought authority to make advance payments this year under the soil-bank program, it is just as well that this authority was denied. That makes the plan much less vulnerable to charges that it is merely an attempt to buy the farm vote. Such charges might have done great harm to an interesting new program that deserves a full and impartial trial.

"At the same time, if it is argued in this year's election campaign that the Republicans ignored immediate relief for the farmer, the Eisenhower administration can say that the Republicans attempted to ease the farmer's financial pinch this year. Congressional Democrats, fearing the immediate soil-bank payments proposed by the Republicans would win votes, defeated the plan for advance payments. The administration then turned to fill the gap by using discretionary powers contained in existing laws to deliver early aid.

"The new bill doesn't solve the farm problems, but insofar as it will keep production in line with demand, it is sound. As a permanent policy, however, the Government ought to start a broad research program to find new uses for farm products. Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has proposed just such a plan, deserving of much prompter attention than Congress is giving it."

"[From the Indianapolis News of May 1, 1956]

"WIDEN MARKETS—ATTACK SURPLUS BY DISCOVERING NEW CROP USES

"(From Farm Journal)

"Congress worked up a farm bill that became a political monstrosity. It ought to have served one useful purpose—to scare the daylights out of anyone who rests in Government his hopes for salvation.

"The course of the bill disclosed blindness to facts, political fear, and demagogy. Commonsense and courage, too, were displayed. Some meritorious features survived the committees, debates, and conferences. The total result, however, was a mess of conflicting measures full of bad provisions.

"Agriculture can't afford to leave the future to Government. Future Congresses may outdo this one—they may be able to pass still worse farm legislation.

"Something substantial must be done for farmers this year—there's no doubt about it. Fortunately, quite a lot can be done—and will be done—even if the President has vetoed the bill. But, without minimizing the present problem, let's take a longer look ahead, toward something that might get us out of trouble permanently.

"The political approach, year after year, has been negative and backward. It has said to farmers, 'Retreat. Produce less. Do less. Go backward.'

"Temporarily this may be necessary. But in the long run no industry has ever advanced by going backward. Agriculture can't get ahead by backing up. Actually, farmers have repudiated the policy of retreat. When directed to reduce acres, they have increased yields to maintain their income. Those who could do so have enlarged their farms. The American habit is to go ahead.

"Farmers have eagerly adopted ways to produce more. They have moved ahead with production. Output has advanced faster than marketing, and much faster than the development of new uses for the products.

"The total surplus production runs now about 4 or 5 percent ahead of demand. New studies indicate that during the years ahead production likely will gain further over present rates of consumption.

"This can only mean that more markets and more uses are absolutely vital. Piling more stuff into Government warehouses provides no answer. It only hangs over the market and reduces current prices. Someone must buy and use the output.

"Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, and 33 other Senators introduced a bill that has received practically no attention. It proposes $100 million for a 'crash' program to find new uses and new markets. Wouldn't it make more sense to spend $100 million in ways that would use up some surplus rather than several billions to build up bigger surpluses?"

"[From the Omaha World-Herald of May 4, 1956]

"MR. CAPEHART'S FARM BILL

"A bill introduced by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, would create an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration and authorize it to spend up to $100 million in developing industrial uses for farm crops.

"The new agency would be empowered not only to carry out basic research, but to establish pilot plants and demonstrate the commercial feasibility of whatever it may discover.

"Senator CAPEHART suggests that the Omaha alcohol plant, owned by the Federal Government and standing idle, should be reactivated immediately under such a program. He foresees an eventual potential industrial market for 6 billion bushels of farm commodities—which would push the productive resources of all the farm land in the United States.

"These are known industrial uses for farm products which have not been fully exploited. Mr. CAPEHART proposes to go the full route and find out, for instance, whether alcohol made from grain can be used economically in motor fuel.

"This appears to be a realistic, long overdue approach to the farm problem.

"The Government now is spending about $350 million a year just to store nearly $9 billion worth of surplus commodities it has taken over in spite of efforts to restrict production.

"If spending a mere $100 million a year would create new farm markets, take the Government out of the costly farm price-support business, and develop new industries and more jobs, it would be a mighty wise investment."

"[From the Farm Journal for June 1956]

"RUBBER FROM CORN?—BACKERS OF THE NEW 'CRASH' RESEARCH PROGRAM ALSO SEE FURNITURE FROM GRAIN, DRUGS FROM NEW CROPS—AND MORE INCOME FOR FARMERS

"We're on the threshold of some amazing farm discoveries—with dividends for farmers everywhere—if we have the 'push' to engineer a bold research program.

"That's the idea behind a $100 million 'crash' research program now before Congress. This is 10 times more than the USDA new gets for 'utilization' research. 'But it's still less than $1 for every $100 tied up in CCC surpluses,' points out Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, who is pushing the increase.

"Here are some promising grain projects that might be speeded up:

"1. Ferment grain to make a substance very similar to sap of the rubber tree. This could replace 600,000 tons of imported natural rubber which could easily be cut off from us.

"Grain needed to do this job: about 50 to 100 million bushels a year.

"2. Another grain-fermenting process may yield a 20 percent protein concentrate—one that is rich in amino acid nutrients needed by livestock.

"Possible use: 150 million bushels.

"3. A grain starch mixture could stretch scarce, expensive paper pulp. It makes better paper, too.

"Grain outlet: Possibly 40 to 100 million bushels of corn or wheat.

"4. We may be able to substitute 6-cent-per-pound wheat flour for 20-cent glues used in hardboard and boxboard. Puffed wheat might make a filler in "coreboard" used in furniture.

"Possible use: 30 million bushels.

"Here are some livestock and poultry projects to be developed.

"Find out how to produce choice weaning lambs in the Southeast and promote it into a 'favored' regional dish. If people in these States ate as much as the national average, it would use 3½ million lambs and boost farm income by $35 million.

"Develop areas free of Newcastle and other important poultry diseases. Europe and South America won't take our poultry now for fear of infecting their own flocks.

"If we cleaned up some areas and maintained a quarantine, we could ship as much as 200 million pounds a year.

"Finish the work on a dried whole milk—one that will keep on the shelf without refrigeration. We're close; but still have some rancidity problems. There's a $227 million-a-year pot of gold at the end of this rainbow.

"Find how to really tenderize the poorer cuts of beef. The United States Department of Agriculture says that this could add 3 cents a pound to the retail price of meat—$1.8 billion a year to the value of cattle.

"Finding new crops for planting in surplus areas and on diverted acres could be an unexplored gold mine.

"1. One possibility is to learn to make paper from timber, bamboo, hemp, flax, and other fibrous crops. If this captured only 10 percent of the paper market, it could use as much as 3½ million acres.

"2. The chances are good for developing new chemical compounds from safflower, flaxseed, and castor beans.

"The United States Department of Agriculture feels that with better harvesting machinery castor beans could replace 400,000 acres of cotton in Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

"3. An interesting variety of 'medicinal' crops are possible, including Tephrosia vegelii, a legume yielding a low-cost rotenone; Dioscorea, whose tubers yield a cortisone-like drug; candelilla, a wax-producing shrub; and Rauwolfia, which furnishes some of the new drugs used in treating mental diseases.

"Right now there's a market that would keep 235,000 acres busy.

"Dr. Byron T. Shaw, head of United States Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, tells Farm Journal that out of every $100 that industry takes in, it sets aside $2 for research and development.

"Government farm research to expand uses comes to only 4 cents out of every $100 taken in.

The surplus story (CCC inventory and loans)

Commodity	Investment, Mar. 31, 1956 (millions)		Alltime high (millions)	
	Amount	Cost	Amount	Date
Wheat.....bushels..	1,096	$2,821	1,119	February 1956.
Cotton.....bales..	13.1	2,275	14.3	January 1956.
Corn.....bushels..	1,141	1,911	1,141	March 1956.
Tobacco.....pounds..	919	547	1,054	December 1955.
Grain sorghum.....hundredweight..	70	141	76	January 1956.
Cheese.....pounds..	295	115	463	October 1954.
Barley.....bushels..	99	100	104	February 1956.
Butter.....pounds..	114	70	521	September 1954.
Oats.....bushels..	88	63	92	November 1955.
Dried milk.....pounds..	142	24	656	April 1954.

Money tied up in CCC inventory and loans, including these commodities above, reached a record alltime high last month of $8.9 billion.

"[From the Farm Journal of June 1956]

"WANTED: 'CRASH' RESEARCH

"The most exciting new farm legislation in the congressional hopper is the Capehart bill. It proposes to set up a $100 million 'crash research' program to find new crops and new uses for present crops. So far, 34 Senators have signed the bill.

"Unless this bill gets snarled in election-year politics, its chances are good. The greatest question is whether the Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill will decide to sidetrack the bill because it is thus far solidly identified with Republican Senators.

"Dr. Byron T. Shaw, USDA, tells Farm Journal that out of every $100 that industry takes in, it sets aside $2 for research and development. Farm research to expand uses comes to only 4 cents out of every $100 taken in."

"[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 7, 1956]

"DAY BY DAY ON THE FARM

"(By Richard Orr)

"LAB STUDYING NEW USES OF CORN

"PEORIA, ILL., June 6.—A new kind of clothing material made from cornstarch is in prospect some day as the result of research in a Government laboratory here.

"Scientists on the staff of the northern utilization research branch of the United States Department of Agriculture have devised a way to modify amylose, a cornstarch component, to form soft but tough fibers for clothing. The same material also may be used to make a film similar to cellophane and designed for similar uses, including food wrappers and containers.

"The discovery is one of several outstanding achievements accomplished here since the laboratory was established in 1940 for the purpose of engaging in research to find new and improved industrial uses for agricultural commodities and thereby expand farm markets.

"LIKENED TO CELLOPHANE

"When and if amylose fiber arrives on the market it will be the second clothing material derived from a corn substance. One, zein, a component of corn protein, already is in use.

"Dr. F. R. Senti, head of the laboratory's cereal crops section, explained that amylose film is as good as cellophane in some respects, having comparable strength and folding properties in dry form, though its wet strength is lower than that of cellophane. Amylose film also has the unique quality of being digestible, which means that, if packaging and merchandising plans were so designed, it could be eaten along with the food it contains.

"The technological problems of producing amylose film are largely solved. However, Senti explained, at present it is relatively costly to separate the amylose from corn. This makes the product not yet commercially economical, compared with the less expensive cellophane which is made from regenerated woodpulp.

"NEED NEW CORN VARIETIES

"One approach to this problem is to develop new varieties of corn which yield a higher percentage of amylose. The laboratory's researchers now are cooperating with State agriculture experiment stations and private corn breeders to develop such varieties.

"Most varieties of corn now yield about 27 percent amylose. Senti said it is hoped eventually to develop varieties that will boost the yield to about 80 percent.

"Breeders already are growing new varieties that consistently yield 55 percent amylose and some which will yield as high as 70 percent, though not consistently. It is just a matter of time, however, before suitable varieties are developed.

"[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of May 20, 1956]

"FARM AND FOOD: INDUSTRY SEEN AS HOPE OF USING SURPLUS CROPS

"(By Dr. Karl Butler)

"The excess production of agricultural products in 1955 over what was consumed has been estimated by a number of experts as being about 4 percent. The trouble is that we have been producing a great many things for which there is no immediate market, and the excess production continues to accumulate.

"In trying to come to grips with this problem, many types of proposals are being brought forth. Only recently, Senator HOMER CAPEHART, who is up for reelection in Indiana, proposed a bill which would set up a czar and an agency, possibly within the United States Department of Agriculture, to explore and expand the industrial uses of agricultural products.

"Senator CAPEHART, being a highly successful salesman and Hoosier farmer in his own right, speaks on this subject with great enthusiasm. Recognizing that farmers do not cherish the idea of having to decrease their

production, but actually would like to increase it, the Senator believes the best way to expand markets is through the industrial route. In 1954 (the most recent figures available) the following percentages of various important crops were used for industrial purposes:

"Crop:	*Percentage*
Potatoes	2.5
Fruits	5.8
Vegetables	0.3
Corn	3.3
Soybeans	3.3
Wheat	0.01
Sugarcane and beans	4.9
Cattle and calves	8.7
Cotton	58.3
Tobacco	67.8
Wool	[1] 291.7

[1] Imports greatly exceeded domestic production.

"All crops used for industrial purposes average not more than 3 or 4 percent of our total production. This doesn't sound too impressive, but even so it almost offsets the excess production of agricultural products for the same period.

"A few weeks ago, several thousand Ohio farmers were asked what they thought should be done to solve the farm-surplus problem. In the survey, the farmers were submitted a list of 11 different approaches to the problem and asked what they considered to be the most promising. It is significant that 'research for new uses and new markets' topped the list, with approval by more than 70 percent of those who responded.

"Wheeler McMillen, vice president of Farm Journal, Inc., has pointed out that the American economy has an insatiable appetite for products other than food. He emphasizes the importance, not only of increasing the industrial use of current agricultural products, but of finding new crops. Although there are more than 300,000 known species of plants on earth, less than 200 are used for commercial agricultural production; and actually only 12 produce about 80 percent of all mankind's food. Only rubber has been added to the list of our most important crops during the last century.

"Some of the suggested increased uses of agricultural crops are: High-protein food by fermentation, paint from vegetable oil, synthetic and microbia rubber, increased use of starch in paper, the manufacture of hardboard, boxboard and building board from grain, and the manufacture of alcohol from grain for blending with gasoline. Most of these uses present difficult problems.

"The amount of effort and money expended in agricultural research is relatively small compared with many other industries. Most manufacturing industries spend from 6 to 10 times as much for research as is spent with food and agricultural products. We could well spend more effort and money in finding new crops and new uses for our agricultural production."

"[From the U. S. News & World Report of May 25, 1956]

"WILL AUTOS SOLVE GRAIN SURPLUS?—YES, IF GRAIN CAN BE MADE INTO CHEAP ALCOHOL

"Drive cars on grain alcohol—new approach to the farm problem.

"A far-fetched dream? Maybe not. At least, 34 Senators think it's time to look into this idea again.

"They're backing a big Federal program for research into new uses for farm products. Object: To rid the Government of those rising mountains of surplus grain.

"There's a move afoot to revive the old plan for getting rid of surplus grain by mixing alcohol with the gasoline you burn in your car.

"That's the key point in a program proposed by 34 Senators for increasing industrial use of farm products. The program would cost $100 million a year. But the Senators contend that's a small sum compared with $9 billion the Government has tied up in farm surpluses.

"The program would be aimed at stimulating output of a wide variety of industrial products from agricultural crops, 'including plastics, building materials, smokeless powder, dyes, varnishes, and oil for paints. It's estimated that 365 million bushels of grain could be consumed annually in making alcohol from grain if such alcohol could be produced cheaply enough to justify its use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

"In all, the Senators figure their plan could boost the outlet for grains by 2.6 to 2.7 billion bushels a year.

"TWO BILLION BUSHELS FOR FUEL?

"The potential of blending alcohol with gasoline, however, far exceeds other possible outlets for surplus crops. In the first place 10 percent of alcohol would make a high-test 'premium' fuel out of ordinary gasoline. And, if the blend were used in all automotive gasoline, it would require 2 billion bushels of grain a year.

"The biggest drawback is a simple one—cost. Gasoline at the refinery costs 12 to 14 cents a gallon. Alcohol made from corn costs 60 cents a gallon, if you can get the corn for $1.25 a bushel. A blend with 10 percent of this alcohol would cost 4.6 cents a gallon more than straight gasoline.

"The Department of Agriculture figures it another way. Suppose this blend is priced a penny a gallon higher at the refinery than straight gasoline, because of the premium quality. Ten gallons would be $1.50. Of that, $1.26 would go for 9 gallons of gasoline, leaving 24 cents for the 1 gallon of alcohol. But alcohol at that price would require grain at 36 cents a bushel. Support prices in 1955 averaged $1.58 for corn, $2.08 for wheat.

"Another complication is that just as good results can be obtained with a blend using ethyl alcohol made from natural gas, at 40 cents a gallon, or methyl alcohol, at 30 cents a gallon.

"Obviously, a law to require blending wouldn't do much toward getting rid of grain surpluses unless it also specified that only grain alcohol—ethyl alcohol made from grain—could be used. Otherwise there would be a repetition of what happened with synthetic rubber. That product was made from grain alcohol early in World War II. Then processes were developed that produced ethyl alcohol more cheaply from natural gas, and grain alcohol was priced out of the picture.

"TECHNICALLY SOUND

"The blending of alcohol with gasoline as a motor fuel is technically sound. This has been proved by experiments in the United States and actual use of blends in other countries.

"For more than 30 years, Sweden has required a blend containing 25 percent alcohol. Blends also have been used successfully in Germany, France, Cuba, Brazil, the Philippine Islands, India, and other countries. But, in every case, the higher cost was justified in terms of national defense or welfare.

"The only substantial effort to put over an alcohol-gasoline blend in the United States was made some 20 years ago by a foundation that set up a trial plant in Kansas. The project was abandoned after a few years because the blend, using alcohol made from grain, couldn't meet the price competition of straight gasoline.

"A different technique was tried several years ago by a firm in Cleveland Ohio. A mixture of alcohol and water was injected into the engine of the car when extra power was needed for passing or for climbing a hill. But the petroleum industry soon increased the octane value of the gasoline and the Cleveland company dropped its project.

"SPONSORS PERSEVERE

"The huge outlet for surpluses that would be created by blending grain alcohol with gasoline, however, continues to make the idea tempting. Despite the cost problems of the plan, the sponsors contend it might be a lot cheaper than buying up surplus grains and then paying $365 million a year to store them."

"[From the Indianapolis News of February 16, 1956]

"GET RID OF THE FARM SURPLUS NOW

"There is proper concern in Congress for getting some immediate help to the farmers. They need it.

"Future price-depressing surpluses can be stopped through the administration's soil bank program to take acres out of production.

"Certainly the idea of returning rigid 90-percent price supports is not the answer either to the immediate or long-range problem. That would only create more surpluses and refill the warehouses which the fallow acres would empty.

"However, even if it is not saddled into ineffectiveness by high rigid supports, the soil bank still is for the years ahead, not now.

"What to do to give the farmers help now?

"Indiana's Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART has come up with a plan which is sound and logical. It is the creation of a Federal agency which would be mandated to sell, barter, or give away as quickly as possible the vast stores of food the Government now is holding.

"As long as that surplus hangs over the market it will continue to depress farm prices. And just as soon as it is cut down to size, farm prices will rise.

"If Congress will adopt the Capehart bill, the farm-price problem could be licked before the summer's end.

"The surpluses would go to needy people in the United States and other countries who would not otherwise be able to purchase the foodstuffs. We would give away only what we could not sell and did not need for a national emergency reserve.

"Senator CAPEHART told the Senate that he had traveled all over Indiana, meeting with farmers and farm leaders. And that he had not 'found one who does not agree that the present low farm-commodity prices are due to the surplus.'

"He said, 'If somehow, in some way, tomorrow we could get rid of the huge surpluses, farm prices would go up where they belong, and we would no longer have to worry about farm prices.'

"America's farm problem is a problem of abundance. We can serve humanitarian interests at the same time we serve the cause of our own farmers if we will only start spreading the abundance about.

"It's as simple as that.

"As Senator CAPEHART says, 'There are thousands of people in the United States who are underfed. There are millions of people in the world who are underfed. Have we not sufficient intelligence in the Congress and as a people to give away some of these foodstuffs?'

"It is a dog-in-the-manger attitude that is keeping these huge stores of food in Government warehouses.

"Every Indiana farmer could have extra dollars in his pocket by July if the Government were only empowered to get rid quickly of this load.

"Cosponsors of Senator CAPEHART'S bill include Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, as well as influential members of both parties like Mundt, of South Dakota, Thye, of Minnesota, Young, of North Dakota, Butler, of Maryland, Welker, of Idaho, George, of Georgia, Case of South Dakota, and Bartlett, of Wyoming.

"Congressmen ought to forget about politics in this matter. If they want to do something for the farmer now—and they certainly should—then let them boost farm prices by getting rid of the present surpluses.

"They can start a flow of greenbacks farmward by oats seeding time if they only will put their minds to getting the Capehart disposal formula going right away."

"[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 11, 1956]

"WORLD DILEMMA: TOO MUCH FOOD; TOO MANY HUNGRY

"President Eisenhower's farm message disclosure that a Surplus Disposal Administrator will be appointed and other measures taken to spur the disposition of excess agricultural products points to one of the major dilemmas of our times.

"On one side many countries of the world—and notably the United States—have more food than they can use. On the other, half the world's population hasn't enough to eat.

"This grave problem hangs over the American farm situation. The surplus farm products we have accumulated—nearly $8 billion worth, which cost a million dollars a day just to handle—reflect both our success in growing crops and our failure to find ways to distribute them. Even though vigorous efforts on the part of the administration resulted in a greatly increased disposition of the surplus, President Eisenhower said that for every bushel moved out of the huge Government stores another bushel and a half took its place.

"Appointment of an Administrator to devote full time to finding ways of decreasing the surplus is a wise move. The President's recommendation that Congress permit sale of our agricultural surplus behind the Iron Curtain offers an additional method of coping with the problem.

"But it is evident that the dilemma will exist for some time. When we have $7,700,000,000 worth of surplus farm products, arranging to get $192 million worth to the needy of other lands—the figure for the last fiscal year—won't make much of a dent. Nor will it do much to relieve the hardships of a billion people in the world who go to bed hungry every night.

"That the dilemma is difficult to resolve is painfully obvious. Selling surplus food at home or abroad at less than prevailing market prices would have a disruptive effect. Even giving the food to countries whose people need it might cause severe economic dislocation.

"Because the problem is difficult, however, is no reason why efforts shouldn't be made to find a solution. Plans put forward by Senator HOMER CAPEHART and others deserve serious study. Congress this year could hardly perform a greater service than making real progress toward answering the problem of distribution of farm products which plagues both our farmers and hungry people throughout the world."

"[From Chemurgic Digest for April 1956]

"SENATOR CAPEHART, OF INDIANA, PROPOSES $100 MILLION FOR INDUSTRIAL USES—CRASH RESEARCH PROGRAM URGED IN NEW BILL INTRODUCED WITH 33 SENATORS AS SPONSORS

"A 'crash' research program to produce industrial outlets for farm products has been proposed in a bill introduced March 21. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART presented the measure, with 33 other Senators joining him as sponsors.

" 'If and when we solve the farm problem, it will be solved on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry,' Senator CAPEHART told the Senate. 'We shall never solve the farmers' problem by producing for food users alone.'

"The measure asks for an appropriation of $100 million. It proposes to create an Agricultural Industrial Production Agency. The administrator in charge, appointed by the President, would have wide powers, and report semiannually to Congress.

"Known as S. 3503, it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"The following excerpts are taken from the speech made by Senator CAPEHART in introducing the bill:

" 'Mr. President, I am about to propose a far-reaching, permanent solution of the farm problem so vast that its potential is virtually unlimited.

" 'While the economic, industrial, and social implications of this program cannot, with any degree of accuracy, at this moment be estimated, it is clear that this program will tend to solve, if not wholly solve, the farm problem for all time.

" 'After months of painstaking examination of its possibilities, I have reached the altogether justifiable conclusion that this plan would, within a few years, create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal in amount to that now consumed for human consumption in the United States. It would double the farm market.

" 'We are only asking for $100 million or less than one-third of the cost to store for 1 year the surplus agricultural commodities the Government of the United States now owns.

" 'No, Mr. President, we cannot solve our farm problem permanently by curtailing production. We must increase consumption; we must find new markets. Since, generally speaking, the vast majority of our people are well fed, our only alternative is to find new and increased industrial uses for our agricultural products.

" 'We are not going to help the farmer very much by reducing his production. We can help him only by increasing his production, and this bill provides for that. The White House is already behind it. It is very enthusiastic about the objectives and purposes of the bill.

" 'As an inherent part of the legislation, we wish to set up an administrator who will have almost the title of czar. He will proceed to get the job done, in the same fashion in which the Government developed synthetic rubber during the war.

" 'The proposed program might well be called a crash program.

" 'I am thinking in terms of $100 million in addition to that which the Congress has already appropriated, or might appropriate.

" 'It is my belief that as fast as the Government proves the practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should then be turned over to private industry for production.

" 'The program we propose should be built on the framework of and within the existing research activities of the Department of Agriculture.

" 'The potentialities are so vast that any attempt to evaluate the benefits to this Nation and its people dollarwise is an almost hopeless task. I have been unable to select any segment of our economy—any group of our people—who would not lead more comfortable lives and enjoy higher standards of living and benefit generally from the fruits of such a program.

" 'It would mean the assurance of a full market for full farm production.

" 'It would end our farm-surplus problem.

" 'It would save the Government money.

" 'It would help to relieve the tax burden and give us a chance to reduce the national debt.

" 'It would create new industries.

" 'It would create new jobs.

" 'It would stimulate retail sales.

" 'It would provide better incomes for our people including the Nation's 6 million farmers.

" 'It is, in our opinion, in all modesty, the most constructive approach to the farm problem yet devised.

" 'I have always said that when handed a lemon, make lemonade out of it.'

"BRICKER, MUNDT SPEAK

"In the course of the colloquy on the floor during Senator CAPEHART'S presentation, Senator BRICKER referred to the work of the Chemurgic Council while its headquarters were in Columbus.

"Senator MUNDT of South Dakota said:

" 'What is sought to be done by the bill is to take the program of farm chemurgy out of low gear and to put it into high gear.'

"Senator MUNDT also referred to the 'crash' programs which produced the vital domestic dye industry during World War I, and those which developed synthetic rubber and atomic energy during World War II."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a few, and only a few, a small percenatge, of the letters I have received from persons in a position to know what can be done as a result of such legislation as I propose, setting forth why such legislation should be enacted, and why we should proceed to do something permanent for the farmers of America, rather than ask them to reduce their production in order to get rid of their surpluses, which I am in favor of at the moment, in order to eliminate future surpluses.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARNER BROODER CORP.,
North Manchester, Ind., June 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Several weeks ago, I received, from you, a copy of your speech made on the floor of the Senate on March 21, 1956, for which I thank you very much.

First, let me state that you are to be commended very highly for your analysis of this farm problem. I have 260 acres near North Manchester, Ind. I have been directly connected with farming for some 40 years, as well as being a manufacturer of poultry and hog equipment for the last 20-some years. I, therefore, feel that I may be somewhat qualified in making the following remarks.

Your proposed solution, in Senate bill 3503, to our farm-products surplus problem, is certainly the most practical approach that has come to my attention.

It seems to me that subsidizing the average farmer only provides for a meager existence, with small chance to improve his farm surroundings and living standards. Whereas, this proposal of yours has a good chance of not only improving the lot of the farmer to the utmost in many ways, but may very well be a sizable boost to our economy in general.

Nothing has come to my attention that would indicate this bill is receiving any kind of action. Will you advise me of the present status? May I encourage you to promote, to the best of your ability, the proper study and enactment of this bill. In my opinion, this is one of the most worthwhile and timely pieces of legislation presented on the Senate floor in quite some time.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD C. WARNER, *President.*

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE,
Columbia City, Ind., April 25, 1956.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Member of Congress,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I have read your speech about agricultural research made in the Sen-

ate March 21, which you submitted with a letter requesting comments, pro and con.

The basic theory of the bill is sound, as I see it. In addition to expanding industrial uses, there is opportunity for expanding export markets through the exchange of goods. Here a slight reduction in the industrial boom can be made to step-up the agricultural economy and put it on a more equitable level.

It is basic that farmers should operate the land at the peak of their ability and skill. And, it follows they should be rewarded for their thrift and industry on the same plane as other producers with similar investments, ability and skills. The limiting of production continuously is wrong and unnatural. Subsidies tend to penalize the efficient and reward the incompetent. A businesslike administration of quotas and subsidies in agriculture is most difficult and mostly not attained.

Real help on the part of the Government can come from finding outlets for farm products which will challenge rural people to create maximum wealth from the lands they control.

Such expanded outlets appear to lie in the fields of industrial uses and foreign markets. Some expansion in domestic consumption of foods is a possibility and deserves exploration.

I hope you succeed in getting established farm aid that is real, permanent, and beneficial to all segments of society. The proposed bill, S. 3503, appears to be a big step in that direction.

Respectfully,

B. V. WIDNEY,
County Agricultural Agent.

ALBANY, IND., *April 5, 1956.*

DEAR MR. HOMER E. CAPEHART, OF INDIANA: Your recent letter received and your material on different things are fine.

If you can bring it through, it sure would help everything. This is a grand old world with lots and lots of opportunities in it. If people would work to find out what's in it instead of trying to destroy it and themselves also, what a world it would be to live in.

Thanks for your fine letter.

Sincerely,

MARY INEZ DAY.

BLOOMFIELD, IND., *April 15, 1956.*

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: I read your copy of the speech made before the Senate, March 21, and want to commend you on your interest in the current farm situation.

In my contacts with farmers in this county it seems to be the general opinions that the soil-bank plan, plus 90 percent supports, is the best alternative for a period until some other cure comes to light.

Your proposal of legislation, adequate funds for research to increase use of agricultural products sounds like a wonderful thing, as farmers will benefit as well as all economies from research.

Glad to hear that you voted for the farm bill on last passage in Senate, which may not have been perfect in your opinion, but keep us farmers in mind.

We want a farm bill this year.

Yours truly,

DON CALVERT,
A. S. C. Grain Inspector,
Greene County, Ind.

HOWE, IND., *April 16, 1956.*

To the Honorable Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: First I want to thank you for your copy of your speech to the Congress as to your views on disposing of the surplus grains now held by the Government.

Your plan made more sense to me than anything I have read pertaining to this problem, than anything I have seen in the last 15 years.

A lot of young farmers, 30 years old and down, have known nothing in this productive life but to expect help from the Government in one way or another, or should I say interference from the Government.

I have just finished reading your research program for the future, it makes sense to me and I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Why not give the farmers the right to think for themselves and to gain back their self-respect.

I say scrap the present program of doling out a few dollars to the farmers and taking back more in taxes. Go ahead with your research plan.

Keep up the good work; I am with you all the way. Give the farmers back their independence.

WINFORD LEWIS, *Auctioneer.*

CLYDE G. HARLOW & SONS,
Tipton, Ind., April 16, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: I am pleased to reply to your letter of April 6 with copy of speech enclosed.

I have heard nothing but favorable comment for the gist of your formula as a solution of this giant farm problem.

Personally, I feel the intent and purpose are 100 percent right, and if successful research is carried out to the point you suggest, I can see nothing but good coming from it.

I hope those in authority give your proposal the attention it deserves, since to me it seems the sound solution would in itself handle the parity problem much better than any proposed farm bill past or present.

Thanking you for this recognition, I am

Yours very truly,

CLYDE G. HARLOW.

OAKLAND CITY, IND., *April 3, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART: I read your speech with much interest and as you say it's a tough problem and all legislation will not solve the problem unless we find ways and means to find a market for our goods.

Thanks for sending me this.

Yours truly,

HERMAN G. SCHMIDT.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Crawfordsville, Ind., April 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your letter received April 7, I have studied with interest your far-reaching permanent solutions of farm problems.

I think that from the long viewpoint, this research program is a most dependable and sure solution to our farm surplus problem. I would like to personally encourage you to pursue the enactment of this proposed research program if at all possible to get the support to do so.

In my contacts with farmers in Montgomery County, I do not find that the majority of them are expecting all of their farm problems to be solved by enactment of legislation for temporary relief. I think as a group, our farmers are very tolerent and understanding.

The young farmer has been affected the most in our county by this adjustment of the agricultural economy. I know that most of the farmers that have been farming back through the war years have been expecting and preparing their operations for an adjustment period.

I personally subscribe to the manner in whcih you are representing your people.

Very truly yours,

GORDON A. SOWERS,
County Agricultural Agent.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
New Castle, Ind., April 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I received the copy of your speech before the Senate concerning your proposal of additional effort to find new markets for agricultural products and also was privileged to hear you discuss this issue at the New Castle "Third House" last Thursday.

It seems self-evident that the creation of new uses for agricultural products would do much to remedy our present situation. As you state, the program is a continuing and long-term approach. Many facilities now exist and much is being done along this line, but doubtless the whole program needs activating and coordinating. Those engaged need to feel the urgency of doing it now. Your proposals would doubtless get this job done.

There is a little concern in my mind that new emphasis will need to be placed on soil conservation when and if new demands give wartime incentive to production. In other words, we must be interested in continued high production as well as getting ourselves out of a present difficulty.

As you know, farmers live to produce and with price encouragement, they are apt to forget long time soil needs.

We certainly commend you for your interest and leadership in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. G. SMITH,
County Agricultural Agent.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

The HONORABLE HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This will acknowledge your letter relative to the proposed legislation which you have sponsored to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing industrial uses of agricultural products. I have studied the proposed draft and believe it merits serious consideration and action by Congress. We have in the past supported the broad objectives of an expanded agricultural program, fully realizing that the welfare of the farmer cannot be divorced from the welfare of the working people in industry.

At the present time we are actively supporting the proposed certificate amendment as sponsored by Senator KERR and others in connection with the social-security legislation now pending in the Senate Finance Committee which would provide food and fiber commodities to dependent widows and children and those permanently and totally disabled. It is our sincere desire to see this legislation enacted because we believe that this would relieve much hardship now faced by our older citizens and those unable to earn a livelihood. In so doing, this could expand our consumption of farm commodities and eliminate much of the unnecessary waste and unnecessary expense of storage.

If the Senate Agricultural Committee holds hearings on the legislation which you have proposed, we will be prepared to support this measure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. NELSON,
Legislative Representative.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Jeffersonville, Ind., April 10, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR CAPEHART: With your letter of April 5, you included a portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comprising your speech

and provisions of your agricultural bill presented to the Senate on March 21. I have read this speech and provisions of the bill with interest and believe that you have struck at the real heart of the agricultural problem. Farmers, as well as almost everyone else, realize that their income cannot be enhanced by reducing production. They realize fully that any programs of acreage allotments, based on previous history, are by their very nature unjust to some farmers. They realize that reduced production would not allow them the opportunity of managing their business in the most efficient manner. Farmers in this area are so opposed to acreage allotments that many of them have expressed the willingness to eliminate any national program in order to abandon acreage controls. You, I am sure realize that it would be tragic for the Government at this point to pull out of agricultural programs when the farmer is being depressed by surpluses encouraged by previous Government programs.

It seems to me that your approach of immediate action to get pilot plants and industry using agricultural products and at the same time promoting greater research in this field, should give the answer in reasonably short time. I read a news release last week of a product developed by a starch factory in Columbus, Ind., which holds tremendous possibilities in this field. That plant has developed through research a starch product made from corn which has proven effective in soil stabilization. That is, it eliminates water penetrating into the soil and gives the soil so treated a consistency almost that of paving. I understand that it is being used to stabilize the soil beds under roadways, and that it could be used for paving farmyards, driveways, and would prove a tremendous market for corn. The cost at the moment is very high, but with proper testing, no doubt, it could be lowered. I believe this is the kind of thing you are talking about in your bill.

My suggestion, whenever possible, is that the pilot testing and research be carried out by industry under contract rather than by the Government, and that the land-grant colleges be called upon to do whatever they can in the program, but that their regular research programs not be disturbed, and that they not be given a major responsibility in this industrial type of program. Where industry could foresee an opportunity to take over the product and profit by it, they would work faster and more effectively than pure research. Of course, this type of program would not solve all the immediate problems of agriculture, but would give confidence which is desperately needed, and then, coupled with a simple, but effective farm program for a few years, could solve the agricultural problem and have going at full capacity a farm production plant ready to meet the needs of any emergency, or of the natural growing population demands. If we build agricultural programs on the basis of controlled production, we could in the not-too-distant future, find ourselves with a problem of shortage. In a program of all-out production and utilization by both industry and for food, in any emergency, the amount used in either place could be expanded or reduced to keep a safe balance.

I have worked almost 24 years as a county agricultural agent and have observed with interest the coming and going of national farm laws and it appears to me that we are today further away from the real solution to the problem with our present programs than we have been through all the years. It seems to me that for the immediate future, an abandonment of all acreage allotments, and maintaining price supports at a reasonably low level, that the greatest good could be accomplished by simply making direct payments to farmers for any acreage he might have or wish to put into hay and pasture crops, and at the same time permit him to use and harvest those crops. This in my opinion would not increase greatly the amount of roughage consuming livestock and the amount of meat and milk, which is feared by so many people, because we all know that the great amount of meat, milk, and other livestock products are produced by grain rather than by grass. A simple 2- or 3-year program of direct help to farmers based on the acreage of land in grass, would give immediate help and would reduce the acreage in grain crops and the tremendous storage problem involved with high supports. The longtime problem could be solved, as you indicate, by the utilization of agricultural commodities through industrial markets.

Yours truly,

M. F. GOODE,
County Agricultural Agent.

CORYDON, IND., *April 16, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I first state that my comments which I make are of my own personal opinion and not necessarily the thinking of the Department of Agriculture by which I am employed.

I would like to wholeheartedly compliment you for the speech made before the United States Senate, March 21, 1956, concerning your proposed research program.

In my daily contact with farmers I find that they are not a type of people who desire a giveaway program. Farmers at this time need assistance and guidance to lift them from the present farm recession created by the great surplus of basic commodities.

However, I personally feel that we should at all times have a nominal amount of grain in reserve and also an adequate incentive program for conserving our water, land, and forest resources.

Again may I congratulate you on your proposed research plan. In order that agriculture can compete with modern industry they must acquaint themselves with the common facilities used by industry.

Yours very truly,

MRS. MARY R. EISENMENGER.

RENSSELAER, IND., *April 13, 1956.*

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I appreciate very much receiving a copy of your speech made in the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 1956.

I commend you highly for your stand in reference to the agricultural problem. An improved market through more uses of agricultural products is the only sound and lasting answers to the agricultural problem. It may be that new and different crops will be grown for some of the needs of industry, but farmers can adjust to the kind of crops or livestock if they have a market for the product.

I hope the idea of using farm-produced products as part of the fuel used in automobiles, trucks, etc., can be further developed. Conserving the supply of natural resources such as oil and coal is just as important for the future as conserving the soil.

Sincerely,

J. A. CARROLL,
County Agricultural Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
EXTENSION OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Washington, Ind., April 13, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER CAPEHART,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I studied with interest your speech of Wednesday, March 21, and your bill, S. 3503, and hope that Congress may be persuaded to adopt this promising measure.

It is true that we have spent large sums of money for increased production, but have left the consumption and utilization of farm crops more or less take care of itself. This, of course, has not been the case.

Research has done wonders in making more goods for a higher standard of living in America. There is no reason why a vigorous research program directed in the proper manner with sufficient funds cannot go a long way in solving the critical problem facing our farmers today in a relatively few years.

Congratulations on the positive, forceful way in which you presented your bill.

Sincerely,

EARL KUMPF,
County Agriculture Agent, Daviess County.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
Princeton, Ind., April 13, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I don't think you are out of line on setting up a research program such as outlined in your speech of March 21, 1956, to the Senate.

You have one more fan believing in your proposal. I'm keeping your report on file.

I would like to see more research for agriculture. It looks to me that what nature made in the way of coal, oil, and other things, science can make it better from agricultural products.

It may be that we may approach an era when we won't have the farmer as we know of him today. Research is the only approach to solve this problem.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED H. GESELL,
Agricultural Agent.

HUNTINGBURG, IND., *April 17, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: I want to congratulate you on the idea for expanding the market for farm products as well as the presentation that you made in the Senate.

This would seem to be one of the most constructive things that has been done in a long time and certainly, is a new and fresh approach.

It is an odd situation that in a country like America, that a bumper crop should create so many problems as to almost be a catastrophe. While there has been talk of using the products of the farm for industrial purposes, of course, nothing has been accomplished in a big way.

We would be so conscious of this situation in southern Indiana where so much of the land is marginal and it would seem to us that some development might be made in the hybridization of trees. I found in Macon, last month, that the time for growing pulpwood, for instance, has been reduced from 30 years to 15 years and that they think with the further selection through the hybridization of the trees themselves, it would be possible to get pulpwood as a crop on a 7-year cycle. If that could be done, there would be untold prosperity in this particular area.

Again congratulations and with warmest regards, I remain,

Yours truly,

R. H. MCMURTRIE.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Newport, Ind., April 12, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I like your approach to the farm problem. I can see no future in the farm program for farmers on tax papers either

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

when the Government pays farmers not to produce. It costs the consumer more for his products and as taxes. The farmer is hurt with less income. Corn is a good crop, but a 100-acre farm that can grow only 20 acres of corn is in bad shape no matter what the support price is.

America was built on more production—making items cheaper and better. Your approach is the only one that looks toward more production.

It seems that our farm problem is one of losing foreign and domestic markets for our crops. One answer is to cut production to meet the demand. The other is to establish new and better markets to use the present or increased production.

I am not sure as to what existing agencies can do or what new ones are needed, but it seems that this is the only approach left.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. STARK,
County Agricultural Agent.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
Bloomington, Ind., April 17, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I have your letter of April 5, together with a copy of your speech before the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21.

When can we learn that there is no reverse gear on progress, and quit looking backwards. Your suggestion of enough basic research to find profitable uses for his agricultural production, is the first sound approach I have seen taken, regarding our farm problem.

I would hope that it would not be necessary to set up a whole new Federal bureau to get the job done. We have only so many scientists and research men in the country anyway, so they will have to do the research work, regardless of the organization within which they do it. We have an experiment station in each State, and also a few Federal research institutions. Strikes me as being more practical to provide more facilities and equipment—and if possible, more scientists—to these institutions to broaden their activities, than to set up a complete new Federal agency.

Very sincerely yours,

CORRY ALCORN,
County Agricultural Agent.

MONTICELLO, IND., *April 17, 1956.*

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for your letter of April 6 and copy of your speech before the Senate.

I have read your speech very carefully and discussed it with a great many farmers. I have met no one who thinks in a straight line, that does not believe it is the right approach to the solution of this whole complex problem.

On page 2, column 2, paragraph 5, which begins, No, Mr. President, we cannot solve—etc., indicates to me that you know what is wrong with present thinking regarding this whole situation.

Your proposed plan of research to discover and create new uses for farm commodities just can't miss being the right plan of attack.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD MIKESELL.

THE PRAIRIE FARMER,
Chicago, Ill., March 29, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Mr. Johnson is serving as an adviser at the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences at Turrialba, Costa Rica. He will not be back until the first of May.

Thanks very much for sending us the bill which you are introducing into the Senate.

I sincerely doubt if the bill is the answer to the farm problem. On the other hand, Prairie Farmer is certainly in favor of research investigating the possibilities of expanding farm crop markets. There is little doubt but that we would be up to our ears in soybeans now if it had not been that soybeans have so many uses. We are certainly in favor of expanding our research to find new and improved uses for agricultural products.

Very truly yours,

RALPH S. YOHE,
Associate Editor.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Crown Point, Ind., May 29, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am very sorry for the delay in answering your letter regarding the speech which you made before the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21. I have been very busy and wanted to study the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which you sent me, in detail.

I think it is very desirable that the Federal Government follow an aggressive research program with regard to the industrial use of farm products. In all of our world history so far no government has ever been able to permanently set aside the law of supply and demand with laws and regulations. I do believe, however, that it is the duty of our Federal Government to do what it can to prevent extremely wide fluctuations in the prices of farm products. Farming is, by its nature, largely a small enterprise business and, inasmuch as it is one of our basic industries, I think that it is the duty and obligation of our Federal Government to engage in research which in other industries might be undertaken by large corporations. It seems also that it is a sound development to expect our Federal Government to engage in exhaustive investigations of the possible industrial uses of farm products so that private industries can immediately avail themselves of up-to-date information on this subject whenever it is economically sound to do so. A research program such as you suggest would undoubtedly develop many industrial uses that manufacturers would want to avail themselves of immediately.

I hope my opinions are of some value to you.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD E. CUTLER,
County Agent.

CARMEL, IND., *April 4, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Your speech sponsoring a bill to set up an Agricultural Products Administration and an Industrial Agricultural Products Agency was received yesterday, and I have just finished reading it. This is a plan which fires the imagination. The first 21 years of my life were spent on a farm, and my determination to obtain a technical education came about because all the farmers in our neighborhood seemed to be at a terrible disadvantage due to lack of anything resembling an industrial approach to their problems of production and marketing. Since my personal interest was in electricity, I planned to work in rural electrification when I finished my college work. However, I graduated in 1936, and there weren't any jobs available in that area, so I ended up on the industrial side of the fence, where I have been ever since.

It seems to me that you and the other distinguished sponsors of this bill have spotlighted the basic farm problem very clearly. Finding markets for farm produce must be just as much of the overall effort as finding ways and means to increase production. The automotive people probably do the best job of creating markets for their product of any specific group in industry. The analogy to the farm problem is not strictly accurate, but it is close. The auto industry spends millions of dollars yearly to develop new components, new styles, new safety devices, and they also spend millions to merchandise these new ideas, so that there is always a newer, better car on the market than the one you presently own. The result, in terms of customer demand, is a matter of record. An ever-increasing demand for farm products must be built up in industry.

Deliberately legislating a sense of urgency into the program you recommend seems to me to be essential. We are all well aware of the tension which surrounds our national-defense projects. I have heard many an industrialist refer wryly to his defense commitments as operating on a madhouse basis. This does not mean that they are disorganized, but that everyone is striving to accomplish great technical and manufacturing strides in the shortest possible time.

One of the problems in carrying out the program envisioned in your bill will be to divert the necessary technical talent to it. As you well know, a great percentage of our young scientists and engineers are struck with the idea of participating in glamorous enterprises like atomic energy, supersonic flight, space satellites, color television, and so on. During the Korean war, I was in Washington, calling on such laboratories as Naval Research, Naval Ordnance, the Bureau of Standards, the Army Engineer Center, and others. I was quite depressed by the great numbers of young men and women who had started their professional life in the business of producing materials for human destruction, and who, unless the pattern changes, will never know the satisfaction of doing something which will improve man's lot, instead of reducing him to an expendable part of a weapons system. National defense is necessary, and it must be maintained at a level which will avoid war, if possible, but some way must be found to lead an adequate number of technical people into the fields of human needs. After all, the producing part of the economy must be big enough and healthy enough to support the cost of the defense program.

If the money is appropriated and put in the hands of people who will get the job done, I think there is no question but what the predictions made in the early part of your speech will come true, and the results will begin to show up in the first year of operation.

As a suggestion (and you undoubtedly have already considered this), it seems to me that the administrator would find an advisory committee very useful. The members of the committee would represent both agriculture and industry, and the membership should change frequently enough to continually bring in fresh points of view, and to avoid criticism that some group was becoming dominant. The Defense Department uses this system very widely, and I am sure that it provides them with assistance and guidance which simply could not be purchased. This system can be used at lower levels, also, to obtain resistance on specific projects.

I hope that you obtain adequate support for this bill, and I am sure that there are many people across the Nation, like me, who feel that some of the techniques developed in national-defense programs and industrial programs would work wonders in the agricultural area. The return from such a program, in terms of better living and greater security for our people as well as others around the world would be nothing short of stupendous.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL WATSON.
P. R. WATSON.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New Brunswick, N. J., May 16, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for sending me the text of your bill proposing a federally sponsored research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. We are greatly interested in the bill, as you can imagine, and are appreciative of what you are doing.

Sincerely,

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., May 15, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you so much for sending me a copy of your speech regarding the unlimited market for farm products. You certainly are to be congratulated on this forward-looking approach to the solution of one of our most basic problems and I am delighted to have had the chance to learn in detail of the bill which you have introduced.

With sincere personal regards,

Cordially,

DEAN W. MALLOTT, *President.*

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., May 9, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your speech and the bill which you and other Senators and Congressmen have introduced pertaining to the ultimate solution of the farm problem. I have read this carefully and it is refreshing to see an approach which is different from that which seems to have become standard in the last several decades.

As soon as I return from a trip I shall write to Senator Earle C. Clements regarding the desire of the university to be represented at the hearings. The only thing which I note about the bill that would be of immediate concern would be the securing of the personnel needed to conduct the research studies provided by the bill. However, even this difficulty should not deter us in the effort.

Very truly yours,

W. G. KAMMLADE,
Associate Director of Extension.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
AND HOME ECONOMICS,
OFFICE OF DEAN AND DIRECTOR,
Fayetteville, May 12, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The subject of your letter of May 1 relative to the bill which you introduced in the Senate on March 21, 1956, has been discussed with President John T. Caldwell. He has written you to the effect that he should like to have the university represented at the hearings to be arranged by the Honorable Earle C. Clements by the dean of our College of Agriculture and Home Economics.

The subject of your bill is of very real interest to us and we shall be preparing ourselves to appear before the hearings called by Senator Clements. If at any time, additional information is issued with reference to your bill, we would appreciate receiving copies.

Sincerely yours,

LIPPERT S. ELLIS,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
College Park, Md., May 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for your letter of May 2 with copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing speech and text of bill which you introduced. I certainly agree with you that new uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby would aid in an ultimate solution of the farm problem.

I am happy to have your speech and text of bill and I wish to congratulate you.

Very truly yours,

PAUL E. NYSTROM,
Director.

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON,
INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Pullman, Wash., May 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your recent letter addressed to Director M. T. Buchanan has been referred to me for reply. I am certainly in agreement with you that part of the ultimate solution to the farm problem lies in new uses of farm products in industry. Much of the data which is needed to develop these new uses of farm products must come from public funds appropriated for research. I am sure that you agree heartily with this approach.

I wish it were possible for someone from our institution to attend the hearing to be held by Senator Earle C. Clements, but because of the distance and the expense it will be impossible at this time.

Let me express our appreciation for your kind invitation.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. CARVER,
Acting Director.

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
Auburn, Ala., May 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is another reply to yours of May 1. At home yesterday I studied your speech and bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21.

There seems to be no evidence against what you are proposing to do. In my judgment it makes sense in every way.

In addition to funds for public research I hope that corporations that use and process farm products will spend more money and energy on research to find new markets and bigger markets. There is a big opportunity for them.

Some time in Washington I hope to discuss this with you because I'm genuinely encouraged by what you are proposing to do.

Sincerely yours,

P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES,
Columbia, May 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Your letter of May 2, with the enclosed copy of the speech which you made concerning research on new uses of farm products, has been received. I greatly appreciate your sending me this statement.

The need for additional research to aid the entire agricultural industry with its problems is just as important as research in the chemical industry or any of the other great manufacturing industries.

I will write to Senator Clements regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

J. H. LONGWELL,
Director.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., May 8, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I appreciate very much a copy of your address and a copy of the bill which you jointly sponsored to appropriate additional funds for agricultural research. Since our extension program is based very largely on the research results of the State experiment stations and the United States Department of Agriculture, we do have a deep, abiding, and continuing interest in an expanded agricultural-research program.

I wish for your great success.

Very truly yours,

H. C. SANDERS,
Director, Agricultural Extension.

IOWA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE,
Ames, Iowa, May 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The Westchester, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I received your letter of May 1 and the copy of the bill which you introduced on new uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby. I have discussed this bill with some of our outstanding farm leaders and asked that they write their Senators and Congressmen. Tomorrow I am going to review the bill with Mr. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and perhaps he will follow up in that organization.

As you suggested, I also wrote Senator Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky.

Dean Harry Reed, of Purdue, has told me of your genuine interest in constructive agricultural programs. I am happy to participate and grateful to you for the contributions you have made.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ANDRE,
Dean and Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Knoxville, May 23, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is in regard to your bill, S. 3503, which is a proposal to authorize large appropriations for support of research in the utilization and marketing of farm commodities. You may feel assured that we are keenly interested in this bill and would like to see it passed.

You are perhaps aware of the fact that we have a legislative committee for the experiment stations representing the land-grant colleges. Dr. L. E. Hawkins, of Stillwater, Okla., is chairman of this committee. If you have not already done so, I think he would be the appropriate person for you to write. Then, if he needs any assistance, he will call upon those whom he feels might be the appropriate persons to have appear before the committee.

You also are perhaps aware of the position taken by the American Association of Land-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Grant Colleges in regard to this particular work. I am quoting same below:

"The association believes that progress can be made in the industrial utilization of agricultural products, and that the best way of making progress is to provide additional funds for this purpose to the established agricultural research agencies of the land-grant institutions and the United States Department of Agriculture."

Sincerely yours,

J. H. McLEOD,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN AND DIRECTOR,
Lexington, Ky., May 30, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is a belated reply to your letter of May 1, with reference to your proposed research program in the field of chemurgy.

We, of course, are vitally interested in finding new uses for farm products, to the end that farmers may profit by such markets and that consumers will have the benefit of new or improved products.

If and when Senator Clements holds hearings on this bill, we probably will be in a position to make a statement on it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. WELCH,
Dean and Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
May 28, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for you letter of May 2, 1956, with information about S. 3503, to provide expansion for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers.

Expanded research designed to find new crops and new industrial uses of present crops, now in surplus, is a worthy effort which our research people have long had as an objective. The framework upon which to build this type of research exists in the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges of the Nation, but the financing has been meager when compared to general industrial research financing. Unfortunately, the research path is slow and the rewards materialize sometime in the future. This is not an argument against expansion of such a program now but it is important to realize that immediate large results will not likely be forthcoming.

The director of our agricultural experiment station, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, is a member of the legislative committee of the directors of the 48 States and 3 Territories. His committee, I understand, is planning to request permission to appear before the appropriate committees of Congress considering this bill, to present the combined thoughts of the agricultural experiment station directors of the United States.

As the research program develops, the university, as usual, is prepared to cooperate in the areas where it can contribute substantially.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT G. SPROUL.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Kingston, R. I., May 21, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am in receipt of your letter together with the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving your speech together with a copy of the bill which you have introduced into Congress. As a station director, I am happy to lend support to this bill.

In our experiment station organization we have a committee known as the organization and policy committee which is represented by directors from the four areas of the country. This committee appoints a legislative committee consisting of one director from each region. We have found in the past that it is desirable for us to have all legislative matters handled by the members of this committee. They are authorized to speak for the directors.

The chairman of our organization and policy committee has requested that the legislative committee handle the testimony for the station directors in support of your bill. I trust, therefore, that having the matter handled in this way will prove satisfactory to you.

Very sincerely yours,

MASON H. CAMPBELL,
Dean and Director.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
V. P. I. AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Blacksburg, Va., May 19, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: On my return to the office, I found your letter of May 2 and the speech which you made on the uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby. I deeply appreciate this and feel that you are on the right track. Certainly, we need a great deal more research in the utilization of farm products. The bill and your speech certainly indicate a thorough consideration of this long-range problem. I sincerely hope that we can be of assistance in this field and will collaborate at the very first opportunity with Dr. H. N. Young, the director of our agricultural experiment station.

Thanking you for your thoughtfulness, I am,

Respectfully yours,

W. H. DAUGHTREY,
Associate Director.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, N. C., May 16, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Reference is made to your letter of May 2, in which you enclose the bill that you introduced which would provide an attack toward the solution of the farm problem by developing new uses for many of our surplus farm products. I am sure that all of us feel that there are real possibilities in exploring further such uses and we are pleased that the Congress is giving attention to this most important subject. The organization of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors has a legislative committee, of which Director Louis Hawkins, of the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station, at Stillwater, Okla., is the chairman. I am sure that you would consider it most appropriate for our appearance in your hearings to come through such a committee. I am assuming, therefore, that you wrote to him also and, furthermore, that when the opportunity arises for hearings that he and members of his committee will represent all of the rest of the experiment station directors.

Very sincerely yours,

R. L. LOVVORN,
Director of Research.

EXTENSION SERVICE,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
New Brunswick, N. J., May 17, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am appreciative of the fact that you have sent me the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your suggestions relative to a new research program leading toward greater utilization of farm products.

If uses for agricultural products can be developed on a basis which will make it economically sound to produce and process the crops in question, I am sure that the farm problem will be solved.

We are very much interested in the plans which you propose but must confess that over the years we have been discouraged by the chemurgic attempts which have, for the most part, met with failure because of the prohibitive costs involved in processing the various agricultural products. Certainly, however, we should not permit such a defeatist attitude to occupy our minds, and we, therefore, will follow with the greatest interest the results of your research campaign.

Sincerely yours,

LINDLEY G. COOK,
Associate Director.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Newark, Del., June 4, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is in response to your letter of May 2, 1956, which accompanied a copy of the speech which you made before the Senate March 21, 1956, concerning a $100 million research program to double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known. I have read your remarks and those of your distinguished colleagues with considerable interest. I am enthusiastic about the possibilities of such a research program. I believe it could be made to yield extremely worthwhile results.

One may wonder why land-grant colleges and agricultural experiment stations have not made more progress on this problem in the past. I would suggest that part of the difficulty arises out of the fact that, as you have indicated in your speech before the Senate, the approaches in the past have only been nibbling at the fringes of the problem. Each new increment in available research funds has been too small to accomplish the large purposes such as you visualize. Each of these increments have been programed well in advance and by and large have been programed primarily in terms of the facilities and research personnel available. This has tended to keep us in something of a rut.

Your approach provides for a stimulus for a new approach not committed to present proposals or programs. We hope that this proposal receives the consideration which it merits.

Sincerely yours,

G. FRED SOMERS,
Associate Dean and Associate Director.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE OF THE
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio, May 23, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of recent date concerning the importance of marketing programs as the ultimate solution to the farm problem. We appreciated very much the attached copy of your speech made in the Senate on March 21.

The Agricultural Extension Service has given major emphasis to marketing education programs during the years past with added emphasis to this phase of the program during the last few years We operate in the area of overall marketing education in assisting rural people in developing new markets, new marketing facilities, and in the orderly movement of agricultural products. During recent years we in Ohio have become

involved in a broad consumer marketing program by assisting the consumers in general by furnishing marketing information on seasonal supplies and buys and in an effort to further promote the orderly marketing of agricultural products. We appreciate very much your interest in this area and agree that much can be accomplished by promoting still further the marketing program.

Very truly yours,

W. B. WOOD,
Director.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING,
Blacksburg, Va., June 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I regret that I have not replied to your letter in reference to your speech on the farm problem. I have read your speech and the comments by yourself and others with a great deal of interest. The solution of many agricultural problems, as you have indicated, lies in research and education. The amount of money spent for research in agriculture is very small compared to that spent in industry. Additional funds expended for research could go a long way toward helping to solve some of our most vexing farm problems.

Thanking you for your courtesy in sending me a copy of your talk, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. B. DIETRICK,
Dean of Agriculture and Director of Extension.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, why do we ask the American farmer to cut back his production? Why do we not say to him, "We are going to find new uses for farm products in industry. We are going to find new uses for your products. We want you to grow more, not less. We want your income to be greater, not smaller. We want to create new jobs in America, not fewer"?

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about a certain school of thought to whose expressions I have listened occasionally. I refer to the thought which is entertained by many persons that the small or marginal farmer must be eliminated, that such a farmer has no place in the scheme of things today. I say shame on any man who makes such a statement. The small farmer can be eliminated, if it is desired to do that, and his land can be turned over to the big farmer. But what will happen? The big farmer will grow more on the land which will be turned over to him than did the small farmer. So we shall have more production. We shall have more surpluses. We shall not have solved any problem by transferring the acreages of the small farmer to the big farmer. We will increase the problem rather than decrease it. What made America great was having a multitude of small farmers and a market for the products they grew.

Let us establish a research laboratory. Let us appropriate the necessary money for it. Let us get the American people thinking about the problem. Let us spend as much time and money in trying to find new uses for farm products as we have spent in showing the farmers how to grow more, so the small farmer on a 40-, 80-, or 100-acre farm can remain in production. A farmer today can produce about twice as much as he used to, by the use of new types of fertilizer and seeds. Let us find new uses for his products, so he can live on the farm and can produce on his acres, regardless of how small his farm may be, and receive sufficient income to make a living. If we do not do that, if we go in the opposite direction, we shall travel backward and bring about a peasant system, a feudal system in America, in which a few farmers will own all the land. That is not what we want. That is why hundreds of thousands of Europeans left Europe originally and came to America. They left to get away from big landowners, so they might own a few acres and make a living from them. Let us create new markets for farm products. Let us find new uses for farm products.

I again say I hope the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on the bill. I dislike saying this, but I hope we shall not have to make a political issue of the matter, because the farm problem is not a political problem; it is an economic problem. Let us handle it as an economic problem. Let us have the bill reported, or, if the bill I have introduced is not reported, let some bill which is similar to it in substance be reported, and let us go forward in finding new uses for farm products and new markets.

Mr. President, I previously asked permission to have printed in the RECORD letters I have received from people scattered all over the United States, who have shown a keen interest in this proposal. I have many more letters. I think I shall withhold them until I make another speech on this subject, which I hope I shall not have to make.

I trust the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on the bill and report it. As Senators know, Congress passed a farm bill. It was not entirely satisfactory to everybody, but, generally speaking, I think it was a good bill. It was as good as any which could be had. I am not criticizing the bill or anyone who had anything to do with it at all. We found ourselves faced with huge surpluses, and we had to get rid of them somehow. We found ourselves faced with the surplus production of farmers who, as a result of help from the Government over a period of years, amounting to billions of dollars, produced crops in such quantity that the market could not absorb them. If we will spend as much time, money, effort, and ingenuity in finding new uses for farm products as we have spent time, money, effort, and ingenuity in showing the farmers how to produce more, we will permanently solve the farm problem.

I appreciate the remarks made by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. I am directing my closing remarks to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman of the subcommittee which would handle the bill I have introduced. I request them, I urge them—yes; I even beg them—not on behalf of myself as the author of the bill, not on behalf of myself as a farmer, but in behalf of all farmers and all Americans, to report the bill so that we may proceed in an earnest effort, not next year, but this year, to find new uses for farm products, and new markets, thus assuring prosperity to the farmers of America, and eliminating the idea that they can become more prosperous by reducing farm production. Moreover, by finding new uses for farm products, we shall be able to eliminate the great price which the farm program has been costing the American taxpayers. I have been told that it will cost $365 million this year to store surplus commodities. My bill asks for only $100 million in the next year to find new uses for farm products. I hope we can get the job done before Congress adjourns, which I hope will be within the next 30 days.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a speech I made upon this subject on March 21, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART POINTS OUT UNLIMITED MARKET FOR FARM PRODUCTS—PROPOSES A VAST $100-MILLION RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DOUBLE THE DEMAND FOR FARM PRODUCTS THROUGH DISCOVERY OF NEW INDUSTRIAL USES AND UTILIZATION OF NEW PROCESSES ALREADY KNOWN

(Speech of Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, March 21, 1956)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am about to propose a far-reaching, permanent solution of the farm problem so vast that its potential is virtually unlimited.

While the economic, industrial, and social implications of this program cannot, with any degree of accuracy, at this moment be estimated, it is clear that this program will tend to solve, if not wholly solve, the farm problem for all time.

After months of painstaking examination of its possibilities, I have reached the altogether justifiable conclusion that this plan would, within a few years, create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal in amount to that now consumed for human consumption in the United States. It would double the farm market.

Essentially, this is a solution of the farm problem based, not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on the positive approach of creating new markets demanding complete and full utilization of our total agricultural capacity.

We have worked long and hard in the Senate for weeks on a farm bill to meet the contingencies of the moment. Out of all the debate, committee findings, staff studies, and my own personal research, I have reached the conclusion that any farm plan, to solve this problem on a permanent basis, must do three things:

First. It must provide for quick disposition of existing surpluses. Our Government is attacking this problem now with admirable vigor. I would like to see it move faster. But we are making substantial progress.

Second. The plan must provide, at the moment, for curtailed production until such time as we can create new demands to prevent accumulation of future surpluses based on normal production. This, too, is a part of the existing plan. This effort will be furthered, somewhat, by provisions of what we have called the soil-bank program.

Third. Most important and almost untouched in relation to its real possibilities, any such plan must include a tremendous research and development program—a program which should be started immediately, and financed by whatever Government funds are necessary—to develop to the utmost the industrial uses we already know about for farm products—and they are considerable—and at the same time find new uses creating a demand for at least double what we have considered the normal farm production of the United States.

It is this third point which I now propose. I know enough about its potentialities to convince me that if we in the Congress will face our responsibility to authorize and order such a program, we shall help to bring about 50 years of the greatest agricultural prosperity in the history of our Nation.

I know enough about it that I have been saying to the farmers of my State of Indiana: Do not sell your farmland. Buy more. The next 50 years on the American farm will see unprecedented prosperity.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. As one of the cosponsors of the bill which is being introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, I wish to say to him that I commend him very highly for this very wonderful bill, which will solve the agricultural dilemma, and again will make it possible for farmers to live. I can pay to the Senator from Indiana no higher tribute than to say that he has done this job extremely well.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from Idaho very much for his remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, or does he prefer first to finish his statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. I prefer first to finish my statement, Mr. President.

Imagine, if you can, what it would mean to this country—to all segments of our society—if we of the 84th Congress should be responsible for creating a farm market at least twice as great as any we ever have known.

It can be done if we will legislate a program to take the blinders off, as it were, of our agricultural research and development program, and throw the full white light of technical research and development, experimentation, test facilities, pilot plants, and unexcelled American know-how into an all-out effort to create new industrial uses for just the everyday products of our land.

First, of course, it would mean to the farmer a new life of productivity. It would provide prosperity for him. It would permit him to follow his natural instinct to get everything he can out of his land.

Second, it would create new jobs. Obviously, the demand for farm labor would increase. But its effect on industrial labor generally would be even more phenomenal. Entire new industries with millions of new jobs would come into being—industries to manufacture new products. The demand for new transportation facilities—automobiles, trucks, buses, railroads, airlines, and so forth—would be tremendous. The demand for new farm machinery alone would provide an industrial and labor stimulus almost beyond our comprehension.

Third, the increase in retail business would mount into the billions of dollars. Farmers, laborers, and, I am convinced, just about every other category of business customer in the United States would have more money to spend for just about everything business has to sell.

Fourth, such a program would, in my opinion, mean the end of a tremendous tax burden now imposed to finance our vast agricultural assistance and storage programs of the moment—a burden which we gladly bear as long as it is necesary, but a burden which all of us will agree would be a welcome deletion from our national budgets. If we can bring this about—and I believe we can—it would enable us to reduce taxes substantially and to make it easier to retire the national debt at a faster pace.

Mr. President, the ramifications of such a plan are staggering. It is brand new. At the outset, it would cost a little money—but, by comparison, only a drop in the bucket. After all, when it begins to cost more to repair your automobile, your tractor, or your furnace than a new one would cost, what do you do? You buy a new one.

I say to you, Mr. President, that it is high time this Congress bought a new approach to the farm problem, in the form of this research and development plan.

It meets the essential test. It is good for the farmer. It shows every promise of proving economically sound. It is, at the same time, good for all of the people.

What would such a plan replace eventually? This year, our agricultural assistance programs will represent a total investment of three billion, four billion, or perhaps five billion dollars. Yet, that assistance program has contributed to the accumulation of some $9 billion in farm surpluses, for which not only has the Government paid with the taxpayers' money, but which is costing in storage charges a million dollars a day—$365 million a year.

By means of this bill we are only asking for $100 million or less than one-third of the cost to store for 1 year the surplus agricultural commodities the Government of the United States now owns.

At this point, I want to take full cognizance of the good work being done toward working out the surplus disposal problem. The Government has sold, or otherwise disposed of, much more of our surpluses than generally is known. I do not want to criticize the good work which has been done, but I am firmly convinced that the program should be expanded and accelerated. Whenever possible, more and more of our surpluses should be made available to the needy at home and elsewhere. I believe that program is being speeded up. It must be.

Meantime, these surpluses hang over farm prices like a sword. They depress farm prices. This means lower farm income. It means less farmer spending for consumer goods. It means less tax revenue for the Government. And it means increased investments in agricultural assistance programs.

The plan I am proposing would reverse that situation. It would insure the American farmer his rightful share of an otherwise bountiful prosperity, by requiring full production in an economy guaranteeing fair prices. It would put an end to the unsound practice of spending billions of dollars to preserve a bad situation, when a great deal less would provide a permanent cure.

No, Mr. President, we cannot solve our farm problem permanently by curtailing production. We must increase consumption; we must find new markets. Since, generally speaking, the vast majority of our people are well fed, our only alternative is to find new and increased industrial uses for our agricultural products.

There is no question that this can be done.

It is my opinion that the Department of Agriculture and our research and development people know enough now, so that, given a real opportunity to prove it, they can find industrial uses for 5 billion additional bushels of grain, such as corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, rice, sorghum grains, and potatoes, each year. Let us remember that at present our total production of these grains is only about 6½ billion bushels. This entails a total of 180 million acres of grain cultivation. If another 5 billion bushels are added to that, we can see what that would mean in terms of additional cultivation for the American farmers.

Under capable and efficient management, the great chemical and oil industries of the United States have found, through research, many new industrial and commercial uses for their products. They now make everything from rubber to clothing materials from chemicals. The plastics industry has had a phenomenal growth through research.

All of this came about in the same degree as these companies invested their profits in research. You will agree that our more successful corporations spend millions of dollars each year seeking new and better products through research.

It is exactly this type of program which must be carried out in discovering new markets for farm products. Yet, no farmer or group of farmers can themselves afford to establish the vast laboratories necessary to carry out that research. It is simply impracticable and impossible for 6 million individual farmers to get together to carry out the kind of research and development program required to keep agriculture abreast of the rest of the economy.

Let me give you one example of a failure to keep pace with an important loss of consumption in farm products. Not so many years ago farm power was provided by horses and mules. This animal power consumed the production equivalent of some 80 million acres of feed grains. For lack of research, in my opinion, we have failed to produce a new market to take up the slack of that displaced production.

We have fewer tillable acres in production today than we had 50 years ago. I think the tillable acres today are about 350 million. Fifty years ago, when the only power on the farm was horses and mules, the horses and mules consumed the equivalent of 80 million acres of feed grains. Therein lies the difference between our surplus today and full consumption.

Mr. President, I come now to the point of proposing the most important program I ever have sponsored in my almost 12 years in the Senate of the United States.

The United States must undertake—and undertake at once—a $100-million-a-year research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. I send to the desk, for myself and other Senators, a bill to accomplish that purpose.

On behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bender], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Martin], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Potter], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoeppel], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Welker], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Martin], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Barrett], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Wisconsin [McCarthy], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to accomplish the purposes I have outlined. I ask unanimouse consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 3503) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received,

read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"DECLARATIONS AND FINDINGS

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the development of new and additional industrial uses for agricultural products:

"(a) Current productivity of farms in the United States is substantially in excess of current markets for their products at price levels which provide fair and substantial income to farmers.

"(b) National defense and the security interests of the United States require increasing and expanding agricultural productivity to meet possible emergency needs of the United States and its allies, which productivity cannot be achieved or maintained at depressed farm prices resulting from overproduction or with acreage curtailments to avoid overproduction.

"(c) It is in the national interest of the United States to increase the level of farm income in order that farmers may continue to share to a greater degree in the general prosperity of the Nation.

"(d) No program has been developed, and none can be foreseen, that can successfully shrink farm production for an extended period of time; but reseaerch programs provide known means potentially to increase substantially the industrial uses of agricultural products and thereby to achieve farm prosperity based on full, rather than curtailed, production.

"(e) Research facilities, both private and public, including those of land-grant colleges and universities, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on the development of increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products to enlarge opportunities for increased production by farmers and to reduce Government costs for the acquisition, storage, and ultimate disposition of agricultural commodities which are now a substantial financial burden to the Government.

"(f) The cost to the United States of such a research program may be expected to be more than offset by increased tax revenues resulting from increased earnings of both farmers and those who sell goods, wares, and merchandise to farmers, as well as by savings to the United States in costs of current agricultural assistance programs.

"PURPOSES

"SEC. 2. The purposes of this act are to find and develop through research, sponsored and financed by the United States, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products.

"ADMINISTRATION CREATED

"SEC. 3. There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administration), in which is vested the duties, powers, and responsibilities hereafter set out in this act. Such powers, duties, and responsibilities of the administration shall be vested in an administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve during the pleasure of the President. The administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

"DUTIES, POWERS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 4. The Administration shall conduct research, both scientific and chemical, make field studies, conduct both laboratory and field experiments, test production procedures on a commercial basis, maintain and expand pilot plants whenever necessary, maintain and operate manufacturing facilities where necessary to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and otherwise promote the finding, development, and commercial use of new, increased, extended, and perfected processes, techniques, and programs for industrial uses of greater quantities of agricultural products.

"POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 5. The Administration is authorized to:

"(a) Utilize such existing facilities of the United States, and such trained personnel employed by the United States, as the President finds can feasibly be transferred to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act. The President is hereby authorized to (1) transfer any such facility, facilities, or personnel to the Administration, or to (2) make any such facility, facilities, or personnel available to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(b) Build, purchase, or lease plant facilities, or necessary equipment, suitable for research, pilot plant, manufacturing, or other needs of the Administration in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) Employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and all technical or scientific employees engaged for research by the Administration shall be exempt from the civil-service laws and regulations.

"(d) Employ or retain on a contract basis individuals, firms, institutions, and organizations, public and private, including land-grant colleges and universities, to conduct research programs for the Administration pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 6. The Administration is authorized to pay incentive awards to private citizens for suitable and acceptable suggestions to implement the program established by this act, such payments to be made in accordance with previously published rules stating the amounts of, criteria for determining, and subjects of, such awards.

"SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized to appoint industry advisory committees and to employ consultants without compensation or at rates of compensation not to exceed $50 per diem.

"SEC. 8. The Administration may make grants to accredited schools, colleges, and universities for fellowships and scholarships in research for the purposes of this act.

"INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AGENCY CREATED

"SEC. 9. There is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture an industrial agricultural products agency (hereinafter referred to as the Agency). The duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the Agency shall be carried out by and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

"DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AGENCY

"SEC. 10. Under the delegations, directives, and policy determinations of the Administrator, the Agency shall carry out all of the duties, obligations, and responsibilities imposed upon the Administration by this act, including the making of research contracts, employment of personnel, contracts for the construction, purchase, lease, or other acquisition of real or personal property, and the maintenance of all records, files, studies, and other data undertaken pursuant to this act. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Administrator may delegate any power given him hereunder to the Agency, and he may control, supervise, and direct all Agency action permitted by law under this act.

"SEC. 11. The Administrator shall report semiannually to the Congress progress on research programs undertaken pursuant to this act to find and develop new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products.

"SEC. 12. The Agency may license, at a fair and reasonable royalty, any person, firm, or corporation to use any process developed by the Agency or to make and sell under any patent, or application for patent of the Agency. Such royalties shall be based upon fair compensation to the Government for its investment and shall be nondiscriminatory. Whenever the Administrator finds it in the public interest to do so, he may grant royalty-free licenses for processes developed under this act, including the right to make and sell under any patent or application for patent of the Agency.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, for the Industrial Agricultural Products Agency, the sum of $100 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the same amount annually thereafter. There shall be paid out of such appropriations the salary of the Administrator as well as all other expenses of his office. The President is authorized to transfer to the Agency $1 million out of unexpended Agricultural Department funds to initiate promptly this program following the enactment of this act for and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator will take into consideration, in introducing his bill, that in 1946 the Congress of the United States enacted the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946, and made provisions that various sums might be appropriated in succeeding years, increasing the amount year by year. The amount that could be used in 1947 for research and marketing was $9½ million. In 1948 it was $19 million. In 1949 it was $33,500,000. In 1950 it was $48 million. In 1951 it was $61 million. Thereafter the sky was the limit. One hundred million dollars could have been appropriated under the act.

I invite attention to the fact that in 1950, when $48 million could have been appropriated for research in marketing, the Congress appropriated $19 million. I suggest to the Senator that the problem is to get Congress to appropriate the money, or authorize it, to the extent of the figure of $100 million, which the Senator has suggested.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am thinking in terms of $100 million in addition to that which the Congress has already appropriated, or might appropriate.

I am also thinking in terms of establishing an organization which will really function and get the job done. Unfortunately, in the past, while the Department of Agriculture has done a good job in developing many programs, it has not had the capacity really to organize and promote a program of research, including the construction of pilot plants, the making of field tests, and doing the job in the spirit called for by the proposed legislation.

As the Senator will see when he reads the bill——

Mr. ANDERSON. I have read it.

Mr. CAPEHART. As an inherent part of the legislation, we wish to set up an administrator who will have almost the title of czar. He will proceed to get the job done, in the same fashion in which the Government developed synthetic rubber during the war. One of the weaknesses of the present plan is that everybody's business is nobody's business.

What we propose is to get the job done immediately. The proposed program might well be called a crash program.

I am mindful of what the able Senator has said. Unfortunately the Congress, both in Democratic and Republican administrations, did not take sufficient cognizance of the existing legislation. In my judgment,

the job should have been done by this time. At least, we should be well on the road toward accomplishment of it.

What we are now advocating is that we give this program everything we have, and get the job done. We should spend whatever money is necessary, and take whatever time is necessary.

Let me say to the able Senator from New Mexico—and no one knows it any better than he does—that if and when we solve the farm problem, it will be solved on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry. We shall never solve the farmer's problem by producing for food uses alone. He will have to produce for industrial uses.

The question is, shall we solve the problem over a period of 10, 15, or 25 years? Or shall we solve it as we solved the synthetic rubber problem during the war period, by doing the job immediately? That is the purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not opposed to solving the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the able Senator is not opposed to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. On the contrary, under the terms of the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946, a special agricultural research administration was established in the Department of Agriculture. Many of us have tried repeatedly since to get sufficient appropriations for that agency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Later in my speech I shall name the laboratories we now have. I shall mention some of the things the Department has been able to accomplish, and I shall cite some of the programs which they are about ready to bring to a successful conclusion. With a mandate from the Congress such as is contemplated in the proposed legislation, I am sure the programs will be accomplished more quickly, and that we shall relieve the farm situation by producing more instead of less. I hope we shall be able to do something really worthwhile for the country and the people. I know that the able Senator is 100 percent in accord with that aim.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, would the Senator object to my asking unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of his remarks, there be printed a table with reference to the previous legislation, showing that it requires steady, constant pushing by the Congress to get the necessary appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be delighted to have the table printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the table which the able Senator from New Mexico has in his hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, speaking for a moment about that $100 million figure, it is less than one-third the amount we now spend merely to store surpluses which, as long as they exist, can have no effect other than to cause low farm prices.

I can think of nothing more economically sound than to buy for $100 million a year a program that would eventually replace an assistance program running into the billions and at the same time eliminate the costly surplus situation which makes such an assistance program necessary.

Some may ask why the Government should finance industrial research for one segment of our economy. There are several reasons.

First. Many years ago we "crossed the bridge" in establishing as public policy that the Government had a responsibility to see to it that farmers shared fairly with all others in the national economy. Our farm assistance program is now public policy. That decision has been made. Our job now is to determine whether we are doing so in the most efficient and economical manner.

Second. We now are spending billions of dollars a year on programs which, on the record, do not face up to our basic farm problems. That is evidenced by the fact that farm productive capacity is far greater than existing markets for farm products.

Third. Industry has proved the value of research in finding new uses and new markets for surplus products. Why, then, should we spend billions of dollars to curtail production and reduce farm income when, as I will show, a few hundred millions of dollars spent on research can be expected to find new markets, sufficient not only to consume our present normal productive capacity but double it?

Fourth. It is just good sound business for the United States Government and all of its people. The Government now owns $9 billion of farm surpluses. Such a program as the one we propose would enable us to realize at least something on the investment we now have in surpluses. But, much greater than that is the probability that such a program should save billions in support programs, increase farm income, boost tax revenues, stimulate business through increased farm purchasing power, and create millions of new jobs. All of this adds up to greater and greater national prosperity to be shared by every man, woman and child in the United States.

So, I say this is the responsibility of the United States Government, which makes it the solemn duty of the Congress. This Congress and the executive branch of the Government never have had a greater opportunity to serve the welfare of the farmers and all of the people than by extending overwhelming approval to this bill. As far as the Congress is concerned, we should arrange quick hearings and pass the bill promptly.

There are a good many specific examples of benefits, through research already done, which accrue from such a program as this one. Let me recite a few:

Some years ago, the citrus fruit industry was in bad shape. Then, our Department of Agriculture, through research, aided in the perfection of the quick-frozen food process. I am told that this virtually saved the citrus-fruit industry. Consumption went up, income went up, and a great new phase of this industry resulted—from what?—from research.

The Department of Agriculture is said to be on the verge of perfecting powdered, whole milk. All commercial powdered milk at the moment is skim milk. I believe that perfection of powdered whole milk would go a long way toward doing for the dairy industry what the freezing process did for the citrus industry.

I understand the Department is about ready to perfect the research on powdered, whole milk. If they are, it means that there will be twice as much whole milk sold as now. It will require twice as many cows as now. It will give the dairy industry twice as much business. If and when the Department of Agriculture perfects powdered whole milk, that is what will happen.

Someone may say to me, "You say they have perfected it." Possibly that is true. However, even after it is perfected, under the provisions of the bill, pilot plants will be built to prove its worth. Field tests will be given, and its worth will be proven. Then private industry will be licensed to proceed with the production of powdered whole milk.

Agriculture is now working on a high-protein food for cattle that would, if perfected, revolutionize animal feeding and consume an additional 150 to 160 millions of bushels of wheat a year, the production equivalent of 7½ million acres. From a 56-pound bushel, we would get 16 to 20 pounds of high-protein feed.

Think of that, Mr. President. One hundred and fifty million to 160 million bushels of wheat. That is almost enough wheat to take up the surplus of wheat at the moment. That is only one item.

Work is progressing to develop metallurgical oils from grain.

I am told that the researchers are near perfection of an oil made from grains which can be used in the manufacture of paint.

We know that synthetic rubber can be made from grain. True, the process is more expensive, at the moment, than rubber made from crude oil. Agriculture is working now to bring that cost down. It would take 350 bushels of grain to make 1 ton of rubber. If we used ethyl alcohol from grain to produce all of the 900,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year, it would require the consumption of 315 million bushels of grain, or the production equivalent of about 7 million acres.

That is 315 million bushels of grain. At the present time we produce only about 6½ million bushels each year. That 1 item alone would take 315 million bushels.

One of the great potentials in the field is the production of microba rubber, a natural rubber, from the gluten in grain. There is another great possibility.

All of these, if finally perfected, would require the production equivalent of hundreds of thousands—yes; millions of acres of grain. Who can tell just how many acres?

There is no limit, as the population increases and new uses are found for the products of the farm.

We have known for many years that ethyl alcohol can very successfully be blended with the gasoline used in an automobile. If just 10 percent of the blend was ethyl alcohol made from grain, it would require more than 2 billion bushels of grain a year and there would be no grain surplus. Actually, a blend of 25 percent of such alcohol could be used without major adjustments to the engine.

At the moment it would cost more, but know-how in America always gets the price down, as we well know. If we had a 10 percent blend, it would take more than 2 billion bushels of grain. The total production at the moment is only 6½ billion bushels. That is the entire production in the United States. That is just one item, Mr. President, and it is a matter of bringing the price down.

Now, if such a program should be undertaken, it might reduce temporarily the consumption of crude oil. But my best judgment is that in the long run this reduction would be more than offset by increased consumption in the hundreds of thousands of new tractors, trucks, transport vehicles, automobiles, and other petroleum-burning equipment in use because of this very program.

The petroleum industry might lose 10 percent and retain 90 percent. However, the 90 percent in only a few years time would be so much bigger in volume and so much more important to the industry, that the two are hardly worth comparing. It shows what can be done, if only we in Congress would have the same imagination now, and get that same imagination and push and zip into the Department of Agriculture, to do the job that private industry is doing. We would not have to appropriate money for subsidies for the farmer, and we would not have to worry about the farm bill.

We could put the farmer into a very prosperous position. We are not going to help the farmer very much by reducing his production. We can help him only by increasing his production, and this bill provides for that. The White House is already behind it. It is very enthusiastic about the objectives and purposes of the bill.

As many Senators know, it was an Englishman who first discovered penicillin. But, it

was our Department of Agriculture that developed the means for its commercial production. So, Mr. President, what I am here proposing already is going on at a snail's pace, while we spend billions on an agricultural surplus program. This must not be a snail's pace program.

This must be a crash program as an investment in agricultural and even greater national prosperity and economic health.

It is the only way I know to achieve a permanent farm prosperity based on full production rather than costly acreage curtailment.

Such a crash program in research will, of course, require pilot plants, field tests, and commercial plant-testing facilities. This type of operation is not new to the United States Government either.

The Government owns a now idle plant in Omaha, Nebr., for making ethyl alcohol from grain. This should be reactivated immediately.

This and possibly other similar plants should at least make into grain alcohol the surplus grains which are available. Yet the plant at Omaha is standing idle, and it should be reactivated.

Plants are being operated under the system about which the Senator from New Mexico was speaking, but they have not a sufficient appropriation. They do not have one man thinking about the problem day and night. They are dragging. They are not going forward. Partially, of course, it is because Congress has not given them sufficient money, and likewise, partially, because they do not have the imagination in the Department which they should have in order to accomplish this objective. In my opinion, they should have advocated the same thing which some 35 Senators are advocating here today. They know the situation and they know what can be done.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Some 10 or 15 years ago there was a great deal of activity in this field by a private organization supported by industry, and known as the Chemurgic Council. They were on the point of success, when the war came on, and the project was temporarily abandoned because of the war. Does the Senator from Indiana know whether there has been any revived activity?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not.

Mr. BRICKER. I have heard of none.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was financed, I think, by private industry.

Mr. BRICKER. It was. The Ford Motor Co. was interested in it, and there was a great deal of interest in my State. It is centrally located, in Columbus, Ohio. It was operated along the line of developing food and fiber products into commercial uses, not only in the field of gasoline, about which the Senator has been speaking, which is entirely practicable except dollarwise, but in every field of utilization for construction, for the building of automobile bodies, as I remember, and soybean utilization. They were manufacturing cloth out of milk. One man had a hat made out of milk. It seemed to be as good as any other hat. It was made by Stetson, as I remember.

Mr. CAPEHART. We should do what we did during the war with reference to synthetic rubber. Once the Government perfects and approves each of these products, it can then be immediately turned over to private industry for production.

Mr. BRICKER. The synthetic rubber program was really perfected by private industry with Government money.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. Private industry is working on many, many uses for farm products. If we can pass this bill, it will help the farmers. The project could be concentrated under one man in Washington whom I am willing to call a czar, to do whatever is necessary—bumping whatever heads are necessary to be bumped in the Government in order to find new ways to use farm products so that the farmer can increase instead of decrease his production and be on an equal footing, so far as profit is concerned, with industry.

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to join the Senator in sponsoring the bill. I think it offers great possibilities. In the years ahead, I believe the possibilities will become greater and greater. It is a field in which the Government should interest itself.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are 6 million farmers, and they cannot all get together.

Mr. BRICKER. Industry is not interested at this time, because there is no dollar return.

Mr. CAPEHART. They have about all the business they can handle at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. So long as they have the resources available to them in coal and fuel oils, out of which they can make so many of the products which are now being made synthetically, they will not turn to farm products, because of the dollar cost.

Mr. CAPEHART. They are selling about everything they can make. Only the Government can help the farmers at this time. Only the Government can do what is proposed, and it should do it.

Mr. BRICKER. I think it is comparable to an observation I heard yesterday with respect to the fiber-glass development in this country. It started in one small plant, and fiber glass is now used in 101 different ways. There was an adequate return to justify investing capital in the project. But the Senator feels that cotton fiber and the like can be utilized.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall show that 11 probable uses can be made of agricultural products. The Department estimates that these uses will take nearly 3 billion bushels of grain. I shall name the 11 products in just a moment.

Mr. BRICKER. It becomes more important as the years go by because our other resources, such as oil, coal, minerals, and so forth, are becoming depleted. We shall ultimately have to have some kind of synthetic substance.

Mr. CAPEHART. It will have to be done some day if we are to solve the farm problem. The question is, Will it be done over a period of 50 years, or are we going to just sit down and think about the money, the time, and the effort required to do the job quickly, instead of spending billions of dollars in subsidies paid to the farmer to keep him from producing something? If we spent a small fraction of the money in helping the farmer to find new uses and new markets for his products, everyone would be better off.

Mr. BRICKER. I think we all agree with the Senator's statement of a moment ago that the farm bill is not satisfactory to anyone. It has been hampered by expediency, and we are not happy about the situation existing in agricultural areas.

There is not only a department of research in the Federal Government, but in practically every State there is an agricultural research station bent upon increasing production. They are developing better crops and new things for the farmer to develop in the conventional agricultural line.

Does the Senator from Indiana know of any research work going on, either federally or at State levels, or in the universities, to transfer to industrial uses some of the food and fiber now used in normal consumption?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think there is considerable work going on, possibly in private enterprise. Our Government departments are doing some work in universities. The Federal Government has been spending hundreds of millions of dollars, as have the agricultural universities, to help farmers to grow more, but they have completely forgotten about where the market can be found. This bill would provide that the Government shall spend money and time finding a market for that which they have been showing the farmers how to produce.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator anticipates, then, in this program, that emphasis would be laid upon the new utilization of farm products, and he would also encourage a continuation of the research now being done in State institutions.

Mr. CAPEHART. The administrator would encourage private industry, the universities, and the Department of Agriculture all to go forward with more research. Everybody would get to work on the problem in an effort to solve it.

Private agencies have been spending large sums of money on research for many years. Consider Purdue University in my home State of Indiana. Purdue has helped the farmers of Indiana to produce more and more and more, but no one is spending the money or taking the time to find out where the farmer will be able to merchandise or sell his increased production. The proposed legislation would do that.

American farm production has been built to a very high level. There is too much on hand. There is overproduction. Vast surpluses exist. Now let us spend the time, money, and effort—and it can be done—to find new uses and new markets for the farm products. When that has been done, the farm problem will have been solved.

Mr. BRICKER. I congratulate the Senator from Indiana upon his leadership in the program, which I think is of great interest to all of us. I am very happy to join with him, and I hope we may successfully start the program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had occasion to read the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, which he kindly sent to my office yesterday, and I also have scanned the bill.

I am wondering what is the difference between his proposal and the proposal submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], which is a part of the bill that was passed by the Senate on Monday.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the big difference is that the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska, which was made a part of the farm bill, called for a commission to study the problem and to report to Congress in June 1957.

My bill calls for getting busy now—today—because now is when the farmers need the help. The program ought to be started now. I do not think a study is needed to learn what should be done. I am a farmer; I know what ought to be done. Only one thing needs to be done, and that is to find more markets for that which is grown on the farm.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was why I opposed the Curtis amendment. It sought to make studies which already have been made. The Senator is aware of the fact that about 12 years ago, as a result of studies made, Congress authorized the establishment of 4 huge laboratories, 1 of them in New Orleans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Before the Senator from Louisiana came to the Chamber, I named them. They are located in New Orleans; Peoria, Ill.; Albany, Calif.; and Philadelphia.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Those four research laboratories ought to be required to make the studies. Why is it necessary to spend more money for further research?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill goes beyond research. It calls for the building of pilot plants. It calls for additional studies to be made by the State universities.

I am not criticizing what has been done in the past. I know that in 1946 a bill was passed, in which a certain sum was authorized, and the laboratories were set up. The complaint I have is that in 10 years——

Mr. ELLENDER. Nothing has been done.

Mr. CAPEHART. There has not been accomplished what I think should have been accomplished. I think that through the proposed legislation Congress ought to mandate the administration, especially the Department of Agriculture. An administrator, whom I should like to call a czar, should be appointed to get the job done. I want to see one appointed who will start bumping heads together. Let us get the job done. The farmers are in a bad situation.

A real farm problem exists. We worried about it on the floor of the Senate for days and days. It is costing billions of dollars.

There is no one who knows anything about business who does not know that a person's income cannot be increased by cutting back production. It is necessary now to do it temporarily under the farm bill, in order to reduce surpluses, so that prices can be brought up higher. But that is not the real answer; it is only a temporary answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to remark that research as a rule is a very slow process. What the Senator from Indiana seeks is a continuation of the utilization of the surpluses on hand, without any method having been found for their use.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not follow the Senator's line of reasoning. I am trying to have Congress and the administration do for agriculture that which was done for the rubber industry during the last World War. During the war and in a hurry, the Government developed a synthetic-rubber industry to the point where today more synthetic rubber can be produced in the United States than can be used.

I do not want to delay the expenditure of the money. The program ought to be what might well be termed a crash program, and the administration ought to be mandated to proceed with it. We should insist that the administration move ahead promptly with such a program. It ought to be accomplished twice, three times, or four times as fast as any similar program that has been undertaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. There must be a basis from which to start. It is not possible to say that wheat or that cotton should be used unless a process has already been devised, and that requires research.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course it does; and that research will not be done in 1 month or 1 year. But if a start is not made, the research never will be done.

I am going to discuss some 11 projects on which the Department of Agriculture is working at the moment, and which the Department feels reasonably certain can be accomplished and will use 3 billion bushels of corn a year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me the difference between the approach which the Senator from Indiana is taking—and I commend him for his constructive thinking, and am happy to be one of the sponsors of the bill—and the approach discussed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is simply that we find ourselves today where we were in 1943, 1944, and 1945 in the development of atomic energy and the atomic bomb. A large amount of research was in progress in a great number of laboratories for many years. Dr. Lawrence, of South Dakota, one of our distinguished sons, was engaged upon that project for a great many years. When the war began, it was put on a crash basis.

Under the bill which is now proposed, the research program will be put on a crash basis, and will be given new impetus. Discoveries, which have already been made in the Peoria laboratory, and in other laboratories and institutions, will be developed further in pilot plants, in an effort to give publicity to the new uses which can be made of farm products, and thus to speed up the disposal of farm surpluses.

I am certain that no one expects that a bill which will be passed this year will solve the problem next year; but it will certainly shorten the time which otherwise would be taken if we relied solely upon the normal processes of exploration, investigation, and study in Government laboratories. Am I correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from South Dakota is 100 percent correct. We are trying to make a start and to arouse enthusiasm on the part of the Department of Agriculture to accomplish this job.

Who would have said 50 years ago that today there would be radio, television, and plastics? Who would have said 75 years ago that there would be automobiles to the extent that they exist today? Who would have said at the beginning of the century that we would have all the new products which we enjoy today?

I think that what we are talking about will eventually be worked out. I think eventually enough uses will be found for farm products. But it will take too long to find them unless the Government becomes interested in the matter, because six million farmers cannot do the work by themselves; they have no way of doing it.

Mr. MUNDT. What is sought to be done by the bill is to take the program of farm chemurgy out of low gear and to put it into high gear.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a very good historical background for doing this. Senators will recall that in World War I the United States found itself without a dye industry. We were at war with Germany, who had a great deal of experience and know-how in the making of dyes. But by putting the program of dyemaking on a crash basis, by stimulating the program for the research and development of raw products in laboratories and chemical factories, and in the clothing industry, before the war was over the United States had acquired a first-class dye industry, in a short space of time. What we did in wartime from the standpoint of dyes we can do in peacetime from the standpoint of farm products. We did that in the matter of synthetic rubber produced from industrial alcohol obtained from corn, molasses, and a great number of other products. We did it from the standpoint of utilization of atomic energy as a weapon of war in the more recent war. America's history is replete with evidence of our capacity to get a job done when we concentrate our money, energy, and know-how on the problem. The only way to get ahead is to make a start.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not any question that the American researcher and American engineer and the American people and this Congress and the Department of Agriculture and our great universities and our great research laboratories can do the job if somebody—and that somebody has to be the Congress of the United States—mandates them and tells them to do it, and helps them to do it with appropriations and with direction, and with an administrator for the whole program.

Mr. MUNDT. The difficulty has been that we have been nibbling away at the whole problem, when it takes a man-sized bite to get going. The bill would provide enough latitude for the Secretary of Agriculture, or the man he appoints to administer the program, not only to enter into contracts with colleges and universities, not only to stimulate American genius in laboratories at Peoria and elsewhere, but to enter into contracts with our great chemical corporations and great industrial laboratories, whereby their genius would be devoted to this problem. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. So we would bring into the picture not only our scientific scholars and students in the laboratories at colleges and universities, but some of the most hardheaded businessmen who for years have utilized their production with scientific discoveries in the laboratory, and who could devote their efforts to the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. It seems to me the parallel between atomic energy and the production of synthetic rubber during the war does not wholly follow. We are not faced with a great need for a product; we are faced with the need for a new utilization of the surplus production of the farms of the country. The problem becomes not one of scientific development, because that is generally understood. Formulas have been arrived at and the research has been done, but not to the degree of determining the economy of such a process. One of the problems of our scientific and research organizations is to work out the economic problem, because in our economy, we have to bring the cost of production down to the point where it can compete with products conventionally used.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which means that we must have pilot plants built and field tests must be conducted in order to prove the products.

Mr. BRICKER. It is an engineering and a production problem rather than a scientific and research problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Possibly it is more of an engineering and production problem.

Mr. BRICKER. I think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. We already know how to proceed. It is a question of ways and means to operate economically.

Mr. BRICKER. Those engaged know how to do many things with the products, but new developments may come.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are more developments we have not heard of than there are that we know of.

The Government owns four going research and development laboratories as follows: First, Southern Utilization Branch, New Orleans, La.; second, Northern Utilization Branch, Peoria, Ill.; third, Western Utilization Branch, Albany, Calif.; and fourth, Eastern Utilization Branch, Philadelphia, Pa.

We now have an oil-from-shale pilot plant at Rifle, Colo.

We have operated two coal hydrogenation plants from which a great deal has been learned about the economics of making gasoline from coal.

Senators all know, of course, that the Government perfected the process of making synthetic rubber during World War II. Recently, we were able to sell the plants we used in this process at a profit and create a whole new series of income-producing, taxpaying properties.

In this connection, it is my belief that as fast as the Government proves the practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should then be turned over to private industry for production.

Mr. President, there can be no justification for further delay in starting this program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator may have mentioned before I came to the floor, but I did not hear him touch on it. We have also developed a very successful method of utilizing industrial alcohol as a gasoline blend.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I mentioned that.

Mr. MUNDT. During the great depression days of the thirties we had, in South Dakota, in Sioux City, Iowa, and in that general area, half a hundred filling stations which were at that time selling an alcohol-blend gasoline, and it worked very satisfactorily in the automobiles of motorists. It was sold, that long ago, at competitive prices.

I have under preparation at this time a bill I intend to introduce in the Senate which would provide some kind of method whereby, from tax or some other concessions, we would make it possible to utilize alcohol from farm products for fuel. We do now have a way to cut into the surpluses.

Mr. CAPEHART. The administrator, under the bill, would be authorized immediately to get busy. The Government now owns an alcohol plant in Omaha. We wish to have that reactivated and have it start making grain alcohol. We wish to have a pilot plant to start blending alcohol and gasoline in order to get the price down and prove its worth. We ought to have all sorts of programs of that kind.

Mr. MUNDT. I presume one of the responsibilities and duties of the new administrator would be to make legislative suggestions to Congress so that Congress could be helpful, perhaps in the way of granting tax concessions for the manufacture of alcohol-gasoline blends for automotive purposes, or perhaps granting tax concessions to factories engaged in the production of industrial goods made from agricultural products. There are many ways in which a man dedicated to this responsibility could function, in addition to handling the contracts and the general scientific and exploratory functions of the office.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is absolutely correct.

When it reaches the point of productivity which I envision for it—the point at which it will obviate the necessity for our present agricultural assistance programs—it will have accomplished the dual purpose of reducing Government expenditures and increasing farm and national prosperity and the social, economic, and industrial welfare of our Nation. As I see it, this thing is nearly all pluses and almost no minuses. I cannot see any minuses in it at all.

What we have been doing up to now is based upon a hope that some day conditions may improve to such a point that we shall have an adequate market for our farm products.

I wish to repeat that thought, and I want the officials of the Department of Agriculture to read it, and I should like to have the Secretary of Agriculture read it. What we have been doing up to now is based upon a hope that some day conditions may improve to the point at which we shall have an adequate market for our farm products.

What we are proposing is a concrete program to create that kind of a market. Much of this program can and should be carried on in existing public and private laboratories, particularly in our schools and colleges. The Department of Agriculture has been working with many such educational institutions for years. Moreover, the Department now has a limited research staff in its several experimental stations working on these and related projects.

The program we propose should be built on the framework of and within the existing research activities of the Department of Agriculture. It would not be well to disrupt the Department's existing organization or disregard the value of its experience.

The program here suggested must use all of the existing research and experimental facilities of the Government. In the past it seems to me, one of the weaknesses has been a lack of funds for pilot plants and field tests. These are, of course, necessary to test the commercial feasibility of any new process or product. My proposal would make such funds available.

So we propose to utilize to the fullest every existing Government facility. But the larger and more dynamic program which we contemplate cannot be accomplished on any business-as-usual basis.

For that reason, we propose that this entire research and development program be placed under the direction of a full-time administrator at the White House level.

He must be the most competent man available—a man of great stature, who would have the complete confidence of the President. No other man in the executive branch of the Government would have a more important job to do for his country. We are convinced that this program, under such dynamic leadership, would go a long way toward permanent solution of the farm program.

For want of a better term, we might call this man the "czar" of the Agricultural Industrial Products Development program.

Who knows what miracle products such a program might develop? The possibilities are challenging to the Congress, to the executive department, to our best scientific research brains, to the American people, and, more particularly, to the American farmer.

There are many industrial uses for agricultural products on which some research has already been done. I shall read a list of 11 probable industrial uses for agricultural products on which the best available estimates indicated a likely annual use of 2½ billion bushels of agricultural products whereas we now produce only 6½ billion yearly. This list was given to me by the Department of Agriculture:

"1. High-protein food by fermentation, 150 million bushels a year.

"2. Paint from vegetable oil, if 5 to 10 percent of potential market is reached, 15 to 60 million bushels a year.

"3. Synthetic rubber, 365 million bushels a year.

"4. Microbia rubber, if 10 percent of the potential market is reached, 25 to 30 million bushels a year.

"5. Increased use of starch in paper, 40 to 100 million bushels a year.

"6. Industrial exploitation of oxystarch, 10 million bushels a year.

"7. Raising disease-free poultry for export, 13 million bushels a year.

"8. New drug plants, 4½ million bushels a year.

"9. Hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat, 20 to 40 million bushels a year.

"10. Development of high-amylose corn, 10 million bushels a year.

"11. Blending 10-percent grain alcohol with gasoline, 2 billion bushels a year.

"Total, 2.6 to 2.7 billion bushels."

Other possible uses for grain derivatives include smokeless powder, plastics, medicinals, toilet preparations, soaps, cleaners, anesthetics, antifreeze, dyes, varnishes, power, and fuel.

If we keep at this research job, I can foresee in time our using in industry 6 billion bushels or more a year of agricultural commodities.

This program has been under study by a great many persons other than myself. It is the product of a great deal of serious consideration of one of the most serious problems in the United States.

The potentialities are so vast that any attempt to evaluate the benefits to this Nation and its people dollarwise is an almost hopeless task. I have been unable to select any segment of our economy—any group of our people—who would not lead more comfortable lives and enjoy higher standards of living and benefit generally from the fruits of such a program.

It would mean the assurance of a full market for full farm production.

It would end our farm-surplus problem.

It would save the Government money.

It would help to relieve the tax burden and give us a chance to reduce the national debt.

It would create new industries.

It would create new jobs.

It would stimulate retail sales.

It would provide better incomes for our people, including the Nation's 6 million farmers.

It is, in our opinion, in all modesty, the most constructive approach to the farm problem yet devised.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say we have no time to waste. I hope the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the committee immediately will hold hearings on the bill, and that representatives of the Department of Agriculture will be prepared to testify in behalf of the bill before the committee. I am certain they will favor it, because, in my opinion, this program, as I said a moment ago, is one which the Department of Agriculture itself should have begun and should have suggested to the Congress 1 or 2 years ago, or perhaps longer ago than that. After all, the solution of this problem is the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture, which does have, as it should, the best interests of the farmers at heart; and the Department of Agriculture should be enthusiastic about any plan which shows any chance whatsoever of helping the American farmers, particularly under existing conditions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Laird in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that I appreciate very much the presentation he has made on this very interesting subject. Some 15 years ago, as the Senator from Ohio has stated recently, there was a chemurgic movement, which I believe was a private activity. The Senator has said he is familiar with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was very much interested then, as a layman, in the field of farming. I think there are many more commercial uses of farm products.

I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana for the very fine presentation he has made; and I wish to say that I can well understand the reason for the great success he has had in the business world, because the zip he has shown in his presentation of this bill demonstrates a positive approach to the problem of finding increased uses for our agricultural products, with the result of greater prosperity for the farmers of the Nation.

I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the bill, along with the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

It is so obvious to me that this plan is the only way to solve the farm problem. That problem will be solved only by finding new uses and new markets for our agricultural products. The problem will not be solved—at least not in a satisfactory way—by paying subsidies or by reducing production or by anything of the sort.

The problem will be solved only by increasing production—by having the farmers produce more and by having an increased economy, rather than a decreased economy. That simply must be the answer; there cannot be any other.

The only question is whether the Congress and the administration wish to go along as usual in regard to this matter; or whether we really want to do a proper job, and do it quickly.

As the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated a moment ago, in 1946 the Congress set up the laboratories. But perhaps both the Democratic administration and the Republican administration since that time should be blamed, and perhaps the Congress itself should be blamed for not appropriating enough money and not requiring the administration to get this job done.

Today, I plead that we do the job. I plead that all of us get behind this program. Let us give the farmer some hope. Let us say to the American farmer, "We are going to get this job done for you. We are going to create new markets for your products. We are going to make it possible for you to grow more, instead of less."

By doing that, the farmer will be able to buy, and will buy, more farm implements and more of all other kinds of products; and the railroads will carry more grain and other farm products, and so will the trucking lines. The retail stores in the small towns in the farming communities will sell more. Everyone will gain; no one will lose.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Indiana for the excellent presentation he has made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive that anyone would be against this plan. In fact, I do not know of anyone who is against it. Some persons have said, "At the moment there are not enough engineers or scientists to make it possible for such a program to be carried out." However, Mr. President, in my opinion, those are alibis and excuses; they are not good reasons.

I have always said that when handed a lemon, make lemonade out of it.

In this case the farmers and the country generally are faced with a great problem because of the overproduction of agricultural commodities. We have encouraged the farmers to produce more and more. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for our agricultural schools, which have worked diligently to show the farmers how to produce more and more and more. The seeds have been improved. Today there is huge production; but the markets for it are insufficient. Let us be just as enthusiastic in helping the farmers find new markets as we have been in increasing agricultural production. Once we do that, we shall really be doing something for the American farmer, and we shall really solve this problem. Unless that is done, the problem will not be solved, in my opinion.

I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am criticizing the farm bill we passed the other night, or that I am criticizing the Department of Agriculture, the Congress, or any individuals. I am simply trying to point out what is so obvious to me as a businessman and a farmer.

We ought to start on this program tonight. Possibly the Senate should remain in session tonight to pass this bill and set ourselves on the road toward accomplishment of this program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a circular issued by the Farm Research Committee, of Indianapolis, Ind., explaining in some detail the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the circular was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPEHART URGES MORE FARM PROFITS, NO FARM SURPLUS

We call it a surplus because farmers produce more than they now sell at a fair price. That's why the Government has invested $10 billion in a price-support program, costing $1 million a day just to store what we don't use.

And we should not reduce production.

Reduced production is a temporary expedient, necessary only because of already-accumulated surpluses. The permanent answer is to create through research and development, new industrial uses for farm products—and thus assure new jobs, new markets and a fair, profitable price for everything the farmer can produce.

What we don't eat can be used to make industrial products: Cosmetics; rubber; vanilla; plastics; vitamins; drugs; dyes; auto fuel; antifreeze; paper; paint; varnish; leather-tanning agent; clothing, from cornstarch; insulation, from cornstalks; nylon, from corncobs; vicara (like lovely cashmere), from corn gluten; penicillin, from cornstarch wastes and wheat bran; tobacco humidifier, from apples; rayon, from vinegar; furniture coreboard, from puffed wheat; auto lubricants, substances for roadbuilding and for keeping chocolate from turning white, from soybeans; wool-like fiber, paper coating, glue and paint, from skim milk casein; white leather (washable in hot water), new hide process; mothproof real wool (won't shrink in automatic washer or dryer), would restore many sheep-grazing acres now in wheat if experiments are concluded successfully; concentrated fruit powders; new fibres (water-resistant stain- and flame-proof, stronger, longer-lasting, "wash-and-wear"), chemically transformed from cotton; etc.

While wisely spending millions to help the farmer grow more, we have spent only a drop in the bucket to find new markets for his increased production.

No more acres are farmed today than 50 years ago. But they produce a lot more because of better mechanical power; better tillage, seeds, and fertilizers; better weed-killers, insecticides and forage crops, and new and better animal breeds, feeds and medicines.

We now produce 5 percent more than we use.

In 10 years, it may be 10 percent.

In 20 years, we'll still meet our food and fiber needs (which will be 60 percent greater than in 1950) * * * with no increase in cultivated acreage * * * with a farm-labor force 20 percent smaller than today's * * * and have more unsold crops than ever * * * unless we do something about it now.

So we should find more industrial uses for farm crops fast.

EVERYONE'S IN FAVOR OF THE CAPEHART FAST RESEARCH FARM PLAN

1. To find new uses for farm crops.

2. To use farm crops as raw materials in already proven manufacturing processes.

3. To create thousands of new jobs.

4. To pay incentive awards to private citizens for suggesting new-use ideas.

5. To enlist and coordinate the intensive help of agricultural colleges, corporations, foundations and industrial advisory consultants.

6. To use Government pilot plants to prove the soundness of new discoveries—then license private persons and companies to make and market the new products.

7. To step up tremendously the activities of the Government's four agricultural research laboratories already in operation.

Already commercialized are over 100 new uses for farm products discovered in these 4 Government laboratories. Income taxes from thousands of resulting jobs have more than paid off the taxpayers' investment.

Already these 4 laboratories (on a far smaller scale than the Capehart plan calls for) are far along with research on another 11 new uses which, if successful, alone could use 2½ billion bushels of grain a year (and our annual total production is now only 6½ billion bushels).

These 11 new uses are: 1. New drugs. 2. Paper from starch. 3. Cardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat. 4. Paint from vegetable oils. 5. Synthetic rubber. 6. Microbia rubber. 7. High-protein food by fermentation. 8. Industrial uses of oxystarch. 9. Disease-free poultry for export. 10. High-amylose corn. 11. Power and auto fuels.

Bigger market, higher income, protection from sudden, damaging price shifts, more and better farm jobs.

Selling more equipment to the farmer, building more factories, trucks and railroad facilities, shipping additional crops and new manufactured products, advertising and marketing new products, etc.

The Capehart fast research farm plan would cost the taxpayer only a penny a year for each $1 already spent on the price-support program, less than one-third what it now costs just to store what we don't use.

Actually, it won't cost anything. It will make money. Its initial cost would be more than repaid by (1) taxes on new income from new jobs, (2) royalties paid to the Government by private manufacturers and marketers of the new products, and (3) sharp drops in the Government's cost of surplus storage and artificial price supports.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should also like to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Indianapolis News of Wednesday, December 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

American farmers again have demonstrated their remarkable ability to produce crops in unprecedented amounts.

The story is the same in Indiana and all over agricultural States—recordbreaking 1956 crops despite the smallest harvested acreage in 20 years.

Indiana farmers' production was so great that the Department of Agriculture has raised its estimate of the corn crop in this State by 10 million bushels. This adds up to 295,546,000 bushels, an average of 62 bushels an acre.

In many parts of the Nation a weather-made crop-control program was in effect. Bad weather in the planting season and serious droughts in several areas, however, could not hold down production records.

The reason for this great outpouring of agricultural products is the technological expertness of the modern farmer. He is quick to enlist the newest scientific knowledge in preparing and fertilizing his fields, in planting his seed and in cultivating his crops. The use of modern machinery has given him greater efficiency.

As related to the future of America, this is a hopeful picture. It does not appear likely that this Nation, although it is undergoing a rapid population growth, will have to worry about food shortages for years to come.

But it also shows that plans for production control to bring the prices of agricultural products in line can at best be only an expedient. A better method must be found.

The plan of Indiana Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART is the most sensible. He proposed at the last session of Congress that a research bureau be created to find new uses for farm products.

The 1956 crop production emphasizes the need for this type of program. The Nation must find a way to utilize the whole abundance of American farms.

HOME LOANS TO VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. HILL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to open the bottlenecks which have frustrated the efforts of veterans to

take advantage of the housing benefits to which Congress believes they are entitled.

This measure has three main provisions:

First, it would make available 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund for direct veterans' home loans at 4½ percent interest. This would mean about $1,400,000,000.

Second, it would increase the authorized amount of the mortgage limit from $10,000 to $14,000.

Third, it would eliminate some of the delays in processing applications which in many cases have actually prevented loans from being made.

Mr. President, the unhappy fact is that in many areas of the country money is simply not available for veterans' housing, except at a price too high to pay, and as the interest rate creeps up availability decreases.

This measure would make available to the veterans money out of their own fund. At the same time, the fund would be protected in two ways—it could neither make a profit nor suffer a loss.

Any profit that accrued to the fund would be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. Any loss incurred by the fund would be reimbursed by the Treasury, but experience has shown that the possibility of a loss is practically negligible.

Experts in the field assert that the lack of money is not the only limiting factor. They say that the present mortgage limit of $10,000 has a dampening effect, and that there have been many cases in which applications to the Veterans' Administration simply have not been processed.

This measure seeks to meet both of these situations as well as a third factor which has contributed to the difficulties of veterans in obtaining home loans. At the present time the Veterans' Administration does not begin to process an application until the voluntary credit groups have reported their inability to obtain private financing. This delay all too often results in the veteran losing the particular housing for which he was seeking financing.

This bill would require action—not necessarily favorable action but action—by the Veterans' Administration on each application for direct loan at the same time as efforts to obtain private financing are being made. If private financing is available, within a 20-day period, it will be preferred and used. But, if private financing is not available, the Veterans' Administration will be in a position to make qualified loans at a much earlier time than at present.

This measure will facilitate the efforts we have made to meet our obligations to our veterans. It would stimulate the construction of housing. And it would help to slow down the constantly rising interest rate which has been so costly and harmful to so many of our fellow Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that this measure be permitted to remain at the desk until next Tuesday so that other Senators may join me in sponsorship if they desire to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 726) to provide that 25 percent of the National Service Insurance Fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans; to increase the maximum loan entitlement of veterans under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to expedite action on certain applications of veterans for direct home loans, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SCIENTIFIC SCHOLARSHIPS FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today we are faced with the same problem our caveman ancestors were faced with 10,000 years ago, that of survival—just plain staying alive, as persons, as cities, as States; in fact, as a nation.

Our Nation has fought for its life many times and won. It has survived because it fought back after it was struck. Without going into too much history, World War II supplies us a good example. The blow that hit Hawaii hurt, but our great heart, the continental United States, was not touched. We were badly damaged, but we had time, and time gave us the chance to use successfully our resources, our brains, our industrial know-how.

We won, but it cost us plenty—in the words of one of the world's great men—"of blood, sweat, and tears."

But suppose we are attacked today. Can we survive a modern sneak blow? The bombs that fell on Pearl Harbor were powerful, and though they did not damage the city of Honolulu, they put our proud Pacific Fleet out of action.

But how about today? One bomb today would not only wipe out Pearl Harbor, but the city and probably the whole island as well. Today, the first blow can be the winning blow. But we are not a people who would strike that first blow. We never have, and we never will.

I believe many in this world in which we live are jealous of us—envious—believing we are trying to take over everything. Some of them think that way because that is their plan. They know we will never be the first to strike. Knowing that a blow, a sneak attack would cripple us, bring us to our knees, might they not try it?

How are we to avoid that first attack? The answer is by having on hand a superior capability to strike back with such awesome power and devastating weapons that they dare not move against us.

Is this strength numbers of men, ships, planes? Yes, they are a part of it. But today we all acknowledge that the race is going to be won by the highly skilled, the highly trained scientists, engineers, technicians, and research personnel.

The complex weapons which will keep the peace not only for us, but for the world, demand an enormous number of individuals trained in these fields. This demand is a growing, ever-expanding one, and if we do not meet it, we are lost.

We have to win this battle of educational superiority, not only for ourselves, our children, and their children, but for the whole world. There is no second prize in this race.

With world conditions being what they are, it is particularly alarming when we realize that the United States is dangerously lagging behind the Soviet Union in the training of its youth, in the fields of engineering, and other scientific research. The situation demands the immediate attention of the Congress, because it has already reached the peril point in our national security and future economic well-being.

What are the indisputable facts concerning this perilous condition? Let me cite a few which will jolt us to the stark realization that we are courting too long the dangerous partner of complacency.

Today the Soviet Union is graduating over twice as many engineers and scientists each year than are being graduated in the United States. According to a recent report issued by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Soviet Union now has an estimated 890,000 trained scientists and engineers, compared to an approximate 760,000 in the United States. This fact alone reveals that the Soviet Union has the world's largest supply of trained scientific and technical personnel. In Russia today, 50 percent, or approximately 543,000 of college students, are engaged in the study of science and engineering, compared to only 15 percent, or approximately 375,000 students, engaged in these fields of study in the United States.

In a recent address delivered by the very able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] before the American Vocational Association, this subject was dealt with in a very lucid and factual manner, pointing out the inherent danger which lies ahead unless immediate, positive, and effective steps are taken to encourage the training of our youth in these scientific fields of endeavor. In this thought-provoking address, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] stated:

> This educational battle, part of the current cold war, is one we cannot afford to lose.
>
> But the facts show we are losing it.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Missouri for rendering such a great public service in trying to focus the attention of the Nation on this extremely important problem. The President of the United States in January 1956 reported to the Congress that there was an inadequate supply of scientists in the United States, particularly in the field of research.

This problem has been of considerable concern to many of us for some time.

After much thought and study, I have come up with what I believe to be a partial solution which we in the Congress can effectuate. It is a solution that will be a long step forward in providing a means by which our youth can engage in the study of science and engineering and allied technical fields.

Mr. President, I introduce at this time, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the use of interest from such investments for scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to make the most appropriate and beneficial use of funds resulting from the wartime confiscation of enemy property, by authorizing the National Science Foundation to use the interest resulting from the investment of such funds for scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

In the 84th Congress, various proposals were introduced designed to provide scholarships in these highly technical fields, none of which were enacted into law. They failed for a variety of reasons, but I feel sure the budgetary problem—the money problem, if you please—was the principal reason.

I am confident that the bill which I am introducing today will answer most all of the objections which this type of legislation encountered in the past. This proposal is entitled the "Veterans' Children Scholarship Act," and would provide $3 million each year for engineering and other scientific studies. More than that amount will be available after the program is in operation. In its first year of operation, approximately 1,500 scholarships would be available.

This is a reasonably simple bill designed to use existing Government facilities, thereby foregoing the necessity of setting up any new governmental agency. Let me briefly describe it.

In 1950, the Congress established the National Science Foundation and empowered it to award "scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study, or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited" institutions of learning. All of these are educational fields in which we are lagging behind.

I have been advised by the Foundation that it is budgeting at the rate of about $3 million each fiscal year for fellowships in these fields. The legislation which I propose will provide an additional sum of approximately $3 million, without the necessity of further appropriations. Let me stress that point—without appropriations.

Because of the limitation of funds, the bill would limit the granting of these scholarships and fellowships to children of veterans of both World Wars and the Korean conflict. Other than that qualification, the Foundation will operate under existing law, and will select the students on a basis of ability, with safeguards as to citizenship, loyalty, and with wide distribution among the States and Territories just as it does today.

The funds for the scholarships will come from moneys and properties vested by the United States under the Trading With the Enemy Act. In this respect, I think it fitting and proper that seized enemy property be used to strengthen our country. This is particularly true since our former enemies have agreed to let us keep these seized assets as our only reparations, a point that seems to be too often overlooked.

While I do not wish to enter into a lengthy discussion of the enemy assets problem at this time, the following points are essential for the record in connection with the proposed bill:

First. All known enemy property in the United States has been vested or seized. Its value is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $575 million.

Second. Existing law bars its return to the former owners, or that they be compensated for it.

Third. Existing law requires the property be liquidated, and claims of our citizens be paid therefrom.

Fourth. The United States has signed agreements with Germany and Japan that in return for our waiving all rights for reparations from our former enemies, we are to keep the vested properties as our only war reparations.

Fifth. Germany and Japan have signed agreements to repay their own nationals for the losses they sustained because of the vesting by the United States of the property in question.

Of the approximately $575 million, $275 million has been disbursed by law, with $225 million going to the war-claims fund, and $50 million for administering the properties since 1942.

There is, therefore, an approximate balance of $300 million. Some of these moneys must be held in trust, since the properties represented thereby are in litigation in our courts and cannot be disbursed until the suits are disposed of. Other sums must be maintained by the Alien Property Custodian for operating expenses.

The bill I am introducing makes $100 million of these moneys immediately available to the Secretary of the Treasury for investment in interest-bearing securities of the United States, and also provides for the continued transfer of additional funds to the Secretary for investment as fast as they become available.

The resulting income would be turned over to the National Science Foundation for scholarships and fellowships.

Under existing law, the money held by Alien Property Custodian is the property of the United States. It belongs to us, to our Government, our people, and we got it because we waived our rights to any reparations from Japan or Germany, or any of our enemies in the last world war. In other words, our only reparations from World War II were the enemy property located within our borders. We and our former enemies agreed to this arrangement. So I say let us use these available moneys now lying useless to educate our young people in order that we may maintain our great strength and develop our skills during these troubled and unsettled times. The children of our veterans constitute a tremendous pool of able young people from which to draw. The Veterans' Administration has advised me that there are approximately 2,500,000 children of veterans in the college-age bracket.

We know only too well that our own national security now and in the foreseeable future depends upon the development, production, maintenance, and improvement of highly complex technical instruments such as supersonic missiles, electronic brains, atomic reactors, thermonuclear development, modern up-to-date aircraft, radar warning nets, and so forth. Highly trained personnel in the fields of science, engineering, and medical research are needed if we are to keep abreast and ahead of the technological advances made by the Communist world.

Aside from the national defense aspect, the skills in these fields will be utilized to the benefit of our future economic well-being, giving us higher standards of living and a continuous expanding civilian economy. This peaceful use of these needed skills will provide us with a long reign of prosperity and make it possible for America to maintain its competitive position in the markets of the world.

Therefore, under this proposed legislation we can enrich our Nation's knowledge and strengthen our capabilities, and do this without creating any additional drain on our Treasury.

The money is available; the Government machinery for operating the program is in being. The need is great and immediate. All that is needed now is action by the Congress.

In doing so by this means, we will further prepare our great Nation for the tasks which lie ahead. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this bill, if enacted into law, would be a major step forward in a field in which we are at present falling behind. I hope that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join with me in supporting this bill and in obtaining its approval at the earliest possible date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 727) to provide for the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the use of interest from such investments for scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNITED STATES ACADEMY OF NURSING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would establish a United States Academy of Nursing. I ask that a statement I have prepared, concerning this proposal, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and that following the statement there be printed in the RECORD the text of the joint resolution itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Nursing, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is existing in the United States a nationwide shortage of women qualified in the nursing profession; and

Whereas this shortage also exists in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas there are at the present time no facilities for the education and training of women comparable to the existing service academies for the training of officers in the Armed Forces of thhe United States; and

Whereas a system of officer procurement that will provide an adequate and continuous flow of young women trained in the profession of nursing and qualified to meet the needs of the armed services is desirable; and

Whereas such a program of basic education should provide courses of instruction designed to equip graduates with the training, experience, and motivation that will prepare them for an active nursing career in any of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established in the Department of Defense the United States Academy of Nursing, hereinafter referred to as the "Academy"; for the purpose of training selected young women who shall be known as cadettes in order to insure a steady flow of trained nurses to the Armed Forces.

SEC. 2. (a) The Academy shall be located at such place within the United States as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, except that any site selected shall be relatively near a major military, Veterans' Administration, or cilivilan hospital.

(b) Following the selection of a location for the Academy, the Secretary of Defense is authorized—

(1) to acquire land from other Government agencies without reimbursement, with the consent of such agencies;

(2) to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 601 of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365, 40 U. S. C. 551);

(3) after consultation with authorities in the fields of medicine, nursing, and hospital administration, to prepare plans, specifications, and designs, to make surveys, and do all other preparatory work, by contract or otherwise, as he deems necessary or advisable in connection with the construction, equipping, and organization of the Academy at such location; and

(4) to construct and equip temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, at such location.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be allowed at the Academy one cadette for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, or Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and one cadette from the District of Columbia. The Secretary of Defense shall select the cadette for each Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner from among persons whose nominations are submitted by said Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, and shall select the cadette for the District of Columbia from among persons whose nominations are submitted by the Commissioners of the District of of Columbia. The total number of cadettes selected by the Secretary of Defense during any one of the first 3 years subsequent to the establishment of the Academy shall not exceed 83⅓ percent of the total authorized strength of the Academy.

(b) Each nominee for appointment as a cadette shall have successfully completed such educational requirements as are generally held necessary for admittance to an accredited school for nursing, shall be between the ages of 17 and 22 at the time she is nominated for appointment as a cadette, and shall be an actual resident of the State, district, or Territory, or other political subdivision from which she is appointed .

(c) The President may appoint annually 30 cadettes to the Academy from the United States at large.

SEC. 4. Each cadette appointed to the Academy shall sign articles, with the consent of her parents or guardian if she be a minor, and if any she have, by which she shall engage, unless sooner discharged by competent authority—

(1) to complete the course of instruction at such Academy;

(2) if tendered an appointment as a commissioned officer in one of the regular components of the Armed Forces, to accept such appointment for not less than 3 consecutive years immediately following the date of graduation; and

(3) in the event of the acceptance of her resignation from a commissioned status in a regular component of any such Armed Forces prior to the sixth anniversary of her graduation, or in the event of an appointment in one of the regular components of the Armed Forces not being tendered, to accept a commission if tendered her in the Reserve of an Armed Force of the United States and not to resign such status prior to such sixth anniversary.

SEC. 5. The instruction and training program for each cadette shall extend over a 3-year period and shall be designed to develop in her the qualities and attributes essential to her progressive and continued development throughout her career as a nurse in the Armed Forces. Courses shall be of such scope and content as the Secretary of Defense shall determine after consultation with authorities in the fields of medicine, nursing, and hospital administration, and shall be designed to provide an education in nursing together with such basic military education as may be deemed necessary. The Secretary of Defense may summarily dismiss from the Academy any cadette who is found unsatisfactory in either studies or conduct, or who may be deemed not adapted for a career as a nurse in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 6. (a) Upon graduation from the Academy, each cadette may be promoted and appointed a second lieutenant or ensign, as the case may be, in the Army Nurse Corps of the Regular Army or in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy or as a second lieutenant in the Regular Air Force, and whenever any such appointment would result in there being a number of active list commissioned officers in any of such forces in excess of the authorized active list commissioned-officer strength, such strength may be temporarily increased as necessary to authorize such appointment. The graduates of each class shall be assigned relative seniority among themselves under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Armed Forces in which they are appointed.

(b) Each cadette at the Academy shall, prior to her graduation, be afforded an opportunity to state a preference for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps of the Regular Army, or in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy, or in the Regular Air Force, and shall, insofar as practicable and with the consent of the Secretary of Defense, upon her graduation be accepted for appointment therein.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall by regulations provide for the equitable and fair distribution of all appointments made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense may assign any commissioned officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man to appropriate instructive duty at the Academy and may appoint such number of civilian instructors as the needs of the Academy require.

SEC. 8. All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this joint resolution, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Academy of Nursing. All references in these laws to the Secretary of the Army, or any officer or agency thereof shall, whenever practicable, in pertaining to the United States Academy of Nursing, be construed as referring respectively, to the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces of the United States, and such officers and agencies of the Armed Forces of the United States as he may designate. The organization of the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 9. There shall be a board of visitors to the Academy, which shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) Six persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall, with the respect to the 6 Presidential appointees, consist of 2 persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, 2 persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and 2 persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Two Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The statement, presented by Mr. IVES, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Out of a deep conviction that something must be done to alleviate the serious shortage of nurses in the United States, I am reintroducing today a joint resolution providing for the establishment of a United States Academy of Nursing.

My feeling in this matter was fortified recently by a study made in my own State. The board of regents of the University of the State of New York appointed in 1954 a nurse-resources study group to assess the extent of the nurse shortage in the State. That group recently reported that 13 percent of the nursing positions budgeted by the 400 hospitals in the State were vacant. Perhaps the specific figures would be more meaningful than the percentage. The budgets of the 400 hospitals provided for 72,663 nurses, and 9,709 of those positions were unfilled.

The American Nurses' Association has reported that the entire Nation needs 70,000 more nurses to reach what the association calls the reasonable goal of 300 professional nurses per 100,000 population. And I have learned from the Defense Department that

the 8,500 military nurses are a thousand fewer than the number required.

The resolution which I am submitting has three purposes:

First. It would provide a steady supply of nurses for the armed services. The academy which I propose would be operated by the Department of Defense. Each of its students would, upon entering, agree to serve at least 3 years in one of the military departments after graduating.

Second. It would enlarge the pool of nurses available for civilian nursing work. Many of the academy graduates who might leave military service after 3 years would continue the practice of their profession in civilian life.

Third. It would be a gesture, however slight, toward righting the balance between the great amount of assistance which the United States Government provides for the education of men and the very little it does to help educate women.

My resolution provides for a United States Academy of Nursing, in which students appointed by members of the Congress or the President would receive a 3-year nursing education at Government expense. Each graduate would be commissioned in the Army, Navy, or Air Force—the one of her choice if possible. The academy would be located near a major hospital.

DESIGNATION OF JANUARY 22 OF EACH YEAR AS UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on January 22, 1957, more than 1 million Americans of Ukrainian descent will observe the 39th anniversary of the proclamation which declared the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. On that day the Ukrainian flag will be flown with the Stars and Stripes on the flagstaff of the city hall of New Haven, Conn., where for several years past Ukrainian independence day has been observed by proclamation of the mayor.

Since 1918, the Ukrainian people have been enslaved in the Soviet empire, without, however, surrendering in spirit or abandoning hope of eventual liberation. All Americans share the hope that one day the blessings of freedom and liberty will again be enjoyed by these brave people.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies. I am joined in sponsorship of the resolution by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. I ask that the resolution lie at the desk for 1 day so that additional Senators may add their names to the resolution if they so desire.

Passage of the joint resolution would be a signal to the Ukrainian people that America has not forgotten and never shall forget the oppressed peoples of the world and their never-ending struggle against tyranny.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which was submitted last October 19 to Secretary Dulles by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day, introduced by Mr. PURTELL (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. PURTELL is as follows:

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MR. SECRETARY: In view of your heavy responsibilities and acutely limited time, we are most grateful to you for this opportunity to meet and discuss with you foreign policy issues that are related to the fundamental subjects of Moscow-centered Communist colonialism and imperialism and of the many captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union.

As executive members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents about a million and a half Americans of Ukrainian descent, we wish to express at the very outset our satisfaction with the many accomplishments achieved by the administration in its policy of peaceful liberation. Its record is a positive and encouraging one, and has certainly kept alive the hope of eventual freedom in all the captive peoples, including the 40 million Ukrainian nation.

Moreover, your emphatic observation last year before the American Legion convention, "The Soviet bloc represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally, constituting more than 20 distinct national groups" (October 10), was most gratifying because it indicates a vital recognition of and abiding interest in the basic fact that the Soviet Union itself is a colonial and imperial complex of numerous captive nations. This development of vital recognition regarding this pivotal fact is seen also in the 1956 platform of the Republican Party which unmistakably points to Ukraine and the other captive nations in the Soviet Union in its marked reference to the liberation of "other once-free countries now behind the Iron Curtain."

All Americans who in knowledge and understanding have come to appreciate the strategic importance of Ukraine to the national interest of our country in its struggle against Communist colonial imperialism, cannot but appreciate also the advances reflected in this development of official thought. We look forward to further advances by way of forthright specification of these many captive nations in the Soviet prison of nations without fear of any baseless recriminations from Moscow which spuriously, but incessantly, claims that they are free and independent.

It should also be indicated that we are not unmindful or unappreciative of the wholesome changes undertaken by this administration in the reorganization of the Voice of America, particularly in respect to the area concerned with the nations in the Soviet Union. The appointment of an American-born chief over the entire area, in order to insure fairness and equality among the various desks, was a salutary step for which we fought many years.

I. AMERICAN POLICY AND THE COMMUNIST COLONIAL EMPIRE

In previous memorandums submitted by this committee, viz, one to President Eisenhower in July 1955, on the eve of the Four Power Conference in Geneva, and the other addressed to you on the occasion of the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference in October, an adequate elaboration of the essential facts substantiating the strategic importance of Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union to our national interests was provided. From every viewpoint—geographical, economic, political, and cultural—the crucial importance of this largest and richest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain was amply shown. Its critical significance to the global plans of imperialist Moscow was likewise demonstrated. In the findings and reports of the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression—the first official documentation anywhere, undertaken by the leadership of a Republican legislator, Charles J. Kersten—all of these conclusive facts on the invincible Ukrainian will for freedom and national independence, on the unbroken resistance of Ukrainian patriots to Russian Communist domination, on the natural alliance of Ukraine with America and its ideals are spelled out in concrete detail.

It is our purpose here to supplement in succinct manner this mass of authoritative material by advancing certain points of American policy in relation to the Communist colonial empire which, we earnestly feel, should receive careful study and be appropriately applied as guideposts in the field of foreign-policy operation. They are as follows:

1. The firm maintenance of the cause of peaceful and eventual liberation of all the captive nations with repeated repudiation of the immoral notion that there is any seeming finality about this captivity. As you yourself admirably stated it in April 1953, "It is of the utmost importance that we should make clear to the captive peoples that we do not accept their captivity as a permanent fact of history." Among these captive peoples is the 40-million Ukrainian nation, which surely falls within the obvious meaning of President Eisenhower's classic declaration: "Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples."

2. To realize these goods for all peoples—the newly created nations, the colonial nations, and particularly the captive nations in the Russian Communist empire—and to capture the imagination of people the world over, our policy should be progressively founded on the winning formula: liberation, independence, federation. This formula, grounded in fixed moral and political principles, would enable us to meet any exigency or problem, whether economic or political, in any quarter of the world. It provides us with a forward vision beyond liberation from the tyranny of Russian totalitarian imperialism in the guise of communism. It furnishes us with the clearest sense of inspired direction beyond the dissolution of this tyranny.

Logically and morally, the association of states, followed after the pattern of our own United States, to be free must obviously be based on the equality of all free nations. Thus, of necessity, any free federation of sovereign states, any federation entered into freely by equal nations—equal among equals—presupposes the condition of national self-determination and independence to insure the freedom of choice of any people. Liberation, therefore, assumes contextual meaning, and tremendous moral force in the broader framework of its necessary sequels, independence, and free federation. Federation without the preconditional step of national independence, which alone guarantees the condition of equal among equals, would be nothing more than a wasteful reversion to colonialism and imperialism.

Perhaps nowhere is this working formula more applicable than to the Soviet Union

and Eastern Europe generally. It is a formula that renders fulfillment to the peaceful policy of liberation. It is one to which you clearly alluded, Mr. Secretary, in 1952, when you wrote: "We could seek to bring other free nations to unite with us in proclaiming, in a great new declaration of independence, our policies toward the captive nations." We heartily agree with you on this, and hope that in relation to all the captive nations, including Ukraine, a universalized declaration of independence will not be too long in the offing.

3. A firm opposition to all forms of imperialism, colonialism, and empire in keeping with the unblemished traditions of our own country. It is recognized that the principle of such opposition must be flexible enough to allow for an orderly development of certain peoples to the point of self-determination. However, in relation to the Soviet Union which is the most tyrannical of all colonial empires in recorded history—an empire within an empire, incorporating civilized and many western-oriented peoples who, in recent history, have already determined themselves as independent states—such principled opposition should continually receive the strongest expression in our policy in favor of all patriotic forces at work in this empire.

4. Scrupulous avoidance of the Moscow term "Soviet people" in our policy statements. This term is a favorite expression of the Moscow dictatorship, employed chiefly for foreign consumption in the hope of conveying the thought of a Soviet monolith. Actually, the centrifugal forces at work in the Soviet Union, as represented notably by non-Russian nationalism, belie the existence of any such monolith. Indeed, Mr. Secretary, the composition of the Soviet Union fits entirely into your well-founded statement of April 1953, that "This present status involves the captivity of hundreds of millions of persons of distinctive nationality, race, religion and culture. * * *" By nationality, religion, and culture, the Ukrainian people, as well as the Armenian, Georgian, White Ruthenian, and others, are different from the Russian, and can always be depended upon to resist the Russifying and deculturalizing influences imposed by Moscow.

5. Forceful rejection of the Soviet Russian concept of "peaceful coexistence" and clarification of what a true peaceful coexistence involves. So long as the Iron Curtain exists, whether at present borders or the naively hoped-for borders of 1939, no such true coexistence is possible. Pope Pius XII's recent statements on the "mirage of coexistence," on the fact that no compromise is possible between Christianity and atheistic communism, deserve studied consideration to the extent that the united sentiment of all Christians in our Nation may be amply reflected in the foreign policy of our Government.

6. The permissible erosion of the unreal concept of "satellite nations" so to allow for a realistic conformity of our ideas and conceptions with the stark actualities of Central and Eastern Europe. All important studies of the situation there show beyond question of doubt that Hungarians, Poles, Slovaks, etc., are as captive politically and economically as the Lithuanians, Ukrainians and others in the Soviet Union. All constitute the captive nations; all are subject to the dictatorial directives of Moscow; all are integral parts of an enlarged colonial empire that was first established in 1920. The satellite notion blurs and conceals these facts, and on the basis of a legal fiction serves to assist Moscow in its colossal pretense that "the People's Democracies" are independent, native products. Again, we need have no fear of any repetition of the Pospelov incident of several years ago by viewing all of these nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, as equal captive, for Moscow, in general falsehood, consistently views them all as being equally "free and independent."

II. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY OPERATION AND UKRAINE

Turning to the field of operation, chiefly with regard to Ukraine, it is our considered judgment that Moscow in pursuing its present de-Stalinization program is operating mainly from a position of weakness created by internal empire troubles. These troubles range from underground resistance to bureaucratic mismanagement. One can be sure, however, that the so-called liberalization measures enacted by the oligarchical dictatorship will not go beyond certain points of danger to totalitarian control. It appears, therefore, that if there was ever a period of opportunity for us to advance further the liberation policy, it is now. The time is most ripe for the intensification and increase of these internal pressures, for us to press forward with bold initiative and imagination in bringing about substantial and irreversible changes in the Soviet Union and thus in the expanded empire itself.

As concerns strategic Ukraine in current circumstances, we recommend studied consideration of the following points of operational endeavor, completely attuned to the spirit of our peaceful policy of liberation as applied to all captive nations:

1. The publication and distribution of Amerika in the Ukrainian language as well as in those other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

2. The maximum use in the United Nations of the two historical documents recently received, via underground channels from Ukrainian political prisoners in Russian Communist slave labor camps. This is the first time that such striking appeals for western assistance have been funneled through the Iron Curtain from any forced-labor camp.

3. In a persistent call for free elections in all captive countries, the insistence upon a vote in Ukraine and in other non-Russian nations under the alleged guaranty provided in article 17 of the Soviet Constitution, which reads: "The right freely to secede from the U. S. S. R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

4. In the wave of posthumous rehabilitation of persons and institutions purged and genocided under Stalin, the advancement of a concrete proposal to reestablish out of their present catacombs the Ukrainian Uniate Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

5. In the additional light of Khrushchev's confession of Stalin's terror and mass murder, steps toward the ratification of the Genocide Convention in the next Congress in order to press for full inquiry and judicial action in regard to these admitted acts of genocide. One cannot but wonder about the splendid opportunities provided us by Khrushchev's admissions had we ratified this convention several years ago.

6. The dispatch of an American delegation to the Soviet Union, led by such men as George Meany, to visit and report on all known slave-labor camps still in existence, and where, in most instances, Ukrainian political prisoners predominate in numbers. Surely, if Mr. Khrushchev was amenable in allowing Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, to travel wherever he pleased in the Soviet Union, although, unfortunately, the Senator did not know what to look for, he should be similarly disposed toward such a delegation which intelligently would know what to look for.

7. The further expansion of the United States Information Services with concentration on the imperialist and colonial character of the Soviet Union.

8. A studied capitalization of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian representation in the United Nations, much in the view of Edward Weintal's observation of the subject (Newsweek, August 29, 1955): "To encourage their independence and to strive for the decentralization of the Soviet Union into its separate though not necessarily unfriendly components is likely to become one of the chief United States objectives."

9. To inspire in the next Congress the necessary continuation of the work of the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, especially in view of Khrushchev's manifest admissions at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, and to distribute the findings and reports on Russian Communist terror and genocide, prefaced by these admissions, through USIS, throughout the world.

10. Steps toward the extension of the Eisenhower Refugee Act of 1953 with adequate visas for those of Southeast Europe and in accurate designation of their respective nationalities, particularly Ukrainian, Georgian, Armenian, and other distinctive non-Russian nationals.

Mr. Secretary, we earnestly believe that these points on policy and operation are in the truest course of a peaceful policy of liberation. In the deepest conviction that under the courageous and moral leadership of President Eisenhower and his administration, under your bold direction, our foreign policy will continue to meet with still further successes in the spirit of the eventual liberation of all the captive peoples and nations, this memorandum is hereby respectfully submitted.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, *Chairman;*
Professor, Georgetown University.

NATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day.

When I introduced a similar joint resolution on February 29, 1956, more than 50 of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, joined me as cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent, that the resolution lie on the desk for 48 hours in order to give any other Members of the Senate who may so desire an opportunity to add their names to the resolution as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the last four Congresses I have introduced for several other southern Senators and myself a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors participating in the election of elective Federal officials, including electors for President or Vice President, and Senators and Representatives in Congress.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I am glad to announce that in reintroducing this joint resolution today, I am joined by the following distinguished Senators as cosponsors: my colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The sponsors of this joint resolution strongly believe that the amendment it proposes should be speedily submitted by the Congress to the States for ratification, and, if so submitted, we beleieve it will be quickly ratified by at least the required 36 States. Because we are so sure that the requisite number of States will speedily ratify the resolution, we are quite agreeable to the allowing of any reasonable period of time for the consideration and ratification of this resolution.

The poll tax requirement, now limited to five States, namely Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia, has been accorded far greater importance than it deserves. The fact of the matter is that the amount of poll tax required to be paid in the several States is so small as to impose only a slight economic obstacle for any citizen who desires to qualify to cast a ballot. This requirement operates, of course, equally on citizens of all races and colors and is generally subject to important exemptions which limit its application, such as the exemption of veterans, of women, and of citizens beyond a certain age.

Many good citizens have indicated their feeling that this subject matter should be dealt with by the passage of a Federal statute rather than by the adoption of a Federal constitutional amendment. The sponsors of this resolution feel very strongly that the Federal Government is without any authority whatsoever to deal with this subject matter except by the submission and ratification of a Federal constitutional amendment. Our position is concurred in by many able constitutional lawyers, coming not only from the South but also from all other portions of the Nation, who believe and contend that the only legal way to deal with this question, other than through action by the States themselves, is by Federal constitutional amendment, and that action through Federal statute would clearly violate the provisions and requirements of the Federal Constitution under which the qualification of electors, as prescribed under the laws of the several States, is adopted as a qualification of electors to vote for Federal officials.

The introducers of the proposed amendment are exceedingly anxious that it be acted upon speedily and favorably by the Congress so that this subject matter, which has been the source of such long controversy and fruitless debate, may be quickly submitted to the States, where we believe that it will be promptly ratified. We feel that such a conclusion of this long-standing controversy is decidedly in the interest of sound democratic government and stronger unity among all of the people of our Nation.

For myself and on behalf of the other Senators whom I have named, I now introduce a joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and that it lie on the desk until next Monday in order that other Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 19th day of January 1957 is the date of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, one of the greatest of all American military heroes; and

Whereas, in the minds of the American people, Gen. Robert E. Lee personifies their lofty ideals of courage, patriotism, and selfless devotion to duty; and

Whereas Gen. Robert E. Lee, following the termination of the War Between the States, by his every act and deed, sought to reunite this country, bind up its wounds and restore peace and harmony, and, by his example and influence, made a major contribution to the early accomplishment of this goal; and

Whereas Gen. Robert E. Lee was never restored to his full civil rights following the termination of the War Between the States, notwithstanding the fact that he made due application for presidential pardon; and

Whereas Gen. Robert E. Lee died October 12, 1870, still denied the right to hold any office, either civil or military, and the right to serve on any jury, and certain other rights inherent in American citizenship; and

Whereas the people of the United States in general venerate the memory of Robert E. Lee and consider him the embodiment of knightly virtue: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in commemoration of the 150th birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee and in honor of the knightly virtues of courage, patriotism, and selfless devotion to duty which he so amply displayed during his lifetime, Gen. Robert E. Lee of Virginia be, and he now is, posthumously restored to his full rights of citizenship, without exception, retroactive to the date of his application for presidential pardon, namely, June 13, 1866.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the desk until Monday next where other Senators may join in cosponsoring it. I also ask unanimous consent that the remarks I have prepared on the joint resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Saturday, January 19, is the 150th anniversary of the birth of that great American, Robert E. Lee.

I would that I had the ability on this occasion to find the words to properly pay tribute to this great American soldier and patriot but, while to be able to do so would personally be most gratifying to me, it is not really necessary, for you here and the people of the country at large, are well aware of the lofty ideals and selfless devotion to duty that this great man so well typified.

Lee was opposed to secession and to the breaking up of the Union; he felt that slavery was a greater evil to the white man than to the colored race; but his loyalty to Virginia made him refuse Lincoln's offer of command of the United States Army in 1861 and to espouse the Confederate cause. His name is forever coupled in our minds with such honored and historic names as Second Manassas, Fredricksburg, and Chancellorsville and his campaigns are studied as models by military men throughout the entire world.

I do not, however, wish to speak to you today of Lee's fame as a military commander, but instead, wish to call your attention to some lesser known events in the career of this great patriot, for his claim to fame can rest as much upon his efforts at reconciliation as upon his military achievements.

After the war, Lee's dignified acceptance of the state of affairs was probably the greatest single factor involved in bringing about a like point of view on the part of the people of the South. His philosophy was expressed in these words:

"I believe it to be the duty of every man to unite in the reestablishment of peace and harmony—the issue between the States has been decided by war. Let us abide by that decision."

By his every act and deed General Lee sought to reunite the country, bind up its wounds, and restore peace and harmony and by his influence persuaded many to a kindly feeling for the North—an almost superhuman task in those days of reconstruction.

Yet, notwithstanding the efforts of this far-sighted chivalrous man and notwithstanding the fact that his efforts were crowned with success and were the largest single contributing factor in reuniting the people of the North and South, Lee himself was never accorded recognition.

Urged to do so by Generals Grant and Meade, Lee applied for Presidential pardon and restoration to rights of citizenship on June 13, 1866. For some reason this was never granted to him and he died October 12, 1870, still denied the right to hold office either civil or military, the right to serve on any jury and certain other rights inherent in American citizenship.

Today, in the minds of the American people, Gen. Robert E. Lee personifies their own lofty ideals of courage, patriotism, and selfless devotion to duty and is venerated by all, both North and South, as the embodiment of knightly virtue. It is altogether fitting, then, that we today, in commemoration of his 150th birthday, set right this wrong of long standing. It is also fitting and proper that this move to restore rights of citizenship to Robert E. Lee and to pay tribute to him should originate in the North. I am, therefore, proud to offer this salute to Robert E. Lee on the anniversary of his 150th birthday and to urge the adoption of this resolution by this honorable body.

This resolution is submitted at the request of the Civil War Round Table of Indianapolis, the members of which believe that its presentation is particularly appropriate since next Friday, January 19, 1957, is the 150th anniversary of Lee's birth.

The Civil War Round Table of Indianapolis has prepared a historical outline of the citizenship status of Robert E. Lee and I include this sketch in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, as follows:

"A REQUEST FOR SENATORIAL RESOLUTION TO CORRECT THE CIVIL STATUS OF ROBERT E. LEE AT THE TIME OF HIS DEATH OCTOBER 12, 1870

"After the close of the war of 1861–65, Robert E. Lee was the outstanding figure in the South. His attitude and opinions were more generous and farsighted than the belligerent and antagonistic feelings then existing in the South. His plea in brief:

" 'The issue between the States has been decided by war. Let us abide by that decision.

" 'I believe it to be the duty of every man to unite in the restoration of the country and the reestablishment of peace and harmony. These considerations governed me in the counsels I gave to others, and induced me on the 13th of June to make application to be included in the terms of the amnesty proclamation.'

"Lee did apply for full pardon after President Johnson's first amnesty proclamation of May 29, 1866. Generals Grant and Meade, both recognizing Lee's influence throughout the South, urged him to do so. On June 13, 1866 Lee's application was sent to General Grant who forwarded it to President Johnson—'With the earnest recommendation that this application * * * be granted him.' No action, however, was ever taken.

"Lee's situation during the four proclamations of President Johnson

" 'Proclamation I (May 29, 1866)

" 'To all persons engaged in rebellion, amnesty and pardon, with restitution of property, except slaves, provided they took the oath prescribed. Except—

" '1. Civil or diplomatic officers of the Confederacy who left judicial stations under the United States.

" '2. Officers above the rank of colonel.

" '3. United States Congressmen who left their seats in Congress.

" '4. Those who resigned the United States Army or Navy.

" '5. Those who treated prisoners unlawfully.

" '6. Those absent from the United States aiding rebellion.

" '7. Military and naval officers educated at West Point.

" '8. Governors of seceding States.

" '9. Citizens who left the United States and went into the Confederacy to aid rebellion.

" '10. Those destroying commerce on the seas or making raids in the Confederacy to aid rebellion.

" '11. Prisoners of war or under bonds as such.

" '12. Those voluntarily participating in rebellion and the estimated value of whose property is over $20,000.

" '13. Those who have not kept their former amnesty oath.'

"Appendage: Special application may be made to the President by persons belonging to the excepted classes and clemency will be liberally extended.

"Lee's situation entirely excluded.

" 'Proclamation II (September 7, 1866)

" 'Full pardon and amnesty to all, except:

" '1. President, Vice President, heads of departments, foreign agents, those above the rank of brigadier general, those above the naval rank of captain, State governors.

" '2. All persons who in any way treated otherwise than as prisoners of war persons who in any capacity were employed in the military or naval service of the United States.

" '3. All who were actually in civil, military, or naval confinement, or legally held to bail, either before or after conviction.'

"The above left Lee and some 300 other persons excluded.

" 'Proclamation III (July 4, 1868)

" 'Universal amnesty and pardon, without oath, to all except such persons as may be under presentment or in indictment in any court of the United States having competent jurisdiction upon a charge of treason or other felony.

" 'To all others—unconditionally and without reservation, a full pardon and amnesty, with restoration of all civil rights of property, except as to slaves, and except also as to any property of which any person may have been legally divested under the laws of the United States.'

"The above left R. E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, John C. Breckenridge, Simon B. Buckner, and a few others unpardoned.

" 'Proclamation IV (December 25, 1868)

" 'Unconditionally and without reservation, to all and to every person, who directly or indirectly, participated in the late insurrection or rebellion, a full pardon and amnesty for the offense of treason against the United States.'

"The above would have restored full rights and privileges to Robert E. Lee had not the 14th amendment to the Constitution been passed on July 21, 1868.

"The 14th amendment to the Constitution (July 21, 1868):

" 'SEC. III. No person shall be a Senator, or Representative in Congress or elector of President or of Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.'

"Lee did not live to be completely restored to full rights of citizenship under the amnesty bill, passed by Congress June 8, 1898, which repealed section III of the 14th amendment. At the time of his death, October 12, 1870, his situation was as follows: He could vote. He could not hold any civil or military office, serve on any jury, serve as administrator of the Custis estate of Arlington to which he was appointed before the war.

"Since the entire Nation, North, East, West, and South, does now honor and respect Robert E. Lee as one of the finest of American gentlemen and is proud to have produced a man of such lofty character, we do therefore entreat that the Senate of the United States, in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Robert E. Lee's birth, January 19, 1807, resolve to extend, posthumously, full rights of citizenship, without exception, to Robert E. Lee and to make such resolution retroactive to the date of his application for pardon, June 13, 1866.

"We then, in all parts of the Nation, can claim him as one of our own and, in all honor, pay him this tribute.

"THE CIVIL WAR ROUND TABLE,
"INDIANAPOLIS, IND."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, when I discovered—and perhaps I should have known this fact, but did not—that General Lee had not had his rights restored, I was amazed, particularly because I had relatives who fought on both sides in the Civil War. Most of my family had migrated from Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina and settled in Indiana in 1812.

As I say, I was amazed that General Lee had not had his citizenship restored. Since General Lee's time we have had four wars, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

I have been in the United States Senate for 12 years, and during that time I have heard speeches lauding persons from foreign countries, who had been enemies of the United States, and the Senate applauded those persons when they visited the Chamber. I am not complaining about that. I want that definitely understood. However, I could not understand it when I was told that General Robert E. Lee had not had his right restored, including the right to hold office and the right to serve on a jury; and I felt that something ought to be done about it.

For that reason I am introducing the joint resolution, and I hope that many other Senators will join as cosponsors. I should like to add that the joint resolution already has some 30 or 40 cosponsors, and they are listed on the bill. I am hopeful that many other Senators will join with me in cosponsoring the joint resolution. I did not read the names of the cosponsors because I did not think it was necessary to do so; the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS FOR PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the last Congress I introduced, for myself and 60 other Senators, a joint resolution establishing a commission to arrange an appropriate observance in 1958 of the 50th anniversary of the national conservation movement.

In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt called the first national conference on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

conservation of resources. He did so at the suggestion of, and with the aid of, the great conservationist, Gifford Pinchot. That is the conference which it is proposed to commemorate by attempting to stimulate not only a proper anniversary observance of the event itself, but also year-long programs by organizations, citizens, the media of information—all who will participate—to renew the Nation's conservation consciousness.

I now introduce, for appropriate reference, as a joint resolution, the same joint resolution which the Senate passed without objection late in the 1956 session. I do so for myself and 63 other Senators, including Senators O'MAHONEY, AIKEN, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARRETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BIBLE, BRICKER, BRIDGES, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, FULBRIGHT, GOLDWATER, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, IVES, JACKSON, JAVITZ, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, LONG, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, McCARTHY, McNAMARA, MONRONEY, MORSE, MUNDT, NEELY, NEUBERGER, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, ROBERTSON, SCOTT, SMITH OF New Jersey, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, TALMADGE, THURMOND, THYE, WATKINS, and YOUNG.

Many additional Senators, who have a rule against cosponsorship, have assured me of their support of the proposal.

A year ago, at hearings on this joint resolution, its passage was urged by Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, widow of the pioneer conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, and also by farm organizations; the National Reclamation Association; movie actor, James Cagney, who contributes much time to youth and conservation movements; William S. Paley, who headed the 1950 Materials Policy Commission; Morris L. Cooke, who headed President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission; and others.

It is especially pleasing that such a large bipartisan group has now joined in the sponsorship of the joint resolution, for there is need for early action upon it.

To be effective, the joint resolution must be enacted this year, in order that the commission may be appointed and organized, and a program developed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State Governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF RECENT INCREASES IN PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have received a great many letters from publishers in my home State and elsewhere calling attention to the fact that there has been a 300-percent increase in the cost of newsprint from Canada since 1933. A major Canadian supplier recently greatly increased the cost again.

It will be recalled, Mr. President, that a few years ago, when this country was being imposed upon by the high prices of foreign producers of rubber, the Government took steps to encourage the domestic production of synthetic rubber, and we find today that rubber prices have assumed a reasonable level.

I am also today sending letters to the Federal Trade Commission suggesting that it expedite its investigation of the situation, and to the Tariff Commission suggesting that they initiate conversations and studies to see whether or not something may be done by that Commission to obtain relief from the steady increases in newsprint prices. In addition I have also sent a letter to J. Leroy Welsh, Chairman of the Commission on the Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products requesting that his Commission do whatever it can to encourage the development of pilot plants for the development of newsprint from farm products.

Mr. President, a democracy like ours requires a widespread and unhampered distribution of news and perhaps Government attention should be given to the encouragement of the production of newsprint from farm and forest products within the United States as a safeguard against our being victimized by outside producers of newsprint.

I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for an investigation of the recent increases in the price of newsprint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 41), submitted by Mr. MUNDT, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to recent increases in the price of newsprint and whether the enactment of legislation, or other action, is necessary to assure adequate and stable supplies of newsprint at reasonable prices for users in the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from the date on which this resolution is agreed to to June 30, 1957, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1957.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few weeks before the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I submitted Senate Resolution 319, to create in the Senate a standing legislative Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to become effective at the outset of the current Congress.

Senate Resolution 319 was not acted on. Thus, we have opened the 85th Congress with the same distribution of veterans' bills we have had previously. That system has proved to be entirely inadequate; far from looking after the vital interests of America's 22 million exservicemen and their dependents, it has had the effect of blocking proposed legislation important to them, and blocking even the consideration of their problems. For example, on February 1 the first draftees will be returned to civilian life without entitlement to the education and training benefits of the GI bill of rights, as a result of the President's executive order terminating Public Law 550.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is introducing today—and I am proud to be one of its sponsors—a bill which he introduced at the last session of Congress. The bill seeks to provide GI benefits to the draftees who are about to leave the service. I think the enactment of the bill is sorely needed if we intend to be just to our veterans.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation which I cosponsored before was introduced in order to attempt to rectify this injustice. I regard it as an injustice to require military service from young men without helping them to make up their service time through training in peacetime professions and occupations.

I wish to compliment my colleague for reintroducing that measure, which seeks to give the GI benefits to the new draftees who now are coming out of the service.

The resolution I am submitting and others like it, languished without even benefit of a hearing, and died with the 84th Congress. Can Senators feel they have discharged their duty to our veterans when in 2 years they have not given a moment's attention to continuing the education and training provisions of the GI bill of rights?

The record of the Senate on pension and compensation bills is just as bad. Last year, the House passed two important bills extending pension rights and raising the amount of compensation for service-connected disabilities; but those bills received no consideration whatever in this body. This does not reflect in any way on the committees to which proposed legislation for veterans is presently referred. They simply have too much work on hand.

Mr. President, I speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during the 80th Congress. At that time my committee made an effort to expedite veterans' legislation in the Senate. As the Senate knows, I

am going back on the committee, but I want to say as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I think veterans' affairs should be taken away from that committee. I think that they should be taken away from the Committee on the Judiciary. I think they should be taken away from the Committee on Finance. I think they should be taken away from each one of the present Senate committees to which veterans' affairs proposed legislation is now being sent, and that we should have a standing committee, a single committee, which should have primary jurisdiction over proposed veterans' legislation.

So, in closing, Mr. President, it is my conviction that the veterans of America need a full-time committee in the Senate to handle their affairs. As I pointed out last summer when I submitted Senate Resolution 319, the Monroney-LaFollette reorganization committee wisely recommended that the Senate establish such a body. A similar recommendation to the House of Representatives was acted on favorably by the House.

I therefore send to the desk a new resolution creating a Veterans' Affairs Committee for the Senate, to which will be referred measures relating to veterans. I ask that the resolution receive the early and favorable attention of the Rules Committee and of the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution on behalf of myself, my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 43) to amend rule XXV, to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. JACKSON), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Effective for the remainder of the 85th Congress, section (4) of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (a) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 85th Congress Members of one party in the Senate are replaced by Members of the other party, the 33rd-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"*Senate seats*

Majority	*Minority*
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"*Third-committee assignments*

Majority	*Minority*
23	7
21	9
19	11
17	13".

SEC. 3. Effective at the beginning of the 86th Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are Members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO COMMITTEE REPORTS ON TREATIES

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"4. When a treaty is reported from a committee recommending the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the report of the committee shall state to what extent, if any, ratification thereof will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress.

"5. When the Senate advises and consents to ratification of a treaty which, in the judgment of the reporting committee, will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress, a copy of the Senate committee report shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the Clerk of the House of Representatives for use by the Law Revision Counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in annotating pertinent sections of the United States Code."

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. THYE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized under the authority of Senate Resolutions 58 and 272 of the 81st Congress to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957 to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTEMPTS TO IMPROPERLY INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the special committee established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress (approved February 22, 1956), is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate on or before May 31, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) The special committee shall cease to exist on May 31, 1957.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized during the period beginning February 1, 1957, and ending on May 31, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 4. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $100,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FOUR-STATE WELFARE FOR CERTAIN INDIANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 14th instant,

The name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 574) to provide: First, that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and second, for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota) on January 14, 1957.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my junior colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 548 and to Senate bill 604. His name has been inadvertently left off of those two bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 30, which provides for a change in the rules, submitted by me on January 9, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend section 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, submitted by me (for myself and other Senators) on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, introduced by me, for myself, the Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY, and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, on January 7, 1957.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 599) to establish a National Monetary and Financial Commission, introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], for himself and other Senators, on January 14, 1957, the next time that bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the able senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], wish to join with me and other cosponsors already listed in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 24, which would establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber.

I want this noted for the RECORD, so that the names of Senators KERR, LANGER, CARROLL, and NEUBERGER may appear on the face of the bill, if and when it is reprinted.

FAVORING SEVERANCE OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND HUNGARY

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United Nations by resolution has condemned the actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Hungary; and

Whereas such resolution declares the Soviet Government of Russia to be the aggressor in the Hungarian blood bath; and

Whereas the present government of Hungary, which was established and is controlled by Soviet Russia, is not the government of the people of Hungary: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and with the Communist government of Hungary.

REPORT ON VARIOUS METHODS OF SUPPORTING THE PRICE OF COTTON (S. DOC. NO. 12)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on May 18, 1956, when the Committee on Appropriations reported the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1957, it requested the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a full detailed report and analysis of the various systems for supporting the price of cotton. On January 3, 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture submitted to the committee a report entitled "Various Methods of Supporting the Price of Cotton."

I present a copy of this report and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, including the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER AND LAND RESOURCES OF THE ARKANSAS, WHITE, AND RED RIVER BASINS (S. DOC. NO. 13)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting a report on the conservation and development of the water and related land resources of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins, with accompanying papers and illustrations, requested in the Flood Control Act of 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON LAND AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE NEW ENGLAND AREA (S. DOC. NO. 14)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting a report on the land and water resources of the New England-New York region, with accompanying papers and illustrations, requested in the Flood Control Act of 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTIONS WITH AUSTRIA AND CANADA RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive A, 85th Congress, 1st session, a Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 25, 1956, and Executive B, 85th Congress, 1st session, a Convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa, on August 8, 1956, further modifying and supplementing the income-tax Convention and Protocol of March 4, 1942, as modified by the supplementary Convention of June 12, 1950, and that the Conventions, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the Conventions, together with the President's messages, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the messages from the President will be printed in the RECORD.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 25, 1956.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention. The Convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1957.*

Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Income-tax Convention between the United States and Austria.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on August 8, 1956, further modifying and supplementing the income-tax convention and protocol of March 4, 1942, as modified by the supplementary convention of June 12, 1950.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention, together with the memorandum enclosed with that report.

The supplementary convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State with enclosed memorandums. 2. Supplementary income-tax convention with Canada signed August 8, 1956.)

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 17, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) to extend the time for transmitting the economic report of the President for the first regular session of the Eighty-fifth Congress.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "A Protest in the Name of Liberty Against the Egyptian Expulsion of Jewry," delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on January 7, 1957.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Text of interview with Senator WILEY concerning danger of Pearl Harbor type of attack against United States, published in the Glendive (Mont.) Daily Ranger of January 4, 1957.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

News release concerning Veterans Day address delivered by him at Greensburg, Pa., on November 12, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SIGURD S. LARMON TO BE A MEMBER OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified. Reappointment.

Notice is given that this nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

SENATOR KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join with so many of my colleagues whom, on the day I took the oath of office as a Senator, I heard pay tribute to our minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who has announced that he is going to leave the Senate, and to pay my tribute to his high-minded efforts on behalf of the Republican Party and on behalf of our country. I wish also to pay tribute to what I think his most signal attribute, which is strength of character and steadfastness in the things in which he believes so sincerely.

COL. DEAN HESS, OF MARIETTA, OHIO

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor there was a young minister of the Church of Christ—Disciples—in Marietta, Ohio, who resigned his pastorage, and enlisted in the Air Force. That young man, now Col. Dean Hess, of the United States Air Force, flew 63 missions in World War II. In 1950 he was assigned to develop a South Korean air force, which he accomplished. He saw the tragic suffering there, particularly on the part of orphaned children, and with his own efforts, established for those children an air lift, called Operation Kiddy Car, to transport them to the safety of Cheju Island, where he created an orphanage.

Colonel Hess has written a book entitled "Battle Hymn," telling of his experiences in Korea and of the establishment of the orphanage. That book has been made into a motion picture, under the same title, "Battle Hymn."

All the receipts from the moving picture and from the book will go to the maintenance of that orphanage. The orphanage is taking care of more than 1,000 South Korean orphans, the victims of that terrible war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that I may present to the Senate Col. Dean Hess, of Marietta, Ohio, who is now in the gallery. To signify his seriousness, his intent, and his determination, let me say that yesterday, when I asked him if he was going to return to the ministry of his church, he told me, "As soon as the greatest enemy of Christianity, communism, is wiped from the face of the earth, I shall return to the mission of my ministry."

May I present to you, Mr. President, and to my colleagues, Col. Dean Hess, of Marietta, Ohio?

[Colonel Hess, from his seat in the gallery, rose and was greeted with applause.]

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer and the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks a statement concerning Colonel Hess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Col. Dean Hess, of Marietta, Ohio, is one of only three Americans awarded Korea's highest military citation, the Order of Military Merit. The other two are held by President Eisenhower and Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The honor was bestowed upon Colonel Hess by President Syngman Rhee not only for heroic military service to the Republic of Korea but for great humanitarian service as well.

The turning point in the remarkable career of this 38-year-old native Ohioan came with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Then 23 and a minister in the Church of Christ (Disciples) in his native Marietta, Dean Hess made the decision to leave his pulpit for combat. He enlisted in the Air Force. A year later he joined the Ninth Air Force in Germany as a fighter pilot. He flew 63 missions in World War II, one of them resulting in a tragic accident. During that mission, his bomb release failed to operate over his target, a railroad marshaling yard. But a few minutes later it snapped open, dropping his bombs on a German schoolhouse. Many children were killed.

Some seven years later in June 1950, Dean Hess was sent to Korea to develop a South Korean Air Force. He began this task at Seoul with 10 American pilots, 4 ground officers, 100 enlisted men, and 10 planes. He also flew the first of 250 combat missions over Korea. But it was not enough for this "flying parson" to fight for the cause of Christian civilization. He was a humanitarian as well as a combat commander. He began a third task which eventually brought him unsought fame.

With the aid of two chaplains, he began caring for Korean children orphaned by the war. He took up collections among his men, raided medical dumps for supplies to take care of the sick and wounded and prevailed upon mess sergeants to give food. By the time the Communist forces threatened to overrun Seoul, Dean Hess had gathered more than 1,000 orphans. Desperately, he called for permission to evacuate the children, and began flying them to the safety of Cheju Island. This airlift was known as "Operation Kiddy Car."

After the war Colonel Hess established a permanent orphanage on Cheju Island for Korean war orphans and threw his entire resources into it. He set up a nonprofit organization called Hope, Inc., which still helps the orphanage.

It has been said that Colonel Hess has been driven to the assistance of these children by a sense of guilt from his tragic mission of World War II in which his bombs accidentally fell on the German schoolhouse. This he denies. He declares that horrible as was the experience, he feels no connection between the two. He simply feels a deep conviction to help these unfortunate children.

This dedicated young man declares it to be more his duty than his personal wish to remain in the service.

"We cannot pray away communism," he says. "I feel I am doing more by fighting the greatest enemy that ever faced our civilization and Christianity. When that greater foreign threat is dispelled, I will leave the service."

Dean Hess has written a book about his own experiences and beliefs. It is called Battle Hymn. All its earnings go to the orphanage on Cheju Island.

Colonel Hess will be further honored by his native city and State on February 14 at a civic celebration at Marietta, Ohio. A local

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

holiday has been declared and the Governor of Ohio, along with Colonel Hess' many other friends will see his story in a world premiere of a new Universal motion picture, Battle Hymn, taken from Dean Hess' own book.

Colonel Hess and his wife, Mary, and their three sons live temporarily at Alexandria, Va.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, 39 years ago the Ukrainian Parliament proclaimed Ukrainian independence, and a treasured goal toward which these hardy people had been striving for 1,000 years had been attained. Hardly had this triumph occurred, however, when the dark shadow of the new and autocratic Communist Russia spread over this free republic and began to subjugate it.

The undying devotion of these 40 million people to freedom and the right of self-determination, which has been such a glorious part of their history, could not be shattered by Soviet tyranny, and on January 22, celebrations across this country will join with others in the free world in saluting this anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Their beliefs in the right of free elections, the right to determine their own form of government, their own form of worship, are even now being uplifted by the growing opinion of the world that no slave state can forever withstand the onslaught of people determined to become free. In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower referred to this powerful surge to satisfy these human aspirations. "The changes already accomplished," he stressed, "foreshadow a world transformed by a spirit of freedom." The President concluded this part of his message with these significant words:

> In the main, today's expressions of nationalism are, in spirit, echoes of our forefathers' struggle for independence.

And so, on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, let us in America recall our own devotion to human liberty and progress, and send our expressions of friendship and hope to the valiant people of the Ukraine.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) relative to the designation of National Junior Achievement Week, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PRESIDENT ON HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, all of us have been very much concerned over the tragedy in Hungary. We have been giving much thought and attention to the problems caused by that tragedy. As a Senator from New Jersey, I visited Camp Kilmer to observe conditions there and the handling of Hungarian refugees.

As we all know, President Eisenhower requested our distinguished Vice President to visit the Hungarian refugee camps in Austria and to submit a report before Congress reconvened. On January 1 Vice President NIXON made a report to the President on Hungarian refugees. Because of the importance of the subject, and because of the importance of the report, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's report to the President be published in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PRESIDENT ON HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

This report deals only with a symptom, and not with the basic problem. No matter how well we care for the victims of oppression, the guilt of those who drove them from their homes, who killed their fellow countrymen and who today keep their nation in slavery must never be forgotten.

The revolt of the courageous people of Hungary against their oppressors is one of the most significant events in the history of mankind. Without plan or organization they rose up in final revulsion against the subjugation and cruelty which has been imposed upon them. What they did and are doing was not in vain for, by their deeds, they sounded the death knell of international communism for all the world to hear.

In a discussion confined, as is this report, to the present plight of the Hungarian refugees, we recognize that we are not dealing with the basic question of how freedom is to be provided for Hungary. Compliance by the U. S. S. R. with the resolution of the United Nations calling for the removal of Soviet troops from Hungary is the only adequate and permanent solution to that problem, and to the problems which face the Hungarian people. Solutions short of this must be considered temporary and basically not satisfactory.

On the basis of a firsthand survey of the Hungarian refugees from the time they cross the border into Austria until they leave the Camp Kilmer Reception Center, I submit the following findings and recommendations:

NUMBER AND CHARACTER OF REFUGEES

Approximately 155,000 refugees have crossed the border between October 23, 1956, and January 1, 1957. An average of approximately 800 per day are coming across the border at this time. (See appendix 1.)

The quality of the people who fled Hungary is of the highest order. For the most part they were in the forefront of the fight for freedom and fled only when the choice was death or deportation at the hands of the foreign invaders or temporary flight to a foreign land to await the inevitable freedom for Hungary. The large majority are young people—students, technicians, craftsmen, and professional people. There are many family units, including a large number of children. (See appendix 2.)

The majority of the refugees who have been interviewed say that they left Hungary because of fear of liquidation or of deportation. The number of floaters and of those who left Hungary purely for economic reasons is relatively small.

The majority of those who have been interviewed to date have expressed a desire to return to Hungary in the event of a change of government which would make it safe for them to do so.

The problem of checking the security backgrounds of the refugees is not as difficult as usual, due to the fact that in addition to the usual documentary evidence available in such cases, direct evidence is being volunteered by other refugees who are well informed as to the identity of spies and agents in their communities.

I am convinced that if the screening process which is presently in effect is continued the Hungarian refugees who are admitted to the United States will present no significant risk of internal subversion in this country.

Taking all the above factors into consideration, I believe that the countries which accept these refugees will find that, rather than having assumed a liability, they have acquired a valuable national asset. As Mr. Herbert Hoover said on December 27, 1956, "The Hungarian refugees have proved by their courage and sacrifice that they are the traditional sort of persons who make Americans."

DISPOSITION OF REFUGEES TO DATE

Eighty-eight thousand of the one hundred and fifty-five thousand refugees have been resettled in countries other than Austria, as of January 1. Of this 88,000, 15,000 have gone to the United States, and 73,000 have been accepted in other countries.

Of the 67,000 who are in Austria at this time, the Austrian Government had indicated that approximately 30,000 could be assimilated into the Austrian economy, provided some assistance was given to Austria for the construction of housing and other facilities to provide for them during an adjustment period.

This leaves a minimum of 37,000 in Austria at the present time for whom homes must be found in other countries.

ESTIMATE OF EVENTUAL TOTAL REFUGEE MOVEMENT

How long the exodus of refugees from Hungary into Austria will continue will depend upon what happens in Hungary. If the character of the Hungarian Government were to change so that a degree of freedom were to be provided for the Hungarian people, there is little question but that the number of refugees leaving Hungary would be substantially reduced, and there is also no question but that many of those who have left Hungary would return.

There is also the possibility that the Hungarian Government might decide to step up its efforts to close the border, and, in that event, the number of refugees leaving Hungary probably would be substantially reduced.

Another factor which must be taken into account in analyzing the total problem is that some of the 73,000 who have gone to other countries did so with the understanding that they were going there temporarily and would eventually have the opportunity to go to the United States.

The President has stated that the United States would accept within this country those who went to other countries with such an understanding.

While the total number of refugees in the above categories cannot be estimated with any degree of certainty, there can be but one conclusion. The United States and other free nations must take substantially more refugees than they have agreed to take up to this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO FUTURE UNITED STATES POLICY ON ACCEPTING ADDITIONAL REFUGEES

It has been suggested that the United States should announce at this time that it would take a fixed additional number of refugees.

Another suggestion that has been made is that the United States should agree to take a certain percentage of all Hungarian refugees who are presently in Austria, and of those who may come to Austria from Hungary in the future.

I have concluded that it would not be wise for the United States to be tied down either to a fixed percentage or a fixed number.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It should be our policy, along with other free nations of the world, to take our full share of these escapees from Communist tyranny.

We should not place a ceiling on what we will do in fulfilling our traditional national mission of providing a haven of refuge for victims of oppression. In addition, because of the uncertainty of the situation within Hungary, it is not possible for us to make any accurate estimate of what such a fixed number should be.

For us to agree to take a percentage of all refugees is also unrealistic. Conditions change within the various countries which might provide homes for refugees, and our policy should be flexible enough to take such changes into account.

Our policy should be based on the following principles:

1. All free nations should share to the extent of their capabilities in the responsibility for resettling refugees. Both through the United Nations, and through normal diplomatic channels, the Government of the United States should work toward the realization of this objective. The United States escapee program, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, all of which are engaged in various phases of resettlement activity, should receive support from us for this purpose.

2. Until Congress passes appropriate legislation, admission of Hungarians to the United States should be continued under the parole procedures now in effect. Most of these admissions should continue to apply to Hungarians in Austria to relieve the pressure in that country. However, some should be reserved for the Hungarians now in temporary asylum in Western Europe outside of Austria, with the understanding that they would eventually be admitted to the United States. Preference within this latter group should be given at this time primarily to those with relatives in this country. To this end, we should begin taking applications from the refugees outside of Austria. United States diplomatic representatives in the countries who are now offering asylum should, wherever possible, work out arrangements whereby refugees from Austria could be received in those countries to replace those we take for resettlement in the United States.

3. An amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act should be presented to the Congress for immediate consideration which would—

(a) Regularize the status of Hungarian refugees brought into the United States under the parole procedure, and

(b) Provide flexible authority to grant admission to this country of additional numbers of Hungarians and other refugees from Communist persecution, through the use of nonquota visas within an annual ceiling.

Such a provision should take into account the escapees who left Hungary before October 23, 1956, and the meritorious cases of those from other Eastern European countries who cannot be resettled in the United States because of the termination of the refugee relief program and the lack of any other legislative authority for their admittance.

(c) I strongly urge the enactment of the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act proposed by the President to the 84th Congress. Such amendments would provide adequate flexibility in our immigration policy to meet more fully our world responsibilities. For example, it would permit consideration for certain escapees from communism other than those in Eastern Europe, including Chinese Nationalists who have had to flee from the Communist government in their country.

4. It has been suggested that no change in the law is needed and that the whole problem of refugees from Communist countries can be handled adequately under the parole provisions of the present act.

While the Attorney General has interpreted the parole provisions so as to cover the 15,000 Hungarian refugees who have been admitted up to this time, and while I believe that the applications of additional Hungarian refugees should be processed under that provision between now and the time the Congress has an opportunity to consider amendments to the act, the circumstances and the limits under which this provision should be applied in the future should be spelled out by the Congress.

As the Attorney General has stated, neither he nor any other administrative official should have unlimited authority to admit aliens to the United States on a parole basis. It is obvious that such power, if arbitrarily used, could completely circumvent the basic purposes and objectives of the immigration law.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES

Our governmental aid for care and maintenance of Hungarian refugees has been partially directed through the United Nations. We should continue our participation with the other free nations in this United Nations effort in order to secure the most effective combination of our resources. But it will be necessary, also, to deal directly with the Austrian Government and relief agencies on various aid matters, particularly those involving expenditures affecting the Austrian economy.

In connection with economic assistance to Austria, it should be pointed out that the cost to the Austrian Government has been considerable up to this time. Austria is a relatively small country of approximately 7 million people. It has a housing shortage. Its economic recovery, though remarkable, was impeded by the long occupation of the country, ended only last year. Its budgetary capabilities are already strained. A substantial refugee program was present in Austria prior to this new influx from Hungary and most facilities were already overflowing. It cost approximately $1 a day to feed each refugee and in addition substantial amounts must be found to improve or renovate existing buildings, to provide internal transportation, furniture, medical care, and related costs.

The refugees arrive destitute with no possessions but the clothes on their backs and they require some additional clothing and the basic amenities needed for living. Although much financial aid has come from the charitable organizations, particularly the Red Cross Societies and much more will be given through their help, the fact remains that the residual financial burden falls on the Austrian Government. This will in turn require the help of other governments, including our own.

The League of Red Cross Societies, of which the American Red Cross is a member, has assumed responsibility for care and maintenance of 35,000 refugees in the larger camps in Austria. The funds which we have transmitted to the United Nations ($5 million) have been divided between the Austrian Government and the LICROSS based on their respective needs and requirements. Additional financial assistance to LICROSS through the United Nations will be required and should be provided.

It is also recommended that the governmental agencies concerned continue to explore the maximum use of surplus agricultural commodities both for the food requirements of the refugees as well as for the generation of counterpart funds which might be used for some of the cash requirements for the relief program.

Most of the cash contributions from our Government have up to now been made from the emergencies fund provided in section 401 of the Mutual Security Act. Current estimates are that presently appropriated funds will be adequate to provide for foreseeable costs of the Hungarian relief program for this fiscal year—until July 1, 1957.

The United States voluntary agencies may in this emergency period need limited governmental financial aid to assist them in the resettlement program in this country. This assistance would not ordinarily be required, but the sudden influx of Hungarian refugees has in the case of certain agencies placed particularly severe demands on their financial resources which they are unable to meet through the voluntary contributions available to them. To the extent that private contributions are not available there is no alternative but to provide support through Government funds.

Coordination of the activities of the voluntary agencies and the Federal Government concerned with refugee resettlement in the United States should continue to be the responsibility of the President's Committee on Hungarian Refugee Relief. The Committee, under the able direction of Mr. Tracy Voorhees has done an admirable job.

GENERAL COMMENTS

This report is not intended to cover all phases of the refugee problem. A more detailed report has already been submitted orally to the President and additional data on economic assistance will be submitted by Mr. Hollister.

After a thorough examination of the placement procedures at the Kilmer Reception Center, I am convinced that there is no question but that the American economy can easily and profitably assimilate into our economy the refugees from Hungary who are entering the United States. (See appendix 3.)

This report would not be complete without paying tribute to the work of the voluntary agencies who have provided an inspiring example in the best American tradition of extra-governmental charity in welfare work. They moved in quickly when the refugees first began leaving Hungary. They provided food, clothing, and care in the first chaotic days. They are processing the refugees for their movement out of Austria and it is to them that we look for the successful resettlement of Hungarian as well as other Iron Curtain refugees in the United States and other countries. They deserve the continued generous financial support of the American people.

I should also like to pay tribute to the American governmental officials who have worked willingly and ably night and day during these last 2 months. Our Ambassador to Austria and his staff, and the staffs of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Public Health Service, and the Department of Labor have all done a superb job. The contribution of the United States Armed Forces in instituting and running the air and sea lifts has been in the best traditions of their respective services. I saw no more striking example of the generous spirit of America than the activities of the wives of Armed Forces personnel who arranged to provide special care for refugees at the various installations through which the refugees passed on their way to the United States.

Another example is the soup kitchens run by the wives of American governmental personnel in Vienna where three to four thousand refugees are fed daily. These are only examples of similar activities at the various installations where American personnel are assigned to this problem.

In conclusion, it is essential that in our necessary and understandable concern over the immediate problem of providing for the needs of refugees we not lose sight of the historical significance of this mass migration of people from an area of slavery to an area of freedom. The Communist leaders thought

they were building a new order in Hungary. Instead, they erected a monument which will stand forever in history as proof of the ultimate failure of international communism. Those people, both inside and outside of Hungary, who had the courage to expose by their actions this evil ideology for what it is, deserve all the gratitude and support which we in the free world are so willingly giving today.

APPENDIX 1

Status report of Hungarian refugee situation as of Dec. 31, 1956, 0700 hours

1. Total influx into Austria Oct. 28, 1956, to date	155,085
2. Total number arrived in Austria last 24 hours [1]	711
3. Total number residing in Austria as of Dec. 31, 1956	67,608
4. Movements:	

Country	Quota	Cumulative total moved
Total		87,572
1. Switzerland	[3] 10,000	10,300
2. Germany	13,552	10,934
3. Holland	[3] 5,000	2,920
4. France	[4]	8,395
5. Sweden	4,000	3,998
6. United Kingdom	[4]	12,866
7. Australia	5,000	1,055
8. Canada	[4]	7,635
9. United States of America	21,500	19,668
10. Belgium	3,000	3,019
11. New Zealand	1,000	66
12. Ireland	1,000	530
13. Luxembourg	200	189
14. Italy	4,000	3,451
15. Spain		
16. Denmark	1,000	1,000
17. Brazil	3,000	
18. Colombia	1,000	
19. Chile	1,000	47
20. South Africa	500	148
21. Norway	1,000	528
22. Argentina	2,000	20
23. Iceland		52
24. Israel		756

[1] Arrivals in Austria. Daily average by weeks for December.

	Number per day
1st week	2,532
2d week	1,724
3d week	1,185
4th week	866
Last 3 days	714

[3] 6,000 on a temporary basis.
[3] 2,000 on a temporary basis.
[4] Unlimited.

APPENDIX 2

Recent Hungarian refugees and parolees admitted to the United States by major occupation group

[Received and processed in Central Office through Dec. 28, 1956]

Occupation group:	Number
Total	9,253
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	1,060
Farmers and farm managers	112
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	121
Clerical and kindred workers	557
Sales workers	100
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	1,963
Operatives and kindred workers	1,538
Private household workers	65
Service workers, except private household	244
Farm laborers	99
Laborers, except farm and mine	435
No occupation	2,959
Housewives	746
Retired	6
Students	602
Children under 14 years of age	1,565
Not reported	40

Recent Hungarian refugees and parolees admitted, by sex, age, and marital or family status

[Received in Central Office through Dec. 28, 1956]

	Total	Males	Females
Total	9,253	6,028	3,225
Age:			
Under 5 years	572	298	274
5 to 9 years	611	320	291
10 to 14 years	461	238	223
15 to 19 years	1,309	955	354
20 to 29 years	3,310	2,354	956
30 to 39 years	1,762	1,099	663
40 to 49 years	865	561	304
50 to 59 years	281	170	111
60 years and over	71	28	43
Not reported	11	5	6
Marital status, refugees only:			
Single	3,205	2,458	747
Married	1,932	1,084	848
Widowed	81	27	54
Divorced	197	128	69
Unknown	22	16	6
Family status, parolees only:			
Principal applicant	2,339	1,859	480
Spouse	629	24	605
Child	847	432	415
Unknown	1		1

APPENDIX 3

Kilmer refugee status summary as of Dec. 30, 1956

Date	Day	Number of planes arrived	Number of refugees arrived	Number of refugees departed	Total planes arrived	Total refugees received	Refugees departed	Total refugees on hand
Dec. 1	Saturday	2	149	90	13	951	583	33
2	Sunday	0	0	90	13	951	613	315
3	Monday	2	143	57	15	1,058	739	329
4	Tuesday	3	211	108	18	1,269	838	431
5	Wednesday	3	218	156	21	1,487	994	493
6	Thursday	4	277	62	25	1,764	1,056	782
7	Friday	4	290	97	29	2,054	1,153	975
8	Saturday	3	207	223	32	2,261	1,376	885
9	Sunday	3	224	144	35	2,485	1,520	965
10	Monday	4	292	384	39	2,777	1,904	873
11	Tuesday	5	359	161	44	3,136	2,065	1,071
12	Wednesday	8	494	163	52	3,630	2,228	1,402
13	Thursday	7	417	239	59	4,047	2,467	1,580
14	Friday	15	1,025	55	74	5,072	2,522	2,550
15	Saturday	7	466	202	81	5,538	2,724	2,814
16	Sunday	12	694	117	93	6,232	2,841	3,391
17	Monday	5	330	256	98	6,562	3,097	3,465
18	Tuesday	17	1,101	365	115	7,663	3,462	4,201
19	Wednesday	2	124	400	117	7,787	3,862	3,925
20	Thursday	6	416	519	123	8,203	4,381	3,822
21	Friday	5	313	341	128	8,516	4,722	3,794
22	Saturday	11	709	229	139	9,225	4,951	4,274
23	Sunday	12	740	169	151	9,965	4,120	4,845
24	Monday	8	517	282	159	10,482	5,402	5,080
25	Tuesday	22	1,406	186	181	11,888	5,588	6,300
26	Wednesday	9	597	316	190	12,485	5,904	6,581
27	Thursday	13	870	823	203	13,355	6,727	6,628
28	Friday	9	596	575	212	13,951	7,302	6,649
29	Saturday	8	473	542	220	14,424	7,844	6,580
30	Sunday	7	491	445	227	14,915	8,289	6,626

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an illuminating address on the Air Force, delivered by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Goldsboro, N. C., on Wednesday evening, January 16, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I am very pleased to be here in Goldsboro. We are again renewing our relationships of the past. I am sure you are proud of Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. So are we. When the planned improvements and construction are completed, Seymour Johnson will be one of the finest Air Force bases in the whole United States.

One of our main concerns when we open a new base, or reopen an old base, is community relations. The air base should not be a separate community. Our aim is that the base become part of the community we join.

Sometimes a local situation makes this difficult, but we have no worries with Goldsboro. You have made us feel that we belong here. The commander of Seymour Johnson, Colonel Richardson, describes his relationship with both civic leaders and citizens in glowing terms. This is important not only because it makes our work more pleasant, but also because it is reflected in greater effectiveness of a unit.

One indicator stands out: the reenlistment rate of a unit. The reenlistment rate at Seymour Johnson is the highest of any base in the whole 9th Air Force—a command that covers many States. This is a tribute to your interest, your cooperation, and your hospitality.

This fine relationship extends all the way to Washington, where it is carried on in other ways by your Senators and Congressmen. Senator SCOTT and your Congressman, Representative BARDEN, have been active in improving our associations—and your Senior Senator, SAM ERVIN, plays a prominent part in the building of our Nation's defenses.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, he has injected energy and wisdom into our plans for a more secure Nation. Senator ERVIN has become an expert in Air Force affairs and, as you know, was chosen as a member of a special subcommittee to examine the adequacy of our Nation's airpower.

He has brought more than wisdom to Washington. He is renowned for his ability to illustrate points with simplicity and humor.

On the premise that home grown products are the best, I intend to borrow from his store of anecdotes tonight.

When Mr. Tanner sent me the invitation to meet with you tonight, he suggested I might talk about Russia. Since my trip to Russia last year, I seem to have spent more time just talking about the trip than I actually spent in Russia. It seems the main thing people want me to discuss.

This reminds me of one of Senator ERVIN'S stories. He once told us about a man who was stuck on one topic. This was a preacher whose sermon Sunday after Sunday was on the subject of baptism.

The deacons of the church tried many times to get the preacher on another subject. Finally they persuaded him to let them pick the text for the next sermon. They chose for him the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis.

The following Sunday the preacher took up the Bible and read this first verse: "In

the beginning God created the heavens and earth."

He then paused and said, "If I remember my geography right, the surface of the earth is one-third land and two-thirds water. This brings me to my subject, the doctrine of baptism."

I am not like that preacher. I would be willing to drop Russia as a topic. Unfortunately, Russia remains a topic of prime importance to us all.

I am sure we all wish that Soviet Russia were not the dangerous power she is today. But the fact is, the threat of Soviet Russia with its aim of world domination cannot be dropped nor can it be wished away. It is a reality of our daily life, and our very survival depends on our vigilance and the steps we take to guard against the danger of aggression.

As you know my visit to the Soviet Union was a short one. No one could become expert in such a short time. Our knowledge of the U. S. S. R. rests upon a much broader base of information and experience garnered through the years.

There has been a tendency in America to view the Soviet Union as a somewhat backward nation. In some ways they are behind the times, but their record of progress and expansion has been phenomenal.

A few days ago the Soviets published a record of their accomplishments in 1956. In that one year they showed an increase of 11 percent in the production of capital goods and 9 percent in consumer goods.

They estimated that at year's end they would have produced 49 million tons of steel, 430 million tons of coal, 84 million tons of oil, and 192 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. While this is far below our Nation's production in all these fields, the fact remains that Soviets are erecting a rapidly expanding and already tremendous industrial base. They have the manpower and resources to continue this growth.

They also are determined to sacrifice the standard of living of their people in order to pour their effort into national strength, particularly their armed forces.

We must not make the mistake of feeling they are far behind—of judging their progress by the plumbing in their bathrooms, or the lack of modern appliances in their homes.

They have few telephones, but the quantity of weapons in their arsenal exceeds any nation in the world.

Millions of Russian people travel on foot, by horse-drawn vehicles, or by antiquated trucks. But their airlines also fly jet-powered airliners—something we have yet to achieve.

The design of their automobiles appears to be about 15 years behind ours, but their engineers have taken a jet engine of Western origin and have developed more power from it than either the British who designed it or the United States industrial experts who produced it here.

They have few television sets, but they produced more than 13,000 jet fighters—the MIG—in a few short years. In fact, they have produced more jet fighters and light jet bombers than the whole free world combined.

We must not be misled by their lack of gadgets and conveniences of the sort that we are accustomed to. Let me illustrate this by an example. I was taken to one of their atomic plants designed to generate electric power. I am no technician in this field but its outward appearance was impressive. Our United States experts who have visited this plant consider it a first-class modern installation.

I was impressed in another way, however, by what I saw just outside the gates of this facility. There, workers were erecting buildings from logs cut out of the nearby forest. The structures were reminiscent of our frontier areas in the 19th century. The logs were being pulled into place, not by modern tractors and trucks, but by spans of horses. Here in one spot was the contrast that is so confusing to observers.

However interesting their log cabins are, we must not let our attention be diverted. We must recognize their capacity to erect modern installations and to build modern weapons as the basis for a very real and up-to-date threat against us.

We must not forget that the Reds developed atomic weapons and nuclear weapons in about half the time we estimated. They are moving modern bombers from the drawing board through production lines in less time than it takes the United States to carry out a similar design-production cycle. We must weigh the results they are getting. We have clear evidence of Soviet industrial and military might. These are roots of the danger we face today.

During my visit to Moscow, I saw new Soviet aircraft we had never seen before. Presumably these were some of their newest aircraft.

They flew large formations of their latest types of operational fighters. One type we know as the Farmer. It is a modern version of the MIG series and appeared to be very fast. In the second formation of 50 or more planes were all-weather fighters, we call the Flashlight. Their development of all-weather fighter types is of special concern to us, for they were deficient in this type of aircraft in the past. The potential danger in this new achievement is clear. If we were forced to strike back at them in war, we would lose many more planes to these improved defenses.

We also saw formations of their long-range bombers, the Bison heavy jet bomber and turbo prop bomber that we call the Bear. Despite their repeated claims that they want nothing but peace, the Soviets have designed these long-range aircraft but for one purpose—to give them the ability to hit the United States.

Of the new aircraft I saw, the most significant to me was a twin-jet, light bomber. The Soviets claim this model is capable of supersonic flight. From a design standpoint this claim may be true; we did not see it fly. However, as a basis for comparing progress in the air, I would remind you that we in the United States are just beginning to test our first supersonic bomber.

Throughout our visit the Soviets maintained careful and firm controls on what we could and could not see. We were permitted to examine the interior of only one of their modern planes—a jet transport that had previously been seen when the Soviets first flew it into London. All of the other types we saw only at a distance as they flew by or as we were driven past them in a car.

Not only were we permitted to see little, we did not hear much, either. The Soviet authorities we met were extremely reluctant to enter into any professional or technical conversations. They were master evaders. For example, one of the members of my group asked one of the Russians how far their light jet bomber—the one they claimed to be supersonic—could fly? The answer was, "Not quite as far as the Badger"—which is their medium jet bomber. Then when he was asked how far the Badger could fly, the reply was, "A little farther than the other one."

The new aircraft engines they are developing are impressive in size and are more powerful than any engine we have in production today. One of the members of a British party commented upon the size and apparent power of the big bomber engine. He speculated to one of the top designers, "The air intakes in these engines are very large, and, therefore, the engines must be very powerful."

The Soviet's response was, "Sir, you can't tell what's in a man's head by the size of his mouth."

You can see from these examples just how reluctant they are to divulge information.

While they publish figures on steel production, oil production, and coal production, their precise total national output remains obscure. It is even more difficult to accurately determine just how much of this output they devote to building military strength.

I asked some questions regarding their budget, and it was very difficult to get them to understand what I meant. They apparently have no budget as such. If a national decision is made to achieve a certain level of strength to build a new aircraft in certain numbers, or to develop a new weapon, the resources are made available.

I would not want to leave the impression that they have unlimited resources, but there appears to be no stinting once a national decision has been made to go ahead with a project.

There are times when I wish that budgets were unknown to me. However, the budget is a necessary part of our way of life and an instrument that reflects how well we fulfill our responsibilities to the people.

The fiscal year 1958 budget was presented to Congress today. The Air Force portion of this program will enable us to carry on through the next fiscal year, and I assure you that we will give the Nation the most effective Air Force with the resources made available to us.

Decisions on these matters rest on overall national interest. I believe a statement from the President's budget message today reflects this approach. He said, "I have given careful consideration to the many complex factors which enter into the development of a well-balanced military structure. I am convinced that the defense program and funds for their support, as recommended in this budget, provide a wise and reasonable degree of protection for the Nation."

Under this budget we will continue to strengthen and improve the Strategic Air Command—our long-range striking force—and the hard core of our deterrent to aggression.

We will continue to replace the aging B–36 with the new long-range jet B–52. In my opinion the B–52 is the finest long-range bomber being produced in the world today. It has made airpower history with its recent nonstop flights of up to 17,000 miles and it will continue to make its mark not only in aviation annals, but also on the minds of any would-be aggressors in the Kremlin.

The SAC B–47 fleet, the medium-range bomber force, will be continued in strength. In a recent test alert B–47 crews flew a thousand planes an average of 8,000 miles each, under simulated combat conditions.

We are now testing a new, supersonic bomber, the B–58, which may replace the B–47. From the trials so far, the B–58 appears to be a top-notch airplane.

Our air defense system will be expanded and improved. Our early warning lines will be extended well out to sea off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the continental warning and control systems will be developed in depth. The Navy is making an important contribution of warning stations on the seaward flanks.

The Army with its Nike missile will improve the close-in defenses of vital points—and it will add new and more effective weapons such as the Talos missile as well as a new version of the Nike.

Our air-defense forces are getting newer and faster interceptor planes such as the supersonic 102's and 104's. These, too, are being equipped with far more effective weapons such as the Falcon missile. All of these elements of air defense are being integrated into a single, immediately responsive system under the Continental Air Defense Command.

The third part of our military airpower is a force familiar to you—the Tactical Air Command of which Seymour Johnson is a

part. This command is developing a terrific striking punch with the addition of nuclear weapons. It is capable of a sudden, close-in retaliation from its overseas bases. As its striking capacity increases, and its ability to move quickly over long distances improves—together with such ground forces as may be required, Tactical Air Command is becoming an even more effective instrument in local conflicts—or what some call little wars.

As we look at the future and the Air Force we must have in the years ahead, two points stand out.

The combat capability of the forces must continually be measured against the capability of the potential enemy. This enemy is improving his force all the time.

The quality of their air force is increasing rapidly and they show no signs of slowing down either in quantity or quality.

This means that our force must be well trained, and instantly ready in large enough numbers to successfully counter the Soviet air threat. No longer can we count on any unit that is not ready to carry out its mission the moment we are attacked. We must have an effective force in being.

Your North Carolina State motto is, "To be, rather than to seem." It conveys a challenge that extends well beyond your State boundaries. We must have a real force, not one with only the semblance of strength. Without it, we would endanger our Nation and our survival.

ARCHBISHOP MURRAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to address a few remarks in tribute to the memory of a great citizen of Minnesota. Last October, our great State of Minnesota mourned the passing of the Most Reverend John Gregory Murray, archbishop of the St. Paul Archdiocese. Exalted in rank among the people of his church, Archbishop Murray never lost touch with the least of them whom he served for a quarter of a century. A man of modest stature but endowed with boundless energy, he was the administrative executive of an area that covered 297 parishes in 27 counties extending across Minnesota; he supervised 178 parochial schools attended by nearly 67,000 children; and, as archbishop of St. Paul, he also headed his church's St. Paul province embracing all of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and presided over its meetings of bishops.

In spite of the eminence of his office, this man was known to live a simple and unassuming life of virtual austerity. He was not only the spiritual leader of his people as archbishop, but through his common touch and human understanding, he was a living example of the virtues he taught. It is in this latter sense that he was a great man among all the people of our State, both inside his church and out, and why President Eisenhower was prompted to say of him, "Archbishop John Gregory Murray, in his actions and in his words, was a man of principle and high purpose."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Star in tribute to Archbishop Murray on October 11, 1956, and an article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of October 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of October 11, 1956]

ARCHBISHOP MURRAY

The Most Reverend John Gregory Murray, third archbishop of St. Paul, will be remembered as a prelate who lived close to ordinary people.

Early in his career in the archdiocese of St. Paul, Archbishop Murray remarked, "The only way to know men's problems is to know the men." He rode the streetcars and buses. He carried his own bundles to the laundry. He took his own shoes to the cobbler. He frequently stopped in and had a soda at a corner drugstore.

People who knew him found him a simple, unassuming man. His personal life was one of virtual austerity. Although he could have had an imposing mansion on Summit Avenue, he preferred a simple room in the rectory of St. Paul Cathedral.

One of the archbishop's objectives was to place a Roman Catholic church within walking distance of every Roman Catholic in the urban centers of the archdiocese. Considering the unprecedented building boom of the postwar years and the gargantuan sprawl of today's suburbs, this seemed like an almost superhuman task. Yet, Archbishop Murray died with his self-imposed program practically completed.

In an age when much of our life grows more and more impersonal, mechanized, and routinized, Archbishop Murray brought the common touch and human understanding to great undertakings. This is a rare quality in persons of high rank, ecclesiastical or otherwise.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of October 12, 1956]

ARCHBISHOP MURRAY PRAISED BY NEW LEADER OF ST. PAUL DIOCESE

Most Reverend William O. Brady issued his formal statement as archbishop of the Diocese of St. Paul Thursday night. He automatically succeeded Archbishop Murray. The tribute to his predecessor follows:

"The death of Archbishop John Gregory Murray means the loss of a great churchman to the Catholic church and the loss of a great citizen to the State of Minnesota.

"Thousands will praise the dead archbishop's simplicity, kindness, practical charity, and courtesy. Thousands will long remember him as an intimate friend in need, a guide to the troubled and a hope to the distressed. Thousands will long marvel at his indefatigable energy and his forgetfulness of self, his interest in the common man, his piety, his cheerfulness and his uncanny knack of making everyone feel important by his phenomenal memory for names and his equally extraordinary ability to bury himself in the problems of others.

"Those thousands should know that all of these qualities which made Archbishop Murray great sprang from a deep faith in his God, a love of his church, a conviction that religion was something of intimate living, not phrases in or from a book.

"Archbishop Murray's concern with civic affairs is well known. He championed the poor, the stranger and the neglected in the spirit of the Catholic works of mercy. Friend of the sick always, he remained faithful to them when his own illness was even greater than theirs. His common greeting was 'Is there anything I can do for you?' and such was the spirit of his whole life.

"Minnesota has lost a man, the Catholic church has lost a great high priest. But we have all gained for having known him, worked with him or been the beneficiaries of his cheerful smile and his Catholic philosophy of life that God's image is to be found in every man."

DECLARATION OF POLICY BY AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in this country there are many groups of business and professional people who zealously and constantly guard the basic tenets of our system of government and business, but I doubt that there is one more vociferous in these fields than is the American Mining Congress. Typical of this expressed concern is their declaration of policy adopted at their annual convention last October, in Los Angeles. Because of the many pertinent and intelligent observations contained in this document, I desire to make it available to all my colleagues in both Houses of Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the declaration of policy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION OF POLICY ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

We commend the present administration for its persistent efforts to ease international tensions and promote world peace. We of the mining industry recognize only too well, however, that our defenses must be maintained at a level adequate to cope with any eventuality. Production of minerals and metals is essential to the welfare and security of the Nation.

The President of the United States has taken a constructive forward step in recognizing the importance of the mining industry by the establishment of Cabinet Committees on Minerals Policy and on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, to develop national policies relating to the production and utilization of metals, minerals and fuels and the maintenance of an adequate mobilization base for the several branches of the mining industry. We commend these Committees for developing recommendations as a basis for sound national mineral and fuel policies. We urge that there be an active program to make such policies effective.

On the domestic front, we likewise commend the present administration for its continued reaffirmation of the United States philosophy of free enterprise; and for its program of withdrawal of Government from activities which can be adequately financed and more efficiently operated by private endeavor.

We commend the interest taken by the governors of the Western States in the problems of the mining industry, and offer our continued cooperation in this activity.

While the continuing demand for certain metals and minerals has created conditions beneficial to some segments of the mining industry, many important parts of the industry have not been so fortunate. We again urge that the Government establish a broad policy designed to provide adequate protection to domestic mineral producers.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Further determined effort and effective action is needed to limit Government expenditures to no more than is necessary to meet defense and other essential governmental functions adequately and efficiently, honestly and fairly, without waste, extravagance, political favoritism or other unnecessary expenditure. These standards should be insisted upon by all within and without the Government with respect to appropriations, administration and control of expenditures.

We support the principle that Federal governmental activity should not extend to those matters which the people themselves, through private enterprise or their local or State agencies, are able to carry out.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TAXATION

Minerals of the earth made available for the use of mankind are essential for our entire industrial and economic life, for our defense and our welfare. The needs can be met only by finding and developing new reserves to replace those exhausted and to meet additional demands; by research and development of improved processes and methods of production and recovery; by investments of capital and by recurring expenditures for payrolls, purchases and other expenses; and by having the best of human ability efficiently applied to meet the mining and metallurgical problems presented. The risks are great and the failures many. Profits, after taxes, must be adequate to furnish needed incentives if we are to have the continuing supply of required minerals.

Our tax system must be such as to yield needed revenues without discouraging the investment, risk, and effort necessary for income-producing activities from which the revenues should flow. We should not by tax rates or substantive provisions impair incentives for economic growth and development under private enterprise and individual initiative which have developed the productivity, prosperity, and well-being of our people.

Many desirable improvements have been made by the present Internal Revenue Code, but some of its provisions need revision so they will better express their real intent, eliminate unnecessary technicalities, and have fairer and more appropriate application to the taxation of income.

Taxes should be imposed and administered fairly, equitably and honestly. Our tax system should be well organized and administered to carry efficiently the immense load imposed upon it, preventing fraud, dishonesty, and tax evasion, but with fairness to taxpayers, full recognition of their rights and minimum difficulties and disturbance to them in preparation, examination, and settlement of their returns.

With respect to income taxation, it is essential that depletion, depreciation, and net-loss carryover be full and adequately allowed at not less than authorized by the present code. We further particularly urge the following:

The present high tax rates leave inadequate incentive for investment, risk, economic effort, and initiative. Their reduction will benefit the economy and yield increased revenues to the Government. In no case should the overall rate on income of the individual or of the corporation exceed 50 percent and in due course should be reduced to not more than 35 percent.

In determining the property basis for depreciation and for cost depletion, the tax-benefit rule should be fully applied.

Exploration expenditures should be fully deductible and present limitations should be removed.

The limited allowance now made to stockholders on dividends with respect to taxes paid by the corporation should be further extended. The depletion allowed to a mining corporation should be carried through to the stockholder on an adequate and equitable basis. Intercorporate dividends should not be doubly taxed.

New mines should be exempt from taxation for 3 years after the beginning of profitable operations.

Capital gains should be taxed at more moderate rates.

United States taxes on income created abroad should give full recognition to its taxability in the foreign jurisdiction and not impose an additional load which may impede or discourage activities abroad. In no event should our taxes be applied to income which is not or cannot be returned to this country. For the benefit of our country and its people and for the peace and well-being of the world, our Government should, by treaty, legislation, and otherwise, actively cooperate with any foreign government which wishes to remove barriers to private investment.

LABOR RELATIONS

The fundamental right of every American to earn a living without being compelled to join and pay tribute to a labor union is in grave jeopardy. Long a matter of controversy between union leaders and those who believe in freedom for the individual, the preservation of this right has now become one of the major issues in the basic struggle between those who seek to maintain the principles of freedom and those who would force us to abandon those principles and take the steps which lead inevitably to labor socialism.

The union leaders have made the destruction of this fundamental right to work the touchstone of their program to control the livelihood of every American wage earner and thereby to dictate the course of our national economy.

To this end they are striving desperately at the State level to eliminate the existing right-to-work laws and to prevent the enactment of such laws in States which do not yet have them. In Congress, their goal is to make compulsory unionism an integral part of the Federal labor laws and to prohibit State legislation in this field.

We believe zealously in the principle of individual freedom. We believe that compulsory unionism is wholly incompatible with that principle.

We therefore dedicate ourselves to the continuation of our longstanding effort to preserve the right to work. We favor the continued recognition by the Federal Government of the right of the States to legislate on the subject of compulsory unionism, and we vigorously oppose the enactment of Federal legislation which would deprive them of that right.

The antitrust laws were designed to prevent monopoly and to promote a healthy economy on the basic principles of the free-enterprise system. The fundamental theory which prompted the enactment of those laws is applicable to any form of monopoly which operates directly or indirectly to control production, fix prices, or otherwise restrict competition. Present-day big unionism, through the mechanics of merger and compulsion and by the use of such economic sanctions as industrywide strikes and secondary boycotts, has long since acquired the monopolistic power and control which, for over half a century, have been recognized as constituting a grave threat to our free economy.

The time has long since come when the basic principles of our antitrust laws should be applied by appropriate Federal legislation to the protection of that economy against destruction at the hands of uncurbed labor monopoly.

We urge the immediate enactment of such legislation by the Congress.

The achievement of the economic control sought by the union leaders necessarily calls for political domination. Having at their disposal millions of dollars collected, by compulsion or otherwise, as dues and initiation fees for the purpose of promoting the welfare of union members in the field of collective bargaining, the union leaders are diverting vast amounts of such union money into political slush funds. Their objective is to place in public office those who will do their bidding and to prevent the election of all those who stand in the way of their grab for power. This they are doing in the face of a Federal law prohibiting the use of union funds for political purposes.

As a result, the right of millions of American workers to exercise individual political action is being thwarted. The earnings of those workers are, in many instances, being used by union leaders to defeat the candidates of the workers' choice.

We urge that the law prohibiting these corrupt political practices be enforced and we again recommend urgently to the Congress that any deficiencies in that law be eliminated.

The fight to maintain and strengthen the basic principles of the Taft-Hartley Act requires constant vigilance and affirmative action. We reaffirm our previously expressed views on the specific measures needed to strengthen that law. Likewise we repledge our opposition to those specific proposals for amending the law which we have previously recited as being aimed at a return to the chaotic days of the Wagner Act.

The forces of labor socialism are moving relentlessly forward. Compulsory unionism, labor monopoly, union political action and a return to Government partisanship in the field of labor-management relations are means to an end—the elimination of individual freedom and the destruction of our free economy.

We pledge our continued and vigorous support to a program of constructive legislation in the field of labor relations which will prevent these forces from attaining their objective and which will effectively protect our free enterprise economy against such onslaughts.

SOCIAL SECURITY

We urge upon Congress and the executive branch of our Government a conservative approach toward further broadening of the scope of our social-security laws. The lowering of the eligibility age for beneficiaries and the broadening of the act to include disability pensions indicate a trend of political thought which is economically unsound.

It is urged that the taxes collected for the support of social security be placed in a trust fund for the payment of benefits provided for by the act. We believe the time has come for immediate consideration of the drastic effect on our economy which will result if this principle is not adopted as the basis for the entire program.

The social-security amendments enacted into law during the closing hours of the 84th Congress demonstrated with frightening clarity the extent to which political expediency can hasten our embracement of the welfare state. The reduction of the retirement age and the extension of benefits to new areas in an election year, with their obvious political appeal, reflect a highly dangerous trend.

TARIFFS

We again endorse the Government policy that a strong, vigorous and efficient domestic mining industry is essential to the long-term economic development of the United States, and that for an adequate mobilization base of metal and mineral production our Nation must look to domestic production and ore reserves for the major portion of our metal and mineral supply, despite progressive increase in imports of some of these materials.

Experience has shown that we cannot depend on foreign ore reserves as a source of supply in an emergency, however important it may be to import some metals and minerals to supplement domestic production and to fill our stockpile with materials in which we are deficient. World political conditions, as well as hazards of possible air and submarine warfare, support this conclusion.

We continue to recommend, therefore, that Congress exercise its authority over tariffs, to be administered for the welfare of the American people and provide reasonable tariff protection. In this connection we endorse the recommendation of the United States Tariff Commission to the President on the industry's application for increased duties on lead and zinc. We commend the Members of Congress who worked tirelessly in support of the industry. The President's alternative

stockpiling program, while having certain desirable features which have been of material temporary benefit, is at best a stopgap solution and does not offer any real long-range cure to the problem of the industry.

A reasonable and workable means of maintaining an adequate "mobilization base" in the production of critical and strategic metals and minerals must be worked out promptly. While each metal or mineral has different problems and each must be considered separately on its own merits, this mobilization base can be maintained in most minerals and metals by maintenance of a reasonable price. To accomplish this we favor enactment of excise taxes or flexible tariffs on imports, which may be suspended in whole or in part whenever prices are at an economic level that will permit the domestic mining industry to maintain such adequate mobilization base for national security. The use of direct subsidies will lead to eventual Government control of industry. The nature of mining requires that the industry make long-range plans, and revocable or stopgap measures by the Government contribute little to the real problem.

We recommend that Congress reject participation in any organization which places the power to regulate trade and foreign commerce of the United States in the hands of any international body.

The industrial strength of our Nation has proved itself to be the unfailing mainspring of defense of the United States and the world's free nations. As a keystone to this industrial strength, we strongly urge governmental policies which will assure the maintenance and encouragement of the fullest possible domestic production capacity in strategic and critical metals and minerals.

INTERNATIONAL AND UNITED NATIONS COMMODITY AGREEMENTS

We endorse the action taken by our representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, with the concurrence of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, in opposing the formation within the United Nations of a Food and Raw Materials Reserve. We oppose congressional efforts to reverse this position.

We have consistently opposed intergovernmental efforts to control the price and production of metals and minerals. Accordingly, our 1952 policy declaration opposed United States participation in the International Materials Conference. Again, in 1954, we expressed concern over the establishment of a Commission on International Commodity Trade by the United Nations. In 1955 we commended the administration for its rejection of intergovernmental commodity agreements to control the price and production of basic raw materials. We again commend the forthright position taken by our Government in opposing the adoption of this latest economic panacea which would substitute bureaucratic controls for free markets.

STOCKPILING

We endorse a national policy of stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and the provision of adequate funds at all times for prompt orderly purchases for possible emergency needs. As long as the security of the free world is threatened, the Nation's stockpiles must be filled.

We believe the most efficient and economical procedure is to stockpile at times when output exceeds demand, and that it is in the national interest to reduce or suspend stockpile purchases during periods when shortage of metals causes dislocation of production in defense and essential industries. We also believe that minerals procured for stockpile should be processed to a usable form when capacity is readily available instead of delaying such processing until a time of shortages which may cause serious and unnecessary dislocations.

In connection with minerals and metals in which we normally are not self-sufficient, a definitely stated long-term objective should be fixed and adequate prices paid to domestic producers to encourage the development of domestic reserves and the expansion of domestic production.

No withdrawals from the national stockpile should be authorized except in a declared emergency when national security clearly requires release of a particular material. We commend the administration and the Congress for the enactment of legislation providing that all metals and minerals acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act shall be subject to disposition only under the same restrictions as apply to materials in the national stockpile. Metals and minerals acquired under the Defense Production Act should be transferred promptly to the national stockpile.

We oppose the purchase or other acquisition of foreign metals and minerals for stockpile when adequate domestic supplies are available. Although the barter of surplus United States perishable products for foreign metals is constructive in its objectives, we oppose the recent action of the Department of Agriculture in holding that metals so bartered must be both mined and refined abroad. If foreign-mined but domestically refined metals are available, we believe that they should be eligible for barter negotiations as well.

LONG RANGE MINERAL PROGRAM

We believe that prompt action should be taken to prepare a long-range program for the development of mineral resources in the United States. Although the responsibility for the preparation of such a program was placed with the Department of the Interior, to date no program has been announced.

We believe continued operation of prospectors and small mining concerns is important because these smaller operations provide a pool of specialized knowledge and trained manpower available for the expansion of minerals production in the event of an emergency. Their activities also are the source of new mine discoveries of consequence.

PUBLIC LAND POLICY

We commend the Department of Agriculture and its Forest Service and the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Land Management for their policies of inviting and giving consideration to suggestions from the mining industry as to proposed regulations, the application and administration of which may affect the mining industry or some segment thereof.

We oppose the withholding of public domain lands from mining location, either through creation of new withdrawals or maintenance of existing withdrawals, except in cases where the necessity therefor is clearly established. We further oppose the extension or continuation of any such needed withdrawal to any area in excess of that required to serve the particular purpose of the withdrawal. We consider as unwarranted many withdrawals precluding mining development on large areas even though undemonstrated objectives thereof may have been denominated as defense or conservation.

We commend policies which open to mining location lands that had been closed, and urge careful review of contemplated or existing withdrawals to determine the extent to which the creating or maintaining of the withdrawals is actually needed, and also the extent to which lands to be included or retained in withdrawals may be opened to mining location under conditions which will protect the proper objectives of the withdrawal.

We recommend an amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 which will eliminate the present limitation as to the maximum acreage which may be held under a phosphate lease by 1 person in any 1 State, thus permitting the presently prescribed aggregate acreage limitation of 10,240 acres to apply without regard to State situs of the holdings.

We recommend an amendment to the General Mining Laws which will afford, prior to discovery, reasonable protection to one who is in good faith engaged in exploratory work.

We reiterate our confidence in the system established by the General Mining Laws for the location and patenting of mining claims as the means of encouraging and providing for development of the mineral resources of the public domain through private initiative and enterprise.

We commend the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Land Management for its present application of the General Mining Laws in a manner consonant with the spirit and purpose of those laws and with recognition of long-established principles as to what constitutes a sufficient discovery upon a mining claim.

GOLD, SILVER AND MONETARY POLICY

Continuation of restrictions on ownership of gold and failure to take any steps to make more effective use of the Nation's stock of monetary gold and silver have made action on the recommendations in our previous statements of policy even more urgently needed.

The few surviving gold mines continue to be faced with diminishing profits as costs expressed in depreciating paper dollars continue to rise while the producers must sell their gold at a price fixed over 20 years ago when the dollar had twice its present purchasing power. The right to own gold is still denied to the American citizen, and the gold miner is allowed no protection whatever against inflation.

Furthermore, with the Treasury acting as a middleman, gold in quantities greater than the entire annual production of the country is supplied to industrial consumers at $35 per ounce, thus providing them with an unneeded subsidy at the expense of the miners.

Correction of this gross inequity by restoring to the American citizen the right to buy, sell, and own gold without restriction, accompanied by termination of sales of gold by the Treasury to industrial users, would be a simple step, involving no change in monetary policies with regard to gold, that would go far toward relieving the increasing difficult plight of the gold-mining industry.

The tax on transfers of silver bullion has no place in a free economy and deserves elimination from the statutes.

The place of silver as a monetary metal for appropriate uses is well established, and we commend the policies of the Federal Government that have contributed to this desirable end. Consumption of silver for both industrial and monetary needs is now absorbing available stocks at an accelerated rate. We recommend continued acquisition of domestic silver by the Treasury for monetary needs and urge that the stocks of silver so acquired be held inviolate for such purposes.

In accordance with these views, we recommend that—

(1) the restrictions on the purchase, ownership, and sale of gold and silver by United States citizens be abolished;

(2) to provide a sound basis for our currency, the Treasury be required to purchase at the monetary price all newly mined domestic gold and silver tendered by producers;

(3) to preserve and improve the backing of our currency, all present stocks and future acquisitions of gold and silver be utilized by the Treasury for monetary purposes only, and that neither metal be sold by the Treasury for industrial uses;

(4) Congress fix the ratio at which the dollar and gold are to be made fully convertible and determine other technical procedures involved in the restoration of the gold standard, after receiving the recommendation of a commission of its creation, to which men skilled in appraisal of the world's potential gold supplies as well as men of competence in domestic and international finance and trade should be appointed by designated Government authorities;

(5) the administration recognize the historical and traditional attachment to gold and silver money throughout the world and, as a part of its foreign policy, aid and encourage other governments in restoring gold and silver coinage as a circulating medium, as a standard of value, and as a form of conserving intrinsic wealth.

SOLID FUELS

The Nation will continue to grow in industrial might in step with dependable power. There is a growing awareness by Federal and State governments, transportation interests, and the customers of coal, of the well-deserved place which the solid fuel industry has in providing power for the economic life of the United States. The increasing use and dependence upon coal in expanding the power industry is most noteworthy. Only through a sound national solid fuel policy can the Nation be assured of adequate productive coal capacity required in these days of new dimensions in almost every phase of general industry. The need of the Nation continues for a dependable coal capacity particularly for power, metallurgical and chemical requirements. It necessitates that this all-important solid fuel industry be maintained and have a growth at an adequate level to assure our national and world markets a sufficient supply of solid fuels in times of peace and war.

URANIUM

During the past year the United States Atomic Energy Commission has sought to meet many of the problems facing the uranium industry. The Commission should be commended for this effort, particularly for its continued encouragement of uranium production and processing, both in the interests of national security and in preparation for increased industrial use.

The Commission by entering into new contracts for expanding milling capacity during the past year has provided better opportunities for the mine operator to dispose of his product. The Commission proposes to authorize the construction of still more mills; we urgently recommend that such contracts not jeopardize the investment in nor duplicate existing facilities. By modifying penalties on high-lime ores, the Commission has aided efficient and economic development of such ores. We commend the Commission for announcing a fixed price for uranium oxide after 1962 which we trust will provide adequately to maintain production at the desired level.

The definition of a mining or operating property in respect to the million-pound per property ceiling under the post-1962 program is ambiguous and should be clarified. The Commission should give consideration to the extension of existing and proposed mill contracts beyond 1962 in order to justify the substantial investment required and to facilitate long-term financing.

We commend the Commission for making available additional technical information relating to concentration and refining processes and for releasing technical and research information to aid in preparing market analyses for future production.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Problems having to do with water and air pollution, in their nature, are uniquely related to individual situations and are therefore local in character. The solution of pollution problems is both the responsibility and the right of local and State jurisdictions. In those cases where local or area pollution problems involve two or more States, the appropriate end should be reached through the cooperative effort of local, State, and Federal authorities to the fullest extent authorized by law, and through the means of interstate compacts.

We commend the Congress, when adopting the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956, for making provisions for cooperative aid by way of research, and for enforcement with proper respect for local and State jurisdiction in regard to laws, standards and regulations. We believe, however, that the provision for direct Federal aid in treatment-plant construction, through partially lifting local responsibility for financing, will tend to delay rather than encourage needed treatment-plant construction.

We therefore urge the Federal agencies allocating such aid grants to retain full authority for approval of individual grants and to exercise the greatest caution in order that (1) such grants may go only to those areas which are able to demonstrate dire need; and that (2) communities otherwise able to do so will not delay construction in anticipation of sharing the appropriation for such grants.

We urge the Congress in its further consideration of pollution legislation to provide accelerated amortization for pollution control facility installations.

MINE SAFETY

We firmly believe that the providing of safe conditions and a healthy place to work is the primary responsibility of the mining industry. We strongly endorse a positive program, based upon the following policies:

1. That the mining operators participate in regional meetings held periodically where safe working practices, safety education of employees, accident reports and other problems relating to accident prevention are discussed and where ideas of safety men are exchanged.

2. That the mining industry continue to give high priority to the discussion of safety and health of miners in its meetings and continue its efforts to develop positive safety measures for improving the industry's safety record.

3. That the industry continue to promote and expand its medical research programs concerned with health and safety of mining employees.

4. That the industry publications continue to promote a strong safety campaign and show by experience and economic fact the benefits to employees and industry of an aggressive safety program and that mining operators support this campaign by contributing safety ideas and experiences which have proven worthwhile in their operations.

5. That the mining operators stimulate and support greater activity in the field of safety education among employees on and off the job and that management promote and actively support their safety organizations and encourage employee participation.

6. That the Bureau of Mines continue and expand its activities toward developing and disseminating improved techniques in mine accident prevention and promoting mine safety education. Adequate additional funds for the Bureau to carry out this important program should be forthcoming. We firmly believe that any necessary governmental safety regulations should come only from within the governmental structure of the States.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—BUREAU OF MINES—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

These three Bureaus of the Department of the Interior are most intimately connected with the administration of public lands in their relation to the mining industry.

We wish to compliment the Bureau chiefs for their continuing efforts to furnish improved service to the public and to make their operations more economical and efficient. These Bureaus furnish many valuable services to the mining industry. Their technical and administrative personnel are outstanding.

We continue our support of adequate appropriations for geologic and topographic mapping.

We urge that continued efforts be made to transfer all Federal responsibilities affecting mineral resources to the Department of the Interior, and deplore the continued policy of scattering such responsibilities among various other departments and agencies.

MINE FINANCING

It is necessary and desirable that mining ventures, whether in the prospecting, development, or production stages, be permitted to raise funds for financing. Such financing should be done honestly, without misrepresentation or other abuses. Reasonable requirements to that end are appropriate but they should not be arbitrary nor should they unduly restrict honest efforts to obtain risk capital. We urge that the Securities and Exchange Commission fully recognize these objectives in redrafting its presently proposed regulations, so that in endeavoring to prevent abuses it shall not prevent proper measures for raising needed capital for mineral ventures.

We recommend that the Small Business Administration liberalize its qualifications for granting loans for worthy mining enterprises. We endorse the defense minerals exploration program and commend the efficient administration thereof; adequate provision should be made for the continuance of this important activity.

RADIO FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS

A recent survey conducted by the American Mining Congress has emphasized the importance of effective radio communication to the safe and efficient operation of the mining industry.

Many mining operators are now being deprived of the full benefit of reliable radio communication by inadequate frequency allocations. There are over 8,000 stations, most of which are crowded into only 5 channels shared by mining with such unrelated activities as farming, ranching, manufacturing, crop dusting, and appliance servicing. Other industries have frequency allocations of their own, such as 39 for the railroads, 7 for motion pictures, 9 for petroleum and forestry, and 9 for the public utilities.

We again urge the Federal Communications Commission to allocate additional frequencies for use in the mining industry.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

We strongly urge that continued favorable action be taken to implement the sound recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government concerning the proper functions and policies of the executive departments and agencies. Only by such considered appraisal and evaluation can the competing and overlapping responsibilities be eliminated and economy and efficiency in the operation of our Government be achieved.

If we are to bring about reduction of the cost of government to those who must support it, it is imperative that the essential functions of government be conducted without waste, extravagance, or unnecessary expenditure.

LABOR'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as both political parties continue to fail to recognize the political potential of COPE, the political arm of the CIO–AFL, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

continue to ignore the import of that organization in the election just passed, and also assume that the leader of that political movement, Walter Reuther, is a friend of either side, it is refreshing to hear a voice in the wilderness of heads in the sands who speaks the truth about this movement.

George Hinkle, of Indiana, a past officer of a UAW local and more recently the commissioner of labor for the State of Indiana, is such a person. He has, as have others, spoken out against the use of compulsory dues moneys for political purposes. That this might annoy some of the timid who inhabit the offices of both parties never entered Mr. Hinkle's mind. He was speaking as others do from a conviction that this type of action is morally wrong. He spoke thusly across the length and breadth of his own State and in many others. He was effective; so much so that the Reuthers cried for his scalp, and they got it.

That the Members of this body may better know what this man stands for and what he says and how he was rewarded for his courage, I ask that an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post and a speech this gentleman made be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

MANY UNION MEN RESENT FORCED CAMPAIGN GIVING

Labor's rank and file has just lost a friend in court under circumstances that every man or woman who holds a union card should know. Politicians, too, will be interested—and perhaps surprised.

The friend of the rank and file is George F. Hinkle, a member of the United Automobile Workers and former officer of Local No. 5, UAW-CIO, at Studebaker's South Bend plant, and the office he vacates is that of commissioner of labor for the State of Indiana. Mr. Hinkle is a Republican, appointed by a Republican governor a year and a half ago. Indiana's new governor is also a Republican, but he and Mr. Hinkle do not see eye-to-eye.

The new governor, Harold W. Handley, backed away from Hinkle's outspoken defense of political freedom for union members. The Indiana commissioner of labor, as the election campaign got under way last spring, openly attacked those union leaders who channel dues money to the support of political parties or candidates. The result, he claims, when the money comes from a worker who has to pay dues to hold his job, is the creation of a "second-class citizen." "There are millions of Republicans in organized labor who are being forced to pay the campaign expenses for Democratic office seekers as a condition of employment," Hinkle asserted. "If they do not pay their union dues, they do not have a job; and if they object to this sort of use of their dues money, they are insulted, baited, and labeled antilabor by the very same labor leaders who claim to be defending their individual rights and freedoms."

Mr. Hinkle proposed a denial of the closed-shop privilege as a suitable penalty for unions persisting in political activity, although he is on record as believing in closed-shop union contracts. "I am not opposed to unions participating in politics," he said, "as long as they finance their candidates with money which is solicited on a noncompulsory, voluntary basis from the membership."

Several Indiana union chiefs, as forecast, promptly labeled the outspoken commissioner of labor "antiunion" and demanded that he be fired. Mr. Hinkle was not fired, but Governor Handley, then Lieutenant Governor and spearheading the State GOP campaign, passed the word that the issue and Mr. Hinkle were "too controversial" and should be swept out of sight. Indiana's commissioner of labor thereafter delivered most of his second-class citizen speeches outside the State. It also was obvious that his career in the statehouse was over.

The election, however, brought a surprising vindication. Senator HOMER CAPEHART did not go along with Handley, and circularized every union member he could reach with the same outspoken attack on politically ambitious leaders that Hinkle used. When the ballots were counted—and Indiana went overwhelmingly Republican—the votes for Senator CAPEHART topped Governor Handley's votes in every industrial community in the State, excepting the Gary region, where he was 500 votes behind. This support from the labor centers ran counter to the State totals, which gave Handley a larger majority than CAPEHART'S.

George F. Hinkle no longer represents labor in the councils of his home State. But his courage, in our opinion, will put heart in the rank and file far beyond Indiana, and might even prompt the politicians in both parties to buck up and face an issue that violates our freedoms. As Mr. Hinkle believes: "If we want to keep America as the land of the free, we have to make sure it is also the home of the brave."

IMPLICATIONS OF LABOR'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

(Address by George F. Hinkle, Commissioner of Labor, State of Indiana, for the National Association of Manufacturers, 61st Congress of American Industry, New York, December 5, 1956)

It is certainly an honor and a privilege to be here today to address this 61st Congress of American Industry. Not only do I consider this a distinct privilege, but I also appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you the subject of labor's political activities.

In order to discuss this problem in its proper light it will be necessary to first establish the fact that unions have become one of the most powerful special interest groups in the political arena today and that many labor political bosses are acquiring this power through the use of compulsory union dues money for political purposes. Next the fact shall be established that this use of dues money for such purposes is immoral and unconstitutional. After establishing these two facts, we can then explore the implications and possibilities of such activities.

In developing this basic outline it shall be to our benefit to touch briefly on the history of the American labor movement as it has been involved politically from its inception to this present date. We must do this in order that we may see how the political complexion of the labor movement has changed down through the years. We shall scrutinize and analyze the philosophy of certain great labor leaders. We shall discuss the problem of labor bosses as a special interest group and their domination of one of our major political parties. We must be constantly aware of the fact that individual rights and freedoms make up the fundamental theme of a discussion such as this and that many times these rights supersede the rights of government or labor organizations.

The American labor movement was born on or about the year 1790 and from that time up to the year 1882, many types and kinds of union organizations came into being, developed, and passed away. One of the principal reasons for the demise of many of these union organizations was their close alinement with political parties and factions. In fact they operated mostly as a supplement to some political group and their success as labor unions, as a result, depended upon the success and power of the particular political organization or faction to which they had become beholden.

It is important to note that in those days the union organizations were beholden to the political parties. Today, the exact opposite is true. One of our two major political parties is becoming more and more indebted to, and controlled by, a group of politically powerful labor bosses.

In 1882, the American Federation of Labor was born and organized by men such as Samuel Gompers, Peter Strasser, and others. The AFL was not the first federation of international unions, but it was the first to weather wars and depressions, and as you know, it is still with us today, more powerful than ever before. There are reasons for the survival and growth of the AFL.

Originally Gompers and the other founders of the AFL were active members of the Socialist Party, but as their federation grew, they became increasingly aware of the incompatibility of socialism as opposed to the American capitalistic type of government, in which they believed. These men discarded socialism completely and developed the first American business-type union with the philosophy of a fair day's work for a fair day's pay and the avoidance of political entanglements and organized politics. This is the primary reason why the AFL prospered and grew. Later we shall examine Mr. Gompers' philosophy more thoroughly.

The AFL reigned as the only great federation of international unions from 1882 to 1936, at which time we saw the birth of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The CIO evolved out of the fact that the true test of organized labor's political power lies in its financial support of a political party or candidate. John L. Lewis made no bones about the fact that the United Mine Workers and the CIO paid $500,000 for a piece of legislation giving them the right to organize.

With the organization of the CIO there came into power a certain leftwing Socialist element, some of whom we might categorize as intellectual radicals. Under Lewis, this group formed Labor's Political Nonpartisan League, which disintegrated in 1940 because the leftwing group was not nonpartisan and Lewis attempted to be when he endorsed Wendell Willkie for President of the United States.

Someone may question the use of the term "leftwing Socialist," so let us go to the year 1942 and see what happened because of what some labor leaders called brazen election victories by reactionary forces. This leftwing group was seeking some way to bore into one of our two major national political parties and because of the results of the 1942 elections, this group organized and promoted the CIO Political Action Committee. The following is from a pro-union publication entitled "The First Round." "PAC was fortunate in having the advice of the distinguished CIO general counsel, Lee Pressman. It was even more fortunate in its own legal adviser, John Abt. John Abt gave more than legal advice. He participated in the planning of every one of the PAC's activities."

Recently, John Abt represented the Communist Daily Worker in its difficulties with the Treasury Department. Pressman has admitted being a Communist at one time. Abt has used the fifth amendment many times in congressional hearings. Pressman and Abt were in a powerful advisory position with the CIO–PAC and someone was responsible for their being there. The term "leftwing Socialist" is very mild when applied to men such as these two.

In 1948, 5 years after the birth of the CIO–PAC, the AFL formed Labor's League for Political Education. This organization, however, was not as active or partisan as the

PAC because of the great number of members in the AFL who were, and still are, exponents of the Gompers' school of conservative trade unionism. In 1952, we saw, for one of the few times in their history, the endorsement of a presidential candidate by the AFL, something the CIO–PAC had been doing consistently since 1944.

In 1955, the merger of the AFL and the CIO came about. As a result we now see a special interest union political organization known as the Committee on Political Education (COPE). This political organization is a powerful, fast-growing arm of the Democrat Party and is well on the path to gaining control of the National Democrat Party as it has that party in the States of Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and others.

Now let's talk about individual rights and freedoms.

Today there are millions of members of organized labor who have been and are presently being compelled to contribute to the campaign funds and efforts of candidates not of their choosing. Candidates these very same union members are opposed to at the polls. This violation of individual rights and freedoms, this violation of individual political freedom is a result of the absolute power the labor political bosses wield over a minority in organized labor and is made possible by the union-shop clause which in turn provides the union boss with compulsory union dues money. This dues money is being used to help finance the campaigns of certain political candidates and segments of the Democrat Party.

A few moments ago I made the point that the true test of a labor leader's political strength and power lies in his ability to financially support a candidate or party and now we tie that point in with the fact that the union-shop clause makes it possible for the labor political boss to render this tremendous financial support to candidates.

You often hear the labor leader defend himself by saying that he cannot deliver any vote except his own and this defense on the part of the labor leader is accepted by many as being true and therefore many persons in our country have a tendency to discount the ability of a union political boss to influence a political contest.

Of course he can deliver only his own personal vote in most instances, but with huge financial resources at his disposal he can propagandize his membership and when he does this he sees to it that they get only one side of the story. He can sponsor and pay for expensive radio and television time, which he does. He can furnish cars, drivers, and workers on and before election days; this he does. The grass root workers and car drivers are the very key to the success of many political campaigns. Any person who is familiar with organizational politics knows this. Of course the labor political boss can deliver only one vote, his own, but he can also deliver the ammunition to be used to influence the thinking and voting of thousands of other persons.

Remember this, when one sells a political candidate, one is selling an intangible; and in order to sell the intangible, which is what the candidate stands for, one must sell an idea; and in order to sell an idea, one must propagandize; and in order to propagandize in a political campaign, one must spend huge sums of money. The labor boss furnishes the huge sums of money and this money is available to him because of the compulsory dues money required by the union-shop clause.

Many union members will not agree with this propaganda, these television and radio programs, the financing of workers and drivers, etc., but still these members are forced to help finance these various political activities against their own will. Individual political freedom is being sacrificed to gain political power for a certain few.

I can cite many instances and examples of the use of dues money for political purposes, but I shall use only one or two major examples because of the limited time.

First let's look at the State of Michigan and the testimony of Mr. John Feikens, Michigan Republican State chairman, before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in the spring of 1955. Mr. Feikens submitted an audit report by Emil Mazy, secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO, for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1954, which showed a political action disbursement from the union general fund of $2,611,980.05. All for the Democrat Party. This amount was broken down into categories labeled educational, editorial, radio, citizenship, PAC department expenses, etc. Regardless of how it is labeled, it is all politics and political action.

In a recent conversation with Mr. Feikens he told me that from all indications the UAW–CIO doubled this tremendous expenditure in the elections of this year. He expects the audit report of the UAW–CIO, which will be published next spring, to bear him out in his analysis of their expenditures.

This case of huge expenditures on the part of the UAW–CIO in Michigan is going before the United States Supreme Court this year or early next year. The decision as to its legality will be one of extreme significance and importance.

When this case was before Federal Judge Frank A Picard in Michigan, the Judge dismissed the case on the grounds that "the expenditures charged in this indictment are not prohibited by the act." This may be true, and if it is, the act should be strengthened so that it would prohibit these expenditures. But the judge goes on to say that the union was "exercising the right of free speech."

"Free speech"? In other words, the individual union member must supply the labor leader with money so that he, the labor leader, can speak freely for the political candidate endorsed by the labor leader. The right of individual political freedom and endorsement is completely ignored by the labor leader and the judge.

In another part of his opinion, Judge Picard says this: "It (the union) desired to inform its members and others of the position of the union on those seeking certain Federal offices." Now I ask you, just who is the union, the bosses, or the rank-and-file membership? In other words, the union boss says he has the right to take my money and spend it to tell me what candidate I am supporting in an election for public office, when I already know what candidate I am supporting and do not particularly care for the labor boss' advice in the first place. That is just like saying down is up.

Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C., of the University of Notre Dame, brought out the case of Cecil B. deMille in his recent book entitled "The Case for Right-To-Work Laws." Mr. deMille refused to contribute a dollar, assessed by the union, for a political purpose to which Mr. deMille was opposed, and as a result Mr. deMille was suspended from his union and consequently put off the air. Father Keller goes on to note that from 1944 to this day Mr. deMille has not been allowed to produce a radio show by reason of his refusal to make a forced political contribution. If this can happen to a man as prominent, powerful, and wealthy as Mr. deMille, what chance has an ordinary worker to protect himself against abuse under compulsory unionism and the use of his dues money for political activities?

In order to establish the fact that the use of such dues money is immoral and unconstitutional, we shall examine certain opinions and philosophies.

First I should like to read from the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII on the condition of labor. This establishment of an individual right is found in the ninth paragraph of the encyclical letter and is as follows: "Clearly the essential reason why those who engage in any gainful occupation undertake labor, and at the same time the end to which workers immediately look, is to procure property for their very own. When the worker places his energy and his labor at the disposal of another, he does so for the purpose of getting the means necessary for livelihood. He seeks in return for the work done, accordingly, a true and full right to not only demand his wage, but to dispose of it as he sees fit. * * * Therefore, inasmuch as the socialists seek to transfer the goods of private persons to the community at large, they make the lot of all wage earners worse, because in abolishing the freedom to dispose of wages they take away from them by this very act the hope and the opportunity of increasing their property and of securing advantages for themselves."

This paragraph of Pope Leo's letter established the right of a worker to dispose of his wages, which is the same as property, as the worker sees fit and also brings out the point that the confiscation of a worker's property without compensation and by force is socialism and the denial of an individual right.

Judge Carter, of the Nebraska supreme court, had this to say about compulsory unionism today and why it should be opposed because unions, in their functioning, are becoming more and more political. "In some instances compulsory membership would compel support, financial and otherwise, of policies which an employee might deem objectionable from the standpoint of free government and the liberties of the individual under it. * * * To compel any employee to make involuntary contributions from his compensation for such purpose is taking his property without due process of law. * * * To force contributions against one's will in the manner here employed is a violation of his fundamental rights and privileges. It is a violation of 'nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law,' contained in the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States."

From an opinion by Judge Abner McCall, associate justice of the Texas supreme court, we find this interesting bit of history.

Prior to the American Revolution, compulsory religion was the law in nine of the original colonies and the churches were supported by taxes. Judge McCall states as follows: "'The crucial struggle came in the Virginia house of delegates in 1784 over a bill for a general assessment for the maintenance of religion. No less an orator than Patrick Henry urged that since religion promotes happiness and prosperity for all, every citizen should be compelled by law to contribute to the support of his church. * * * The opponents of the general-assessment bill, led by James Madison, supported an opposition bill drafted by Thomas Jefferson, entitled 'Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom', which declared in its preamble the following, 'That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical.' * * * Madison and Jefferson won this fight and later Madison wrote Jefferson the following in a letter. 'I flatter myself that we have in this country extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind.'" Judge McCall goes on to say that "Apparently the gift of prophecy was not among Madison's endowments."

If in this case one will substitute the word unions for the word churches, one can see that the use of compulsory union dues money for political purposes is a violation of individual rights by unions, and those union bosses who claim they have a right to do this are placing themselves and the union above and beyond the rights and the powers of the state and the church. If certain labor

political bosses believe that they have rights and powers which are greater than the state or the church, what will happen to government when candidates owned and controlled by labor bosses are elected to office? They will make sure that they get these powers and maintain them.

Now we have established the fact that compulsory union dues money is being used for political purposes and we have established the fact that it is immoral and unconstitutional. Let us now examine the philosophy and the thinking of two prominent labor leaders in the American labor movement—Samuel Gompers and Walter Reuther.

Gompers had this to say about the Socialists at the 1903 convention of the AFL. "I want to tell you Socialists that I have studied your philosophy, read your works upon economics. * * * I have heard your orators and watched the work of your movement the world over. * * * I have kept close watch upon your doctrines for 30 years; have closely associated with many of you and know what you think and what you propose. * * * I know, too, what you have up your sleeve. And I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. * * * Economically you are unsound, socially you are wrong, and industrially you are an impossibility."

At the American Federation of Labor's convention held at El Paso, Tex., in 1924, Gompers had this to say about voluntarism: "So long as we have held fast to the voluntary principles and have been actuated and inspired by the spirit of service, we have sustained our forward progress and we have made our labor movement something to be respected and accorded a place in the council of our Republic. Where we have blundered into trying to force a policy or a decision, even though wise and right, we have impeded, if not interrupted, the realization of our aims."

Today this does not seem to be the policy of the now merged AFL–CIO and I say that the ranks and leadership of this great organization abounds with those persons who are of the leftwing Socialist school. These persons, some of whom are the intellectual radical type, are doing their utmost to promote and foster their absolute control over all the citizens of our country. They wish to promote their own socialistic ideals by using the labor movement as a vehicle for the attainment of these ideals.

Most of you have probably heard of the famous Reuther letter dated January 20, 1934, which Walter and Victor Reuther sent from Russia to their brother and sister in America. This letter is a glowing accolade to the Russian Communist movement and ends with this statement: "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America." The letter was signed Vic and Wal.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, August 2, 1955, an excerpt from the remarks of CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Congressman from Michigan, the following is taken, and I quote: "In 1933 Walter Reuther was lecturing under the auspices of the Young People's Socialist League, which was a forerunner of the League for Protection of Civil Rights. At this meeting Walter Reuther was asked this question: 'Do you believe in religion and God or in science as a religion?' His answer was: 'We do not believe in God, but that man is God.' (Testimony of Herman Luhrs, chairman of the joint committee of the American Legion, Flint, Mich.; vol. 2, p. 1654.)"

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections (the Gore committee) just last October, a month prior to the national elections, Reuther made some rather startling, questionable, and contradictory statements throughout his appearance.

In a question on the results of voting for or against a union shop, Reuther said the following, and I quote: "They came to be liberated. We liberated the workers in this industry. We didn't enslave them. A little insignificant minority that wouldn't pay a dime for anything want a free ride."

When I ask you did we ever in this country ever consider any minority insignificant? A minority of one is not insignificant according to our concepts of government. I wonder if Walter Reuther considered himself a member of an insignificant minority when he first started to help organize the United Auto Workers? There is no question about their having been a small minority at one time.

In another part of his testimony, Reuther says "* * * that for every democratic right there is a corresponding responsibility, for every democratic privilege there is an obligation. * * *" I agree with him. Rights are dependent upon responsibilities and responsibilities are dependent upon rights. Now let us go a little further and see what else he has to say.

Again I quote Mr. Reuther: "When Life magazine, which is a corporation, when they endorsed President Eisenhower, as they did in the last issue, they have a right to do that constitutionally. When the Detroit News, which is a corporation, does the same thing on the front pages, they have a right to, and we have the same constitutional right, as a trade union, to put out publications, to buy radio time, to buy television time, to express our point of view on the issues and our preference on the candidates."

Mr. Reuther wants the same rights as corporations. I wonder if he would want the same responsibilities? He said in testimony that for every right there is a corresponding responsibility and obligation. I wonder if he would want the responsibility and the obligation of paying corporation taxes? How much are they? It's 52 percent, isn't it? I gather from Reuther's testimony that he considers himself and the UAW equal to corporations and deserving of the same rights as corporations, so I cannot help but take that to mean that he believes that the UAW should be subject to the same tax responsibility as Life magazine or the Detroit News. I can just imagine Walter Reuther agreeing to that.

In another part of his testimony, Mr. Reuther says, "I am not a member of the Democratic Party." In another part he says, "We didn't get anybody in the Cabinet when we used to win the national elections." His testimony is generally confusing and misleading. I am absolutely sure that he is not a member of the Republican Party so I can gather from his testimony that he considers himself to be a member of the Democrat Party even though he denies it in one place and admits it in another. If not the Democrat Party, what party is he referring to when he says, "When we used to win the national elections"?

I bring these points out only to give an example of the difference in the thinking of Samuel Gompers, the father of the American labor movement and Walter Reuther, the leading exponent of compulsory political action on the part of union members. Gompers was usually clear, concise, and straight from the shoulder. Reuther contradicts himself continually and is a master of the distorted, twisted statement.

What does all this fanfare and commotion about labor's political activities mean? What does it imply?

There is no doubt that many union labor bosses are in this political picture more so than they are in the bona fide business of representing dues-paying members in labor-management relations. These leaders intend to stay in the political arena and build as much power and control over as many elected officeholders as they possibly can. This is not a partisan problem. It affects the Democrat Party as much as it does the Republican Party. In fact it affects the Democrat Party more than it does the Republican Party because the labor bosses intend to gain control of the Democrat Party. If this march toward power continues, one day the term "Democrat Party" will be a misnomer, for it will actually be the labor party. And when I say labor party, I mean a party controlled by labor bosses.

Walter Reuther is an extremely intelligent, aggressive labor leader and the man is very ambitious politically. He is no longer biding time in his quest for power in the political arena of this country. He is conducting a positive campaign to become the political power of our country. A man with his philosophy must continually increase and develop organizational power in order to exist. Any major setback or defeat of Reuther as an organizational leader would jeopardize his position as a labor leader and make him vulnerable to attack and defeat by other ambitious leaders in the labor movement.

There have been many polls and surveys showing preelection inclinations of the rank-and-file union members of this country. Since the recent national elections, I don't think there is any reason for examining these polls closely. All we have to do is to examine the returns from some of our huge industrial centers and see how deep an inroad President Eisenhower made in labor areas. It is no secret that an overwhelming majority of the labor bosses in this country were supporting Adlai Stevenson and were using every financial facility at their disposal to elect him. It is safe to say that between 40 percent and 50 percent of the union members today supported President Eisenhower and the dues money of this 40 percent to 50 percent was being used in an attempt to elect Mr. Stevenson. Is this political freedom in America? These union members, because of the union shop clause, were forced to support Stevenson as a condition of employment.

No agreement between unions and management should be permitted which will force a person to give up any one of his fundamental constitutional rights. No employer or union leader has the right to speak, act, or contribute for an individual union member when it comes to selecting people who will govern that member in all phases of his social and economic life. To most union members, the union is only one phase of their life in our society and to most union members there are other things which they deem much more important than laws or candidates which may give increased power to their labor leaders. The union member may want to support candidates who will work for those things which he believes to be most important.

When we discuss the potential results of this march toward socialism we must realize that this type of political activity on the part of the union leader is pure socialism and that it in turn will beget socialism. We must remember that their activities in this field are not for the benefit of business, large or small. We must realize that most labor bosses do not believe that business directly or indirectly always serves the masses. We must realize that the labor bosses do not supply any one of the three primary factors necessary for the development of our free enterprise system. The labor bosses do not represent those who accumulate capital, they do not represent those who invest capital, and they do not represent those who develop new fields for the employment of such capital and the employment of millions of American workers. In fact, a great many powerful labor leaders do not subscribe to capitalism or the free enterprise system and they do not contribute to the growth and development of our system. The labor leaders who do not subscribe to our system of government are advocates of statism and are desirous of gaining enough political power to change this system.

These facts should be of primary importance to you here today because the businessman is the very backbone of our free enterprise system. It is you the labor boss is challenging. It is you that an ever increasing number of educators are challenging. This group of labor leaders, politicians, and educators do not participate in our free enterprise system in the same manner as you. They do not contribute to its development and growth, and when they accuse you of exploitation and monopoly, they are indirectly condemning our American Republic and our free enterprise system.

If the labor political bosses can gain control of enough of our large industrial States, as they have in some at the present time, and if the labor bosses can gain control of the National Democratic Convention, as they are coming close to doing every 4 years, and if, after gaining control of this National Convention, they are successful in electing their candidates, you, the businessmen of today, will be the target for tomorrow.

Some may be of the opinion that these are idle remarks on my part. Let's do a little research.

Victor Riesel, the eminent labor writer, wrote a column shortly after the recent national elections in which he made the point that labor was the big winner in the last election. Some would say that this is silly. Let's see if it is.

In his column, Mr. Riesel stated that President Eisenhower won the Presidency but lost the election to labor leaders. He said that it was labor's political machine, operating in the Nation's 154,865 precincts, which prevented the President from winning a friendly Congress. He states that from now on labor can write its own ticket inside the Democrat Party and that there would have been practically no Democrat campaign if the labor people had not poured every facility available into the Democrat campaign. He tells about Michigan, Pennsylvania, Oregon, and how labor candidates piled up votes even when losing. Mr. Riesel went on to say that there were no blues in labor's camp the day after the election because they, for the most part, won at the grassroots level on their homefronts, and are now turning to the task of winning inside the Democrat Party. A task which they will not put off until 1960, but are intent on exerting even more influence in the elections of 1958.

Did you notice how many union bosses were in attendance at the Democrat National Convention last summer? Reuther, Carey, McDonald, Kennedy, Harrison, and many lesser men in labor's hierarchy. They were there backing their candidates before any of them had read or seen the platform of either the Democrat or Republican Parties. Their claim of nonpartisanship does not seem to hold water. Walter Reuther's delegation from Michigan at that convention was the delegation which, when it was committed to Stevenson in the prenomination maneuverings by Reuther, assured Stevenson of the nomination on the first ballot.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been my opinion for several years that you, as business men and women, have a job on your hands. A job which will call for the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars and also the expenditure of many hours of effort and time. This job is your responsibility because it involves your very way of life and also the very concepts of our American form of government. The manner in which you go about doing this job, the thoroughness you attain in completing this task shall determine whether or not the businessman and the free-enterprise system as we know it today shall survive tomorrow.

Not only do you have a responsibility to yourselves, but you have an equal responsibility to the millions of American workers who are dependent upon you for the employment opportunities which you create for them. You have a responsibility to tell the American worker of his great partnership in this system, of his responsibility to maintain this system and how history has proved that this is the only system which has been able to provide this tremendous expansion of employment and high standard of living.

For the past two decades, many labor leaders, politicians, and educators have made great strides in the acquisition of political power by discrediting and vilifying the businessman. What have you been doing to counteract this concerted effort on their part to destroy you?

The unions spend millions of dollars on propaganda and publicity in which you are made to appear to be the villainous exploiters of the American masses. How much have you spent to tell your side of the story?

I know that you have done something toward informing and educating the various echelons of management and to a degree you have been successful. One of the reasons for this being true is that the people to whom you direct your propaganda are originally sympathetic with you because they are one of you to begin with. That, however, is not even half the job done. Those whom you inform and educate in the various echelons of management should in turn strive to educate and inform the rank-and-file union member and the American citizen who is not one of you. They deserve to hear both sides of the story and at the present time they are not getting it. I know you spend millions of dollars selling your products to the public, but how much do you spend to sell the free-enterprise system to the American public? The system of which you are such a vital part.

The other side is selling an idea which is diametrically opposed to the free enterprise system and they have the money to spend, public relations men who are every bit as good as the so-called Madison Avenue publicist, and they have a one-sided press.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time you stood up to be counted. Go to the rank and file worker, go to the American citizen and tell them the story of business and free enterprise before it is too late.

In this discussion today, we have examined the history of the American labor movement, the use of compulsory union dues money for political purposes, the immorality and unconstitutionality of this action, the philosophy of certain labor leaders, the control of one of our major political parties by a special interest group, and the possible results of the activities of this special interest group if it continues to grow in strength and power as it has in the past decade.

I say to you delegates of this 61st Congress of American Industry that there is a course charted for you and it is your responsibility to follow it.

First, you should commence a program of education for the benefit of all the American people. A program which will explain, defend, and promote the free enterprise system. Those who are opposed to our system have been working at it for years. I say it is your duty to lead the fight to effectively halt the socialism which is growing in this country.

Second, you as the greatest exponents of the free enterprise system should encourage the active participation of all segments of management and business in the political field. Remember, in order to have good government, you must have good, capable people in the political field, regardless of party. This is a simple formula, but it has proved itself to be basic and true.

Third, you should participate in a concerted effort to prevent the use of compulsory union-dues money for political purposes. Half the American labor movement today is being relegated to a role of second-class citizenship because of this violation of their constitutional rights, and I say that those unions which are guilty of this violation should be denied the right to have a union shop. Look to the United States Congress and Senate. Find out what men such as Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator CURTIS, of Nebraska, have been doing in an attempt to eliminate this second-class citizenship. Give them your active support, not just your tacit approval of what they are doing. Make an effort to do something about this problem on a local and State level, the most important level of our Government.

In closing, I say to you what I have said many times before. It is time we took cognizance of the fact that our individual rights and freedoms are in jeopardy and that our children will not enjoy the freedoms we enjoy today if proponents of the antifree enterprise system are permitted to thrive and grow in power and control.

We must face this problem head on, with foresight and courage, and faith in this free enterprise system—a system that has worked so well that it seems sometimes to be the architecture of God. It is the same today as in the time of Samuel Gompers. If we want to keep America the land of the free, we have to make sure it is also the home of the brave.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Honorable C. Wayland Brooks, who died on Monday, January 14, was United States Senator from Illinois for the 8 years from 1941 to 1948 inclusive. Born in Wyanet, Ill., in a ministerial family, he attended the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. Enlisting in the Marine Corps at the outbreak of World War I, Senator Brooks distinguished himself by his conspicuous bravery at Chateau-Thierry and other battles. For this, he received well-deserved honors and decorations.

Active in the American Legion and the Republican Party, and a public speaker of great ability and persuasiveness, Mr. Brooks led an eventful and action-packed life and worked hard for the causes in which he believed. After leaving the Senate, he was elected Republican national committeeman from Illinois and held that office at the time of his death.

Mr. Brooks and I differed profoundly on a wide variety of issues, both domestic and foreign. But I would prefer not to dwell on these matters at this time. I would rather emphasize his bravery as a marine and his continuing loyalty to that corps, and his sincerity in support of the causes in which he believed. I extend my sympathy to his widow, his son, the other members of his family, and to his many friends.

VINDICATION OF HOWARD YOUNG

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last year one of the most prominent and highly thought of citizens of Missouri, Mr. Howard Young, was attacked on the floor of the Senate as the result of a report from the General Accounting Office.

Friends of Mr. Young, including myself, were confident that any fair investigation would justify our high opinion of his character and his integrity.

Such an investigation has now been completed, and in the interest of justice I ask that a recent editorial entitled "Vindication of Howard Young" published in the St. Louis Globe Democrat, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VINDICATION OF HOWARD YOUNG

Special notice should be taken of the clearance by the Justice Department of the "conflict of interest" charges against Howard I. Young, St. Louis mining executive, who was falsely charged by the General Accounting Office.

When the GAO's accusations were first made and Mr. Young was denounced for using his Government position to help his own firm and the zinc industry generally, Mr. Young vigorously denied the charges and was in turn warmly defended by several Members of the Senate and the House.

It turns out now, one and a half years later, that the General Accounting Office was wrong. Both a congressional committee and the BI have made a very thorough investigation of Mr. Young's actions as deputy administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency and have found, quite contrary to the charges, that Mr. Young had gone out of his way not to favor his own company.

We doubt that any damage has been done to Mr. Young's fine reputation. This newspaper and his many friends defended him when the charges were made. But that is not the point. What is pertinent is the question how the Government can hope to attract top executives to dollar-a-year jobs if they are to be harassed and persecuted irresponsibly.

This does not mean for a moment that transgressors should not be ferreted out and, if necessary, prosecuted. Somewhere, however, there must be the middle ground which defends the public servant and the public from damaging charges which hurt not only the subject of the attacks but the public itself, by making it more difficult to get proper people to run the Government's business.

Howard Young has been a great citizen of St. Louis and of the Nation. His stature, if anything is increased by virtue of his ordeal. Those of us who have had faith in him right along are joined by the rest of the St. Louis community in rejoicing in his complete vindication.

SEVENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the fact that 74 years ago this week President Arthur signed legislation which formed the foundation of our present-day career civil service. The past 4 years have brought about greater public understanding and new heights of prestige for Federal employment and Federal employees. The observance of National Civil Service Week is a tribute to the men and women dedicated to public service.

The growth and complexity of our Government emphasizes the need for continued efforts in the strengthening of our merit system and in furthering public appreciation of civil-service employees.

Mr. President, I had the honor of addressing the National Civil Service League's second annual awards dinner on July 2, 1956, at which 10 distinguished Federal employees were honored for their outstanding contributions in public service. The credit of these awards reflects representations of the high caliber of the persons who are serving the public.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR CARLSON AT THE NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE SECOND ANNUAL CAREER SERVICE AWARDS DINNER, JULY 2, 1956

President Kelley, Governor Meyner, my congressional colleagues, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great privilege for me to have this opportunity to congratulate publicly the two sponsors of this memorable event: The National Civil Service League, which during its existence has contributed so much to the growth and development of the Federal civil service; and Look magazine, whose vision in joining with the league on this occasion for the second time exemplifies the high sense of public responsibility that is the hallmark of enlightened journalism.

And may I add a special compliment to Mr. Gardner Cowles for his appreciation of the fact that "the people's right to know" includes the right to know the good as well as the bad in public affairs.

Among the various means of bringing to public attention the high caliber of Federal career employees, awards and honors publicly conferred are particularly effective. Incentive awards, honors from business and professional groups, grants from foundations, and the like, have contributed greatly in recent years to an improved public appreciation of civil-service employees.

I regard the league's career service awards as especially valuable in this respect, because of the fact that they emphasize not only accomplishments but also character. They are granted on the basis not only of what these people do, but also what they are.

The 10 distinguished Federal employees whom we are honoring tonight therefore typify in all respects what is best in our career service—as did their 10 distinguished predecessors who were similarly honored last year. I take great pride in congratulating them on being selected to receive the second annual Career Service Awards, and I want to add to those congratulations my personal expression of appreciation to them for their invaluable services to me as a citizen and to all my fellow citizens.

In the final analysis, it is the character and ability of the men and women in the career service that make events such as this one possible. The credit that these awards reflect on the career service in general gives a real lift to the morale of all career employees, for recognition is one of the most essential ingredients of morale. Remembering the tremendous success of the first program, it is my earnest hope that these occasions will be repeated annually for many years to come.

The determination with which the National Civil Service League embarked last year upon this new program is consistent with the manner in which it has pursued its objectives over a period of 75 years. Dedicated to the high purpose of developing "an enlightened public attitude toward efficient and non-partisan personnel practices in government," it was organized while President James A. Garfield lay on his deathbed, a martyr to the spoils system. For three-quarters of a century the League has continued with unabated vigor its battles on behalf of good government, concentrating in its early years on laying the foundation of the merit system and progressing, as the merit system progressed, to increasing emphasis on methods of improving public personnel administration.

Through the long fabric of the League's history runs one consistent thread: the thread of its concern for the quality of public-service personnel. One of its basic contentions 75 years ago was that open competition and merit-system administration would provide the Federal Government with a competent, stable, and loyal work force.

We have with us tonight living proof of that contention, because these ten career employees are representative of the best in the career service rather than unique. It is doubtful whether a single person could have been found in the Government service in 1881 who could meet all the League's present criteria for career service awards—competence, efficiency, character, and continuity of service. Certainly there was no dignity in public service in the days when the first concern of every Government job holder was the mad scramble for political patronage.

Over the years, the National Civil Service League has served not only the Executive Branch of Government but the Legislative Branch as well. Through this organization, and others of its kind, the Congress has had the benefit of advice on important personnel matters from men of wisdom and experience. These people have no personal axe to grind and they are motivated solely by their sincere and unselfish interest in good government. Only a Member of Congress can know how pleasant it is to encounter "advisors" who are working for a principle rather than for a personal interest.

This is not to say, of course, that the members of the Civil Service League do not have a personal interest in their cause. Actually, it is the most enlightened kind of interest. Those who identify themselves with this organization do so because they are more keenly aware than the average citizen is of the fact that every man, woman and child in this country has a personal stake—and a big one—in the honest and efficient operation of our Federal Government.

I think it is appropriate on this occasion to point out that from the day the present administration came into office it has been actively concerned with the improvement of the Federal civil service, and with the closely related problems of the prestige and the morale of Federal employees. Under the inspiring leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, great gains toward more efficient and economical administration of the executive departments and agencies have been made, and it has increased the average citizen's respect both for the Government activities with which he comes in contact and for the Government employees who carry on those activities.

The fact is that since 1953 we have seen a significant improvement in the prestige of Federal employment and Federal employees, and I hope that the employees themselves realize how great a change has taken place.

In a public address a few weeks ago, President Harold Dodds of Princeton University praised the high caliber of Government employees and their devotion to duty, and expressed the belief that they are more generally appreciated by the American people than they sometimes realize.

The enactment of progressive personnel legislation is in itself evidence that the representatives of the people hold Federal employees in high esteem. I am proud to have been the author of many laws that have been enacted for the benefit of those in the public service.

And finally, let us not overlook the fact that the dignity, the efficiency, and the prestige of the career civil service all depend upon its being kept clear of the taint of politics. As a practical politician, I am naturally interested in patronage. I want to see it well and wisely used in its proper place, namely, the legitimate political or policy-making area of the Government. I do not want to see it mixed with the career civil service, because such an association

gives both the career service and patronage a bad name.

This is a big problem for both major political parties and there is no simple answer. I do however pledge myself to the continued nonpartisan development of the career civil service.

I believe that with this administration the stability and value of the career service is well established and the integrity of the career service has been advanced.

And now let us take a brief look into the future problems. In spite of the almost unbelievable distance we have traveled in three-quarters of a century, much important work yet remains to be done. Seventy-five years from now, for that matter, there will still be work to do. For the merit system is not a thing of fixed rules or eternal laws; it is a dynamic, living force that must change with changing times. While its fundamental principles need not—and indeed must not—be altered, the application of those principles should be adapted to serve the needs of our Government under whatever conditions the future may bring.

Several problems requiring such solutions are currently before the Congress. Among these is the provision for outside-Government training of selected Government employees. As you know, this proposal was advanced by the Hoover Commission and is strongly favored by the administration. I shall do all I can to secure its enactment before the end of this session of Congress. And may I add here my pledge to consider carefully all the Hoover Commission recommendations, to work for the adoption of those that are meritorious and practicable, and to cooperate fully with the executive branch in carrying them out.

Looking ahead a little farther we will encounter the problem of automation, which we are told is practically upon us. I see no great cause for alarm in this prospect. Actually, "automation" is more a new word than a new thing. It is a further development in the whole process of mechanization which has been going on ever since the industrial revolution. And just as the industrial revolution created vastly higher standards of living, rather than the dire want and distress that many predicted, so automation in the Government should result in better Government service. Of all people on earth, Americans have the least cause to fear mechanization; it has already brought us a level of economic well-being that cannot be matched anywhere in the world.

To be sure, when automation is introduced or expanded in Government agencies it must be carefully planned in advance so that the necessary reorganization, retraining, and reassignment can be accomplished in an orderly and equitable manner.

Normal attrition will eliminate any possibility of widespread reductions in force. We have every reason to believe that, in the coming years, automation will bring greater benefits for employees—a shorter work week, more leisure time, less nervous pressure and strain, and relief from many monotonous and blind-alley jobs.

But let us take a real look to the future.

We have an opportunity here tonight to do more than recognize the historic advances in the last 75 years—or even the high degree of competence in our career service that we are now recognizing.

I have pointed out that we have in American Government three great factors: (1) An outstanding career service which is strong, efficient, and capable of great improvement and advancement; (2) we have a great American tradition of citizen concern for good government, which is represented here by the fine efforts of the National Civil Service League and the distinguished group of public-spirited citizens who are ever alert to the needs for improving government; (3) we have that essential characteristic of American democracy, responsible political leaders.

It is my proposal that we rapidly raise our sights to the true challenge and opportunity of a peacetime atomic age. I feel especially confident in discussing this because of the factors which we represent and recognize tonight.

I would like for us, however, to stop for a moment and think of the tremendous responsibilities which we as a free nation must meet in terms of the future of the world and the miraculous and fantastic development of nuclear power.

God has given us the use of atomic energy first to defend the freedom of the world. We have—in true fashion of the American way—pursued vigorously this development. While other forms of actual defense use may be forthcoming, it seems to a practical layman that we have reached the ultimate.

Most scientists agree we can destroy ourselves, so what else is there? Therefore, let me urge that we turn and direct our energies and resources for the fullest peacetime development, both at home and for world wide benefits.

Certainly, in receiving this great miracle as a defense measure, we must assume full responsibility for its beneficial development for world peace.

This we can undertake in full confidence because of the factors which we are recognizing and honoring here tonight. I am not ready to make a specific proposal in terms of dollars to be spent or exact programs to be undertaken, but we have learned a great deal about cooperation by the American Government and the factors of the capitalistic system.

Today more than ever before, the people of America are realizing that government as an institution of American society can and must participate in America's development as a partner with the constructive forces of capitalism. I am certain, therefore, that government must work with private forces in finding ways for fullest use in peacetime of atomic energy. It may be to heat the new Senate Office Building; it could possibly be to run a tractor in the wheat fields of Kansas. Whatever it is, we should work diligently on it because every stage of advance not only improves our way of life in America, but constitutes one more step toward world peace.

We must join in training the scientist who will work in industry and who will serve Government like these outstanding scientists we honor here tonight. Not many years from now, we will be honoring the people who have done most for the development of atomic science for peacetime utilization.

In the same vein, we must keep our sights broad and recognize that many economic, social, and political questions will arise and need to be given thorough study. Government in every phase must meet this challenge. It must be as efficient and as forward looking as progressive private industry. In other words, an ever-developing, ever-improving thing. It must maintain its efficiency and adaptability to meet the 20th century challenge.

In my capacity as United States Senator, I will work toward this end of the fullest American responsibility for the peacetime use of the great miracle of the 20th century. I feel strong in this because of the friends and colleagues represented at this dinner tonight and the fine spirit in which we are meeting.

I have outlined a few examples of the work to be done by the Government. There is also important work still to be done by the National Civil Service League. Eternal vigilance has been the league's watchword for 75 years, and I cannot foresee a time when that vigilance can safely be abandoned.

One of the most important of the league's activities is its grassroots educational work on behalf of good government at all levels. I hope it will never lack the necessary resources for carrying on this work. The public must be given the same facts over and over; some of the things the league was saying 75 years ago still need to be said today. Neither the merit system nor career employees must ever be taken for granted.

The National Civil Service League, like the Federal civil service, was born of the martyrdom of a President—the tragic event that we commemorate today. But the spoils system itself was a great tragedy also—less dramatic but equally disastrous to the American people. The tragedy must never be permitted to recur. The smallest evidences of spoils practices must be recognized and stamped out before they have a chance to develop. The time will never come when the "watchdogs of the civil service" will not have work to do.

May I express again my gratitude to the league and to Look magazine for the privilege of taking part in this inspiring program—my hearty congratulations to the winners of the career service awards—and my sincere admiration for the competent, devoted, loyal, and honorable men and women of the career civil service whom I have known and with whom I have worked for so many years.

PROTESTS AGAINST INCREASE OF PRICE OF FUEL OIL AND GASOLINE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I have received bitter protests from constituents against the price increase of household fuel oil, industrial fuel oil and gasoline. Others of my colleagues have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate earlier in the week, and have suggested action in which I wholeheartedly concur. The many protests against the recent increases in the price of gasoline and fuel oil are warranted.

Mr. President, I have before me a telegram from a small business concern in my State, the Seymour Paper Mills, of Seymour, Conn. It reads:

> Bitterly protest price increase in industrial fuel oil received this morning. This is second increase in short period on item which is big factor in our cost. Small competitive industry cannot survive such inflationary measures. Is bankruptcy to be our reward for your support of foreign aid and greedy oil interests?

There are other protests, but this points up the effect of what, in my judgment, are unnecessary and indefensible price increases made simply because the consumer has no choice but to accept them.

Mr. President, fuel oil is not a luxury in my State or in other States. It is the only means available to thousands upon thousands of people for household heating and for industrial concerns such as the firm to which I have just called attention. We described, and properly so, the natural gas consumers as captives at the end of a pipeline. They were, in fact, captives of one source. But the users of fuel oil are no less captives. They are captives of an industry that has seen fit to increase prices twice in a short time, taking advantage of a most unusual situation prevailing elsewhere in the world as an excuse for inflicting upon users of their product price increases which appear to be unjustified.

Less than 2 months ago, it was reported that the stored and available supplies of oils and their products were

greater than ever before. Now the consumers are told that they must pay higher prices because of alleged oil shortages. The old story of the law of supply and demand cannot be used as a reason in this case, because when the supplies were great, the consumers at no time had been given a reduction in price.

Mr. President, I believe in, and have preached for years, the virtues of our system of competitive capitalism. I still believe in them as strongly as ever, but I have said before on the Senate floor, and I shall say again and continue to say, that the gouging of the defenseless consumers must not and cannot be justified in the name of that system. The license to extract all the market will bear is not inherent in competitive capitalism, particularly when the products sold become so vital a part of our very existence.

My fears for competitive capitalism are not founded upon what those who do not believe in it preach, my fears for its future rest with those who claim they believe in it but who practice abuse on the public in its name. In thousands of homes throughout my State and many others, the consumers of fuel oil were, in effect, told to pay or freeze. They are hooked, Mr. President. They cannot convert quickly, if at all, to other fuels. The alternatives are plain and cruel—pay or freeze.

Nor is this all of the sorry picture as I see it. Those who imposed and profited by the added levy escaped the odium of their action. As has been pointed out on this floor, the wrath of the consumers will be visited upon the heads of the retailers who, in truth, profit little—if at all—by the price increase, but who find themselves, along with the consumers, victims of what has every evidence of being a philosophy of "Get while the getting is good."

I sincerely trust that the various agencies of the Government and the congressional committees already contacted will waste no time in determining why in the bitter cold of January these price increases were put into effect, and also what can now be done about them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Senate is operating under the 2-minute limitation on speeches.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PURTELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain the Senator from Connecticut remembers that about 2 years ago, or perhaps a little longer, I introduced a bill to provide standby authority for the President of the United States, and under that bill in the case of a dire emergency, the President would have the right to put into effect price, wage, and rent controls, on the theory that if and when emergencies arose, such as in the case of a declaration of war, when prices automatically go up and usually go completely out of control, there would be some opportunity for legislative regulation.

Now there seems to be such an emergency in respect to oil as a result of the closing of the Suez Canal, and the emergency has been deemed to be so serious that the President has asked for a standby law to give him the right, under certain conditions, to use the Armed Forces in the Middle East.

I simply could not help thinking, as the able Senator was making his speech concerning the rise of the prices of oil and gasoline, how important it is, in my opinion, to have legislation and ways and means all prepared whereby price, wage, and rent control may be imposed in a time of emergency; otherwise the prices automatically go up, as they are going up at the moment in the case of oil and gasoline.

Mr. PURTELL. Was the question directed to me as to whether or not I believe such action should be taken or should have been taken?

Mr. CAPEHART. The question was whether the Senator remembers my introduction of a bill providing for such controls.

Mr. PURTELL. I believe I joined with the Senator from Indiana in the introduction of the bill.

It is stated that the reason for the price increases is the situation which was created by the closing of the Suez Canal and the pipelines. That is simply the explained reason. In my humble opinion, it is not the real reason at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. At the same time, the President is asking for standby authority to use the Armed Forces under certain conditions. Would the Senator from Connecticut say that that is more important than the lives of the American people when the temperature goes down below zero?

Mr. PURTELL. I would not attempt to answer concerning the degree of importance; I should say that both situations are very important.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 73, which requests the President of the United States to designate the period from January 27 to February 2 of this year as Junior Achievement Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) relative to the designation of National Junior Achievement Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This resolution, Mr. President, is similar to one I have already submitted and which was offered in the House at my request. The House has already acted, and it is my hope that the Senate will do likewise.

Junior Achievement Week is one of the imaginative ideas that has helped to keep the economy of this nation strong. It is a device through which we can foster a constant flow of capable, experienced executives who will be able to take over the reins of business.

I have a great deal of respect for the men who have fostered this idea. It gives young people an opportunity to learn early in life of the tremendous responsibilities which they will face, and also gives them some idea of just how to tackle the problems.

Junior Achievement Week helps to build character and self-reliance. I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that it should have the blessings of the Senate by a unanimous voice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Inc., through its learning-by-doing program, is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their experience for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 27, 1957, and ending February 2, 1957, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 27, 1957, through February 2, 1957, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

CHARLES McDONALD PUCKETTE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with much sorrow that I learned a few days ago of the passing of Charles McDonald Puckette, the general manager of the Chattanooga Times, and formerly associated with the New York Times.

Mr. Puckette brought to his position on both newspapers a faith in the usefulness of a competent newspaper and a sensitivity to the responsibility of the press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Chattanooga Times and one from the New York Times be printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of January 16, 1957]

CHARLES McD. PUCKETTE

"Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken * * *."

The death of Charles McDonald Puckette saddens the hearts of the Chattanooga Times

family. The passing of a friend has more poignancy for all of us at this hour than our pride in his achievements as a journalist, a newspaper executive, a civic worker, a friend of the humble, and a peer of the most distinguished in intelligence, breeding and general worth.

We extend to Mrs. Puckette, who was his partner and companion in all of the phases of his career, a heartfelt sympathy in so great a loss. And to all of his family at home go tenderest thoughts from his newspaper family.

Mr. Puckette had an understanding heart for all of us. If there were conflicts of opinion, he would gently resolve them. He had a forgiving heart, always tolerating temporary weaknesses in others in the charitable knowledge that out of those weaknesses could be developed strength.

His personal integrity was a shining light, throwing its gentle beams into every facet of the Chattanooga Times. During a long and painful illness his courage was an inspiration to our staff. Until the last, he hoped to be back with us, and we clung to that hope. We had a sinking of spirit when his daily telephone messages ceased, but he never lost contact with the newspaper he loved and with his friends in all departments of that newspaper.

His character was, in a way, an inheritance from a distinguished ancestry, and he had the gentleness for which his grandfather, Bishop Elliott, was renowned. Strongly influential in his attitude toward life was his relation to Sewanee as student, regent, and constant friend of that great institution.

He came to the Chattanooga Times with an extraordinary knowledge of journalism, through years of experience first on the New York Evening Post, when it was at its peak, and later with the New York Times.

He gave this newspaper 14 years of brilliant service.

In the community, he had the common touch, especially giving time and devotion to children as they were affected by the Family Service Agency, the juvenile court, and in State organizations. On the business level, he was, before his illness, president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association. He was one of the founders of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

During his years as general manager of the Times, cultural organizations found him willing to associate the Times with their causes as a generous benefactor, and among these joining in sorrow over his death will be the musical and art associations, the United Fund and similar groups.

Mr. Puckette was a liberal, but not merely in a political sense. His feeling for the underprivileged came from his heart. In his social life he delighted in the company of the intelligent, the gay, and the cultivated. A well-rounded man, his ideals were a strong influence on the policies of the newspaper he served.

He once wrote: "The newspaper, an institution by its nature able to shift daily to the needs of the times, can confidently look forward, under competent management, to a stronger and more established existence. Probably it will swing slowly but surely in response to a world more aware of broad social progress, in the direction of becoming a more consciously social agency than it now is."

Those in Chattanooga who have watched Mr. Puckette's career here can easily observe how he sought to translate that opinion into action.

Mr. Puckette's influence on the thinking, the character, and the ideals of the members of the Times family is no passing thing—it will endure. His warm friendship will be treasured by those who delighted to work with him. His patience, his personal interest in everyone, will be remembered many years to come.

At the moment, however, our own thoughts of the future are subordinated to our grief. Mingled with that sadness is an admiration for a man of character. With all of his gentle nature, he was not a man to compromise with principle. He had the qualities of a knight, and, in the belief of those of us on the Times who knew him so well, the words of Sir Thomas Malory could be applied to our departed friend and leader:

"Ah, Sir Lancelot, thou wert head of all Christian knights; thou wert never matched of earthly knight's hand; and thou wert the courtliest knight that ever bare shield; and thou wert the kindest man that ever strake with sword; and thou wert the goodliest person that ever came among press of knights; and thou wert the meekest man and the gentliest that ever ate in hall among ladies; and thou wert the sternest knight to thy mortal foe that ever put spear in rest."

[From the New York Times of January 16, 1957]

CHARLES McD. PUCKETTE

Charles McDonald Puckette had a long, useful life in journalism and he had a devotion to his profession that was an inspiration to those around him. Whether on the old New York Evening Post, or in his many years on the New York Times or in the management of the Chattanooga Times to which he gave his later years, he served with a fidelity, an integrity, a competence that compelled respect and admiration.

We remember him here as a grand person to work with and be with, a man never too busy to take an interest in younger men and help them on their way up, a sympathetic, approachable person who by setting his own sights high encouraged others to do likewise. He had great faith in news as the basic, dependable commodity and responsibility of newspapers. His standards were high, and they were influential. So we part sadly with an able colleague and an old friend.

JEROME N. FRANK

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I know that all of us who knew Judge Jerome Frank are grieved at his passing. He was a capable public servant and friend and counselor, and was one of the outstanding members of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

I knew Judge Frank over a period of many years. His suggestions, advice, and writings were always useful.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief editorial in regard to his life and service be printed at this point in the RECORD. The editorial is from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEROME FRANK

The death of Judge Jerome N. Frank is a loss not only to the Federal bench but to the wider political world which knew him as a useful and sharp-tongued controversialist. Along with Rexford Tugwell, Tommy Corcoran and Raymond Moley, Judge Frank is remembered here as one of the early New Dealers who once charged the air with an incandescent excitement. It is well to celebrate such men at a time when controversy and independent thought are frequently discouraged by timid men who forget that free debate is the lifeblood of a democracy. Judge Frank, of course, was a warm and able partisan of the New Deal, serving as one of Roosevelt's original "braintrusters," as counsel to the faction-torn Agriculture Adjustment Administration, and as chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

But Judge Frank's spirited liberal partisanship was tempered by a pungent wit and a willingness to admit error—as he did in reversing himself on the isolationist issue just before Pearl Harbor. On the bench he became more detached and judicial in his approach. During his 16 years on the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in New York he displayed a blend of humane liberalism, wit and independence. In a characteristic opinion, Judge Frank struck down a contempt conviction of a union official last September, noting tartly: "An overzealous prosecutor's heaven may be everyone else's hell." He will be remembered as a champion of individual rights and unfettered debate.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a complete statement made yesterday by the Honorable George M. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his press conference on the new budget.

This statement comes from a man dedicated to the public service of our country. It comes from one of the ablest public officials ever to serve the United States. He speaks in a field where he is the best qualified man in America today. His warning should be heeded by the public and by the Congress.

After losing 48 percent of the purchasing power of the dollar from 1940 to 1952, inflation was halted, and the dollar was stable in value until 1956, when inflation began again in substantial measure; and the value of the dollar declined in 1956 by 2 cents, so that today the American dollar is worth just one-half what it was worth in 1940.

It is very evident that we have now embarked upon another era of inflation, which may be disastrous. Inflation, once started, is one of the most difficult things in the world to stop. In my judgment, we are faced with a very serious situation.

The Secretary of the Treasury urges Congress to reduce the President's budget. It is now up to Congress to act, if we are to represent the best interests of America. This budget, which will lead to still further inflation, and will commit our Government to new avenues of spending, must be substantially and drastically reduced in order to preserve our solvency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Humphrey and the interview he held with representatives of the newspapers be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and interview were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LENNARTSON. Everything distributed and said here is for use with the budget message at 12 noon Wednesday.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think perhaps the best thing to do is to start by reading a statement. I have a written statement which is being distributed and I think perhaps if I read it and you can follow along, we will all get through about the same time. Then we will go back and go into the questions.

In support of the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1958, which has just

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

been presented to the Congress, there are several recommendations which I want particularly to emphasize.

The President has often said that the basic fiscal problem confronting this Government is how to meet the necessary costs of an adequate defense and other governmental activities and, at the same time, furnish the incentives necessary to a thriving, growing, and reasonably stable economy. Failure in either direction could well mean the gradual loss of our freedom and of our way of life.

During the past few years the greatest strides in history have been taken in the development of modern lethal weapons which can literally destroy great cities and whole areas of population. The methods are completely new. They are extremely costly. They are shared to some degree by two great powers with wholly different ideologies.

In this state of affairs, we must remain both militarily and economically strong. To do so, the extremely high cost of the new weapons demands that we be highly selective and quick to abandon the expense of obsolete methods and equipment.

No one can say exactly how much we can continue to spend for defense and all other governmental services without seriously weakening our economy. While military manpower and equipment protect our lives and our land, they make virtually no addition to the permanent wealth of the Nation—to new plants and machinery, new mines, new farms, new homes, or to new jobs for peacetime living.

The billions of dollars spent annually by the Government for military equipment and manpower go into the spending stream but are not matched by an increase in the production of peacetime goods, so that heavy pressure is put on the price of goods which all the people must buy. This imbalance makes it more difficult to keep the cost of living within bounds. Monetary measures alone may not be sufficient for this task unless the Federal Government makes reductions in its manpower and in its purchases which will help to increase the production of additional peacetime goods and so help to hold down prices. Moreover, the funds so released will then be available to build up the capital needed to help create the new jobs, to build the new schools and the countless other improvements required in this growing country of ours.

Our reduction in Government expenditures 3 years ago made possible the greatest tax cut in history and stimulated the surge of national confidence which has created the prosperity of the past 2 years, the greatest we have ever known.

These reductions in Government spending also helped to give greater stability to the cost of living than we ever had in a period of such prosperity. The cost of living has recently moved up somewhat in spite of monetary measures to restrain it. Governmental expenditures and the number of Government employees are now increasing. This trend should promptly be stopped.

This administration has a record of gratifying achievements in economical and efficient management of the Federal Government. The civilian working force of the Government has been reduced by over 234,000 persons during the past 4 years; the accounting and management procedures of Government have been vastly improved; over 400 Federal enterprises competing with business have been abolished; surplus real estate worth $366 million has been sold and turned back to local tax rolls. These are but a few specific illustrations of our progress. We all must work together to widen and enlarge these accomplishments.

Long hours of painstaking and conscientious work have gone into the preparation of the budget for the fiscal year 1958. All departments of Government should be commended for the efforts they have made.

The President of the United States in his state of the Union message has just said:

"Through the next 4 years, I shall continue to insist that the executive departments and agencies of Government search out additional ways to save money and manpower. I urge that the Congress be equally watchful in this matter."

To accomplish these essential objectives we should now all go to work, not simply to keep within the limits of this budget, but to make actual and substantial reductions through improved efficiency of our operations during the period of the next 18 months which this budget covers. To make this possible, every department of Government must with vigor and determination modernize and streamline their services. The management of every service must be conducted with the possibilities of economy always in mind.

The President has said that the Federal Government alone cannot successfully combat inflation without the earnest cooperation of all individuals and groups of our citizens. As emphasized in the state of the Union message, business leaders and labor leaders, through their wage and price policies, must make their full, constructive contribution. All other groups must also contribute to the common effort.

First. We must seek the full cooperation of the public generally in limiting its demands upon the Federal Government for only essential Federal functions, especially at this time when the economy is operating at such a high level. Requests should be avoided for services or assistance which properly can be supplied by States or local communities or by the citizens themselves.

Second. We must request the support of the Congress to restrict the appropriation of public money to amounts within those recommended in the budget which may be required to carry out the necessary Federal functions.

Third. We must require every department and agency of the Government to take vigorous measures, without harm to either security or service to the public, to see that actual expenditures are kept well within the present budgeted figures between now and the end of the next fiscal year and, as the President has said, "search out additional ways to save money and manpower."

Fourth. We must plan for the 1959 budget, giving urgent attention to making further reductions both in Government employment and in expenditures where these savings will not lessen our security or the quality of the necessary services rendered to the public.

If this program is adopted and resolutely followed, we can, a year hence, give consideration not only to some further payment on the public debt but also to further tax reductions. This, of course, must be conditioned upon continuation of our present prosperity. Just when and how a tax reduction should be made can be determined only when it is known how well these conditions have been fulfilled. In any event, any such tax cuts must provide relief so that every individual taxpayer may have some benefits. In the meantime, and until this is accomplished, we must continue to oppose any revision of the tax laws which results in any substantial loss of Government income.

This program will provide more effective control of our spending. It will become a desirable restraint on inflationary pressures through release to the private economy of added manpower and money which, in turn, can open the way to lower taxes, with a sharper spur to incentive and greater opportunity, and production of more and better jobs.

You have heard a good deal of talk about whether or not we are just continually going to go up and up and up and that is my answer to that talk.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on page 2 you say "governmental expenditures and the number of Government employees are now increasing; this trend should promptly be stopped." Who do you blame for this increase?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Everybody.

Question. The administration?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Everybody. Congress enacts laws, that start with the public. The public, various groups of the public—and it is getting so more and more—keep turning to the Federal Government for everything in the world to be taken care of. Whenever anybody gets into a little bit of trouble he immediately runs to Washington and asks for something to be done about it.

The pressure is put on Congress to enact laws to help them. Congress enacts some laws to help them and the Executive when the laws go in has to support the laws and work with the laws and that adds to the payrolls and it adds to the employment and it adds to the cost of Government and that adds to the taxes. It is just everybody——

Question. Are you criticizing the administration for this?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I criticize everybody from the public right straight through to myself. We have not been firm enough. We have to be firmer than we have been and we have to get our expenses in better control than they now are.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in your statement you speak of cutting back expenditures next year, you hope, and we all remember how you complained over the past 4 years that it was very hard to cut expenditures because of the immense carryover of unexpended funds. How do you figure that you can cut expenditures next year when your unexpended balances are once again going up?

Secretary HUMPHREY. They only went up a little and they have been substantially reduced. In this budget you will notice they are held down to about the same amount.

The appropriations are right close to the estimated expenditures. We have done a lot with that. We have to make more progress with it, but we have already made a lot of progress.

Question. Do you support those parts of the current budget which propose increased expenditures?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think this budget as now drawn has been prepared with the very greatest care and I think it is the best that we can possibly do right now.

Now my whole point is this: That it is 18 months before we get through living under this budget and I think there are a lot of economies and a lot of savings that we ought to be able to make if we pay strict attention to our business and work at them hard enough during the 18 months.

I don't think there is anything in sight at the moment that can be done better than is now proposed in this budget, but I think we ought to improve it as time goes on.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you say on page 2 that the expenditures are now going up and must be promptly stopped, yet the four budgets this administration has had beginning with the low of 64.6 have gone up every year. You're now 7 billion up.

Secretary HUMPHREY. We made—let's see 3 years ago—a very substantial reduction in our expenditures.

Question. 6.46?

Secretary HUMPHREY. A very substantial reduction. The thing has been creeping up ever since.

Question. You are up 7 billion?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right; $7,200,000,000.

Question. Do you really think it will go down at any time?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it must.

Question. Why didn't it this time?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It just kept creeping up on us. It did it for the reasons I gave.

Everybody from the public all the way through have just been looking to the Federal Government for more and more and more and we have not controlled it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on page——

Secretary HUMPHREY. Congress and executives and the public and all.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on page M-68, it tells about your increase in interest rates. There is a hundred million dollars increase in interest. You can't stop a thing like that.

The statement reads: "As a result, the average rate the Treasury pays on outstanding interest-bearing public debt has risen in the past 12 months from 2.49 percent to 2.67 percent." Will they not increase?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't know whether they will increase or decrease. That will depend on what the demands are. There again reductions of Federal expenditures would have a wholesome effect in supplying additional capital which would be available for use in peacetime industry and living and for peacetime goods, and the production of goods would tend to reduce the price of goods and would tend to reduce the demand for money and would tend to reduce the cost of interest. Interest would come down.

Question. Your interest rate is seven billion three.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Not the rate. The total amount of dollars.

Question. In dollars?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right.

Question. Is that figured on your 2.67?

Mr. BURGESS. That is approximately the average rate.

Question. What I am asking is, Will that rate increase as you do your refinancing?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It will all depend on market conditions. And as I just got through saying, if we can reduce our Government expenditures, it will help to tend to bring those interest rates down and we will have our money for less interest instead of more.

Question. The point I am interested in and a lot of people are interested in is whether you are going to raise the rates on your E bonds? You have already said you were.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, we never have said it.

Question. That has been published that you would.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No.

Question. Because you are getting more E bonds cashed in than you can sell. Isn't that a serious problem?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Very little difference.

Question. Is consideration being given?

Secretary HUMPHREY. We are not prepared today to make a final and definite statement on E bonds. That has no part in the budget. We will have a permanent and definite decision and statement before very long on E bonds.

Question. To clarify this particular point, you say the average rate has risen to 2.67. Of course, you have a decline in the public debt, whereas your total debt interest charges are going up. That increase in the total interest charges is based on what assumption as to an average interest rate in the 1958 fiscal year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. You mean this estimate here. I presume that is based on approximately the present rate.

Question. On approximately the present rate?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes.

Question. Mr. Brundage told us that he thinks we have got about to the peak of the tight money market. Do you share that judgment?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I wouldn't undertake to say. I think it depends on a great many conditions and again I get right back to what I said a minute ago. It depends a good deal on how much the Government itself spends, how much the Government takes out of the economy. And it is taking a great deal out of the economy today.

My own feeling is that we are taking more out than we can continue to do over a long period of time. I think the present trend must be reversed. I think our present taxes, the trend in our present taxes, the amount of our present taxes, are too high. I think they have to come down. Over a period of time, the only way they can come down is by spending less money, and having a greater margin between income and outgo.

Question. Where would you cut?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think there are a lot of places in this budget that can be cut.

Question. Name three.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think—well, I don't believe I will do that. We have been all over this with the greatest care and I don't believe it is up to me to start now to point the finger at people to make cuts but I think a lot of people will make some cuts. I think we will do so in the Treasury.

Question. Don't you think that is an executive problem—must not leadership come from the executive branch for cuts in the budget?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right.

Question. The administration proposes the budget. They make the proposals. If there are to be cuts must they not necessarily come right from the White House?

Secretary HUMPHREY. You just heard me read it. I read you a statement that said cuts ought to be made.

Question. But they didn't do it.

Question. The small business proposal, the President's message is rather vague on it. I wonder if you can make it more specific as to what tax recommendations you are making with regard to that?

Secretary HUMPHREY. So far as the Treasury is concerned, we are saying just as I said in this statement:

"Until the time comes when a general overhauling of our taxes can be made and reductions can be made, we are opposing any changes that will substantially reduce the Government's income."

Question. In the Cabinet Committee's recommendations, one was for a change in the corporate tax rate which would help small business. Are you opposed to that particular recommendation this year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I am opposed to that this year.

Question. Could you go through the other four items on taxes in the Cabinet Committee report and say which of those you feel does not involve a substantial loss of revenue and therefore can be done this year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, I can't do that, for this reason. There are a large number of suggestions for reductions in taxes that are going to be brought before this Congress.

Question. By the administration?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, by Congress and by various people.

The Congressmen themselves are going to be bringing lots of things up. A lot of people are here in Washington now, complaining about various taxes and asking for reductions. Just at the moment it is particularly confined to the excises. But there will be more and more coming and there are 3 or 4 committees of Congress who are making reports or will make reports.

So far as the Treasury is concerned, we object to any reduction, any law, any change in the tax law which will mean a substantial loss of revenue.

Question. Would you favor, sir, the suspension entirely of the 5-year write-off, the so-called fast tax write-off?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't think it should be entirely eliminated. It is reduced now as you know to a very small amount and it is confined now by order to only, I think, 15 or 16 classifications, out of something over 200 previously, that apply directly to the defense effort.

Now, I think perhaps it is well to leave it for those few particular things that are directly, and importantly, and in a large degree strictly defense. Does that answer your question?

Question. Yes, sir; if you give me a definition of defense. You use a very narrow definition, sir. You are not talking about any wide category of defense support?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right. I am talking about direct defense.

Question. Like steel?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Not at all. Any industry like steel where a relatively small amount of the total production goes into direct defense and the great growth is in the normal economy, I am opposed to having any rapid amortization.

Question. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary——

Secretary HUMPHREY. Just a minute, please. That does not apply necessarily to the consideration that is being given all along to the previous adjustments of depreciation and the proper depreciation schedules. We are talking about rapid amortization.

Question. The fast stuff?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on the receipts side what estimates are you making for calendar year 1957 on personal income and profits?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, we are estimating personal income for calendar 1956 at $325.5 billion. I don't know why I put in .5; it came out that way. That is the estimate for last calendar year's personal income and I will give you the figure for the next calendar year personal income, and those are the figures on which we base the estimates of income with respect to fiscal years. Last year it is 325.5.

Question. So that is 1956?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is 1956, calendar year 1956. It was 316 in January, it was 333 in November, which is almost exactly 325, if December is approximately the same or a little bit higher than November.

We are estimating $340 billion for calendar 1957.

Question. How about corporate profits?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Corporate profits have been estimated at $43 billion for calendar 1956 and $44 billion for calendar 1957.

Question. Do you have an estimate, sir, for gross national product for those 2 years also—GNP?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't have it here.

Question. Mr. Humphrey, a year ago with reference to depletion allowances on oil, you said "Proper depletion is a very proper deduction and a very desirable one from the whole point of our economy."

Do you regard, sir, the rate of 27½ percent in oil a proper rate?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't know whether it is proper or not. That figure was arrived at after long hearings and a great deal of discussion on the subject and all sorts of evidence and proof and the Congress finally picked out that figure. That was done before we came here.

Question. Yes, sir.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I had no part in those proceedings. In the way the thing has worked out, our reserves of oil, our new development of oil in this country, which is continually more expensive, both searching for it and getting it after it is discovered, producing it, has just about kept pace over the past half dozen years or more with the consumption so that from a practical point of view it looks as though this thing was about working out practically.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you have any estimate on the corporate profits for total 1956—this $43 billion, is that a pretty firm figure?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I hardly know what to say about being firm. You know they must publish these figures and you remem-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ber last year I showed you some figures that had been published and 2 years later they changed them by $2 or $3 billion, went back in the record, 3 years after the record had been published for 3 years. So it is pretty hard to say. You see, after all it isn't quite so important that we have it exactly as it is, so long as we keep it relative.

We know what we collected last year upon the way business was. If we have a relative figure for this year that is the important thing even though it may be that the Commerce Department 3 years later may come along and say we made a bad mistake. They may say it never was 43, we published that for 3 years but it ought to have been 41 all along.

Question. Forty-three was the figure you used last August?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is about it. Let's see, what was it? What is this 42.7 figure that we gave last year?

Mr. SMITH. That was for calendar 1955. So this is substantially the same as last year.

Secretary HUMPHREY. There is very little difference. Some businesses are running ahead and notably some of the larger ones have been running behind.

Question. Do you have any figures for the fourth quarter?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I haven't seen fourth-quarter figures. I don't believe you will get such a figure for quite a while. You don't get it usually until April. The last quarter is always the quarter where the big adjustments are made for the end of the year and those are slow coming out.

Question. I have another question: You commented in the past on the size of the budget surplus. You thought that would properly be necessary before you could consider a tax cut, and I think one time the figure of $2 billion was mentioned—two or three billion dollars.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I said I thought two was too small. There is no magic in that at all. We are figuring on getting about 37 to 38 billion dollars from individual taxpayers, you know. If you talk about a 10-percent cut in individual taxes that is $4 billion. There is no magic in it. There would be no cut in corporate taxes in that amount. It all depends on what you are going to do. I think about all you can say is, as to the amount required before you make a general tax revision, is that you should have enough money to make a reasonable, respectable tax reduction. I don't think you would want to make a 1-percent tax reduction and get all the confusion that would follow.

Question. Would you say at the present income levels that something like $3 billion would be a minimum?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Three to five.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the tone of what you are saying here today might be taken as encouragement for Congress to go ahead and cut this budget quite a lot. Do you want to encourage that sentiment or not?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Dick, that is a hard question to answer. If the Congress, in further study, after hearing the expressions of the executive department on what they believe it is necessary to do, if the Congress can find ways to cut, and still do a proper job with respect to our security and with respect to the proper services to the public, I would be very glad to see it. It is possible there are some things we still are doing that were necessary some years ago that we are still continuing that we might find ways of eliminating.

I think that in all of these things we don't want to stand still, we want to go ahead and continue to do new things and continue to meet changing conditions.

On the other hand, I think we have to be very selective and I think that you just can't do everything. As a matter of fact it isn't a bit different than it is in your own home. You can't have everything you want and what you want to do is to pick out the things that the present situation demands the most and then in order to be able to afford them you have to eliminate some of the things that maybe you did before that now you can get along without.

Question. That would be pretty good political story, wouldn't it, Mr. Secretary, if a Democratic Congress cut a Republican President's budget.

Secretary HUMPHREY. To be perfectly frank I am only thinking of the good of the country.

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Secretary HUMPHREY. I am not thinking of the political angle—what we want is to have a good country and that is what I am interested in.

Question. Could you tell us a little something about why this strong call for economy comes from you rather than from the President himself and the budget? Has this been a result of consultation? Is this your view or are you speaking for the administration or the President? Just what is the background of that?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I am speaking for the Treasury Department largely. We are responsible for the Federal finances. I am trying to give as good a picture as I can of what is required for what I believe is the strongest financial position for this country. Referring to the previous question I am thinking of ourselves as citizens and not as voters.

Question. In that connection, in your statement here, I'm sorry I can't put my finger on it, you state that the pressure is on Congress with respect to matters that in some cases at least should be taken care of by the States. I think you made that statement.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Local communities and by the citizens themselves.

Question. Does it matter much from the standpoint of the total inflationary effect where the pressure is applied?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it makes a great deal of difference, because I think that as you get nearer and nearer to local expenditures, the spending will be more properly and effectively spent, if it is done locally for local issues. It is very much more efficiently done, very much better done, than if the Federal Government reaches into the locality, takes the money out in taxes brings it down here, carries a lot of overhead on it and then passes part of it back to do the same job that they ought to do at home.

Question. Is it always available in those particular spots?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Not always. A great many places it is. There are a great many things that people run down here for that can be very much better done at home.

Question. The tone of your statement this morning makes it sound as though you had pressed in the administration's councils for some sharp spending cuts and would have been overruled.

Would that be an unfair inference?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes; that is unfair. I have pressed for less spending right along. There is no division or difficulty in the administration at all on this subject. This is a thing that we all are in accord on. This budget was made up as I say with the very greatest care and a great deal of time spent on it and this is apparently the best we can do at the present time.

But I just believe that over 18 months we ought to keep doing better.

Question. Can you be specific? Are you for instance for that Federal aid to education program? That is a $1.4 billion outlay. That is what you are talking about as far as taking money in the local communities and giving it right back.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't believe I can get into these specific things. If you do you get into a maze of problems——

Question. You put a lot of contingencies on your tax reduction but you do say a year hence we can give consideration. What information do you have that all of these conditions you laid down in the matter will be met in the next year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I say if you do it in the year then you can give it consideration.

Question. Does it mean anything?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't know. We did it once before. We made some very substantial reductions once before.

Question. And the next year you raised your expenditures $8 billion?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; we didn't.

Question. From 60 to 68?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; not in any year. It has gone up 7.2 billion in 3 years.

Question. In 3 years but then it has gone up since 1954?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes. Seven billion two hundred million dollars since 1954.

Question. What makes you think that these things will all be done in the next year? That is what I am trying to clarify.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I said I think they ought to be done.

Question. You hope they will.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's right. We ought to set our sights for that and ought to try to accomplish it. If we do accomplish it then we are in a position for a tax cut.

Question. But if none of these conditions——

Secretary HUMPHREY. If we make no progress whatever——

Question. Then no tax cut?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Then there is no tax cut next year.

Question. No consideration?

Secretary HUMPHREY. How are you going to? You have nothing to pay it with.

Question. You did it before without a balanced budget.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; we didn't.

Question. The budget was balanced in 1953?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It was right on the line and coming down. I have said always that you don't have to wait until you have the money in your hand; you have to have your trend of expenditures going down and be able to estimate ahead to see that it's coming down, and have some real firm basis for seeing that it is coming; the last time we did have a firm basis because it came true.

Question. Aren't you really paying now for the tax cut you gave then?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No. Why would you say that?

Question. Well, your budget is going up.

Secretary HUMPHREY. But we balanced the budget on the last tax cut. The budget was balanced right the following year after the last tax cut.

Question. But you emptied the pipelines on defense.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; we didn't do anything on the pipelines on defense.

Question. Yes; you did.

They testified they did.

Secretary HUMPHREY. When you make a tax it isn't effective on the day you make it. It becomes effective as you move forward over the next months in the time when the money is being collected, you see, and when the money is going out so that that is why I have always said you don't have to have it in your hand today.

You don't have to wait until the $4 billion or $5 billion or what you will give back to the people is in hand that very day, but you have to be sure that it is available as you move forward.

It was available the last time when we moved forward on that.

Question. Has not the tax cut been offset by taking more money away from the taxpayers the succeeding 3 years?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't think you can offset it. We have taken more money out of more taxpayers who had bigger incomes. If the tax cut had not been made, we would have taken still more money out of them. We have taken less out of every taxpayer during these 3 years than we would have taken if it hadn't been for the tax cut. Do you see what I mean?

Question. Not in my pay check.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Let me put it this way. If you are earning $1,000 and your tax take is 10 percent, we take $100 out of it. Then if you reduce the 10 percent to 5 percent and you earn $3,000, we take $150 out of it. But you have had the benefit of the tax cut, haven't you?

Question. Momentarily, but not over the long run, because if you have reduced it——

Secretary HUMPHREY. Over the long run you have. If the same rate is in effect, you would pay $300 as against $150.

Question. Isn't that against your own argument that you must reduce the expenditures for me to get the real benefit out of it?

Secretary HUMPHREY. We must reduce expenditures, and that is what we will do when we don't need to collect so much money from you.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would it be possible——

Secretary HUMPHREY. If your earnings are going up and there are 2 of you instead of 1, we keep adding taxpayers and we keep adding taxpayers who are getting more money; therefore, when we made the lower rate, we still were able to collect more total dollars, but each single taxpayer was better off.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you say that a tax reduction must be conditioned upon the continuation of our present prosperity. Does that mean that the administration will not cut taxes so that it can add to purchasing power to offset a recession or to prevent a threatened recession?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will contest a tax cut out of deficits as long as I am able. I will not approve, myself, of a tax cut out of deficits. I think it would start a downward spiral that would be serious. I don't believe in this idea that you can cut taxes out of deficits, and then build up from that.

Question. Then you don't believe in compensatory spending?

Secretary HUMPHREY. What do you mean by that?

Question. In other words, increasing the level of Government spending during a period in which business generally is declining and, therefore, presumably tax receipts will be declining.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I don't think so, Joe. I don't think you can spend yourself rich. I think we went all through that for a good many years, and we kept spending and spending and spending, and we still didn't help our employment or help our total position.

Question. Mr. Secretary, perhaps the answer is to put more of the Government's operations under trust funds like the highway program.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I don't think that is necessarily so. The reason for the trust fund is, I think, a very good one.

Question. Your budget would look better today if highway was in the budget.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is right. Why fool the people?

Question. You think we are fooling them now on highways, sir?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I think, if you put it in the budget, if you go out and collect a lot of money ahead of time that you are obligated to spend, and show it as assets, and show that you are better off, I think you are fooling the people. I think that ought to be out of your budget. It would be an easy thing for us to make a wonderful showing here. I wouldn't do it because I don't believe in fooling the people. I believe in showing them where they stand and letting them know where they stand all the time.

That is what the highway fund does. That is the principal reason for it. That money is for a specific purpose. It is set aside for that purpose and, if we happen to have a surplus of it this year, which is obligated to be spent next year, that is no reason why we should think we are rich this year.

Question. Then you think that, by and large, the Government's productive expenditures should remain within the framework of the general revenue rather than be put on a use-tax basis?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, not necessarily. No, no. The road tax is a use-tax basis.

Question. Yes, sir.

Secretary HUMPHREY. And I am for that.

Question. Could we have more of that type?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes, I was its principal advocate. We should have more of it. I am an advocate of it. I think a use-tax is a very proper tax.

Question. For instance, what besides roads? Schools?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Roads is the principal thing. That is the biggest item. There can be others that can be developed.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you resign if the administration embarked upon the deficit program you have just described?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think I would.

Question. Mr. Secretary, suppose inflationary pressures exist a year from now and you have a projected surplus of $3 billion to $5 billion, would you oppose a tax cut because of the effect on inflationary pressures?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, it is pretty hard to say—you would have to see just what the causes of the inflationary pressures were, if we had as much of a surplus as that. It is pretty hard to have that kind of a surplus with strong inflationary pressures all at the same time. You wouldn't be apt to have it. There might be a reason why you would, and you would have to know. I don't believe you can make a categorical answer to that.

Question. Mr. Secretary, some private industrial firms may have been holding back expansion in the hope of getting accelerated tax amortization, but you seem to have killed that hope. Others may have been holding back on the hope of a general overhauling and liberalizing of the depreciation structure. Do you think that hope is groundless?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I don't. I think that you are continually reviewing the life factors, and things of that kind, in depreciation. I do not think there is a great big change coming in depreciation.

Question. Nothing that would warrant them holding off a necessary project?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I wouldn't think so. I think that, if you take the total dollars of depreciation that we collect and divide it by the total amount of capital investment in the country, you would come out with something in the order of 17 years—now, there is nothing scientific about that, but it gives you an idea that you are depreciating your total investment in the area of somewhere near 17 years under present rates. Readjustments might reduce that to 16 or 15½ or might put it up to 19, or something like that, as you move along, but there isn't anything that should encourage anybody to wait for some special windfall.

Question. Mr. Secretary, for several years—that is back on the depletion privilege—you said you had been studying whether this 27 percent was right, and then today you said you don't know whether this is the right level, but you think it works out about right.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is right.

Question. Could you spell that out?

Secretary HUMPHREY. All I am saying is that I don't think anybody in the world can tell you whether 27½ or 27⅝ or 27 and some other fraction is exactly right. These have to be approximations to obtain a certain objective. If you have a figure which works out to about a proper objective, that is about as close as you can come.

The same thing is true with depreciation. You estimate the life of equipment at about so long, and you do it the best you can. You keep revising that. If the equipment changes more rapidly, why, you cut it down. If it is too long, you raise it up.

Question. On this point the Congress will ask your ideas this year, I think. Maybe there are a couple of questions in your shop now.

Secretary HUMPHREY. My answer would be the same I gave you.

Question. To stick to 27½?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I gave you the best answer I have. I think in practice this has worked pretty well.

Question. In the increased spending in this budget, can you make any estimate as to how much is inflation and include in that inflation the increase in interest rate?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, that is pretty hard. You mean inflation for how long a period? In the last 4 years?

Question. Well, all right, take the last 4 years.

Secretary HUMPHREY. In the last 4 years the general change in the price level has been comparatively little. Even up to this minute, it is only 2 to 3 percent. So I would think that up to date comparatively little is due to depreciation of the dollar. It has to be that. If the dollar has only, over the 4 years—the depreciation of the dollar is measured in your price levels of various commodities—and if all balanced out, it has only moved a cent or 2 or 3 or in that area, it couldn't be anything different than that.

Question. You don't regard the increase in interest rate as an inflationary factor?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes, I do, but the increase in interest rate is relatively small. You are getting into small percentages. It is a lot of dollars, but a very small percentage you are talking about.

Question. Mr. Secretary, at this time last year, when corporate profits were clearly rising, you estimated for budget purposes that they would remain level throughout 1956. Now, when the last figures we have, the third-quarter figures, on corporate profits, show a decline, you are estimating that they are going to go up in the coming year. Why?

Secretary HUMPHREY. We estimated about the same both years, and we hit them pretty close as far as the corporate profits are concerned. Our corporate profit estimates have been very close right along. The estimates that have been off, the estimates that we have missed, have been the individual incomes.

Question. You missed it by 3 billion last year.

Secretary HUMPHREY. The individual people made a lot more money than we had estimated.

Question. You missed it by 3 billion. Do you call that close?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Not corporate. I just got through explaining—I guess you were writing. The big difference was in the individuals, not the corporate.

Question. Will the Eisenhower administration put more pressure on Congress to eliminate the Post Office deficit than they have in the past?

Secretary HUMPHREY. They are going to put all they can. I hope it is more.

Question. Could you tell us what is contemplated in that legislation—5 cents for first class——

Secretary HUMPHREY. The detail of it, I can't. The objective is to make the Post Office a pay-as-you-go.

Question. They didn't put much pressure on last time.

Secretary HUMPHREY. They thought they did. They worked awfully hard at it. I don't believe I would tell Art Summerfield that.

Question. You have to have someone more than Summerfield to do it.

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I think the whole administration feels that—and very definitely—the Post Office is a service department which ought to pay its way, and that the general public shouldn't pay for subsidies in a hidden way.

Question. Is it high administration policy to put the pressure on?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It is.

Question. Mr. Secretary, I was going to ask you, you mentioned individual tax cuts in all caps next year, but next year also the corporation thing will again come around, and it is being presumably renewed this year. Does that mean you favor renewing it again next year, or what about the corporation tax?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That all depends, as I say, on the amount that might be available for a tax cut. I personally feel that for the next tax cut, the first emphasis is for the individual. If you can have enough for a general revision, that is fine if you can also have an individual cut. Otherwise I would be opposed to a corporate tax cut. Somebody asked me here a minute ago if I was in favor of the corporate tax cut that has been proposed for this year for small business. I am opposed to it for a number of reasons not worth going into now. But one is that I think the next emphasis is on the individual.

Question. Mr. Secretary, a few minutes ago you were asked a few questions about your own reactions to taxes and budget policy in the event that we faced a depression.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Let me interrupt to make perfectly plain that on small business, I am not opposed to help for small business, but I am opposed to that particular proposal this particular year.

Question. What other ones would you be for this particular year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I am opposed to any reduction for anybody in a way that substantially reduces our revenues.

Question. What is a substantial reduction?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Anything that is going to deplete our revenues much. You can see we are on very narrow ground here.

Question. A billion?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No. I am talking about small amounts. We are on very narrow ground to make a balanced budget here. I don't think we ought to give tax cuts to anybody until we are paying as we go.

Question. Fifty million, is that too much?

Secretary HUMPHREY. If you had a half dozen things—I will object to 50 million each. I will object to anything that costs much, but if the Congress passes 50 million, I won't go out and cut my throat. If it is 51 million, I might.

Question. What do you think it would cost you to enact the recommendation for small business corporate tax relief?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Do you mean the whole program?

Question. No, just that one corporate income tax rate.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Dan, what is that?

Mr. SMITH. Four hundred forty million for that one, alone.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Between four and five hundred million for that one.

Question. On page M–9, the President says—

"Some relief in the tax burden affecting small business as recommended by that committee", that is the Cabinet Committee, "which would give help with a minimum loss of revenue should have early consideration by the Congress."

Which of those recommendations give help to small business with a minimum loss of revenue, and therefore could be approved by the Treasury?

Secretary HUMPHREY. There is one recommendation that costs very little. There is another that costs twenty million and another that costs thirty or forty.

If the Congress is going to adopt one and only one tax cut for anybody, and they pick out a twenty or thirty million-dollar item, I can say for these proposals that the committee has given them very good and careful consideration, that they are good proposals, and that they are worthy of consideration and worthy of help, and if they are only going to give one of twenty or thirty million dollars or something of that kind, I would be glad to see them have some one of these.

That is about the net of it. I want to say this: I think we all want, and you all want, to think as citizens. Now, what goes on is this: Our tax laws are so very high, the amounts that we take from everybody are so very high, that there is hardly anybody in this country or any group of this country that cannot come down here and show that they are hurt by the taxes they pay. It hurts almost everybody in this country and almost any group can come in and make an awfully good case for tax relief. What has been going on, and it still goes on, is this, and it is perfectly natural that it should.

Groups come down here and make a showing that they are badly hurt by these taxes and they ask for tax relief and, if that group is sufficiently powerful and has a sufficiently powerful backing and makes a sufficient effort, the Congress has given them some consideration. From a little tax law this thick, we have one that is as thick as this, because all sorts of gadgets and relief of various kinds have been granted to various sets of people instead of having overall relief granted.

Of course, there are a few strictly unfair things that creep into the law occasionally that need to be straightened out, but if we can stop making all these little adjustments all around, except the very unfair ones, and save our money until we can make a reduction all down the line, everybody gets the benefit of that, and the pressure on everybody is taken off. And I believe that instead of this group and this group and this group, each one being favored here and there all over the place, what we need in America is to have this whole tax structure come down, and when our whole tax structure comes down, everybody will be better off, and the necessity for meeting these demands of these little groups will be largely reduced because it is the height of our rates that causes the trouble.

If you take the opposite side of that and if you go on just giving little groups here and there and everywhere special consideration and bringing them down, the first thing you know, you are going to have to raise the rates on the poor fellows who are left, and they are going to have to pay higher rates, because we have to have so many dollars to run the business with.

Every time you give a special group some relief, you are just putting that much burden on everybody else, and I think it is high time we quit burdening everybody else for special people and we should try to get everybody down all at one time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, I believe you said a few moments ago that you would not be in favor of cutting taxes or increasing Government expenditures as an antidote to a depression.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't say that as a categorical thing. I said cutting taxes out of deficit.

Question. Yes. Well, I have two questions to ask about that general policy.

First, isn't that attitude in general disagreement with what has been the expression of Presidential policy, as indicated in the economic reports over the years; and, secondly, what would you do to counter a depression?

Secretary HUMPHREY. In the first place, I think that it is at variance with a lot of economic writing that there has been in the past, a lot of the economists having advocated that. I just personally do not believe in it. I think that a depression is brought about by imbalances that come in, some sort of imbalances that come into your economy. I think the thing to do to avoid a depression is to try to correct those imbalances and take some measures, some basic measures, and, as you get your imbalances corrected, if you are on a sound base, then people begin to take courage, people begin to get confidence, and it is the confidence of the people that moves the thing ahead.

Question. What is the role of the Federal Government in trying to redress those imbalances?

Secretary HUMPHREY. To try, as rapidly as possible, to assist in getting those imbalances brought back into balance, and then to try to resist all sorts of novel ideas and to try to get down to a sound economic base, and by being on a sound economic base, give courage to people to go ahead. After all, it is the people going ahead that does the job.

Question. Just how do you do it, sir?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It all depends on what is the matter.

Question. Would you let them starve?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, I wouldn't let them starve; no, sir. Or sell apples on the corner.

Question. Suppose there was a decline, a considerable decline in plant and equipment expenditures of corporations, would you not advocate a speed-up, let us say, in Government expenditures on construction, in order to countervail that?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't think so, Joe; no. Of course, you would have to know where it was and why it was, and all that. I think you just can't sit and speculate without knowing all the conditions. That doesn't get you very far. I will put it this way; we didn't do it the last time, did we? Pressure was brought on us to do it. We didn't do it, and it worked.

Question. Even President Truman didn't do it in 1948.

Secretary HUMPHREY. We didn't cut taxes until we got ready for a balanced budget, until we saw it in hand, and it came true.

Question. The President has repeatedly claimed that the automatic reduction in individual income taxes and the elimination of excess profit taxes helped offset the 1954 depression by adding to purchasing power.

Secretary HUMPHREY. The excess profits tax went out long before that.

Question. It went out automatically after the Eisenhower administration came into office?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It went out 6 months later. The other went out a year and a half or 2 years later.

Question. There was a simultaneous reduction. The excess profits tax lapsed, and then the other came through.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is right. That was when our expenditures had been reduced by more than enough to pay for the tax. We were on the way then and before we failed to collect the money from the people, we had the money in hand.

Question. The deficit increased the next year.

Secretary HUMPHREY. The reduction in tax became effective later.

Question. Eighteen months later. It increased in 1955.

Secretary HUMPHREY. As we went along and our spending decreased, we decreased our collection of money.

Question. Mr. Secretary, Senator RUSSELL said yesterday he would not consent to grants for Middle East economic aid. Would you consent to an economic program in the Middle East that created a deficit?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is a very difficult and hypothetical question. I myself, Miss Craig, really do not know. Our whole program, as you know, is under consideration by Members of Congress, and the committees, and all I think I am going to say is that I am going to be extremely interested to see what the recommendations are and how they work out. There are a good many things that we have done in the past that I personally do not approve of and that I hope will be terminated.

On the other hand, I would certainly not urge the complete elimination of any activity of that kind.

Question. Mr. Secretary, isn't nearly all the talk here today about cutting spending and cutting taxes largely academic, as long as the world situation remains what it is?

Looking at this budget, I find that the lion's share of the increased expenditures, $2.6 billion of it, is for mutual security and defense. Is there any hope anywhere in the world situation that you can do any cutting in defense spending in the next few years?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think there is; yes. I do. I think there is some hope you can reduce expenditures all along the line. I would certainly deplore the day that we thought we couldn't ever reduce expenditures of this terrific amount, the terrific tax take we are taking out of this country. If we don't over a long period of time, I will predict that you will have a depression that will curl your hair, because we are just taking too much money out of this economy that we need to make the jobs that you have to have as time goes on.

Question. Could we have the stenotypist read that back to us? That is a good quote.

Question. The President says he will make recommendations on the waiver clause in the British loan. Are you in favor of postponement as against cancellation of the interest payment due on December 31?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I am in favor of an adjustment in that document that will carry out the spirit of the document. I would feel just as I would if I had any business arrangement with anybody, that conditions had changed so that some of the wording was no longer applicable. The spirit is perfectly plain that some relief should be available.

I think the spirit of that should be carried out, even though the language itself is complicated now by change in conditions, and I think we ought to revise that language to carry out the spirit of it and work out some proper kind of an adjustment that will give some relief.

Question. Would the spirit include paying the interest some day, if not now, rather than canceling it?

Secretary HUMPHREY. There are a lot of ways to work it out, and we haven't come to an agreement as to how it should be done. The general spirit of it should be carried out.

Question. Which do you favor, a postponement or a cancellation?

Secretary HUMPHREY. We have not reached a conclusion.

Question. Are you in favor of canceling some of the lend-lease silver obligations of India or Pakistan or other countries?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Why would you want to cancel them?

Question. I wouldn't want to. Maybe they would.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I go along with you.

Question. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 o'clock p. m., the press conference was concluded.)

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLT—ARTICLES BY CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Claiborne Pell, the Washington chairman of the International Rescue Committee, has recently returned from a trip to Austria, where he watched the Hungarian relief operation. He has written two interesting articles for the Providence Journal, of Providence, R. I.; and I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal, of November 28, 1956]

HUNGARIANS FLEE FROM SIBERIA PERIL

(By Claiborne Pell)

VIENNA.—The Hungarians continue to stream across the Austrian border in an unending torrent of humanity. Already thousands have crossed and the rate is increasing. A fair estimate is that well nigh 100,000 will have come into already overcrowded Austria by the end of this month.

These refugees travel light. The most luggage that any of them has is a satchel or a brief case. I spent from 1 to 4 in the morning and the same hours in the afternoon at the Einser Canal on the Hungarian border 5 miles beyond Andau and found that the pattern did not differ between morning and night. Only at night the temperature dropped to 4° F. There was no hut or other warmth at this border except for an open bonfire that was continuously fed with beet stalks.

The refugees came in steady groups of anywhere from 2 to 20 and from 5 to 10 minutes apart.

At another crossing I was at, a half-mile walk through Hungarian territory, the Hungarian border guards were helpful to their fellow Hungarians. After frisking the refugees for arms, the guards would shake their hands and wave them on. Occasionally, one of the guards would fire his tommygun into the swamp in order to make a noise and show his superiors that he was carrying out orders and attempting to stop the flood of refugees. At other border points, however, the going was much tougher. As the Russian troops moved across the Hungarian plain and came closer, the shooting became more serious and reports came in of refugees being wounded or killed.

The fleeing Hungarians are one vast cross-section of their country. While the majority are young workers, either skilled or unskilled, there are older people, professors, and journalists. There are also many youngsters in our country would be called children. The almost universal reason for fleeing is the fear of deportation to Siberia. Some mothers had told their children to leave while they could, even though the mothers remained behind.

One particularly sad scene was when a father and two boys arrived at the border. After they had been searched by the guards, the younger boy, a handsome blond about 14 years old, hesitated. He did not want to cross and leave his mother behind in Budapest. The father and older brother urged him to come. After a quarter of an hour, with tears streaming down his face, the youngster crossed the border.

Since ours were the first free world faces seen by the refugees, some refugees would shake our hands and greet us with great emotion. Others appeared as nonchalant as if they had been strolling down a Budapest boulevard.

The Austrians are pitching in and doing a magnificent job. However, their task is overwhelming and it is proving difficult to provide transportation for refugees from the border to the first reception points. The Red Cross, various private organizations such as the International Rescue Committee, and Caritas, and just warmhearted individuals are going to the actual border with hot coffee and tea and helping the particularly weak who can't make it to the receiving station.

One man's heart gave out two hundred yards from the bonfire. He was helped to the friendly fire and soon revived.

Toward the end of our early morning vigil, four men and a woman came along carrying a blanket by its corners. In the blanket was a fat, rosy 2-year-old baby boy. I later went with the baby and his mother to Andau. The mother said that the preceding day all the freedom fighters in an apartment house next door to her in Budapest had been taken away by the Russians, presumably to be deported. The janitor, who had at first refused to admit the Russians, had been taken away, too. He returned, an incoherent, gibbering wreck, the next morning. The sight of this janitor convinced the mother and her husband that they should flee since he had been active in a workers' council during the short-lived Nagy regime. The mother, father, and child had hitchhiked a ride to near the border, found a reliable guide and had walked 12 miles across by the time we saw them.

This woman made various statements which were confirmed by our conversations with other refugees. She said the work stoppage continued. People were being deported to Russia in droves. The Hungarian uprising had been spontaneous, without organization and without leadership. It had sprung from the mass of the Hungarians themselves.

One sad youngster appeared and said a companion had had a cramp in the swamp some three-quarters of an hour earlier. The young man warmed himself, went back into "no man's land," couldn't find his friend, and returned.

In Andau, itself, the refugees are placed in a big barn, strewn with clean hay and given a hot meal and chocolate. The barn is so full there is no place for a person to lie stretched out. Men, women, and children slept or dozed or vacantly stared, all curled up on one another. The cheerful lighting and colored paper streamers contrasted with the blank, sad faces of the refugees. By this time the reaction had started to set in as they contemplated their future. In the whole room of several hundred people, not one smiled or looked happy. And this is particularly striking since Hungarians are by nature lighthearted and gay.

However, by the time the refugees got to Andau, the worst was over for them, as regular buses were provided by the Austrian Government to take them to Eisenstadt, the main receiving camp. From there, the Hungarians are distributed to various other camps in Austria, and a lucky few are taken straight to one of the European countries that have offered them refuge.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal]

FREE WORLD SHOULD HAVE PLAN OF ACTION TO ASSIST ANTI-REDS

(By Claiborne Pell)

PARIS.—The surprising thing about the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist revolution in Hungary is that it was launched by young people and workers. Classically, these are the very two groups who have always fought the hardest for the Communist cause in past revolutions.

And afterward, the young people and workers have been thought the bulwarks of Communist society. To have these two groups not only abjure the Communist philosophy, but do so violently and at infinite sacrifice has rocked the Communist ship of state as it has never yet been rocked.

There are two main conclusions we can draw from the Hungarian revolution and the Soviet lack of success in crushing it. First, human beings find the Communist system unnatural and distasteful and will do what they can to get rid of it. Secondly, the Soviet apparatus and military force is much weaker than the West had suspected.

The prime political weakness of communism is that it is a way of life that runs against human nature and human progress. The desire of the individual for privacy, for freedom in work and leisure, and for the possibility of acquiring, increasing, and passing on worldly possessions are basic human drives. When a regime runs counter to these drives, it is running against human nature. It is, in fact, coiling its own spring of resistance.

KREMLIN EASED TENSION

Since Hungary is a country where the original standards had been relatively high and where the Communists had compressed the spring with immense speed and brutality, its tension increased equally. The Kremlin recognized the long-term impossibility of maintaining the spring's pressure and of maintaining Stalin's harsh policies. Moscow shifted toward a lighter but, it was hoped, a more permanent relationship with its Soviet and satellite subjects.

However, the released spring started to expand. First, in Poland there were the Posnan outbursts and the emergence of nationalistic Gomulka. Then, perhaps taking heart from Poland, perhaps because the Communist boot had pressed so hard, the spring burst in Hungary with wild force.

Hungary's violence of reaction and her withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact made Soviet counteraction inevitable. Any major nation, particularly such an utterly ruthless one as the Soviet Union, will do what it can to prevent the emergence of a hostile power on its border.

Undaunted, the Hungarians resisted and fought in subfreezing weather and in hunger. The hospitals of Budapest lack windows, many sections are in rubble. When the going got too unbearable or fear too strong, individual Hungarians fled rather than surrender.

DEFIANCE OF SERFDOM

I stood for hours on the Hungarian border, watching them stream across, watching what appeared the first step toward national suicide rather than the acceptance of serfdom. More than 1 percent of the Hungarians have already taken this choice. And these people are of all sorts. Since mine was the first Western World face that many of these refugees encountered on their flight, they would often seize my hand and shake it. I marveled at the diversity of hands I shook. There were those of manual workers and clerks, of young people and farmers. And scarcely a hand had a glove, although the temperature was as low as 4° Fahrenheit.

Meanwhile, the free world watches Hungary in her agony and regrets that, except for refugee relief through such organizations as the Red Cross, the International Rescue Committee, and other private agencies, there is little it can do to help.

The free world's only comfort in watching the Hungarian revolution is that it is also watching the clearest exposition yet of the fundamental weakness of the Communist apparatus. Moreover, we are also watching the first major sign of the inevitable destruction of the Soviet Empire from within.

This view is well expressed by George Kennan who recently said of the violent events in Eastern Europe: "* * * certain moral principles really must be observed in the long run in the successful government of great peoples. These events prove that if these principles are consistently violated over a long period of time, this violation avenges itself. It inevitably produces trouble and disorder and even greater violence and bloodshed and tragedy. The Soviet Government has ignored these principles, has denied these principles for a very long time indeed; and they are getting the results of that in Eastern Europe today."

CAUGHT IN VISE

The Soviets are caught in their impossible vise. The events in Poland and Hungary have taught them that their structure has very shaky foundations indeed and that a different type of structure must be built if it is to last. And yet the Soviets dare not lighten up for fear of repetitions of outbursts of wrath from indignant, downtrodden satellite peoples. The results of this dilemma may be perceived in the Soviet Union itself where there have been upheavals in Moscow University itself and a general increase in restlessness.

Eventually, these tensions and events will produce a fundamental policy change in the Soviet Union, perhaps accompanied by violence, perhaps not. If this change is back to Stalinism, the ground will be laid for more fiery outbursts and the eventual violent destruction of the Soviet Union from within. And, if the change is toward a milder course, away from Stalinism, then there will be an increase in the tempo with which the bonds of the Soviet and satellite peoples are snapped and a change in the very character of the Soviet system itself. This process will inevitably take some years and will be accompanied by many shifts of the pendulum.

In the meantime, we in the West should not think that Hungary's agony is in vain. Not at all. The weakness of the Soviet philosophy and apparatus is being nakedly exposed to the whole world. Moreover, the Soviets have been placed in a most embarrassing position. The coiled spring of resistance, once sprung, will never again be as secure as it was. On the other hand, the Soviets cannot release the pressure for fear they will have a hostile neighbor on their border.

The free world can only comport itself with skill and compassion. If we react with atomic violence, world war III is upon us. Even if we react with direct conventional armaments, if we send in American troops and tanks, we will produce hardening of the Kremlin's position and a return to Stalinism. Our only wise course is to help the victims as much as we can and, perhaps, to make arms available through nonofficial channels to Freedom Fighters.

SHOULD DEVISE POLICY

Moreover, we ought to draw from the Hungarian experience in order to prepare a crash policy position. Then when another East Berlin affair, another Posnan or another Hungary occurs, as it most certainly will, we will be set to take decisive steps immediately. This crash program would include recognition right away of the insurgent regime and the flying in of as many high level and low level United Nations and Western officials as possible so that the whole world may be adequately informed of developments.

Another time too, we should be careful that the inference not be let abroad in Eastern Europe via Radio Free Europe that, in case of insurrection, American armed aid will soon arrive, while at the time the administration specifically informs the Soviet Union that the United States will not use those measures that include force. Rather, we should make sure that the Eastern Europeans realize that their struggle for independence must be waged by themselves, while letting the Soviets guess a bit and not specifically tie our hands in advance.

RELATIONSHIP OF WAGES, PROFITS, AND PRICES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for some time various voices have been raised asking for a congressional investigation into the relationship of wages, profits, and prices in the present economy. Such an investigation would seek the root causes of the creeping inflation which has plagued American consumers for the past three years, and which now seems to be increasing at an accelerated pace.

Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the International Union, UAW, wrote to President Eisenhower on November 28, following some remarks made by the President in his press conference on November 14, which implied that wage increases were responsible for advancing prices.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Reuther's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1956.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At your press conference held on November 14 you discussed the danger of inflation. Since that date, the October Consumer Price Index has been published showing a further increase to a new alltime high. Prices of new automobiles played a major part in this latest rise of the Index.

As you doubtless know, the dangers of inflation and the inflationary price practices of the leading automobile corporations have been matters of deepest concern to the UAW throughout the entire postwar period. The concern of the UAW for the interest of American consumers has been more than academic and has been demonstrated in a very tangible and practical manner. In 1945–46, a quarter of a million UAW members struck against the giant General Motors Corporation for 113 days in an effort to win "wage increases without price increases." They struck, in other words, not only to win their just wage demands but to prevent the fulfillment of those demands from being used as an excuse for completely unjustifiable price increases.

The UAW's continuous effort at the bargaining table has been to achieve greater purchasing power to balance expanding productive power. We have insisted that wage increases be paid out of the greater productivity made possible through advancing technology rather than out of higher prices to consumers.

Higher wages, followed by higher prices, merely rob Peter to pay Paul and do not contribute toward the achievement of the dynamic balance between increasing production and increasing consumption which is essential to the achievement of a full production, full employment, peacetime economy. Unfortunately, the growing imbalance in our economy during the postwar period has, in a large measure, resulted from the fact that profits of America's giant corporations have reflected a disproportionately large share of the fruits of advancing technology and greater productivity and that American wage earners and American consumers have not received their rightful share of the greater productivity of the American economy.

The UAW members who struck in 1945–46 were just as strong in their desire to protect consumers and the Nation against inflation as they were firm in their determination to win a fuller measure of economic justice from General Motors. This they proved when they offered to reduce their wage demand to whatever amount—zero, if need

be—that could be paid without necessitating an increase in prices charged the consumer for General Motors' products.

During the period of this strike, America faced the grave threat of inflation caused by pent-up wartime demand and inadequate supplies of goods whose production had been suspended during the long years of the war. UAW members and their families endured many months of hardship and sacrifice in a gallant effort to protect the Nation, and to arouse consumers generally to protect themselves, against the inflationary flood that shortly afterward burst upon us when the price control dikes were destroyed by a congressional majority misled by spokesmen for big business who promised that there would be no inflation if price controls were removed.

Ever since then, before, during, and after the fighting in Korea, the UAW has continued in the forefront of the fight against inflation.

The record will show that, starting in 1947, we proposed aggressive steps to end the policy of planned scarcity in the steel industry that threatened spiral-inflation throughout the economy. In 1947, and again in 1948, we directed public attention to unjustifiable price increases by the auto manufacturing corporations. In 1950, immediately following the Korean outbreak, we called for the quick imposition of anti-inflationary controls. Later in the same year, we issued a detailed analysis proving conclusively that the price increases then contemplated or put into effect by the auto corporations, the steel industry, and other basic industries were unnecessary, unreasonable, and unjustifiable.

Again last year, when the auto and steel industries once more raised their prices, we published data showing that these price boosts were without justification and we called for a congressional investigation of the entire wage-price-profit relationship in these and other industries. It was our hope that such an investigation, by enabling the public to fix the responsibility for profiteering price increases where it properly belongs, would deter similar irresponsible corporate greed and price gouging in the future.

At one point, in September 1955 to be specific, we tried to enlist the support of Secretary of Agriculture Benson for such a congressional investigation. This effort failed. Mr. Benson apparently preferred to sow division among the American people by blaming workers for the high prices charged farmers, rather than to seek the facts which would reveal where the real fault lay.

Now, once more, prices are moving upward with a rapidity that is all the more alarming because the rise is occurring at a time when the Nation is not involved in hostilities. So far this year, the Consumer Price Index has four times established new alltime record-breaking highs, each one exceeding the last.

Only a few months ago, the steel industry, although already enjoying record-breaking profits, raised its prices once again. The auto manufacturers followed when their new 1957 models were introduced. Almost daily, the newspapers and trade publications carry reports of price increases in other industries, and the steel industry now threatens to accelerate the inflationary spiral by hiking its prices further.

More than a million wage earners and their families enjoy the safeguards of UAW collective-bargaining agreements containing cost-of-living escalator clauses which protect their current wages against the erosion of inflation. At the beginning of September, UAW members covered by such collective-bargaining agreements received a 4-cents-per-hour cost-of-living wage adjustment, and beginning with the first pay period in December, they will receive an additional 2-cents-per-hour cost-of-living adjustment.

However, despite the protection that UAW members enjoy, we are concerned with the economic well-being of millions and millions of American families who do not enjoy such protection against inflation. I need not tell you what hardships these price increases bring to families living on fixed incomes—pensioners, unemployed workers drawing benefits that were pitifully inadequate even before the price increases, salaried workers and wage earners without the protection of collective bargaining, Government employees, and many others. Nor do I need to spell out in detail the plight of farmers who pay ever higher prices for what they buy, while the prices they obtain for their own products continue to decline; or of small retailers and manufacturers who are unable to pass on the higher prices charged by the big corporations which supply them. Neither is there any need to describe the devastation wrought on the buying power of the life savings of millions of American families—savings accumulated to pay for the education of children; to meet the hazards of illness, disability, or unemployment; and to buy security and dignity in old age.

Current and threatened price increases that are having and that will have such far-reaching and serious consequences for the general welfare must arouse not only the concern of all of us, but a national determination to check them.

On November 14, you expressed your own belief that they must be checked. But, Mr. President, do you not agree that it will not be possible effectively to check the forces of inflation until we first determine conclusively the real causes and fix the responsibility for price increases? To objectively analyze the causes and fix the responsibility, it is necessary to approach the matter with an open mind and to avoid prejudgment before all the facts are before us.

Unfortunately, and I am sure unintentionally, the example you used in your press conference of November 14 left the impression that wage increases are the cause of our current inflation. For example, the New York Times, in reporting your remarks, used the caption, "Mentions Labor Rises." We are of the firm belief that an objective analysis of all the economic factors relating to wages, prices, and profits will furnish irrefutable proof that wage increases definitely cannot be blamed for recent price increases by major corporations in basic industries such as auto and steel.

The domestic economic forces that make our inflationary threat both real and urgent are being further intensified by the serious developments in the world situation. Only prompt and decisive action on our part can check the growing inflationary forces before they snowball to even more serious proportions. As a practical and effective step to bringing about a better understanding of the underlying causes of inflation, I would like to urge that you use the great influence of your office to call for and support a searching congressional investigation into wage-price-profit relationships in the auto, steel and meat packing industries and other basic industries whose pricing policies exert such a decisive influence on the American economy. Our deep concern about the threat of inflation prompted us to ask for such a congressional investigation of the wage-price-profit relationship as early as July 1955. I am confident that your urging of such an investigation will encourage those congressional leaders who have already expressed an interest and desire to explore this problem, and will win additional support so that such an investigation can be gotten under way without further delay.

As an indication that such an investigation will yield meaningful information that would provide a basis for appropriate action, permit me to recite a few facts about price increases in the auto industry. I choose this industry, of course, because it happens to be the major industry organized by our union. But, as you know, information pertaining to the auto industry takes on particular significance at this time because prices charged for new car models were a major factor in boosting the Consumer Price Index to a new alltime high in October. (The October index, incidentally, does not fully reflect the impact of recent car price increase since certain of the new models were not yet on sale when prices were collected for that month's index.) The pricing policy of the auto industry has a broad impact upon the total American economy because the auto industry is the largest single consumer of steel, rubber, glass, textiles and electrical equipment, and directly and indirectly affects the employment opportunities of more Americans than any other industry.

When General Motors raised its prices in 1955, it used as an excuse the 20 cents per hour in economic gains won by UAW members. It ignored the fact that its profits, based on the first 9 months of 1955, were equal to $2.93 per hour for every hour worked by all factory workers in its United States plants. Its profits before taxes were running at an annual rate of 78.9 percent on its net worth—3.2 times the average for all United States manufacturing corporations during the same period. General Motors' profits, before the 1955 price increase, were 20.7 percent of sales, equivalent to $310 on a car wholesaling for $1,500 and retailing for $2,070.

Ford, whose workers won approximately the same economic gains as those of General Motors, raised prices in 1955, after reporting profits during the first 9 months of the year equal to 57.7 percent on net worth on an annual basis and to $3.06 per hour for every hour worked by its United States factory workers.

In the face of such profits it would be a gross distortion of the truth to say that economic concessions to their workers compelled these corporations, which account for 80 percent of total car production, to raise their prices.

From the time of last year's auto price increases to the introduction of the 1957 models, auto workers had received an average of slightly more than 10 cents per hour in wage increases. Of this amount, 4 cents reflected cost-of-living wage adjustments to restore the buying power that these workers and their families had previously lost to inflationary price increases affecting the things they buy. The remainder was compensation for increased productivity under the so-called "annual improvement factor" provisions of our collective bargaining agreements. This part of the total wage increase, by the industry's own admission, does not provide any basis or justification for a price increase. In fact, it is quite likely that the entire wage increase, including the cost-of-living adjustment, meant no cost increase whatsoever to the industry because of increased productivity resulting from automation and other technological changes. (The offset of the cost of wage increases by productivity advances is certainly a matter that should be given intensive study in the kind of congressional investigation for which we are asking your support.)

Nevertheless, General Motors and Ford, despite profits that were still exorbitant (although lower than last year because of reduced sales) raised prices on their new models by sizable amounts again this year, claiming or hinting, in accordance with what has now become standard operating procedure, that wage increases were responsible for their higher prices. These latest price increases were put into effect although the executives of both corporations have publicly predicted substantial increases in sales which, of course, would have the effect of raising profits much more than proportionately.

The price increases, however, will limit the size of the sales rise and thus make for continuance of unemployment for a significant number of auto workers. This is evident from the warning given the industry by the president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, who said that higher price tags "could mean the difference between a 6½ to 7 million car year or a 5½ to 6 million car year." This difference in sales would reflect itself in a difference of approximately 100,000 jobs in the auto industry.

These facts relating to the auto industry are cited purely for purposes of illustration. There is much more evidence to prove the complete lack of justification for price increases in this industry. In addition, other unions have published or compiled data which reveal similar profiteering by major corporations in their industries.

Yet the public is misled into believing that wage increases are to blame for high and rising prices.

So long as that belief remains unchallenged by public exposure of the actual facts, the guilty corporations will be able to continue their price gouging without hesitation or fear. In so doing, they will not only create widespread personal hardships of the kinds described above but they will also be introducing serious imbalances into our economy, tending to undermine its stability and to create serious economic dislocation. Through its irresponsible pricing policies, big business is usurping a growing and disproportionate share of the fruits of advancing technology, thereby siphoning off consumer purchasing power and narrowing the market for the products of farms and small business. At the same time, by undermining the consumer purchasing power base of the economy, industry destroys the outlets for profitable reinvestment of its extortionate profits. The serious end result of a continuation of this process is obvious. The inevitable economic dislocation which will ultimately result, unless action is taken in time to prevent it, will seriously undermine America's ability to supply the moral leadership and the material assistance needed to restore and firmly secure peace in a world teetering on the brink of a new holocaust.

The essential first step to check our current inflation before it reaches tragic proportions is to inform and arouse the public by making available all the relevant facts about recent and threatened price increases. Once that step has been taken, the processes of democracy can get to work in developing solutions to the problem of an inflationary spiral created, not by the blind forces of the market, but by unconscionable profiteering on the part of a relatively small number of gigantic corporations which use their positions at strategic economic crossroads to extort an inflationary toll from unprotected consumers.

We wholeheartedly share with you your desire to check inflation. Our members have proved by paying a high price in sacrifice and hardship their devotion to the cause of combating inflation. We believe that gives us the right to ask of you on their behalf that you use your good offices to call for a searching congressional investigation of wage-price-profit relations that, by revealing the true causes of our current inflation will make it possible for America as a nation to combat them promptly and effectively.

Mr. President, in this period of fear and uncertainty in the world—at a time when once again we are witnessing the brutality and the immorality of Communist tyranny in its latest effort to crush freedom in Hungary—the truth that America is the last best hope for preserving peace and freedom in the world is more appreciated than ever before. In this hour of crisis the American economy is freedom's greatest material asset. How effectively we mobilize our productive potential and how intelligently we distribute and share the fruits of our advancing technology will be a decisive factor in the struggle to make peace and freedom secure in the world. It is for these reasons that we cannot permit the forces of inflation to undermine our economic stability at home nor to weaken our ability to discharge our world responsibilities.

Ours is the challenge of maintaining a dynamic expanding balance between greater productive power and greater purchasing power so that the greater economic abundance, made possible by automation, the peaceful use of the atom and by our developing technology, can be reflected in higher living standards, increased material comforts, more leisure, and a greater opportunity for spiritual and cultural growth for all people.

Ours is the challenge of achieving the delicate economic balance within the framework of our free economy in which we encourage maximum voluntary economic decisions, with a minimum of governmental economic directives. To do this, all of the free economic groups in America who exercise the right of voluntary economic decisions must, of necessity, recognize that the degree of Government interference into our economic life will be determined in a large measure by the degree of social and moral responsibility and concern for the general welfare that free economic groups demonstrate in making their voluntary economic decisions. When free economic groups fail to carry out their basic social and moral responsibilities to the community as a whole, the vacuum created by such failure will inevitably be filled by greater Government intervention into the economic sphere and the area of voluntary economic decisions will be narrowed in like proportion.

The key to economic stability and growth is the achievement of a dynamic balance in the wage-price-profit equation. To insure that all three voluntary economic groups—workers, investors, consumers—and all three economic factors—wages, prices, and profits—are kept in proper relationship one to the other, we need to achieve the broadest possible understanding of the economic facts bearing upon this relationship. It is to get all of the basic economic facts before all of the American people that I sincerely urge that you call for a searching congressional investigation of the wage-price profit relationship. In a free society the moral persuasion of an enlightened public opinion can be a powerful force in fixing responsibility and encouraging voluntary discharge of such responsibility.

Mr. President, I sincerely urge your consideration of this proposal, and I hope that you will find it possible to give the matter your earliest attention, since action taken in time could succeed in blocking the threatened new increases in steel prices which would give new and further impetus to the already dangerous inflationary spiral.

Sincerest best wishes,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, International Union, UAW.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Msgr. George G. Higgins, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Council, wrote an article, which was distributed on December 17, 1956, supporting Mr. Reuther's proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YARDSTICK

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins)

CONGRESS SHOULD STUDY PAY, PRICES, PROFITS

Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, recently addressed a lengthy letter to President Eisenhower urging him to support a searching congressional investigation into the relationship between wages and prices in the major industries of the United States. "Current and threatened price increases * * *," he wrote, "arouse not only the concern of all of us, but a national determination to check them." He asked the President whether he did not agree that to control the forces of inflation, we must first determine conclusively the real causes and fix the responsibility for unsettling price increases.

Reuther himself appears to be convinced that the pricing and profit policies of basic industry are primarily responsible for inflation. This may or may not be true. In any event, Reuther is willing and eager to have his own analysis of the problem tested for accuracy in a full-scale investigation.

A newspaper clipping summarizing Reuther's letter to the President was recently forwarded to our office by a scholarly priest who is one of the pioneers in the Catholic social action movement in the United States.

On the margins of the clipping he wrote the following questions "Isn't this (the relationship between wages, prices, and profits) going to be the ultimate socio-economic question? And what should we in the Catholic social action movement be saying and doing about it? Am I looking too far ahead—or am I too impatient?"

In our opinion, the answer to the last two questions is "No." Our correspondent is not looking too far ahead, nor is he too impatient. The problem is every bit as serious as he thinks it is.

The answer to his inquiry about the Catholic social action movement is that we ought to second Reuther's request for a full-scale congressional investigation into the wage-price-profit equation as the first step toward a rational solution to the problem of inflation. The sooner such an investigation can be held, the better.

On the basis of previous experience, we would expect this indorsement of Reuther's proposal to be criticized by some of our correspondents as a partisan prolabor recommendation. Actually there is nothing partisan about it at all. A congressional inquiry into the causes of inflation—if it is conducted fairly and objectively, as we would expect it to be—will serve the public interest and will benefit all of us across the board regardless of our occupations.

It will provide labor and management the information which they need to bring about what Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno, refers to as "a right proportion" among wages, salaries, and prices. This right proportion, so necessary to the healthy functioning of our economic system, cannot be left to chance but must be consciously promoted by labor and management working together for the general welfare. It cannot be imposed from the outside by the Government. On the other hand, the Government may and should cooperate with labor and management by providing them the information they need to arrive at sound conclusions. A congressional inquiry into the causes of the present imbalance among wages, prices, and profits, would, in our opinion, be extremely helpful in this regard.

Incidentally, there is no reason to anticipate that such an investigation would play into the hands of the labor movement or that it would necessarily put the stamp of political approval on the current wage policy of the UAW and other bellwether unions in the United States. The purpose of the investigation would not be political at all. The important thing is to get the facts and to get them straight. Then, and only then, will it be possible for labor, management, and the general public to approach the problem of inflation objectively and to keep it from becoming a political football.

We are pleased to note, in conclusion, that A. H. Raskin of the New York Times—who

is one of the fairest and most knowledgeable labor reporters in the business and who is anything but a blind protagonist of Walter Reuther—has also come out in favor of a congressional investigation into the wage-price-profit equation.

It is to be hoped that those newspaper editors who have summarily dismissed Reuther's proposal as a partisan political stunt will take another look at it now that it has been vigorously supported and seconded by Mr. Raskin, who is a great credit to their own profession and cannot in fairness be accused of having a political ax to grind or of being an uncritical apologist for organized labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, not only would unchecked inflation inflict serious economic hardship upon millions of America families, but it would also weaken American economy, which is freedom's greatest material asset in the world struggle to preserve peace and to meet the challenge of Communist tyranny.

I wish to take this opportunity to urge prompt consideration by the appropriate Senate committees of this proposed congressional investigation. The urgency is clear, and I hope that Congress will accept its responsibility to act.

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the security of the people of the United States rests not alone on the strength of our defenses, but rests also, in very great part, upon a strong economy at home. All of us recognize this statement to be true. Economic disaster, brought on by an upward spiral of inflation which finally would break, and topple business and industry, would be as great a loss to our country as a defeat in battle.

Our Government, both the executive and legislative branches, achieved the encouraging and rather novel fiscal feat of balancing the Federal budget in 1956. It appears that the 1957 budget will be balanced as well. And the President stated, as he transmitted his budget message to us yesterday, that his budget proposals for 1958 continue a regime of living within our Federal income. Congress will now play its part in achieving this worthy goal.

So long as American business is sound, so long as it progresses, we may look forward hopefully to high employment and economic happiness in our country. The policies we lay down in the field of Federal taxation obviously have a relevant and highly important impact on American business. Indeed, the problem of high taxes which all business has been made continually to face represents, in my judgment, the most critically important question for American business and industry.

I speak today particularly with respect to the small-business man of America. I have been privileged to serve on the Senate Small Business Committee under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. In the deliberations of the committee we have seen the growing hazards to the small-business man of our country.

I was gratified to read in the President's message yesterday his general endorsement of legislation designed to assist small business. I quote from the President's message:

> In the area of taxation, I am especially interested in the problems of small business. Last August the Cabinet Committee on Small Business made a series of carefully considered recommendations in this field. Some relief in the tax burden affecting small business, as recommended by that Committee, which will give help with a minimum loss of revenue should have early consideration by the Congress. Any changes involving substantial loss of revenue should be considered at a later time when a general tax reduction is possible.

Later in his budget message the President states:

> Of particular importance are recommendations to protect and foster the initiative of the small-business man. The Small Business Act should be extended. In order that small business may have better opportunity to secure adequate financing, issues of securities up to $500,000 should be exempted from the regular registration provisions of the Securities Act of 1933. Similarly, the Congress should enact legislation providing for notification to the Federal Government of proposed business mergers, and should amend the procedural provisions of the antitrust laws to facilitate their enforcement. Wage reporting for income tax and social security purposes should be consolidated and simplified. Other means of assisting small business will be discussed in the economic report.

I endorse and approve these statements by the President. They represent a growing possibility of our assisting independent small business, which continues to be the mainstay of our country's economy.

Against this background of Presidential recommendation, I am very glad to say that I have joined with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in coauthoring several bills which I believe will assist the independent small-business man in our country, regardless of what, from a legal standpoint, his business status may be, corporate, partnership, or otherwise. In a word, these measures would: First, amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the payment of estate taxes in installments—S. 348; second, amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships—S. 349; third, amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit sharing, or stock bonus plan—S. 350; and, fourth, amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the benefits of rapid depreciation to purchasers of used equipment—S. 351.

Basically, the problem of Federal taxation for the small-business man represents the area in which this Government can be of the most inestimable assistance. There is a continuing and serious threat to our free enterprise system implicit in Federal tax rates which take away 52 percent of all earnings above $25,000. Small business can hardly hope to expand through retained earnings when such retention, under the law, is relatively impossible. Even the larger business entities in our country are hampered in their efforts effectively to compete with the great business corporations.

I know of only one way to determine what amount of tax relief can be given. That is for the Senate and the Senate Finance Committee, and the House of Representatives and its committee as well, to hold hearings as early as possible on rate structure legislation designed to bring what the President calls some relief in the tax burden affecting small business in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions from independent organizations in California may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Whereas the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., is an association of practically all the independent refiners in southern and central California; and

Whereas both Houses of the United States Congress have repeatedly recognized that it is vital to the general economic welfare of the United States and the capacity of the United States to maintain a virile national defense, that the small-business man continue to exist and prosper; and

Whereas this recognition by the United States Congress has been particularly effective in its passage of the Small Business Act and its adoption of legislation creating the Small Business Administration; and

Whereas the United States Senate, after the passage by the Congress of the Small Business Act, by resolution set up as a temporary committee of the United States Senate the Select Committee on Small Business, to investigate, observe, and determine whether or not the Small Business Act and the Small Business Administration were operating in a manner to strengthen and secure the position of small business in the national economy, all as intended and directed by the Congress; and

Whereas the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., has had repeated occasions to present problems to the select committee of the United States Senate, problems encountered by the small refiners in their effort to secure a fair share of petroleum procurement by the Defense Department through implementation of the Small Business Act and other applicable legislation; and

Whereas the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., on all such occasions aforementioned, has obtained the sympathetic, effective, and continuing assistance of the able staff of the said committee under the direction and as requested by the Committee's chairman, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, and Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL; and

Whereas the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., has concurrently, by resolution directed to the appropriate officials of the executive department of the United States Government, and the honorable committee members of both Houses of Congress concerned with such matters, recommended that the Small Business Act, which now has a fixed expiration date, be improved, strengthened, and made a permanent law of the United States, and that the Small Business Administration be made a permanent agency of the executive branch of the Government to administer such Small Business Act; and

Whereas in view of the experience of the membership as aforesaid, the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., believes that it will be of inestimable benefit to the country in general, and to their industry, their employees, and their customers in particular, that the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate be made a permanent standing committee

of the United States Senate, and to permanently exercise the jurisdiction and responsibilities heretofore entrusted to it for and in behalf of the entire United States Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., in meeting assembled, do unanimously petition the honorable Members of the United States Senate, upon the convening of the new Congress in January of 1957, that the august United States Senate take such action as may be necessary to make its Select Committee on Small Business a permanent standing committee of the United States Senate, with continuing jurisdiction and authority; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and the secretary of the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., be and they are hereby directed, in the name of the association, to forward copies of this resolution to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate; to Senator JOHN B. SPARKMAN, present chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business; and to the balance of the membership of said Select Committee on Small Business: Senators RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida; JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona; and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California; and to the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee in the new Congress, and to the chairman of such other committee or committees of the United States Senate in the new Congress which may have before it the consideration of the subject matter of this resolution.

Dated at Los Angeles, Calif., this 23d day of October 1956.

GEORGE T. GOGGIN,
President.
MALCOLM MCDUFFIE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Whereas the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., is an association of practically all the independent refiners in southern and central California, all of whom have qualified with the Small Business Administration of the United States Government as being within the provisions of the Small Business Act passed by the Congress at the instance of President Eisenhower; and

Whereas it is vital to the general economic welfare of the United States, and the capacity of the United States to maintain a virile national defense, that the small-business man continue to exist and prosper; and

Whereas the economy of the United States and the independent businessman are vitally affected by capital and market influences in interstate commerce and by the procurement policies and practices of the United States Government; and

Whereas under the Small Business Act, and the agency set up thereunder to administer its provisions—the Small Business Administration—energetic and encouraging attention has been given to many of the dangers threatening the gradual extinction of the independent businessman and affirmative relief extended to the varied problems peculiar to the independent businessman; and

Whereas under its terms, the Small Business Act is scheduled to expire, and with it the Small Business Administration, in 1957, unless further affirmative legislation is adopted by the United States Congress; and

Whereas the members of the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., believe it to be in the best interests of the general and economic welfare of the entire country, as well as the entire membership of this association, that said Small Business Act be renewed, strengthened, and made permanent, and the Small Business Administration be made a permanent agency, and its ability to effectively assist the small-business man be extended and expanded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., in meeting assembled, do unanimously petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States that, upon the convening of the new Congress in January of 1957, immediate legislation be sponsored, introduced, and speedily enacted into law, to renew, extend, expand, and make permanent the Small Business Act, and to provide for the continuation of the Small Business Administration as a permanent executive agency to carry out and implement such renewed, extended, expanded, and permanent small-business legislation; of our desire and willingness to actively support such legislation, by attendance at committee hearings thereon and/or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and the secretary of the Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc., are directed, in the name of the association, to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress from California, and to the chairman of the appropriate committee of the House and Senate which will have referred to it consideration of such legislation, and to the Honorable Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Dated at Los Angeles, Calif., this 23d day of October 1956.

GEORGE T. GOGGIN,
President.
MALCOLM MCDUFFIE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER AT CONGRESS OF CLERGY AND LAITY AT GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a statement I have prepared concerning the Greek Orthodox Church.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the statement will be read as requested.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this time I would like to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain remarks made by me at the Congress of Clergy and Laity of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America given on October the 2d, 1956, at Washington, D. C.

I was very happy to visit with His Eminence Archbishop Michael, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, and the distinguished bishops of seven dioceses of the Greek Orthodox Church, including many distinguished clergy and laymen of that religious faith, who have helped to make Greek orthodoxy in the United States one of the great religious faiths in this country. I was very much impressed, Mr. President, with the business being conducted at the conference, some of which was rendered in the Greek language as well as the English language. I met with some of the outstanding citizens of the United States at that conference. Hon. Thomas A. Pappas, of Boston, Mass.; Mr. Spyros Skouras, of New York City; Mr. Charles Kotsilibas Davis, of Worcester, Mass.; Mr. Spyros Ponty, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Mr. John L. Manta, Mr. Pierre DeMets, and Mr. Van A. Nomikos, of Chicago, Ill.; and other distinguished business leaders of the Greek Orthodox faith who were in attendance. Mr. President, I was very happy to be one of the principal speakers at the congress of the Greek Orthodox Church since the list of guests who appeared included the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Honorable Adlai Stevenson.

It is most fitting in this great country of ours that the great religious faiths should hold annual and biannual conventions to discuss not only matters dealing with the religious life of their followers, but also outstanding national and local problems dealing with social, economical, and civic matters.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the congress referred to be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR LANGER AT THE CONGRESS OF CLERGY-LAITY OF THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH AT WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 2, 1956

Your Eminence, Your Graces, and distinguished clergy and laymen of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, it is a great privilege and a pleasure for me to appear with you this morning and speak to you on matters of great importance to your church, in which the Senate of the United States interested itself.

I could go into a discussion of the great role that your church has played in world religion, but these facts are so well known to you all that it would suffice to say that the Greek Orthodox faith is one of the great religions, comprising over 25 percent of the Christian peoples of the world.

SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE

I understand that the first Greek Orthodox church in this country was established in New Orleans in 1864 and since that time some of the country's most beautiful edifices have been built by you.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of religion. The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the United States Senate, which is headed by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, and of which Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and I are members, conducted a survey among religious leaders of all faiths and denominations to determine if there are any violations in this country of this constitutional guaranty of religious freedom. The questionnaires received immediate public attention and many responses were returned to the subcommittee. However, the subcommittee determined that although we must be constantly on guard in protecting the rights and privileges of all religious faiths and denominations, there was no need for a public hearing on this matter. Of great interest to you in this respect is the fact that for years, perhaps in violation of the constitutional guaranty, the Greek Orthodox faith was not granted certain rights and privileges. I refer specifically to the

fact that no Orthodox chaplains were designated in the Armed Forces, nor were members of the Armed Forces permitted the choice of Orthodox-Christian designation on their identification tags. However, this matter has now been corrected by the introduction of several legislative bills into the Senate and the House, in which the efforts of both political parties were reflected. I wish to assure you that any complaint that you may have as to possible violation of the right of freedom of religion, our subcommittee would be most happy to receive.

SENATE REFUGEE SUBCOMMITTEE

I have had the privilege the past few years of being chairman of the Refugee Subcommittee of the United States Senate. I know of no people who are more concerned with the work that this subcommittee is doing than you since many Orthodox-Christians of Greek and other European ancestry are affected. Six significant Senate bills were introduced which would have continued the refugee law and increased the number of Greek and Italian refugees and orphaned children admitted into the United States. In this respect His Eminence Archbishop Michael was kind enough to submit a written statement and several prominent leaders of Orthodox and Greek-American groups appeared personally to support these bills.

I am sorry to say that although the bills passed the United States Senate, Congress adjourned before the House of Representatives could act on the measures. However, in the next Congress I assure you that these Senate bills will be reintroduced, since they will aid many oppressed peoples to whom the United States should open its hearts and its doors.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member, had before it several very fine immigration and naturalization bills which were not enacted into law because of the pressure of other legislative business. We of the Judiciary Committee from both parties realize that more liberal immigration and naturalization laws must be passed. Again, representatives of your church and Greek-American organizations appeared before the Judiciary Committee espousing the cause of a more liberal immigration and naturalization law, especially that part which will wipe away the restriction of immigrants because of national origin. I urge you, that in your deliberations you come up with a recommendation to the Congress of the United States asking for a more liberal immigration law which will aid not only those of the Orthodox-Christian faith but those of the other religious faiths also.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE

The United States Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which is chairmaned by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and of which I am a member, has done excellent work in trying to combat America's No. 1 social problem, that of juvenile delinquency. There is no group of people in the United States who are more concerned with the juvenile delinquency problem than the leaders of our churches and schools. Since your church operates parochial as well as day schools, you are doubly concerned with this problem. Speaking for the chairman as well as the other members of the subcommittee, we were gratified that your archbishop, your bishops, and your clergymen actively participated as expert witnesses in several of our hearings throughout the United States, making constructive suggestions as to the role of the church in combating juvenile delinquency. We have received reports from various agencies pointing out the low delinquency rate per capita among the Greek Orthodox children in this country. It has been stressed that the close family unit as well as the fine religious training that the Orthodox youth receive are highly responsible for this very low delinquency rate. I, therefore, urge you, that in each of your communities throughout the United States, you participate with other civic and religious community leaders in city and statewide programs to combat juvenile delinquency.

THE CYPRUS ISSUE

Perhaps one of the most emotional and stirring issues that confront you as Orthodox Christians and as Americans of Greek descent is the issue of self-determination for the island of Cyprus. It is most regrettable that three of America's great allies, England, Greece, and Turkey, have found themselves at odds on this issue. I wish to state to you categorically, as I have stated previously, that the United States of America was founded on the principle of anticolonization and the principle that all peoples should be free to determine how they should be ruled. This principle is embodied also in the Atlantic Charter and in the United Nations Charter. It was with this principle in mind that I joined with prominent Democratic and Republican Senators in cosponsoring Senate Resolution 229, introduced by Senator Lehman of New York, setting forth clearly that the principle of self-determination must be recognized for all peoples. I assure you that this resolution will be reconsidered at the next session of Congress.

There are so many other things that I would like to talk to you about today but they are very time consuming. I do want to tell you that I have been greatly impressed by the leaders of your church and by the clergy and the laymen who have taken such a great interest in issues which have come before the Congress of the United States and others that are before the State and city governments. The Greek Orthodox youths of America have within a period of 5 years emerged as an organization of national significance taking part in the religious, civic, and community activties. The strength and the prestige of your church has become noted year by year. On behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, I wish you the greatest possible success in your deliberations this week and hope that you will always be mindful of the many critical problems and conditions that demand attention by people such as you.

DEATH OF WALTER E. EDGE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] announced with deep regret the death, on October 29, of Walter E. Edge, a former Member of this body from the State of New Jersey.

At that time the Senator from New Jersey was joined by his distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] in tribute to this great American statesman and patriot. I was not present on that occasion, but I desire to associate myself with the remarks which were made in praise of Walter Edge and of his outstanding record of service to his State and the Nation.

It was my happiy privilege to be closely associated with Senator Edge for many years. During World War II we served as governors of our respective States at the same time. During World War I he served a previous term as governor. He was a Member of the Senate from 1918 to 1929, and brought his distinguished career to a climax as Ambassador to France from 1929 to 1933.

His career in public life embraced a half century of brilliant achievement which should be an inspiration to every American.

To his widow and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

PANAMA CANAL: A CHALLENGING PROBLEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an important paper on the Panama Canal, with some preliminary remarks by myself.

There being no objection, the statement and paper were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

Among the results of my correspondence about the Panama Canal in the last session of Congress was the bringing to light an unpublished manuscript prepared in 1954 by four distinguished engineers who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal.

One of its authors, Edward C. Sherman, was designer of the Gatun Spillway; another, E. Sydney Randolph, the designing and constructing engineer of the Madden Dam and power project and later principal engineer of the Panama Canal. The other two, William R. McCann and William G. B. Thompson, have outstanding records of achievement in engineering and industry.

In connection with their paper, which discusses the principal proposals for increasing capacity of the Panama Canal, the attention of the Congress is invited to my remarks to the Senate on June 21, 1956, quoting a declassified wartime report of Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton on the elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks of the Panama Canal. In that report General Edgerton, who was Governor of the Panama Canal when the well-conceived Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal for its operational refinement was developed, approved it in principle. In discussing the "sea-level" proposal, he expressed the view that the main arguments for a canal at sea level are not the quality of its navigational features but the "relative vulnerability of the high-level-lock and sea-level types to enemy attack." He prophetically warned that advocates of a sea-level canal would oppose unjustifiably any major alteration of the existing canal on the ground that it would defer the time when conversion to ocean level might otherwise be authorized. These views were expressed prior to the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, which, in the opinion of competent independent experts, render any canal fatally vulnerable regardless of type or location.

In their arguments about vulnerability, advocates of the sea-level type do not appear to have been candid. For example, they stress the Gatun cluster of locks and dams as vulnerable but are absolutely silent on the serious vulnerability to slides by nuclear attack of Gaillard (Culebra) Cut, which would be obviously increased by lowering its present bottom (40 feet above m. s. l.) more than 100 feet as specified for the sea-level project. These advocates have also ignored and continue to ignore the gravely important question of a new treaty with Panama with greatly increased indemnity and annuity benefits to that country. Such diplomatic benefits would have to be added to the costs of a sea-level undertaking at Panama, presently estimated from five to ten billion dollars. Nor, in event of authorization of a water-level plan, have they pointed out the demands that would unquestionably develop for transferring jurisdiction of such project to international or other non-United States

control, a threat as serious to canal security as modern weapons.

From the arguments these advocates put forth in behalf of alleged greater security of the sea-level project over the lake and lock type, which has survived the two greatest wars in history, they apparently believe that the Members of Congress are and will be utterly stupid. Moreover, the arguments for a sea-level endeavor have not been fairly based but appear intended to deceive both the Congress and the Nation.

The facts in the situation clearly demonstrate the absolute need for an independent interoceanic canals commission to reevaluate the entire problem in the light of up-to-date developments and the best interests of the United States and the world at large.

The article follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL: A CHALLENGING PROBLEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By William R. McCann, E. Sydney Randolph, Edward C. Sherman, and William G. B. Thompson, engineers, all formerly with Isthmian Canal Commission)

The recent disclosure of serious cracks along the crest of Contractors' Hill, which were first observed in 1938,[1] the alarming press reports of possible blockage of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut by rock slides, the award of an emergency contract for the removal of more than 2,000,000 cubic yards of earth and rock, and a subsequent movement of the long dormant Cucaracha Slide on the opposite side of the Cut, blocking the east half of the channel, together with the Guatemalan crisis, have again directed world attention to the entire Panama Canal problem.

For many years, subject to controversy and confusion, the principal issues of this problem have been substantially obscured. The issues, nevertheless, are fundamental, and they transcend all questions of personal and group considerations. As such, they require vigorous clarification.

PANAMA CANAL A LONG NEGLECTED WATERWAY

The Panama Canal is a much neglected waterway, now approaching obsolescence. The necessity for its increased capacity and operational betterment have long been recognized by the Congress.[2] Recently the volume of commercial traffic has been the highest since 1914. However, there have been no major improvements in the shipway since its original opening to traffic.

With the saturation point approaching, it is of preponderant importance to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and essential operational improvements required to meet present and future needs.

PROPOSALS FOR INCREASED FACILITIES

The two major proposals for increased facilities at Panama are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing an authorized third locks project adopted to include the features of a terminal lake plan, to form a terminal lake-third locks project.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal, improperly termed the sea-level project.

The above terms require some explanation.

THIRD LOCKS PROJECT

The third locks project, authorized by the Congress in 1939 as a defense measure, without a comprehensive investigation,[3, 4] provided for locating a new set of larger locks (140 feet by 1,200 feet) in the vicinity of the existing locks and at some distance away from them for the primary purpose of affording greater protection through dispersal. The new locks were to be joined with the existing channels by means of bypass channels.

The layout for bypass channels in the Pacific sector contains three sharp bends—29 degrees, 47 degrees, and 37 degrees in succession, from north to south. This scheme, if constructed, would create operational problems and navigational hazards of the gravest character. The bypass plan for the Atlantic sector is not subject to such criticism.

The third locks project also includes a number of costly features for a future conversion of the Panama Canal to sea level. Adopted without either specific authorization by the Congress or a comprehensive investigation of the ultimate objectives, this project is now recognized by discerning students as resurrecting the old battle of the levels in a new form—that of conversion.

Authorized at a cost of $277 million, construction on the third locks project was started in 1940, and pushed vigorously for a time. In May 1942, however, after the expenditure of approximately $75 million, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, the undertaking was suspended because of shortage of ships and materials, more urgently needed elsewhere for war purposes. No excavation was accomplished at Pedro Miguel.

The attempt, to say the least, proved disappointing. Suspension, however, has afforded an opportunity for reexamination in the light of experience in operating the canal.

MARINE OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS

Painstaking studies and repeated observation of Panama Canal operations have established that its principal marine problems are: [5]

1. Dangerous bottleneck at Pedro Miguel, and lack of a Pacific summit anchorage.

2. Double handling of vessels at separated Pacific locks.

3. Effect of fog in Culebra (Gaillard) Cut on canal capacity and operations.

4. Lockage surges in Culebra (Gaillard) Cut caused by operation of the Pedro Miguel locks (3-foot maximum amplitude).

5. Limited operating range of Gatun Lake water level (87 to 82 feet).

6. Navigational hazards in the restricted channel of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut (300-foot minimum width).

7. Inadequate dimensions of present locks (100 by 1,000 feet).

To the above a number of lesser difficulties can be added. Included in these are regulation of the intermediate Miraflores Lake water level, silting in the Pedro Miguel lock chambers, excessive time required for lockages, and periodic reductions in canal capacity caused by lock overhauls.

TERMINAL LAKE THIRD LOCKS PLAN

Historically, the idea of a high-level lake at the Pacific end of the Panama Canal traces back to the Godin de Lépinay conception of 1879. After occupation of the Canal Zone by the United States, Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, early in 1906, urged, as a desirable change in plans,[6] the construction of the Pacific locks in continuous lifts near Cerro Aguadulce, duplicating the Atlantic locks at Gatun. In 1908, Col. William L. Sibert made the identical proposal,[7] which will be discussed later.

During World War II, the same idea was further developed by an operating official of the Panama Canal, in what was the first reasoned solution of operational problems based upon marine experience, known as the Terminal Lake Plan. Publicly presented in the Canal Zone in a paper delivered on May 20, 1943, before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers,[8] the proposal caused an immediate engineering sensation on the Isthmus, and quickly aroused worldwide interest, particularly among maritime agencies.

The main features of the terminal lake plan, which is designed to solve the principal marine problems, are:

1. Physical removal of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel locks.

2. Construction of all Pacific locks in continuous lifts, near Miraflores to eliminate double lockages, and to reduce both capital outlay and operating costs.

3. Elevation of the intermediate Miraflores Lake water level (54 feet) to that of Gatun Lake to create a summit-level anchorage south of Culebra Cut.

4. Raising the entire summit water level to its optimum height, approximately 92 feet, thereby deepening the channel and conserving water.

5. Widening of Culebra (Gaillard) Cut.

6. Construction of a set of larger locks.

These modifications would remove the traffic choke at Pedro Miguel, correct the present operational dissymmetry of the Panama Canal, improve navigation, simplify canal operations, mitigate the effect of fog on capacity, reduce marine accidents, decrease transit time, and increase canal capacity. The best operational canal economically practicable would be attained.

Such a program of improvement, which may be described as the terminal lake-third locks plan, could be accomplished at relatively low cost—estimated under $600 million, widening Culebra (Gaillard) Cut excluded. The latter would be frugally accomplished over a prolonged period. Moreover, there is no doubt as to the soundness of the terminal lake idea at Miraflores, as a similar arrangement has been tested for 40 years at Gatun, and found eminently satisfactory.

The terminal lake-third locks plan, if lock sites at the Pacific end of the canal are properly selected, will permit the construction of additional paralleling locks to meet future needs. This likewise could be done at Gatun.

The Governor of the Panama Canal, when testifying before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on November 15, 1945, approved the terminal lake plan in principle,[9] for the major modification of the existing waterway.

It is important to record here that the enlargement of existing canal facilities, such as contemplated in the terminal lake-third locks plan, is specifically covered by treaty with the Republic of Panama,[10] and would not require negotiation of a new treaty.

SEA-LEVEL PROJECT AND TIDAL LOCK

After the first explosion of an atomic bomb in 1945, the 79th Congress enacted Public Law

[1] Panama Canal Review, Vol. 4 (May 4, 1954), p. 1.

[2] Hon. Clark W. Thompson, "Interoceanic Canals Problem," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 98, Pt. 8 (Jan. 15, 1952), p. A163.

[3] H. Doc. No. 210, 76th Cong. (1939).

[4] Public Law 391, 76th Cong., approved August 11, 1939.

[5] Hon. Willis W. Bradley, What of the Panama Canal? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 10 (Apr. 21, 1948), p. A2449, contains an able discussion of the principal operational problems.

[6] Miles P. DuVal, And the Mountains Will Move (Stanford University Press, 1947), p. 216.

[7] Harry O. Cole, Tribute to Sydney B. Williamson, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 11 (May 21, 1948), p. A3191 contains a brief summary of Pacific lock arrangement history.

[8] Duval, "The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution," A. S. C. E. Proceedings, vol. 73 (Feb. 1947), p. 161; and Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), p. 558.

[9] Hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Congress, November 15, 1945, p. 9.

[10] Treaty Series No. 945, General Treaty Between the United States of America and Panama of March 2, 1936 (Hull-Alfaro Treaty), United States Government Printing Office, 1939. D. 4.

280, authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing canal "capacity" and "security" to meet future needs of "interoceanic commerce" and "national defense," including a reexamination of the third locks project and consideration of canals at other locations.

The Governor's report of his investigation,[11] predicated on an extreme interpretation of the "security" factor of a law originally drafted in the Canal Zone, recommended construction of a practically new Panama Canal, known as the sea-level project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost approximately $2,500,000,000. Under present conditions, the proposal would likely cost several times that amount, not to mention its engineering uncertainties and international complications. The project would require a tidal lock at the Pacific end of the canal, many miles of massive dikes for flood reservoirs on both sides of the main channel, diversion channels, and other vulnerable features.

The report makes no mention of important diplomatic involvements of the sea-level project. These involvements include construction of a new channel somewhat removed from the existing channel, diversion of the Chagres River with a flooding of Panamanian territory below Madden Dam, draining of Gatun Lake with health and sanitation implications, and disruption of several small channels to Panamanian settlements on the lake with probable grounds for damages.

The sea-level project is not covered by existing treaties and, therefore, would require negotiation of a new treaty to determine specific conditions involved in its construction, operation, and protection, with tremendous indemnity, greatly increased annuity payments, and diplomatic hazards. Not to be overlooked is a likelihood that demand for internationalization of the Panama Canal may be precipitated.

The official report of the 1947 investigation recommends none but the so-called sea-level project for a major increase of canal facilities. This recommendation serves to exclude what may be the best solution of the canal problem when evaluated from all angles.

The report[12] was transmitted to the Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, and without Presidential approval. The report was never published, nor has the Congress ever taken any action thereon.

SYMPTOMATIC TREATMENTS NO SOLUTION

As recently reported in October 1953, canal authorities have obtained approval to expend funds for repairs and alterations to existing canal facilities and structures, at an estimated ultimate cost of $26,500,000. The proposition is not a fundamental canal improvement; symptoms are being treated. While some more-or-less minor improvements would be made, inherent defects of design will still prevail.

For this reason, such repairs and alterations are makeshift in character and without sufficient merit. Moreover, reliance on minor alterations, in lieu of major improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the canal question. The funds expended on structures that may be abandoned in the Terminal Lake-Third lock proposal, for example improvement of Pedro Miguel locks, would be a waste of money; and all such improvements necessarily would be abandoned if a sea-level canal were ever built, except perhaps the all-weather navigation equipment.

PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL CANALS

The historic rival of the Panama Canal route is one using Lake Nicaragua. There are other areas that have sought an interoceanic canal, some of which have had strong support.

In the development of a long-range Isthmian Canal Policy,[13] all routes should receive full and unbiased consideration by an independent body.

QUESTION OF TYPE OF CANAL

The third locks project, as previously stated, served to resurrect the old debate as to the type of canal. Later, on advent of the atomic bomb, discussions of the defense aspects of the canal problem became animated, with the 1946–47 investigation directed toward securing maximum inherent physical resistance to destruction from attack. The development of more powerful A-bombs and of the H-bomb since 1947, however, has shown that the idea of obtaining security through passive protection embodied in design is untenable.

Aside from the atomic and hydrogen bombs, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the high-level (lake-and-lock) and sea-level (tidal-lock) types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1906, when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the high-level plan[14] under which the canal was constructed. With the exception of operational defects in the Pacific sector, it has been successfully operated. These defects can, and should, be corrected.

In considering the question of type of canal, it is self-evident that the operational advantages of unrestricted navigation in lakes outweigh the minor hazards and time lost by passage through locks. Not only that, raising the entire summit water level as provided in the Terminal Lake-third locks plan is less hazardous and far more predictable in its consequences than attempting to lower the bottom of Culebra Cut another 108.7 feet at Contractors Hill, as contemplated in the sea-level project.

PACIFIC LOCK LOCATIONS

A proper location of Pacific Locks with relation to the major improvement of the Panama Canal cannot be overemphasized. This subject was seriously studied in 1907–08 by Col. William L. Sibert of the Isthmian Canal Commission—a fact that should be better known.

Ever desirous of consolidating the 3 Pacific-Lock lifts, as had been originally suggested by Chief Engineer Stevens, Colonel Sibert organized extensive explorations to find proper rock foundations for a pair of three-lift locks at Miraflores, as at Gatun. In the drafting room daily rumors of the rock situation were coupled with close observation of Colonel Sibert, who ordinarily was a very calm man, always interested in every one in the office.

One day, in 1908, he emerged from his office, waving a roll of blueprints, and exclaimed, "There is enough rock at Miraflores for 3 lifts"[15]—the only time he ever showed such animation. His subordinates, recognizing the significance of his excited statement, looked forward to acceptance of the idea, as a great improvement of the approved design.

Unfortunately, the Sibert proposal was not adopted. The stated reasons for its rejection were:

(1) Work accomplished would be lost.
(2) Construction plant had been ordered.
(3) Canal completion would be delayed.
(4) Public opinion in the United States would be adversely affected by a change of any sort, as evidence of weakness in the high-level plan.

The first three reasons, in the perspective of today, do not appear valid. The fourth, perhaps, was controlling.

When the decision against combining the Pacific locks was made, the Isthmian Canal Commission did not include a member experienced in marine operations. What would have been the result had there been such a member for Colonel Sibert to consult, no one can now state. But, in the light of later knowledge developed in 1941–44, it is indeed regrettable that Colonel Sibert's solution was not accepted.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY

The Isthmian Canal policy of the United States has long had as its main objective, the construction of an interoceanic waterway of the best type at the best location to supply the best canal for the transit of vessels—and at low costs of construction, maintenance, and operation.

The achievement of this objective involves a thorough study of the operational, engineering, and construction history of the Panama Canal, its Third Locks Project, other locations, diplomatic relationships, protection, and effect of burdensome construction costs on tolls.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION REQUIRED

Experience in the recent past (1939–54) has conclusively established that the canal problem is not a proper task for routine agencies of the Government, which of necessity are ex parte in character, with results well illustrated in the collapse of the Third Lock Project, and in the failure of the Isthmian Canal Studies of 1947[16] to win congressional approval.

Today, in Panama, the United States stands challenged before the world. We started a third-lock project—but we never finished it. An ill-advised sea-level project submitted by Canal Zone authorities has failed of Executive and congressional approval. And still the years pass by with no constructive action yet in evidence to provide an improved canal capable of handling the traffic of peace—or war.

In order to secure a proper resolution of the problem, it is abundantly clear that an independent and wholly American interoceanic canals commission is required, and that it should be immediately created and put to work in developing a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy. To this end, the Commission should be made up of broad-gaged, unbiased, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, not dominated by routine executive agencies.[17]

---

[11] Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, available at headquarters of American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, N. Y., and in various committees of the Congress.

[12] Summarized in American Society of Civil Engineers, Transactions, vol. 114 (1949), pp. 608–906.

[13] Hon. Clark W. Thompson, "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 3 (Mar. 23, 1955), p. 3610, contains useful bibliographical list.

[14] President Theodore Roosevelt, message to the Congress, transmitting report of International Board of Consulting Engineers, February 19, 1906, and act of Congress, approved June 29, 1906.

[15] Recollection of Wm. R. McCann, who was attached to Colonel Sibert's staff. For Colonel Sibert's story, see William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens, The Construction of the Panama Canal (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1915).

[16] Harry O. Cole, What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal and Sequel, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 10 (May 4, 1948), p. A2743, contains illuminating information.

[17] The Panama Canal Problem: A memorandum to the Members of the Congress, 1954, quoted in an address to the House of Representatives by Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 5 (April 29, 1954), p. 5795.

THE HONORABLE GEORGE BENDER, OF OHIO

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, during 14 of the 16 years I served in the United States House of Representatives one of my colleagues who distinguished himself for his outstanding service to his constituents was the Honorable George Bender, of Ohio. He not only won recognition for his good work in the House of Representatives, but he also won election to the United States Senate in 1954 to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable Robert A. Taft; and it was my great pleasure to serve in the United States Senate with him in the 84th Congress.

Recently an editorial appeared in the Cleveland (Ohio) News which describes so well the outstanding qualities of Senator Bender that I am proud to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE SERVED CONSTITUENTS

George H. Bender leaves the United States Senate and public life in the next few days, ending another phase of his long legislative career.

Whether it will be resumed in the future, only time will determine.

Behind him is service as an Ohio State senator, as an Ohio Congressman-at-large, as a district congressman representing the 23d district here, and most recently as a United States Senator.

Few Ohioans have had as long or as continuous a span of State and national legislative service as he.

We can appreciate Mr. Bender's personal feelings as he leaves the Senate, the type of work he cherishes, and has found satisfying for so many years.

As his Senate seat is taken by Frank J. Lausche, we wish to reiterate what we have said previously regarding Mr. Bender as a Member of Congress.

He served his constituents.

He worked hard at his job as Congressman and as Senator.

His office in Washington was expertly staffed by aids who knew how to get things done.

No questions were asked by Mr. Bender whether the person seeking help in the labyrinth of Washington bureaus or agencies was a Republican or a Democrat. Suffice it only that the individual was an Ohio constituent.

He coupled this energetic service with loyal support of his party and of President Eisenhower in legislative work on Capitol Hill.

Senator Bender should find much personal satisfaction in all these things. His misgivings should be few. He loves politics too much to give it up.

Whatever his future plans, we wish the Senator well and congratulate him for outstanding service in Washington.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Seems to Me," which appeared in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

President Eisenhower's request for authority to use our fighting forces in the Middle East against Communist armed aggression, as submitted in person to Congress yesterday, is likely to run into a few congressional snags.

While the President's personal popularity and the great confidence placed in him by the American people would seem to assure approval of the request, there are phases that will meet with opposition.

On the other hand, it is likely the part of his request dealing with economic aid for the friendly Middle East nations will be approved without much serious debate or objection.

It is quite likely, too, that public pressure for approval of the whole program outlined by the President will have its influence in Congress, though a considerable segment of our people may be with the opposition.

It seems to me the request for authority to use troops is simply for the purpose of bypassing Congress should an emergency arise, with the usual congressional authority surrendered to the United Nations Security Council.

The President did not ask for authority to go it alone and at his own decision. He told Congress any use of troops would be only at the request of an attacked nation and "subject to the overriding authority" of the Security Council.

Thus approval of his proposal would simply mean that the President would not have to deal again with Congress, but could go ahead at the invitation of the nation attacked and with approval of the United Nations. There will be many Members of Congress opposing the proposal on the grounds that, instead of Congress, the U. N. will tell us whether we should fight.

It will be emphasized, of course, that the President does not have to send troops just because a nation requests it or the U. N. gives the go ahead, and that our safeguard lies in the President's judgment.

But just what is gained in an obviously urgent situation is not apparent to this writer. True, it can be argued that congressional debate and objections might delay action dangerously, but that might be a safeguard.

Assuming the President had no new authority to make the decision for the United States entirely alone, as he requests, and that he had to proceed through the constitutional channels of Congress, obviously there would be some debate.

However, if the President is to wait for the final signal from the U. N., isn't it just as likely there will be delay there that would allow time for Congress to express its opinion and make its decision?

And isn't it more in keeping with our ideas of Government to leave to Congress the decisions the Constitution says it shall make than to have the legislative body transfer this authority to one man—the President?

There are obvious dangers in the proposal. I believe the judgment of the President is just as sound as that of any Member of Congress, but the many opinions of Congress are more likely to reflect the national thinking, whether it agrees or disagrees with the President.

That is what Congress is for—to act as the direct representatives of the people and do whatever they feel meets with the approval of their constituents.

Inasmuch as the President has no apparent desire to go to war without approval of the United Nations, there is no apparent strategic military value in his proposal for authority to use troops, for any action taken would be advertised in advance through U. N. debate and decision.

If it were proposed to give the President blanket authority to act entirely on his own, using our troops as he thought justified in handling the Middle East situation, there would be stronger argument in favor of it in many quarters.

In the U. N., of course, with the United States backing the use of troops, there likely would be no prolonged discussion over approval of use of United States troops, for it is not hard to decide that somebody else should do the fighting.

If the situation is so obviously acute that the President is convinced armed intervention is the only answer, he should have little difficulty convincing Congress that it should approve use of our troops.

With no element of surprise involved, whatever delay that would result from congressional debate might be a good thing, for then, at least, our own legislative body would be deciding whether our men were to fight and die on foreign battlefields.

To assign the responsibility for that decision to a world group that would have little or no participation in the actual fighting would hardly stir a patriotic mood in this country, in my opinion.

M. M. OPPEGARD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ADMINISTRATION OF DROUGHT AID

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the President of the United States concluded his drought-inspection tour this week with a request for authorization to use $50 million in funds already available, and also for a new relief appropriation of $25 million.

It was with great regret the farmers of Missouri found out that President Eisenhower did not plan to visit Missouri on his tour of drought States. I was out in the State this week and farmers so told me.

Nor is his Secretary of Agriculture allowing Missouri to receive any real drought aid, despite the fact my State is one of those most grievously stricken.

According to the United States Weather Bureau, over the past 5 years, southwest Missouri is short 1¼ years of rainfall.

In Platte County, Mo., a river that once ran as deep as 29 feet disappeared completely last October. It just dried up.

With pastures burned, many farmers have been feeding winter forage since last July.

Many have already been forced to sacrifice their foundation herds.

A letter which I received this week from Murray C. Renick, president of the Rolla Feed Mills, Inc., illustrates the economic disaster staring Missouri farmers in the face because of the shortage of hay. It shows clearly just how much Federal help would mean to them.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from Mr. Renick be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLLA FEED MILLS, INC.,
Rolla, Mo., January 11, 1957.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have combed the country for hay to take care of our farmers.

Within a 2-week period there will be no hay left in our vicinity. We are now hauling from Illinois by truck and the cost is prohibitive. Can you do something that will enable our farmers to get some type of Federal or State relief to keep them from going completely broke?

Very truly yours,

MURRAY C. RENICK,
President.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, since 1952, southwest Missouri has suffered most. But a number of other counties in Missouri have also been seriously affected during the past year.

Congressman CHARLES BROWN, of Springfield, representing the southwestern counties, has stated that drought aid is now a matter of survival for many of the farmers in his district. This is the famous Springfield milkshed, one of the largest concentrated dairy areas in the United States.

At this point I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on the floor of the Senate at this time are four distinguished Members of the House from Missouri. They are the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, of the 10th District, member of the House Committee on Agriculture; the Honorable CHARLES H. BROWN, of the 7th District; the Honorable W. R. HULL, of the 6th District; and the Honorable MORGAN MOULDER, of the 11th District.

Over the years, Congress has provided a number of programs to help farmers suffering from drought and other disasters. In the main, these programs provide emergency credit, discounts on federally owned feed grains, and Federal aid for the purchase of hay.

As of now, the Department of Agriculture, by administrative action, has refused to allow the farmers of Missouri to participate in the programs they have given other States, even though the Department certified 90 out of Missouri's 114 counties as drought-stricken counties.

Theoretically, therefore, this administration recognizes the existence of a drought in Missouri, but practically it does nothing about it.

This continuing refusal of aid for Missouri is bitterly ironical.

The Department's Agricultural Marketing Service publishes maps indicating the supply of pasture feed for grazing, and a map reflecting this condition was published only last Sunday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The map is before me today, Mr. President, and is available to any Senator who wishes to look at it. It shows that most of Missouri has less than 35 percent of the normal supply of pasture feed available—a condition classified on the map by the Department of Agriculture as "extreme drought."

Of the six other States with substantial portions of their area classified as "extreme drought" by the Department of Agriculture, each is receiving some form of Federal help—loans, feed, or hay—according to the records of the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the kinds and amounts of Federal aid enjoyed by these six States and in others in the last 6 months of 1956 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture—Drought and other disaster assistance program (fiscal year 1957) [1] loans, feed, and hay programs (July 1–Dec. 31, 1956)

	Loans						Feed and hay assistance					
	Production disaster		Economic disaster		Special livestock		Emergency feed program [2]				Agreements with States under hay and roughage program [2]	Number of counties
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Purchase orders issued to farmers	Hundredweight of feed	Dealers certificates issued			
									Number	Amount		
States designated under Public Law 875:												
Arizona					1	$5,330	3,394	1,028,970	441	$451,167	$1,000,000	14
Colorado	222	$485,868			57	561,140	11,111	1,354,592	1,553	789,267	1,000,000	33
Kansas	396	1,559,302	75	$106,400	20	471,575	83,700	5,289,066	10,467	4,408,588	500,000	89
Nebraska							23,832	1,269,348	1,576	1,101,646		47
Nevada					2	79,670	589	43,199	43	23,273	30,000	3
New Mexico	47	117,625	12	20,480	44	388,015	15,485	3,282,736	2,666	2,206,795	1,225,000	31
Ohio	14	38,330			1	5,500	1,450	47,345	74	18,362		8
Oklahoma	184	498,162	240	233,985	70	535,228	206,705	7,805,778	16,147	6,476,172	2,000,000	77
South Dakota	5	1,335			9	70,100	3,040	214,844	315	117,432	75,000	5
Texas	2,775	6,135,534	1,149	2,158,345	354	3,231,855	398,396	18,982,668	41,889	15,150,209	7,500,000	239
Utah					16	326,805	2,936	483,286	388	341,994	250,000	19
Wyoming	9	54,870			11	159,580	2,469	507,901	321	230,878		12
Other States	563	1,575,630	363	208,055	87	634,420						
Total	4,215	10,466,656	1,839	2,787,265	672	6,469,218	753,107	40,309,733	75,880	31,315,783	13,580,000	577

[1] This report covers the States in which counties are currently designated as disaster areas. Separate reports are available covering activities under the drought program in fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956.

[2] This reflects activity under the 1956 feed program. The cost of the subsidies under this program are borne by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to sec. 301 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). The administrative costs are charged to Public Law 175 funds.

[3] Charged to the balance of the $50,000,000 appropriated to carry out sec. 2 (d) of Public Law 38, as amended by Public Law 115, 83d Cong., and in part to an allocation provided from the President's disaster relief fund in October 1956.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this time Missouri is receiving none of these aids shown on this table. Nevertheless, it ranks first among the seven drought-stricken States as shown on United States Department of Agriculture maps in the percentage of its gross agricultural receipts received from all livestock and products, and sixth among these States in percentage of gross receipts from cattle and calves.

A livestock State, Missouri nevertheless finds itself a poor relation when it comes to obtaining drought emergency help for the production of livestock and products.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator list those States?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to list the States for the Senator from North Dakota. As shown on the table, the States receiving drought aid are Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

According to United States Department of Agriculture maps, the seven States suffering most from drought are Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and Missouri.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, from the Department of Agriculture's own records, the Agricultural Marketing Service reports that in 1956 Missouri's hay crop was—and I quote from the 1956 Missouri Crop Report—"damaged most severely by the 1956 drought, 28 percent below normal."

To make a bad situation even worse, adjoining States now receiving aid have bought up our Missouri hay, and now alfalfa hay is selling for $52 a ton, and prairie hay is selling for $35 a ton. Many farmers are being forced out of business by such prices.

In a recent survey, the New York Times found Missouri among the States hardest hit by the drought. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief portion of a story which appeared in the New York Times of December 9, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1956]

DROUGHT DAMAGE IN BILLIONS SCARS SOUTHWEST AREA—PRESIDENT WILL TOUR DISTRICT IN JANUARY—BLIGHT CALLED WORST IN 700 YEARS—DRINKING WATER SCARCE—CROPS LOST OVER WIDE AREA, BASIC HERDS IMPERILED, 57 PROSPECTS BLEAK

President Eisenhower will find in his projected mid-January air tour of the Southwest farm and ranch lands that have been scarred by one of the worst droughts in the Nation's history.

Scientists at the University of Arizona, judging from growth rings on trees, appraise the drought as the worst in 700 years.

The States the President will visit for a first-hand look at the problem have not been named, but the ones hardest hit are Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Missouri, Kansas, and Utah.

From the air, the President will see a desolate, dun-colored tundra stretching between successive horizons in dismal miles of caked and cracked earth that appears lifeless and barren. What grass remains has been bleached yellow or white.

Aground, the grass is brittle. It creaks and crackles and breaks underfoot.

DETAILS OF DISTRESS

A survey by the New York Times produced the following details of the problem from farmers, ranchers, and State government officials:

Vast damage and billions of dollars of losses; bleak prospects for the coming year; complaints of inadequate Federal aid and of "gougers" capitalizing on relief programs; some farmers leaving the arid land; foundation herds threatened; drinking water so short in some places residents have had to haul it in jugs from other communities; reports that some farmers were borrowing money to meet the crisis beyond the ability to repay.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the drought in Missouri is real. Our parched land and our empty haylofts testify to it.

Farmers forced to sacrifice their foundation herds in the stockyards bear witness to it.

The Weather Bureau records the drought.

Newspapers continually report it.

The Department of Agriculture publishes statistics and maps proving the existence of drought.

But Mr. Benson repeatedly refuses the farmers of my State the drought assistance approved by the Congress.

These are some of the grim ironies of the drought in Missouri. But there are others.

Our farmers can stand in their fields and see Government bins stocked with grain—a "burdensome surplus," to quote a recent United States Department of Agriculture spokesman.

The Department of Agriculture apparently would rather hoard grain than sell it to Missouri victims of the drought.

But these same Missouri farmers can look across the State boundary into Kansas and see Kansas farmers, adjacent to their own farms—where the pastures are no browner and the soil no drier—feeding both hay and grain which the United States Department of Agriculture has provided them.

What is fair or right about playing that kind of favoritism in a democratic form of government?

Missouri farmers also know that for many months farmers in adjoining States have been receiving emergency Farmers' Home Administration credit.

This credit has been denied to the farmers of Missouri.

Missouri farmers ask no preferential treatment. They only ask that they also have recourse to programs established by law for just such emergencies as the present drought.

On three separate occasions in the past year, the Governor of Missouri urged drought assistance aid for Missouri, and I supported the Governor in each of these requests.

On 16 occasions since last May, I have tried to impress the gravity of the situation on the Department of Agriculture.

The record shows that eight times I personally wrote or wired the Secretary of Agriculture on this subject, without the Secretary himself answering me once.

On October 10, last, Mr. Benson, while campaigning for the Republican Party met with the State drought committee in Columbia, Mo. At that time he promised a quick decision on our committee's request for Federal aid for farm ponds and pasture seeding.

This meeting was reported in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 11, 1956, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 11, 1956]

BENSON PROMISES ACTION ON DROUGHT

COLUMBIA, Mo., October 10.—Secretary of Agriculture Benson today promised the Missouri Emergency Drought Committee prompt action on its request for assistance in combating shortage of pastures and roughage.

Benson heard the 8-man committee stress the need for Federal assistance in establishing and improving farm ponds and of 50 percent Federal assistance in fertilizing and seeding wheat, rye, and silage to provide livestock roughage "which will become critical after Christmas."

Murray C. Colbert, chairman of the Missouri Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee and a member of the Emergency Drought Committee, predicted after the hour-long meeting that Benson will have an announcement on a program within 2 days.

The drought committee, referring to Missouri's haylift in previous drought disasters, indicated that such a program is not contemplated now, and that it would be less effective than fall seeding of roughage. The need for roughage is not now immediate, they said, and they believe farmers will take a chance on seeding in the dust if the Federal Government will bear half the cost. The other point stressed was increased assistance to provide water supplies through digging new ponds or improving old ones.

Benson suggested that the committee survey military establishments for loans of pumps and similar equipment to provide emergency assistance.

Warren Fuqua, Farm Bureau representative on the drought committee, told the Secretary that unless rain falls, "towns as well as farms will be without water in a month to 6 weeks."

L. C. Carpenter, State agricultural secretary, presided at the meeting and presented county-by-county reports on Missouri's drought situation.

Benson inquired if any State funds are available for a drought-relief program, explaining that the President has been urging joint State-Federal participation to combat emergencies. Carpenter said that about $23,000 in State funds are available, and indicated that the general assembly might join in a program when it meets in January.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. Benson chose that occasion to release the wonderful news that Mexico had received a $5 million loan, which would be used to purchase good quality cattle our own drought-area farmers were being forced to sell.

What a strange concept of drought aid for American farmers.

The Secretary, campaigning for his ticket on the same day in Kansas City, Mo., promised a prompt decision on the drought requests of Missouri's Governor Donnelly. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of a story from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 11, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, a portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 11, 1956]

BENSON PLEDGES FAST ACTION IF STATE IS LISTED AS DROUGHT AREA—AGRICULTURE SECRETARY IS IN MISSOURI ON SPEAKING TOUR—PLANS TO INSPECT DRY CONDITIONS

(By Herbert A. Trask)

KANSAS CITY, October 10.—Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, today pledged prompt consideration of the request of State officials that 90 of Missouri's 114 counties be declared drought disaster areas and eligible for Federal aid.

Benson, who arrived early today for a 1-day campaign speaking tour of western Missouri towns, told reporters he is certain President Eisenhower will act immediately on Gov. Phil M. Donnelly's request that Federal drought aid be made available to farmers throughout most of the State.

PLANS TO INSPECT CONDITIONS

The Secretary of Agriculture said he will peronally check into drought conditions during his Missouri trip.

Donnelly's request covers all counties in the State except Audrain, Barton, Bollinger, Butler, Cape Girardeau, New Madrid, Pemiscot, Perry, St. Charles, St. Francois, Ste. Genevieve, St. Louis county, Scott, Shelby, Stoddard, Warren, Carter, Franklin, Gasconade, Jasper, Lincoln, Macon, and Mississippi.

In the drought area, a report showed, pasture conditions ranged from poor to nonexistent. Only a small percentage of normal acreage is seeded for grain for pasturage, and it was in poor condition.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on last October 11 the President told the farmers of 90 counties in Missouri they could graze their cattle on soil-bank acreage.

This meant little or nothing, and Mr. Benson knows it, because he also knows that most dairy and beef farmers in Missouri had no soil-bank acres; and those who did found these acres just as dry as their other acres. The hot sun hit both.

The president of the Missouri Farmers Association, Mr. Fred Heinkel, aptly termed the soil bank grazing privilege "an empty gesture."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his comments as expressed in a press release of January 14, 1957, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COLUMBIA, MO.—"Grazing privileges of soil-bank acres can hardly be considered adequate drought aid for the State's hard-hit farmers," explains Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

"Southwest Missouri is suffering from 5 years in a row of drought. Most of the farmers in this area are dairy farmers. They are not in the commercial corn area and have no corn base to put in the soil bank in the first place. These farmers grow very little wheat and again if they have a wheat acreage allotment, it is small. For all practical purposes these farmers never were eligible to share in soil-bank benefits. Granting these farmers soil-bank-grazing privileges as a means of helping them weather 5 long years of drought is nothing but an empty gesture," Heinkel said.

"What our farmers need is hay and lots of it. Small grain purposely planted for pasture made no growth this fall. Springfield weather bureau reports a rainfall deficiency of 57¾ inches—almost 5 feet—in the last 5 years. Many farmers started feeding their winter supply of silage and hay in July. They simply had nothing for their livestock to pasture," Heinkel continued.

"Secretary Benson has promised to reconsider Missouri's plea for drought aid. In the meantime the State's farmers are pulling their belts tighter and tighter. Repeated attempts to get pasture seeding established have not only been costly but have failed when the rains did not come. It is hoped fall and winter pasture will be considered as a factor in determining the need for drought assistance," Heinkel said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Secretary's promised decision on the rest of Missouri's requests—additional aid to build or renovate farm ponds, to purchase seed and fertilizer for pastures and to purchase grain and hay was not forthcoming as promised.

After repeated requests for drought aid, Missouri's commissioner of agriculture, Mr. L. C. Carpenter, came to Washington to carry his appeal personally to the Department of Agriculture.

Subsequently, hearings were held in some of Missouri's drought-stricken counties. An administrative assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, along with a Utah ASC official, heard many farmers testify on the effects of the drought during a tour of the drought area.

Stories from the Mountain Grove News of November 29, 1956, and the Warsaw Enterprise of December 6, 1956, plus an editorial from the November 20, 1956, issue of the Springfield Leader Press, referred to these hearings and this inspection tour.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stories and the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the stories and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mountain Grove (Mo.) News of November 29, 1956]

FARMERS FACING FINANCIAL RUIN UNLESS DROUGHT PROGRAM INAUGURATED SOON

Unless the United States Department of Agriculture comes through with an approval of Missouri's application for an emergency drought feed program, a majority of Wright County's livestock farmers are facing financial ruin.

Over 300 farmers attended drought meeting conducted by State Agriculture Commissioner Clell Carpenter, United States Department of Agriculture fieldmen, and Taylor Allen, and Congressman-elect Charlie Brown at the circuit courtroom in Hartville Monday night.

Time after time, local farmers rose to their feet to relate the pitiful feed situation on their own farms.

Wilson Watt, of Mansfield star route, was typical of most of the farmers at the meeting. Watt, who operates a 1,200-acre dairy farm, told Allen his operation was usually self-sustaining, "But I won't have a bit of feed after January 1," he stated. Watt said he had just sold off 100 head of cattle because of the critical feed conditions. He now has about 200 head left on his farm.

"We put up only about 50 percent of our normal supply of roughage last summer. Now our pastures are burned out," he told the Federal investigator. When asked what the Federal Government could do to help, Watt said he felt it could help the most by selling small grain at reduced prices and helping farmers acquire access to some roughage.

Emmett Jones, Hartville farmer, spoke on behalf of practically every farmer at the meeting when he told Allen, "These people feel embarrassed to think they have been farming all their life and can't raise enough feed. They don't want something for nothing; what they need is some temporary help to get them through this condition which they couldn't help or control."

Carpenter explained to the audience that he and Allen were not trying to embarrass anyone. "But when Mr. Allen makes his report to Washington, he must have specific cases to report," Carpenter said.

Ellis Hart, when asked if he normally produced all his grain, replied that in normal years farmers in this area used small grain for feed. But in drought years they had been forced to use it for pasture.

Vance Henry, of the State extension service, told Allen that the thing which really hurt farmers in this area was the lack of late summer and early fall moisture which prevented the sowing of small grains. "Normally, these people here sow small grain for fall pasture and for early spring pasture. That pasture, together with their roughage they put up in the spring, usually gets them through the winter," Henry stated.

"But this year," he continued, "farmers couldn't get any fall pasture and had to start feeding roughage 2 months earlier than usual. Not only that, but they won't have small grain for spring pasture, and will have to continue feeding roughage much longer in the spring. That's what really hurts."

One farmer added that nobody had mentioned the grasshoppers. "The drought hurt us," he stated, "but we would still have had roughage if the grasshoppers hadn't eaten everything left."

When Carpenter asked how many farmers would be out of feed grains by January 1, 95 percent of the farmers attending the meeting held up their hands. Only three farmers said they had enough grain to carry them through to spring grass.

Only 35 percent of the more than 300 farmers at the meeting said they had enough roughage to carry them over to January 1.

Allen is making the tour of the Ozarks drought area with Carpenter to draw up recommendations on emergency feed program. After he completes his study, he will make a recommendation to the Department of Agriculture in Washington. There, the recommendation will be reviewed by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson and President Eisenhower. Final decision on whether a grain program will be inaugurated will be put up to the President.

At the conclusion of the meeting Allen told the News that "conditions in Wright County are as bad as any I've seen so far." When asked whether he would recommend that an emergency feed program be inaugurated for this area, Allen said, "I have no statement to make at this time."

He explained that he would have to get together with Harry Dahl, who is surveying conditions in northern Missouri, and study their findings. After they have studied the facts obtained in the on-the-spot interviews, then their recommendation will be drawn up and sent to Benson.

Congressman-elect CHARLIE BROWN told Allen, "These people need some temporary help to see them through this crisis."

The young Democratic Congressman-elect added, "This emergency program won't get the price you receive back in line with the prices you have to pay. And this man (Allen) can't do anything about that. This price thing is a situation I'm going to take up with his boss when I get to Washington next month."

BROWN told those attending the meeting that word had been received early Monday that a definite "yes" or "no" answer on the drought petition would be given by the Department of Agriculture next week. "By next week we will know whether we are going to get some help, or whether we are going to starve to death and can start making some arrangements," BROWN said.

Allen told the News that he had made the survey of drought conditions in Oklahoma about 2 months ago. Farmers in Oklahoma have been eligible for surplus grain price reductions and a hay program since October.

When asked why it had taken so long to get action on Missouri's application for an emergency program, Allen said he was not aware there had been any delay. Several State Democratic officials have charged that Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas received immediate help because the administration felt such a program would carry those States for Eisenhower. They have charged that the Republicans had no hopes of carrying Missouri, and therefore made little effort to offer any assistance to drought-stricken farmers in this area.

Allen said he did not think there was any foundation for those charges. "If there has been any delay, it has been in Washington and not in the field," he declared. He added that the survey had been scheduled a week earlier, but the fieldman who was to have made the inspection had become ill and could not make the trip.

BROWN told the News that Missouri's application for an emergency grain and hay program had been filed with the United States Department of Agriculture since October 2—approximately the same date that Oklahoma was declared a drought area.

[From the Washaw (Mo.) Enterprise of December 6, 1956]

FARMERS TELL OF PLIGHT ON THEIR PROPERTY HERE

Among testimonials given at the meeting of Benton County citizens for drought aid last Friday were:

Frank Vaughn: Usually carried 100 beef herd, has had to sell down to 35. Carries about 20 head dairy herd. Will have to sell unless there is some help. The cattle population has gone down. One neighbor sold

half of his cattle. Another neighbor has sold all of his cows except a few milk cows.

Elmer Estes: Sowed sudan. Had no oats to cut or harvest because of dry weather and grasshoppers. Had no wheat at all. If we don't get something done, we are going to have to dispose of the whole herd. As to the corn crop, all that was produced was in the low land below the lake-flood level. The people who farmed on the lowlands got a crop of corn.

Raymond Findley: In the east part of the county more people farm land that is ordinarily under water. They made silage. My herd of 35 milk cows started on feed the first of August. There is no grass. Put out sudan pasture and it just did not grow. Have same silage but have been feeding since the first of August and will soon be out of feed. Have no grain. All feed was put in silo. We normally put out and get a good yield from oats but had to turn in and use oats for pasture. Had out 30 acres of oats.

Charley Parker: The grass on our old pasture land is nearly all dead. I am not looking for help but people have the longest feeding season I have ever known. I never saw the native and bluegrass pastures in the condition they are in now.

J. E. McLerran: Sowed 180 bushels of seed oats and combined only 90 bushels. Just got back half of his seed. Cut 790 bales of hay off 14 acres. Farms both upland and bottom. Bottom production was good. Everytime a rain went over, it seemed to fall on that piece of ground. The cattle have been reduced in the county. I run a truck. I would be afraid to say how many cattle I have hauled from herds who said they had reduced because of the drought.

Mr. Armstrong from Camden County: We had a few pretty good rains in July, but then our pastures burned up in the hot winds which immediately followed in August. We have nothing left. It was dry in the spring and so we have no feed or pasture.

Has 450 ewes. His 1,400 acres of pasture just as bare as the floor.

Mr. Lugenbeel Edwards: Has 34 head dairy herd. Has hay to last until February. No grain. I am going to have to sell part of the herd to get by. Alfalfa hay is selling for $34 to $35 per ton some places, mixed alfalfa and grass is selling for $38 per ton, and alfalfa for $43 a ton. Corn is $1.40 a bushel. He feels the grain program would be the most important.

Bill Watkins: Lives in the south part of the county along the Hickory County line. Had a grade A dairy herd of 20 and runs 10 head of stock cattle. Sold off all but 15. He has some silage, no hay, has 500 bushels of corn that he bought. Farms 120 acres of good, productive land on the Pomme de Terre, and 160 acres of hill land. I will still have to sell more cattle before I can get through. I think a supplement of grain would help me most.

McMillin: Had 58 head of cattle; 15 are dairy. He had already sold 2 truckloads this fall. Had enough feed to carry his cattle 40 days. No grain but what he bought.

One farmer asked Dahl why Kansas and Oklahoma received drought disaster aid and not Missouri.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader Press of November 20, 1956]

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY

Illness of a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture yesterday halted the proposed series of drought hearings that were to be held through the southwest Missouri area over a 2-day period, after yesterday's initial hearing at Springfield.

Here the hearing developed as expected. About a hundred farmers dropped their early morning work to come in and tell of the hardships of 5 years of drought: feeding begun a month to 6 weeks sooner than normal from stocks of hay that were far below normal; hay that was worth $25 to $30 in the early summer now priced at $40 to $45 with virtually none available at any price. Few dairymen and no beef men can afford to feed $40 hay in these times.

That is what undoubtedly will be said at other hearings to be scheduled later in place of those that were postponed. Nothing wrong about it, for it's tragically true—all this and much more.

On the other hand, aren't these hearings a trifle silly? What can a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture hope to learn about the ravages of a 5-year drought by means of a hop-skip trip through the area? What can he see for himself, know to be true? How can he tell whether or not testimony isn't deliberately loaded against him?

The answer is, he can't.

Drought is never spectacular. It's a slow, grim, colorless, strangling death of the land and all that lives on it. Driving along the highways of the Ozarks this season, who can see drought or recognize it if he sees it?

A survey, if it is to mean anything, would require days, perhaps weeks, of thoughtful farm-to-farm observance and inquiry. It would go afield and see seared weeds where lush grass had once grown, springs mute and dry where once had run clear, inexhaustible water. It would check on farmer's hay supplies, silage, and grain. It would observe the tragedy of farmers lined up to haul water many miles to their farms. It would note wells that have failed, dried-up ponds and creeks.

There's no seeing drought in a 2-day trip that skims across 300 to 400 miles of highway with eight 2-hour stops in towns en route.

This isn't to be construed as an attack upon local or State farm leaders. Everyone knows they have tried hard—the very hardest they knew how.

It is a bitter kick in the pants for the United States Department of Agriculture which will sit blandly in Washington, discussing in academic terms the tragedy of thousands of farmers, and then stupidly sending a representative into this area for an absurdly impossible first-hand report on conditions—a hastily skimmed, unfair, unseeing report at best.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after the Secretary's October 10 visit to Missouri, despite the obvious degree of disaster, 2 long months went by before any decision was announced with respect to the urgent requests of Governor Donnelly and the State drought committee.

And the answer given on December 7 was "No."

Thereupon on December 18, following another meeting of the Missouri State Drought Committee, Governor Donnelly wired the President himself, again urgently requesting that the Department reconsider the drought conditions in Missouri and extend this badly needed aid. At that time I supported the Governor in his request by again wiring the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Governor's telegram, and my telegram of December 19, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Jefferson City, Mo., December 18, 1956.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The Missouri State Drought Committee in a meeting December 17, 1956, unanimously recommended that I urge you and Secretary Benson to reconsider Missouri's request for designation of drought disaster counties in our State. I urge your immediate reconsideration of Missouri counties which were recently visited by Mr. Harvey Dahl and Mr. Taylor Allen of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Facts brought out at the committee meeting revealed:

1. Farmers' feed supplies, both grain and roughage, are either exhausted or are diminishing daily.

2. Hay production in Missouri is 22 percent below the 10-year average.

3. November 1 roughage production for 1956 is estimated at 72 percent of normal.

4. This year farmers in many parts of the State started feeding hay as soon as it was harvested. Considering a minimum 7-month feeding season, the monthly supply would be 55 percent of the average for the State as a whole.

5. A major contributing factor is the condition of the pastures for the season. The 10-year average for the entire season is 80 percent of normal; the 1956 average is 58 percent. In 1956 pasture condition was much below average and most of the season was below average each month, April through November.

6. In relation to condition of pasture is the condition of fall-seeded grain, as evidenced by reports on wheat. The 10-year average of wheat on December 1 was 82 percent, whereas December 1, 1956, the average was 68 percent, the lowest average for that date on record, and emphasizes the fact that little feed has been available from small grains seeded this fall.

These figures were prepared by State-Federal Statistician A. C. Brittain.

I urgently request an immediate reconsideration of our drought problems and further request that a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture meet with the State drought committee at the earliest possible date. I cannot overemphasize the important of prompt and decisive action in the making of this review.

PHIL M. DONNELLY, *Governor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 19, 1956.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

Strongly support Gov. Phil M. Donnelly's request for favorable reconsideration on emergency drought assistance for Missouri counties. Need is great as shown by on-the-spot inspection by Missouri drought committees and two USDA representatives, Harvey Dahl, of Nevada, and Taylor Allen, of Utah.

Many beef and dairy farmers who had no fall pasture and therefore have been buying hay and grain for several months must either have assistance or be forced to sacrifice their foundation herds.

Designation of drought counties for reduced cost on Government-owned surplus grain, for reduced freight rates and emergency credit, would help.

Your favorable decision will be appreciated.

STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 9 Mr. Wesley D'Ewart, writing for the Secretary, replied to my telegram of December 19. He again told us that Missouri had been turned down for drought aid.

At that time Mr. D'Ewart suggested the drought-stricken farmers of Missouri should apply to the Farmers' Home Administration for credit, even though he, D'Ewart, knew and knows that the same credit is available in every State which has no drought.

Congress has provided for emergency credit in such circumstances.

Last year the Department made emergency drought assistance credit available in 11 States, but not in Missouri.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. D'Ewart's letter of January 9 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 9, 1957.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Your telegram of December 19 addressed to the Secretary, Ezra Taft Benson, concerning the drought situation in Missouri has been referred to me for reply.

I am sorry to have to advise you that the Department's Drought Committee unanimously agreed that the area could not qualify under Public Law 875 for disaster assistance. This decision was based on a careful study by the Committee of a report made by two of our most able fieldmen, together with a study of factual data available within the Department.

If credit would be helpful in this area, the Farmers' Home Administration is ready and willing to lend such financial help as is possible under the laws governing that service. I suggest those needing such assistance contact their local Farmers' Home Administration office.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, inspection apparently was an objective of the President's recent tour. The New York Times last January 14 said the trip was "designed to dramatize to the Congress that many areas are experiencing the worst drought conditions in history and that more help is needed."

The story continues to the effect that the President was accompanied by three men whose presence emphasized "the public relations aspect of the journey."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be happy to yield to the able Senator from Minnesota, who has so consistently supported programs of benefit to the farmers in my State, in his State, and throughout the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I was intrigued by the comment of the New York Times that the purpose of the President's trip—and, by the way, I am very happy that he made the trip—was to dramatize to the Congress the need for aid to the drought-stricken areas. The only thing necessary would have been to suggest what aid Congress might render. Every such request has been quickly honored and quickly acted upon in the past. I know of no request at any time for emergency drought relief or any other kind of emergency aid to our farm families under this administration or any other administration, that has not been acted upon almost in a moment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Minnesota is correct and I thank him for his constructive comment.

Mr. President, it was not necessary for anybody to "dramatize to the Congress" the fact that Missouri is "experiencing the worst drought conditions in history and that more help is needed."

Mr. President, I ask that a portion of this New York Times story be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, a portion of the New York Times article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 14, 1957]

EISENHOWER FLIES TO TEXAS TO BEGIN DROUGHT SURVEY—SAN ANGELO IS FIRST STOP IN 6-STATE TOUR OF RAVAGED FARMS AND RANCHES—CONFERENCE TOMORROW—PRESIDENT TO ATTEND WICHITA TALKS—SPECIAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS EXPECTED

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—President Eisenhower flew west today on a campaign-promised inspection tour of the drought area. He will visit six States before midnight Tuesday.

With General Eisenhower were top-ranking officials who will urge on him new measures to meet the water shortage and alleviate the plight of farmers and ranchers.

The trip is designed to dramatize to Congress that many areas are experiencing the worst drought conditions in history and that more help is needed.

General Eisenhower left Washington in late afternoon aboard the Columbine III, the Presidential aircraft.

OTHER STOPS SCHEDULED

The first scheduled stop was at San Angelo, Tex. The President will make a 1-hour automobile tour there tomorrow morning to get an on-the-spot view of conditions in the State in which he was born. This area got only 37 percent of its normal precipitation last year.

Stops also are scheduled tomorrow at West Woodward, Okla., Clovis, N. Mex., and Tucson, Ariz. On Tuesday, the Presidential party will visit Pueblo, Colo.; Garden City, Kans.; and Wichita, Kans., before flying back to Washington.

At Wichita the President will take part in a regional conference on drought problems. There he will receive the reports of delegates from the area.

Most of the area to be visited by the President already has been certified for emergency relief. But during the campaign he promised a personal inspection tour to determine what else might be done by the Federal Government. In a sense, therefore, this will be the first campaign promise of the 1956 election to be fulfilled.

PRESS AIDS WITH HIM

Traveling with the President as his top advisers are two Cabinet members—Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior.

The public relations aspect of the journey is emphasized by the presence of three men—James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary; Murray Snyder, Mr. Hagerty's assistant, and Thomas E. Stephens, who holds no formal Federal post but is the President's principal field representative for political affairs. Mr. Stephens formerly was the White House appointment secretary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if Secretary Benson would read my mail, he would know that it is not necessary for anybody to dramatize the intensity of the drought to my Missouri colleagues, or to me.

Because the Presidential party was not stopping in Missouri, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], together with Representative BROWN and myself, wired Secretary Benson, requesting an audience for members of the Springfield, Mo., Chamber of Commerce who were willing to travel to Wichita, Kans., to meet with the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. We felt that if Mr. Benson had advised the President, as he apparently did, not to visit our State, representatives of our State had the right to visit with him in Wichita.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture replied to our telegram; and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that our telegram and the response of Under Secretary Morse be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and response of Under Secretary Morse were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1957.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

Pursuant to urgent drought situation in Missouri, three members of the agriculture committee of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce respectfully request a brief audience with you and the President or you alone in Wichita, Kans., to present the special situation of southwest Missouri. Could this be arranged? Thank you for an early reply.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
STUART SYMINGTON,
CHARLES H. BROWN,
Members of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1957.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: This is in response to the telegram of January 8, addressed to Secretary Benson and signed jointly by you, Senator Hennings, and Congressman Charles H. Brown. I have talked with the Congressman about the request that the Secretary and the President grant an audience to the agriculture committee of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce while they are in Wichita, Kans., next week.

I have offered to meet with the delegation in Wichita on Wednesday morning, January 16, or here in Washington if they desire.

I have suggested that it might save the time and travel expense of the committee if they submitted in writing the points they wish considered, following which their recommendations could be discussed here in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Missouri's most important economic endeavor is agriculture.

This great agricultural economy of our State has been badly damaged by the drought, and, along with it, the welfare of tens of thousands of farm families.

This fact is the more tragic because assistance authorized by the Congress is being deliberately withheld by Mr. Benson.

We of Missouri do not understand this refusal, because this type and character of assistance was designed and authorized by Congress for just such an emergency, as I am sure my distinguished friend with whom I have the honor to sit on the committee will verify.

For reasons we do not know, at the same time he has denied assistance to drought-stricken farmers in Missouri, Secretary Benson has been generous to the farmers in other States in our part of the country.

It should be noted that at the same time the Secretary of Agriculture is refusing this aid for our drought-stricken farmers, only this week at Wichita, Kans., his Chief, President Eisenhower, said:

> We are going to come up with additional programs that the Federal Government can commend to you to work with you in solving this problem which I assure you we will solve.

Mr. President, may I assure the Secretary and President Eisenhower that under this administration of his Department of Agriculture little or nothing is being solved so far as Missouri is concerned; and we would be more interested in carrying out the present programs in accordance with the intention of the Congress than in any promises about future programs.

We plead with the President to instruct Mr. Benson to carry out the wishes of the Congress.

Drought strikes impartially, but the Department of Agriculture extends aid with a partiality that poses many grave questions, questions for which I intend to seek answers, as a Representative of the people of Missouri and as a member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

A high official in the farm effort in Missouri may have given me part of the answer when he said that he believes Mr. Benson has passed the word through his organization to slight Missouri because he feels he was insulted by the Missouri State Commissioner of Agriculture.

If that is true I am truly sorry, but on the other hand, if Mr. Benson is taking out his personal pique against one Missourian on the hundreds of thousands of Missouri farmers, then he is unfit for the high office he holds, and he should resign.

Before making this talk today, Mr. President, I called up the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. He was unavailable to me, but I did talk to the Under Secretary, Mr. Morse, and stated that I was going to criticize the way in which the Secretary himself was handling this program, and that if any Member on this side of the aisle, or on the other side of the aisle cared to defend Mr. Benson, I would be very glad to debate the matter to the extent time would permit.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who I believe asked first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my friend from Missouri that his concern over the welfare of the Missouri farmers is a concern which is well deserved. I think any of us who have visited Missouri—and it has been my privilege to visit that State several times in the past year on official committee business of the Congress, as well as on personal business—will agree as to the seriousness of the drought, and the terrific economic toll and personal hardship which have resulted from it. At least, I think it is well known in Washington; certainly it is well known in the area of Missouri and its neighboring States.

I suggest to my good friend from Missouri, in the light of what I have heard, and in the knowledge of his other attempts to get some response from the Secretary of Agriculture—and the Senator from Missouri has detailed those efforts on other occasions—that I should be more than happy to join with him. Then if the Secretary of Agriculture does not respond in the complete fulfillment of his duty, I suggest that the Senator from Missouri prepare a concurrent resolution, for which he will find many cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize that the State of Missouri is a drought-stricken area, and that it is entitled to the relief and assistance which the law provides.

If Mr. Benson does not know where Missouri is, we can provide for him a conducted tour.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I believe the work he did when he came to Missouri as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the ASC problems of my State, an inquiry which demonstrated that 29 percent of all the discharged ASC county committeemen in the United States were discharged in Missouri, was of great help in bringing before the people and the Congress the facts with respect to that problem in my State. I look forward to discussing with him this concurrent resolution and again thank him for the thought.

I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that I asked in routine staff fashion for information with respect to the soil bank, including where the money was going and who was getting it. My office was told that the information could not be supplied unless requested more formally. I thereupon approached the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and asked if the information I was requesting was proper. He assured me that it was. On January 8 I requested the information by letter to the Secretary.

Mr. President, I now yield to my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator's remarks with great interest, because Arizona is one of the States participating in the disaster program. I have just returned from the West, where I visited several States in the drought area.

Can the Senator from Missouri tell me offhand the total agricultural income of his State?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The total direct agricultural income of the State of Missouri was some $933 million. The indirect income from the handling of food, and so forth, is over another $1,300,000,000.

So agriculture, to the people of the State of Missouri, represents an income of more than $2¼ billion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But $933 million would be the total income from livestock and agriculture?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is the total direct agricultural income of the State of Missouri.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Missouri agree with me that during the period beginning with the fiscal year 1954 through November of last year, Missouri has received $13,433,000 in emergency credits?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Arizona has some detailed figures as the result of my call to the Secretary of Agriculture, I shall be glad to discuss them with the Senator at another time. I do not have those detailed figures now. I have asked for figures showing the amount of drought relief received by all States in 1956. I shall place them in the RECORD as soon as they come from the Secretary.

If the Senator from Arizona will let me complete my remarks now, I shall then be glad to listen to him, and think I will be able to answer some of his points.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Missouri indicated that he wanted to discuss the problem. I was merely trying to fulfill that desire. If the Senator wishes me to wait, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The drought assistance figures given by the Senator from Arizona were for drought assistance in Missouri, prior to 1956. I am talking about the year 1956. But I shall be glad to remain on the floor and discuss the subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not want to leave unchallenged the statement that the Department of Agriculture has not provided any relief for the State of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Missouri did not get any assistance in 1956.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss a book entitled "Farmers at the Crossroads," written by Ezra Taft Benson. The book was distributed by the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation. A telegram from Mr. Benson to Mr. Fred H. Sexauer, president of that foundation, reads as follows:

> Mr. FRED A. SEXAUER,
> *President, Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, New York, N. Y.:*

That is right in the middle of the farm district, Mr. President.

The telegram reads:

> Of course, we were surprised and much interested in hearing of your program for the nationwide distribution of the book, Farmers at the Crossroads. In this book I have tried to outline the principles that must guide to a sound nonpolitical solution of our farm problem so far as possible within our free-enterprise system.

Then, Mr. Benson, as do many others, begins to plug the subject of quantity of distribution. I continue to read the telegram:

> By laying the foundation now for the mass distribution of this book during the next 6 or 8 months your foundation and those who are cooperating are rendering a distinct public service.
>
> EZRA TAFT BENSON.

Now let us see exactly what type of special service Mr. Benson is referring to.

The first paragraph of the foreword of the book in question reads as follows:

> When President-elect Eisenhower offered Ezra Taft Benson the post of Secretary of Agriculture in November 1952, he demurred, explaining that he was a clergyman and doubted whether he could engage in politics, where expediency is often the rule. Mr. Eisenhower replied that the American people had given him a mandate to restore their faith in the integrity of the United States Government and surely that was a spiritual job. From that time on, frank and honest dealings were to mark the relationship of the Department of Agriculture and the American farmer.

Mr. President, I would be interested to know what the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a great former Secretary of Agriculture, thinks about this statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was very much impressed with the words in the telegram "frank and honest dealings." I gather that that does not include the cheese scandal which took place under this administration, and in connection with which the Comptroller General found that more than $5 million of the public's money had been pilfered. I gather that it does not take into consideration some of the grain bin scandals. I gather that it does not take into consideration a few other little matters which have been brought to the public's attention, even including, I may say, the occasion when the administration itself found that a security risk in the Department of Agriculture was a very safe risk in the Department of State.

I am certain that these little addenda, these little supplements, which I have suggested could be placed as footnotes to Mr. Benson's publication. In other words, everything is frank and honest and aboveboard, except when one is caught.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me thank my colleague for his observation. There are other similar points which might be discussed. I intend in due course to make that information a part of the RECORD for future discussions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say, while I am making these comments at the Senator's pleasure, that I stand in the same great respect of Mr. Benson as a politician. I do not know whether he would include expediency as one of the criteria or credentials for a politician. But, however he may define the word or whatever he may consider to be the criteria for a good politician, I may say that Mr. Benson is a good politician, and he is rough and tough. He plays for keeps. He still has not acknowledged that the State of Missouri is entitled to all reasonable and equal opportunities and privileges under the law. And I know why. It is because both the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] have been on this floor, time after time, exposing the unbelievable political manipulations in the farmer State committee system in the State of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask a question of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, who has such an excellent record in support of the family size farm—not the factory size farm that Mr. Benson apparently is trying to elevate to complete supremacy in this land: Based on the record, does the Senator from Minnesota believe that Mr. Benson is justified in what he is trying to do to the State of Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that, without regard to any particular State or without regard to any man's politics, the Government of the United States has an obligation, when people are in need, under the law of this land to respond and to assist; and the emergency assistance for drought relief is provided for by statute.

Let me say that it is nothing short of unbelievable, and bordering upon indecency, to permit large storehouses of feed grains to be within almost arm's length of a farmer whose cattle are starving; and, Mr. President, it is unbelievable that farmers are compelled to pay from $35 to $40 a ton for hay, when they do not even have enough money to pay their taxes.

I say to my friend, the Senator from Missouri, that it is about time Mr. Benson is brought to Capitol Hill, to give an accounting to some of the Members of Congress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield, although I am anxious to complete my remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator from Missouri is anxious to complete his remarks and to leave the floor, but I could not let the statement the Senator from Minnesota made go without being challenged.

Let me say that in the Southwest hay was selling for approximately $23 a ton. Since that area has been declared a disaster area, the Government has been paying up to $10 or $20 a ton as the cost of shipping the hay. The natural result was that hay rose in price, and now the farmer and rancher is paying up to $50 a ton for the hay.

My point is that prices go up when the Government is brought into any situation. That always happens.

The grains referred to by the Senator—those that the Government under this program has to sell to the farmers at $1 below the market price—rose in price $1.50 or $2. My point is that the price of the commodities referred to by the Senator, both in his section, in Missouri and in my own section, has gone up because of the operation of the legislation that both the Senators criticize.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator from Arizona criticizing the aid given to the farmers of Arizona by the Government? Does the Senator from Arizona say here that no Government aid should be given to Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Missouri is trying to read into the words I used, something I did not either say or imply. I am rather surprised that the Senator from Missouri would attempt to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I misunderstood the Senator from Arizona, I apologize.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am trying to point out an economic fact of life, namely, that the farmer is not helped when Federal aid is injected into the hay program. It already has doubled the price of hay. That has happened in the Senator's State of Missouri and in Minnesota and in Arizona.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Missouri in yielding.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, that if the price of hay is doubled because of the activity of the Federal Government, then that is the worst indictment of the Department of Agriculture under this administration that I could ever imagine.

Let me say that I am not a novice in these matters. Our State produces a substantial amount of hay which not only has been sold but has been given to drought areas, not only this year, but in years gone by.

The only time I can recall when hay was inflated in price when the Federal Government got interested in it was under the Hoover administration, in 1932; and I remember that some persons did rather well on the misery of other persons at that time.

I say, Mr. President, that during previous droughts in this country, hay has been shipped and has been provided for nothing by the Federal Government. I say further, Mr. President, that if the Federal Government really wishes to give assistance to any farmer in Missouri, that can be done by utilizing the feed grain in the storehouses. However, the Government is giving a great deal of this assistance through the feed dealers in Texas and in Oklahoma.

Let me say that I am quite well prepared about this situation, and there is going to be a showdown on the matter of drought relief, once the programs comes before us, because the Federal Government has been using the normal channels of trade in some areas, and that has resulted in the inflation of prices and the skyrocketing of prices, at a time when the Federal Government has millions and millions of pounds and bushels of feed grains with which to relieve the suffering. When the Government goes into an assistance program, it can set the price, because it controls the commodities.

Surely the Senator from Arizona does not believe that it is right or proper for Missouri farmers to lose their livestock because they are unable to purchase hay at prices they can afford to pay, whereas Mr. Benson is helping some farmers in other States get hay at the same time he is refusing to help the farmers in Missouri get hay.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear both Senators criticize this Agricultural Act.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I respectfully call the attention of the Senator from Ari-

zona to a letter in respect to the hay problem of our farmers which I placed in the record before the Senate from Arizona came on the floor.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell a little further on Mr. Benson's book. The foreword goes on to say that originally Mr. Benson refused to come to Washington as a lobbyist until "given assurance that it did not entail plying Senators and Congressmen with cocktails."

Mr. President, I do not know about Mr. Benson's philosophy with respect to alcohol. I have never discussed it with him. I read in the book that he had no objection to having people smoke or drink in his presence; but the book adds "but somehow very few people do."

Mr. President, the slur against some Members of Congress by a high Government official, who to the best of my knowledge has never run for public office, is just another illustration of his opinion about some Members of this body and about some Members of the House of Representatives.

Apparently this Cabinet member, as he wanders through the maze of maladministration now characteristic of his administration of the farm programs, does not realize that a man can get just as drunk with power as he can with alcohol.

The foreword of the book also illustrates Mr. Benson's opinion of Republican as well as Democratic Members of Congress. Let me quote another paragraph:

> He [Benson] has been figuratively manhandled by committees of Congress, they being controlled by the Democrats, though members of his own party have occasionally joined in.

Mr. President, this talk is already of some length. I have more facts on the matter, however, which I will present to the Senate in the weeks to come.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am certain the Senator from Missouri did not mean what could possibly be interpreted from his remarks when he referred to Secretary Benson's not smoking or drinking, nor minding that people did so around him. I know he did not mean to imply what might possibly be interpreted from his remarks. So that people will not misunderstand his remarks, I want to say Secretary Benson is one of the high men in the Mormon Church. I know that persons of the Mormon faith do not believe in smoking or drinking. However, having been raised with Mormons, I know they are broadminded. I wanted to put those remarks in the RECORD, so people will not misunderstand the remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there is nobody in the Senate of the United States who has more respect for the Mormon Church than I do. Let the record be crystal clear on that.

Now, I have in my hand a booklet entitled "Ezra Taft Benson (as told to Carlisle Bargeron)," and the further title of the booklet is "Farmers at the Crossroads." It is the unabridged special edition distributed by the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, 210 East 43d Street, New York.

I shall have more to say about this book at another time. However, now I should like to read another statement from the book, to be sure that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona is not in any way implying any misinterpretation on my part. I now read a paragraph from the foreword of Mr. Benson's book, written by Mr. Bargeron:

> Secretary Benson neither smokes nor drinks, nor do any of the rest of his family. And when he goes to gatherings where there is drinking, as is necessitated by his official position, he doesn't hold a glass of ginger ale to give the appearance of having a highball. Although he adheres to his standards, he does not impose them on others. It is perfectly all right to drink or smoke in his immediate presence, but somehow very few people do.

I have just read this from the foreword in the book.

I read now, to be sure that the RECORD is clear, Mr. Benson's opinion of the original bill passed by the Congress with respect to agriculture. I now quote:

> When Congress passed the earlier hodgepodge, self-defeating farm legislation in 1956, many influences were brought to bear upon the President to accept it. If he vetoed it, he was told, the Democrats would claim that he didn't have the farmers' interests at heart. Benson strongly urged a veto. The President did veto it, and the subsequent favorable response throughout the country, together with a better farm bill, brought a sorely needed unity to the Republican Party.

Finally, Mr. President, with respect to the remarks made by my good friend the Senator from Arizona, who referred to certain figures, I should like to point out that in 1954 the State of Missouri spent approximately $9 million on drought assistance. My staffs tell me they believe that is more than was spent by any other State during this administration. The State government of Missouri did its part.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to thank the Senator for clearing up the matter of Secretary Benson and his religion. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask a question. Is it not true that the production of corn in 1956 was not only ahead of production in 1955, but above the 10-year average in Missouri? By the way, I have those figures from the Department of Agriculture. I shall be glad to give them to the Senator from Missouri, if he does not have them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would be interested in knowing more about my State from the Senator from Arizona, as I am sure he would be to know more about his State from me. It is a fact that we did have an exceptional corn crop in some of our commercial corn counties. But that did not help the dairy or beef cattle farmer who had no corn and no pasture.

In part of Missouri the soil bank helped to some extent also, but it did not help the farmer unable to participate. In many Missouri drought counties there are few if any soil bank acres. There are 5 Missouri counties where the average annual gross income per farm is less than $1,000. No program has helped those people. On analysis, I believe, to the best of my knowledge, that the present agricultural program of this administration is helping primarily the large factory-size farm and is not materially helping the family-size farm.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield further for a question along this inquiry, I should like to say that I am trying to ascertain the reason why Missouri might find itself in the position in which she finds herself relative to drought relief. The figures from the Department of Agriculture, which I have in my hand, show wheat, corn, oat, soy bean, and barley production in 1956. The figures show that 1956 corn, wheat, and soy-bean production was ahead of 1955 production, and that production in 1956 was below the 10-year average for 1945 to 1954 in only one category, and that was hay, which fell below the 10-year average production in Missouri. Might not the Senator from Missouri be inclined to agree that there is a surplus of those grains in Missouri available to Missouri farmers and Missouri cattlemen?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has pointed out certain crops in which there were good yields. The Senator is not discussing livestock. He is not discussing problems of drought in the great milkshed of southwest Missouri. He is not discussing other aspects of the farm program in many parts of our State. So long as the Senator is apparently defending the prejudice expressed by the Department of Agriculture against Missouri, I ask him what right he thinks the Secretary of Agriculture has to give grain, hay, and special loan assistance to farmers right across the State line of Missouri, but refuse that assistance to the Missouri farmer?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In answer to that question, I should like to say that if the Department of Agriculture finds certain counties in the State of Missouri, or the whole State of Missouri, to be a disaster area, the grains which are in surplus are available to the livestock people and to the farmers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think the Senator from Arizona is expressing the whole situation accurately. The Secretary did declare 90 of our counties to be drought counties but did not designate them for assistance on emergency credit, for discounts on grain, or help in buying hay. The only credit available to any farmer in Missouri is the same credit which is available to farmers who have had no drought problem. Neither grain nor hay has been granted the farmers of Missouri. All that has been allowed them, under the present administration, is the right to graze cattle on soil-bank acres, which, in effect, means little, because those acres have been subjected to the hot sun just as other acres.

I presented to the Senator from Arizona that I had to leave to attend a meeting the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has called for 2 o'clock. I understand a vote is to be taken with respect to a witness being in contempt.

I shall be very glad to discuss this matter further on the floor of the Senate at any time, with either the distinguished Senator from Arizona or with any other Member on either side of the aisle.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield to me so that I may place some

figures into the RECORD, which would add to the present discussion? I certainly welcome the opportunity to discuss the subject further. I shall not inject anything which is controversial into the RECORD at this point, so the Senator may feel free to leave.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield. The Senator was not present on the floor when I put into the RECORD a great many figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture. I stated I would yield to my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] when I completed my discussion of the matter. I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Chair will state that the Senator from Missouri cannot yield the floor to another Senator. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was explaining why I yield the floor at this time. The Senator from Indiana has been very courteous in waiting until I had completed my remarks. I shall return to the floor at any time convenient to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate the invitation of the Senator from Missouri to continue the discussion of this subject at a later date. However, I believe it would be appropriate at this time to insert in the RECORD some additional figures. First, the farm income of Missouri was higher during the first 9 months of 1956 than during the first 9 months of 1955.

I feel that fact has some bearing on whether or not an entire State should be called a disaster area.

I ask unanimous consent that the Missouri production figures which I have obtained from the Department of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, along with statements made at Wichita, Kans., at which drought and other natural disasters were discussed, and other material.

There being no objection, the figures and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm income, Missouri: 1955, first 9 months,, $622 million; 1956, first 9 months, $663 million.

Farm income, first 9 months, Arizona: 1955, $212 million; 1956, $202 million.

So that we can get a true picture of the conditions in Missouri, let me give you the official Department of Agriculture figures showing feed production in Missouri in 1956 compared with 1955 and with the 1945–54 10-year average:

Missouri production

	1945–54 average	1955	1956
Corn ____bushels	141, 798, 000	162, 720, 000	189, 408, 000
All wheat____do____	27, 976, 000	48, 081, 000	49, 800, 000
Oats____do____	36, 203, 000	50, 976, 000	42, 129, 000
Soy beans____do____	20, 616, 000	33, 250, 000	39, 120, 000
Barley____do____	2, 510, 000	15, 428, 000	11, 826, 000
All hay____tons__	4, 190, 000	4, 010, 000	3, 523, 000

These figures show that Missouri produced record or near-record crops in most feed grains and that production was well ahead of the 10-year average in every commodity except hay. Under such conditions it is hard to believe that the 18-percent reduction in hay could not be supplemented from the bumper yields of feed grains or from the substantial hay production of neighboring States.

	1945–54 average	1955	1956
Hay (Illinois)____	4, 254, 000	4, 937, 000	4, 998, 000
Hay (Iowa)____	5, 925, 000	6, 954, 000	5, 793, 000

There can be no doubt that there is some economic stress in Missouri, but it can hardly, under these conditions, be considered a major disaster area.

Federal funds have been made available to Missouri in the past when they were needed and there are many programs in which we are sharing now. During the fiscal years 1954 through 1957 (through November 30, 1956) Missouri received Federal farm assistance under Department of Agriculture disaster programs in these amounts:

In emergency credit____	$13, 433, 522
In allocations for feed grains___	16, 512, 525
For hay distribution agreements____	2, 104, 000
In assistance under food-distribution programs____	30, 000
Total amount of assistance__	32, 080, 047

Mr. Chairman, I submit these facts so that the truth about the Missouri situation may be known.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you very much for allowing me to be heard. I had understood that the hearing today was to be concerned only with the soil bank, but since the drought problem in my State has been brought up I am glad for the opportunity to be heard.

In the special meeting on drought and other natural disasters, held in Wichita, Kans., January 14–16, 1957, Mr. Harold Sauer, Washburn, N. Dak., reporting for the more than 150 farmers, ranchers, State, and agricultural leaders in the conference, said to President Eisenhower:

"The first morning of this meeting we heard reports from each of the 15 States represented at the conference. That includes all of the 10 Great Plains States. While hardships and suffering on the part of farmers and ranchers in disaster areas were reported, there was a feeling of confidence—that the situation is not hopeless.

"There were many reports on the effectiveness of the emergency feed and hay, credit and other emergency programs. They have helped farmers and ranchers maintain their basic herds. Emergency tillage has enabled many farmers to check serious soil blowing. These programs have been appreciated."

Mr. H. Mark Richman, farmer from La Mesa, N. Mex., said:

"We have talked a lot about those responsibilities in our meeting here, yesterday and today. You will be interested to know that we have found a strong feeling that we must not get into the habit of calling on the Federal Government for help every time and in every kind of natural disaster that comes along. We think that it is part of the American tradition—to take care of as many of our troubles as we can before calling for outside help. In our final conclusions this viewpoint appears certain to be stated."

NEW USES AND NEW MARKETS FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, to my mind we have four major problems facing this Nation, and at least one of them, to my mind, is a world problem. The first problem, in my opinion, is that of maintaining peace, or keeping out of war.

I would say that the second problem is that of avoiding runaway inflation.

I would say that the third major problem facing the country is that of maintaining full employment. I do not believe we can afford to have a third world war. I do not believe we can afford runaway inflation. I know we cannot afford to have unemployment.

I would say that the fourth great issue facing the country is that of permanently solving what we ordinarily refer to as the farm problem.

Mr. President, before we can solve the farm problem I think we will have to admit that there is now, and there has been from time to time, a farm problem. I become very impatient with certain persons who fail to realize that there is a farm problem from time to time. There is a farm problem today. There has been a farm problem during my lifetime, except when we have been at war. When we were in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, we had no farm problem. Why? Because the Government set the prices at which farm products could be sold, and likewise set the prices for products which the farmer purchased. I have always thought the prices for farm products were set too low, but, nevertheless, there was no particular farm problem when we were at war.

What is the farm problem today? It is nothing more or less than depressed farm prices from time to time. Putting it in another way, it is nothing more or less than too low farm prices from time to time. It certainly is not a problem of production. We have no farm production problems in America. The problem arises because of depressed farm prices.

Why are farm prices depressed from time to time? Simply because we farmers—and I am a farmer—produce more than the market will absorb.

To put it in another way, we produce more than we can sell in the open market, and the result is that we have surpluses and depressed farm prices.

So, Mr. President, the problem is one of depressed farm prices, and not one of farm production. We do not need to worry about farm production, because we have overproduction of farm products in the case of almost every agricultural item.

Mr. President, as a businessman, one who thinks things through, let me say that if the problem were one of overproduction or one of producing more than could be sold at a fair price, we might know what to do about it. What would we do about it? We would find new markets and new uses, or we would stop overproducing. A small group can control production, but inasmuch as there are 6 million farms in the United States, the question cannot be handled in that way. Corn and other crops are planted and are harvested in the fall. Such production cannot be shut off or curtailed as production can be in manufacturing businesses.

We have been trying to solve the problem—and this is true of both political parties—on the basis of reducing farm production on one hand, and, on the other hand, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in teaching farmers how to produce more. That is what we have been doing.

The Democratic Party tried to solve the problem of depressed farm prices by passing a law in 1938 known as the price-support law, or what we know today as the parity formula. The purpose of that act was to reduce production by providing that every farmer raising basic products, such as corn, should be allotted X number of acres.

If a farmer does not plant any more than the allotted acreage, he is permitted, when he harvest his corn, to go to his local bank and borrow so much a bushel, and sign a note due a year later. The amount he may receive for a bushel is based upon a parity formula concerning which we hear a great deal of argument as to whether it should be 75 or 80 or 90 percent. A year later, if the market price is more than the partity price on which the farmer borrowed, he can sell his corn and pay off his note. If the price is less than that, the Government will take physical possession of the corn and cancel the farmers' note. The Government has taken physical possession of corn in the past years and still has on hand 7 billion, 8 billion, or 9 billion bushels.

But the purpose of the law was to reduce production in order to push up the price of farm products in the open market. I am not quarreling about that. I am only trying to be factual about it. That was the Democratic Party's way of solving the problem.

Then last year the Republicans tried to solve the problem on a similar basis. We gave the American farmer what was called the soil bank. We said to every corn farmer, "If you will further reduce the number of acres allocated to you for the production of corn, we will pay you X dollars an acre." That is not a guaranteed price. The Republican Party and the administration thereby recognized the fact that the problem was overproduction, and we were seeking to solve the problem by reducing farm production.

Therefore, Mr. President, both political parties have recognized that the problem was one of overproduction, and both parties have tried to solve it by reducing farm production, and thereby raising the farmer's price in the open market.

But both parties have failed, because we cannot help any one by pushing him down. I recognize that a huge surplus was on hand, and something had to be done about it. But what we did was definitely wrong. We cannot help men by pushing them down.

During the past 100 years we have spent, I suppose, billions of dollars to teach the farmer how to grow more and more and more. All our emphasis, with certain exceptions about which I shall speak a little later, has been on teaching farmers how to grow more and more, until we have farm production away up here [indicating]—and I wish everyone who reads the RECORD could see where I have my left hand. We have spent billions of dollars and billions of manhours teaching the farmers how to produce more and more.

I am not quarreling about that, Mr. President. I am glad we did it. There are county agents in every county in the Nation. We have agricultural policies; we have the Department of Agriculture. Private industry has given us better tractors, better seeds, better fertilizers. The Federal Government has spent millions of dollars in eradicating plant diseases.

The purpose of the bill which I have today introduced, which is sponsored by myself and many other Senators, is to spend as much money, as much time and effort, and as much ingenuity in finding new uses for farm products in industry, and new markets for farm products, as we have been spending in showing the farmer how to grow more.

What I wish to do, Mr. President, is to bring the farmer's market up to fit his production. Every policy we have had up to this time has been on the basis of pushing production back with the market. What happens when we push the production back with the market? The farmer makes less money. Every one in the cities who manufactures products to sell to the farmer sells less of them to the farmer, because if the farmer produces on only 80 percent of his tillable acres, he needs 20 percent less gasoline, oil, and so forth, so that everyone who sells to the farmer sells less. That means fewer jobs in the cities.

If the farmer allows a number of acres to lie idle, and grows nothing upon them, as a result the railroads and the trucks haul fewer cargoes, the grain elevators handle less grain, and there are fewer jobs. The farmer buys less gasoline, less oil, fewer tractors, and less of everything else which he normally buys. The taxpayer sits in the corner and puts up a couple of billion dollars a year to pay the farmer for not producing agricultural commodities. In the long run, fundamentally, no one wins under that kind of a program.

I am not trying to be critical; I am simply attempting to speak factually. I want to have as much money and as much time as are necessary spent in fundamental research. The bill I have introduced, in cosponsorship with a great many other Senators, calls for the expenditure next year, of only $100 million on fundamental research, in order to try to develop new uses for farm products in industry and also to find new markets for farm products.

One hundred million dollars is less than one third of the amount which was spent last year, 1956, for storing surplus commodities. In 1956, a million dollars a day was spent simply to store surplus commodities. That meant a total of $365 million. The bill would start the program with an expenditure of $100 million a year for research.

Mr. President, unless a policy is adopted looking to new uses for farm products in industry, together with the finding of new markets for everything the farmer has to market, so as to result in an increase both in his production and in his income together, we shall eventually socialize the farmer. We cannot help doing so. If it is to be our policy to reduce farm production, and to make such a policy work, we shall only be fooling ourselves.

It will be necessary to pass and enforce laws which will regiment the American farmer. This means that he will be required to plant only X number of acres, and market only X amount of products every year. If we continue to follow the policy which we apparently have adopted, the policy of trying to solve the farm problem by reducing production, eventually the farmer will be regimented. We have not really accomplished this result yet, because all that has been done has been to pile up surplus after surplus, and to tax the American people billions of dollars to pay the farmers for not raising even more farm products.

During the past 10 years, starting in 1946, Congress has appropriated more than a billion dollars to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of showing the American farmer how to grow more and more, and of helping him to do it. During the same period, only about $70 million was appropriated for what we know as industrialization, or what I like to refer to as the finding of new uses for farm products in industry. That amount includes the $12 million which Congress appropriated last year.

I now have the actual figures before me. Starting in 1946, and continuing through the fiscal year 1957, the fiscal year in which we are now operating, $1,098,792,000 was appropriated, of which $88 million was to be used to find new uses for farm products in industry.

Mr. President, this is a very, very important matter. At least, it is important to me, as a farmer, and I think it is important to all the farmers in Indiana. It is an attempt to solve the problem of farm surpluses. I think all Senators ought to be very much interested in the matter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The problem is one which is of great importance to farmers all over the country. They have been seeking a solution to it because it has been getting more serious every year. I am delighted to hear the excellent elucidation of the subject now being made by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. A solution will not be found merely by reducing farm production. Of course, there can be a reduction in farm production, if such a program is to be successful, and an increase in the prices paid farmers in the marketplace is to be achieved simply by a reduction of the farmers' production, it will be necessary to regiment the farmers. They will actually have to till fewer acres and grow fewer farm products. That will not accomplish anything except the building up of a great expense which the American taxpayers will have to pay.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Do I understand correctly that the bill provides for the authorization of $100 million for research?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill provides for the appropriation of $100 million for research and other means of finding new uses for farm products in industry and new markets for farm products.

Mr. LANGER. How much has been spent in the last 10 years for this purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. For this purpose, $88 million has been spent in 12 years, and $12 million of that amount was appropriated last year.

I shall place in the RECORD the amount which was appropriated in each year since 1946 to help show the farmer how to grow more and further aggravate his situation and further depress his income, thus requiring more money to be paid by the taxpayer.

In 1946, payments to State agricultural experiment stations in Federal grant funds totaled $7 million. For production research, the Agricultural Marketing Service received $14 million. For marketing research, the Agricultural Marketing Service received $2 million.

The total for that year was $24 million, of which $5 million was to find new uses, or what is called utilization research.

From 1948 through 1957, $84 million was spent on everything except industrial uses or the finding of new industrial uses.

Mr. LANGER. Considering all the money which has been spent on research, what have been the results in the finding of new uses for farm products.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Department of Agriculture in its four research laboratories, with its small personnel and inadequate sum of money available, has done exceptionally well. Many new industrial uses have been found for farm products. If the Department could obtain $100 million and sufficient personnel, and could build some pilot plants to do what ought to be done in this field, many more new uses for farm products could be found, thus enabling the consumption of 100 million more bushels of grain a year. This information will be found in the exhibits I am having printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I shall not take the time to read all of them today.

As the Senator from North Dakota knows, I have spoken on this subject several times on the floor of the Senate. I shall continue to talk about it, because I am certain that this is one of the most important ways in which to solve the problem of farm surpluses. The problem will not be solved by reducing farm production on a permanent basis, unless it is desired to regiment the farmer 100 percent, and unless he wants to be regimented, which he does not want to be. The problem will be solved only by the finding of new uses for farm products in industry and in the developing of new markets to enable the farmer to grow more farm products.

Mr. LANGER. Consider, for example, alfalfa. As I understand, through the use of research funds, new uses for alfalfa have been discovered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Many new uses.

Mr. LANGER. Under the bill, would corn and rye be included in the research work?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill includes everything which conceivably can be grown, even to the development of new crops. I remember, as I am certain the able Senator from North Dakota remembers, because he is a little older than I, although not much, when soy beans were not grown in the United States. I remember the first soy beans which were grown in my section of Indiana. They were grown for hay purposes.

Today in Indiana many thousands of acres of soy beans are grown and harvested. They are used primarily in industry. What would our economy be like today if soy beans were not grown for use in industry?

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill also provide for exploitation, if I may use that word, or the seeking of new markets in other countries?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes. One of the purposes of the bill is to develop new markets in other countries, as well as in the United States. It is hoped to develop new markets wherever they can conceivably be developed.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill include research in fruit production, such as the raising of oranges?

Mr. CAPEHART. It includes every product which is grown or which can conceivably be grown from the soil.

Mr. LANGER. Tobacco?

Mr. CAPEHART. Anything which can be grown from the soil.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to have had the colloquy with the able Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I hope it will be possible to find new uses for farm products, so that the farmer may grow more instead of less, and in doing so receive a fair price for what he grows. The result will be that more jobs will be available in the cities. Retailers and wholesalers will sell more goods to the farmers. The railroads and the truckers will haul more produce.

Not the least of all, it will enable the American taxpayer to get out of the farming business. I think it has been costing the American taxpayer approximately $2 billion a year to engage in the farming business. The finding of new uses for farm products will enable the taxpayer to get out of the farming business and thus save $2 billion a year. The savings thus made can be used for the building of necessary schools and hospitals and for the reduction of the debt and of taxes. Still the farmer will be making more money and will be free. He will not be regimented. He will have a market for everything he grows.

The farmer's problem, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, is not simply a farm problem; it is not merely one of depressed farm prices; it is not the lack of production. Of course, there is a lack of production in the drought-stricken areas of the United States, but Congress cannot do much about providing rain. Generally speaking, however, we have more of everything that is grown than we need. It is practically running out of our ears. We can produce still more. There is not a farm in the United States which cannot produce more than it is producing. All that is necessary is to place more fertilizer on the land and to use more improved methods.

I hope the Department of Agriculture will get behind the bill and that every Senator will give it his approval.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, since I must now leave the floor, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be placed on the bill as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

As I have said, Mr. President, the bill will lie on the table until Monday for the purpose of enabling other Senators who might wish to do so to join with me as co-sponsors.

I hope the Department of Agriculture will support the bill. I think it should.

I shudder to think what will happen to the American farmer in the next 10 years if we continue to follow the course we have been following during the past 20 years, namely, trying to solve the problem by reducing farm production. If farm production is reduced, all other forms of production in the United States will decline. In addition, the ability of the farmers to pay taxes will decline. Everyone loses as a result of the farm policy we are following. Everyone would gain if more time, money, and effort were spent in finding new uses for farm products.

Only today a bill was introduced—or perhaps it is soon to be introduced—to call for a study of the rise in the price of newsprint. As we know, the price of newsprint has risen higher and higher, until today the price is almost prohibitive. Ninety percent of the newsprint used in the United States is purchased from foreign countries. If the program to which I have referred is adopted, and if the necessary research is done, it will be possible to produce in the United States all the materials required for the production of the newsprint needed in this country. Today newsprint is produced from pulpwood, and at the present time most of the pulpwood required for the production of the newsprint used in the United States comes from Canada. However, weeds and other plants which can be grown on farms can be used for the production of paper or newsprint, and that should be done. We should produce our own newsprint; and the time will come when we shall be forced to do so, because the supply of pulpwood will be exhausted. So we should be engaging in such a program at the present time.

Mr. President, we should be trying at this time to solve—on a permanent basis—the farm problem. One of the troubles is that we have been looking upon the farm problem as a political problem. However, it is not at all a political problem. It is an economic problem. The problem arises because the farmers produce more than they can sell, more than the market can absorb. Unless we can find new markets and new uses for farm products, we shall not solve the farmers' problems, without

ultimately having the farmers regimented 100 percent. If that is what the farmers want and if that is what the Congress wants and if that is what the Department of Agriculture wants, at least it is definitely not what I want. I myself want no part of regimentation. But regimentation will be necessary unless the program to which I refer is put into effect; and year after year the situation will get worse, instead of better.

In the last farm bill we authorized the President to set up a commission to study the very problem I am now talking about. A fine commission was established, and at the moment it is doing an excellent job in studying the entire problem. I believe the commission will make an interim report on about March 1, and I believe the law requires the commission to make its final report by June 30. I am entirely confident—because I have great confidence in the good judgment of the members of the commission—that within the next 90 days it will recommend that we try to solve the farm problem on the basis of finding new uses and new markets for farm products, and that we spend the necessary amounts for the research required in order to accomplish that objective.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that in a short time I shall have a great deal more to say on this subject; and I shall continue to discuss it and work on it until the problem is solved. Certainly it will not be solved if we continue on the basis on which we have proceeded in the past.

I say to all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, that this is not at all a political matter. It should be a nonpartisan matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope all Senators will join in sponsoring this proposed legislation, and in working toward its enactment. I shall be delighted to have all Senators do so. Certainly that will be in the best interests of the Senate, in the best interests of the farmers, and in the best interests of the entire country.

AMERICA SHOULD HAVE BEEN READY TO LEAD WESTERN ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST RUSSIA AT TIME OF HUNGARY'S FIGHT FOR LIBERTY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the glories and tragedies of our time has been the valiant resistance of the Hungarian people to the barbarism of Soviet tyranny. The glory of this resistance is theirs, and it will not soon be forgotten. In the tragedy, we must share—for it is part of the tragedy that thus far the free world, and particularly our own country, has done little for the brave Hungarians, except to utter feeble protests.

Possibly our share of tragedy goes beyond this. Talk by some of our national leaders during the past few years, including the President and the Secretary of State, about liberation and rolling back the Iron Curtain as goals of our policy, widely broadcast in Europe, may have served to build up hopes and optimism among freedom-seeking Hungarians far exceeding the realities behind those slogans. I confess I have been disturbed over just how much our propaganda may have encouraged Hungarians in their hopes that their desperate uprising against tyranny would gain assistance from the West. There have been repeated reports, from journalists and observers on the scene, that many of these brave fighters for freedom were disappointed and bitter over the failure of any such assistance to materialize. As only one example of such reports, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a significant dispatch from Vienna, of November 24, 1956, by John MacCormack, of the New York Times, which describes the emotions of Hungarian refugees crossing the border into Austria and their disillusionment about western inaction.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RADIO'S ROLE IN THE REVOLT—HUNGARIANS DECLARE THEY WERE MISLED

(By John MacCormack)

VIENNA, November 24.—United States correspondents in Budapest during the uprising have reported the astonishment of the Hungarian people at the failure of the West, and particularly the United States, to help them repel the Soviet attackers.

In some circles it is charged that the impression of impending United States help was created as a result of broadcasts by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

The real charge is not that United States propaganda media incited the Hungarian revolution but that such agencies led the Hungarians to think the West would aid them if they revolted. To that, officials of Radio Free Europe reply by challenging their critics to cite any statement by them to this effect.

HUNGARIAN REACTION

For this correspondent the proof of the pudding was in the eating. In the 19 days he spent in Budapest while the Hungarians were first demonstrating, then revolting, and finally resisting Soviet aggression he saw ample evidence that the Hungarians were thoroughly convinced the United States would help them against the Soviet Union.

"Why don't you help us?" was the standard query of the Hungarian rebels and their sympathizers when they saw a United States flag on a correspondent's car.

Both from Zoltan Tildy, former President of Hungary and chief representative of the democratic Smallholders Party in the Imre Nagy government, and from Maj. Gen. Bela Kiraly, revolutionary who became for a few brief days the commandant of Budapest under that government, this correspondent heard criticisms of United States broadcasts. Both said they had been useful in the early days of the revolution because of their news broadcasts but harmful later because they incited the Hungarians to further revolts and strikes, whereas what the Nagy government needed was to have the revolutionaries return to work.

Since his return from Hungary this correspondent has listened to many denials by the Voice and Radio Free Europe that they were ever guilty of such incitements. Radio Free Europe officials produced a communication from a Hungarian lawyer who said that although he had been a faithful follower of its broadcasts he had never heard any that advocated revolution or promised military help.

SUPPORT EXPECTED

The fact remains that the Hungarian revolutionaries, rightly or wrongly, expected Western support, which they did not get. Who was responsible? In the opinion of this correspondent and several colleagues with whom he discussed the matter in Budapest and since his return to Vienna, this responsibility rests on the Government of the United States—of which the Voice and Radio Free Europe are merely mouthpieces official and unofficial—and on its people, since people are responsible for their governments.

Even if the two propaganda media did not themselves preach revolution or promise help, they quoted freely from United States newspapers and utterances of public men in the United States who were less careful.

DULLES QUOTED

They quoted, for instance, Secretary of State Dulles when he talked of "rollbacks" and President Eisenhower when he endorsed the Secretary's stand in more general terms. They recorded as news the speech of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., before the United Nations, November 2, in which he recalled pledges given by the United States to assist "the brave Hungarian people in their struggle for freedom." That speech was made when it looked as if the Hungarian revolution against Soviet communism had succeeded. Two days later, when Moscow sent the tanks into Budapest to crush the revolution, no more was heard of the promised assistance.

But the Hungarian people could scarcely be blamed for regarding Mr. Lodge's words as a pledge of help, nor could United States propaganda media be reprehended for recording them. If history one day should hold the United States guilty of having deluded a brave people with false hopes it would seem that the responsibility must be placed higher up.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 10, 1956, in a speech in Hermiston, Oreg., I suggested a congressional inquiry into the true relationship between the "liberation" talk in our Government during recent years and the actual policies followed by the administration during the same years. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my remarks on that occasion appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR NEUBERGER AT HERMISTON, OREG., MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1956

A congressional investigation of the role of American propaganda in "feeding false hopes" to Hungary's fight for freedom from Soviet rule was suggested today by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

"Reports from correspondents on the scene and in Austria have told of the surprise and dismay of the Hungarians at the failure of material support of their uprising from American and other Western sources," NEUBERGER said. He cited a New York Times dispatch which reported that the Hungarians did not claim that American propaganda had incited them to revolt against communism, but that broadcasts by such media as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe had led them to believe a national fight for freedom would have American support against military repression by Russia's Red Army.

"Of course neither the administration nor the privately operated Radio Free Europe would have called upon the people of the Soviet satellite states to revolt," the Oregon Senator stated. "But for 4 years, there have been broadcast to these people the statements of our top leaders about 'liberation', 'rollbacks,' and similar phrases and slogans from this administration's pronouncements on Eastern European affairs.

"It should hardly come as a surprise if brave and desperate anti-Communists in

Hungary took these statements to reflect an actual American policy, not merely words," NEUBERGER said, "and if so, our phrasemakers must assume a share of responsibility for the terrible bloodshed and tragedies of the Hungarians' courageous battle for national liberation.

"I believe the Congress should inquire fully into what relationship, if any, there has been between these slogans which have been so recklessly broadcast for the past 4 years and the actual foreign policies of this administration."

The Senator did not criticize the decision not to intervene militarily in the Hungarian crisis, which he said could not have been done without facing full-scale war with the U. S. S. R. "But our national spokesmen must have known all along, before any revolts happened in the Soviet empire, that we could not support such revolts against Soviet military repression," he said. "Thus they should have been especially concerned to bend over backward to avoid giving false impressions to brave people behind the Iron Curtain, who stood to pay the supreme price for any misunderstanding of the meaning and motives of our liberation talk."

"Theodore Roosevelt advised us to speak softly and carry a big stick," NEUBERGER reminded his audience. "We have completely failed to develop the political and economic unity of the Western democracies, which could be our only effective nonmilitary stick against communism, in the form of trade boycotts and other economic sanctions. But this softness in our ability to act was not matched by any softness of our words—at least as they reached the people of Hungary over their clandestine radio sets. It is time for a public review of this discrepancy between our actual policies and the image created by our propaganda abroad."

"It is time we accepted the knowledge that with great power comes responsibility, and that ringing declarations of high principles do not take the place of leadership in practice, even when they are endorsed by a great majority vote in the U. N. General Assembly," NEUBERGER said. "We must learn to resist the temptation to preach and to admonish as a substitute for the cost and difficulties of effective action."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, I do not charge, Mr. President, that administration leaders and spokesmen meant to encourage revolt among the people of Russia's Eastern European satellites. Nor do I have reason to think that Western media of information directed to these people—such as the Voice of America and the unofficial Radio Free Europe—had such intentions, or that they did more than to disseminate the statements of responsible public leaders. But we must recall, Mr. President, that for reasons which may have had little to do with international affairs, this administration made every effort to exaggerate the differences between its Eastern European policies and that of the preceding administration—to create the illusion of new and supposedly firmer policies, at the same time that the Soviet Government was actually given every reason to know that the United States would not lift a finger over events in Eastern Europe. If our public phraseology was so designed to create illusions here at home, Mr. President, is it surprising if it may also have created illusions among brave men abroad who would grasp at any straw in their hunger for liberty?

I hope that Congress will take a look at this question, Mr. President, and that our information media will reexamine their programs, so as to avoid any future misunderstanding of our actual position toward satellite revolts, unheroic as that position may be. I ask that a brief item from Newsweek magazine of December 10, 1956, referring to such a reexamination, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA OVERHAUL?

The Hungarian tragedy may force a complete overhaul of United States psychological warfare.

It's not true, despite charges, that United States propagandists have been encouraging the peoples of the Red satellites to revolt.

It is true, however, that occasional broadcasts and leaflets have spoken of the eventual liberation of the satellites, and that many desperate victims of the Communists read more into these words than was intended.

This is causing some deep soul searching in State Department circles.

UNITED STATES COULD HAVE LED WESTERN SUPPORT FOR HUNGARY

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is tragic enough, Mr. President, if divergence between our actual national policies and our leaders' phrasemaking about our policies has added to the sacrifice, disillusionment, and bitterness of brave men and women in Eastern Europe. But beyond this, I have felt strongly that there is more that the United States could have done to make Russia feel the wrath of the free world over Soviet oppression and cruelty in crushing the Hungarian struggle for liberty. Our cablegrams of protest and toothless resolutions in the General Assembly of the United Nations must be regarded with the utmost cynicism by the ruthless men in the Kremlin once it became clear that they were not to be backed by any effective pressures.

When the Hungarian revolt occurred I publicly urged that the United States take the lead, along with the other Western democracies, toward organizing trade boycotts and other economic sanctions against the U. S. S. R., so as to back up the United Nations in the Hungarian crisis. We would have been in a position to do this very effectively, Mr. President, if the administration had not permitted our Western alliance to deteriorate to the point where we were, in effect, fighting England and France rather than the Communists at the time when the crisis came. I pointed out in November that the necessity of meeting a challenge, such as this Hungarian crisis, by nonmilitary means is precisely one of the reasons why we must develop political and economic functions for the North Atlantic community. One-half of Soviet trade outside the Communist orbit is with NATO countries; yet the Western democratic alliance has no means of using this economic leverage jointly and rapidly and to lead the United Nations in the imposition of economic sanctions in the cause of freedom.

I have recognized, Mr. President, that in organizing such sanctions we would have to be prepared to assume some of the burdens of the resulting interruption in the flow of international trade. We might have to increase our own imports, even if this meant that my own Pacific Northwest might have to accept some competition from Scandinavian timber products; New England might face additional fish imports; industrial States might have to absorb increased competition from the industries of Western Europe or Japan; California might have to tolerate fruit imports from Mediterranean countries. After all our brave talk of liberation and roll-backs would we boggle at such trade measures if the cancellation of Russia's commercial ties with the non-Communist world over Hungary would hurt Russia in the pocket nerve? Our verbal protests have inhibited the Russian leaders not at all, and certainly they have not helped the valiant people of Hungary to win the freedom for which they fought. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement of November 23, 1956, proposing our leadership in the organization of economic sanctions against Russia over the Hungarian incident.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER, NOVEMBER 23, 1956

The Western democracies should be prepared to organize economic sanctions to back up United Nations condemnation of Soviet terrorism in Hungary, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER said today.

In a statement released from his Washington office, the Oregon Senator declared that through joint action the Western nations could impose on the U. S. S. R. a new trade boycott and other economic pressures sufficiently severe to add noticeably to other present strains on the Russian economy.

"Individually, the trade of single nations with the U. S. S. R. may not be significant to the Soviets, and its abandonment may cause dislocations in the individual free nation's economy," said NEUBERGER. "But together non-Communist nations contribute as much as 20 percent of the U. S. S. R.'s total foreign trade, and the loss of this trade, with its attendant opportunities for commercial and cultural contacts, would not be insignificant for Soviet policies."

"In taking the lead toward organizing economic sanctions, the United States must be prepared to help assume some of the burdens of finding new channels for this trade—perhaps by increasing our own imports," NEUBERGER said, "yet such burdens are a relatively easy and minor price to pay if it will make it possible for the free world to take some initiative to back up Hungarian resistance to Soviet tyranny."

"Organization of economic sanctions in a situation of this kind is a typical example why we must develop political and economic functions for the North Atlantic community," the Oregon Democratic Senator declared. "NATO was conceived as a purely military alliance when the military defense of Western Europe appeared the immediate urgent task. When confronted with a different challenge, as in the Hungarian crisis, the Western democratic alliance has no adequate means of meeting it jointly and rapidly by political and economic action.

"Yet one-half of Soviet trade with non-Communist countries is with members of NATO. This adds up to Soviet imports of about a quarter of a billion dollars a year, including imports of chemicals, electrical products, metals, machinery, and ships. But United States imports from the same NATO countries approach $5 billion annually, com-

pared with which Western trade with Russia is a drop in the bucket.

"A single foreign economic and political policy among the democracies of the Atlantic community—which is also overwhelmingly the major industrial and trading area of the world—would permit us to offer real leadership in the United Nations in cases like Hungary and to organize meaningful nonmilitary action in support of the U. N.'s determinations."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also desire to bring to the attention of the Senate two articles in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of November 28, 1956, and November 29, 1956, by Mr. Claiborne Pell, a distinguished resident of Newport, R. I., who traveled to Austria and to Hungary with a Government commission to study and analyze the reasons why refugees from Communist-dominated countries have changed their minds and redefected.

Claiborne Pell has very properly emphasized the urgent need that we of the Western world formulate a positive program in advance of any future episodes in the breakup of Stalin's European empire—which was something we certainly lacked in the Hungarian crisis. Let me quote one paragraph from his excellent series of articles in the Providence Journal:

Moreover, we ought to draw from the Hungarian experience in order to prepare a crash policy position. Then when another East Berlin affair, another Posnan or another Hungary occurs, as it most certainly will, we will be set to take decisive steps immediately. This crash program would include recognition right away of the insurgent regime and the flying in of as many high-level and low-level United Nations and Western officials as possible so that the whole world may be adequately informed of developments.

I also should like to call attention to the comment by Mr. Pell, this informed observer who was on the scene along the Hungarian frontier, that "we should be careful that the inference not be let abroad in Eastern Europe, via Radio Free Europe, that, in case of insurrection, American armed aid will soon arrive, while at the same time the administration specifically informs the Soviet Union that the United States will not use those measures that include force."

After all, Mr. President, when poorly armed men and women revolt against Soviet military forces in partial reliance on a mistaken impression of our policies, they face death, torture, and cruel deportation in many instances. As Claiborne Pell has pointed out, the Hungarian rebellion has greatly weakened the prestige of Russia in Europe, but our own prestige does not soar high when false hopes of American aid are first raised and then shattered among some of the bravest patriots of our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Pell from the Providence (R. I.) Journal be printed in the RECORD, followed by an able editorial from the Portland Oregonian of December 13, 1956, entitled "How U. N. Might Help Hungary," and a column by Mr. Drew Pearson of November 23, 1956, from the Capital-Press of Salem, Oreg.

There being no objection, the article, editorial, and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of November 28, 1956]

HUNGARIANS FLEE FROM SIBERIA PERIL

(By Claiborne Pell)

VIENNA.—The Hungarians continue to stream across the Austrian border in an unending torrent of humanity. Already thousands have crossed and the rate is increasing. A fair estimate is that well nigh 100,000 will have come into already overcrowded Austria by the end of this month.

These refugees travel light. The most luggage that any of them has is a satchel or a brief case. I spent from 1 to 4 in the morning and the same hours in the afternoon at the Einser Canal on the Hungarian border 5 miles beyond Andau and found that the pattern did not differ between morning and night. Only at night the temperature dropped to 4 degrees Fahrenheit. There was no hut or other warmth at this border except for an open bonfire that was continuously fed with beet stalks.

The refugees came in steady groups of anywhere from 2 to 20 and from 5 to 10 minutes apart.

At another crossing I was at, a half-mile walk through Hungarian territory, the Hungarian border guards were helpful to their fellow Hungarians. After frisking the refugees for arms, the guards would shake their hands and wave them on. Occasionally, one of the guards would fire his tommy-gun into the swamp in order to make a noise and show his superiors that he was carrying out orders and attempting to stop the flood of refugees. At other border points, however, the going was much tougher. As the Russian troops moved across the Hungarian plain and came closer, the shooting became more serious and reports came in of refugees being wounded or killed.

The fleeing Hungarians are one vast cross-section of their country. While the majority are young workers, either skilled or unskilled, there are older people, professors and journalists. There are also many youngsters who in our country would be called children. The almost universal reason for fleeing is the fear of deportation to Siberia. Some mothers had told their children to leave while they could, even though the mothers remained behind.

One particularly sad scene was when a father and two boys arrived at the border. After they had been searched by the guards, the younger boy, a handsome blond about 14 years old, hesitated. He did not want to cross and leave his mother behind in Budapest. The father and older brother urged him to come. After a quarter of an hour, with tears streaming down his face, the youngster crossed the border.

Since ours were the first Free World faces seen by the refugees, some refugees would shake our hands and greet us with great emotion. Others appeared as nonchalant as if they had been strolling down a Budapest boulevard.

The Austrians are pitching in and doing a magnificent job. However, their task is overwhelming and it is proving difficult to provide transportation for refugees from the border to the first reception points. The Red Cross, various private organizations such as the International Rescue Committee, and Caritas, and just warmhearted individuals are going to the actual border with hot coffee and tea and helping the particularly weak who can't make it to the receiving station.

One man's heart gave out 200 yards from the bonfire. He was helped to the friendly fire and soon revived.

Toward the end of our early morning vigil, four men and a woman came along carrying a blanket by its corners. In the blanket was a fat, rosy, 2-year-old baby boy. I later went with the baby and his mother to Andau. The mother said that the preceding day all the freedom fighters in an apartment house next door to her in Budapest had been taken away by the Russians, presumably to be deported. The janitor, who had at first refused to admit the Russians, had been taken away, too. He returned, an incoherent, gibbering wreck, the next morning. The sight of this janitor convinced the mother and her husband that they should flee since he had been active in a workers' council during the short-lived Nagy regime. The mother, father, and child had hitchhiked a ride to near the border, found a reliable guide and had walked 12 miles across by the time we saw them.

This woman made various statements which were confirmed by our conversations with other refugees. She said the work stoppage continued. People were being deported to Russia in droves. The Hungarian uprising had been spontaneous, without organization, and without leadership. It had sprung from the mass of the Hungarians themselves.

One sad youngster appeared and said a companion had had a cramp in the swamp some three-quarters of an hour earlier. The young man warmed himself, went back into "no man's land," couldn't find his friend, and returned.

In Andau, itself, the refugees are placed in a big barn, strewn with clean hay and given a hot meal and chocolate. The barn is so full there is no place for a person to lie stretched out. Men, women, and children slept or dozed or vacantly stared, all curled up on one another. The cheerful lighting and colored paper streamers contrasted with the blank, sad faces of the refugees. By this time the reaction had started to set in as they contemplated their future. In the whole room of several hundred people, not one smiled or looked happy. And this is particularly striking since Hungarians are by nature light-hearted and gay.

However, by the time the refugees got to Andau, the worst was over for them, as regular buses were provided by the Austrian Government to take them to Eisenstadt, the main receiving camp. From there, the Hungarians are distributed to various other camps in Austria, and a lucky few are taken straight to one of the European countries that have offered them refuge.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of November 29, 1956]

FREE WORLD SHOULD HAVE PLAN OF ACTION TO ASSIST ANTI-REDS

(By Claiborne Pell)

PARIS.—The surprising thing about the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist revolution in Hungary is that it was launched by young people and workers. Classically, these are the very two groups who have always fought the hardest for the Communist cause in past revolutions.

And, afterwards, the young people and workers have been thought the bulwarks of Communist society. To have these two groups not only abjure the Communist philosophy, but do so violently and at infinite sacrifice, has rocked the Communist ship of state as it has never yet been rocked.

There are two main conclusions we can draw from the Hungarian revolution and the Soviet lack of success in crushing it. First, human beings find the Communist system unnatural and distasteful and will do what they can to get rid of it. Secondly, the Soviet apparatus and military force is much weaker than the West had suspected.

The prime political weakness of communism is that it is a way of life that runs against human nature and human progress. The desire of the individual for privacy, for

freedom in work and leisure, and for the possibility of acquiring, increasing and passing on worldly possessions are basic human drives. When a regime runs counter to these drives, it is running against human nature. It is, in fact, coiling its own spring of resistance.

KREMLIN EASED TENSION

Since Hungary is a country where the original standards had been relatively high and where the Communists had compressed the spring with immense speed and brutality, its tension increased equally. The Kremlin recognized the long term impossibility of maintaining the spring's pressure and of maintaining Stalin's harsh policies. Moscow shifted toward a lighter but, it was hoped, a more permanent relationship with its Soviet and satellite subjects.

However, the released spring started to expand. First, in Poland there were the Posnan outbursts and the emergence of nationalistic Gomulka. Then, perhaps taking heart from Poland, perhaps because the Communist boot had pressed so hard, the spring burst in Hungary with wild force.

Hungary's violence of reaction and her withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact made Soviet counteraction inevitable. Any major nation, particularly such an utterly ruthless one as the Soviet Union, will do what it can to prevent the emergence of a hostile power on its border.

Undaunted, the Hungarians resisted and fought in subfreezing weather and in hunger. The hospitals of Budapest lack windows, many sections are in rubble. When the going got too unbearable or fear too strong, individual Hungarians fled rather than surrender.

DEFIANCE OF SERFDOM

I stood for hours on the Hungarian border watching them stream across, watching what appeared the first step toward national suicide rather than the acceptance of serfdom. More than 1 percent of the Hungarians have already taken this choice. And these people are of all sorts. Since mine was the first Western World face that many of these refugees encountered on their flight, they would often seize my hand and shake it. I marveled at the diversity of hands I shook. There were those of manual workers and clerks, of young people and farmers. And scarcely a hand had a glove although the temperature was as low as 4° F.

Meanwhile, the Free World watches Hungary in her agony and regrets that, except for refugee relief through such organizations as the Red Cross, the International Rescue Committee and other private agencies, there is little it can do to help.

The Free World's only comfort in watching the Hungarian revolution is that it is also watching the clearest exposition yet of the fundamental weakness of the Communist apparatus. Moreover, we are also watching the first major sign of the inevitable destruction of the Soviet Empire from within.

This view is well expressed by George Kennan who recently said of the violent events in Eastern Europe: "* * * certain moral principles really must be observed in the long run in the successful government of great peoples. These events prove that if these principles are consistently violated over a long period of time, this violation avenges itself. It inevitably produces trouble and disorder and even greater violence and bloodshed and tragedy. The Soviet Government has ignored these principles, has denied these principles for a very long time indeed; and they are getting the results of that in Eastern Europe today."

CAUGHT IN VISE

The Soviets are caught in their impossible vise. The events in Poland and Hungary have taught them that their structure has very shaky foundations indeed and that a different type of structure must be built if it is to last. And yet the Soviets dare not lighten up for fear of repetitions of outbursts of wrath from indignant, downtrodden satellite peoples. The results of this dilemma may be perceived in the Soviet Union itself where there have been upheavals in Moscow University itself and a general increase in restlessness.

Eventually, these tensions and events will produce a fundamental policy change in the Soviet Union, perhaps accompanied by violence, perhaps not. If this change is back to Stalinism, the ground will be laid for more fiery outbursts and the eventual violent destruction of the Soviet Union from within. And, if the change is toward a milder course, away from Stalinism, then there will be an increase in the tempo with which the bonds of the Soviet and satellite peoples are snapped and a change in the very character of the Soviet system itself. This process will inevitably take some years and will be accompanied by many shifts of the pendulum.

In the meantime, we in the West should not think that Hungary's agony is in vain. Not at all. The weakness of the Soviet philosophy and apparatus is being nakedly exposed to the whole world. Moreover, the Soviets have been placed in a most embarrassing position. The coiled spring of resistance, once sprung, will never again be as secure as it was. On the other hand, the Soviets cannot release the pressure for fear they will have a hostile neighbor on their border.

The Free World can only comport itself with skill and compassion. If we react with atomic violence, world war III is upon us. Even if we react with direct conventional armaments, if we send in American troops and tanks, we will produce hardening of the Kremlin's position and a return to Stalinism. Our only wise course is to help the victims as much as we can and, perhaps, to make arms available through nonofficial channels to freedom fighters.

SHOULD DEVISE POLICY

Moreover we ought to draw from the Hungarian experience in order to prepare a crash policy position. Then when another East Berlin affair, another Posnan, or another Hungary occurs, as it most certainly will, we will be set to take decisive steps immediately. This crash program would include recognition right away of the insurgent regime and the flying in of as many high-level and low-level United Nations and Western officials as possible so that the whole world may be adequately informed of developments.

Another time, too, we should be careful that the inference not be let abroad in Eastern Europe via Radio Free Europe that, in case of insurrection, American armed aid will soon arrive, while at the same time the administration specifically informs the Soviet Union that the United States will not use those measures that include force. Rather, we should make sure that the Eastern Europeans realize that their struggle for independence must be waged by themselves, while letting the Soviets guess a bit and not specifically tie our hands in advance.

[From the Oregonian of December 13, 1956]

HOW U. N. MIGHT HELP HUNGARY

Consciences of freemen everywhere have been deeply disturbed by the fact that the Hungarians have had to fight their magnificent battle alone. But to have come to their aid with the troops and guns they need so badly would have been to risk a third world war which might leave all cities as rubbled as Budapest.

Condemnation by United Nations resolution of the Soviet Union for its brutalities focuses the censure of a large part of the world on Moscow. But it is cold comfort to the Hungarian citizen looking into the gun barrel of a Soviet tank. There must be more that the United Nations can do to force compliance by the Kremlin with the basic rules of civilization.

Delegate Emilio Nunez-Portuondo of Cuba contends that the condemnation resolution backed by the United States and many other countries is too weak. He believes that the General Assembly should vote to suspend or expel the Soviet Union if it continues to ignore U. N. resolutions on Hungary. But he has admitted that such action, too, would be only a gesture, for suspension or expulsion would have to be first recommended by the Security Council where Russia would veto it.

Perhaps, however, there is a field of action, short of war, where the Assembly could exert the kind of pressure the thick-skinned rulers of the Soviet Union would respect. This is in the field of foreign trade.

Sylvia Porter, business and financial analyst, reported the other day that public opinion alone already has hit hard the advances in the economic field made last year and this by then smiling salesmen for post-Stalin communism. In 1955, West Europe bought some $825 million of goods from the Soviet bloc and sold about $770 million worth in return. In the first 4 months of 1956, East-West trade was 15 percent higher than in the same period of last year. But since Russia turned its guns on the Hungarian people this movement of goods reportedly has dropped off markedly. European public opinion is set against dealing with the Soviet Union.

If U. N. censure and unorganized boycott are insufficient to cause Russia to withdraw its forces from Hungary, perhaps the General Assembly could exert the necessary extra pressure by calling on member nations to sever economic and financial relations with the Soviet.

The Uniting for Peace resolution adopted by the Assembly November 3, 1950, provides that if the Security Council, by reason of a lack of unanimity among the permanent members, fails to exercise its responsibility for maintenance of peace, the Assembly itself may make recommendations to members for collective action.

Although recommendations would not be binding on member nations, they would carry more weight than unorganized public opinion in individual countries. Economic isolation of Communist areas on a permanent basis undoubtedly would tend to intensify rather than lessen the dangerous division of the world into opposing armed camps, and, therefore, should be avoided. But it might prove to be an effective emergency weapon.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press of November 23, 1956]

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Newsmen in Southeast Europe report that, next to Russia, the United States is the most hated nation in Hungary. Freedom fighters spit when the name America is mentioned. "You have been telling us to revolt," they are reported as saying. "Yet when we face Russian tanks, you stand by and watch them crush us."

Much of this is unfair, some of it inevitable. Turmoil inside the satellite countries was bound to come. But to see who had the greatest long-range view of the satellite problem, let's take a look at the record—among others that of Harry S Truman.

Mr. Truman is the man who branded me with initials now currently featured in the Saturday Evening Post under the caption "Confessions of an S. O. B." I owe him no debt of gratitude.

Despite this I should like to call attention to some farsightedness on Harry's part when

he warned the American people, September 2, 1952, of exactly what is now taking place in Hungary.

"Nothing could be worse," said Truman, "than to raise false hopes of this (insurrection) in Eastern Europe. Nothing could be worse than to incite uprisings that could only end by giving a new crop of victims to the Soviet executioners."

Truman, then President of the United States, was replying to two speeches made by John Foster Dulles and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower encouraging the satellite nations and virtually, if not actually, promising them aid.

Speaking in Buffalo August 27, 1952, in a speech obviously aimed at winning Buffalo's huge Polish-American vote, Dulles promised that if the Republicans were elected the Voice of America would begin to stir up the resistance spirit behind the Iron Curtain, letting the Poles, Czechs, and others know they had the moral backing of the United States.

"Resistance movements would spring up among patriots who could be supplied and integrated via airdrops," Dulles pledged.

Answering Averell Harriman, who had warned of dangers in the Eisenhower policy of liberation, Dulles said:

"It is nonsense for Mr. Harriman to say that General Eisenhower's liberation policy is a trap and would lead to premature uprisings and more Warsaw massacres. The only trap I see is that in the Democratic platform which says they look forward to liberation of these peoples but they aren't willing to do anything about it. That's a trap to get votes."

IKE WENT OUT ON LIMB

General Eisenhower went just about as far in a speech before the American Legion in New York, August 25. This was what especially aroused Harry Truman.

"The American conscience can never know peace until these people are restored to being masters of their own fate," the general began rather mildly. He also talked about man's brotherhood under the fatherhood of God, and so on. Then he warmed up.

"We can never rest," he said, "and we must so inform the world, including the Kremlin—that until the enslaved nations of the world have the fullness of freedom, the right to choose their own path, that then and then only can we say that here is a possible way of living peacefully with communism in the world."

The President told his press conference last week that his administration had never used the satellite peoples to armed revolt. True, he never used that word. But here is exactly what he said:

"We must tell the Kremlin that never shall we desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seeks refuge with us, any man who keeps burning among his own people the flame of freedom or is dedicated to the liberation of his fellow men."

TRUMAN'S FIERY REPLY

To this, former President Truman, speaking at Parkersburg, W. Va., September 2, replied:

"The fate of the people in the Soviet borderland is one of the greatest tragedies of human times * * *. We shall never forget these people. But we shall never treat their plight * * * as matter for partisan debate. Millions upon millions of human beings are going through dreadful agony, and it is not for us to play cheap politics with their needs and fears and hopes. Yet that is exactly what these Republicans have begun to do.

"They are telling us we must undertake to liberate these people and do it right now. * * * Maybe the Republicans don't realize this, but the people who are on the spot in Europe know very well that talk of liberation under present circumstances is war talk.

"All Europeans know quite well that insurrections in the Soviet borderlands could only be successful with armed support from the outside world.

"If the Republicans don't mean to give that armed support—and I feel sure they don't—then they are playing cruel gutter politics with the lives of countless good men and women behind the Iron Curtain.

"Surely," concluded Mr. Truman from the rear of his train in Parkersburg, W. Va., "the Republicans must know that the Iron Curtain and the Kremlin walls will not come tumbling down from a few blasts on a campaign trumpet."

OUR VOICE IS DELAYED

On September 3, one day after reading the Truman speech, John Foster Dulles held a press conference at which he replied that the Truman "mood of weakness, timidity, and appeasement is the sure road to war."

Here is the last tragic chapter in the story of revolt behind the Iron Curtain:

On October 30 the Hungarian rebels had almost pushed Russian forces out of Budapest. Moscow indicated it would appease.

On November 3 the U. N. called for a vote of censure of Moscow. The U. N. had been procrastinating all week.

Soviet delegates on November 3 argued that the Security Council should not act that day. Things were settling down in Hungary, the U. N. should not intervene, they said.

Other delegates disagreed. Delegate after delegate urged immediate action. Finally, spoke United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge:

"We believe," he said, "that adjournment for a day or two would give a real opportunity to the Hungarian Government to carry out its announced decision to arrange for an orderly and immediate evacuation of all Soviet troops. In this spirit I would be willing to adjourn until tomorrow or the next day."

That virtually ended the discussion. The Australian delegate argued vigorously against Lodge, urged the council not to adjourn but to act immediately.

There was a vote. The United States of America voted against Australia and for the Soviet.

Before the next day dawned, new Soviet armored divisions were crushing Hungary.

The Truman administration made mistakes in handling Russia. So has the Eisenhower administration. Anyway, that is the record.

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an informative speech being delivered around the country on the subject Secrecy in Government, by a stalwart American and fighting editor of the Tampa Morning Tribune, Mr. V. M. Newton, Jr.

I am in agreement with the principles enunciated by him and feel that the views expressed will be of interest to the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great privilege and honor for me, a representative of the free American press, to appear before you, the liberal arts members of the senior class of this great university, and discuss the question of freedom and tyranny, which has troubled man's soul down through the ages.

Thirty-seven words in the American Constitution spell out the difference between freedom and tyranny.

Paragraph 2 of section 9 article I of the Constitution states:

"The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it."

These 26 words protect you from secret and arbitrary arrest and guarantee you a public hearing before the bar of the public opinion of your fellow citizens.

The first amendment of the Constitution states, in part:

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom * * * of the press."

Those 11 words give the free American press the right to alert the free people any time the politician violates the writ of habeas corpus.

Together, these 37 words distinguish the free American citizen from the citizen of Soviet Russia and the citizens of all other slave states in man's history. And they actually serve as a guaranty for all the other freedoms so carefully spelled out in our Constitution.

What good are these other freedoms if the politician can, at his will, throw the citizen into jail without the benefit of a public hearing? And what good even is this great freedom from secret arrest if the press is deprived of the right to alert the public in the event of its abridgment?

I ask these questions to show you how very vital to you, as you conclude your studies and prepare to sail forth on the stormy seas of life, is this purely American principle of freedom of the press. Need I remind that within less than 24 hours flying time from your campus, the Russian politician, sipping from his cup of vodka, throws his political opponent into jail and keeps him there because the Soviet press is shackled by tyranny and is the tool of the dictators and thereby cannot alert the Russian public to the horrors of the Siberian concentration camp? Need I remind also that this very great danger hangs constantly over the Free World today and, sad as it may be, it will face you young men and women for many years to come, and possibly throughout your lifetime.

But, if it is any comfort to you, this great danger always has confronted man ever since he crawled out of his cave armed with a club. And I say to you, supported by millions of pages of history, that the fight for freedom has been a constant one, that the fight is going on today with just as much intensity as it ever had, and that a free press, through which we have an informed public, is the sole key to the liberty of your actions, your words, and even your thinking.

We almost lost this freedom in the early days of our Republic. In my correspondence with Senator BENNETT, of Utah, over the secret proceedings in the United States Senate today, the good Senator wrote me as follows:

"I remember that the Constitution of the United States was written in a session so bound by secrecy that not only were no minutes kept, but the members were enjoined by their own honor not even to reveal the way in which they themselves voted. I am inclined to believe that, without that protection, we might never have had a Constitution."

In my reply, I wrote as follows:

You tell only part of the historical story, Senator BENNETT, and the part you leave out proves you wrong and stands forth as a great historical monument in favor of free open American government as contrasted to the secrecy now in Congress.

When the Constitutional Convention met in secrecy to draw that great document, a bitter roar of criticism swept the Thirteen Original Colonies. On August 20, 1787, Thomas Jefferson wrote John Adams as follows:

"I am sorry they began their deliberations by so abominable a precedent as that of tying up the tongues of their members. Nothing

can justify this example but the innocence of their intentions and ignorance of the value of public discussion."

And when the first draft of the Constitution came out of that secret meeting, a number of States indignantly declined to ratify it, because, behind those locked doors, the framers had chopped out of it all the great principles of freedom for which the colonists rebelled against England and shed blood on the battlefield to achieve.

So, amid great public hullabaloo, there was drawn the American Bill of Rights, which was attached to the Constitution as the first 10 amendments and which set forth in plain language the great principles of freedom which guide the American people today. Yet these great principles were left out of the document drawn in secrecy and they became a prime part of American Government only at the insistence of public opinion, which overruled the politician.

Senator BENNETT promptly dropped this correspondence.

The world's history shows plainly that whenever and wherever the politician piles up power in a strongly centralized government, the citizen's freedom of expression always dies. Less than 10 years after the adoption of the American Constitution, the Federalist Party which stood for a strongly centralized government, gained control of Congress and railroaded through the Sedition Act on July 14, 1798.

This act, in direct violation of the Bill of Rights, forbade criticism of Federal Government, the Congress, and the President under penalty of imprisonment. And in the next 2 years, 25 American citizens were arrested and 10 imprisoned, among them free American editors, for the great crime of criticizing Government.

Once again American public opinion rose up, just as it did in the fiasco of the secret Constitutional Convention, and repudiated this abridgement of the citizen's freedom. And it swept into the White House Thomas Jefferson, the great American voice of freedom, and it destroyed forever the Federalist Party.

Thus was established the great American principle of freedom of the press, which is your protection against governmental enslavery, and it stood unchallenged by the politician for 130 years. It withstood even the great trial by blood of the War Between the States, when Lincoln, a truly great American, took criticism from both northern and southern newspapers that no other American public has had to take.

But in our thirties began a new struggle in American Government in which once again proponents of a strongly centralized Federal Government began encroachments upon the individual's freedom. And once again the politician sought to curb the free press and its inherent right to criticism of Government, and this time, to get around the Constitution, the politician used the age-old tactic of secret government. That struggle is going on today, with your freedom at stake.

When a free people bestows freedom upon its press, it also bestows the very great obligation and responsibility of reporting all the facts, all the business and all the discussion of free government in the printed column at the time and not after the fact, when too often it has been too late for the general benefit and well-being of the free people. Neither the press nor the people are free when the politician deprives them of the facts of government, and the pages of history tell us over and over that whenever the people are barred from knowledge of their government and deprived of the opportunity of constantly exerting the restraint of public opinion upon the politician, man's liberty always descends into the tragic limbo of forgotten privileges.

During the Roosevelt administration, Government moved into all phases of the citizen's private life as it coped first with the depression and then with the greatest of all world wars. And as government interfered with the citizen's private life, our politicians piled more and more power in central government.

During the dire days of the depression and the exciting days of the war years, the press, short of help, materials and time, was gravely preoccupied with those tragic matters. And, at the same time, it became accustomed to accepting in good faith the proclamations, reports, and propaganda issued by Government press agents.

So, ignored by the press and left largely on his own in Federal office, the politician developed the new American philosophy that, once elected or appointed, government belongs to him as his private domain; that he feels he has the right to give out or withhold information of Government as he sees fit; and that he sincerely thinks that the people should be satisfied with the decisions of Government after he has made them.

After the war, when the press turned its attention back to domestic affairs of our Nation, it found itself confronted with a cloak of secrecy draped over most of Government in Washington. In 1951, President Truman attempted to justify this cloak of secrecy with an executive order which gave just about everybody in Washington the right to withhold news in the sacred name of national security.

So, during the late forties, we in the American press sat by in good faith and watched our Government so badly abuse this responsibility that virtually all Department of Defense news today is censored, regardless of whether or not it affects national security, and regardless also of the fact that 70 cents of every American tax dollar is spent on defense. And we sat by in good faith also while spies and traitors, apparently operating at ease behind the cloak of governmental secrecy, slipped key American defense data to the enemy.

Mr. Truman's executive order was so badly abused that the press almost en masse protested, and a committee representing the Associated Press Managing Editors Association conferred with him personally at the White House. Mr. Truman told this committee that if it didn't like his order, then it could submit another to him. The committee promptly withdrew from the negotiations simply because these sincere editors did not want any part in the setting of a precedent wherein the press, itself, agreed to censorship.

On November 6, 1953, Mr. Eisenhower issued a new directive limiting the right to classify and restrict information in the sacred name of security to the heads of only 17 of the nearly 2,000 Federal agencies and bureaus. But this was still censorship and during the last 3 years it has been abused by the Republican administration just as badly as the Democratic administration abused Mr. Truman's directive.

Last year, as chairman of the national freedom of information committee of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic fraternity, I compiled a report on freedom of information in Washington, or your right to know about your Federal Government, based on the personal experiences of the leading Washington correspondents.

This report, which I later submitted to the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Government Information, exposed clearly an alarming picture of a "paper curtain" draped securely over the release of news in the executive branch of Federal Government; of direct censorship in many departments, agencies and bureaus; of arrogance on the part of many of our public servants; of much propaganda for political gain or privilege; of utter public confusion as to the facts of the big stories of the day; and, in some cases, of favoritism, intimidation, and revenge in the release of news of Government to the people.

This cloak of news censorship, new to American Government, became so critical that Congress, composed of the people's representatives, found itself barred by arrogant bureaucrats from information of Government so necessary to the formation of the people's laws. So last summer, the House of Representatives appointed a subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, to investigate secrecy in the executive branch of Federal Government. This committee, after 8 months of hearings, disclosed this year the following:

1. Federal agencies and bureaus are using more than 30 subterfuge censorship classifications to withhold legitimate information from the people.

2. Letters from President Eisenhower to Secretary of Defense Wilson and from Attorney General Brownell to the Federal Security Commission advising them to withhold information of the inner operations of their agencies from the people.

3. Representatives of 19 key Federal agencies testified that they withheld nonsecurity information from the people.

To give you a typical example of one of many cases, Chairman Philip Young, of the Federal Civil Service Commission, which pays out your tax moneys in Federal pensions, bluntly told the subcommittee that he had an "inherent right" to withhold information. Three years ago, I asked Mr. Young to release a list of Federal pensions paid to former Congressmen. He declined on the grounds that this matter of the people's tax moneys also was a matter of privacy between the Government and recipients. After 3 years of correspondence, he finally wrote me that he had changed his policy to the extent that he would release the pensions provided the ex-Congressman gave their permission. But whoever heard of the people having to beg permission from their public servants before they can find out how their tax moneys are spent?

And it is interesting to note that in June of last year, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, in a speech to the Senate, revealed that a former Congressman had reaped an additional $444 annual pension through payment of only $22.10, and that three other Federal officials had finagled windfall pensions through similar small payments.

This, of course, brings up the question of the secret proceedings of Congress, and I must confess that it greatly troubles me. I took up this matter with Representative Moss and his subcommittee and was told that the jurisdiction of the subcommittee's investigation extended only to the executive branch of Federal Government. Yet, how can one branch of Government, nursing its own pet brand of secrecy, investigate with a clear conscience the pet secrecy of another branch of Government?

During 1953, congressional committees held 3,105 meetings and 1,357—or 44 percent—were secret meetings held behind locked doors with press and public barred. In 1954, congressional committees held 1,357 secret meetings—or 41 percent—and during 1955 and 1956 more than 40 percent of the committee meetings were secret.

Few of these secret meetings dealt with defense or security affairs. Instead, they dealt with virtually every matter before Congress. Nearly every one of the Appropriations Committee meetings, in which our public servants decided how to spend the citizens' tax funds, was held in secrecy.

Much of this legislation conceived and congealed behind the locked doors of these secret congressional committee meetings was railroaded through Congress with a minimum of debate and with little opportunity for the restraint of public opinion to

be exerted. Actually, some it did not see the light of public print until it became law.

In my correspondence with Members of the United States Senate over this matter, your own Senator JENNER, of Indiana, wrote me as follows:

"Another reason for the 'railroading' of legislation through Congress is the very large role played in legislation by the bureaucracy of the executive branch. They frequently draft the bills. They write the arguments for the bills. They fill the record of hearings on bills. They have supporting groups which come in and testify to the 'approved line.' Ordinary citizens cannot meet such well-financed, well-organized competition. It may appear as if the sentiment is all in one direction on a bill and Congress hears little or no objection, and so moves quickly to pass it."

Now when you add Senator JENNER'S damning statement to the fact that nearly half of all congressional committee meetings are held secretly behind locked doors, you can reach only the conclusion that the ordinary American citizen has very little to say about our legislation. Under such a system, the ordinary American citizen is deprived by his elected representatives of his inherent right to exert constantly the pressure of public opinion upon his free government. And any student of history soon learns that free government cannot long last in such secrecy.

And in support of Senator JENNER'S statement and my comment, late in July the United States Senate, in one 2-hour session, "whooped through," to use the exact words of one national publication, no less than 134 laws. That is better than two laws a minute, and I doubt seriously that any one of our good Senators knew the contents of half of them.

I corresponded with 63 Senators on this matter of secret proceedings, and only 25 stated they were for open committee meetings. And only 11 had the courage to state outright that they favored secret meetings. The others hemmed about this qualification or hawed about that reservation.

Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, wrote me that the secret committee meetings were necessary to "mark up" bills and to prevent the Congressmen from being self-conscious and from dropping into oratory. Yet it is in the same peace and quiet of these secret meetings that amendments are tacked onto the bills and other changes made that the American people should know about at the time and not after the fact, when too often it has been too late.

Senators Holland, of my Florida, Smith of Maine, Payne, Dirksen, Gillette, Walker, Ellender, and Hendrickson, expressed great and tender concern over the danger of needlessly ruining the reputations of witnesses and appointees before public meetings of the committees. But what about the case of Harry Dexter White, the Communist spy? His appointment was considered and confirmed in a secret meeting of a Senate committee and then railroaded through Congress. How in the world can the interests of the American people be properly protected unless all the facts are made public at the time and not after the fact, as in the case of White?

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, wrote me that he felt the American people would be more informed if their legislators are allowed to work in the privacy of their own arguments. Isn't this the modern philosophy in Federal Government today, that government belongs to our public servants, and that the American people are entitled only to that information which our public servants think they should have?

Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, wrote me that the secret meetings were necessary to protect our Congressmen from the bureaucrats and the lobbyists. But what about the protection of the American people from those same bureaucrats and lobbyists? What about giving the people a look at the bureaucrats and lobbyists in action?

Senator MILLIKEN, of Colorado, wrote me that the publicizing of the committee's work prior to final decision, and I use his exact words, "might lead the citizen into actions harmful to himself." In reply, I asked the Senator if he could name just one case in all history where free, open government, under the constant restraint of an alert and informed public, has "led the citizen into actions harmful to himself." On the other hand, any student can dig out of the pages of history thousands of cases wherein the politician, acting behind the locked doors of secret government, really dealt the citizen a knockout punch.

Senator BENNETT, of Utah, wrote that it would be impossible for our Congressmen to reach a compromise in a public committee meeting. This poses an interesting question. Does free American government today consist of nothing more than a secret compromise between two political parties without the restraint of the people's opinion? Isn't this a sad commentary on free government, anyway you look at it?

Later in our correspondence, Senator BENNETT wrote that if the congressional committee meetings were opened to the public, it would force the committees to adjourn to secret meetings in so-called smoke-filled rooms. In reply, I wrote that a group of Congressmen meeting unofficially in a smoke-filled room would have no official power whatsoever. They could not draw up a bill; they could reach no official decision. And if the American people ever tumbled to the fact that our legislation was being cooked up a smoke-filled room, I am sure that we would have a new set of public servants in Congress after the next election.

Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, suggested that I propose the plan of open meetings to the board of directors of my newspaper and invite the reporters of competitive newspapers to sit in on all meetings of our board of directors. In reply, I reminded the Senator that American citizens, through considerable taxation, are stockholders in their Government and had the right to check on the actions of their public servants just as the stockholders of a newspaper have the right to check on the actions of their board of directors.

Senator IVES, of New York, wrote me that the quiet atmosphere, divorced from the temptation of public expression or political maneuver to gain advantage in the eyes of the public was much more efficient than a public sounding board. In reply I asked this question: Which is better for the people, the harmony of the secret communistic government in Russia, or the turbulence of free, open democratic government in America? I think the answer to this question also would answer all of the questions involved in the quiet atmosphere of any secret meeting in Government. We cannot afford to sacrifice the basic freedom of our country for expediency or because another way is speedier, easier or more efficient. The world's history shows that once you sacrifice freedom, you regain it only through bloodshed.

So, it is not difficult to see that you, as citizens of free America, are not getting the facts of your Government from your public servants and that, in this matter of freedom of information, there is no difference between our two political parties. Likewise, it should be evident to you that there also is no difference between our parties in the matter of piling power into our evercentralized Government at Washington.

If the Republicans sponsor soil subsidy payments, which of course extends Federal authority over every farmer in our land; then the Democrats promise 90 percent crop parity and cash payments. I was very interested in Speaker SAM RAYBURN'S somewhat cynical boast to the Democratic National Convention a few weeks ago. He said, and I quote:

"After 4 years I challenge any Republican anywhere to put his finger on my changes they have made. I challenge them to show where anybody in this administration, from the President down, has advocated the repeal of a single law we passed in 20 years of Democratic administrations."

Down through the ages, ever since man first conceived the idea of freedom, the struggle in government has pitted the conservative, who always has believed in a strongly centralized government, against the liberal, who likewise always has believed in the individual rights of man.

But in our day, sad as it may be, we see the strange sight of our intellectual liberals careening starry-eyed on the bandwagon of centralized power in government, not knowing where they are going. And the tragedy is that not a single great liberal voice has been raised in our land against this constant abridgment of man's freedom.

So, in conclusion, I warn that we can no more have a little secrecy in government than we can have a little freedom, a little justice, or a little morality. Of course, we do not have absolute freedom, absolute justice or absolute morality today. Yet our adherence to these great absolute principles, even though we yield a little here or compromise a little there in actual practice, has given the world the greatest free civilization of all time.

And I tell you with great personal conviction that should we ever veer away from our absolute principles of freedom, justice and morality, even though we occasionally compromise them in practice and in deference to human frailties, we will consign the great American experiment to that limbo of fallen civilizations.

So I tell you also, with equal conviction, that we in the newspaper profession are deeply obligated, under the precepts of free government, to fight with all our might for the absolute principle of freedom of information; for it is only through upholding that absolute principle, in the face of human frailties, that a free people can be guaranteed the maximum information of government, so necessary to retention of our freedom.

Thank you.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11:15 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 21, 1957, at 11:15 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, January 17 (legislative day of January 3), 1957.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Metropolitan John Theodorovich offered the following prayer:

Our Eternal Father, Thou createst us. Thou lovingly endowest every one of us with Thy ray of potential perfections. We are to bring them out, to shine in us with the beauty, peace, and love of Thy gracious gift.

Give us, our Father, grace to realize firmly that the blessings of Thy gift may be brought out only in the freedom of self-expression. Guide us to achieve that freedom and with it the love, understanding, and tolerance of others.

Our Heavenly Father, Thou blessedest our country with might, peace, and prosperity. Grant us the grace to share with others Thy blessings. Keep us free of selfishness. Grant our leaders the loving heart, the noble spirit, the chastity of purpose in this country to be the hope of all oppressed, to be a luminous torch and a promise of freedom everywhere, to all races, nations, and individuals. The coming of Thy kingdom, Father, commands that freedom. The present turbulent days of discord, of enslavery, of brutal oppression demand also that freedom.

This prayer we raise up to Thee, Father, on this anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Ukraine, whose freedom was suppressed with brute force, whose millions of martyrs cry to Thee, Father, for justice, and whose indomitable spirit of freedom is never dying.

We beseech Thee, merciful Father: shorten the dark days of discord among nations, remove the threats of war, smother every form of oppression.

May Thy will of love, of freedom for us, Thy children, be everywhere reasserted and may it prevail. May all peoples and the Ukrainian nation with them keep the spirit of freedom steadfast, hope—undying that Thy will be done and Thy kingdom come.

We humbly implore Thee, our Father, grant us this blessing and may Thy name, O God, be forever glorified by us, Thy children. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 16, 1957, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 110

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, January 17, 1957, it stand adjourned until 11 a. m. Monday, January 21, 1957; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 22, 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, can the distinguished majority leader give us any information as to when the resolution, offered to the Congress by the President, will be considered; whether it will be next week or the week following?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state now. The best information I have, and I do not want to be bound by it, is that they expect to get through with their public hearings Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I shall make inquiry to try to give a more responsive answer on Monday.

Mr. GROSS. May I suggest to the majority leader that we have ample time to read the hearings that have been held before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on this subject so that the Members of the House may be advised as to what has taken place before the resolution is brought to the House for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I do not want to be bound by any commitment except that it is always assumed that Members read all hearings, and I know the gentleman from Iowa particularly reads them.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will agree with me that this is one of the most important resolutions likely to come before this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly aware of the fact, and is also aware of the fact that the calculated risks of action are probably less than the calculated risks of inaction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS ON MONDAY NEXT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Monday next. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11 o'clock Monday morning. In order to go out on the official platform, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket, it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

So if you expect to be in the procession and get a seat on the platform, it will be wise for you to be in the Chamber at 11 o'clock on next Monday.

NATIONAL JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Inc., through its "learn-by-doing" program is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their experience for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 27, 1957, and ending February 2, 1957, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 27, 1957, through February 2, 1957, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I understand this has been approved by the respective leaders of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I have taken the matter up with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

May I also advise the Members of the House that I have received a message from the majority leader of the Senate expressing the hope that the resolution pass here quickly, and stating that they would take it up over there.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE ON MONDAY NEXT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be acting Speaker on Monday next.

A UNITED NATIONS SECURITY FORCE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, people as well as nations often learn by experience, and recent experiences in the Middle East may contain a lesson that we could profit by.

The crisis in Egypt started on October 29, 1956, when Israeli troops penetrated deep into the Sinai Peninsula in retaliation for continued raids by Egyptian Commandos. On October 30, Britain and France vetoed a United States sponsored resolution against new outbreaks of military action in Egypt and the next day launched air attacks aimed at separating the belligerents and safeguarding free passage through the Suez Canal. On October 31 the United Nations Security Council voted for an emergency session of the General Assembly. On November 2 the Assembly approved a United States proposed resolution calling for a cease-fire. Britain and France rejected this appeal but agreed to stop action on condition that the Egypt and Israeli Governments agree to accept a United Nations force to protect the peace and the canal. Later, on November 4, the Assembly, by a vote of 57 for, none against, approved a Canadian resolution for an emergency international United Nations force to obtain and supervise a Middle Eastern cease-fire. On November 5, Major General Burns of Canada was designated head of the force. The next day France, Britain, Egypt, and Israel accepted the United Nations appeal for a cease-fire.

This token force of approximately 5,000 men from the smaller countries of Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, India, Norway, Sweden, and Yugoslavia was organized as quickly as possible to forestall intervention by the Soviet Union. By November 9 a staging area was set up on an airfield near Naples, Italy, and on November 15, 17 days after Israel had launched her attack, the United Nations Emergency Force landed in Egypt to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities.

Thus arrived in battle-torn Middle East the first international police force of its kind in history. The presence of this force in Egypt is a strong deterrent to any independent military actions by any of the powers involved in the dispute, or by still another party, such as the Soviet Union.

For over a decade the United Nations has attempted to establish some type of an international police force similar to the one now on duty in Egypt. In fact the Charter of the United Nations itself envisages the possibilities of such collective measures to maintain peace. The Security Council was designated as the principal organ charged with the responsibility of peace enforcement. However, the constant use of the veto by the Soviet Union has prevented the Council from establishing an international police force which could aid the United Nations in its endeavor to promote world peace and security.

The Korean conflict showed the danger of placing too much responsibility for halting aggression in the hands of the Security Council. It was only the absence of Russia from the Council meeting that prevented the police action from being vetoed.

Recognizing the dangers inherent in such a system, and conscious that the veto might prevent action in future cases of aggression, the General Assembly, in November 1950, gave the first real impetus toward the establishment of an international security force by adopting the uniting-for-peace resolution.

A part of this resolution recommended that the United Nations be responsible for earmarking trained, organized, and equipped forces that could be called promptly in accordance with each nation's constitutional provisions to meet aggression immediately anywhere in the world. The resolution also urged member states to submit to the Assembly information on measures taken to maintain within their armed forces contingents readily available for use by the United Nations in times of emergency.

Unfortunately, although a few nations did cooperate and submit their information to the General Assembly, most refused to make advance pledges of troops for such an international police force. Consequently, little progress has been made under the uniting-for-peace resolution.

Various other plans have been suggested aiming at the establishment of some sort of a permanent international contingent. Some have recommended that such a security force should be made up of individual volunteers trained and organized under a United Nations Command and always ready for combat; while others think that the most efficient force would be a legion consisting of volunteers already serving in national armed forces who indicate their desire to serve under the United Nations.

Whatever the type, it is apparent that unless some system is adopted, the United Nations will always lack the necessary prestige and authority which is essential if threats to world peace and security are to be prevented.

The recent crisis in Egypt pointed out the necessity of a permanent police force which could be sent on United Nations authorization to any trouble area of the world. The existence of such a force would have exercised a great deal of moral pressure and perhaps have been the decisive factor in maintaining peace.

We should profit by this experience. Out of this crisis in the Middle East we may have found a solution to our dilemma. The token force created by the General Assembly to meet the particular emergency in Egypt could very well be the nucleus for a future permanent international force to handle any threat to world peace. This small force could be expanded into other troubled areas of the world at any time the United Nations so authorized.

Once a permanent force is organized it should be limited in such a way that no one nation or group of nations could dominate the force. In addition provisions should be made whereby no nation involved in a particular dispute could be a member of the security contingent. These and other problems will have to be ironed out by the United Nations before an effective international security force is finally formed.

The formation of some type of police force has become a matter of urgency for the world. No longer can the United Nations afford to sit idly by until tragedies such as Suez strike. The continued tensions in this atomic age make it imperative that immediate action be taken by the members of the United Nations to establish a combat-ready international security force which could be dispatched instantly to the scene of potential or actual aggression, wherever it may erupt.

The need for an international force is clear. The opportunities to establish it are infrequent and fleeting. The present time, while the nucleus of such a force is in being, is one of these opportunities, perhaps the best of them. We should not let it pass.

INCREASE IN GASOLINE AND OIL PRICES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution directing the Banking and Currency Committee to conduct hearings and study the effect of the action of the Office of Defense Mobilization in granting export authority for 500,000 gallons of domestic oil daily to meet Western European needs, the current price increases in gasoline and fuel oil, and the advisability of standby oil price controls to guard against profiteering during the Middle East crisis.

There can be no valid argument against supplying oil temporarily to fill critical needs in Europe. However, when the industry takes advantage of the situation by making an unwarranted

domestic price increase the entire subject demands review.

With an annual domestic consumption of 1,334,205,000 barrels, a 1-cent-per-gallon increase in gasoline costs the American people $479,235,000, while a one-half-cent increase in fuel oil will cost the American people an additional $179,235,000. These unwarranted price increases will cost the American people $599 million, one-half the cost of the Aswan Dam, which precipitated the original controversy.

The storage tanks are bursting with oversupplies of gasoline stocks which are undisturbed by crude-oil exports to Europe. There is no justification for gasoline price hikes.

The domestic oil industry has substituted greedy profit taking for patriotism. Instead of receiving seasonal price reductions, the American oil and gasoline consumer is called upon again to pay tribute to the oil dynasties which exercise powerful controls over our economy.

NATIONAL MONETARY COMMISSION

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced into the House of Representatives a bill for the establishment of a National Monetary Commission. This bill provides for 23 members as follows:

First. Six appointed by the President of the United States.

Second. Six appointed by the President of the Senate.

Third. Six appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Fourth. Provision for certain ex-officio members, including the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, the chairman of the Federal Farm Credit Board, the chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In this bill, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote and maintain the utmost stability of domestic and international trade and of dollar values and money rates, to the end that the orderly commercial relationships built up by the citizens of the United States of America both within and without the country shall remain as free as possible from uncertainty concerning and arising from the relative or absolute values of the currency of the United States: equally in terms of commodities and currencies of other countries, and of monetary metals.

It is within the jurisdiction of this Commission to consider whether it would be advisable for this Nation to return to the gold standard, which it enjoyed for many years prior to the date when it left the gold standard and entered upon a policy of irredeemable currency. The value of the American dollar has declined in purchasing power from a little more than 100 cents in 1939 to approximately 52 cents today. This decline of the American dollar has had a great impact upon the lives and fortunes of the American people. The value of life-insurance policies, time deposits, E, F, and G savings bonds has just about been cut in half. The misery caused the old-age pensioner and those, who with thrift, had saved something for their declining years is sad to relate. It will be within the province of the work of this Commission to recommend measures for the stability of the American dollar and advise as to whether a return to the gold standard would be in the best interests of these United States.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, a letter from the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and a release regarding voluntary agreements on textiles from Japan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, a letter from the Acting Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and a release regarding the voluntary agreement on textiles from the Japanese Government.

Something has been accomplished. I do not know whether it is enough to protect adequately our present textile industry from the tremendous influx of Japanese goods. The velveteen and other textiles have not made a public report as yet. It would have been a calamity for the velveteen industry especially all over the country if something had not been done at once. I am very glad Japan has made a voluntary agreement, and if this is not enough we should come back and ask Japan to do something more.

The textile industry really needs a greater safeguard from Japan plus an increased tariff.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 16, 1957.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The Government of Japan is announcing today a 5-year program for the control of exports of cotton textiles to the United States. The program places an annual overall ceiling of 235 million square yards on the export of cotton cloth and manufactures to the United States with specific ceilings on many items, including gingham an velveteens.

In view of the widespread interest in the problem of the effect of import competition on the United States cotton textile industry, I wanted to be sure that you had immediately first-hand information on the subject. The Japanese program and its background is summarized in the advance copy of the enclosed press release.

In my judgment, the voluntary action of the Japanese government is a major step forward in the development of orderely and mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Japan. It is a constructive measure aimed at forestalling possible future injury to the United States cotton textile industry.

For the United States cotton textile industry the program should provide a basis on which it can look forward to the future with the confidence and the knowledge that import competition from Japan will follow an orderly pattern. It should permit the textile industry to devote more attention to some of its other problems which have also contributed to keeping that industry from sharing fully in our great national prosperity.

The executive branch of the Government has devoted a great deal of effort to the textile problem over the past year. There have been many discussions with representative United States cotton textile and apparel manufacturers aimed at establishing the facts of their situation and obtaining the best possible advice on how to meet it. There have also been many discussions with Japanese government representatives to convey to them an understanding of the nature of the United States market and the desirability of following a pattern of orderly marketing and sound merchandising of cotton textiles in the United States.

You may be sure that the Department of Commerce and the other interested Government department will continue to keep in closest touch with all aspects of the situation in order that the greatest benefit may be derived from this approach—both in terms of the welfare of the domestic industry and the interests of maintaining a sound foreign-trade policy.

I would be very pleased to try to answer any questions you may have on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

JANUARY 16, 1957.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am enclosing herewith an advance copy of a press release to be issued this afternoon regarding the Japanese program for the export of cotton textiles to the United States. This program, which is to be of 5-year duration beginning January 1, 1957, places an annual overall ceiling of 235 million square yards on the export of cotton cloth and manufacturers to the United States with specific ceilings on many items, including ginghams and velveteens.

The voluntary action of the Japanese Government is a major step forward in the development of orderly and mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Japan. It is a constructive measure aimed at forestalling possible future injury to the United States cotton textile industry.

In view of the widespread interest in the problem of the effect of import competition on the United States textile industry, I wanted to be sure that you had immediately first-hand information on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

THORSTEN V. KALIJARVI,
Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

RELEASE BY THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND AGRICULTURE

JAPANESE TEXTILES

The United States Government was informed today by the Government of Japan, in a note from the Ambassador of Japan to the Secretary of State, concerning the details of the Japanese program for the control of exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

This program, effective as of January 1, 1957, has a 5-year duration. The details were developed pursuant to a note submitted to the United States Government by the Government of Japan on September 27, 1956

The new program places an annual overall ceiling of 235 million square yards on the export of all types of Japanese cotton cloth and cotton manufacturers to the United States, with specific ceilings on many items.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture issued the following joint statement commenting on the new Japanese program:

"The action taken by Japan is a major step forward in the development of orderly and mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Japan. It is a constructive measure aimed at forestalling possible future injury to the United States cotton textile industry. It recognizes the problem faced by various segments of the domestic industry and meets this problem through the voluntary exercise of restraint on exports of cotton textiles to the American market.

"The program demonstrates an understanding by Japan of the importance of the orderly marketing of an item as significant to the economies of both countries as cotton textiles. It not only provides an over-all limit on the total volume of cotton textile exports to the United States, but perhaps even more important, it sets a pattern for the diversification of these exports over the entire area of cotton textile manufacturers. Under this program, it should be possible to avoid situations such as those which developed during 1955 and 1956 in blouses, velveteens and ginghams.

"The Japanese action provides a basis for the expansion of two-way trade between the United States and Japan in an atmosphere of the friendliest cooperation between the two nations, such as that which has characterized the economic and political relations between the two countries over the last decade.

"For the United States cotton textile industry, the Japanese program should provide a basis on which it can look forward to the future with the confidence and the knowledge that import competition from Japan will follow an orderly pattern.

"Officials of the several interested United States Government departments had the opportunity to hold a series of constructive discussions with representatives of the Japanese Government. Such discussions may be held from time to time, as needed, during the course of the program."

The overall ceiling for the export of cotton manufacturers to the United States announced by the Japanese Government is 235 million square yards. Within this ceiling the limit for cotton cloth is 113 million yards; the limits for woven and knit apparel total 83 million yards; and the limits for household goods and miscellaneous items total 39 million yards.

The cloth ceiling of 113 million square yards compares with a ceiling of 150 million square yards in 1956. Individual ceilings are specified for velveteens, ginghams, and high-grade (combed) cotton fabrics. The export limit for velveteen is 2.5 million square yards for each of the first 2 years. The export limit for gingham is 35 million square yards for each of the first 2 years. With respect to the remaining 75.5 million yards for "all other fabrics" a limit for high-grade (combed) cotton fabrics of 26 million square yards is established.

In the other groups covering cotton made-up goods individual annual ceilings have been established for pillowcases, dish towels, handkerchiefs, table damask, blouses, sports-shirts, dress and work shirts, brassieres, and other body supporting garments, men's and boys' T-shirts, and gloves and mittens.

The program also provides for Japanese cotton textile exports to the United States to be distributed equally by quarters as far as practicable and as necessary to meet seasonal demands. The Japanese Government will also take all feasible steps to prevent transshipments to the United States through third countries.

The Japanese program has been developed in an effort to meet the problems which arose in 1955 when exports of Japanese textiles to the United States increased sharply. These exports were heavily concentrated with respect to certain commodities such as blouses, velveteens, and ginghams. Not only were the domestic producers of these items affected, but the entire textile industry became concerned because of the impact on the price structure of the industry and the uncertainty as to where other concentration of Japanese exports might hit.

The concern of the textile industry was expressed in a number of escape-clause petitions filed with the Tariff Commission, and in requests to the Congress and to the executive branch for action to establish quotas on imports of textiles.

More than a year ago, the executive branch of the United States Government began an extensive study of the problem with a view to finding a resolution which would provide appropriate safeguards for the domestic industry within the framework of established United States foreign-trade policy.

One phase of the executive branch action involved fact-finding and frequent consultation with representative United States cotton textile and apparel manufacturers.

A second phase involved a series of discussions with representatives of the Japanese Government, aimed at exploring constructively measures which might alleviate the situation, and at conveying to the Japanese Government a better appreciation of the nature of the American market, and the desirability of a program of orderly marketing and sound merchandising.

On December 21, 1955, the Government of Japan announced a program for the voluntary control of exports of cotton goods to the United States in 1956. On May 16, 1956, the Japanese Government advised the United States officially of the details of the program and of its intention to exercise similar controls for 1957.

On September 27, 1956, the Japanese Government advised the United States as to the principles on which Japan intended to base its control of cotton textile exports to the United States for 1957 and subsequent years. This note set forth the principles of diversification of exports and avoidance of excessive concentration of exports in any particular period or on any particular item. The 5-year program now established represents the actual implementation of these principles.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE MILLET HAND

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the year of 1956 has taken a heavy toll of membership in the House. All of us were shocked at the announcement of the death of our colleague, Millet Hand.

I considered him my personal friend. He was an industrious, effective, conscientious Member of the House. His record of public service both before becoming a Member of Congress and during the years he served here was one of the highest order. It is tragic that at the age of 54 years, in the very prime of his life, he should suddenly be called, for Millet Hand had not only a splendid background as an able lawyer before entering Congress but, as is true of many Members, he developed with his experience in the Congress.

Millet Hand was not only a sincere and honest friend, but he was an honest, logical thinker of strong convictions. I often admired him for his voting record and his strong adherence to voting as he thought was best for the United States. This independence and courage endeared him to his own people, as shown by the increasing majorities by which he was returned to Congress.

Millet Hand had many fine qualities that endeared him to his friends and his constituents. He at all times conducted himself with dignity, and yet he was very humane and kind and possessed a delightful sense of humor. It could truly be said of him that his qualities were so mixed as to give him the ideal makeup for a Member of Congress.

To his wife and to his son, I convey my deepest sympathy.

His district and the State of New Jersey have lost a splendid legislator, and the country has lost a devoted and patriotic son.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to reconstitute the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. In this action I have the approval of my Republican colleagues on the committee, the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN of New York, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., of Connecticut, the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH of Ohio, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN of Illinois.

In introducing this resolution the minority does so with the awareness that the distinguished chairman of the committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has introduced House Resolution 56, which has for its purpose the reconstitution of the committee. House Resolution 56 would have created a committee of 12 Members of the House of Representatives—7 from the majority party and 5 from the minority party. This division, of course, has never been the custom in appointment of members to the Small Business Committee. However, it is my understanding that this particular point has been resolved and agreement has been reached to recommend the creation of a Select Committee on Small Business composed of 13 Members of the House with 7 from the majority party and 6 from the minority party.

The purpose which has motivated the minority in introducing this resolution is to formally offer for consideration by

the Committee on Rules and the membership of this House certain vitally important matters concerning the operation and procedures of the committee.

In the 84th Congress, we are convinced, the Select Committee on Small Business did not fulfill the purpose for which it was created. The objections which the minority has had to the committee's operation and procedures have been called to the attention of the House by the minority on several occasions. The minority is frank to say that if the committee's business is to be conducted in the same manner during the 85th Congress, the committee has outlived its usefulness. As most of us are aware, the committee was established in the 77th Congress and has been reconstituted in each succeeding Congress thereafter. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 6, page 7363, I gave the House a short history of the committee and called attention to the numerous departures from orderly committee procedure. I said at that time:

> Any constructive program of study and investigation for small and independent business when sponsored by the Small Business Committee must be approached on a strict nonpartisan basis.

And that, Mr. Speaker, has been and is the fundamental position of the minority members serving on the Small Business Committee.

If a Select Committee on Small Business is to properly serve the small-business community of our Nation, then the majority and minority members of the committee must work together in complete cooperation and in good faith. The absence of free and frank intercourse, which was the case during the 84th Congress, has defeated the very purpose for which the House established the committee. Actually, as I stated on May 2, 1956, the methods of operation which were in vogue during the 84th Congress made the minority sometimes doubt whether or not we were actually members of the committee. The minority does not propose to submit to another 2 years of discourteous treatment or to political exigencies which only serve to create prejudice through the subordination of facts. The minority does not propose to sit idly by and view the spectacle of the committee or its staff depriving the minority of its rights as members of the committee and publishing numerous documents and other media which have not been properly presented or passed upon by all members of the committee, and especially by the minority members of the committee.

The minority does not expect the Committee on Rules to report out the resolution which we have this day submitted, but the minority does earnestly and respectfully request the Committee on Rules to consider the language which we are adding to the creation resolution and to make it a part of any resolution reported which has for its purpose the reconstitution of the Select Committee on Small Business.

THE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE IN THE 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has indicated, the minority has continuously objected during the 84th Congress to the extremely partisan operations of the Select Committee on Small Business. In the conduct of its investigations and in its general operations the minority members have, with few exceptions, been completely ignored.

Mr. Speaker, this committee never operated in this fashion in prior Congresses. Up until the 84th Congress Democratic and Republican Members cooperated in a most harmonious fashion so that the greatest benefit might accrue to the small-business segment of our economy. In past Congresses, the committee acting as a service organization has been of considerable assistance to the constituents of the Members of the House. Through its studies and reports the committee has developed recommendations which enabled the administration in power to better understand the problems of small business and to improve the programs which had been established to assist small business.

Up until the 84th Congress the final report and other reports issued by the committees were always unanimous reports, reflecting the views of both Democrats and Republicans. As has been so often stated, the operations of this committee had to be nonpartisan to be effective.

The Small Business Committee was operated during the 84th Congress, however, on a strict partisan basis with little regard to an objective evaluation of the problems of small business. The minority members of the Small Business Committee were forced to submit minority views to the final report to the 84th Congress and to two other important committee reports, The Organization and Procedures of the Federal Regulatory Agencies and Their Effect on Small Business (H. Rept. 2967), and Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws (H. Rept. 2966). The minority members were forced to state, and I quote in part from our conclusions in the final report:

> The minority is always willing to join in justified criticism of Government or other activity which is detrimental to our economy or to small business. The minority believes, however, that appropriate suggestions for improvement in a particular situation are as important as the criticism itself if not more so. * * *
>
> The minority, of course, is expressing its own views. But the minority is convinced that if this final report is published in its present form it will reflect little or no credit on the committee, its members, or the House of Representatives.
>
> The minority firmly but regretfully rejects the final report because its content is biased, unobjective, and nonfactual.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the entire minority views on the final report be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. They are as follows:

FINAL REPORT—84TH CONGRESS—THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MINORITY VIEWS, JANUARY 2, 1957

The minority disagrees with the final report of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. It is not a committee report in the accepted sense. Rather, for the most part, it is written as a report of the chairman of the committee.

The report unfortunately—and it is hoped inadvertently—is persuasive that only big business can survive in our free competitive system. The position of small business is absolutely hopeless if the report were to be taken seriously.

The report keeps the fires of political prejudice alive and burning. This is a technique which has destroyed the nonpartisan and unbiased approach to the solution of small-business problems in many of the committee's activities in the 84th Congress. The report sacrifices objectivity for political considerations. This is best illustrated by the language in the introduction which refers particularly to the past 2 years.

The report on pages 3 and 4 states that—

"When the House adopted the resolution creating our committee, almost 2 years ago, the clear purpose was to help small business. That purpose we have tried to accomplish. In all candor, however, we must report that in these 2 years we have witnessed a substantial deterioration of the position of small business and a strengthening of the position of the giant combines.

"We have witnessed, as a result of an inadequate anti-price-discrimination law, inadequately enforced, much needless destruction of small firms. We have witnessed big manufacturers, with sales outlets in many markets, cutting prices in a few selected markets, with the effect of destroying small competing manufacturers and barring access to markets wherever new small competitors try to arise. Such, for example, has been the demise of many small manufacturers of bread. An official of an association of bread manufacturers, testifying to our committee on the effects of discriminatory pricing in his industry, has offered an estimate that the number of bread manufacturers in the country has been reduced by one-half during the past 10 years.

"We have likewise witnessed much needless destruction of small wholesalers and retailers as a result of these price discriminations. We have found that manufacturers are again giving big chains and other big buyers extensive price advantages which they do not accord their smaller customers, and the old rule of limiting these advantages to the amount of the differences in the manufacturer's costs of supplying the different customers has fallen by the wayside.

"We have witnessed a sad deterioration, not only in the antiprice-discrimination law, but in the administration of the other antitrust laws which were designed to protect small business from monopolistic practices and to keep the channels of commerce open.

"We have witnessed most serious restrictions of individual business freedom among retail gasoline dealers—who are supposedly independent businessmen. We have heard complaints of an unholy alliance between the giant oil companies and the great rubber companies, the terms of which are, allegedly, that the oil companies exercise a coercive influence over their respective customers—for a fee—to cause these retailers to deal only in the tires, batteries, and other products manufactured by the chosen rubber company.

"We have witnessed the Attorney General of the United States lending his name and the prestige and resources of his public office to a formidable project aimed at a further weakening of the antitrust laws. Specifically, we have witnessed the Attorney General extending the auspices of his office to the creation of a 'report' conceived and executed by a group of big-business lawyers and notorious lobbyists, and we have witnessed this report being used in an attempt to instruct the law enforcement agencies and, worst of all, our Federal courts, in ways to interpret the antitrust laws.

"We have witnessed—as a result of an inadequate antimerger law, inadequately enforced—a great consolidation and centralization of many previously competitive industries. We have witnessed such mergers taking place for no apparent reason, except that the bigger corporations have great accumulations of undistributed profits to reinvest, on behalf of their stockholders, and manifestly the lessening of competition which can be expected to result from the mergers promises enhancement of profits and a more secure control over the corporate destinies.

"We have witnessed the biggest corporations of all, flush with accumulatd savings, engaging in a recordbreaking expansion of production plants and sales outlets, while smaller competitors could barely find sufficient credit to carry present inventories. We have witnessed record levels of new investment which will add little to the productive capital of the Nation, but which will add, rather, new facilities to the holdings of the corporate giants—to take the place of facilities of smaller firms destined to go out of business.

"We have witnessed the corporate giants quietly raising taxes, shifting the burden of the corporate-income taxes on to consumers, and taking more profits with which to acquire a larger share of the productive resources of the Nation. At the same time we have witnessed smaller corporations, not so exempt from competitive pressures, struggle under the burden of the tax.

"We have witnessed Government steps to squeeze commercial bank credit, as a result of these big-business price increases, and we have witnessed small-business needs for credit grow as a result of these price increases.

"We have witnessed our military services, either through ignorance or indifference to the consequences, place an annual $15 billion in defense business with a few favored corporate giants. And we have found the military services dispensing $1.5 billion a year in subsidies for development of new products and production techniques, and not only funneling subsidies to a few giant corporations but allowing these corporations to acquire and control the patents on the new technology which these Federal subsidies produce.

"Finally, we have heard all of these things defended as being not only eminently fair, but in the highest public interest."

It will be noted in the foregoing quotation that the editorial "we" is used throughout. In fact, this editorial device is used 98 times in the report. The very first word of the report is an editorial "we." Therefore, the question may well be asked, "Who is 'we'?" Is it the committee? Is it the chairman? Is it certain members of the committee? Or is it the staff? The answer to this question is one in which every member of the committee should be vitally interested.

Continued lack of objectivity

The final report makes the same misuse of statistics as has occurred on many occasions in the 84th Congress. It is well established that statistics can be utilized to prove any point which is desired to be proved. In fact, the same set of statistics can be brought forward as proof on both sides of any question.

The minority finds that this distortion of facts and figures pertains in particular to the report's discussion of business failures, business profits, financial assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration, the role of small business in research and development contracts of the military departments, the availability of credit on the part of private financial institutions and in the effect of the excess-profits tax on new and small business. The minority cannot adopt the clear misstatements which are an integral part of this report.

While it is generally accepted that small business today faces serious problems, few will agree with the report that small business is subject to a gigantic conspiracy conducted by the heads of the country's largest corporations and by highly placed officials of the Federal Government in this or any other administration. The report even appears to suggest that Members of Congress have joined this great conspiracy against small business by their failure to enact certain legislation. The remedy offered to correct this implied conspiracy appears to be a leveling process which does not take into account the diverse structure of our economy. The report has reduced the entire operation of our competitive system to a battle between General Motors and the smallest local business institution. This oversimplification results in a distorted view of the assured place of small and medium independent business in a dynamic and growing economy.

The report completely ignores the fundamental restrictions of the activities of the Small Business Administration contained in the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, and blames that agency, if any blame is due, for carrying out the intent of Congress in the manner prescribed by its basic legislation. For example, Congress established the Loan Policy Board and determined that SBA could function as an independent agency by coordinating with other departments of the executive branch through the offices of the Loan Policy Board. Nevertheless, the report complains of the Loan Policy Board and "find(s) • • • that no action or activity of the agency has been independent. We find that the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury control the loan policies of the agency through actions of the Loan Policy Board."

The minority must state that no evidence has been presented to the Small Business Committee which would support this statement. Numerous changes have been made in SBA loan policy which broadened the amount of financial assistance rendered small business. In most instances these changes were recommended by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and concurred in by other members of the Board. Moreover, the report does not point out that in the extension of the Small Business Act in the 84th Congress the Loan Policy Board was kept intact.

In the same manner the report suggests that the Small Business Administration's credit standards are unreasonable. The minority, however, suggests that the SBA is legally and morally bound by the criteria which the Congress saw fit to include in the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended.

A similar lack of objectivity is evidenced in the report's discussion of the administration of the lending program. Even if there were agreement with some of the extreme and intemperate views which are expresed, it is difficult to see how the conflicting, inaccurate, unfair, and misleading statements embodied in this report can be reconciled. For example, in chapter V entitled, "The Small Business Administration Loan Program," the report criticizes SBA officials for their alleged failure to advocate appropriations sufficient to carry out the agency's financial assistance programs. In direct contradiction the report also makes the assertion that the lack of appropriations has not been the limiting factor in SBA's lending program. The report adopts the unsubstantiated contention that any inquiry addressed to SBA is a request for financial assistance and complains of the low number of loans made as compared with the number of inquiries. The report states as a fact, when there is no basis for such a statement, that SBA's lending activity is small because SBA "discourages applications." The report ignores the obvious relationship between the demand for loans and the number of loans authorized by SBA. No acknowledgment is made of the increase in agency activity based upon the need of small business for Government financial assistance. At times the report appears critical of the small-business men themselves for their failure to demand financial assistance whether or not it is needed.

The report very obviously distorts the significance of the SBA lending program. The report ignores the requirement in the Small Business Act that no direct loans be made if participation with banks is available and minimizes the economic significance of participation loans made to small concerns. It is also found that the figures used for disbursements in the report are inaccurate.

In a similar manner the report complains that the interest rates established by the Small Business Administration are too high, but ignores the fact that section 207 (a) (2) which established interest at the rate prevailing in the area where the money loaned is to be used but shall not exceed 6 percent per annum is unworkable since it is administratively impossible to establish any such area. In addition, it is doubtful if the committee would want the Small Business Administration to ever charge the interest rates of 7, 8, or 9 percent which prevail in many sections of the country on small loans.

The report views with alarm the fact that the average size SBA loan has declined. This decline is, of course, due in part to the fact that the agency has made new lines of credit available to the smallest concerns which need smaller loans. A large volume of this type of financial assistance obviously affects the size of the average loan. However, this decrease in size cannot be interpreted as the report would have it.

No analysis has been made of the several procurement and technical-assistance programs of the Small Business Administration. At one point in the report the Small Defense Plants Administration is applauded for instituting a procurement set-aside program for small business. At still another point this very same program under the Small Business Administration is derided in both principle and operation.

The report demonstrates a distinct lack of understanding of many aspects of military procurement, particularly with regard to the importance of subcontracting to small business, the use of partial and progress payments, and the operation of the qualified products list. While the report recognizes the need for greater participation by small business in research and development contracts, it shows a deplorable inconsistency in arriving at the actual dollar volume of such contracts. At least four different figures are given as representing the contract awards for this type of procurement.

Economic distortions

The report states that in 1954 and 1955 the population of business firms has failed to keep pace with the growth of business. The implication is made that this reversal is a significant indication of a weakening of

the small-business segment of the economy. The so-called slower rate of increase in the number of firms indicated on chart 1 is not only very slight but also totally inadequate to support any conclusion of a deterioration in the economic position of small business. The deviations as shown during the period 1942–46 are the type of change which merits an explanation. It is hard to believe that this argument is put forward sincerely.

The report professes grave concern over the growing number of small-business failures. This concern seems to be of a partisan rather than economic origin. For the first half of 1956, the failure rate was 48.7 per 10,000 firms compared to 42.2 in the first half of 1955. However, for the years 1939 through 1941 the average was 63 and for the period 1900 through 1955 it was 70 per 10,000 firms. The most astonishing (and absurd) feature of this discussion of the weakening position of small business is the comparison between business failures and stock prices. The relationship between the two is most remote, if there is any relationship. The report apparently adopts the thesis that, for example, small business was in a healthier state than big business during the period of 1947–49 solely because at that time stock prices were unusually depressed.

It is true that only about 15 percent (not 10 percent as stated in the report) of business firms are incorporated. Nevertheless, the rate of business incorporations is significant since it measures not only the increase in new firms but also the growth of previously established firms which now desire to obtain the advantages of incorporation. If, as the report indicates, business incorporations are not a significant index because it only measures 15 percent of the small-business firms, then, applying the same logic, business failures are an insignificant index, since the failure rate is an insignificant fraction of the number of business firms.

In its discussion of business profits the report deals in statistical legerdemain. By picking the most favorable index in the most favorable base years almost any proposition can be proved. Much is made of the proposition that larger businesses are more profitable than smaller businesses. However, if this were not the case, obviously there would be no incentive for any business to strive to grow and expand. The comparison appears to have little significance in the solution of small-business problems.

While there has been a decline in profit rates both before and after taxes in 1953 and 1954, there was a dollar improvement for 1954 to 1955. This general pattern of decline and recovery characterized all sizes of manufacturing concerns. The decline in profit from 1953 to 1954 was greater for the small than for the large enterprises, but the smaller manufacturing companies experienced a sharper improvement in profit ratios in 1954 and 1955 than the larger concerns. In 1954 and 1955, improvement in profit ratios was extended to 1956 especially for smaller companies; 1956 is ignored in the report. Perhaps this is because profit ratios after taxes for manufacturing corporations in the larger size class—$100 million or more of assets—was slightly lower in the first half in 1956 than in the corresponding period in the previous year.

The many comparisons made between corporations with $100 million assets and those with less than $250,000 assets are not valid because the concerns involved are not comparable. For example, expense accounts for the smaller corporations often include actual living expenses for the owners. When the compensation of officers is added back to the rate of return and the calculation is made on net worth between 1947 and 1953, no appreciable decline for small business is demonstrated. This factor is ignored in the report.

The evaluation of the shift of assets into the hands of larger corporations is misleading because it ignores the inflationary factor. Because of the change in the value of the dollar it is natural for corporations with the same physical volume of sales to move into a higher bracket.

The report concedes that there is no adequate information as to the availability of the small-business credit. Nevertheless, it cites with apparent satisfaction the report of the Standard Factors Corp. which purports to show that large borrowers are hoarding long-term credit and that small business is suffering thereby.

The minority believes that considerable inconsistency exists in the report's discussion of the excess-profits tax. Whereas in this report that tax is stated to work little or no hardship on small business, the Small Business Committee has, in the past, drawn just the opposite conclusion. In both the Democratic 82d Congress and in the Republican 83d Congress small-business men testified before this committee with regard to the hardship imposed by the excess-profits tax. In both Congresses the committee unanimously called for its abolition.

Other reports

The minority has already filed its views on committee reports entitled, "Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws" (H. Rept. 2966, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) and "The Organization and Procedures of the Federal Regulatory Commissions and Agencies and Their Effect on Small Business" (H. Rept. 2967, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). The minority views on the foregoing reports are equally applicable to the comments on these subjects as set forth in the final report.

Conclusions

The minority is always willing to join in justified criticism of Government or other activity which is detrimental to our economy or to small business. The minority believes, however, that appropriate suggestions for improvement in a particular situation are as important as the criticism itself if not more so. The report fails in two major objectives. They are (1) the absence of constructive conclusions and (2) the absence of recommendations for remedial action. Of course, there are conclusions scattered throughout the report which are neither helpful nor sound. There are also lengthy chapters, on material which has been included in other reports.

The minority, of course, is expressing its own views. But the minority is convinced that if this final report is published in its present form it will reflect little or no credit on the committee, its members, or the House of Representatives.

The minority firmly but regretfully rejects the final report because its content is biased, unobjective, and nonfactual.

The minority desires at this point to state the principles which have motivated its considerations as members of this committee:

1. The Republican members of the Select Committee on Small Business do not question the basic premise that all members of the committee have the same fundamental objective—the welfare of the small-business segment of our economy.

2. The immediate and ultimate fulfillment of that objective, insofar as the committee is concerned, may be accomplished only by a concerted effort made through the closest cooperation of the entire membership of the committee.

3. Political overtones in the conduct of an investigation or in the writing of a report serve only to obscure the purpose for which the committee was established and to nullify any beneficial results.

4. Any investigation, conducted in the atmosphere of secrecy, which denies all or any members of the committee full and reliable information in every particular is an unwarranted use of the committee's powers.

5. The careless use of allegations as to persons, whether in the Government service or in private endeavor, without presenting positive proof and without such person being given an opportunity to be heard in his own behalf, is not only unfair but also a reflection on the committee and its members.

6. A consideration which should always be paramount is the reputation of the committee in business and Government circles, since that is the measure of the committee's success and influence.

7. The distortion of facts and figures in committee reports or releases cannot be condoned under any circumstances. The small-business community is entitled to know the truth regardless of the circumstances.

8. The integrity of the committee is dependent to a great extent on the work of the committee staff. In approaching any matter concerning the committee or its business the staff should remember that the work is not being done to satisfy an individual member or in the interest of an individual member, but that such work involves the committee, the House, the Congress, and the public interest. The committee as established during the past eight Congresses was for the sole purpose of investigating small-business problems and making recommendations which would assist in solving these problems through legislative action or otherwise. It is true that many of the committee's recommendations have not required legislative action, but when such recommendations are sound they can be administratively accomplished in the executive departments and agencies.

Finally, the minority believes that during the entire period of its existence the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives has many great accomplishments to its credit. It is the minority's hope that in the future the committee may be worthy of the trust which the House has placed upon it so many times in the past.

ADDITIONAL MINORITY VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

On December 31, 1956, at 5:45 p. m., a tender was made by the staff director to the minority members of the committee of a document entitled "The Committee's Recommendations." The document, which consisted of 14 legal-sized, single-spaced mimeographed pages, bore the notation: "Draft: for the Committee's Consideration." The accompanying letter, signed by the staff director, stated in part:

"With this draft of the recommendations the final report will be complete for the committee's consideration January 2, when the committee meets at 9:30 a. m."

Due to the late hour of the tender on December 31 and due to New Year's Day following, the minority members were not in physical possession of the proposed recommendations until the morning of January 2, 1957. This timing of the tender, of course, has deprived the minority of an opportunity to make no more than the most cursory examination of the document.

The minority, as pointed out above, had noted the fact that the proposed final report contained no conclusions or recommendations. The report was mailed on December 15, 1956, and received by the minority at their District offices some days later.

The minority decries any situation which successively transgresses upon orderly committee procedure. As has been previously pointed out, the minority has been bypassed on committee business many times during the past 2 years. Official documents which the minority must pass upon have been submitted in such a manner as to create an atmosphere of urgency. In addition to this, some of the documents have been presented a year or more following the hearings on

which the reports are said to have been based.

In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, the minority is forced to withhold its decision on the proposed recommendations until a later date.

We mutually subscribe to the foregoing minority views.

WILLIAM S. HILL.
R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH.
TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN.

PROPCSED VISIT OF TITO

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to speak from the well of the House when so many Members are present and the galleries are packed. Perhaps, under the rules, I should not refer to the galleries, therefore I apologize to the Speaker for that.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it was evidenced from the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that many people, and, undoubtedly, Members of Congress, were not aware whether Tito had been invited by the State Department or the President to visit this country. Undoubtedly the people have not the correct information on that and neither have the Members of Congress.

The gentleman from New York expressed the opinion that it was all wrong to ask one whom he described as a criminal, an outlaw, to visit the White House and this country. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] followed that by expressing a similar opinion. He then stated that if Tito was invited here by the officials of this Government he would resign.

Many of us—I think all of us—recognize the worth of the timely and distinguished services rendered in years gone by by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who so often, so earnestly urges us to remember our duty to our country.

It is his privilege if he feels it necessary to resign. But it occurs to me, and this is only an opinion, that—in order to expose the Nation's peril in asking Tito to visit this country as its guest—if he does resign then he should go back to the people of his district when a special election is called and stand for reelection. Everyone there knows his views and as he undoubtedly would be reelected then Mr. Dulles, the State Department, and other top officials of this administration would know that at least one segment of this country was not in favor of being buddies or associating with any of the Communists who come to our country.

Long, long ago we should have severed relations with Russia and every nation which goes along with her.

I am not speaking for anyone else in the House. It would be well if somebody at the State Department learned what people were thinking of, what the people believe, what the people want. It is obvious, I think even to the Speaker, that Members of the House very seldom know even a little about our foreign policy, what it is, its purpose. Perhaps I should modify that statement because I understand the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the whip [Mr. ARENDS], and the chairman of the Rules Committee go down to the White House sometimes but, again with due apology, at least as one Member of the House I never know what is going on, what it is proposed that the Congress do in connection with foreign policy. In the local press I see a likeness of the President—perhaps of Mr. Dulles—of the minority leader, of the minority whip, of the chairman of the Rules Committee, but that does not enlighten me as to what is in store for our country.

DISTRESSED ECONOMIC AREAS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that the President in his budget message referred again to the desire to have this body pass legislation in behalf of the so-called distressed economic areas of the Nation where there is chronic surplus unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced in this body a copy of the so-called Flood-Douglas bill, which passed the other body last session. A dozen or more of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle introduced similar legislation. I am advised that in the other body the same thing will be done. I earnestly hope and pray that the leadership on both sides of the aisle will join in having this essential and necessary legislation become law.

TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 954

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 20) to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 954 of the 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, entitled "An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space," be amended as follows: In the second sentence of section 1 strike out the words "within 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof the words "within 10 months."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF DEMOCRATIC WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the appointment for the 85th Congress as Democratic whip the able and distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF REPUBLICAN WHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House the appointment of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] as Republican whip.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE CO-OPERATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to point out to the Members of this body that the State Department is still busy in its long-range strategy to maneuver Congress out of its power to regulate the foreign commerce of this country.

The evidence of this is unmistakable. The President in his annual message on the state of the Union has again asked the Congress to approve United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, known as the OTC. The international agreement calling for such an organization was negotiated in Geneva, Switzerland, by the State Department 2 years ago.

The President originally sent his plea for approval to the first session of the 84th Congress. Congress did nothing with the request. In the second session of that Congress, that is, in 1955, the President renewed his plea.

The House Committee on Ways and Means held hearings and reported the bill. That was the end of it. Neither the House nor the Senate took any action.

Now the OTC is back again, a warmed-over dish for which Congress not only has shown no appetite but a distinct distaste, as the record shows.

This short review of the State Department's recent efforts is only the latter-day part of the story. The whole story goes back to 1945. It was in that year that the State Department proposed to the world an International Trade Organization and drew up a proposal to launch it. This was a very ambitious undertaking that would have placed the regulation of our foreign commerce under a specialized agency of the United Nations. It provided for a governing body representing member countries in which the United States would have had one vote. The Organization was to be dedicated to international economic planning and the establishment of world free trade.

The negotiators forgot all about Congress and completed the negotiations in Habana, Cuba, in 1948. Four members of the House were indeed privileged to be present in the Habana conference, which was the last of a series of 4; but even those 4 were handpicked.

It was 1950 before the Habana Charter was sent to Congress for approval. It was referred to the House Committee on

Foreign Affairs, where public hearings were held.

The effect was numbing, if not stunning, for the charter resolution was never reported out of the committee. In the Senate no action at all was taken.

To prevent the corpse of the ITO from causing too great embarrassment the President thereafter withdrew his request for approval of the ITO Charter from Congress. And that was the end of the ITO. Failure of ratification by the United States was its death sentence. The country that had launched it had turned its back on it. No one else wanted it sufficiently to proceed with setting up the organization.

I have spoken of the persistence of the State Department in its efforts to replace Congress in the regulation of our foreign commerce.

Certainly the answer of Congress to the ITO Charter was clear enough. There are many ways of saying "no" legislatively. One is to defeat a bill on the floor. Another is to keep a bill from coming to the floor. One of the most definite reflections of the attitude of Congress is demonstrated by the failure of a bill in committee. A complete indisposal to act is often exhibited by refusal of a committee to take up a bill at all. The ITO Charter experienced this fate in the other body, where not even the hope of a hearing was granted; while as already said, it never came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House after hearings were held.

In this way Congress unmistakably let the State Department know how unwelcome was the proposal to make this country a member of the International Trade Organization.

But the State Department has not relinquished its goal. Although it has already usurped much of the power of Congress to regulate foreign commerce under the guise of the Trade Agreements Act, it has not yet succeeded in putting this usurped power out of the reach of Congress. The ITO Charter was designed to do this. Having failed in that venture in 1950, the State Department came forward in 1955 with a bobtailed version of ITO, namely the OTC, and trotted it out in the most disarmingly innocent garb for introduction to Congress.

A new name was given this second creature of the State Department's one-world philosophy. In changing its name it was thought no doubt that the true nature of this new proposal could be concealed. Fortunately the close resemblance of the OTC to the ITO became apparent once the articles of agreement of the OTC were examined. Behind the false front lay the same unchanging State Department purpose.

In bringing out the OTC the State Department and the White House denied on behalf of the proposed new organization the only thing that gave the State Department an interest in it. If the OTC would not confirm the Department's usurpation of congressional power that Department would have no interest in pushing the legislation. In other words, if the OTC were designed to be nothing more than what the State Department says it would be there would be no reason for proposing it. Nothing would be added that GATT does not already do or has been doing for 8 years.

What is behind the maneuver is legitimization of GATT itself and approval by Congress of its own divestment of power. By approving the OTC Congress would in the same step approve GATT even though GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—itself has never been brought before Congress. And GATT has been running loose since the day of its birth 8 years ago, unblessed by constitutionality or legitimacy.

There is yet more to the maneuver with OTC.

The cautions that I offer here are not, I assure you, fabrications of a feverish imagination. They are offered as a result of experience with the Trade Agreements Act, with State Department actions under GATT and with the escape clause which I offered on the floor of this House in 1951 when it was first adopted by Congress. My own experiences have been corroborated by the experience of many others. Therefore, I hope that Members of this body will take my caution to heart.

When the bill offering the OTC to Congress came before the House Committee on Ways and Means in 1956, the public hearings turned up strenuous opposition from all parts of the country and particularly from industrial, agricultural, and labor groups that would be affected directly by the results of United States membership in the OTC. The committee adopted certain reservations to the bill in an attempt to make sure that the OTC would not become a supranational organization. Obviously the committee was concerned on that score and I do not doubt in the least that the reservations were made in all sincerity.

Unfortunately none of the reservations changed any of the articles of agreement that would determine the rights, powers, and jurisdiction of the OTC. Therefore if adopted, the reservations would only represent a unilateral interpretation by the United States and such an interpretation could later be upset by a contrary vote of the OTC membership.

Let me be more specific.

The OTC articles of agreement themselves provide that no new obligation could be imposed upon any member without the consent of such member. In the hearings fear was expressed that such consent on behalf of the United States could be given by the official delegate of the State Department without reference to Congress.

The question was an important one because the power of the OTC to amend itself was not questioned. The charge was made that it could convert itself into the very ITO that Congress had so unceremoniously rejected 5 years earlier.

In recognition of the cogency of this argument the Committee on Ways and Means inserted a reservation that no amendment could be accepted by the United States without the approval of Congress. To many observers this seemed to close the gaping loophole through which the power of Congress could have leaked away.

Unfortunately it did not close the real loophole; and it may be doubted that even the reservation to the bill expressing the view of Congress, as adopted by the Ways and Means Committee, would have bound OTC itself. Any time OTC, if set up, had a sufficient number of votes to the contrary, any United States reservation could be upset.

However, the real loophole was left open presumably because it could not be closed. This lies in the provision that the OTC would give full effect to the objectives of GATT: and these objectives could be amended, extended, or modified by GATT itself without so much as a glance at Congress.

Assume now that the Ways and Means Committee had sought a further reservation to close this cavernous loophole. It could not have reached the spot because GATT is not before Congress. The Congress cannot amend GATT with the purpose of placing a restraining halter on it for two reasons, namely, first, as already said, GATT is not before Congress and the State Department has no intention of sending it to Congress—it is clearly afraid to do so; second, we could not unilaterally amend GATT. GATT is an agreement and has built-in procedures for its own amendment. Congress in no way figures in those procedures.

Thus it is clear that there is nothing that could be done this side of outside rejection of the OTC that would prevent the new organization from emerging in time as a replica or reasonable facsimile of the rejected ITO. Thus Congress would have been neatly bypassed, only to find itself handcuffed and the keys thrown away.

If any doubt should linger in the mind of anyone about the charge of State Department and executive usurpation of congressional power or of the intent to keep and extend the usurpation, let me suggest that he consider the President's recent action in rejecting unanimous decisions of the United States Tariff Commission, an agency set up by Congress to assure nonpartisan, competent, and expert handling of certain phases of tariff administration.

In the groundfish fillet case the President, closely advised by the State Department, conceded the plight of the New England fisheries but invoked our friendship with Canada, Iceland, and Norway as a reason for rejecting the unanimous recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

The withholding of a decision in the velveteen case, after the expiration of the statutory 60 days allowed the President to reach a conclusion, represents simple contempt of Congress and it should be called by its right name.

No bolder disregard of Congress is easily conjured. The action was inreality a double contempt. The first has already been mentioned. This was the bland disregard of the 60-day period in which the President was to act. The second is more far-reaching and has the appearance of pushing Congress openhandedly in the face and out of the way where regulation of foreign commerce is concerned.

The velveteen case came to the President under a unanimous finding of serious injury and a unanimous recommendation for an increase in the tariff.

In the meantime the State Department and other executive departments were negotiating behind the scenes with Japan to bring about a self-imposed quota on exports of cotton goods by Japan in her trade with the United States.

This was not to be a negotiated agreement. It was even conducted by the State Department outside the jurisdiction of its own fathered GATT—thus showing a phenomenal lack of confidence in its own handiwork. An understanding or arrangement was sought with Japan but stopping short of an agreement. There would therefore be no means of gaining compliance other than through threats or other arm-twisting exercises that could hardly be expected to warm the hearts of the Japanese nation toward us.

Now, without further exposure of this law-evading phenomenon of the State Department, let me point out that Japan laid down as one of the conditions of the understanding an assurance that the United States would not invoke any of the administrative restrictions on imports of cotton goods available to it. This meant that we would not invoke the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act or section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This explains why the President delayed action on the Tariff Commission's recommendation in the Velveteen case. The understanding had not been completed. The illegal arrangement had not been sealed by a final wink.

Here we see the State Department playing the big man regulating foreign commerce of the country and saying to another power that the United States will withhold enforcement of laws passed by Congress if the other country will do thus and so.

They propose to mislead textile producers in the country just as they misled the coal industry into thinking a voluntary arrangement could be worked out with Venezuela to limit imports of residual oil that is destroying markets for domestic soft coal.

All the coal industry got out of this byplay was a 3,000 barrel per day reduction. When I remind you that these daily imports are more than 750,000 barrels per day you see a reduction of less than one-half of 1 percent.

If this arrangement with Japan can be made to prevail, I say to you that Congress has surrendered the trust placed in it by the people. It is my belief that the Congress will not, if fully informed on this subject, submit to the insatiable ambitions of the State Department. The end run has already gone too far. The Department's goal line is not far away.

I implore you to look closely at State Department proposals in the field of tariffs and trade. If you do, the OTC proposal will meet the same well-deserved fate as its forerunner, the ITO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that if the escape clause had not been inserted in the most recent act it never would have passed the House or the Senate? That bill had a very difficult time in the Senate until the escape clause was introduced.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I would like to remind the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that a little later I shall refer to the fact that the unilateral agreement announced by the State Department with Japan sets aside that escape clause and I hope the gentlewoman will pay attention when I get to that point.

Yesterday the Department of State announced they had reached a gentleman's agreement outside the trade treaties with Japan under which they voluntarily agreed to cut down the amount of imports of certain categories of cotton cloth. Remember, Mr. Speaker, before this new Japanese treaty went into effect, I pleaded with the House, about a year ago, to do something about it when the House had the opportunity. We were then getting about 15 million yards of Japanese cotton goods into the country. Let me remind you right now that it is running at 270 million yards and they are agreeing to cut that back to 235 million under this voluntary agreement. Why was not this agreement carried out in the regular way? Why do we let the State Department take over the authority of the Congress?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked a question. Does he not know that the Department of State is running this Government of ours? I gather that he does.

Mr. BAILEY. I am beginning to become aware of that fact.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is a man after my own heart. He calls a spade a spade. Does not the gentleman understand that it is true that after the Committee on Ways and Means voted out OTC on a divided vote, it went to the Committee on Rules for clearance to the House last year, that it was held in the Committee on Rules until a poll of this House was made and they discovered they did not have the votes, so they did not dare to bring it before the House? Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. BAILEY. That is my understanding.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman how long he thinks it would take the House to pass legislation to give relief by insisting that an increased tariff be put on cotton textiles?

Mr. BAILEY. I am ready to answer the gentlewoman. Had the House approved the amendment that I offered to the escape clause last year, which provided that on all matters not affecting national safety the ruling of the Tariff Commission shall be final and binding—had that amendment been approved, you would have been rid of the Department of State running the trade relations of this Nation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, sir; but we are placed in this situation today, and I think this is not right. I do think this is a step in the right direction in that I understand, from the industry, that it will give some relief immediately. Of course, if we could get legislation through the House, that is one thing; we could try, but it would take weeks and perhaps months to do it, I think something has been accomplished. I think the cotton textile industry now will agree that under this arrangement something has been accomplished. Without a quota system and with an increased tariff there still would be nothing much to prevent the Japanese making an arrangement and still send enormous quantities of cotton textiles and velveteens into the country. But I do think that speed, expedition in making some sort of an arrangement is essential.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this is a clever device on the part of the Department of State to whittle off one more sector of opposition to their running the affairs affecting our commerce. I understand they are hoping to stop the growing resentment on the part of the textile industry of this country and the cotton growers industry of this country, but I say to you it is not a solution to the problem.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has always made a great fight to protect our industry. I am anxious to get immediate relief. For some years we have known that the textile industries, both cotton and woolen, have been considered expendable in the development of our foreign trade. We need foreign trade, but we certainly need these industries.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope the gentlewoman will go along with me in a move to support the findings of the Tariff Commission. It was set up by the Congress and is a creature of the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would be delighted to go along with the gentleman. I have pleaded and pleaded with the White House, with the State Department, and with the Department of Commerce to urge the President to use the escape clause and agree to the Tariff Commission's unanimous recommendation for increased tariffs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have all due respect for my colleague from Massachusetts and all the other Members of that Northeast section, and I am not referring to all of them now, but our colleague who complains about this situation, if I am not mistaken, went along and goes along with the State Department. I cannot shed too many tears. I try to be sympathetic with her people when they are suffering, and I can understand this fishing situation. I know something about fishing inland lakes, not out on the ocean.

But how they do squeal when, under the authority granted, the State Department interferes in their local business and brings destitution to the people up there.

Mr. BAILEY. There is something to be said on both sides of the question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Everyone in this House and past Houses that voted for the reciprocal trade agreement in the first place and voted for each continual extension of it is to blame for the situation that is facing the cotton industry, the fish industry, the clock industry, and every other industry that has been affected, because we gave the power from the Congress and it has been taken over by the executive. That means, of course, the State Department runs our whole tariff problem.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am sure the gentleman is aware of my deep interest in this whole subject matter. I am very much interested in the ideas of the gentleman from West Virginia on the value of the so-called voluntary-quota agreement which was announced yesterday. Will it afford anything like an adequate protection to the industry? That, I think, is what all of us want to know.

Mr. BAILEY. It will be a temporary relief, but it will not be a permanent solution of it. Suppose some other nation that is party to the Geneva Agreement to which we hold membership objects to that arrangement with Japan? There is no assurance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Michigan stated that it was only the Eastern and Northern States that were interested in this cotton-textile industry. Just as many protests come from Kentucky and from the Southern States as from the New England States. I believe both an increase in tariff and quotas are needed for protection from Japanese cotton imports.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but we did not vote for it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we are doing a little something to help the industry. I sincerely hope so, because it is a horrible thing to see two great industries, the cotton and the wool industries, made expendable. We have to trade with other countries, I know that, but fairness should be used.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman and I have been together on this fight a great deal, as he knows.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Is it not a fact that, when we talk about new legislation on the subject and on the other matters that have been before us, we are overlooking the fact that we do not need new legislation, but we need the courage in the House of Representatives to follow the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. BOW. The Constitution provides, and I will read from it in article I, section 8, that the Congress shall have the power to set the duties and tariffs, and that the Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations. If we will have the courage to remember and follow the Constitution, then we do not need anything else. We need the courage in the Congress to follow the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman remembers the bitter floor fight in 1955 when we lost by a single vote when I failed to get an open rule to offer the amendment to the escape clause, which would have provided that the findings of the Tariff Commission except in cases of national security shall be final and binding. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. BOW. The gentlemen and I have been together in this fight right along.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to remind my colleagues of the congressional fellowship program of the American Political Science Association. As many of you know, this association is a professional organization consisting of about 6,000 teachers and practitioners in the field of political science. The fellowships are made possible through a grant from the Edgar B. Stern family fund of New Orleans, La. The program is now in its fourth year and has proved to be very successful. The primary objective is to give young political scientists and journalists an opportunity to learn about the legislative process from a first-hand experience. They then can return to their schools, papers, radio, or TV stations with an increased understanding of how Congress functions.

This year 11 of these young men are taking part in the program. They came to Washington last November to participate in an orientation period under the direction of Kenneth Hechler, an associate director of the American Political Science Association. The orientation program included interview sessions with about 30 people connected in one way or another with the legislative process. For example, the group met with Congressmen, Senators, committee staffs, legislative liaison officials in the executive office, the Legislative Reference Service, Coordinator of Information, legislative counsel, lobbyists, parliamentarians, and representatives of the press and radio. This series of interviews will continue throughout this session of Congress. By January 3, each congressional fellow had found a place in the office of a Congressman or a House committee, and will be working as staff members until May 1. At that time each is required to become a member of the staff of a Senator or a Senate committee where he will work for another 3 or 4 months. As staff members they perform the usual tasks of a full-time person in the Member's or committee's employ. In this way each of them comes into close contact with the real, day-to-day work of Congress.

I have served as a member of the association's advisory board for this program, and have had a congressional fellow in my office. I am sure that those of you who have also had one of these individuals on your staff will agree that they are capable, mature persons who take full advantage of the opportunity offered to them. I am sure as a result of this experience they are better teachers and journalists, and consequently, bring a clearer picture of how Congress works to an important segment of the American people.

For these reasons I urge the Members of Congress to support and further this program. At this time you can be of assistance by calling the fellowships to the attention of any political scientist, journalist, radio or television personnel who might be interested. Applications can be obtained from the American Political Science Association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. The closing date for applications is February 15, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an announcement issued by the American Political Science Association.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION ANNOUNCES CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIPS FOR POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND JOURNALISTS

Stipend: Approximately $4,500 for 9-month period.

Qualifications: Preference will be given to applicants in the age group 25 to 32. The following types of experience and training are suggestive rather than binding: (1) Completion of 2 years' graduate work in political science plus 1 year of experience in politics, teaching or public administration or (2) A. B. degree (honor graduate) in political science or journalism with 2 years of full-time practical experience in newspaper, radio or television work.

Program: One-month orientation period.

Four months as a staff member in the office of a House Member or House committee.

Four months as a staff member of a United States Senator or Senate committee.

Applications must be submitted prior to February 15.

Appointments will be for a 9-month period in Washington, D. C., November 18–August 18. Awards will be announced early in May. Preference will be given to candidates, without extensive experience in Washington, D. C. Further information may be obtained from the American Political Science Association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an announcement issued by the American Political Science Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BOLLING for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. HULL and to include an address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. LONG and to include an article appearing in the Shreveport Journal on January 7 and to include other related material.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include his own remarks.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona), and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to extend the time for transmitting the economic report of the President for the 1st regular session of the 85th Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), pursuant to an order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, January 21, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

321. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a report on its activities during the period January 1 to June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

322. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting the fifth special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the 2-year period April 1, 1954, to March 31, 1956, pursuant to section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

323. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

324. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

325. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the ninth annual report of Federal tort claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1956, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

326. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

327. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

328. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

329. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

330. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3204. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3205. A bill making grants of land in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3206. A bill to provide hospital and other care for certain veterans residing in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3207. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the duty imposed on the importation of wool shall be payable in all cases, regardless of the purpose for which the wool is to be used; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3208. A bill to amend the Dependents' Medical Care Act to entitle certain retired members of the uniformed services to the same benefits as certain dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3209. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wire which is to be used in automatic baling machines for baling hay and other farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3210. A bill to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 3211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3212. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to require that unfair labor practice cases be tried in Federal district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 3213. A bill to provide for separate and distinct schools and classes for boys and girls in the grades from 6 through 12, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3214. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3215. A bill to provide that certain findings of disability made for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3216. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3217. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions for permanently and totally disabled wartime veterans, and for the widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3219. A bill to amend section 6 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 3220. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in or near Nashville, Tenn., the Percy Priest Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3221. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 3222. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of a breakwater for the protection of the Cleveland, Lakewood, Rocky River, and Bay Village, Ohio, shore of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3223. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3224. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a wife or widow, or a dependent husband or widower, may be entitled to benefits thereunder even though not actually living with the insured individual at the time required for entitlement to such benefits if found to have been abandoned or deserted by such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3225. A bill relating to the computation of income for purposes of non-service-connected pension benefits payable to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3226. A bill to extend benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to persons injured while engaged in civil-defense activities during World War II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3227. A bill to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the classification and rate of duty on certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior tranfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3229. A bill to increase from $600 to $300 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3230. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage of $1 to $1.50; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3231. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3232. A bill to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3234. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3235. A bill to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 3236. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEENEY:

H. R. 3237. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3238. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 3239. A bill to authorize a project for flood control and wildlife conservation in the Saginaw River Basin, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 3240. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3241. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3242. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction in federally impacted areas, to provide a more equitable method of determining the average per pupil costs of construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3243. A bill to amend section 412 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to contracts relating to the selection or appointment, or the utilization of the services, of travel or ticket agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3244. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3245. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3246. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3247. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 915; 28 U. S. C. 631), as amended, to provide for appointment of a United States commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3248. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to permit junior colleges to participate therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 3249. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3250. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain handmade and moldmade paper on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3251. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3252. A bill to amend section 17 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3253. A bill relating to the information required from certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3254. A bill to remove inequities in the allowances for interest on overpayments attributable to final determinations on applications for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 3255. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3256. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 3258. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 3259. A bill to amend sections 5 and 6 of the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 635, 636), so as to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe, to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years, to transfer trust property of the tribe to any corporation owned by the Navaho Tribe or to municipal corporations within the boundaries of the Navaho Indian Reservation, to adopt a tribal constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 25 years on active duty and who thereafter die shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of the Oceanside-Libby Union School District, San Diego County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3262. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted United States Government life (converted) insurance or national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3263. A bill to authorize the construction of highways and other facilities within the boundaries of Government-owned lands for recreational or other use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3264. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3265. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life insurance and United States Government (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3266. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1948 in order to constitute the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service an ex officio member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3267. A bill to increase the personal tax exemptions of a single taxpayer or head of household from $600 to $1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses

which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3269. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3270. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal payment for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled shall be $30 per recipient per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3271. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 3272. A bill to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of government to finance the development by such States and local units of government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating National Defense Transportation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEENEY:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution relating to the stockpile of extra long staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the 1st conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to restore to the States certain rights affected by recent Supreme Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full ecnomic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicity the longstanding national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 111. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 112. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the advisability and feasibility of a governmental lottery; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 113. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 114. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries by House Resolution 113; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 115. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. Res. 116. Resolution directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to study the advisability of establishing standby oil price controls to eliminate oil and gasoline profiteering in the current Suez crisis; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 117. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Camastra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of Fuad Jacob Salah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of Harry A. Brereton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Servando Lopez-Broges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefine Augustine Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace C. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3282. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of William Badinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3284. A bill for the relief of Joseph Colonna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Connie Maria Fennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Prima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3287. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Guth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schleger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3289. A bill for the relief of Daisy Cecile Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3290. A bill for the relief of Evelyne J. Norris, nee Guerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3291. A bill for the relief of Juan Blas-Nunez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Socorro Raquel Mendez-Cacho and her four minor daughters, Alicia Mendez, Imelda Mendez, Mariana Marta Mena, and Marta Lurdez Mena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3293. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rios-Souza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3294. A bill for the relief of Hene (Genia) Wasser and Michael Wasser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3296. A bill for the relief of Carlos Quecedo Garcia and his wife, Josefa Moya Quecedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3297. A bill for the relief of Arie Cornelis DeVos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 3298. A bill for the relief of Ingrid and Joerg Baxter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tama Moriyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Maria Elizabeth Rambo (Mrs. Charles B. Rambo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Marika E. Demos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 3303. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fox Stapleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3304. A bill for the relief of George Petrolekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3305. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsui Ying Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3306. A bill for the relief of Margaret Bronner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3307. A bill for the relief of Marion L. Barstow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3308. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain real property heretofore acquired by the United States for the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir project, to Ed Rabb, Atlanta, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3309. A bill for the relief of Harry Gold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 3310. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chun-Juan Kao Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3311. A bill for the relief of Pauline and Angelica Semensky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3312. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pollina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3313. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Diugopolska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3314. A bill for the relief of Herman Shin Gee Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3315. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz and Elzbieta Faliszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3316. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Buoy Ngow Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3317. A bill for the relief of Antonio Quijano, Lilia Quijano, and Aurora Quijano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3318. A bill for the relief of Alejo T. Tano, Ignacio Martal Romano, Marcos Sabuloan Jampas, Paulino Josue Elizalde, Jose Gracia, and Alberto Jesus Martinez (Jesus E. Martinez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3319. A bill for the relief of Magtangol C. Polintan, Modesto Erispe Tanoja, Emiliano Jesmundo Magellanes, Eriberto Chavez Abella (Henry Chavez Abella), Federico Tamayo Dagdagan, Rodrigo Corope Alaura, Marcial Mariano Yamio, Carlos Odac Magahiz, Laudelino Tejada Avelino, Gaudioso Trumata Macias (Joe Macias), Godofredo Matados de la Cruz, and Jesus Monzon Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3320. A bill for the relief of Elgin Manor, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3321. A bill for the relief of Roland W. McQuagge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of James L. Bostwick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3323. A bill to authorize former Maj. John R. Brown, Jr., United States Air Force, to accept the Air Force Wings and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of Pakistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. R. 3324. A bill for the relief of Nena Ethline Strickland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 3325. A bill for the relief of Sok Nam Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3326. A bill for the relief of Rahmi Tugrul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 3327. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel certain obligations arising out of a contract relating to the reimbursement to the United States of certain costs incurred by it in the construction of irrigation facilities at Ganado, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 3328. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giacomo DiGangi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Kurt Grossman and Mrs. Theresa Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Marie Vinogradoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief under national service life insurance contract of George A. Whitaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3333. A bill for the relief of Dr. John W. Gruen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

43. By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Petition of Township Committee of Ewing Township, Mercer County, N. J., adopted January 3, 1957, urging assistance to Hungarian refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

44. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Sophia Asbury, Montgomery, Ala.; requesting an investigation relative to charges against her honesty in fulfillment of a contract, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Veterans' Day Address by Senator Martin of Pennsylvania at Greensburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a release concerning an address I made at a Veterans' Day celebration at Greensburg, Pa., on November 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Addressing a Veterans' Day celebration at Greensburg, Pa., today United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN said, in part:

"It is proper on this Veterans' Day to ask whether we can look forward to the day when we will no longer live under the dark tragedy of armed conflict.

"It is proper to ask how we can free ourselves from the shadow of another and more terrible world war.

"It is my humble opinion there is one answer—one course upon which we can place firm reliance. The answer that I would suggest is embraced in one word—strength—strength for victory—strength for peace.

"How can we attain the unity and spiritual strength we require in order to carry out our world mission?

"I believe that the best way to attain military preparedness is through the maintenance of a comparatively small but highly trained professional military establishment, supported by a large body of trained citizen-soldiers in reserve status.

"We should proceed at once to create a system of universal military training, without exemption except for physical or mental reasons and sincere conscientious objections. Universal military training would be fair. It would divide equally the responsibility for national defense. All would have a part in it. It would encourage further service in the Regular Army, National Guard, Reserves, and in technical and professional work. It would teach all of us the real meaning of America and our way of life.

"As loyal Americans, what should our program be? Humbly, I would suggest the following:

"First. We need great production in the United States. Our economy of plenty has made us a rich country with the highest of living standards. Great production will be accomplished by a better know-how, improved tools, and more work.

"Second. While minorities have a right to be heard, they must not be permitted to destroy. America must be governed by majority rule and in no other way. Political parties are a safeguard against minority rule. A strong minority has an important mission, but it is not able to perform that mission unless there is party solidarity. Too many weak political parties were partly the cause of the downfall of France. The United States needs two strong, virile, and clean political parties and no more.

"Third. Every true American must take a part in politics and government. A political slacker is just as dangerous as a military slacker. It is shameful that in many primary and general elections, less than one-third vote. One million American boys and girls have made the supreme sacrifice to insure free elections.

"Fourth. We must retain our know-how in the United States. That means the industrial crafts of America must be protected against the cheap labor of the world. It is the only way we can retain our skill for a national emergency and sustain our high living standards.

"Fifth. We must conserve our natural resources. The world can help replenish our stockpile of deficit items in return for our financial help.

"Sixth. Our national security must be protected by a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, backed up by well-trained civilian components and an organized industrial group to properly supply the services. Each must take a part in the defense of the Nation. It is not a job for the few but for all.

"Seventh. We must all know our Government and the ideals under which it was formed. A great danger in our form of government is the political demagog who promises to give us things. It is always dangerous to vote to contribute to ourselves from the Treasury. High taxes and governmental debt have destroyed more nations than invading armies.

"Eighth. We must become a law-abiding, self-sustaining and God-fearing people. The tabernacles, synagogues, and churches must be the armories of great battalions of righteous men and women, going forth to preserve peace and good will on earth.

"If this is done, it will be the finest and most permanent monument that can be erected to the fine men and women whose heroism and sacrifice we honor today."

A Protest Against the Egyptian Expulsion of Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday night, January 7, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], spoke at a public meeting af the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington at the Statler Hotel. His address was entitled "A Protest in the Name of Liberty Against the Egyptian Expulsion of Jewry." With his customary incisiveness, Senator O'MAHONEY has clearly described the current tragedy which is facing Egyptian Jewry, and which makes it a matter of more than regional concern. I ask unanimous consent that the text of our colleague's remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROTEST IN THE NAME OF LIBERTY AGAINST THE EGYPTIAN EXPULSION OF JEWRY

(By Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming)

This is the sixth decade of the 20th century. Religion, science, and philosophy through numberless generations have proved the folly of war and have taught the God-given dignity of every human soul. Yet the world is not now at peace, and millions of people all over the earth are refugees from the tyranny and oppression of totalitarian dictators who consistently deny the moral principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded.

LIBERTY BELL PROCLAIMS SAME PRINCIPLE OF FREEDOM AS DID MOSES

On the face of the Liberty Bell, which on July 4, 1776, pealed out the tidings that the American Declaration of Independence had been signed, there appear words from the Old Testament which signify the common devotion of the ancient Jew and the modern American to the principles of human freedom.

The Old Testament tells us in chapter 25 of Leviticus that the Lord spake unto Moses on Mt. Sinai and that in the obedience to the divine command Moses, speaking to the children of Israel, adjured them in the words which long ages afterwards were implanted upon the historic bell in Independence Hall, Philadelphia: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

FREEDOM IS INALIENABLE RIGHT OF ALL

I am not a linguist competent to translate the Hebrew words into the English language, but I note that both upon the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia and in the 10th verse of chapter 25 of Leviticus that the word is not "people," nor "citizens," but "inhabitants." Nasser's order of expulsion directed against the Jews was an obvious violation of the faith in liberty which Moses preached from Mt. Sinai and the founders of the United States Government pledged to the world when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The divine injunction recorded in the Old Testament and accepted without reservation by the authors of the American Government was that freedom should know no limitation of citizenship, of religious faith, of race, or any other classification that men may adopt, but is the inalienable right of all the inhabitants of the land. In our day when science has eliminated all geographic boundaries and made the whole world one land, we of this Nation mean the inhabitants of the whole world when we think of liberty and what it means. As Thomas Jefferson wrote it into the Declaration of Independence it is the heritage which all men receive from their Creator.

Our Government, therefore, should have no hesitation in announcing in simple words its condemnation of the inhuman order of expulsion announced by dictator Nasser without reason or cause against the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt. I make this declaration now for myself, and I know that all Americans will join with me, ordinary people as well as those in Government.

Nor are there any facts in the record which the modern world now lays before us which should deter us from such a declaration. Indeed, the facts would all move us to take this action. The Jewish refugees from Egypt are only the last of a long list of refugees whose hopeless subjugation by totalitarian tyranny all over the world make it clear that the fight for liberty is a global fight which can never be successful until the inhabitants of every land enjoy freedom and peace.

MILLIONS ARE REFUGEES OF TYRANNY TODAY

We know, of course, of the terrible concentration camps of the Hitler era. We know the ruthless defiance of principles of human liberty in Communist Russia. We know that millions of people even now, long after the shooting of World War II came to an end, are refugees from tyranny of one kind or another. The Chinese and the North Koreans who have fled from Chinese communism are still without secure haven. When north Vietnam fell to the Communists, hundreds of thousands of Catholic refugees fled across the boarder to south Vietnam. There are refugees in Pakistan who have fled from India, and refugees in India who have fled from Pakistan. Tens of thousands of liberty-loving Hungarians are now fleeing to this and other countries as refugees from the tyrannical oppression of Soviet Russia. And in the Middle East there is the problem of the Arab refugee from Israel, and now of the Jewish refugee from Egypt.

Let no one fail, however, to understand the difference between the Arab refugee from Palestine and the Jews who have now been expelled from Egypt. The Arab refugee, the record shows, left voluntarily—the Jew was driven out against his will. The Government of Israeli has announced its willingness to reimburse the Arab refugees, but the Government of Egypt confiscates without reimbursement the property of its Jewish victims.

PALESTINE HOME FOR JEWS BEGUN 40 YEARS AGO

It must be remembered that 40 years ago on November 2, 1917, the Government of Great Britain through the then Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, announced that it viewed "with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." He went further and declared it would be the purpose of the British Government "to facilitate the achievement of that objective." Then he added that it was understood "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country." The record shows that the Jews have followed the agreement. The Arabs have not.

The principal allied powers, including the United States, endorsed this declaration.

At the time it was made, Palestine was subject to the Ottoman Empire. It was not under the jurisdiction of any independent Arab state. None of its people, Arabs or Jews, enjoyed the liberty, civil or political, which is now the objective of the free nations of the world to attain for all peoples. Therefore, when this declaration was made, nothing was taken from the Arabs. Turkey had conquered this area as long ago as 1520. When World War I was over, the League of Nations gave its mandate to Great Britain in 1923 to administer Palestine as the trustee of that first League to win peace with moral obligations toward the inhabitants.

ARABS HAVE FORCIBLY OPPOSED JEWISH STATE

Then when at the end of the Second World War the United Nations organization was formed, the Assembly of the United Nations in 1947 adopted its resolution calling for the partition of Palestine into two independent states, one was to be an Arab state, and the other a Jewish state. The Jews accepted the decision of the United Nations, the Arabs did not; and in 1948 they began a war the express purpose of which was to destroy the free government of Israel, and the language of Arab leaders left little doubt that they hoped to destroy the Jews as well.

It was then that Arab leaders urged all the Arab inhabitants of Israel to depart. They were called upon to flee to surrounding Arabian areas in order that they might escape death and injury from the guns of the invading Arabs, not from the persecution of Jews. The invasion was initiated, but it was not successful; and we are justified in accepting the report of Dr. Bunche, of the United States, who as a representative of the United Nations reported to that organization in December 1948 that "the Arab States had forcibly opposed the existence of a Jewish state in Palestine in direct opposition to the wishes of two-thirds of the Assembly. Nevertheless that armed intervention had proved useless." Liberty prevailed. Humanitarianism prevailed. The State of Israel prevailed.

Confirming the view thus expressed that the Jews were not responsible, Emile Ghoury, who in 1948 was secretary of the Arab higher committee, declared it to be a fact that the reason "there are these refugees is the direct consequence of the action of the Arab States in opposing partition and the Jewish state." That is the testimony of a high Arab official that the Arab governments were responsible for the Arab refugees.

ARABS CAN LIVE IN PEACE IN ISRAEL, BUT JEWS CANNOT IN ARAB STATES

Arabs can live in peace and security under the jurisdiction of the Israeli Government. Reports to the United Nations indicate that thousands of them live in Israel and pursue the normal activities of any inhabitant, but in that part of Palestine which at the time of the partition became an Arab state no Jew lives with liberty.

FORCE CANNOT SAVE US

This then is the situation with which the liberty-loving people of the world are confronted. The solution is not easy. For 40 years the Jews, after the flight from Egypt, wandered in the desert before they were able to enter the Promised Land. It is now almost 40 years since the United States entered the First World War "to make the world safe for democracy," in the words of President Wilson. But the Land of Promise, the land of milk and honey, the land of peace and security, is still beyond our reach. There can be no peace as long as one area or one group is

under tyranny. Like the Israelites of old, we are still wandering in the desert. We are still worshiping the golden calf. Greed and hate and personal ambition close our ears to the words that Moses brought down from Mount Sinai. We still hope that force in the end may save us, even with the ill-gotten gains with which we stuff our pockets. This we do although the wars of this century have proved beyond challenge that the instruments of war have now become so expensive, so destructive of every sound principle of economy, that no man's savings, let alone his property or his life, can survive another world conflict. We must take the blinders from our eyes and boldly confront the facts which science has proved, which religion has taught, that no nation, no race, can survive the terrors and totally destructive quality of nuclear weapons.

We have no recourse as a Nation but to acknowledge frankly that moral suasion and example alone are the instruments by which to win peace. Every nation and every people who want peace and liberty must forgo all hateful emotions, sacrifice all purely material and selfish objectives in order to contribute the courage and the free will with which the Almighty has endowed them so that they may be willing to make the personal sacrifices without which freedom cannot be won or preserved. If we are to see the Year of Jubilee, when Moses told his people to proclaim liberty throughout the land, both men and governments must be ready to show the patience, good will, and courage which are the only real substitutes for force; not force, but faith in the spiritual, humanitarian principles we have been taught. In this struggle our country must take the lead, not by the resort to force, but by the unequivocal and continuous condemnation of oppression wherever it appears, and the clear declaration that never shall we be deceived into any appeasement of tyranny or tyrants.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 22, marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian national people. It is, therefore, appropriate to call the attention of the Members to this significant fact and to remind them that the people of Ukraine, no less than other enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain, are still passionately longing for their freedom and independence from Soviet communism. It is an interesting fact that, when the Hungarian revolt broke out last October, many of the Soviet occupation troops stationed in Hungary at that time were of Ukrainian origin. A substantial number of them are believed to have defected and gone over to the side of the revolutionaries with their guns and ammunition.

This one example shows that the people of Ukraine can still be counted on the side of freedom's cause. When the day of liberation comes, as come it surely will, the movement for self-determination will spread to the Ukraine whose people have not forgotten their historic traditions or their glorious moment of independence in 1918–20. It is well for all of us to recognize the significance of this date and to again express our conviction that freedom will one day return to the Ukrainian people as well as their enslaved neighbors.

Abbeville, La., High School Band To Participate in the Inaugural Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the very high honor that has been paid the Abbeville, La., High School Band, from my congressional district, which has been selected to participate in the Presidential inaugural parade next Monday.

This capable and popular 87-piece band will come to Washington at the invitation of Hon. Harold E. Stassen, special assistant to the President, who heard the band when he attended the eighth annual Louisiana Dairy Festival and Fair in Abbeville last October and told Mayor Roy R. Theriot of that city that the group should play for the inaugural. In due course of time arrangements were made for the band to represent Louisiana in the inaugural parade.

To finance this memorable trip, the justly proud citizens of Abbeville staged a successful campaign for the raising of the $8,000 necessary. A series of benefit projects followed, featured by a $10 a plate testimonial banquet honoring the band, with Louisiana Republican National Committeeman John Minor Wisdom as principal speaker.

The young musicians will arrive here early Sunday and after attendance at church services will begin a busy round of activities including sightseeing and other events, preceding the inaugural. A tour of the Capitol is planned for Tuesday before the members of the party leave at noon. Some stops en route to and from Washington are scheduled for the presentation of concerts.

Those making the trip to Washington with the band and Director Anthony Fontana will include, Mayor Theriot; Mr. W. G. Bazar, music supervisor of Vermilion Parish—County; Mr. L. J. Berry, principal of Abbeville High School; Mr. Joe Choate, of the Abbeville Meridional, representing the press; and the band chaperones who are Mrs. Howard Hollier, Mrs. Alpheus Sellers, Mrs. Charles Piazza, Jr., Mrs. E. M. Stokes, Miss Mazie Gisclair, Mrs. Abel Landry, Mrs. Clemile Thibodeaux, nurse, Mrs. Walter Bertrand, Mr. Howard Hollier, Mr. Vic Schriefer, and Mr. Dudley Dubois.

The roster of band members follows:

Larry J. Baudoin, Michael Bazar, Edna Bertrand, Virgie Bertrand, Dionise Boudreaux, Jackie Britt, Cludette Broussard, Donavon Broussard, Eugene Broussard, Rosa Nel Broussard, Ruby Broussard, Wayne Broussard, Wesley Broussard, Willie Broussard, Rosalie Cain, Nettie Campbell, Donald Chauvin, John Daspit, Patricia d'Augereau, Henry Delino, Inez Detraz, Patrick Dore, Glenn Dubois, Judy Fleming, Daniel Frederick, Katherine Fusilier, Frances Gisclair, Jeffrey Guidry, Gordon Haseman, Clifford Hebert, Elaine Hebert, Gene Hebert, Steve Hebert, Carol Henry, Glenda Hollier, Kent Hungerford, Robert Jones, Dorothy Kelly, James Kitchell, Paul LaBauve, John Emery Landry, Judy Landry, Phyllis Landry, Dorothy LeBlanc, E. Kent LeBlanc, Leewood LeBlanc, Leonard LeBlanc, Nedley Leger, Kenneth LeMaire, Bobby Meaux, Roy Miguez, Audrey Montet, John Morin, Calvin Mouton, Harold Mouton, Lorena Mouton, Mary Musumeche, Claudette Nugier, Jerry Olds, Jackie O'Neil, Donne Lee Piazza, Carrol Pontiff, Lionel Primeaux, Jr., Verna Primeaux, Glenn Richardson, Douglas Romero, Eugene Romero, Jr., Weston Romero, Brenda Roy, Karen Russo, Judy Schexnaider, Margaret Schriefer, Russel Sellers, Krabben Sellers, Ruth Sellers, Donn Stansbury, Elizabeth Stokes, Gary Theall, Clemile Thibodeaux, Joseph Thibodeaux, Jane Touchet, Donald Toups, Denery Trahan, Waynoka West.

A National Pension To Protect Aged American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it requires no great gift of prophecy to predict that, not only is social security here to stay, but that its coverage and benefits will come closer to matching the promise implicit in its title, as time goes on.

At this opening session of the 85th Congress, I am reintroducing the bill that I presented on January 5, 1955, calling for the payment of a $100-a-month pension to all American citizens who shall attain the age of 65, who have been citizens for at least 10 years.

Due to the increase in the minimum cost of living, it is necessary to raise the benefits. The precedent for reducing the qualifying age requirements is found in recent amendments to the social-security law that now make women eligible at 62.

Our Nation was tardy in recognizing the need for an adequate program of social security. As we were late in starting one, we have not succeeded as yet, in bringing it up-to-date.

This timelag has resulted in threadbare respectability for many of our older citizens who cannot make both ends meet under the present formula for benefits.

For them, the present social security program provides little sustenance, and less comfort.

That is why a strong and persistent movement is under way to amend the Social Security Act to provide a pension

sufficient in amount to meet the minimum cost of living. A direct national pension, based on qualifying age and citizenship; easy to administer, and adequate in its benefits.

And providing for $150 a month for each pensioner, which is the irreducible minimum under today's high cost of living.

The time has long since passed since we based our appeals for this type of legislation on humanitarian grounds alone.

Even orthodox economists claim it to be one of the built-in cushions that will prevent any repetition of our crippling experience during the depression of the 1930's.

We have learned that the widespread distribution of purchasing power is essential to our progress as a Nation.

Of one thing I am certain; that the American people are determined, through their Representatives in the Federal Government, to build a social security program that will protect them against the economic vicissitudes of old age.

The Nation is prospering.

It is in a far better position to improve its protection for the aged, than at any previous time in its history.

The next step forward should be the legislation of a direct national pension to provide better security for all qualified American citizens at the age of 62.

Comments by Senator Wiley on Danger of Pearl Harbor Type of Attack Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been called to my attention a most interesting article published in the January 4, 1957, issue of a daily newspaper in Montana called the Glendive Daily Ranger.

The article is the result of an interview with our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the interview be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY, FOREIGN RELATIONS LEADER, WARNS OF DANGER OF RUSSIAN PEARL HARBOR ATTACK ON UNITED STATES IN A DAILY RANGER EXCLUSIVE

(By Ken Byerly)

The gray-haired, distinguished-looking man of the day-coach seat behind me looked familiar. It was at Wyeville, Wis. I had just boarded the North Western Railway's streamliner, the 400.

"Pardon me," I said. "Aren't you Senator WILEY?"

He was, and he introduced me to his attractive young wife.

The veteran Wisconsin legislator was en route from his home at Chippewa Falls, Wis., to the Nation's Capital, and the present session of Congress. I was traveling from from Rochester, Minn., to Milwaukee and Racine.

"A lot of us out in Montana were glad to see you get reelected," I told the 18-year Senate veteran who is a past chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and is an active and effective supporter of the Eisenhower foreign policy. WILEY is a Republican. "We figured some of the old guard in your party gave you a bum deal."

Wisconsin has a primary law for nominating candidates. Some of the GOP leaders in that State backed a movement last summer at a convention to oust Senator WILEY as Republican candidate for the United States Senate, despite his almost two decades of service.

BY 260,000 VOTES

WILEY ran anyway, beating his opponent in the primary, and winning 6 more years in the Senate by the overwhelming margin of more than 260,000 votes in the November general election.

"What about the rebellions in Hungary and Poland against the Kremlin?" I asked the long-time expert on foreign affairs. "Is this the beginning of the end for the Communists?"

The Wisconsin Senator preferred not to be quoted on the subject, but he did have a word of warning for all of us.

"You newspapermen have a job to do," he said. "You must keep the people of the United States alert. Tell them the changed facts of life in this changing world where every nation is in every other nation's backyard.

"Few people seem concerned about the Communists and the dangers of war. Farmers talk about prices, schoolmen want more schools, small businessmen worry about profits. Everyone wants taxes cut.

"All these things are important," the 72-year-old solon said, "but the big thing right now is the danger of a sneak attack on us by the Russians, and our being asleep as we were at Pearl Harbor."

NOT A DRILL

"I have been reading in Life Magazine about the attack on Pearl Harbor. You remember how an American soldier picked up the approaching Japanese planes on radar when they were a hundred miles out. He reported them, but nobody paid any attention, thinking an enemy plane was impossible.

"When the Jap planes attacked shortly after, American soldiers, sailors and marines had to be told over loudspeakers, 'This is not a drill.'

"Thousands of American lives were lost on December 7, 1941, because we weren't alert. And the damage done our ships and other equipment probably added as much as 2 years to the war and $100-billion to the war costs.

"The big danger is that this could very well happen again. Now we would not have the time to get ready and pick up the pieces that we had after Pearl Harbor. Then we had 2 years because the world was large and the Pacific was a barrier. Now we won't have 2 hours. Time and distance have been annihilated by man's ingenuity.

OLD STUNT

"If the Kremlin is having trouble with its own people, and there are signs that it is, they might pull the old stunt of staring a foreign war as the only way of rallying the people around them.

"It was a big world in 1941, yet the Japs were able to attack us successfully at Pearl Harbor and do tremendous damage.

"Now it is a little world and any place in the United States is only a few hours from Russia.

"There are atom and hydrogen bombs now, and it has been said by military experts that in case of another war Americans killed may total 70 million people.

"This is our danger, and it is a terrible one," Senator WILEY told me. "Only alertness and military adequacy can avert a catastrophe. The Kremlin understands force.

"We were complacent in 1941, and we are complacent again now. It could happen again, only this time it would be far, far worse.

"Yes, you newspapermen have a job to do. You must keep the people of the United States constantly alert to the dangers," Senator WILEY concluded.

Does the veteran Wisconsin Senator speak with authority? After all, in the old days some insisted on branding him "an isolationist."

TEN MONTHS BEFORE

Yet in February 1941, 10 months before the treacherous and sneaky Jap attack on Pearl Harbor Senator WILEY introduced a resolution in the Senate asking about the state of our defenses at Pearl Harbor and across the Pacific. And in March 1941 he made a speech on the Senate floor repeating the same question: "Will our fleet be caught as the Russian fleet was caught in the Russian-Japanese war?" No heed was paid to the Senator's remarks and 9 months later Pearl Harbor came upon us while we slumbered. All this can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

No on paid any attention. If they had, Pearl Harbor would never have happened. Thousands of American lives would have been saved. And World War II might have been shortened by as much as 2 years.

This time a sneak attack would be infinitely more horrible, with the chance that 70 million Americans might die, and the Communists would take over the world.

Senator WILEY's warning is a timely one. It should be heeded by all of us, here in Montana, across the United States, and everywhere in the free world.

"It is a time for greatness," the Senator said, "in you newspapermen. The citizens of this country must get an understanding of the changed and changing world so they will recognize that the law of national preservation calls for alertness and adequacy with all that those terms imply."

The Russians Are and Will Continue To Be on the Inside of Any Military Action Taken by the Security Council of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is a situation inherent in the Charter of the United Nations of which I believe very few citizens of the United States are aware. It is highly dangerous to the security and welfare of our Nation and, I believe, should be called to their attention.

The Secretary of the Security Council Affairs is now a Russian, and the 3 men who have held that position since the Security Council was organized are: A.

A. Sobolev, 1946–49; Constantin E. Zinchenko, 1950–53; Ilya S. Tchernychev, 1953–.

This means that since the Security Council was organized the Russians, through the secretary, have had close touch will all military plans. The directives to MacArthur and the reports coming from him passed through the hands of this secretary. Now can you realize what MacArthur was up against in trying to win the Korean war? Can you imagine what the commander of the United Nations' troops in the Suez zone is up against?

In article 47, paragraph 3, the United Nations Charter states:

> The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible through the Security Council for the strategic direction of any Armed Forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council.

On January 10, 1957, the State Department informed me that—

> The Military Staff Committee is made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the Security Council, five in number. Its chairman rotates every month in alphabetical order, and therefore once every 5 months there is a Russian in charge of the Military Staff Committee.

I have repeatedly said that the United Nations can get nowhere with Russia as a member. It is powerless to do anything without troops, and as soon as troops are called the Secretary of the Security Council Affairs gets all the information going out to commanders and coming back from them. How do you like this arrangement?

This situation of having a Russian on the receiving end of all information as Secretary of the Security Council Affairs was brought about by an agreement made between Alger Hiss and Molotov in London in 1945–46. The agreement has been kept, as a Russian is there today as secretary, and has been since the organization of the United Nations.

If all the other reasons I have given for the ouster of the Russians from the United Nations are swept aside, this last reason is unanswerable. If we continue the practice, we can win no war that might start if it is to be checked by the Security Council. What is the use of declaring war or engaging in another Korean catastrophe? Haven't we commonsense, or are we playing ball with the Russians, and at the same time talking about stopping the spread of communism? What will happen to our troops under this setup if we give the President the power to send them into war without the consent of Congress?

If we have the least glimmering hope of bringing about world peace, let us oust the Russians and get down to patriotic business. We are in a situation where we are engaged in a cold war against Russia, with a Russian at the helm, getting all the information about troops and supplies, ammunition, and the size of our forces, where they intend to attack, and when.

I don't suppose I can awaken the sleeping guards of this country to a situation that is steeped in betrayal. Are we men or mice?

Bill Introduced To Prohibit Use of Outdoor Advertising Display

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, legislation has been introduced in the Senate to prohibit the use of billboards and other outdoor advertising displays along our National System of Highways. My good friends, Mr. HALE, of Maine, and Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin, have introduced companion measures in this body. I feel privileged to join them by submitting my own measure today.

The area I represent constitutes approximately a thousand square miles due east of New York City. This is Long Island, a narrow strip of land 140 miles long, projected out into the Atlantic Ocean. Twenty-five years ago this area—Suffolk and Nassau Counties—was "real country." Today this area is fast being developed. Along with this incredible rate of development has come the evil of the signboard, the display, and the general unpleasantness of what is commonly called outdoor advertising. Someone once said that it was impossible to see the forest for the trees. On Long Island it is impossible to see the woods because of the billboards. An almost solid line of advertising greets the motorist once he has left any major parkway. In fact, he finds a far more countryfied atmosphere on the Long Island parkway system than he does along the main highway a few miles from my own home, located 70 miles beyond the last parkway exit.

There are three principal reasons why I feel this blight should be eliminated. The first I have already mentioned. Billboards and signs have destroyed the native beauty of the American countryside. This factor is of no importance to the directors of the major oil companies and beer concerns. The admen on their payrolls are only interested in one thing—selling their particular brand of gasoline or their brand of beer. What care they if a little fish pond is obliterated from the motorist's view? A beautiful and historic 18th century house will have a flashing neon sign in its front yard advertising some sickly soft drink. "Sell more bottles," say the admen. "Who cares about antiquity?" The motorist drives along what used to be a bound set of dunes, with waving beach grass and small beach plum bushes, can no longer find these dunes or beach plum bushes. They are hidden behind a vast array of motel advertisements: "Stop at Cozy Corners," or "We have the best little weekend nest on Long Island" reads another spread. What do they care about the out of doors? It is he that gets the most tourists that really counts. One good friend of mine who has a number of discreet billboards advertising his concern bemoaned the fact that he had to resort to this type of advertising. "My competitor did, so I had to keep up with the Joneses."

The second cogent reason for eliminating this blight is road safety. With death on the highway increasing at an incredible rate, who is to say that it is not important for the driver to keep his mind on the road? If his entire attention is devoted to flashing red and yellow lights promoting a new toothpowder or a fancy, tricky blinker to catch the driver's eye in behalf of an insipid lipstick, how can he keep his eyes on the big trailer truck approaching around the curve? How many holidays have ended up in death because the driver was absorbed with a whisky ad—or a motor-court ad?

The third factor regards the value of real property itself. Outdoor advertising, despite what the professionals will tell you, has done more to destroy the value of property adjacent to the billboards than any other factor. Who wants to buy a home in the shadow of a 100-by-30-foot placard whether it promotes a brand of beer, toothpaste, lipstick, gasoline, or any other product.

It is my earnest hope that this Congress will have the opportunity to act upon this measure and that the action will be favorable.

Strength for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely and pertinent speech entitled "Strength for Peace" which Missouri's Senator, STUART SYMINGTON, delivered before the National Aeronautical Association in Kansas City, Mo., on December 5, 1956.

Senator SYMINGTON's long experience and devotion to the American people particularly qualify him to speak on this subject. So poignantly expressed is his warning that Russia's educational program and technological development is geared to build power, while our educational program in the basic sciences and use of technological experts in defense continue to lag, that I sincerely feel the views of this great American should be made available to the public.

STRENGTH FOR PEACE

Thank you for the honor of my being with you today.

I understand that this, the 51st annual convention of the National Aeronautical Association is concerning itself primarily with how aviation, education, and science might join their best efforts for the peaceful future of the United States.

I understand also that in this regard there are present at this convention a number of educators from all over the country who are here primarily to learn how they might work to that end in their chosen field.

All good citizens agree with your association's premise that in these troubled times

the national interest includes not only the steady economic and social improvement of our country—but also the consideration of what each of us, as individuals, must do to insure the survival of our way of life.

With Hungary and the Middle East in mind, every citizen can now almost feel the increasing pressure being posed against the United States by the leaders of the Kremlin.

It is on the subject of this threat, and the current and planned strength of the United States to defend against it, that I speak today.

The present keystone of the free world's power to defend itself against Soviet aggression lies in the quality and quantity of modern weapons systems in the defense forces of the United States; and also in the Soviet Union's conviction that we are not afraid to use that power in retaliation against possible aggression.

Since the end of World War II, the Soviets have maintained a steady campaign of economic, psychological, and political combat against the free world. But they have been deterred from all-out aggression because of the atomic superiority of the United States; and their belief we would use it if attacked.

Even the economic deterrents we have underwritten, starting with the Marshall plan, have succeeded only because they have been backstopped by American military strength.

This same strength has been the keystone of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO in itself is a force of arms obviously inferior in conventional strength to the Soviet power poised opposite it across Europe. But it is backed by American air-atomic power.

In March of 1949 Winston Churchill stated that the only reason the Soviets were not on the English Channel at that time was possession by the United States of nuclear weapons, plus the power to deliver them.

Nearly 8 years later the retiring commander of NATO, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, in effect reiterated Churchill's position, when he said only last month:

"Probably the outstanding element in our deterrent force today, as of November 1956, is the fact we have air units with an overwhelming capacity which could retaliate very significantly."

General Gruenther observed that if the Soviets were to launch an attack with the new rocket missiles, as Bulganin recently threatened to do against France and England, it would "follow as the night the day" that the full weight of American atomic power would be used against Russia.

This open brandishing of America's air arm as a political method for deterring the Soviets from actually using some of their modern weapons was welcomed by all on the side of freedom.

There was one element of General Gruenther's remarks, however, which failed to get the attention it should have had, particularly in the United States.

The general said he was speaking of our retaliatory capability as of now. He took care to point out that he "was not saying we would have the same capacity 5 years from now, or that we would have overwhelming capacity to deter at that time."

It is on the implication of General Gruenther's phrase "as of now" that I would like to dwell briefly—using that thought as the basis for an evaluation of where we stand today; and also for raising the question as to where we may stand 5 years from now, in terms of a military force in being, still modern enough to discourage the Soviets from aggression.

To assess where we do stand vis-a-vis the Communists, let's first take a brief look at the immediate past; more specifically, the last decade.

Ten years ago the United States enjoyed supremacy in modern airpower.

Ten years ago we had atomic weapons. The Soviets had yet to explode their first atomic bomb.

Ten years ago to the best of our knowledge, the Soviets had no jet aircraft in operation.

So far as the free world knew 10 years ago Soviet air power was comprised of relatively primitive ground support fighters and bombers, plus a number of carbon copies of our piston-driven B–29 bombers. Also there were some missiles taken over from the Nazis, along with their inventors.

What is the picture today? In barely a decade, Communist Russia has risen to the position of a modern military power comparable, if not equal, to the United States.

We know they have 175 divisions to our 19. So they are supreme on the ground.

We know that they now have the second largest navy in the world, including hundreds more submarines than we have—so they are also superior under the sea.

But today what we are talking about is air-atomic power.

Seven years ago, in September 1949, the Soviets exploded their first atomic weapon—a number of years earlier than our leading scientific advisers were saying they could.

Over 3 years ago, in August 1953, the Soviets tested their first hydrogen bomb, within weeks of the United States first effective experiment with that same weapon.

A month ago, during the same week of their latest proposal for disarmament, Russia tested its 33d nuclear weapon.

In 1950, at the outset of the fighting in Korea, the Soviets surprised the world by possessing hundreds of MIG–15 jet fighters in the Far East. We had no fighters of equal capability in the area at the time.

Three years later, in 1953, the Soviets had thousands of MIG–15 jet fighters in Korea. At that time out there the United States had less than 200 jet fighters of comparable performance.

It took us nearly 10 years, from predesign to operational stage, to develop and produce the B–52.

As best we can determine, it took the Soviets about half that time to develop and produce their long-range jet bomber, the Bison—and simultaneously they developed and produced their very long range bomber, the turbo-prop Bear, which, because of previous limitation in our funds for research and development, we have no counterpart.

About 18 months ago the Communists showed the world more long-range jet Bisons over Moscow in one formation than this country had in operation a year later.

Yes, the Soviets have come with a rush over the past 10 years, to the point where this administration now admits the Soviets have in operation thousands more jet fighters, thousands more jet bombers, and hundreds more submarines than does the United States.

And there is more. During this past year, Soviet political leaders have stepped down the ramps of many commercial airports from jet transports developed in Russia. The engine of this transport has many thousands pounds more thrust than any engine on any plane in this country.

American leaders still fly in piston-powered planes. We have no jet transports.

In the scientific fraternity, Russian research is now universally respected. At the 1955 World Atomic Conference in Geneva and also at subsequent meetings our scientists have observed that, whereas the Communists lag behind us in some scientific areas, they may well lead in such fields as metallurgy, and may be on a par with us in many others, including the study of physics.

You will be addressed this evening by a very great American, Dr. Edward Teller, whom I particularly respect because, as much as any man, he was responsible for pushing through—over serious objection—our successful development of the hydrogen bomb.

The Russians now have it. Where would we be today without it?

Dr. Teller's authority on this particular subject far exceeds mine, so I won't go into it further except to express my conviction, and this after listening to many thousand words of testimony that the Soviet system, in an overall comparison, today enjoys comparable scientific standing with the free world.

Never forget that, whatever is their industrial complex, built with their technological development, they are using it primarily to build power; whereas we are using our industrial complex primarily to build comfort and a better standard of living.

Under present educational plans and programs, the future looks even darker.

Today Russia has approximately the same number of engineers, and almost as many scientists, as do we.

Recently, Allen Dulles, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, warned that by 1960 the Soviet Union will have graduated during the past decade 1,200,000 university students in the basic sciences; whereas we, during that period, will have graduated about 900,000.

It is now known that the current long-range program of the Soviet Union for the education of its people in engineering and the sciences is by far the most extensive educational program ever undertaken by any government in the history of the world.

Over here, almost the reverse is true. Less than 25 percent of our high school students are studying algebra, the gateway to advanced mathematics, in turn the basis of science and engineering.

Less than 12 percent of our high school graduates are studying sciences—in fact a large proportion of our secondary schools do not have science courses of any kind.

Most of us in this room know of these discouraging trends, but millions of our fellow Americans either do not, or do realize their implications in terms of future security.

Unless this trend is halted, in the not-too-distant future the United States will become second to the Soviet Union in engineering and sciences.

Do we realize what this could mean?

Do we want to assist Mr. Khrushchev, who recently announced publicly that the Kremlin leaders intended to "bury" all those who stood in their way?

Burial might be better than some other fates. Would we like our children to be in the sealed boxcars now moving across Russia to Siberia, loaded with young men and women from Hungary?

Those are the facts; and let it never be said that our people have grown so rich and complacent they will no longer face up to the facts.

Tomorrow in St. Louis I discuss in more detail before the American Vocational Association what we must do in this field of technical training if we want to protect both our security and our prosperity.

Today, I want to talk about how urgent it is for us to do more with the scientific and technical talents and dollars we plan to expend in the future.

Our interest is underscored and heightened by what has transpired recently in Egypt, in Syria, and of course in Hungary. These latter developments but underline the pattern of what has gone on since World War II, starting with the sad business of Czechoslovakia in 1948, then Korea, then Indochina and Formosa—as Russia continues her efforts toward the world conquest her leaders have stated publicly for so long that they intend to achieve.

Mr. Bulganin's threat of the use of rockets against Europe cannot be dismissed as cocktail chatter when it is voiced, as it was, amid the Soviet shipment of large numbers of modern jet aircraft and other arms to Egypt and Syria. This rocket blackmail apparently worked exactly as General Spaatz predicted;

because the British and French, left alone to face the Bear, promptly accepted a cease-fire agreement.

Every fact presented here is known to the Kremlin. Those men ruling the Communist world may not yet be sure of their strength. But by every indication, they feel growing confidence in it.

From our own point of view, any fair analysis of America's military power relative to that of the Communists can only conclude with honest doubt as to just where we stand today; and, under present policies, grave apprehension about where we will stand 3 to 5 years from now.

Leaders in this administration acknowledge that the Soviets far outnumber us in the quantity of their modern weapons, in the air, on the land, and under the sea. But we are told that, despite this numerical inferiority, America retains its leadership in military strength because the aircraft and missiles and other weapons systems presently in our Armed Forces will outperform the weapons the Soviets are using as of today.

In other words, because of our qualitative superiority, and in order to balance our budget, we can afford to pass over to the Communists quantitative superiority.

Only recently, however, in sworn testimony before the United States Senate, our leaders in the engineering and production of airpower asserted upon their return from Moscow last June that it was their conviction the Soviets had already closed five-sixths of any qualitative gap the United States had at the end of World War II. In some fields, the testimony shows, it is their considered opinion the Russians are ahead.

Now the quality of our military force today was determined 5 to 10 years ago, in the research and development dollars, and the talents, we expended during that period.

In other words, there is nothing one can do to improve the quality of our forces today, should we have to use them this week, this month, or even next year.

My hope for appropriate action has to do, therefore, with the force of tomorrow—about which something can be done now.

The quality of our defense 5 years from now will reflect the emphasis in dollars and scientific and engineering talent we apply to research and development this coming year.

It is the general impression that we are doing very well in our research and development for national defense. Responsible people state we are reducing the number of divisions in our Army and the number of wings in our Air Force because of the improving quality of the weapons those services now have available.

This should mean we will find in our next and succeeding defense budgets a substantial increase in funds available for research and development, across the spectrum of both basic research and applied research and development.

If such an increase is proposed, it will reverse the trend of the past 3 years; because those years have found research and development funds reduced each succeeding year.

There would appear to be some contradiction here. We steadily reduce research and development funds at the same time we voluntarily pass over quantitative superiority to the Soviets on the grounds we are superior in quality.

If we are to retain the retaliatory edge in modern weapons systems which we are told we have "as of now," there must be more efficient use of all aspects of technological research and development.

In this regard, you educators and we citizens must call to the attention of students and all other Americans the facts of life in the deadly competition now being waged against us by the Communists—in a field where all too many people still consider the United States unchallenged.

You cannot blame the public, because there are still some in high places who are inclined to publicly deride the Communists for their lack of modern plumbing, rather than respect them as an able and formidable foe, dedicated to our national destruction first, the comfortable life later.

How many Americans pause to consider that in less than 40 years the Communist leaders have organized and led the Russian people to where today they are a serious threat to the free world?

It has happened so quickly most Americans do not realize it yet.

Since their organization as a government, the Communists have had a clear objective—world domination. Toward this objective they have had a plan, or a series of plans, one growing from the other.

No one who believes in freedom could stomach the Soviet totalitarian system, a system which demands that the individual become the slave of the state. But they do have some short-term advantages over our more deliberate democratic system. Among these is a facility for quick decisions. In turn this means more rapid development and production cycles in the obtaining of modern weapons.

As example, it took America some 8 years to progress from test firing the atomic bomb to test firing the hydrogen bomb. It took the Soviets 4 years to cover the same time span.

A major reason for our taking 8 years to the Soviets 4 was because of the delays in policy decisions as to whether or not we should proceed with the hydrogen bomb. Comparable delays incident to decisions about other weapons developments is one of the chief reasons the Soviets have been developing their systems much faster than have we.

Another important advantage possessed by the Communists is the immoral one of initiative. That initiative allows them the element of surprise, an even greater military advantage in the nuclear age.

We have as many engineers, probably more scientists, than they do at present. For over 30 years, however, they have been using the cream and most of the milk of that science and engineering talent to develop their military machine.

In our democratic society, where the individual is free to work where he pleases, far less than a majority of our scientists and engineers are employed in the defense effort.

In summary, the Communists have been making maximum use of their system and their talents toward the development of their war machine; and as a result, their machine today is larger than our own, on the ground, under the sea, and in the air.

We now know also that their long and careful planning, especially in the field of education, has already closed most of the qualitative gap previously held by the free world in weapons and weapons systems.

Unless present policies are reversed, therefore, the current Soviet quantitative lead will soon be augmented by a lead in quality.

If we are to remain free, this trend must be reversed. We must create policies which will enable us to win the cold war now being waged.

Policies must be established which will create events. No longer can we afford to have events create our policies.

If our engineers and scientists and citizens would realize that the fight to maintain freedom is actually going on at this moment, we would soon have a majority rather than a minority of technological experts working in the defense effort.

If the American people were only told frankly that we are actually being hard pressed to stay ahead of the enemy in the quality of our defense (the administration now admits it has given up in the race for quantity) the people would demand, and they would receive, far more efficient use of the technologists already working in defense.

If the people knew the form and character of the growing threat, they would also demand decision as to which among the many costly weapons systems now being proposed and built by the several services are the ones really required in case of future attacks.

Everyone connected with the defense effort knows that with the establishment of proper priority, there could be a far more efficient application of available engineers and scientists, and that in turn would result in more rapid development of the needed defense programs.

Putting it another way, in this air-atomic age, our greatest aim, permanent world peace, can only come through mutually agreed upon, inspection-proof disarmament.

But we have no chance to succeed in that aim if we conduct negotiations from a position of relative weakness—whereas we have every chance of success if they are conducted from a position of relative strength.

A Misleading Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and letters:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of January 7, 1957]

NEGRO INSPECTOR KEEPS VIGIL ON VA INTEGRATION

A member of the American Legion's special State committee studying integration in Veterans Administration hospitals in Louisiana said today he was amazed to learn that a Negro is employed by the VA to oversee integration practices in its facilities.

L. R. Anderson, of Homer, said the committee, which inspected facilities at the VA hospital in Shreveport Sunday, learned from William K. Hinds, local manager, that the VA has an "administrative co-ordinator of minority groups" at its regional office in New Orleans.

Sole duty of the co-ordinator, a Negro, Anderson said, appears to be to check on treatment accorded Negro patients in the Government hospitals and to make sure that the VA's integration directions are enforced.

"That's a farce in my opinion," Anderson declared. "If we need him, we need a co-ordinator for majority groups, too."

Anderson charged that the special State committee is getting far afield of its purpose and that a "weak-kneed" stand on the matter by the Louisiana Legion is likely to result.

He said the committee is gathering statistics which have no bearing on integration.

ATTORNEY OUTSPOKEN ON TOUR

John Reynolds, a Homer attorney and member of the Legion post there, who accompanied the committee on its tour of the hospital in an effort to determine just what the committee is doing, was even more outspoken about the minority groups coordinator.

"That's the most ridiculous thing I ever heard of in the whole area of segregation and integration," Reynolds asserted. Both he and Anderson said they had never known before that the Negro made periodic checks

of conditions at the hospital, or that such a position existed.

"It's sort of terrifying to me to realize that we have this kind of thing on the payroll," Reynolds continued.

The visitors said he went along on the tour because he wanted to find out what the committee, appointed by Department Commander M. C. Gehr, is trying to do. "They say they're investigating integration in the VA hosptial. I don't know what they expect to find. There's no question about the hospital's being integrated. If there's not but one Negro in the entire hospital and he's served on an integrated basis, that's too much."

"It doesn't matter about the number which they stress is four whites to one Negro at Shreveport," Reynolds went on.

He said he suspects the State Department of the Legion will "try to soft-pedal the whole thing and stay on the outside" when the committee report is submitted at the midwinter conference at Lafayette January 26 and 27.

PLAYS COMPLACENCY

He complained that there is too much worry about what the national Legion will think, "when the big problem is integration. There's too complacent an attitude and we are too late getting the thing started."

Reynolds said two things have particularly amazed him about public apathy.

One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS of the 4th District, Dr. GEORGE S. LONG of the 8th and OTTO PASSMAN of the 5th, were invited to a meeting and notified of the order. Reynolds said it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were appraised of the situation. "At any rate, I found nothing about it in the newspapers," he remarked.

The other shocking thing to Reynolds was the report yesterday by Kirk Morley, service officer for the Legion at the Shreveport hospital, that he has never received an official complaint about integration. The patients may have grumbled to him about it, but have never done anything more, he said.

Reynolds said the committee Sunday talked with many patients who said plainly that they were unhappy about being quartered next to Negros but had never voiced any protest.

"Maybe they did not understand the situation; maybe they were awed by the large building but none of the people ever objected and never did until the Broughton case," he said.

Reynolds referred to C. D. Broughton, Homer Legionnaire, who brought the conditions into public focus when he complained he was denied treatment at the hospital in November because he refused to share quarters with a Negro.

"It boils down to the fact that our representatives in Congress did not object, nor did the patients," he said in summary.

DECLINES TO KEEP SILENT

While Gehr said after last Sunday's inspection at the Alexandria hospital that nothing would be made public until the recommendations were sent to the executive committee, Anderson told the committee yesterday he had not promised the State commander to maintain silence. Unless the committee would release an official report after each meeting, Anderson said, he could not be silent because that "denoted secrecy and secrecy denoted something to hide."

His position was disputed by other members.

Anderson reported that Hinds prefaced the 2-hour conference the committee held with him by a discussion of the difference between desegregation and integration. Anderson said he cannot see the difference.

"If a Negro is beside a white, we call it integration," Anderson said.

The Homer Legionnaire reported on the questions asked of Hinds which had been placed to the Alexandria hospital manager last Sunday after being drafted by the committee.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In brief, Anderson said, questions and answers by Hinds were:

Are any Negroes admitted in whom social diseases subsequently are detected? Very few and they are always isolated when found.

How many patients' complaints have you received about integration? Since Hinds took over in February 1955, there have been two.

How many patients refused to enter because of integration? None.

How many ill patients left because of integration? Broughton was the only one.

Any complaints about discrimination? None, personally.

Any complaints of Negro patients unnecessarily exposing themselves in front of white visitors? No.

IDENTIFIED ON RECORDS

Do you identify Negroes as such on the hospital records? They are identified by race except on the P–10 admittance form. Hinds said the forms have been in use 25 years and as far as he knows none but the P–10 are new. He said he has never had any directive from the VA saying anything about not listing race on the forms except the P–10, which followed the September 1953 integration directive.

Asked whether the VA approved designating the race of patients on all forms except the P–10, Hinds said the inspector had been there several times and had not censured use of the other forms.

According to Hinds' figures, 2,581 Negroes or 29.1 percent of the patientload were in the hospital from its opening in October 1950, and September 30, 1953, when integration began. In that period there were 6,295 whites, or 78.9 percent.

From October 1, 1953, through December 1956, the Negro load was 19.2 percent (2,678) with 80.8 percent (11,260) whites. For the entire period, there were 5,259 Negroes (23.1 percent) and 17,565 whites (76.9 percent).

Anderson said he did not plan to attend the meeting at the New Orleans VA hospital Sunday week.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

Hon. JOHN REYNOLDS,
Attorney, Homer, La.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: We, the undersigned Members of Congress from Louisiana, have just read in the January 7, 1957, Shreveport Journal an article entitled "Negro Inspector Keeps Vigil on VA Integration." In the course of this article, after saying that two things have particularly amazed you about public apathy, you are quoted as follows:

"One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for the integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS of the Fourth District, Dr. GEORGE S. LONG of the Eighth, and OTTO PASSMAN of the Fifth, were invited to a meeting and notified of the order (integration order). The article further states that Reynolds further states it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were appraised of the situation—'at any rate I found nothing about it in the newspapers,' he remarked."

We, the undersigned, jointly wish to state that none of us has any recollection of being notified of the Executive order of the President of March 1953 under which all VA hospitals of the United States were integrated and that we, at no time, have gotten together in a joint meeting in Louisiana or elsewhere to be formally notified of such order or to discuss the effect of this order. Since there was no meeting and no notice, no quotation as to what occurred or was said at the meeting has any validity or truth, and we, as Members of Congress, are asking you, in the proper way and at the proper time, to make corrections of what is now a very misleading statement in the Shreveport Journal of that date attributed to you.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress.
OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.
OTTO PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1957.

Hon. JOHN REYNOLDS,
Attorney at Law,
Homer, La.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I have read closely the article entitled "Negro Inspector Keeps Vigil on VA Integration," which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, January 7, 1957.

"One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS of the Fourth District, Dr. GEORGE S. LONG of the Eighth and OTTO PASSMAN of the Fifth, were invited to a meeting and notified of the order. Reynolds said it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were appraised of the situation. 'At any rate, I found nothing about it in the newspapers,' he remarked."

I have always taken a strong stand on segregation and have so indicated my vigorous disapproval by signing the manifesto against integration along with 100 other Members of Congress. I am for segregation in the schools, hospitals, and other places.

I did not receive information or attend any meetings either here in Washington or Louisiana regarding the Executive order of the President of March 1953.

The quoted portion from the article in the Shreveport Journal is most misleading, and I consider an apology to me is in order for having made such a false and unwarranted statement without any foundation whatsoever.

Sincerely,

GEO. S. LONG,
Member of Congress.

Joint Committee To Evaluate Fiscal Requirements of Executive Agencies of United States Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1957

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the usual furor, concern, and dismay that annually surrounds the creating and adoption of a new budget is upon us again following the submission of the proposed budget for fiscal 1958 to the Congress by President Eisenhower.

The job of determining what will be the final form and size of the budget now rests solely in the hands of Congress. We can adopt a good budget or we can adopt an ill-advised budget. Many of us believe that the budget as proposed is too high and needs to be trimmed or reduced if we are ever to make progress in the way of tax reductions. Few would or could, for that matter venture to say

with certainty exactly how or in what way the budget should be cut.

The making of a budget and the planning of Federal expenditures is an extremely complicated process and is becoming more so. Not only does it involve the expenditure of vast amounts of the taxpayers money with myriads of items to be considered, but more and more the decisions to spend money involve considerations of a complex technical nature, or involve complicated and far-reaching social, economic, and foreign policy considerations, to name but a few.

Though the Appropriations Committees as presently constituted and organized, perform their difficult tasks ably and commendably, it is becoming increasingly clear that these committees, and the Congress in general, should be equipped with additional machinery to cope adequately with the complicated job of planning and evaluating Federal expenditures.

On January 3, 1957, I introduced H. R. 1169, the purpose of which is to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Federal Government. This bill would create a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of 24 members, to be drawn from both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and from the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

It would be the duty of the joint committee to make a detailed study of the annual budget of all the Federal agencies and furnish the Appropriations Committees of both Houses with information on items contained in such budgets as may be necessary for the committees to give adequate consideration thereto.

The joint committee would also study the President's messages on the state of the Union and economic report, all information relating to estimated revenue, essential programs, and the general economy, and would report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee its findings concerning budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold Government expenditures at a minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security. It would also report its findings on revenue matters to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

In addition it would report to appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate with respect to existing laws and their effect on the efficiency and economy of the Government, and would make reports and recommendations to standing committees of either House on matters relating to deviations from basic legislative authority, matters relating to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with basic legislative authority, and matters relating to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations.

The joint committee would employ a staff and be authorized to utilize the services of experts from business, industry and commerce, and in addition it would have subpena powers. Staff members would have the right upon authority from the chairman or vice chairman, to examine fiscal records of any Government agency.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this proposed legislation, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members a very interesting and informative editorial by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the February 8, 1957, issue of the U. S. News & World Report entitled "The Budget That's Too High."

In this editorial Mr. Lawrence presents a searching analysis of the budget-making process of the Federal Government and concludes:

Someday Congress should set up large enough committees with proper staffs—perhaps a joint committee of both houses—to study continuously throughout each year the workings of the budget system and gather the necessary information to guide Congress.

Because of the pertinence of the editorial to this proposed legislation, and also because it is material at this time when Congress is deeply involved in budgetary and fiscal matters, I submit the entire article for inclusion in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE BUDGET THAT'S TOO HIGH
(By David Lawrence)

Seventy-two billions of dollars is a big sum of money for a Federal budget. It is an amount difficult, even for Members of Congress, to evaluate. They cannot possibly familiarize themselves with the wide variety of items in a budget.

Someday the American people will demand that the system of budget making be reformed. Today's methods are absolete and madequate. The Government is too big to be run as it was 36 years ago when the present budget law was passed.

For the truth is Congress created a Bureau of the Budget but made it a subdivision of the Office of the President. It gave no power to the Budget Director himself to change the estimates furnished by heads of departments and other governmental agencies. It made the Budget Director only a sort of information gatherer for the President. It did not even require the Budget Director to be confirmed by the Senate.

No member of the Cabinet—not even the Secretary of the Treasury—has the official duty of reviewing the whole budget to determine what items should be included or eliminated.

The President receives estimates from each department or agency and depends on the Director of the Budget for explanatory data. But the decision in the last analysis as to how much shall be included must, by law, be made by the President himself.

Does anybody believe for a moment that any President can make a detailed examination or review of a present-day budget of the Government of the United States and do anything else?

There are, of course, items that do not change from year to year—obligations that grow out of existing laws or previous commitments. The President cannot, for instance, assume that certain laws will be repealed even though he may dislike them, yet they involve recurrent expenditures of many billions every year.

A President, to be sure, is the head of the Government and represents the national interest. He cannot be biased in favor of this or that special interest or locality. He must weigh judicially the demands of pressure groups. He must be sensitive to public opinion—for the continuance of his party in power depends on whether he has in general satisfied the wishes of the electorate.

When the budget law was passed in 1921, it was recognized that officials of the various departments might not be satisfied with the sums allotted to them in the budget and might complain to Congress. Strict regulations—which are still in force—were, therefore, issued by the President forbidding executive department employees from going to Congress to obtain higher appropriations than those set forth in the budget. This has been ingeniously circumvented by Congress itself. Officials are usually invited to testify at congressional hearings, and from them is elicited the information on which champions of particular causes base their demands for enlarged appropriations.

The voting of about a billion dollars more than the President and the armed services themselves asked for at the last session of Congress was so transparently the result of political demagogery and collusion with overzealous advocates of larger spending within the executive departments that the incident makes one wonder whether strong laws rather than mere regulation should not hereafter govern the behavior of executive employees who connive with Members of Congress to lobby for increases in the budget.

In all fairness, however, it must be said that the armament-spending group doubtless felt it was as much entitled to the taxpayers' money as the groups pressing for some of the so-called welfare items in the budget.

But who is to weigh all the facts and say for what the taxpayers' money shall be spent? The budget recently presented by the President was, according to his own admission, very high. He said he hoped it could be cut.

Congress has the sole duty of deciding what the final budget shall be. Under the British and Canadian system, the budget is submitted by the Prime Minister and then the Parliament must accept or reject it as it is, for both the executive and the legislative branch are controlled by the same political party. In America, where divided Government prevails, today, the people pay a high price for their failure to fix responsibility in a single party.

Some day Congress should set up large enough committees with proper staffs—perhaps a joint committee of both houses—to study continuously throughout each year the workings of the budget system and gather the necessary information to guide Congress.

Nobody likes the size of the new budget—neither the President nor the Congress. Certainly the taxpayers don't like it. For they see the Federal budget going higher and higher, with no relief in sight from heavy taxes on the incomes of individuals and businesses.

How much longer will taxpayers tolerate such a haphazard system of budget-making as we have today?

Control Over Interstate Shipment of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I feel would greatly strengthen control over the interstate shipment of firearms to those

who may use them for illegal and wanton purposes.

My bill would amend the Federal Firearms Act of 1938 to prohibit any licensed person, a mail-order house, manufacturer, or dealer from shipping or transporting a firearm across State lines to another person in a State which requires a permit for the purchase or possession of a gun, unless such shipment is made to a licensed manufacturer or dealer or the shipper receives proof positive of the buyer's permission to own a gun in compliance with the law of his State.

This bill specifies that the permit of the purchaser can either be shown to the licensed seller or the seller may receive proof through certification by the licensing authorities in the person's State that he has a permit.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is directed mostly at the transportation of pistols, revolvers, and other small concealable firearms. There is no doubt that firearms of this nature are the ones which figure predominantly in crimes throughout the country involving murder, armed robbery, and so forth.

My own State of Connecticut is one with stringent laws for firearms transactions within its boundaries. Connecticut requires permits to sell, records of sale, proven identity of the person, delayed delivery after filing for a permit to possess and other precautionary requirements. In spite of all this, five Connecticut residents have been brutally murdered by the whims of seasoned thugs and gunmen within the last 2 months.

I am of the opinion that a great many of the crimes and murders which we have witnessed in Connecticut are being committed with weapons indiscriminately shipped in interstate traffic and it is for that reason that I am submitting this bill.

As the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over firearms transactions within the State is questionable, likewise neither Connecticut nor any other State has control over interstate shipment of guns. This is specifically the obligation of the Federal Government in its power to regulate interstate commerce.

Although the Federal Firearms Act contains certain prohibitions against interstate shipment of guns it has proven to be an inadequate law, full of loopholes through which its intent can be gracefully circumscribed.

The language in the bill I proposed was designed to include all organizations which are engaged in the transportation of guns across State lines. While mail-order companies are supposedly licensed and required to keep records of sale, descriptions of guns, name of buyer, and so forth, there is nothing in the present law providing law enforcement agencies in the buyer's area or the State with copies of such information.

It is entirely possible that a person with a record as long as his arm could now write away for a .32-caliber pistol he saw advertised in a sporting magazine. Although the mail-order house requires certain affidavits, the prospective buyer could easily lie in swearing he is over 21 years of age, not an alien, never been convicted of a crime or violence and is not a fugitive from justice, for he knows the local or State police do not even realize he will receive the pistol and the mail-order house will not go to the inconvenience and expense of testing the veracity of his statements.

It is also possible that some such mail-order houses do not even have licenses to ship or bother to keep records of sales since the licensing and records provision in the Federal Firearms Act now applies only specifically to manufacturers or dealers. If a mail-order house considered itself merely as an agent of a licensed manufacturer or dealer, it could conceivably be within the law by not being licensed nor requiring affidavits from the prospective purchaser.

In addition to bringing mail-order businesses and all other companies shipping guns through interstate traffic under the same control by which licensed manufacturers and dealers are now governed, my bill also requires that all licensed shippers, if shipping to another State, must send records of sales to the proper law or police officials of the city, town, or political subdivision in which the prospective purchaser resides. These records must contain the date of sale, caliber, make, model, and manufacturer's number of the gun, and the purchaser's name, age, address, and occupation and any other information required by the Secretary of the Treasury, who administers the Federal Firearms Act. This procedure will provide law enforcement or police officials with complete and important information on every single gun being sent into the States and, more important, to whom the gun is shipped.

Although I am familiar with the firearms laws in some of the States, I have not made an exhaustive study of the laws throughout the Nation.

I know that Connecticut has very good laws. In fact, recently the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association has requested legislation for a longer waiting period before an applicant can take possession of a firearm purchased within the State and I strongly support such a procedure by which the character and background of the prospective buyer can be carefully checked.

There are some States with painfully inadequate safeguards against illegal use and ownership of guns. The force of the act now applies more specifically to the shipment of guns to States where licenses to purchase and possess are necessary. It is my belief that for any State to be able to take advantage of the safeguards as spelled out in the Federal Firearms Act it must have adequate regulations of its own to govern against illegal intrastate transactions.

It is not my intention nor purpose that this legislation will curb the sale of firearms to persons using them for a hobby or other well intentioned reasons, as I know the use of firearms for such purposes is a healthy, wholesome, and popular form of recreation. This bill is purely a means to control against indiscriminate use of such dangerous weapons.

I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which this bill will be referred gives this proposal its earnest and serious consideration and that the necessary reports will be obtained to enable the committee to present the bill to the floor for consideration by this body.

Testimony of Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, Before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by me before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Wednesday, January 16, 1957:

I wish to thank you for the opportunity this committee has given me to express my views on the so-called Eisenhower plan for the Middle East area. I have welcomed this opportunity because for years now I have had a special and active interest in the development of that region and it is my fear that the plan outlined by the President may and can be used as an oversimplification of one of the most complex problems that face us today.

I wish to start off by saying that it is well for the United States to place the Soviet Union, as well as the rest of the world, on notice that the Middle East area is of active and vital concern to its national security. This was a belated conclusion on the part of the administration. It was obvious to many of us when Soviet arms over a year ago started pouring into Egypt that we had failed to see the significance of Soviet penetration. With 1 step forward and 2 steps back, Secretary Dulles, in the handling of the Suez seizure by Egypt, succeeded only in convincing the American public and the world that the United States was not seriously interested in a region which, as President Eisenhower now has pointed out, bears directly upon the safety of Western survival.

I do not wish to belabor the points of nonfeasance on the part of our administration, but the public estimates made by both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles on the Suez situation and the penetration of Soviet influence in that area have direct bearing on the resolution now before us. A year ago Mr. Dulles said, "The problem of the Suez has been successfully resolved." He listed the evacuation of the British among the events which, he said, made the Suez situation better and brighter. And in April the President detailed Suez as one place where we were winning the cold war.

Permit me also the luxury of quoting a few instances of the clouded crystal ball as Time magazine peered into it. On January 3, 1955: "Dulles is the man of 1954 because, in the decisive areas of international politics, he played the year's most effective role. * * * Regionally, 1954's greatest area of success for American diplomacy and the man who runs it was the Middle East. * * * After decades of dispute, the status of the Suez Canal area was settled more firmly than ever before."

And on August 6, 1955, Time reported: "The United States had speculated that Egypt's Nasser might seize the Suez Canal in retaliation but State Department did not rate the chances very high."

On July 30, 1956: "On the broad chessboard of international diplomacy, the United States moved decisively last week in a gambit

that took the breath of professionals for its daring and won the assent of kibitzers for its intrinsic rightness." Might I still quote from Time magazine, "John Foster Dulles advised Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser that the United States is no longer interested in building the $1.3 billion Aswan High Dam. The risk of Soviet penetration was no greater than the risk of having Nasser go on with his fast-and-loose game in the precarious Middle East. It was highly possible that Chessmaster Dulles had his opponents in check."

Then, of course, it is difficult to forget the use of the peace theme in a recent campaign. Now we are faced with a delayed reaction on the part of the administration. But I fear that again we are not being asked to look at the whole picture and see it whole. Can we realistically divorce the problem of Soviet penetration, or the possibility of overt Soviet aggression in the Middle East, from the regional problems, which problems are being used by the Soviet Union as a lever for its entrance into that area? The division is made in the proposal before us between overt Soviet aggression and the problems of Suez and the Arab-Israeli dispute. No such division can be made.

Moreover, it has seemed to me—and I know that my viewpoint is shared by millions of our constituents—that the administration has never made clear what it means when it uses the term "aggression." History does not begin at any set hour of the day; it is a stream that flows around many bends. What was the provocation that led to the intervention of England and France in the Suez? What was the provocation that led to the Israeli intervention? Was not the seizure of the Suez by the Egyptian Government, without notice, in itself an act of aggression? Was not the failure of the Egyptian Government to guarantee free access to all nations an act of aggression? Were not the border raids by fadayeen, the ignoring by Egypt of the United Nations resolution demanding free access to Suez to Israel, acts of aggression? The United Nations has never clarified, nor has the administration lent its collective mind to an examination of what constitutes aggression.

The Suez and the Arab-Israeli dispute, we are told, are to be left to the United Nations. Until the United Nations has means of enforcing its resolutions, has means of acting to stem the defiance of these resolutions, the United Nations can play no greater role than moral persuasion permits it. The United Nations was able to prevent the extension of the war in Egypt only because England, France, and Israel voluntarily accepted its resolution; but it could not end the Soviet aggression against Hungary. It could not make Nasser live up to the terms of clearance of the canal, which was not to be dependent on the withdrawal of foreign troops, but upon the actual order of cease fire. It has been helpless to stop the fadayeen raids against Israel. It has been impotent in forcing the puppet government of Hungary to accept the presence of United Nations observers. When Egypt denied transit through the Suez Canal to Israeli ships, sent commando raids into Israel, and violated the Treaty of Constantinople, the United Nations could not act. Even now, it is impossible for the United Nations to negotiate with Nasser. It is Nasser who sets the terms and the United Nations police force is there on suffrance of the Egyptian dictator.

The United States cannot then leave the decision on these important matters (which must be United States responsibility) up to the United Nations. That is ducking responsibility. The United States will now have discharged its full responsibility by saying we "stand behind the United Nations" for the U. N. can only be as strong or weak as the United States chooses to make it. To say "Let the U. N. do it" is our policy, is, in a way, to avoid making hard and difficult decisions. It is passing the buck.

Viscount Cherwell, nuclear scientist, in the House of Lords recently sought to dispel exaggerated notions of the great power of the United Nations. He said: "In the Assembly, 5 percent of the world's population can carry the day against the other 95 percent and 10 percent could claim a two-thirds majority. * * * Half the population of the world is represented by 4 delegates, the other half by 75. Some are the most highly educated and civilized countries on the planet. The inhabitants of others can scarcely read or write. * * * The vote of 400 million (East) Indians or 160 million Americans is equated to the vote of 4 million Bolivians."

As for the U. N. police force in Egypt, "it * * * could be swept away by 1 brigade of Israelis and probably even by 2 or 3 divisions of Egyptians." To be of any use, a U. N. police force would have to be stronger than any nation or combination of nations. What sort of force would be required to turn Russia out of Hungary, of America out of Formosa, should the Afro-Asian bloc, voting with the Latin American or the Iron Curtain countries, secure an Assembly vote to this effect?

Small wonder the New Yorker calls the United Nations the "United Notions."

How, then, can these problems which affect the entire world—these problems of Suez and Arab-Israeli relationships—be left to the United Nations when they constitute the tinderbox from which world conflagration can start? The Arab-Israeli dispute is obstructed by a Soviet veto in the Security Council and in the General Assembly we have the Arab-Afro-Asia-Soviet bloc forming a coalition to frustrate the best of intentions. How far from simple this problem is when we consider that the United Nations presses Israel to withdraw from Sharn el Sheikh in the Sinai Peninsula. It was here that the Israelis stopped the batteries which shelled United States and British vessels in the Gulf of Aqaba. Can we stop communism from literally walking into the Middle East if, with Communist weapons, the Egyptians control the Gulf of Aqaba which becomes significant as an alternate route to the Suez?

True, the Soviet Union will be placed on notice by this resolution that the United States is determined to protect its national security in the area of the Middle East. But this constitutes only one step, and it is no more than that. This we must recognize lest smugness overtake us in the mistaken belief that we have devised a policy rather than having made just a beginning toward reaching a realistic coordinated policy which includes all these variants.

I call the Eisenhower plan only a beginning, and this the Congress will surely recognize. What part do we play in assuring that all nations shall have access to the canal and the straits of Aqaba? What role do we play in insuring that the Arab world will recognize and acknowledge the existence of the State of Israel? Let us not forget that in that region the Arab-Israeli dispute—if I can use so weak a word—is of greater immensity to them than any potential Soviet threat.

The plan is only a beginning toward a workable policy. But we realize that we are only to take actual notice, through the deployment of troops to the Middle East, when there are overt acts of aggression by the Soviet Union or a Soviet dominated country. It leaves out of consideration completely the problem attendant upon subverted governments. Once a government has been subverted, and there is the usual Soviet putsch, we can hardly expect that it will ask for our aid against Soviet domination.

How clearly this matter of oversimplification stands out when we consider the Middle East itself. We are dealing here with nations of diverse composition, economically, socially, culturally. Yemen and Jordan, for example, are hardly viable states, dependent as they are upon foreign government subsidies. Iraq and Saudi Arabia, despite the enormous oil royalties which they receive annually, are, as far as the people themselves are concerned, underdeveloped to a point of misery. In most of the Middle East area, frankly the enemies of the United States are ignorance, fear, corruption, poverty.

At this point I wish to direct the attention of the committee to some facts which I believe will have total relevance to the examination of the proposal before it.

The Arab countries receive a total of $83.8 million each month from the petroleum industries in the form of royalties, taxes, or other payments. Saudi Arabia, based on 1955 figures, will have received each month during 1956 the equivalent of about $24 million, in dollars, pounds, and francs, paid to it by Aramco which is owned by Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Socony-Mobil. In other words, American companies contributed totally to this figure.

Iraq will have received, in the year 1956, approximately $18 million per month from the petroleum industries, 23.75 percent of which is from American petroleum interests. Iran will have received about $13 million per month, 40 percent of which comes from the American oil industry.

Kuwait will have received $25 million each month of the year 1956 from the petroleum industry, 50 percent of which is American. Quatar will have received about $3 million per month, 23.75 percent coming from American petroleum interests.

Bahrein will have received approximately $800,000 each month during 1956 from the petroleum industry, all of it derived from American interests.

The total received by these four countries is almost a billion dollars a year.

Egypt has a degree of political maturity lacking in such countries as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, or Yemen. Again, it is only a beginning because it leaves out of account the various rivalries that exist among the Arab nations themselves. The one note of unity, and the only note of unity, exists in their attitude toward Israel. In the Middle East we find one country oriented toward the West, politically mature, a practicing democracy, with skilled technologists, a managerial class, and a background of science and experimentation—which is Israel.

I note that King Ibn Saud will visit with the President. In discussing the conditions of his country with him, he can determine how much of oil royalties are used for the betterment of Saudi Arabia economically. It is well, however, for the President to hear first-hand reports from the heads of these governments and it would not be amiss for the administration to invite the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, likewise, to give firsthand reports of the fears and the tensions in the Middle East.

I should like to quote from U. S. News & World Report which, after all, cannot be said to be unfriendly to the administration. In discussing the Eisenhower plan, it says: "Does this increase the chance of war? The idea is that, by warning of American intent to resist aggression, the United States will restrain Soviet Russia. Will it mean American troops for the Mideast? No. This is just to be a warning to Russia to keep out. Will it mean bigger United States armed forces? No. United States already has powerful naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean and very powerful air force strength not far away in the western Mediterranean. Will it call for marines to patrol the area? There is no thought of that. Will United States be committed to move in on local wars? Not necessarily. That would be a

United Nations job. What's it all about, then? The latest United States move primarily is designed to warn Russia against new adventures."

It is not that this warning should not be given. It is only that we must recognize that, in and of itself, it cannot insure peace. The United States must make its position equally clear vis-a-vis Egypt. It must leave neither side guessing in the Arab-Israeli dispute, of the United States conviction that Israel is here to stay; that the United States is firm in its stand that the Suez must be held accessible for all nations, bar none; that it will insure the territorial integrity of the nations in the Middle East as against each other as well as against the Soviet Union; and to the end of promoting peace in that area, it will impose an embargo on all arms to the Middle East and demand all nations do so.

The question, too, must be asked: "Are we going it alone?" It cannot be gainsaid that the oil from the Middle East is the lifeblood of Europe; that European interest in that area is equally urgent. Must we not ask ourselves if this is not a further downgrade of England and France, whose stake in the continuance of civilization is certainly as great as ours?

Again we must take a close look at the program for economic aid as outlined in this resolution. Economic aid designed as a crisis program must fail, in and of itself. The tragic economic plight of the Middle East needs no recounting here. But must we not examine the dangers inherent in a blanket allotment which can be manipulated politically, which is withdrawn from standards placed upon its spending by the Congress? Must not the Congress assure itself that these moneys will be spent for the region as a whole, such as the Johnson irrigation plan, which has been rejected by the Arab nations because, while it will be of benefit to themselves, will also be of benefit to Israel?

The administration at times has appeared to adopt a philosophy of abstention, conciliation, and pacification—all virtues at times, but any of which, under certain circumstances, can be a vice. Peace at any price is fraught with evil. One may speculate whether the price the Nation will have to pay in the long run, even for its present domestic tranquillity, in terms of moral stagnation, intellectual sterility, issues unrecognized, and problems unsolved, may not be too costly and excessive in the end.

It has been the Dulles and Eisenhower policy to avoid problems—push them under the rug—in order to preserve a false front of uninterrupted tranquillity. But in the end the difficulty of solution becomes exacerbated. You cannot keep these difficulties under the rug.

The resolution does not come to grips, as I have tried to emphasize, with such agents of destruction and obstruction as Nasser; does not come to grips with the pouring of Communist arms into the Middle East; does not come to grips with our self-interest of maintaining a democracy like Israel in the Middle East; does not come to grips with the real economic woes of the whole region. And I wish to reemphasize in my conclusion that this resolution is not a program, but only the beginning of one; and while these problems cannot be met properly in the form of the resolution requested of Congress, most certainly the members of this distinguished committee can set this forth in the report accompanying the resolution so that there will be for all the world to read that the United States is not unmindful of the complexities, not unmindful of the mistakes heretofore made, not unmindful of what yet remains to be done.

My position is this: The military warning expressed by the President might have a restraining influence on any rash Russian action. In that sense the Eisenhower doctrine may be commended—but only in that sense.

The second part of the doctrine involves a blank check—blanket authority to spend $400 million within 2 years for economic aid. I hope the committee will separate the two proposals and treat them separately. I want the military warning to Russia to be given. But I don't wish to be stampeded or bludgeoned into granting this huge sum for so-called economic aid. Are we again yielding to the old business of blackmail without any assurance that our aid will be used for real social and economic reform in 10th-century feudal Arab bailiwicks? We have seen the evidence of vast sums siphoned off by Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, and Bahrein. Kuwait is the only sheikdom which spends that money wisely for the social and economic betterment of the fellaheen. Senator KNOWLAND, Senate Republican leader, said yesterday that he was "greatly troubled" by the request to include economic aid in the measure.

It would be difficult to recite how President Eisenhower could spend an additional $200 million each year for 2 years in the Middle East—the angry Middle East.

Saudi Arabia is bursting at the seams with oil money at the rate of $288 million each year (figures for 1956). Iraq gets $216 million in oil royalties each year. The President, in addition, under the Baghdad Pact, has great sums to bolster the defenses of Iraq.

Syria is fast becoming a Soviet puppet if she is not such now. Already she has refused dollar aid at Russia's urging. Nasser in Egypt, is making great anti-American noises. Cairo radio and press daily denounce us and call the Eisenhower doctrine American imperialism. Jordan may go the way of Syria. Anyhow, Britain subsidizes Jordan with $35 million a year. Britain might resent our replacing her. Mr. Dulles admitted before the Senate Joint Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that we would not pick up the "tab" for Britain's subsidy of Jordan. Actually, Israel is the only nation left, plus Lebanon and Yemen. $400 million would not be spent on these three nations. Where, I ask, is this taxpayers' money to go?

Indeed, most intensive hearings should be used to inquire how, when, and why this money is to be spent. We dare not buy a pig in a poke. Mr. Dulles must be subjected to sharp questioning in this regard. In the absence thereof and in the absence of adequate answers I am extremely doubtful of this request for blanket, unqualified economic aid. Mr. Dulles has yet to outline the projects for which money will be spent. It is no answer to say that the whole area would be lost unless the money is forthcoming. That is nonsense. If true, where was Mr. Dulles the months before. Such a debacle must have been discernible and danger signals set over a year ago. He was derelict a year ago or is just indulging in sophistry and mere debate now. He should be compelled to spell out a well defined long range, short range economic aid program for the Middle East. He only has given this committee vague and vapid assumption. When he has been severely questioned he talks differently. The Senators closely interrogated him and he has offered in part to restrict the broad proposed language and use the money for such things as paying security forces in the Middle East nations, tiding them over budget deficits due to major impending cuts in their oil revenues because of the closed Suez and blown up pipelines.

It is incumbent upon you to recall him so that he unfold to you just how this money will be spent. Don't let him frighten you with his crash announcement that unless $400 million is forthcoming forthwith all will be lost.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 11:15 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, Thou to whom a thousand years are but as one day, while lasts life's ebbing hours make us bold and swift to find and do Thy will for our times. In all the fever and fret of a confused day, may we never forget that he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his own heart is better than he that taketh a city.

In this exalted chamber of governance, we beseech Thee, pour the riches of Thy grace upon those who here stand in the Nation's name, upon the President of the Republic, who this day upon the Holy Bible, the charter of our costly freedom, takes again the oath of his great office, upon the Vice President, and upon the Congress, pour for these momentous times a double portion of Thy spirit. Save us from lowering the shield of national unity and solidarity in a perilous hour when the poisonous arrows of tyranny are being aimed by determined foes at the very life of this dear land of our hope and prayer. To all who serve in the ministry of public affairs give fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the kindly heart, nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in man that is more than coronets. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1957.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONRONEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 17, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies on the east front of the Capitol, incident to the administration of the oath of office to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 20) to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is desired to have a brief morning hour. I announce that the absence of a quorum will be suggested at about 11:25 a. m., but I ask unanimous consent that the Senate have a brief morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business with a limitation of 1 minute on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES AND ACQUISITION OF LAND

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for the 2-year period April 1, 1954, to March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council on its activities during the period January 1 to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 729. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to correct certain deficiencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 730. A bill for the relief of Shao Fong Sha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS ORDERED PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, the following address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the Inaugural Nationalities Banquet at Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on January 20, 1957.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no Senators who desire recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate now proceed to the inaugural platform.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes a. m., the Senate, headed by the President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the places assigned them on the left of the place reserved for the President.

The House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CARL VINSON], and the Clerk (Ralph R. Roberts), had preceded the Senate to the inaugural platform and taken the places assigned them on the right and left of the place reserved for the President.

The Governors of the States, escorted by Robert G. Baker, secretary for the majority of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them on the right.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and their aides, escorted by Edward E. Mansur, Jr., legislative clerk of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them on the right.

The diplomatic corps, escorted by Jessop I. McDonell, assistant secretary for the majority of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them on the left.

The members of the President's Cabinet, escorted by Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, headed by the Clerk (John T. Fey) and the Marshal (T. Perry Lippitt), accompanied by the Reporter (Walter Wyatt) and escorted by William Brownrigg, assistant secretary for the minority of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them, the Chief Justice being seated immediately to the right and the Associate Justices being seated to the left of the place reserved for the President.

The Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, escorted by the Sergeant at the Arms of the Senate (Joseph C. Duke) and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives (Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.), and by Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, of Rhode Island, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and Representative

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took the place assigned him immediately to the left of the place reserved for the President.

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, escorted by the Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and House of Representatives, and by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and member of the joint committee, and by the other four members of the joint committee, accompanied by J. Mark Trice, secretary for the minority of the Senate and also secretary of the joint committee, proceeded to the inaugural platform and took his place at the front and center.

Mrs. Eisenhower was escorted to the platform by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and took the place assigned her next to the President.

The President's son, Maj. John S. D. Eisenhower, his wife and children were escorted to the platform and took the places assigned them.

The Marine Band, under the direction of its leader, Capt. Albert F. Schoepper, played ruffles and flourishes and Hail to the Chief.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE INAUGURAL PLATFORM

(The introductions were made by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee.)

INVOCATION

The Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following invocation:

Almighty God, our Creator, Redeemer, and Judge, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, make sacred to us this solemn hour of dedication.

Correct what is wrong; confirm what is right.

Make us good enough and great enough and strong enough to be the servants of Thy purposes in our age.

Guard, guide, and empower Thy servants who here renew their vows before Thee and this people.

Hallow the coming days of their service that they may live and labor as under the higher order of Thy kingdom.

Enable us all to be worthy of that blessing which belongs to the nation whose God is the Lord.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

SINGING OF NATIONAL ANTHEM

Miss Marian Anderson sang the Star-Spangled Banner, accompanied by the Marine Band.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, administered to the Vice President the oath of office prescribed by law, and it was repeated by him, as follows:

I, RICHARD M. NIXON, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

PRAYER

His Eminence Michael, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee and glorify Thee our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, for this ever-memorable day of the inauguration, for another period of 4 years, and lofty stewardship in the governing of our country, the United States, by our God-fearing and beloved President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We praise Thee, and bless Thy Name, and we voice our deepest gratitude to Thee, Almighty Creator of the Universe, for all the peace, the good living, and the perfect freedom that we, as American citizens all, have enjoyed in the past, and during the 4 years just ended, of our President's leadership; for his superb example, his faithful life, his devotion to duty.

We entreat Thee, Almighty Lord, to grant him health of body, and, through Thy Holy Spirit, all wisdom and guidance that he may perform his high tasks in the most fruitful manner.

Yea, O Lord, Thou art the fountain of all good things and without Thy grace we can do nothing profitable and lasting. Without Thy blessing we work in vain.

We, therefore, humbly pray to Thee: Grant to our President and our Vice President Thy precious blessings of grace, vision, and judgment, in the name and for the sake of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

The Marine Band played America the Beautiful.

SOLO

Mr. Brian Sullivan sang America, accompanied by the Marine Band.

PRAYER

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, chancellor, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, grant Dwight David Eisenhower and RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON the blessings sought of Thee for all mankind by the saint Rab 16 centuries ago in Babylonia. Give them long life, life of peace, life of happiness, above all life which may prove a blessing to mankind. Do Thou fulfill in their days and in ours Thy promise to the prophets, that Thou wilt cause fear of Thee to enter the hearts of all Thy creatures, so that mankind may become one society, dedicated with a complete heart to performance of Thy will. May wickedness be silenced, may the rule of arrogance vanish, and Thou alone reign over all. Our Father and our King, may our time be ripe for Thine own intervention as of yore, to inspire us to obey Thee, that all mankind may join us in Thy service, for their own sake, and for the sake of Thy holy name. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT

(The Marine Band sounded ruffles.)

The Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, administered to the President the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, and it was repeated by him, as follows:

I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

THE PRICE OF PEACE

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Speaker, members of my family and friends, my countrymen, and the friends of my country, wherever they may be, we meet again, as upon a like moment 4 years ago, and again you have witnessed my solemn oath of service to you.

I, too, am a witness, today testifying in your name to the principles and purposes to which we, as a people, are pledged.

Before all else, we seek, upon our common labor as a nation, the blessings of Almighty God. And the hopes in our hearts fashion the deepest prayers of our whole people.

May we pursue the right without self-righteousness.

May we know unity without conformity.

May we grow in strength without pride in self.

May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice.

And so shall America—in the sight of all men of good will—prove true to the honorable purposes that bind and rule us as a people in all this time of trial through which we pass.

II

We live in a land of plenty, but rarely has this earth known such peril as today.

In our Nation work and wealth abound. Our population grows. Commerce crowds our rivers and rails, our skies, harbors, and highways. Our soil is fertile, our agriculture productive. The air rings with the song of our industry—rollings mills and blast furnaces, dynamos, dams, and assembly lines—the chorus of America the bountiful.

This is our home—yet this is not the whole of our world. For our world is where our full destiny lies—with men, of all peoples, and all nations, who are or would be free. And for them—and so for us—this is no time of ease or of rest.

In too much of the earth there is want, discord, danger. New forces and new nations stir and strive across the earth, with power to bring, by their fate, great good or great evil to the free world's future. From the deserts of North Africa to the islands of the South Pacific one-third of all mankind has entered upon a historic struggle for a new freedom: freedom from grinding poverty. Across all continents, nearly a billion people

seek, sometimes almost in desperation, for the skills and knowledge and assistance by which they may satisfy from their own resources, the material wants common to all mankind.

No nation, however old or great, escapes this tempest of change and turmoil. Some, impoverished by the recent World War, seek to restore their means of livelihood. In the heart of Europe, Germany still stands tragically divided. So is the whole Continent divided. And so, too, is all the world.

The divisive force is international communism and the power that it controls.

The designs of that power, dark in purpose, are clear in practice. It strives to seal forever the fate of those it has enslaved. It strives to break the ties that unite the free. And it strives to capture—to exploit for its own greater power—all forces of change in the world, especially the needs of the hungry and the hopes of the oppressed.

Yet the world of international communism has itself been shaken by a fierce and mighty force: the readiness of men who love freedom to pledge their lives to that love. Through the night of their bondage, the unconquerable will of heroes has struck with the swift, sharp thrust of lightning. Budapest is no longer merely the name of a city; henceforth it is a new and shining symbol of man's yearning to be free. [Applause.]

Thus across all the globe there harshly blow the winds of change. And, we—though fortunate be our lot—know that we can never turn our back to them.

III

We look upon this shaken earth, and we declare our firm and fixed purpose—the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails.

The building of such a peace is a bold and solemn purpose. To proclaim it is easy. To serve it will be hard. And to attain it, we must be aware of its full meaning—and ready to pay its full price.

We know clearly what we seek, and why.

We seek peace, knowing that peace is the climate of freedom. And now, as in no other age, we seek it because we have been warned, by the power of modern weapons, that peace may be the only climate possible for human life itself.

Yet this peace we seek cannot be born of fear alone: it must be rooted in the lives of nations. There must be justice, sensed and shared by all peoples, for, without justice the world can know only a tense and unstable truce. There must be law, steadily invoked and respected by all nations, for without law, the world promises only such meager justice as the pity of the strong upon the weak. But the law of which we speak, comprehending the values of freedom, affirms the equality of all nations, great and small.

Splendid as can be the blessings of such a peace, high will be its cost, in toil patiently sustained, in help honorably given, in sacrifice calmly borne.

We are called to meet the price of this peace.

To counter the threat of those who seek to rule by force, we must pay the costs of our own needed military strength, and help to build the security of others.

We must use our skills and knowledge and, at times, our substance, to help others rise from misery, however far the scene of suffering may be from our shores. For wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope, the hope of progress—or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict.

We recognize and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere. We are accordingly pledged to honor, and to strive to fortify, the authority of the United Nations. For in that body rests the best hope of our age for the assertion of that law by which all nations may live in dignity.

And beyond this general resolve, we are called to act a responsible role in the world's great concerns or conflicts—whether they touch upon the affairs of a vast region, the fate of an island in the Pacific, or the use of a canal in the Middle East. Only in respecting the hopes and cultures of others will we practice the equality of all nations. Only as we show willingness and wisdom in giving counsel, in receiving counsel, and in sharing burdens, will we wisely perform the work of peace.

For one truth must rule all we think and all we do. No people can live to itself alone. The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense. The economic need of all nations—in mutual dependence—makes isolation an impossibility; not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people, seeking such shelter for themselves, can now build only their own prison.

IV

Our pledge to these principles is constant, because we believe in their rightness.

We do not fear this world of change. America is no stranger to much of its spirit. Everywhere we see the seeds of the same growth that America itself has known. The American experiment has, for generations, fired the passion and the courage of millions elsewhere seeking freedom, equality, and opportunity. And the American story of material progress has helped excite the longing of all needy peoples for some satisfaction of their human wants. These hopes that we have helped to inspire, we can help to fulfill.

In this confidence, we speak plainly to all peoples.

We cherish our friendship with all nations that are or would be free. We respect, no less, their independence. And when, in time of want or peril, they ask our help, they may honorably receive it; for we no more seek to buy their sovereignty than we would sell our own. Sovereignty is never bartered among freemen. [Applause.]

We honor the aspirations of those nations which, now captive, long for freedom. We seek neither their military alliance nor any artificial imitation of our society. And they can know the warmth of the welcome that awaits them when, as must be, they join again the ranks of freedom.

We honor, no less in this divided world than in a less tormented time, the people of Russia. We do not dread, rather do we welcome, their progress in education and industry. We wish them success in their demands for more intellectual freedom, greater security before their own laws, fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their own toil. For as such things come to pass, the more certain will be the coming of that day when our peoples may freely meet in friendship.

So we voice our hope and our belief that we can help to heal this divided world. Thus may the nations cease to live in trembling before the menace of force. Thus may the weight of fear and the weight of arms be taken from the burdened shoulders of mankind.

This, nothing less, is the labor to which we are called and our strength dedicated.

And so the prayer of our people carries far beyond our own frontiers, to the wide world of our duty and our destiny.

May the light of freedom, coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly—until at last the darkness is no more.

May the turbulence of our age yield to a true time of peace, when men and nations shall share a life that honors the dignity of each, the brotherhood of all. [Applause.]

BENEDICTION

Edward Cardinal Mooney, of Detroit, Mich., pronounced the following benediction:

Lord God of men and nations, hear us, we beseech Thee, and bless us.

Bless our Chief Executive as he assumes for another term the heavy responsibility of the Presidency in a troubled and confused world.

Bless him in discharging his sworn duty to uphold the Constitution and thus to establish justice within our borders, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure for every citizen the enjoyment of the equal and inalienable rights with which, as the Founding Fathers solemnly declared, all men are endowed by Thee.

Bless him in exercising the leadership among the free nations of the West which has devolved upon our country. Bless him with the strength to stand firm for what is right and the skill to achieve international conciliation in truth and patience—that all nations may, even in this nuclear age, enjoy the security of a just and lasting peace. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

The Marine Band played the Star-Spangled Banner.

RECESS

On the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies, at 12:45 o'clock p. m., the Senate, under the order previously entered, stood in recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 22, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1957

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. VINSON].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, we thank Thee for these days, so significant in the calendar of our national life, when Thy servants, two of our fellow citizens, are taking the sacred oath of office as the President and the Vice President of these United States.

We earnestly beseech Thee to bless them abundantly with Thy grace and favor as they solemnly pledge themselves before God and man to discharge the duties and responsibilities of their high vocation with a pure and steadfast devotion.

May our leaders in Government and all our chosen Representatives be men and women upon whom Thou hast put Thy spirit and the seal of Thine approval.

Grant that daily they may enter into counsel with the God of all wisdom, recognizing their absolute dependence upon Thee and always holding their own desires and wishes in abeyance and waiting until Thou hast revealed unto them Thy way and Thy will.

Wilt Thou continue to bestow upon our beloved country Thy benediction and use us mightily in guiding burdened and groping humanity by the light of Thy truth and into the fellowship of Thy love and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 17, 1957, was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce to the House that we will leave here in a body to go out on the official platform for the inaugural ceremony. In order to get on the platform it will be necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The seats to be occupied by the Senate and the House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair also desires to state that, pursuant to House Resolution 110, on the conclusion of the ceremonies on the east front of the Capitol, the House will stand adjourned until noon on tomorrow.

The Speaker pro tempore, preceded by the Clerk, will head the procession, and the Members of the House will form in double column following them.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a. m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker pro tempore and the Clerk, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 110, stood in adjournment until Tuesday, January 22, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

331. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 1, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Escambia River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

332. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 27, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Wolf River and tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 5, 1952 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

333. A letter from the Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 10 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1363); to the Committee on Agriculture.

334. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense for the calendar year ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

335. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

336. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

337. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, listed individual procurement actions negotiated in the period from January 1 through June 30, 1956, pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (codified in August 1956 as 10 U. S. C. 2301 et seq.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

338. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc., transmitting the audit report of March 31, 1956, of the Reserve Officers Association, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

340. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

341. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judicial Conference of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

342. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Apostolos Stefanatos, A-5107356, relating to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual, pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

343. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, relative to position in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503 (a), title V of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

344. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3334. A bill to provide for a program to encourage the utilization of domestic cotton fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3335. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3336. A bill designating the first day of May in each year as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3337. A bill to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3338. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3339. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 3340. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3341. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit policemen and firemen in positions covered by retirement systems to obtain social-security coverage on the same basis as other State and local employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3342. A bill to adjust the compensation of officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3343. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to cause a survey to be made of San Jacinto River, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the officials of the Federal Government not to invite Marshal Josip Broz Tito to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 3344. A bill for the relief of Kenneth F. Ailes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3345. A bill for the relief of Parania Mykycey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3346. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Mrs. Sophronia Smiley Delaney and her sons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 3347. A bill for the relief of Sadako Kaneshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Nellie Brent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

45. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Fort Plain Council No. 415, Knights of Columbus, Fort Plain, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strenuously protesting the proposed coming visit of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

46. Also, petition of the president, District of Columbia Dental Society, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring the enactment of H. R. 9 and H. R. 10, which would make possible the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

47. Also, petition of Sophia W. Asbury, Montgomery, Ala., transmitting additional material numbered as file No. 1 and file No. 2, and excerpts from testimony in the case of *Homer L. Cochran, complainant* v. *Sophia W. Asbury, et al., defendants*, relating to petition No. 44 listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 17, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland Before Inaugural Nationalities Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 21, 1957

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a speech I delivered last night at the inaugural nationalities banquet at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is most fitting that this banquet, held on the eve of the public inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States, should be under the sponsorship of the Nationalities Advisory Committee and the Inaugural Nationalities Committee.

Firstly, with the exception of American Indians, in this new world all of us ourselves or our parents, grandparents, or more distant forebears, came from the old worlds of Europe, Asia, or Africa.

While as citizens of the United States our loyalty is to this great republic it is also natural that there remain ties of historic interest, family or racial connections, and religious beliefs, together with our natural humanitarian instincts, that makes what happens in Budapest, Berlin, London, Peiping, Cairo, or any other city large or small more than just newspaper datelines.

Secondly, the nationalities groups throughout our country made notable contributions to the reelection of our great president Dwight D. Eisenhower and our able and effective Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. Not only are you entitled to be here to witness the culmination of your individual and collective constructive labors in the last campaign but you have earned the right to a respectful hearing to your recommendations.

There are many great problems confronting our country, domestic and foreign. The President in his address on the Middle East resolution, in his state of the Union message, in his inaugural address tomorrow, or in future special messages to the Congress will discuss them.

To me the greatest issue of the day is human freedom. Under either Republican or Democratic administrations our foreign policy should be based upon it. What advances freedom we should support and what retards or endangers it we should oppose.

There are principles that cannot be compromised without fatal effects on the compromiser or on the sacrificial victim. Czechoslovakia was a casualty of such a deal. Munich should have taught the world that appeasement is not the road to peace but is only surrender on the installment plan.

Communism is an evil thing. It is destructive of religion, freedom, family life, and other human rights that free men honor and hold dear. Dare we forget the admonition in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Kadar, Khrushchev, Gomulka, Chou en Lai are not to be trusted. The policy of international communism has been, is, and will remain the destruction of freedom and national sovereignty. Any nation in Europe, Asia, or the Middle East that ignores this basic fact will do so at its peril.

A propaganda barrage is developing here and abroad to give economic aid to the Communist states of Eastern Europe. For what purpose? To lessen the drain on the Soviet Union so it will have more economic resources to use against the nations of the free world or to subvert the uncommitted countries outside the Iron Curtain? To sustain godless local Communist chieftains who would not last a month were it not for the support of Soviet bayonets within their borders? To give character and prestige to men whose hands are red with the blood of those patriots whose love of freedom for their countrymen was greater than their love of life? Are we to bolster sagging Communist economies whose own workers by strikes, slow downs, or sabotage in the face of death penalties and prison terms have contributed to the weakening of an important segment of the Communist regime?

None of these things make sense to me. I shall oppose the taking of a single dollar from the overburdened American taxpayer to build the economic strength of any Communist country behind the Soviet Iron Curtain or to give military aid to any Communist state anywhere in the world.

If the Soviet Union wants peace there is an honorable proposal that could be made to that Government.

Withdraw all Soviet forces from Poland, Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria and guarantee free elections under United Nations supervision. Let the people decide, free from the farce of Gomulka counterfeit elections such as Poland was insulted with on Sunday, January 20, while Soviet troops still occupy that restless country.

Let the great powers and the United Nations guarantee the neutrality of all of these eastern European states after the withdrawal of all Soviet troops and after the free elections under United Nations auspices have been held.

Both the Soviet Union and the West could then be assured that these free states would be similar to the neutral position which is today existing in Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden. They could not be used as a springboard for invasion against the free world or against the Soviet Union.

The free world has no quarrel with the people of Russia. They were the first victims of Communist aggression. It is not the Russian people but the Soviet Communist regime which has broken all of its international agreements with non-Communist powers and which has been a disturber of the peace of the world and still threatens it.

With such a settlement in Eastern Europe the burdens of armaments could be lifted to a considerable extent from the backs of the people of the free world and the Soviet

Union as well. Then the people of Russia who do not have the privileges of the small but relatively well off Communist Party hierarchy would be able to enjoy during this lifetime better housing, more consumer goods and a certain amount of luxuries which are now enjoyed by urban and rural workers in the free world.

But let us not as a great free Republic ever compromise the basic principle of human freedom. Let us never give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of millions behind the Iron Curtain who long to be free. Nor should we permit any international organization of which we are a member to compromise us in this regard.

How can any nation ignore the moral issue involved in Soviet destruction of freedom in Hungary and subsequently want sanctions applied in the case of troubles in the Middle East? What organization can survive such a double standard? Either we have a system of law and order or the doctrine of might makes right is recognized. Communism cannot be allowed to place itself above international law or God-given moral law.

Our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down to the latest generation. * * * We, yes even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose this last best hope on earth."

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, known of old, in the quietness of this storied Chamber, where the voice of unshackled freedom is the hope of a world now half slave and half free, we come with the sobering awareness that our democratic faith is defended and made victorious, not in the pomp and circumstance of ceremonial occasions, but as it is expressed in unspectacular days dedicated to the routine of grim and grinding duty faithfully performed.

Set Thou a seal upon the lips of those commissioned by the Nation to speak here, and for their own sake and the world's sake deliver them from wild tongues that have not Thee in awe. And so, as "the tumult and the shouting dies" and "the captains and the kings depart, still stands Thine ancient sacrifice, an humble and a contrite heart"—

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 21, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who will be on active duty with the Air Force from January 25 through January 31, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to be absent at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address of President Eisenhower delivered on January 21, 1957, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY 561ST AIR FORCE BAND, CALIFORNIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased that today there is in one of the Senate galleries the 561st Air Force Band, of the California Air National Guard, which participated yesterday in the inaugural parade. I ask that the members of the band stand so that the Senate may see them.

[The members of the band rose in their places, and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CLARK COUNTY (NEV.) SHERIFF'S POSSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the second inauguration of a great President and a great Vice President occurred on yesterday. Today there are in one of the Senate galleries the members of the Sheriff's mounted posse, of Clark County, Nev. The posse took part in the inaugural program, and traveled 3,000 miles to do so. I ask that the members of the posse stand.

[The members of the posse rose in their places, and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 954, 84TH CONGRESS, RELATING TO PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 20) to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure comes from the Committee on Public Works; the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], has reported the bill, which has passed the House of Representatives. The bill merely extends from 6 months to 10 months the period during which the report of the Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space is to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 20) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the companion Senate bill (S. 466), to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, providing for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TONNAGE COMPOSITION OF UNITED STATES NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and

Air Force, and the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, relating to the negotiation of prime contracts for the period January 1 to June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 331, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judicial Conference of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETIREMENT AGE OF CERTAIN JUDGES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that chief judges of circuits and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT, COMPENSATION, AND POWERS OF BAILIFFS IN DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROSTER OF CERTAIN JUDGES AVAILABLE FOR SPECIAL JUDICIAL DUTY

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MINIMUM STANDARDS OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROBATION OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 752, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSION OF ADJUSTMENT STATUS OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rescission of adjustment of status granted to Apostolos Stefanatos, under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association, as of March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in that Department, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that two positions had been filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Dental Society, relating to certain taxes for self-employed persons; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Fort Plain (New York) Council, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the coming visit of Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION URGING THE OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOT TO INVITE MARSHAL JOSIP BROZ TITO TO THE UNITED STATES

"Whereas Marshal Tito is an avowed Communist which form of government is repugnant to the concepts of a Christian nation and repugnant as well to an ordered democracy; and

"Whereas Marshal Tito is an infamous persecutor of religion avowedly apposed to it in any form, arresting and imprisoning theologians and ecclesiastics; and

"Whereas Marshal Tito has boasted of receiving aid from the United States and bragging that no concessions were made therefor and

"Whereas organizations offering aid and succor such as the War Relief Services of 1946 have been expelled, as have American newsmen seeking enlightment; and

"Whereas organizations of American citizens such as the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations have expressed their opinions of Tito's dictatorship as 'reprehensible foes of human dignity, decency, and liberty'; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the House of Delegates of Maryland the citizens of the United States would be ill used if forced to act as involuntary hosts to a dedicated enemy of democracy who has turned Hungarian refugees back to their Communist masters: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Marshal Tito be not invited to the United States at this time; And further, be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the Journal of the House of Delegates and that the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of State Dulles, to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Maryland to the Congress of the United States, and to Congressman O'KONSKI of the United States House of Representatives.

"By the House of Delegates, January 4, 1957.

"Introduced, read the first time, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"Favorably reported by the committee on rules.

"By the house of delegates, January 8, 1956.

"Adopted.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"GEORGE N. OWINGS, Jr.,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.
"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates."

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions adopted by the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, at their annual meeting in Hutchinson, Kans., on January 16, 1957.

In the resolutions the Kansas wheatgrowers state that they believe the following basic essentials to be fundamental to a successful national wheat program:

A. Assure to wheat producers full parity for the portion of the United States wheat crop used for food consumption.

B. Make crop loans available to producers at a price level designed to insure orderly marketing to protect producers of feed grains and of wheat against unduly low returns, and to promote international trade to the maximum.

C. Stimulate maximum economic use of wheat, and return the handling and marketing of wheat to private trade channels.

D. Encourage the production of strong type wheat, with full recognition of gluten quality factors.

E. Encourage sound soil-conservation practices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS AT ANNUAL MEETING, HUTCHINSON, KANS., 1957

1. Kansas Association of Wheat Growers believes agriculture commodity groups are necessary for the best promotion of each commodity. We believe each group must recognize the rights and needs of all other groups and all general farm organizations. We pledge ourselves to work in close and

friendly cooperation with all such groups and organizations.

2. Kansas Association of Wheat Growers is proud of the recognition and support which has been given them by both industry and producers in the past year. The association shall strive with complete integrity to merit increased recognition. We will represent the composite views of the wheatgrowers of Kansas as we are able to determine their views.

3. We believe the wheatgrower must cooperate with other segments of the wheat industry to promote the expanded use of wheat for food and in industry. We believe a contribution of one-fourth cent on each bushel of wheat as it crosses the scale is the fairest, the simplest, and best method by which this promotion can be financed. We believe this assessment must not replace existing or future increased appropriations for wheat research.

4. We commend the National Association of Wheat Growers for their leadership in developing the wheat council in which all segments of the wheat industry can participate.

5. We believe the following basic essentials to be fundamental to a successful national wheat program:

A. Assure full parity to wheat producers for the portion of the United States wheat crop used for food consumption.

B. Make available crop loans to producers at a price level designed to insure orderly marketing to protect producers of feed grains and of wheat against unduly low returns and promote international trade to the maximum.

C. Stimulate maximum economic use of wheat and return the handling and marketing of wheat to private trade channels.

D. Encourage the production of strong-type wheat, with full recognition of gluten-quality factors.

E. Encourage sound soil-conservation practices.

6. The current soil-bank program plus the aggressive sales program of the United States Department of Agriculture has great merit in solving the present wheat-surplus problem. In order to achieve the above longer range goals, we need the principles of domestic parity for wheat added to build a permanent effective program for wheat.

7. We recognize the fundamental economic principle that any program which tends to dislocate production from a low-cost area to higher cost areas is detrimental to the industry and costly to the consumer.

8. We recommend that there be no ad valorem tax on wheat.

9. We believe there are many areas of research that can help the wheat farmer. We need more help from our State college and the United States Department of Agriculture. Even with farm income down we do not approve of across-the-board cuts in appropriation to Kansas State College as a means of solving the tax problem facing the Kansas Legislature. Their work needs to be expanded, not cut back.

10. We recommend the immediate appropriation by the legislature of funds to provide greenhouses for wheat research.

11. We urge that the effective date of modernized parity be postponed until such time as a new formula can be developed which will more accurately reflect equality of purchasing power for the wheat producer.

12. If we must continue to operate under present control and price-support programs we recommend the elimination of the 15-acre or 200-bushel exemption from the marketing-quota law and that no further increase be made in the noncommercial wheat area.

13. We commend the President of the United States and his staff for their interest in the agricultural problems of this area and their efforts to find a workable solution.

14. We recommend that our secretary be instructed to express to the Hutchinson Chamber of Commerce and to the Reno County Wheat Committee and the program committee our heartfelt thanks for arrangements for this convention and the courtesies extended.

RESOLUTION OF MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSIONERS OF TOPEKA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution, adopted by the mayor and city commissioners of Topeka, Kans., petitioning Congress to take action authorizing the Tuttle Creek Reservoir to provide for a conservation pool of water.

During the past few years, Kansas has suffered seriously from a critical shortage of water, an element which is essential for the growth and development of the State.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PETITIONING CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION TO ASSURE THE CONTINUANCE AND COOPERATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS THAT ARE VITAL AND NECESSARY TO THE CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS, THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, AND THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas; and

Whereas the city of Topeka, Kans., exists under a continual threat of floods in the Kansas River and of shortage of water in dry seasons; and

Whereas the United States Army has formulated and Congress has authorized a comprehensive plan for the Kansas River watershed designed to control these two situations; and

Whereas this comprehensive plan consists of (a) upstream reservoirs to be financed by Federal funds, and (b) local protection works to be financed jointly, that is, the construction costs to be financed by Federal funds and the cost of right-of-way and damages to be financed by local funds; and

Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers is now constructing the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, which is Topeka's controlling upstream reservoir; and

Whereas the construction of the reservoir will benefit all interests located down the river from the reservoir; and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought, but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Commission of Topeka, Kans., hereby petitions Congress to—

(1) Change the Senate directive which would make Tuttle Creek Reservoir a dry dam; and

(2) Make Tuttle Creek a wet dam to provide water from such a reservoir for cities, industries, and farms downstream; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each Kansas Senator and to each Kansas Congressman.

Adopted by the board of commissioners, January 8, 1957.

Approved January 8, 1957.

GEORGE G. SCHNELLFURHER,
Mayor.

FRANK J. WARREN,
Finance Commissioner.

LOUIS E. HOWARD,
Water Commissioner.

A. EDMON WILLIAMS,
Street Commissioner.

PRESTON D. HALE,
Park Commissioner.

Attest:

BETTY J. MOTT,
Deputy City Clerk.

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding organizations which I have been privileged to know and to work with in trying to build world peace based upon justice and freedom is the organization known as the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Its address is 29 West 57th Street, New York City, and it represents those countries which have been taken over by the Communist conspiracy and Communist military strength. The countries represented in the Assembly of Captive European Nations are Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

It was my privilege during my service as a delegate to the United Nations to speak to the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and it was also my privilege to work with them on occasion respecting problems which are very close to the hearts of the delegates, one of which is the Hungarian question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Assembly of Captive European Nations on January 10, 1957, entitled "U. N. General Assembly Delegates Approached on Hungarian Question," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY DELEGATES APPROACHED ON HUNGARIAN QUESTION

With regard to the current debate on the Hungarian situation in the United Nations General Assembly, the Assembly of Captive European Nations presented its views to the permanent delegates of the free nations who on December 12 in the General Assembly condemned Soviet aggression against Hungary.

The text of the communication read:

"Welcoming any step designed to establish authoritative record of events in Hungary, we endorse proposal to establish special committee of Assembly to investigate the situation created by the intervention of the U. S. S. R., through its use of armed force and other means, in the internal affairs of Hungary. But we must warn against any attempt to use such investigation as a substitute for effective action or as an excuse to further defer long overdue enforcement efforts.

"Essential facts on Soviet aggression against Hungary, on Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary, and on deportations of Hungarian nationals to the Soviet Union have already been established by the General Assembly. Therefore, in accordance with point 4 of operative part of Resolution 1004—ES II, the U. N. Secretary

General should suggest 'methods to bring an end to the foreign intervention in Hungary in accordance with the Principles of Charter.'

"Since all methods short of sanctions have already been resorted to without avail, it is evident that the suggestions of the Secretary General can only refer to collective measures as provided in article 6, 42 and 43 of the Charter. This obligation is all the more obvious as draft resolution now under debate reaffirms request made to Secretary General in November 4 resolution.

"Independently of the action the Secretary General may undertake it is to be hoped that the initiative for enforcement action will also be taken in the General Assembly. The most urgent and most overdue such action is a decision to suspend Hungary as represented by the Kadar regime from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership, under article 5 of the charter. It is equally important to give urgent consideration to other collective measures against the Soviet Union under the charter since, as proven by recent developments in Hungary, failure of the U. N. to take effective action has given the Soviet Union and its puppets assurance that they have no consequences to fear whatever they may do in Hungary.

"General Assembly may derive useful information concerning Soviet intervention and current developments in Hungary from escaped leaders of the Hungarian revolutionary movement. According to the Hungarian National Council, Miss Anna Kethly, Gen. Bela Kiraly, and Mr. Jozsef Koevago would be the most appropriate witnesses. We respectfully suggest that they be given a hearing either in the General Assembly or in a public meeting of one of its committees."

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE COMMON DEFENSE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 48) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Common defense generally;

(2) The War Department and Military Establishment generally;

(3) The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) Soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) Selective service;

(7) Size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) Ammunition depots;

(10) Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consents of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY AND WAR CLAIMS ACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants, and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION MATTERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO CERTAIN EUROPEAN AND ASIATIC COUNTRIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain western European nations, and in certain near eastern, middle eastern, and far eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $47,500 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 54) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct a full and complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement through changes and additions in existing laws and enforcement procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments of agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $43,000 shal be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments of agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND ANTIMONOPOLY LAWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate to make a complete, comprehensive and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) Clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) Improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) Supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems

advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expense of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $300,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $289,291.45, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 5, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton	Professional staff member.	$7,150.62
Henry J. Casso	do	5,768.46
Porter M. Hedge (until July 15).	do	383.09
Cotys M. Mouser	Chief clerk	5,590.08
James M. Kendall	Assistant chief clerk	5,456.34
Betty M. Mason	Clerical assistant	2,764.56
Blanche M. O'Berg	do	3,381.12
Ida B. McCall	do	2,764.56
		33,258.83

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$1,593.95
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	1,593.95
Expended during period	125.30
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	1,468.75

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Gardner C. Turner	Staff member	$6,704.76
Lewis C. Prell	Staff member (to Oct. 31).	3,548.40
Alonzo B. Gonzales	Staff member	4,049.04
Maurice P. Pujol	do	5,500.92
Paul J. Cotter	do	5,636.18
REGULAR EMPLOYEES		
Everard H. Smith	Chief clerk	7,399.98
Thomas J. Scott	Assistant chief clerk	7,150.62
Francis S. Hewitt	Assistant clerk	6,704.76
Edmund T. King	do	6,348.06
Kenneth J. Bousquet	Professional staff member.	6,704.76
Earl W. Cooper	do	6,808.80
Herman E. Downey	do	6,704.76
Leonard E. Edwards	do	6,348.06
Joe E. Gonzales	do	6,258.90
Grace E. Johnson	do	5,411.76
William J. Kennedy, Jr.	do	6,438.06
Cecil C. McDaniel	do	6,704.76
Harold E. Merrick	do	6,704.76
Raymond L. Schafer	do	6,348.06
Thomas F. Shannon	do	6,036.00
John M. Witeck	do	6,214.32
William W. Woodruff	do	6,704.76
Gloria S. Butland	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Leon DeVille	do	2,610.42
Mary G. Gatton	do	2,713.14
Mary F. Holloway	do	2,713.14
Ruby C. Hutchinson	Assistant clerk	2,246.04
Mamie L. Mizen	do	4,646.16
Rebul H. Nichols	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Rose M. Parker	do	2,507.64

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 29, 1947, as of Dec. 31, 1956	$24,151.49
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956	0.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as of June 30, 1956	367,613.99
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956	0.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956	367,613.99
Amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1957	400,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956	25,512.29
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956	374,487.71
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act, and S. Res. 136 as of June 30, 1956	3,795.43
Additional authorization by S. Res. 271	15,000.00
Total available for expenditure	18,795.43
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956	11,440.38
Unexpended balance as of Dec. 31, 1956	7,355.05

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Atkinson, Herbert S.	Assistant chief clerk	$4,400.97
Be Lieu, Kenneth E.	Professional staff member.	5,545.52
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr.	do	6,808.85
Brugman, Charlotte [1]	Clerical assistant	692.96
Dantzic, Maurine E.	do	2,764.56
Darden, William H.	Professional staff member.	6,808.85
Johnson, Edna E.	Clerical assistant	2,764.56
Schweigert, Esther N. [2]	do	1,176.75
Welker, Mary M.	do	2,507.65
Wingate, Harry L., Jr.	Chief clerk	5,545.52

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$1,543.01
Additional funds authorized during period	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	11,545.01
Expended during period	2,646.09
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	8,898.92

[1] As of Nov. 7, 1956.
[2] Services terminated Sept. 30, 1956.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees

during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 9156, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Barker, Sophia E.	Stenographer [1]	$93.52
Canaday, Alyce D.	Clerical assistant	2,353.50
Clark, Joyce	Stenographer	2,096.58
Cooper, Genevieve	Secretary	2,661.78
Engle, Wallace L.	Investigator	3,997.68
French, Stuart P.	Special counsel	5,010.48
Friedenberg, Ronald	Attorney	4,322.50
Gilleas, Benjamin J.	do	4,449.96
Hamilton, Fowler	General counsel [2]	113.48
Jeffries, Jo Ann V.	Clerk-typist	2,096.58
Looney, Robert E.	Attorney [3]	1,044.85
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr.	do	4,499.04
Neal, Robert M.	do	3,381.12
Potts, Ramsay D., Jr.	Associate counsel [4]	113.48

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$136,636.70
Additional funds authorized during period	None
Total available for expenditure during period	136,636.70
Expended during period	40,840.33
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	95,796.37

[1] Services terminated July 7, 1956.
[2] Services terminated July 3, 1956.
[3] Services terminated Sept. 15, 1956.
[4] Services terminated July 3, 1956.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
John H. Yingling	Chief clerk	$7,400.00
Robert A. Wallace	Staff director	7,150.67
Paul Cyr	Assistant clerk	6,808.85
William F. McKenna	Counsel	6,808.85
James B. Cash, Jr.	Professional staff member.	6,808.85
Donald L. Rogers	Counsel	6,808.85
Henrietta S. Chase	Clerical assistant	3,432.52
Florence Barr	do	3,175.61
Pauline C. Beam	do	3,124.23
Caro M. Pugh	do	3,124.23

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$17.82
Additional funds authorized during period	------
Total available for expenditure during period	17.82
Expended during period	------
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	17.82

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 155, agreed to February 21, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Matthew Hale	Counsel	$6,808.80
Arthur J. Wilson	Staff assistant	4,646.16
Olin Cavness	do	4,302.84
Frances K. Topping	Economist	3,226.98
Dorothy L. McCaffrey.	Clerical assistant	2,507.64
Jason Rouby	Staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Nov. 15).	2,092.19

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$67,630.44
Additional funds authorized during period	------
Total available for expenditure during period	67,630.44
Expended during period	53,849.45
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	13,780.99

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING
(S. Res. 160, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Jack Carter	Staff director	$6,808.80
Milton P. Semer	Chief counsel	6,808.80
Clarence M. Dinkins	Assistant counsel	4,876.74
Dean F. Cromer [1]	Staff assistant	3,208.84
Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr.	Assistant counsel	3,792.18
Clarence R. Jacobs	Accountant	3,329.70
Mildred Mitchel [2]	Clerical assistant	1,215.79
Dixie J. Thomas	do	2,302.08
Doris I. Thomas	do	2,302.08

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$61,431.66
Additional funds authorized during period	------
Total available for expenditure during period	61,431.66
Expended during period	42,241.72
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	19,189.94

[1] Leave of absence Oct. 1 to Nov. 12.
[2] Leave of absence Aug. 27 to Nov. 25.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Leo A. Casey	Chief clerk	$6,808.80
William P. Gulledge	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Murray W. Weight	Professional staff member (to Dec. 16).	4,785.23
Ruth W. Bryant	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Arlene B. Williams	do	3,483.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$5,011.36
Additional funds authorized during period	------
Total available for expenditure during period	$5,011.36
Expended during period	576.79
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	4,434.57

M. M. NEELY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer	Chief clerk	$5,723.88
Betty Mae Tapy	Clerical assistant	3,226.98
Evelyn R. Thompson	do	3,226.98
Sandra Everly	do	2,045.22
Jesse R. Nichols	Document clerk	2,610.42
Serge N. Benson	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Fedele F. Fauri	Professional staff member (to Aug. 6).	1,361.76

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$1,421.07
Additional funds authorized during period	------
Total available for expenditure during period	1,421.07
Expended during period	635.09
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	785.98

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Carl Marcy	Professional staff member.	$7,399.98
Pat M. Holt	do	7,150.62
Alwyn V. Freeman	do	6,808.80
Julius N. Cahn	do	6,808.80
C. C. O'Day	Chief clerk	6,808.80
George C. Denney, Jr.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.80
Emmett M. O'Grady	Clerical assistant (to July 31).	529.26
June C. Pitts	Clerical assistant (to Oct. 2).	1,728.12
Mary A. Sames	Clerical assistant	3,184.16
Doris B. Covington	Clerical assistant (to Oct. 31).	1,980.04
L. June Connell [1]	Clerical assistant	2,747.40
Orrin E. Cressey [1]	do	2,918.70
Milrae E. Jensen	Clerical assistant (from Aug. 20).	2,273.72
		57,147.20

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$8,192.88
Additional funds authorized during period	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	18,192.88
Expended during period	10,648.26
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	7,544.62

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 161, agreed to Feb. 3, 1956.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

(Under authority of S. Res. 185, agreed to February 8, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, toegther with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Betty Lou Goetz	Acting staff director	$3,381.12
Paula L. Underwood	Clerk	2,147.96
Daniel B. Jacobs	Research assistant	3,535.26
		9,064.34

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$10,627.64
Additional funds authorized during period	32,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	42,627.64
Expended during period	11,855.80
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	30,771.84

NOTE.—The detail of certain personnel by the Library of Congress on a reimbursable basis, was authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for services rendered the subcommittee.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE MAKING A FULL AND COMPLETE STUDY OF FOREIGN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(Under authority of S. Res. 162, agreed to Feb. 8, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Morella R. Hansen	Clerk	$3,843.54

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$22,739.49
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	22,739.49
Expended during period	14,190.14
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	8,549.35

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

(Under authority of S. Res. 285, agreed to July 11, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Arthur M. Kuhl	Chief clerk (from Aug. 6).	$4,183.59
Henry F. Holthusen	Consultant (from Aug. 15).	575.55
Lindsay Rogers	Consultant (from Aug. 15).	205.55
John Carlton	Professional staff member (from Nov. 1).	2,269.60
Mildred L. Fowlkes	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 21).	1,776.81
Theresa Bowen	Assistant clerk (from Sept. 26).	1,264.95
Marguerite L. Fry	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 19).	573.12
DeVenter, June C.	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 5).	488.38
		11,337.55

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$300,000.00
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	300,000.00
Expended during period	77,015.87
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	222,984.13

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds	Chief Clerk	$7,093.65
Glenn K. Shriver	Professional staff member.	6,600.73
Eli E. Nobleman	....do	6,600.73
Richard J. O'Melia	....do	6,808.80
Miles Scull, Jr.	....do	6,600.73
Ann M. Grickis	Assistant chief clerk	3,997.68
Ray Barnett	Clerical assistant	3,124.20
Kathryn Keeney (Mrs.) (from July 1 to Aug. 30, 1956) (from Dec. 1 to Dec. 31, 1956).	....do	1,407.96
Esther M. Hutchinson (Mrs.).	....do	2,713.14
Ann Dorman Glass (from July 13, 1956).	....do	2,388.40

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$6,379.61
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	6,379.61
Expended during period	648.11
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	5,731.50

JOHN MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1957.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 188, agreed to February 16, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Jerome S. Alderman	Assistant counsel	$6,808.80
Edith H. Anderson	Staff editor	3,381.12
Maxine B. Buffalohide	Assistant clerk	2,610.42
Alphonse F. Calabrese	Investigator	5,679.30
Alice S. Dearborn	Assistant clerk	2,456.22
Margaret W. Duckett	....do	2,713.14
LaVern J. Duffy	Investigator	3,792.18
Robert E. Dunne	Assistant counsel	4,548.06
James N. Juliana	Chief counsel to minority.	6,808.80
Robert F. Kennedy	Chief counsel to majority (To Sept 22 From Nov. 9)	3,171.10
		2,137.77
Rosemary K. Kennedy	Assistant clerk	2,230.72
H. Michael Mann	Messenger	1,839.66
Angela M. Novello	Assistant clerk	2,456.22
Leo C. Nulty	Investigator	5,411.76
Donald F. O'Donnell	Assistant counsel	6,808.80
Ruth S. Price	Assistant clerk	2,353.50
Paul J. Tierney	Assistant counsel	5,679.30
Ruth Young Watt	Chief clerk	3,894.90

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$125,172.42
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	125,172.42
Expended during period	105,296.05
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	19,876.37

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Callaghan, Richard L.	Chief clerk	$7,150.62
Coburn, William H.	Professional staff member.	7,399.98
French, Stewart	....do	6,808.80
Gamble, James H.	....do	6,808.80
Lineweaver, Goodrich W.	....do	6,808.80
Callaghan, Marcia M.	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Davis, Dorothy A.	....do	3,141.34
Donnelley, Rosemary	....do	3,072.84
Gillette, Margaret G.	....do	2,713.14
McSherry, Nellie D.	Assistant chief clerk	5,545.50

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$7,234.31
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	7,234.31
Expended during period	7,207.26
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	27.05

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

(Under authority of S. Res. 183, agreed to February 20, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees

during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Chambers, Edward T.	Professional staff member.	$5,099.64
Eaton, Eugene D.	do	2,422.10
Graham, Leland O.	Professional staff member (to July 15).	488.13
Hannett, George	Special counsel (from Aug. 16).	4,526.99
Holderer, George B.	Professional staff member.	6,258.10
Mapes, Milton C., Jr.	do	5,411.76
Nelson, Elmer K.	do	6,808.80
Redwine, Robert W.	do	5,820.46
Stong, Benton J.	do	6,744.39
Whitacre, Roy M.	Professional staff member (to Sept 15).	2,217.75
Wilson, Platt	Professional staff member.	5,367.18
Boedecker, Louis G.	Research assistant (to July 15).	178.99
Harrington, Joan M.	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Hoban, Cecelia A.	Clerk-stenographer	2,790.23
Lahr, Mary Catherine	Clerical assistant	2,661.78
O'Connor, Adele R.	Stenographer	2,661.98
Todd, Pauline B.	Clerical assistant	2,867.28
Michael W. Straus	Consultant	822.21
Richard F. O'Toole	do	5,351.88

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$112,936.05
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	112,936.05
Expended during period	110,750.01
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	2,186.04

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Standing Committee and Subcommittee.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Baynton, Harold I.	Chief counsel	$6,808.84
Chamberlin, Louise I.	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 15).	511.31
Jarrett, Edward S.	Chief clerk	7,150.62
Knudson, Lois M.	Clerical assistant (to Nov. 15).	2,150.46
Rudolph, Vera B.	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Smigen, Cecelia M.	do	3,072.84
Wissman, Bertram O.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.84
Zapple, Nicholas	Staff member	6,808.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$509.36
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	509.36
Expended during period	368.22
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	141.14

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(S. Res. 163, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, toegther with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bailey, James E.	Assistant chief counsel, (from Nov. 15).	$1,740.03
Barton, Frank L.	Staff member	6,808.80
Bourbon, August J.	do	5,545.50
Black, John W.	do	3,792.18
Bowers, Joan A.	Clerical assistant	2,250.72
Busby, David	Staff member	5,322.60
Butz, John R.	Clerical assistant	3,226.98
Cox, Kenneth A.	Special counsel	6,808.80
Drake, Robin	Staff member (to Aug. 31).	1,161.28
Fadely, Catherine E.	Clerical assistant	2,815.92
Geissinger, Wayne T.	Assistant chief counsel (to Nov. 15).	5,068.77
Huse, Harry C.	Staff member	5,322.60
Kohler, William L.	Staff member (to Sept. 15).	1,792.85
Luckey, Albert B. Jr.	Staff member	4,960.14
Monk, Jane E.	Clerical assistant	2,507.64
Moore, Milo	Staff member	6,808.80
Murphy, Robert T.	Special counsel	6,808.80
Ogden, Daniel M. Jr.	Staff member (from Sept. 15).	943.11
Rogers, Kathryn B.	Clerical assistant	2,404.86
Shaffer, Martha P.	do	3,072.84
Stern, Edward A.	Staff member	4,965.90
Torre, Catherine C.	Clerical assistant	2,610.42
Watkins, Charles D.	Staff member	3,894.90
Wood, Henry G.	do	6,808.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$158,077.17
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	158,077.17
Expended during period	108,615.51
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	49,461.66

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Joseph A. Davis	Chief clerk	$6,808.80
Francis C. Rosenberger.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.80
Thomas B. Collins	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
George S. Green	do	6,808.80
Robert M. Kilgore	do	6,808.80
J. Carlisle Ruddy	do	5,857.62
Wayne H. Smithey	do	6,808.80
Robert B. Young	do	6,808.80
Mary I. Rogers	Clerical assistant	3,278.34
Mildred E. Canon	do	3,278.34
Carrie Lee Conner	do	3,278.34
Katharine M. Ellis	do	3,278.34
Costas D. Chrissos	do	3,278.34
Richard F. Wambach	do	3,278.34
Naomi Hankins	do	3,278.34

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$1,755.86
Additional funds authorized during period (S. Res. 309, July 13, 1956)	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	11,755.86
Expended during period	1,186.71
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	10,569.15

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(Under authority of S. Res. 165, agreed to February 21, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Caldwell, James N., Jr.	Assistant counsel	$3,792.18
Carp, Richard L.	Associate counsel (to Aug. 31).	1,332.56
Escoe, J. Delmas	Assistant counsel	3,503.82
Ginzburg, Benjamin	Research director	5,857.62
Grieg, Lydia S.	Secretary	2,404.86
Irwin, Mary A.	Legislative consultant.	3,997.68
Lopes, Nicholas F.	Associate counsel	4,646.16
MacNaughton, Marcia J.	Research assistant	1,993.58
Patton, William D.	Assistant counsel	3,458.19
Raymond, Allen	Consultant	6,209.36
Simmons, Belva T.	Secretary	2,404.86
Slayman, Charles H., Jr.	Chief counsel and staff director.	6,279.23
Smith, Francis	Chief counsel (to July 15).	567.40
Williams, Jane E.	Secretary	2,404.86

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$61,405.44
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	61,405.44
Expended during period	51,189.88
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	10,215.56

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*
THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Subcommitee Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

(Under authority of S. Res. 166, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Gasque, Cecial A.	General counsel	$6,808.80
Chambliss, June	Secretary (to July 20).	255.79
Gabrys, Marilyn L.	Clerk-typist (to Sept. 15).	563.30
Townley, Kay	Secretary (to July 31).	409.37
Easley, Rita C.	Clerk-typist (to July 2 and from Dec. 26 to Dec. 31).	57.23
Salisbury, Joseph F.	Assistant counsel (to Aug. 31).	1,685.02
Holland, Margaret L.	Secretary (from Sept. 10).	1,704.81
Horrigan, Arthur J.	Research analyst (from Dec. 10).	442.41

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$18,369.78
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	18,369.78
Expended during period	13,889.78
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	4,480.00

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.
PRICE DANIEL,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 167, agreed to February 21, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Caplan, Julian	Consultant [1] (from Mar. 20).	$534.43
Cardozo, Michael H.	Consultant [1] (from May 24).	1,048.32
Clesner, Herschel F.	Investigator	3,740.76
Ercegovich, Ann M.	Secretary (from Dec. 5).	384.48
Haaser, Stephen G.	Chief clerk	4,787.52
Hoy, Ann S.	Secretary	3,175.56
Hollabaugh, Marcus A.	Counsel	6,808.80
Huber, Walter B.	Investigator	4,787.52
Julian, Joseph K.	Secretary-typist	2,147.94
Melman, Seymour	Consultant [1]	164.44
Rideoutte, Jane E.	Secretary	3,175.56
Solo, Robert A.	Consultant [1] (from May 18).	205.55
Stedman, John C.	Consultant [1]	4,152.20
Vernon, Raymond	Consultant [1] (from May 5).	267.21

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$78,906.26
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	78,906.26
Expended during period	$38,926.98
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	39,979.28

[1] When actually employed.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JOSPEH C. O'MAHONEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 168, agreed to February 16, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Guthridge, Eleanor C.	General counsel	$6,808.80
Beaton, Adele V.	Clerical assistant	2,610.42

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$23,524.60
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	23,524.60
Expended during period	9,839.10
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	13,685.50

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

WILLIAM LANGER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under authority of S. Res. 169, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

None.

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$4,252.89
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	4,252.89
Expended during period	467.81
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	3,785.08

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

(Under authority of S. Res. 170, agreed to February 21, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Amidon, Robert H.	Attorney-investigator.	$4,302.84
Arnett, Lucy V.	Stenographer	2,594.68
Banner, Paul H.	Economist	4,548.06
Beath, Paul R.	Administrative assistant (to July 31).	572.08
Bloch, Beate	Attorney	2,764.56
Bolton-Smith, Carlile	do	6,808.80
Burton, Irene	Stenographer (to Sept. 20).	1,137.33
George E. Clifford	Attorney investigator.	4,548.06
Cobb, Julia S.	Stenographer	2,559.00
deFelice, Antoinette [1]	do	545.82
Friedman, Jesse J.	Consultant	6,808.80
Green, Paul S.	Hearing editor	4,921.32
Keeffe, Arthur J.	Assistant counsel (to Sept. 13).	2,754.42
Liebow, Bernice	Stenographer	2,275.72
McHugh, Donald P.	Chief counsel and staff director.	6,808.80
Milligan, Robert E.	Messenger (to Oct. 1).	982.01
Mitchell, Richard H.	Investigator	4,548.06
Montier, Gladys E.	Clerk	3,381.12
Neville, Gareth M.	Assistant counsel	6,808.80
Olshine, Lucille L.	Research assistant	2,764.56
Rosenman, Louis	Attorney	2,679.46
Seeley, Joseph A.	Assistant counsel (to Aug. 15).	1,702.20
Skeen, John R. [1]	Economist	4,096.66
Sparks, Wilbur D.	Attorney	4,548.06
Tucker, Ernest C.	Attorney-investigator.	4,049.04
Williams, Thomas C.	Research employee	2,552.15
Zalany, Emily W.	Stenographer	2,559.00

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$136,889.87
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	136,889.87
Expended during period	106,706.88
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	30,182.99

[1] When acutally employed.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 171, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Wood, Harlan	Counsel	$6,808.80
Downey, Mabel A.	Clerk	2,931.50
Johnston, Sally L.	Typist (to July 15)	141.13
McElroy, Marcia L.	Stenographer	2,006.66
Haight, Frank R.	Clerical assistant (July 2 to Sept. 15).	840.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$32,727.99
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	32,727.99
Expended during period	13,200.16
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	19,527.83

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 172, agreed to February 20, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Asheraft, Ann	Clerk	$2,302.08
Blair, Drury H.	Staff member	6,307.46
Brown, James M.	Legal assistant (from Oct. 23).	1,960.21
Buckner, Catlett L.	Staff member	4,253.82
Burton, Robert R.	do	5,061.02
DeGooyer, Franzetta R.	Clerk	2,970.06
McCloskey, Mary J.	do	2,970.06
Mesmer, Fred M.	Staff member	6,438.23
Total		32,262.94

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$70,257.24
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	70,257.24
Expended during period	32,387.19
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	37,870.05

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman and Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

(Under authority of S. Res. 173, as amended, 84th Cong., 2d sess.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st

session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bobo, James H	General counsel	$6,808.80
Chumbris, Peter N	Associate counsel	6,660.18
Erwin, John D	Editorial director (to Aug. 31, 1956).	588.28
Gibbons, Richard M	Clerical assistant—Files (to Aug. 31, 1956).	835.88
Johnson, Sarah F	Secretary (from July 3, 1956).	2,682.99
McGill, Elizabeth T	Secretary	3,278.34
Marshall, M. Bernadine.	Assistant counsel (to Aug. 31, 1956).	1,434.28
Mayes, Martin	Consultant (to Aug. 15, 1956).	948.04
Mitler, Ernest A	Special counsel	4,253.82
Perian, Carl L	Research director	3,997.68
Pitt, G. Elaine	Secretary	2,096.58
Schonberger, Claude M.	Research assistant	3,432.48

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$25,644.62
Additional funds authorized during period S. Res. 303	25,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	50,644.62
Expended during period	44,598.29
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	6,046.33

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 174, agreed to February 20, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Arens, William H	Investigator	$4,832.16
Baker, Dorothy C	Records manager	4,646.16
Barber, Frank D	Clerk-messenger	3,021.42
Betts, Mary E	Secretary (from July 4).	2,465.84
Brown, James M	Legal assistant (to Oct. 22).	3,183.37
Buckley, Wilburn	Investigator	5,829.87
Dun, Bernice E	Secretary	2,507.64
Duffy, Edward R	Investigator	5,144.22
Fox, Miriam O	Confidential secretary.	3,483.84
Hutto, Ralph H., Jr	Assistant editorial director.	5,055.06
Lowell, William E	Editorial director	6,303.48
Malaney, Elinor L	Confidential secretary.	3,483.84
Malaney, Ethel A	Stenographer	2,764.56
Mandel, Benjamin	Research director	6,303.48
McManus, Robert C	Investigations analyst.	6,125.16
McManus, William F	Research assistant	3,107.05
Meshan, Antoinette M.	do	3,124.20
Merow, Joan F	Clerk	2,199.36
Morris, Robert	Chief counsel	6,808.80
Poe, Edgar A., Jr	Clerk (to Sept. 15)	894.97
Richards, Ann E	Stenographer	2,970.06
Rusher, William A	Administrative counsel.	6,258.90
Schrider, F. Lois	Stenographer (to Sept. 15).	1,002.02
Schroeder, Frank W	Chief investigator	$6,125.16
Sourwine, J. G	Associate counsel (from Oct. 1).	3,404.40
Stavropulos, Mary	Clerk	2,610.42
Tonnar, Helen H	Secretary	2,634.66
WAE EMPLOYEES		
Fluegel, Edna R	Research analyst	3,749.63
Frank, Nelson	Consultant	3,749.62
McManus, Mary B	do	715.10
Mitchell, Jonathan	do	1,724.82
Munson, Lyle H	do	2,174.76
Walter, James H	Editorial assistant	76.61
Total		118,480.64

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$173,226.80
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	173,226.80
Expended during period	136,460.94
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	36,765.86

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman and Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Stewart E. McClure	Staff director	$6,808.80
Roe E. James	Minority staff director, (from Nov. 1).	2,269.60
Crawford C. Heerlein	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Vivien T. Harman	do	3,381.12
Thelma W. Blankenship.	do	3,124.20
Marjorie M. Whittaker.	do	3,072.84
Helen H. Papps	do	3,072.84
Alice H. Price	do	2,867.28
Helyn Eagle	do	2,867.28
Lucille Gould	do	2,661.78
John S. Forsythe	General counsel	6,808.80
William G. Reidy	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Michael G. Bernstein	Minority staff director (to Oct. 31), professional staff member (from Nov. 1).	6,808.80
Mary DiDio	Professional staff member (to Oct. 31).	4,172.60
Frank Cantwell	Chief clerk (to July 15).	567.40

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$6,709.59
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	6,709.59
Expended during period	4,300.82
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	2,408.77

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

(Under authority of S. Res. 320, agreed to July 26, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 26, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Wilbur J. Cohen	Consultant	$411.11

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$30,000.00
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	30,000.00
Expended during period	673.65
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	29,326.35

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Brawley, H. W	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Kerlin, J. Don	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Johnson, Robert W	do	7,150.62
Faucette, Andrew McC.	do	6,808.80
Finzel, Hubert H	do	6,808.80
Perrott, Virginia E	Assistant chief clerk	3,483.84
Sisk, Elizabeth R	Clerical assistant [1]	3,244.09
Donovan, Winifred J	Clerical assistant (to July 15).	230.37
Thornton, Peggy L	Clerical assistant (from July 16).	2,285.82
McDonald, Innis E	Clerical assistant	2,867.28
McElroy, Marty [1]	do	2,764.56
McInroy, Joan M	do	3,072.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$45.25
Additional funds authorized during period S. Res. 249 on July 2, 1956	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	10,045.25
Expended during period	6,119.57
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	3,925.68

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 164, agreed to Feb. 8, 1956.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM

(S. Res. 154, agreed to February 20, 1956; S. Res. 294, agreed to July 12, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Gillette, Guy M	Special counsel (to July 31).	$1,070.80
Hadlick, Paul E	Assistant attorney (to Aug. 15).	1,252.62
Humphrey, David J	Investigator	3,843.54
Johnson, Claudine B	Clerical assistant	2,353.50

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Slear, John K.	Counsel (to Nov. 15).	$2,056.97
Slear, John K.	Chief counsel (from Nov. 16).	1,520.14

Funds available for expenditures at beginning of period	$23,253.38
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	23,253.38
Expended during period	13,969.78
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	9,283.60

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
INVESTIGATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(S. Res. 153, agreed to February 20, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Banghart, Abigail	Clerical assistant (to Sept. 30).	$1,151.04
Bryan, Louis C.	Investigator	4,219.69
Fitzgerald, Frances K.	Clerical assistant	3,278.34
Gooselaw, Jay E.	do	2,353.50
Miller, William W.	Investigator	4,646.16
Thornton, Peggy L.	Clerical assistant (to July 15).	196.12
Walters, William R.	Junior investigator	3,843.54
Wenner, Faye M.	Clerical assistant	2,199.36

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$44,178.12
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	44,178.12
Expended during period	31,650.84
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	12,527.28

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to January 1, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Theo. W. Sneed	Professional staff	$6,303.48
John L. Mutz	do	6,303.48
Frances Ortiz	do	6,303.48
Dennis Chavez, Jr.	do	7,150.62
Filo M. Sedillo	Chief clerk	7,399.98
Charles N. Kapnic	Assistant chief clerk	6,303.48
Eloise Porter	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Frances T. Clark	do	3,483.84
Thomas F. Fox	do	3,226.98
Ercilia E. Martinez	do	2,918.70

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$741.65
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	741.65
Expended during period	
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	741.65

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(Under authority of S. Res. 70, agreed to March 18, 1955; S. Res. 159, agreed to February 17, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to January 1, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bazan, Lee J.	Clerical staff	$395.50
Graves, John R.	do	1,709.59

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$53,504.47
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	53,504.47
Expended during period	9,494.65
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	44,009.82

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Harrison, Gordon F.	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
St. Claire, Darrell	Professional staff member.	7,150.62
McCain, Robert S.	do	5,099.64
Ryan, Charles H.	Assistant chief clerk	3,483.84
Moore, Marian G.	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Gavin, B. Floye	do	3,483.84
Mitchell, Elizabeth S.	do	3,072.84
Greene, Eleanor L.	do	2,713.14
Coder, John P.	Printing and editorial assistant.	1,017.96
Total		36,905.70

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$9,659.06
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	9,659.06
Expended during period	79.34
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	9,579.72

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Sam Akelson	Professional staff member.	$1,359.64
Nina Baber	Clerical assistant	378.26
Walter J. Bristow, Jr.	Professional staff member.	2,808.36
E. Wayles Browne, Jr.	do	3,153.27
Irene Burton	Clerical assistant	1,678.56
Pauline Chaternuck	do	1,382.28
Alice Clark	Clerk	3,192.70
Edward M. Corneaby	Investigator	2,363.23
Helen B. Daily	Clerical assistant	1,349.39
Elaine H. Dixon	do	1,125.46
Richard P. Donovan	Professional staff member.	814.42
James H. Duffy	Counsel	6,578.43
Charlotte C. Garver	Clerical assistant	828.34
Loretta M. Jonkers	do	325.10
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	1,189.40
Isabelle Lynn	do	146.96
Irvin Lechliter	Professional staff member.	2,527.53
Andrew D. Mapes	Minority counsel	6,253.97
Sadi J. Mase	Legal consultant	5,459.33
Robert E. Milligan	Clerical assistant	1,087.45
John P. Moore	Special counsel	3,404.40
James M. Morse	Clerical assistant	641.29
Charles H. Mueller	do	919.83
Stephen Pace, Jr.	Staff assistant	3,370.04
Fred S. Peabody	Investigator	1,235.46
Shirley A. Preston	Clerical assistant	41.79
Joseph A. Roney	Professional staff member.	2,527.53
Christine Villines	Clerical assistant	125.03
Jacquelyn M. Westcott.	do	869.67
Emmet C. Yokley	Professional staff member.	2,808.36
WAE EMPLOYEES		
Richard P. Donovan	do	164.44
George Alexander-Heard.	do	986.65
Florence Hincks	do	884.47
Arthur J. Keeffe	do	2,384.43

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$50,000.00
Additional funds authorized during period	100,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	150,000.00
Expended during period	80,771.22
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	69,228.78

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1957.

SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

(Established pursuant to S. Res. 219, agreed to February 22, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Blackburn, G. Robert.	Research analyst (to Aug. 31).	$854.31
Clapp, Charles L.	Research analyst (from Sept. 16).	2,624.44
Burke, John P.	Assistant counsel (from July 20).	5,398.86
Dickinson, Arthur B.	Investigator	4,548.06
Fay, George Morris	Counsel	7,399.98
Healey, John S.	Investigator	5,278.02
Kamerick, Paul E.	Chief investigator	6,808.80
Kopecky, George M.	Investigator (from Sept. 20).	2,811.43
Lockwood, John F.	Investigator	4,499.04
McConnell, Vivien L.	Chief clerk	3,381.12
McGovern, John J.	Associate counsel	6,808.80
Neuland, Joanne C.	Clerical assistant	2,764.56
Ryan, Mary	do	2,764.56
Scott, Yvonne	do	2,764.56

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Shea, Mary D	Clerical assistant	$2,764.56
Weber, Abraham K	Assistant counsel	6,036.00
Wilber, Georgia H	Clerical assistant	2,661.78
Total		70,168.88

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$326,464.40
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	326,464.40
Expended during period	81,434.04
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	245,030.36

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Amis, William D	Professional staff member.	$5,575.24
Byrne, Elizabeth	Clerical assistant	3,278.32
Jehle, Philip F	Assistant chief clerk	5,173.96
Lasky, Sara Betty	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 15).	614.05
Messick, Wiley S	Professional staff member (from Dec. 1).	766.19
Novak, Gertrude C	Clerical assistant	2,507.62
O'Connor, Blake	Professional staff member.	5,575.24
Odom, Lewis G., Jr	Professional staff member (to July 1).	39.72
Ruppert, Minna L	Chief clerk	5,233.40
Ryan, Nell F	Clerical assistant	2,370.62
Stults, Walter B	Staff director	7,399.98
Total		38,534.34

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$6,237.53
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	6,237.53
Expended during period	281.14
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	5,956.39

JOHN SPARKMAN.
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 175, agreed to February 20, 1956)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Adams, Walter	Professional staff member (to Nov. 15).	$5,106.60
Alford, William C	Clerk-messenger	1,839.66
Burwell, Rose M	Clerical assistant	2,079.46
Creech, William A	Professional staff member.	$4,368.26
Dye, Elaine C	Clerical assistant	2,267.84
Flynn, John J	Professional staff member (July 1 to Sept. 15 and Nov. 15 to Dec. 31).	2,947.24
Foulke, Roy E	Professional staff member.	4,368.26
Hendry, James B	Professional staff member (Aug. 24 to Nov. 15).	2,646.81
Mund, Vernon A	Professional staff member (from Sept. 4).	3,923.39
Noone, Charles M	Professional staff member (July 1 to Sept. 10).	2,647.86
Noone, Charles M	Consultant (WAE) Nov. 2, 5, 6, 7, 14, 17, 19, and 20).	328.88
Weadock, Robert L	Professional staff member.	4,548.08
Total		37,072.34

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period (S. Res. 175)	$59,418.80
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	59,418.80
Expended during period	41,664.82
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	17,753.98

JOHN SPARKMAN.
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 731. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 732. A bill granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 733. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 734. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 735. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Pawnee State Park as a national monument;

S. 736. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as a national monument a site on the Old Santa Fe Trail near Dodge City, Kans.;

S. 737. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Hays as a national monument;

S. 738. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Alcove Springs, located in Marshall County, Kans., as a national monument;

S. 739. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Larned as a national monument;

S. 740. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Medicine Lodge Indian Peace Treaty site as a national monument and historic shrine;

S. 741. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Waconda Spring, Mitchell County, Kans., as a national monument;

S. 742. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Rock City as a national monument;

S. 743. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Wallace, in Wallace County, Kans., as a national monument; and

S. 744. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Shawnee Mission as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 745. A bill for the relief of Yoko Sugita; and

S. 746. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Jun Sok Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 747. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Chan Wing Cheung;

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Loutfie Noama; and

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Wong Sau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (by request):

S. 751. A bill to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 752. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously to Adna Romanza Chaffee, major general, Regular Army, a commission as lieutenant general, Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 753. A bill for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) (by request):

S. 754. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Legatos;

S. 755. A bill for the relief of Athena Nicholas Euteriadou; and

S. 756. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sciortino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 757. A bill for the relief of Vincent B. Moore; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 758. A bill to allow a credit of $25 against the Federal income tax of any individual who during the taxable year votes in an election for Federal officers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 759. A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex;

S. 761. A bill for the relief of Charles C. and George C. Finn;

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Nellie Iverson; and

S. 763. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 764. A bill to promote the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for compensation for the disability or death of workers from silicosis or other dust diseases, by providing for cooperation with the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 765. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 766. A bill for the relief of Aftim Saba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Christos A. Mauroyenis (Mavrogenis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILEY, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 768. A bill to designate the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 769. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution, and to provide for the choosing of a President and Vice President in certain cases where the President dies, is removed from office, or resigns, or where the President-elect dies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the "common defense."

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing an investigation of matters pertaining to constitutional rights;

S. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy and War Claims Acts;

S. Res. 51. Resolution authorizing an investigation of immigration and naturalization matters;

S. Res. 52. Resolution authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States;

S. Res. 53. Resolution authorizing an investigation of problems pertaining to certain European and Asiatic countries;

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code;

S. Res. 55. Resolution to examine the administration of the Patent Office and statutes relating to patents, copyrights, and trademarks;

S. Res. 56. Resolution authorizing an investigation of national penitentiaries;

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration; and

S. Res. 58. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration and operation of the national security law and matters relating to espionage.

(See above resolutions, printed in full, under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROPOSED RESIDENCE FOR PAGES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, during the past several years, we have spent many billions of dollars for foreign aid, and at the present time we are giving away billions of dollars to foreign countries. I believe that at present we are overlooking an opportunity to spend a few thousand dollars at the Capitol, to serve a worthy purpose.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a residence for the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Page Residence Board. This is the same bill as S. 973 which I introduced last year and was referred to the Committee on Rules.

If enacted, this bill would create a Capitol Page Residence Board composed of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives who would be authorized to establish a home for the young men who serve as pages. I feel that every Member of the Senate and the House realizes the need for such a home with adult supervision. Under the present setup, the pages have living accommodations scattered throughout the city. Some of these boys are paying exhorbitant rents and in many cases are exposed to the evils of a large city.

Members of Congress have appointed these young men to leave their homes and travel to this city and work here several months out of each year. We should feel a certain responsibility toward them and their families back home. I feel very keenly that it is our duty and moral obligation to establish such a residence board which would in turn acquire a home near the Capitol in which the pages would live under adult supervision.

The page boys have to attend school before reporting to work each morning and in some cases these boys have to travel several miles in the early hours of the morning alone.

My proposal would require the pages to pay rent as they now do, whereby this home would be self-sustaining. I am sure that the parents of the pages would be very grateful to the United States Congress for legislation of this kind.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will consider favorably this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 733) to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation.

It is, in my humble judgment, an important bill.

It is a bill which should be enacted, indeed, one which must be enacted for the good of our growing Nation.

The review and reform of America's current tax maze—a program indispensable to progress under our free economy—should be extremely high on the 85th Congress' priority list.

COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION

The bill as introduced today completely parallels previous Hoover Commission legislation.

The proposed Commission would consist of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch and 2 from private life; 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and 4 to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House and 2 from private endeavor.

For the calendar periods of 1957 and 1958 the Commission would take a comprehensive look at the Nation's tax structure.

COSPONSORSHIP WELCOME

It is my belief that a number of my colleagues may be interested in this proposal, just as seven of them, last week, introduced—very properly, I believe—a bill to carry out the President's wise recommendation for a National Commission on Economic and Financial Policy.

For that reason, I shall ask that the bill remain during this week in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate. I warmly invite my colleagues to communicate with me in the event that they would like to be cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the bill be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, following the text of the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 769) for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the general policy of the Congress:

(a) to strengthen the private enterprise system of the United States in terms of its changing needs, requirements, and opportunities, and thereby to advance the freedom and well-being of the American people;

(b) to provide the soundest basis for the collection of adequate revenue to meet the obligations of the Federal Government;

(c) to promote respect for and observance of Federal revenue laws and regulations; and

(d) toward the accomplishment of these objectives, to promote efficiency, stability, economy, clarity, simplicity, consistency, equity, and justice in the tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

It is the purpose of this act to establish a medium for the comprehensive implementation of this general policy through the establishment of a commission to study and investigate the fundamental tax policy and the tax structure of the Federal Government and their application to the people on an individual basis as well as to the various segments of the national economy in order to improve the existing tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Federal Taxation (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government, the kinds of direct and indirect taxes imposed thereunder (with particular reference to the Federal income tax and its impact on individuals and on enterprises—small, medium, and large), and the nature and extent of the application of such taxes generally and specifically (including the imposition and collection of taxes), in order to determine what changes in such tax policy and tax structure, and in the application and administration thereof, are necessary in its opinion to carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times as it deems necessary and shall submit to the Congress on or before January 1, 1959, its final report of the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations. Such final report may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administration actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. On the 60th day after the date of submission of such final report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure—directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality—information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The purposes and background of this legislation are obvious:

THE SPIDER'S WEB OF TAXES

1. The American tax structure has become a complex "spider's web" of levies stretching in all directions.

We have taxes of 1 percent, 3 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, 20 percent, and more—all the way up to 91 percent.

We have individual income taxes, partnership, corporation, excise, gift, inheritance, capital gains, and vast variety of other taxes—hidden and direct. Meanwhile, Uncle Sam's taxes often duplicate and overlap taxes of our States and local governments.

We have so-called temporary Federal taxes which were actually started during the depression. But they have been continued ever since, and will undoubtedly continue indefinitely until and unless we take a brand-new look at the tax structure.

The same is true of the so-called wartime taxes which still prevail, although the war ended over 11 years ago.

When, I ask, are we going to get some system out of the tax confusion?

ARE TAXES LEGALIZED CONFISCATION?

2. April 15 income-tax deadline is not far away.

I doubt if there is a single Member of the Congress who has not already received a great many letters and postal cards, as I have, from deeply aroused constituents, literally pleading for tax reform and tax relief.

Taxes today definitely are no joking matter either to individuals, partnerships, or corporations.

Taxes are an economic life-and-death struggle for many individuals and economic units in our society.

Who among us has not received mail—yes, mail from people we highly respect, mail denouncing present tax rates as constituting legalized confiscation? Who among us has not received mail stating that taxes constitute a crippling, creeping paralysis on many aspects of growth of our economy?

CONGRESS' PIECEMEAL ADDITION, SUBTRACTION

3. We all recognize that the entire tendency of the Congress has been to add piecemeal or subtract piecemeal to our tax structure. The result, while unintended, has often been to cause still more confusion in our tax structure.

The minimal reforms which we wrote in the Internal Revenue Code in 1954 made for some constructive changes. But the basic pattern of our tax structure remains about as lopsided as ever.

This is despite the earnest efforts of the outstanding group of men who serve on Congress' tax-writing committees. And it is

despite the fact that the present Secretary of the Treasury is universally regarded with high esteem.

TAX-WRITING COMMITTEES ARE HARD PRESSED

4. Once again, our friends on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives are hard at work. They are reviewing a vast number of Treasury Department suggestions, as well as recommendations from other public and private sources—for modest tax revisions, mostly to close various loopholes which have developed.

Under the circumstances, however, neither the House Ways and Means Committee, nor the Senate Finance Committee, nor the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue are in my judgment, in a position to take the sort of high-level, top-visibility approach which is so necessary if we are to take an effective brandnew look at the tax structure.

5. The Commission approach is, however, in no way incompatible with the prerogatives of these able tax-writing committees of the Congress.

Whatever the Commission ultimately recommends will come before these tax-writing committees. They, like the full membership of the Congress, will have the final say. What the Commission will, however, provide is an opportunity which the tax-writing committees do not have in the heavy day-to-day pressure of congressional duties—an opportunity to take a long-range look.

NOT A TOKEN BILL

6. This Tax Commission idea is not new with me, and it is not new to the Congress.

The general idea has been frequently expressed, and it has been placed in bill form previously, especially in the House. But now is the time to enact it.

Thus, this legislation is being introduced by myself today, not as a token gesture, but for the purpose of actually getting it accomplished this year.

THE BILL DOES NOT DELAY RELIEF

7. In the past, there have been those who have said that they did not object to the idea of a Tax Commission. But they feared that it would serve as a delaying factor insofar as providing early tax relief for particular hardpressed groups in our economy.

There are many Americans, for example, who want to provide early tax relief for small business, and I certainly am one.

But we are all aware of what President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey have both frankly said about the little likelihood of early tax relief. We are all aware that the nature of America's domestic and foreign responsibilities, as of January 1957, and stretching through the 1958 fiscal year—are such as to make extremely improbable any substantial tax reduction this coming fiscal year.

Since we apparently are not going to be able to reduce taxes immediately, the very minimum that we ought to do is to use this precious opportunity, this precious time, to study taxes on a comprehensive basis.

In that way, when our Federal fiscal situation eases up and when we can truly reduce taxes, we will have used the time wisely. We will then be ready to legislate the necessary tax changes.

COMMISSION OF ITSELF IS NO CURE-ALL

8. A Commission is no cure-all for the tax-problem of the United States.

We have seen Commissions in the past whose recommendations have been followed, at least in major part. We have seen other Commissions whose recommendations have often been largely ignored.

The success of a Commission depends in part upon the caliber of individuals who make up the Commission. It depends upon the attitude of the Congress and, basically, upon the attitude of the American people to the Commission's suggestions.

It is my hope that a Hoover-type Commission which I am suggesting would carry the imprint, the quality, which is suggested by the very honored name Hoover. I mean the imprint of statesmanship, the highest type of public service that we in this country can and will mobilize for this important subject.

ALL FAIR-MINDED AMERICANS SHOULD SUPPORT BILL

9. This Commission bill is not submitted with any built-in preconceptions as to what it should recommend.

I believe that any fair-minded American, regardless of what his own concepts may be, can and should support this legislation.

Support for it need not be limited to any so-called conservative or liberal or middle-of-center group. Any fair-minded American should be willing and eager to let the Commission call the shots as it sees them.

The only preconceptions that I have as regards the direction of the Commission are stated in the first part of the bill; namely, that the tax structure shall be a means of advancing the free-enterprise economy of the United States. In addition, our tax structure must provide the necessary revenue to support the Government of the United States in its various responsibilities.

TAX STATESMANSHIP NECESSARY

10. I am not one of those who believes in taking the so-called popular approach of being against all taxes and in favor of all appropriations.

Again and again, in my public comments, I have pointed out realistically that every program involving Uncle Sam's so-called expenditures actually comes—in one way or another—from out of the pockets of the American people.

Under these circumstances, the writing of any tax bill almost inevitably is one of the most difficult tasks facing the executive or legislative branches.

Literally hundreds of groups are now confronted with tax hardships. Where are we to begin to provide the relief from these hardships? That is the problem.

I don't think that we can come up with a fair answer to that question unless we have this type of a Commission approach.

AMERICA'S SURVIVAL—OUR SUPREME OBLIGATION

And, as much as I want to see tax rates reduced, I want at the same time to make sure that Uncle Sam has the necessary financial wherewithal to assure the survival of this country. In my judgment, that is the supreme obligation of our Government—that this Republic shall endure, that it shall survive in the face of the worldwide Communist peril, in the face of the danger of a Pearl Harbor-like attack.

I say that as a citizen, as a United States Senator, and as senior Republican on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

ARE NEW-TYPE UNITS BEING TAXED SUFFICIENTLY?

11. Let it not be thought that the Commission will come up with all sorts of pleasant suggestions simply to reduce taxes.

On the contrary, we may expect realistically that tax increases in numerous categories may be suggested, particularly tax increases to apply a fair share of the burden in new areas of endeavor.

America today is changing more rapidly than ever before. Our dynamic free economy is expanding in a tremendous variety of directions. New-type communities are on the landscape; new industries have emerged, new products, new services, new forms of organization.

The question is: Whether all of these new forms are bearing their fair share of the tax-load, or whether, perhaps, there might not be opportunities to extract a reasonable amount of new revenue which we are not at present drawing from these new sources.

TAX LAWS SHOULD NOT INDUCE CRIMINALITY

12. It will be noted that one of the stated purposes of this bill is to encourage respect for and observance of the Nation's tax laws and regulations. In my judgment, this is one of the most important of the purposes.

I do not believe that our tax statutes and regulations should have the effect of encouraging all sorts of dubious subterfuges by taxpayers. I do not believe that a condition should be developed in which the line between legitimate tax avoidance and illegal tax evasion—in which that line becomes more and more blurred and indistinct, and almost impossible to determine.

As a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I am especially interested in effective law enforcement. But I know that we cannot have faithful enforcement of law unless the people respect the law.

The mass of the American people are honest, law-abiding citizens. I think that our tax structure should help to keep them so.

If and when people, however, come to feel that they are the victims of complete injustice, if and when they feel that there is rank discrimination in the tax laws, complete inequities, then almost inevitably there is a tendency for moral scruples to decline—and that condition is one that we want to minimize and avoid.

These, then, are some of the thoughts which serve as background for this tax commission bill.

AN INVITATION FOR COSPONSORSHIP AND PUBLIC REACTIONS

I want to issue now a two-fold invitation. The first is an invitation to my colleagues in the Senate to advise if they would like to cosponsor this bill.

The second is an invitation to the American people to give me the benefit of their reactions to this bill.

For this purpose, I am contacting some of the leading private enterprise groups of our Nation, some of the great spokesmen of our free enterprise system.

I am contacting men and women in all walks of life who are part and parcel of our expanding economy. I refer to varied individuals from expert professors of economics in our great universities to captains of finance and industry, serving as trustees of the savings of literally millions of people.

INVESTORS' CONFIDENCE ESSENTIAL

I am communicating with able men responsible for the employment of vast numbers of Americans. I want to get their judgment because, as I have stated earlier, the growth of our economy is essential.

If America's 8 million and more investors, for example, do not have the incentive to plough back their hard-earned savings into free enterprise, then our economy cannot possibly come up with the costly tools and facilities to create the jobs of tomorrow.

FUTURE COMMENTS IN THE RECORD

I intend to make future statements on this same subject and shall be bringing them to the attention of my colleagues through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other means.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution cosponsored by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would require the Executive to present a balanced budget, with a further require-

ment that the Congress could not adjourn or recess for more than 3 days without the passage of a balanced budget except in time of a declared war or a national emergency.

I have said before, and reiterate with complete conviction, that in my over 2 decades in the United States Senate I have never sponsored a resolution which I thought contained greater potential good, so far as the future welfare of this Nation is concerned, than is contained in this resolution.

Perhaps in the past many years the prospect of a balanced budget was such a matter of wishful thinking or remote accomplishment that any proposal along such line met with a certain amount of apathy. The budgetary dislocations of World War II, the Korean conflict, and postwar rehabilitation had first concern, and rightfully so. Now, however, we have a stabilized economic situation in which we are enjoying not only a very high but a constantly increasing productivity. This makes a reasonably predictable situation where we can tailor our national outgo to national income and demonstrably can meet the current needs both in domestic and foreign programs. Certainly at no time in the foreseeable future will we be in better condition to come to grips with the vital matter of budget balancing and a method of making it an automatic procedure, not left in future years to the chance whims of a topheavy bureaucracy or at the mercy of every political breeze that blows.

I do not mean to say that budget balancing is a matter of easy achievement. Certainly when more than two-thirds of the national budget consists of defense and allied items, balancing it is not easy of accomplishment. Yet, such is the resiliency of our economy that we have been able to do so, and if we can do so under the present circumstances, we should certainly be able to do so in the foreseeable future. This joint resolution, however, is not dependent upon foreseeable budget balancing, because it provides the safety valve of an unbalanced budget in times of declared war or grave national emergency, as I have already stated. Except for such occasions, there is no legitimate excuse for an unbalanced budget, and the provision of the proposed constitutional amendment would merely guarantee a fiscal responsibility on the part of the Executive and the Congress.

I am not one, Mr. President, who feels that a balanced budget is a matter merely of bookkeeping figures. To me it represents the integrity of the dollar and the responsibility of our Government toward its citizens in the protection of the purchasing power of their dollars, the value of their investment and securities and the value of our social security program. The volume of mail coming to my office on the subject of shrunken dollar values is an all too painful reminder of our failure in the past to live up fully to our responsibility. The mere existence of a vast and increased national debt is bound to cause almost uncontrollable inflationary pressure. The only way that situation can be brought under control is to have on record a firm clear-cut policy in regard to additional indebtedness, coupled with actual performance along the line of reducing the existing debt.

We are all familiar with the round figure of $274 billion of debt. Perhaps we are not quite so familiar with more dramatic ways of stating this cold figure. It is a figure greater than the combined indebtednesss of all the other governments of the world put together. It is obvious that if we started off paying this amount at the rate of $1 billion a year it would take 274 years to pay it off. Two hundred and seventy-four years, Mr. President, is 93 years longer than the total lifetime of this country from its birth as an independent nation to the present time. And finally, Mr. President, the amount of yearly debt service figured at simple interest at the rate of 3 percent comes to approximately $8.22 billion.

Sobering as these figures may be, they are even more sobering in the face of the fact that it is quite apparent, as I have been predicting for some time, that the so-called cold war is shifting from the military to the economic front. As champion and rallying point for the free world, we are going to have to meet cold war economic competition, and we certainly cannot do so unless we first put our financial house in order.

Economic war, unlike military war, is not a succession of crash programs, but is a war of slow attrition, and we must get ourselves in the utmost state of economic health in order to carry on that gruelling campaign. First, we can hardly preach economic stability to our friends and allies if we are not a shining example of it ourselves, nor will we have the primary weapon of an economic war, namely, capital for expansion and development both at home and abroad, if we do not achieve a budgetary balance in our own fiscal situation.

In summation, Mr. President, the importance of this joint resolution is that the neglect to accomplish a balanced budget, for which the resolution provides, could be as fatal to the future of this country as actual aggression resulting from neglect of our Military Establishment. The virtue of the resolution and the constitutional amendment for which it would provide is its simplicity from the standpoint both of interpretation and operation and the clear-cut position it puts us in regard to future fiscal integrity and responsibilty.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator have any objection to my joining him as a cosponsor of his joint resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly not; and I invite any other Senator who desires to do so to be a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the balancing of the budget, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, to repeal the 22d amendment, which limits Presidents of the United States to two terms in office and to provide for midterm election of a new President in case the Office of President becomes vacant within the first 2 years of a President's term.

Mr. President, I am proposing this constitutional amendment today because it is the first session of the Senate following yesterday's inauguration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower for his second term. Under the Constitution as altered by the 22d amendment, this must be President Eisenhower's last term, even if the American people should want him to continue in office. Under the constitutional amendment I propose today, there would be restored to the American people the right to continue Dwight Eisenhower in office if, with the knowledge they had acquired during his service as President, they should so desire after the termination of his present term in 1960.

President Eisenhower himself has expressed serious misgivings about the 22d amendment. At his press conference last October 5 he called it "not wholly wise," and declared:

> By and large, the United States ought to be able to choose for its President anybody that it wants, regardless of the number of terms he has served. Now, this is what I believe. Now some people have said, "You let him get enough power, and this will lead to a one-party Government." That I don't believe. I have got the utmost faith in the long-term commonsense of the American people.

The President concluded this statement by repeating his belief that there should be no restrictions on Presidential qualifications, other than those originally written into the Constitution.

I fully agree with the President about this fundamental aspect of the Office of our Chief Executive. Our recurring presidential elections are the highest expression of the people's will. The American people are mature and capable of sound judgment. They should be free to elect any citizen they favor for President as long as they want his services in the White House.

Canada is a land in which a high degree of liberty and freedom prevail. Indeed, in these days our American capitalists are scrambling over one another to invest money in Canada. Yet Canada not so long ago had a Prime Minister who served for 20 consecutive years, the late W. L. Mackenzie King. There is absolutely no evidence that Canadian institutions suffered as a result of this long incumbency—an incumbency at the head of Canada's Government which exceeded by a good many years President Franklin Roosevelt's occupancy of the White House.

TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT WAS ILL-CONCEIVED ATTACK ON PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

The idea of imposing a constitutional limit of two terms on the Presidency was conceived primarily by political opponents of the only President in our history who, in a supreme national crisis, was elected to more than two terms—one of the Nation's greatest and most beloved leaders, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

These political opponents took the lead, out of ill-conceived malice against Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the hasty adoption of the 22d amendment by the 80th Congress, soon after his death. They cared little what dangers might follow adoption of the amendment to effective Presidential leadership. Many of them did not believe in Presidential leadership, anyway. They wanted only to make sure that the American people would not again be permitted the liberty to repeat what seemed to these men the frightful mistake of having reelected President Roosevelt.

Since then, however, many people have had second thoughts about the significance of the artificial two-term limitation and about its effect on the power and influence of the President. It has always been assumed that a President in his 2d term would not again be a candidate for reelection, but only the 22d amendment has made this a constitutional certainty. The impact of this certain knowledge has not yet been determined, but it cannot enhance a President's power to lead his party.

Many prominent newspapers, writers, and leaders in both parties have expressed concern over the prospect. The Congress has the opportunity to propose repeal of this undemocratic restriction at this session, so as to give the State legislatures an opportunity to ratify it before another election. I hope Congress will take this opportunity.

MIDTERM ELECTION IF PRESIDENCY BECOMES VACANT

Mr. President, section 2 of the constitutional amendment which is proposed in my draft joint resolution would provide for holding a new presidential election in conjunction with the next congressional election, whenever a President dies, resigns, or is removed from office during the first 2 years of his term, or if any similar event should keep a President-elect from taking office.

I believe the reasons for such a provision are fairly obvious and require little elaboration. While, under our modern political system, the people vote for both a President and Vice President on a single ticket, it is the candidate for President in whom they by their vote place their confidence to lead them as the Nation's Chief Executive. If circumstances cause the office of President to become vacant early in the term, and a Vice President succeeds to its powers and duties, it is both in the people's interest and in the interest of the successor to the Presidency that his mandate be renewed at the earliest opportunity. If the people have confidence in continuing the Vice President in office as President, he gains the prestige and assurance of having been elected President in his own right. If the people prefer to make a change, they should have that opportunity without having to wait for the end of the former President's 4-year term. At the same time, they will also fill the vacancy in the important office of Vice President, which may otherwise remain unfilled for years.

The best opportunity for obtaining a new popular mandate for the Presidency, when it becomes vacant in the beginning of a term, is of course, in conjunction with the regular congressional election which occurs in the middle of the presidential term. This is what my proposal provides. So as to make it possible to nominate candidates and to carry on a campaign for the Presidency and Vice Presidency in such a midterm election, the proposed election would be held only if the vacancy in the Presidency should occur within more than 60 days before the date of the Congressional midterm election.

In other words, Mr. President, I propose this very simple reform. If the man whom the people elect President in November dies or otherwise leaves office within approximately the first 20 months of his 4-year term, the last 2 years of the term of office will be filled at the time of the midterm congressional election.

Whoever may be elected President in such a midterm election, whether it be an incumbent Vice President or someone else, will have the advantage of having been elected along with the Congress with whom he will have to work. He will have the advantage of having taken his own program to the people and having received their vote of confidence. The people will have had the opportunity to express their judgment and their will, which is the essential foundation of effective government in a democracy. And the Nation will have a Vice President who in modern times has come to carry a heavy load in our Government.

In our history, Vice Presidents have seven times succeeded to the powers and duties of the Presidency upon the death of the President. Six of these seven deaths—in the cases of Presidents Harrison, Taylor, Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—occurred within the first 20 months of the presidential term of office. On these occasions there would, under the amendment I propose, have been new elections for President and Vice President in connection with the midterm congressional elections. The executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government would have returned to the Capital with a fresh mandate from the electorate. In many instances, I believe, the result would have been to avoid undesirable friction and difficulties.

SENATORS MUST RUN TO COMPLETE PREDECESSOR'S TERM

Mr. President, requiring a midterm election after succession to office should be nothing new to us Senators. If a seat in this Chamber becomes vacant, the successor does not automatically have until the term of the former Senator runs to its natural conclusion. No; the successor who takes office here through gubernatorial appointment can occupy a Senate seat only until the next biennial election; then he must face the voters to determine if they desire to have him serve the remainder of the 6-year term. Why should the far greater office of the Presidency be separated from the electorate for a longer period than mere Senate membership?

For these reasons, I introduce my joint resolution today. I believe the majority of the American people would want the two-term limitation repealed. I believe they should be trusted with the power and the responsibility to reelect President Eisenhower, or any other President, for as long as they want him to lead the Nation. At the same time, I think the people should also have the opportunity to vote again on the Presidency, and to elect a new Vice President, if a vacancy occurs during the first 20 months of a presidential term. In the interest of popular representative democracy, therefore, Mr. President, I hope Congress will give early consideration to my proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two editorials in support of repeal of the 22d amendment, one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the other from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution, and to provide for the choosing of a President and Vice President in certain cases where the President dies, is removed from office, or resigns, or where the President-elect dies, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The editorials, presented by Mr. NEUBERGER, are as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

MR. EISENHOWER AND A THIRD TERM

President Eisenhower has voluntarily expressed his disagreement with the 22d amendment to the Constitution which limits presidential tenure to two terms. Speaking at a White House press conference, the President said he thought that the voter should be able to choose whomever he wanted "regardless of the number of terms served."

Let us say, first, that we are pleased with this position of Mr. Eisenhower, since it is precisely the stand taken by the Post-Dispatch 10 years ago when the limitation amendment was agitated. We thought it a mark of confidence in democracy to leave this question in the hands of the people to be decided by them when and as the occasion arose.

But although we agree with Mr. Eisenhower, we are more than surprised that he now takes the view he does. It may be asked if he is familiar with the history of the amendment which he now criticizes as unwise?

A simple way to describe it in political terms would be to say that this amendment was the one piece of legislation in behalf of which the Republicans worked the hardest in the postwar decade. It was conceived, planned, and executed as a rebuke to the

Democratic Party and four times elected President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When the Republican 80th Congress met in January 1947, then Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introduced on the first day a constitutional amendment to limit a President to one 6-year term. DIRKSEN's G. O. P. colleague, Earl C. Michener, of Michigan, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, favored a limit of two 4-year terms.

In the latter form the limitation proposal went before the House and Senate for submission to the States. Democrats quoted not only Washington, Jefferson, and Theodore Roosevelt, but also such Republican Senators as Borah and Lodge against a constitutional limitation on White House tenure.

On the final rollcall in the House of Representatives, the Republicans voted 238 to 0 against the position the President now assumes. The Democrats voted 120 to 47 in support of the view Mr. Eisenhower holds. In the Senate the Republicans voted 46 to 0 for the tenure amendment and the Democrats 23 to 13 against it. The Missouri and Illinois Senators of the time divided as follows: Republicans Donnell, Kem, and Brooks, for the two-term limit; Democrat Lucas against. And that was typical. Apparently if Dwight D. Eisenhower had been in either Chamber as a Republican he would have cast the only GOP vote against the amendment in the entire Congress.

In some ways this is President Eisenhower's strangest break so far with his party. Some voters will wonder if Mr. Eisenhower at the age of 66 is thinking of a possible third term 4 years from now. Our guess would be that he is not, but we have no plausible explanation for his discussing the subject in terms of unwisdom in the midst of the 1956 campaign. The logic of his position is that if he were to be reelected he would urge Congress and the States to repeal the two-term limit on the Presidency.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard]

THE 22D AMENDMENT

Among the "reforms" contemplated by the incoming Congress is repeal of the 22d amendment to the Constitution, the amendment which prohibits a President from serving more than two terms. President Eisenhower is on record as feeling that the amendment was unwise. We agree.

Not that we feel the again-and-again example of FDR should become standard. And not that we feel this vast Nation is likely to experience the services of a truly indispensable man. But we do feel that the amendment is a check on the right of the people to choose their own servants, and that the amendment was put into the Constitution for dishonorable and vindictive reasons.

For a century and a half the tradition was strong. Following George Washington's example, no other man succeeded in securing a third term in the White House. U. S. Grant wanted to. And Theodore Roosevelt ran in 1912 in an attempt to serve all but a few months of three presidential terms. But it wasn't until Franklin Roosevelt in 1940 ran a third time that the tradition was shattered. Then the knives came out. After FDR was dead, a Republican Congress and Republican legislatures dealt FDR this posthumous insult.

FDR died nearly 12 years ago. A lot of history has been written since. His ghost, thoroughly spited now by men who could not lick FDR when he was alive, should be allowed to rest. They made their point. Now let them relax.

President Eisenhower, now safely reelected, realizes he is already something of a lame duck—and with 4 years to go. His influence will wane, must wane, now as congressional Republicans look around for the man who will have coattails in 1960.

Moreover, we question the wisdom of limiting the President to an 8-year term if we permit our Congressmen—and our legislators who were in such a hurry to pass the amendment—to spend many years in their legislative halls. Especially in the case of Congress is this serious. A Congressman with 20 or so years of service becomes, in fact, a resident of Washington, D. C. His associations with the people he is elected to represent become more and more distant. If Congress and the legislatures do not repeal the 22d amendment, one wonders if they will impose similar limitations upon their own political careers.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 42) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate problems of American small and independent business, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

This resolution authorizes the expenditure of funds by the Select Committee on Small Business. I am informed that such resolutions for the past 6 years have not been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that on the last occasion when this was done, 6 years ago, a comparable resolution was then rereferred by unanimous consent to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by me (for myself and other Senators), on January 7, 1957, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 550) to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to State tax authorities with respect to certain real property subject at the time of its acquisition by the United States to real property tax committed to the discharge of bonded indebtedness for any public improvement, the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF ARTICLES OBTAINED BY FALSE OR FRAUDULENT PRETENSES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1957, the name of Mr. HENNINGS was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 675) to amend section 2314, United States Code, title 18, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or through any scheme or artifice to defraud, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LANGER) on January 17, 1957.

STUDY OF INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1957,

The names of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. HRUSKA were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 724) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. JENNER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. LANGER) on January 17, 1957.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ROBERT E. LEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1957,

The names of Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. THYE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LONG were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FREAR, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH

of New Jersey, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. RUSSELL) on January 17, 1957.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIBLE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 420) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REFERENCE OF MONEY RESOLUTIONS TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all money resolutions reported to the Senate today from the standing committees of the Senate be referred immediately to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the Committee on Rules and Administration will look into all the money resolutions, and will report to the Senate on them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely requested that as the standing committees of the Senate report the money resolutions to the Senate, they be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, so that it may hold such hearings as in its judgment it deems proper.

Mr. ELLENDER. I express the hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will hold hearings on the resolutions, and will try to reduce the expenditures we have been making from year to year for many of the investigations conducted by committees. I hope to be notified when the resolutions come before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the interest and concern of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has been very faithful in watching the various expenditures. I have no doubt that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], will be prudent and careful in any reports and recommendations he may make to the Senate.

DR. EDWARD M. GANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on November 27 of last year the American Medical Association named the Nation's outstanding family doctor of the year. I am pleased to state that he comes from a community in my State of Montana. Dr. Edward M. Gans has been practicing as a country doctor for 51 years. Forty-four of those years were spent in Montana, 27 of them at Harlowton.

His medical practice dates back to the horse-and-buggy days; and he has practiced under all conditions, both fair and foul. We in Montana have an appreciative glow in our hearts for the recognition given to the dedicated services of this veteran Montana practitioner, an appreciation due so many small-town doctors throughout the Nation.

Not only has Dr. Gans served those in need with his whole heart and soul and without publicity or fanfare, but he has contributed two sons to the medical profession. His eldest son, Dr. Paul Gans, is practicing in Lewistown, Mont., and Dr. Edward Gans practices in California. In addition, Dr. and Mrs. Gans, who recently celebrated their golden-wedding anniversary, have 1 daughter and 11 grandchildren.

Mr. President, in order that all my Senate colleagues may appreciate the qualities and character of Dr. Edward M. Gans, the Nation's family doctor, I ask unanimous consent that the following newspaper articles be printed at the conclusion of my remarks:

An article from the New York Times of November 28, 1956; 1 from the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., of November 28, 1956; 2 from the Great Falls Tribune of November 30, 1956; 1 from the Montana Legionnaire of January 1957; 1 from the Lewistown Daily News, Lewistown, Mont., of December 20, 1956; and 1 from the Carroll News Letter of Carroll College, one of the Nation's outstanding Catholic colleges, at Helena, Mont., on January 7, 1957.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 28, 1956]

MONTANA MAN, 80, IS DOCTOR OF YEAR—AMA HONORS EDWARD GANS—HEAD OF GROUP DECRIES MEDICAL AID BY UNITED STATES

SEATTLE, November 27.—Dr. Edward M. Gans, 80 years old, of Harlowtown, Mont., was named today by the American Medical Association as the Nation's outstanding family doctor.

The tall, lean physician, who has been practicing for 51 years, was selected as general practitioner of the year by the AMA's House of Delegates. Dr. Gans received a gold medal.

He was graduated from the University of Minnesota Medical School in 1905. He practiced in Eveleth, Minn., and Dickinson, N. Dak., before going to Harlowton.

His two sons are physicians. Recently Dr. Gans and his wife celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. They also have a daughter and 11 grandchildren.

GOVERNMENT AID ASSAILED

At a business session of the convention, Dr. Dwight H. Murray, president of the AMA, said it was time the Nation's doctors sounded the alarm against the soft and superficial security offered by the intervention of Government in medicine.

Dr. Murray, of Napa, Calif., commented:

"Unfortunately, in recent years a benevolent Federal Government appears to be more attractive to the voting public than the preservation of individual freedoms. Medicine must do its utmost to reverse this trend."

Dr. Murray asserted that no system of medical care that uses a third party to bring doctor and patient together can match our kind of cooperative performance.

"Freedom to select a doctor is part of everyone's great freedom to choose—to choose what he wears and eats, where he works and worships, and how he votes," Dr. Murray said. "Take away any part of this freedom and great damage is done to our democratic system."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of November 30, 1956]

NATION'S MOST OUTSTANDING FAMILY DOCTOR, MONTANAN, RECALLS EARLY DAYS OF PRACTICE

SEATTLE.—The Nation's "most outstanding family doctor" is a spry, lean man with a twinkle in his eye who has delivered babies in boxcars and fought blizzards to tend the sick.

Dr. Edward M. Gans, 80, Harlowton, Mont., was selected by the American Medical Association's house of delegates Tuesday to wear the gold medal and hold the title of "General Practitioner of the Year."

Dr. Gans, a graduate of the University of Minnesota, has been a country doctor for 51 years. He has never had a plush uptown office or a carriage trade practice. Instead, his patients have included the iron workers in Minnesota's Mesabi Range and the sheepherders and cowboys of the Montana prairies.

"My first practice was in the Mesabi country and this was an education in itself," Dr. Gans said. "The Mesabi was a melting pot of nationalities, and the combination of cultures and mannerisms, mixed up with payday and liquor, put me on a busy schedule right from the start."

He recalled that one of his first patients was a pregnant woman lying in labor on a filthy bed.

"I bathed her and made the bed with clean sheets, only to return a short while later to find she had remade the bed with the dirty bedclothes and redonned her dirty gown."

But Dr. Gans finally had his way and the baby arrived in good shape.

"Ten months later," he recalled, "I had a call at the same house to treat another patient. There was the baby, husky, healthy, and eating head cheese, drinking beer, and walking all over the place."

After 6 years in Eveleth, Minn., Dr. Gans moved to Dickinson, N. Dak., and then on to Montana, where he settled in the town of Judith Gap. Seventeen years later he moved to Harlowton, where he has practiced for the last 27 years.

"You might call me a horse and buggy doctor," he said. "But that wasn't my only mode of travel in those days. I've used railroad handcars, haywagons, and half-broke horses to reach my patients."

One maternity trip in the teeth of a Montana blizzard kept him from home for 3 days.

His patients have included sheepherders suffering from stomach ulcers, a common ailment in parts of the West because of the monotonous diet of flapjacks, bacon, and strong coffee.

During the winter of 1920, the P. H. Haegen family of Buffalo, Mont., came down with scarlet fever. Dr. Gans not only treated the sick, but he also attended the household and did the farm chores.

But Dr. Gans has contributed to the medical profession in more ways than his practice. His two sons also are doctors. The eldest, Dr. Paul Gans, is practicing in Lewistown, Mont., and the youngest, Dr. Edward Gans, practices in Oakland, Calif.

A daughter, Mrs. Don O'Connor, lives in St. Paul, Minn. Recently Dr. Gans and his wife celebrated their golden wedding anniversary. They have 11 grandchildren.

Dr. Gans held a news conference Tuesday which one reporter missed. The doctor willingly returned to accommodate the newsman.

"Thank you for your patience," said the newsman.

"Patients," punned Dr. Gans, "that's all I've had for 51 years."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of November 28, 1956]

DR. EDWARD GANS, 80, OF HARLOWTON, NAMED NATION'S TOP FAMILY DOCTOR

SEATTLE.—Dr. Edward M. Gans, 80, Harlowton, Mont., was named by the American

Medical Association Tuesday as the Nation's most outstanding family doctor.

The tall, lean physician, who still practices after 51 years in the profession, was selected "general practitioner of the year" by the AMA's house of delegates meeting here in connection with the 10th clinical session of the AMA. Gans received a gold medal.

Dr. E. Vincent Aske, Los Angeles, speaking for the AMA's house of delegates, said:

"In a way, the career of Dr. Gans is the story of many doctors who are called into the profession as if by some mystic manner and who serve it without publicity or fanfare with their whole souls."

Dr. Gans has practiced in Montana the past 44 years, 27 of them at Harlowton.

He was born in St. Cloud, Minn., in 1875, attended St. Cloud schools, and graduated from St. Cloud Teachers College.

After teaching 3 years, he entered medical school at the University of Minnesota, graduating in 1905. After interning at a hospital in Duluth 3 months, he moved to Eveleth, Minn., where he practiced 6 years. Then after a year at Dickinson, N. Dak., he moved to Judith Gap in 1912. His pracice there was interrupted by a term of service with the Army in France during World War I. After the armistice he returned to Judith Gap where he stayed until 1929, when he moved to Harlowton.

His public service included terms as mayor of Judith Gap and coroner of Wheatland County.

Dr. and Mrs. Gans celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary in August. They were married at Stillwater, Minn.

Both of Dr. Gans' sons are physicians. The elder Dr. Paul Gans practices in Lewistown, Mont., and Dr. Edward Gans, Jr., is an ear, nose, and throat specialist at Oakland, Calif. A daughter, Mrs. Don O'Connor, lives in St. Paul, Minn. Dr. and Mrs. Gans have 11 grandchildren.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of November 30, 1956]

HIGH HONOR TO HARLOWTON DOCTOR

The award which has come from the American Medical Association to Dr. Edward Gans of Harlowton as "the Nation's most outstanding family doctor" is one which inspires an appreciative glow in the hearts and minds of many. It recognizes in the dedicated services of this veteran Montana practitioner the characteristics which have made so many general practitioners loved and respected figures in their home communities.

Medical science is merely an essential tool to the ministrations of such a doctor. The relationship between the doctor and his patients and extending to the whole community is the thing that sets him apart for endearment.

Dr. Gans had his full share of experiences of horse and buggy days. It is related that on one of his maternity trips during a Montana blizzard he was gone for 3 days. His own comment on that was concise: "No sense in going back until it was over. Was a nice little girl."

After his selection as Montana's "general practitioner of the year," one letter to the doctor's son from an old friend said in part:

"Dr. Gans has been more than just a doctor to our family in time of need. In the winter of 1920 when the whole family was down with scarlet fever, he did not only attend to the sick in our household, but also took care of the livestock until he could arrange for a man to come in and help. During that time we lost our first born to the fever and Dr. Gans was kindness itself, with a steady and sustaining faith that helped us as no words could ever do."

Such are the elements which have gone into his selection as "the Nation's most outstanding family doctor."

[From the Montana Legionnaire of January 1957]

AMA DOCTOR OF YEAR HONORED BY HOME POST

Dr. E. M. Gans, who was honored by both the Montana and American Medical Associations by being given Doctor of the Year awards for 1956 upon completion of 50 years of medical practice, and Mrs. Gans were honored speakers at the annual Christmas party of Wheatland Post 15 and Unit 15 of the American Legion Auxiliary, held at American Legion hall in Harlowton on December 15.

Dr. Gans, who was Wheatland post's first commander, told of the awarding of the medal to him at the recent Seattle convention of the American Medical Association, and incidents connected with it. Mrs. Gans gave a woman's viewpoint of these events.

A. D. Eggenberger, who was master of ceremonies for the evening, read a telegram from two Legion and Auxiliary members, Mr. and Mrs. Merle Edson, who are spending the season on the coast. Post Commander Harry Mitchell welcomed the guests.

About 50 people enjoyed a turkey dinner. Dr. Gans accompanied for community singing. Christmas gifts were exchanged. Dancing completed the evening.

[From the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of December 20, 1956]

DR. E. M. GANS HONORED AT ST. JOSEPH'S BANQUET

Dr. Edward M. Gans, Harlowton, general practitioner of the year, was honored Wednesday night at St. Joseph's Hospital at a banquet described by a friend as a very pleasant occasion.

Dr. Ray Johnson, Harlowton, and Dr. Grant Raitt, Billings, attended the annual banquet usually given by the sisters of the hospital to honor the medical staff.

Chosen as general practitioner of the year by the clinical session of the American Medical Association in Seattle during November, Gans has been an honorary member of the local hospital's staff for many years.

Other doctors on the staff were also feted during the informal get-together.

Local doctors attending were Dr. Raymond Eck, Dr. Joseph Frazer, Dr. Paul J. Gans, Dr. William Barelman, Dr. John Schubert, Dr. George LeTellier, Dr. Joseph Orley and Dr. E. A. Weldon.

For many years, a well-known Lewistown doctor, Gans is especially remembered for his work during the trying years of the Second World War. While many other doctors were in the service, he and the late Dr. Fred Attix worked long hours in the hospital day after day carrying an extra load of work.

The banquet was sponsored by the Fergus County Medical Society.

[From the Helena (Mont.) Carroll College newsletter of January 7, 1957]

JANUARY SPOTLIGHT

Dr. Edward M. Gans was selected on November 27 as the Nation's outstanding family doctor of the year by the American Medical Association. Dr. Gans, who has been a country doctor for 51 years, is the father of two Carroll alumni, both doctors themselves—Paul J. Gans, M. D. (1925), Lewistown, and Edward W. Gans, M. D. (1927), Oakland, Calif. Dr. and Mrs. Gans, who recently celebrated their golden wedding anniversary, also have a daughter and 11 grandchildren.

INDEPENDENCE: THE DETERMINATION OF THE UKRAINIANS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to the people of the Ukraine and to Americans of Ukrainian descent, January 22 is a day of challenge. On this date 38 years ago, the hopes of a nation were fulfilled. On this date the identity of the Ukrainian people—oppressed for centuries—emerged in Ukrainian independence. On this date the national will of the Ukrainian people for freedom and self-determination brought a new state into being.

The independence gained was short lived. Freedom again was suppressed and stifled. The Ukrainian people once more were subjected to the iron hand of foreign rule.

During these 38 years under Soviet domination, the will of the Ukrainian people for independence has continued to burn. Their determination to achieve freedom has not been suppressed by genocide, enforced starvation, or mass enslavement. While the Soviet Union enacts the lie of Ukrainian independence, while puppet officials cast a separate vote for the Ukraine in the United Nations, while Premier Khrushchev attempts to shift the responsibility for the past 38 years to Comrade Stalin, the deportations continue; the young manhood is inducted into Red armies, never to be permitted to return to the homeland; food grains are collected within the shadow of the treads of tanks; public assembly, public and private utterance, the press, the radio, the schools, all intellectual and cultural life conform to the rigid enforcements of state dictation. Yet, notwithstanding the weight upon them, the Ukrainian people continue their painstaking march toward independence.

Ukrainian-Americans, and indeed all Americans, on this independence day share in these aspirations of the Ukrainian people for freedom. Our heritage is their ideal. Their ideal is our challenge.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, today, January 22, is the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It was 39 years ago today that the Ukrainian National Republic came into being and a cherished dream became a reality.

Tragically, that independence was short-lived and in 1920 Ukraine was once again ground under the Russian boot—this time under the Communist boot.

This proud land, which was the seat of an independent and free state from the 9th to the 14th century and again from the middle of the 17th century to late in the 18th century, has writhed under the oppressor for more than 300 years.

Its extensive natural resources have made the Ukraine coveted by its neighbors, and its people have been forced to exploit the fertility of their land to feed their oppressors.

Rich as it is in natural blessings, Ukraine is, and has been, even richer in spiritual blessings. The love of liberty held by its people is deeply rooted in their unyielding love for their God. There are no fiercer fighters for freedom in their own land or throughout the world than the brave and valiant men and women of the Ukraine.

All people who enjoy liberty are aware of the sacrifices which make it possible

and keep it intact. That awareness, however, is often relative to the length of time the blessings of freedom have been enjoyed. The passage of time can dull the realization of the extent and great cost of the very sacrifices which made freedom possible.

The Ukrainians, however, in their heartland or wherever in the world they may reside, have lost not one iota of their awareness. The more hopeless their cause has been at times, the more fiercely determined they have become to restore freedom to their homeland.

Their love of liberty for all men has led them to fight for this Nation and for other nations who have sought freedom. Their fight has been continuous and unrelenting.

In 1953 in East Germany, in 1954 and 1955 in the slave-labor camps of Vorkuta and central Asia, Ukrainians joined other non-Russian patriots in attempting to rid themselves of the Communist yoke. Most recently Ukrainian officers and men of the Red Army sided with the valiant Hungarians in Budapest to write one of freedom's most glorious chapters upon the history of the world.

Mr. President, men and women who want to be free share an especial brotherhood with men and women who are free. In paying tribute today to the 40 million people of the Ukrainian nation and to those of Ukrainian descent who have made such important contributions to our own and other nations, we renew our determination to speed the day when the Ukraine, and the the other nations behind the Iron Curtain, may be restored to rightful dignity and take their places with the other free nations of the world.

I am indeed happy to have had the opportunity last week to introduce a joint resolution, in behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. BUSH], calling for the designation of January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day, as another indication to these brave people that they are not and will never be forgotten or forsaken.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I take this occasion, on the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, to express my approval of the joint resolution which was introduced to designate January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day.

I think we should do everything possible short of war to aid the Ukrainians in their long and, at times, discouraging fight for freedom. We of the United States should not only hope, but should exert every effort to make certain that the bright new light of freedom shall shine over the Ukraine in the very near future.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, with a deep sense of personal loss, I join in tribute to a distinguished American patriot who served his country faithfully and well in war and in peace.

The untimely death of C. Wayland Brooks came as a great shock to all of us who valued his friendship and who honored him as an outstanding soldier and statesman.

A former influential and highly esteemed Member of this body, Senator Brooks held a warm place in the hearts of a great host of friends, by whom he was affectionately known as "Curly."

His record of service in the Armed Forces was exceptional. He enlisted in the Marine Corps when the United States entered World War I, and before he end of the war he had been wounded seven times and had been decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the American Navy Cross, the Croix de Guerre, and the Purple Heart. For gallantry in action, he won a battlefield commission as second lieutenant and was advanced to first lieutenant in the front line.

Senator Brooks was a vigorous and courageous fighter for the principles in which he believed. His dedication to the ideals of patriotic Americanism was honest and sincere. He battled constantly for a strong America, even though his convictions brought him into frequent conflict with proposals which he could not conscientiously support. The State of Illinois, which he represented so ably, and the Nation have lost a great leader in public service.

To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy in this time of their tragic bereavement.

PROGRESS ON SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS FOR WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the issues in which I was deeply interested during the preceding 84th Congress was the establishment of a Federal grant-in-aid program for the purpose of assistance in the construction of municipal sewage-treatment plants.

This subject is of tremendous significance throughout the 48 States. That fact can be confirmed by public officers who have wrestled with the extremely difficult pollution problem at State and local levels, or who, in Washington, have worked with such officials.

BADGER STATE'S FINE PROGRESS

I am proud to say that my own State of Wisconsin has been one of the leaders in the battle against pollution. We have done so through the construction of needed treatment plants, as well as through other necessary steps.

All over Wisconsin, individual communities have made notable progress in meeting this challenge head on. They have done so by taking on serious financial burdens. Local taxpayers have assumed heavy loads which will take years and years to pay off.

Despite the wonderful progress which has been made, the fact is, however, that there are many communities in the Badger State, and elsewhere, which still find themselves hardpressed by the pollution problem.

I am pleased, therefore, to record the excellent progress which has been made, pursuant to the Federal grant-in-aid program, by the Wisconsin State Committee on Water Pollution, whose director is Mr. Theodore F. Wisniewski.

I have received in this morning's mail from Mr. Wisniewski the text of a progress report on the work of the State committee. It includes a memorandum on the method which has been used in determining priority for Federal aid for construction of sewage-treatment plants.

SYSTEM OF LOCAL PRIORITIES

I believe that my colleagues will be interested in the State priority system established, based upon financial need and water pollution control need.

The necessity for such a system is readily apparent in view of the fact that the total amount of funds available to Wisconsin is only $917,000. On the other hand, a total amount of requests, in excess of more than $3,600,000, has already been received from the various Badger communities.

I send to the desk the text of this memorandum, which illustrates, I believe, the orderly progress being made at the State and grassroots level.

OTHER REQUESTS FOR FEDERAL FUNDS

I present it particularly as background to further consideration by the present Congress of this particular very important grant-in-aid program.

I may say parenthetically that we are all aware that there is a heavy burden on Uncle Sam because of new requests for a tremendous number and variety of still other grant-in-aid programs.

In the consideration by Congress of these proposed programs, in turn, we must set up a priority system. Obviously, Uncle Sam cannot hope to meet his own problem of a $72 billion budget and an already enormous tax load unless great care is exercised in weeding out unnecessary new proposals. To take this particular instance, however, sewage treatment, while it may sound unimportant to the uninformed, is actually highly significant in terms of health, welfare, commerce, industry, and recreational values.

I ask unanimous consent that the material which I earlier mentioned be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
COMMITTEE ON WATER POLLUTION,
STATE OFFICE BUILDING,
Madison, Wis., January 17, 1957.

Theodore F. Wisniewski, director.

Members: George P. Steinmetz, chairman, commissioner, public service commission; O. J. Muegge, vice chairman, State sanitary engineer, State board of health; Laurence F. Motl, chief engineer, conservation department; Ralph D. Culbertson, State chief engineer, bureau of engineering; Carl N. Neupert, M. D., State health officer, State board of health.

Enclosed is a summary of information on Federal grant-in-aid applications received and the method used in determining priority for Federal aid for construction of sewage-treatment plants.

The proposed certification of priority was adopted by the committee on water pollution at its meeting on January 15, 1957.

It should be noted that highest priority was granted to projects for which sites were acquired and for which final plans were ready or approved.

Applications from those communities which have not been granted priority will be kept on file and, unless there are major changes in procedures or in proposed projects, these will be considered again in the event the Congress, which is now in session, appropriates grant funds for continuation

of the grant-in-aid program for construction of treatment facilities to abate water pollution.

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE ON WATER POLLUTION,
THEODORE F. WISNIEWSKI, *Director.*

Wisconsin Federal grant-in-aid applications

Name	Project No.	Cost	Grant requested
Abbotsford	55	$119,180	$35,754
Amery	50	112,070	33,621
Athens	37	102,282	30,684
Balsam Lake	51	61,500	18,450
Beloit	17	893,250	250,000
Bloomington	23	118,216	35,465
Brodhead	6	129,051	38,716
Cambria	52	105,413	31,624
Casco	21	84,000	25,000
Cashton	45	102,442	30,733
Centuria	47	109,000	33,000
Clayton	54	83,713	25,114
Clinton	19	115,000	34,500
Clintonville	11	145,465	43,640
Devils Lake State Park	32	37,307	12,435
Durand	20	169,016	50,705
Fairchild	24	71,066	21,319
Florence	34	54,650	16,395
Genoa City	38	83,230	24,969
Hales Corners	31	242,200	72,660
Independence	9	72,342	21,703
La Farge	7	108,022	32,407
Lake Delton	25	155,096	46,529
Madison Metropolitan Sewer District	14	3,671,820	250,000
Manitowoc	43	1,250,000	250,000
Mazomanie	8	140,400	42,120
Menomonie	4	275,161	79,613
Merrillan	12	46,992	14,098
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District	28	830,500	250,000
Do	29	1,072,500	250,000
Mineral Point	10	266,354	79,906
Montfort	26	76,956	23,086
Monticello	33	55,020	16,506
New Glarus	41	367,369	110,211
Osceola	27	134,118	43,285
Phillips	46	142,021	42,606
Plymouth	36	209,425	62,827
Portage	3	184,364	55,309
Potosi	18	112,397	33,719
Rib Lake	48	100,000	30,000
Shawano	53	298,604	89,581
Sheboygan	5	919,721	250,000
Somers Sanitary District No. 2	44	63,530	19,059
Superior	1	1,651,775	250,000
Sussex	30	306,788	92,036
Tigerton	42	162,360	48,708
Twin Lakes	16	199,169	59,751
Viola	40	140,812	42,244
Washburn	22	140,012	42,003
Westfield	15	81,614	24,484
Whitehall	35	232,650	69,795
Whitewater	2	125,000	37,500
Williams Bay	13	105,380	31,614
Woodruff	49	9,570	2,871
Woodville	39	92,662	27,798
Total	------	16,738,555	3,686,153

PRIORITY FOR FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID

Public Law 660 requires that the State agency certify priority for Federal grant-in-aid on the basis of financial need and water pollution control need.

As a measure of financial need it is proposed to use median income for families and unrelated individuals as reported in Bulletin P-B 49, 1950 Census of Population, Wisconsin, General Characteristics.

For determination of pollution control need, the pounds of biochemical oxygen demand discharged per cubic feet per second of 98 percent streamflow is used.

By dividing median income by the biochemical oxygen demand load discharged on 98-percent flow, there is obtained a factor on the basis of which priority can be determined. The lower the number expressing the need factor, the higher the priority.

Communities which have applied for Federal grant-in-aid have been divided into three groups:

Municipalities having public sewer systems and no treatment are listed in group A.

Municipalities having treatment plants requiring replacement are listed in group B.

Municipalities having existing plants requiring improvements or additions or building new sewerage systems are listed in group C.

It is proposed to certify projects for priority in the following manner:

First to group A in order of need factor, next, if funds remain, to group B in order of need factor, and finally, if funds remain, to group C in order of need factor.

First consideration is given to communities in each group which have acquired a site and have plans ready or approved. Then the remaining communities in each group in order are considered for priority.

It should be noted that the allotment for the State of Wisconsin amounts to $971,425. Total grant requests amount to $3,686,153.

Group A

Applications received from municipalities having sewer systems and no treatment: Beloit, Durand, Florence, Independence, La Farge, Merrillan, Osceola, Rib Lake, Superior, Viola, Washburn, Whitehall.

Group B

Municipalities where replacement of existing treatment plants is required: Athens, Bloomington, Brodhead, Cambria, Clinton, Genoa City, Menomonie, Monticello, New Glarus, Phillips.

Group C

Municipalities having existing plants requiring improvements or building new systems: Casco, Cashton, Clintonville, Devils Lake State Park, Fairchild, Hales Corners, Lake Delton, Madison Metropolitan Sewer District, Manitowoc, Mazomanie, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District, Mineral Point, Montfort, Plymouth, Portage, Potosi, Sheboygan, Somers Sanitary District No. 2, Sussex, Tigerton, Twin Lakes, Westfield, Whitewater, Williams Bay, Woodville, Abbotsford, Amery, Balsam Lake, Centuria, Clayton, Shawano, Woodruff Utility District No. 1.

Proposed certification of priority

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Rank		Need factor	Grant requested	Cumulative
1	Superior	9.8	$250,000	$250,000
GROUP A. SITE ACQUIRED AND PLANS READY OR APPROVED				
2	Beloit	24	$250,000	$500,000
3	Independence	271	21,703	521,703
4	La Farge	787	32,407	554,110
GROUP B. SITE ACQUIRED AND PLANS READY OR APPROVED				
5	Menomonie	224	$79,613	$633,723
6	Athens	234	30,684	664,407
7	Clinton	571	34,500	698,907
8	Brodhead	613	38,716	737,623
GROUP C. SITE ACQUIRED AND PLANS READY OR APPROVED				
9	Twin Lakes	11	$59,751	$797,374
10	Whitewater	13	37,500	834,874
11	Williams Bay	14	31,614	866,488
12	Casco	31	25,000	891,488
13	Portage	172	55,309	946,797
14	Mazomanie	256	42,120	988,917
15	Clintonville	426	43,640	--------
	Alternates			
16	Washburn	1.5	42,003	--------
17	Florence	3.5	16,395	--------
18	Merrillan	23	14,098	--------

SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is made up of 96 different persons with individual personalities, from 48 different States. Each has, perhaps, his own claim to fame, but one Member of the 85th Congress can boast of something truly American, the fulfillment of a boyhood wish.

At the age of 32, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has fulfilled a youthful ambition to be a Senator, an ambition which began at the age of 14.

It is a great privilege to be associated with Senator CHURCH as a friend and colleague. I am told that this self-made Democrat looks to the late Senator William E. Borah as a guide and preceptor. The people of Idaho shall be ever grateful for the inspiration which spurred this young man on to the service of his State and Nation.

I know full well that in the years to come the young people of the Northwest will be looking up to Senator CHURCH as a great legislator and skilled orator. His colleagues from that area have every faith and confidence in him. We expect great things from him and we know that FRANK CHURCH—a man with his feet on the ground and an intense desire to serve his State and Nation—will not fail us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three character studies appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Washington Evening Star, and Labor's Daily be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 3, 1957]

IN THE NEW SENATE

(By Utahna L. Hall)

CHURCH, ADMIRING BORAH, WANTED SENATE SEAT AT 14

BOISE, IDAHO.—When FRANK CHURCH, Democrat and 32-year-old Boise lawyer, is sworn in the United States Senate January 3 as junior Senator from Idaho, he will have fulfilled a boyhood ambition. He has wanted to be Senator since he was 14.

He will also attain the title as youngest Member of the Senate, taking it away from Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, 38, of Louisiana, who was elected at 30. Henry Clay, Kentucky Whig, was elected and seated in 1806 at the age of 29½, the youngest man ever to serve.

But if CHURCH remembers any predecessors in the marble halls, it will be the late Senator William E. Borah, who served Idaho some 30 years. In junior high school CHURCH wrote an essay in response to one of Borah's speeches on foreign affairs. Like his hero, CHURCH became interested in that subject and in the law and skilled in oratory, and he, too, in time married a governor's daughter. But he chose the Democratic Party instead of the Republican.

CHURCH will take his Senate post by virtue of having beaten Herman Welker, Republican incumbent, in a State traditionally Republican, by a plurality of 46,315 votes. The victory is sweeter because, at the same time, he had to fend off the sniping of Glen A. Taylor, former Democratic Senator, who engineered a write-in campaign.

Born July 24, 1924, into a pioneer Idaho family of gold-rush days, he is a mixture of Yankee, Irish, and German extraction. He is the third member of his family to bear the name Frank Forrester Church, and his son, "Twig," age 8, is the fourth.

His father, now deceased, was a Boise businessman. His mother, Mrs. Fay Bilderback Church, will attend the Senate ceremonies as will his wife and only brother, Marine Col. Richard B. Church, of Quantico, Va., who followed the family's Navy tradition. Frank however, chose the Army and enlisted as a private in World War II. Graduated from

Fort Benning, Ga., as a lieutenant, he served in military intelligence in India, Burma, and China, and spent some time in Nanking and Shanghai.

In Boise High School he was elected student body president by the same coterie of friends who aided him in the Senate campaign. In high school he also won the American Legion $4,000 oratorical contest. This money financed him through Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif., where he received both a bachelor of arts degree and a bachelor of laws degree in law. He made Phi Beta Kappa, scholastic honorary, and at Harvard Law School, which he attended 1 year, made the Blackstone Club.

His wife, the former Bethine Clark, one of his high-school friends, was graduated from the University of Michigan. She is charming, practical enough to fix a car engine in an emergency, and politically adept. Campaigns are an old story to her. Her father, Chase A. Clark, United States judge for Idaho, is a former governor, an uncle was governor, and her cousin, the late D. Worth Clark, was formerly a United States Senator.

While CHURCH looked toward the Senate a long time, he waited to declare himself until last year, when he called a political powwow of his friends, and announced his candidacy to them. He did not file until February. He chose Carl P. Burke, Boise lawyer and Stanford classmate, as his campaign manager—chairman of CHURCH for Senate in the primary and of Citizens for FRANK CHURCH in the general election.

CHURCH realize he faced a tough primary as he had never won an elective office and he was little known throughout the State.

To remedy this, he and his wife started out in their car in March to visit all the distant corners of the State. Idaho has 83,354 miles, with an estimated population of only 625,000. CHURCH says he must have shaken hands with around 35,000 persons.

His main campaign issue was the development of Idaho and attraction of industry. Second was his advocacy of multiple-purpose reclamation programs that will reclaim our desert lands and provide necessary guaranties of existing water rights. He also pledged himself to work toward preserving the family-size farm, to aid schools, the aged, and to work for a bipartisan foreign policy.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 11, 1957]

AT 32, CHURCH, OF IDAHO, IS THRILLED BY SENATE

(By Mary McGrory)

The sheer joy of being a Senator is something you don't run into very often in Washington.

Although men will fight around the clock for the privilege, mortgaging homes, reputations and futures in the attempt, they are often, on arrival, at great pains to conceal their pleasure.

Ask a new Senator how he feels about becoming a member of the most exclusive gentlemen's club in the world, he may tell you hardily that it's very like the city council in Ashtabula; or he may speak weightily of the crushing burden of public office.

Watch a new Senator being sworn in and you will see that in most cases, he has assumed an expression he believes to be statesmanlike or one that seems to say that he is treading the middle aisle of the Chamber only in answer to a deafening public clamor.

CHURCH SCORES QUICKLY

A notable exception to this tradition has come to Washington this year in the person of FRANK CHURCH, the brandnew Senator from Idaho, who at 32, has realized a boyhood dream of being elected to the Senate in his first bid for public office. He beat the Republican incumbent, Herman Welker.

At the swearing-in ceremonies, his bright and shining countenance glowed among the more sombre faces around him. His face was wreathed in smiles and he looked up frequently at the gallery where the equally happy members of the Church family were gathered.

And in his office, where there is a strong smell of new paint, Mr. CHURCH says frankly, "I worked hard to make it, and I'm delighted to be here."

ARGUED WITH FATHER

The aura of the boy orator, which he was, clings about the youthfully handsome Mr. CHURCH. His sentences are balanced in the fashion of one trained in the principles of unity, coherence and emphasis. When he talks he paces with his hands behind his back, or placed on the back of a chair or upraised in the approved platform manner. A Boise lawyer, he is a self-made Democrat. His father, a Republican, liked to argue. Frank, the nearest opponent, boned up on Democratic Party principles, and convinced himself, although not his father, of their truth.

When he was asked how one whose reputation was made from public speaking would adapt to a Senate rule of the new Members being seen but not heard he replied quickly, "I'll live with it.

"I think it is a good thing. If you speak too often you get the reputation in the country and in the Senate—where it would do the most harm—of being brash, like a bumblebee. You know, the bumblebee who is biggest when he is born. Besides there will be other opportunities to be heard."

MANY INVITATIONS TO SPEAK

Young Mr. CHURCH, who won a 4-year scholarship to Stanford University in an oratorical contest, is at the moment swamped with bids for speaking engagements. In his first week in Washington, he spoke two nights in a row at public banquets, and finds he is already tired, due he thinks to the change in altitude between the hills at home and the low-lying Capital City.

And in his first week, too, he has had what he calls "a baptism of fire." In his first vote, on rule 22, he went against the leadership of his party—"a thing I found very difficult to do." He later voted against the liberals favoring radical rules changes and joined Majority Leader JOHNSON in sponsoring a more moderate rules change.

He is like some other new Members, something of a bone of contention between the two factions in his party. They divide roughly into the boat rockers represented by such Senators as HUMPHREY and DOUGLAS and the nonboat rockers led by LYNDON JOHNSON. Mr. CHURCH has been approached by ambassadors of both sides in his short stay.

"I can see the difficulties of serving," he says. "There is the pressure, or rather suggestions, brought in perfectly good faith, by other Members. You weigh them against your own standing in the Senate, in the country, in your own State, your influence in gaining their support in measures of your own, in getting along in the Senate. You could after a year of approaching matters that way end in an institution. You simply have to weigh each measure on its merits."

LIKE A NEW CITIZEN

Mr. CHURCH thinks being a new Senator is like being a citizen in a new community. "You come in and if it is found that you deal honorably with other people, pay your debts, and your word stands up to the test of time, you are accepted."

Already Senator CHURCH has discovered that his fellow Senators are a friendly, talented, and principled group of men. He has noticed that there is a well of sand on his desk, memento of the time when it dried the ink from senatorial quill pens. He has found the atmosphere of the Senate most affable and that he has been welcomed by his fellow Democrats in a way which has been cordial, but never fatherly or patronizing, which, as a junior, he appreciates.

He has even enjoyed being taken for a page boy by Senate doorkeepers. And when he was waiting for an elevator and heard a lady telling him and another page boy that that new Senator CHURCH had been mistaken for one, he couldn't resist telling her who he was.

[From Labor]

GRATEFUL TO LABOR, CHURCH SAYS—YOUNGEST SENATOR TELLS HIS AIMS FOR STATE AND NATION

When a 32-year-old political unknown ousts an entrenched GOP Senator in a Republican State, against the writein opposition also of an ex-Democratic Senator, that's real political history.

FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, did just this last November. Moreover, while President Eisenhower was carrying sparsely settled Idaho by some 60,000 votes, young CHURCH on the Democratic ticket rolled up a plurality of nearly 50,000.

How did it happen? A Labor representative sought the answer this week from Idaho's youthful new Senator. The talk covered also CHURCH's approach to his awesome duties as the Senate's youngest Member.

Seeking to explain his extraordinary victory, CHURCH first cited the widespread feeling that Senator Herman Welker, his Republican opponent, had failed to represent the interests of the State in Washington. Welker, in fact, proved himself a die-hard reactionary.

SEEKS PROGRESS FOR IDAHO

CHURCH, in contrast, campaigned on the need to reverse the trend whereby Idaho, despite its great potential resources, has lagged behind the rest of the West. CHURCH's own personality and style of campaigning undoubtedly played a big part also.

Despite his quick rise, FRANK CHURCH is neither slick nor glib. His generally progressive views are obviously his own, and deeply held. He's articulate, but sincerity and commonsense are the qualities that shine through most vividly as he speaks.

CHURCH recalled that he first began campaigning last February. The son of a pioneer Idaho family, and related to prominent political figures through his wife, CHURCH himself was then a complete political unknown.

With his wife, he crisscrossed the State, speaking and shaking hands with many thousands of people. "I shook so many hands I got a callus," he recalls now with a smile, "I guess I'm the only lawyer in Idaho with a callus on his hand."

CHURCH turned most of his meetings into open forums without a set speech but devoted to answering questions from the audience. "This proved highly popular," he notes.

CHURCH's early campaigning was made necessary by a hot primary, in which he defeated former Democratic Senator Glen Taylor and two other candidates. Later Taylor made an unsuccessful write-in race in the general election.

GRATEFUL FOR LABOR SUPPORT

Idaho is primarily a farm State but CHURCH hailed the support of organized labor as a significant factor in his victory. "Organized labor pitched in and worked for me," he said. "I'm very grateful for it," he added, citing also the help provided by a special edition of Labor.

Looking forward, CHURCH said that as a new Senator I can be most effective in those matters relating closely to my own State. He emphasized especially a farm program

better designed to give relief to the small farmer and the development of water resources.

The latter is a big issue in the Northwest, and CHURCH stressed that it should be tackled in practical terms. The issue is not private versus public power, he said, but rather to develop our resources as comprehensively and effectively as possible.

FAVORS HIGH DAMS

Big high dams are needed to do this in the Northwest, he declared, and only Uncle Sam can meet the cost. Moreover, he emphasized, these dams pay off.

CHURCH said he'll work also to eliminate the punitive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and for other measures to meet working people's legitimate needs. He stressed also better credit for small business, and a Federal school-construction bill.

Judging by his own meetings, CHURCH declared no other single subject generates more interest among the people at large than the need for better schools.

Later on when he has more experience, the new Senator added, he hopes he can put to service his great personal interest in foreign policy. If that happens, CHURCH will be following in the footsteps of one of his famed predecessors, the late William E. Borah, who served many years as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I desire to join with my friend from Montana in welcoming our new colleague from Idaho and especially in congratulating him for looking to the late William E. Borah as his model to follow in the United States Senate. Let the record show that the late Senator Borah was a member of the Republican Party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say that in the past it was entirely praiseworthy for the new Senator from Idaho to follow the course he did. I give him credit for it. But, in the future, people in the United States are going to look to FRANK CHURCH as a guide, and, of course, we expect the Democratic Party to profit thereby.

TULARE (CALIF.) UNION HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, millions of people, both in person on the scene and in homes and other places across the Nation, thrilled yesterday to the precision, the color, the inspiring music, and the significant floats which characterized one of the finest inaugural parades ever to celebrate the induction of a President and a Vice President of the United States.

I am sure my colleagues will allow me to register the pride which I and numerous other Californians felt upon learning that the best musical organization in the high school division was the Tulare Union High School Band from my native State of California.

The results of patient instruction and drilling were obvious to all who watched this aggregation of young girls and boys brilliantly represent their State. The talent displayed in their musical performance further demonstrates why these students recently were honored as the best high school band in a statewide competition.

I desire to congratulate the members of the Tulare Union High School Band and their instructors for the well-merited distinction of being the finest in their class appearing in the inaugural parade. I also wish to commend the public-spirited townsfolk and other neighbors in California who have supported this situation and generously made it possible for the youngsters to participate in the inaugural celebration.

COMMEMORATION OF 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Sunday, January 13, at the Washington Cathedral, there was held a service in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury. On that occasion the sermon was delivered by Rev. Alexander Hamilton, of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Conn. Rev. Mr. Hamilton is a great grandson of Alexander Hamilton.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the program, as well as the text of the address delivered by Rev. Mr. Hamilton on that occasion.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SERVICE OF COMMEMORATION FOR THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON, JANUARY 13, 1957, THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL, MOUNT ST. ALBAN, WASHINGTON, D. C.

ORDER OF SERVICE

The prelude: Chorale prelude, Comest Thou Now Jesus, from Heaven To Us Below? (Johann Sebastian Bach).

The sentences.

The processional: Hymn No. 52, As With Gladness Men of Old (Dix).

The preces:

Minister: "O, Lord, open thou our lips."

Answer: "And our mouth shall show forth Thy praise."

Minister: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost."

Answer: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

Minister: "Praise ye the Lord."

Answer: "The Lord's name be praised."

The Word of God: The Psalm: No. 84, the Book of Common Prayer, page 445. Chant: Martin.

The lessons read by United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT, chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The first lesson: Ecclesiasticus 44: 1–8, 13–14.

For the canticle:

"In natali Domini (Michael Praetorius)

"In natali Domini clamant mortales singuli:
Wo ist uns ein Kind geborn?
Zu Bethlehem ist uns geborn ein Kindelein,
Gewunden in ein Tüchelein,
Jesus ist der name sein.

"(In natali Domini clamant mortales singuli:
Where for us is born a Child?
In Bethelehem for us is born a little Child to make us free,
Enwrapped in swaddling clothes is he,
Jesus is his name to be.)"

—Unknown; English version by E. Harold Geer.

(Sung by the Mary Baldwin College Glee Club, Staunton, Va.; Gordon C. Page, director.)

The second lesson: Ephesians 6:10–20.

For the canticle:

"Psallite unigenito (Michael Praetorius)

"Psallite unigenito, Christo Dei Filio,
Psallite redemptori Domino,
Puerulo iacenti in praesepio.
Ein kleines Kindelein liegt in dem Krippelein,
Alle liebe Engelein dienem dem Kindelein,
Und singen ihm fein.

"(Psallite unigenito, Christo Dei Filio,
Psallite redemptori Domino,
Puerulo iacenti in praesepio.
What if an infant small be cradled in the stall,
Angel quires in heavenly hall before his footstool fall,
"Singing anthems all.)

—Unknown; English version by George Ratcliffe Woodward.

The Apostles' Creed, Prayer Book, page 29 (sung by all).

Versicles and responses: V. "The Lord be with you." R. "And with thy spirit." V. "Let us pray."

The Lord's Prayer (sung by all).

The Suffrages.

Minister: "O Lord, show thy mercy upon us."

Answer: "And grant us thy salvation."

Minister: "O Lord, save the State."

Answer: "And mercifully hear us when we call upon thee."

Minister: "Endure thy ministers with righteousness."

Answer: "And make thy chosen people joyful."

Minister: "O Lord, save thy people."

Answer: "And bless thine inheritance."

Minister: "Give us peace in our time, O Lord."

Answer: "For it is thou, Lord, only, that makest us dwell in safety."

Minister: "O God, make clean our hearts within us."

Answer: "And take not thy Holy Spirit from us."

The Prayers.

The collect for the first Sunday after Epiphany.

The collect for Epiphany.

A collect for peace.

A collect for aid against perils.

The grace.

The offertory sentences.

The offering.

The Anthems Three Sacred Choruses, Op. 37.

(Johannes Brahms).

"O Bone Jesu

"O bone Jesu, miserere nobis, quia tu creasti nos,
Tu redemisti nos sanguine tuo praetiosissimo.

"(O blessed Jesus, look on us in pity; since thou hast created us,
Thou hast redeemed us, pouring forth for us Thy precious blood.)

"Adoramus

"Adoramus te Christe, et benedicimus tibi,
Quia per sanctam crucem tuam redemisti mundum,
Qui passus est pro nobis,
Domine, miserere nobis.

"(We adore thee, Christ Jesus, and with our voices we bless thee,
For by Thy holy cross and passion Thou redeemed all sinners,
For us it was Thou suffered,
Christ, our Lord, O have mercy on us.)

"Regina Coeli

"Regina coeli, laetare, alleluia!
Quia quem meruisti portare, alleluia!
Resurrexit sicut dixit, alleluia!
Ora pro nobis Deum, alleluia!
Regina coeli, gaude et laetare, virgo Maria,
Quia surrexit Dominus vero, alleluia!

"(Be joyful, O Queen of Heaven,
For He whom thou didst bear as our Saviour,
Rose again as He had promised.
Grant us Thine intercession,
O Queen of Heaven, be thou glad and joyful,
O Blessed Virgin,
Jesus is risen as our Redeemer, alleluia!"
—*English versions by Harold Heiberg.*

The presentation: "All things come of Thee, O Lord!" Chant: Tallis.

Hymn No. 146.: "God bless our native land" "America."

The sermon: The Reverend Alexander Hamilton, St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Conn.

The choral prayer (kneeling).

(Henry Purcell): "Let my prayer come up into Thy presence as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands, be as an evening sacrifice." (Psalm 141:2).

The litany:

Minister: "Almighty and everlasting God, before whom stand the spirits of the living and the dead, light of lights, fountain of wisdom and goodness, vouchsafe to the people of this land, a good spirit and the security of Thy providence.

"For all who have witnessed to Thy glory and striven for the welfare of our Nation, and especially for Thy servant, Alexander Hamilton."

People: "We praise Thee, O God, and bless Thy name."

Minister: "Forbid that we should be recreant to our trust, or that the fire which has been passed on to us should perish. Help us to be worthy of our fathers, and of our father's God.

"To all the high desires of the pioneers and patriots—"

People: "O God, help us to be faithful."

Minister: "To their passion for freedom and their readiness to live and die in its defense"—

People: "Help us to be faithful."

Minister: "To their scorn of tyranny, and their trust in men to rule themselves"—

People: "Help us to be faithful."

Minister: "To their vision of a human commonwealth in which the people from many lands might share"—

People: "Help us to be faithful."

Minister: "To their release from prejudice and passion for an old world and their will to build a new"—

People: "Help us to be faithful."

Minister: "O God, our fathers trusted in Thee"—

People: "And were not confounded."

Minister: "They lifted their faces to Thee"—

People: "And were not ashamed."

Minister: "So enlighten us, O Father, and lead us on Thy redeeming way; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The benediction.

The recessional: Hymn No. 46, Morning Star, Brightest and Best of the Sons of the Morning.

The postlude: Chorale prelude, Ah, Stay With Us, Lord Jesus Christ (Johann Sebastian Bach).

ADDRESS AT THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL JANUARY 13, 1957, BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER HAMILTON

You have just heard Senator KARL MUNDT read the famous passage from Ecclesiasticus (44:1, etc.), "Let us now praise famous men." This is what we are gathered here to do today, thanking God for Alexander Hamilton and the other men who were the founders of our great Nation. We were asked to speak of the religious side of the character of Alexander Hamilton. Most of what we know of this aspect must be inferred from other facets of his life, and from his writings. As we might expect, few details have been preserved.

There is one direct personal link with the past: You may be aware that Secretary Hamilton's widow, Elizabeth Schuyler Hamilton, survived him by more than 50 years. My own father was her great-grandson. He raised two families, and was at a great age when I knew him. In his early youth, his great-grandmother took him about New York City and showed him the scenes of Washington's first inauguration. She took him to St. Paul's Chapel, for Trinity Church was in ruins, and described how the Hamiltons, Washington, and others attended a service before the inauguration at old Federal Hall. She took him to the then new building we know as the old Sub-Treasury and described the first inauguration as it took place on the site of Federal Hall. This account my father passed on to me, and others I was too young to remember.

To go back somewhat—Alexander Hamilton appears to have come by his mature experience of religion after his arrival in the then colonies, especially at what is now Columbia University, and in his association with General Washington. His home background was unfortunate, and the details of it may never be clear. We do know that he had his own way to make in his early teens, without much of a home or parental guidance. That he did so successfully, we praise God for today. In my turn, my father taught me (shortly before his death) to stand on my own feet also.

It is probable that Hamilton in his college days had a feeling for religion, but it showed first in his pamphlets disputing the religious standards of the day. His able writings were answered under a nom de plume by a prominent Anglican clergyman, who became a few years later the first bishop in this country, Samuel Seabury. The replies made a great impression on this college youth, for they helped to turn him to the Church. We understand that a local rector come onto the scene before Hamilton left the campus for his military career, and established Hamilton as a believing and practicing Christian and Episcopalian.

The influence of General Washington is clear enough. He was a fine judge of men, and successful in his dealings with the very young aides he chose during the war for independence. Not only do I speak of Hamilton, but of Tilghman, Laurens, and the others. Under this wise and fatherly older man, these young men served their leader and country extremely well. The Nation they founded was based upon enduring Christian principles. The wide variety of talent of young Hamilton were most opportune, for there have been other men as able, but few that had such opportunities to serve their country. That our Nation has endured nearly two centuries, shows how well they built. They set an example not only for their descendants, but for all citizens of our great country.

Hamilton's influence is still with us, a constant reflection of his character, his standards, as a citizen. That influence goes beyond our boundaries, so the principles of government, so heavily in debt to Hamilton, are the model for much of the free word.

We are gathered not to dwell upon the details of Hamilton's public career as a soldier and a statesman. It must be obvious that in all he did he had the restraints of religion, the guidance of God the Holy Spirit. It is not for us the man's merits or degree of success, but to thank God who accomplished so much through His servant, Alexander Hamilton.

We know much about Hamilton from the writings of those who knew him, as well as from his own words. I am increasingly suspicious of judgments rendered writers of later days. Some of them went so far as to fictionalize Hamilton's life and work, and been misleading their readers. Enough to report such history as remains. The grave danger is that we tend to judge in the light of our own times and our own experience, but times have changed. Life is different in detail even though it is not in principle. I have become very weary of the publications of recent decades, and rejoice that the bicentennial is an occasion for careful study and accurate historical writing. I commend to you the new books now coming before us.

Many of you here today have occasion to realize that a life of public service has its rewards and its liabilities. Secretary Hamilton had a family to provide for, and he had to retire to private life as a young man. He accomplished more in relatively few years than most great men do in a lifetime. He rose to the occasions before him. He lived entirely for others, and trusted in God's providence for immediate and future needs.

We think of events moving rapidly today. In the postwar period of our Nation, its formative years, circumstances brought forth rapid evolution. Especially after the death of President Washington, new men came to the fore. Hamilton and others of the founders became elder statesmen. One man who refused to accommodate himself to changing times was Colonel Burr. He looked upon Hamilton chief of the stumbling blocks in his desire for personal aggrandizement. That he took violent means to attain his ends made a martyr of Hamilton, and a traitor and murderer of Burr. Our Nation has never changed this judgment.

Hamilton felt obligated to the code of honor then prevailing, to the standards expected of public men, and to his family. In his last letter to his wife, he anticipated Burr's intentions, and committed himself and his dear one to God's mercy. I quote from this letter:

"The scruples of a Christian have determined me to expose my own life to any extent, rather than subject myself to the guilt of taking the life of another. This much increases my hazards, and redoubles my pangs for you. But you had rather that I die innocent than live guilty. Heaven can preserve men, and I humbly hope will; but, in the contrary event, I charge you to remember that you are a Christian. God's will be done! The will of a merciful God must be good. Once more, Adieu, my darling, darling wife." (Quotation from Lodge, Works, X, p. 475–476.)

Alexander Hamilton's body lived into the day after the shooting. In that time, he requested and received the ministrations and sacraments of our church. He made his farewells, and passed to his reward.

This grateful Nation has never forgotten the work of this great founder. Alexander Hamilton's spirit, under God, is upon us here today, and we render humble thanks. May you go forth, my friends, in his spirit of patriotic self-sacrifice, and love of your fellow men, to serve God as He calls you to do.

COMMITTEE SERVICE—RANKING MINORITY MEMBERSHIPS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my position as ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services be exchanged for that of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the next ranking minority member of that committee, for the duration of the 85th Congress, with a full and complete understanding that this arrangement is temporary in nature and that at the expiration of the 85th Congress I will resume my seniority rights in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for doing what he is doing. As I understand, he is ranking minority member of two committees, and he is now voluntarily relinquishing his ranking minority seniority right on one of those committees. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that I am in a somewhat similar position, in that a Senator senior to me holds the ranking minority position on both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will follow the good example of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire. It seems unfair to me that one Senator should be placed in the position of not being the ranking minority member of any committee while another of his Republican colleagues holds the senior minority position on two committees.

I again wish to compliment my friend the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his cordial remarks. I deeply appreciate them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and to the Senate that the courtesy he is rendering me today is the same courtesy he rendered to me 2 years ago. I appreciate the position he takes, and I thank him very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORLISS LAMONT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I have prepared may be read by the clerk at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection, because it is my understanding that the Senator asks that privilege because of the difficulty he has with his eyes and his desire that the proceedings of the Senate may go forward. We sympathize with the Senator. I understand that that is the reason for his asking the privilege of having his speech read by the clerk.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection, under that explanation.

Mr. LANGER. I also thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the speech will be read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the 30th day of July 1955, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published on the same date, in connection with the citation for contempt of the Honorable Corliss Lamont, who had refused to answer certain questions before the one-man subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. There was some discussion of the citation at that time by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the then Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, and myself. I ask unanimous consent that that discussion may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUSE OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATORY POWER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, day before yesterday there was a controversy on the floor with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] relative to a citation of Harry Sacher for contempt. I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that many persons who have been cited by this body for contempt have had their contempt citations reversed by the courts. I particularly mentioned the fact that the case of Corliss Lamont was pending. I think Senators are now aware that the court has held that Mr. Lamont was improperly cited. In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared an editorial which is on all fours with the Sacher case. The editorial is entitled "Out of Bounds," and reads as follows:

"OUT OF BOUNDS

"Corliss Lamont deliberately defied the McCarthy subcommittee in 1953 in order to bring about a court test of the subcommittee's authority to question him concerning his opinions and associations. The subcommittee was an appendage of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Mr. Lamont was a private citizen not employed by the Government in any capacity. The pretext under which the subcommittee summoned him before it in the course of an investigation of military intelligence was that a book which he had written was included in the bibliography of an Army Intelligence Manual titled 'Psychological and Cultural Traits of Soviet Siberia.' After asserting that 'I am not now and never have been a member of the Communist Party.' Mr. Lamont said: 'This committee has no authority to examine into the personal and private affairs of private citizens. Any action with regard to my books by officials of the Government was done without my prior knowledge or consultation with me. I took no part in any proceedings involving any governmental authority and therefore this committee is without power to examine me under the rules and statutes governing it.'

"Much as we disagree with Mr. Lamont's political views, he was, in this instance, precisely right. On Wednesday a Federal judge dismissed the Lamont indictment for contempt of Congress on the ground that it was 'barren of any allegation or fact from which the authority of the permanent subcommittee to conduct an inquiry can be ascertained.' Manifestly, a Subcommittee on Government Operations has no business probing into matters wholly unrelated to Government operations. Its jurisdiction is fixed by the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act which established it; and these give it nothing whatever in the nature of a roving commission to investigate at will outside the Government.

"'A witness,' said the Supreme Court in a case involving contempt of Congress in 1927, 'rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or the questions are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry.' By applying this rule of law a Federal judge has once more set appropriate bounds to the power of investigating committees. Their power is not plenary. It can be exercised only within constitutional limits—and within limits of the authority specifically delegated to them by the House or by the Senate."

Mr. President, I hope every Senator will read the editorial. It seems to me outrageous that citizens can be subpenaed before a congressional committee and asked about private affairs which have no connection with the Government in any way, shape, form, or manner. So long as I am a Member of this body, I intend to protest against such action. I protested in connection with the Peters case. Nevertheless, a resolution citing him for contempt was adopted.

In the Scheiner case, a Federal judge in Florida has just held that Scheiner was not guilty of contempt.

It seems to be a custom in this body to hold in contempt of the Senate anyone who refuses to answer any question which any Senator may ask him, no matter how private may be the matter to which the question relates.

Mr. President, I desire to compliment my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who stood on this floor and protested against the citation of Corliss Lamont. I know the Senator from New York agrees with me in congratulating Mr. Lamont for having the courage to take his case to the Federal court, which yesterday held him not guilty.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think the comments of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota are very helpful. If all Members of the Senate would read them, I think they would understand that the investigatory power of this body and of the House of Representatives is based primarily on obtaining facts on which the Congress can legislate. Of course, the Congress has additional authority in connection with the investigation of Government efficiency or of wrongdoing in the Government service.

However, I agree fully that, generally speaking, Congress must not abuse its power

of investigation, by extending it beyond those limits, and applying it to matters as to which we really have no power or jurisdiction to investigate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for the comments he has made. Like the Senator from North Dakota, I felt that that citation seriously curtailed the constitutional rights of the man who was accused; and therefore I was very glad indeed to join the Senator from North Dakota and, I believe, one other Senator—I think there were only three of us—in opposing the citation and in voting against it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Sentaor from New York has, time and time again, demonstrated on the floor of the Senate his great courage in following his conscience, no matter how unpopular his course of action may be, in protecting the rights of private citizens. I hope we may go along together for a great many years in this body, even though we may be in the hopeless minority time and again—if that should happen—and that we shall stand fast in following our conscience and doing what is right, in accordance with the truth, in any matters which may develop, even though such a course may be unpopular.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I reciprocate the expression of the hope that we shall be associated in fighting for human rights for many more years.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, thereafter, on the 2d day of August 1955, there was a further discussion of this matter, particularly dealing with the request made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], to the Attorney General for a redrafting of the indictment by the Attorney General. This was done by the Attorney General, and the indictment was again dismissed. An appeal was then taken by the Government to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, and this court affirmed the action of the lower court.

Because of the great importance of this matter involving one of the most courageous and fearless men, Mr. Lamont, I think it of great importance to the Senate that this decision by the court of appeals may be brought to the attention of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the decision may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, Nos. 301, 300, 299, OCTOBER TERM, 1955 (ARGUED JUNE 5, 1956, DECIDED AUGUST 14, 1956), DOCKET NOS. 23955, 23954, 23953—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLANT, *v.* CORLISS LAMONT, APPELLEE; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLANT, *v.* ABRAHAM UNGER, APPELLEE; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLANT, *v.* ALBERT SHADOWITZ, APPELLEE

Before: Clark, chief judge, and Hincks and Waterman, circuit judges.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Edward Weinfeld, judge.

The United States of America appeals from the dismissal (D. C. S. D. N. Y., 18 F. R. D. 27), of three indictments charging Corliss Lamont, Abraham Unger, and Albert Shadowitz respectively with refusing to answer questions before a Senate committee in violation of title 2, United States Code, section 192.

Robert Kirtland, assistant United States attorney, southern district of New York, New York City (Paul W. Williams, United States attorney, New York City, on the brief), for appellant.

Philip Wittenberg, New York City (Irving Like, New York City, on the brief), for Appellee Lamont.

David M. Freedman, New York City, for Appellee Unger.

Victor Rabinowitz, New York City (Rabinowitz & Boudin and Leonard B. Boudin, New York City, on the brief), for Appellee Shadowitz.

Clark, chief judge: These are appeals from orders of Judge Weinfeld dismissing three indictments charging Corliss Lamont, Abraham Unger, and Albert Shadowitz respectively with refusal to answer questions before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on the ground that the indictments failed to charge violations of title 2, United States Code, section 192. Judge Weinfeld's scholarly opinion is reported (D. C. S. D. N. Y., 18 F. R. D. 27).

Lamont, Unger, and Shadowitz were called before a one-man subcommittee and asked to answer certain questions relating to their possible participation in or knowledge of subversive or leftist activities. They refused on the grounds that the subcommittee was without authority to require answers to the questions and that they were entitled under the first amendment to remain silent. The Senate cited them for contempt; and they were indicted substantially in the statutory language of title 2, United States Code, section 192, the pertinent portion of which reads as follows: "Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of * * * any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor * * *."[1]

The other indictments differed only in the counts or statements of questions asked. The indictment against Shadowitz sets forth 12 counts of questions apparently designed to show Communist infiltration or control of his union and of the articles appearing in the union paper. The indictment against Lamont contained 23 counts showing inquiries as to Communist Party control over his own writings, some of them purchased by the U. S. Government or Army, how long a trip he made to Russia, whether he knew that certain persons, writers and professors whose works had also been used and purchased by the Government were Communists, and whether he himself was a Communist or had engaged in Communist activities or attended party meetings.

The judge found each indictment to be fatally defective in that it failed to plead the following elements of the offense: (1) That the committee before which the alleged refusal to answer occurred was duly empowered by either House of Congress to conduct the particular inquiry, setting forth the source of the authority; (2) that the inquiry was within the scope of the authority granted to the committee; and (3) that the witness' refusal to answer was willful or deliberate and intentional. Of these three asserted deficiencies we need here consider only the second and so much of the first as may also relate to the question whether this inquiry fell within the subcommittee's authority.[2] This question and its corollary as to the right of the defendants to raise it prior to the trial is the basic issue in the case.

On this appeal the Government contends in effect that the authority of a congressional committee should be presumed for purposes of testing the indictment, or alternatively, that the general reorganization statute and congressional resolutions referred to in the indictment constitute a sufficient pleading of the subcommittee's power. Defendants, on the other hand, argue that they should not be put to the expense and humiliation of preparing for trial and defending themselves when purely as a matter of law it is clear that the excursions of this Senate subcommittee, constituted to study the operation of Government activities to determine its economy and efficiency,[3] when

---

[1] The formal charges of each indictment are shown by that against defendant Unger as follows:

"INTRODUCTION

"1. On or about the 17th day of September, 1953, in the southern district of New York, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was holding hearings pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress, 2d session, chapter 753, as amended; Senate Resolution 180, 81st Congress, 2d session, dated February 1, 1950; Senate Resolution 280, 82d Congress, 2d session, dated March 3, 1952; Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, dated January 30, 1953.

"2. The defendant, Abraham Unger, having been summoned as a witness by the authority of the United States Senate to give testimony, appeared as a witness before the permanent subcommittee aforesaid at the place and on the date above stated, and was asked questions which were pertinent to the question then under inquiry. At the place and times stated, the defendant refused to answer those pertinent questions. The allegations of this introduction are adopted and incorporated into the counts of this indictment, which follow, the same as if set forth therein in extenso, each of which counts will, in addition merely describe the questions which were asked of the defendant, Abraham Unger, and which he refused to answer.

"Title 2, U. S. Code, sec. 192.)

"Count 1. Were you active in the Professional Communist Group in New York?

"Count 2. Were you head of the Professional Group of the Communist Party in New York?

"Count 3. Are you a member of the Communist Party as of this moment?

"Count 4. Do you know whether you are a member of the Communist Party?

"(Title 2, sec. 192, U. S. Code.)"

[2] The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has recently held, contrary to the decision below, that a specific allegation of willfulness is not required. *United States* v. *Deutsch*, D. C. Cir., July 26, 1956.

[3] See Public Law No. 601, 79th Cong., 2d sess., c. 753, which as amended to the date of these alleged offenses provided in part:

"Sec. 102. * * * (1) The following standing committees [of the Senate] shall be appointed * * *:

"(g) (1) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

extended into the field of alleged subversive activities of nongovernmental persons were entirely unauthorized. The question is of substantial importance, touching one of the sensitive areas of public thought and governmental control.

It is of course the function of an indictment to set forth without unnecessary embroidery the essential facts constituting the offense and thus accurately acquaint the defendant with the specific crime with which he is charged.[4] But an allegation for lack of which the prosecution must evidently and as a matter of law fail cannot be regarded as superfluous. In *United States* v. *Kamin*, D. C. Mass. (135 F. Supp. 382, 136 F. Supp. 791), a closely similar prosecution for contempt committed before the same subcommittee here involved, the indictment contained no allegations showing the nature or subject of the inquiry in question or the committee's authority to conduct such an inquiry. Defendant's motion to dismiss the indictment was denied by Judge Aldrich, but he ordered a bill of particulars to be furnished in which the Government set forth the subject matter of the inquiry. Defendant then renewed his motion to dismiss on the affirmative showing from the particulars furnished that the inquiry was outside the subcommittee's alleged authority. In an oral decision denying the motion the judge appears to have recognized the dilemma he had thus created for himself, but held that just as a bill of particulars cannot be used to repair a fatal defect in an indictment, so it cannot be used to create a fatal defect in an indictment held valid.

Defendant Kamin was then put to trial and subsequently acquitted upon a determination by Judge Aldrich that the alleged instances of refusal to answer questions took place during the course of an inquiry which lay outside the scope of the subcommittee's authority. (*United States* v. *Kamin, supra*, D. C. Mass. (136 F. Supp. 791).) Thus an unnecessary trial might have been averted had it been made clear in advance thereof that there was lacking an essential element of the crime charged, namely, that the inquiry was within the subcommittee's authority.

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member. * * *"

Of the Senate resolutions cited in the indictments, S. Res. 180, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950), authorized the fixing of certain quorum requirements; and S. Res. 280, 82d Cong., 2d sess. (1952), changed the name of the committee. S. Res. 40, 83d Cong., 1st sess. (1953), continued the operations of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations for a year, with authority to investigate improper influences in government. But S. Rept. 19, 83d Cong., 1st sess. (1953), which accompanied S. Res. 40, explained the authority of the subcommittee in this connection as follows:

"Under this resolution, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will inquire into the administration of Government agencies to see wherein certain economies may be effected. It is also intended that certain aspects of improper influence in Government shall be investigated, but any inquiries undertaken will in no way interfere or transgress those investigations which other Senate and House of Representatives committees may be engaged in making in comparable areas of Government operation, such as subversive activities."

[4] See Cummings, The Third Great Adventure, 3 F. R. D. 283, 285; F. R. Cr. P., rule 7 (c).

The deficiencies in the indictments now before us are thus quite fundamental and go far beyond the question whether defendants have been put on adequate notice. Rather, the question is whether defendants are to be put to trial on an allegation which on its face charges no offense. Section 102 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, 2d session, chapter 753, section 102 (g), setting forth the scope of the authority of the parent committee, states in pertinent part that—

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—* * *

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;"

There is no allegation in the indictments here linking the inquiry conducted by the subcommittee to the grant of authority dispensed to its parent committee.[5] In fact, on its face and taking judicial notice, as we must, of the pertinent legislation, the inference must be just the opposite.[6]

"* * * If the committee selected a subject which is prima facie within its jurisdiction, doubtless a court could not go behind it, since jurisdiction then affirmatively appears. But if it selected a subject that was not prima facie within its jurisdiction, but was prima facie without it, it is not entitled to a presumption that the investigation differed from what it purported to be. That would be, in effect, to operate the presumption in reverse." (*United States* v. *Kamin, supra*, D. C. Mass. (136 F. Supp. 791, 804).)

We have then the anomalous situation that the Government is now attempting to hang onto and retain for trial indictments for offenses which it cannot support in law. For Judge Aldrich's reasoning on the merits of the Kamin case, supra, seems quite convincing. We shall not repeat his cogent statement here, but point out that the problem is particularly highlighted by some of the questions put to Lamont. How a committee to promote retrenchment and efficiency in governmental operations is going to be aided in any way by an inquiry as to the length of time spent by a private writer on a trip to Russia must remain undisclosed. The latest ruling of the Supreme Court seems clearly to forbid so extensive, if not purposeless, an invasion of the rights of the individual.[7] The leading modern authority is *United States* v. *Rumely* (345 U. S. 41, 44). (See also *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 173, 176, 50 A. L. R. 1); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168); *United States* v. *Orman* (3 Cir. 207 F. 2d 148, 153); *Bowers* v. *United States* (D. C. Cir., 202 F. 2d 447).)

As presented to us, the emphasis has been upon matters of criminal pleading and adequate notice; while these are involved, the issue goes beyond this to the very substance of whether or not any crime has been shown. This concentration upon procedure perhaps explains why in his generally able brief the prosecutor has failed to touch upon the crucial problem at the heart of the case. For the charges could not have survived had there been more formal and precise allegations of pertinency, since the governing legislation viewed in the light of the pertinent precedents demonstrates the lack of pertinency of the questions. It is elementary law that pleadings, both criminal and civil, must be read in the light of the facts of which the court takes judicial notice. See, among a wealth of precedents, *Coppola* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 217 F. 2d 155); *Kempe* v. *United States* (8 Cir., 151 F. 2d 680, 684); *First Nat. Bank of Genoa* v. *American Surety Co. of New York* (239 App. Div. 282, 267 N. Y. S. 565); *U. S. ex rel, Altieri* v. *Flint* (D. C. Conn. 54 F. Supp. 889, affirmed 2 Cir., 142 F. 2d 62; 42 C. J. S. Indictments and Informations sec. 113; 71 C. J. S. Pleading sec. 7; 20 Am. Jur. Evidence sec. 25; Clark, Code Pleading 250, 251, 513 (2d ed. 1947)). Here the matter is yet stronger, for in ordinary matters of judicial notice, there is, it seems, some option in the court whether to accept facts without proof or to require formal proof. See Morgan, Judicial Notice (57 Harvard Law Review 269 (1944)), and compare Davis, Official Notice (62 Harvard Law Review 537 (1949)). But it can hardly be thought that we can assume to deny knowledge of the governing legislation creating the very committee and showing its powers. Volume 9, Wigmore on Evidence, section 2572 (3d ed. 1940); McCormick on Evidence, section 326 (1954); Uniform Rules of Evidence, Rules 9 (1) and (2). The indictments are therefore fatally defective. Cf. 24 Geo. Wash. Law Review 342 (1956).

Pleading, either civil or criminal, should be a practical thing. Its purpose is to convey information succinctly and concisely. In older days the tendency was to defeat this purpose by overelaboration and formalism. Now we should avoid the opposite trend, but of like consequence, that of a formalism of generality. There seems to be some tendency to confuse general pleadings with entire absence of statement of claim or charge.[8] But this is a mistake, for general pleadings,

[5] It may be noted that in recent cases involving perjury before a congressional committee the indictments set forth at length the nature and scope of the inquiry. See *United States* v. *Debrow* (5 Cir., 203 F. 2d 699, 702, note 1)—involving this same committee—reversed on other grounds (346 U. S. 374); *United States* v. *Lattimore* (D. C. Cir., 215 F. 2d 847, 856, note 2). Although concededly the purpose of such allegations in perjury proscutions is to establish the materiality of alleged false answers, like allegations are equally requisite here to establish the authority of the subcommittee in the premises.

[6] The result might well be different were this a case of a committee created by Congress to hold hearings for a specific purpose, with the inquiry in question apparently falling within the assigned purpose. Cf. *United States* v. *Josephson* (2 Cir., 165 F. 2d 82), certiorari denied; *Josephson* v. *United States* (333 U. S. 838)—un-American activities; *Bowers* v. *United States* (D. C. Cir., 202 F. 2d 447)—organized crime in Interstate commerce; *United States* v. *Rumely* (345 U. S. 41)—lobbying. See also cases involving committees created to conduct a specific inquiry, e. g., *Sinclair* v. *United States* (279 U. S. 263, 297, 299).

Here the function of the committee—to investigate governmental efficiency—has no apparent connection with the inquiry from which these convictions arise. "It is significant, although not necessarily controlling, that in every case except those involving this committee examined by the Court, or called to the Court's attention, in which reference is made to the indictment, is unmistakably appears that the authority of the committee to conduct the investigation was either pleaded in haec verba or incorporated by reference." *United States* v. *Lamont* (D. C. S. D. N. Y., 18 F. R. D. 27, 36, note 28).

[7] Although not in the record before us, certain extracts from Senate hearings and debates suggest a purpose to trace Communist infiltration in defense plants and the Army, and to that end to find use of writings of Communist authors. Whatever bearing the beliefs of such authors beyond anything disclosed in their writings may have had on the inquiry thus set, at least no connection with governmental economy or retrenchment is indicated.

[8] As in the loose descriptions of Federal civil pleading as "notice pleading"—a characterization never accepted or approved by the Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure. See Report of Proposed Amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts, October 1955, 18, 19.

far from omitting a claim or charge, do convey information to the intelligent and sophisticated circle for which they are designed. Thus the charge that at a certain time and place "John Doe with premeditation shot and murdered John Roe" (F. R. Cr. P., form 2), even though of comparatively few words, has made clear the offense it is bringing before the court.* The present indictments, however, do not show the basis upon which eventual conviction can be had; rather, read in the light of the background of facts and congressional action, they show that conviction cannot be had.

We do not reach the other alleged insufficiencies of the indictments or the constitutional questions raised by the defendants.

Affirmed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Lamont rendered a great public service to the people of the United States in standing upon his rights as a private citizen and refusing to answer the questions involving his private life and private beliefs, and that he is to be congratulated upon his complete vindication by the court of appeals. Through the many years of his life, Mr. Lamont has demonstrated time and again that he is in the very forefront in the fight to concentrate his efforts to protect the rights of private individuals, and I feel that all liberty-loving men and women in this country, who believe in our Constitution and particularly the Bill of Rights, should feel indebted to him.

In connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release by Mr. Lamont.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Corliss Lamont, author and educator, said today that the Department of Justice will not attempt to carry his congressional contempt case to the Supreme Court. The time for filing an appeal has now expired.

"I congratulate the Department of Justice on having the good sense to drop this prosecution," Dr. Lamont said in a statement. "What it means is that there now stands as definitive the unanimous decision of the Federal Court of Appeals stating that the McCarthy committee (the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations) went beyond its authority in questioning me about my political opinions, my associations, and my writings.

"I am very glad that my court battle has resulted finally in hammering another nail into the political coffin of Senator MCCARTHY.

"Even more important," Dr. Lamont added, "is that this decision lays down a valuable precedent for keeping congressional investigating committees within legal and constitutional bounds. The House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee have persistently exceeded their authority under the Bill of Rights.

"These committees have been especially flagrant in violating the first amendment. I hope that the opinion by the Federal Court of Appeals in my case will help put an end to illegal congressional probes."

THE HEALTH PROGRAM IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for some time I have watched with sympathy and admiration the excellent work of the International Cooperation Administration relating to the health program in the Philippines. In the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk recently wrote an excellent survey on these developments in the Philippines entitled "Islands Gain in Health." He quite properly gives deserved praise to Col. Harry A. Breen and Dr. Horace Delien for their admirable leadership in this program.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Rusk's article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISLANDS GAIN IN HEALTH—A SURVEY OF THE PHILIPPINES' STRUGGLE AGAINST THE WASTE OF WAR AND POVERTY

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

MANILA.—The Republic of the Philippines is the largest island group in the Malay Archipelago and includes more than 7,000 islands, of which about 1,000 are inhabited and 11 are of major size and importance. There are roughly 47 ethnographic groups speaking 80 known dialects with Tagalog, English and Spanish being generally used in schools and among professional groups. The birth rate is currently estimated at 34 for each 1,000, the death rate at 10 for each 1,000.

This is a country of poverty and plenty, of great natural resources and the most primitive and squalid living conditions, a country of rich and poor with only a few in the middle class.

Health is a primary problem in the Philippines. In the categories of disease the respiratory ailments, led by tuberculosis, pneumonia and bronchitis, are in first place. Then following in the runnerup position are malaria and schistosomia, nutritional diseases headed by beriberi, vitamin deficiencies, dysentery and parasitic diseases.

The infant mortality rate is very high—84.3 for every thousand of live births. Twenty-eight percent of all the deaths in each year are of children under 1 year old and 50 percent are of children under the age of 5.

The life expectancy is about 57 years, compared to 70 in the United States. Health conditions here generally are comparable to those that existed in the United States at the turn of the century.

The Philippine Islands suffered great damage and destruction to its physical, human, cultural, medical, and educational resources during the Japanese occupation in World War II. Manila was second only to Warsaw in the damage suffered from shelling and bombing, although only a few scars are visible today. The Filipinos have come a long way in rehabilitating their country with a program based on long-range planning, hard work, dedicated self-help and substantial assistance from the United States.

PHENOMENAL PROGRESS MADE

In the health field phenomenal progress has been made during the last 3 years under the dynamic leadership of President Ramon Magsaysay, who was elected on a platform of assistance to the rural areas, where 75 percent of the Filipinos live and work. President Magsaysay has made health programs in the rural areas his No. 1 health project, and it is surprising in talking with him to note the great knowledge he has, not only of rural health, but of all phases of the problem from the technical to the socio-economic.

Immediately after his election in 1953 he appointed Dr. Paulino J. Garcia, professor of radiology at the University of Santo Tomas, as the Minister of Health, a position of cabinet rank. Dr. Garcia was not a politician but a doctor known for his integrity and ability. His record of accomplishment substantiates his reputation and President Magsaysay's confidence.

Among his accomplishments was a pilot program that started with only 81 rural health units. The experiment proved so impressive that in 1954 the Philippine Government appropriated funds to establish rural health units in each of the 1,300 municipalities. Each municipality consists of a poblacion containing a school, a statue of José Rizal (a Philippine patriot), a church and municipal buildings. It is usually the center of governmental activities and around it are groups of people living in barrios often separated one from another by rice paddies. Each rural health unit has a staff consisting of a doctor, a nurse, a midwife and a sanitary inspector. The United States Government through the International Cooperation Administration provided major items in equipment, materials, and supplies to carry the program through 1 year's operation; the community provided buildings and the Philippine Government paid the staff. To date the personnel have been trained and a total of 1,067 units are established and in operation. They are distributed in all the provinces of the Philippines, from the most remote northern island of Babuyan in the China Sea to Tawitawi in the Sulu Sea.

In 1955 these groups did 40 million units of work—a unit consisting of such activities as the delivery of a baby, an immunization, a minor surgery, a physical examination, a school visit, a demonstration of privy construction, and many other activities.

One interesting phase of the rural health program has been the digging of "liberty wells." President Magsaysay noted during his election campaign that it was impossible to get a drink of pure water in the villages. He promised to do something about this fundamental problem, and he has, with voluntary groups assisting in the government program. Providing pure water in the villages has been a fundamental part of the rural health program. One wise Filipino has remarked: "If any group in the United States wants to honor the Philippines, do not erect monuments but help us to dig liberty wells, which will be living memorials for generations to come."

The second major accomplishment has been the conquest of malaria. Up to 1953 it destroyed about 100,000 lives annually and caused in excess of 20 million attacks of the disease per year. The loss in the labor force was immense as was the pain, the suffering, the disability and the family disruption. Three men were needed to do the work of two under these conditions. A noted malariologist estimated that malaria added a hidden tax of 5 percent to all of the products produced in infected areas. Fifty percent of the land in the Philippines was undeveloped in 1953 principally because it could not be settled because of malaria and other health hazards.

A pilot study demonstrated that spraying with DDT could control and possibly eradicate malaria. Two sprayings of a total of 1,270,000 homes provided protection for 6 million people and the prevalence of disease was reduced between 70 and 80 percent. The program is now changed from control to eradication, which should be just around the corner.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVED

The third phase of the program was to improve hospital facilities. To date 59 hospitals have been rebuilt and made operable. They had been badly damaged, stripped of all equipment and were just empty shells before.

This job is far from finished for today in many of the hospitals there are more than twice as many patients as the hospital was originally built to care for. This problem is increasing because the people now have confidence in their hospitals and believe they are not just places to go and die in.

*So also the famous form 9 of the Civil Rules, "Complaint for Negligence," shows a complete claim for damages for personal injuries.

Except in Korea during the war, this writer has never seen such crowding. In Capinitials, the ortheopedic hospital in Manila, patients were often 2 in a bed, and to have 3 children in 1 bed was not uncommon. The aisles of wards and even the outer corridors were jammed with patients. In one operating room three major operations were being performed at the same time. And yet, in spite of crowding, a dedicated staff was doing excellent work. They had established a pathological museum, a residency training program and, in lean-to buildings, a primitive but effective rehabilitation program with physical therapy, occupational therapy, social service, and a special unit for cerebral palsy that used the hall for its training area. There was no equipment in the brace shop except crude hand tools. As a result of the lack of braces there were 120 paraplegics in the hospital, many of whom had been there for years.

This hospital was visited just after going through an elaborate Veterans Administration hospital built by the United States Government at a cost of $9 million and opened just last year. It has a capacity of 700 beds and an occupancy rate of only 70 to 80 percent. The Philippine Government is supposed to take over the maintenance of this hospital in the next 2 or 3 years, but many physicians and Government officials believe it will be impossible for them to support the hospital. They also believe it would have been much wiser to have built a modest hospital in Manila and to have supported community health and hospital services in the provinces where the majority of the veterans live. The cost of travel and the long distances involved make caring for the 22,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities very difficult. It is the hope of many physicians and of thoughtful citizens in the Philippines that some means may be found for increasing the utilization of the VA hospital. One suggestion has been that since the Philippines is to be a center of the "atoms for peace" program in this part of Asia, 200 hospital beds needed in that program could be allocated to the Veterans' Administration hospital and the money saved could be used to provide help to struggling civilian hospitals that need it so desperately.

The VA hospital project was not an ICA operation but was built with funds appropriated by Congress for that specific purpose.

Probably the most important phase of United States support to the Philippine health program is the long-range support in health education. To date 135 doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, technicians, public-health engineers, health educators, and others have been trained and have now returned to their country to help in its progressive health program. Thirty-seven more are in the United States at this time. In addition to training in the United States the joint program established 5 regional training centers for an on-the-job kind of training, and from 1954 to 1956 some 1,365 doctors, nurses, sanitary inspectors, midwives, and health educators have been taught under that program. The Institute of Hygiene (School of Public Health) of the University of the Philippines is being greatly strengthened this year by bolstering its teaching laboratories library and by giving technical assistance to the faculty in establishing graduate programs in health education, public-health nursing, public-health engineering, and hospital administration. The health program for the public has been bolstered by 30 public-health educators, professionally trained and placed in strategic spots such as training centers, rural health units, special programs, and provincial offices.

This writer has visited many health projects in every part of the world that are supported by our International Cooperation Administration but he has never seen a program conducted with more imagination, down-to-earth commonsense and understanding cooperation with local health officers than the program in the Philippines. The success of this program has been a result of the dynamic leadership of Col. Harry A. Brenn, a veteran of 17 years in the Far East, including a distinguished war record in World War II. He has been the Director of the ICA since August of 1955 and with Dr. Horace Delien, of the United States Public Health Service, who is the Chief of the Health Division, a devoted and capable physician, should get credit for this program's success. They are doing their job imaginatively and well and in addition to the present program are making plans for a far-eastern postgraduate training center in the Philippines, where physicians could come for training in chest surgery, tuberculosis rehabilitation, and in other scarce specialist categories. Working as a team with President Magsaysay and Dr. Garcia they have given to the Philippine Government and the people a practical evidence of our friendship and our dedication to assist this new Republic to its rightful place of strong leadership in the Pacific.

SURVEY BY NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Park Service recently completed a survey which contains some alarming information concerning the rapid disappearance of our Atlantic and gulf coast seashore areas which are available for public use. The National Park Service survey was analyzed in an article entitled "Save the Seashore," written by Mr. Max K. Gilstrap, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for January 2, 1957. The issue is so important that I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gilstrap's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE THE SEASHORE

(By Max K. Gilstrap)

WASHINGTON.—Those who delight in the sound of crashing waves on the shore and who like to prowl across sand dunes and frolic in the breezy carefree atmosphere of beach expanses undoubtedly will give serious consideration to these provocative words:

"One of our greatest recreation resources—the seashore—is rapidly vanishing from public use. Nearly everyone seems to know this fact, but few do anything to halt the trend."

This warning from Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, comes, he says, as the result of facts uncovered by a privately financed survey of the Atlantic and gulf coastline made by the National Park Service. Such facts, Mr. Wirth says, "are alarming to those who wish to save what is left of desirable seashore for public enjoyment."

Mr. Wirth says hopes that the disclosures will serve the purpose of arousing public-minded citizens and local, State, and Federal Governments to take necessary steps before it is too late to save this priceless national heritage.

Signs helping to emphasize Mr. Wirth's concern are scattered along America's eastern coast. "Private Property," "No Trespassing." "Subdivision: Lots for Sale."

Such signs mean that almost every attractive seashore area on the Atlantic and gulf coasts has been preempted for commercial and private development. Only a fraction of the long seacoast is left for public use, and much of this small portion is rapidly disappearing.

DWINDLING PRESERVE

More specifically the National Park Service survey, mentioned by Mr. Wirth, disclosed that: Only 240 miles of the 3,700 miles of general coastline from Maine to Texas is now in Federal and State ownership for public recreation purposes. About half of the 240 miles is embraced by 3 areas of the national park system—Acadia and Everglades National Parks, and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The major remaining opportunities for conservation of seashore resources are largely confined to 54 undeveloped areas comprising 640 miles of beach front.

This is a far cry from the day 50 years ago when a boy could go 5 miles from Boston, spend the day combing the beach or digging mud clams in the estuaries and seldom see another human being within shouting distance.

In those old days, Old Orchard Beach below Portland offered a vast expanse of wilderness. Miles of sandspit front of Long Island were awaiting those who would exert themselves a bit. Even colonies of fashionable folk were mere specks on a far-flung landscape.

As late as 1935 a National Park Service survey showed plenty of unspoiled seashore areas suitable for public recreation. A big rush for seashore property began after World War II. In part a product of postwar prosperity, its spectacular acceleration in only a decade is nothing short of a business phenomenon.

PROMPT ACTION URGED

In view of the skyrocketing market for seashore property, Mr. Wirth says that prompt action should be taken by Federal, State, and local agencies to acquire at least half of the remaining 640 miles of seashore suitable for recreation. He is appealing for assistance in this project from all persons in a position to give aid—women's clubs, chambers of commerce, historical societies, service clubs, universities, conservation groups, and others.

If such helpers need ammunition in the way of arguments, Mr. Wirth offers some here and can supply more from the National Park Service headquarters at the Department of the Interior Building in Washington.

Why should anyone be concerned about this problem? Mr. Wirth's answers are simple and cogent: The seashore is a priceless scenic, scientific, and recreational resource for which there is no substitute. Once subdivided and developed it is lost for public use.

Having recognized the problem, the big challenge comes in solving the problems of preservation extending from erosion control and recreation to the protection of biological and historical values.

The seashore is constantly vulnerable to the action of wind and tide but it can adjust itself to changing conditions—except when man intrudes. When man alters the delicate balance sustained by nature, cutting into dunes, destroying vegetation, the results may be spectacular cases of erosion, heavy property damage and permanent loss of precious seashore. All of this argues for the preservation of a fair number of spots where the equilibrium is left undisturbed or is affected as little as possible.

When the white man first made his appearance on the shores of America he found countless species of fish thriving in a marine community; migratory fowl in the salt marshes; the sea oat and beach grass covering the sand dunes; the beach plum and bayberry among the shrubs, evergreens, and oaks and an abundance of wildlife. All lived in a harmonious, cooperative balance of nature.

Then man sharply disturbed the pristine scene, often destroying it and upsetting the balance of nature. But even at this late date, remaining natural plant and animal communities that are found nowhere but

along the seashore can be preserved from further modification if given prompt and permanent protection.

Looking ahead, the recreation aspect looms in staggering outlines as the enchantment of the sea lures new millions every year. With higher incomes and shorter working hours and ever-improving road systems, crowds have increased at New York State park beaches alone from 5 million in 1934 to well over 60 million today.

What will it be like when the country's present population of nearly 170 million increases to 200 million in 20 more years and to 300 million by the year 2000? Only a program of tremendous vision and bold execution can save these areas for the best recreational use.

PRODIGIOUS FEAT

There is, of course, the argument that local governments lose revenues when beach property is acquired for public use and removed from tax rolls. However, experience has shown that money spent by visitors to public recreation areas results in much greater return to the community than would be received from private development of the same land.

As assistance is being marshaled to save the vanishing shoreline, the prodigious feat of the National Park Service survey looms as no less than remarkable. To find how much of the shoreline area has been developed or despoiled and how much is suitable for public use, the group covered 3,700 miles of shoreline, of all the 18 States with Atlantic or gulf frontage.

From the outset the survey party had generous assistance from other organizations: transportation from the United States Coast Guard and advice and help from directors of State parks, universities, museums, libraries, historical societies, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Audubon Society and various other Federal and State agencies.

The survey staff, which included among others a biologist, a historian, and two landscape architects, first examined the entire coast from helicopter and amphibious planes. The team made aerial photographs and spotted undeveloped areas on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts. Then followed ground reconnaissance, by power wagon, jeep, and patrol boat of 126 areas spotted on the map.

RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED

Out of its long and thorough survey the National Park Service has made these recommendations for preservation of the Nation's shorelines:

1. That at least 15 percent of the general shoreline of the Atlantic and gulf coasts be acquired for public recreation purposes to be administered by Federal, State, and local agencies. If the public agencies acquire half of the suitable undeveloped seashore land remaining, they would then have, including their existing areas, the recommended 15 percent.

2. That prompt action be taken to acquire available beach sites before the best of such areas are acquired for private or commercial development. The critical situation deserves the attention of all persons and organizations in a position to give aid.

3. That the acquisition of areas should be related as directly as possible to the distribution of population except where biological, historical, or other values supersede.

4. That ample quantities of hinterland of marsh and swamp, which provide a valuable habitat for a large and interesting variety of bird and animal life, be acquired in connection with beach property. Where such areas can provide a fresh-water habitat, the variety will be greatly enhanced.

5. That plant-animal communities of great ecological interest found along the seashore be acquired and preserved regardless of the desirability of the adjoining beach; and that consideration be given to such communities now in a modified condition which might return to a more natural condition if permitted to remain undisturbed.

6. That further land-use studies be made of selected coastal areas of unusual importance, giving consideration to proper boundaries and long-range planning for the best use of recreation values.

While the National Park Service findings admittedly resulted from only a reconnaissance, the study was thorough. The facts uncovered are alarming. It will have served a vital purpose, Mr. Wirth points out, if public-minded citizens are aroused to take steps to preserve this national heritage—before it is too late.

SECRETARY HUMPHREY'S CRITICISM OF THE BUDGET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald there is published an editorial relating to the President's budget and the peculiar and almost unbelievable position of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, in opposition to certain parts of the budget.

It is generally to be expected that when a President presents a budget it represents the coordinated thinking of all the departments of Government and that it also represents the best political and fiscal judgment on the part of the administration. I do not recall at any time, at least in recent years, in the past half-century, when a Secretary of the Treasury, who is the chief fiscal officer of the Government, openly opposed the budget presented by the Chief Executive. Yet, today we find that this highly important Cabinet officer, the Secretary of the Treasury, admonishes the Congress not to accept the budget, advising us to cut the budget, and stating that the budget is not well prepared, at least, not well enough prepared to merit the support of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD note that the Secretary of the Treasury makes it quite clear that in the event, as he puts it, there is a depression, he is not for deficit financing, and that he is not for programs requiring the use of Federal resources to curb the effects of such depression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HUMPHREY'S ENIGMA

Reverberations from Secretary Humphrey's perplexing remarks last week on the President's budget provided some discordant overtones to the harmony of the second Eisenhower inaugural. Mr. Humphrey appeared to be at odds with the President on two principal points, with the extent of the disagreement depending upon the weight given his remarks. He seemed to invite Congress to make sweeping cuts in Mr. Eisenhower's budget; and he enunciated a philosophy of Government action, or rather inaction, in a recession that is in blunt contrast to the course to which the President is pledged. The Secretary of the Treasury needs to clarify his position on both points.

Every business, indeed every household, experiences moments when the person attempting to balance the books lectures about the importance of frugality. These reminders are both necessary and useful, and in this sense Mr. Humphrey's strictures may well have the President's blessing. Some cuts can be made in individual items, and some approved expenditures postponed, without harm. There are enough signs of inflation on the horizon to warrant extraordinary governmental prudence.

But an impression persists that Mr. Humphrey meant more than this—that he was asking Congress to slash heavily into aid to education, foreign aid, and other major programs that the Secretary may consider frills. The United States is a country of 170 million persons. It is entirely normal and natural that the budget will grow with the population and the size of the economy. No 1928 or even 1950 yardstick is adequate to today's demands.

Thus it is absurd to think that the richest country in the world cannot provide adequate school facilities for its children; and Congress has a responsibility to weigh the relatively modest costs of action against the appalling costs of inaction. By the same token, foreign aid imaginatively programed may be a long-range economy, helping to reduce the need for the armaments that make up the lion's share of the budget.

By far the more alarming part of Mr. Humphrey's doctrine is his apparently deadset opposition to tax cuts and deficit spending in order to counteract a depression. The use of the full machinery of Government to prevent a depression from developing has, one would have thought, been generally accepted. This means efforts to maintain the income stream through tax cuts, public works spending, and the like (always with overall regard for the stability of the dollar). Such a philosophy is basic in the Full Employment Act of 1946 (which had Senator Taft's support) and has had the endorsement of the Council of Economic Advisers and most of the President's associates.

This is by no means to say that a need for such measures is imminent. Mr. Humphrey may well be right in thinking that at the moment the danger of further inflation remains great. There is mixed evidence of inflation and deflation in the economy; the automobile market is off and housing is down, but the steel and oil price increases are inflationary and there is no guarantee that either labor or business will respect the President's call for wage and price restraint. The situation could change quickly, however, and a downward cycle could be well in motion before the signs were clear.

What is disquieting is that a man of much power and influence in the administration apparently still believes in a 1929 or 1932 formula for coping with national economic disaster. It is not enough to say that if Mr. Humphrey actually tried to carry out such negative policies in a recession in all probability he would be quicky overridden before any new breadlines started. The fact that a man in his position holds such views is in itself cause for serious concern. If Mr. Humphrey misstated or overstated his convictions in response to reporters' questions, it is important for him to acquaint the public, which has little access to him, with what he really thinks. If his comments gave an accurate picture of his views, then there is a split between him and the President which cannot be covered over by honeyed words.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the administration expects cooperation from the Congress in connection with the budget, the least it can do is to get cooperation in its own Cabinet. I respectfully suggest to the President that if he cannot get George Humphrey to support his budget, HUBERT HUMPHREY will try to do so, although I may say that George Humphrey has closer connec-

tions with the White House than has HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, so far as I know, the Secretary of the Treasury is supporting the budget, although he has some ideas with regard to cutting some items. I think we are together on this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts. The Secretary of the Treasury supports the budget with tongue in cheek. He says it is a good budget, but he says, "Really, you Members of Congress know there is a lot of pruning to be done, and I suggest that the fiscal surgery be done at the Capitol."

I cannot recall, at least in recent years, that the Secretary of the Treasury has been the Cabinet officer who has said the President's budget was not what it should be and that Congress had better do something about it. There have been some lesser lights in Government who may have said such a thing. Anyway, Mr. President, I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Massachusetts in an effort to see if we cannot get both of the Humphreys satisfied that we have an enlightened budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President. I wish to make an announcement for the information of the Senate, particularly the chairmen of the standing committees of the Senate.

Many of the so-called money resolutions will be reported by the standing committees in the next few days. Most of the committees which have previously been created will expire at the end of this month.

The Committee on Rules and Administration has set tomorrow for the holding of hearings on the money resolutions. I have already obtained unanimous consent that all such resolutions reported today may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I am hopeful that if the standing committees are unable to report their resolutions today, they will act promptly tomorrow. It will be my purpose tomorrow to ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the hope that perhaps that committee can meet again on Thursday.

GOV. LEROY COLLINS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Chair is so graciously occupied by one of the Senators from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the other Senator from Florida happens to be acting temporarily as the majority leader, I think it is understandable that we are particularly proud to present to the Senate and to the guests in the galleries the distinguished Governor of Florida, who honors us by his presence on the floor today. I present Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to observe that it is unusual for the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to be the acting majority leader while at the same time the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is presiding over the Senate. But it is not unusual to feel the effectiveness of both Senators from Florida at all times when the Senate is in session.

We are delighted to have the very able Governor of Florida with us today.

GOV. JOSEPH B. JOHNSON, OF VERMONT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been very happy to listen to the introduction of the Governor of Florida and to the comments made by the majority leader concerning the two Senators from Florida.

I am proud to say that the Governor of Vermont also is on the floor of the Senate. I am happy to present to the Senate Gov. Joseph B. Johnson, of Vermont.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are delighted to extend a warm hand of welcome to the outstanding Governor of Vermont, who is at this time in the Senate Chamber in the company of the distinguished Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FLANDERS].

I am very proud to know that the Johnsons, although they have made a mistake in party, are so highly regarded in the State of Vermont. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business to come before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. A. Carl Adkins, Dauphin Way Methodist Church, Mobile, Ala., offered the following prayer:

As we pause here now, our Father, we do so with grateful hearts. We are thankful for the privilege that comes to each of us daily to serve Thee and to serve others, which is, perhaps, the perfect way of serving our Father in heaven. And as we this morning look out upon this atomic-ridden world we keep asking ourselves, Is there no way out? Are we driven to the monstrous conclusion that there are situations in which a decent people like ourselves can do nothing except constantly accept these thrusts from the outside? And yet the fact remains we live in one of the most critical and needy generations in our world's history. We have a great civilization that is literally struggling to get on its feet, and yet our lives, most of them, are being lived entirely on the surface.

Help us to see, O God, that there may have been a day when men could drift listlessly through such apathetic years. But if there ever has been such a day, it is gone now. For today the demands of life are constantly screaming at us, saying: Either attend to me here or perish; attend to me here and here and here or whole generations to come will perish.

May the Members of this Congress, our Father, be totally aware of the fact that no matter how noble their intentions, no matter how clever their self-deception, inevitably the law of the harvest still works that whatsoever a man or nation sows that shall they also reap.

Now, our Father, we pray that in Thine inimitable way Thou shalt gather these men up in Thine own arms and speak to their hearts and to their minds, and may in this very moment here and in every moment that shall follow during this hour, the deliberations that shall take place in this House today be wise deliberations simply because, first of all, we have sought guidance from our Father in heaven, in whose name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution relative to the designation of National Junior Achievement Week.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. REED, of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. TABER, of New York.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United

State Code, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania; Mr. TALLE, of Iowa; Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; and Mr. KILBURN, of New York.

MARSHAL TITO HAS BLOOD ON HIS HANDS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are incensed by the rumor that Marshal Tito, the Red dictator of Yugoslavia, may be invited to come to this country as an official guest by our State Department.

Tito came to power through the typical Communist formula; deceit, betrayal, torture, and murder.

The fact that he has fallen out temporarily with his fellow tyrants in the Kremlin does not absolve him of his hideous crimes.

There is no return for the thousands of his victims who rest at last in hidden graves. There is no audit of the suffering he has caused. There is no opportunity for the overwhelming majority of the people of Yugoslavia to express their revulsion for his ironhanded despotism.

Much to the shame of most Americans, our Government has tried to bribe him with billions of dollars in military and economic assistance, but Tito still remains a Communist, with all the dread implications of that fact.

When brave little Austria opened its frontiers to 175,000 Hungarians fleeing from the terror imposed by Red Russia's armies in their homeland, what did neighboring Yugoslavia do?

In the United Nations, it alined itself with the Communist regimes that practice brutal oppression as the way to maintain their cruel and totalitarian power.

Khrushchev, Chou En-lai, Tito: What fundamental distinction separates one from the other?

None.

Their hands still drip with the blood of innocent victims, the tens of millions who have been enslaved, and tortured, and murdered in the name of the monstrous evil that is communism.

To the hundreds of millions of captive peoples who long for freedom, justice, and humanitarianism the spectacle of the United States unrolling the welcome mat to honor one of these tyrants would be a crushing blow to their hopes.

Its cynical expediency would not be lost on them.

In their minds it would confirm their fears that United States foreign policy is confused, vacillating, and materialistic.

We cannot be a party to this unfortunate impression.

Already the voices of protest arise from our own citizens.

The First Annual Congress of the Council of Catholic Youth, Archdiocese of Boston, has voted unanimously in opposition to an official visit to this country by Marshal Tito.

The swelling tide of protest will rise higher and higher, until the State Department abandons the shameful proposal to invite this tyrant to be our guest.

We cannot receive, we cannot honor, we cannot shake the hand of Marshal Tito, so long as we love freedom and respect those who struggle against despotism.

Tito is unwelcome.

Our doors are closed to him.

TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks we have been hearing reports that President Eisenhower intends to invite Communist dictator Tito as an honored guest of our President and our Nation. In view of the many statements made by the President and his followers during the campaign, which were so obviously inconsistent with this rumored action, many of us, including myself, refused to take seriously the reports that this recognized murderer of innocent victims, this atheistic persecutor of the church, this crusher of human rights would be so honored by a nation which prides itself as being the spiritual leader among the free nations of the world.

Lately, however, these reports have been so persistent, and the President has continued to refuse to deny them, that it must now be accepted that, unless this Congress and the people of our country raise their voices in loud protest, the invitation to Tito will be an accomplished fact, if it is not one already. Certainly the President and his advisers must know that such an invitation is repugnant to the people of our country and to Congress. The fact that he is reported as intending to arrange for a visit after Congress recesses is obvious proof of that assumption.

Why, then, is Tito being so signally honored by the Chief Executive of our Nation? Is it because he has demonstrated any change in his position or has shown any indication that he regrets his sins of the past? Of course not. He is as much a Communist tyrant now as ever.

Or are we honoring him because of his part in assisting the heroic people of Hungary and Poland in their recent desperate but noble and glorious efforts to throw off the yoke of Communist despotism? If that is the reason, then we are indeed doing a grave and shameful injustice to these brave people. They received no encouragement or help whatever in their struggle for freedom from the Communist tyrant Tito. Tito merely and grudgingly accepted the results as inevitable, in view of the strong will and determination of these patriots, just as his Soviet counterparts did in Russia.

Unless the President acts, and acts quickly, to unequivocally deny his intention to invite Tito as our honored guest, he will be dealing a crushing blow to the hopes of suffering men, women, and children behind the Iron Curtain who seek the dawn of a new world of freedom and justice. He will be furnishing ammunition to those throughout the world who claim that our national policies are based, not on moral principles, not on lofty ideals, but on considerations of material convenience to us at the moment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] was right when he said that such action would be accomplishing a greater service for the Communist cause than anything that Alger Hiss ever did. I associate myself completely with our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the many other Members who have strongly protested this shocking and almost unbelievable intended act of the President. Unless an early denial is made by the President, I shall be forced to give much more serious consideration and be more hesitant before voting to give approval to additional discretionary powers to the executive branch of our Government. I feel sure that many of my colleagues join with me in these sentiments.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the First World War had caused misery to many millions and brought to death to many more. But it also cut the chains of subjection and servitude of many national groups suffering under unwanted, detested and dreaded alien autocrats. Many nationalities attained their freedom and their national independence in various parts of Europe as the result of that war. The Ukrainians were one of these. The Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed on January 22, 1918.

That day remains a memorable national holiday in the annals of Ukraine. For about 300 years some 30 or 40 million Ukrainians had yearned and dreamed their freedom, and they attained that goal only when the Czar's autocracy was overthrown and the Austrian Empire was broken up. But the Republic thus proclaimed did not last long. Its powerful and greedy Communist neighbor on the east wanted to destroy it and absorb it into the Soviet Union. This the Russian Communists did early in 1920. That was the sad fate of the Ukrainians;

it was also a sad event for the lovers of freedom. But tyrannies never endure and with God's help the Ukraine may again be free.

Today Ukrainians in the free world celebrate a memorable day in their history, and I join the Ukrainian-Americans on this solemn occasion, in the commemoration of their independence day.

CAMPAIGN FANTASIES ARE SO DIFFERENT FROM BUDGET REALITIES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our Republican friends in high places required almost all of the 4 years from 1952 to 1956 to explain why they could not fulfill their campaign promises of 1952 to cut the budget. Most of us who observed that doubletalk thought that our Republican campaign orators would have learned their lesson and that during the 1956 campaign they would stick to the realities and omit the rash promises.

Nevertheless, the 1956 campaign brought forth its full share of promises of economy in Government and cutting of budgetary expenditures.

Now that the campaign is behind us, a new year is started, the new state of the Union message has been delivered, and a new budget is before us for action.

The realities of Government expenditures now highlight two important factors:

First. The national debt authorized at a maximum of $266 billion in 1952, at the request of this administration, is now authorized at $276 billion. Against that sum, as of the beginning of the current fiscal year we had actually borrowed almost $273 billion.

Second. This administration, which was going to cut-cut-cut expenditures, has raised-raised-raised them, and for the next fiscal year asks for an additional increase. We are now presented with the highest peacetime budget the Congress has ever had submitted to it.

What has happened to all of those fine promises? Shortly after noontime on January 10 the press and Members of the Congress were given advance copies of the President's state of the Union message. I read it with much interest and observed with even greater interest that when the President delivered that message at 12:30 that day he deleted these very significant words:

> Through the next 4 years, I shall continue to insist that the executive departments and agencies of Government search out additional ways to save money and manpower. I urge that the Congress be equally watchful in this matter.

I can understand the reason for deleting those words in view of the fact that in almost every instance his budget message reflects that the executive departments and agencies of the Government find it necessary to spend additional money rather than to save money.

I hope that, without impairing any of the services necessary for the proper operation of our Government, and without in any way impairing our national security and defense, the Congress will find ways to save money and cut some of the items in the budget.

TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a joint resolution designed to effect the outright repeal of the 22d amendment to the Constitution.

First, let me say that I have no illusions about the present chances of this proposal. There are several reasons why it will get a cold shoulder from the 85th Congress. It is too early to expect many of our Republican colleagues—who voted unanimously for the 22d amendment in 1947—to alter their views on this controversial question. Although many of them voted against the 22d amendment, the Democrats' memories of last November 6 are too fresh for them to show any enthusiasm for this proposal except on terms which would exclude President Eisenhower from a try at a third term, and finally, Dr. Gallup's recent poll, which showed that current American public opinion favors the 22d amendment by a 2 to 1 margin, indicates that events must occur which demonstrate the unwisdom of this amendment before repeal will be a popular cause.

Attempting to appraise them impartially, I believe the principal arguments of those who favor the type of limitation embodied in the 22d amendment might be summarized in these three axioms:

First. The national interest demands that the office of the Presidency be rotated at least every 8 years, with no person being permitted to serve for a longer period under any circumstances whatsoever. With the experience factor being so vital to the office of the Presidency, should the people be deprived of the opportunity to elect the most experienced man they can find to serve in times of crisis? For example, would any Member of this body think it wise that no person be allowed to serve as Speaker more than 2, or, say, 4 terms?

Second. For the present at least, the electorate cannot be wholly trusted to perceive the dangers inherent in long presidential tenure by one man, or to determine when the usefulness of a President is ended. Cannot the Congress, with the vast powers delegated to it by the Constitution, stand guard effectively against authoritarian rule by any President? Is not the fear which underlies this axiom oddly out of place in 20th century America?

Third. If the Constitution places no limits on presidential tenure incumbents will frequently yield to inordinate pressures, procure their renomination, and seek more than two terms. Does our history really bear out this argument?

I would summarize the arguments against the 22d amendment by these axioms:

First. Rely on the good judgment of the people where presidential tenure is concerned, rather than rigid constitutional commands. President Eisenhower put this axiom rather well when he said last October in commenting on the 22d amendment, "I have got the utmost faith in the long-term commonsense of the American people."

Second. Where selection of national leaders is concerned one generation should not try to bind succeeding generations by inflexible limitations.

Third. It is foolish to deprive ourselves of the experience and talents of great leaders who are ready to serve, have the confidence of the people, and understand the great issues of the times.

Perhaps it is too early to assert that the 22d amendment will operate to drain off the political power and influence of any second-term President, but on the other hand it can hardly be argued that it will strengthen his hand.

It is my hope that the joint resolution I have introduced today will serve to stimulate public discussion of this important question.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 39th anniversary of the formation of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. I would like to commemorate for the people of the Ukraine this significant occasion, the memory of which has kept the flame of freedom burning bright within their hearts; and at the beginning of this new year express the hope felt not only by millions in our own great land but by all freedom-loving peoples that the future will bring to the Ukrainian people again, and for all time, the liberty and freedom for which they have never ceased to fight.

The past months have dramatically demonstrated to all the world the passion of men to be free and the sacrifices that they will make to render such freedom an actuality. Man was not born to live in chains of mind or body.

As we celebrate the birth of the short-lived freedom of the Ukrainian National Republic, we look forward with Ukrainians everywhere to the day when mankind and governments will exist around the globe on principles of independence, justice, and equality.

CRITICAL PRICE SITUATION IN OIL AND GAS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, a strange thing has happened within the past 2 weeks. The President delivered his state of the Union message on January 10. In his message he urged everyone to hold both wages and prices down. This was no sooner carried in the papers, than the very next day the same papers carried reports that oil in the State of Florida was going up immediately. Gasoline prices were raised from 1 cent to 2½ cents a gallon. The big oil companies were blaming the price hike on the so-called crisis in the Middle East.

Reliable sources in industry and government have reported that there is adequate oil to meet the demand. I understand that the pipelines are full and no shortage occurs for domestic consumption today.

It just seems strange to me that the coalition of the oil-producing States can regulate supply to a point where users of our natural resources must pay an exorbitant price. It is time that the partnership between government and industry quit bleeding the people of this country.

I want to urge that Congress look into this situation immediately and find the true causes of this inflation of oil. And I am urging my constituents to back me in this request.

Governor Collins of Florida says that the State of Florida must advocate price controls unless the price comes down. Both of our distinguished Senators from Florida are pushing the investigation into the practices of the industry. Several of my colleagues in the House are doing likewise.

The disturbing thing to me is that consumers are being hit twice by these hikes in prices. You know in Florida our main fuel for electricity generation is residual fuel oil. Since the price of this fuel has been increased by 30 cents per barrel in Florida, the various public utilities in our State must necessarily raise the power rates to consumers. Budgets for the many communities that own their own powerplants are thrown into a turmoil. Private power companies will have to raise their rates to consumers. We can reasonably expect each consumer of electricity in the State of Florida to have his rates increased.

And it is reported in the morning paper that the gasoline stocks in this country are about 18 million barrels more than at this time last year. Evidently the oil industry has not heard of the law of supply and demand. Or, if they have, they are choosing to ignore it at this time. The consumers cannot ignore it. How do you think they feel when they see that the oil companies are racing to fill our streets and highways with service stations? Do you think they can be fooled into thinking that there is a shortage of oil when these stations are popping up everywhere? It is logical to assume that they are building them as a marketplace for their products.

The consumer in Florida is being hit at the gas tank and at the light bulb. Many of you know that I am against Federal price controls in principle; but if something is not done at once, I might feel compelled to go all out for the control of prices on oil by the Government.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 22, 1957]

OIL SQUEEZE IN TEXAS

The behavior of the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates oil production in Texas, is surely becoming curiouser and curiouser. In the face of a rising world demand for crude oil, the commission ordered a production cutback last week. It is true that the commission raised daily output limits slightly, but it simultaneously trimmed allowable monthly production days from 16 to 15, meaning that the February output limit is 3.5 percent lower than this month's limit. All this takes place at a time when Western Europe is much more dependent on American oil because of the Suez stoppage.

What kind of game are the oilmen playing? Recent crude-oil price increases have been blamed on Suez, yet it may well seem, particularly to the British, that Texas producers have a responsibility along with Colonel Nasser. (Some 45 percent of all domestic oil is produced in Texas.) The railroad commission's ruling does little to still that suspicion. It has been a matter of record that independent Texas oilmen have clamored for lower production quotas in the hopes of getting their long-sought crude-oil price increase, which they now have obtained.

In addition, the Suez crisis is also being blamed for gasoline price increases that all of us will pay. Here the situation is even more curious, because there is presently a glut of American gasoline. As of January 11, the American Petroleum Institute reported gasoline stocks of 189.2 million barrels as against a backlog of 171.9 million a year before. (This gasoline surplus offers little overseas relief, since Europe wants crude oil which can be refined abroad, saving dollar reserves.) It is little wonder that the oil price increases are stirring congressional attention and a Justice Department probe.

The public is surely entitled to know more about oil economics—Texas style.

A BILL TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to create a Department of Transportation and Communications and to prescribe its functions.

The purpose of the legislation is to create an Executive Department with a member of the Cabinet as its Secretary, and to transfer to that Department all of the personnel and functions now performed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Federal Communications Commission; the Civil Aeronautics Board; Civil Aeronautics Administration; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Federal Maritime Board; Maritime Administration; and St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Originally our Founding Fathers had in mind the creation of a Government with three equal and coordinate departments: Executive, legislative, and judiciary. Through the creation of independent boards and authorities, we have set up a fourth branch of the Government which exercises administrative functions, legislative functions, and quasi-judicial functions.

Many of these bureaus, boards, and administrations were established as arms of the Congress, but in many cases we now find that, through the issuance of rules and regulations, these independent bodies attempt to circumvent or nullify acts of the Congress.

From my experience on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and on the Government Operations Committee I have concluded that our Government will function much better if the work performed by these independent bodies were supervised by, and made responsible to, the Cabinet and the President of the United States, who after all bears the responsibility for the total executive administration of our Government.

Our Government operates as the biggest business corporation in the world, and I know of no corporate setup which permits groups within the corporation to operate and function independently of the board of directors or executive officers of that corporation.

The records of the Government Operations Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are replete with examples where conflicts between the independent agencies have prevented prompt action on matters vitally affecting the public interest as well as public safety.

I sincerely hope that this bill will receive a proper hearing and sympathetic consideration.

WE SHOULD REDUCE THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has sent to Congress another balanced budget. This budget will show approximately a $2 billion surplus over our expenditures. It is to be noted that the President suggests that this surplus be used to cut down the national debt. It is also to be noted that the President has issued an order to the various department heads to hold down hiring of new Government employees and to hold back on "spending programs that are not urgent."

I think in all fairness, we should compare the budgets of the last few years.

In 1954 President Truman's budget request called for expenditures of $77,900,000,000.

The 1955 budget, which was the first of this administration, called for $65,000,000,000.

The 1956 budget called for $65,900,000,000.

The 1958 budget called for $71,800,000,000.

In checking we find that $38 billion of this 1958 budget amount comes under the category of defense. Breaking this down into dollar values, we find:

	Cents
National security	59
Interest on Federal debt	10
Veterans benefits	07
Agriculture	07
Debt retirement	02
All other programs	15

This money is collected from the following sources:

	Cents
Individual income taxes	51
Corporation income taxes	29
Excise taxes	12
Customs and other receipts	08

This enormous budget worries all of us. I feel when our income is at its highest, that is the time to pay on our debt. This statement is applicable, not only to the Federal Government, but to the various State governments, local communities and political subdivisions, and "yes" to each individual. Inflation is one of our most dangerous enemies. It cannot continue to rise, so each and everyone of us, Federal, State, local and individual should cut our expenses in every possible manner.

H. MEADE ALCORN, JR.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as the youngest Republican here, with my first opportunity as a new Congressman to speak before this distinguished legislative body, I consider it a great honor and pleasure to speak about a man who is near and dear to me personally and greatly respected by the people of Connecticut; in fact, he was just chosen as national chairman of the Republican Party.

That man is H. Meade Alcorn, Jr., of Suffield and Hartford, Conn., my home district. He has been a great leader of the Republican Party in Hartford County and in the State of Connecticut, and I know I speak for all the people in my State and district in expressing our sincere congratulations to him.

Meade Alcorn has had a glorious civic and political record. Born on October 20, 1907; graduate of Dartmouth in 1930, cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa; track star and New England low-hurdle champion in 1928; graduate of Yale Law School in 1933; admitted to the Connecticut bar on July 11, 1933; member of the Hartford County, Connecticut, and American Bar Associations, and a member of the American Judicature Society; president of the Connecticut Bar Association in 1950 and 1951; president of the Hartford Rotary Club, 1949–50; director for many years of the Connecticut Society for Crippled Children; member of the Charter Oak Council Executive Committee of the Boy Scouts of America; assistant State's attorney for Hartford County, 1935–42; State's attorney from 1942 to 1948; member of the Connecticut House of Representatives from 1937 to 1943; Republican majority leader, 1939, and speaker, 1941; Republican town chairman of Suffield, 1938–1953; delegate to the Republican National Convention, 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, 1956; State chairman, Citizens for Eisenhower, 1952; presently State central committeeman, 7th senatorial district, Connecticut; national committeeman from Connecticut and vice chairman of the Republican National Committee. He was the vice-chairman in charge of arrangements for the San Francisco Republican Convention in 1956 and chairman of the Connecticut delegation.

His long record of civic and political experience leads me to believe that, in my humble opinion, he will be a keen, affable, most intelligent, and inspiring leader of the Republican Party. He will carry on in the footsteps of our great chairman, Leonard W. Hall, of New York, beginning February 1, 1957. I am sure Meade Alcorn's leadership will be in the best traditions of the Republican Party.

I have seen Meade Alcorn's leadership firsthand as he took the initiative in my congressional campaign as we overcame a 36,000-vote deficit of 2 years ago to win by 22,000 votes. His work has always been selfless, untiring, and in the best interests of all the people. He has a firm belief in the youth of our party, and he believes that old and young can be united with campaigns that produce the best candidates, with the best platform and the best organizations from the precinct to the national level.

Again, I know I can speak for all those who have been associated with him in the past, in expressing our supreme confidence in the splendid job we know he will do as national chairman of the Republican Party.

McKINLEY DAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, every year we observe McKinley Day on the 29th of this month. I have talked with the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and, if it meets with the approval of the Speaker, we would like to have an hour on next Monday. We hope we will not consume that much time. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to address the House for an hour on next Monday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROTEST AGAINST VISIT OF TITO

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by the national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this short time to repeat for the purpose of emphasis what I think is the opinion, I hope, of the majority of this House and of the country to protest the intended and expected visit of Tito to this country. I hope the Government will not continue to exercise that very bad judgment. I use this time to appeal to the people of the United States of America to write, to telephone, to wire, and in every way reasonable and possible through the membership and other means of communication to direct to the President or to the Secretary of State that it is the overwhelming opinion of his country, this House, and the people that Tito the tyrant not be admitted and made respectable by the United States of America.

I have been reliably informed that it is the intention of our Government to invite Tito to the Nation's Capital during the coming Easter recess. This purpose here is obvious.

The administration knows, or should know, that there is an overwhelming feeling within this House and within the other body openly and repeatedly expressed by the most distinguished members of both sides of the aisle on the floor here, in the press, radio, and television, against this invitation to Tito. This opposition is widespread here, and nationwide as well. That being the case, it is a subterfuge to tab the visit for the Easter recess, when the Congress is not in session. It is well known that if Tito is in Washington when Congress is in session, as a chief of state of a foreign nation, he would, of course, be invited to address a joint session of Congress, or separate sessions of both Houses.

The Government would not dare bring him to Capitol Hill for such a purpose; it is my considered judgment that there would not be a corporal's guard of Members of either House on the floor at the time of such an appearance by Tito. This would be an appalling embarrassment to the Government, and would defeat whatever purpose there might be in bringing Tito to this city. Hence, the Easter recess visit.

I repeat, since the administration knows or should know of this set of facts, and the general sentiment, and persists in the invitation and the reception of Tito, that the only thing left for me to do is to use the forum of this House to appeal to the American people to register their objections as I have indicated above.

AMERICAN LEGION CHIEF BANGS TITO TETE-A-TETE

WASHINGTON, January 12.—Dan Daniel, national commander of the American Legion, today issued a strong statement of unqualified opposition to reported White House plans for a visit to the United States by Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito.

Daniel released the statement, documenting Tito's long Communist record, in reply to a survey query by publisher William Loeb of the New Hampshire Sunday News and the Manchester Union Leader.

He asserted he was documenting Tito's record in his reply for the benefit of any

among us so naive and so ignorant of very recent history to believe we can do business with Communist Tito.

In his opposition to any invitation to Tito to visit the United States, the American Legion commander has joined with such respected and influential national figures as United States Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; United States Senator William F. Knowland, of California; United States Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, and Cooper T. Holt, commander in chief of the VFW.

STATEMENT TEXT

Following is the text of Mr. Daniel's statement:

"Recent reports in the Nation's press indicate that the administration is considering the possibility of inviting Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to visit this country for conferences with President Eisenhower at the White House. I cannot believe the President would ever give serious consideration to such an invitation.

"To invite Tito to this country for any purpose, let alone to confer with the President or other officials of our Government, would be to confer upon him recognition and respectability which he does not deserve.

"There may be those who seriously believe that Marshal Tito, if he visits this country, can be persuaded to aline himself actively with the free world in opposing Russia. Those who believe this deceive themselves."

WORDS AND DEEDS

"Tito has proven by his words and deeds that he is as godless and fanatically ruthless a Communist as Lenin and Stalin. He is an unprincipled opportunist to whom murder, imprisonment of church leaders, and double crossing diplomacy are but a means to an end.

"If there are any among us so naive and so ignorant of very recent history to believe that we can do business with Communist Tito, I would ask that they review this record:

"July 7, 1946: Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch, leader of Serbian nationalist resistance against Germany, executed for collaboration with the enemy.

"December 3, 1946: Greek Government informs U. N. Security Council that Yugoslavia, under Tito's leadership, supports guerrilla warfare waged by Communist rebels in northern Greece.

"September 18, 1946: Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic prelate of Yugoslavia, arrested and subsequently sentenced to 16 years at hard labor for collaboration with the enemy.

"July 21, 1948: At Yugoslavia Communist Party congress, Tito declares that Yugoslavia Communists remain loyal to the Soviet Union.

"April 9, 1949: At a mass meeting, Tito calls Yugoslavia an ally of the Soviet Union.

"June 25, 1950: North Korean Communists invade South Korea. Two days later Yugoslavia is the only member of the U. N. Security Council to vote against the United States resolution to assist South Korea.

"November 29, 1952: Vatican announces that Archbishop Stepinac will be appointed cardinal.

"December 17, 1952: Yugoslav Government severs diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

"October 1, 1954: Soviet economic blockade against Yugoslavia is ended by trade agreement.

"May 26–June 3, 1955: Bulganin and Khrushchev visit Yugoslavia—joint declaration, Bulganin and Tito:

"A. Calls for peaceful coexistence regardless of ideological differences.

"B. Calls for admission of Communist China to and transfer of Formosa to Communist China.

"C. Asks for removal of embargo on trade with Communist countries.

"July 25, 1955: Tito tells a visiting American group:

"A. Yugoslavia Communist Party is ready to resume relations with the Soviet Communist Party.

"B. The Soviet Union sincerely wants peace.

"C. Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey may relax their defensive efforts because the danger of a Soviet attack is no longer imminent.

"September 7–30, 1955: United States Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy and Tito reach agreement by which Yugoslavia will permit the United States military mission to visit rather than inspect American military equipment shipped into Yugoslavia. In return, Yugoslavia will get $40.5 million already appropriated as well as 6 million tons of wheat. This is in addition to the more than $1 billion in American military and economic aid already given Yugoslavia since September 1949.

"January 19, 1956: United States-Yugoslavia aid agreements signed in Belgrade. United States will give Yugoslavia $95 million in economic aid by June 30, 1956, most of which will be a direct gift. On same day, a Soviet-Yugoslavia credit agreement is published in Belgrade. Soviet credit up to $110 million will be given Yugoslavia over the next 10 years. Yugoslavia's government radio station calls the Soviet agreement 'more favorable than any that Yugoslavia has been able to make with other countries.'

"January 28, 1956: Soviet-Yugoslavia agreement is signed to cooperate in the field of nuclear energy.

"June 11, 1956: Tito, speaking to a crowd in Stalingrad during Russian visit, said: 'In peace as in war, Yugoslavia must march shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union toward * * * the victory of socialism.'

"June 17, 1956: Tito, still in Russia, declared: 'No one can ever separate the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.'

"November 4, 1956: Molivan Djilas, former vice president of Yugoslavia, published an article in the New Leader (New York): 'The Hungarian revolution blazed a path which sooner or later other Communist countries must follow. The wound which the Hungarian revolution inflicted on communism can never be completely healed.'

"November 19, 1956: Milovan Djilas was arrested and sentenced to 3 years in prison on charges of spreading propaganda hostile to the Yugoslavian regime. Foreign journalists were excluded from attending the trial.

"November 21, 1956: Yugoslavia opposes U. N. resolution ordering withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. Abstains from voting on resolution to send U. N. observers to Hungary."

Noting that this is only a part of Tito's sordid record of duplicity, deceit, and diplomatic double dealing, American Legion National Commander Dan Daniel declared:

"I cannot believe in light of this record that the American people need worry about the possibility of Tito being invited to this country."

As a further extension, Mr. Speaker, I include a telegram received by the distinguished majority leader of this House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, from His Excellency, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, and from Edward J. Madden, archdiocesan president of Council of Catholic Youth. This telegram emphasizes the eloquent and vehement protest made by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, against the visit of Tito:

DEAR JOHN: One thousand five hundred delegates attending the annual congress of the Council of Catholic Youth in the city of Boston on Sunday evening, January 20, and representing hundreds of thousands of the future citizens and promising leaders of the United States, by a unanimous vote, protest with all their enthusiastic love for God and country the invitation extended Marshal Tito to visit our country.

RICHARD J. CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.
EDWARD J. MADDEN,
Archdiocesan President of Council of Catholic Youth.

H. MEADE ALCORN, JR.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that we listened this morning to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAY], who, in November last, by a 22,000 majority replaced a Democrat who, 2 years ago, received a majority of 36,000.

That spectacular outstanding victory stands as irrefutable evidence of the ability, the political sagacity, the statesmanship of our colleague from Connecticut. Beyond question, his activities here will be of inestimable value to some of us who have failed to keep in as close touch with our constituents as we should. It may be that his campaign will serve as a guide to our party in winning a Republican majority of the House in 1958.

Our colleague praised the selection of H. Meade Alcorn, Jr., as chairman of the Republican National Committee. While some of us may be apprehensive that the selection of Mr. Alcorn to the high office which he now holds may mean the reappearance of the former Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, as the presidential candidate of the Republican Party in 1960, that fear may be lessened or wiped out by our colleague's outstanding victory of last November and campaign which he waged.

Yesterday we were advised that the conservative wing of the Republican Party either had been or was being liquidated.

This morning the Washington Post—usually far to the left, always, at least for the last 20 years, apparently more deeply concerned in the welfare and security of countries other than the United States—carried an editorial which might be described as an obituary, certainly not as a eulogy, of conservative Republicans, who still believe that a man, if able, should earn and pay his own way, who still owe and practice allegiance to the principles laid down in the Constitution—a document praised by the Post when it serves its interests, but often forgotten when that great document indicates a course in conflict with the policy of the Post.

The great personal victory achieved by Ike is being constantly referred to by the international and domestic free spenders as a mandate to travel far to the left of past national policies. Those so using that victory overlook the fact

that, while international, New Deal, so-called liberals, both Democrats and Republicans, voted for Ike, the victory was made possible only because conservatives, Constitutionalists, States-righters, had no political choice—voted for Ike.

If we are to have war, as we may have if we keep interfering in the internal affairs of other nations, certainly the man who commanded the victorious forces in World War II is infinitely better qualified as Commander in Chief of our armed services to guide us through another war than is Adlai Stevenson.

Without the support of conservatives in both parties, it may be most respectfully and humbly submitted, the President could never have been elected.

It is my hope that some day conservatives, if they be in the minority, will hold the balance of political power. Perhaps then their support, like that of other minority groups, may, by the leaders of both political parties, be earnestly sought—perhaps then they may be able, in exchange for that vote and support, to obtain a somewhat clearer adherence to constitutional principles.

While, according to the New Dealers, the free spenders, the internationalists, the conservative wing of the party may be dead and buried, it seems that somewhere in the past it has been my privilege to read that in the end there will be a resurrection. It is quite possible that uncontrolled inflation, national bankruptcy, a real depression, or perhaps another war, will once more give our people a choice between two qualified patriotic Americans, one of whom may be a so-called liberal, the other a true conservative.

ANSWERING MINORITY ON HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take all the time but I want to include in the RECORD an answer to the minority members of the Small Business Committee, an answer to their criticisms which they put in the RECORD a few days ago. If any Member wants to ask me any questions, I will be glad to yield now, but if not, I will just proceed to include the material in the RECORD.

THE MINORITY MEMBERS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HAVE OBSTRUCTED EFFORTS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, on January 17, the majority of the Small Business Committee were treated with another personal and political attack from certain of the minority members of our committee.

The excuse for this attack, as it was presented by the two minority members, is their disagreement with the committee's final report for the 84th Congress. The minority appended a statement of minority views to this report, setting out their attack; and on January 17, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] inserted this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel compelled to answer that statement.

The majority, in its final report, have set out a searching analysis of the problems besetting small business, and they have recommended congressional and administrational actions which would go a long way toward solving these problems. The minority condemn everything. They condemn the sweeping way as being wrong, biased and nonfactual, while failing to specify wherein the analysis is wrong. They offer no analysis of their own. They concede that small business has problems, but they have pointed to no problem, and they have offered nothing to correct any problem.

If the minority's statement were no more than a personal attack on the majority of the committee, and on the committee staff, I would, perhaps, let it pass. But it is more than that.

MINORITY VIEWS ATTACK SMALL BUSINESS

The minority statement will do great harm to small business, and its long-run effect will be to weaken the competitive enterprise system on which depends our traditional form of political and social order. The reasons are clear. Informed public opinion is usually prerequisite to intelligent public action to correct things that need correction. This is especially true of problems pertaining to small business and monopoly. The minority statement seeks to destroy fact and analysis and substitute in their place political passions and confusions. In a measure it will succeed, in that it will help prevent or delay actions—both administrative and legislative—which are urgently needed to preserve a free enterprise system.

Most of the readers of this report—those who have the sustained interest to read it through—will be those equipped to evaluate the report and to discover for themselves wherein the analyses are faulty, if they are faulty. A substantial proportion of readers, however, will be those who read in haste; and there will be readers even among professional groups who are in no position to verify for themselves the factual data here present. In the minds of such readers the minority's yells of inaccuracy, distortion, and statistical legerdemain will plant confusion and doubt.

FACTS VERSUS DOCTRINE

In a nutshell, the minority statement seeks to preserve a political propaganda line. It would have us believe that all is well with small business, and that never before has small business enjoyed either such prosperity or tender care from a Federal administration. More specifically, the minority statement urges us to believe, contrary to all of the facts, that the numbers of small businesses that are failing are insignificant, that the net disappearance of 126,000 business firms is a slight matter, that the drop in small business profit rates is meaningless, and that all data pertaining to SBA's activities are either inaccurate or placed in a distorted context. In short, we are urged to believe that this committee's final report takes a distorted view of what the minority statement calls "the assured place of small and medium independent business in a dynamic and growing economy."

Finally, the minority's statement would have us believe that only proscribed political claims are worthy of belief, and that statistical fact provides no trustworthy source of information.

The Small Business Committee was created for the express purpose of investigating the problems of small business. I do not construe the assignment to investigate to mean that we are merely to mouth the claims of a political party, or that we are to applaud one administrative agency or another merely because we are given a signal to applaud.

THE MAJORITY ATTACK PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS—THE MINORITY ATTACK THE MAJORITY

The last two reports of this committee, prior to this final report, were graced with dissenting views from a unanimous minority. In both instances those dissenting views leveled personal attacks against majority members of the committee and against the committee's staff. And what is worse, they painted the committee's reports as hideous compounds of error, injustice and malicious distortion. These statements were left unanswered. In one instance, the majority was afforded the courtesy of seeing the minority's statement only after it had been filed with the Clerk of the House and had appeared in public print—House Report 2966 of the House Select Committee on Small Business entitled "Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws."

In the second instance the minority filed dissenting views to a report—House Report 2967 of the House Select Committee on Small Business entitled "The Organization and Procedures of the Federal Regulatory Commissions and Agencies and Their Effect on Small Business"—which had been rewritten to their specifications. At a meeting of the committee on December 3, the minority objected to the committee print of that report, wherewith the minority's suggestions were invited. Those suggestions called for revamping and extensive rewriting of the report. They called for deletions of all references to an entire field of governmental activity, and they called for toning down or omitting conclusions. The minority's suggestions were agreed to, and the report was rewritten. Naturally it was assumed that rewriting the report to the minority's specifications would make the report acceptable to the minority. But no, on the deadline day for filing the report the minority submitted a statement dissenting from the report.

Concerning the section of the report which was deleted, the minority had argued that deletion should be made, because the section contained references to testimony given before another committee of the House. But after the deletion was made they still dissented because, they said, they thought they could detect the influence of the deleted materials. Furthermore they supplied minority views setting out criticisms which go, not to the rewritten report that the committee adopted, but to the

original committee print which the committee had rejected.

Now come minority views which decry any situation which successively transgresses orderly committee procedure. Here the minority proclaim, as one of their motivating principles, that the committee's objectives can be attained only by the closest cooperation with the entire membership of the committee.

HIGH PRINCIPLES AND LOW PERFORMANCE

Keeping in mind the high principles, which have motivated the minority, what, then, has been their record of cooperation with this final report?

On December 3, the committee assembled in Washington, for what was to be a 2-day meeting, for the announced purpose of considering the adoption of two reports then in page proof, and for the purpose of deciding what should be contained in the committee's final report.

The first day of the projected 2-day meeting was spent on the two reports already in hand, the time being taken up largely in eliciting the minority's suggestions for rewriting the report already mentioned. At the end of the first day, the minority expressed a desire to conclude the meeting, without discussing a projected final report, suggesting that the committee meet again on January 2, for the purpose of adopting a final report. The minority's wishes were acceded to.

On December 15, the proposed final report was transmitted, in page proof, to all members of the committee. Between that date and the morning of January 3, the minority made no suggestions for modifying the report. They pointed out no errors or misstatements, and they indicated no dissatisfaction with the report. Yet the House resolution under which the committee was created gives us no option as to whether we shall make a final report; the resolution requires a final report, and it requires that it be filed by 12 o'clock noon on January 3.

Since December 15 the minority has prepared—or has had prepared—an extensive criticism of this final report. Manifestly, this criticism has not been quickly prepared. It has been written with considerable malicious artistry, requiring both a close study of the report and extensive inventions of things to criticize which were never in the report. It would do credit to the propaganda artists which the Small Business Administration employs—no funds appropriated to help small business—to carry on propaganda against small business. Now, at this late hour, the minority charge inaccuracies and misstatements and they are convinced that the report should not be issued.

Has it, then, been the minority's purpose that the committee should fail in its duty to file a report? Or has the minority remained silent on the inaccuracies and misstatements which they say they know about, in the hope that the majority will issue an inaccurate report?

In many respects we could all wish that the report were inaccurate, but it is not inaccurate.

This incident climaxes 2 years of activities on the part of the minority members of the House Small Business Committee which, it seems to me, have been devoted to obstructing and disrupting the committee's effort to be of some real service to small business. These activities have not been directed solely at the committee's report, but have gone behind the reports to the committee's hearings. The minority—or appointed members of the minority—have been diligent in attending these hearings. They have been equally diligent in turning the course of questioning away from the topic being investigated, and in disrupting all probing for facts which might be displeasing to any big business concern or to any administrative agency.

WHERE ARE THE MINORITY'S CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS?

What of the present minority views? It has two conclusions. In the first conclusion they declare that the report fails because it lacks constructive conclusions and recommendations for remedial action. Then in a codicil, or postscript, they conclude that they must withhold decision on the constructive conclusions and recommendations which have been put before them, because, they say, they have not had sufficient time to consider these recommendations.

None of the suggested recommendations that were put before the minority are new. They have all been under discussion for many months and, in most instances, for many years. Surely the minority must know how they stand on each and every one of these recommendations. The draft statement of the proposed recommendations was put before the majority members no sooner than it was put before the minority members. The majority members knew where they stood; and in several instances where they did not agree with a suggested recommendation, they were able to make prompt decisions as to what they could agree to.

Since the minority was preparing, prior to December 31, a statement condemning the report for lacking constructive conclusions and recommendations, where, then, are their own constructive conclusions and recommendations? They have made none; and they have suggested none to the majority.

The minority now proclaim that they are "always willing to join in justified criticism of government or other activity which is detrimental to our economy or to small business." Where, then, have they joined in any such criticism? Are we to believe that all criticisms appearing in this report are unjustified? The minority has agreed with none.

Where, then, has the minority utilized its lengthy dissenting views to express its own criticisms, in its own words, of any "government or other activity?" There is none. The minority has seen nothing detrimental to our economic system or to small business. It has had criticism only for the majority members of the committee, and the committee's staff.

THE MINORITY'S COURAGEOUS ATTACKS (ON THE COMMITTEE'S STAFF)

The minority's repeated personal attacks on the committee's staff have, in the present "minority views," finally sunk to an intolerable low. These attacks are not only lacking in any justification whatever, they are useless to the minority's plain purpose. When the minority get to know, as I know, the high integrity and the tested devotion to public service enjoyed by our top staff, they will learn that these people cannot be intimidated or frightened into taking directions away from their assigned course.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress I felt that problems facing small business, taken in context, were of such magnitude that the Small Business Committee should have a top staff of the best people in the country. Considerations of the public interest, it seemed to me, had to come before any personal attachments I might have to people who had served the committee creditably and loyally in the past. Consequently I sought, and succeeded in getting, for the committee's general counsel and staff director, and for the committee's chief economist, the two people who were, all things considered, the best qualified for these jobs. In both instances these individuals made personal sacrifices to serve the committee, by resigning from high jobs in the civil service in which they had long since earned both job security and security of reputation. This has been true of most of the staff, and in any case I have insisted on the same high standards for appointment of all of the staff members. It does the minority little credit to repay these people for their personal sacrifice, and for the magnificent service they have given the committee, with loose uses of the word integrity and the other smearing innuendoes which appear in the minority views.

MINORITY'S CRITICISMS OF DEMOCRATS PROVE THEIR NONPARTISANSHIP

In the spring of last year, the minority launched an attack upon the majority members of the committee and its staff, in a series of speeches in the House. Their theme was the same as now. They charged that conduct of the committee is partisan; they professed shock that any member of the committee could possibly allow any partisanship to creep into his approach to the problems of small business, and they pointed to the minority's conduct in past Congresses as a model of nonpartisanship. These speeches admonishing the majority members against any partisanship in small-business matters were liberally interspersed with such nonpartisan statements as:

> This administration, the Eisenhower administration, has more accomplishments to its credit in the interest of small business and our free-enterprise system than any administration in the past 20 years—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 6, page 7365.

And:

> Until President Eisenhower was inaugurated in January 1953, no lasting small-business program was ever given the support it needed to assure maximum success—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 6, page 7368.

My answer to the charge of political partisanship is the same answer as I gave in the House on May 16, 1956; and I respectfully make the same suggestion to

the minority members I then made, which was, in part:

On May 9, another minority member of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], made a speech elaborating on the previous attack from the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] elaborated on the theme that the Small Business Committee is now partisan in its approach. He made the claim that prior to the present Congress the committee had always been nonpartisan in its approach to small business, and by way of supporting this claim he cites a great number of instances when the committee issued reports criticizing the Federal agencies during Democratic administrations, and while I was chairman of the committee. He did not cite, however, any report issued during the Republican-controlled 83d Congress that was critical of any executive agency. I believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] has fully answered his own complaint, as well as that of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. Clearly the committee is nonpartisan when it has a Democratic chairman and issues reports critical of administrative agencies during a Democratic administration; but the committee is partisan when it has a Democratic chairman and makes criticisms of an administrative agency during a Republican administration. I suggest my colleagues should reevaluate the question whether their primary concern is to help small business or to protect the Eisenhower administration from criticisms.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 6, page 8308.

MISREPRESENTING THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Coming now to the merits of the minority's specific criticisms of the report, I point out that the minority not only indulge in unjustified characterization of the report, they stoop to criticizing things which the report does not contain.

For example, the minority state that:

Few will agree with the report that small business is subject to a gigantic conspiracy conducted by the heads of the country's largest corporations and by high-placed officials of the Federal Government.

This conspiracy is the minority's own conclusion or idea. It is not in the report. Nor do the facts presented in the report suggest, to my mind, such a conspiracy. But the minority's idea may be influenced by additional facts which I do not have.

And again the minority states:

The report has reduced the entire operation of our competitive system to a battle between General Motors and the smallest local business institution. This oversimplification results in a distorted view of the assured place of small and medium independent business in our dynamic and growing economy.

The report has in no sense reduced the operation of our economic system to a battle between General Motors and small business. The report does not, however—nor do I—share the minority's optimistic confidence that small and medium independent business has an assured place in our economy.

THE MINORITY IS GENUINELY SHOCKED

Finally, I come to a statement which reveals, I think, the nub of the minority's difficulty. The minority states:

The report is persuasive that only big business can survive in our free-competitive system. The position of small business is absolutely hopeless if the report were to be taken seriously.

Of course, the report does not take the view that the position of small business is absolutely hopeless; otherwise the report need not have been written. The prospects for small business' survival are black, it is true, but the report recommends corrections in the tax, antitrust, and other laws, and in administration programs which will, if accepted, restore to small business a competitive chance to survive. I will concede that the facts presented in the report are shocking, particularly to people who have not previously been exposed to the facts or who have been unreceptive to the facts.

Indeed, I suspect that the character of the minority's dissenting statement is largely a reaction to shock. This statement expresses the disbelief which initially—and quite naturally—follows first exposure to facts which are contrary to one's cherished beliefs and happy contentment. It is only natural to wish to reject such facts and to assume that they must, somehow, be distortions and statistical legerdemain.

ANSWERING SPECIFIC CRITICISMS

It is doubtless for this reason that, which the minority alleges wholesale inaccuracies and misstatements in the final report, they have, except for hinting at broad chapter topics, given few specifications as to where the inaccuracies and misstatements might be found. And despite the repeated allegations that figures are erroneous, they have in but one instance supplied what they think the correct figure to be. Yet they proclaim that the small-business community is entitled to know the truth regardless of the circumstances.

In truth, with all of the combing of this report the minority has done, or had done for them, they have succeeded in isolating only one printing error in a figure and one sentence which might be more aptly phrased. I will come to these in turn.

Those who have read this final report will instantly realize that the criticisms set out in the minority views really need no answer; these follow a consistent pattern of reading into the report things that are not there, or so grotesquely distorting the things that are there as to leave them unrecognizable. With apologies to the professional reader, I offer appropriate answers to minority's criticisms as follows:

SBA DISBURSEMENT FIGURES

The minority says that it has found that the figures used in the report for disbursements on SBA loans are "inaccurate." They do not say what they have found the accurate figures to be, nor do they indicate whether the alleged inaccuracy is a significant one. The figures used in the report for SBA disbursements were supplied by the Controller of the SBA, as were all other figures pertaining to SBA loan matters.

SBA LENDING

The minority says that the report "very obviously distorts the significance of the SBA lending program." They think this is so "very obvious" that they need not specify where the distortion is, except that they do hint, at another place, that the volume of SBA lending to small business had something to do with the demand for loans.

As has been pointed out in the report, in the 3 years 1949–51, the RFC made 3 times as many loans to small business, and lent about 2½ times as much money as the SBA lent in 3 years ended June 30, 1956.

In the same 3 years of SBA lending, moreover, the World Bank lent 16 times as much money abroad and the Export-Import Bank lent 20 times as much for business abroad as the SBA lent to small business in the United States. These lending programs are of particular benefit to the giant corporations and such lending has been vastly expanded, while lending to small business has been sharply curtailed.

Furthermore, Congress has recently authorized, at the administration's request, still another foreign lending program—the International Finance Corporation—which will enable the big corporations to finance their reports on still easier credit terms.

With reference to the report's discussion of SBA lending program, the minority allege "lack of objectivity," "extreme and intemperate views," "conflicting, inaccurate, unfair, and misleading statements" which cannot be "reconciled." Then they offer in support of these charges "an example" of a "contradiction" between the report's criticism of SBA's failure to ask for adequate appropriations and the observation that appropriations have not been the "limiting factor" in SBA's lending. The criticisms are correlative, not contradictory. SBA has asked for too little money, and has lent even less.

"CONTROL" VERSUS "VOTING CONTROL"

In our discussion of the SBA's "independence," the minority objects to our saying that Secretary of Commerce Weeks and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey "control" SBA's Loan Policy Board. The sentence has been changed to read:

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce have voting control of SBA's Loan Policy Board.

I would add, for the minority's benefit, that when Secretary Humphrey was before the House Banking Committee last July, urging Congress to authorize the new International Finance Corporation, I asked him about credit for small business and he assured me it is not needed. I quote the record as follows:

Secretary HUMPHREY. Mr. PATMAN, I just can't imagine that capital is unavailable at any cost for a suitable industry in the United States. There is plenty of capital in the United States for anybody that has got a business that looks as though it could succeed with a management that is entitled to credit.

Mr. PATMAN. I will change that to reasonable cost.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will say "reasonable cost," too. There is plenty of money available in this country for any project with

the right kind of management. (House Committee on Banking and Currency: Hearings on H. R. 6228, p. 10, 84th Cong., 1st sess., July 11 and 15, 1955.)

And again Secretary Humphrey said:

I personally think that there isn't any place in this country where, if there is a legitimate opportunity to do business and make money at it, with good management, that you can't get money together to go into that place, and do business (hearings, op. cit., p. 12).

SBA INTEREST RATES

An amendment which was made to the Small Business Act, in the summer of 1955, forbids SBA to charge on its business loans an interest rate higher than that prevailing in the community; and in no case is SBA to charge a rate of more than 6 percent. Yet SBA has continued its previous policy of charging 6 percent on its direct loans, irrespective of local rates. The minority statement defends this defiance of the law with the assertion that the law is administratively impossible and concludes with a question whether the majority members of the committee would wish SBA to charge rates of 7, 8, or 9 percent?

I assume the majority members of the committee would not wish SBA to charge such rates, since they proposed the amendment to the law restricting SBA to 6 percent, for no purpose other than stopping SBA's practice of charging more.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS—SBA GOT LESS THAN 2 PERCENT

The minority says that the report applauds the SDPA for instigating the joint set-aside program for defense contracts, but derides the same program under SBA in both principle and operation. As I read the report it neither applauds performance nor derides principle. The report quotes a letter of mine in which I pointed out that in the 3 years ended June 30, 1956, contracts awarded to small business—firms with less than 500 employees—the set-aside program amounted to about 1 percent of the value of all of the military contracts awarded in this period, while small business received about 21 percent of the value without benefit of the set-aside. The quoted letter also states that—

So far, SBA has developed almost nothing in the way of a program to carry out the congressional mandate that a fair proportion of Government contracts be awarded to small business.

SBA has had several hundred people continuously employed on this program. It follows then, that either SBA's performance on the program has been strikingly poor, or the method is wrong. I am not now prepared to recommend an alternative, and I have not heard of SBA's proposing any alternative; but it seems to me that the screening of proposed contracts should be done, if at all, at central places where procurements are first planned and decided upon, rather than out in the contracting offices.

FOUR FIGURES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

The minority says the report shows a deplorable inconsistency and uses four different figures for the dollar value of research and development contracts. The four figures refer to different things which are fully identified. The Attorney General's recent report presents several dozens of figures on this subject; I commend this latter report to the minority's reading.

EXCESS PROFITS TAX

I am not sure the minority is correct in saying that the Small Business Committee in the 82d and 83d Congresses called for abolition of the excess profits tax. The committee did, in the 82d Congress, call for modifications of certain features of the tax, such as the method for computing the income base in the case of a new firm.

I will however concede the minority's enthusiastic efforts to have this tax eliminated. Yet I cannot agree with minority's suggestion that because the committee may have favored its abolition we are now foreclosed a critical examination of the results.

In passing, I might point to another example of the minority's repeated misstatements of what is in this final report. The minority views alleged that "in this report that tax is stated to work little or no hardship on small business." No statement even similar to this appears in the report.

The report simply points out that the benefits from abandoning the tax went overwhelmingly to big business. In 1952, corporations having less than $25,000 of net income paid out less than one-tenth of 1 percent of their taxable income to this tax; corporations having more than $1 million of net income paid 80 percent of all the excess profits taxes. Furthermore, abolition of the tax encouraged the big-business price increases which are being referred to collectively, and politely, as inflation.

This report does not recommend reenactment of the excess-profits tax. It recommends a modification of the corporate income tax to make this tax less uneven and less discriminatory in its impact, and the report recommends several other measures to give small business tax relief. I would like to hope that we may yet get support from the minority members of the committee, for small business tax relief, even half as enthusiastic as they gave to removal of the excess-profits tax.

STOCK PRICES AND BUSINESS FAILURES

This report points to a number of symptoms of the unevenness of the recent business boom. One fact pointed out is that, between the third quarter of 1953 and the third quarter of 1956, big business stock prices were rising rapidly while small-business failures were also rising rapidly.

The minority views, on this point, have the report uttering absurdities it does not even suggest. But that is not important. The important thing here is that the minority views take a firm position that the causal relationship between big business stock prices and small business failures is remote. And if the minority will stick by their guns on this point they can help bring about a change in the economic theories now guiding the administrative agencies, particularly the SBA—see, for example, page 122. This, it seems to me, is in clear agreement with a basic thesis of the whole report, which is that policies to make the giant corporations more prosperous are not necessarily the best or most direct ways of aiding small business.

PROFIT RATES

The minority takes two contradictory positions with reference to the report's discussion of profit rates, both of which are equally fantastic. One is that, while profit rates have gone up for the big corporations and down for the small corporations, this creates a better climate for small business, since it will encourage small firms to grow (although the evidence is that it is encouraging small firms to go out of business).

The minority's second view also is unique. This is that profit rates for larger and smaller corporations really cannot be compared. This comes as a rather startling idea, after reports of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and even the Small Business Administration, have, after all of these years, been making these very comparisons.

Then the minority statement hits on a unique idea for a statistical device which would produce an inflated picture of small business profits, and it concludes that because the majority had not thought of this scheme and arranged an original research project to put it into effect, this factor is ignored in the report. The absurdities which would result from such a scheme have been discussed by economic researchers. See, for example, W. L. Crum, Corporate Size and Earning Power, page 308.

The factor which has been ignored is a suggestion that the majority should have made arrangements to obtain unpublished data for officers' compensation and then added these data into profits, ignoring both commonsense and standard practices among business and economic researchers.

The minority's proposal that salaries paid to officers should be treated as profits will, if it succeeds, result in even further tax inequalities for small corporations—unless, of course, all executive salaries are treated as profits.

INCREASING CONCENTRATION OF MANUFACTURING

In 1951, corporations with more than $100 million of assets owned 47 percent of all the assets of all manufacturing corporations; in 1956, this proportion had risen to 59 percent. Asset data are presented in the report for each corporate size group.

The minority views say this comparison ignores the inflationary factor. There is a penny's worth of truth in this criticism; with rising costs there would be a tendency for the average asset size to shift upward.

But if this factor is to be called on to explain the shifts, where, then, are the increased assets in the one-fourth million dollars to $1 million asset size group which are supposed to result from the upward shift of firms previously having less than one-fourth million dollars of assets? There were actually less assets in this size group in 1956 than in 1951. The same question could be asked about every other size group. Even the in-

crease in assets in the $50 million to $100 million size group, 25 percent, was less than the increase for all manufacturing corporations, 31 percent.

While the inflationary factor would indeed tend to shift assets upward, increased speedup amortizations coming into effect during this period tend to offset the increased costs. Furthermore, these speedup amortization privileges are disproportionately high among the top corporations and hence tend to understate increases in concentration.

It is remarkable how finding minor statistical imperfections leaves the minority views perfectly content—and happy to sweep the larger truths under the rug. The conclusion stated in the report still stands:

If this rate continues without acceleration * * * then all assets of all manufacturing corporations will be concentrated in corporations with more than $100 million each, in the course of a little over 18 years.

BUSINESS POPULATION

This report compares the number of business firms in operation with the real volume of all business done in the country. Thus it points out, considering both business failures and new firms being organized, a net disappearance of 126,000 firms by the beginning of 1956. The minority dismisses this as a slight matter.

BUSINESS INCORPORATION

This report contains a great many statistics. I come now to the single error which the minority found in the page proof to support their sweeping charges of inaccuracy, nonfactual, and so forth. The report stated that about 10 percent of the business firms are incorporated. It has been corrected to read "about 13 percent," which is the correct computation based on latest Department of Commerce estimates—see United States Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, April 1955, page 15, and June 1956, page 8. The minority asserts the figure should be 15 percent, but they have indicated no source of their estimate.

Contrary to the minority assertion, the report does not of course take the position that either 10 percent, 13 percent, or 15 percent of the business population is insignificant. On the contrary, it does not even agree with the minority that the disappearance of 126,000 small businesses is a slight matter.

A purpose of the report's discussion of both rates of incorporation and the relationship between business population and the volume of business done, was to correct some of the misleading comparisons which are being used to give widespread impressions of glowing small business health. While the report does not identify the origins of misleading comparisons, it is evident that the minority has recognized their origins.

Thus, SBA's sixth semiannual report to Congress opens with such statements as:

Since 1939 the increase in the business population has kept pace with the increase in the Nation's human population. (6th semiannual report of the Small Business Administration for 6 months ending June 30, 1956, to Congress, p. 5.)

which, for reasons discussed in our final report, is not a proper basis for determining whether or not business opportunity has been preserved.

And again, SBA's report states:

While the increase in new business incorporations beginning with 1954 has been due partly to changes in the tax law of benefit to enterprises which use the corporate form, a primary factor has been the continuing opportunities for a large number of new business. (Ibid. at p. 6.)

Are we then to adopt SBA's usual method of emphasizing new business incorporations (and not substracting corporate failures) as a weathervane pointing to increasing numbers of new businesses in order to avoid the minority's cries of "economic distortions??' I think not.

BUSINESS FAILURES

Business failures rose last year (1956) to the highest toll in 15 years. According to Dun & Bradstreet figures 16 percent more businesses failed last year than in 1955. Yet the "Minority Views" state that the committee's report "professes grave concern" and adds that this concern "seems to be of a partisan rather than an economic origin." Then these "views" revert to the average failure rate over the past 56 years as the rate at which concern can properly be expressed.

The history of how it came to be discovered that SBA's "normal" base for comparing business failures was, in fact, this 56-year rate is discussed in the report. I am surprised that the minority would bring up this matter again, to say nothing of using it as a basis for crying "distortions" and "partisanship". In my answer to the political attack which the minority made on the majority, in the House last spring, I gave an analysis of the partisan aspect of these statistics, which I repeat here:

The main thing wrong about comparing the present rate of business failures with the average for the past 56 years is that things which happened 56 years ago, or 35 years ago, or even 10 years ago, are not particularly relevant to our problem today. We are primarily concerned, I should think, with current trends. Certainly if we had been properly concerned about small business 56 years ago, and about the growing monopolization of American business 56 years ago, or even 35 years ago, we would not have many of the most serious problems facing us today.

Since the gentleman * * * has brought up this comparison with ancient history, however, I might also point out that a second thing which is wrong with comparing present and recent rates of small-business failures with the average for the past 56 years, is that this span of history includes too many years of prosperity under Republican administrations.

In the past 56 years, 1900 through 1955, there were 28 years under Democratic administrations and 28 years under Republican administrations.

* * * * *

If we take the Dun & Bradstreet failure rates as they are reported, we find that the average rate of business failures during the 28 years of Republican "peace and prosperity" has been about 80 percent higher than the rate of business failures in the 28 years of Democratic administrations; and if we make certain necessary adjustments in Dun's figures, which I shall explain in a moment, we find that small business has failed at a rate of 88 percent higher in the 28 Republican years than in the 28 Democratic years.

* * * * *

I should think my Republican colleagues on the Small Business Committee would be in some wise concerned about the presently increasing failures among small business, and would perhaps offer some suggestion for getting at the root of these failures; but it appears that their only concern is in helping Mr. Barnes in his propagandizing against small business. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 6, pp. 8309–8310.)

THE LATE HONORABLE CARL RICHARD CHINDBLOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1956, during the adjournment of Congress, former Representative Carl Richard Chindblom passed away suddenly in Chicago at the age of 85. He was a friend who was both near and dear to me. For 14 years, from 1919 to 1933, our departed colleague ably served as the Republican Representative of what was at that time the 10th District of Illinois.

Congressman Chindblom, a lifelong resident of Chicago, had a distinguished career as a public servant—a product of Chicago, from the time of his birth on December 21, 1870. After attending Chicago public schools, he graduated from Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., in 1890, with the bachelor of arts degree, and from Kent College of Law, Lake Forest University, Chicago, in 1898, with the bachelor of laws degree. From 1893 to 1896, Mr. Chindblom taught in Martin Luther College, Chicago.

He began the active practice of law in Chicago in 1900 and was a member of the law firm of Brecher and Chindblom. From 1906 to 1910 he was a member of the Cook County Board of Commissioners and was Cook County attorney from 1912 to 1914. He later served as master in chancery of the Circuit Court of Cook County, 1916 to 1918.

On April 27, 1907, our late colleague married Christine Nilsson, of Minneapolis. His bride of some 49 years followed him in death on the very same day, September 12, 1956.

Representative Chindblom's whole life was one of deep convictions, of confidence in the ultimate victory of what he believed to be right. When convinced of the rightness of a cause, he stood firm, even when he stood alone. He was a man of faith. He had faith in himself; he had faith in his fellow man. That faith in others led them to put their trust in him.

He had a great faith in representative government with his life dedicated to its preservation and its betterment. His compass was the Constitution of his country; his ultimate goal, a better life for his fellow man. To paraphrase Emerson—governments have their development in the moral identity and character of men.

During life, Carl Chindblom architectured an everlasting memorial. His services to his fellow man through his community, his State, and his country

will go on and on. Many hereafter will gain inspiration to serve faithfully the American ideals to which he gave many years of devotion.

As a friend and the present Congressman, it is a proud pleasure to offer my sympathy to his remaining loved ones.

THE LATE HONORABLE ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the course of the tribute being paid to the late Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, or, if they so desire, at any other time in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the passing of our friend and colleague, the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, my fellow Congressman from New Mexico. His sudden and untimely death on November 7, 1956, the day following his reelection to an eighth term in this honorable body, took from our membership a man greatly beloved and most highly esteemed.

The people of the State of New Mexico, who had imposed in Congressman FERNANDEZ their complete and unswerving confidence during his many years in public office, were indeed shocked and grieved at their loss. I know full well that the people of the Nation and the Members of this House share that grief.

It was my privilege and good fortune to work closely for several terms in the Congress with this dedicated and God-fearing man. He was truly a Christian gentleman in all that the term implies. He was a man highly respected for his fine qualities and courageous adherence to his convictions. As a legislator in his State and in the Congress, his course held true to what he believed to be the best interests of those whom he served. He gained great satisfaction from achieving those things which were beneficial to his State and Nation which he served with utmost fidelity and sincerity. His record of service on the Appropriations Committee won for him the confidence and high regard of every member of that committee.

He was a good father and husband, rearing and educating a fine family. His 5 children and 7 grandchildren have been given a heritage of honor that will continue for them throughout their lives. His highly-respected wife, Cleo Chavez, whom he married in 1924, has suffered a bereavement that all of us share. This gracious lady has, however, a memory to carry through her life which must be to her most gratifying—the memory of a man who rose from a humble beginning to become one of New Mexico's greatest citizens.

The career of Congressman FERNANDEZ epitomizes the true American tradition of opportunity for those who are willing to strive for it. Born in Springer, N. Mex., in 1902, he worked his way through school and became a court reporter. He then studied law and was admitted to the practice of law in New Mexico in 1931. He served as assistant district attorney, chief tax attorney for the State, and first assistant attorney general and a member of the New Mexico Public Service Commission before being elected to the Congress in 1942. His service in the Congress was continuous from that date until his death. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, a self-made man, built a record of public service of which any man could justly be proud.

My words cannot adequately measure the immensity of the loss we have suffered. The legislative accomplishments of Congressman FERNANDEZ will be of lasting benefit to the people and the Nation he loved and so ably served. Beyond question, he has been taken unto his Maker as one worthy of "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

I know the entire membership of this House joins with me and his myriad other friends in an expression of deepest sympathy to his wife and family. May God repose his soul in the peace he so truly merits for his many good works among men.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly moved and deeply distressed when word reached me last fall that ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was no longer with us. Losing him is like losing a member of one's own family. I served in the Congress with him for a long time. I knew him intimately for his fine qualities, his gentle, pleasant manner and his studious and capable devotion to his duties.

New Mexico has lost an outstanding son and we in the Congress have lost an able colleague who was both beloved and respected. I am sure that each of us will long cherish the memories he left with us.

My earnest sympathies are extended to Mrs. Fernandez and their sons and daughters. Their loss is great indeed and we pray that God will comfort and strengthen them in this trying period.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my late friend ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ.

When I came to Washington, he had been a Member for 11 years, and I was soon honored to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations and especially on the Subcommittee on Mutual Security where we enjoyed a close relationship. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was a fine Christian man with many laudable characteristics. Outstanding to me was his consideration for his fellow man. He was a man without cant, without hate; he had a profound respect for the integrity of his fellow man, and he, in turn, deservedly earned their respect. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was a true public servant, constant to the principles he believed right even under the most adverse circumstances. His example should be an inspiration to every Member of the House. His achievements would have been impossible if he had not possessed a rugged sense of integrity, an unflinching devotion to duty and family, and an unusual sense of humor.

The United States and especially New Mexico have suffered a severe loss for ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was in the prime of life when he was called. I have lost a true friend. To his lovely wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my very dear personal friend, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, who passed away last November, just after being reelected to Congress for his eighth consecutive term.

I had the honor of serving with Mr. FERNANDEZ on various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for many years. We made many congressional inspection tours together. May I say that I have never known a more sincere and capable public servant than my friend, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ. His devotion to duty as a member of this House, his great capacity for work and his record of accomplishment were an inspiration to me. His leadership was a fine example to all who knew and served with him in this House and on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERNANDEZ was one of the best friends I had. As the occupant of a neighboring congressional office I had an opportunity to become well acquainted with Mr. FERNANDEZ, and I shall always cherish the friendship which developed between us. His cheerful personality and his willingness to counsel with and assist his friends in any problem endeared Mr. FERNANDEZ to all who knew him.

Mr. FERNANDEZ will be greatly missed by his colleagues in the Congress and on the Committee on Appropriations. I am grieved at the loss of a loyal and true friend, and I should like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife, Mrs. Cleo Fernandez, and to their five wonderful children.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with ANTONIO FERNANDEZ on several subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations at one time or another during his service on that committee. I always found him to be on the job and attending to every responsibility that he had to meet. He was one of the most friendly men and one of the hardest workers I have met here, and it is going to be difficult to replace him.

It was my privilege to know him quite well and to have quite a good deal to do with him. I appraise him as one of the best men I have ever known.

I extend to Mrs. Fernandez and her family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Representative ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, affectionately known as Tony to his friends,

has left a place which will be difficult to fill. Tony was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and those of us who worked with him knew him for what he really was—a quiet, efficient, loyal, serious-minded, hard-working Member of the House of Representatives.

No one could ask for finer cooperation than that which he gave as a member of our Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

To reason he would listen, and once convinced of the rightness of his stand he stood firm for his convictions.

Those of us who knew him so well will miss him in our future deliberations, and we will long remember him as we pass by the chair he once so ably filled.

Mr. Speaker, no words of ours can lessen the loss, but to his loved ones our heartfelt sympathy is extended in the sorrowful hours.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cordial personal friendships I have enjoyed during these several terms of membership in this great legislative body was with my great friend Representative ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico. It just seemed to us that we had much in common, not only because of the proximity of our respective States and the problems common to both; but, also because a warm, cordial understanding sprang up quickly between us which made it mutually pleasant for us to discuss basic problems before our beloved Nation. I always found him friendly, humble, learned, and anxious to possess all of the facts and information possible before he came to a conclusion. Many times I would deliberately seek him out on the floor of this Legislative Chamber, or elsewhere, in order to speak with him about some legislative problem or to just visit with him on a friendly basis for at least a few minutes. And, because he was naturally very proud of his distinguished Spanish ancestry, he found a cordial listener in me to the history of the early days of the Southwest when first visited and later inhabited by the Spanish folks and also the folks from Mexico. Being a native son of the Golden State of California myself, his fondness to speak of the friendly, and at the same time the strong traits of the Mexican and Spanish people was a common bond between us. And then, Mr. Speaker, he had such an abiding ambition for the very best for his native State of New Mexico, that it also formed a common bond between us. He for New Mexico and I for California. But, Mr. Speaker, both of us for the United States of America.

I shall never forget it was the good fortune of Mrs. Doyle and myself to be guests in their home in New Mexico just a few weeks before his untimely death. It was, therefore, naturally a great shock to my wife and me to learn so soon after we had visited with them in Santa Fe, N. Mex., that he had passed on on such an untimely occasion and left behind him his lovely wife and splendid children. While my wife and I visited with them and rode with his lovely wife as the auto driver to the historical Indian Taos, having a day's pleasure and information, we learned of their mutual ambition that their children might have the best education and opportunities and that their State might also achieve its rightful place in the progress of all of the States. We learned also from his wife herself of her distinguished ancestry and parentage, and we thus realized we were visiting in the presence of a most distinguished couple and family and in the midst of a community with great historical significance to the progress of the United States toward the west.

And as we visited with them in their community for those 2 days and met many, many people of distinction and also of long acquaintance with them, we heard and observed nothing but expressions of sincere affection and of high regard and respect for both the Congressman and Mrs. Fernandez.

I shall personally continue to miss the real pleasure I always had and the benefit realized from visiting with him and learning from him his considered opinion and the reasons therefor on many of the matters which came before us. My wife and I sincerely, and with understanding and deep feeling, extend our sympathy to his lovely wife and their children.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of the official representatives of this body to attend the last services held for our distinguished colleague, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ. It was a memorable experience to go to his home in Santa Fe and see the old cathedral there filled with his neighbors and friends who came to pay him homage.

Tony, as I got to know him in the past 2 years both in this body and as a congressional neighbor, was a quiet man. He was one of those real gentlemen who do so much to make this a pleasant and agreeable body. Tony, too, was of Spanish descent, of whom we have so many out in the great Southwest. He was one of the few Spanish-speaking persons in this body. In the performance of his duties in the Congress he reflected great credit not only on himself but upon his people in the Southwest.

Tony was not only one of those gentle and industrious men who do so much to make the machinery of the House turn in a quiet and easy way, but, as his colleagues have already said here, he was a real friend. I found he was friendly and helpful to newcomers who entered the Congress. So I will always remember him, as I think all of his friends will, with respectful reverence.

I, too, join my colleagues in expressing my sympathies to his wife and his fine family.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know ANTONIO FERNANDEZ unusually well. Since my return to this body I have missed him greatly.

Inasmuch as I had the honor and privilege of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and inasmuch as that great committee deals with matters of particular interest to the West, such as Indian affairs, irrigation and reclamation matters, and so forth, I learned very shortly after becoming a member of that committee that ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was one of the best authorities in this House on such matters. He taught me a lot. I conferred with him many times.

I was not only impressed with his profound knowledge of those subject matters, as well as others, but I was impressed with his contriteness of heart, his true humility. He was a wise man and a good man, a man of much learning, yet he was somewhat reticent in his attitude. I would say he had one of the finest attitudes I have ever known a person to have. If you asked him a question concerning a matter that he was deeply interested in and conversant with, he never gave a condescending answer, but he always seemed to enjoy imparting the knowledge which he had, and he always treated everyone with whom he dealt as his equal. I have never known a person, I believe, in my life, who was more anxious not only to serve and serve well but to see others serve and serve well. He was a great, unselfish soul, and I miss him greatly. I miss his counsel, his wisdom; I miss his personality, and it is with true sorrow that I now stand here in this House knowing that he has passed on. May God rest his soul in peace. I feel certain that he has earned a place in our heavenly home, because he was, in my judgment, a true Christian gentleman. To his wife and family I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved last November when I read in the Boston papers of the death of our late friend, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, who passed away the day following his reelection to this body. Throughout my years of service in this body there are few men who have impressed themselves more deeply upon the minds of their colleagues than did TONY FERNANDEZ. He commanded our respect because of the contributions he made to the deliberations of this body both in committee and on the floor. There was no harder working Member of this body than TONY FERNANDEZ. But, he profoundly impressed himself upon us because of those fine qualities that he possessed; qualities that Members who have preceded me have so ably and eloquently referred to. He had that quality of kindness. I can see him now with that whimsical smile on his face as we would meet here in the chamber of the House, in the corridors, or in committee rooms or under other conditions as Members meet each other in our daily lives. He was not only kind; he was understanding; he was a man whose mental outlook on life in connection with his fellow man was unlimited in his understanding mind and his profound respect for all of his fellow men. He was a great man in this body; not

great so much as any speeches are concerned but great in the real sense of greatness, in the contributions he made in committee to the production of legislation, much of which was enacted into law, which was of great benefit not only to the people of his State and his area of the country but to the people of our entire country. But, more than being great, TONY FERNANDEZ was a good man. He was good for the reasons which other Members have referred to and which I have briefly stated: his love of his fellow man. TONY FERNANDEZ was good because he had an intense love of God and His law. To his loved ones left behind I join with my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] representing the New Mexico delegation, and all of my colleagues, in extending to Mrs. Fernandez and her loved ones our deep sympathy in her bereavement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my personal tribute of respect to my dear departed friend, TONY FERNANDEZ. He was a great fellow. I had the privilege of having him as a member of the subcommittee of which I served as chairman. No chairman ever had a Member who cooperated more heartily than did Tony.

He was a man of great ability. I enjoyed so much knowing him because he was a man who had a keen sense of humor. It was always a pleasure to be in his company. He contributed greatly to the deliberations not only of our subcommittee but to the work of the entire Committee on Appropriations.

The Congress has lost one of its most valuable Members. His lovely wife has lost a devoted husband. His children have lost a devoted father. I have lost a close friend.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my deepest sympathy at this time to his family and let them know that we, his friends, share their sorrow.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the passing of ANTONIO FERNANDEZ from this body leaves us with a great deal of sadness. As his name indicated, he was a descendant of that group in the southwestern part of the United States who contributed so much to this Nation.

ANTONIO FERNANDEZ made it the hard way. As a self-made man, he experienced the hard knocks of life, and in that way developed the ability to represent well those people who helped to establish the great Southwest.

TONY FERNANDEZ was a personal friend of mine and of many other Members of this Congress. We knew that he was honest, sincere, and trustworthy. Throughout the time we had the privilege of serving with him, we know that his services were in the best interests of the people he represented.

By his death, we in the southwestern part of the United States have lost a great public servant, because he was always working hard and conscientiously to represent those people who had placed their faith and trust in him.

To Mrs. Fernandez and the family I offer my deepest sympathy in their loss. I know that we shall remember TONY FERNANDEZ for many, many years to come.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, late a Member of Congress from New Mexico. My congressional district for many miles joins the State of New Mexico. Geographically, and otherwise, I felt very close to TONY FERNANDEZ during his service here. He was a stalwart citizen, the soul of honor, considerate of his colleagues and everybody else, highly capable and fair in all his dealings.

He was not provincial. He took the broad view. He was a citizen of the United States and the world, not just New Mexico.

TONY FERNANDEZ made a big contribution to the public service in Washington and New Mexico. It lifts my spirits to recall today that so fine a man as TONY FERNANDEZ looked upon me as a friend. I wish to extend words of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Fernandez and the other members of the family.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I pay a tribute of deep respect to TONY FERNANDEZ. He was a gentleman and a capable legislator.

To his wife and family I express my deepest sympathy in the loss of this fine and noble kinsman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who serve in this House grow to learn and to love the individuals with whom we serve. We learn to appreciate those fine men and women who can be trusted. We feel a grief and loss when they are taken from us. TONY FERNANDEZ was a man you could believe in, a hard worker, a first citizen of New Mexico and a first citizen of this Nation of ours. I know every man in this House joins with his family in a feeling of grief at his passing, yet a certain joy that we have been able to associate with so fine a person as TONY FERNANDEZ.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to know ANTONIO FERNANDEZ and to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations. I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in all they have said in respect and honor to a great man. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was truly one of God's great noblemen, and he shall be missed. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family. Not only will he be missed in the great State of New Mexico but those of us in the East and Middle West will also miss his fine service and his contribution to the Government here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this expression of my feeling of deep personal loss over the untimely death of my friend ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ. A beloved Member of this body, Tony had received the day before his death a manifestation of the affection and esteem in which he was held by the people he represented here. He had just been reelected by a record vote in his State. He deserved this honor, because he was one of the finest Members of this House.

TONY FERNANDEZ was my friend. He was a kind, generous, and thoughtful man. He was a diligent worker and outstanding member of the great Committee on Appropriations. This House will miss him. His State has lost an outstanding Representative. His country has lost a devoted public servant.

To his lovely wife and children and all his loved ones, I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a great phrase, coming to us from the wisdom of the East, is: The saddest words are "might have been."

This was the thought that came to me as I walked into this Chamber today, knowing that we would attempt to express our feeling of loss that ANTONIO FERNANDEZ would not be with us. Sad words, indeed. He might have been with us to our profit and pleasure and to the benefit of his State and his country. But it is not so. A Higher Power has called him home.

As we are saddened that TONY FERNANDEZ is not with us, so must the angels be happy that he is safe on shore. It must be that there is a promise of many tomorrows for such men as TONY FERNANDEZ.

I have seen other faces fade from this assembly and other faces fade from the close circle of friends, yet I do not recall any instance where a greater loss was felt.

A better companion than ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, for work or pleasure, could not be found. I worked with TONY FERNANDEZ is one cause and another from the beginning of my service in Congress. I shall miss his companionship, his counsel, his help in the days to come. No matter how pressing the time, how dark the prospect, how unpleasant the task, TONY FERNANDEZ was there with a smile, with fresh determination, with a new approach. His hand and his help is well recorded in much legislation now enrolled as law. His unflagging devotion to his constituency, not only those of his own district, which was the whole State of New Mexico, but those of the rest of the Nation, was a marvel of our democratic

system. It is in men like ANTONIO FERNANDEZ that representative government acquires worth and meaning. His love and respect for his fellow man was such that he could not act but in their interest, labor for their welfare.

I could talk on at great length about the virtues of TONY FERNANDEZ and still not repeat any of them. Still it seems to me that their genius was his charity and the humility by which he gave life to the thought that only in serving others do we find perfect happiness.

By humility we mean not merely a lack of posturing and an absence of vanity but a real and living force animated and illuminated by a just and contrite heart. Man's rewards our late colleague wore lightly, knowing that though they might fill the sail of vanity, they could not push man through the ebbing tide of evil. The promised reward of his God he did not seek like the publican that it might be worn proudly as a badge before men. Not TONY FERNANDEZ. Rather he kept his eye on the sparrow; on the faint outline of virtue's path, and if reward came, it came by grace, for the best was barely virtue in his judgment of himself.

Enough is attempted to use words to convey the transcendent spirit of ANTONIO FERNANDEZ. To his wife, to his five children, and to the rest of his family I can only say that even a small time with such a man is to be treasured beyond its measure in years. I extend to them every sympathy in their loss.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, when we parted in this very Chamber last August there was no way of knowing that I and so many of his other colleagues would never see TONY FERNANDEZ again. This day revives the deep sense of loss which was ours on receiving word of his untimely passing.

TONY FERNANDEZ served the people of his State well in this House; he was a man of ability, of integrity, and a man whose vision extended to the broad horizons. His activities in the field of medical research and public health generally were devoted and effective. A true son of the West, he fought hard for the development of the great State in which he was born and in which he maintained his residence all of his life.

TONY FERNANDEZ was a kind and helpful man; I have personal experience attesting to that developed over the years. My sincerest condolences go to Mrs. Fernandez and to their children.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I learned with genuine sorrow that our friend and colleague, TONY FERNANDEZ, had left us.

I enjoyed working with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and had grown to know him as a real friend, particularly as the result of the bountiful hospitality which he and Mrs. Fernandez were good enough to extend to me and the members of my family in the course of a visit to New Mexico some years ago.

A lawyer, assistant district attorney, member of the State legislature, chief tax attorney for the State tax commission, first assistant attorney general of New Mexico, member of the New Mexico Public Service Commission, a Member of this House for 14 years, he made a real contribution to his State and to the country.

I know that Mrs. Fernandez and all the members of his fine family have our heartfelt sympathy. We shall miss him.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying homage to my dear friend and fellow committee member, the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ.

I was deeply moved and profoundly shocked to learn of the passing of my dear friend on the very day that the people of New Mexico reaffirmed their confidence in his integrity and legislative ability. I was further saddened as I recalled the many occasions on which Mr. FERNANDEZ went out of his way to right a wrong or to assist someone in difficulty. The friendship and wise counsel of the gentleman from New Mexico will be sorely missed and I extend to the Fernandez family my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. GATHINGS. It was my distinct pleasure to know and work with ANTONIO FERNANDEZ for several years in this House. It was a wholesome and refreshing experience to have known him. He generated confidence by his every act or move. I was shocked and grieved to learn of his passing.

The pressure of the heavy tasks which were his during the turbulent war years and the more recent period of international unrest could have, to a degree, affected his health and shortened his span of years. He fulfilled every responsibility with which he was confronted or called upon to perform. He did it well, too. He was never too busy to be cheerful and helpful to those of us with whom he was associated. He must have been carrying heavy burdens, but always, he greeted you with a genuine and pleasing smile. He made life easier and more pleasant for me. His attitude was kindly and inspiring.

"TONY" FERNANDEZ spoke rarely on the floor of the House. He felt that a person should be well versed on a subject before being in a position to make a real contribution and taking up the time of the membership in the discussion on the floor. When he spoke, the House listened. He was the master of the situation. He knew the topic far better than his listeners and his remarks were always enlightening every time he made a floor speech.

Two or three years ago, the House was debating the question of extending the authority to negotiate an international agreement with Mexico for the recruiting of Mexican nationals for seasonal farm work. The debate became heated. There seemed to be quite a lot of misapprehension about the proposal in the minds of some of the Members. At least there was until TONY FERNANDEZ explained the program, its purposes, and method of administration. His speech removed the doubt and was largely instrumental in the bill being passed.

I will miss a true friend in his passing.

I would like to express to Mrs. Fernandez and his fine children my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I knew TONY FERNANDEZ as a loyal friend and effective member of our great legislative body. I knew him as a special pleader for the American Indian, for any group of our citizenry in distress. He was a most wholesome down-to-death Representative. He had a keen native intuition, a remarkable sense of foresight, and a quick power of analysis. He was clean and he was bright. I shall miss him greatly and my heart goes out to Mrs. Fernandez and the family in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late departed friend and colleague, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico. This body and our country have lost a dedicated public servant in his passing from our midst.

It has been my good fortune to work with Congressman FERNANDEZ as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have admired his diligence and application to duty. He was always faithful and had a conscientious regard for his responsibility. He was devoted to the people of his district and State and although not a "pork barrel" politician, he was always insisting that New Mexico receive its just share of appropriated funds for public works programs and projects in his area. He made splendid contributions to his State and certainly was a valued member of the Committee on Appropriations and of this House.

We had a special area of friendship and interest inasmuch as Tony was a graduate of Cumberland University's School of Law, which is located in Lebanon, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent. Cumberland has produced many great lawyers and legislators and Congressman FERNANDEZ was certainly numbered among this outstanding group of alumni. He often spoke to me of Cumberland and of Tennessee. I shall miss him and I join with my colleagues in expressing to his wife and the members of his family my most sincere expression of sympathy in the loss which they have sustained.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, no man who served in the House was held in deeper affection and respect than TONY FERNANDEZ, and his untimely passing was a profound shock to us all.

Tony served on several committees with me prior to the Reorganization Act of 1946, and on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after 1946 and until he became a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He outranked me in service and was one place ahead of me on the Interior Committee. He mentioned several times, with some regret, I thought, that he would have been chairman of Interior had he not moved. But his service on Appropriations was needed to keep Western representation on that important committee in balance with other areas of the United States. And Tony, responding to what he regarded as his public duty, gave up the opportunity for an early chairmanship to move to a committee where he had to start at the bottom and work the long way up.

This was characteristic of TONY FERNANDEZ. He always placed his public

duty first. Moreover, his kind and gentle nature led him to place consideration for others first as a matter of practice. He never engaged in personal controversy, never said an unkind word publicly or privately, about anyone, and never had an enemy. He was a fine and gentle man and as genuine a friend as I have ever known. His death is a grievous personal loss to me.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our departed colleague ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ. I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of his passing last November.

Since my district borders on the State of New Mexico there were naturally many matters of common interest to both Mr. FERNANDEZ and myself. I always found him very cooperative and helpful. We worked very closely together on legislation which involved either New Mexico or Colorado.

The State of New Mexico has suffered a great loss in the passing of Mr. FERNANDEZ. He worked diligently and unceasingly for the progress and development of his State. I know of the high esteem in which he was held by the people of New Mexico, who appreciated his efforts in their behalf, as demonstrated by his reelection every 2 years.

I greatly enjoyed my friendship with TONY FERNANDEZ, and his fine family. We talked frequently about mutual friends in our States. He had relatives in my hometown of Trinidad and was well known there.

TONY FERNANDEZ was a delightful person to know. He was always of the same happy disposition. I never heard him speak ill of anyone. He had the happy faculty of making and retaining friends. It was a real privilege and pleasure for me to serve with him in the House over a period of many years. I shall greatly miss him.

I wish to again extend my deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Fernandez and the other members of the family.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to a good friend and highly capable legislator, Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico, whose untimely death occurred on Wednesday, November 7, 1956.

It was my privilege to have enjoyed a very close and warm friendship with Tony, as he was affectionately called, since I first came to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress. We served together for years on the House Appropriations Committee where he displayed outstanding ability and had the confidence of and was held in the highest esteem by all the members of the committee, from both sides of the aisle.

ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was of great and noble character, and he likewise enjoyed not only in his home State of New Mexico, not only in this body, who knew him so well, but throughout the Nation, a splendid reputation for honesty, intelligence, and ability.

ANTONIO FERNANDEZ was a most diligent Member and was the author of many proposals which were of great benefit to the people of the State of New Mexico. Men like TONY FERNANDEZ are sadly missed, and we do well to honor the memory of one who served his country and the people so well. I shall always think of him with fond memories and again express my personal regret at the untimely loss of this great American, and to his dear wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in offering sincere sympathy to the family of our friend and colleague, ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, on their great loss.

It was a privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations and his conscientious service will remain an inspiration to those of us who worked with him. In committee, as on the floor of the House, he devoted his efforts to the welfare of all of the people of the United States while ably representing the people of New Mexico.

Unassuming and mild mannered, Representative FERNANDEZ was a working legislator who knew and loved the work of the House of Representatives. His long experience in public service gave him an insight into both the legislative and administrative functions of representative government.

Our lives have been enriched by having known him and his record of service will always remain a source of pride to his family and the people of New Mexico.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can add very little to the eloquent and fully deserved tributes which have been paid to our departed colleague, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico, but I wish to associate myself with all that has been said about him here this afternoon. It was never my privilege to serve with him on a committee but I have noted his remarkable accomplishments here on the floor of the House in behalf of his constituency. He was affable, friendly, kindly, and always considerate. He was persuasive, forceful, and convincing in debate. His people will miss him as we, here in the House, will miss his many kindnesses. I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my personal tribute to those of my colleagues, for my dear departed friend and colleague, the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, late Congressman from New Mexico.

We were close personal friends and, with our families, shared many happy social hours together.

In the Congress Tony was always ready to give the needed helping hand when legislation of potential benefits to the people of Puerto Rico was at issue. Many times he raised his voice in this Chamber on their behalf. Many times he took up their fight as his fight and in addition to the great effort that he made in Congress on behalf of the people from New Mexico, whom he so well represented here. Thus it is that the people of Puerto Rico are fully aware of their great loss through his untimely death. And I must express my personal feeling that the great Halls of Congress seem just a little empty now.

But ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ was more than a good friend. He was a great American in every sense of the word; he was a true statesman and a fine legislator. His influence was felt in the discussions of important matters before the powerful Committee on Appropriations, of which he was a member. His counsel was often sought. I know that I personally sought his advice on many occasions.

Though the late Representative from New Mexico is no longer present, the example that he set here is one to follow; the example of honesty, integrity, courage, patriotism, and perseverance in the pursuit of the wisest possible defense and development of our country. His name is on many of the bills which became law and which are important to the Nation and to the people of New Mexico. His example of unswerving devotion to God and country is one which we must not forget. His extreme generosity and selflessness are going to be remembered, together with all of the other fine qualities which made ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, the late Representative from New Mexico, the statesman, TONY FERNANDEZ, the man, our colleague, and our friend.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, aspiration toward freedom and independence strike chords deep in American traditions and affections. Ukrainian Independence Day, January 22, with its long story of a people's courageous struggle toward independence is an occasion not for celebration but for sober thought.

In the 18th century when we were fighting for independence and working out national unity, the Ukraine, called Little Russia or South Russia was clinging to customs, folklore, songs, national costumes to maintain a cultural or social national identity.

During the 1840's students and teachers at the University of Kiev dreamed of an independent Republic of Ukraine.

The stirrings of nationality were suppressed by the czars from time to time. Despite discouragements a Revolutionary Ukrainian Party emerged in 1899. From this came many of the Ukrainian leaders of World War I.

January 22, 1918, the Ukraine was proclaimed a sovereign independent state, recognized as such by Lenin. While preaching self-determination, however, he prepared to invade the Ukraine on the pretext that the Ukraine was acting in a bourgeois manner and could not be accepted as an empowered representative of the laboring and exploited masses of the Ukraine. Thus the Bolshevik government of Russia became a military aggressor against the young Republic it had helped to create.

The lure was in the fact that the Ukraine with its rich soil, coal, and iron could produce the food and the sinews of industry which Moscow needed. Today

despite Moscow's mismanagement the Ukraine, the breadbasket and sugar bowl of the Russian empire, accounts for 70 percent of its sugar production; 23 percent of its grains; 30 percent of its hogs; 51 percent of its coal; 50 percent of its iron ore; 53 percent of its coke.

The story is a sordid one of a people gallantly fighting to maintain its identity against a colonialism which seeks to control by genocide. Russian reports admit that blood was spilled for every pound of grain collected.

In 1921 a change of policy was announced. Concessions were to be made to the aspirations of the Ukrainian people. "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" completely independent, not a part of the U. S. S. R. but of equal status, was proclaimed. Preservation of formal state sovereignty turned out to be but a clever ruse for Russian domination.

Ukrainian enslavement in the U. S. S. R. is primarily the complete economic exploitation of her resources, her labor power for the benefit of Russia. Economic exploitation has been followed by a complete Russification of schools. Russian industry is financed with Ukrainian money, built by Ukrainian manpower. Meanwhile Ukrainians are deported for construction of the White Sea-Baltic, Moscow-Volga Canals, or to "cultivate" more lands in Siberia. To carry out this latter project, some 800,000 young Ukrainians are being forced to "volunteer" for this pioneering service.

Perhaps the story of Hungary makes that of the Ukraine more poignant at this time.

On this anniversary occasion we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States raise our voices again to proclaim the stout and eternal friendship of the people of the United States to the courageous and freedom-devoted people of the Ukraine. Confidently we look forward to the happy day not far away when the Ukraine will be a free, an independent, and a sovereign nation, our brother republic linked with our own great Republic in our common destiny to carry mankind to greater heights of government for, of, and by the people to any this old world of ours has ever known. Meanwhile to the people of the Ukraine we send the message of a brother that with them always are our prayers and our will to stand behind them in the achievement of the destiny of God's purpose for a great and a free Ukraine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate Ukrainian Independence Day with added feeling and a renewed appreciation for the suffering and heroism of the Ukrainian people. For we are now seeing in Hungary a new example of the ruthlessness of Soviet totalitarianism as it seeks to maintain its stranglehold on a freedom-loving people by brutality and terror. The Ukrainian people have long endured this Russian persecution and have been able to live in freedom for only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920. Since then they have been a constant reminder of Soviet imperialism and disregard for the feelings of nationalism among peoples that border the Russian state. The experience of the Ukrainian nation shows all the world the hypocrisy of the Soviet claims to be the champion of national self-determination and the advocate of freedom for all peoples under colonial rule. The fate of the Ukrainian Republic and of Hungary must make it clear that Russia favors freedom for oppressed peoples only when it can be made to result in the extension of Soviet power abroad. This is what she now seeks to do in the Middle East and in Asia.

The American people, throughout their history, have been true advocates of freedom for captive peoples. The continued growth of democracy in America is influenced by our defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. For, if Americans ever close their ears to the cries of others who call out in the name of freedom they will also become insensitive to the threats to individual liberty which might arise in their own communities. But beyond this, the love of freedom for all mankind is one of the bases of the American democratic code of life to which each of us declares our loyalty in our own heart.

Today, the United States must seize every possible opportunity to give substance to this ideal. Finally, each of us should devote something of his personal resources to extending aid to the oppressed peoples of the Russian-controlled lands wherever this is possible. On this day our thoughts and hopes go out in particular to you whose homeland, the Ukraine, has actually been swallowed up in the Soviet Union and to hope and pray for its early day of deliverance.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may have permission to address the House for 5 minutes on the subject of Ukrainian Independence Day, and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 39th anniversary of the proclamation declaring the Ukraine a free republic. However, the spirit on this anniversary day is somewhat dimmed for us in the free world because we know the Ukraine today is not free in fact. In this area, as in other areas of Eastern Europe, the peoples are held captive within the imperialist grip of Communist Russia. Nevertheless, we also know the spirit of freedom still burns clear for these oppressed peoples, constantly demonstrated by their unceasing resistance to the forced collectivization of their Red masters. As a tribute to that spirit, several Members of the United States Congress are now recommending the passage of a resolution authorizing that the President "issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies." I wish to join in urging the passage of this resolution to show the Ukrainian peoples that we understand their plight and have not forgotten them.

JUDICIAL REFORM

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills designed to carry out the President's budget message recommendations for clearing up congestion in the Nation's courts. The President's recommendations grew out of proposals of the Judicial Conference and the Attorney General's Conference on Court Congestion and Delay in Litigation.

The bills are designed to alleviate the interminable and unnecessary delay in disposition of suits in our Federal courts today.

One bill would confer on the President power to appoint a new Federal judge in any district where a sitting judge reached the age of 70 and continued on the bench, providing the need for such a judge was certified by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The other bill would bar Federal chief judges of circuit and district courts from serving in that capacity after reaching the age of 70.

On the opening day of this Congress I introduced a joint resolution to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address annually a joint session of Congress. The President also manifested his deep interest in such legislation in his budget message.

The validity and vitality—in fact, the very existence—of a free nation often depend in great measure on the extent to which its judicial arm properly performs its functions. Irreparable harm to our form of government can result from a lack of judicial efficiency.

In these times of change and progress, it is well that we reexamine our legal house. In some fields it is clear that it needs some housecleaning. Chief among the areas in which judicial reform is needed is in the time element involved in disposing of cases in our courts.

It has been truly said that tardy justice is often no justice at all. In many cases delay has clearly thwarted reparation for wrongs. Needy parties may be forced to make unjust settlements rather than wait for disposition of their cases. Or witnesses may die or become unavailable. Certainly their memories are dimmed by the passage of time.

In recent years, under the leadership of the Justice Department, many improvements have been made in Federal jurisdictions in disposing of litigation.

But the Department has wisely realized that to be successful, attack on court congestion must be undertaken at all jurisdictional levels. For it is clear that this problem can only be cleared up by a nationwide program for all our courts.

It is to be hoped that the organized approach fostered by the Justice Department—as implemented by Congress—can succeed where earnest but localized efforts in the past have failed.

The Department, working closely with the Judicial Conference and the Attorney General's Conference on Court Congestion and Delay in Litigation, has come up with some very worthwhile and workable suggestions to help alleviate this situation. They have been recommended by the President in his Budget Message.

The suggestion to invite the Chief Justice to address Congress is legislation which I have been urging for the last 2 years. I first introduced a resolution on this subject on January 20, 1955.

An address by the Chief Justice can do much to present to the Congress and the American people the problems and progress being made by the Judiciary and to present recommendations of the Judicial Conference. The appearance of the Chief Justice before Congress would also serve the less tangible, but equally important, purpose of enlightening and reassuring the people of our country and of inspiring Members of Congress to continue their fealty to the Constitution, which we are pledged to protect and enrich.

I am extremely hopeful that all of these worthy measures, given the additional impetus of the President's blessing, will become the law of the land before this session ends.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the text of the proposed bills is attached:

A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge under certain circumstances

Be it enacted, etc., That section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof an additional subsection reading as follows:

"(c) Whenever any district judge appointed to hold office during good behavior attains the age of 70 years and neither resigns nor retires, and the Judicial Conference of the United States certifies to the President that there is need for an additional judge in that district, the President may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge for such district. If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation or retirement of the judge who had attained the age of 70 years and had neither resigned nor retired shall not be filled."

A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 45 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The circuit judge in regular active service who is senior in commission and under 70 years of age shall be the chief judge of the circuit. If all the circuit judges in regular active service are 70 years of age or older the youngest shall act as chief judge until a judge has been appointed and qualified who is under 70 years of age."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 136 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In each district having more than 1 judge the district judge in regular active service who is senior in commission and under 70 years of age shall be the chief judge of the district court. If all the district judges in regular active service are 70 years of age or older the youngest shall act as chief judge until a judge has been appointed and qualified who is under 70 years of age."

SEC. 3. The amendments to sections 45 and 136 of title 28 of the United States Code made by this act shall take effect at the expiration of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois for 1 hour on February 14 and on February 15.

Mr. PATMAN for 15 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYLE, on today, for 30 minutes, on the late Honorable Carl Richard Chindblom.

Mr. DEMPSEY, on today, for 1 hour, on the late Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ.

Mr. HOFFMAN, on Thursday, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. GRANAHAN.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. PFOST.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. MAY and to include an article on Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BONNER.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. BOW).

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI).

Mr. DINGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

345. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 57th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Dallas, Tex., August 12–17, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

346. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

348. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 752 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the appointment of secretaries and law clerks by district judges"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

349. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 18th Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, etc., pursuant to section 16 of Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Sixth Annual Report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3349. A bill to provide for the reorganization of administrative procedures and practices in Government operations for improving their economy and efficiency; to provide for the organization of machinery to coordinate and administer such procedures and related practices; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 3350. A bill to provide for the reorganization of administrative procedures and

practices in Government operations for improving their economy and efficiency; to provide for the organization of machinery to coordinate and administer such procedures and related practices; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3351. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bagpipes, kilts, sporrans, and other accessories on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3352. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to reduce the rate of interest which mortgages insured thereunder may bear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3353. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a new program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 3354. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3355. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 3356. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3357. A bill to amend section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3358. A bill to supplement the land-grant provisions of the Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3359. A bill to amend and improve the child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3360. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3361. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 265), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3362. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3365. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3366. A bill to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, and Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 1837 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civilian cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3369. A bill relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3370. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3371. A bill to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3372. A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3373. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 3374. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3375. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce, to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 3376. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act to provide for the inclusion in the Federal-aid highway system of certain parkways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3377. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 3378. A bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3379. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3380. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for amounts paid into a public retirement fund by an employee of the Federal Government or of a State or local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3382. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3383. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3384. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 3385. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Soquel Creek, Santa Cruz County, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3386. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal post office and office building in San Jose, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 3387. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3388. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3389. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3390. A bill to provide for the issuance of a new series of 2½-percent tax-exempt United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3391. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3392. A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3393. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3394. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3395. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 3396. A bill to authorize the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to charter production cost insurance associations to insure farmers against losses resulting from farming operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3397. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act

of 1954 to remove certain restrictions on the sale in foreign countries of surplus cotton and tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3398. A bill to provide for the construction of buildings for post-office purposes and for the replacement of inadequate postal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3399. A bill to amend the law relating to residence of assistant assessors for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 3400. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3401. A bill to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3402. A bill to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3403. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 3404. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3405. A bill to provide for a dual banking system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 3406. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 3407. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3408. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3409. A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3410. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3411. A bill relating to the naturalization of certain merchant seamen who later serve in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3412. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3413. A bill to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 3414. A bill to exempt certain nonprofit organizations from the tax imposed on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3415. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3416. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3417. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 3418. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3419. A bill to authorize contributions to colleges and universities to provide buildings for instruction in military science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3420. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain deductions from a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3421. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3422. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide a 25-percent increase in widows' annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3423. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to correct certain deficiencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 3424. A bill to create a Department of Transportation and Communications, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 3425. A bill to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3426. A bill to provide for payment of the balance due on joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3427. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate 1 week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution designating the 3d day of February 1957 as a day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. Res. 118. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Independent Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the house of representatives, State Legislature of Oklahoma, requesting that the President and Congress make use of every avenue open that would aid the State of Oklahoma in developing fully its potential water resources, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to extending the duck season in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3429. A bill for the relief of Thomas V. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:
H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Joseph Rusk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ANFUSO:
H. R. 3431. A bill for the relief of Fitzgerald Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3432. A bill for the relief of Jozef Golinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3433. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Zanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Dezso Kremer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3435. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Fiordaliso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. AYRES:
H. R. 3436. A bill for the relief of Stavros Kyriakides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BARING:
H. R. 3437. A bill for the relief of Monica Zatica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BOLAND:
H. R. 3438. A bill for the relief of George Nicholas Pvlakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DORN of New York:
H. R. 3439. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Abdul Kerim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FOGARTY:
H. R. 3441. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yo Seup Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HYDE:
H. R. 3442. A bill for the relief of Dosinda Gonzalez Mendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KEATING:
H. R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Turri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 3444. A bill for the relief of Ma Pong Hi (Suzie); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KING:
H. R. 3445. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara M. Stamat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LATHAM:
H. R. 3446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fakhiri and Keyounars Vaziri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3447. A bill for the relief of Jahangir Afkhami and Fatima Afkhami Mohajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3448. A bill for the relief of Chang Yak Shing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3449. A bill for the relief of Alexander S. Prager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Catherine Mokides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Mario Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of William S. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Yolanda Dondero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Panagis Antippas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Pasqualina and Michele D'Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LIPSCOMB:
H. R. 3456. A bill for the relief of Otis D. Shreves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3457. A bill for the relief of Eustace Victor Phelan (also known as Robert Phelan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McMILLAN:
H. R. 3458. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
H. R. 3459. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1956, entitled "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
H. R. 3460. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Cornelia W. Heiss, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MASON:
H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of citizens of the State of Illinois and of the State of New Jersey, organizers and owners of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Co.'s; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. METCALF:
H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Constantinos G. Diapoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Filberto Barajas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Yurdann Atakan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Anthony Flambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of Keiko Asaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:
H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Khalil S. A. Aoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SHEEHAN:
H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3469. A bill for the relief of James McSweeney (Sweeney); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cortina Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 3471. A bill for the relief of the London Guarantee & Accident Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TELLER:
H. R. 3472. A bill for the relief of Ivo Bukvic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. UTT:
H. R. 3473. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of California to the Pine Tree Lumber Co., Escondido, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. YOUNGER:
H. R. 3474. A bill for the relief of Annabelle Pidlaoan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ZELENKO:
H. R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Maria Pszenyczny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Julius Maranze, of Dayton, Ohio, urging the Defense Department to provide drinking water free of fluoride chemicals for those employees and servicemen at military installations who feel such chemicals would be injurious to their health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of executive director, American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, San Francisco, Calif., requesting that all appropriations to the Committee on Un-American Activities be stopped and, at a proper time, to dissolve the committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in honoring the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine.

In these times of worldwide struggle of free men against those who would dominate others, and enforce their rule upon the subjugated peoples, it is fitting that we recall this historic milestone in man's ageless effort to gain and preserve freedom and liberty.

The example of the heroic people of the Ukraine, who 39 years ago established a free Republic, should strengthen us today in our determination to combat totalitarian aggression and oppression.

The anniversary of that day is also a fitting occasion for us to extend our sympathy to the Ukrainian people who are today suffering in Communist bondage and to express the hope that the day will soon arrive when they will regain their proper place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues in supporting a resolution offered on this floor to declare the 22d of January as Ukrainian Independence Day, to be observed with proper and fitting ceremonies throughout our land. It is my hope this resolution will receive prompt and favorable consideration from this body.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all national origins, but of one faith, faith in the cause of freedom, salute the people of the Ukraine on the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1918.

This year we can look ahead with greater hope that the day may not be too far distant when all the people of the enslaved nations may once again be liberated. The brave patriots of Hungary

are only the latest manifestation of the unceasing yearning for freedom which some day will surely prevail in all the lands behind the Iron Curtain.

We must recognize, of course, that the real liberation of the Ukrainian people can never come about through the cataclysm of atomic war. Peace, not war, is the true ally of freedom.

But we must recognize, too, that we in the Western World cannot in good conscience sit idly by and wait for the Russian Communist tyranny to collapse. America must continue to take the lead in building the strength and unity of the free world so that Russia is confronted by an irresistible force of world opinion and determination working for freedom.

To this end we reaffirm our dedication as we pay homage to all of Ukrainian birth and descent, both those in our own United States and those still engulfed by Soviet tyranny in their native land.

Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep satisfaction that I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the fact that the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, the newly elected Democratic Senator from my State of Idaho, was one of the cosponsors of the bill to authorize a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, which was introduced in the Senate on Monday. The Hells Canyon bill now has Idaho sponsorship in both the House and the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD excerpts from the remarks Senator CHURCH made at the time he announced he was joining with 27 other Members on cosponsoring this measure, which is of such immense significance to the development of the Pacific Northwest and would provide a source of power for the defense of our country. Senator CHURCH said:

A high dam at Hells Canyon would prove a great stimulant to the entire Northwest. It would bring to Idaho, in generous measure, benefits of the kind that have enriched neighboring States from such mighty Government dams as Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Shasta, and Hoover.

The bill meets three requirements which are necessary to fully protect Idaho's interests (1) unequivocal protection for present and future water rights upstream on the Snake River and its tributaries, (2) an adequate allotment of firm power for industrial development in Idaho, and (3) provision for making power revenues available to help defray the cost of future reclamation projects in Idaho.

The building of the Hells Canyon Dam is consistent with my belief that our water resources must not be wastefully exploited. Today we are consuming our fuels at a fearful rate. Falling water is our only inexhaustible source of power, and we must, therefore, efficiently develop our rivers. This we owe, not only to ourselves, but to our children and our grandchildren, because dams once built last not for decades, but for centuries. The Hells Canyon site is one of those that calls for the construction of a high dam of the kind that only the Government can build. These dams have proved good investments. They have paid for themselves with interest. They have produced the maximum amount of electricity at the lowest feasible rates. They have promoted new industrial growth, and they furnish us a means, in time, to help defray the costs of future reclamation projects upon which the growth of the West and the country itself will come more and more to depend. Idaho, which draws so much of its daily nourishment from such reclamation development, should know well the contribution that Government dams have made to the building of the West.

The Federal Administrative Practice Reorganization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled "The Federal Administrative Practice Reorganization Act." The subject matters covered by this bill pertain to the operation of Government machinery in matters affecting the rights, duties, and privileges of citizens in day-to-day dealings with Federal agencies and these matters are, in my judgment, of great interest to the Congress.

This bill would implement proposals approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association—a policy-making body that includes representatives of major State and local bar associations throughout the country. These proposals deal with four subjects pertaining to agency proceedings; namely, first, conflict of interest and right of representation; second, status of all civilian lawyers in Government; third, the organization of an independent hearing officer system; and, fourth, the establishment of an independent agency to administer these three functions and to coordinate practice and procedure matters of uniform application to all Federal agencies. The Congress will recall that these subjects were included in the March 1955 report of the Hoover Commission and two of the subjects were included in the contemporaneous report of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure. The American Bar Association's special committee on legal services and procedure has independently evaluated these proposals and after intensive studies has drafted the bill which I now submit which it proposes as a broad legislative program on these subjects.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

The bill would provide for the reorganization of procedures and practice in Government operations by establishing an Office of Federal Administrative Practice, an independent agency, which would provide for centralized coordination of procedure and practice matters; administer an improved hearing-commissioner program; establish a new legal-career system for Government legal services and provide for the admission and control of practice and representation of persons in the conduct of proceedings or matters before the various Federal agencies.

The Office of Federal Administrative Practice, under title I, would be headed by a Director and Deputy Director appointed by the President, with consent of the Senate, for terms of 10 years and 5 years respectively. The Office would have three major divisions administered by Assistant Directors; namely, Division of Administrative Procedure, Division of Hearing Commissioners, and Division of Government Practice. The Director would report directly to the Congress on any matter for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Government operations in the area of procedures and practice. The Office mainly would operate at interagency level and would provide machinery for the coordination and direction of procedures and practice on matters of concern horizontally and uniformly among the agencies. It would perform needed and indispensable service to citizens, concerns, and industries in their day-to-day dealings with agencies of Government.

Title II would provide new and improved measures for the recruitment, appointment, and administration of Hearing Commissioners. Trial Examiners now serving would be given Hearing Commissioner status and continued duty with the agencies where they now serve.

Title III would establish for the first time a Legal Career Service for civilian lawyers in Government service and promote the efficiency of Government legal services. The present system is haphazard and confused. The proposed bill would facilitate the recruitment, employment, and retention of lawyers of outstanding character and ability in the legal-career service, and assure the performance of the legal work of the Government in accordance with high professional standards.

Title IV assures the right of persons to representation in matters or proceedings before Government agencies. It provides for both attorney practice and lay representation and imposes standards of conduct for both in the handling of matters before Government agencies. The bill would assist attorneys throughout the country by providing for centralized admission to practice. Detailed provisions are made for disciplinary proceedings and control of unprofessional conduct, including new provisions on conflict of interest.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine,

and I am very happy to add my voice in commemoration of this date.

The Ukraine in territory and population is the largest non-Russian nation, not only in the primary empire known as the Soviet Union, but also behind the Iron Curtain. The proclamation of the independence of the Ukraine took place on January 22, 1918, after centuries of foreign domination. It is unfortunate indeed that the joy of commemorating that independence today is coupled with so much sorrow. For despite the unrelenting fight on the part of the 40 million occupying the Ukrainian nation against domination, their freedom and liberties have been destroyed by the crushing forces of communism.

We here in America who have been so privileged to enjoy the fruits of freedom cannot help but have our hearts filled with sorrow at the spectacle of tyranny evident in Ukraine.

Nevertheless, we can take hope that the spirit which has characterized the Ukrainian nation will eventually prevail and the Ukraine will again be restored to its rightful place among the family of nations. We salute these brave people in this country, and we extend to them friendship and encouragement of the people here in the United States.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to rise to pay tribute to the people of the Ukraine and their sincere devotion to the spirit of liberty. January 22 marks the 39th anniversary of the day the Ukrainian people declared their independence from foreign despotism. Sad to say, this freedom, so hard won, after years of rule by foreign powers, was lost in 1920.

However, the proof that the 40 million Ukrainian people have not given up this hope, is seen in the recent little noticed reports coming not only from Kiev and other major cities, but from the countryside showing that the Ukrainian people still desire their freedom and are engaged in an actice effort to drive out a hated foreign invader, and restore to themselves the right to determine their own future in the democratic manner. Among instances reported are freedom riots in Kiev requiring Russian tanks and troops to quell the disorders. Other reports show that in the rural area the partisans continue their efforts, destroying bridges and sabotaging railroads and other facilities, and even clashing with Russian troops and police.

I know on this anniversary that all free men join me in looking forward to a time when the Ukrainian people may again celebrate this day as free men in a free land.

Support of 4-Year Term for Representatives to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader News of January 2, 1957, as well as my statement in support of a 4-year term for Representatives to the United States Congress:

[From the Times-Leader News of January 2, 1957]

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR REPRESENTATIVES

As the 85th Congress prepares to convene in Washington tomorrow, many problems, foreign and domestic, loom on the legislative horizon. Let us hope, in its absorption with these challenges, the membership does not neglect to put its own House in order. A good beginning would be the extension of the term of Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

To pave the way for this, a constitutional amendment is necessary, as the 2-year limit was established by the Founding Fathers. That calls for approval of a resolution by two-thirds of the Senate and the House as well as ratification in 7 years by three-fourths of the States, preferably through their legislatures.

Bills have been introduced at every Congress in recent years, but no action has been forthcoming, although it is generally agreed the modernization of the House is long overdue.

There are two schools of thought on the election itself.

One would provide for the election of Members from even and odd numbered districts respectively every 2 years, thus making available to the Congress at all times the services and experience of one-half the membership. At the present time, vacancies in one-third of the Senate seats are filled every 2 years, making for stability since two-thirds carry over. This has obvious advantages.

The other school of thought is that the people should elect the entire House of Representatives in presidential years, so it would be possible to entrust the Government to one party, if that were the desire of the electorate. This would fix responsibility and give the administration a relatively free hand to carry out campaign pledges. While this argument, too, has merit, the majority of proponents of a change favor the election of one-half the membership every 2 years in the interest of efficiency.

The mechanics of the election might be threshed out and, in any event, they are incidental to the main issue—the 4-year term for Representatives.

The House of Representatives occupies a peculiar position in our governmental setup. Whereas the President represents the Nation and Senators the States, the Representatives are regarded as the direct agents of the people. That is why the 2-year term was instituted; the drafters of the Constitution felt Members of the House should be answerable at frequent intervals to constituents.

Times have changed since the early days of our Republic when travel conditions and communications generally were poor. We live not only in a different era, but at a faster pace. The reasons, justifying an accounting of their stewardship every 2 years, no longer obtain.

From a practical point of view, a 2-year term for a freshman Congressman makes it impossible for him to give a great deal of service to his country or district. By the time he learns the ropes, he has to start campaigning for reelection. Even the seasoned veteran is on the job only 1 year out of 2 because of fence-mending chores. With a 4-year term, a Representative would have 3 free years to devote to his duties and possibly an additional 6 months since a longer term would eliminate certain demands on the candidate.

Many individuals with superior qualifications are frightened off now by the prospect of running for office every 2 years because of the physical and financial hardships involved. A 4-year term would be an inducement to many substantial citizens who would not, under any circumstances, consider aspiring to the House under the existing setup.

The country should be allowed to pass judgment on the proposal. We have reason to believe the amendment would be ratified if no gimmicks were attached.

THE CASE FOR A 4-YEAR TERM—CONGRESSMAN FLOOD'S STATEMENT FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Under the American system of government, where Members of Congress represent and reside in States and local districts and depend upon their favor for reelection, the influence of localism is very difficult to escape. Members may aspire to be national statesmen rather than State and local politicians, but few of the former emerge from the fray or long survive the physical and political hazards of legislative life. Some steps might be taken, however, that would encourage the development of national leaders and attitudes.

Longer terms of office for Members of the House of Representatives might tend to increase their independence of local pressures and improve the quality of their service. Under the laws of many States, in order to retain their seats, Congressmen must be active candidates, including the primary and general election, for various periods ranging in length from 3 to 10 months. Coming up for reelection every 2 years, Members are so involved in local politics that it detracts from their ability to function as effective national legislators.

To correct this condition, proposals to amend the Constitution have repeatedly been introduced in Congress since World War I, providing for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives. One of the most active advocates of this change was former Representative Clarence Lea, of California, who also proposed to stagger the congressional elections so that half of the membership of the House would be elected every 2 years. I believe that a 4-year term for Representatives would make a substantial contribution to the efficiency and stability of our Government. The schemes of staggered elections and overlapping terms would also retain that frequency of public expression on a nationwide scale which was contemplated by the authors of the Constitution.

This proposal has received impressive professional support in recent years. The committee on political parties of the American Political Science Association, in its 1950 report, believed it to be desirable to lengthen the term of Representatives to 4 years. "The present term is so short," they said, "that a freshman Member is involved in a campaign for renomination before he knows his job or has had much opportunity to prove his worth to his constituents or his party. A more important consideration is the possible effect upon party unity of synchronizing the terms of Representatives and President."

Political scientists also assert that a 4-year term would, in effect, carry the mandate

given in presidential elections for a sufficient period to test out a foreign policy and avoid the upsets of the midterm elections by the calendar. Students of our political system generally concede that the midterm elections do not turn on national issues to anything like the extent of presidential elections, since the Presidency is not at stake. It is felt, moreover, that the weakness of party discipline would allow a change of sentiment among Members of Congress, so that the 4-year term would not constitute too great a remove from the check of the elected legislative body on foreign policy.

Another point in favor of the longer term is that it would tend to decrease the weight of pressure groups, which now operate effectively in the thinner voting of the midterm elections. The positions of Members of the House of Representatives perpetually in need of running for nomination and election and of keeping up their political fences to the detriment of their national responsibilities might be greatly improved by such an amendment.

Statement by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in Connection With the Introduction of a Joint Resolution for the Establishment of National Defense Transportation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced for appropriate reference a joint resolution calling for the designation of the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day. With the enactment of this resolution, the President will be authorized annually to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, including labor, management, users, and investors, in all communities served by any of the various forms of transportation by land, by sea, and by air, to observe this occasion by appropriate ceremonies which will give full recognition to the importance to every community thereof of our transportation system and the necessity for the maintenance of its facilities in the most effective state of readiness to serve our needs in times of peace and war.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am naturally most directly concerned and familiar with the part played by the American merchant marine as the vital connecting link in the economy and security of the free world. But it is only a link, however vital, which could not serve its purposes, or even survive, without being a part of the great interlocking American transportation system, upon which our high standard of living and expanding economy, as well as our national strength to meet emergency, are based.

It is most appropriate, therefore, that recognition of the true importance and significance of our vigorous transportation system in the community life and security for all our people, and as a bulwark in a national emergency—and for preparedness in the defense of our country—be given in the manner proposed by the joint resolution.

The enactment of the resolution will be tangible proof that the healthy and hard-hitting competition inherent in the American system, is dependent upon our national unity of purpose and the greater good for all.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it was 39 years ago today that the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic was formed by a people whose love of freedom and respect for the inherent dignity of man dated back 1,000 years.

Tragically, the Ukrainian Republic's independence did not long endure. The Ukrainian people became the first victims of the brutal tide of Communist conquest when invading Red Russian armies took over their country and its government in 1920.

Since then, the tide of Communist imperialism has engulfed many free nations until—today—millions upon millions of the earth's peoples are living in a night of terror and oppression behind a wall of totalitarian ideologies which we know as the Iron Curtain.

The 40 million people of the Ukraine know only too bitterly the full meaning of Communist rule. Through the years, their patriots have been liquidated; their population has been purged and decimated by Moscow's periodic genocide programs; their people comprise the leading national component in the Russian slave labor system; their religious beliefs have been trampled upon.

Yet, all of the humiliations, degradations, and blood baths have failed to quench the undying spark of freedom. In the 1940's the Ukrainian insurgent army fought both the Nazis and the Communists; today, it still operates an underground movement of resistance and sabotage. Ukrainian political prisoners have led uprisings in Russia's slave labor camps, and—during the revolt of the Hungarian people last November and December—Ukrainian officers and men in the Red army deserted to join the Hungarian patriots in Budapest.

This strong nationalist feeling which has survived in the Ukraine is one of the vital forces at work beneath the crumbling wall of communistic tyranny. We have seen the same freedom-inspired forces at work, with rising frequency and vigor, in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other captive nations of the Kremlin. Our hearts have gone out to these people, for we know that their hopes and ambitions, their yearnings and struggles are sparked by the same intense desire to be free that inspired our Founding Fathers. And we have wept for the dead patriots on the streets of Posnan and Budapest and prayed for those brave men and women who, against unimaginable odds, are fighting for the cause of free men everywhere in their defiance of the Communist rulers.

We in the free world know how important this fight is. The majority of the population of the Soviet Union—like the Ukrainians—are non-Russian, a factor which comprises the weakest link in Russia's dreams of world conquest. Already, the seeds of revolt which found a fruitful soil in the Ukraine have spread on the winds of human misery to other Iron Curtain countries; and the day will come when Communist Russia will reap the bitter harvest.

That is why I believe we who sit in the Congress of the United States today should join in extending a hand of friendship across the horizons of the world to the people of the Ukraine on their independence day. Such a gesture is a natural expression of the devotion our peoples share for human and national freedom; it will help in some measure, I am certain, sustain and encourage the spirit of freedom among the Ukrainian people as well as all other captive nations.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, each year it is important that we who are fortunately endowed with freedom, remind ourselves of the great numbers of our fellow men throughout the world who do not enjoy the fruits of liberty that we seem to take for granted.

On this day, 38 years ago, the Ukrainian Republic was established as an independent nation. Because of Soviet domination and the distance which separates our nations, we tend to forget that the citizens of the Ukraine still yearn for their freedom and a return to their sovereignty.

We must not lull ourselves into an acceptance of the Ukraine as a mere province of Russia, but rather must remind ourselves that the Ukrainian people are a proud nation and demand the right of self-determination.

Ukrainian nationals constitute the largest percentage of victims of Soviet slave labor and concentration camps. This is an indication of the degree to which underground resistance is alive in the Ukraine. The spirited adherence to religious belief and theological principle in the face of determined Soviet efforts to subjugate the Ukrainian people is another indication of their refusal to be enslaved and exploited.

Therefore, it is fitting that we pause to reflect on this day on the heroic struggle which Ukrainians are waging in their

own way to resist Communist domination and to achieve freedom.

In my district, Americans of Ukrainian descent look with hope to that future day when they may be reunited with their families left behind to carry on the struggle for freedom.

The Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have received many comments and inquiries from my constituents on the Middle East situation. In order to disseminate my views on this matter as widely as possible, I am placing a copy of a form letter I have prepared in answering my constituents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter expressing your views on the Middle East situation. I have received many letters on this matter from my constituents in the St. Louis area expressing their views and asking for mine. Regrettably the press statement I gave setting forth my views has not been printed in the St. Louis newspapers. Accordingly, I have prepared this mimeographed letter so that as many people as possible can have my thinking on the subject. After reading my preliminary views I hope you will give to me your further thinking on the matter. This is a very serious question and we need as much wisdom as we can possibly get in order to arrive at the proper decision.

First, let me state that I highly approve of the method President Eisenhower has adopted in handling this matter. This statement is entirely apart from the substantive question of whether what the President wants to do is wise or unwise.

The President decided to refer this matter with his recommendations for action and the authority he desired to the United States Congress, the representatives of the people of the United States. He did not do as President Truman did in the Korean crisis just proceed with Executive action to become involved militarily in the Korean peninsula. At the time I publicly criticized President Truman for this method of handling the matter which resulted in war. The criticism was not directed to whether we should have resorted to force in Korea at the time we did. The criticism was twofold: 1. The wisdom of the course of action we pursued which led us to the point we reached in Korea. 2. Having reached this point, whether the course of action then taken should have been taken without referring the matter to the Congress.

So I say it is perfectly fair to argue, whichever way you see it, that the course of action that has led us to the point we have reached in the Near East has been wise or unwise. But having reached that point, the question now is: Should the President just go ahead and act as he sees fit without regard to the people's representatives or should he refer the matter to the people's representatives with his recommendations of what to do?

There is no question in my mind but that the President should refer this matter to the Congress. The Constitution vests in the Congress alone the power to declare war and I submit that our constitutional fathers were quite wise in vesting this power in the people's representatives. We can't fight a war successfully without the people behind it. A war which comes about without a referral of the matter to the people's representatives is quite apt to be a war which the people are not behind. By referring the matter to Congress we do two things: 1. We give ourselves an opportunity for getting more brainpower applied to the subject. 2. We deal the people into the matter so that after the decision is reached by the basic method in a Republic, that is by majority vote of the people's representatives, we have the people's support.

The very fact that all of you have written to me on this subject * * * some pro and some con * * * some just wanting information, indicates the merits of this procedure. Your thoughts, your reasons mean a great deal to me and the thoughts and reasons presented to my colleagues in the Congress by their constituents mean a great deal to them. Your collective thoughts go to help in knowing whether the people of this Nation will be behind the Executive in the course of action he has suggested.

Both the House and the Senate Foreign Affairs Committees are holding public hearings and executive sessions on this matter. The testimony of what I trust are the best minds in the country is being heard on this matter. Most of this testimony is available to the public. The hearings will be printed and published. Before we are done with this matter we should know a great deal more than we do now.

What is the decision? I am waiting for the studies to be complete and to hear the recommendations of the members of the two committees. My present thinking is this: I believe peace in the Middle East is very important to the welfare of the non-Communist world including the United States. Temporary peace may be had through force of arms, but attainment of justice alone can insure permanent peace. Under United States doctrine there is hope of attaining justice, or at least progress toward justice. People are not prone to resort to force even where there is gross injustice if they see that peaceful means exist whereby progress toward justice may be made. If Soviet Russia takes over the Middle East all hope of progress toward justice will disappear and though peace may be maintained perhaps more firmly under communism because of the belief of the proponents of that form of society of using brutal force, in the long run the lid will be blown off and the most horrible of all warfare, revolution, will take hold of the area.

Soviet Russia is a threat in the Near East. However, Soviet Russia in my judgment is not really strong, but essentially quite weak. If the Soviet leaders thought they could move into this area without a fight * * * as they thought they could in South Korea or as they thought they could for a short time in Formosa * * * they would move. If on the other hand they know if they move they will face a fight, being weaker than the United States they will not move and risk such a fight.

The Executive has warned Russia about any movement in the Near East. However, if the Congress adds to this Executive warning its warning (if the people believe that is the right course of action) then I think there is no question that peace will be maintained in the Middle East.

Now just a word about attaining justice in the Near East. I thought the Eisenhower administration was quite right in opposing Israel, France, and Great Britain's action in Suez. This is no way to go about attaining justice. On the other hand I think Nasser's position is wrong and untenable. No nation has a right, in justice, through arbitrary action to so adversely affect the economy and living standards of so many other people and this is what Egypt under Nasser is doing to over 200 million people in Western Europe not to mention many millions of people in India and the rest of Asia who depend upon the free flow of commerce through the Suez. It is important that either Nasser see the injustice of his position or that the Egyptian people see it. It is also important in moving toward justice to do something about the problems of Israel. Israel is quite right in complaining against Egypt's action in not permitting her ships through the Suez. But the problems of Israel in relation to the Arab States are much deeper than this. We must do something to move toward attaining some justice in this deep and complicated matter.

How we solve the deeper problems of attaining justice so that we can have lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be solved now or in a few months. The issue right now is do we have enough faith in mankind's ability to solve these problems peaceably in the long run? If we have this faith we must maintain temporary peace so that this progress toward justice can be brought about.

I conclude by saying it was a great day for government of, by, and for the people when President Eisenhower decided to lay these issues before the people's representatives so that they and the people they represent could become part of the decision. This all Americans should take joy in, whether their views are for the President's proposals to the Congress or against them. Unless new facts and arguments I have not heard are forthcoming, I stand quite strongly behind the President's proposals for maintaining peace in the Middle East.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Capitol Hill To Have Its Own Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Unit Composed of Eligible Members of Congress, Staff Assistants, and Capitol Hill Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, composite Company 5–63 for Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers will be established in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, January 24, 1957. Members of the company will be reservists attached to the Congress of the United States, and the drill sessions will be held in the Caucus Room of the Old House Office Building. Members and staff assistants who are reservists in ready status or S–1 status are eligible.

Scheduled drills will be held on Thursdays from 0830 to 0930. The drill program will cover lectures on subjects of national and international importance, as well as naval subjects that will be of substantial value to the members.

Periods of group training may be arranged whereby members may participate in this type of training on ships of the Operational Development Force and Fleet ships. Group training consists of 1 or 2 days active duty for training without pay. Normal active duty for training for a 2-week period each year

with pay for ready reservists and without pay for other categories will be available at a variety of activities.

The scheduled drills coupled with active duty for training will be such as to permit members of the company to acquire sufficient points to constitute a satisfactory Federal year of service under the requirements of Public Law No. 810.

The company will be under the command of Capt. J. E. VAN ZANDT, U. S. N. R., brigade commander of nonpay companies, Washington, D. C., and will be under the immediate sponsorship of the Office of Legislative Liaison.

Anniversary of Polish Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who are Americans of Polish descent, and, indeed, to all free men, January 22 brings bitter sweet memories.

Throughout history the people of Poland have spent almost all their time fighting foreign invaders. Indeed, much of Poland's recent history has been spent under the heel of one oppressor or another. This sad fact has neither dulled the desire of Poles to be free nor has it destroyed their will to fight, and to die when necessary, to maintain their freedom and national identity. For centuries the Polish people have clung devoutly to their church as a symbol of their national identity, and have remained Polish citizens of a Polish nation, despite continued attempts to Austrianize, Russianize, Germanize, or now to communize them. These barbarous attempts have taken many brutal forms, with exile, death, fine, imprisonment, and property confiscation on a mass scale used to accomplish this end. The use of the Polish language and its teaching in the schools was outlawed by foreign governments. Teaching of Polish history and membership in Polish cultural and historical societies were prohibited.

As often as circumstances permitted, the Polish people manifested their love for freedom by bloody and often unsuccessful revolts against hated foreign rulers. Such an insurrection occurred on January 22, 1863. In a limited sense, it, like many other revolts, was a failure, not for want of courage or a will to be free, for of those priceless commodities Poles have always had plenty. Rather it failed from lack of support without, and from lack of the equipment to fight fully equipped and trained armies. Cruel treatment for the Polish patriots followed, mass exile and the murdering of whole villages. But the will to be free lived on in the Polish people of that day as it does in 1957.

In a greater sense it was a success, for it manifested not only to Poles, but to world, the unbreakable will of the Polish nation to be free. It maintained within the hearts and minds of Poles everywhere, that priceless desire for freedom which triumphed after World War I, when Poland, after centuries of partition and repression, won her freedom.

It is not lost on us that the struggle of the Polish people at Poznan have a close parallel in the insurrection of 1863, and that that struggle may well result again in a free Poland, if we in America and other lands help these brave people in their unending struggle for self-determination.

Thirty-ninth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, America has profited greatly from the contributions of people from many lands who have come to our shores in search of freedom and opportunity. We Americans, regardless of our national origins, should observe the significant anniversaries in the history of people who have helped to make this Nation great. Such an occasion we mark today.

Today, 39 years ago, the people of the Ukraine formed the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. This should be a bright and happy day for these people, whose separate, distinctive, and proud national history dates back to the ninth century. But unfortunately there is little cause for celebration on this January 22.

Destroyed by the advance of invading Russian Communist armies in 1920, the independent government of the Ukraine has since been wiped out by the despotic rule of the men in the Kremlin.

However, this oppressive yoke of Soviet tyranny has not destroyed the will to be free and the ancient yearnings for independence of the Ukrainian people. Bloody massacres, yearly purges, and deportations to Siberia lend mute testimony to the manner in which the Soviets have attempted to stamp out this ferment of freedom. Recent reports, filtering through the Iron Curtain, indicate something of the magnitude of this potentially explosive force. Most recently we have heard of attempts to hinder Red efforts to stamp out the brave revolt in Budapest.

Although within the realms of a realistic foreign policy the United States cannot despatch military forces to drive the Red oppressors from the Ukraine, we can continue to do much to remind these people that their plight is not forgotten. In doing so, we can hope, pray and plan for the day when the Ukrainian people will be free. And in doing so we will be aiding a people whose representatives have given much of their unique background to America.

In my home city of Rochester I have witnessed at first hand the numerous ways in which these fine people have contributed of their rich cultural and political heritage to the enrichment of the local scene. They have become strong, loyal, and alert American citizens, yet they continue to practice many of their time-honored musical and other national activities. More than that, our country has profited from the love of freedom and devotion to God manifested by these Americans of Ukrainian descent.

America is surely a finer land today because of the many ways in which these people have given of their talents and heritage to our country.

By giving concrete expression today to our mutual belief in the principles of liberty and justice, basic to both the American and Ukrainian character, we give assurance to those still behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten. It is my sincere hope that these fundamental ideals will in the not too distant future triumph, and that a new and brighter Ukrainian Independence Day will soon be upon us.

A New American Policy for the Middle East—a Proposal Made by Congressman Brooks Hays on July 5, 1956, 6 Months Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the light of recent developments, a statement I made to the House about the middle eastern situation last July 5 appears relevant. I ask the indulgence of the House in reproducing the remarks I made at that time, as follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST

This general discussion of the benefits of our mutual-security program to our freedom-loving friends and world neighbors should not overlook the existence of various "malignancies" around the globe. Grave dangers exist in the Middle East, and the greatest threat to peace arises there. While strategic considerations are obviously of prime importance, we can readily see that the basic cause of the disturbances is economic. We must, of course, do everything in our power to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the immediate future, but in the long run, peace in the Middle East is dependent on political and economic stability and security. We are prepared to offer the economic and technical assistance that will aid in gradually raising the living conditions of the area to an adequate level. In the meantime, we shall maintain an attitude of friendship to all the peoples of the region, seeking to arrive at a peaceful and equitable settlement of Arab-Israeli differences through the United Nations. Above all, we will strive to repel the penetration of Communist influences which seek to inflame passions and stir up enmities. There is no other course available to us that will achieve these ends better than contributing to the establishment of strong independent nations, whose peoples are secure, well trained, and well fed.

Segregation in the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Shreveport, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently much agitation and severe criticism of the Veterans' Administration has been caused by the integration policy of the Administration in the Shreveport, La., Veterans Hospital. This policy was established under an Executive order and covers all veterans' hospitals in the United States. To put this matter in its right perspective, I reproduce a telegram from the Veterans' Administration below:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Federal Building, Shreveport, La.:

In reply to your telegram of December 4 in September 1953 all VA hospitals where segregation then existed including Shreveport were verbally instructed by VA's central office in Washington to end segregation practices as quickly as possible keeping uppermost in mind the well-being of patients. These instructions were issued in conformance with the administrations objective to eliminate segregation practices on Federal property.

HIGLEY,
DMS, Veterans' Administration,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

On January 7, 1957, and then again on January 14, 1957, Mr. John Reynolds, of Homer, La., made certain statements referring to my colleagues Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, of the Fifth Congressional District, Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, and myself. The general purport of these remarks can be obtained from the article appearing in the January 7, 1957, and January 14, 1957, issues of the Shreveport Journal. I quote one paragraph from the January 7, 1957, Shreveport Journal article:

One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS of the Fourth District, Dr. GEORGE S. LONG of the 8th and OTTO PASSMAN of the 5th, were invited to a meeting and notified of the order. Reynolds said it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were apprised of the situation. "At any rate, I found nothing about it in the newspapers," he remarked.

When these two articles were called to my attention, I wired Mr. John Reynolds, as follows:

Reference articles appearing in Shreveport Journal January 7 and January 14, 1957, regarding Executive order from White House on segregation dated 1953, and its application to the Shreveport VA Hospital. Statements attributed to you in articles January 7, reiterated January 14, are vague, misleading, false and untrue. My position on segregation is well known and is set forth in southern manifesto which I signed and in many subsequent statements and speeches in which I strongly support segregation in both schools and hospitals. You owe me personally a full apology and you owe the public a retraction of this statement and I trust that you will make them both immediately in the same manner as the two statements attributed to you.

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

At the same time, my colleague Dr. GEORGE LONG wrote Mr. John Reynolds, Homer, La., as follows:

Mr. JOHN REYNOLDS,
Attorney at Law,
Homer, La.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I have read closely the article entitled "Negro Inspector Keeps Vigil on VA Integration," which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, January 7, 1957:

"One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS, of the Fourth District; Dr. GEORGE S. LONG, of the Eighth; and OTTO PASSMAN, of the Fifth were invited to a meeting and notified of the order. Reynolds said it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were apprised of the situation. 'At any rate, I found nothing about it in the newspapers,' he remarked."

I have always taken a strong stand on segregation and have so indicated my vigorous disapproval by signing the manifesto against integration along with 100 other Members of Congress. I am for segregation in the schools, hospitals and other places.

I did not receive information or attend any meetings either here in Washington or Louisiana regarding the Executive order of the President, March 1953.

The quoted portion from the article in the Shreveport Journal is most misleading, and I consider an apology to me is in order for having made such a false and unwarranted statement without any foundation whatsoever.

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress.

Shortly thereafter, Congressman OTTO PASSMAN wired Mr. John Reynolds as follows:

Reference the article that appeared in the Shreveport Journal, January 7, 1957, relative to Eisenhower's VA directive on segregation and the public statement that I was apprised of the situation is misleading, false and unwarranted. My position on segregation is well known. I refer you to my signature on the manifesto and susequent statements, as well as activity and public statements on the subject. You owe me a public apology. I trust it will be made through the same media that carried the false statement about me.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

We also sent the following letter signed jointly by Congressmen OTTO PASSMAN, Dr. GEORGE S. LONG, and myself to Mr. John Reynolds; and this letter reads as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1957.

Mr. JOHN REYNOLDS, *Attorney,*
Homer, La.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: We, the undersigned Members of Congress from Louisiana, have just read in the January 7, 1957, Shreveport Journal an article entitled, "Legion Committeemen Amazed—Negro Inspector Keeps Vigil on VA Integration." In the course of this article, after saying that two things have particularly amazed you about public apathy, you are quoted as follows:

"One was Hinds' report that before the VA directive for the integration was placed in effect, the three area Congressmen, OVERTON BROOKS, of the Fourth District; Dr. GEORGE S. LONG, of the Eighth; and OTTO PASSMAN, of the Fifth, were invited to a meeting and notified of the order (integration order)." The article further states, Reynolds states, "it was his understanding that they made no objection at that time although they were apprised of the situation. 'At any rate I found nothing about it in the newspapers,' he remarked."

We, the undersigned, jointly wish to state that none of us has any recollection of being notified of the Executive order of the President of March 1953 under which all VA Hospitals of the United States were integrated and that we, at no time, have gotten together in a joint meeting in Louisiana or elsewhere to be formally notified of such order or to discuss the effect of this order. Since there was no meeting and no notice, no quotation as to what occurred or was said at the meeting has any validity or truth and we, as Members of Congress, are asking you, in the proper way and at the proper time, to make correction of what is now a very misleading statement in the Shreveport Journal of that date attributed to you.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE S. LONG,
OTTO PASSMAN,
OVERTON BROOKS,
Members of Congress.

I have always opposed a breaking down of segregation in the South. I oppose it in the Veterans' Administration and elsewhere. These statements all supported by three Members of Congress should put at rest for all time any charges that I have been lax about opposing the Presidential Executive order on segregation. I shall continue to fight for the maintenance of the Southern Way of Life.

Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years have elapsed since January 22, 1863, but the spirit of freedom represented in the Polish insurrection of 1863 is as much alive today as then. Today, indeed, it is more appropriate than ever that we should mark again this anniversary.

It is striking that 1863 is a significant year in the annals of freedom of both Americans and Poles. For the United States, we look back on the great Emancipation Proclamation of President Abraham Lincoln. For Poland, we recall the gallant efforts of the Polish people to throw off their Russian oppressors—an effort which was barbarously repressed. Yet Polish determination to rise again as a free nation remained unquenched.

Today we see that age-old struggle renewed again. We Americans, whatever our own national origins, are stirred by the deep currents of Polish determination to be a free and independent nation. If we are to be true to our own faith in liberty, we must play a positive role in working for the conditions under

which the Polish people can again seek their own destiny.

Our own determination to do so will be the finest way of insuring that the Polish martyrs of 1863—and of 1956—shall not have lived and died in vain.

How Permanent Can an Emergency Be—Some Observations on the Harmful Effects of the Cabaret Tax on Employment of American Musicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend to my colleagues H. R. 4224 which seeks to repeal the so-called cabaret tax, the only one of the wartime excises remaining at an unrealistic and discriminatory 20 percent level. This resolution is similar to legislation introduced in the 84th Congress by me and some 14 other Members of both Houses of that Congress. Although our efforts to correct the long-standing injustices of this tax on music and musicians had the expressed blessing of fully three-fourths of the Members of both Houses no opportunity was afforded in the 84th Congress to vote upon this matter. I trust that will not be the case in this 85th Congress.

In renewing my efforts to correct this unfair and unremunerative Federal tax policy I am again one of several introducers of remedial legislation. Because the subject matter of my resolution is taxes and tax revenues it properly is referred to the Ways and Means Committee and I should like to say most respectfully to the members of that important committee that what is proposed in H. R. 4224 and companion bills would, in my considered opinion, not deny the Treasury of any material revenues. In short, I am persuaded by able economic research testimony offered before the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Excise Taxes that this so-called cabaret tax is long since revealed as a tax of no-return when its returns are contrasted with accruals from certain substantial gains in employment for musicians, other entertainers and service employees which would result from its repeal.

Even if I were not so persuaded on the subject of tax revenues, Mr. Speaker, I would insist that my H. R. 4224 deserves enactment for at least two other valid reasons.

First, this 20 percent excise is a glaring inequality in our Federal tax structure. When this tax was first levied by a much earlier Congress it was applied as an emergency tax. The promise was that it would be repealed when that wartime emergency passed. That was many, many years ago. Back in 1946 the House of Representatives of the 79th Congress moved in the direction of meeting this pledge when it voted a 50 percent reduction of the cabaret tax. The Senate did not then see fit to concur.

My second valid reason, Mr. Speaker, for seeking the long-delayed repeal of the cabaret tax is because it has been shown to be responsible for fully half of the unemployment that besets the instrumental music profession today. This lack of employment is so pronounced as to threaten the very existence of music. And when we permit a fallacious Federal tax policy to strike at the vitals of a basic culture we are indeed surrendering the main redoubts of our free world to Communist infiltration. It is wholly unrealistic to support cultural programs for winning the hearts and minds of peoples in distant lands while taxing out of existence three-fourths of the businesses which support music employment here at home.

In my State of New Jersey a recent survey covering approximately half of the State was made to determine the music employment potential. Two hundred and eight establishments in the area covered by the survey have either closed their doors, dispensed with musicians entirely or cut down the employment time of musicians. Nine hundred and forty-eight musicians were affected by this curtailment of earning possibilities as well as about six times that number of service employees. Please note, Mr. Speaker, these places did not discontinue the sale of liquor; they only discontinued live musicians. My colleagues report that the same kind of situation exists in most other States.

Until the cabaret tax forced so many of them out of business, hotel dine-and-dance rooms provided our young people with safe, sane places to dance. Now they frequent places that should be out of bounds for them. Let us repeal the cabaret tax before it makes a very real contribution to juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have shied away from adopting this legislation partly because its name suggests luxurious living and has about it the smell of liquor. But hiding our heads has not decreased high living nor the consumption of liquor. I notice no such squeamishness on the part of the National Federation of Music Clubs, the Music Educators National Conference, Department of Music of the National Education Association, the National Music Council, and the American Federation of Musicians. These groups recognize, as we should, that the cabaret tax is rapidly downgrading music from its rightful status as a vocation to an avocation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for a majority in both Houses in urging that H. R. 4224 shall be brought to a vote in this session of the Congress.

The American Federation of Musicians feels, as a result of studies it has made, that 25,000 jobs have been lost because of this unfair and unnecessary tax and has long sought passage of legislation to remove this unfair tax.

I would like to include here an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Aiding the Arts" which comments on the lack of support by our rich Nation of our own cultural activities:

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1957]

AIDING THE ARTS

The proposal of the Canadian Government to establish a $50 million fund for development of the arts, humanities, and social sciences suggests that a booming material prosperity has not blinded our northern neighbors to the need for national support of cultural activities. The moral for our own country, where the Federal Government does virtually nothing toward domestic encouragement of the arts, is painfully obvious.

Inspired no doubt by the Arts Council of Great Britain, a completely independent but governmentally subsidized body, the Canadians are planning to set up a Canadian council that would provide scholarships and assistance to artists, dancers, musicians, writers, and scholars. Prime Minister St. Laurent has assured Parliament that the council will be above politics. The British model, organized more than 10 years ago, has shown that governmental patronage of the arts without political interference is a practical and attainable goal. The British Arts Council spends less than a million pounds a year, but its funds serve to encourage the highest standards in the arts; and Americans who have enjoyed the performances of some of the leading British companies—such as Sadler's Wells and Old Vic—have reason to believe that the subsidies, small as they are, are well used.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, one of the few Members of Congress who has consistently shown an interest in these matters, was responsible, with a handful of colleagues, for getting through a measure last year providing governmental support for American artists performing abroad; but this, while highly desirable in itself, must be looked at as primarily a matter of propaganda and cultural exchange: It is ironic, in fact, that this one substantial recent Federal contribution to the arts is limited to backing them outside—not inside—America.

Practically every other civilized country (and some not so civilized) has recognized that the Government has a proper interest in promoting the arts, and in promoting them with cash. It would be a mark of maturity and enlightenment if we were to do the same.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 39th anniversary of the formation of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic, it is fitting that we pay tribute to the Ukrainian people's continuing aspirations for national freedom from the yoke of Russian communism. Within 2 years after the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic, proclaimed on January 22, 1918, the Soviet promises of national self-determination for the Ukrainians and other nationality groups were revealed to be a cruel hoax.

The destruction of the free Ukrainian National Republic in 1920 and the subsequent enslavement of the Ukrainian

people should serve as a tragic warning to colonial peoples currently looking to Moscow for assistance. Similarly, the unrelenting struggle of 40 million Ukrainians against their Russian oppressors shows that the spirit of freedom which inspired the brave Hungarian freedom fighters is not dead even in those areas which have been under the heel of the Communists for over a generation.

What Is Our Policy Toward Russia and Who Is Really Behind It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of our policy toward Russia in the last few months, it might be well to recall or refer to a little-known memorandum written in 1942. When it was written, it appears to have been an exceptionally important memorandum. It seems to have been written on orders of the late Harry Hopkins by one Gen. James H. Burns, and it sets forth the United States policy in regard to Russia, and was distributed, so it is alleged, to every department of Government.

Mr. Speaker, this memo came to my attention in a book called The Enemy at His Back, by Elizabeth Churchill Brown, page 68. There is no title to this memorandum, but it was circulated. However, item (6) could very well be the title—"With Reference to Our Need for Russia as a Real Friend and Customer in the Postwar Period." Item (8) g sums it all up:

> Establish the general policy throughout all United States departments and agencies that Russia must be considered as a real friend and be treated accordingly, and that personnel must be assigned to Russian contacts that are loyal to this concept.

Elizabeth Brown states in her book that this memo was "the basis for our wartime foreign policy, and has remained so even today."

Contrary to the recent statement of Nehru that our foreign policy is "not as rigid as I expected it to be," it would seem that perhaps Mrs. Brown is correct in believing that the Burns memorandum has survived three administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

Many will argue that this could not possibly be our rigid policy because since 1945 we have had the Marshall plan with all its subsequent aliases, such as ERP, ECA, and so forth; the Truman doctrine, the NATO, SEATO; and now the proposed Eisenhower doctrine. But I submit that none of these policies has halted the spread of Russian imperialism, even if at times it seemed delayed. Could it be possible that these outward acts against Russia were no more than "parting grants"? Many of us remember that before South Korea was attacked by North Korea Owen Lattimore wrote in a New York newspaper that there were those in high places in Washington who believed that our policy toward the South Koreans should be "to give them a parting grant of $150 million and let them fall, so it won't look as though we pushed them."

Are all these doctrines, plans, and treaties which have so miserably failed to bring peace to the world, mere sand in our eyes when in fact our true, rigid policy is that "Russia must be considered as a real friend and be treated accordingly," no matter what?

Let us take a bird's eye look at the Hungarian and Middle East situations:

Since 1945 our policy has been to encourage the slaves of Russia in the satellite nations to stand firm against their oppressors. We did this through political platforms, through the Voice of America and with Radio Free Europe, to name a few avenues. Yet when the Hungarians rose in rebellion and fought Russian tanks with bare hands we said to them, "We never told you to revolt, and we warn any other people with such ideas that we won't come to your rescue." The truth is, all our propaganda aimed behind the Iron Curtain does not mean a thing.

Since 1945 observers throughout the world have known of Russia's aims in the Middle East. Newspapermen have given warning time and again and so have many diplomats in our State Department. Yet nothing was done about the seathing caldron from Turkey to Algeria. At the same time the United States taxpayers spent billions of dollars to keep England from going bankrupt after World War II and to help France regain her strength as one of the "big" nations.

So the play starts all over again. We must have another doctrine, commit troops to the Middle East and spend more billions to keep France and England from going bankrupt. Is it a vicious circle?

To return to the Burns memo; it goes on to say that "personnel must be assigned to Russian contacts that are loyal to this concept." Are the policymakers and advisers to the President and Secretary of State loyal to this concept? that is, "we must treat Russia as a real friend?" There must be some reason why we did no more than express outrage and dismay at the massacre of the Hungarians by the Russians. There must be some reason why we denounced our allies, the French and the British, and withheld oil from them for 60 days. There must be some reason why we proposed a doctrine for keeping Russia out of the Middle East now instead of at a time before the Suez crisis arose.

Is the proposed Eisenhower doctrine really going to stop Russian influence in the Middle East, or will it fail as did the ECA, NATO, et cetera, to bring peace to the world?

Has the Burns memorandum, revised to conform to current world situations, been lurking behind all these plans, doctrines, and treaties? Elizabeth Brown, in listing the advisers of President Eisenhower writes:

> Never mentioned but not to be forgotten is the late Harry Hopkins' trusted aide, Gen. James H. Burns, author of the important 1942 memorandum. Like Milton Eisenhower, he has never lost his usefulness in Government during the last 20 years. An old friend of Milton, General Burns is now retired. But his advice is still sought by the official family of the Chief Executive.

Mrs. Brown makes another important point when she says:

> Whoever our President and Secretary of State may be, now and in the future, American people have a right to ask, "Who are your advisers?"

I therefore ask, who are the advisers who so misguided President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in our dealings with the Hungarian revolt and the Middle East fiasco?

Congressman Roosevelt's Statement on House Joint Resolution 117

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of my colleague and by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, at the public hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs during its consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, OF CALIFORNIA, ON EISENHOWER DOCTRINE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, in coming before you and the members of this great committee, I come only because of my deep conviction that the subject matter of the resolution you are considering deeply affects every American that we as Congressmen represent. Each of us individually will have to report and explain our vote on this resolution in its final form. It may well be the most important vote that any of us will be called to cast in this 85th Congress.

It seemed, therefore, that it was my responsibility to raise certain questions before this committee and to ask that certain matters be clarified, both in the presentation of the report of the committee and in explanation on the floor.

First, let me repeat what has been said by others. Is there here a serious and important constitutional question?

Stripped of its frills, divorced from the somewhat tortuous explanations of Secretary of State Dulles, this resolution in the form requested by President Eisenhower boils down to an undated congressional declaration of war to become effective at a date chosen, not by Congress, but by the President, not against a nation named by Congress, but one named by the President and under circumstances not judged by the Congress, but judged solely by the President. In other words, Congress is being asked to abrogate its constitutional function. To justify

this serious step, if, indeed, it can be justified, there must have been made a clear case of great emergency.

To the contrary, Mr. Dulles, in a statement before a joint committee of the other body, indicated only a threat of infiltration and subversion, rather than overt aggression. This threat may very well be, as Secretary Dulles said, the gravest we have faced in 10 years. So far as the American people have been told, and so far as this Member of Congress has been told, the threat on January 15, 1957, is no graver than it was last October.

There may be urgency for military action. If so, the resolution requested does not even itself so indicate, for its language is not the language of a resolution designed to cope with an immediate situation. As described by the President, we shall use armed forces if Soviet Russia, or if a nation dominated by Soviet Russia, attacks a nation in the Midle East, and if that nation in turn requests assistance.

That, to inherit a phrase, is too "iffy."

Whatever it is, it is not a forthright declaration; a declaration suggesting fast, emergency action.

If such an emergency should govern us, then it is up to the administration either to tell us or to act to meet the emergency. Neither course has been followed.

History records many instances where Presidents have used troops, either to fight or to occupy territory, to protect what was considered the vital interest of the United States, without first coming to Congress to seek a conditional declaration of war.

President Truman, who thinks Congress should adopt this resolution, did not come to Congress and request a resolution when the Communists invaded South Korea. Even before the United Nations acted, Mr. Truman ordered naval and air units in the area to help the South Koreans because he believed the vital interests of the United States were threatened.

To carry out that policy, and to meet our commitments to the United Nations, Mr. Truman came to Congress many times for authority and money in connection with the rearmament program.

President Roosevelt issued orders to the Navy to "shoot to kill," and he sent troops to Iceland without coming to Congress, because he felt such action was necessary to protect United States interests in the face of unrestricted U-boat warfare in the Atlantic.

As a result of these and other actions, he had to come to Congress for money and authorizations. Congress generally then ratified what he had done, although one issue of ratification—the draft extension—passed by but one vote.

The Eisenhower administration itself, a few years ago, was thinking of using troops in Indochina. The President said "no," but had he said "yes" at Denver there was no indication he would have come to Congress.

If we have a serious and emergency threat in the Middle East now, or if one develops at some later date, the President can, and should, act immediately. In the absence of proof of immediate emergency at this time, we must assume no urgency is attached to this declaration of war.

Does not the President himself, in the very body of his message to us, indicate the possibility, and to my mind, the desirability of maintaining the constitutional prerogatives of both the executive and legislative? The President stated to us, "If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would, of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session." The words speak for themselves.

And I should like to respectfully suggest that if this committee has facts to justify such a far-reaching proposal, then it should present these facts to the membership of the House—and the American people.

There are other aspects to the military side of the Eisenhower doctrine, quite apart from the fundamental question of necessity.

An important aspect is our ability to fulfill these blanket commitments. If we can't—and there is reason to question our ability—then this becomes nothing but another gigantic bluff, something we cannot afford. If we can afford to add to our existing commitments, I think we need more specific information from our military forces to satisfy the many questions of responsible Congressmen.

The avowed purpose of the administration's military policy, we have been told, is to maintain a force that would not concern itself with brush fires, but would lay back and wait for the big one.

Now it is suggested that we may have to fight a number of brush fires, and presumably, we are not equipped to do so, unless we borrow from the forces earmarked for the big one. Have we cut too deeply to be able to fight a series of brush fires, or will we cut into our forces earmarked for the big one, and then leave our homeland to the mercy of the enemy? The American people are vitally interested and have a great stake in the answers to these questions.

Serious doubts also exist as to the use our military aid may be put to in the Middle East. I wonder whether the nations to whom we give such aid will be able to use it, and if they can, will they use it to repel Communist aggression or to attempt to destroy Israel, the one democratic oasis in the entire area. If so, we are playing directly into the hands of the Communists who depend upon the age-old rivalries to so weaken the area that it can be added to the Kremlin orbit with ease.

The published and spoken words of Colonel Nasser and many other governments of the Middle East, including some of those within the orbit of the Baghdad Pact, have repeatedly declared that their primary aim, now and always, would be to drive the people of Israel into the Mediterranean Sea. I cannot believe that the American people would want to contribute in the slightest manner to such a possible catastrophe. Indeed, I believe they realize the importance to our own country and to the principles of freedom everywhere that Israel shall be protected from aggression and encouraged to contribute her already proven ability to raise the standard of living of all the peoples of the Middle East.

There is ample reason to wonder whether the governments of the Middle East can make most effective use of modern weapons. Egypt had received a number of deliveries of arms from the Communists when the Suez crisis erupted last fall. We all know how easily they were captured by Israeli forces. Are we to allow American arms to fall as easily to Russian domination?

If there is ground for doubting the urgency of the military aspect of the Eisenhower doctrine, there is extremely little justification for speed on the economic side, although, in my opinion, economic aid is the greatest tool we have to build a just peace, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world.

President Eisenhower has already informed us that he will need no additional funds for the current fiscal year. For the two subsequent fiscal years he asks for the modest sum of $400 million. This can be studied later; it can be a part of our regular foreign-aid bill.

But we have been asked now as an emergency proposition, to grant a blank check beyond June 30. Considerable clarification is required. We should know where the money shall be spent, and in what manner. We should be advised what the individual nations of the area want and can use. I suggest no more than an extension of the partnership philosophy into the field of foreign development.

As of now, we are completely in the dark. There has been no official indication of how this economic assistance is to be used.

We have had some speculation that we shall take over the $35 million payments Britain once made to Jordan. There have been vague mentions of the Jordan River development, and some vague press speculation about Aswan Dam in Egypt—and our off-again-on-again tactics in connection with this project contributed a great deal to the current sad state of affairs in the area.

These might be very wonderful projects. Certainly, the harnessing of the Jordan probably could make a tremendous impact on the economy of the area. However, we all agree that it can never go forward until the Arab States and Israel settle all their main problems.

Until those problems are settled, there is little hope that local interest will jell insofar as a Jordan Valley Authority is concerned, because more than one nation is involved. We in the West are more than familiar with the age-old struggle for the waterhole. In Southern California we have recently lost a struggle where water was the central issue, and we can appreciate the forces that make it so difficult for two areas to reach agreement on division of the benefits.

It has been suggested that Congress has no alternative but to go along with the President. We do have an alternative. We can—and I think we should—go to the United Nations and encourage the formation of an adequate security force to handle overt aggression anywhere in the world, and specifically Communist aggression in the Middle East. A congressional expression of opinion might be of tremendous value in promoting such a force.

Once such a force is established we should support it, and provide some of the manpower. One of the weaknesses of the United Nations intervention in Suez was that the Secretary General raised an army without help from us, and in his dealings with Nasser the Egyptians acted in the light of a promise by President Eisenhower that our troops would not be involved. Yet today it is suggested we go it alone.

At the same time we should encourage the various United Nations programs—those in existence as well as proposed—for economic development. Our aid should and must be worked out as part of a joint United Nations program even though we administer it ourselves.

Neither the additional drive we would then develop through the United Nations, nor our own participation, should infringe upon our right to make our own foreign policy, nor to deploy our military forces where national interests require them. But to the greatest extent we should use the United Nations to help us carry out our own policy.

Now if United Nations security forces are inadequate to halt aggression, there is no reason why the United States should not fill the gap in the Middle East or any other area vital to us. But with our full cooperation we increase the chances for the success of a United Nations Security Force.

Similarly in the case of economic development. If assistance is not forthcoming from the United Nations—or if it is blocked by the Soviet group—then the world shall know where responsibility lies. We can stand ready to fill that gap also.

I insist we need a reaffirmation of the position Congress has held traditionally. The President makes foreign policy. The Congress implements that policy. If we disagree, we do not implement. We can and should resolve, we should not—and I hope not—legislate in the field our Constitution says belongs to the responsibility of the President.

A decade ago the foreign policy of this country took an affirmative course in opposing Communist expansion, either by military aggression or by political and economic infiltration. In fact, the very area of our concern now—the Middle East—was a major factor in acceptance of the Truman doctrine, and its implementation by voting assistance to Greece and Turkey.

President Truman, by his deeds in Korea, proclaimed that United States policy included armed intervention if necessary to halt Communist aggression. Congress implemented that decision time after time.

This is a new Congress. An expression, reaffirming the traditional position of previous Congresses and previous Presidents may be of value. The need for such an expression indicates that our traditional opposition to Communist expansion and aggression has been weakened in the most recent past. In fact, it points up the inherent weakness of a policy of drifting and dreaming.

If such a declaration by the Congress is needed to let the world know that this time the administration means it, it should not be in a form so broad, so endless, nor so servile as the President has requested. It should be stated in the time-tested fashion of American policy. Its force will be as strongly deterrent to irresponsible Soviet Russian action and it will encourage, not discourage, those new partners we so earnestly seek in the fight for freedom if they are sincere and trustworthy.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian nation was born, with the hope that it would take its place as a free state among the democracies of the world.

Unfortunately, its liberty was not long lived because by 1920, the Russian Communists had destroyed its independence and subjugated its people.

On this 39th anniversary we should take time to salute those brave souls whose spirits could never be made captive by the slave masters. Our spiritual affinity for these fighters for freedom must never be lessened. We must give them every possible encouragement against the day when they will throw off the yoke of dictators and again take their rightful place among the free nations of the world. I hope that this encouragement on the part of the United States of America to the Ukrainian people, and others similarly situated, will take on a more realistic form than mere words.

Just as in the early days of this Nation we accepted the help of all freedom-loving people to attain our own liberty, we should now offer material support to all of those desiring such help from us.

Including the United Nations' Uniting-for-Peace Procedure in the Middle East Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1957, I was privileged to testify before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs concerning House Joint Resolution 117, relating to economic and military cooperation with nations in the Middle East. My statement, together with excerpts from the questions and answers, follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY S. REUSS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

"The central purpose of House Joint Resolution 117 is to erect a firm deterrent by the United States to Russian or Russian-inspired aggression in the Middle East. I would not weaken that purpose one iota. But the resolution can and should serve not only the central purpose of warning those who do not wish to be our friends, but an important corollary purpose of reassuring those who do want to be our friends that this Nation operates not only from strength but with a deep respect for justice and world order.

"House Joint Resolution 117, in its important section 2, talks of United States armed action that will be consonant with the United Nations Charter and with United Nations actions and recommendations. But in practical effect the resolution in its present form, while it is consonant with the U. N. in the sense that it does not violate the U. N. Charter, operates outside the U. N. and fails to envisage the use of U. N. machinery from which we have much to gain and nothing to lose—the uniting-for-peace procedure.

"Under House Joint Resolution 117, if there is Russian or Russian-inspired armed aggression in the Middle East, the President is authorized to undertake United States armed action on a unilateral basis. True, such unilateral action is consonant with the provisions of article 51 of the U. N. Charter recognizing 'the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense' against armed attack. But it is nonetheless unilateral action. Under House Joint Resolution 117, the United Nations would remain outside the picture. This is so because under article 51 the Security Council can terminate such collective self-defense only when the Security Council has put a stop to the aggression: Russia is obviously going to veto any attempt by the Security Council to stop Russia's own aggression.

"Thus House Joint Resolution 117 envisages action by the United States on an independent basis, and in an area of the world where vital interests of countries other than the United States are at stake. By failing to mention the U. N. General Assembly's uniting-for-peace procedure, it creates the impression that the President would not consider using this procedure. Indeed, his address to the joint session of Congress indicated no intention to employ this U. N. resource.

"The uniting-for-peace procedure was devised as a method of getting around Russia's ability to veto antiaggression action in the Security Council. Action by the General Assembly recommending the use of armed forces by its members against aggression is just as effective, for all practical purposes, as action of the Security Council directing such action. In either case, the sovereign member will have to consent to the United Nations action before it commits its own armed forces. The great difference is that the Assembly procedure requires only a two-thirds majority of the 80 members of the Assembly present and voting, whereas Security Council action can founder on one vote—the Russian.

"This failure of House Joint Resolution 117 to envisage the use of the uniting-for-peace procedure could be cured by a simple amendment adding to section 2 along the following lines:

"'*Provided further*, That the President, as early as possible before or during such employment, shall unless he deems it inadvisable request the United Nations General Assembly, under the uniting-for-peace procedure adopted by the Assembly on November 3, 1950, to recommend to its members their coordinated use of armed force to stop the aggression.'

"The proposed amendment to House Joint Resolution 117 would tell the world right now that our recent policy of working with and trying to strengthen the U. N. is a continuing one. As Secretary Dulles has testified, we are using the U. N. with respect to Egypt, with respect to Hungary, with respect to the Arab refugees, with respect to the Arab-Israeli dispute. We should not now give the impression that we propose to use our Armed Forces in the Middle East without concurrently using our best efforts to invoke the United Nations through its uniting-for-peace procedure.

"Secondly, if and when it became necessary for the President, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 117, to employ United States Armed Forces in the Middle East to stop aggression, successfully invoking the uniting-for-peace procedure would obtain for us the moral and physical backing of the United Nations. Free world opinion would then rally behind the United States effort. And the burden of military action could be spread among the peace-loving nations of the world.

"On the two occasions when the uniting-for-peace procedure was used, it had just this effect. The uniting-for-peace resolution itself, passed during the Korean conflict on November 3, 1950, by a vote of 52 to 5, with 2 abstentions gave to this country great moral and some military support for the action in Korea. More recently, on November 5, 1956, the General Assembly's vote of 57 to 0, with 19 abstentions in favor of the U. N. emergency force for Egypt further proved the utility of the uniting-for-peace procedure.

"Nor would use of the uniting-for-peace procedure in any way retard the speed with which the United States intends to meet armed Communist aggression in the Middle East. The proposed amendment does not envisage delaying our armed reaction to aggression one moment. It merely asks that, concurrently with such armed action by this country, we seek moral and physical support from the United Nations General Assembly.

"Judging by the overwhelming response to the uniting-for-peace procedure on the two occasions of its use, a two-thirds majority vote in favor of such action—ratifying the United States armed action already taken, clothing it in the mantle of the U. N. and adding military support from other members—would seem likely. But even if an attempt to invoke the procedure failed to obtain a two-thirds majority, it would in no way interfere with the United States action,

which would still be "collective self-defense" under article 51. While continuing our unilateral action, we could continue to try to persuade a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly to utilize the uniting-for-peace procedure.

"The uniting-for-peace procedure is essentially a bipartisan achievement. It was formulated under former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. As Secretary of State Dulles has just testified, he was largely instrumental, as our then delegate to the United Nations, in securing its passage in 1950 by the General Assembly."

Chairman GORDON. Thank you, Congressman REUSS, for your very fine statement.

In your opinion can the United States afford to wait for action by the General Assembly of the United Nations before using our forces in case of an attack on the Middle East countries?

Mr. REUSS. No, sir, and the amendment does not suggest that we wait. The amendment very clearly continues to lodge power in the President to act immediately with armed reaction and simply asks him, as soon as may be, to go before the United Nations General Assembly and give the facts, "Yesterday an armed invasion was launched and America, consistently with House Joint Resolution 117, reacted to it. Now we ask the U. N. General Assembly to ratify this action under article 51. We had to act without consultation because the U. N., while it acts fast, cannot act within an hour. We ask the U. N. to act within its uniting-for-peace procedure so that the United States will not have to go it alone."

Chairman GORDON. As you mentioned, we would have to get a two-thirds majority vote in the General Assembly?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, sir.

Chairman GORDON. Suppose we fail to get that two-thirds majority vote in the General Assembly. Only about 27 nations would have to vote against it. Should we refrain from taking action we feel necessary to keep the Middle East free?

Mr. REUSS. Certainly not. I think a failure of our getting the necessary two-thirds majority is simply an indication that two-thirds of the Assembly present and voting at the particular time do not think that the United Nations Assembly at this particular time should call upon its members to contribute armed forces. It in no way impinges upon the action which we already would be taking under article 51 to use our massive Armed Forces to do whatever the Congress and the President thinks should be done to protect a Middle East free country against Communist invasion.

Indeed, I do not think we can escape the judgment of the rest of the world on what we do. If one-third of the 80 member nations at a given time disapprove of the United States action, they are going to signify their disapproval through any number of channels other than the United Nations. It may be, for example, that members of the United Nations would introduce a resolution which would have nothing to do with House Joint Resolution 117 or my amendment, which would try to condemn the United States for what it was doing in the Middle East. Secretary Dulles, I think, gave us what the United States answer to that would be. We would pay no attention to a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly which we felt was a wrong interpretation of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

I am dredging up a ridiculous example, of course, but, in answer to the chairman's question, the failure of the United Nations General Assembly at that particular time to yield a two-thirds majority would, in my opinion, be of no detriment to us militarily or psychologically or from a propaganda standpoint or any other way. It would show we tried to get a United Nations mantle and did not succeed. If at first you do not succeed, try and try again; and I feel sure in time they would see the light. * * *

Mr. MORGAN. Congressman REUSS, do you feel that the addition of your amendment to this resolution would enable us to get some help in case of an armed Soviet attack in the Middle East?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I do. That help in the military sense may not be as massive as we would like, but I point out in the Korean situation where we in effeect used the Security Council, because of Russia's happy absence, for the same purpose I now propose we use the General Assembly, I am personally thankful we had a Turkish battalion and Canadian forces fighting with us in Korea. There were not as many as we would have liked, but any time we can get allies to take the burden off American boys, I am for it as we all are.

In addition to getting additional fighting men and planes and guns, there is, of course, the moral question. I think we are better off resisting aggression under the mantle of the United Nations than purely by ourselves. I think one of the reasons this resolution is before this committee, the failure of French and British policy in the Middle East, is because they tried to operate, by and large, by naked power, and I think it would be a mistake for us to take over what I regard as the less attractive element of French and British policy in the Middle East. I think it is very important right now that we indicate to people all over the world that we are prepared to use the United Nations machinery which was so brilliantly evolved on a bipartisan basis 6 years ago.

Mr. MORGAN. You would not ask for any delay under your amendment? This amendment could be put into action while the armed attack was going on?

Mr. REUSS. Absolutely. I feel very keenly about that and if the wording of my rough draft can be made any clearer to show that not 1 second's delay is intended, I certainly hope that clarification will be done, although the language which talks about "during" the employment by the President of American Armed Forces clearly envisages that that employment in many possible instances would come first. If, of course, the President does not want to employ for 2 days, of course he would, under this amendment, want to first go to the U. N. General Assembly; but if he wants to employ at 3 o'clock in the morning, he could do so.

Mr. MORGAN. That is all.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. VORYS.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. REUSS, it looks to me as if your proposal involves semantics on the words "consonant" and "envisages." You claim "consonant" does not "envisage" the uniting-for-peace procedure. I think it does or was intended to. I agree with you on the value of this mechanism. I do not see any reason, unless we go to the dictionary and work over those two words further, I see no reason for any amendment to the resolution to invoke or to encourage the use of the machinery you refer to.

That is all.

Mr. REUSS. Could I comment?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. REUSS. While you did not end with a question mark, I think it was a question, Mr. VORYS.

I certainly am antisemantic, and I do not want to take the committee's time with what might seem to be a verbal quibble. I do think, however, Mr. VORYS, that there is more than that involved. The world and lawyers and everybody else will read this resolution in the light of the language it contains and also in the light of the President's address to the joint session of Congress, which gave it its color and flavor. The President, in his joint address to the Congress, had the following to say in regard to the United Nations:

"Our thoughts naturally turn to the United Nations as a protector of small nations. Its charter gives it primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our country has given the United Nations its full support in relation to the hostilities in Hungary and in Egypt. The United Nations was able to bring about a cease-fire and withdrawal of hostile forces from Egypt because it was dealing with governments and peoples who had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind as reflected in the United Nations General Assembly. But in the case of Hungary the situation was different. The Soviet Union vetoed action by the Security Council to require the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Hungary. And it has shown callous indifference to the recommendations, even the censure, of the General Assembly. The United Nations can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved."

That quotation from the President, Mr. VORYS, strongly indicates to me that the administration thinks that you really cannot use the United Nations, because of the Russian veto in the Security Council, and the President and Mr. Dulles went on to say the United Nations General Assembly was not any good in Hungary; Russia just sneered at it. Really, the reason Russia was able to display callous indifference to the United Nations General Assembly's resolution last October and November on Hungary was because the United Nations General Assembly's resolution did not really propose anything. It was just moral censure, and of course Russia is not deterred by moral censure. Here we are talking about force, and my suggestion is that that force which has been decided to be used by this committee and the Congress, be force exercised, if possible, through the United Nations.

So it is not just a question of semantics. The proponents of this resolution apparently are of the opinion you just have to write off the United Nations in cases of great power disputes against Russia.

I am sure that on reflection they do not really mean to intend that, and I have high hopes that Mr. Dulles, particularly, from the kindly remarks he made in answer to a question from the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] on Monday of this week, might accept this amendment or something like it. But in the light of the legislative history, if Congress wants to urge the President to use the U. N. uniting-for-peace procedure, it has to somehow, in my opinion, patch up this amendment or patch up the legislative history because the history at the moment is that the administration does not recognize that the uniting-for-peace procedure is something that it ought to use concurrently with armed resistance.

Mr. VORYS. My interpretation of the President's message is not consonant with the interpretation you envisage. I think that the President's message and the resolution envisage an appropriate use of the uniting-for-peace resolution. But I do not want to detain the committee further with debate on your envisagement and my idea of what is consonant with it. Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. CARNAHAN.

Mr. CARNAHAN. We appreciate your coming before the committee and the excellent statement you made.

I notice your suggestion for wording for the amendment: *"Provided further,* That the President, as early as possible before or during such employment, shall, unless he deems it inadvisable, request the United Nations General Assembly"—

You are not directing the President that he must proceed and that he must make——

Mr. REUSS. That is correct, and I shall here reveal a little of my own internal draftsmanship. I put in, frankly, the "unless he deems it inadvisable" after turning the matter over in my mind and an earlier suggested draft by me did not have those words and

did direct him when he uses armed force to concurrently use the uniting-for-peace procedure.

The reason I added the words "unless he deems it inadvisable" is because of a feeling I have that Congress must be very, very slow to tie the hands of the President in any way in the field of foreign policy.

As of the moment I cannot, frankly, conceive of any set of circumstances in which the President would want to use armed force and yet not at the same time invoke the uniting-for-peace procedure of the General Assembly.

On reflection, however, and because of the delicate ground we in Congress tread at all when we endeavor to tell the President what he can or should or may do in the field of foreign policy, I thought it well to add those words.

I do not think it weakens the sense of it much, because it indicates a strong wish on the part of Congress that the President do use the uniting-for-peace procedure, and if the President deems it inadvisable, he certainly would be required in all fairness to inform the Congress and the public why he deemed.

Let me say in conclusion that if the committee should view favorably an amendment along these general lines, it might well ask the administration how it feels about not only the general idea of the amendment, but also the necessity for including the clause that you have just remarked, Mr. CARNAHAN, "unless he deems it inadvisable." If the administration feels it unnecessary to have that exculpatory clause, certainly I do not think Congress would want to insist upon it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I am glad you included these words in the proposal, and I think they should be left in.

Mr. MORANO. Would you yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. Would you tell us the conditions or circumstances that impel you to use the words "deems inadvisable" that you thought might arise that the President would deem it inadvisable to take action?

Mr. REUSS. Honestly, Mr. MORANO, I cannot conceive of any set of circumstances in which I think the President should deem it inadvisable.

However, today is January 1957. This resolution, when passed, will remain on the books for many months, certainly. I did not want to do anything by which it could later be said that Congress had tied the hands and affirmatively directed the President to do something in the field of foreign policy in the future where the President, in his best judgment and knowing the wish of Congress in the matter, felt that he should not.

So, in answer to your question, I cannot conceive of any specific set of circumstances.

Mr. MORANO. Do you not agree that the language is conflicting with the word "shall"?

Mr. REUSS. Now I will admit that we do get into semantics. If we say "may" instead of "shall," we imply that Congress or at least the drafter of this amendment does not care much about this. I do care much about this. I think this is important. I think Congress should, if it passes a resolution, not couch it merely in terms of naked power but in terms of world order and the United Nations.

Therefore, I like the words "shall unless he deems it inadvisable."

In other words, Congress wants the President to do this unless the President, in the exercise of his good judgment and for reasons he is prepared to state before the bar of public opinion, feels it should not be done.

Mr. MORANO. If you give him that escape with the words "deemed inadvisable" why do you not say "may" and give him the escape you give with the other language?

Mr. REUSS. My reason for not using "may"—and maybe it is a bad reason—is that, if a majority of the Congress believe as I do, Congress wants to inform the President and the world that it does believe in this uniting-for-peace procedure and affirmatively wants it used.

If you merely say "may," that merely indicates that Congress is permitting such use if the President very much wants to do it. "Shall" is stronger and in my opinion the wording should be stronger.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would like to say that I feel your wording has been carefully and well chosen and that your recommendation deserves the careful consideration of the committee. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. MERROW.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Congressman REUSS, I think your proposed amendment merits our careful consideration. I want to compliment you on the facility with which you have explained what you have in mind. I think it is a valuable contribution to our thinking on this subject.

In reference to the words that have just been under discussion, I think they are important and should remain in the amendment, because it would seem to me that would give us the opportunity to act when we deem it necessary for our security and would have no hampering effect upon the action by the President.

Now, do you not feel that, by spelling this procedure out in this amendment or a similar amendment, it would greatly strengthen and add to the effectiveness of the already admirable leadership we are giving in the United Nations?

Mr. REUSS. I do, sir, and that is exactly why I have introduced it. It seems to me that in view of the truly admirable leadership we have recently been giving in the United Nations, it would really seem to veer off in a different direction in which we do not want to veer for us to inadvertently give the impression that we do not think the U. N. is useful in security matters where Communist Russia is concerned. I believe that it is most useful, has been and will be again.

Mr. MORANO. And at the same time, as you explained, that does not hinder our action in any way.

Mr. REUSS. It should not and does not. * * *

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I compliment our colleague for his fine statement.

I have only one question, if I can express it. I understood, as I interpreted the statement of the Secretary of State and Admiral Radford yesterday, their idea is that Resolution 117 is for psychological purposes more than anything else. They do not anticipate we will ever use our Armed Forces, that the President will ever resort to using our Armed Forces under this resolution. It is possible all of the members did not get that same idea, but I thought that was it, that we served notice to the world that we were going to defend free nations, particularly in the Middle East, but did not anticipate we would have to.

You have thought out your amendment splendidly and stated your thinking very clearly. The only thing I thought was if this resolution is for psychological purposes, does your amendment strengthen it? Would some countries think, well, the United States might resort to the use of their Armed Forces. They will think it over and see what the United Nations wants to do first.

Mr. REUSS. Indeed, Mr. LECOMPTE, I think that psychologically it is very necessary to recognize by the resolution which Congress is to pass that we not only are going to react promptly and with powerful effect on our own initially, if that is the timing of it, but that we have sufficient respect for the orderly process of the United Nations so that we are going to do our level best to get them, the member nations of the United Nations, on our side through the United Nations as speedily as possible.

If, indeed, the purpose of this resolution is largely psychological, and our military and strategic thinkers believe that it will never need to be used, then it seems to me doubly important that we make it psychologically attractive to the many people in the world who do not like the idea of great power leadership and like the notion that they have a little place in the sun which comes about through their membership in the United Nations.

I would say in conclusion, Mr. LECOMPTE, that any language which the committee can use to make it crystal clear that our invoking the United Nations here is not going to delay our military reaction by 1 second should be added. I tried to make it clear. It certainly should be.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I agree with you that since we have the United Nations we should employ the facilities and the power of the United Nations wherever we can.

I was just wondering about the thought that would occur at capitals of many nations, whether the governments in some of those countries might feel that the United States will debate the subject quite a while before employing our Armed Forces.

Mr. REUSS. We should make it clear, sir, that we are not only not going to debate it but that we are going to act; however, that we are going to try to get support for our cause in the United Nations as soon as possible. * * *

Mr. MORANO. I thank you for your views, Mr. REUSS.

I want to ask a couple of questions. The first is this: Do you not believe every member who has affixed his signature to the United Nations Charter has in essence pledged to come to the defense of any member that has been attacked?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; but as a practical matter, unless this country takes the leadership in these matters of armed aggression and international security, they are quite likely to content themselves with platitudinous resolutions and things that do not really mean much.

Mr. MORANO. Would you not say your amendment, in effect, is a reaffirmation of that pledge that has already been made by member nations?

Mr. REUSS. A reaffirmation, Mr. MORANO, and a determination that we are going to call out that spirit. It takes parliamentary action. It takes a resolution by somebody. That somebody in the situation envisaged should be us.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not so that if any member declines or for some reason did not furnish the aid by supplying arms and men when an attack occurred, they would be dishonoring the pledge they made when they signed the United Nations Charter? Is that not so?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; and that is a strong force in favor of getting a two-thirds majority. That is why the uniting-for-peace procedure has been successful so far.

Mr. MORANO. Let us look at the procedure that must be followed when an attack occurs. When an attack occurs, if we were to come to the defense of a member nation attacked or some nation in the Middle East that was attacked, we would then have to report it to the Security Council under article 51; would we not?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORANO. How long would the Security Council—how long could the Security Council delay in taking action, if any?

Mr. REUSS. The procedures in both the Security Council and the General Assembly are really quite swift.

Mr. MORANO. You have seen them when they were not so swift, have you not?

Mr. REUSS. As parliamentary bodies go, I find the Assembly, particularly, moves rather fast.

However, let me just say this. I am not prepared to say that there cannot be tentative filibusters, amendments made for delay,

and other methods of slowing down this procedure.

If those occur, we are still better off for having tried to invoke the moral authority of the United Nations and let the filibusterers bear the onus of holding back our effort to accompany our armed resistance to aggression by invoking the United Nations.

Mr. MORANO. Can the Assembly act only after the veto has actually occurred in the Security Council, or before a veto has occurred?

Mr. REUSS. That is a moot question. The uniting-for-peace resolution talks about when the Security Council has a disagreement about action to be taken, as I recall the words. Whether that takes a formal veto or not, I do not know. But if it does, I should think that that would be a necessary first——

Mr. MORANO. Will you say that again?

Mr. REUSS. If it does require a veto——

Mr. MORANO. If what?

Mr. REUSS. If the uniting-for-peace procedure does require a Security Council veto before the General Assembly may entertain the procedure, I would think that we are, nevertheless, better off for doing our level best to prepare the matter for the General Assembly by tabling something which Russia will be required to veto. If Russia is delaying and filibustering, which I do not believe is possible in either body for long, then she bears the onus. It is she who is unwilling to submit the dispute to the U. N.

Mr. FULTON. Under the uniting-for-peace resolution passed by the United Nations in 1950, there is the requirement that any action be taken by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. But if the General Assembly is not in session at the time, the call for a special session or meeting can be made by decision of the majority of the General Assembly.

I will state the resolution language more specifically as I remember it. "If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency session within 24 hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session may be called if requested by the Security Council on the part of seven such members or by a majority of the members of the United Nations."

Mr. MORANO. You have heard the testimony of the Secretary, or have read it very carefully. Do you not think the statement he made fully covers the point made in your suggested amendment?

Mr. REUSS. On one point on page 55 of the record in response to the question of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, the Secretary made what I thought was a fine statement about the uniting-for-peace resolution, saying how he had worked for it and how he thought it was a good thing, which to me was tremendously encouraging.

Again, however, on page 88 and a number of other places he seemed to be repeating what the President said, namely, that we cannot really use the U. N. because, in the Security Council you are met by a veto and in the General Assembly look what happened to Hungary.

Mr. MORANO. That is the very point.

Mr. REUSS. My point is that no, in God's name, let us not look at what happened in Hungary. The apposite analogy would be what would have happened in Hungary if we had moved under the uniting-for-peace procedure and said the U. N. General Assembly herewith calls upon its members to supply armed forces to resist the foreign invasion by Russia of Hungary and the attempt to overthrow the legitimate Imre Nagy government. If we had had that situation and the U. N. had failed, you could point to the Hungary situation as an example of why the U. N. is no good.

But since such a resolution was never proposed—I am not saying such a resolution would be good or bad—you cannot really say that the Hungarian experience shows that the U. N. General Assembly is powerless because the U. N. General Assembly was never asked to take uniting-for-peace procedure which involves the use of armed force. Here, in considering House Joint Resolution 117 our jumping-off place is armed force.

Mr. MORANO. You seem to be making a strong statement in support of the use of the word "may" instead of "shall."

Mr. FULTON. I agree with Mr. MORANO, too.

Mr. REUSS. As I say, "may" and "shall", they come close to being the same thing. If the committee believes that "may" sufficiently indicates the hope and intent of Congress that we want the President, unless unforeseeable circumstances arise, to use the uniting-for-peace procedure, I will be very happy.

Mr. MORANO. I do not want to do anything, knowingly at least, to weaken the objective of the President as it is contained in this resolution. If I thought your amendment weakened that purpose and that objective, then I would feel constrained to oppose it. But I wish to again compliment you for bringing this very important matter to our attention.

Knights of Columbus Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, I introduced a companion bill to S. 259 by Senator POTTER, of Michigan, to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the 75th anniversary on March 29 of the Knights of Columbus.

As a Member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am hopeful that my bill (H. R. 3042) can be called up for early attention and favorable action.

The suggestion for such legislation was made to me by a close family friend, William M. Lennox, of Philadelphia, supreme director of the Knights of Columbus, who informs me that the Knights of Columbus presently has a membership of more than 1 million, of whom more than 54,000 are Pennsylvanians.

The members of this organization have always worked diligently in behalf of a better America. Issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the 75th aniversary of the organization would be warranted recognition for an outstanding group dedicated to the highest moral principles.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 22, 1957

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, freedom and dignity of the individual and the right to choose the form of government under which he will live and conduct his daily affairs means much to every American, but is too often taken for granted. Our Ukrainian-American friends well recognize that the light of freedom in their homeland has been extinguished.

A distinct and separate nation of 40 million people lies subject to Moscow oriented Communist colonialism and imperialism. Rich in the talents of its people and in a wealth of natural resources a free Ukraine would certainly become one of the leading nations in the world.

In order to keep alive the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples everywhere we must do everything possible to implement a policy of peaceful liberation. We must work together diligently to insure that every practical step be taken to insure that Ukrainian Independence Day will soon be celebrated by free men in a free land.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1957

Rev. Thomas G. Jones, Methodist minister, of Montgomery, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, maker of all things, judge of all men, we adore and worship Thy holy name.

We thank Thee for the good providence that brings us again to this place for our daily tasks. Vouchsafe, we pray Thee, the light and guidance of Thy holy spirit.

We confess our sins before Thee, and pray for pardon according to the abundance of Thy mercy.

And unto Thee we give all honor and glory and majesty, now and evermore:

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 22, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attending the next four sessions of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 20) to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide additional authority for distribution of loans among States and Territories (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF LOANS

A letter from the Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE IN SHORTAGE OF RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE FUNDS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortage of residential mortgage funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, together with reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 490, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID FOR DAMAGE OCCASIONED BY VESSELS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, during the period January 1 through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to extending the duck season in California

"Whereas wise game management contemplates not only proper measures to protect and aid in the propagation of wildlife but also the fullest utilization of such wildlife commensurate with conservation of the species of waterfowl; and

"Whereas in setting the arbitrary period for the hunting of migratory waterfowl in the State of California a normal weather cycle was contemplated; and

"Whereas the weather cycle actually experienced in California was one of the dryest in many years which meant that the migratory waterfowl concentrated in inaccessible areas and did not migrate along usual routes with the result that the 175,000 duck hunters in this State experienced one of the poorest years since the advent of modern game management; and

"Whereas unless the season on migratory waterfowl is extended the proper utilization and harvest of these birds will be impossible: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President of the United States is respectfully memorialized to issue a proclamation to extend the migratory waterfowl season in the State of California for 30 days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 1

"House resolution urging the officials of the Federal Government not to invite Marshal Josip Broz Tito to the United States

"Whereas Marshal Tito is an avowed Communist which form of government is repugnant to the concepts of a Christian nation and repugnant as well to an ordered democracy; and

"Whereas Marshal Tito is an infamous persecutor of religion avowedly opposed to it in any form, arresting and imprisoning theologians and ecclesiastics; and

"Whereas Marshal Tito has boasted of receiving aid from the United States and bragging that no concessions were made therefor; and

"Whereas organizations offering aid and succor such as the War Relief Services of 1946 have been expelled, as have American newsmen seeking enlightenment; and

"Whereas organizations of American citizens such as the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations have expressed their opinions of Tito's dictatorship as 'reprehensible foes of human dignity, decency, and liberty'; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the House of Delegates of Maryland the citizens of the United States would be ill used if forced to act as involuntary hosts to a dedicated enemy of democracy who has turned Hungarian refugees back to their Communist masters: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Marshal Tito be not invited to the United States at this time: And further, be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the House of Delegates and that the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of State Dulles, to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Maryland, to the Congress of the United States, and to Congressman O'KONSKI, of the United States House of Representatives.

"By the house of delegates, January 4, 1957.

"Introduced, read the first time and referred to the committee on rules.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"Favorably reported by the committee on rules.

"By the house of delegates, January 8, 1957.

"Adopted.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"GEORGE W. CUMINGS, Jr.,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A resolution adopted by the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, Dallas, Tex., protesting against the enactment of any legislation to increase the total number of immigrants into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Enrolled House Resolution 506

"House resolution expressing gratitude to President Dwight D. Eisenhower for coming to Oklahoma to examine firsthand the severe drought conditions in Oklahoma; recommending a continuing review of the United States Department of Agriculture's farm program in the hope that farm prices can be stabilized at a higher minimum level than is now possible; urging President Eisenhower, the Oklahoma congressional delegation, and all other Members of the 85th Congress to assist in developing fully Oklahoma's vast potential water resources

"Whereas Oklahoma looks to a continuing harmonious partnership with the Federal Government to assure essential development of its vast store of natural resources; and

"Whereas the lifeblood of Oklahoma's future is its presently untamed source of water, which can be useful only if we complete development of such projects as the Arkansas-Red-White River program; and

"Whereas supplies of water for industry, irrigation, and home use throughout this area depend more on leadership by the Federal Government than any other factor; and

"Whereas the house of representatives of the 26th session of the Oklahoma Legislature wishes to express its full confidence in the desire of our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to work with Oklahoma's outstanding congressional delegation and the Congress of the United States in providing the leadership for this priority program; and

"Whereas it is our further desire to express gratitude to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, for coming to examine firsthand the terrible blight to our economy caused by a combination of the most severe drought in Oklahoma's history, plus a general standard of farm income far below other segments of the Nation's economy; and

"Whereas the house of representatives of the 26th session of the Oklahoma Legislature recommends a continuing review of the United States Department of Agriculture's

farm program, in the fervent hope farm prices can be stabilized at a higher minimum level than is now possible: Now, therefore,

"We, the members of the 26th session of the Oklahoma Legislature, strongly urge that you, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Oklahoma congressional delegation, and all other Members of the 85th Congress make use of every avenue open to you to aid us in developing fully Oklahoma's vast potential water resources, and that special consideration be given our farmers, who cannot much longer endure the double disaster of drought and farm prices far below the level of the rest of the Nation's economy.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of January 1957.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma the 11th day of January 1957.

"RAYMOND GARY,
"Governor of the State of Oklahoma.

"Received by the secretary of state this 14th day of January 1957.

"ANDY ANDERSON."

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation allowing an optional standard deduction for operating expenses for tax purposes

"Whereas provisions of the Federal income tax law now require the keeping of voluminous records by business and professional men relating to operating expenses; and

"Whereas the maintenance of such records is a source of irritation, entailing time, expense, and space; and

"Whereas a provision of law allowing an optional standard deduction for operating expenses to business and professional men would eliminate the need for keeping voluminous records in many cases and would not result in loss of revenue to the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact appropriate legislation to allow an optional standard deduction for operating expenses for tax purposes to business and professional men; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from South Carolina.

"State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S. C., January 18, 1957.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

[SEAL] "INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to give tax encouragement to individual retirement savings

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina is of the opinion that tax encouragement should be given to individual retirement savings similar to that which is now given to pension plans of employers; and

"Whereas this body is of the opinion that individuals not eligible under any qualified employer's pension plan should be allowed to exclude from current income an amount set aside for future retirement benefits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact legislation which will permit individuals not eligible under any employer's pension plan to exclude, for tax purposes, from current income an amount set aside for future retirement benefits; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from South Carolina.

"State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S. C., January 18, 1957.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

[SEAL] "INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

TAX BENEFITS TO CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Fox River Valley Dental Society, Aurora, Ill., relating to tax benefits of self-employed persons. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE JENKINS-KEOGH PROPOSAL

Whereas the Internal Revenue Code discriminates against those individuals who are employed by denying to them tax benefits similar to those granted to corporate officers and employees with respect to funds allocated to private pension or retirement programs; and

Whereas this discrimination against self-employed individuals cannot be justified by any acceptable standards of fairness or equality; and

Whereas a proposal, known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, to rectify this inequity in the Internal Revenue Code has been before the Congress for some years, and in that period, the principles of this proposal have gained the full support of both major political parties, of the President of the United States, of leading tax authorities, of numerous private organizations, and of millions of self-employed individuals; and

Whereas the enactment of this proposal, in addition to correcting a gross tax inequity, would further substantially the anti-inflation policies of the Federal Government by stimulating sound and useful saving programs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the FOX River Valley Dental Society supports the principles of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal and urges the 85th Congress to enact it into law: And be it further

Resolved, That the FOX River Valley Dental Society urge Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Representative RUSSELL KEENEY, Representative NOAH MASON, Representative JERE COOPER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to lend their efforts, influence and support to the early enactment of this proposal.

THOMAS P. HOWLAND,
President, Fox River Valley Dental Society.

PAUL E. KEISER,
Secretary, Fox River Valley Dental Society.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to employ two additional clerical assistants from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1957."

CONTINUATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT, AND FUNDS THEREFOR—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution authorizing a continuation of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, and providing funds therefor, and I submit a report (No. 11) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 61) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the subcommittee (as authorized and directed by S. Res. 93, of the 84th Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 25, 1955; as amended by S. Res. 185, 84th Cong., 2d sess., agreed to February 8, 1956; and as amended by S. Res. 286, 84th Cong., 2d sess., agreed to July 13, 1956) of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the international control and reduction of armaments, as further described in Senate Resolution 93, 84th Congress.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to June 30, 1957, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Mutsuko Miyaji; and

S. 771. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 772. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to provide for the issuance of additional visas to certain alien orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 774. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 775. A bill to encourage investment in school bonds and other tax-exempt Government obligations by authorizing Federal Reserve member banks to invest in securities of regulated investment companies which invest 95 percent of their assets in such obligations which are normally legal or member banks and 5 percent in taxable Federal Government obligations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 777. A bill to authorize Federal assist- Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 777. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 778. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Piperis;

S. 780. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cortina Montero;

S. 781. A bill for the relief of Michele Niro;

S. 782. A bill for the relief of Maria Keller;

S. 783. A bill for the relief of Norris C. Barnes; and

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Dwight S. Sharer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Helga Binder; and

S. 786. A bill for the relief of Richard Rhen-Yang Lin and his wife, Julia Lam Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 787. A bill to extend the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to World War II veterans to certain citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 788. A bill for the relief of Thelma Margaret Hwang; and

S. 789. A bill for the relief of Herbert T. King; his wife, Chang Si-Ling King; and his daughter, Chen Hsiao-Ling King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 790. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Grabbert Underwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 791. A bill for the relief of Speros Evangelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 792. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 793. A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to the mothers and fathers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen upon an equal basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Loutfie Siemon Noma (Noama); and

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Ziang Tsien Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 796. A bill for the relief of Zacharoula Papoulia Matsa;

S. 797. A bill for the relief of John Leary;

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Baffo;

S. 799. A bill for the relief of Eldur Eha;

S. 800. A bill for the relief of Maria Naldo;

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yong Nak Park; and

S. 802. A bill for the relief of Carmine Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Claudio Guillen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 804. A bill for the relief of George Christopoulos, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of Manuel Souza Novo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 806. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to quitclaim all interest of the United States in and to certain lands located in Indiana to the State of Indiana and to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 807. A bill for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. JENNER, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. THYE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 809. A bill to provide economic assistance to the American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 810. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933 to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $500,000 from the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 811. A bill for the relief of Fannie Alexander Gast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 812. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 813. A bill relating to agency contributions under the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of employees engaged in the operation or maintenance of irrigation projects; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortage of residential mortgage funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following original resolutions were reported and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 59. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two temporary additional clerical assistants.

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 60. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 162, 84th Congress, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing a continuation of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, and providing funds therefor.

(See above resolutions printed in full under the heading "Reports of Committees," in today's Senate proceedings.)

ISSUANCE OF ADDITIONAL VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of additional visas to certain alien orphans.

There is indeed a most compelling need for speedy enactment of this proposed legislation. Under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the Congress made provision for the issuance of 4,000 special nonquota immigrant visas for eligible orphans. This special quota was exhausted even before the authority to issue visas under the act terminated on December 31, 1956.

The Senate, cognizant of the existing situation with respect to the many American families, here and abroad, who had adopted foreign-born orphans, last year passed a bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], similar to the one being introduced today. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives did not consider this matter prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress. As a result, President Eisenhower authorized, pending congressional action, a waiver of the visa requirement for such children, and their parole to their parents.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has introduced a bill to remedy this situation, through amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill which my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and I are introducing today carries forward for 2 years the authority contained in the Refugee Relief Act, and provides for the issuance of an additional 5,000 nonquota visas for certain alien orphans.

It is our hope that this most important matter will receive committee consideration as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 772) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to provide for the issuance of additional visas to certain alien orphans, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 is amended (1) by striking out "4,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "9,000", and (2) by striking out "10 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "14 years."

(b) Section 5 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Any visa issued under this section to any eligible orphan who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business shall be valid until such time as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service or business.

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 20 of this act, visas may be issued under this section for a period of 2 years following the date of the enactment of this subsection."

DOMESTIC PARITY FOR WHEAT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill known as "the bill for domestic parity for wheat," sometimes incorrectly known as "the two-price system." At the last session, a similar bill passed the Senate by a vote of 54 yeas to 39 nays.

The bill would establish 100 percent parity for wheat sold for domestic human consumption, and would permit competitive market prices for wheat sold for feed or export. The plan would be self-financing, through the use of marketing certificates. Farmers would be issued certificates which would be redeemable for the difference between the market price, as estimated in advance by the Secretary, and 100 percent parity.

The plan would return the sale and purchase of wheat to the open market, where the price is determined by the factors of quality and demand. The bill would guarantee wheat farmers full parity on the part of the annual crop which goes into domestic human consumption.

The wheat growers of the Nation have passed through a transition period in the production of wheat, where, in changing from animal power to mechanical power, we have attained a degree of production several times that of the past. We have yet to pass through the transition period of disposal of our product, which is as important, or perhaps even more important, than the production.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for the introduction of the so-called two-price wheat bill. This bill seeks a worthy goal. I ask his permission to have myself listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the distinguished Senator from Oregon listed as a cosponsor of the bill, as he was last year, when he rendered such valuable service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that several other Members have spoken to me about cosponsorship of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and that it lie on the table for other signatures until the conclusion of the session on Monday, January 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 774) to provide an improved farm program, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 774

A bill to provide an improved farm program

Be it enacted, etc., That the following new section be added as follows:

"Wheat—domestic parity

"SEC. 102a. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: 'Title III—Loans, parity payments, consumer safeguards, marketing quotas, and marketing certificates'; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: 'Subtitle E—Miscellaneous provisions and appropriations'; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

" 'SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

" '*Legislative findings*

" 'SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

" '*Domestic food quota*

" 'SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

" '*Apportionment of domestic food quota*

" 'SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately

preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"'(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"'(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"'Marketing certificates

"'SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates,

"'Marketing restrictions

"'SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"'Conversion factors

"'SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'Civil penalties

"'SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'Adjustments in domestic food quotas

"'SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 380d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 280d of this act.

"'Reports and records

"'SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the Act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'Referendum

"'SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1958 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1958 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle and marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B. If the marketing certificate program authorized by this act is approved for the 1958 crop by farmers voting in a referendum as provided herein, the provisions of section 101 (d) (8) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall have no applicability to the 1958 crop of wheat.

"'Price support

"'SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"'(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates.'"

PROGRAM OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for Federal aid for school construction. My bill is identical with the one introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 1, the first bill of this session, by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, sponsor of the famous Kelley bill during the 84th Congress. I should like to congratulate Representative KELLEY and his colleagues on their tireless efforts toward the goal of Federal assistance to meet the evermore critical needs of America's schoolchildren. All of us who are concerned about such needs hope for the successful enactment of this program during the present session. My purpose in introducing a companion bill to H. R. 1 is to make it possible for the Senate to start its work on this proposed legislation simultaneously with its progress in the House of Representatives.

Because of the loss of a year since the Kelley bill failed of enactment during the last session of Congress, and because the need is even greater than before, the bill I now introduce provides for $600 million a year Federal assistance to school construction for 5 years. Last year's Kelley bill proposed $400 million a year for 4 years, and the administration's plan called for only $250 million a year for 5 years.

I have received from the National Education Association, which has taken such active leadership in the work for this program, a chart showing the allocation of the increased sums to the several States, upon the basis of school-age population provided in the bill. I shall ask unanimous consent that the chart be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The chart shows that my own State of Oregon would receive approximately 1 percent, or $5,839,900, of the annual $600 million of Federal school construction funds.

I wish to point out, in conclusion, that the fiscal policies of the administration have contributed greatly to the need for Federal funds for school construction. Recent newspaper reports tell of instance after instance in which school districts and communities have had to pay as much as 4½ percent or 5 percent interest on their school bonds—a cost which makes the financing of new schools from local sources of revenue almost prohibitive in many communities. Schools are not a profit-making business which returns tangible earnings on the invested capital. They cannot compete for capital on that basis. But all of us agree that the actual return from good schools to the whole Nation is far greater and more valuable than the return from any business. If we are to pay more than lipservice to this principle, we must act to make available the necessary funds with which to build the schools we need. I am confident that Congress will take such action this year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 777) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I now ask that the chart to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1957.

Allocation of funds under H. R. 1 based on $600 million annual appropriation

State or territory	School age population (5 to 17) 1954 U. S. Bureau of Census	Percentage distribution of col. 2	Allotment by States
1	2	3	4
Total	36,844,000	100.00000000	$600,000,000
Alabama	827,000	2.24216462	13,452,850
Arizona	234,000	.63442143	3,806,520
Arkansas	490,000	1.32848932	7,970,900
California	2,540,000	6.88645483	41,318,700
Colorado	333,000	.90283050	5,416,980
Connecticut	441,000	1.19564039	7,173,840
Delaware	77,000	.20876261	1,252,570
Florida	703,000	1.90597549	11,435,850
Georgia	944,000	2.55937534	15,356,200
Idaho	156,000	.42294762	2,537,680
Illinois	1,867,000	5.06181542	30,370,890
Indiana	943,000	2.55666414	15,339,900
Iowa	592,000	1.60503199	9,630,190
Kansas	438,000	1.18750678	7,125,000
Kentucky	767,000	2.07949246	12,476,950
Louisiana	746,000	2.02255721	12,135,300
Maine	207,000	.56121896	3,367,300
Maryland	572,000	1.55080794	9,304,840
Massachusetts	975,000	2.64342262	15,800,500
Michigan	1,573,000	4.26472183	25,588,300
Minnesota	710,000	1.92495391	11,549,700
Mississippi	600,000	1.62672161	9,760,300
Missouri	846,000	2.29367747	13,762,050
Montana	147,000	.39854679	2,391,200
Nebraska	297,000	.80522720	4,831,300
Nevada	43,000	.11658172	699,400
New Hampshire	118,000	.31992192	1,919,530
New Jersey	1,046,000	2.83591801	17,015,500
New Mexico	214,000	.58019737	3,481,180
New York	3,024,000	8.19867693	49,192,000
North Carolina	1,123,000	3.04468062	18,269,580
North Dakota	159,000	.43108123	2,586,400
Ohio	1,866,000	5.05910422	30,354,600
Oklahoma	527,000	1.42880382	8,572,800
Oregon	359,000	.97332177	5,839,900
Pennsylvania	2,315,000	6.27643423	37,658,000
Rhode Island	164,000	.44463724	2,667,800
South Carolina	646,000	1.75143694	10,508,600
South Dakota	159,000	.43108123	2,586,400
Tennessee	846,000	2.29367747	13,762,060
Texas	2,027,000	5.49560785	32,973,600
Utah	200,000	.54224054	3,253,440
Vermont	89,000	.24129704	1,447,780
Virginia	849,000	2.30181108	13,810,860
Washington	553,000	1.49929509	8,995,770
West Virginia	530,000	1.43693742	8,621,620
Wisconsin	806,000	2.18522937	13,111,350
Wyoming	72,000	.19520659	1,171,230
District of Columbia	148,000	.40125800	2,407,540
Alaska	[1] 33,000	0.08946969	536,810
American Samoa	[2] 7,000	.01897842	113,870
Canal Zone	[2] 10,000	.02711203	162,670
Guam	[1] 13,000	.03524563	211,400
Hawaii	130,000	.35245635	2,114,700
Puerto Rico	[1] 774,000	2.09847088	12,590,800
Virgin Islands	[1] 9,000	.02440082	146,400

[1] As of July 1, 1953. Later figures not available.
[2] As of Apr. 1, 1950. Later figures not available.

NOTE.—Allotment per child $16.28487 in each State and Territory.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, RELATING TO TRADING IN ONION FUTURES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last year, at the request of representatives of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association, in the Snake River Valley of eastern Oregon, I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee in support of House bill 7920, which would end futures trading in onions. The bill had wide support from onion growers all over the United States. It was their concerted opinion that such trading was chiefly responsible for the depressed prices which have afflicted the grower. The practice also contributed in great measure to overplanting and the ensuing surplus condition and glutting of the market.

When called on for a report on House bill 7920, the Department of Agriculture advised against favorable action on the bill. It was their wish that stricter regulations which were being imposed on trading in onion futures be observed and studied before the trading was stopped by legislative enactment. The committee bowed to the request and judgment of the Department.

A few months ago it was my privilege, Mr. President, to meet with representatives of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association, in Ontario, Oreg., to discuss this subject at length. In their judgment, regulation of the futures trading in onions would not correct the problems that beset the industry. Only abolishment, they believe, will assure the balance between demand and supply that will enable these onion growers to stay in business—at least the business of growing onions.

A few days ago, House bill 376, which is similar to the one I supported last year, was introduced by Mrs. PFOST, the very able Congresswoman from Idaho. I understand a like bill will also be introduced by Congressman AL ULLMAN, the Representative of the Second District of Oregon, which includes Malheur County.

At this time, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a companion bill to H. R. 376. My bill will stop the futures trading in onions in the commodity exchanges of the United States. At the proper time, I expect to appear before the House and Senate committees to offer testimony in support of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 778) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS TO ENGAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage small-business concerns engaged in foreign trade. The bill is introduced on behalf of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and myself. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred, and that a statement whch I have prepared be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 808) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. JENNER, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATION ACT

I have introduced, for the consideration of the Senate, a bill to amend the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act.

At the time a similar bill was introduced in the 84th Congress by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and myself, it was pointed out in our statements that a correction of the act is necessary in order to overcome the discriminatory effects of a Treasury Department interpretation against small business.

The correction is still needed since the Treasury Department has not changed the interpretation which now requires that title to all exports to Western Hemisphere nations must change hands outside the United States in order to qualify the exporter for the 14 percentage points benefit in corporation income tax.

It can be shown that large corporations have no problem meeting the Treasury interpretation to gain the tax benefits, but the small-business man, in most cases, finds it financially impossible to meet the Treasury Department requirements.

It can also be shown that the original intent of the act was to stimulate all export business to Western Hemisphere countries through a medium of meeting competition from low-labor-cost countries on the Western Hemisphere market and that it was never intended the act should discriminate against small business.

The bill I have introduced today for myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] spells out the intent of the Congress when it passed the original act and eliminates the discriminatory effect of the Treasury Department interpretation.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Senate the statement made at the close of the last session of Congress by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance that a study of the act and Treasury Department interpretation appeared to be in order.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO THE AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide economic assistance to the American Indians.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to my bill may be read at this time by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this year, Congress will appropriate billions of dollars to take care of people outside of the United States of America. It is incumbent upon Congress, therefore, to appropriate $200 million to service properly the needs of the American Indians living on reservations throughout the United States. It is a fitting commentary that year after year we are failing to appropriate sufficient sums to care for these native Americans as to their health, education, social welfare, employment, relocation, loans for housing, and chances to earn a decent income.

The United States Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has held hearings in four areas in North Dakota on or near the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, Fort Berthold Reservation, Turtle Mountain Reservation, and Fort Totten Indian Reservation. Hearings were also held in Phoenix, Ariz., and Palm Springs, Calif., which covered Indian reservations in New Mexico, Arizona, California, and parts of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada. Further hearings were held in Montana, affecting Indian tribes in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. Proposed hearings in Washington, Oregon, and Oklahoma had to be postponed. Hearings before the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee and conferences held by Glenn Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, also revealed much evidence of conditions on Indian reservations. During the course of these hearings, much evidence was received in the form of testimony, charts, schedules, and statistics pointing to the great needs and problems of the Indian people. A detailed report was submitted to the Congress on the findings and recommendations as a result of these hearings and other material gathered by the staff through research.

However, it is necessary to report briefly on health, education, welfare, relocation, law and order, poor living conditions, low incomes, and the need for employment which make it mandatory that this bill for $200 million to aid the economy of the Indians be seriously considered by the Congress of the United States.

HEALTH

In the field of health, we find that the Indians in practically every part of the country are suffering from chronic and contagious illnesses. Statistics show that the tuberculosis rate of the Indians is 121.1 per 100,000 as compared with 22.5 per 100,000 of the total population of the United States. The pneumonia and influenza death rate among Indians is 114.9 per 100,000 as compared with 31.3 per 100,000 of the total population. Further, it should be noted that there were 91.7 deaths of Indians under 1 year of age per 1,000 births, as compared with a rate of 31.5 per 1,000 live births of non-Indians. A survey of the Papago and Navaho Indians shows that the infant mortality rate in those 2 reservations was approximately 50 percent. The life expectancy of the American Indian is 17 years as compared with the national average of 69 years.

Among the greatest needs to improve the health conditions of the American Indian, naturally, are more money, hygienic facilities, and clinics. Dr. Shaw, of the Health Branch of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has stated that in a recent program inaugurated in the State of Washington, astounding improvement was shown in the health of the Indians in that State. With comparable funds, amazing improvements can likewise be realized in the 25 remaining States which contain Indian reservations.

EDUCATION

Despite the fact that we in this country take great pride in our public school educational system, it is unbelieveable that on the Navaho reservation in the 1952–1953 school year, out of 28,000 children between the ages of 6 and 18, less than 6,000 attended school. With the passage of the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act, there are now 22,751 children between the ages of 6 and 18 in school, and the remaining number who are not in school are expected to enroll within the next year or so.

This is one perfect example of the achievement of remarkable results after Congress has acted to remedy a crying need, as it has done in its rehabilitation program for the Navaho and Hopi tribes. Testimony taken on the Papago reservation shows that 60 percent of the Papago Indians do not speak English. Statistics such as these are reflected on Indian reservations throughout the country.

WELFARE

One of the greatest needs on the Indian reservations is for expert community counselors and qualified welfare workers. Many State welfare departments are attempting to give service on reservations, but meager funds for this purpose result in a service which, where existent, is on a "too little and too late" basis. Special Federal appropriations for the development of additional child-welfare services in Indian reservations would, in the long run, save the still larger sums which will be required to pay the costs which will be involved in caring for neglected youngsters grown into adult liabilities of the community.

The Indian Bureau has pointed out that the child-welfare workers, in many instances, are unable to do any counseling whatsoever because of the limited staff, and the main duties performed are only the processing of applications for welfare.

RELOCATION

Much has been said of the advantages of the relocation of the American Indians from the overcrowded reservations to areas where they can obtain year-around employment and better housing. However, the program is grossly inadequate and the services rendered to the relocated families are ineffective because of the very small appropriation for such purposes. It is a known fact that since the relocation program has started there has been in the past years on the various Indian reservations so great an increase in the birthrate that the relocation program does not noticeably reduce the number remaining on the reservations.

Another great need in the relocation program is to assure the Indians who are relocated that they will receive the services which are provided for them on the reservation until they are able to adjust themselves to their new environment. This would greatly reduce the number—30 percent—who return to the

reservations because of the lack of these services outside the reservations.

LAW AND ORDER

One of the biggest problems on the Indian reservation is that of effective law and order. In a recent congressional report on Indian affairs a very pertinent observation was made on law and order which gives a clear picture of the situation on any Indian reservation. The need for adequate law and protection is urgent. Although the tribes are making a commendable effort to cope with the situation, much still remains to be done. The existing conditions contribute to lawlessness, a breakdown of morals and morale, and an increase in delinquency, which becomes a great burden upon the people.

In 1951 the Indian Bureau requested of Congress and the Budget Bureau an appropriation of $1,400,000 for its law-and-order program. It was cut down to approximately $350,000. Imagine a law-enforcement program being cut down to approximately one-fourth of what it asks for. Imagine Washington, D. C., having a police force reduced by 75 percent in the face of increased need for protection. What could we expect here? Testimony from police officer Pat Nelson on the Navaho Indian Reservation revealed that the reservation needs 38 additional police officers, plus 20 additional vehicles to transport them over the 25,000 square miles they are supposed to cover.

In North Dakota we found the same crying need for law-enforcement services. In a hearing before the subcommittee it was testified that one officer takes care of all Indian reservations in Montana and a part of Wyoming. The testimony also divulged that because of the insufficient funds for personnel and facilities, only the more serious offenses can be dealt with.

POOR LIVING CONDITIONS AND LOW INCOMES

Testimony adduced before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in North Dakota, Arizona, California, and Montana pointed to the primitive living conditions under which the Indians live. Imagine a mother, father, and 13 children living in a 1-room cottage with no flooring, no utilities, no water, and no sanitation.

It took only a little money appropriated by Congress in 1954 for the Ute Mountain and Southern Ute Tribes to make it possible for the Utes, in the southwestern corner of Colorado, to construct model 3-bedroom bungalows for all the families. These homes are comparable to the fine homes that the average American workingman lives in. This is another indication of what an adequate appropriation from Congress can do for the betterment of the living conditions of the American Indians.

LIVING CONDITIONS

The low-income level of the Indians is reflected in statistics which show that some Indian families receive an annual income, from all sources, of as low as $400 a family a year. Families receiving $1,200 or more are in the minority. In comparable areas the non-Indian family's income is usually $2,500 or more a year.

Certain Indian reservations have been fortunate, through Government and private activities, to be located near industries which afford year-round jobs for the Indian people. An extension of such a program is greatly needed to raise the income level of the average Indian family.

At a meeting called jointly by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself on January 7, 1957, in my office, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from 11 States met with representatives of the Department of Defense, Office of Defense Mobilization, Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, and two Senate subcommittees. There were two primary subjects of discussion: First, a plan to bring more industrial plants to or near the various Indian reservations in the United States; and second, to urge the continuing operation of the Turtle Mountain ordnance plant at Rolla, N. Dak., which hires almost exclusively Indian skilled labor in the production of jewel bearings for defense and other purposes.

After fully discussing both of these issues for almost 3 hours, in summary these points were reached: First, the Indian people have proven themselves as capable and industrious, and have an excellent record of average daily attendance on the job. It was pointed out that at the Rolla jewel-bearing plant in North Dakota, the turnover of employees was only 3 percent, whereas in a similar plant in Massachusetts, employing non-Indian labor, the turnover of employees was 100 percent; second, the Indian people, contrary to some public belief, have adapted themselves to a special type of skilled labor; third, industrial plants have now been established on or near Indian reservations in Rolla, N. Dak.; Gallup, N. Mex.; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Cherokee, N. C.; Lame Deer, Mont.; Casa Grande, Ariz.; and Zuni, N. Mex.. There are also under consideration plants in Oklahoma and Wyoming, and in the area in close proximity to the borders of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho on the McNary site; fourth, it was pointed out that many Indian reservations have the facilities for industrial power availability of water, including the use of power, transportation, available sites for expansion, and a stable source of labor supply; fifth, the Indian leaders on all Indian reservations have expressed the desire for industrial plants to be brought onto or near the Indian reservations to stabilize the economy of the Indian people. This not only will provide salaries for workers, but will aid other factors in the stabilizing of the economy of these communities. At the same time it will permit Indians to obtain jobs near their reservations and near their families and cultures, rather than force them to go to large cities away from their families and traditions. This is especially significant, since the relocation program cannot possibly absorb enough Indians to stabilize the economy of the Indian people living on the Indian reservations; and sixth, the Indian people through their leaders have expressed the desire to provide for themselves and their children by obtaining stable and gainful employment, so that they may become self-sustaining, and not have to depend, any more than is necessary, on the services accorded by the Federal and State Governments. Not only will they be more self-sustaining economically, but it will further establish in them the strong family and community pride that has always been a part of the Indian people.

Summarizing the views on the reasons for continuing the Rolla plant, other than those expressed above, it was pointed out: First, that more than 50 million jewel bearings are needed to accommodate the defense needs of this country; second, that only approximately 3,600,000 jewel bearings are in storage at this time; third, that the Rolla plant is the only available source of jewel bearings in this country; fourth, that Russia produces more than 200 million jewel bearings each year, and is not dependent upon outside sources for jewel bearings; fifth, that Switzerland, which is, and has been, a source of supply of jewel bearings to the United States, in the event of war may be stopped in some fashion by Russia from either the production or the distribution of jewel bearings for the use of the United States; sixth, that without question jewel bearings are an essential ingredient of almost all phases of our defense activities, whether in the production of missiles, equipment, or transportation facilities; and seventh, that the differential in cost and the quantity of production has reached the point where it is feasible to continue production at Rolla.

Mr. President, the passage of this bill will be one of the most significant steps taken by Congress to date in the administration of Indian affairs. The signatures of the distinguished Senators cosponsoring the bill are evidence of its importance to the welfare of our Indian citizens.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, now that the clerk has read my statement on the bill, I may say that the bill is sponsored by a number of Senators, nearly all of whom come from States in which Indian reservations are located.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with the names of its sponsors, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in order that other Senators may join in cosponsoring the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for 4 days, for such purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, together with a list of the sponsors, will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 809) to provide economic assistance to the American Indians, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. THYE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its

title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to provide programs of assistance to the American Indian tribes and their members in the establishment upon Indian reservations of industries and other activities which will provide employment and otherwise improve the economic status of such Indians, and to provide programs for encouraging the establishment by private enterprise of industries and other activities on or near Indian reservations which will provide employment and otherwise improve the economic status of the Indians residing upon such reservation.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") is authorized to formulate and carry out programs designed to carry out the purposes of this act. In carrying out such programs the Secretary is authorized—

(1) To make loans or grants to Indian tribes for the establishment of tribal enterprises or activities designed to carry out the purposes of this act;

(2) to make or guarantee loans to individual Indians for the establishment by such individual Indians of enterprises or activities which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will aid in carrying out the purposes of this act;

(3) to make or guarantee loans to non-Indians for the establishment or expansion of enterprises or activities which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will aid in carrying out the purposes of this act;

(4) to furnish to Indian tribes or to individual Indians technical information and assistance necessary to enable them to establish and operate enterprises and activities designed to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Loans and grants under this act shall be made upon such reasonable terms and conditions as the Congress shall approve upon recommendation by the Secretary including, in the case of loans to non-Indians, such assurances as may be necessary to guarantee preferred employment will be given to Indians in the operation of enterprises and activities established or expanded through loans made under this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress during the month of January in each year a complete report of his activities under this act during the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200 million to be available until expended for carrying out the provisions of this act.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE IN RELIEVING SHORTAGE OF RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortage of residential mortgage funds. The President, in his Economic Report, recommended the enactment of this proposed legislation.

The joint resolution has been recommended by the FHA. It provides an additional $1 billion for FNMA.

I ask unanimous consent to have the joint resolution itself printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement which I have prepared in explanation of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortage of residential mortgage funds, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 38

Joint resolution to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortage of residential mortgage funds

Resolved, etc., That (a) section 303 (d) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following sentence:

"In addition to the preferred stock provided for in the first sentence of this subsection, the Association is authorized and directed to issue and deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to accept, preferred stock of the Association having an aggregate par value equal to $100 million."

(b) Section 303 (e) of such act is amended by inserting the words "the first sentence of" immediately following the words "delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to," and by adding the following sentence:

"The preferred stock of the Association delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (d) of this section shall be in exchange for a note or notes of the Association aggregating $100 million (upon which the accrued interest shall have been paid through the date of delivery) held by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to authority contained in section 304 (c) of this act."

(c) Section 304 (c) of such act is amended by striking all of the second sentence after the phrase "or (2)" and by substituting therefor the following: "such purchase would increase the aggregate principal amount of his then outstanding holdings of such obligations under this subsection to an amount greater than $1,700,000,000, or an amount greater than $1,350,000,000 if such purchase is made prior to July 1, 1957."

SEC. 2. Section 309 (c) of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon, and inserting immediately thereafter the following: *"Provided,* That in computing such equivalent amount, there shall be deducted from the gross income of the Association, with respect to such secondary market operations, all expenses and other deductions which would be authorized by the Federal income tax laws to be deducted if the Association were not exempt from such taxes with respect to such secondary market operations and any amounts paid to the Secretary of the Treasury as a return on his investment in the securities of the Association."

The explanation, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

SECTION 1

Section 1 proposes an increase of $100 million in FNMA's capitalization, providing a total capitalization in excess of $208 million, with the consequent broadening of its borrowing authority under its secondary market operation. The increase would be accomplished by changing the nature of $100 million of the Treasury's existing debt financing of FNMA from such present debt financing to financing evidenced by preferred stock. The total borrowing authority under the secondary market operations would be thereby increased to an amount in excess of $2.1 billion, from the present approximately $1.1 billion. The ratio of borrowings to the sum of capital and surplus would remain 10 to 1.

Also, the limitations on the amount of FNMA's secondary market operations obligations that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to hold would be changed. The effective limitation now applicable is $1 billion. A flat overall maximum of $1.[illegible] billion that the Secretary of the Treasury could hold would be substituted for the existing limitations, except that until July 1, 1957, the new limitation would be $1.35 billion.

During the past several months, because of the severe shortage of funds in the residential mortgage market, there has been a very sharp increase in the number and amount of mortgages offered to FNMA, with the result that it has become apparent that FNMA needs additional capital to carry out the purposes for which the secondary market operations were established. The number of mortgages offered increased from about 5,800 in August 1956 to about 10,000 in September, and to approximately 19,000 in each of the months of October and November. The unobligated resources (including possible borrowings) of FNMA's secondary market operations at December 31, 1956, were only approximately $240 million and those resources could become exhausted early in 1957.

SECTION 2

Section 2 proposes a statement of the formula for computing the amount which FNMA would pay to the Secretary of the Treasury as the equivalent of Federal income taxes, with respect to its secondary market operations. It provides for the deduction from gross income of all expenses and other deductions which would be authorized by law to be deducted if the association were not exempt from such taxes and any amounts paid by the association to the Secretary of the Treasury as a return on his investment in the securities of the association. The latter category includes payments made as a return on Treasury advances on account of notes, stock, or debentures.

FNMA, so far as its Secondary Market Operations are concerned, was organized under the Charter Act on the basis of the Federal Government's sponsorship, the sponsorship in large part consisting of the Government's subscription to preferred stock. While the Secondary Market Operations have been both useful and successful thus far, their very nature requires FNMA to obtain a major portion of its private financing during periods of money shortages and high interest rates. At the present time, the absence of an express direction that FNMA's payments made to the Secretary of the Treasury as a return on Treasury advances on account of preferred stock of the association held by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be deductible from gross income in computing the Federal income tax equivalent, coupled with the increasing cost to FNMA of all its financing, jeopardizes FNMA's ability to continue successfully in establishing the Secondary Market Operations so that they will ultimately constitute the privately owned and financed instrumentality contemplated by the Charter Act.

It is believed that the proposal in actuality conforms to the intent of the FNMA Charter Act, as to the point involved. Under the Charter Act, the measure of the preferred stock dividends is the interest rate on obligations of the United States, and consequently the dividends were made cumulative and are variable as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus, while FNMA can never control the rate or amount of its preferred stock dividends, the contrary is customarily the case with respect to ordinary business corporations. Also, the investment of the Secretary of the Treasury in FNMA's preferred stock will entitle him to

an ultimate major share of FNMA's surplus, an advantage not usually connected with preferred stock.

The proposal will go far in assuring that full dividends to the Secretary of the Treasury can be continued with respect to FNMA's preferred stock. It is to be noted especially, as has already been indicated, that a substantial part of the surplus under the Secondary Market Operations, including any portion thereof resulting from any tax savings, will ultimately be distributed to the Secretary of the Treasury as owner of the preferred stock. The Charter Act provides that the distribution shall be that "percentage which is equivalent to the proportion borne by the employed capital represented by the Secretary's stock ($193 million of preferred stock is proposed) to the total employed capital of the Association ($15 million of common stock is now subscribed for, providing an aggregate proposed current total capitalization of approximately $208 million)."

HOME LOANS TO VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1957, the names of Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MALONE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. KENNEDY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 726) to provide that 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance Fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans; to increase the maximum loan entitlement of veterans under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to expedite action on certain applications of veterans for direct home loans, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. THURMOND) on January 17, 1957.

ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIAL USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 724) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 17, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF RULES RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 36) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the standing committees, submitted by me on January 14, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address on Robert E. Lee delivered by Senator STENNIS in Statuary Hall, the Capitol, before the United Daughters of the Confederacy, on January 19, 1957.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Statement prepared by him relative to the career of Andrew N. Overby, who is resigning as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Excerpts from address entitled "Patriotic Americanism," delivered by him before the Pennsylvania State Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on September 28, 1956.

THE 1958 BUDGET—EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF PRESS CONFERENCE WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, since President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress his budget for the fiscal year 1958, on January 16, 1957, there has been considerable discussion in the press and in Congress in regard to the views of Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey concerning the 1958 budget.

Statements made by Secretary Humphrey and statements attributed to him have been interpreted as indicating that the Secretary does not support the 1958 budget. As he has himself indicated repeatedly, nothing could be farther from the truth. For example, at a press conference on January 16, 1957, Secretary Humphrey was asked the following question:

Do you support those parts of the current budget which propose increased expenditures?

In his usual straightforward manner, Secretary Humphrey replied as follows:

I think this budget as now drawn has been prepared with the very greatest care, and I think it is the best that we can possibly do right now.

Now my whole point is this: That it is 18 months before we get through living under this budget, and I think there are a lot of economies and a lot of savings that we ought to be able to make if we pay strict attention to our business and work at them hard enough during the next 18 months.

I don't think there is anything in sight at the moment that can be done better than is now proposed in this budget, but I think we ought to improve it as time goes on.

Secretary Humphrey's attitude on the 1958 budget is clearly that of a realistic, conscientious, economy-minded public official who is trying to do a thorough job of holding Federal expenditures to the minimum for efficient operation of the Federal Government. Who is this great deliberative body or in the Federal Government would try to do less?

If the Secretary of the Treasury were not actively interested in keeping the 1958 budget under continuing scrutiny, in order to effectuate all possible economies in the 18-month life of this budget, criticism would then be justified, and I would be among the first to participate in it.

So as to keep the record straight on Secretary Humphrey's attitude toward the 1958 budget, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from his January 16 press conference, as contained in the January 25 issue of U. S. News & World Report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following are excerpts from the transcript of a press conference held by Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey on January 16, 1957:

Secretary Humphrey: "The President has said that the Federal Government alone cannot successfully combat inflation without the earnest cooperation of all individuals and groups of our citizens. As emphasized in the state of the Union message, business leaders and labor leaders, through their wage and price policies, must make their full, constructive contribution. All other groups must also contribute to the common effort.

"First, we must seek the full cooperation of the public generally in limiting its demands upon the Federal Government for only essential Federal functions, especially at this time when the economy is operating at such a high level. Requests should be avoided for services or assistance which properly can be supplied by States or local communities or by the citizens themselves.

"Second, we must request the support of the Congress to restrict the appropriation of public money to amounts within those recommended in the budget which may be required to carry out the necessary Federal functions.

"Third, we must require every department and agency of the Government to take vigorous measures, without harm to either security or service to the public, to see that actual expenditures are kept well within the present budgeted figures between now and the end of the next fiscal year and, as the President has said, 'search out additional ways to save money and manpower.'

"Fourth, we must plan for the 1959 budget, giving urgent attention to making further reductions both in Government employment and in expenditures where these savings will not lessen our security or the quality of the necessary services rendered to the public.

"If this program is adopted and resolutely followed, we can, a year hence, give consideration not only to some further payment on the public debt but also to further tax reductions. This, of course, must be conditioned upon continuation of our present prosperity. Just when and how a tax reduction should be made can be determined only when it is known how well these conditions have been fulfilled. In any event, any such tax cuts must provide relief so that every individual taxpayer may have some benefits. In the meantime, and until this is accomplished, we must continue to oppose any revision of the tax laws which results in any substantial loss of Government income.

"This program will provide more effective control of our spending. It will become a

desirable restraint on inflationary pressures through release to the private economy of added manpower and money which, in turn, can open the way to lower taxes, with a sharper spur to incentive and greater opportunity, and production of more and better jobs.

"You have heard a good deal of talk about whether or not we are just continually going to go up and up and up, and that is my answer to that talk."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, whom do you blame for the increase in spending and the growth in Government employees?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Everybody."

Question: "The administration?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Everybody. Congress enacts laws, that start with the public. The public, various groups of the public—and it is getting so more and more—keep turning to the Federal Government for everything in the world to be taken care of. Whenever anybody gets into a little bit of trouble he immediately runs to Washington and asks for something to be done about it.

"The pressure is put on Congress to enact laws to help them. Congress enacts some laws to help them, and the Executive, when the laws go in, has to support the laws and work with the laws, and that adds to the payrolls and it adds to the employment, and it adds to the cost of Government, and that adds to the taxes. It is just everybody——"

Question: "Are you criticizing the administration for this?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I criticize everybody from the public right straight through to myself. We have not been firm enough. We have to be firmer than we have been and we have to get our expenses in better control than they now are."

* * * * *

Question: "Do you support those parts of the current budget which propose increased expenditures?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I think this budget as now drawn has been prepared with the very greatest care, and I think it is the best that we can possibly do right now.

"Now my whole point is this: That it is 18 months before we get through living under this budget, and I think there are a lot of economies and a lot of savings that we ought to be able to make if we pay strict attention to our business and work at them hard enough during the next 18 months.

"I don't think there is anything in sight at the moment that can be done better than is now proposed in this budget, but I think we ought to improve it as time goes on."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, the four budgets this administration has had have gone up every year. You're now $7 billion up"——

* * * * *

Secretary Humphrey: "We made—let's see, 3 years ago—a very substantial reduction in our expenditures. The thing has been creeping up ever since."

Question: "You are up $7 billion?"

Secretary Humphrey: "That's right, $7.2 billion."

Question: "Do you really think it will go down at any time?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I think it must."

Question: "Why didn't it this time?"

Secretary Humphrey: "It just kept creeping up on us. It did it for the reasons I gave. Everybody from the public all the way through has just been looking to the Federal Government for more and more and more, and we have not controlled it."

* * * * *

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR E BONDS

Question: "A lot of people are interested in whether you are going to raise the (interest) rates on your E bonds?"

Question: "You have already said you were."

Secretary Humphrey: "No; we never have said it."

Question: "That has been published—that you would."

Secretary Humphrey: "No."

Question: "Is consideration being given?"

Secretary Humphrey: "We are not prepared today to make a final and definite statement on E bonds. That has no part in the budget. We will have a permanent and definite decision and statement before very long on E bonds."

* * * * *

Question: "Mr. Brundage, the Budget Director, has told us that he thinks we have got about to the peak of the tight-money market. Do you share that judgment?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I wouldn't undertake to say. I think it depends on a great many conditions, and again I get right back to what I said a minute ago. It depends a good deal on how much the Government itself spends, how much the Government takes out of the economy. And it is taking a great deal out of the economy today.

"My own feeling is that we are taking more out than we can continue to do over a long period of time. I think the present trend must be reversed. I think our present taxes—the trend in our present taxes, the amount of our present taxes—are too high. I think they have to come down. Over a period of time, the only way they can come down is by spending less money, and having a greater margin between income and outgo."

Question: "Where would you cut?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I think there are a lot of places in this budget that can be cut."

Question: "Name three."

Secretary Humphrey: "I think—well, I don't believe I will do that. We have been all over this with the greatest care, and I don't believe it is up to me to start now to point the finger at people to make cuts, but I think a lot of people will make some cuts. I think we will do so in the Treasury."

Question: "Don't you think that is an executive problem—must not leadership come from the executive branch for cuts in the budget?"

Secretary Humphrey: "That's right."

* * * * *

Question: "In the Cabinet committee's recommendations, one was for a change in the corporate tax rate which would help small business. Are you opposed to that?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I am opposed to that this year."

* * * * *

"There are a large number of suggestions for reductions in taxes that are going to be brought before this Congress."

Question: "By the administration?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No, by Congress and by various people.

"The Congressmen themselves are going to be bringing a lot of things up. A lot of people are here in Washington now, complaining about various taxes and asking for reductions. Just at the moment it is particularly confined to the excises. But there will be more and more coming and there are 3 or 4 committees of Congress who are making reports or will make reports.

"So far as the Treasury is concerned, we object to any reduction, any law, any change in the tax laws which will mean a substantial loss of revenue."

Question: "Would you favor, sir, the suspension entirely of the 5-year write-off, the so-called fast tax write-off?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I don't think it should be entirely eliminated. It is reduced now, as you know, to a very small amount, and it is confined now by order to only, I think, 15 or 16 classifications, out of something over 200 previously, that apply directly to the defense effort.

"Now, I think perhaps it is well to leave it for those few particular things that are directly and importantly and in a large degree strictly defense."

Question: "Like steel?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Not at all. Any industry like steel where a relatively small amount of the total production goes into direct defense and the great growth is in the normal economy, I am opposed to having any rapid amortization. That does not apply necessarily to the consideration that is being given all along to the previous adjustments of depreciation and the proper depreciation schedules. We are talking about rapid amortization."

Question: "The fast stuff?"

Secretary Humphrey: "That's right."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, on the receipts side, what estimates are you making for calendar year 1957 on personal income and profits?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Well, we are estimating personal income for calendar year 1956 at $325.5 billion * * *"

"We are estimating $340 billion for calendar 1957."

Question: "How about corporate profits?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Corporate profits have been estimated at $43 billion for calendar 1956 and $44 billion for calendar 1957."

* * * * *

Question: "You commented in the past that a surplus would properly be necessary before you could consider a tax cut. And one time the figure of $2 billion was mentioned"—

Secretary Humphrey: "I said I thought 2 [billion] was too small. There is no magic in that at all. We are figuring on getting about 37 to 38 billion dollars from individual taxpayers, you know. If you talk about a 10-percent cut in individual taxes, that is $4 billion. There is no magic in it. There would be no cut in corporate taxes in that amount. It all depends on what you are going to do. I think about all you can say, as to the amount required before you make a general tax revision, is that you should have enough money to make a reasonable, respectable tax reduction. I don't think you would want to make a 1-percent tax reduction and get all the confusion that would follow."

Question. "Would you say, at the present income levels, that something like $3 billion would be a minimum?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Three to five."

CONGRESS TO CUT THE BUDGET?

Question. "Mr. Secretary, the tone of what you are saying here today might be taken as encouragement for Congress to go ahead and cut this budget quite a lot. Do you want to encourage that sentiment or not?"

Senator Humphrey. "That is a hard question to answer. If the Congress in further study, after hearing the expressions of the executive department on what they believe it is necessary to do, if the Congress can find ways to cut, and still do a proper job with respect to our security and with respect to the proper services to the public, I would be very glad to see it. It is possible there are some things we still are doing that were necessary some years ago that we are still continuing that we might find ways of eliminating.

"I think that in all of these things we don't want to stand still. We want to go ahead and continue to do new things and continue to meet changing conditions.

"On the other hand, I think we have to be very selective, and I think that you just can't do everything. As a matter of fact, it isn't a bit different than it is in your own home. You can't have everything you want, and what you want to do is to pick out the things that the present situation demands the most and then, in order to be able to afford them, you have to eliminate some of the things that maybe you did before that now you can get along without."

* * * * *

Question: "The tone of your statement this morning makes it sound as though you had pressed in the administration's councils for some sharp spending cuts and have been overruled. Would that be an unfair inference?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Yes, that is unfair. I have pressed for less spending right along. There is no division or difficulty in the administration at all on this subject. This is a thing that we all are in accord on. This budget was made up, as I say, with the very greatest care and a great deal of time spent on it, and this is apparently the best we can do at the present time.

"But I just believe that over 18 months we ought to keep doing better."

* * * * *

Question: "You put a lot of contingencies on your tax reduction but you do say a year hence we can give consideration. What information do you have that all of these conditions you laid down in the matter will be met in the next year?"

* * * * *

Secretary Humphrey: "If we make no progress whatever"——

Question: "Then no tax cut?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Then there is no tax cut next year."

* * * * *

Question: "Aren't you really paying now for the tax cut you gave in 1953?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No. Why would you say that?"

Question: "Well, your budget is going up."

Secretary Humphrey: "But we balanced the budget on the last tax cut. The budget was balanced right the following year after the last tax cut."

TIMING A TAX REDUCTION

Question: "But you emptied the pipelines on defense."

Secretary Humphrey: "No, we didn't do anything on the pipelines on defense."

Question: "Yes, you did. Officials testified they did."

Secretary Humphrey: "When you make a tax cut it isn't effective on the day you make it. It becomes effective as you move forward over the next months in the time when the money is being collected, you see, and when the money is going out; so that that is why I have always said you don't have to have it in your hand today.

"You don't have to wait until the $4 billion or $5 billion, or what you will give back to the people, is in hand that very day; but you have to be sure that it is available as you move forward."

* * * * *

Question: "Mr. Secretary, you say that a tax reduction must be conditioned upon the continuation of our present prosperity. Does that mean that the administration will not cut taxes so that it can add to purchasing power to offset a recession or to prevent a threatened recession?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I will contest a tax cut out of deficits as long as I am able. I will not approve, myself, of a tax cut out of deficit. I think it would start a downward spiral that would be serious. I don't believe in this idea that you can cut taxes out of deficits, and then build up from that."

Question: "Then you don't believe in compensatory spending?"

Secretary Humphrey: "What do you mean by that?"

Question: "In other words, increasing the level of Government spending during a period in which business generally is declining and, therefore, presumably tax receipts will be declining."

Secretary Humphrey: "No; I don't think so. I don't think you can spend yourself rich. I think we went all through that for a good many years, and we kept spending and spending and spending, and we still didn't help our employment or help our total position."

Question: "Perhaps the answer is to put more of the Government's operations under trust funds like the highway program."

Secretary Humphrey: "Well, I don't think that is necessarily so. The reason for the trust fund is, I think, a very good one."

Question: "Your budget would look better today if highway was in the budget."

Secretary Humphrey: "That is right. Why fool the people?"

HOW HIGHWAY FUNDS ARE HANDLED

Question: "You think we are fooling them now on highways?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No. I think, if you put it in the budget, if you go out and collect a lot of money ahead of time that you are obligated to spend, and show it as assets, and show that you are better off, I think you are fooling the people. I think that ought to be out of your budget. It would be an easy thing for us to make a wonderful showing here. I wouldn't do it, because I don't believe in fooling the people. I believe in showing them where they stand and letting them know where they stand all the time.

"That is what the highway fund does. That is the principal reason for it. That money is for a specific purpose. It is set aside for that purpose and, if we happen to have a surplus of it this year which is obligated to be spent next year, that is no reason why we should think we are rich this year."

Question: "Then you think that, by and large, the Government's productive expenditures should remain within the framework of the general revenue rather than be put on a use-tax basis?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No, not necessarily. No, no. The road tax is a use-tax basis. And I am for that."

Question: "Could we have more of that type?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Yes; I was its principal advocate. We should have more of it. I am an advocate of it. I think a use tax is a very proper tax."

Question: "For instance, what besides roads? Schools?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Roads are the principal thing. That is the biggest item. There can be others that can be developed."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, would you resign if the administration embarked upon the deficit program you have just described?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I think I would."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, suppose inflationary pressures exist a year from now and you have a projected surplus of three to five billion dollars, would you oppose a tax cut because of the effect on inflationary pressures?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Well, it is pretty hard to say—you would have to see just what the causes of the inflationary pressures were, if we had as much of a surplus as that. It is pretty hard to have that kind of surplus with strong inflationary pressures all at the same time. You wouldn't be apt to have it. There might be a reason why you would, and you would have to know. I don't believe you can make a categorical answer to that."

Question: "Mr. Secretary, some private industrial firms may have been holding back expansion in the hope of getting accelerated tax amortization, but you seem to have killed that hope. Others may have been holding back on the hope of a general overhauling and liberalizing of the depreciation structure. Do you think that hope is groundless?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No; I don't. I think that you are continually reviewing the life factors, and things of that kind, in depreciation. I do not think there is a great big change coming in depreciation."

Question: "Nothing that would warrant them holding off a necessary project?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No; I wouldn't think so. I think that if you take the total dollars of depreciation that we collect and divide it by the total amount of capital investment in the country you would come out with something in the order of 17 years. Now, there is nothing scientific about that, but it gives you an idea that you are depreciating your total investment in the area of somewhere near 17 years under present rates. Readjustment might reduce that to 16 or 15.5, or might put it up to 19, or something like that, as you move along, but there isn't anything that should encourage anybody to wait for some special windfall."

* * * * *

Question: "In the increased spending in this budget, can you make any estimate as to how much is inflation and include in that inflation the increase in interest rate?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Well, that is pretty hard. You mean inflation for how long a period? In the last 4 years?"

Question: "Well, all right, take the last 4 years."

Secretary Humphrey: "In the last 4 years the general change in the price level has been comparatively little. Even up to this minute, it is only 2 or 3 percent. So I would think that up to date comparatively little is due to depreciation of the dollar. It has to be that. If the dollar has only, over the 4 years—the depreciation of the dollar is measured in your price levels of various commodities, and, if all balanced out, it has only moved a cent or two or three or in that area; it couldn't be anything different than that."

INFLATION FROM HIGHER INTEREST

Question: "You don't regard the increase in interest rate as an inflationary factor?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Yes; I do, but the increase in interest rate is relatively small. You are getting into small percentages. It is a lot of dollars, but a very small percentage you are talking about."

* * * * *

Question: "Mr. Secretary, I was going to ask you, you mentioned individual tax cuts. * * * What about the corporation tax?"

Secretary Humphrey: "That all depends, as I say, on the amount that might be available for a tax cut. I personally feel that, for the next tax cut, the first emphasis is for the individual. If you can have enough for a general revision, that is fine if you can also have an individual cut. Otherwise I would be opposed to a corporate tax cut. Somebody asked me here a minute ago if I was in favor of the corporate tax cut that has been proposed for this year for small business. I am opposed to it for a number of reasons not worth going into now. But one is that I think the next emphasis is on the individual."

* * * * *

"I am not opposed to help for small business, but I am opposed to that particular proposal this particular year."

Question: "What other ones would you be for this particular year?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I am opposed to any reduction for anybody in a way that substantially reduces our revenues."

Question: "What is a substantial reduction?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Anything that is going to deplete our revenues much. You can see we are on very narrow ground."

Question: "A billion?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No. I am talking about small amounts. We are on very narrow ground to make a balanced budget here. I don't think we ought to give tax cuts to anybody until we are paying as we go."

Question: "Fifty million, is that too much?"

Secretary Humphrey: "If you had a half dozen things—I will object to 50 million each. I will object to anything that costs much, but, if the Congress passes 50 million, I won't go out and cut my throat. If it is 51 million, I might."

Question: "What do you think it would cost you to enact the recommendation for small-business corporate tax relief?"

Secretary Humphrey: "Do you mean the whole program?"

Question: "No, just that one corporate income tax rate."

Secretary Humphrey: "Dan, what is that?"

Dan Throop Smith, Deputy to the Secretary: "Four hundred forty million for that one, alone."

Secretary Humphrey: "Between 400 and 500 million for that one."

* * * * *

"If the Congress is going to adopt one and only one tax cut for anybody, and they pick out a 20 or 30-million-dollar item, I can say for these proposals that the committee has given them very good and careful consideration, that they are good proposals, and that they are worthy of consideration and worthy of help, and if they are only going to give one of 20 or 30 million dollars or something of that kind, I would be glad to see them have some one of these."

TAX SETUP "HURTS ALMOST EVERYBODY"

"That is about the net of it. I want to say this: I think we all want—and you all want—to think as citizens. Now, what goes on is this: Our tax laws are so very high—the amounts that we take from everybody are so very high—that there is hardly anybody in this country or any group in this country that cannot come down here and show that they are hurt by the taxes they pay. It hurts almost everybody in this country, and almost any group can come in and make an awfully good case for tax relief. What has been going on—and it still goes on—is this, and it is perfectly natural that it should.

"Groups come down here and make a showing that they are badly hurt by these taxes, and they ask for tax relief and, if that group is sufficiently powerful and has a sufficiently powerful backing and makes a sufficient effort, the Congress has given them some consideration. From a little tax law this thick, we have one that is as thick as this, because all sorts of gadgets and relief of various kinds have been granted to various sets of people instead of having overall relief granted.

"Of course, there are a few strictly unfair things that creep into the law occasionally that need to be straightened out, but, if we can stop making all these little adjustments all around, except the very unfair ones, and save our money until we can make a reduction all down the line, everybody gets the benefit of that, and the pressure on everybody is taken off. And I believe that, instead of this group and this group and this group, each one being favored here and there all over the place, what we need in America is to have this whole tax structure come down, and when our whole tax structure comes down, everybody will be better off, and the necessity for meeting these demands of these little groups will be largely reduced, because it is the height of our rates that causes the trouble.

"If you take the opposite side of that, and if you go on just giving little groups here and there and everywhere special consideration and bringing them down, the first thing you know, you are going to have to raise the rates on the poor fellows who are left, and they are going to have to pay higher rates, because we have to have so many dollars to run the business with.

"Every time you give a special group relief, you are just putting that much burden on everybody else, and I think it is high time we quit burdening everybody else for special people and we should try to get everybody down all at one time."

Question. "Mr. Secretary, I believe you said a few moments ago that you would not be in favor of cutting taxes or increasing Government expenditures as an antidote to a depression."

Secretary Humphrey: "I don't say that as a categorical thing. I said cutting taxes out of deficit."

Question: "Yes. Well, I have two questions to ask about that general policy:

"First, isn't that attitude in general disagreement with what has been the expression of Presidential policy, as indicated in the economic reports over the years; and, secondly, what would you do to counter a depression?"

Secretary Humphrey: "In the first place, I think that it is at variance with a lot of economic writing that there has been in the past, a lot of the economists having advocated that. I just personally do not believe in it. I think that a depression is brought about by imbalances that come in, some sort of imbalances that come into your economy. I think the thing to do to avoid a depression is to try to correct those imbalances and take some measures, some basic measures, and, as you get your imbalances corrected, if you are on a sound base, then people begin to take courage, people begin to get confidence, and it is the confidence of the people that moves the thing ahead."

Question: "What is the role of the Federal Government in trying to redress those imbalances?"

Secretary Humphrey: "To try, as rapidly as possible, to assist in getting those imbalances brought back into balance, and then to try to resist all sorts of novel ideas and to try to get down to a sound economic base, and, by being on a sound economic base, give courage to people to go ahead. After all, it is the people going ahead that does the job."

Question: "Just how do you do it, sir?"

Secretary Humphrey: "It all depends on what is the matter."

Question: "Would you let them starve?"

Secretary Humphrey: "No, I wouldn't let them starve; no, sir. Or sell apples on the corner."

* * * * *

CHANCE OF CUTS IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Question: "Mr. Secretary, isn't nearly all the talk here today about cutting spending and cutting taxes largely academic, as long as the world situation remains what it is? Looking at this budget, I find that the lion's share of the increased expenditures is for mutual security and defense. Is there any hope anywhere in the world situation that you can do any cutting in defense spending in the next few years?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I think there is; yes, I do. I think there is some hope you can reduce expenditures all along the line. I would certainly deplore the day that we thought we couldn't ever reduce expenditures of this terrific amount, the terrific tax take we are taking out of this country. If we don't over a long period of time, I will predict that you will have a depression that will curl your hair, because we are just taking too much money out of this economy that we need to make the jobs that you have to have as time goes on."

HERBERT ELLISTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the late Herbert Elliston, whose death was announced this morning in the Washington Post.

I knew Mr. Elliston well. He was one of the best informed, most intelligent, and most courageous editors I have ever known. In the highest sense of the word he was a fine public servant. He tried to reveal to the public the truth about public affairs.

His greatest distinction was that, having a wealth of knowledge and a deep understanding, he was able to see through the sham and pretense so often encountered in the conduct of the Nation's business; and, seeing the truth, he did not hesitate to write it as he saw it.

Mr. President, it is tragic that so fine a mind and so courageous a spirit should be taken from our midst at such an early age. We can ill afford to lose him. He was a good citizen and an honest man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article about Mr. Elliston, written by Edward T. Folliard, and published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT ELLISTON DEAD—POST EDITOR UNTIL 1953

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Herbert B. Elliston, editor of the Washington Post until 1953 and an outstanding figure in American journalism, died yesterday morning of a heart attack in his apartment at 2500 Massachusetts Avenue NW. He was 61.

Mr. Elliston, who won a Pulitzer prize for distinguished editorial writing in 1949, was stricken with angina pectoris in 1952. He suffered a paralytic stroke later that year, and this led to his resignation as editor of this newspaper on April 20, 1953. He continued, however, as a contributing editor, writing editorials, articles, and a Sunday column.

On Monday afternoon, he watched the pageantry of the Eisenhower inaugural on television. He turned on his set again that night for the inaugural balls, and watched until midnight. He was seemingly well except for a touch of bronchitis.

Yesterday morning, about 1:30 o'clock, Mr. Elliston's housekeeper, Louetta Eckstrand, heard a thump from his room and a cry of "Lou." She rushed into his room to find him crumpled alongside the bed. He died a moment later of a coronary thrombosis.

ESTEEMED BY FRIENDS

Happily, Mr. Elliston learned while still alive of the esteem in which he was held by fellow journalists, statesmen, and rank-and-file newspaper readers. This appreciation was expressed when the Washington Post announced his retirement as editor in 1953.

James F. Byrnes, then Governor of South Carolina, whom Elliston had come to know when Byrnes was Director of War Mobilization and Secretary of State, wrote in to say:

"The editorial page of the Post without the views of Herbert Elliston would be unconstitutional, so please see to it that he keeps his promise to write a column weekly."

Edward Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly and publisher of Mr. Elliston's book Finland Fights, said that the Post's editorial page under Mr. Elliston had "generated both light and heat." He added: "You might differ with what was printed—and in the touchy atmosphere of the Capital many did—but you could never question the integrity which prompted his opinions."

REGRETS IN THE SENATE

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, arose on the Senate floor to express regret over the retirement of Mr. Elliston as editor of the Washington Post, "one of the Nation's great newspapers." Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, praised the retiring editor for his courage.

Walter Lippmann said of Elliston:

"He had—like Cobb of the World, like Parsons of the Herald Tribune, like C. P. Scott of the Manchester Guardian—the true genius of the editor. It shows itself in something else besides being right a good part

of the time. It shows itself in the capacity to evoke, and to conjure up and to create a personality which, often because and sometimes despite the opinions it prints, people feel they are living with and that they need and can count upon."

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, remarked on the eminence of The Washington Post in the editorial field while Mr. Elliston was editor, and said:

"I know of no paper that is as often quoted, or has as much effect on legislative and executive policy as The Post has acquired throughout the years that he sat in the slot and both wrote and directed the editorial policy of this great newspaper."

AMERICAN HISTORY EXPERT

A brilliant writer, with a robust and lilting style, Mr. Elliston was an extraordinary figure in American journalism. He was born in England and never lost his rich Yorkshire accent. But he was an authority on American history. Dercaree Bess, associate editor of the Saturday Evening Post, who knew him in China 30 years ago, said in 1953 that he had "an intimate knowledge of American history and politics which few native-born Americans can match."

He never went to college, owing to the interruption of his education by World War I, but he was a profound and well-rounded scholar who was sought as a lecturer by Harvard and other universities.

In one sense, he was old-fashioned—a throwback to the days of Horace Greeley, Charles Dana, and Henry Watterson. He did not know how to operate a typewriter. He wrote all of his editorials by hand in a tiny, but clear script. After his stroke, which crippled his right side, he had to learn to write with his left hand. In his latter days, he used a dictating machine for his Sunday column.

ONCE WROTE ENTIRE PAGE

On one occasion, when illness struck down other editorial writers of the Washington Post, Mr. Elliston wrote the whole editorial page, turning out a half dozen pieces on different subjects.

He had great powers of concentration, and there were times when they took over against his will. One evening he dressed up in a silk topper and an Inverness cape and started out to walk to a fashionable party in Georgetown. His mind fastened on some issue of the day and would not let go. A bus, headed for downtown, stopped near him. Absorbed in thought and forgetting all about the party, he climbed aboard it.

Herbert Berridge Elliston was born November 15, 1895, at Wakefield, Yorkshire, son of Frederick Thomas and Elizabeth (Berridge) Elliston. He left school in World War I to enlist in the British army and served for 3 years as a signaller with the Royal Horse Artillery. Having been recommended on the field for a commission, he was a cadet when discharged at the end of the war.

Returning to civilian life, he entered newspaper work as a reporter for the Midland Daily Telegraph in Coventry, later transferring to the staff of the Portsmouth Evening News. In 1919 he became a foreign correspondent in China for the Manchester Guardian and the New York Herald.

CAME TO UNITED STATES IN 1920'S

Mr. Elliston traveled from the Far East to New York in the early 1920's, and became an assistant to the cable editor of the New York Sun. Later he became an editorial writer for the New York Herald.

He fell in love with the United States and determined to seek American citizenship.

Mr. Elliston returned to China to become economic adviser to the Chinese government and chief editor of its economic publications. He returned to New York in 1927 and from that year to 1930 served in the editorial offices of the Council of Foreign Relations, directed by Allen Dulles.

In 1930 he moved to Boston to serve with the Christian Science Monitor, first as an editorial writer, then as a financial writer and as the author of a page 1 column on international affairs, This Changing World.

SAW FINNISH INVASION

Mr. Elliston was on a roving assignment and happened to be in Helsinki when Russia's Red army invaded Finland on November 30, 1939. He filed the first cable dispatches on that David-and-Goliath struggle, and on the third day made a radio broadcast on the fighting. His book, Finland Fights, published in March 1940, was the first of the World War II books, and won much praise. Last March the Ambassador of Finland here, Johan A. Nykopp, presented him with the Order of the White Rose of Finland.

Mr. Elliston returned to the United States in 1940 and in October of that year became associate editor of the Washington Post. As such he was in charge of the editorial page in a time of the highest tension. In 1945, a hundred or so Washington correspondents said in a poll that the Post had the best editorials of any paper in Washington.

When Eugene Meyer gave up the title of editor and publisher in 1946 to become the first president of the World Bank, that of editor was given to Mr. Elliston. His task, however, remained the same to direct the editorial page.

LEAD THE WAY

Reminiscing about his early days on this newspaper, Mr. Elliston recently told about the instructions he got from Mr. Meyer, now chairman of the board.

"Mr. Meyer told me," he said, "that I should lead the way for the country through the editorial page of the Post. He said that I was to keep on top of the news, even ahead of it, and not trail behind."

Mr. Elliston said that Mr. Meyer always backed him up, no matter how severe the criticism that occasionally pourcd in on him.

Until he became paralyzed, Mr. Elliston was a hearty fellow who took his job seriously, but not himself. In describing the work of an editorial writer, he said:

"He is not a trained specialist, but has been trained to know something about everything, and, to conform to the textbook ideal, he is expected to know everything about something. Sometimes in these complicated days he feels like the blind leading the blind, even as Bernard Shaw called the editorial writer, a half wit; but the deadline creeps closer, and gradually he assumes the mantle of authority, and applying the seat of his pants to the seat of his chair, manages to turn out his lucubration."

EULOGIZED BY DULLES

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles yesterday issued this statement when he learned of Mr. Elliston's death:

"The fields of foreign affairs and of journalism are both poorer today because of the loss of Herbert Elliston.

"His knowledge of foreign affairs was wide ranging; and through his writing he was able to convey that knowledge to the public with a perception that added to the general understanding of the complex problems of our time.

"My sympathy goes out to the members of his family and to his many friends throughout the world."

John H. Crider, former editor of the Boston Herald, who shared a Pulitzer prize with Mr. Elliston for editorial writing in 1949, cabled the Washington Post from London yesterday to praise Elliston as a man "who grappled with illness with the same tenacity he always applied to the search for truth."

Mr. Elliston married Mildred Foster in 1923. From that marriage there was one son, Stephen Foster Elliston. In 1941 he married Joanne Shaw, and they had two sons, Peter B. and Michael S.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p. m. Thursday at the All Souls (Unitarian) Church, 16th and Harvard Streets NW. It was Mr. Elliston's request that there be no flowers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a tribute in the Washington Post of this morning to Herbert Elliston, who died yesterday. I was proud to be his friend, and I think all of us will miss the prodding, whether gentle or fierce, which he has supplied Congress through the Post's editorial columns in the past 16 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial for January 23 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT B. ELLISTON

It is with heavy heart that we record the death of Herbert Berridge Elliston, who successively during more than 16 years was associate editor, editor, and contributing editor of this newspaper. The editorial page was his stimulus, his joy, and his life. He gave to it all the insight, prescience, and directness of which his many-faceted mind was capable.

Herbert Elliston brought to his readers an incredibly rich background. There was scarcely a country of which he did not know the politik. He never quite lost the accent and mannerisms of his native Yorkshire, but he was not an Anglophile. He could view British-American relations objectively, and he had a much larger platform of world affairs. After coming to the United States as a journalist in the early 1920's, he went abroad to become an adviser to the Chinese Government for several years. He absorbed a knowledge of China and Japan which he continually refurbished. He had the same knowledge of Europe and the remainder of Asia from his contacts and travels. He had a special regard for the fortitude of Finland, which he visited during the winter war of 1939.

To his constant sense of the important in international relations he added a thorough understanding of economics and fiscal affairs (he was for a time financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor). Service in the British army on the fighting fronts during World War I had ingrained in him a twin horror of war and of authoritarianism. He was never a pacifist, however. He understood fully that war is the failure of diplomacy, but that some things are worse than war.

What was most striking was his knowledge of history. He knew far more about American history than most persons born here, and he drank in relevant facts with the passion of a self-educted man. He had a classicist's devotion to the lessons of the past, but he was not awed by them, and he was always conscious that in his daily work he was writing the first version of history. He read selectively but intensively. He had a prodigious memory with a mental filing system which enabled him to produce details on command. He could quote from Palmerston or Lincoln, Macaulay or Ferrero with equal ease.

Never did he forget that he was a newspaperman. His mind worked 24 hours a day seeking meaning and perspective; although he knew diplomacy he did not play diplomat. He had a vast pride of craftsmanship. His writing style at its best was mellifluous and rolling, and was replete with

literary allusion. He did not hesitate to use an unfamiliar word when it expressed his meaning precisely, and he was a stickler for precision. He was gratified by the award of a Pulitzer Prize in 1949. Characteristically, after he was partially paralyzed by a stroke in 1953, he read a great deal about his affliction and never let it daunt him. He recovered much of his power of locomotion and continued to write editorials, articles, and a Sunday column until the day of his death.

Many persons felt the sting of Herbert Elliston's barbs. He could be acerb and blunt when he thought the occasion warranted. Sometimes he wrote with an imp on his shoulder, and at times he would address his criticisms to just one official. But his criticisms were seldom personal. He had a gift of compassion along with his plainspokenness, and he believed, as he often said, in issues, not men.

He had many dislikes, but few hatreds. Among his dislikes were pomposity, sham, and fraud. He could detect these qualities quickly in measures as well as in individuals. He had a keen ability to penetrate to the heart of issues, and he exercised it both as an editor and as a commentator. He sometimes improved a colleague's copy by cutting it in two.

In politics he was an approximation of the old-fashioned British Liberal. He wanted a maximum of individual freedom along with social reform. He had no permanent political allegiances, shifting back and forth between the parties depending upon the issue. His one fixed star was internationalism; but in international affairs he also always was a pragmatist. He laid much store on the independence of the newspaper, and his philosophy of independence contained a good bit of Mr. Dooley's dictum of afflicting the comfortable and comforting the afflicted.

Although he professed no formal religion, Herbert Elliston was a deeply religious man and looked to religion for inspiration. He had, moreover, an enormous faith in the power of militant freedom, properly marshaled, as the offset to both Marxism and Communist imperialism. He knew personally many recent world figures. He was particularly close to the late James Forrestal, with whom he exchanged many ideas.

He continued to believe that unconditional surrender was a pernicious doctrine which prolonged World War II, and that the dropping of the atom bomb was unnecessary and a mistake. He was at the same time a strong proponent of European and Atlantic unity. He was distressed because of what he regarded as a lost opportunity to develop a political side to the Marshall plan. He was convinced that regionalism and a powerful diversion, in the Near East as well as Europe, were the surest antidotes to war.

The impact of Herbert Elliston upon his community and upon his times is for those less closely associated with him to judge. What we shall remember most about him was his unerring ability to sort the meaningful from the trivial. We know many others will share our sense of loss.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of Herbert Elliston. I knew him through many years as a great newspaperman, as a friend, and as a counsellor whose wise and friendly advice many of us treasured.

He had a broad knowledge of foreign affairs and showed much foresight in understanding and articulating what policies of today, both international and economic, would mean for the future. His writing showed depth—a third dimension which is often so rare in the day-to-day discussion of developments.

My deepest sympathy goes to his family. I share the sense of loss which I know his colleagues on the Washington Post and Times Herald feel today.

AMERICAN LEGION ASSISTANCE TO HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the first refugees from the recent Hungarian revolt against Soviet oppression and barbarism arrive in this Nation, a number of them are beginning to come to the various States and communities throughout our country. Many individuals and organizations are participating in various ways to make them feel welcome here and to ease their assimilation into our communities.

Among these is the American Legion. The most immediate and urgent need of these newcomers to our land is, of course, to acquire at least rudimentary means of communicating in our language. The Oregon Legionnaire, which is distributed to the members of the American Legion of Oregon, reports in its January 1957, issue about the American Legion's project of presenting Hungarian-English dictionaries to the Hungarian refugees when they enter the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Oregon Legionnaire be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION TO PRESENT DICTIONARIES TO HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The American Legion has purchased all available Hungarian-English dictionaries in the United States and will present them as quickly as possible to the Hungarian refugees streaming into Camp Kilmer, N. J., National Commander Dan Daniel has announced.

In addition, the American Legion has ordered reprints to supplement the existing supply. Additional copies will be distributed as soon as they are printed.

"This project has been undertaken by the American Legion in the belief that one of the greatest problems which these refugees will face will be the language barrier. Not until they learn our language can they begin to understand our people, customs, and traditions and our proud heritage of freedom," Commander Daniel said.

"I am certain that these brave people want to become self-reliant, useful citizens in their adopted land as quickly as possible. They want to earn their own way and become part of the communities throughout America in which they will settle. To do so they must know our language.

"The dictionaries which the American Legion is supplying will be only a start toward learning the English language. But they symbolize our desire to help these Hungarian refugees find the opportunity and freedom which they seek in America."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American Legion is to be commended for this gesture of welcome to the brave and homeless men and women who are seeking new lives in America, after their tragic experiences with Soviet tyranny. I am sure that most of us share this spirit of welcome, which is in accord with one of the oldest and finest traditions of America. I know that occasionally some persons have misgivings about the impact of the immigration of these Hungarian men and women—few as they are—on employment conditions in the communities to which they come. I have answered inquiries of this kind by pointing out the real effects of immigration and population growth on the expansion of our economy. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
January 15, 1957.

DEAR FRIEND: I appreciate your sending me your views regarding the immigration of Hungarian refugees into this country. I recognize your feelings in the matter, yet I honestly do not believe that the comparatively small number of these refugees which we are accepting into a nation of 169 million people can in any way result in disclosing the American economy.

To begin with, we must remember that all of us except full-blooded American Indians are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. The United States has a tradition of offering sanctuary to the oppressed. The refugees from Hungary are victims of a cruel and barbaric despotism. A little nation like Switzerland, which has fewer inhabitants than our single State of New York, has taken 10,000 of these refugees. Can America, with more than 10 times the total population of Switzerland, refuse to accept a mere 21,000?

In addition, immigration has helped to build up America. Each immigrant is not only a jobholder. He and his family are consumers who buy goods and services and otherwise contribute to our economic system. Unless this were true, it is obvious our forefathers would have been better off if they had shut off immigration many decades ago and left the United States a relatively small Nation. To the contrary, the great American economy has flourished because of the constant expansion made possible by population growth, which has made our system of mass production and consumption work. In this continued population growth, immigration now plays a very minor role—in the past 10 years, for example, only 2 million immigrants have entered the country, but our population has grown by 25 million new Americans, with beneficial rather than depressing effect on employment and the economy.

Oregon's share of the Hungarian refugees will be a few hundred men, women, and children. It is apparent that this handful of individuals can have no real effect on unemployment in our State, even if one were to admit that a few of them may be given jobs which would otherwise be available to local citizens.

The economic situation facing Oregon is far more fundamental than this. It requires stern remedies and new policies. So that you can see I have been thinking about this just as earnestly as you have, I am enclosing an article which I wrote for the Oregonian of December 23, 1956, outlining a program which I believe may help to produce more jobs and new payrolls for Oregon. Unless we adopt some of these progressive ideas, I fear that Oregon will lag behind the rest of the Nation. I shall devote my attention to this now and in the months ahead. At the same time, however, I believe America and Oregon should offer our traditional warm and generous welcome to the homeless refugees from Hungary.

With good wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT—HEARINGS ON BILL REVISING STATUTES GOVERNING BANKS, SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS, AND CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Economic Report of the President endorses the study of the Federal statutes governing financial institutions and credit which I have been conducting on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The report, at page 49, states in part:

> The exceptionally heavy demands which economic expansion is placing on credit and capital markets have directed attention increasingly to questions concerning the adequacy of our financial facilities, and of the laws and regulations which govern their operation. Alert to these problems, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the past year made an extensive and constructive investigation of Federal laws affecting financial institutions.

On the basis of this study I have prepared a comprehensive 253-page bill revising the statutes governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions. On next Monday the Banking Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on this proposed legislation. The bill is important to every financial institution in our country, and I am sure that the Members of the Senate will want to follow closely our hearings.

RESPONSES TO SENATOR WILEY'S BILL FOR A FEDERAL TAXATION COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note today in President Eisenhower's Economic Report a renewed appeal for action on his proposal for a National Monetary and Financial Commission.

As I have previously indicated, I would regard the appointment of such a commission as extremely helpful and sound. Such a body would give a long-needed high-level review to the financial structure of our dynamic country.

So, too, I should like to point out that yesterday, as recorded, beginning on page 822 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduced my own bill for the establishment of a somewhat parallel Hoover-style commission on Federal taxation.

The only previous reference to this tax commission which I had made was in a weekly newsletter which I had sent to my constituents on January 3. I am pleased to say that within 48 hours of receipt of this newsletter I received a wave of enthusiastic reactions from all over my State, and from numerous individuals outside Wisconsin who received the newsletter as well.

I should like to have appear in the RECORD excerpts indicating a few of the initial reactions which came in. Since they are from private individuals, I will, of course, completely respect the confidence in which they wrote, and will not use their names. I send to the desk short texts of quotations from their messages. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSINITES' PRAISE OF SENATOR WILEY'S BILL FOR A FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

From a physician in central Wisconsin: "I think your suggestion of a Wiley bill for a tax commission based on the Hoover type of investigation would be an excellent idea. I hope that you will follow through with this, and believe that it will be a great help to us all."

From Madison: "You are to be complimented upon your efforts to instigate a review of American taxes. I hope your bill meets with overwhelming success."

From Milwaukee: "I agree with you wholeheartedly that there is urgent need for a high-level review of American taxes, and I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a copy of this newsletter, as I do not have one, and if you can spare a few more I would like to pass out three or four to people I know to be interested."

From Racine: "Your newsletter of January 3, 1957, in regards to Hoover-type tax study commission is a very good move. Your foresight on this matter is very excellent. Keep up the good work."

From Manitowoc: "Your proposal, outlined in your last newsletter, for a Hoover-type commission to study the income-tax situation deserves a real cheer. Here is an area that has been called the root of all evil and I believe that's pretty close to the truth. The income tax is unfair, unwieldly, unwise and, without some sort of modification, can be the undoing of our whole economy.

"We might not agree on the things we would do right now to solve this problem, but if good men are selected for your proposed commission and they are given free rein and plenty of time, we will have to accept their recommendations.

"I'm not one to approve of committees on this, that and everything. But on the matter of the income tax, which hasn't received a real study since its inception—just a distortion which would have been unbelievable in 1913—we can surely stand one. I'm all for you on this one, Senator, and I will urge all my friends in the Senate to support you when this thing comes up."

From a dentist in a Lake Michigan port city: "I am very happy that you are going to study taxes. I have felt for a long time that many parts of our inheritance taxes are wrong. For example, if I put money away for my children, and then they should pass on I have to pay an inheritance tax on my own money. Same applies to my home if my wife's name is on deed. I bought the house but put part in her name. If she dies I am allowed only so much, then must pay taxes on money which was actually my own.

"Hope some of these things can be ironed out by your study."

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ARCADIA, CALIF., HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and I are delighted to join with the President of the Senate and a distinguished Member from the House of Representatives, the Honorable PATRICK J. HILLINGS, in bidding welcome to a group of young citizens from the State of California who are present in the gallery today.

The city of Arcadia decided, in December of last year, that it would like to have the honor of being included in the inaugural parade for the President and Vice President of the United States. Within a period of 10 days the civic-minded townspeople raised approximately $28,000 in order to send to the Nation's Capital the excellent band of the Arcadia High School.

Mr. President, I am delighted to welcome these fine young people. They are seated in the gallery directly opposite where I am standing.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California ask the members of the band to stand?

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Arcadia High School students, numbering 108, please stand?

[The members of the band rose in their places, and were greated with applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Vice President and the 2 Senators from California, as well as other Senators, in welcoming this very fine, handsome body of students. I am glad they have come to this Capital City and thus have an opportunity to get acquainted with life here.

ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on November 6 last, election day, there died in New Mexico a great man, Antonio M. Fernandez. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States for many years. A newspaper, El Crepusculo, of Taos, N. Mex., printed and published in Spanish an editorial concerning the services rendered by Mr. Fernandez to his State, to his country, and to the world. The editorial appears on one page, and I now read a translation of it:

ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

The unexpected departure of Antonio M. Fernandez from the midst of his family, his home, and hundreds of friends has left an empty space hard to fill.

Fernandez breathed his last a few hours after he had been elected and honored for his eighth term in the service of his constituents as Congressman from the State of New Mexico.

During his life and service to his country, he was highly respected by his colleagues in the Congress and by the people with whom he associated himself, and he served with honesty as a true and faithful servant.

Antonio M. Fernandez has disappeared from amongst us. However, his record and affections, his outstanding service will always remain and live in the minds and hearts of his countrymen.

Our heartfelt sympathies are extended to Mrs. Fernandez and her esteemed family during her hour of sorrow.

The funeral rites were solemnized in Santa Fe, and his remains were laid to rest in the presence of many friends from different parts of the State. A requiem pontifical mass was solemnized by His Excellency Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne, who said in brief, "Death is not the end, but the beginning of life. Real life comes after death."

He said that the deceased had died in peace with all the blessings of his church, amongst the immediate members of his family, while the Catholic nuns asked that mercy be implored.

What I have read is translated from the original Spanish editorial. I may

say to the Senate that it so happens that in New Mexico there are two constitutional languages. It is the only State in the Union of which that can be said. It is legal to print in Spanish or to print in English important historical or official documents.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

La insperada separacion de Antonio M. Fernandez del ceno de su hogar, de su familia y centenares de amistades, ha dejado un vacio dificil de llenar.

Fernandez exhalo su ultimo suspiro unas horas despues de haber sido electo y honrado por el termino octavo a servirle a sus constituyentes como Diputado por el Estado de Nuevo Mexico en el Congreso nacional.

Durante su vida y servicio a su pais se gano el alto respeto, tanto de sus colegas en el Congreso, como del pueblo a quien siempre le sirvio honestamente y con todo el esmero de un fiel sirviente.

Antonio M. Fernandez ha desaparecido de entre nosotros, sin embargo su historia y hazanas, su devocion en el servicio publico siempre vivira en las mentes y corazones de todos aquellos que lo admiraban.

Nuestras simpatias de condolencia son extendidas a la Sra. Fernandez y su estimada familia en esta, su hora de luto y tristeza.

Las exequias funebres fueron solemnizadas en Santa Fe el sabado pasado, sus restos mortales siendo bajados a la tumba, entre amistades de todas partes del estado, despues de habersele dado Misa de Requiem Pontificial por su Senoria, el Arzobispo Edwin W. Byrne, quien en breves remarcas, dijo "la muerte no es el fin, sino el principio de la vida. La vida verdadera viene despues de la muerte." Anadio diciendo, "El finado murio con todas las benediciones, rodeado de su estimada familia, quienes oraban, mientras que las Monjas, pedian misericordia de Dios."

STATEMENT BY BENJAMIN H. HILL, OF GEORGIA, AT THE TIME OF THE DEATH OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement made by Hon. Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, when Robert E. Lee died. This statement was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many years ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile. He was Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was as gentle as a woman in life, and modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates; and grand in battle as Achilles.

PUBLIC DEBT—REPORT BY RAYMOND E. MANNING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the wake of the President's budget message of last week, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a report concerning the public debt, prepared for me last fall by a senior specialist in taxation at the Library of Congress, Mr. Raymond E. Manning.

I commend this study to the attention of my colleagues, because Mr. Manning has answered some very important questions relating not only to the increase in the public debt, but to debt management, as well as the interest rates which are charged on the debt.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the attached tables, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 7, 1956.

To: Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.
From: Raymond E. Manning, senior specialist in taxation.
Subject: Information on the public debt.

This is in response to your letter of July 14 in which you asked for specified information concerning the Federal debt. I have attached various tables which cover the points raised by you. To help in relating the questions to the answers, I set forth seriatim each sentence of your letter and refer to the specific numbered table which carries the answer.

Question. "Ascertain for me the cost of managing the Federal public debt from the years 1950 through fiscal 1956, also the estimate for fiscal 1957."

Answer. Table 1 shows the interest actually paid in each year, 1950 through 1956, together with an estimate for fiscal 1957.

Question. "We know * * * that the interest rate on Government bonds and securities has increased in recent years. Just how much. * * *?"

Answer. Perhaps the best way to show this is to compare the so-called computed interest rate on Federal securities. Table 2 entitled "Computed Annual Interest Rate on the Public Debt by Security Classes, June 30, 1940, 1945, 1950–56," gives the requested information.

Question. "What was the Federal public debt in 1950, and what was the aggregate interest charge on that date?"

Answer. The aggregate Federal public debt in 1950 will be found in table 1, together with the interest paid. For the so-called computed interest rate, see the answer to the preceding question.

Question. "What was the rate of interest on the particular issues, bonds, or notes used to refinance or finance the debt?"

Answer. The computed interest rate on each type of Federal security for a period of years is contained in table 2. I have also clipped or photostated a table from two issues of the Treasury Bulletin entitled "Offerings of Marketable Issues of Treasury Bonds, Notes, and Certificates of Indebtedness." These show all marketable issues from January 21, 1946, through June 1956. You will note that the next to the last column indicates the amount of the issue exchanged for other securities. Where bonds were issued in exchange for other securities, footnotes explain the exchange and the interest rates on the exchanged issues. The table showing computed interest rates for each type of security, year by year, will perhaps be adequate for exchanges of short term issues.

Question. "Give me similar statistical information on other years from 1950 through fiscal 1956, and estimate on 1957. What is the total amount of interest payments on the Federal public debt at present? How does this compare with last year and the year before?"

Answer. Tables 1 and 2 referred to in answer to the previous questions cover those set forth here.

Question. "What is the percentage increase in interest rates since 1952 as these interest rates relate to Government refinancing programs?"

Answer. I don't quite see how we can provide an answer to this in any way other than to compare the computed interest rates on each type of issue outstanding in the 2 years 1952 and 1956. The difficulty, of course, is that refinancing was effected with a variety of types of security with different maturities and different rates. In table 2, I compare the rise in points and the rise percentagewise in the computed interest rates for the various types of securities between June 30, 1952 and June 1956.

Question. "I should also like to have information concerning the alleged rise in interest rates on municipal securities, State bonds and securities, school district bonds and securities, and other local government jurisdictions. How much have these interest rates increased since 1952? What is the estimated cost to local and State governments?"

Answer. The change in interest rates during this period is presented in table 3 entitled "Yields of State and Local Government Bonds, 1940, 1945, 1950–56." The cost in interest to the States and local governments in recent years is shown in table 4 entitled "State and Local Government Expenditures for Interest on Debt, 1952–55."

Question. "Finally, if possible, what has been the rise in interest rates for commercial and consumer credit since 1952? I am particularly concerned about the financing of capital goods, buildings, plant equipment, etc., including utilities."

Answer. Tables 5–8 and a chart are submitted in response to this question. Tables 5 and 6 are presented to show the trend in costs of short and long term financing by business. Table 7 shows the interest income on all types of loans made by insured commercial banks. Table 8 and a chart are presented to show the change in interest rates on conventional mortgages. The chart appears in the July 1956 issue of the National Market Letter, which is sent herewith. The conventional loans reflect the money market conditions more adequately than the VA and FHA guaranteed and insured loans whose interest rate maximums were set by law and regulations. No time series data showing interest rates on consumer credit are available.

TABLE 1.—*Gross public debt and interest paid thereon, 1950–56, and estimate for 1957*

	Gross public debt as of June 30	Total interest paid year ending June 30
1950	$257,357,352,351	$5,749,913,064
1951	255,221,976,815	5,612,654,812
1952	259,105,178,785	5,859,263,437
1953	266,071,061,639	6,503,580,030
1954	271,259,599,108	6,382,486,640
1955	274,374,222,803	6,370,361,774
1956	272,750,813,649	6,791,873,771
1957 (estimated)	----------	7,000,000,000

Sources: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1955, p. 351, 404; Monthly Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the U. S. Government for the period July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956, p. 1, 7; The Budget of the U. S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, p. M77.

TABLE 2.—*Computed annual interest rate on the public debt by security classes, June 30, 1940, 1945, 1950–56*

June 30	Total public debt	Marketable issues					Nonmarketable issues				
		Total	Bills	Certificates	Notes	Treasury bonds	Total	Savings bonds	Tax and savings notes	Other	Special issues
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1940	2.583	2.492	.038	----------	1.256	2.908	2.908	2.900	----------	3.000	3.026
1945	1.936	1.718	.381	.875	1.204	2.314	2.473	2.789	1.076	2.000	2.436
1950	2.200	1.958	1.187	1.163	1.344	2.322	2.569	2.748	1.383	2.407	2.589
1951	2.270	1.981	1.569	1.875	1.399	2.327	2.623	2.742	1.567	2.717	2.606
1952	2.329	2.051	1.711	1.875	1.560	2.317	2.659	2.745	1.785	2.714	2.675
1953	2.438	2.207	2.254	2.319	1.754	2.342	2.720	2.760	2.231	2.708	2.746
1954	2.342	2.043	.843	1.928	1.838	2.440	2.751	2.793	2.377	2.709	2.671
1955	2.351	2.079	1.539	1.173	1.846	2.480	2.789	2.821	2.359	2.708	2.585
1956	2.576	2.427	2.654	2.625	2.075	2.485	2.824	----------	----------	----------	2.705
	Rise 1952 to 1956 in percentage points										
	0.247	0.376	0.943	0.750	0.515	0.168	0.165	----------	----------	----------	0.030
	Rise 1952 to 1956 percentagewise										
	Percent 10.6	*Percent* 18.3	*Percent* 55.1	*Percent* 40.0	*Percent* 33.0	*Percent* 7.2	*Percent* 6.2	----------	----------	----------	*Percent* 1.1

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1955, p. 502; Daily Statement of the United States Treasury, June 29, 1956, p. 5.

NOTE.—The computed annual interest rate is determined first by determining the computed annual interest charge. The computed annual interest charge represents the amount of interest that would be paid if each interest-bearing issue outstanding at the end of each year should remain outstanding for a year at the applicable annual rate of interest. The charge is computed for each issue by applying the appropriate annual interest rate to the amount outstanding on that date. The aggregate charge for all interest-bearing issues constitutes the total computed annual interest charge. The average annual interest rate is computed by dividing the computed annual interest charge for the total, or for any group of issues, by the corresponding principal amount.

TABLE 3.—*Yields of State and local government bonds, 1940, 1945, 1950–56*

Year	Moody's [1]			Standard & Poor's high-grade municipals [2]	Bond buyer's [3] 20-bond index	Dow & Jones revenue [4] bond index	Moody's 10-year State bonds—Aaa [5]
	Total	Aaa	Baa				
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1940	2.35	1.83	3.00	2.50	2.56	----------	----------
1945	1.50	1.07	1.95	1.67	1.51	----------	----------
1950	1.94	1.56	2.32	1.98	1.93	2.34	1.18
1951	1.98	1.61	2.37	2.00	1.94	2.29	1.37
1952	2.22	1.80	2.70	2.19	2.18	2.45	1.48
1953	2.82	2.31	3.41	2.72	2.73	3.02	1.91
1954	2.46	2.04	3.09	2.37	2.40	2.81	1.52
1955	2.57	2.18	3.14	2.53	2.47	2.85	1.85
1956 (July) [6]	2.80	2.41	3.35	2.77	2.66	3.11	----------

[1] The data for 1953–55 were taken from Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1956, p. 731; data for earlier years are our own computation. All averages are based on information published in Moody's Investors Service. The average for July 26, 1956, was taken directly from Moody's Bond Survey, July 30, 1956, p. 420.

[2] Economic Indicators, July 1956, p. 29; 1955 Historical and Descriptive Supplement to Economic Indicators, p. 63. Yield shown for 1956 is as of July 14.

[3] Bond Buyer, Municipal Sales Section, Jan. 11, 1947, p. 2; Bond Buyer, July 21, 1956, p. 8. Yield shown for 1956 is as of July 19.

[4] Data for 1953–55 were taken from Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1956, p. 731. Earlier data are our own computations based on information supplied by the Federal Reserve Board. The average for the week ending July 27, 1956, was taken from Barron's, July 30, 1956, p. 52. All the averages have been based on information published by Dow-Jones & Co.

[5] These yearly averages are our own computations based on monthly averages shown in Moody's Investors Service.

[6] The averages given here are for the latest dates available. The exact date for each category of bonds will be given in the footnotes pertaining thereto.

TABLE 4.—*State and local government expenditures for interest on debt, 1952–55*

[In millions]

Type of government	Interest on debt			
	1952	1953	1954	1955
State and local	$724	$798	$916	------
State	144	162	193	$251
Local (total)[1]	580	635	723	------
County	49	56	68	------
City	341	359	389	------
Township	15	16	16	------
School district	94	110	135	------
Special district	81	96	116	------

[1] These data for the local governments include interest payments on utility debt as well as for general debt. The interest on utility debt for local governments was as follows: 1952, $172 million; 1953, $184 million; 1954, $198 million.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census: Summary of Governmental Finances in 1954, p. 30–31; Compendium of State Government Finances in 1955, p. 21.

TABLE 5.—*Interest rates on prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months, and on short-term business loans, 1940, 1945, 1950–56*

Year	Interest rate (percent)	
	Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months	Short-term bank loans to business
1940	0.56	2.1
1945	.75	2.2
1950	1.45	2.7
1951	2.17	3.1
1952	2.33	3.5
1953	2.52	3.7
1954	1.58	3.6
1955	2.18	3.7
1956 (June)	3.38	4.1

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, various years.

TABLE 6.—*Corporate bond yields, 1940, 1945, 1950–56*

Year	Total	Yield by selected ratings	
		Aaa	Baa
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1940	3.55	2.84	4.75
1945	2.87	2.62	3.29
1950	2.86	2.62	3.24
1951	3.08	2.86	3.41
1952	3.19	2.96	3.52
1953	3.43	3.20	3.74
1954	3.16	2.90	3.51
1955	3.25	3.06	3.53
1956 (July 26)	3.52	3.31	3.83

TABLE 6.—*Corporate bond yields, 1940, 1945, 1950–56*—Continued

Year	Yield by groups		
	Industrials	Railroads	Public utilities
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1940	3.10	4.30	3.25
1945	2.68	3.06	2.89
1950	2.67	3.10	2.82
1951	2.89	3.26	3.09
1952	3.00	3.36	3.20
1953	3.30	3.55	3.45
1954	3.09	3.25	3.15
1955	3.19	3.34	3.22
1956 (July 26)	3.44	3.62	3.50

Source: Data for 1940–55 were taken from various years' issues of the Federal Reserve Bulletin. The data were based on information published in Moody's Investors Service. July 26, 1956, data were taken from Moody's Bond Survey, July 30, 1956, p. 422.

TABLE 7.—*Income per $100 of loans of insured commercial banks in the United States, 1950–54*

Year:	*Income per $100 of loans*
1950	$4.34
1951	4.45
1952	4.64
1953	4.84
1954	4.79

Source: Annual Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended Dec. 31, 1954, pp. 140–141.

TABLE 8.—*Interest rates on conventional savings and loan associations' mortgages (data are as of February of the years)*

Interest rate	Percent of total mortgage loans at various rates of interest			
	1949	1953	1954	1955
4½ percent and under	5.7	2.9	1.1	2
5 percent	52.0	53.3	43.3	45
5½ percent	13.6	11.3	19.1	16
Over 5½ percent	28.7	32.5	36.5	37

Sources: United States Savings and Loan League; Fact Book, Chicago, the league, 1954, p. 54, and 1955, p. 58.

[From Treasury Bulletin of July 1952, p. 25]

Debt operations—Offerings of marketable issues of Treasury bonds, notes, and certificates of indebtedness

Date subscription books were opened	Date of issue	Description of security	Period to—		Amount of subscriptions tendered		Amount issued		Allotment ratio
			Maturity	First call	Cash [1]	Exchange	For cash [1]	In exchange for other securities	
					In millions of dollars				
Jan. 21, 1946	Feb. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Feb. 1, 1947-B	1 year			4,954		4,954	100
Feb. 18, 1946	Mar. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Mar. 1, 1947-C	do			4,106		3,133	76
Mar. 20, 1946	Apr. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Apr. 1, 1947-D	do			4,742		2,820	59
May 20, 1946	June 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, June 1, 1947-E	do			4,168		2,775	66
June 14, 1946	July 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, July 1, 1947-F	do			4,673		2,916	62
July 17, 1946	Aug. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Aug. 1, 1947-C	do			2,307		1,223	52
Aug. 19, 1946	Sept. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Sept. 1, 1947-H	do			4,145		2,341	56
Sept. 18, 1946	Oct. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1947-J	do			3,203		1,440	44
Oct. 21, 1946	Nov. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Nov. 1, 1947-K	do			3,432		1,775	51
Nov. 18, 1946	Dec. 1, 1946	⅞-percent certificate, Dec. 1, 1947-L	do			3,281		3,281	100
Dec. 18, 1946	Jan. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, Jan. 1, 1948-A	do			3,134		3,134	100
Jan. 20, 1947	Feb. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, Feb. 1, 1948-B	1 year			4,801		3,947	82
Feb. 17, 1947	Mar. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, Mar. 1, 1948-C	do			2,951		2,142	72
Mar. 19, 1947	Apr. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, Apr. 1, 1948-D	do			2,669		1,321	48
May 21, 1947	June 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, June 1, 1948-E	do			2,510		1,777	70
June 23, 1947	July 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, July 1, 1948-F	do			2,742		2,742	100
July 21, 1947	Aug. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, July 1, 1948-G	11 months			1,127		1,127	100
Aug. 20, 1947	Sept. 1, 1947	⅞-percent certificate, July 1, 1948-H	10 months			2,209		2,209	100
Sept. 2, 1947	Sept. 15, 1947	1-percent note, Oct. 1, 1948-B	12½ months			4,092		4,092	100
Sept. 22, 1947	Oct. 1, 1947	1-percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1948-J	1 year			1,354		1,354	100
Oct. 22, 1947	Nov. 1, 1947	1-percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1948-K	11 months			1,467		1,467	100
Nov. 19, 1947	Dec. 1, 1947	1⅛-percent note, Jan. 1, 1949-A	1 year 1 month			3,535		3,535	100
Dec. 19, 1947	Jan. 1, 1948	1⅛-percent certificate, Jan. 1, 1949-A	do			2,592		2,592	100
Jan. 20, 1948	Feb. 1, 1948	1⅛-percent certificate, Feb. 1, 1949-B	do			2,189		2,189	100
Feb. 18, 1948	Mar. 1, 1948	1⅛-percent certificate, Mar. 1, 1949-C	do			3,553		3,553	100
Mar. 22, 1948	Apr. 1, 1948	1¼-percent certificate, Apr. 1, 1949-D	do			1,055		1,055	100
May 19, 1948	June 1, 1948	1¼-percent certificate, June 1, 1949-E	do			4,301		4,301	100
June 21, 1948	July 1, 1948	1¼-percent certificate, July 1, 1949-F	do			5,783		5,783	100
Sept. 1, 1948	Sept. 15, 1948	1⅜-percent note, Apr. 1, 1950-A	1 year 6½ months			3,596		3,596	100
Sept. 20, 1948	Oct. 1, 1948	1¼-percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1949-G	1 year			6,535		6,535	100
Dec. 6, 1948	Dec. 15, 1948	1¼-percent certificate, Dec. 15, 1949-H	do			519		519	100
Dec. 15, 1948	Jan. 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, Jan. 1, 1950-A	do			5,695		5,695	100
Jan. 19, 1949	Feb. 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, Feb. 1, 1950-B	do			1,993		1,993	100
Feb. 15, 1949	Mar. 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, Mar. 1, 1950-C	do			2,922		2,922	100
Mar. 21, 1949	Apr. 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, Apr. 1, 1950-D	do			963		963	100
May 19, 1949	June 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, June 1, 1950-E	do			5,019		5,019	100
June 20, 1949	July 1, 1949	1¼-percent certificate, July 1, 1950-F	do			5,601		5,601	100
Aug. 31, 1949	Sept. 15, 1949	1⅛-percent certificate, Sept. 15, 1950-G	do			1,197		1,197	100
Sept. 21, 1949	Oct. 1, 1949	1⅛-percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1950-H	do			6,248		6,248	100
Dec. 5, 1949	Dec. 15, 1949	1⅜-percent note, Mar. 15, 1954-A	4 years 3 months			4,675		4,675	100
Dec. 19, 1949	Jan. 1, 1950	1¼-percent certificate, Jan. 1, 1951-A	1 year			5,373		5,373	100
Jan. 20, 1950	Feb. 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, Oct. 1, 1951-A	1 year 8 months			1,918		1,918	100
Feb. 17, 1950	Mar. 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, July 1, 1951-B	1 year 4 months			2,741		2,741	100
Do	Mar. 15, 1950	1½ percent note, Mar. 15, 1955-A	5 years			5,365		5,365	100
Mar. 20, 1950	Apr. 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, July 1, 1951-C	1 year 3 months			886		886	100
May 22, 1950	June 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, July 1, 1951-D	1 year 1 month			4,818		4,818	100
June 21, 1950	July 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, Aug. 1, 1951-E	do			5,351		5,351	100
Sept. 5, 1950	Sept. 15, 1950	1¼ percent note, Oct. 15, 1951-F	do			5,941		5,941	100
Sept. 18, 1950	Oct. 1, 1950	1¼ percent note, Nov. 1, 1951-G	do			5,253		5,253	100
Dec. 4, 1950	Dec. 15, 1950	1¾ percent note, Dec. 15, 1955-B	5 years			6,854		6,854	100
(3)	Apr. 1, 1951	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1956-EA	do			[3] 1,007		[3] 1,007	100
June 4, 1951	June 15, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, Apr. 1, 1952-A	9½ months			9,524		9,524	100
July 16, 1951	Aug. 1, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, July 1, 1952-B	11 months			5,216		5,216	100
Sept. 4, 1951	Sept. 15, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1952-C	do			583		583	100
Sept. 18, 1951	Oct. 1, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, Sept. 1, 1952-D	do			1,832		1,832	100
Oct. 1, 1951	Oct. 15, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, Oct. 1, 1952-E	11½ months			10,861		10,861	100
(2)	Oct. 1, 1951	1½ percent note, Oct. 1, 1956-EO	5 years			[3] 550		[3] 550	100
Dec. 3, 1951	Dec. 15, 1951	1⅞ percent certificate, Dec. 1, 1952-F	11½ months			1,063		1,063	100
Feb. 18, 1952	Mar. 1, 1952	2¾ percent bond, Mar. 15, 1957-59	7 years ½ month	5 years ½ month		927		927	100
Do	do	1⅞ percent certificate, Feb. 15, 1953-A	11½ months			8,868		8,868	100
(2)	Apr. 1, 1952	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1957-EA	5 years			[3] 512		[3] 512	100
June 16, 1952	July 1, 1952	2¾ percent bond, June 15, 1958	5 years 11½ months		[p] 11,693		[p] 4,248		[4]
Do	do	1⅞ percent certificate, June 1, 1953-B	11 months				[p] 4,963	[p] 4,963	100

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

[1] Consists of all public cash subscriptions and subscriptions by U. S. Government investment accounts.

[2] Exchange offering available to owners of nonmarketable 2¾ percent Treasury bonds, investment series B-1975-80, dated Apr. 1, 1951. For further information relating to the original offering see Treasury Bulletin for April 1951, p. A-1, and for that relating to the reopening on June 4, 1952, see Treasury Bulletin for May 1952, p. A-10. Amounts shown are as of June 30, 1952.

[3] Includes exchanges by Federal Reserve System amounting to $1 billion in the case of series EA-1956, $500 million in the case of series EO-1956, and $500 million in the case of series EA-1957.

[4] Nonbank subscriptions were allotted in full. Commercial bank subscriptions for amounts up to and including $100,000 for their own account also were allotted in full. Commercial bank subscriptions for amounts over $100,000 for their own account were allotted $100,000 on each subscription.

[p] Preliminary.

[From Treasury Bulletin of June 1956, p. 23]

Debt operations—Offerings of marketable issues of Treasury bonds, notes, and certificates of indebtedness

Date subscription books were opened	Date of issue	Description of security	Period to—		Amount of subscriptions tendered		Amount issued		Allotment ratio
			Maturity	First call	Cash [1]	Exchange	For cash [1]	In exchange for other securities	
					In millions of dollars				
June 16, 1952	July 1, 1952	1⅞ percent certificate, June 1, 1953–B	11 months			4,963		4,963	100
	do	2⅜ percent bond, June 15, 1958	5 years 11 months		11,693		4,245		([2])
Aug. 14, 1952	Aug. 15, 1952	2 percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1953–C [3]	1 year			[3] 2,008		[3] 2,008	100
Sept. 15, 1952	Oct. 1, 1952	2¼ percent note, Dec. 1, 1953–A	1 year 2 months			10,542		10,542	100
([4])	do	1½ percent note, Oct. 1, 1957–EO	5 years			[5] 824		[5] 824	100
Nov. 17, 1952	Aug. 15, 1952	2 percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1953–C [3]	1 year			[3] 873		[3] 873	100
Feb. 2, 1953	Feb. 15, 1953	2¼ percent certificate, Feb. 15, 1954–A	do			8,114		8,114	[7] 100
	do	2½ percent bond, Dec. 15, 1956 [6]	5 years 10 months			[6] 620		[6] 620	
([4])	Apr. 1, 1953	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1958–EA	5 years			383		383	100
Apr. 13, 1953	May 1, 1953	3¼ percent bond, June 15, 1978–83	30 years 1½ months	25 years 1½ months	5,250	[8] 418	1,188	[8] 418	([9])
May 20, 1953	June 1, 1953	2⅝ percent certificate, June 1, 1954–B	1 year			4,858		4,858	100
July 6, 1953	July 15, 1953	2½ percent certificate, Mar. 22, 1954–C (tax anticipation [10]).	8 months		8,687		5,902		([11])
Aug. 5, 1953	Aug. 15, 1953	2⅝ percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1954–D	1 year			2,788		2,788	100
Sept. 2, 1953	Sept. 15, 1953	2⅝ percent certificate, Sept. 15, 1954–E	do			4,724		4,724	[12] 100
	do	2⅞ percent note, Mar. 15, 1957–A	3 years 6 months			2,997		2,997	
([4])	Oct. 1, 1953	1½ percent note, Oct. 1, 1958–EO	5 years			121		121	100
Oct. 28, 1953	Nov. 9, 1953	2¾ percent bond, Sept. 15, 1961	7 years 10 months		12,543		2,239		([13])
Nov. 18, 1953	Dec. 1, 1953	1⅞ percent note, Dec. 15, 1954–B	1 year ½ month			8,175		8,175	[14] 100
	Feb. 15, 1953	2½ percent bond, Dec. 15, 1958 [6]	5 years 10 months			[6] 1,748		[6] 1,748	
Feb. 1, 1954	Feb. 15, 1954	1⅝ percent certificate, Feb. 15, 1955–A	1 year			7,007		7,007	[15] 100
	do	2½ percent bond, Nov. 15, 1961	7 years 9 months			11,177		11,177	
([4])	Apr. 1, 1954	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1959–EA	5 years			119		119	100
May 4, 1954	May 17, 1954	1⅞ percent note, Feb. 15, 1959–A	4 years 9 months		9,750		2,205		([16])
Do	do	do	do			2,897		2,897	[17] 100
	do	1⅜ percent certificate, May 17, 1955–B	1 year			3,886		3,886	
July 21, 1954	Aug. 2, 1954	1 percent certificate, tax anticipation [18], Mar. 22, 1955–C.	7½ months		9,250		3,734		([19])
Aug. 3, 1954	Aug. 15, 1954	1⅛ percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1955–D [20]	1 year			[20] 3,558		[20] 3,558	[21] 100
	do	2⅝ percent bond, Nov. 15, 1960	6 years 3 months			3,806		3,806	
Sept. 23, 1954	Oct. 4, 1954	1⅝ percent note, May 15, 1957–B	2 years 7½ months		8,190		4,155		([22])
([4])	Oct. 1, 1954	1½ percent note, Oct. 1, 1959–EO	5 years			99		99	100
Nov. 22, 1954	Aug. 15, 1954	1⅛ percent certificate, Aug. 15, 1955–D [20]	1 year			[20] 4,919		[20] 4,919	[23] 100
	Dec. 15, 1954	1¼ percent certificate, Dec. 15, 1955–E	do			5,359		5,359	
	do	2½ percent bond, Aug. 15, 1963	8 years 8 months			6,755		6,755	
Feb. 1, 1955	Feb. 15, 1955	1⅝ percent note, Mar. 15, 1956–A	1 year 1 month			8,472		8,472	[25] 100
	do	2 percent note, Aug. 15, 1957–C	2 years 6 months			3,792		3,792	
	do	3 percent bond, Feb. 15, 1995 [24]	40 years			[24] 1,924		[24] 1,924	
Mar. 22, 1955	Apr. 1, 1955	1¾ percent certificate, June 22, 1955–F (tax anticipation). [26]	2½ months		7,938		3,210		([19])
([4])	do	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1960–EA	5 years			198		198	100
May 3, 1955	May 17, 1955	2 percent note, Aug. 15, 1956–B [27]	1 year 3 months		3,989	[27] 3,174	2,532	[27] 6,841	([24])
July 8, 1955	July 18, 1955	1⅞ percent certificate, Mar. 22, 1956–A (tax anticipation). [29]	8 months		10,620		2,202		([30])

[1] Consists of all public cash subscriptions and subscriptions by U. S. Government investment accounts.

[2] Nonbank subscriptions were allotted in full. Commercial banks' subscriptions for amounts up to and including $100,000 for their own account also were allotted in full. Commercial banks' subscriptions for amounts over $100,000 for their own account were allotted $100,000 on each subscription.

[3] The 2 percent certificates dated Aug. 15, 1952, were reopened with all certificates of the series identical in all respects, as an exchange offering for the 1⅞ percent certificates which matured Dec. 1, 1952. Total exchanges in the 2 offerings amounted to $2,882 million.

[4] Exchange offering available to owners of nonmarketable 2¾ percent Treasury bonds, investment series B–1975–80, dated Apr. 1, 1951. For further information on the original offering see Treasury Bulletin for April 1951, p. A–1. Amounts shown are as of May 31, 1956.

[5] Amount shown includes exchanges by Federal Reserve System open market accounts amounting to $714 million.

[6] The 2½ percent bonds dated Feb. 15, 1953, were reopened with all the bonds of the series identical in all respects, as an exchange offering for the 2¼ percent notes which matured Dec. 1, 1953. Total exchanges in the 2 offerings amounted to $2,368 million.

[7] Holders of the 1⅞ percent certificates which matured Feb. 15, 1953, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities for either the 1-year certificates or the 5-year, 10-month bonds.

[8] The bond offering was made available for exchange of series F and G savings bonds maturing from May 1 through Dec. 31, 1953.

[9] Total allotments on cash subscriptions were limited to approximately $1 billion. Nonbank subscriptions in amounts up to and including $5,000 were allotted in full. All other subscriptions were allotted 20 percent. Commercial banks' subscriptions were restricted to an amount not exceeding 5 percent of their time deposits as of Dec. 31, 1952. The Treasury also reserved the right to allot limited amounts of these bonds to Government investment accounts, which subscribed to a total amount of $118 million.

[10] Also designated tax anticipation certificates, acceptable at par plus accrued interest to maturity in payment of income and profits taxes due Mar. 15, 1954.

[11] Subscriptions for amounts up to and including $100,000 were allotted in full. Subscriptions for amounts over $100,000 were allotted 67 percent but in no case less than $100,000.

[12] Holders of the 2 percent bonds which matured Sept. 15, 1953, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities for either the 1-year certificates or the 3½-year notes.

[13] Subscriptions for amounts up to and including $10,000 were allotted in full. Subscriptions from mutual savings banks, insurance companies, pension and retirement funds, and State and local governments were allotted 24 percent. All others, including commercial banks, were allotted 16 percent but not less than $10,000 on any 1 subscription.

[14] Holders of the 2¼ percent notes maturing Dec. 1, 1953, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities for either the 12½-month notes or the 5-year, 10-month bonds.

[15] Holders of the 2¼ percent certificates which matured Feb. 15, 1954, and the 1⅜ percent notes maturing Mar. 15, 1954, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Feb. 15, 1954, for either the 1-year certificates or the 7-year, 9-month bonds. In addition, holders of the 2 percent bonds maturing June 15, 1954, and 2 issues of 2¼ percent bonds called for redemption on June 15, 1954, were given an opportunity to exchange their holdings on Feb. 15, 1954, for the 2½ percent bonds.

[16] Subscriptions for amounts up to and including $10,000 were allotted in full. All other subscriptions were allotted 22 percent but in no case less than $10,000.

[17] Holders of the 2⅝ percent certificates maturing June 1, 1954, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on May 17, 1954, for either the 1-year certificates or the 4-year, 9-month notes.

[18] Also designated tax-anticipation certificates, acceptable at par plus accrued interest to maturity in payment of income and profits taxes due Mar. 15, 1955.

[19] Subscriptions for amounts up to and including $50,000 were allotted in full. Subscriptions for amounts over $50,000 were allotted 40 percent but in no case less than $50,000.

[20] The 1⅛ percent certificates dated Aug. 15, 1954, were reopened with all the certificates of the series identical in all respects, as an exchange offering for the 1¼ percent notes which matured Dec. 15, 1954, the 2 percent bonds which matured Dec. 15, 1954, and the 2 percent bonds which were called for redemption on Dec. 15, 1954. Total exchanges in the 2 offerings amounted to $8,477 million.

[21] Holders of the 2⅝ percent certificates, maturing Aug. 15, 1954, and the 2¾ percent certificates, maturing Sept. 15, 1954, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Aug. 15, 1954, for either the 1-year certificates or the 6-year, 3-month bonds.

[22] Subscriptions for amounts up to and including $50,000 were allotted in full. Subscriptions for amounts over $50,000 were allotted 50 percent but in no case less than $50,000.

[23] Holders of the 1¼ percent notes maturing Dec. 15, 1954, the 2 percent bonds maturing Dec. 15, 1954, and the 2 percent bonds called for redemption on Dec. 15, 1954, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities for either the 1⅛ percent certificates, the 1¼ percent certificates, or the 2½ percent bonds.

[24] The 3 percent bonds dated Feb. 15, 1955, were reopened with all the bonds of the series identical in all respects, as an additional cash offering on July 11, 1955. The total amount issued in the 2 operations was $2,745 million.

[25] Holders of the 1⅝ percent certificates maturing Feb. 15, 1955, and the 1½ percent notes maturing Mar. 15, 1955, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Feb. 15, 1955, for either the 1-year, 1-month notes or the 2-year, 6-month notes. At the same time holders of the 2¼ percent bonds of 1955–60, called for redemption on Mar. 15, 1955, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Feb. 15, 1955, for either the 1-year, 1-month notes or the 4-year bonds.

[26] Also designated tax anticipation certificates, acceptable at par plus accrued interest to maturity in payment of income and profits taxes due June 15, 1955.

[27] The 2 percent notes dated May 17, 1955, were reopened with all the notes of the series identical in all respects, as an exchange offering for the 1¼ percent certificates maturing Aug. 15, 1955. Total exchanges in the 2 offerings amounted to $10,015 million.

[28] Cash subscriptions for $100,000 or less were allotted in full. Subscriptions for more than $100,000 were allotted 62 percent but in no case less than $100,000.

[29] Also designated tax anticipation certificates, acceptable at par plus accrued interest to maturity in payment of income and profits taxes due Mar. 15, 1956.

[30] Subscriptions for $100,000 or less were allotted in full. Subscriptions for more than $100,000 were allotted 19 percent but in no case less than $100,000.

[From Treasury Bulletin of June 1962, p. 23]

Debt operations—Offerings of marketable issues of Treasury bonds, notes, and certificates of indebtedness—Continued

Date subscription books were opened	Date of issue	Description of security	Period to— Maturity	Period to— First call	Amount of subscriptions tendered: Cash [1]	Amount of subscriptions tendered: Exchange	Amount issued: For cash [1]	Amount issued: In exchange for other securities	Allotment ratio
					In millions of dollars				
July 11, 1955	Feb. 15, 1955	3 percent bond, Feb. 15, 1995 [34]	40 years		[34] 1,720		[34] 821		(31)
July 20, 1955	Aug. 1, 1955	2 percent certificate, June 22, 1956–B (tax anticipation).[32]	10½ months			1,486		1,486	[33] 100
	May 17, 1955	2 percent note, Aug. 15, 1956–B [37]	1 year 3 months			[37] 6,841		[37] 6,841	
Oct. 3, 1955	Oct. 11, 1955	2¼ percent certificate, June 22, 1956–C (tax anticipation.) [32]	8 months		8,778		2,970		(34)
(4)	Oct. 1, 1955	1½ percent note, Oct. 1, 1960–EO	5 years			278		278	100
Nov. 28, 1955	Dec. 1, 1955	2⅝ percent certificate, Dec. 1, 1956–D	1 year			9,083		9,083	[36] 100
	do	2⅞ percent note, June 15, 1958–A [35]	2 years 6 months			[35] 2,282		[35] 2,283	
Mar. 5, 1956	Mar. 5, 1956	2⅝ percent certificate, Feb. 15, 1957–A	11½ months			[p] 7,219		[p] 7,219	[37] 100
	Dec. 1, 1955	2⅞ percent note, June 15, 1958–A [35]	2 years 6 months			[p 35] 2,109		[p 35] 2,109	
(4)	Apr. 1, 1956	1½ percent note, Apr. 1, 1961–EA	5 years			19		19	100

[31] Subscriptions from savings-type investors totaled $749 million and were allotted 65 percent. Subscriptions from all other investors totaled $970 million and were allotted 30 percent. Subscriptions for $25,000 or less were allotted in full. Subscriptions for more than $25,000 were allotted not less than $25,000. In addition to the amount allotted to the public, $25 million of the bonds were allotted to Government investment accounts. Savings-type investors were given the privilege of deferring payment for the bonds, provided that not less than 25 percent of the bonds allotted were paid for by July 20, 1955, not less than 60 percent by Sept. 1, 1955, and full payment by Oct. 3, 1955.

[32] Also designated tax-anticipation certificates, acceptable at par plus accrued interest to maturity in payment of income and profits taxes due June 15, 1956.

[33] Holders of the 1⅛ percent certificates which matured Aug. 15, 1955, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Aug. 1, 1955, for either the 10½-month certificates or the 1-year, 3-month notes.

[34] Subscriptions for $100,000 or less were allotted in full. Subscriptions for more than $100,000 were allotted 32 percent but in no case less than $100,000.

[35] The 2⅞ percent notes dated Dec. 1, 1955, were reopened with all the notes of the series identical in all respects, as a partial exchange offering for the 1⅝ percent notes maturing Mar. 15, 1956. Total exchanges in the 2 offerings amounted to $4,392 million.

[36] Holders of the 1¼ percent certificates and 1¾ percent notes, both maturing Dec. 15, 1955, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Dec. 1, 1955, for either the 1-year certificates or the 2½-year notes.

[37] Holders of the 1⅝ percent notes maturing Mar. 15, 1956, were offered a choice of exchanging the securities on Mar. 5, 1956, for either the 11½-month certificates or the 2½-year notes. Holders of the 1½ percent notes maturing Apr. 1, 1956, were permitted to exchange their securities only for the certificates.

[p] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 39 years ago some 40 million people in the Ukraine declared their independence, a goal they had sought for 1,000 years. Yesterday, January 22, more than 1 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, including a number of my fellow Minnesotans, paid special tribute to that glorious day in Kiev in 1918 when their forefathers proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic. Just 2 years later these people were again made captives by Communist armies. But the significance of the birth and existence of the Republic lies in the spirit and love of freedom that is as much alive today as it was in 1918, in spite of the many years of constant oppression and the most barbaric religious persecution.

With friendship and hope, let us express to the Ukrainian people our deep appreciation for their sacrifices, confident that the democratic principles and beliefs that once produced their free Republic today are the strength of their resistance.

The oppression and tyranny we are witnessing in the Ukraine and in other nations of Eastern Europe make it most urgent that we adopt a firm policy regarding our role in assisting these peoples. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has made some excellent suggestions to the State Department which I hope will be carried out. These include a full investigation and report on Communist oppression in captive nations and the liberalization of our immigration and nationality laws especially as they apply to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

The President has stressed the importance of letting the people in captive nations know that we do not accept their captivity as a permanent status. It is important today that the people of the Ukraine know of our heartfelt concern for their present subjugation and that we share with them the hope for their early return to the brotherhood of free nations.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a declaration adopted by Americans of Ukrainian descent, in the city of Auburn, N. Y., on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a celebration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the free, sovereign, independent, and democratic Ukrainian National Republic by act of its Parliament and Government on January 22, 1918, hereby appeal to the conscience of the free world and to all free and freedom-loving nations to help the people of Ukraine enslaved by the colonial empire of Communist Russia to reassert their independence and once again join the proud ranks of free nations.

We protest on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence against the employment by Communist Russia of Ukrainian nationals in the ranks of the Soviet Armed Forces to crush the liberation movements of other nations and to be ordered to slaughter people rising and bidding for freedom. We also wish to call the attention of the people of these United States to the fact that the fate of Ukrainians living in the so-called satellite countries or peoples' democracies is no better than within the Soviet Union. Most recent reports assert that about a quarter of a million Ukrainians in Poland are being subjected to persecution along with Jews, Byelorussians, and others. This fact has been editorially reported in the New York Times of January 10, 1957, and should serve as warning to the free world that in spite of ostensible ideological differences, the dictators of the satellite countries are dedicated partners of the Kremlin in the crimes of oppression, extermination, and genocide committed upon people seeking freedom and constituting a threat to the colonial empire run by Moscow.

Ukrainians in their enslaved homeland and their blood brothers scattered throughout the free world will never give up the fight until Ukraine is once again united, free, and sovereign just like during the time of proclamation of the acts of independence and unity in Kiev on January 22, 1918 and 1919.

This community of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the city of Auburn, N. Y., hereby goes on record as being of one heart and purpose with the freedom-seeking people of Ukraine until the day of final liberation.

DISASTROUS EFFECTS ON SMALL BUSINESS OF ADMINISTRATION'S TIGHT MONEY POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for many months those of us who have a particular interest in the small business of this country have warned about the disastrous effects on small business of the administration's current tight money policy, high taxes on small business, the growth of mergers and unfair competition. These factors have begun to take their deadly toll in small business bankruptcies. It is a record which is full of foreboding for the future of small business in America, as various commentators have begun to recognize.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Your Money's Worth," written by Sylvia Porter, which appeared in the Washington Star for December 21, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

SMALL FIRMS IN CRISIS

Every week this year, between 240 and 250 business firms will fail—and most of them

will be small companies. Most of the bankruptcies will wipe out the owners and their families.

By the end of 1957 about 13,000 business firms will have died.

This will be a year of crisis for small business and the crisis is likely to get worse.

This is the grim picture at a time when the chief concern of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board is that the overall economy will become too exuberant. This is the situation at a time when the President is emphasizing that prosperity—not depression—is the major problem facing the country.

I'm not guessing about the trend of business failures. I'm simply making a conservative projection of the statistics on business failures released each week by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Already 1957 has exceeded the same periods of 1956, 1955 as far as business bankruptcies go. The average is about 240 a week against 222 in 1956 and 199 in 1955. And while the failures are concentrated in retailing, small manufacturing, and homebuilding, the casualties cross all industry and trade groups, crop up in all areas of the country.

It's a certainty that the plight of the small-business man will intensify—unless the administration and Congress act quickly and boldly to give small business essential relief.

Competition in every line of industry and commerce is getting fiercer. Big companies are merging with big companies; medium-size firms are merging with medium-size firms. The small independent in retailing, wholesaling, and manufacturing is at an increasing disadvantage.

Tight money is hitting the smaller-business borrower much harder than the big. In a period when the demand for money exceeds the supply of money, it is understandable that lenders will prefer the safer, more established firm over the little fellow. It's understandable—but that doesn't lessen the impact on the small borrower.

Rising costs cited

The rising emphasis in our land on research, new and improved inventions, etc., obviously favors the big corporation. Add rising costs of manpower and materials as well as money—and you have the basic factors in the stark trend.

Before the election a lot of pious words were said by the Republicans and the Democrats about helping the small-business man, and since Congress convened a lot more pious words have been said. The bright hopes of speedy action are dimming, though.

President Eisenhower is on record with a pledge of tax relief to small corporations. But the Treasury is arguing it can't afford to lose any revenue. In Congress, Democratic leaders are quarreling about how the relief should be granted and Republicans are dragging their feet.

That small business should be in this crisis after the most prolonged period of unparalleled prosperity in history is terrifying. The small-business man is the heart and backbone of our economic system. If he dies, private enterprise dies.

MILITARY BASES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate has been deeply concerned and disturbed over the reports coming from Manila in the Philippines indicating that the discussions between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Philippine Republic over the issue of military bases have broken down.

The United States has an important network of highly strategic bases in the Philippine Islands. These bases are a vital part of our defense structure and security system. Regrettably, the discussions relating to the terms of occupancy of the bases have completely broken down. There is evidence of considerable misunderstanding, both on the part of the Philippine representatives in these negotiations, and ourselves.

The article by Mr. Gordon Walker, chief foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, dateline Manila, December 7, describes in considerable detail the nature of the difficulties in the negotiations and what had transpired up to the point where negotiations were broken off.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Walker when he writes:

What is needed now is resumption of the talks—at diplomatic level if not on a government basis at the earliest possible moment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Walker be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIPPINE TANGLE HITS UNITED STATES DEFENSES

MANILA.—Breakup of United States and Philippine talks over terms of operation of the highly strategic network of United States military bases here has cast a deep shadow over the entire pattern of United States defenses against possible Communist aggression in the Far East.

For the time being, at least, there will be no change of status in the operation of the vast network of naval and air bases maintained here since Japan's surrender. And there are still grounds for optimism that a mutually satisfactory solution can be found whereby United States military installations can continue to operate without compromising strong Philippine concepts of sovereignty and independence.

But for the moment, emotions here are running high. The United States is being heavily blamed for callous disregard of Filipino sensibilities. And despite the fact that blame for the breakdown can be equally distributed between United States and Philippine negotiators, anti-United States sentiment—already a significant obstacle to smooth United States-Philippine relations—has been given new powerful ammunition.

MAGSAYSAY UNDERCUT

As an added unwelcome dividend, collapse of the talks has had the effect of cutting the rug from under President Magsaysay, who is probably Asia's leading exponent of democracy and certainly the best friend of the United States in this portion of the globe.

The question of United States bases in the Philippines has been a growing source of internal political strife ever since the 1947 treaty which gave the United States the bases—a treaty now universally recognized as being politically and diplomatically obsolescent.

Opponents of the treaty terms here were outraged when Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., in 1954 pointed out that the United States still retains title to thousands of acres which comprise United States military installations in the Philippine archipelago.

And Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S abrogation of the Brownell statement here the past summer failed to allay Philippine concern that the United States intended to run bases under conditions of virtual extraterritoriality, which in Asia today constitutes political anathema.

Serious incidents revolving around base operations motivated Washington to dispatch a top-level team headed by former Under Secretary of the Army Karl Bendetsen in August to negotiate the bases issue only on matters pertaining to modernization of present facilities, acquisition of new land, and relinquishment of some lands now unused.

Apparently because of lack of adequate briefing in the preliminary diplomatic interchange, Mr. Bendetsen was totally unprepared for the broader scope of issues which were presented when he sat down with the Philippine Government opposites.

HEADED BY POLITICIAN

The Philippine negotiating panel—inadvisedly headed by an aspiring politician of dubious loyalties—refused to deal with United States requests until a wide range of other matters was settled.

The talks actually snagged over a Philippine demand for jurisdictional prerogatives which actually went beyond United States agreements with Japan and North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. But even if this roadblock had not emerged, the talks would probably have hit equally rough going over Philippine demands which were tantamount to reassessment of the entire question of the bases treaty, the mutual defense treaty between the two countries, and United States military aid to the Government here.

At one point the Philippine panel requested the United States to permit operation of a huge public sea channel through the United States naval base on Subic Bay—a request which if fulfilled would critically jeopardize the security of the United States fleet.

This attitude on the part of the Philippines panel, coupled with highly vocal and anti-American demands of political opposition groups here, made it abundantly clear after nearly 4 months of negotiation that the timing and political atmosphere precluded any mutually satisfactory solution.

The United States side thereupon abruptly cut off the talks and Mr. Bendetsen departed from the Philippines amid a local atmosphere which could only be described as frustrated and hostile.

Further negotiations, meanwhile, appear here to be both mandatory and feasible.

On the Philippines side, in the opinion of neutral observers, there is need for a more realistic approach to the bases question, plus subjugation of highly irresponsible charges that the United States is seeking to undermine the Philippines' sovereign rights.

And on the United States side there is need for a new appreciation of nationalistic forces which now are gaining strength in the Philippines, which feed heavily upon such incidents as the breakdown of the bases talks, and which conceivably could grow strong enough to undo many solid democratic accomplishments which the United States, together with responsible Philippines officials, have so far achieved.

The United States negotiating team's final gesture in turning over to the Philippines title deeds to all United States bases is not in the opinion of most competent observers enough.

What is needed now is resumption of the talks—at diplomatic level if not on a government basis—at the earliest possible time.

Otherwise Washington may find that the Philippines—like the developing pattern in Japan—is becoming increasingly limited as a base from which to maintain its primary defense commitments for the western Pacific and Southeast Asia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I urge the State Department to give the Philippines base discussions top priority on the agenda of important business for the defense and security of this coun-

try. We cannot afford to have relationships between our friends in the Philippines and ourselves deteriorate or become the victim of local politics.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

AID TO DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is generally believed that the drought which is afflicting various parts of our Nation is restricted primarily to the Southwest and northward through wide areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Congressional discussions of drought aid all too often reveal a lack of appreciation of the extent of the drought area and the ever-increasing number of States being afflicted by drought conditions.

I call to the attention of my colleagues an article in the Tuesday, January 15, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch by the noted and highly respected columnist and student of agricultural problems, Mr. Alfred D. Stedman. The article is entitled "Drought Extends to Northwest." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press and Dispatch of January 15, 1957]

DROUGHT EXTENDS TO NORTHWEST

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Prolonged and intense drought, which has summoned President Eisenhower, Agriculture Secretary Benson, and other aids to a Southwest tour and conference today in Wichita, also extends deep into the Northwest, crop authorities pointed out Monday.

Short subsoil moisture, a dry winter, little snow, declines in lake levels and water tables and of the flow of the Mississippi and many tributaries are matters of concern in a vast area that extends from the Great Lakes to the Rocky Mountains, weather specialists emphasized.

But one great agricultural difference between the Southwest and the Northwest has glossed over the extension of drought into the northern Great Plains, taking away its urgency here for the present.

That difference is the one between the Southwest's major crop, which is fall-sown wheat called winter wheat and is planted and comes up in the autumn, living through the winter to mature at the start of summer, and the spring wheat, other spring-sown small grains and corn of the northern plains.

Absolutely depending on winter moisture, the Southwest's great acreage of winter wheat is now in a bad way—whereas the spring planted crops of the northern plains, though they do best with subsoil moisture, still can do fairly well on surface moisture even if general rains hold off until our growing season of spring and summer. In Minnesota, Wisconsin, eastern Iowa, North Dakota, and parts of Montana, such rains concentrated in the growing season have saved our crops in recent years.

Nevertheless, the drought has been creeping on the northern plains from the southwest and last year spread northward over wide slices of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa, into parts of the Dakotas and Montana and to the southern and western thresholds of Minnesota.

Thus the Northwest is in the path of a drought of 6 to 16 years duration. On its most recent previous round of general drought in 1934 and 1936, it extended into Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana and had to be broken in the northern Great Plains before it ended. The biggest of the F. D. Roosevelt drought conferences was held at Des Moines in August 1936.

The drought relief measures to be talked about by President Eisenhower and his aids at Wichita today are therefore of interest to the Northwest as standby measures which can be used in this region if, as in the past, the drought should extend itself over larger areas than those which felt its hot breath last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Stedman points out that the drought has been creeping on the northern plains from the southwest and last year spread northward over wide slices of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa, into parts of the Dakotas and Montana and to the southern and western thresholds of Minnesota. As Mr. Stedman so properly suggests, drought relief measures are of vital interest to the Northwest, not only as a means of urgently needed temporary assistance, but also as standby measures which can be used in the upper Midwest areas if the drought becomes more severe and damaging.

Mr. President, again I wish to advert to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

CONFLICT WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION OVER FISCAL POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I made a brief statement regarding the President's budget message. I indicated my amazement over the evidences of conflict and disharmony within the administration, while it is seeking the support of the Congress for its views. It will be rather difficult to provide such support when we can never tell with certainty what those views are.

I respectfully suggest that if President Eisenhower wants modern Republicanism in fact as well as in name, he might start with some changes in his own Cabinet. A good place to begin would be with Mr. George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury.

I consider it highly improper and most unusual for the Secretary of the Treasury to be openly criticizing the President's budget.

We in the Congress should be spared the confusion of Cabinet members, supposedly spokesmen for the President, campaigning against what the President asks us to do.

It is incredible that the chief fiscal officer of the administration, publicly in disagreement with his chief on budget policies, should be kept in his role as a Cabinet member and key adviser. If his advice is not good, it is time to get a new adviser. If his advice is unacceptable to the President, it should be unacceptable to the Congress.

When the President sends a budget to the Congress, it is supposed to be more than a mere gesture or rough outline of suggestions. It is supposed to be the considered, coordinated, and consolidated best judgment of the entire administration as to what is required to perform essential public services and carry out the programs Congress has enacted.

Differences in the preparation of the budget are not only understandable, but to be expected. After decisions have been reached by the White House, however, it is improper and unfitting for the Secretary of the Treasury to be opposing the recommendations of the President for whom he was supposedly the key budgetary adviser.

If Secretary Humphrey's McKinley era budget views have been rejected by the President, the most graceful thing for Secretary Humphrey to do is either to accept that decision or get out.

I am tired of having the White House express one view publicly, and then have other members of the administration pass along a different word around Congress. We have seen that happen on other vital legislation, and now it is happening on the budget. Somebody must speak for this administration. Presumably it is the President. If any of his aids disagree so strongly they feel they cannot concur, they should resign.

I suggest that it is about time for the President to reexamine his Cabinet in the light of the criteria he has laid down for rebuilding his party, a party that obviously does not share his own personal popularity. There are others in the Cabinet who are far from "modern republicanism" in the sense President Eisenhower is apparently trying to use that term. It might be well for the President to start in on his own official family, before indicating what Senators and Representatives the people should elect to conform to his viewpoint.

After all, he has—or should have—control over his appointive officers. Elected officials are up to the people. If President Eisenhower means what he says about "modern republicanism," let him test his own Cabinet in the image he has created.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial on the subject which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, and a column by Doris Fleeson which appeared the day before.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 22, 1957]

MR. HUMPHREY'S ENIGMA

Reverberations from Secretary Humphrey's perplexing remarks last week on the President's budget provided some discordant overtones to the harmony of the second Eisenhower inaugural. Mr. Humphrey appeared to be at odds with the President on two principal points, with the extent of the disagreement depending upon the weight given his remarks. He seemed to invite Congress to make sweeping cuts in Mr. Eisenhower's budget; and he enunciated a philosophy of Government action, or rather inaction, in a recession that is in blunt contrast to the course to which the President is pledged. The Secretary of the Treasury needs to clarify his position on both points.

Every business, indeed every household, experiences moments when the person attempting to balance the books lectures about the importance of frugality. These reminders are both necessary and useful, and in this sense Mr. Humphrey's strictures may

well have had the President's blessing. Some cuts can be made in individual items, and some approved expenditures postponed, without harm. There are enough signs of inflation on the horizon to warrant extraordinary governmental prudence.

But an impression persists that Mr. Humphrey meant more than this—that he was asking Congress to slash heavily into aid to education, foreign aid, and other major programs that the Secretary may consider frills. The United States is a country of 170 million persons. It is entirely normal and natural that the budget will grow with the population and the size of the economy. No 1928 or even 1950 yardstick is adequate to today's demands.

Thus, it is absurd to think that the richest country in the world cannot provide adequate school facilities for its children; and Congress has a responsibility to weigh the relatively modest costs of action against the appalling costs of inaction. By the same token, foreign aid imaginatively programed may be a long-range economy, helping to reduce the need for the armaments that make up the lion's share of the budget.

By far the most alarming part of Mr. Humphrey's doctrine is his apparently dead-set opposition to tax cuts and deficit spending in order to counteract a depression. The use of the full machinery of Government to prevent a depression from developing has, one would have thought, been generally accepted. This means efforts to maintain the income stream through tax cuts, public-works spending, and the like (always with overall regard for the stability of the dollar). Such a philosophy is basic in the Full Employment Act of 1946 (which had Senator Taft's support) and has had the endorsement of the Council of Economic Advisers and most of the President's associates.

This is by no means to say that a need for such measures is imminent. Mr. Humphrey may well be right in thinking that at the moment the danger of further inflation remains great. There is mixed evidence of inflation and deflation in the economy; the automobile market is off and housing is down, but the steel and oil price increases are inflationary and there is no guaranty that either labor or business will respect the President's call for wage and price restraint. The situation could change quickly, however, and a downward cycle could be well in motion before the signs were clear.

What is disquieting is that a man of much power and influence in the administration apparently still believes in a 1929 or 1932 formula for coping with national economic disaster. It is not enough to say that if Mr. Humphrey actually tried to carry out such negative policies in a recession in all probability he would be quickly overridden before any new breadlines started. The fact that a man in his position holds such views is in itself cause for serious concern. If Mr. Humphrey misstated or overstated his convictions in response to reporters' questions, it is important for him to acquaint the public, which has little access to him, with what he really thinks. If his comments gave an accurate picture of his views, then there is a split between him and the President which cannot be covered over by honeyed words.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 22, 1957]

MR. HUMPHREY AND THE BUDGET—OPPOSITION TO HIGH GOVERNMENT COSTS POSES MANY INTERESTING QUESTIONS

(By Doris Fleeson)

When Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey all but invited Congress to cut President Eisenhower's record peacetime budget, he revived a question long familiar to Washington. It is this:

What is the duty of a Cabinet member or other top Federal administrator who finds himself compelled to support a Presidential policy with which he violently disagrees and which falls within the area of his responsibility?

Mr. Humphrey set this Capital on its ear with a series of provocative comments. He not only disclosed his own unhappiness over the size of the new budget but predicted "a depression that will curl your hair" if the increasing cost of government is not stopped.

This is strong language. The economizers in government, Democrat and Republican, seized upon it eagerly. Other Democrats, not notably stingy with the taxpayer's money, could not resist the temptation to goad the opposition which has long inveighed against big government and big spending.

Thus Washington is presented with another thrilling version of the Perils of Pauline.

What will Secretary Humphrey say to the Appropriations Committees of Congress? Will President Eisenhower back down? Did Vice President NIXON, who already is campaigning for the Presidency in 1960, force the welfare state budget on the ground that only a liberal Republican can win? Will the GOP conservatives stay hitched? What will the political harvest be?

For the answers to these important mysteries, the voters have only to read their daily newspapers. This is not a situation that can be compromised without loss of face for some very important people nor can it be obscured by Madison Avenue propaganda.

It is clear that Mr. Humphrey would hate to leave the team. In an effort to avoid putting the blame for the budget on the President, that ordinarily candid man went through some extraordinary verbal contortions.

Yet, in Macauley's deathless phrase, every schoolboy knows that the budget is the President's responsibility and that in framing it he has the advice and consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The latter has been particularly true in this administration because Mr. Humphrey has been generally acknowledged as the strong man of the Cabinet. But reporters had no trouble discerning that his advice was not heeded and that he was something of an Indian-giver about his consent.

After budget news stories had made it brutally plain that the increasing size and cost of government were dividing the administration, Republicans sought to minimize the Humphrey comments.

It was even said that the President had given his chief financial adviser authority to support budget cuts that would not impair security or essential services.

It is difficult to see how the Secretary could support any real budget cuts that would not impair the President's proposals. It is already widely believed that he pointed out a few places for cuts but was overruled.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to my friend from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I had occasion to be on the floor yesterday when my good friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota, first brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. I will say to the Senator that he might refer to the statement which I placed in the RECORD earlier today. That statement does not refer to his speech of yesterday, but does relate to what appears to be a conflict of opinion which seems to have arisen on the subject. The Senator might wish to read that statement, which is a matter of record, not of speculation, because it consists of excerpts from the transcript of testimony given by the Secretary of the Treasury. A reading of that testimony will show that statements attributed to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, are not in fact being clearly stated to Congress or to the people of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Maine. I would say most respectfully that while I always respect his judgment, it is a fact that the transcript of testimony reveals that the Secretary of the Treasury was in disagreement with the President. I would also say to the Senator from Maine that his comment just now is an indication to me that the press of the Nation, regardless of its vintage or its location, whether it be the Washington Post or the Chicago Tribune or the Baltimore Sun or the San Francisco Chronicle or the Chicago Sun-Times or the Minneapolis Star, has indicated clearly that the Secretary of the Treasury is opposed to certain aspects of the Presidential budget.

Furthermore, I should like to say most respectfully that the Secretary of the Treasury indicated in his press conference that he did not look with favor upon the Government of the United States using its vast financial resources in what we call deficit financing to combat a depression or recession. I believe that that kind of economic philosophy still expressed by the Secretary, is something out of the past, and hardly worthy of contemporary consideration.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was out of the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was elaborating in detail on his views. However, as I came into the Chamber I thought I heard him make the statement that he believed the Secretary of the Treasury should resign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I never like to admonish the Secretary of the Treasury, for whom I have a very high regard. I did say, it seems rather peculiar that the chief financial officer of the Federal Government, who was appointed by the President, should find himself in disagreement with the President over the budget, which is supposed to represent the considered judgment of the administration. I said I felt that if the Secretary of the Treasury had such strong views on the subject he should do one of two things, namely, he should either reconcile his views with the views of the President as expressed in the budget, or he might very well consider leaving the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Minnesota, as I have observed him in action over the years, has always stood for independence of thought and action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; indeed I have.

Mr. BRIDGES. Here we have a good example in the Federal Government of the Secretary of the Treasury exhibiting that quality which the Senator from Minnesota over the years has always exhibited himself, and has always praised in others. I commend the Secretary of the Treasury. I am glad that we have a prominent man in the Government of

the United States who pleads for economy and is willing to apply it.

So far as I am concerned, I do not believe there is any inconsistency, so far as the objectives of good government or the objectives of the political party he represents, are concerned. Neither do I believe there is any great conflict between the views expressed by the Secretary of the Treasury and those of the President.

I consider it my duty as a Republican and as a United States Senator to cut the budget if I see a way in which it can be cut.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his expression with respect to my great desire for independence of judgment in government. The Senator from New Hampshire is a living example of independence of judgment, the kind of independence I respect.

However, we should note the difference between the position of the Senator from New Hampshire and the position of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senator from New Hampshire was elected as a Republican in his great State. He was elected to office and he is a Member of Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury was not elected; he was appointed. Therefore it is to be assumed that the President has a philosophy of government. It is also to be assumed that he has an economic philosophy—and I trust he does.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the Senator's arguments with respect to independence of judgment do not apply in the case of the Secretary of the Treasury, because when a man is appointed to an official position in the Government, most particularly as a member of the Cabinet, although he may use his powers of persuasion to have his view adopted, nevertheless, once an administration position is arrived at within the Cabinet, the President should come to the Hill with one mind and with one view.

All too often the Senator from Minnesota has heard the President plead for something one day, only to observe the next day a Cabinet official in the cloakroom, calling Senators off the floor politely—but very urgently—suggesting that it might be a good idea if a budget request for a particular item were not adopted.

I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I respect independent political judgment on the part of elected officials. I am merely saying that when the chief financial officer of the Government openly disagrees with the chief of the Government, it does not indicate to me much coordination of policy or very sound administrative practice.

Mr. KERR subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say a word concerning the apparent difference of opinion between the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

One possible interpretation of what my good friend from Minnesota said would be that he thought it might be advisable for the Secretary of the Treasury to resign. But, in order to relieve my friend from New Hampshire of any great concern about it, I did not understand that the Senator from Minnesota was urging any hasty or precipitate action on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As one who has great respect for the Secretary of the Treasury and personal friendship for him, I may say that I was suggesting, first of all, that he might wish to reconcile his views with those of the President of the United States. I would want to give him that opportunity.

Second, knowing that the Secretary is a man of principle, I thought he might wish to give further consideration to a suggestion which I have read in the newspapers and in which he is already interested, namely, going back to Ohio.

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator has clarified the matter so that I now understand it to be what I thought it was, namely, a question of alternatives. The Senator is not insisting upon the Secretary's resignation today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, not today.

[Laughter.]

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have two unanimous-consent requests to make before the minority leader leaves the floor for a policy committee meeting at 12:30.

First I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until next Friday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERENCE OF THE PRESIDENT'S MIDDLE EAST PROPOSAL AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19 TO THE COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND ARMED SERVICES, SITTING JOINTLY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a unanimous-consent agreement on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered by unanimous consent, That the agreement entered into on Monday, January 7, 1957, with reference to joint hearings by the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services on the President's Middle East proposal, be modified to read as follows:

"Ordered by unanimous consent, That an official copy of the message of the President of the United States on the Middle East proposal, delivered before the two Houses in joint session on Saturday, January 5, 1957, together with the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, introduced on January 9, 1957, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, be referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly for consideration and study, including the holding of hearings, if deemed advisable, and that the said committees, acting through the chairman of one of said committees, shall at the earliest practicable date, submit a report to the Senate thereon, and that the said committees, acting jointly, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

"The procedure above indicated shall not be deemed as establishing a precedent in future cases of a similar nature."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the purpose of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, it is merely to make clear that the Senate is authorizing to be done what was intended to be authorized on the day when the original unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, namely, that with respect to the Middle East the resolution shall be referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, sitting jointly for that particular purpose, and, in fact, acting as one committee, but that thereby no precedent for the future shall be established. Is that a correct statement of the situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

H. MEADE ALCORN, JR.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Republican National Committee yesterday the resignation of the Honorable Leonard W. Hall was most regretfully accepted.

Len Hall, as he is affectionately called by all who know him, has been an able and distinguished leader of the Republican Party, and the attainments of the Republican Party during his term as leader are in themselves a monument to his outstanding work. Happily, a worthy successor to Len Hall was chosen in the person of H. Meade Alcorn, Jr., a resident of Connecticut, and a very dear friend of mine.

Mr. H. Meade Alcorn, Jr., a resident of Suffield, has been a great leader of the Republican Party, not only in Hartford County, but in the State of Connecticut. He has had an outstanding civic and political record. Born on October 20, 1907, Mr. Alcorn is a graduate of Dartmouth, 1930, cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa; track star and hurdle champion in 1928; graduate of Yale Law School in 1933, in which year he was admitted to the Connecticut bar. He is a member of the Hartford County, the Connecticut, and the American Bar Associations; president of the Connecticut Bar Association in 1950 and 1951; past president of the Hartford Rotary Club; a director for many years of the Connecticut Society for Crippled Children; member of the executive council of the Boy Scouts of America; and many other civic organizations.

Mr. Alcorn was assistant State's attorney for Hartford County from 1935 to 1942, State's attorney from 1942 to 1948, member of the Connecticut House of Representatives from 1937 to 1943, Republic majority leader in 1939, and speaker of the house in 1941. He has been a delegate to 5 Republican national conventions, was State chairman of the Citizens for Eisenhower in 1952, and presently is a State central committeeman from the 7th senatorial district of Connecticut and national committeeman from the State of Connecticut. He was vice chairman of the Republican National Committee until his election yesterday to the office of chairman.

Mr. Alcorn was in charge of the arrangements of the San Francisco Republican convention in 1956 and was chairman of the Connecticut delegation as well. He has a long record of civic and political experience. He is a man of high standing in his community, with proven organizational and administrative ability. He is a prodigious worker, agreeably aggressive, one who can work with others and get others to work with him willingly. He is objective in his thinking and fair and open-minded in his approach to new ideas. He is a man of balanced judgment, is effective in presenting his thinking, and in directing and working with others he earns and receives willing cooperation.

Meade Alcorn is one of our outstanding citizens, and will, I know, discharge ably and well the duties of the office which he will assume on February 1. We in Connecticut are happy and proud that the great Republican Party selected H. Meade Alcorn as our national chairman, and I know I speak in behalf of the people of my State when I extend felicitations and congratulations to Mr. Alcorn in his new office and to the great Republican Party in its selection of him to serve as national chairman.

EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, these days, if one permits himself to be drawn into a discussion of our Government's tax policy, he is apt to find himself wading through seas of figures, poring down endless columns of fine print, or waging a heated philosophical battle on tax policy.

I wish to go on record, Mr. President, as favoring a balanced budget. In my opinion, our tax philosophy, on the whole, is eminently fair. But there is a glaring exception.

I refer to the automobile excise tax. Excises are for ermine wraps, alcoholic beverages, exotic perfumes. The excise is and always has been a luxury tax. Just how the automobile happened to be singled out as a luxury and saddled with a 10-percent Federal excise tax is a long and involved story which I shall not recount here.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the automobile is the mainstay of America's workingman. It is his means of going to and from his job. In America's mushrooming suburbs, the automobile is frequently the one and only means of transportation. This tax, therefore, penalizes the average American hundreds of dollars for an item necessary to his livelihood. For that reason, I have on three separate occasions introduced measures to abolish this unfair levy.

I have before me an editorial entitled "Stupid and Unjust" which appeared in the Detroit Times of January 15, 1957. This great Michigan newspaper aptly points out that we do not act in a narrow or provincial sense when we fight the automobile excise tax. In the Times' words, we are "seeking to right a long-standing injustice."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUPID AND UNJUST

In seeking reduction or repeal of excise taxes upon automobiles, members of the Michigan congressional delegation are not acting primarily on behalf of the auto industry.

They are seeking to right a longstanding injustice which penalizes every motorist and is a direct assault upon the Michigan economy, as well as a brake to national prosperity, which the auto industry has so aided.

Facts and history of the automobile excise tax would be ludicrous were not the situation so serious. And it should be kept in mind that excise taxes are those usually associated with mink coats and perfume, rather than with basic transportation.

The first excise tax upon automobiles, for 3½ percent, was levied in 1932 as an emergency depression measure. The auto industry, auto purchasers, and Detroit, shouldered the burden and led a return to prosperity.

The reward: In 1941 Congress doubled the automobile excise to 7 percent as a wartime measure. Next, auto production was halted and the industry, and Detroit, became the arsenal of democracy.

Next scene, 1951: In 5 postwar years the automakers, management and workers, and Detroit, had reconverted to peacetime production, once more as the wheelhorse of the Nation.

Industry representatives appealed for reduction of the emergency and the wartime excise tax on automobiles.

Congress replied by increasing the tax to 10 percent—where it now stands, 25 years after the first emergency levy. Other excise taxes have meanwhile been reduced or entirely canceled.

As it now stands, for every $2,000 spent by the consumer for a new automobile, $146 is for this emergency-wartime-capricious tax.

And this is but the beginning of taxation on the automobile. By computation of the automobile manufacturers, total taxation is equal to $560 on every $2,000 automobile sold—down to a 42-cent Federal excise tax on 5 gallons of gasoline and 6 quarts of oil to get the car out of the dealer's showroom.

This is more than an infringement upon the opportunity of every motorist to drive an automobile to work.

For every four $2,000 autos which rolls from the production line there is one ghost car never built—a $2,240 deluxe model which the consumer pays for, in total taxes, but never gets.

Because this ghost car is never built it requires no autoworker to produce it—creating one ghost job which nobody can hold because his wages from the consumer dollar have been absorbed by taxes.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, hackneyed as the phrase may seem.

The auto industry and auto purchasers, and autoworkers, and Detroit, are pretty hard beasties. All they ask is that Congress loose the noose of excise taxes enough to let them breathe while turning out the Nation's golden eggs.

ADMINISTRATION OF DROUGHT AID

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article entitled "And They Say Drought's Not Bad in the Ozarks," written by Tom A. Ellis, and published in the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of January 13, 1957. The article refers to a matter which on last Thursday was discussed on the floor of the Senate primarily by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and myself. Inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona is not today in the city, I shall not further discuss this matter until both of us can be on the floor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of January 13, 1957]

AND THEY SAY DROUGHT'S NOT BAD IN THE OZARKS

(By Tom A. Ellis)

In late November, after a hop-skip-and-jump survey across the several-thousand-square-mile area of southwest Missouri, the United States Department of Agriculture declined the Ozarks' plea for Federal drought relief.

Reasons offered for declining the plea were dual: Missouri's 1956 hay crop was 80 percent of normal; her grain yield was nearly a record.

That was that. To the resultant clamor came a distant promise to review the case, but what the review would bring was a foregone conclusion, a conclusion well justified, for nothing came of the review.

Whether or not politics had anything to do with it, political implications and insinuations were inevitable. Just 2 weeks prior to the USDA representative's survey, Missouri voters went against the Eisenhower landslide to put their electoral college weight in Democrat Adlai Stevenson's column. And in breasting that political tidal wave, they had pulled under one of the GOP's strongest entrenched Congressmen, Representative Dewey Short, who represented one of the hardest hit drought areas of Missouri.

It may have been that politics had something to do with the rejection of Missouri's drought-aid plea, or maybe they didn't. The end result is the same: It's going to be hard to convince hard-pressed Ozarks farmers that there's any other reason why they aren't just as entitled to drought aid as are the farmers of Kansas and Oklahoma, but a few miles away, across the State lines.

There the matter has rested until now when, through the instrumentality of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, the seventh district's new Congressman, CHARLIE BROWN, and the two United States Senators from Missouri, TOM HENNINGS and STUART SYMINGTON, this area has won a new hearing for its drought plea.

BROWN called the Springfield Chamber of Commerce Friday afternoon, to announce that he had won a hearing for the Ozarks at Wichita, this week. The chamber of commerce promptly appointed John Fawcett, widely known dairyman from Point Lookout, and Karl Wickstrom, public relations representative of Producers Creamery, to carry the Ozarks plea to Wichita in what is probably this area's last hope for aid.

What can they tell USDA officials? How press their case to overcome that "80 percent of normal" hay crop and record grain harvest

which have already been the basis for drought-aid rejection?

On the surface, those would appear good reasons—but only on the surface.

In the first place, it now seems fruitless to press for the Ozarks' first need—hay. Greene County Agent Clyde Clubb emphasized that yesterday. "I can't believe they could get a hay program rolling in less than 5 to 6 weeks," Clubb said. "By that time it will be too late."

(Five to six weeks would carry the season into late February or early March by which time there should be small grains pastures in this area.)

Grain was something different, Clubb said. Farmers of this area could use that to good advantage—undoubtedly it would keep many of them from going to the wall, financially.

But how answer the USDA contention on hay and grain in Missouri? The answers are obvious to anyone who knows the area, and they are also statistically broken down into a graphic picture of need. Furthermore, they are documented by the USDA's own Agricultural Marketing Service at Columbia.

In the first place, the hay crop was only 72 percent of normal, based on the best information available through the State drought committee. Furthermore, here is the way Alfred C. Brittain, statistician in charge of the AMS in Columbia, presents the case:

"During the 10-year period, 1942–51, when an average of 4½ million tons of hay were harvested, there was available 900,000 tons per month. This year many parts of the State started feeding hay as soon as it was harvested. Considering a minimum 7-month feeding season, the monthly supply would be 55 percent of the average for the State as a whole. The monthly supply for the western half of the State would be much lower."

In other words, where a normal supply of hay is expected to last through a 3- to 4-month feeding period, a 72 percent of normal crop was expected to feed through 6 to 7 months in 1956–57.

Many Ozarks farmers started feeding hay as soon as it was harvested—as far back as early July to August. Normally, hay isn't fed in any great quantity in southwest Missouri before November to December. Why? There was no pasture in the late summer and early fall this past season. Or, as Clubb graphically put it, "We had a 72 percent normal hay crop and a 200 percent of normal feeding period."

Brittain had something to say about that short, poor pasture season, too:

"The 10-year average condition for pastures for the season was 80 percent of normal. The 1953 average was 47 percent; 1954, 59 percent; 1955, 76 percent; and 1956, 58 percent. While the 1956 season average was about the same as 1954 and a little above 1953, there was one significant difference. In 1953 and 1954 the condition of pastures early in the season was near the average and there was some recovery late in the fall of 1954. In 1956 pasture conditions were much below the average for most of the season and were below average each month (April through November)."

Wheat is usually one of the pasture stalwarts in late fall and early spring in the Ozarks. But on December 1, 1956, it was only 68 percent of normal—"the lowest for the date on record, and (it) emphasizes the fact that little feed has been available from small grains seeded this fall," Brittain pointed out. And what was true of the 1956 fall wheat was just as true of barley and rye, the other two standby fall pasture crops in this area.

A near-record grain crop was produced with subnormal fall and spring moisture conditions through a freak in the weather pattern. Checking the precipitation in this area last year, it is easy to see why. Here are the reports of rainfall in the critical months, as released by the Weather Bureau in Springfield—normal rainfall is listed first and actual rainfall next after each month reported:

January, normal 1.31, actual 1.0 inch; February, 1.76 and 1.88; March, 2.71 and 0.5; April, 4.34 and 1.75; May, 5.02 and 0.58; June, 5.56 and 3.63.

Notice the terrible deficiencies of March, April and May when rains are most needed for the production of pasture, hay and silage. But if the rains failed for pasture, they came just right for grain, hence that record crop.

Significantly, then, farmers were feeding their last reserves of hay when they should have been utilizing the normal season's lushest pasture. This was just as true in the fall of 1956.

After a wetter-than-normal July, notice the fall rain pattern: August brought 1.27 inches as compared with a 4.01-inch normal; September's fall was 0.26 as compared with a norm of 3.86. August and September are the seeding months for rye, wheat and barley that were to furnish pasture last fall and next spring. The grains would sprout and die, or wouldn't even sprout, or were never seeded by farmers helplessly and hopelessly awaiting the life-giving rain. And those grains that did survive went into the winter stunted, still providing virtually no pasture.

So, the farmer did all he could—he fed through August, September, and on through the fall and up until now.

But why wasn't the Ozarks farmer more provident? Why didn't he prepare for this emergency? What of that record grain crop?

The USDA may ask those questions, but if it would trouble itself to look at the reports of its own Agricultural Marketing Service, Brittain has provided the explanation.

As for preparation, remember that 1956 was the fifth year of drought and marked up a 5-foot deficiency of moisture over 5 straight years. Observe what that did to the once orderly system of crops. By Brittain's figures, covering seven southwest Missouri counties—Webster, Christian, Douglas, Lawrence, Greene, Polk, and Laclede—between 1949–54:

Lespedeza production for hay dropped from 161,781 acres to a paltry 4,258 acres—about one-fortieth the original acreage. Why? Drought killed it—no Ozarks farmer in his right mind would ever forsake lespedeza.

Corn grown for grain fell from 90,670 acres to 9,197—about a tenth the original acreage. (Does that explain why a normal grain yield has little meaning to this area?)

Clover and timothy for hay declined from 36,369 to 15,378 acres, much less than half. Why? Drought and drought alone.

Alfalfa slipped from 25,333 acres to 19,858 acres despite every effort to reseed and get new fields started.

As for improvidence, here is what farmers were doing to offset drought losses in those same years, 1949–54:

Corn acreage for silage (not grain) leaped from 6,857 to 54,100—more than eightfold; oats and small grains for hay increased from 11,302 to 94,887—about eightfold; improved pasture seeded in a single county was 18,205 acres in 1950 alone and of that only 1,600 acres was left alive 5 years later. Alfalfa seeding in that same county totaled 12,134 acres in 1950 alone, and the county's entire acreage had shrunk to 1,819 acres by 1954.

Do those figures tell a story of negligence, indifference, improvidence? Or don't they tell a story of using every defense possible, of gambling hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight drought?

That "record" grain crop would be amusing if it weren't so tragic. Oh the small grains are grown here, all right, but except for small cash-crop wheat seedings, they're grown almost exclusively for pasture, silage, and hay. And it's almost impossible to find a field of corn that isn't destined for silage.

That being true, what advantage to this area if the corn yielded a record 34.5 bushels to the acre (as it did in 1956) or 345 bushels to the acre? The overall difference would go in a politician's eye less painfully than a fleck of dust in a farmer's. The same thing is true for the small grains. Farmers have increased their use of silage 789 percent in 5 years and their use of small grains for hay by 804 percent. Yet farmers are still on the ropes.

This is only part of the drought picture. It doesn't include 1956 figures which will be worse than the latest available, those for 1954. It doesn't tell of the thousands of dollars farmers have spent on seeds, fertilizer and field preparation only to see their investments go up in eddying clouds of dust or curl and die under a blazing summer sun unrelieved by moisture.

One farmer told this writer last week that he had seeded improved pasture on the same field twice a year for the past 3 years—then he had to sell the field to recoup his losses.

What of the tens of thousands of acres of alfalfa lost in 1956 to aphids and grasshoppers?

Or what of the fact that about 14 percent of the Ozarks' farmers were forced from the farms in the years, 1949–54—more by drought than any farm price pinch? Or that hundreds of others were able to hold on to their farms only by working part time in town?

Yet, Secretary of Agriculture Benson had never heard the details of the Missouri plight. At least, that is what he told Representative BROWN.

BROWN wrote Benson on December 20, received no reply until last Thursday, he told the chamber of commerce group. He said he had talked to both Benson and True Morse, Benson's righthand man from Missouri. And out of that, with the air of pressure applied by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, BROWN said he received Morse's consent to hold the forthcoming hearing at Wichita.

BROWN promised that he would push the matter in Washington after the Missouri hearing has been held.

Meanwhile, the Springfield Chamber of Commerce has designated Wickstrom and Fawcett as its delegates to present the Ozarks' drought story to Federal officials this week.

What will it bring? No one knows.

As one wag observed: "It's kinda like a feather in a pillow—don't amount to much, maybe, but get enough of them and you can make a pillow."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on the same subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Do We Need Help? published in the Springfield Leader-Press of January 14, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press of January 14, 1957]

DO WE NEED HELP?

Two Ozark farm leaders, John Fawcett and Karl Wickstrom, left today for Wichita, Kans., where, as official representatives of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, they will confer tomorrow with a group of the highest officials from the United States Department of Agriculture about drought aid for this area.

It would be difficult to find two men more competent for the task. Fawcett is one of Missouri's best-known dairymen, with full knowledge of dairymen's needs and their plight after 5 years of drought. Wickstrom's business as public-relations representative of Producers Creamery is to assemble data on the agricultural situation in southwest Missouri, and he has at his fingertips probably a better statistical breakdown of the situation than any other man in the area.

The two will be backed by a preponderant amount of support from all levels in this

area. They represent the chamber of commerce, which is desperately worried about the plight of farmers in an area where feed supplies are virtually exhausted. Also, they will carry such petitions as the one drafted Saturday by the Southwest Missouri Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, representing about 70 high-school vocational agriculture classes of this region. It might be interesting to note that only one teacher—a man from Polk County—refused to sign the drafted petition. County agents have been virtually unanimous in putting their weight behind the Ozarks plea.

Even so, will it change the verdict already rendered by the United States Department of Agriculture? A similar plea was rejected in November.

It might, for Secretary of Agriculture Benson informed Seventh District Congressman CHARLIE BROWN last week that he had never been apprised of the true situation in the Ozarks—someone below him had apparently applied the stopper. Benson might be the man who turns the tide.

Certainly this is considered in the light of an emergency area by other national agencies. For example, Time magazine, in December issue, had charted the vast drought area which sprawls across the score of States, according to the intensity and disaster of each area. About three-fourths of Missouri, including all the western area, was placed in the most critical zone.

If this drought survey is sincere in its aims, we'd say that Missouri has a good chance. It may well be utterly sincere. Mr. Eisenhower certainly has shown much concern.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Policy Than Defense," published in the Boston Herald of January 17, 1957. I am sure all Senators are interested in our national policy, and, therefore, I believe they will be much interested in this able editorial from an outstanding independent Republican newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of January 17, 1957]

MORE POLICY THAN DEFENSE

With a very grim attempt at humor, we would like to ask if Mr. Wilson and Mr. Dulles have been speaking to each other recently.

Secretary Dulles has advanced a bold policy in the Middle East. He has advanced it with solemn overtones of impendirg crisis there which may send American GI's into battle. He warns that the decisive test in the struggle between communism and freedom may take place there.

Yet, while his words have hardly stopped echoing, the 1958 budget goes to Congress with recommendations for defense hardly enough to maintain the inadequate degree of military strength we now have.

And that is why we wonder if there is any communication between the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

In spite of President Eisenhower's reassuring words that defense funds are enough, there are overwhelming indications that they are not in the light of our world responsibilities. And these indications are of a kind to be understood by the average American citizen.

Let us review some of them. First, consider our foreign obligations:

We are taking on almost the sole responsibility for keeping the Soviet out of the Middle East. The British have canceled orders for 100 jet fighters, are disbanding most of the auxiliary air-force units, and have curtailed training programs as the beginning of major slashes in defense. If nothing else, the American defense effort should be taking up this slack.

But we also have obligations for the defense of virtually the entire free world, obligations in many cases concretely specified in mutual defense treaties.

Less specific but more crucial is the growth of Russian atomic power. The Soviet has shown increasing readiness to launch nonatomic offensives in the belief that its growing ability to deal a terrific atomic blow to us will deter us from launching a full-scale atomic retaliation. Premier Bulganin, in his warning to Britain in the Suez crisis, claimed the Soviet capacity to conquer Western Europe "even without the use of up-to-date nuclear and rocket weapons." Significantly, he asserted, "The strategic situation as it has developed in Western Europe now is even more favorable for the armed forces of the Soviet Union than it had been at the end of World War II." (This peril is cited by Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in the January issue.)

That means that the United States must consider whether to leave Europe's defense to the ultimate gamble of a total atomic deterrence, or whether to set up a nonatomic deterrence by strengthening NATO forces.

Despite Russian satellite defection—which can as likely bring on new Soviet aggression as discourage it—the security of the United States today demands a greater military capability than ever.

Yet what are we doing? We are, to be sure, adding $2 billion to our defense budget. But the $38 billion the budget provides for fiscal 1958 will not buy any more overall defense than the $36 billion we are spending this year. We may well be falling backward rather than forging ahead.

Part of that $2 billion will be consumed simply in meeting the increased costs of the same items. Another part will be consumed in meeting the additional expense of new weapons, mostly planes, ordered in the past but just now coming into production.

Furthermore some of the fantastic new weapons which have passed beyond the relatively inexpensive research stage are now entering into the much more costly prototype stage.

But the most striking discrepancy between our foreign obligations and our defense capability is in our facilities for meeting peripheral emergencies. It appears from uncontested statements before the Symington committee last year that we cannot put out a sudden fire in the Middle East, say, and at the same time maintain our vital Strategic Air Command at readiness.

Major General Wheeler, of the Army's Military Operations Office, testified that the Air Force had the planes to lift one 5,000-ton division, which is simply the combat echelon with a minimum of technical service troops and no accompanying supplies.

Yet to move this minimum airborne division, practically the whole of the available Air Force transport capabilities would have to be used. There would be none left to maintain the readiness of SAC.

In the face of this, Secretary Wilson declared less than a couple of months ago that the Air Force structure "provides adequate airborne lift in the light of approved strategic concepts."

How now does Mr. Wilson expect to back up Mr. Dulles' foreign policy? With what do we stop the Reds in the Middle East?

These are searching questions that Congress must ask.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER—STATEMENT BY HARRY S TRUMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from Missouri's No. 1 citizen, former President Harry S Truman, commenting on the recent inaugural address by President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HARRY S TRUMAN

I have carefully read the President's message. It is a nice collection of beautiful words. It is very strong for home and mother and for world peace, just as we all are, but I see no plan of action outlined in the message.

Peace in this present troubled world can be obtained only by action on the part of the free world, and it will require the leadership of the United States to accomplish that action.

I see no reference to action in the message. Neither do I see any idea for relief for the farm population; nor do I see any effort to straighten out the finances of the Government and restore building opportunities for returned soldiers and sailors and the other people who want to build modest homes.

No effort is being made to stop the gouging of people who are anxious to obtain loans for small business and for building purposes. The money lenders are at their old tricks of gouging the applicant for loans by commission.

I am sorry about this, because I was hopeful that an active and militant approach to these matters would be made by the President.

He is the only source from which leadership in these matters can come.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 29)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

(For President's report, see House proceedings for today.)

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION OF INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED RACKETEERING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in recent days I have been asked by several members of the press to comment, as a newly appointed member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the question of Senate investigation of alleged racketeering in American unions.

On yesterday I prepared a press release on the subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked by the press for comment as to which committee of the Senate should investigate alleged racketeering in labor unions and alleged misuse of union welfare funds.

It is my view that basically these problems clearly fall within the purview and jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as far as the Senate is concerned. However, I recognize that the subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee, of which Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN of Arkansas is chairman, has been carrying on for some weeks an investigation of certain phases of these problems. This investigation is based upon the rightful but limited jurisdiction of the Government Operations Subcommittee.

It is my understanding that the McClellan committee has an investigation staff under the direction of its counsel, Mr. Robert Kennedy, that has already collected a considerable quantity of data and information.

It seems to me that the two Senate committees should not become involved in a jurisdictional dispute, but should resolve any difference that may arise by the appointment of either a joint committee or a special committee. This committee should make use of the investigative personnel of the McClellan committee and should be composed of Senators from each committee to continue the investigation.

There are two things that I wish to make perfectly clear. The first is that the public is entitled to have the investigation completed. Therefore, I think the Senate itself should pass the necessary resolution that establishes beyond any question of legal doubt the authority of whatever committee is assigned the investigative duty.

Second, I wish to make clear that I have notified Senator LISTER HILL, Chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, that I would not serve on such a joint or special investigating committee because of the fact that some of the allegations under investigation involve claimed labor abuses in my own State.

As one who has served in a quasi-judicial capacity, both as an arbitrator of many labor disputes and as a member of the National War Labor Board, I know how vital it is to the administration of justice that anyone sitting in the seat of judgment should disqualify himself in any case in which anyone could ever harbor a suspicion of partiality.

Having said that I wish to make clear that I am convinced that it is in the best interest of labor in my State and throughout the country that any alleged malpractices by labor be thoroughly investigated just as alleged malpractices on the part of any other economic group in our country must always be investigated if we are going to protect the public interest. I am sure that all responsible leaders of labor share my view on this matter.

Therefore, I have recommended to the chairman of the Senate Labor Committee that he should consider the advisability of recommending to the leadership of the Senate the appointment of a joint or select committee to conduct the labor investigation that has been started by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, my position is this: I believe that any allegation of racketeering in American unions or in any other phase of our economy—and let me say that racketeering is not limited to misbehavior on the part of some union officials—should be investigated by the Senate, through committees which have appropriate jurisdiction.

As my press release makes clear, I happen to think that, in the first instance, the jurisdiction over the pending racketeering allegations falls clearly within the authority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But as I say in the press release, Mr. President, there are certain facets of the problem which I believe as a matter of committee right certainly do fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. However, I think the Senate owes it to the American people to clarify at an early date the question of committee jurisdiction in regard to this matter, so that the investigation will proceed without delay.

In the press release I indicate—subject to a change of opinion if Senate debate or committee conference shows that some other solution would be better—that under the circumstances I now think that either a joint committee or a select committee should, by resolution of the Senate, be given jurisdiction over this matter.

In the press statement I also make perfectly clear that, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I would not accept appointment to such a proposed committee—although my appointment has been suggested by some persons—not because I have any question as to my own ability to be impartial, but because as one who has held quasi-judicial positions, I know how important it is that those who sit in judgment not be even under any veil of suspicion that complete impartiality would not exist.

Therefore, because the press has been carrying stories that in one of the principal cities of my State it is alleged that there have been some abuses on the part of some union officials, I think that everybody will understand why I take the position, as any judge would take the same position, of disqualifying myself from sitting in any investigation where I would occupy a seat of judgment in respect to those charges. However, let me make it very clear that I could judge the charges judiciously if I had the evidence before me, and I could do so with complete impartiality, as anyone who knows my quasi-judicial record would so testify.

What I want to stress on the floor of the Senate today is that I think the Senate should proceed with the investigation, but I think it should proceed with the investigation under a resolution adopted by the Senate which removes all doubt and controversy as to the jurisdictional power and legal authority of the committee. That is the recommendation I have made to the chairman of my committee, and I hope the leadership of the Senate, at a very early hour, will work out some agreeable settlement of this jurisdictional problem.

I happen to be one, as a Member of the Senate, who thinks it is unfortunate that in the very beginning the matter was not handled by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That is no reflection, I may say, on the committee that has been handling the matter. I wish to say on the floor of the Senate that, as my press release indicates, I have the highest regard for the judiciousness of the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and I also have a very high regard for the staff, under the counselship of Mr. Robert Kennedy, that, so I understand from press reports, has been conducting the investigation.

I make these brief remarks on this subject, before I turn to another subject, because I think we should proceed to get the matter settled at once so that the investigation can proceed, with unquestioned power of the committee to act.

I turn now to another subject, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for 3 or 4 minutes I desire to take the Senate back a few months to the discussion we had on the floor of the Senate at the time the availability of a limited quantity of Salk vaccine was first announced. I am very proud to stand on the floor of the Senate today, Mr. President, and reaffirm every observation I made at that time, when I pointed out then, as I do today, what I consider to be the great moral obligation of our Government to see to it that this great humanitarian discovery is put to its maximum use for the best protection of the health of the American people. At that time I was called a creeping Socialist because I proposed that the Federal Government exercise jurisdiction over the distribution of the then limited supply of Salk vaccine. I am so used to that charge that I not only find it amusing, but when it is made of me in connection with such issues as this one, it only reaffirms my conviction that I am right. Mr. President, we have almost reached the point in this country that if one makes a fight on the floor of the Senate for general welfare legislation, in keeping with the general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States, seeking to advance, promote, and protect the welfare of the American people, the reactionary forces of the Nation charge one with being a creeping Socialist.

I want to say that the latest chapter in regard to the Salk Vaccine program only confirms the soundness of the position that some of us took at the time that great, miraculous discovery was made. We pointed out at the time that the Salk vaccine research program was financed by the dimes contributed by the people of the United States in the great March of Dimes program. We argued that the benefits ought to accrue to the health welfare of the people, and not to the profit dollars of the drug companies or the medical profession. I think the medical profession has a tremendous moral obligation with regard to this matter. We now read in the papers that thousands of vials of the precious Salk vaccine have to be destroyed, because, after the vaccine has been kept in storage

for a while, it, of course, deteriorates, and no longer can be used.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the time has come again for the committee of the Senate, of which I am now a member—and I serve notice today that I intend to ask for action by the committee, and shall submit, in due course, and appropriate resolution if necessary for such action—to find out why it is that his horrendous plague which constantly threatens the health of the American people cannot be more adequately checked by the full use of the Salk vaccine that is available.

Mr. President, communications that I have received in recent hours, one from one of our great radio commentators, who has been discussing this matter on the air, give as one of the reasons for the situation the fact that, unfortunately, there are thousands of people in our country who find that injections of Salk vaccine cost too much. Information has been given me that the standard medical charge for an injection of Salk vaccine is $6, and three injections are needed. So the total cost is $18 per person if this information is correct. I am sure that in many instances the cost is much less and I imagine that in many cases doctors have given free injections.

However, have we reached the point, Mr. President, where it is to be considered creeping socialism if a government, which ought to be dedicated to humanitarianism and the protection of the health of its citizens, makes available Salk vaccine injections at cost to every man, woman, and child in our country who would use the vaccine if it were provided? Mr. President, if you should sit with me for a while on the Foreign Relations Committee you would observe the great sums of money the taxpayers of America are contributing for health programs abroad and for economic and military programs abroad. I have not heard anyone get particularly concerned about a socialistic program on the part of our Government in connection with the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I realize full well that when one suggests any Government aid program for the benefit of our own people, in connection with our own health, he will run into one of the most powerful political lobbies existing today in America. But let me say on the floor of the Senate today that the health of the American people is the concern of the American people, and we have the right to look to those who have the sacred obligation of protecting the health of the American people in the field of medicine to see to it that they fully live up to their social responsibilities, too. That is why I repeat here today that it is not in the public interest to allow a situation to develop in which a single vial of Salk vaccine must be destroyed because it has been allowed to deteriorate due to the fact that the cost involved has reduced the demand for its use. If the proposed committee investigation to which I allude should show, by way of proof, that one of the reasons for the slowdown in the Salk vaccine program is that it costs too much, then I think the Government should assist with the program. We do it for livestock. Let us do it for people.

I happen to believe that the health of the American people calls upon us, as a Congress, to find out the truth and the facts about this subject immediately. If the reason why Salk vaccine is not being used fully is a financial one, then I repeat what I said many months ago on the floor of the Senate when I introduced a bill limited at that time only to a Government program of supplying the vaccine free to small children and pregnant women. I suggested that those inoculations ought to be free, and provided at the expense of the Government. For that stand I took the name calling, abuse, and castigation to which I have previously referred.

Now I understand that we have reached the point where we can produce this miraculous drug and help to reduce, if not remove, the possibility of any serious plague of infantile paralysis in this country. If that is true, then let us, before it is too late, make the vaccine available to all of our citizens at little cost. In the case of those who cannot afford to pay even a cost fee then in the interest of national health let us give it to them free. I am not asking the doctors to do it without cost. I am not asking for free service from the medical profession. The doctors are entitled to a reasonable fee for administering the vaccine, but in this instance I am willing to have the Government foot the bill in the interest of national health. As a constitutional liberal on the floor of the Senate, I raise my voice again in support of a program which would promote the welfare and health of our own people. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I shall continue to support legislation which seeks to do the same for people abroad. But I shall not accept the fallacious argument of the reactionaries that it is socialism to support a Government program at home that seeks to protect the health and economic welfare of our own people, but it is great statesmanship to finance some foreign government's nationalistic economic program abroad. The American people are fast becoming wise to that reactionary doubletalk.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, January 25, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1957:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James T. O'Connell, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

COAST GUARD

The following officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard:

Stephen Hadley Evans
Edward H. Thiele
Allen Winbeck

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, from whom to turn away is to falter and fail, Thou art always seeking to draw us nearer to Thyself in faith and in fellowship.

We penitently confess that when we look deeply into our own souls we find that we are guilty of the infidelity of following Thee afar off and with stumbling and halting steps.

Grant that daily, in the sacred attitude and atmosphere of prayer, we may learn the secret of a life that is steadfast and secure, calm and courageous.

Hitherto Thou hast sustained us with words of good cheer, even though at times we seemed to be hearing only the beating of our own trembling hearts.

Lead and lift us by Thy spirit, out of those fears and anxieties, which so frequently haunt us, into a new experience of confidence and joy.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 29)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 23, 1957.

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have received the assistance and advice of the

Council of Economic Advisers. I have also had the advice of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government.

I set forth below, essentially in the words of the report itself, what I consider to be its major conclusions and recommendations.

OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN A FREE ECONOMY

The vast productive power of the American economy was demonstrated again in 1956 in a record national output of $412 billion of goods and services.

In addition to providing this material basis for better living, our free economy gives indispensable support to our form of political life and offers unparalleled opportunities to the individual for personal choice and development.

Important responsibilities accompany these opportunities. They are borne in part by Government, but they must be borne also by the individual in his own economic activity and in his organized activity with others.

Government must use all practicable means to promote high levels of production and employment, and to contribute toward achieving an expanding and widely shared national income, earned in dollars of stable buying power. It must pursue policies that encourage the enterprising spirit of our people and protect incentives to work, to save, and to invest. It must exercise a strict discipline over its expenditures and avoid taking in taxes too much of the incomes of individuals and businesses. It must strive to strengthen competitive markets and to facilitate the adjustments necessary in a dynamic economy.

Even more exacting are the responsibilities of individuals and economic groups. Business managements should formulate and carry out their plans so as to contribute to steady economic growth. They must also recognize the broad public interest in the prices set on their products and services.

Both management and labor should remove restrictions on the operation of competitive markets and enhance the economy's adaptability to change. Of particular importance in a prosperous economy is the responsibility of leaders of business and labor to reach agreements on wages and other labor benefits that are consistent with productivity prospects and with the maintenance of a stable dollar.

Reliance for stability in economic growth cannot be placed exclusively on the fiscal and monetary policies of Government. The successful extension of prosperity with price stability calls for a cooperative effort in which the policies of individuals and economic groups and of all levels of Government are consistent with one another and mutually reinforcing.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND IMPROVEMENT, 1953–56

The opportunities which our free economy provides for the improvement of well-being are clearly evident in the record of the last 4 years. Civilian employment increased by about 3.7 million. Per capita personal income measured in constant dollars rose 10 percent after taxes. Five million homes were built and home ownership became more widespread. Rising incomes enabled consumers to expand their purchases of virtually all types of goods and to make important improvements in their own provisions for financial security. Participation in, and support of, religious, cultural, educational, and civic activities increased significantly.

Great strides were taken in the expansion and improvement of the Nation's productive facilities. Business firms and farmers spent over $150 billion for this purpose. These investment outlays contain the promise of greater national output and better living in the years ahead.

Agriculture has faced difficult problems in this period, resulting chiefly from the persistent tendency for production to exceed commercial demands. Progress has been made, however, toward a better balanced farm economy, and there has been some recent improvement in farm income. To sustain agricultural progress, experience suggests that continued emphasis is needed on the basic objectives of the last 4 years—wider freedom for our commercial farmers in managing their own enterprises, appropriate shifts in the use of the Nation's cropland, an improved system of price supports, and research into new products, markets, and uses.

The period was marked by economic improvement throughout the free world and by a notable expansion of international trade and finance, including our own exports and imports. Sharp increases have occurred in our exports to industrialized countries with high per capita incomes and to others currently experiencing a rapid rate of economic growth. This fact shows that prosperity elsewhere widens markets for the products of our farms, mines, and factories.

The contributions that Government can make toward the achievement of stable economic growth have been evident during the last 4 years. The 1953–54 experience demonstrated that, when consumer and business confidence is maintained, timely public policies can help keep recessionary tendencies in check. The Government policies followed in 1955 and 1956 helped to moderate the upward pressure on prices and to prevent conditions that would threaten economic stability.

THE ECONOMY IN 1956

The Nation's aggregate output of goods and services in 1956 was $21.5 billion greater than in 1955, despite a decrease in activity in some sectors of the economy, notably in automobile production and home construction. Heavy expenditures for new plants and equipment by business concerns, increases in foreign trade and investment, a high rate of consumer expenditures, and rising outlays by State and local governments contributed to the expansion. About half of the increase represented a gain in physical output, and the remainder reflected moderately higher prices.

Sizable gains in employment were made in important sectors of the economy; for the year as a whole, there was an increase of 1.8 million over 1955 in total civilian employment. Incomes rose for all major groups of income recipients.

As the year progressed, farm income improved. There were further advances in the value of farmland, in the net worth of farm proprietors, and in agricultural exports. Farm technology continued to improve.

Financial markets and prices were under continuous pressure. Interest rates rose as the demand for credit continued large relative to the supply of funds. The unusually heavy demands of business concerns tended to raise prices of capital goods and related commodities. High costs of raw materials and wage increases that tended to outrun the year's small gain in productivity were pervasive factors making for higher prices.

Pressures on prices, costs, and financial resources in 1956 called for the continuation of policies designed to counter inflationary forces. The Federal Government's budget surplus contributed to this end, as did the credit restraints imposed by the Federal Reserve System. The events of the year showed, however, that when production and employment are high, wage and price increases in important industries can create upward pressures on costs and prices generally, and that the monetary and fiscal policies of Government must be supported by appropriate private policies to assure both a high level of economic activity and stable prices.

EXTENDING AND BROADENING ECONOMIC PROGRESS

This report outlines legislative proposals designed to carry out the declared policy of the Employment Act. They include measures to strengthen our enterprise system, enlarge our national resources, and improve the level of living.

Government can strengthen the enterprise system at this time by preserving a balanced budget. Accordingly, the Congress should continue tax rates at their present levels, and Federal expenditures should be strictly limited.

Our enterprise system would also be strengthened by legislative measures to assist small businesses and to foster competition. These measures, which the Congress is urged to consider, include extension of the Small Business Act beyond June 30, 1957; easier access of small- and medium-sized companies to capital markets; such tax adjustments as can be made with a minimum loss of revenue; and reduction of the burden of paperwork imposed by Government. The Congress is also urged to provide for needed improvements in the antitrust laws and in the procedures available to enforcement agencies.

Recent changes in our financial structure and practices call for careful study of the adequacy of existing facilities for meeting the Nation's capital and credit requirements and of the means for exercising appropriate controls over credit. As requested in the state of the Union message, the Congress should authorize a National Monetary and Financial Commission to perform this important task.

Our enterprise system would benefit from United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation and participation in the International Atomic

Energy Agency, and from continuation of economic assistance, including defense support, under the mutual-security program.

Additional measures are required to enlarge and improve our national resources. The partnership principle, which encourages local leadership and participation in the development of water and power resources, should continue to be given close attention in current authorizations and appropriations.

To aid agricultural adjustments, recommendations will be made to the Congress for an improved acreage-allotment and price-support program for corn, and for steps to deal with problems of land use and water shortage accentuated by recent drought conditions. Extension of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 1 year, and a limited increase in permissible losses, would be a useful short-run measure for helping reduce surplus stocks of farm commodities.

The Congress is again requested to enact a program of Federal assistance for developing the economic base of local areas experiencing persistent unemployment.

No proposal for enlarging our national resources is more important than that for Federal assistance in overcoming the critical shortage of schoolrooms. The Congress is urged to enact a program which would help meet the backlog of these needs within 4 years. After that time full responsibility for school construction should revert to the State and local governments.

Further advances in the level of living would be accomplished by measures to raise the Nation's standards of housing, health, and personal security. Home building and ownership would be aided by an adjustment that would bring the maximum interest rate on VA-guaranteed home loans into closer conformity with competitive market rates; by an increase of funds for the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association; and by an extension of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program.

Health standards would be advanced by legislation to encourage voluntary health plans and by a program of construction grants for medical and dental training facilities.

Personal security would be strengthened by extending unemployment insurance coverage to employees of small firms and certain other groups; by broadening minimum wage legislation to cover additional workers needing this protection; by requiring Federal registration and reporting by private pension and welfare funds; and by a program of technical aid and limited financial assistance to States for promoting occupational safety.

CONCLUSION

There are grounds for confidence that the Nation's overall prosperity will be extended into the months ahead. A moderate rise in business capital outlays is indicated. Construction expenditures and foreign trade and investment should continue to favor economic expansion. The combined expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments are expected to be higher. Consumer expenditures should be sustained by favorable employment conditions and good earnings.

However, uncertainties and problems are always present in the economic situation and require careful attention. These include the present international situation, the upward pressure of costs and prices, factors affecting capital outlays by business, and the provision of an adequate flow of new savings to meet the prospective heavy demands for funds.

These and other uncertainties and problems which inevitably arise in a dynamic economy challenge individuals, economic groups, and Government to meet their respective responsibilities for maintaining stable economic growth. If all live up to these responsibilities, the capacity of our economy to provide the high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power envisaged by the Employment Act, and broadly attained in the past year, will be further enhanced.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF MIDDLE EAST HEARINGS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I promised the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that I would try to obtain certain information for him, which information is pertinent to all other Members, in relation to the printed hearings on the Middle East. I talked with Chairman GORDON yesterday, and he told me he expected that they would be printed by sometime next Friday. At any event, all speed is being taken to expedite the printing of the hearings. If the resolution is reported out of the committee, which is reasonably expected—and I hope—this week, it is the intention to bring it up for consideration next week, but not on Monday. So, beyond that I would not want to say at the present time, but I can protect the Members up until Monday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether the resolution will come up under a closed or open rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state definitely except what I read from the newspapers. I prefer not to answer that question now, because if I give a definite answer, I keep my word, as the gentleman knows.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, with no desire whatever for injecting partisanship, I must call attention to the fact that we have before us the highest peacetime budget in history. Each Eisenhower budget that has been submitted to the Congress has called for greater expenditures in Government, for more Federal workers and for a higher total figure. This cannot be attributed to defense, for security expenditures account for only half of the increase. Non-defense costs are up about five billions of dollars since the first Eisenhower budget was submitted to Congress.

The so-called welfare state continues to grow at an astounding rate despite an all-time high in employment and in general prosperity.

The present precarious balance in the budget is due not to savings and economy in Government, but to the highest tax collections in history. We should be genuinely alarmed by the fact that expenditures of Government are going right out of the top of the tent and there seems to be no determined and coordinated efforts in the administration to check this trend. The tax cuts which are so greatly desired by the public are obviously impossible unless the Congress will drastically slash administration spending proposals. I believe the Congress must assert its constitutional authority and materially reduce the budget now before us.

FUEL OIL PRICE INCREASES

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that due to recent oil price increases it is estimated that Floridians this year will pay more than $30 million in added expenses to manufacturers, processors, and people who pay electricity bills. I have received communications from the Florida REA Cooperatives, Inc., and from the City Commission of the City of Gainesville, Fla., in my district, protesting the advance in price of fuel oil.

I am submitting in full detail copies of these protests:

FLORIDA REA COOPERATIVES, INC.,
Wellborn, Fla., January 19, 1957.

Hon. D. R. MATTHEWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: The board of directors of the Suwannee Valley Electric Coop-

erative are quite disturbed over the advance in prices of fuel oil. The advance in price of fuel materially increases our wholesale power bill. The members of the Suwannee Valley Electric Cooperative are made up in the main of farmers. For some time these farmers in this area have had serious financial difficulties. Under these circumstances, we are reluctant to increase the power rates, yet our wholesale power rate continues to advance due to the high price of fuel oil. If this situation pertaining to fuel oil is not arrested or adjusted our cooperative will be thrown into a serious financial difficulty. The board of directors request your influence to arrest this upward trend in the price of fuel oil.

We appreciate your support in the past in behalf of our electric cooperative and trust that you will be able to use your good influence in helping us with our fuel-oil problem.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

H. L. JOHNS,
President.

JANUARY 18, 1957.

Hon. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Residual fuel oil increased 23 cents per barrel in November and 35 cents per barrel today. This is over 30 percent increase since January 1, 1956. Price now equals all-time high of 1948. If there is a shortage, allowable production should be increased immediately. If not, and the oil industry is taking advantage of Suez crisis, wartime controls should be granted if President does not already have such emergency powers. Gainesville's utilities system depends on fuel oil, as do practically all others in State of Florida, and continued price rise will wreck economy. Anything you can do to alleviate this serious situation will be greatly appreciated.

CITY COMMISSION, CITY OF GAINESVILLE, FLA.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much distressed about this situation and have communicated with the President requesting that he intercede with oil producers in this country to ask them on a voluntary basis to reduce the price of fuel oil. I have also urged the appropriate committees of Congress to look into this matter immediately. Florida has a special interest in this problem because the generating plants to produce our electricy depend upon oil for fuel. Immediate action should be taken on this critical matter.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am authorized to announce for that committee that there will be 4 days of hearings on the bills referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on the important subject of civil rights. Those hearings will be held on February 4, 5, 6, and 7. The record of testimony that was taken in the 84th Congress will be made a part of the record of these pending proceedings and will become a part, as it were, of the hearings on these proposed bills in this Congress. Those who have already testified will be permitted to submit, if they wish, any additional statements for the record. They will be privileged to add to their statements by putting additional statements in the record. Members of Congress, of course, will be invited to testify if they so desire. The Attorney General will likewise be invited to testify. It is suggested that Members who wish to testify so advise the Committee on the Judiciary as soon as possible, and submit as well the names of other witnesses who have not previously testified.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. This is the first I heard of the decision to hold hearings on civil rights, or, at least, the first I heard of it officially. And, I want to say that I am grateful and know others similarly minded are, also, that there will be hearings. I understand from the gentleman that the hearings will commence on the 4th of February.

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. And the gentleman said that the hearings will last for 4 days.

Mr. CELLER. Correct.

Mr. WILLIS. Well, now, in regard to that, is that not an unusual thing for that committee to do? I have been a member of that committee now for 8 years and to set in advance a certain number of days for hearings is unusual. I am not pleading for any particular length of time, but would the gentleman be disposed not to set out a binding rule that there will be 4 days of hearings period?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to convey the suggestion the gentleman is making to the members of the subcommittee. It is hoped that we will not take more than 4 days, because we had extensive hearings in the last Congres. I find under those circumstances that the testimony usually is mere repetition. However, I shall be glad to convey that suggestion to the members of the committee.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the gentleman.

UKRAINE AGAIN WILL BE FREE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the time allotted, to join with a number of my colleagues in commemorating the 39th anniversay of the independence of the Ukraine, and in expressing the fervent hope and belief that the time is getting closer when once again this nation of more than 40 million will be able to rid itself of the yoke of Communist imperialism's political, economic, and military control.

In my own district, whom I am proud to number among my friends and constituents, are more than a thousand families of American citizens, whose roots are in the Ukraine. I know what this day means to them; and I take this opportunity to urge all their neighbors and mine, too, to give heed to the significance of this day as we press forward toward the great objective as charted by President Eisenhower in his second inaugural, of a just and lasting peace for all mankind.

I especially approve, and am glad to give my support, to the resolution introduced in this Congress jointly by two colleagues from my own State, Congressman CRETELLA and Senator BUSH, designating January 22 as "Ukrainian Independence Day."

The independence which the people of the Ukraine won by overthrowing the despotism of the czarist government of Russia was still new when Communist imperialism conquered this nation of non-Russian Slavic people, and by infiltration, bloodshed, and military dictatorship it was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The sturdy and resourceful people of the Ukraine never have been willing to accept this condition as any more than temporary.

As Ukrainian Independence Day once more arrives, there are important signs that deliverance is at hand for the Ukrainian people. There are signs, too, that when they break the bonds that have held them so precariously within the "union" of the Communist dictators, that they will be joined, one after the other, by the other freedom-loving nations behind the Iron Curtain, who want and surely will seek the freedom that can be theirs only by self-determination.

NEED OF FOOD AND DRUG INSPECTION DISTRICT OFFICE IN DETROIT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the new budget for the executive departments there is a $260,000 item which, if approved, will provide for an additional food and drug inspection district office and laboratories.

Several years ago I introduced legislation to create such a district office in the greater Detroit area, but this bill did not receive favorable action. Now, as the St. Lawrence Seaway and its vastly increased traffic becomes more of a reality every day, the pressing need for such an inspection station in Detroit is most manifest. At this point, I would like to quote the Deputy Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration regarding this matter:

The budget proposals do not specify the location of the new establishment and it is the judgment of the Food and Drug Administration that the extent of the consumer population and of the industrial and food producing volume of the Detroit area warrants placing the establishment at Detroit in preference to a number of other places in the United States, which eventually must have similar facilities if we are to do our

job thoroughly. * * * Among the reasons why Detroit was first considered was the significant volume of importations from Canada which reach us through the port of Detroit for distribution over a wide consumption area in the United States. Adequate facilities at that point will enable us to do a much more effective job in this respect. It seems reasonable to anticipate that the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway will eventually add immeasurably to our responsibilities in the Detroit area.

It is my hope that Congress will approve of this vitally needed inspection station, the first in over 25 years, and locate it where it will do the most good—in the city of Detroit.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a certain President once said that there were "too many BYRDS in Congress." Of course, that President meant that there were too many economy-minded people in Congress and not enough liberal spenders.

In view of the President's budget, I say that there are too many liberal spenders surrounding the President and giving him advice and too few Secretary Humphreys, and men of that type and caliber.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATION LAW

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a portion of the text of a pamphlet entitled "Pointers on International Trade," prepared by the Small Business Administration, which deals with the problems of small business in availing itself of the benefits provided under the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law.

I have again introduced a bill to equalize the benefits under this law between big and small businesses. Though the technicalities involved in equalizing these benefits are considerable, I have been disturbed at the seeming reluctance to resolve these difficulties so that small business has equal, not superior, merely equal opportunities with big business.

The text of the pamphlet to which I have referred is as follows:

WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATION LAW

Another Federal statute relating to foreign trade, and of interest to small firms, is the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law. This law was created to encourage American companies to trade in foreign areas. One of the disadvantages faced by American companies in this field is the tax inequality to which they are subject. This situation stems from the fact that most foreign governments provide tax benefits to their own concerns engaged in foreign trade. The United States, through the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law, recognizes the importance of these benefits. Sections 921 and 922 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are commonly called the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law.

Section 921 defines a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, and which satisfies these main conditions:

At least 95 percent of its gross income for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for the part of this period during which the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources outside the United States.

At least 90 percent of its gross income for this period (or part thereof) was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

Section 922 provides a special deduction against taxable income for domestic corporations qualifying as Western Hemisphere trade corporations. This deduction is computed by multiplying taxable income (before the deduction) by a fraction. The numerator of this fraction is 14 percent. The denominator is the sum of the normal-tax and surtax rates as prescribed by section 11 of the Code. If there is no applicable surtax, the normal tax alone is used.

Conditions to be met: Today, in order to qualify for the benefits of this act, the following conditions must be met:

1. The taxpayer must be a domestic corporation.

2. All of its business must be done in one or more of the Western Hemisphere countries.

3. At least 95 percent of its gross income for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year must have come from sources outside the United States.

4. At least 90 percent of its gross income for that period must have come from active trade or business.

It is important for small-business operators and their legal advisers to note that the act lays down conditions which may tend to make qualification for its benefits difficult. The first and fourth conditions, of course, are not very hard to meet. The second will necessitate the formation of a separate subsidiary to handle Western Hemisphere business if any trade with other areas is carried on.

Major limitations: The third condition is the one which gives the trouble. To the majority of foreign traders seeking to qualify, the time element can be met by organizing a new corporation. But the real limitation lies in the fact that under customary trade procedure the income will not have the necessary foreign origin. For this reason, many companies have to revamp their methods of carrying on Western Hemisphere trade before they can obtain the benefits of the law.

A problem also arises from the definition of source of income. Normally, according to Internal Revenue Service practice, the place where title actually passes determines the geographical source of income. Thus, in October 1947, the Internal Revenue Service (then the Bureau of Internal Revenue) adopted the passage-of-title rule for which rather strong precedents had been established by the courts. But Internal Revenue, itself, imposed an important qualification: In situations where tax avoidance is the primary purpose, it would treat the sale as having been consummated where the substance of the sale occurred.

Therefore, in order to qualify for the tax benefit, it is necessary to have an authorized agent, outside the United States, to whom the goods are consigned, and who in turn will relinquish title to the purchaser in the foreign country. In such case, however, the parties should agree in the contract of sale (1) that the risk of loss is to be on the seller, and (2) that title is not to pass until the goods reach a specified point outside the United States.

Combining the provisions of both the Webb-Pomerene law and the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law can yield a dual benefit. The company which forms a foreign-trade pool under the Webb-Pomerene law can operate at a proportionately lower cost by sharing certain expenses with other firms. If the concern has also taken the proper steps to qualify under the Western Hemisphere trade corporation law, a substantial tax benefit becomes available after a period of time.

Small-business owners and operators should be certain to note, however, that this tax relief is not extended to an individual. It applies only to Western Hemisphere trade corporations, as defined in the law.

H. MEADE ALCORN, JR.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the election yesterday by the Republican National Committee of the Honorable H. Meade Alcorn, of Connecticut, at the express indication of the desire of the President, the Republican Party will have as its leader a lawyer of proven and unquestioned ability, a zealous and energetic spokesman for the principles of the Republican Party, a man experienced in the political life and history of this country, who embodies in his personality and in his principles the concept of Modern Republicanism as enunciated by the President. The party, and in a broader sense the Nation, are most fortunate to have Mr. Alcorn as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. I certainly subscribe to the gentleman's statement and agree wholeheartedly with what he says. I have known Meade Alcorn for many, many years, and I agree that the things the gentleman says about are so. He is just that type of man, as characterized by my colleague from Pennsylvania. We of Connecticut are proud of him, and I am sure all members of my party will share this pride.

THE PRESIDENT'S MIDDLE EAST DOCTRINE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, the President of the United States delivered a solemn message to a joint

session of the Congress of the United States on the serious situation which confronts the nations of the free world in the Middle East. I could not help but be impressed at the time with the President's sincerity in urging the Congress to approve as rapidly as possible his program designed to prevent international communism from gaining a foothold in this area so vital to all the peoples of the world.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has supported the President's position in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Secretary Dulles made quite clear that, considering the information at his disposal, this important area can well be lost to the ambitious men in the Kremlin unless action is taken immediately.

I feel very strongly that this is no time to engage in semantics. Whether the action of the Soviet Union is overt or subversive, there is little question of their intent.

I agree that, as some of the President's critics have stated, the Suez and Palestine problems are of the utmost importance, and really lie at the heart of the Middle East situation. As the President pointed out, these problems must be considered and solved in moments of sober reflection. We must strive to work continually in close cooperation with the United Nations. I strongly urge, however, that we back the President now in his desire to let the Soviet Union know where we stand. The President has acted. The eyes of the world are on the Congress of the United States.

THE PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep appreciation of the great courtesy and efficiency of all the employees here in the House of Representatives in connection with the inauguration. It was not an easy matter and the efficiency and courtesy were beyond compare beginning with the extremely kind and helpful congressional police officers who met us as we came up the hill. That added greatly to my pleasure and well-being, and it is something to remember always.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, 435 men were sworn in as Members of the 63d Congress. Among those Members was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the present Speaker of the House of Representatives. Mr. RAYBURN is the only one sworn in on March 4, 1913, who is still a Member of this body. Among the freshmen Congressmen along with Mr. RAYBURN was a newspaperman from my home city of Hoquiam, Wash., Mr. Albert Johnson. Mr. Johnson was destined to serve in the Congress for 20 years, between 1913 and 1933, and to become one of the most distinguished, most colorful, most widely known, best loved, one of the ablest and most effective Members of the Congress of his generation. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to the Members of the House that Albert Johnson died in Tacoma, Wash., last week at the age of 87.

Albert Johnson was chairman of the House Committee on Immigration. He was the author in 1924 of the restricted Immigration Act which remained the law of the land until 1954, when the Walter Act was passed. Mr. Johnson was the subject of many articles in the leading magazines of his day. He was honest, courageous, fearless, and able. The Nation profited greatly from the 20 years that he spent in the Congress.

Albert Johnson was a newspaperman. At 28 years of age, he was news editor of the Washington, D. C., Post. Later, he went west to become the managing editor of the Tacoma Daily News. In 1908 Mr. Johnson purchased and became the editor of the Hoquiam Daily Washingtonian of Hoquiam, Wash., and owned the newspaper until 1934.

Of all the men who I have known in a long lifetime, Albert Johnson is the most unforgettable character I have ever known. Kindly, lovable, and generous, he made friends of everyone in every walk of life with whom he came in contact.

Albert Johnson should have written an autobiography of his 20 years in Congress. Such a book would have been interesting and exciting. But, Albert Johnson was so busy living in the present that he never had time to dwell on the past.

After he had become 70 years of age, he suffered a serious illness. I visited him in the hospital. As I went into the sickroom, Albert Johnson sat up in his bed and said, "Russell, if I were to die tonight, I would have to testify that it has been a great life—a great adventure." Let us who knew him best and loved him most cherish the thought that in death, Mr. Johnson has entered upon a far more interesting, much more exciting and happier experience than he knew in the almost 88 years he spent upon this earth.

The sympathy of all Members of the House of Representatives, I am sure, goes to all members of his family who survive. Among these are his daughter, Mrs. Dorothy Johnson Russell, of Arlington, Va., wife of Rear Adm. James S. Russell, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, United States Navy; and grandsons, Donald Johnson Russell, 27, and Kenneth McDonald Russell, 19. Three sisters, the Misses Edith Johnson, Anne Johnson, and Jeanne Johnson, all of Los Angeles, also survive. Mrs. Albert Johnson died in 1951 and has a sister, Mrs. William B. Stenton, of Spokane, Wash.

I append to my remarks an Associated Press dispatch, written by William Koski, of Aberdeen, Wash., which was carried in many newspapers on March 15, 1949, on the occasion of Albert Johnson's 80th birthday. The Koski article contains valuable historic biographic material on this great American statesman of the 1913 to 1933 era. The Associated Press biographic sketch by Mr. Koski on Mr. Johnson follows:

Former Congressman Albert Johnson, once dubbed by the Saturday Evening Post as "The Man From Hoquiam," is a Northwest oldtimer who refuses to dwell on the past, who keeps his mind occupied with the problems of the day.

Johnson, who will mark his 80th birth anniversary next March 5, has little patience with those who shake their heads in the belief that the younger generation has "gone to the dogs." He is proud of the young men and women now assuming the role of leadership in the State, and pins his faith on the forward vision of the younger generations.

Mr. Johnson's dynamic career as newspaperman and Congressman, and the world-wide impact of his immigration legislation, have stamped him as the outstanding elder citizen of his generation.

And though he is better known through his famous immigration bill passed by Congress in 1924, Johnson is essentially a newspaperman at heart. Born in Springfield, Ill., he started his career with the press on the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and at the turn of the century was a reporter and night editor of the Washington, D. C., Post.

In 1898, the lure of the West brought Johnson from the National Capital to Tacoma, where he took charge of the Daily News, which he edited for 6 years. A short time later, when the Seattle Morning Times was launched, he moved to Seattle. He was selected as its editor, and after almost 2 years with that paper, moved to Hoquiam, where he purchased the Grays Harbor Washingtonian, which he published until December 1934, when he sold it to RUSSELL V. MACK.

Up to that time other papers in the State which had seen Johnson at the desk were the Daily Olympian and a Fairhaven paper during the days he carried on a vigorous campaign for the consolidation of Fairhaven, Sehome, and Whatcom into one city, now known as Bellingham.

When Johnson first came to Hoquiam, the principal streets were all planked and two sloughs ran their sluggish course through the heart of the city. Logging and lumbering were the heart and soul of the entire area, and the harbor fishing industry, then in its infancy, was almost forgotten as virgin timber poured through busy sawmills to supply a never-ending demand for lumber for a growing and expanding nation.

It was during those days, while watching the influx of great numbers of people from all nations into the pioneering communities of the West, that Johnson first began thinking of restrictive immigration, of immigration limited to the ability of the Nation to absorb the increased population without an enforced lowering of the standard of living.

In 1912, when Woodrow Wilson, William Howard Taft, and Teddy Roosevelt fought for the Presidency as Democrat, Republican, and Bull Mooser, Johnson was elected to Congress on the Republican ticket. He held that post until March 1933.

Campaigning for Congress in 1912 was a far cry from the modern campaigns of today, Johnson recollects. In 1912 the Third Congressional District was composed of 13 counties instead of 9 as at present, and there were few good roads for travel. Radio was undreamed of.

Johnson's district took him as far north as Port Townsend and Port Angeles, and as far east as the eastern border of Klickitat County, almost to Pasco. In order to reach Port Townsend and Port Angeles, Johnson

frequently was forced to travel by boat. In order to speak in Raymond and South Bend, he also was forced to travel part of the way by boat.

In that 1912 campaign, with three major parties in the field, Johnson hitched a team of horses and conducted a house-to-house campaign in Klickitat County, where the election results gave him a huge majority.

His most formidable opponent, incumbent Congressman Stanley Warburton, who deserted the ranks of the Republican Party to join the Bull Moosers, conducted a house-to-house campaign in Jefferson County, but lost it by a handful of votes.

In 1915 the Congressman gained the attention of the press though his battles with the growing and lusty Industrial Workers of the World, known as the IWW or the "Wobblies."

During this battle Congressman Johnson took part in a debate still vividly remembered among harbor oldtimers. The debate took place in Hoquiam's Arcade Theater with one-half of the audience hostile to the other half. Terms for the debate had called for seating one-half of the theater with Wobblies and the other half with those opposed to them.

On the night of the debate Congressman Johnson matched thunder with George Holmes, a shrewd and able orator of the IWW.

Members of that 50–50 audience who heard the debate still argue over who was the winner, but Johnson continued to win his elections and the Wobblies continued to go on strike.

Later, during World War I, Johnson was commissioned a captain in the United States chemical warfare service and was assigned to Camp Humphreys, Va.

In 1925, as chairman of the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee, he steered through Congress his famous bill which restricted immigration to 2 percent of the foreign born of each nation here in 1890. Passage of the bill made Japanese exclusion a Federal policy. Earlier, in 1920, Johnson had started a campaign against an organized system of smuggling Japanese into this country.

Today more than 100 amendments have been added to his bill, but Johnson warns that agitation for removing restrictions during these critical days should be treated cautiously, and that we should not let our sympathies unbalance our commonsense.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, Albert Johnson was one of the active and influential Members when I came to Congress 32 years ago. His colorful appearance and the vigor of his speech was most impressive. Johnson was a man of great ability. He was an expert on legislation treating with immigration and education. He had written a good part of the Immigration Act of the previous year and was forced to exert every effort to prevent it being changed. He was a man of fine character and of the highest integrity, beloved by all. His services to his country was of tremendous value.

The State of Washington has lost a valued citizen and the country a great, patriotic American. My deepest sympathy goes to his bereaved family.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I served with the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Mr. Johnson, for 20 years. He was a colorful and able exponent of all the fine fundamental principles which have made this country great. He constantly stood guard, as chairman of the committee, against the infiltration of dangerous characters from abroad. I do not think the people of the United States fully appreciate what he did in keeping out dangerous people who were a menace to our country.

I am very proud of the fact that I served with this distinguished gentleman. He was a great patriot, well worthy of the tributes that we pay to him here today.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I had the honor of serving with Albert Johnson on the Committee on Immigration. He was a fine chairman, and he was profoundly interested in the great subject that we had to deal with at that time. I am proud to think that I helped him somewhat materially in the preparation of the legislation restricting immigration to which the gentleman referred a moment ago.

Albert Johnson can be considered as one of the most sincere and effective champions of restrictive immigration that we have had in our country.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with the expressions of sorrow on the passing of Albert Johnson last week, and in extending sympathy to his family which survives him.

Albert Johnson served not only the district now represented by the able gentleman from the Third District of Washington [Mr. MACK], but also represented the district which I now am honored to serve. That was prior to the redistricting of the State in the early thirties.

During the 20 years that Mr. Johnson served in this body he made an enviable record in the field of immigration legislation, and also in the field of fisheries legislation. He was not only highly regarded and respected in this body, but was highly regarded in the State of Washington where he was recognized for his legislative and civic contributions.

He was a spirited and highminded citizen, serving not only in a public way in this body, but also as a newspaper publisher. He took an active part in the civic affairs of our great State, and particularly of his own district. In his passing our State lost one of its most distinguished citizens.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am grieved to learn of the passing of my former colleague, Albert Johnson. He and I were sworn as Members of the 63d Congress in 1913. He was an able and hard-working Member of this House. He really served his day and generation. My deep sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD concerning the late Albert Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to raise the compensation of the members of the Legislature of Hawaii. The Members of Congress will be interested in the fact that the compensation and the mileage of the members of the Legislature of Hawaii comes from the Treasury of the United States. The last change in compensation was by act of Congress on July 9, 1921—almost 36 years ago.

While no man in public office seeks election because of the financial return, the compensation of such office should be sufficient to warrant that able, qualified people of character and integrity may not suffer too great a financial loss. Public office should be open to all qualified candidates and not confined to those who are possessed of private fortunes or who work for corporations who find it to their interest to have people on their payroll in the Legislature.

The satisfaction obtained from conscientious and devoted service of one's fellow man in public service is indeed a great reward. However, public officials should not be required to pay for that great honor.

MILITARY CEMETERY AT MANILA

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to give Gold Star Mothers and widows of World War II and Korea the privilege of attending the dedication of a military cemetery at Manila, Philippine Islands, to be opened in 1958, and to visit other cemeteries outside of the United States.

This legislation grants to Gold Star Mothers, whose sons gave their lives in World War II and in the Korean action, the privilege extended to mothers whose sons were killed in World War I.

The cemetery in Manila shall be dedicated in 1958, and will be one of the largest of its kind.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may address the House for 10 minutes,

in which time the Members from Ohio may pay respect to our deceased colleague, Mr. Weichel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any other special orders today, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of Ukrainian Independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Ukrainian Independence Day this year, our attention is inevitably drawn to the recent revolt in Hungary.

Undoubtedly one of the most important lessons the Communists could learn from the Hungarian revolution is that time is working against them. History reveals that peoples will not long tolerate tyrannies, however great the weight of the burden, and that at some time tyrannies are compelled to give way to the unrelenting forces of liberation.

At the same time it is instances like the Hungarian revolution that test the mettle of the tyranny itself and oftentimes reveal its basic weakness. This fact was borne out in recent months by reports reaching the West from Hungary that many Soviet troops deserted rather than shoot innocent men, women, and children. It was also reported that many of these Soviet troops were in fact Ukrainian men.

The unwillingness of Ukrainians to support Soviet tyranny was first brought to light in World War II by large-scale refusals to return to the Soviet Union. Once again we have seen a similar spectacle of Ukrainian soldiers seeking an escape from Communist tyranny when the opportunity presented itself.

The fact remains that the Ukrainian people as a whole are an oppressed people who like all oppressed peoples held within the Communist empire want above all else freedom. It only takes such reports as those from Hungary to remind us again of this primal desire of the Ukrainian people.

On this 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence it is fitting, therefore, that we of the West renew our faith in the people of the Ukraine and hope with them that the time of their complete freedom will not be too far in the distant future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON in two instances.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania and to include a letter on the maritime situation.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. PELLY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON and to include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS and include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and include extraneous material.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SANTANGELO, on Tuesday, January 29, for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN, on Monday next, for 10 minutes.

Mr. NEAL, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 30 minutes tomorrow.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 20. An act to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 24, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

350. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956, pursuant to Public Law 724, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

351. A letter from the Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to Public Law 692, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

352. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to give additional assistance in relieving the shortages of residential mortgage funds"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

353. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of claims paid during the period January 1 through December 31, 1956, for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

354. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

355. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

356. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated December 21, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on Elm River Dam, S. Dak., required in accordance with the President's message vetoing the river and harbor and flood-control bill of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3476. A bill to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3477. A bill relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 3478. A bill to amend section 26 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to increase the compensation of members of the legislature, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 3479. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3480. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a new building for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3481. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3482. A bill to provide that certain retired officers of the Army of the United States who were advanced in rank at the time of or after their retirement shall receive retired pay of the rank to which advanced; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3483. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3484. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3485. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3486. A bill to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3487. A bill to encourage investment in school bonds and other tax-exempt Government obligations by authorizing Federal Reserve member banks to invest in securities of regulated investment companies which invest 95 percent of their assets in such obligations which are normally legal or member banks and 5 percent in taxable Federal Government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 3488. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 3489. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3490. A bill to provide for equality of treatment in the restoration to tribal ownership of surplus lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3491. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3492. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for Indian tribes on the Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and Blackfeet Reservations, and to provide that such lands shall become a part of such reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3493. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3494. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3495. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 3496. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3497. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 3498. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide a penalty for the mailing of obscene literature to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3499. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that certain enlisted men retired with credit for service counted as double time shall receive retired pay computed on the basis of the highest federally recognized officer rank or grade held by them during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3500. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3501. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3502. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3503. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3504. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Sequoyah, the famous Cherokee Indian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3505. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of all law-enforcement officers throughout the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3506. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3507. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3508. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3509. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make it clear that the taxes on transportation of persons and property do not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 3511. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 3512. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3513. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the entitlement to reenlistment under certain circumstances of certain former officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3514. A bill to revise the Communications Act of 1934, title 47, United States Code, section 307 (d); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3515. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 3516. A bill to authorize the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research to award master of science, master of public health, and doctor of science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3517. A bill to provide for the development of minimum basic recreational facilities in connection with Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 3518. A bill for the relief of the Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District No. 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 3519. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3520. A bill to provide for a Federal lottery to raise funds for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3521. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in planning and financing the construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 3522. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3523. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3524. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct national pension of at least $150 per month to all American citizens who have been citizens 10 years or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3525. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3526. A bill to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances and complaints of all Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3527. A bill to provide and adjust certain allowances, expenses, and other fringe employment benefits for certain Government employees stationed overseas, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3528. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3529. A bill to appropriate $40,000 for the restoration of a navigable channel 10 feet deep in Bayou Bonfouca, La.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3530. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Port Allen-Indian Village Canal in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3531. A bill to make ineffective a certain requirement of local cooperation with respect to the river and harbor project on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3532. A bill to provide that a levee shall be constructed and maintained by the United States along the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3533. A bill to assist certain classes of municipalities to finance vitally needed and specific types of public works by providing for a guaranty by the United States of approved bonds hereafter issued by these municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3534. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3535. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3536. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River, Minn., for navigational purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3537. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen of the Armed Forces of the United States dying in the service during World War II or the Korean conflict and now interred in cemeteries outside the United States to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3538. A bill relating to the definition of the term "public utility" for purposes of computing the deductions for income-tax purposes for dividends paid and received on certain preferred stock of public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 3539. A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the Army or Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. R. 3540. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Upper Fox River, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3541. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3542. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3543. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 3544. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayou Lafourche, La., and construction of the Lafourche-Jump Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3545. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuities for all individuals who have completed 30 years of service at age 60 and reduced annuities for individuals who have completed 30 years of service at age 55, and to increase the maximum annuity payable to an individual with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make a full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States and to restate explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. Res. 119. Resolution amending the rules of the House to create a standing Committee on Administrative Procedure and Practice; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt Good Friday as a legal national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps that may be necessary to give proper national recognition to The Altar of the Nation, located at the Cathedral of the Pines, in Rindge, N. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3546. A bill for the relief of James Flying Horse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Donald Sheng Peh Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Cecil E. Finley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Sumie Good; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Speros Evangelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3552. A bill for the relief of Hsin-Kuan Liu and Esther T. C. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3553. A bill for the relief of Walter Scott Turrill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rozalia Sipeki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 3555. A bill for the relief of Zsuzsanna (Suzanne) Szekely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3556. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Koung-Shin Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3557. A bill for the relief of Odilon Cortez-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3558. A bill for the relief of Ernest Hagler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3559. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3560. A bill for the relief of Anna D'Oria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 3561. A bill for the relief of Briccio Garces De Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Mariko Nakashima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Francisco Gomez-Olvera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 3564. A bill for the relief of Alejo T. Tano, Ignacio Martal Romano, Marcos Sabuloan Jampas, Paulino Jose Elizalde, Jose Gracia, and Alberto Jesus Martinez (Jesus E. Martinez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Magtangol C. Polintan, Medesto Erispe Tanoja, Emiliano Jesmundo Magellanes, Eriberto Chavez Abella (Henry Chavez Abella), Federico Tamayo Dagdagan, Rodrigo Corope Alaura, Marcial Mariano Yamio, Carlos Odac Magahiz, Laudelino Tejada Avelino, Gaudioso Trumata Macias (Joe Macias), Godofredo Matados de la Cruz, and Jesus Monzon Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3566. A bill for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3567. A bill for the relief of John R. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Labibe Salibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria del Rosario G. Arocena, Sister Maria Aranzazu A. Mendizabal, and Sister Maria Dolores O. Goyenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3570. A bill for the relief of An Ding Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3571. A bill for the relief of Boris F. Navratil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 3573. A bill for the relief of Hubert Wellington James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 3574. A bill for the relief of Santo Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3575. A bill for the relief of Caterina Miletò; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3576. A bill for the relief of Francesco Carozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3577. A bill for the relief of Jaime H. Salva and Fred H. Salva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3578. A bill for the relief of Francis P. Meehan, trustee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3579. A bill for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 3580. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Mancino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 3581. A bill for the relief of Imre and Margareta Seykell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY (by request):

H. R. 3582. A bill for the relief of George K. Jue (also known as Jew Ten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3583. A bill for the relief of Chandler R. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 3584. A bill for the relief of Carmen Andreatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. R. 3585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 3586. A bill for the relief of Makoto Yasumura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 3587. A bill for the relief of Hur Mei Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3588. A bill for the relief of John R. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3589. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW (by request):

H. R. 3590. A bill for the relief of George Hodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3591. A bill for the relief of Reginald Clio Rickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainians is the story of a large group of gifted, industrious, and brave people who have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of their labor during most of modern times. Through some unfortunate turn of history, 30 to 40 million Ukrainians have not been masters of their fate, and for about 300 years, except for a brief period of 2 years, they have not known national political independence. In their historic homeland they have been held down by alien despots. They have endured all sorts of hardship, privation, and misery and have suffered much, yet they have maintained their desire for freedom and for national independence. The events which led to the revolt against the Czar in 1917 also gave the Ukrainians the opportunity to regain their independence. When the Czar's autocracy was overthrown and the Russian Government in Ukraine ceased to exist, Ukrainians seized upon the opportunity and proclaimed their independence on January 22 of 1918.

That event, the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic, symbolizes the realization of a dream centuries old, and has become a landmark of great significance in Ukrainian history. That significance is not lost to the liberty-loving and hard-working Ukrainians, and that day is celebrated annually as a national holiday wherever they have the freedom to do so.

Unfortunately the newly born Republic was under severe handicaps at its birth. War torn, the countryside was stripped; the fertile Ukraine was a wasteland. Most of its inhabitants were uprooted from their homes and the normal course of life disrupted. These were terrible problems for a new government to face, but even more serious and ominous was the Communist Russian threat. Before the Ukrainian Government had the chance to bring some order out of the existing chaos, it was attacked by the Soviets, the country was overrun early in 1920, and independent Ukraine ceased to exist. It was merged with the Soviet Union.

Ukrainians have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than under the autocratic czars. Today their fair land is shut out from the free world and events there, like those on the dark side of the moon, are unknown to us. We know for sure that, under Soviet tyranny, the people there are not allowed to celebrate their national independence day. That supreme privilege is denied to them by their heartless overlords. But Ukrainians in the free world, and here in the United States, celebrate that day as the symbol of their free and independent spirit. I heartily join Ukrainian-Americans in the celebration of this holiday, the celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Andrew N. Overby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning Mr. Andrew N. Overby, who is leaving the service of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDREW N. OVERBY: ON LEAVING THE SERVICE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

When the resignation of Andrew N. Overby as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was announced earlier this month, President Eisenhower wrote a personal letter in appreciation of Mr. Overby's contributions in his decade of public service. A special tribute of this nature would seem ample evidence of the Nation's gratitude, yet I feel that Congress would be remiss if Mr. Overby were permitted to depart his Government office without an expression of thanks from someone on Capitol Hill who has had the pleasure of sharing his acquaintance and working with him.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have had numerous opportunities to meet with Mr. Overby. I have at times sought his counsel. I have been assisted by his interpretations of matters national and international. I have found him to be a personable, conscientious, and dedicated representative of the executive department.

To me, Mr. Overby characterizes the ideal type of individual who, inherently and by training and experience, is best qualified to fill the challenging positions of highest trust and responsibility in the Federal Government. His career may well serve as a model for young American men who aspire to dedicated positions in Government office.

Mr. Overby has announced that he will join the First Boston Corp., where he will be concerned with various aspects of the investment company's business, with particular emphasis on international and monetary affairs. I am sure that he takes with him the best wishes of every Member of Congress who has had the pleasure of working with him.

Relief for Small Breweries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today I inserted in the hopper a bill designed to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry.

As you probably know, the brewing industry is in dire straits as a result of a disproportionate tax load. The small brewers, in addition to a staggering tax assessment, are also beset with the problem of competing against huge combines that threaten to engulf the lesser operators. My bill, in essence, would lower the tax rate temporarily to allow brewers to take a breathing spell in the battle for economic survival. Tax relief would be on a graduated scale, applying only to the first 100,000 barrels produced each year, commencing July 1, 1957. The prevailing rate of $9 per barrel would be reduced to $7 per barrel. On the following year, the tax rate on the first 100,000 barrels would be reduced even further.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and never was it more apropos than in the brewing industry today. While I certainly feel that the brewing industry should pay their share of the taxes, I do not feel they have been equitably treated in recent years. A common fallacy existing today is that certain industries such as the breweries and cigarette manufacturers can absorb any amount of tax load and remain a healthy, vital industry employing thousands of skilled workers. This idea, aided and abetted by those who are morally opposed to the sale or distribution of the aforementioned commodities, has done a great deal of damage to the American economy. I hope Congress will realize that it is on the brink of destroying the goose that lays the golden revenue egg and take appropriate action in the very near future.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1957, marked the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution in Congress asking that every January 22 be proclaimed a national holiday in commemoration of the struggles of these people to overcome the bonds of terror and subjugation.

The loss of independence and nationalism in Ukrainia is an outstanding example of Bolshevik imperialism, since this tiny country was one of the first to lose its identity under the spreading yoke of the Russian Communists.

Because Ukrainia is an old and natural ally of the United States, a national recognition of this alliance on our part will serve to strengthen the ties between our two countries and reassert our abhorrence of Communist colonialism, tyranny, and murder.

Some towns and cities in the United States today pay fitting tribute to the independence of Ukrainia, which was violated by her Russian neighbors before the people of the Ukraine were even given a chance to taste liberty and freedom of thought. Such a city is New Haven, Conn., which once again will fly the blue and gold colors of the republic of Ukrania over the city hall on Tuesday in memory of the 1918 declaration.

Every revolt and uprising against international communism has been strongly supported by Ukrainia. In the recent revolt in Hungary, Ukrainian officers and men in the Red Army joined Hungarian patriots in Budapest in the fight against the common enemy of communism.

It is the Ukrainians and the Hungarians and the Poles behind the Iron Curtain who symbolize the hopes and aspirations for freedom. We, who enjoy the fruits of liberty in the United States as a result of the struggles of our Founding Fathers, would do well to take every advantage of offering moral, spiritual, and material support to these subjugated people, who, against overwhelming adversity, still keep alive the spirit of decency, humanity, and independence.

Arcadia High School Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Arcadia High School Apache Band performed admirably in yesterday's inaugural parade. The people of my district and of the State of California can be proud of the excellent representation given us by these fine young people.

Arcadia is a new high school only a few years old but it has already established itself as one of California's outstanding educational institutions. Its exceptional work in the field of music led to the invitation to participate in the inauguration of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Arcadia, which is one of Southern California's fastest growing communities, is located some 15 miles east of Los Angeles in the foothills of the Sierra Madre. It is my hometown which makes me particularly happy to bring the Arcadia High School band to the attention of the House.

More than $28,000 was raised by the community to send the Apache band to Washington. The finance drive was under the direction of Mayor Donald S. Camphouse of Arcadia and a splendid committee of public-spirited citizens. Mr. Elbert E. Souders, high-school principal, came with the band to Washington. The director of the band is Mr. Ray B. Bowman.

The young people who came here have had an opportunity to participate personally in a dramatic moment of American history. They have also been given an opportunity to learn at first hand the basic functions of our American system of Government.

I know that all my colleagues join me in saluting and congratulating these fine young people from Arcadia who typify America's good citizens and leaders of tomorrow.

The following is a list of the faculty, chaperons, and students of Arcadia High School who came to Washington to participate in the inaugural parade: Faculty: Mr. Elbert E. Souders, Mr. Albert Acton, Mr. Ray B. Bowman, Mr. Francis J. Boyer, and Mr. Werner R. Maiwald. Chaperons: Mr. Ellsworth Harmer, Mr. Michael J. Caparone, Mr. Kenneth Eisenbise, Mrs. Herman Kambeitz, Mrs. Morris J. Kaplan, Mrs. Edgar H. Reeve, Mrs. Roger A. Witt, and Mrs. H. T. McLaughlin. Students: Jerry Adams, Andy Anderson, Joe Alexander, Jim Barrington, Richard Benson, Bill Black, Glenn Broadhead, Dave Caparone, Fred Childs, Dennis Crabhill, Gary Cramer, Ronny Dietz, Gary Eisenbise, Bill Eden, Jim Faeth, Bob Bearhough, Jeff Goldberg, Jeff Haack, Bill Halverson, Dick Hanson, Dennis Harmer, Tom Heinz, Jerry Hogue, Ken Kirmase, Tom Kreinbring, Sam Laughlin, Gary Lauman, Robert Leigh, Doug MacDonald, Ron Miller, Mark Mitchell, Jim Moore, Dave Pendleton, Steve Perlof, Charles Pfeferkorn, Jerry Phillips, William Rife, Joe Rogers, Bill Roth, Terry Santo, Jim Smeenge, Ken Springsteen, Phil Starkenburg, Roger Steinbrenner, Jack Watkins, Jerry Weidaw, Richard Wheatley, Richard Wilson, Ed Witt, Wayne Woods, Ron Giambrone, Tim Rife, Milly Ashley, Sharon Crutchfield, Dorothy Heffner, Janet Reeve, Margaret Spencer, Diane Stepan, Joan Spratling, Bonnie Balch, Barbara Goldman, Toni Carava, Cindy Davelaar, Kay Petrisha, Linda Wellington, Dottie Yates, Beverly Blanchard, Anne Molino, Ann Pomeroy, Mary Lee Grant, Diane Henisse, Linda Hunsicker, Jo Anna Funderburg, Rosemary Kay, Sammajane McMullen, Judy Malone, Nyda Moore, Peggy Tremayne, Linda Andrews, Arlene Alpert, Phyllis Arozena, Pat Banko, Mary Caparone, Jan Carver, Margie Clarke, Judy Darrow, Carolyn Grant, Dianne Harmer, Sheila Kaplan, Donna Latham, Pat Lenz, Judy McCoy, Vermille McLaughlin, Nancy Mason, Sandy Muir, Marcia Petty, Barbara Randell, Anne Reeve, Verna Smiley, Sandy Spalding, Suzanne Splaver, Donna Steinbrenner, Anne Thomson, Betty Touchon, Claire Wheeler, Mary Williams, Joyce Mark, and Charlene Mayne.

Herbert B. Elliston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Herbert B. Elliston will be deeply felt particularly in Washington where we looked forward to his pungent, informed, and penetrating comments, comments which added greatly to the distinguished record of the Washington Post and Times Herald as a newspaper worthy of the attention of official and

unofficial Washington. It is particularly gratifying to know that much honor came to Mr. Elliston in his life, for we are prone to overlook the kind of contributions made by men of Mr. Elliston's integrity and responsibility. The universal expressions of regret upon Mr. Elliston's passing mark not only the impression Mr. Elliston made, but mark also the breadth of understanding we have of the work and the life of men like him.

Exchange of Correspondence With White House on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current discussion in both Houses of Congress concerning United States policy in the Middle East, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the public generally an exchange of correspondence which I had with the White House on the subject.

On January 7, 1957, 2 days after President Eisenhower delivered his address at a joint session of Congress in which he formulated his doctrine on the Middle East, I wrote to the President and expressed my views. I urged the following:

First. That a limitation be set on the authorization requested for the use of our Armed Forces in the area.

Second. That we should not take unilateral action, but that we should act in conjunction with our allies.

Third. That the President assume the role of mediator between Egypt and Israel, since a settlement between these two nations would go far in ending the turmoil in the Middle East. I suggested a conference be held in Washington between President Nasser, of Egypt, and Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, of Israel, who would discuss their dispute in the presence of President Eisenhower.

I am now in receipt of a reply from the White House, dated January 22, 1957, and signed by the President's administrative assistant, Mr. Bryce N. Harlow. The letter speaks for itself. I am sure all my colleagues will find its contents most interesting, particularly the part dealing with my proposal to arrange a conference in Washington with the heads of Egypt and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert into the RECORD the White House letter of January 22 and my letter to the President on January 7. They are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1957.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: It is a pleasure to refer again to your comments on the President's proposal respecting the Middle East. The President is gratified to learn of your conviction that Congress should grant the requested authorization for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States. In his view, the economic provisions of the proposal are likewise extremely important, and merit the favorable consideration he hopes you will feel able to give them.

As regards the proposed resolution's provisions, it does not constitute an unlimited commitment for the use of United States Armed Forces in the Middle East. Certain limitations are imposed. You may have noted that United States military forces would not be employed under the terms of the resolution except when such employment is consonant with "the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations." The funds required would be authorized and appropriated by the Congress. Economic and military programs within the appropriated funds would be approved by the President. The authorization to the President to use armed force would apply only in the event of Communist armed aggression. The President would be required to report yearly to Congress regarding action taken under the resolution. In addition, the resolution would expire when the purpose for which it was passed has been accomplished.

The proposal is not designed to be a unilateral attempt by the United States to bring peace and security to the Middle East area, nor is it intended to supplant the role of the United Nations. It is designed to deal with an aspect of the problems of the area with which the United Nations in present circumstances is not adequately equipped to deal. It is intended to supplement the various United Nations efforts to bring peace and security to the area by establishing further evidence of United States determination to deter these forces which wish to profit as a result of unsettled conditions. Of course, the United States Government will continue to offer strong support to the United Nations in these efforts.

In view of the nature of the problems in the area and the attitudes of the parties, the most effective way to work for a solution of the complex Arab-Israel issue remains the United Nations. The United States will continue its support of the United Nations in this task. The President welcomes your suggestion, but even were the United Nations not seized of the Arab-Israel conflict, it appears doubtful that a moment when Israel forces remain on Egyptian territory would be an auspicious time to attempt to bring the President of Egypt and the Prime Minister of Israel together at a meeting with the President of the United States, in order to resolve differences between them.

The President warmly appreciated your constructive and thoughtful suggestions and views on this vital problem confronting our Nation and the cause of freedom in the world. With kind regard,

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

JANUARY 7, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last Saturday I was present in the chamber of the House of Representatives and heard your address on the Middle East which you delivered that day before a joint session of Congress. I have since then given much thought to your proposals.

Let me state at the very outset that, in my opinion, Congress should grant the authorization you request to use "the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism." I believe that to do otherwise, in the case of the Middle East nations, would invite aggression by the Communist forces without any fear of reprisal.

It is my view, however, that there must be some limitation attached to this authorization. Whether the limitation is to be for 1 or 2 or more years is for the most part immaterial. The time factor as such is not important, but the principle involved here is essential. An indefinite commitment to use our troops in any given area is not desirable and would set a bad precedent for the future because it could be utilized under different circumstances for different purposes.

Furthermore, it is questionable whether we should take unilateral action in the Middle East. I fear that eventually such action would get us involved in a forest of trouble from which we could not come out without tremendous dissipation of our wealth and our manpower. Sooner or later we would be obliged to call upon our old allies for assistance. Remembering the rebuff which two of our most faithful allies have received from the United States recently when they attempted unilateral action to protect their national interests, I fear that we would face a difficult task of obtaining their support.

All of this, of course, would play right into the hands of the Kremlin. By sniping, threats, infiltration and other means short of war the Kremlin would continue to make strong gains, while we would gradually become impoverished and bereft of resources and friendly allies. Consequently, I would caution against taking such action alone.

At the same time, Mr. President, it is imperative that the United States should take immediate steps to alleviate some of the tension in the Middle East and do all in its power to bring back a semblance of normalcy to that area. Utilizing your tremendous prestige and your good offices, I believe the free world would owe you a great debt of gratitude if you undertook the role of mediator between Egypt and Israel. A settlement between these two nations would also mean its acceptance by all other Arab countries, and it would go far in ending the turmoil in the Middle East. History would always remember your role in this instance.

Therefore, I suggest, Mr. President, that you extend an invitation to President Nasser, of Egypt, and Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, of Israel, to meet with you in Washington in the near future to discuss their dispute in your presence. Both of these men have great respect for you and both would unquestionably give serious consideration to your views as mediator.

A conference of this nature would also test the sincerity of these two leaders and their desire for peace. Should either or both of these men refuse to accept the invitation, it would be interpreted that they are not genuinely interested in peace in the Middle East, and that they wish to jeopardize the security of the United States and of the free world as a whole. Under such circumstances, it would be wisest for us to cut off all military, economic, and other assistance for such nations at once.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

The ICC's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1957 issue of the American

Cattle Producer, official magazine of the American National Cattleman's Association, there appears the following short editorial:

THE ICC'S ROLE

The railroads were granted a 5 percent increase in freight rates on livestock last March. Just a week or two ago the Interstate Commerce Commission gave them another increase of 5 percent.

During the past 10 years railroads have been given a dozen raises, one after another, bringing the aggregate postwar hikes to almost 100 percent for this cateory.

And in the meantime the price of cattle has fluctuated up and down but today stands about $5 a hundredweight below that of 10 years ago.

Originally the Interstate Commerce Commission was set up to protect the shippers. Looks as though its role has changed. Now it protects the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing rise in transportation rates hit the cattleman and the farmer going and coming—for he must pay a higher freight rate to ship his cattle and his agricultural products and he has to pay a higher price for the fertilizers and the feed and the machinery shipped to him. The rural businessman cannot pass on to the consuming public his freight bills, but those things that he buys carries a higher price because of a higher transportation charge.

Does the Interstate Commerce Commission give full recognition to this economic fact when they are considering rate increases? Do they give full consideration to the intent of Congress as expressed in the Smith-Hoch resolution of 1925?

These are matters to concern the Congress.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine is a large area in Eastern Europe, and a crossroad between East and West. Throughout modern times it has also been an apple of discord between Austria on the west and Russia in the east. For almost 300 years most of it was held by Russian Czars, and today again it is held by Communist Russian tyrants. And the Ukrainians, who are one of the most numerous ethnic groups in all Europe, some 40 million in all, have been kept a subject nation, held down by their powerful conquerors. But even in their misfortune and misery they have not given up; their alien overlords have never succeeded in eradicating Ukrainian nationalism. Throughout this long period Ukrainians have maintained their love of freedom, their national ideals, and their goal of political independence. And they saw the realization of their dream in 1918, when the dreaded Czarist regime was overthrown. Then they declared their national independence on January 22 of that year.

Unfortunately the Ukrainian Republic, proclaimed on that day, was surrounded by powerful enemies, all eager to crush and destroy it. Early in 1920, the young Republic was attacked and overrun by Communist Russians, and since then it has been submerged in the Soviet Union.

Today the unfortunate Ukrainians suffer under Soviet tyranny. They do not enjoy many of the elementary necessities of a decent life, and of course, none of the freedoms enjoyed by free men. But the West remembers their suffering and agony, and their heroic struggle for freedom.

Ukrainians in all parts of the free world celebrate their independence day as a national holiday. I understand there is proposed legislation to designate January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day, and it is my hope that we might quickly enact this measure as evidence of our sympathy in their distress and faith in their continued resistance to and efforts toward freedom from the yoke of tyranny.

I am happy to join Ukrainian-Americans in the celebration of this solemn and memorable day, the Ukrainian Independence Day.

The Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me on the Polish Insurrection of 1863—its meaning for Poland today:

THE POLISH INSURRECTION OF 1863—ITS MEANING FOR POLAND TODAY

Almost 100 years ago the people of Poland rose in rebellion against the Russian Empire in a desperate attempt to gain their freedom and independence. Like previous rebellions, however, the insurrection of 1863 was summarily crushed by overwhelming Russian power. The "Freedom Fighters of '63" were dispersed, deported to Siberia and many were executed. Hope for Polish freedom went thereafter into a state of eclipse and remained so for over a half-century.

On this anniversary of this ill-fated revolt we are reminded that the Polish people today are in a position that could well invite the same violent retribution, the same terror, the same terrible loss of human life were they to attempt a national revolution. We have seen it happen in Hungary last Autumn; it could happen in Poland today. More than ever before, Poland is caught between the hammer and the anvil.

The Poles, however, following the wise counsel of their great and heroic spiritual leader, Cardinal Wyszynski, have chosen the path of moderation, a path short of open revolt against Russia, but a path that might well lead to a broader democratic order. The Poles have kept their October revolution within a structural framework through which they are seeking greater freedom and independence while at the same time not provoking Russian intervention.

Last Sunday the great mass of the Polish people sanctioned this compromise in a national election. To be sure, under a broad and genuinely democratic election a truly democratic order would have arisen in Poland. But the people of Poland had little choice other than to settle for a Communist regime which has committed itself primarily to Polish national interests.

Americans must reconcile themselves with this present compromise, however distasteful it may seem. To provide some form of economic aid to Poland, a nation now in a dismal state of economic chaos, should continue to be our most earnest objective. In this way, perhaps, we can help Poland along her way to greater freedom.

We must give Poland an alternative; we must not compel her out of desperation to turn to Soviet Russia.

We must do this because our interest and our profound sympathy lie not with a Polish Communist regime, albeit a nationalist one, but rather with the truly great and generous people of Poland.

Thus, on this anniversary of the Polish insurrection the free world is reminded of the many and great sacrifices the Polish people have made in order to gain freedom and independence. They have paid the price of freedom, paid it deadly in a long history of oppression.

Pray God that Poland shall never again have to sacrifice her life's blood, her young manhood and womanhood, on the altar of Russian despotism for the sake of the inalienable right of freedom and independence.

The Eisenhower Budget for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget that President Eisenhower sent to the Hill at the beginning of the 85th Congress is twice the size of a Sears, Roebuck catalog. Actually it weighs 6 pounds, 4 ounces, measures 9 inches by 11½ inches by 2½ inches, and contains 1,521 pages. It lists thousands of different budget items. The overall expenditure called for is $71.8 billion—$3 billion more than the 1957 budget.

To analyze, condense, and summarize such a budget is a real task. It is a task that must be done, however, if a Member of the House of Representatives is to act intelligently upon the legislation that comes before him.

When the budget is analyzed and summarized, it can be condensed into six overall general budget items. These six items are as follows:

[In billions]

	For 1957	For 1958
Interest on the public debt	$7.1	$7.4
National defense	38.5	39.5
Veterans' benefits	4.9	5.0
Foreign aid	4.9	5.0
The Federal payroll	9.5	10.2
Miscellaneous items (subsidies, grants-in-aid, etc.)	4.0	4.7
Total Federal budget	68.9	71.8

As one can see, the budget called for by President Eisenhower for the year ending June 30, 1958, is $3 billion more than for the year ending June 30, 1957.

It almost equals the last Truman budget which was a war budget.

AN INFLATIONARY BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, on the heels of the President's plea in his state of the Union message for "self discipline in spending" and his advice to the American people to "spend less and save more to provide investment capital" in order to head off inflation, the President has asked in this budget message for the fattest peacetime budget in all history.

The budget request is loaded with nonessential spending items. They are as follows:

First. Huge farm subsidies—$1 billion increase over the past year.

Second. An increased foreign-aid program.

Third. An increased military-spending program.

Fourth. Twenty-seven thousand new jobs in nonmilitary agencies.

Fifth. Greatly increased welfare spending.

Sixth. Huge expenditures for public works.

The President's budget request for the year ending June 30, 1958, totals $3 billion more than the 1957 budget and $7 billion more than the 1955 budget. There is no possibility of a tax cut for the American taxpayer until the following steps are taken:

(a) Adopt the Hoover recommendations, which would save over $5 billion per year.

(b) Stop trying to bolster up the world—38 countries at a yearly cost of about $5 billion.

(c) Reduce the 2,400,000 civilian payroll now costing $10.2 billion yearly, instead of adding the 27,000 more that the new budget calls for.

(d) Postpone the building of gigantic dams to irrigate desert acres, to grow surplus crops for the Government to buy and store. These improvements, costing all told several billion dollars, can wait until we need the crops these desert acres are to grow.

(e) Eliminate the spenders surrounding the President and give him more advisers of Secretary Humphrey's type and caliber.

THE EISENHOWER FINANCIAL RECORD

Mr. Speaker, the following table gives the total receipts and expenditures in billions for the years ending on June 30, as follows:

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Receipts	$64.8	$64.6	$60.4	$68.1	$70.6	[1] $73.6
Expenditures	74.0	67.7	64.5	66.4	69.0	[1] 71.8

[1] Estimated.

NOTE.—Figures taken from Facts and Figures, Published by the Tax Foundation.

The above table shows that our balanced budgets for 1956, 1957, and 1958 are entirely due to increased receipts, not reduced expenditures. It also shows that the increased receipts of these 3 years have encouraged increase expenditures for these 3 years. With a national debt of $270 billion we should be reducing our debt instead of increasing our expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 17, 1957, tells the story much better than I can, therefore, I include it as a part of my remarks for the edification of my colleagues:

THEY WANT MORE

President Eisenhower's budget, transmitted to Congress yesterday, calls for the spending of 71 billion, 870 million dollars in the 1958 fiscal year starting July 1.

Only once since World War II—in the 1953 fiscal year when military spending on the Korean war reached its peak—have Federal expenditures mounted so high. In fact, the President proposes to spend through this budget 73 cents for every dollar that went out of the Treasury in the 1945 fiscal year, which marked the peak of World War II spending.

A variety of specious excuses are offered for this unparalleled peacetime spending—the dangerous adventure in the Near East, an unsound Federal school subsidy, to cite principal examples, foreign and domestic—but the key to this budget can be found in the fact that Federal revenues are also estimated at an alltime high, 3 billions greater than during the present fiscal year.

Tax cuts are rejected as unthinkable. The national debt is at record height. Any prudent householder, when his income increases, pays any debts he may owe. The Federal Government, more prosperous than ever before, thinks only of spending and more spending.

Defense spending is supposed to be sacrosanct. Yet surely when the emphasis on defense is shifted by rapid technological changes, some of the former expenditures in this field should be considered nonessential. Not so in the Eisenhower budget. The President emphasized our increased reliance upon guided missiles, but will allow no real reduction in the size of the Army.

Appropriations to the Air Force, which is cutting down on planes and shifting to missiles, are increased by $600 million. Appropriations to the Navy are to go up by $600 million also, and those to the Army by $500 million. Plainly the so-called unification of the forces has failed to achieve the expected savings. If one service gets more, all get more.

"Progress toward greater equality of opportunity for all our people," said Mr. Eisenhower in his budget message, "as well as toward a balanced development and conservation of our natural resources, must go forward. Emphasis must continue upon promoting, through private enterprise, the development and productivity on our economy."

In fact, appropriations for virtually every domestic function of the Government are to be increased. Mr. Eisenhower's theory, it appears, is that private enterprise is promoted when he takes your money and spends it for you.

This is a dangerous budget. It is dangerous because it seeks to project this Nation into more and more foolish activities abroad. It is dangerous because it seeks the Federal Government's intrusion in domestic activities with which it should not be concerned. But it is most dangerous because it assumes that prosperity—or inflation—will continue forever, and that the day will never arrive when our national survival will depend on the resources that we are squandering instead of husbanding.

America cannot support and defend the whole world. But it can go broke and lose its own freedom trying.

Only 53,000 of 262,500 Musicians Fully Employed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to H. R. 858, a bill to repeal the cabaret tax which I introduced January 3, 1957. In this measure I seek to right a long-standing wrong—the elimination of a misguided Federal tax policy that has existed to the detriment of music employment since World War I.

H. R. 858 is the reintroduction of similar legislation which I introduced last year in the 84th Congress for the repeal of this discriminatory excise which is misnamed a "cabaret tax." My bill was, I believe, the first of several such proposals presented in both Houses of the 84th Congress and supported by the expressed desires of a large majority of the Members of both Houses of that Congress.

Neither my proposal nor those of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle were acted on favorably at that time by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Under the rules, of course, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 858 has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the 85th Congress because it bears the label of a revenue measure. But in actuality, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the only effect adoption of H. R. 858 could have on Federal revenues would be to increase Treasury income because the prohibitive 20-percent excise denies normal tax revenues by destroying trade and jobs.

This tax jeopardizes a basic cultural art, music; and represents a very real threat to an important part of the cultural heritage of our people. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that our Government does much with our tax dollars to keep music alive throughout the free world, yet it does little or nothing to encourage its survival here at home. Let me quote from testimony of the legislation chairman of the National Federation of Music Clubs, an organization with a membership of approximately 600,000 citizens dedicated to the preservation of American music and American musicians. This testimony was given before a House subcommittee studying excise taxes:

The free, democratic way of life that our talented American musicians symbolize before enthusiastic audiences in Europe and the Far East is hardly complimented by the fact that almost without exception those same talented American musicians, on return to their beloved homeland, all too often are faced with unemployment. The paradox is that American tax dollars are being generously expended to rebuild bombed opera houses abroad and to rehabilitate government-supported symphonies of the Old World, while the drying up process of our own well of talented American musicians is being accelerated through lack of funds and inequitable taxation. * * * America time and time again is described as the land of

opportunity. Just what opportunities can we offer the 31 million music students currently in grade schools, in high schools, and in colleges throughout the Nation? There are already 262,500 qualified professional musicians in this great country of ours with full employment for only 53,000 of them.

Mr. Speaker, in my home city of Seattle I have been privileged to participate in the cause of cultural music, having been a trustee and in fact at one time president of the Symphony Orchestra Association. I know at first hand how this great art suffers under the lash of a misguided Federal tax policy which is compounded by technological displacement of live musicians.

Because of public resistance to this tax, entertainment places across the country by the thousands—hotel rooms, cabarets, restaurants, taverns, and other recreational establishments furnishing entertainment, have been forced to close, thus stifling the economic breeding ground for musicians of all kinds. And the closing or curtailment of these establishments furnishing entertainment has resulted in loss of employment to thousands of citizens, with resultant loss of revenue to the Treasury.

I share, and I believe a majority of Members of the Congress share the conviction of the executive secretary of the Music Educators National Conference, Department of Music, National Education Association, who testified before the subcommittee of the House referred to earlier:

> No impediments of a financial nature, tax-wise, should be a deterrent to the future of the United States artist. Further, no deterrents of a financial nature, tax-wise, should be continued which stand between the millions of people in the United States, all of whom have come through the United States school systems, and the right of these millions of people to enjoy and participate in music whenever and wherever they find it whether as performers or audience.

I can hope, Mr. Speaker—and I invite the many Members in the Congress who think as I do to join me in the hope—that this measure which seeks to correct a long injustice is not again denied full congressional debate and a vote because of its word association with the overall problem of excise taxation. The adoption of H. R. 858 will not cure all of the blight that besets music in America today, but repeal of this unjust tax would be a substantial, perhaps a saving, economic antidote.

Herbert Hoover, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, a great American has just retired from one of the most important positions in our Government. He is the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Jr., who is returning to private life after a period of outstanding service as our Under Secretary of State. As the Representative in Congress of the district in which he resides, I am particularly honored to raise my voice in praise of the outstanding contribution he has made to our country and the entire free world.

Mr. Hoover comes from a family which has been noted for its splendid service on behalf of all of our citizens. He has made his own special contribution in the vigorous and dedicated manner in which he handled his high office in the field of foreign affairs.

President Eisenhower's glowing tribute to Mr. Hoover at the time of his resignation expresses more ably than I can the debt of gratitude which we all owe this fine public servant. It is significant that the President has indicated that Mr. Hoover may be called upon again to assume a high office and great responsibility in Government service.

I have never met nor known a more unselfish and patriotic official of our Government than the recent Under Secretary of State. I am sure that all my colleagues join with me in congratulating him on a job well done and in sending to him and his family best wishes for good health and continued leadership on behalf of our Nation in the days to come.

Need Fair Egg Prices for Farm Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous importance eggs play in domestic life of rural agriculture, I wrote a letter to Secretary Benson requesting that a floor be placed under egg prices for the sake of better food and living standards on our family farms. Living interests of the farmer require this floor because the so-called law of supply and demand has not worked for a number of years now. While farmers in my district get only 21 to 23 cents a dozen for grade A eggs—this is less than the cost of producing them—consumers here in Washington pay 65 cents a dozen for the same type of eggs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert current egg prices to farmers from the Willmar Tribune, the letter I wrote to Secretary Benson on this subject, and the reply I received from Assistant Secretary Earl L. Butz in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WILLMAR MARKETS, MORNING QUOTATIONS OF JANUARY 7, 1957

Eggs:	*Dozen*
No. 1, large	$0.23
Grade A, medium	.19
Grade B	.19
No. 2	.15
Live poultry:	*Pound*
Light and heavy hens	$0.10
Springs	.10
Old roosters	.10

LETTER TO SECRETARY EZRA BENSON, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 4, 1957.

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: I have received many letters regarding the low prices of eggs on the market. I want to call this to your attention again, because this situation has been quite consistent for several years now.

I realize, of course, that until a comprehensive parity bill is passed and not vetoed by the President, you have the discretion of whether to support egg prices or not. These low prices are a very serious problem for small farmers who often rely on their egg checks for groceries and other necessities. I hope you will use the authority which only you have within your control to reconsider and put a floor under the price of eggs. This floor will help this section of the farmers in maintaining good living standards.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for placing supports on turkey prices which I requested you to do during the last campaign, but during a tour of my district I found many evidences of farmers who want to keep their farms but are so psychologically distressed they feel no hope.

I want to thank you for considering this request for a floor under the price of eggs.

Sincerely yours,

COYA KNUTSON,
Member of Congress.

LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SIGNED BY EARL L. BUTZ, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, IN REPLY TO LETTER OF JANUARY 4, 1957

JANUARY 17, 1957.

Hon. COYA KNUTSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KNUTSON: This is in reply to your letter of January 4, 1957, in which you call our attention to the market prices of eggs.

The Department is aware of the serious market problem confronting egg producers across the Nation. The basic problem is the result of unusually heavy seasonal production. During December, for example, the number of eggs produced exceeded a year earlier by over 5 percent. On January 1, 1957, egg production was exceeding a year earlier by 8 percent. It is not unusual for production increases of such magnitude to result in depressed prices to producers. The solution to the problem is a reduction in production to the extent necessary to result in profitable prices to producers.

The Department has been very active in a number of ways during recent months in assisting the egg industry. Section 32 funds have been used to purchase over 500,000 cases of eggs. It was necessary to discontinue these purchases early in December because outlets through the school-lunch program and eligible institutions became filled through January. In addition, to these direct purchases, the Department has been aggressively promoting eggs through its plentiful foods program. Eggs are featured in the Department's current list of plentiful foods. Such efforts contribute greatly in relieving temporary surpluses. In order to correct the current situation, however, it will be necessary for the industry to make substantial production adjustments in the months ahead.

Production adjustments are a matter for the industry to take care of in the period immediately ahead. During the coming weeks chicks for flock replacement to produce eggs this fall and winter will be placed on farms. If production adjustments are not made at this time the problem of surplus eggs will continue. It is the opinion of the Department that it is to the long-time best interest of the poultry industry for the Government to avoid any action, such as the

support of market prices, which would have the effect of perpetuating the surplus problem.

Thank you for your comments concerning the recent section 32 turkey surplus removal program. These purchases were not to support prices, but rather were for the removal of a limited quantity of the surplus of turkeys as a means of assisting producers.

The Department expects to continue assisting the poultry industry through the aggressive promoting of eggs through its plentiful foods program and in other appropriate ways.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

A University in Every Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress should be grateful to the alert membership of the Junior Chamber of Commerce for the work fostered and promoted throughout the Nation under a program titled "Operation Library." This national project starts officially this month.

The State of Arkansas is proud that this splendid project originated in our State. A brief history of its development shows the speed with which the program gained momentum and spread throughout the Nation.

In the spring of 1955, Mr. Cecil Edmonds of West Memphis, Ark., an outstanding businessman and one of the leading members of the West Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce, spearheaded the movement. He conferred with Mrs. Merlin M. Moore, of Little Rock, who was the chairman of the Arkansas Library Commission, a State agency organized in 1935 to assist in the development of library services throughout the State.

Mrs. Moore received an immediate reply offering assistance in the efforts of the West Memphis Jaycees to improve the local library. M. W. Hightshoe, West Memphis librarian, contributed greatly to the efforts of the West Memphis Jaycees by urging their support of the movement.

Out of several meetings, Mr. Edmonds and members of the West Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce devised Operation Library. The program called for consultations with the local librarian and the trustees of the library to ascertain immediate needs. They took the lead in publicizing library facilities available and in the local newspapers and radio station. Finally, as a means of crystallizing interest in the library, a book fair and exhibit was arranged.

At the same time this work to increase the value of the library as a community facility was going on, the Jaycees worked to improve the financial backing of the library both from municipal appropriations and from private donations.

So successful was the West Memphis program that Mr. Edmonds and the West Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce received the plaudits of the entire State and the program was recommended as a State program to be carried out by the State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Within 6 months, the program of Operation Library was on the work schedule of 75 percent of all junior chamber of commerce organizations in Arkansas. In West Memphis, for example, a new building for the library was envisioned. In Hamburg, Ark., the Jaycees worked closely with the Ashley County Library and celebrated the opening of a beautiful new library building. McGehee Jaycees started an extensive program of improving the lighting in their local library. The Osceola Jaycees joined with the Progressive Club of that city to establish a library improvement program.

Mr. Cecil Edmonds, who had been designated State chairman of Operation Library by the junior chamber of commerce, sounded the clarion call to all State clubs in a letter to local library chairman dated June 1956. He said:

> Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a University in every town in Arkansas? This sounds like a fantastic statement, but it is not really as out of reach as it might seem. A well known educator recently stated that every building on the Harvard University campus could be burned to the ground, and if the library building was still intact there would still be a university.

Under such inspired leadership, the junior chamber of commerce membership went to work in Arkansas. The success of the program was recognized in such publications as Future, the national Jaycee magazine; Public Libraries, published by the American Library Association; and the Saturday Review.

Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas, on behalf of the State of Arkansas, the Arkansas Library Association, and the Arkansas Library Commission, gave the Arkansas Junior Chamber of Commerce an award of merit for their work on Operation Library. National leaders expressed their approval of the program and stressed its importance. Many, such as Mr. Winthrop Rockefeller, donated money to publicize and extend the program.

And, in 1956, at the national convention of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Arkansas Jaycees won second place in the national competitions for Operation Library and the awards manual of the national organization was amended to include the development of libraries.

Such has been the success of this program that it appears certain to become a leading project of the Junior Chamber of Commerce. And, indeed, there is a real need for such a program. As the Committee on Education and Labor reported to the House of Representatives in July of 1955:

> There can be no question that the free, tax-supported library, where it has been adequately supported, is an integral part of public education in the many communities where it exists. The library has supplemented and worked with the public schools so that the children of most communities have an integrated book program. These library facilities are important to schoolchildren during the school year as well as during the summertime when reading programs are provided. Actually the public library has been a positive force against the bad effects of vicious comic books.
>
> The public library offers opportunity for adults, regardless of the amount of formal education, to carry on continuing education throughout their lives. With the many complex problems facing our people today, the national welfare requires that a well-stocked library, as a headquarters for unbiased fact, be available to all of our people. As the educational level rises, more people use libraries. Therefore, the needs and demands for adequate library services are now greater than ever. Altogether, the public library performs a practical operating function in our educational processes, our cultural evolution, our economic activities, and our political and social development.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce has earned our appreciation for their Operation Library. Today there are still 27 million Americans without access to libraries, and about 90 percent of these Americans live in rural areas or communities with populations of less than 10,000 persons. Another 58 million citizens have library services which are deemed inadequate. So, there is a real need for Operation Library and the Junior Chamber of Commerce has undertaken a valuable program of work.

Let us add our encouragements to the Junior Chamber of Commerce and work toward that day when there will be a university in every community.

American Plywood Industry Injured by Cheap Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I warned the Members of the House of Representatives of the impending injury to the American plywood industry from growing imports of cheaply produced foreign hardwood plywood. Today I would like to report what has happened since then and the damage which has been done.

Since 1951 there has been a tremendous industrial expansion in United States industry. The hardwood plywood industry is one of the few exceptions. It has shown only a six-tenths of 1 percent increase since 1951. This, despite the fact that there has been a 74-percent increase in the domestic consumption of this plywood. Consumption has jumped from 870 million square feet in 1951 to 1.5 billion square feet in 1956.

Who has supplied the hardwood plywood to meet this increased consumption? Foreign nations, especially Japan. In 1951 Japan exported to this country about 13 million square feet of hardwood plywood. In 1956 she sent to this country 510 million square feet. Thus her exports to the United States rose 4,000 percent between 1951 and 1956. Other nations exported 180 million square feet to the United States. Altogether the total imports into the United States

amounted to 690 million square feet, or 46 percent of our domestic market.

Why have the foreign nations, especially Japan, been able to take over such a large percentage of our domestic market? Cheap labor is the answer. Japanese plywood workers are paid 11½ cents per hour. One thousand square feet of plywood costs the Jap producer only $4.17. In the United States the cost to

425061—62249

the domestic producer is about $30 for 1,000 square feet. Therefore, the Jap producer is able to send his plywood to the United States and sell it on our domestic market for less than the domestic manufacturer can make it. The American producer simply cannot compete.

The foreign producers now have 46 percent of our market. Within a short period of time, unless something is done, they will take all of our hardwood plywood market. In Japan particularly there has been, and is going on, a rapid expansion in the plywood industry. A few short years are all that is needed to command our domestic market and drive every single American plywood manufacturer out of business. Even now American plants are curtailing production or closing down, driving thousands of United States workers out of employment.

What can be done to save the United States hardwood plywood industry? There is only one answer. A quota on imports of foreign plywood. Included in our foreign policy has been the objective of supplying trade rather than aid to our needy foreign friends and allies. But I doubt that many persons in Government meant that we should go so far as to destroy our American industry.

It seems to me that the only logical and consistent conclusion we can reach in connection with this problem is to allow a portion of our domestic market to be supplied by foreign nations. Thus we will be engaging in trade with them. What that portion of our market given over to foreign producers should be, I am not prepared to say at this point. The American hardwood-plywood industry has suggested 15 percent. A thorough study would indicate whether or not this is a correct figure.

But it is clear that something must at once be done to save the United States industry. I have introduced a bill which calls for quotas to be fixed in cases of United States industries threatened with destruction by cheaply produced foreign products. I urge the House to give early consideration to it, or to similar measures now pending.

Seventy-four Members of Congress Join To Question Dulles on Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, relevant to crucial issues in the Middle East and to which views 74 Members of Congress have subscribed. I also insert herewith a supplemental letter addressed to the Secretary, asking him to make known his reply to me. If there are any other Members who wish to join in the expression of these views, please so advise me. The texts of the letters follow:

JANUARY 23, 1957.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We believe that the American people are generally in agreement that the administration and Congress must take effective measures to strengthen the Middle East against the threat of Communist aggression. In view of the fact that the administration has now come to Congress seeking confirmation of its judgment on future plans for the defense of the region, we are presuming to express our concern on current developments within the region, as they affect the interests of the free world.

We are referring to the danger that the Egyptian Government may be in a position soon to renew its blockade of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, and thus dominate these two waterways.

Should we not ask Colonel Nasser for a commitment to keep the Suez open to the shipping of all nations without exception? Should we not ask him for an undertaking to desist from any blockade of the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba? And, in the interests of all nations, should we not insist on guaranties for free passage for all shipping at Aqaba before the area is prematurely abandoned by the Israeli forces? Would it be feasible to provide for a permanent U. N. force at this critical point—critical not only for the survival of Israel, but also for the economies and defenses of the free world?

The economic dislocations in Europe and even in our country which have resulted from the closing of the Suez Canal have dramatically demonstrated the importance of the Suez, not only to the economic stability of the free world, but also to the maintenance of free world defense. It is a futile enterprise to erect defenses against external Soviet aggression if we ignore the danger that a Communist-armed or Communist-inspired power is in a position, at any time it wishes, to close this major waterway.

For these reasons, we believe it important to search and establish routes which will serve as alternates to the Suez Canal. One of these is the Aqaba-Mediterranean route across southern Israel which, in our judgment, should be developed and secured from the threat of Egyptian or Communist control.

Accordingly, we have been disturbed by reports that the United Nations is bringing pressure to bear on Israeli forces to withdraw from positions which they took from the Egyptians during the recent fighting in the Sinai Peninsula and from which the Egyptians were able to shell and block ships going through the Straits of Tiran. We understand that Israel has no desire to annex this area or to remain there permanently, but that it wants guaranties that if it does withdraw, the Egyptians will not be permitted to return to the area and reestablish their blockade. We can understand the reasons for the concern of the Israel Government in view of the fact that the United Nations failed to carry out the September 1, 1955, resolution ordering Egypt to desist from its blockades of Suez and Aqaba in the past.

We write to ask for some assurance that we are not returning to the conditions which obtained on October 29 and which precipitated the hostilities. Many of us fear that Colonel Nasser of Egypt is dictating the terms and conditions of the implementation of the November 2 resolution and that the U. N. force is merely clearing the way for the return of Egyptian forces wherever he wants them to be.

Many of the problems which now confront us in the Middle East today would not have arisen if we had secured an absolute commitment from Egypt back in 1954, when the British agreed to withdraw, that the Suez would be open to the shipping of all nations without discrimination. In the light of that experience, we believe that it would be most desirable to insist that Nasser now be pressed to make a contribution to the solution of these problems in the future.

Respectfully yours,

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ohio; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; CHARLES A. BOYLE, Illinois; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York; ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; EMANUEL CELLER, New York; EARL CHUDOFF, Pennsylvania; FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania; JAMES J. DELANEY, New York; JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; CLAIR ENGLE, California; GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York; DANIEL FLOOD, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland; KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; EDITH GREEN, Oregon; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Michigan; WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; HERBERT ZELENKO, New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, New York; KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois; LESTER HOLTZMAN, New York; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri; EDNA F. KELLY, New York; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; CECIL R. KING, California; THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; PETER F. MACK, Jr., Illinois; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; GEORGE P. MILLER, California; JOHN E. MOSS, California; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York; BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Massachusetts; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; PETER W. RODINO, New Jersey; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California; ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey; B. F. SISK, California; LEONORE K. SULLIVAN, Missouri; LUDWIG TELLER, New York; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey; STEWART L. UDALL, Arizona; CHARLES A. VANIK, Ohio; ROY W. WIER, Minnesota; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania; GEORGE MCGOVERN, South Dakota.

JANUARY 25, 1957.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 23, a letter relative to the situation in the Middle East was addressed to you over the signatures of 70 Members of Congress.

In order to relieve you of undue burden, the signatories have asked that I advise you that your response to this letter may be addressed to me, and I, in turn, shall advise the other signatories.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

Patriotic Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered before the Pennsylvania State Society of the Daughters of the American Colonists, at Pittsburgh, last September 28.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTIC AMERICANISM

(Excerpts from address of United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN at the 34th State assembly of the Pennsylvania State Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Friday evening, September 28, 1956)

At this time of crisis in world affairs, when the fate of all civilization hangs in the balance, our great need here in the United States is for more organizations like this.

We need more loyal dedication to the ideals symbolized by the Stars and Stripes. We need more people like you who are proud to be called patriotic Americans.

It is our duty to proclaim the greatness of our Republic—to teach young and old the good and noble qualities that have entered into the making of America.

At the same time we must be aware of our shortcomings. We must consider the dangers that confront us at home and abroad. We must never forget our duties and obligations as free citizens of a free nation.

It is true that we have shortcomings. It is true that there are defects that should be overcome. Nevertheless, for more than 200 years people of every country have sought a haven of freedom and opportunity upon our shores and today the oppressed and downtrodden of every land clamor for admission to the United States.

America is different from any other nation.

What is that difference? It is something which should be studied by every American.

We can only understand why the thinking people of this earth look to the United States for leadership out of a dreary, war-sick, hungry world when we fully appreciate the ideals of the Founding Fathers.

Our forefathers braved a mighty and turbulent ocean, a savage and unexplored wilderness, severe hardship and possible death from hunger and cold in order to get away from governmental controls, heavy and burdensome taxation, tyranny, bigotry, and war. They wanted to live in a country where they could have a life of opportunity and freedom to live as their conscience dictated. They did not ask for help of any kind. They just wanted freedom of action.

Their first concept of government was a settlement dedicated to the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith. In their government they recognized their dependence upon God. They recognized their responsibility and duty to each other.

The freedom that they desired did not mean the right to do as they pleased regardless of others. It was freedom to do what was right. They recognized that a nation living under God must be a righteous nation, living in obedience to the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

A European statesman was once asked to explain why North America had made so much more progress than South America. His reply was this:

"Those who came to South America were seeking gold, while those who settled North America were seeking God."

That was a wonderful answer. If we keep it always before us and live up to that answer we will fulfill the greatest expectations of the Founding Fathers.

It would give us the highest moral and spiritual standards in government, in business, and in our private lives. It would mean no tax scandals, no evasion of military or civilian responsibility. It would mean a full day's work for a full day's pay. It would mean no improper combination of wealth or powerful individuals to damage others.

It would mean decent living, thrift, hard work, tolerance, and faith. It would mean Christian consideration for the less fortunate among us.

Our forefathers were not afraid of work but they believed that every man is entitled to the rewards of his energy and industry. They believed that the right to own and acquire property is one of the greatest of all human rights.

Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, the great men who wrote the Declaration of Independence, each had much to say concerning this important question.

Jefferson said: "A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned—this is the sum of good government."

John Adams wrote: "The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence."

In the writings of Benjamin Franklin we find this quotation: "Two virtues, industry and frugality, tend more to increase the wealth, power, and grandeur of the community than all others."

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed our ideals. It said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Constitution was the means by which those ideals could be carried into effect and the freedom of the individual protected from government.

The Declaration of Independence appeals to the laws of nature and of nature's God. Our forefathers always felt that there was a divine providence that guides the affairs of men.

There is always the danger of the welfare state. The individual must never be forced to depend upon the state. A communistic or socialistic state has never advanced the individual. It always degrades him. A country which provides free bread and circuses and other unearned benefits, finally fails. Beware of the political party or the politician making great promises. Those promises, if fulfilled, will be paid for by your money.

The Founding Fathers fought tyranny, arbitrary bureaucratic action and artificial class lines. They never indicated there should be any leveling off process. They gave no thought to differences of creed or color. They upheld the great truth that all men are created in the image of God.

How are we to establish and strengthen among ourselves faith in their ideals? It can be done by studying the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It can be done by knowing the lives and achievements of our heroes of both war and peace. We can gain inspiration by visiting our historic shrines. The lives of our great preachers, teachers, statesmen, soldiers, artisans, industrialists, agriculturalists and pioneers should be known to all of us.

The hallmark of a real American has always been love of liberty, adventure, the desire for improvement and the creative urge.

These have developed so many noble American ideas that have advanced the material and spiritual welfare of our people.

For example, so many ideas have originated with our arteries of transportation—trails, waterways, highways, railroads, and the airplane. They have been the means of exploring our broad prairies, discovering the hidden wealth in great mountains. Transportation decided the location of homes, villages, towns, and cities.

The people themselves have paved the way. They have explored the mountains, forests, and prairies. They have discovered and developed our natural resources. They have broken up the prairies, opened up the mines and cleared the forests for civilization. They have cultivated the farms and made them fruitful. They have built churches, schools, and libraries in order that the ideals of the Founding Fathers might be expounded.

Our material gains, our cultural position, and our spiritual attainments have depended on communications. These communications have meant the expenditure of much treasure, hard work, and even the sacrifice of lives.

America is the greatest Nation of all history, because the mark of an American has been the sense of independent and individual adventure. Each American has stood on his own feet.

It is necessary for the people of the United States to recapture this hallmark, which has always designated an American, if we are to continue our progress.

Americans never forget that the future always belongs to those with the creative urge. This type must be encouraged.

Americans love freedom. We are rugged individualists. For that reason many races and creeds have been blended into a great people with the American outlook as our inspiration. The American outlook is based upon freedom of the individual, with equality, justice, and freedom for all.

Although we have great accomplishments as a country our cultural and spiritual advancement has not kept pace with our material gains. Regardless of this, we need not be ashamed of our great progress. We should never be ashamed of patriotic assertions. The glory of our flag should be the pride of everyone.

In all this, we must remember that the United States has enemies. They are both foreign and domestic. A domestic enemy is more dangerous than a foreign enemy.

Let us make it the purpose of loyal Americans to take subversive influences by the throat. Let us make patriotism and love of country popular during peacetime. Let us make it fashionable to be outspoken Americans, who live and practice the ideals upon which our country was founded. That calls for work, thrift, and tolerance. It means we must accept the doctrine that we are our brother's keeper, with love of our country, love of God, and with justice toward all men.

Again, the great American ideal may be summed up as deep belief in God and nature's laws; that freedom of the individual depends upon God and not on government; that we demand equal opportunity regard-

less of race, creed, or color; that we recognize our obligation to our fellowmen; that great centralization of government is dangerous; continued faith in equality of opportunity; and that tyranny must be rejected whether from government, a dictator, a minority, or a mob.

The hallmark of an American is independence and faith.

Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very brilliant and illuminating address on the immortal Robert E. Lee, delivered on his birth date, January 19, in Statuary Hall, before the United Daughters of the Confederacy, by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I think, Mr. President, that all who have served in the Senate with JOHN STENNIS will agree with me that in no time in recent memory has a man, in less than two terms in the Senate, risen higher in the esteem and the affection of his colleagues than has Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi. He has reflected credit upon the schools that educated him, Mississippi State College and the University of Virginia, where he graduated magna cum laude in the law school with a Phi Beta Kappa key.

The Senator from Mississippi, in his address on Robert E. Lee, voices the sentiments of the South concerning a great leader, who was willing to sacrifice for a cause, and when, on the battlefield, the issue of secession went against him, appealed to everyone in the South to accept the resolution of that issue and to do what they could to heal the wounds of an unnecessary fraternal war, and to build up another great Union. His fame, Mr. President, belongs to the ages. I am pleased that my distinguished colleague from Mississippi shares my admiration and affection for a wonderful organization known as United Daughters of the Confederacy, as named in the charter granted it by the Congress. It is their love that keeps green the memory of departed leaders like Lee and Jackson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT EDWARD LEE

(Address by Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi)

A search of all recorded history could not lead to the name of a man or woman less in need of our praise, but more deserving of it, than that of the man we are gathered here together today to honor, a century and a half after his birth at nearby Stratford, Va.

Robert Edward Lee has long been recognized as one of the greatest military leaders of the English-speaking peoples, and indeed of the world. Nothing we can say here can add a cubit to his stature as a world figure. How might I add anything to the almost perfect tribute paid General Lee by another Senator many years ago? It was Senator Ben Hill of Georgia who said of him:

"He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without vices, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guilt. He was Caesar without his ambition, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant and royal in authority as a king. He was as gentle as a woman in life, pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestal, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

Although Lee's fame and memory have no need of us, we have need—dire need—of him and what he stood for, in this our world of today. There never was a time when those qualities of heart and mind which combined to make the greatness of Lee were more needed in the world than they are this day.

As in the case of all great men, Lee's entire life was marked by a deep and abiding sense of humility. His was an ordered life of self-abasement, self-abnegation, self-denial, and unselfishness. "But then again, I may be in error," he was often heard to say as he pondered the daily and almost hourly decisions he had to make in the course of military routine. Several times when he had to administer what appeared to be harsh and rigid discipline, he cried out in genuine anguish of spirit, "God help me, if I am wrong."

Perhaps there never was such an example of humility, certainly never in military circles, as Lee's heart-wrung cry, after the Battle of Gettysburg, "It was all my fault." Here was the apex of his military career, here, indeed, was the high tide of a young Nation's fight for independence, here was "the fierce South cheering on her sons," and victory almost within grasp—and here was one of those unaccountable, inexplicable, and well-nigh inexcusable military mistakes which turned the tide of battle and sent the long gray lines of Lee back upon Richmond and ultimately to Appomattox. And here was the living symbol of the spirit of the Confederacy, in full realization of defeat and its meaning, taking upon himself all the blame. Fortunately, history, which has a way of searching out and correcting such errors, has absolved the great military chieftain of the blame he so meekly and humbly assumed.

Out of this pronounced humility of Lee's sprang the conviction which later made him pronounce his life a failure. "Life is gliding away and I have nothing to show for mine. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God," he wrote shortly before he died. History, too, has long since answered the great man's misgivings as to his life of success or failure. Lee—a failure? "If so, history's most magnificent failure."

In suggesting duty as the second cornerstone in the arch of Lee's greatness, I am not unmindful that it is a word which has been greatly talked about but meagerly exemplified in many of the lives of the great. "Thank God, I've done my duty," gasped Lord Nelson with his last breath. The poet Wordsworth, you will remember, called duty the voice of God. And our own Woodrow Wilson had this to say about it as a qualification of greatness: "There is no question what the roll of honor in America is. The roll of honor consists of men who have squared their conduct by ideals of duty." General Lee said to his son: "Duty then is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."

No critic of General Lee has ever dared suggest anything but that his entire life was a devotion, a dedication and in a sense a consecration to his ideals of duty. As a young man at West Point; as a soldier under orders at Buena Vista; as superintendent of the West Point Academy; as the man sent to capture John Brown at Harper's Ferry; as General Scott's and President Lincoln's choice to head the Armed Forces of the United States in 1861; as military adviser to President Jefferson Davis and later commander-in-chief of the Southern armies; and as president of Washington and Lee University and a citizen in the humble ranks of a reunited country—Lee literally lived up to his sense of duty and the oath taken for him by his sponsors in baptism—"to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me."

Volumes of words have been written as to why and how Lee turned down President Lincoln's offer to command the Union armies. No one who has studied his life can doubt but that in making this tremendous decision Lee was guided entirely by his sense of duty. Listen to his own words on the subject: "I never intimated to anyone that I desired the command of the United States Army, nor did I ever have a conversation with but one gentleman, the Honorable Francis P. Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation and, as I understood, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and as courteously as I could that though opposed to secession and deprecating war, I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States."

Perhaps even more revealing was what Lee, the Virginian, had to say to his beloved friend and mentor, General Scott, a few days later in resigning from the United States Army—"Save in the defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword." Lee loved the Union. He loved the West Pointers, both those he had trained and those with whom he had served. He abhorred slavery and had long since freed all his slaves. He hated the idea of secession, and as late as January 1861 said, "I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than a dissolution of the Union."

But Lee had been brought up in a great tradition. His father had been Governor of Virginia. Two of his kinsmen, Richard Henry and Francis Lee, were signers of the Declaration of Independence. It never occurred to any of these men, and certainly not to Robert E. Lee himself, that the Union, however desirable, was anything but a compact between sovereign States, from which any State could secede at will.

Search as you may, and as diligently as his detractors have tried, and you will not find the vestige of a reason why Lee turned down the brilliant opportunity offered him by Lincoln and Scott—an assured commander-in-chiefship—and threw in his lot at great hazard with his native State, except a compelling and burning sense of deepest duty and most sacred obligation to uphold his conception of the Constitution of the United States, and of State sovereignty.

Many other qualifications entered into Lee's greatness, both as a man and as a soldier. His courage, his integrity, his tolerance, his great store of human kindness, all played their part in the makeup of the man and hero. His soldiers worshiped him, and at the Battle of the Wilderness saw him silhouetted against flaming gunfire, both he and Traveller, calm and undisturbed, amidst a rain of shells. A whole company rushed to throw themselves up as a barricade in front of him, pleading with him to take a more protected position. "Push the enemy back, boys, and my position will be safe enough," replied the general, of whom Bradford, the historian, said, "He had no sense of fear. It was entirely alien to his makeup."

Another example contributes to the picture of this fundamental attribute of courage. In the night prior to that fateful day at Appomattox when the Confederate armies were surrounded and the gloom of imminent defeat pervaded the Confederate camp, some members of his staff, solicitous for his personal safety, approached the general in the privacy of his tent. They advised him that the probabilities were that he would be captured, tried, convicted, and executed. Without his knowledge or consent they had arranged a plan of escape and ultimate safety in South America. General Lee instantly and calmly replied, "There is only one thing I can do: Go to General Grant and obtain the best terms I can for my men. I am prepared to take the consequences of this act." Had he followed the other course and sought personal safety, would his statue now represent his beloved Virginia in Statuary Hall in our Capitol? Would this ceremony be held in his honor in this rotunda today? Would his likeness adorn the walls of West Point Military Academy almost a century later as one whose character and record affords an example for American youth to follow?

This great character faced his most severe test at the end of that most unfortunate of all wars. His fortune was lost; his property was confiscated; his family was in need; his privileges of citizenship gone. An insurance company offered him its presidency at an annual salary of $75,000. His reply reflects the character and integrity of the man: "I have nothing to give the insurance business but my name, and my name is not for sale."

Instead of seeking personal gain or trying to justify past conduct, he accepted the presidency of what was then the small Washington College, at Lexington, Va. (now Washington and Lee University), and met the challenge of his remaining years by guiding, inspiring, and training the youth of the Nation. His own example was their best lesson, and remains the best lesson for the youth of today.

Further, he counseled and advised all States to return to the Union peacefully. He advised every individual to take up the duties of citizenship in a constructive way and build for a new future, and said: "I think it is the duty of every citizen in the present condition of the country to do all in his power to aid in the restoration of peace and harmony and in no way oppose the policy of the State or general government directed to that object." Thus, instead of looking backward he looked forward, taking the initiative by advocating that state of mind necessary for the true rebuilding of the South and of the Union.

But of all these things, tangible and intangible, physical and spiritual, which made General Lee the man he was, there are reasons to believe that he himself would most like to be remembered as a Christian. He was not only a devoted churchman, laying upon himself the obligations and duties of the simplest layman in the church of his allegiance, and striving diligently for their performance; but he was a man of God and a man of prayer. Consider his own prayer: "Father, put any burden on me, only sustain me; send me anywhere, only go with me; sever any tie but this, which binds me to Thy service and to Thy heart." He had just been to a meeting of his church vestry and returning to the dining table was about to return thanks when, on October 12, 1870, in this prayerful attitude, he was called to his eternal reward.

And now, as worthy daughters, sons, granddaughters and grandsons of the illustrious Lee and the generation he so nobly personified, let us look to the future. Let us face the problems of our day and steadfastly seek their solution. As we face this future let us dedicate ourselves to those same virtues of duty, integrity, honor, and faith as personified by Lee.

Let us all go forward inspired by the greatness and the example of Lee and truly serve our country and our time in loyalty and in constructive effort to solve her present problems, always with an unfaltering trust in our country's future and a supreme faith in our God.

The Eisenhower Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following address made by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, ALVIN M. BENTLEY, who spoke to a luncheon meeting on January 16, 1957, of the board of directors and the executive committee of the National Federation of Republican Women. Mr. BENTLEY'S topic was the Eisenhower doctrine and constitutes a detailed explanation of the President's requested congressional resolution on the Middle East and what is hoped to be accomplished thereby.

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

(Address of Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, before board of directors of National Federation of Republican Women, Washington, D. C., January 16, 1957)

I am delighted to have this opportunity to appear before your group this afternoon and both Mrs. Bentley and I greatly appreciate the invitation and your kind hospitality extended thereby.

The role of our Republican women in our party organization at all levels has been emphasized many, many times and I merely wish to add my own brief contribution. The great Republican victories of last fall, especially at the national level, could never have been possible without the tireless and devoted contributions of our women members and workers. Every Republican, indeed every American who joined us in rejoicing over the Eisenhower victory, must feel a deep sense of gratitude to you who went so far to win this victory. I therefore want to pay particular tribute to you directors in whose able hands the activities of all of our Republican women are correlated and directed. I hope that your influence and prestige within our party will continue to grow during the years ahead because such a growth would mean an increase in the power of our party among the electorate.

One of the most useful qualifications for party workers at all levels is a familiarity with national and international problems and an ability to discuss them with the voting public. Questions of our foreign policy are of special importance to American women, to wives, mothers, sisters, daughters, because they involve the fundamental issue of war and peace itself. No one can deny that the Korean war was a very decisive issue in the 1952 campaign, no one can deny that the international situation loomed large in people's minds when they went to the polls last November 6. It is therefore a subject of timely and vital importance, not only to our party but to the country as a whole.

The first Saturday of 1957 saw the Congress assembled in joint session for a special message of unusual importance from our great President. It is seldom, if ever, that crises develop of such magnitude that a president would feel compelled to appear before Congress even before his state of the Union message. The request of the President on this occasion was for a congressional grant of authority that is not unprecedented in itself but whose broad application in this instance is quite unparalled in recent times. This application of these principles has been termed popularly the Eisenhower doctrine—the subject of my talk today.

In his address the President made four distinct requests: First, to authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence; second, to authorize the Executive to undertake in the same region programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid; third, to authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism; and, fourth, to authorize the President to employ, for economic and defensive military purposes, sums available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, without regard to existing limitations. These requests have been formulated in House Joint Resolution 117 and Senate Joint Resolution 19, introduced by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs and the Foreign Relations Committees, respectively.

The purpose of these several requests is designed to deal directly with the threat of Communist aggression, direct and indirect, in the Middle East. I think there can be no doubt in the minds of any reasonable person that this threat does exist. What the administration desires is the cooperation of Congress in a clear definition and declaration of our policy in that area.

History has taught us that wars frequently result when ambitious aggressors deceive themselves as to the reaction of peace-loving nations in time of international conflict. At the outbreak of World War I there was surely little thought given by the German Kaiser to the possibility of eventual American intervention. As late as 1916, the then Chief Executive, Woodrow Wilson, was reelected with the slogan "He kept us out of war." And yet, barely 6 months later, we were at war. Surely imperial Germany had miscalculated our intentions at that time.

At the outbreak of World War II there was presumably little thought given by Adolph Hitler to the possibility of American intervention. Do you remember that President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated during the 1940 campaign that American boys would not be sent to die in foreign lands. Surely Nazi Germany miscalculated our intentions again.

In January of 1950 the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, omitted Korea in a description of America's defense perimeter, thus implying that it was outside of the area that we intended to defend. One can hardly blame the North Korean Communists for the assumption that we would not defend South Korea against external aggression. And yet, 5 months later, we did just that. This is a third example where evident miscalculation on the part of totalitarian aggressors has involved us in a war which might never have been fought had the enemy had due notice in advance of what our reaction was likely to be.

By contrast with its predecessors, the Eisenhower Republican administration has acted on several occasions to remove this contingency when conflict threatened. The most notable example occurred in the spring

of 1955 when the Congress, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, acted to authorize the Executive to defend Formosa and the Pescadores from attack from the Chinese mainland. Arguments such as I have heard recently that the Chinese Communists had no intention of attacking Formosa are, I think, irrelevant. The fact is that Formosa was not attacked and this country was spared a military involvement which certainly appeared possible at one time.

That is basically what the President is requesting now. He wants the Congress, representing the American people, to go on record that aggression on the part of international communism in the Middle East, will, if necessary, be met by the use of American Armed Forces. At the same time he wants authority to cooperate with freedom-loving countries of that area in the implementation of economic and military assistance programs and authority to use the necessary funds to insure the success of such programs.

No one, of course, can regard this as a guarantee that the Communists will not start war in that part of the world. But its adoption will guarantee that, if war should break out as a result of Communist initiative, they will be fully warned as to the consequences. We all realize that the Soviet Union has the power and ability to begin world war III at any time it desires. But we do not believe that the Communists will deliberately choose to start world war III at this time for a very good and obvious reason—because they know they could not win it. What we seek to guard against is the possibility that war might break out through miscalculation on their part, that we and they alike would stumble into it.

Another motive for the President's request is a psychological one—it is designed to give the nations of the Middle East the strength and the desire to resist Communist aggression through possession of the knowledge that, if necessary, we will assist them to do so. Regretfully, we cannot assume that all peoples share the same spirit manifested by the brave Hungarians who fought on even without hope of outside assistance. Of course, I wish it clearly understood that I believe the peoples of the Middle East are just as sincere in their desire to resist communism as are any other group of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. But we want to give them our assurance that, unlike the Hungarians, they will not have to fight alone. The adoption of this resolution by Congress would promise the support they might require in the defense of their own freedom and independence.

There are those who will claim that we are again approaching the brink of war by taking such a stand. My favorite reply to such critics is that it is certainly preferable to be on the brink rather than in the drink. But, more seriously, we feel that peace is so vital a thing to our people and to the people of the entire world, that it is worth while taking some risks if our chances of preserving it are enhanced thereby. And, given the lessons of history, we feel that advance warnings of this sort increase the likelihood of preserving the peace, even the uneasy, unstable peace that we are living with today.

Many persons believe that the mission of maintaining international peace and security in this part of the world should be left to the United Nations. Now, the pending legislation which I mentioned definitely provides for consultation and cooperation with the United Nations. The terminal date of the authority is to be reached when the United Nations or some international force has succeeded in restoring stability to this part of the world. But the lesson of Hungary has rather clearly shown us of the U. N.'s inability to move rapidly in a crisis which has been created by the Soviet Union. As long as the Soviets retain the veto power within the Security Council which they possess today, the U. N. is, in fact, prevented from taking any action which would be effective and necessary at such a time. Let us not forget that the United Nations could never have intervened militarily in Korea had not the Soviet representative been absent from the Security Council at that time.

No one pretends that this authority is going to solve all the problems now current in the Middle East. There is the question of the relationship between Israel and the Arab States; there is the matter of the Suez Canal crisis and its aftermath; there are other situations which tend to create confusion, instability, and ferment. We have seen how these situations have been exploited by the Communists for their own purposes and to the best of their ability. We believe that by lessening the danger of Communist influence, of Communist infiltration, of Communist pressure in the Middle East, we will contribute immeasurably to a final solution of these problems by the appropriate international agencies. There should be little doubt that the removal of Communist activity in this area will create a more favorable atmosphere in which to deal with these other matters.

I have heard it said that in this address the President was not asking for any authority that he did not already possess and that, therefore, the entire affair was meaningless. However, it must be admitted that specific approval by the Congress of such authority has a very real psychological value. More basically, however, I heartily endorse the motives that impelled Mr. Eisenhower to come before the Congress and seek its cooperation and assistance in such matters of the gravest importance. I do not imagine that any of us wish to register a complaint that the President is trying to work too closely with the Congress of the United States.

The recent action of the State Department in releasing for publication a large part of the testimony given in executive session hearings has also cleared up many doubtful points in people's minds, notably the exact geographical definition of the term "Middle East." I feel sure that the Executive will make public all information in this respect whose release would not prejudice our national security.

I must say truthfully that I do not regard this resolution as perfect in all aspects. For one thing, it does not meet the dangerous question of subversion except indirectly. I do not regard, as I stated earlier, the possibility of an open Soviet attack on any of these countries as very likely. What is much more probable is that one of these nations might fall under Communist domination and then attack a neighboring state. Perhaps even more likely, a government would be subverted from within and collapse to a Communist internal movement with little or no resistance. I believe that the resolution should be strengthened to permit this country to assist nations of the Middle East to defend themselves against subversive movements of any sort if it is known that such movements are being directed or controlled by an external force of Communist origin.

The resolution requests the authority to use up to $200 million annually for the purpose of its implementation. The Executive, I understand, does not intend to request any new authorizations or appropriations for this purpose during the balance of the present fiscal year but such requests are contemplated for both fiscal 1958 and fiscal year 1959. Since the need for actual funds is not, apparently, an urgent one, I would like to see this part of the requested legislation deferred until the Congress can give consideration to the full mutual-security or foreign-aid legislation.

Finally, I would like to see this authority terminate with the expiration of President Eisenhower's present term of office; that is, on January 20, 1961, if not earlier. I regard the vote last fall as a mandate from the American people to Ike to continue his foreign policy program and surely that vote can be interpreted as an expression of confidence in his direction of the foreign affairs of this country. I see no reason, however, why this should be regarded as a mandate for future administrations. If the state of the world at that time demanded similar authority, the new Chief Executive could submit a similar request. From a technical point of view, the terminal date might be March 1, 1961, to permit time for congressional consideration following the inauguration of the new President.

There has been a good deal of speculation about congressionally prepared substitutes for the requested legislation although at this time I have not seen any such substitutes in actual written form. As I say, I do not regard the proposed legislation as perfect and would support amendments along the lines previously indicated. I might even be tempted to offer some of them myself. But, although the inclusion of authority for military and economic assistance may be debatable, there should be no weakening of the President's request for congressional authority to use our Armed Forces to protect these nations against Communist aggression, if necessary. That is the heart of the Eisenhower doctrine and, without it, the policy contained therein would be meaningless.

Fortunately, our Democrat friends do not appear to be at all agreed upon what a substitute resolution should be. The President's request has received support, for example, from such a surprising source as Mr. Truman. On the other hand, former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, who appeared before our committee last week, took very much the opposite viewpoint.

Mr. Acheson, who is usually regarded as a major spokesman for his party in the field of foreign affairs, had some interesting answers to questions which I propounded to him during the hearings, interesting because they reveal a philosophy very different from that of our administration, a philosophy presumably shared by a large part of his party. For example, I asked him about this possibility of miscalculation on the part of the Communists, miscalculation which this resolution is designed to prevent. He admitted that such a possibility was always present. Then I asked him about the Formosa resolution, passed by the Congress in the spring of 1955 which we regarded as needed to prevent miscalculation on the part of the Red Chinese. He replied that he did not believe that the Chinese Communists had any intention of attacking Formosa and that he regarded the Formosa resolution as (and I quote) unnecessary, foolish and dangerous. Mr. Acheson who still has some very peculiar ideas on Far Eastern matters, was certainly not very complimentary to the many Democrat Congressmen who supported the President by voting for the Formosa resolution.

I then endeavored to get some indication of Mr. Acheson's thinking regarding the desirability of the President requesting the approval of Congress for action involving the Armed Forces of the United States. You will, of course, recall that the Truman administration never asked Congress directly to approve our fighting in Korea on behalf of the United Nations and when I mentioned this, Mr. Acheson replied that he thought it was unnecessary to do so. He went on to say that it was unfortunate to come to a state of mind where the President felt he could not do something within his constitutional powers unless he got someone else to share the responsibility. His inference was rather obvious that the White House was in such a state of mind at the present time.

I was not surprised that Mr. Acheson thinks this way but I was surprised that he would say so (just as I was surprised later to hear him state that there was doubt in his mind as to the wisdom of our having participated in the creation of the State of

Israel). Not only was he opposed to the idea of preventing or deterring an aggressor from miscalculation, as in the case of the Formosa resolution, but he also stated, in effect, that when the President had the responsibility to take certain action under the Constitution, he should not ask the Congress to share that responsibility with him. Personally, I am thankful to the Almighty that we have a President and a Secretary of State that wants to work with the Congress. I am also thankful that the elections of last fall did not return to prominence a gentleman with the ideas and theories held by Mr. Dean Acheson, even though I am confident that there are many members of his party who do not share his views.

Ladies, I have tried to explain what this request of the President, this Eisenhower doctrine, entails, as well as to deal with some of the objections to it, both on my part and on the part of others. Let us, in conclusion, remember just a few important things.

First, its basic motivation is a psychological one, to inspire the peoples of the Middle East to resist Communist aggression, both from without and within. That is the reason that authority is requested, not only to use our own Armed Forces, if need be, but also to cooperate with those countries from a military and economic point of view. You will, of course, recall that assistance is only to be tendered to those countries who freely request it.

Second, it is our belief, as it was in the case of Formosa, that by serving clear notice of our reaction in case of overt aggression, we will go far toward deterring a would-be aggressor. We believe that this will effectively remove the dangerous possibility of miscalculation. Remember, too, that we feel the greater menace at the moment to lie in the chance of aggression from a Communist-controlled country in that area rather than directly from the Soviet Union itself.

Third, there is no doubt as to the existence of crisis in the Middle East. There is likewise no doubt that if this area, with its tremendous oil reserves and its strategic location at the crossroads of the world, fell under Communist control it would probably mean the loss, or, at best, the neutralization of Western Europe.

Fourth, we are attempting to coordinate with, not to bypass the United Nations, but we are making certain that the Soviet veto in the Security Council cannot prevent our action if we believe it to be necessary in our own best interests.

Because of its broad application, the Eisenhower doctrine is certainly one of the most important matters laid before any American Congress in recent years. It is a tribute to our great President and to his Republican administration that he saw fit to request partnership with the Congress at this time instead of proceeding alone under a cloak of Executive secrecy. I am sure that the Congress will appreciate the confidence which has been placed in it and that the Eisenhower doctrine will be adopted, at least in principle, at an early moment of this session. I promise to do my part toward assuring its passage.

Disperse Our Two Atom-Powered Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, now that there are two nuclear-powered submarines in active operation in our United States Navy, it is time to transfer one of them to the west coast.

The military is not like a football team that can operate successfully with an unbalanced line. We have two goal lines to defend. The Pacific is not less vulnerable nor important from a defense standpoint than the Atlantic Ocean. Shipping on the west coast on account of Hawaii and Alaska would need protection as much or more so in a war than water transportation and supply on the east coast.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, shore facilities and skilled manpower familiar with experiments and maintenance of atom-powered naval craft should be available on both coasts. The only way to obtain these with the know-how of nuclear use in ship propulsion is to disperse the two examples presently available.

The Future of Family Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD my speech before the Indiana State Farmers Union convention, held at Indianapolis, January 16, 1957:

THE FUTURE OF FAMILY FARMS

(Address of Hon. COYA KNUTSON, Congresswoman from Minnesota, before Indiana Farmers Union convention, Indianapolis, Ind., January 16, 1957)

I feel deeply honored for the privilege of being with so many Farmers Union folks tonight. This is an occasion I shall not forget. The problems being discussed at this convention are the most biting of all problems confronting our Midwest.

The question of the future of our family farms reminds me of an incident a friend of mine tells about. One Friday night, about 12 o'clock, he passed a car in the ditch. The fellow was putting chains on to back out of the snow; his girl held the flashlight. My friend stopped to pull him out. After the car was out of the ditch the driver invited him to look at the front end of the car that was bashed in from hitting the telephone pole. Then the fellow looked to see that his pretty blond girl was in the car, and said, "You know, I was more concerned with what I was driving with than what I was driving at." We should be concerned with what we are driving with, and I wish to concern myself tonight with what I feel we are driving at.

We have tried to solve our problems through many and varied ways over a period of years, but none of them have succeeded all the way. Many times we have had drives for increased sales, notably in the 1890's, 1920's, and now. We have had an advertising program, the cost of which has been deducted from the price the farmers get; the farmers absorbing the burden, rather than passing it on to the consumer.

Secretary Benson gave dairymen 1 year to conduct a sales campaign that was utterly unsuccessful. No piecemeal solution will work here. Only an overall, long-range, planned program holds out any hope for preserving our rural way of life.

We must be concerned with agriculture to prevent a complete breakdown of that part of our economy. The great depression is burned into our memories by the 25-cent wheat and 5-cent cotton, the loss of farms through foreclosure, and the great swirling black clouds of dust that blotted out the sun and the hope of a crop for another year. With it came grasshoppers. I lived on my parents' farm in North Dakota at the time the grasshoppers stopped for lunch. When they took off again our crops went with them.

During the 10 years after World War I, more than 450,000 farmers lost their farms because they couldn't make enough money to pay off their loans. Two hundred thousand farmers became tenants because they were unable to buy their farms.

Our family-type farmer is our most important agricultural unit, both economically and socially. If we can't maintain it as a reasonably profitable kind of life and living, we will start an economic and social prairie fire such as we have never had. The principle of a family living on its own land was established and developed by our Founding Fathers and still remains the saving feature of our individuality. It is and always has been our national policy.

Our wonderful country was settled by people who wanted to own their own soil. They broke away from tyranny, abuse, taxation without representation, and fled here to build America. Thomas Jefferson said, "The small landholders are the most precious part of the State." How was it done in the new world? Large estates were broken up and parceled out to citizens as small farms. The Government opened up public lands for individual settlement. People from the old world sought political democracy, on the basis of economic democracy, that of individual citizens to own productive land. Politics and economics, friends, still are synonymous. They always shall be.

In 1800, Congress in a battle against land speculators, fixed 160 acres as a family-sized farm. That is the size a family could earn a living on. Now, of course, that figure varies with the soil, location, and several other elements that have come into the picture. But it stuck to the principles of equal opportunity for all and not only for a few. When Lincoln signed the Homestead Law for family farms, call it subsidy if you want to—he said, "I am in favor of settling the land into small parcels so every man can have a home."

The desire to settle land, to populate it, and to keep it productive, is still with us. Our farmers are 13.6 percent of the population of the United States but they have only 6 percent of the income. Official Government figures show that from 1919 to 1922 all farm prices dropped 40 percent. At the same time, if the theory back of the sliding scale is correct, we should have seen a definite drop in the production of farm commodities. Despite the 40 percent drop, farm production went up 1 percent. From 1930 to 1932 farm prices went down 57 percent but farm production went up 4 percent. 1936 to 1939 prices dropped 17 percent, but production went up 18 percent. As a nation we must be concerned with a fair standard of living for all of our people including the farmer.

First, let me develop the needs of agriculture as I see them from our farming experience in Minnesota.

I have found that to start farming today one needs capital outlay of from $20,000 to $40,000. Our farming is now a highly specialized occupation. When I lived on the farm, it meant getting up at 5 o'clock in the morning to help with the milking before breakfast. For my husband it meant that after breakfast, he got the machinery ready to do whatever was necessary and urgent for that day. It could be plowing, cultivating, harvesting, threshing, or hauling hay in winter. Much of the time, the weather was below zero. If there was a breakdown

of machinery, it meant he had to go to town for repairs and parts, another time-consuming venture. Often our work was hindered by weather, too much of the wrong kind, and lack of the kind that would bring our crops through. Farming on the family-type farm is not a seasonal job. It has to be a year-round job to have some income. We were constantly tied down. We couldn't take a week or two for a vacation. We couldn't afford $150 a month for a farmhand. Our margin was too narrow between price and cost.

Did you know that the cost of a plow tractor at today's prices would have financed the production expenses on an average United States farm in 1910 for 3½ years? I have found that in terms of current dollars, today's farm production expenses are about six times those of the 1910–14 period. Today that means that the price of a tractor plow equals the expense of running an average farm only 6 months.

As farmers we are dependent, to a large extent, on the rest of the economy. The only real benefit we derive nowadays from living on the farm is the milk we drink and the eggs we eat. We have meat in the lockers and some of us still have gardens. For this the farmer pays about half in the cost of its production. Let us measure this against the higher taxes we have because of improved roads, school and public buildings, and the increased costs of farming. Rising costs and falling prices have brought the farmer at the end of 1953 to the smallest share of the national income on record. The average person living on the farm has less than half the income of the average nonfarm individual. Though taxes are high, Government outlays for agriculture, however, represent such a small percent of the total Federal expenditure that the average taxpayer would scarcely notice the difference even if all Government farm programs were abolished. In fact, the income tax alone that farmers paid, when receiving parity, nearly covered the total cost of the farm program. Of the budget dollars in 1954, 17 cents was allotted to the cost of running the Government, providing all the services to labor, agriculture, industry, including health, education, welfare programs, and the development of natural resources.

Second, we must be concerned with the standard of living our rural population has. Forty years ago, farmers produced most of their own power, raised most of their own fuel, and depended mainly on farm-produced fertilizer. As we can see, most of the material for production came from the farm. Before the mid-thirties, farmers could reduce their purchases from industry without a serious loss in production. But today farmers cannot produce without material from industry. These must be paid for in cash. Today farmers are producing more with less labor and little more land, because petroleum and electrically driven machines are more efficiently performing the work done by men and animals. As late as 1935 there were only 1 million tractors on farms. Today we have 4 million. In 1935 we had about 900,000 trucks; now we have 2,280,000. At that time there were 120,000 milking machines; now there are 655,000. Farmers use each year 7 million tons of finished steel, more than the quantity that goes into a year's output of passenger cars. Farmers are big consumers, buyers of tremendous amounts of goods.

In other materials produced by industry and labor, farmers use 50 million tons of chemical material, 16½ billion gallons of crude oil, more than is used by any other industry. Today farmers are using 320 million pounds of raw rubber, enough rubber to make tires for 6 million cars. Our farmers use 15 billion kilowatt hours of electric power, which is enough to supply Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore and Houston for 1 year.

We have come to the crossroads where the American farmer is concerned. If we are to preserve farming as a way of life, if we are to be concerned with their standard of living, if we are to keep them from being driven off their land by a sliding scale price support program, which in a few years is no support program at all, now is the time to take some positive action.

When we have the process of falling farm prices, falling farm income, expansion of farm debt, bankruptcies, increase in tenant operation of absentee-owned farms—farm abandonment and concentration into larger and larger holdings, a very severe strain is placed upon the farm resources, soil, water, fences, machinery, and the rest. The farm owner tries to meet his costs and repayment on debts as he tries harder and harder to hold on to his farm. Something must give somewhere, so the land, water, buildings, improvements, and other capital assets begin to suffer. Before long they begin to deteriorate very badly, if the family has not already given up the fight and moved to town.

There will be no surplus problem when the soil resources are gone and the farm people have moved away. If that's the way we want to reduce the pressure of supplies on effective demand, we can do it. The sliding scale way will involve a lot of human suffering and resource loss, but in the long run it may bring supplies in balance with demand. But that ultimate day when the sliding scale has worked its final result will be a sad day for the Nation.

Picture the situation—the sliding-scale program has brought farm production into line with demand. Not many farm families are left on the land. National population has increased apace. Farmlands and water resources have been depleted and eroded. Families still on the land are deeply in debt. Living standards on the farm are unbelievably low. Much top soil has been lost; water tables have dropped; soil structure has been irreparably injured; improved farm technology has not been adopted and placed in use.

Then imagine just at the moment when the sliding-scale approach has attained this zenith of its mission, and supply just barely balances demand—a national emergency breaks out. How many billions would we then be willing to spend to bring the families back to the land, to recapture the lost top soil, to replenish the depleted water tables, to rehabilitate the farm plant so the people of our Nation will not go hungry?

This does not need to happen.

What can be done to prevent this black picture from becoming reality? What should have been done about it? Is the farm problem so perverse that it cannot be solved by wise and intelligent national policies? Are farm people somehow morally degenerate when they want and think they should be able to earn by their work, management, and property ownership, increased incomes equivalent to those earned by people of other occupations who utilize an equal amount of effort, skill, and capital assets?

There is, of course, no secret to the answer to these questions. It will, and can, be solved by wise and intelligent national policies—strongly and effectively administered. Those problems cannot be solved by half-hearted, part-time efforts based upon outmoded and unworkable economic theories. But they can be solved by the intelligent and sympathetic use of improved family farm policies such as you people in the Farmers Union are fighting for.

Your Farmers Union family farm income protective program starts with the basic truth that the capability of food and fiber is a great tangible national asset. This asset can and should be used for the great good and benefit of our Nation and all its people. National policies necessary to do this must be grounded on three basic principles:

First, we must preserve and improve the family farm pattern of American farming. This mode of combined farm business and farm living is the envy of the rest of the world. It is an example of hope and encouragement to the hundreds of millions of the world's people who depend upon agricultural production for their livelihood. The family farm in the United States is one of democracy's greatest exhibits before a troubled world.

Second, the farm people living and working on, and managing their family farms, should be given every legitimate opportunity and protection to enable them to earn full parity family incomes. A truly democratic nation cannot permit nor will it long endure if it permits continuation of a situation where national economic policies weighted against farmer in the marketplace clamp upon the 22 million people on our farms a chroic status where they can earn less than 45 percent of a fair parity income.

The third principle upon which our national farm policies should be based is that as a Nation we should enable our farm families to produce not only the continuous abundance needed to fulfill the market needs of those at home and overseas of those who now have the purchasing power to buy. We should also make positive use of the abundant production capacity of America's farms to eliminate hunger in this country and to use our abundant farm production as capital assets to promote more rapid economic development in the still free have-not nations of the world.

We must be concerned that as an intelligent and progressive people we maintain a progressive standard of living for our whole Nation.

People who lack proper diets number among the 60 percent that make less than $4,000 a year. Folks above this figure buy just about all the food they want and need. As the incomes go lower, the consumption of healthful foods goes with it, so that finally protective foods reach the vanishing point. There is no excuse in this enlightened and advanced Nation to permit the continued existence of poor nutrition and clothing standards in the midst of plenty. We should immediately initiate a complete nationwide food-allotment stamp plan.

The population of the United States has increased 68 percent since 1910. Our farm production has increased about the same amount during the same period but with most of the increase coming in the last 15 years. Population has caught up with production, so now our problem lies in distribution.

Our largest overall problem lies in distribution. America must grow to be prosperous. With the growth of America, comes more jobs, more income, more consumption of food and fiber. The Paley Commission gave a conservative estimate that we will need 40 percent more food and fiber by 1975 to adequately feed and clothe our people. This increase will have to come from our family-type farms.

We are at the beginning of a new era. We must go forward with our abundance, the creation of which grows from the bottom up. We need a steady climb up the economic ladder. A ladder that was itself on the rise. We cannot let it skid any further. Holding the ladder firmly in place is our Government. With the advent of World War II, as the noted economist, Stuart Chase expressed it, came the advent of a new regulator on the flow of our economic resources. Where Wall Street previously controlled a volume of money which directly affected our country, sometimes used for our good, sometimes to our detriment, now the Federal spending and Federal regulation have firm control of the ladder's legs to guard the destiny of our economy. Principles of Government help have been accepted by every segment of our people.

Perhaps business was one of the first to accept help. When industry needed help or protection, a tariff was used to prevent smothering competition. We also have trade regulation to maintain fair practices. We have established minimum-wage laws. These are accepted patterns in a complicated society. Where problems grow so large that individuals cannot cope with them, we must solve these problems with Government help.

Therefore parity prices now mean even prices in troublesome times with the added advantages of plenty. Parity simply means justice—fairness. I want parity for the farmer, too. We must not sacrifice the farmer and his family when he is nailed against high costs of production over which he has no control.

At this very moment we are perhaps in the gravest circumstances our beginner farmers have ever seen in our land. With high living and production costs, the beginner farmer's price just does not stretch to meet the interest and capital payments.

I have just learned of a threatened foreclosure by the Farm Home Administration because the individual was not able to make the last $100 of his $500 payment. This calls for investigation, and believe me I am going to investigate.

Cost statistics of farm losses in the Wall Street Journal may mean very little to the Wall Street broker, but they mean something to the farmers of Indiana. When the Wall Street Journal itself figures about 3 out of every 4 auctions are for beginner farmers there is something wrong.

Auctioneers have told me that normally there is a week of sales per month in a normal spring. Last year the farm auctions ran the month through.

It is normal for a farmer to dispose of his farm and stock when the prime years of his life are passed. But is not normal for farmers to dispose of farms before they have begun farming. There is something wrong with our economy and it hurts. Our young people must start their lives sometime, and without a sinker to mire them in quicksand parity. Twenty thousand dollars to $40,000 investments are not plucked off trees.

It will take more than a sop report on low-income families to quench the thirst for farm income. It will take more than tears over a wind-eroded farm, to cover crop insurance loss. These young family farmers must be protected now or sink into oblivion.

I do not propose to know everything and all of the solutions. However, I do know the practices that have proved themselves, should be used, not reversed, not forsaken. In the terms of progress we must explore the new avenues which we have not used. We need at least 90-percent parity until another solution takes over. Let us promote adequate diets for the 15 million people on public assistance and the unemployed. Let all our schools have lunch programs to help equalize opportunity for healthy minds to learn. Food for international aid should be used in such a way that it will be welcome and not revolting to needy people.

Friends, we can develop farm life to take its rightful place in our standard of living and to maintain it as a most satisfying way of life. This is a crucial problem affecting us—our stake—yours and mine. Conditions for the first tobacco grower who settled in Virginia creased his troubled brow, to be solved by his thought and imagination, just like we must wipe the crease of hardship from our farmer's brow today. Our son tugs into his uniform of service for our protection. When he leaves our Armed Forces, opportunity must be available for him and all others to choose as he pleases. Whether he wishes a drygoods store in Brooklyn, or a $30,000 farm in Indiana, the choice to a fair standard of living is right for us all. The glitter of opportunity has always been the gem of America.

Poor Man's Tax Reduction and Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill that seeks to help the low-income taxpayer in two ways: First, to raise the existing tax exemption from $600 to $800 for all taxpayers and their dependents, including those entitled to exemption because of old age or blindness; and second, to provide for a special deduction to taxpayers for educational expenses up to $1,000 which they incur in connection with the college education of their dependent children.

Because of this double-barreled help to the low-income, and also middle-income, families whose tax burden should be reduced, I call my measure the poor man's tax reduction and education bill.

I shall not dwell at length on the first part of my bill because it is self-explanatory. Income-tax day, April 15, is almost around the corner and before long we will have the usual cry and complaint from the average taxpayer who is having a real tough time to meet his budget and somehow is always left without any surplus after paying his taxes. I believe it is high time that he be given some consideration for a tax cut in the form of increasing his exemption and the exemptions of his dependents.

In recent years, the low- and middle-income groups have shared very little in tax reductions, since most of the tax benefits were granted to the high-income group, to the big corporations, the big investors, and big business generally. To my way of thinking, taxes should be based on the ability to pay. It is not unfair to ask that the greatest burden of taxation be placed on those enjoying the larger incomes and making the most profits. That should be regarded as axiomatic and morally justified. The burden of the middle- and lower-income groups should be made proportionately lighter and more easy to carry. At the present time the burden of taxation falls most heavily on these sections of our population, because they are least able to carry that burden.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be a false and unrealistic approach on the part of the Government to show tax favoritism to the upper income strata, while ignoring the low-income taxpayers. A tax cut for low-wage families is desirable as a matter of equity, and I shall pursue the fight for this legislation in the 85th Congress. Adoption of my bill would mean about $3 more each week in the average wage earner's pay envelope, or about $150 additional and direct income per family each year.

Incidentally, this reduction will not necessarily constitute a total loss to the Government. The added income will unquestionably augment the purchasing power of the Nation. It will help to stimulate greater consumption of all goods in all types of businesses and, consequently, will improve business everywhere. As such it will serve as a boon to the economy of the country, and much of this money will be coming back into the Government's Treasury coffers in the form of sales, income, and other taxes.

The second part of my bill not only seeks to help the taxpayer, but in the long run will prove to be of great help to the Nation as a whole. It provides for an income-tax deduction of up to $1,000 for college expenses. This is to be in the nature of a special deduction, in addition to the regular exemption now provided in the law for dependent children. The bill requires, however, that the dependent must pursue a bona fide course of higher education beyond the high-school level, which means at a college, university, or other institution of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion recognizes two very important facts in present-day America: First, the rising cost of a college education; second, the increasing social and economic value of a higher education. A generation or so ago, a college education was generally regarded as a luxury which only the rich could afford for their children. A poor man's children or even those of middle-class families could obtain such education only at considerable sacrifice on the part of the family. The growth of the Nation's economy in the last two decades, our high standard of living, and the changing concept of educational needs in present-day society, have taken the college degree out of the luxury category. Today such a degree is a necessary qualification for employment in many fields, just as a high-school education was a generation ago.

But aside from that there is a greater need for higher education of our youth from the standpoint of national security. We have had a number of studies and surveys by Congress and governmental agencies which show a growing shortage of scientists and professional people of all types. The demand for skilled talent in nearly every field of endeavor is said to be unprecedented, particularly in science and engineering where shortages in some instances have reached a critical stage. What this means for our national defense and our industrial activity is illustrated in the testimony of the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who told a Senate committee last year that 800 companies were competing for 700 of that school's students.

A further illustration is the more recent observation by Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, who said:

> It is entirely possible that if we cannot get enough qualified men to operate and maintain the increasingly complex equipment of this jet-electronic-nuclear air age, the Air Force could be forced into a technological retreat.

In an interim report, dated July 12, 1956, by the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the subject Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower, it is stated as follows:

> At a time when science and technology are the key both to military superiority and to

economic strength, the popular consciousness of the immediate and urgent need for men and women to man the laboratories, the drawing boards, and the production lines is essential. * * * The shortage of skilled talent in this country is a very real problem and one with which we must come to grips if we are to maintain the present rate of growth which is so essential to the Nation's strength and well-being. We are, in essence, engaged in a battle for brainpower.

It seems to me, that the battle for brainpower is not determined so much by our scientific and technical personnel which has been trained in recent years, as by those still in process of training and those to be trained in the future. In other words, we can truly say that our national security and our prosperity in the future are being decided in today's classrooms in the schools and colleges. This is one battle which we cannot afford to lose.

It has been widely reported in recent years that Soviet Russia is training her youth in the sciences and professions at a more rapid pace than we are doing. In fact, in an address at Columbia University last year, Mr. Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, made this observation:

In round numbers the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000.

If that is the case, it means we are losing the educational battle for brainpower.

It is not that we are lacking in human resources, or that the youth of our country is lacking in ambition or ability. We have the brainpower, but we are not developing it sufficiently. We are not doing enough to encourage our people, to afford them with the means and the opportunity to develop their abilities in accordance with the needs of the country in this crucial era. The best way to achieve this is by encouraging larger numbers of American youth to seek a higher education.

Among the major requirements for a program of action listed in the interim report of the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is one which reads as follows:

Greater encouragement of students with high ability to continue their education beyond high school and removal of economic barriers.

It is worth noting the subcommittee's view on removing economic barriers to enable students to continue their education. I need not belabor the point that a college education is quite an expensive undertaking these days, which in many instances is unfortunately beyond the reach of low- and middle-income families. Parents today find themselves in a tight spot when they have to spend about $1,500 and even $2,000 per year for their child's college education. The $600 tax deduction for a dependent child to which they are entitled is pitifully below the real costs of maintaining a child in college. As a result, many capable and worthy students who should continue their education are deprived of this opportunity.

The loss in such instances is not merely that of the individual concerned or his family. When multiplied in the thousands and tens of thousands it constitutes a loss for the whole Nation which, in the long run, means a terrific loss of trained manpower. For our own self-interest, I feel that we must adopt a more realistic approach to this problem by helping to lighten the burden of parents who wish to give their children a higher education.

A step in this direction is my bill to allow a deduction on college expenses up to $1,000. How much of a tax savings would the adoption of this bill mean for parents, and conversely how much of a loss in revenue would this constitute for the Government? Only a rough estimate can be made. The number of college students in the country is about 1,900,000. Taking into account expenses for tuition, room, board, and other costs, it is estimated that the total loss of revenue to the Government would be somewhere around $200 million to $250 million annually. We shall be spending about 20 or 25 times that amount in foreign aid alone this year. The taxpayer permitted this deduction would save about $100 million to $150 million annually, which means that parents would be helped to the extent of about $500 over the 4-year period when their child attends college. While this does not constitute a huge sum, it would certainly be helpful and encouraging to many parents and provide new opportunities for many young people.

Let me point out another factor which is perhaps overlooked by many. A taxpayer is allowed a deduction for any contribution he makes to an educational institution. The question I raise is this: If the taxpayer can deduct this contribution to an institution for the education of others, not known to him, why should he not be entitled to a similar deduction for his contribution toward the education of his own children? I believe such deduction makes sense.

And, finally, it should also be noted that unless tax deductions are permitted to ease some of the burden of the costs of higher education, colleges and universities will become more and more dependent on Federal and State subsidies and on grants from foundations and corporations. While I regard such subsidies and grants as necessary and desirable, grave damage would be done in the years ahead to the American system of education if our schools of higher learning become totally dependent on the support of government, business corporations, and private foundations while the role of the individual is completely overshadowed and ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my bill, the poor man's tax reduction and education bill, is the practical answer to a serious need. I urge the Congress to enact it at an early date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we continue to go forth into the hours of this new day, may we see more clearly and define more accurately the meaning and purpose of life in terms of service and the common good.

Inspire us to order our character and conduct in such a way that they shall be in complete agreement with the creed we confess of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Help us to realize the absolute insecurity and the ultimate failure of a life that is intent upon personal aggrandizement and strives to gratify its own selfish desires.

May we seek more earnestly to be the messengers and mediators of the spirit of generosity and good will to needy humanity everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the great Minister and Master of men who went about doing good and always responded to the calls and cries of weakness and want, of sorrow and suffering. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE VISIT OF KING SAUD TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, perforce as a Member of the legislative branch of the American Government I can entertain no legal objections to the meeting of the President with any head of state of any foreign country, but in the light of King Saud's visit next Tuesday to the United States, it might be well to point up at this seasonal time the Senate's previously enacted resolution which called on the various friendly nations not to discriminate against any segment or nationality of American citizenry.

The record indicates that American Jewish soldiers in the American forces have been separated from the regiments to avoid possible humiliation when their groups became stationed in Saudi Arabia.

Second, American Jewish visitors and business people have been arbitrarily deprived of the right of entry to that country.

King Saud, in paying respects to our country should pay them to one and all. His visit should not be at the sacrifice of any American principle and it occurs to me that this would be an appropriate moment for our great President of the United States to implement in his conversations while working with King Saud, the nobility of the American tradition and the American stand for fair treatment.

The finest possible way for us to demonstrate our way of life is to insure his

meeting representatives of all our people—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants; labor as well as business.

We are proud of the fact that we can live together, in the United States, as a whole people striving for ever greater racial and religious harmony. We have before us a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate that fact.

I trust that the State Department, in its concern for the anti-Semitic sensibilities of our royal visitor, will not instruct its employees of Jewish faith to stay home from work so as to avoid offending King Saud during his visit.

It would be a national disgrace if American honor was compromised in this instance.

BIRMINGHAM'S FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call public attention to Birmingham's sixth annual festival of arts, which is contributing materially to the cultural development of our region and also is strengthening Anglo-American ties. The festival theme serves to link Alabama and England, who both are proud of their iron and coal queen cities of Birmingham.

The festival of arts opens tomorrow night with a beaux arts ball and pageant of "merrie olde England." Mr. I. P. Garran, minister—commercial—of the British Embassy in Washington, is to be honor guest for this special occasion.

The festival will continue for more than 3 weeks with almost daily events. This extended program is put on through the combined efforts of some 36 organizations, which have contributed immeasurably toward the success of the festival. It is truly the result of an inspired populace, and we of Birmingham are indeed glad that it is festival time again.

This is an event with an international flavor and one that is already attracting worldwide notice. The British Broadcasting Corporation and the Voice of America are heralding this spirit of friendship between our two great sovereign nations. The Birmingham festival comes at a time when our diplomatic relations are somewhat strained. The festival should do much toward closing the gap before it widens.

Equally as important as its international effect is the festival's contribution to our community culture. The calendar of events includes pop concerts, ballet, opera, organ recitals, band concerts, drama, exhibits of English paintings, showings of English films, historical exhibitions, panel discussions, art studio tour, Anglo-American affairs forum, and a fashion show. Most of the programs are open to the public without charge, with special programs arranged to be of interest to children.

In addition, festival prizes will be awarded in the fields of drama, music, art, literature, and photography. Cash prizes totaling almost $3,000 will be given amateur playwrights, composers, artists, writers, and photographers. This prize money was contributed by the good people of Birmingham. Other prizes are to be awarded in special fields, such as architecture, flowers, and special English exhibits in store windows. Silver awards will be presented citizens who have made outstanding contributions in the field of drama, music, literature, art, and dance.

For the festival, the Birmingham Public Library has arranged displays of English books—those by British authors and others about England. The Birmingham Museum of Art is exhibiting British paintings lent by museums all over America. There will be numerous programs emphasizing English times and customs.

The Highlands Methodist Church will present a concert featuring a chorus of English handbell ringers. On the same program the Birmingham-Southern College ensemble will sing a number of Madrigal songs. English antiques in a number of Birmingham homes will be displayed in a pilgrimage. There will be an English tea party at Arlington Shrine, a famous old mansion of the War Between the States. Women's clubs will study, through films and lectures, the scenic gardens of England.

T. S. Eliot's Murder in the Cathedral will be presented by the Town and Gown Civic Theater, in cooperation with the Episcopal Church of the Advent choir. The famed Red Shoes ballet will be given by the Birmingham Civic Ballet Company. The ballet will feature Miss Gage Bush, who is reigning as festival queen. The Junior Town and Gown will offer Knave of Hearts as a children's event.

Other festival programs will include the Birmingham Civic Opera Association's chamber opera Sunday Excursion with Andrew Gainey, the Boston Pops Orchestra in its first Birmingham appearance, the Birmingham Symphony Orchestra with Witold Turkiewicz and guitarist Andrea Segovia as guest artists, the Third Army Band in concert, Jose Greco and company for a Spanish ballet, a fashion show with Gordon MacRae, concert pianist Artur Rubenstein, and a concert by the combined Birmingham and Montgomery youth orchestras.

A stellar attraction will be the American premiere of Love From Judy, a first-rate musical scheduled for five performances by the University of Alabama Birmingham Center's Town and Gown Civic Theater. The music is by Birmingham's Hugh Martin of Broadway fame. Miss Alabama, Anne Ariail, is among the cast.

Official representatives of Great Britain are on many festival programs. Besides Mr. Garran, other special English guests will include Mr. Reginald Watts, British consul from Atlanta, who will be presented at the opening of the English paintings exhibit; Gen. Sir Ronald Adams, who will appear on a literary program; Mr. Donald MacFarlain, commercial counselor of the British Embassy, and Mr. Alec Robertson, British information officer, who will talk at separate showings of films about Britain; and the Earl of Antrim, speaking on Anglo-American affairs.

The special film showings will include scenes of the coronation and cover such subjects as the Lake District, Impressions of London, Festival in Edinburgh, Westminster Abbey, and Churches of England.

The Birmingham Men's Camellia Society is also cooperating in the festival program and is exhibiting camellias of the variety sent to Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth.

The festival program, which includes 42 separate events, has been in preparation for months. Mrs. David Roberts III, herself a native of England, is festival chairman and has worked hard to coordinate the efforts of thousands of her fellow Birmingham citizens. She was chairman of last year's festival, which was also a memorable event, and her townspeople gave her due honor and recognition in naming her Birmingham's 1956 woman of the year.

As one can easily see, this inspiring festival is a community's endeavor for the community's good. We Birmingham folks are very grateful for this chance to profit by centuries of English culture, pausing at the same time to review our own great advances. We take enormous pride in our citizens' gigantic, unselfish undertaking in building this outstanding festival. I have asked for festival programs for every Member of Congress. We are proud of our festival of arts in Birmingham, and we want the world to know.

PUBLIC USE OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 2019, a bill to establish the policy of Congress with respect to public use of the national forests and to provide for the development and maintenance of facilities for public use. This is the same legislation that I introduced during the 84th Congress, and I am very grateful for the fact that our Subcommittee on Forestry of the full Committee on Agriculture had an extended hearing on this and similar legislation during the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

On January 16, 1957, I received, along with other Members of Congress, an interesting letter from Mr. Richard E. McArdle, the able Chief of the Forest Service, with an attached pamphlet entitled "Operation Outdoors." In this pamphlet we are given an excellent plan for the improvement of recreational facilities in our national forests over the next 5 years. The only problem, it seems to me that we have, is how to obtain the money for the 5-year program. If H. R. 2019 were passed into law, I believe it would make it possible for us to get the money that we need to improve these

recreational opportunities in our great national forests.

Recreation visits to the national forests are expected to hit the 66 million mark by 1962. These visits numbered an all time high, 45.5 million in 1955, as compared to 18.2 million in 1946. Most of the facilities that we have at the present time were built by the Civilian Conservation Corps between 1933 and 1941, and naturally these facilities have greatly deteriorated under excessive use.

The plan projected by Chief McArdle of the Forest Service anticipates a budget of $85 million over the next 5-year period to take care of an expanded recreational program. I am wondering whether our Appropriations Committee will be inclined to appropriate that amount out of general tax funds, in lieu of our high national debt and present high volume of defense spending. I know that the Appropriations Committee will be as generous as they think they possibly can be, but I believe there should be some certain definite revenues earmarked for recreation in our national forests.

Beginning several Congresses ago, bills designed to provide these funds and solve this perplexing problem were introduced in Congress. At first these bills took the simple form of providing that a certain percentage of all the receipts of the national forests should be set aside into a special fund to be used for the development, maintenance, and operation of recreational facilities within the national forests. This was a simple and effective plan and there was precedent for it in laws, providing for the setting aside of a part of the Forest Service receipts for other special purposes. For example, we know that Congress has provided that an amount equal to 25 percent of the gross receipts from the national forests be paid each year by the United States Treasury to the States for distribution to counties containing national-forest lands. In addition to these direct cash payments to the States, Congress has provided that 10 percent of the national-forest receipts be made available each year for expenditures on forest roads and trails in the States of origin. Many persons have objected to this approach in principle, however, believing that the policy of establishing special funds which can be spent without further approval of Congress, and of establishing permanent appropriations, is not the best governmental procedure. Most of the major conservation groups and organizations in the country alined themselves solidly behind this approach, and I, myself, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, introduced H. R. 4994, which follows this approach. By the terms of this bill, there would have been set aside an amount equivalent to 10 percent of the moneys received from the national forests for each fiscal year, but not to exceed $5.5 million in any year, which would have been set apart in the Treasury as a special fund, and which would be spent under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture might prescribe for the development, maintenance, and operation within the national forests for facilities in areas for recreational use; for the improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat on the national forests; and for adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures in connection with uses of the national forests.

These bills have never been approved by Congress, and for several years now there has been a virtual stalemate, as it has been so far impossible to secure favorable action on this type of legislation.

As an alternative to this type of approach, there were introduced in the 82d Congress bills which would have established some kind of fee system whereby the users of the national forests for recreational purposes would have paid a small fee, and by their aggregate contributions would have provided the funds for maintaining additional facilities.

These bills, too, encountered the valid objection that they gave the Forest Service what amounted to a taxing power and turned over to it funds for expenditure without the necessity of presenting to the Congress and receiving approval of their plans.

These bills were also objected to by certain groups, who have said that they were opposed to having to pay anything, no matter how small, for the use of facilities in the national forests.

Since then, intermittent conferences have gone on almost constantly between the staff of the Committee on Agriculture and the various groups and agencies and individuals interested in this problem. A number of compromise bills were developed seeking to resolve the differences in viewpoint which heretofore have prevented effective legislative action. Limitations have been put on the amount of money which could be accumulated in this special fund; requirements have been included that the Forest Service should have to seek an appropriation each year, even though the money were coming from a special fund, and other licensing provisions and campfire permit provisions have been advanced.

The bill which I am now discussing, H. R. 7537 of the 84th session, and now H. R. 2019 of the 85th session, is not by any means an entirely new approach to the subject, but is rather, I believe, a refinement and development of the many proposals which have heretofore been made. The bill will authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the fee annually at a level which he estimates will reimburse the Treasury for appropriations made for the development, maintenance, and operation of these recreational facilities. The money will not go into a special fund. It will be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneour receipts, along with other Government income. The Forest Service will not have any fund available for expenditure without accounting to Congress. On the contrary, the Forest Service will seek and obtain its appropriations for recreational facilties in the usual budgetary manner, but the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will have the assurance when the appropriation is made that there will be no actual cost to the taxpayer and that every dollar appropriated for this purpose will be reimbursed to the Treasury by the special license fee established and collected by the Forest Service. I have confidence enough in our Committee on Appropriations to believe that they will recommend and the Congress will approve, an amount for recreational facilities in our national forests equivalent to the amount each year which is collected by the Secretary of Agriculture through the special fees.

I know that there will be those who will protest against the imposition of any fee or license for the use of what is regarded as general public property. I will not be impressed by these objections, however. It is not intended that there shall be a fee imposed for access to the national forests, but only for the use of certain facilities which are provided therein for campers and others using the forests for recreational purposes. To my way of thinking there is no more democratic way of doing business than to provide that those who use and enjoy special benefits and facilities should pay the major part of the cost of those facilities. I can see no reason why the taxpayer in Maine or New York City or Miami who may never have any opportunity of going into the national forests should bear any part of the cost of providing special facilities for me, and others like me, who do want to go into the forest and engage in fishing, hunting, and other recreational facilities. On the contrary, it seems quite plain to me that those of us who want to use these facilities should be willing to bear the cost of their development and maintenance. I think that every American who enjoys and loves the forests enough to want to get out into them will be proud and happy to have an opportunity to pay the small fee which will be assessed, and know that he is doing his part to provide the facilities that he uses, and to protect the forests and the watersheds against unnecessary damage.

Nor am I impressed by the protests that I assume will come from some people that here is another fee being added to the backs of the fisherman or the hunter. I have bought enough trout flies and bass plugs and shotgun shells in my life to know that the 50 cents or $1 fee per year that a sportsman may be asked to pay to maintain national forests recreational facilities is going to comprise such a small part of his recreational budget that he will have forgotten about it by the time he makes the next trip to the sporting goods store.

I want to stress that my bill does not visualize charging any casual visitor to the national forest a fee for eating a basket lunch or for pausing a short while to look at the beauty of the environment. I certainly do not have in mind penalizing the poor man whose back is already bending under the terrific burden of the high cost of living. I do visualize the visitor who spends hundreds of dollars each year on recreation accepting the opportunity to pay a small fee with a sense of responsibility that I believe belongs to all of us who love the great outdoors of America.

If my bill were passed, as I see it, the licenses required by the bill would be in most cases a windshield sticker that could be affixed to the automobiles of those using the forest facilities. The

price of the license would depend, of course, upon the amount of the appropriation and the estimated number of persons using the facilities. Our best rough estimate at the present time is that when the program got into full operation the fee would be somewhere between 50 cents and $1 per automobile each year. What a small amount to ask our people to contribute. If only 5 million of the 50 million people who used the national forests last year had paid $1 apiece, we could have an amount of $5 million already in the fund for improving our recreational facilities in our national forests, and it is a pleasing picture to project into the future about what could be done if we had this amount every year to use for recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that it is not my intention that a fee should be charged those people who in route from one place to another merely pass through the national forests, and stop along the road for a picnic or make other casual use of the forests. It is intended that the license and fee should apply to those who use special facilities such as a camping site to camp out at night in the forest, or to those who fish or who go there for skiing or hunting or similar recreational activities that require more than an ordinary amount of supervision and maintenance. It might be desirable that the criterion as to when a license is required might be determined on the basis of whether or not the person was staying overnight within the forest.

In 1953, the policy of making a moderate charge for use of the camping, picnicking, and swimming facilities was used at some 45 of the larger, better improved camp and picnic areas in our national forests. Our State forests make charges for special services. In other words, we have a precedent for the idea of making a modest charge for the use of special facilities. In the January 1957 publication of the Michigan Out of Doors, the official publication of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, is a headline article on the front page which states that 85 percent of the visitors in Michigan's State parks selected some type of user fee for all park users. This indicated that the public in Michigan, as far as the use of their State parks was concerned, was generally willing to finance State park improvements by direct user fees rather than general State funds and taxation. The survey was conducted on an impartial basis by the Michigan State University's Bureau of Business Research.

I visualize that we shall continue to have direct appropriations made from general revenue funds and that the fees derived from users will be in addition to those funds. In August of 1955 I, as a member of the Subcommittee on Forestry of the House Committee on Agriculture, traveled with other members of our subcommittee to many of the great national forests in the Far West. We visited in the States of Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California. Without an exception, I found the Forest Service valiantly trying to take care of the recreation demands, but faced with facilities that were hopelessly inadequate and deteriorated to a point beyond repair in many areas.

In my own district, the Eighth District of Florida, in the Osceola National Forest on the shores of a beautiful lake called Ocean Pond for many years there was a recreation building available for the public. However, the building was in such a deteriorated state it had to be demolished. Many hundreds of people in that area had enjoyed the facilities offered by this building and many times they have asked me if something could not be done to provide such facilities. The Forest Service has attempted a cooperative project between the Board of County Commissioners of Baker County, which is near the recreational area, and the Forest Service. The Forest Service has been helpful within the limits of their resources in every way possible. In many areas of our country these cooperative plans have been successful and have resulted in expanded recreational opportunities. However, the fact of the matter is that we still need more money appropriated directly to the Forest Service for an expansion of recreational facilities in our national forests.

The Forest Service, I know, has some doubts about this legislation that I am proposing. I have a high regard for members of the Forest Service, and I recall that during my visit to the national forests in the summer of 1955, that the morale of our Forest Service people was excellent, and I found without an exception in the areas that I visited that they were doing a magnificent job. Some of them have expressed concern to me about my bill because they are naturally worried about the amount of work it would require of the Forest Service and they were fearful they would not be able to supervise properly the recreational areas. They are concerned about being made policemen with all of the problems of being an enforcement agency. However, it should be pointed out that if we had more money for recreational facilities, there would be more money available for personnel to give proper supervision. I want to emphasize, also, that my plan is elastic and there is no rigidity in the formula, so techniques should be formulated in line with the Forest Service to insure the best possible course of action for the benefit of our people. I want to say very frankly, also, that in several areas in the far West during my visit in 1955 there were chambers of commerce and groups of sportsmen who lived close to the national forests who did not like the idea of charging anybody a fee for using national forest facilities. To these fine Americans I replied then, as I do now, that it was difficult for me to see why they who have the forests so close by could possibly object to a small fee of about $1 a year, and that I thought the money that would come to the forests for increased recreational facilities would actually bring many more visitors to their communities from other parts of the country and would result in increased prosperity. These visitors would naturally buy more fishing equipment and other paraphernalia that would be used in the improved recreational areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe if we could get the kind of a national-information program behind a fee system for the use of our forests, such as the great program of Smokey the Bear, to eliminate forest fires, that we could well instill in the hearts of our people a desire to buy these stickers to prove their interest in our great national forests.

As I visualize it, the license stickers would be on sale very generally in sporting goods stores, general stores, courthouses, and other public agencies, in similar convenient locations within reach of all the national forest areas. Special provision should be made in the Secretary's rules and regulations for parties which travel by bus, or in some manner other than by private automobile.

I want to emphasize that it is not my intention in this bill to turn forest rangers into policemen, and in my opinion, the policing job would be very slight. I cannot conceive of any redblooded American who likes to use and enjoy our national forests objecting to paying a very nominal fee, so small that it would not even cover the cost of one motion picture show here in metropolitan Washington, for the purpose of developing and maintaining the facilities he enjoys. Personally, I would be glad to have the privilege of buying such a license each year, even if I were not fortunate enough to get to make use of it, and I want to repeat again that I believe with the proper public-relations program back of this idea, that those who buy the stickers or the license would be proud to have the opportunity.

For the information of those who are interested, my bill, H. R. 2019, is printed below:

A bill to establish the policy of Congress with respect to public use of the national forests and to provide for the development and maintenance of facilities for public use

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Forest Public Use Act."

SEC. 2. It is the policy of Congress that public use of the national forests for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of such forests; that development and maintenance of areas and facilities for such public use, including safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat, and the concurrent maintenance of other forest values, including sources of water, is a proper function of the Federal Government; that the persons who make use of such areas and facilities should bear the major part of the cost of the development, maintenance, and operation of such areas and facilities; and that provisions should be made whereby the users of such areas and facilities may reimburse the Treasury for the current costs of such development, maintenance, and operation.

SEC. 3. In furtherance of the policy set out in section 2, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, to require a recreation-use license for the use of lands, improvements, and facilities in the national forests for recreational purposes, such as camping, picnicking, swimming, skiing, hunting, fishing, and similar pursuits, and to issue such licenses and provide for their sale by public and private agencies. Licenses may be issued for a calendar year or any portion thereof and the fees for such licenses shall be established annually and become effective on January 1 at a level esti-

mated by the Secretary to return to the Treasury in the aggregate (together with other related fees and charges) an amount substantially equivalent to the amount made available by the Congress for the development, maintenance, and operation of recreational areas and facilities in the national forests for the fiscal year in which the fees are established. All moneys received from the sale of such licenses shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and violation of such regulations shall be a petty offense as defined in title 18, United States Code, section 1 (3), punishable by a fine of not more than $100.

SEC. 5. The recreation-use license provided for in this act shall not relieve any licensee of the obligation to obtain any hunting, fishing, or other license which may be required under other provisions of Federal or State law, or relieve any licensee of his obligation to comply with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from establishing and collecting fees and charges for use of any national forest substantially improved recreation area where special services and facilities are provided nor to relieve any holder of the license authorized by section 3 from payment of any such fees or charges for the use of a substantially improved recreation area.

Mr. Speaker, I will welcome the interest of all my colleagues in helping me to obtain adequate funds for the promotion of recreational facilities in our national forests.

RESTORING THE COMPETITIVE MERIT SYSTEM TO THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to insure that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, reinvigorated by the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, retains its character as a competitive career service based on merit.

Public Law 1024, approved August 8, 1956, was designed to increase the prestige and effectiveness of the Fish and Wildlife Service. It specified that the Service should contain only two political appointments—the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife, and the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, both to be appointed by and with the consent of the Senate. It then established two bureaus—Commercial Fisheries and Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—with a director of each Bureau to be appointed by the Secretary at grades GS–17 each. Congress was saying, in short, that the 2 top jobs were to be political but that all jobs under these 2 were to be civil service. The bill I have introduced would reaffirm this principle.

THE NOVEMBER 27 LETTER

I have just learned of an attempt to undo the reform in the Fish and Wildlife Service before it has had a chance to get started. In a letter to the Civil Service Commission of November 27, 1956, Assistant Secretary of Interior Otis Beasley requested that the Civil Service Commission take from civil service and make political appointments out of 12 career positions in the Fish and Wildlife Service, 9 of them the top civil-service positions. The 12 positions include Directors of each of two bureaus, Associate Director for each bureau, Assistant Director for each bureau, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary, an assistant to said special assistant, special assistant to the Commissioner, private secretary to the Commissioner, and private secretary to each Director.

The Department of the Interior recognized that all of these positions were now under civil service, but instead requested that they be placed under schedule C, the device used for so many raids on the civil service in the last 4 years. When a job is blanketed under schedule C, it then becomes subject to political appointment. The Civil Service Commission has not yet acted on the November 27 request.

We have already had one look at what happens to the Fish and Wildlife Service when you let in the spoils system, and it is not reassuring. From the start of the Fish and Wildlife Service many years ago until 1953, it had a splendid tradition of career service. Its employees were 100 percent civil service, right up to and including the top man in the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Director. To an unusual degree, the Fish and Wildlife Service was staffed with men and women with technical skills and specialized knowledge, so that it was not surprising that it had kept its civil-service status from top to bottom.

DETERIORATION OF MORALE

But in 1953 schedule C was used to take from civil service and put under the spoils system 5 Fish and Wildlife officials, 4 of them at the top level. The 5 positions taken away from career employees and made subject to political appointment were those of the Director, 2 Assistant Directors, 1 Associate Director, and a private secretary.

The effect of this raid on the Fish and Wildlife Service was quick and destructive. The morale of the remaining career service went into a decline. Suddenly, the opportunity to advance to the top 4 positions on merit, which had attracted so many to the Fish and Wildlife Service, was taken away. Moreover, the top positions themselves, now under schedule C, became less attractive, because their civil-service protection had been stripped from them. As a result, recruitment for the top positions, both within the Service and from the State conservation departments and the universities, received a severe setback.

With morale within the Service shaken, and recruitment from without the Service seriously handicapped, the Fish and Wildlife Service drifted downward. Men who had devoted their lives to the career service found it necessary to resign from the Service. In a recent series of articles in the Milwaukee Journal, Russell G. Lynch has told the story of the decline in morale of the Service. Last November 27, Dr. Paul Hickie, acting chief of the branch of wildlife research, turned in his resignation with a blast at Director John L. Farley, a political appointee who is still there. Dr. Hickie said:

> Lack of decisions in the Director's office has had a shattering effect on morale. The atmosphere of encouragement, understanding, and reasonable support necessary for the Service to meet its responsibilities adequately and efficiently has not existed for 3 years.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Dr. Albert Day, the former Director, stuck it out for several years after he was demoted to assistant to the Director in hopes that he could still be effective under the new regime, but finally left in 1955 to go with the Arctic Institute of North America. Day's assistants, Clarence Cottam and Dr. John L. Kask, had already left to become, respectively, director of the Western Wildlife Foundation, and head of the Canadian Fisheries Research Board. Dr. Logan Bennett resigned as Chief of the Branch of Wildlife Research in 1953. Dr. Durward Allen, who became Acting Chief, resigned a year later. Dr. Joseph Linduska succeeded him and resigned last year. Ernest Swift, who had been director of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, was appointed Assistant Director in 1953, but he too resigned a year later.

A large part of the purpose of Public Law 1024 was to restore the morale of the Fish and Wildlife Service, by returning to it its civil service character. Faced with the ravages wrought by schedule C, Congress expressly provided that only the assistant secretary and the commissioner be political appointees. Indeed, Public Law 1024 went a long way in making positions political when it so designated the offices of assistant secretary and commissioner. It will be recalled that recommendation 18 of the first Hoover Commission—report on General Management of the Executive Branch, February 3, 1949—recommended that even certain assistant secretaries should be under Civil Service "where length of tenure makes appointment for career service preferable." Be that as it may, Congress indicated that it wanted the political appointments to end at these two top positions and go no further. Now the Department of the Interior is apparently attempting to undermine Public Law 1024 by removing from the Civil Service not merely the 4 top positions which were successfully removed in 1953, but the 9 top positions—in addition to the Assistant Secretary and Commissioner—which are the subject of its November 27, 1956, request to the Civil Service Commission.

WHERE POLITICS SHOULD END

It is significant that the appointment of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Ross Leffler was made on January 2, 1957, more than a month after the November 27 letter. Mr. Leffler has an outstanding conservation background. I cannot believe that he would have made the November 27 request had he then been appointed. Mr. Leffler could quickly set the minds of conservationists at rest that he does not intend a wholesale introduction of the spoils system

into the Fish and Wildlife Service by promptly rescinding the November 27 letter and announcing that all positions below that of Commissioner will be filled according to the procedures of the competitive Civil Service, as Congress intended.

After all, the operating policies which need to be determined by these officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service below the level of Assistant Secretary and Commissioner are not policies on which Republicans or Democrats should differ. Political decisions can be made by the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary and the Commissioner. Below that level, there is no need for political appointments.

I hope that Assistant Secretary Leffler will promptly withdraw the November 27 letter. In either event, passage of the bill herewith introduced would give renewed evidence of Congress' wish to maintain the principle of merit in the upper ranks of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the serious farm-income problem in Montana, as well as in other States, I am today introducing a bill which would permit farmers to substitute their earnings in the years between 1950 and 1954 for their low earnings in 1955 and 1956 in calculating old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This legislation also is being introduced in the Senate by Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, as well as my Montana colleague in the House, Mr. METCALF.

When social security was provided farmers, it was believed our older farm citizens should be retired at benefits based on income levels of the preceding years. The measure did not foresee what drought, a disastrous farm policy and other factors could do to slash farm incomes. This slash in net income for farmers from $16.1 billion down to less than $11.5 billion in 1956 affects many older farmers. The first large group of farmers is eligible this month to retire under the terms of the Social Security Act. The great majority of them, however, are finding their benefits greatly reduced because of low incomes in 1955 and 1956. There are instances of farmers who earn the maximum of $4,200 income on which benefits can be based who have had no, and I repeat, no income in 1955 and 1956 due to disaster conditions. Unless this proposed legislation of mine and companion measures of my colleagues is enacted, these farmers will be unable to retire as do persons in industry who enjoy the right under prior legislation of selecting their better income years.

THE LATE ALVIN F. WEICHEL

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of our former colleague, Congressman Al Weichel. Mr. Weichel passed away a short time ago. He will be remembered by all of us who knew him as a man of great ability and great industry. He had been for a long time the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and before coming to the Congress he had distinguished himself in his home section as being a very astute lawyer. He had held high positions with the Bar Association of Ohio, and he came here well prepared for his work as a Congressman, and he acquitted himself nobly and patriotically on every occasion. I am glad to bring this testimonial with reference to him to my colleagues.

I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the death of our late colleague Alvin Weichel, who served in this House with great distinction. During his service in the House he made many deep and lasting friendships. I have said many times that the middle aisle means nothing where friendship is concerned. Our late colleague was one whom I had the pleasure of knowing closely and one whom I respected deeply. He was a contributing Member of the House, a hard worker in committee, and always in constant attendance when the House was in session. I join with my friend from Ohio and the Ohio delegation in expressing my sympathy in the passing of our distinguished beloved colleague.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn from the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio of the death of our friend and colleague, Mr. Weichel. I served with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a most conscientious legislator. For years he gave a great amount of time, energy, and devotion to the affairs of that committee, of which he served as chairman in the 80th Congress. He was a very conscientious and industrious Member of the House. I felt a great deal of sympathy for him in his long illness, which compelled his retirement from public life. I wish to express my sympathy to his family.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, all of us are greatly saddened to know that Alvin F. Weichel, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the 13th Ohio District, has passed away, and we want to extend heartfelt condolences to his wife and family.

I had a somewhat unique relationship with Al, in that I was both his predecessor and successor. Following my resignation from Congress in 1942 to enter the United States Navy, Al was elected to represent the 13th District. He served six full terms with distinction, notably on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which he ultimately became chairman in 1953. Unfortunately his declining health forced him to step out of the committee chairmanship in the 83d Congress, and he decided not to seek reelection in 1954.

Like the late Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King, another native of the 13th Ohio District, Al Weichel did not care to win popularity contests. He had a strong moral sense that made him an outspoken critic of anything he viewed as compromise and vacillation. He sought only respect for his candor and dedication to principle, and he earned it from everyone who knew him.

A man of integrity and honesty, Al Weichel will be missed by all of us who knew and worked with him.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement from Congress and death of our able and distinguished colleague, Al Weichel, was a personal loss to me and, I feel certain, to all Members who had the privilege of knowing him.

Mr. Weichel and I were first elected to the 78th Congress and it has been my privilege to know him very well personally. I have always held him in the highest esteem. Mr. Weichel was devoted to his work in Congress and used his exceptional ability on behalf of the general welfare of his constituents and the Nation. Ohioans were proud when Mr. Weichel became chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and they were proud of the manner in which he conducted the affairs of that most important committee.

Al Weichel will remain in the history of Ohio as an able and distinguished statesman who zealously and faithfully served his constituents and his Nation. To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our former colleague, Alvin Weichel, has not only left me with a sense of personal loss, but has brought the same feeling to all the people in the 13th district of Ohio he served for so many years in the United States Congress.

I wish to join my friends in the House of Representatives today in paying tribute to one of the most dedicated, arduous workers in this legislative body. Alvin Weichel was what is known as a self-made man with two great ambitions

from boyhood—to protect and strengthen the transportation system on the Great Lakes, and to become an expert in the legal profession. Both of these goals he accomplished in his lifetime, although he never lived to see the full fruition of his efforts. Returning from World War I where he served with honor, he became a cabin boy on a Great Lakes ore carrier and saved his money for a college education which was not then so easily obtainable by veterans as it was after the last two wars. He graduated with honors from Michigan University with a law degree and for a number of years served as county prosecutor where he was highly respected. He was well known for his fairness and I have heard it said that men whom he had sent to jail later returned to visit him with nothing but friendship and respect for him in their hearts.

His brilliant legal mind served him well in the Congress where he labored so devotedly on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. During his last term—the 83d—he was responsible for initiating and promoting the merchant marine shipbuilding program in operation at the present time. Under his sponsorship took place the first departure from Government financing of ship construction. This program will strengthen our merchant marine without costing the taxpayers a cent, being financed as it is by private industry with a guaranty by the Government. I cite this as just one example of his accomplishments in the field of endeavor which was his greatest interest while in the Congress. His contribution to the shipping and fishing industry not only benefitted the people of the district he loved so much, but it strengthened the economy and very safety of the whole country and we are all indebted to him for his devotion to his foresight and vision.

We can truthfully say that Alvin Weichel died in the service of his country because he continued to carry on his duties for many months toward the end of the 83d Congress when he was a sick man. Only very reluctantly did he make his decision not to run for another term. His courage and perseverance in the face of suffering and poor health are a source of inspiration to all of us and we honor his memory. My sincere sympathy goes out to his widow and all the people of the 13th District of Ohio who had grown to love him so well.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Alvin Weichel, who served the 13th Ohio District in the Congress.

I knew Al Weichel before he became a Congressman, as a lawyer and prosecutor in Sandusky, Ohio, who tried his cases hard and well. As a Member of Congress, his head was not turned by public clamor, and he steadfastly followed his basic philosophy and his own political convictions in making a decision.

Al Weichel took particular pride in representing his district, and especially in rendering every service he could to those whom he represented. He served six full terms on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and was known as an authority on matters pertaining not only to the merchant marine but to problems of the commercial fisherman as well.

I will always remember him with highest regard and respect. We will all miss him greatly.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Al Weichel was one of my longtime friends. He was an able lawyer. This was attested by the fact that while he was prosecuting attorney of Erie County, the Ohio State Association of Prosecuting Attorneys chose him as its head.

He represented the congressional district which borders on the Eighth District of Ohio, which I represent. In 1952 Seneca County was transferred from his district to the Eighth. Subsequently I had the opportunity to mingle with his former constituents, and I soon learned that he was universally respected as a public servant. He applied himself diligently and ably to the task of serving his constituents, and he contributed a sound philosophy of government to the welfare of his country.

It was with genuine and sincere sadness that I learned of his death.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry indeed to learn of the death of my longtime friend and colleague, Al Weichel.

When I came to the House of Representatives in 1947, Al Weichel became one of my first and best friends. This friendship lasted permanently and was most helpful through the years, to me and to my constituents.

Al Weichel was a courageous, conscientious, farseeing Member of the House of Representatives. The good that he did will live long after his passing. His family has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point concerning the life and character of our late beloved friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute paid to our former colleague, Alvin E. Weichel, of Ohio, who passed away November 27, 1956.

Al Weichel came to Congress in January 1943. He served during the 78th Congress and up to and including the 83d, at which time he voluntarily retired on account of illness. Our offices adjoined each other in the Old House Office Building for several years and I became well acquainted with Al at that time and I value his friendship during his service in this House. He was a highly conscientious and hard working public official. He served in various capacities in his county and State before coming to Congress, having been prosecutor in his home district for a number of terms. He became Chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee during his last two terms in Congress and served with great ability in carrying on the work of that important committee.

Alvin Weichel was a veteran of World War I, a member of the American Legion and for years took an active part in veterans' affairs and problems in his home area.

He was a lawyer of outstanding ability. This experience he used to great advantage during his service in Congress. Unfortunately, he became stricken with illness about 3 years ago and was partially incapacitated from carrying on his profession up until the time of his passing last November.

The announcement of his death was sad news to me and the great number of friends he made during his service in this body.

I wish to extend to his wife Olga and his relatives my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Ohio and the other Members of the House in paying tribute to my good friend and former associate in the Congress, Alvin F. Weichel, whose recent death has been a great personal loss to all of us as well as to the State of Ohio and the Nation generally.

Al Weichel, as we called him, was a hard-working, sincere, and able representative of the people in the Congress of the United States. Before coming to Washington, he had established himself as one of the outstanding attorneys at law of our State. He was honest and conscientious; and, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he helped guide through the Congress many important pieces of legislation. He was especially interested in the welfare of shipping and commerce on the Great Lakes, and the people of that section of the United States and Canada owe him a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid.

We shall miss Al Weichel, and we who served with him are better for having known him. He has left behind him the priceless heritage of a good name and to those of us who called him friend and colleague many precious memories.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in tribute to the memory of Alvin Weichel.

Most of us here know of his many years of service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, including his chairmanship during the 80th Congress, and of the splendid contribution he made in this special field of endeavor. As one whose work on the Appropriations Committee brings him into contact with maritime activities, I can testify that Alvin Weichel's influence and accomplishments in building American merchant shipping will be a permanent memorial to his name.

As an Ohio lawyer, I can testify also to his leadership in the field of law. As prosecuting attorney, president of the

Ohio Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, special counsel for the attorney general of Ohio, member of the Ohio bar examiners committee, he distinguished himself in his profession.

All of us regret the illness that cut short this splendid and useful career, and our deepest sympathy goes out to his family. They may take comfort in the fact that his contributions to better government in his country, in his State, and in the Congress of the United States will be long remembered.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time accorded me to give to my good friend the recognition which is due him for his long, brilliant, honest, and sincere career as a Congressman.

FARM INCOME DATA BY ECONOMIC FARM CLASS

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has traditionally shown strong interest in the well-being of the American farmers. There has also been a growing concern over the particular plight and role of the small-family farmer in our economy and our society.

We have experimented with various types of price support, credit facilitation, research, and extension activities and programs. However, one of the handicaps from which we suffer in applying these programs is that we cannot accurately assess their impact upon various classes of farmers.

Congress would be greatly assisted in passing legislation which applied equitably to the various classes of farmers if we had accurate, annual farm income data by economic class of farm. Last July representatives of the National Farm Bureau and the National Grange expressed in testimony their regret that we had insufficient, accurate, and current data on farm incomes of various classes of farmers.

We do know that gross differences exist among different types of farmers. For example, in 1954 the agricultural census revealed that we had 4.7 million farms. Two million of the larger commercial farms, although mostly of a family-type nature, produce nearly 85 percent of our annual marketable crop value and their owners receive nearly 80 percent of net farm income. This helps demonstrate that average farm-income figures distort the well-being of various types of farmers and provide an inadequate figure for policy determinations.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm as a companion bill to S. 405 introduced by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS of the Senate. We introduced similar bills in the last session of Congress.

I would like to quote from the favorable reports given last year on a similar bill introduced by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget.

The Department of Agriculture report states:

> This Department recommends that the bill be passed.
>
> The bill provides that the Bureau of the Census henceforth collect farm income data by economic class of farm in its annual current population survey of consumer incomes, taken in April of each year, and covering incomes in the previous year. The current population survey of consumer incomes has been taken annually since 1945. It has always included a small sample of farm operators, and has usually published summary money income data for farm operators as a group. The present sample is inadequate to obtain income information by economic class.
>
> The bill will make it possible to obtain more adeqaute farm-income information by economic class of farm. This identification of farms by economic classes will be very helpful in many respects in dealing with the problems of agriculture. In fact, as indicated by the President's message to Congress on January 9, 1956, and a House Committee on Agriculture report issued March 31, 1956, some of the most difficult farm problems are with low-income farms. This measure will be helpful in identifying this class of farms. Moreover, from a statistical standpoint, the national and regional estimates of gross and net income that would be obtained would supply useful information for strengthening our regular estimates of farm income, both on a national and State-by-State basis. In getting the income material which this bill would make possible, there also would be obtained enough information identifying the farm population as to aid substantially in keeping track of the farm manpower situation and other related developments. This would be especially valuable in case of a national defense emergency.

The Department of Commerce report states:

> The Department of Commerce agrees that data now available on farm income are inadequate. Agricultural policy determinations are frequently based on the farm-income situation. Since the incomes of commercial and noncommercial farmers and on large and small farms may differ substantially, information about income by economic class of farm is needed. The Department believes that positive, immediate action should be taken to supply these data.

The Bureau of the Budget report agrees with the affected Departments, stating:

> In view of the complex policy and program decisions ahead in the agricultural field, it would be highly desirable to have additional information on the incomes of different economic classes of farms.

In view of this widespread recognition of the vital importance of expanding the farm income data in the manner proposed by this bill, in order to formulate better agricultural policy, I urge the House to favorably consider this measure during this session.

LOW PRICE OF EGGS TO THE PRODUCER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a critical situation that has been growing steadily worse in Iowa until it is almost tragic is the difference between the low price the egg producer receives for his eggs and the price the consumer is required to pay for them at the food store.

The farm wife, who largely depends on egg money for the purchases she must make at the grocery or department store, finds at this time that she is receiving less than the feed cost for the laying flock. Figures are subject to rapid change, of course, but here are recent quotations from Iowa: Grade A large eggs, 24 cents per dozen; medium eggs, 20 cents per dozen; small eggs, 16 cents per dozen.

Those are the prices paid the poultry producers at one town in Iowa on a given day last week. On the same day the price per dozen in the food stores was around 49 cents per dozen. This makes the cost of marketing equal to or exceeding the original purchase price of the eggs. Is it any wonder that Iowa farmers are clamoring for help from the Agriculture Department.

Other segments of our economy are enjoying a boom period, but the farmers' situation does not improve. No wonder the farmer complains about the alltime record peacetime budget which means higher costs for everything he buys at a time when he badly needs help. Yet his calls seemingly are unheeded.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am trying to ascertain some more or less definite information.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does not have definite information at this moment, I should be glad to withdraw my request at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer that the gentleman would.

I might announce to the Members that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] at my request made inquiry of the committee staff about the printed hearings and was informed that the hearings will be printed and available for the Members tomorrow—Friday. Is that correct, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

THE LATE EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret and profound sorrow that I learned of the death of Hon. Edward G. Rohrbough on December 12,

1956. Mr. Rohrbough served in the House of Representatives for 2 terms, during the 78th and 80th Congresses, representing the Third Congressional District of West Virginia.

Before coming to Congress Dr. Rohrbough had made an enduring place for himself in the educational field in West Virginia, where his influence was strongly felt by all those who came in contact with him.

He received his bachelor of arts degree from Allegheny College, his master of arts degree from Harvard University, and in 1914–15 did graduate work at the University of Chicago. He held an honorary doctor of laws degree, conferred by West Virginia Wesleyan College, and an honorary doctor of philosophy degree conferred by Salem College. He taught at Glenville State Normal School, Fairmont State Teachers College, and for a short time at West Virginia Wesleyan College and West Virginia University. In 1908 he returned to Glenville State College as president and remained in this position until his retirement in 1942, being at that time the dean of college presidents in West Virginia. From 1942 until his death he had the title of president emeritus of Glenville State College.

He will be missed greatly by his many students scattered into all parts of the country, as well as by his colleagues in this House, who came to know him as a quiet, stately, friendly gentleman at all times and under all circumstances

To Mrs. Rohrbough and her son and to the other members of his family I extend my deep sympathy, and as a fitting summary of his life I should like to include the following remarks made by President Harry B. Heflin of Glenville State College, Glenville, W. Va., at the funeral service for Dr. Rohrbough:

I should like to speak for a few minutes of a job, a man, and the way they affect each other.

A college is designed to give. It doesn't require that others give to it but is a place where an opportunity is afforded students to think and learn under expert guidance. The more students grow and learn, the happier are those responsible for the college. It takes dedicated people to assume college responsibilities.

Our students stay for a year, 2 years, or at the most, 4 years. During that time it is inevitable that each student leaves a little of himself. Our faculty stays for a year, or 5, or 10, or even 20 years; some few stay for 25 or 30 years; and some very few are here for 35, 40, or even more years. If a student leaves something of himself in 4 years, how much more must be left in 40 years?

Dr. Rohrbough had a privilege few of us can ever enjoy with his 40 years of active service, and 14 more years when his continued interest made him ever available. More than one-half a century—a lifetime for many. The college was in his individual life, and it was in his family life, for throughout all but the earliest of these 40 years he had the trusted and valued cooperation of Mrs. Rohrbough.

A college is greater than any one person—it is, in fact, a composite of all those who work in it. People come and go but the college continues. However, there must be someone to take these diverse thoughts and actions and coordinate and direct them to the lines of greatest good.

It is impossible to see the whole picture of an institution and to be constantly aware of its needs and its progress toward meeting those needs without giving over a part of one's self. The man and the job are inseparable. It was his desire that this service should be conducted here.

When the workday ends for most people, they go home to their families and to an entirely different kind of activity. If they awaken at night, it is to the sounds associated with a house at night or the passing traffic of unknown drivers. Such is not the case with a college president in an institution like this. He simply goes to another part of the campus and another type of college problem. The sounds he notices at night are those of students on the move—the dormitory noise, the student car. If the fire siren blows, he wonders which building it is. There is no time when the activities of the college are not present. Is it any wonder the man and the job become so entangled that it is impossible to separate them? The habits in actions and thoughts which last through life may be established in far fewer than 40 years.

Never again will it be possible to do at Glenville State College what Dr. Rohrbough did. He established a pattern which others enlarge upon and fill out. In 1901, there was only one building on the campus. In 1942, when he retired, all of the present buildings were here except two. From any part of the campus, most of the things to be seen are the results of his plans and his efforts. We now build on the fringes to fill out the picture he began.

There have been presidents since his retirement and there will be others in the future. The things I have said should take nothing from any of them or from their achievements. There is a matter of when certain things can be done, and the time in which to do them, and the interest necessary to seize these opportunities. Dr. Rohrbough had all of these.

Buildings are easy to see as are the other physical facilities on the campus. Not so easy to see or measure, but far more important, is the effect of people on one another. Classes give the student an opportunity to learn facts; people help them to learn one another and develop the attitudes that enable wise people to live together. Confidence in ourselves and trust in God are a part of the picture we wish our students to draw. To thousands of former students, Glenville State College and E. G. Rohrbough mean the same thing. No greater compliment could have been paid to his ability to think well and act wisely than to select him as a West Virginia Congressman. May we all be as successful in leaving a part of ourselves with our students.

My own responsibilities of the past 9 years have been made more pleasant by his never intrusive interest in the development and welfare of the college. At homecoming, graduation, alumni dinner, or other major event, we could depend upon his presence.

Success and accomplishment in the direction of a college program call for a builder—a builder of buildings, of character, and of faith. Perhaps the words of Longfellow summarize this thought in his poem The Builders. I should like to read a few verses for you:

"THE BUILDERS

"(By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow)

"All are architects of fate,
Working in these walls of time;
Some with massive deeds and great,
Some with ornaments of rhyme.

"Nothing useless is, or low:
Each thing in its place is best;
And what seems but idle show
Strengthens and supports the rest.

"For the structure that we raise,
Time is with materials filled;
Our todays and yesterdays
Are the blocks with which we build.

"Truly shape and fashion these;
Leave no yawning gaps between;
Think not, because no man sees,
Such things will remain unseen.

"In the elder days of art,
Builders wrought with greatest care
Each minute and unseen part;
For the gods see everywhere.

"Build today, then, strong and sure,
With a firm and ample base;
And ascending and secure
Shall tomorrow find its place.

"Thus alone can we attain
To those turrets, where the eye
Sees the world as one vast plain,
And one boundless reach of sky."

These things Dr. Rohrbough did.

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, we West Virginians, regardless of political affiliation, feel that in the death of the Honorable Edward G. Rohrbough on December 12, 1956, the State of West Virginia lost one of its outstanding citizens, one of its better known legislators, and indeed an unusual gentleman. For 34 years Mr. Rohrbough served as president of the West Virginia Teachers College at Glenville, W. Va.

He was well and favorably known in the educational field not only in West Virginia, but in the adjoining States. Mr. Rohrbough was a gentleman in every respect. It was my pleasure to be his opponent on three separate occasions as a candidate for the Congress. On two of those occasions, I came out victor and on the other occasion Dr. Rohrbough won. Let me say to you, you can measure the caliber of a man if he is your opponent in a political campaign. Let me say for Dr. Rohrbough that his campaigns were conducted on a high plane and his activities here in the Congress were equally on a high plane. His interests, of course, in the Congress were along the lines of education and along the lines of security for the older people of the Nation. He did an excellent job. I believe his record here is peculiar in that I am almost certain he never failed to answer a single roll call vote during the time he was a Member of the House of Representatives—unusual, indeed. At this time I would like to express not only my own heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Rohrbough and their son, but I think I can speak for the remainder of the West Virginia delegation when I say that though we may have differed with Dr. Rohrbough in our political beliefs, we must acknowledge that he was a gentleman of high caliber and that he was an unusual citizen of our State and we will mourn for many years the loss of this outstanding man.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to obtain the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Based on the information that the leadership on both sides has at the present time, there is reasonable ground to believe that a resolution relating to the Middle East will be reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this week, in which event the measure will be brought up on Tuesday next. Therefore I am advising the membership that if the resolution is reported out this week, and it seems to be reasonably certain, then it will come up on Tuesday, and general debate will start on Tuesday of next week.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKER and to include an editorial.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. DINGELL and include certain extraneous matter.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend Public Law 854, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 28, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

357. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide additional authority for distribution of loans among States and Territories"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

358. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the annual report on the progress of the flight-training program, pursuant to the act of August 1, 1956, chapter 830 (70 Stat. 804); to the Committee on Armed Services.

359. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the Management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and Sawmill"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

360. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538–540)"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

361. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

362. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional material relative to the case of Hunfy D. Lee, on July 1, 1956, case No. A–10067117, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be returned to this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

363. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust the postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

364. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the first annual report of the Renegotiation Board, pursuant to section 114 of Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 3592. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3593. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3594. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3595. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3596. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3597. A bill to provide that the manufacturer's excise tax on mechanical pencils and pens shall not apply to pencils and pens manufactured to retail at $1 or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 3598. A bill to repeal the act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3599. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 3600. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3601. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); and to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid by a taxpayer for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3602. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3603. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3604. A bill to amend section 831 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code to make it a felony to injure or destroy works, property, or material of communication, power, lighting, control, or signal lines, stations or systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 3605. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3606. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency-feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 3607. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3608. A bill to liberalize the basis for and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 3609. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3610. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place marine sextants on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3611. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3612. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3613. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3614. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3615. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3616. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3617. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3618. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3619. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired list of certain Reserve officers recommended for promotion or decorated during World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3620. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to make an investigation and study of the feasibility of constructing heliports in connection with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3621. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3622. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent increase in all monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3623. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 3624. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3625. A bill to amend section 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to prevent the use of arbitrary stock par values to evade Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3626. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 3627. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 3628. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3629. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 3630. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that an aid and attendance allowance of $200 per month shall be paid to triple and quadruple amputees during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3631. A bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3632. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3633. A bill to exempt from Federal income tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is 95 percent derived from tax-exempt Government obligations and 5 percent from Federal Government taxable obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 3634. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3635. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 3636. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part, of any institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3637. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital of 750 beds at Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3638. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3639. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3640. A bill to provide that any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board may bring action on his claim in a United States district court; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3641. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 3642. A bill to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3643. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 3644. A bill to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of tourist literature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3645. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3646. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3647. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3648. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3649. A bill to issue a special postage stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Milwaukee Liedertafel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3650. A bill relating to positions in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 3651. A bill to determine the claims of certain prisoners of war permanently disabled, and to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims in the event of disagreement as to such claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3652. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3653. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,000 beds within the State of Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 3654. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 3655. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3656. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 3657. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3658. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3659. A bill to provide that a manufacturer or producer of nonbeverage products containing distilled spirits shall not be required to pay the tax imposed on such spirits by section 5001 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if he is appropriately licensed and bonded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 3660. A bill to establish a National Monetary and Financial Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 3661. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3662. A bill to amend section 1717 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to make nonmailable certain defamatory and other matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 3663. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3664. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs and other essential items for the sustenance of the civilian population of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3665. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 450 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 120. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, the social security amendments of 1956; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Erma Murer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen-Hung (Carlos Joseph) Chao and Mrs. Julia (Shih-San Yu) Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Poliszczuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3669. A bill for the relief of Gordon Louis Schmidt (also known as John Campion and Frank James); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Robert Louis Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothea Aloisia Albert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Kiriazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Franz Krudewig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3674. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aida S. Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3675. A bill for the relief of Louis Mavros (also known as Elias Mavrodontis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3676. A bill for the relief of Katie L. Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3677. A bill for the relief of the Aurex Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of the Aurex Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Company; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3680. A bill for the relief of Albert Svarc, his wife, Tikva Svarc, and their daughter, Sulamit Svarc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. R. 3681. A bill for the relief of Casimir Ramsauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3682. A bill to commemorate the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3683. A bill for the relief of Adrian Sung-chi Tse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3684. A bill for the relief of Carlos Arribe Lopez Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3685. A bill for the relief of Oscar Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3686. A bill for the relief of Helen Chronopoulos Vallas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3687. A bill for the relief of Paul Levitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3688. A bill for the relief of Josephine Elenora Ambrose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3689. A bill for the relief of Ettore Recine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3690. A bill for the relief of Miss Mavis Louise Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 3691. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Elizabeth Graubart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3692. A bill for the relief of Lelas Constantinos Tsamopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3693. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Loizos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Micich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3695. A bill for the relief of George Kefalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Enrica Naldini Marzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Fulea Petre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Tsuchiya Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 3699. A bill for the relief of Lilly Yolando Bonifacio Rosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3700. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Chiaramonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Manuel Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3702. A bill for the relief of Benito Comellas Freixa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3703. A bill for the relief of Margaret Kwei Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 3704. A bill for the relief of George Shin-Chang Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3705. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Hoczak Aumueller Cathey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 3706. A bill for the relief of George Huppert and Marta Huppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3707. A bill for the relief of Rachel Abouganem vda de Violin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Celestina N. Namoc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3709. A bill for the relief of Liane Ingrid Neuburger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3710. A bill for the relief of Ismene Orsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Guevrekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3712. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Kerope Kalustyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Masako Onta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3715. A bill for the relief of Musaitif Mustafa, also known as Jowad Mistafa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Frank Ming-Shin Shu, Grace Yung-Chen Yuan Shu, Maurice Shu, May Shu, Marjorie Shu, and Lily Shu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3717. A bill for the relief of Jose Medina-Galvan (also known as Jose Moreno-Munoz and Milton Gonzales-Rivera); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN (by request):

H. R. 3718. A bill for the relief of Samson Scholom and Ruth Scholom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3719. A bill for the relief of Marie Fratoni Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3720. A bill for the relief of Carl J. Warneke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Mark Yee Ling, Mark Sue Ling, and Mark Yen Kai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Chin Geoy Shiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Lourdes Abulencia Aningalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Kilpatrick (nee Lubiana); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Frosene Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 3727. A bill for the relief of Newton Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of Home Builders Association of Howard County, Ind., relative to the present Veterans' Administration mortgage situation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

51. By Mr. KEENEY: Resolution of the Fox River Valley Dental Society, Aurora, Ill., in support of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

52. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the commander, District No. 1, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Paterson, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to vigorously opposing any visit of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to the United States until he allows complete freedom of religion and thought; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

53. Also, petition of Leland H. Madorie, Washington, D. C., with reference to a grievance relative to his divorce case, No. C. A. 2436–54, entitled "Persecution and Extortion by United States Court"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Situation in the Realm of Dictator Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the world has always viewed with alarm and disgust mass persecutions and atrocities against races of people by ruthless totalitarian governments. Poland and other nations conquered by Germany's dictator Hitler, and nations enslaved under the equally tender rule of dictator Stalin and his successors, Khrushchev and Bulganin, have all suffered such brutality. People in devastated Hungary and in dictator Nasser's Egypt today feel the ruthless cruelty of mass persecution.

But while the world's attention has been centered on the plight of the people of Hungary, and rightfully so, the situation in the realm of dictator Nasser has not received the attention which it so rightfully deserves.

For example, the government of dictator Nasser has:

First. Incarcerated some 1,900 Jews and a number of others also innocent of wrongdoing in concentration camps.

Second. Summarily deported large numbers of others, Jew and Gentile alike, and

Third. Confiscated the property of these helpless prisoners and deportees whom it has sent forth penniless and with little more than the clothes on their backs.

Fourth. Seized or frozen assets of Jews amounting to over $100 million.

Fifth. Ordered 21,000 Jews, who are Egyptian citizens, citizens of other countries, or stateless persons, to leave the country within periods of 7 to 30 days.

Sixth. Held members of many families as hostages, while expelling other members of those families.

Seventh. Either seized most Jewish businesses or compelled the owners to turn them over to the Egyptian Government or to selected Egyptian citizens without compensation.

Eighth. Seized or is in the process of seizing assets of foreign nationals, including Americans, worth several billions of dollars.

All right-thinking men condemn these things which have been done by Dictator Nasser and his government to a helpless and defenseless people.

The Government of the United States should immediately and strongly protest these actions by the Egyptian Government, and take all diplomatic and other measures which we can to compel Nasser to restore dignity and justice to the people he has so brutally oppressed, and to compensate them as fully as possible both monetarily and otherwise for the multitude of wrongs done.

Under the circumstances which we witness in Egypt, it is, of course, unthinkable that the United States should expend foreign aid funds for the support of a government which would conduct itself in this way.

It is also equally clear that the United States has a duty to receive the refugees of this persecution in the same way in which it is receiving the refugees of Hungary, a thing which I hope the President will order at the earliest possible time.

It is my sincere belief that this matter should be brought to the attention of the United Nations by appropriate resolution, sponsored by the United States, to condemn these vicious actions, compel Egypt to protect and indemnify these helpless minorities, and halt and prevent recurrence of outrages of this sort. I hope the President will so instruct the American delegation to the United Nations at the earliest possible moment.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence and in commemorating that occasion, I wish to pay tribute to that gallant little nation. My prayers and good wishes go to her people in their struggle for freedom.

Educational Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, which grants educational benefits to World War II veterans, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which grants educational benefits, among other things, to Korean war veterans.

Certain deficiencies in these two laws should be corrected and corrected at once. These deficiencies came to light last year when a Senate subcommittee, investigating the Communist ownership of GI schools, discovered that under existing provisions of these laws the Veterans' Administration is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist-owned. In fact over $3 million was paid out by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which, because of their Communist connections, should be ineligible to participate in the veterans training program. These four schools are the Cartoonists and Illustrators School, Inc., of New York City; the Radio and Television Technical School, of Allentown, Pa.; the Robert Louis Stevenson School, of New York City; and the California Labor School, of San Francisco, Calif.

During the hearings it was brought out that under the provisions of Public Laws 346 and 550, the approval of veterans training schools is left solely to the local State-approving agencies, customarily a local department of education, and unless the local department rules otherwise the Veterans' Administration must pay the tuition for the veteran at

these Communist-owned schools or Communist-dominated schools.

In order to correct this situation, my bill requires private schools, below the college level, who are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans, to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2,400 schools throughout the country that will file affidavits under this proposal. The bill also provides that in the event a school fails to file an affidavit, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. On the other hand, an individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations. Obviously, this bill does not affect colleges or academic preparatory schools. I also want to emphasize the fact that this proposal does not affect or even mention schoolteachers at any level. The measure in no way curtails academic freedom or our civil liberties. This bill was introduced solely to plug a loophole in the law where known Communists have been scoffing at the Federal Government's attempts not to contribute money to the coffers of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will act promptly on this measure so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House during the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Passage of this bill will prevent millions of American taxpayers' money from being expended to train veterans at Communist-owned or at Communist-dominated schools.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 39 years ago the Ukrainian National Republic proclaimed its independence, threw off the yoke of Russian domination and took its proper place among the nations of the world. It was a proud day for a proud people.

It was a day that marked the triumphant close of centuries of struggle for freedom and independence. It was a day that, even now, can inspire all men with the knowledge and assurance that, despite the most cruel denial of human rights, a gallant people can still overthrow despotism and regain their natural sovereignty.

This anniversary day is not a happy one. Today 40 million Ukrainians have been subjugated by a still more malevolent despotism than that from which they were freed on January 22, 1918, but the inspiring point is still clear to all who realize how firmly, how dearly the people of the Ukraine hold liberty, freedom, and independence. What happened once will surely come to pass again. The Ukraine will one day be free.

There are over a million people of Ukrainian descent in America today. May we all join with them in the hope that the time is not too far in the future when a new independence day will be celebrated in a newly reborn Ukraine.

West Point TV Program Aids Understanding of United States Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for over 150 years, the people of America have been able to point with great pride at the United States Military Academy at West Point, a school which has given us some of our greatest leaders in peace and war.

I, myself, am proud to be a former West Point cadet, and a lifetime member of the Association of Graduates. Through my association with this group, I have often heard an important need cited by West Pointers and their friends—the need for a close understanding on the part of the average American of the role of the United States Military Academy and its basic aims.

There is another need I have also heard often—the need for continuous enrollment at West Point of the very highest caliber of young men in our high schools and colleges.

I would therefore like to call the attention of the House to a really remarkable job now being done in accomplishing both of these objectives through the medium of a weekly television series called West Point.

It is not often that we have reason to make mention of an individual television show in this body, although all of us, I am sure, are aware of television's tremendous impact on American homelife.

Through the West Point television series, which is filmed by Ziv Television Programs at the actual locales of the Academy, the sportsmanship, high ideals, and scholarship of the Corps of Cadets is portrayed accurately for millions of television viewers.

As a national monument as well as a military academy, West Point, of course, is open to visitors. Tens of thousands visit the Academy each year, touring the grounds and monuments, walking the same soil once marched over by men like Grant, Pershing, Patton, Bradley, and even President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, through the electronic magic of television, millions of Americans every week can sit in their living rooms and at the same time visit the classrooms, the dormitories, the mess halls, the athletic fields, and the many other sights of West Point.

Never in the long history of the Academy have so many people been able to observe it so well, and thus develop an appreciation of the great job done at West Point to train the future officers of the United States Army.

This in itself is worthy of remark. But I would like to point out what I feel is an additional and worthwhile job being done by the West Point series, namely, its influence on young men watching the program.

The producers of the series place a very heavy emphasis on the serious ideals of the cadets themselves—clean living, clean sportsmanship, a healthy mind in a healthy body, and the responsibilities of teamwork in which men's lives may depend on your good judgment.

However, the West Point television series does not preach. Rather, it entertains, and makes these points in a fashion that can only be an important step in combating juvenile delinquency among the young men of our Nation.

It is a worthwhile example to our American youth, I feel, to portray the Corps of Cadets, and to show that a cadet makes the grade on the basis of his character, his ability, and his own efforts without regard to his background, religious belief or social level.

In closing, I would like to point out one other fact.

There have always been more applicants at West Point than there are appointments available, as Members of the House know. Nevertheless, I feel that the West Point television series is going to have a profound long-range effect in attracting many thousands of the highest caliber of young men to seek appointments. In turn, this will enable officials at West Point to take their choice of what will undoubtedly be the cream of the Nation's youth.

The producers of this fine television series, Ziv Television Programs; the program's sponsor, General Foods; and the Columbia Broadcasting System's television network are certainly to be commended, and to receive the warm appreciation of all those concerned with the welfare of the United States Military Academy, for making this program available to television audiences.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the House briefly in regard to

the brave fight for freedom constantly being waged against Moscow by the people of the Ukraine. This region, which is essentially non-Russian and is the largest, most resourceful of those states incorporated into the Soviet Union, recognized yesterday the 39th anniversary of its independence from the Russian czars. And, though in 1920 the Ukrainian people were robbed of this independence by Communist Russia, their lamp of freedom has since continued to burn. In view of the Hungarian revolt and other hopeful symptoms of a breakdown in Moscow's influence, it is my feeling that we should continue to encourage also these Ukrainian lovers of freedom in their own indictment and defiance of Communist imperialism.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, the 39th anniversary of the Independence of the Ukraine, marks still another milestone in the grim history of the resistance waged by freedom-loving people against the oppressive force of Soviet Russia.

In recognition of the spirit of rebellion against Communist tyranny now sweeping the world, it is fitting that we express our sympathy with the 40 million of Ukrainians who have refused to forget that they are a nation although national independence was wrested from their land 37 years ago by the invading armies of the Soviet Union.

During the long years since, the struggles of the Ukrainians have been unremitting, and have made them a source of internal peril to the Soviet empire. Their undermining efforts have never ceased, and most recently, Ukrainian officers and men in the Red army gave aid to the Hungarian patriots in their heroic stand.

On this 39th anniversary of their national independence, we extend to the people of the Ukrainian Nation our sincere hope that the coming year may see their moral and political heritage restored to them.

Ten Thousand Orphans for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 24, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today on behalf of several thousand war orphans and American families who seek their admission to the United States.

Such legislation would reestablish, within the State Department, an orphan program quite similar to the provisions of the orphan section of the Refugee Relief Act. My bill provides for a quota of 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to be issued to eligible orphans until such time as the quota is exhausted. My bill also increases the age of eligible orphans from 10 years as provided in the Refugee Relief Act to 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD one of the typical letters of the heavy number being received by my office each day on this matter. This letter is written by Mr. and Mrs. Leslie E. Wilson of Medford, Oreg., and states as follows:

DEAR MR. PORTER: We are writing to ask your help and support in the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953.

We are fairly young and have planned our lives so that now we live more than comfortably, on investments we have made during the 10 years of our marriage. There is a need in every home for a child. Although we have everything, materially and spiritually, a couple could need or desire, we do lack the greatest joy of all, a child of our own to raise and to love.

We understand that throughout our country, social workers and welfare organizations are fighting adoption by proxy and the allowing of more orphans to enter the United States. For the past 3 years, we have tried to adopt a child here in America.

Mrs. Wilson was a social worker in Oregon for a little over 6 years and neither of us approve the procedures set down by the social services in Oregon or many of the other States and agencies we have contacted. One of our objections is that we do not feel psychoanalysis should be the primary basis for judging a couple's suitability to raise an adoptive child. Our youth, whether speaking of America or foreign youth, is the future of our world of tomorrow. If American families can give love and security to foreign children, they should be allowed to enter this country.

It indeed seems a shame that the work of Harry Holt, of Creswell, should be stopped. He has brought joy and hope to many couples and has much work yet to be done. The Hungarian situation has focused attention on the immigration question and we feel that youth should have a priority to enter our country.

Do fight for and obtain passage of an extension of the Refugee Act of 1953 that will allow the continued adoption by proxy.

Thank you, and with our best wishes, we remain.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. LESLIE WILSON.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to note that Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., have initiated, and personally undertaken, with the effective support of Senator NEUBERGER, the herculean task of bringing many Korean children to America. This unselfish act has been at great personal expense to Mr. Holt and cannot, of course, answer the many requests made of him.

Mr. Speaker, the other important section of my bill would grant permanent residence in the United States for those orphans admitted under the emergency parole procedures, and these adopted orphans would thus be on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

I should like to emphasize that the orphan problem is not solely concerned with Japan and Korea, but that the problem is also urgent in the Middle East, Greece, Italy, and other countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to note that in the enrichment of human life lies a part of America's greatness, based not upon our size, our strength, our wealth, but upon our belief in liberty and our deep passion for the rights of man.

I firmly believe passage of this bill is a step in which the world can appreciate our sincere interest in helping the oppressed.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, bowing for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy grace, we acknowledge before Thee that our lives are so often as restless pools. We are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them, but praying for Thy empowering, so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry. In a divided and violent world, may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed because even when rampant evil compels us to unsheath a clean sword our record will write our names among today's makers of a just peace. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 23, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

On January 11, 1957:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On January 18, 1957:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to extend the time for transmitting the Economic Report of the President for the first regular session of the 85th Congress.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to this motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of William Kelley, of Florida, for promotion in the Foreign Service, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt;

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan;

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia; and

James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration for Evaluation in the Department of State.

Howard S. Cullman, of New York, to be United States Commissioner General, Brussels Universal and International Exhibition, 1958.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1959:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut.

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service; and

Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker has lived near my home in Vermont for many years. As a member of the community, he has been a good neighbor. As Ambassador to India, he should well maintain the position of the United States as a good neighbor in the community of nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to report bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate. The committee is to meet on Monday, and it desires authority to report bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate, in order that they may be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are the bills and resolutions to which the Senator refers money measures?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will lie over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. However, the committee desires authority to report them on Monday, when the Senate will not be in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the customary 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Mo. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE AIR FORCE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1956, there was an aggregate of 2,772 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the flight training program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, The Renegotiation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retiremen and Disability Fund, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MANAGEMENT OF RED LAKE INDIAN FOREST AND SAWMILL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and Sawmill (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 633, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FEES OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1716, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1716 of Title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538-540) (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Hunfy D. Lee from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 1, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 645, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 645 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims incident to activities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 4

"House resolution urging the Congress of the United States to adopt Good Friday as a legal national holiday

"Whereas America is a Christian nation; and

"Whereas all Christian religions recognize Jesus Christ as the Son of God and this Nation has created a national holiday to commemorate the birth of Christ; and

"Whereas the decease and departure from this earth by the Son of God is of equal significance with His birth; and

"Whereas the State of Maryland recognizes Good Friday as a legal holiday: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland urges the Congress of the United States to adopt Good Friday as a legal national holiday; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house of delegates and that the secretary of state be directed to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the Members of the Maryland delegation to the Congress of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States

"By the house of delegates, January 9, 1957.

"Rules suspended and adopted.

"By order, Elizabeth M. Reese, assistant chief clerk.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"GEORGE W. OWINGS, Jr.,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the Altar of the Nation, located at the Cathedral of the Pines, in Rindge, N. H., which has been dedicated to the glory of God of all American war dead and which, in fact, has been recognized as an interdenominational shrine by Americans everywhere; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has previously declared a national policy to preserve objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire that steps be taken to recognize the national sentiment already expressed by dedicating this memorial as a national shrine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire memorializes the Congress of the United States and the appropriate officials of the administration in Washington to take whatever steps may be necessary and proper to give this shrine its national recognition, upon the provision, however, that nothing herein shall be held or understood to deprive the State of New Hampshire of its jurisdiction in and over said site or the conveyance of title therein to the Federal Government; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, to the Representatives and Senators of this State in Washington, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to such other officials in the United States Government as may request the same.

"Passed January 17, 1957.

"Attest:

"ROBERT L. STARK,
"Deputy Secretary of State."

CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Charleroi, Pa., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 21, 1957, relating to the designation of the first Sunday in February of each year as Chaplains' Day. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths: George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester,* to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the 1st Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Thomas N. Tuttle, president of the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association, information concerning a resolution adopted by that fine organization urging the passage of what has come to be known as the Jenkins-Keogh legislation.

This proposed legislation, whose principle, in my judgment, is eminently sound, would permit self-employed individuals to build up what amounts to a financial nest egg for their later retirement years, by being relieved of the heaviest rates of taxation during their earlier years of relatively higher earnings.

The Jenkins-Keogh bill, as I have previously indicated by comments on the Senate floor, has received wide approval in principle from the White House down.

Of course, the inevitable problem has arisen as to its cost to the Treasury in terms of reduced revenue intake.

It is, however, the hope, I believe, of thinking citizens throughout the Nation—particularly members of the great legal profession—that the day will soon come when America's revenue situation will permit adoption of the principle of this proposed legislation.

I believe that Representative JENKINS and Representative KEOGH are to be congratulated for their continued effort down through the years on behalf of this legislative objective.

This is the sort of proposal which should, in my judgment, receive consideration from the Federal Commission on Taxation, which I have proposed be set up under my bill, S. 769.

I present Mr. Tuttle's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1957.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On January 7, 1957, the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association adopted a resolution urging the passage of the so-called Jenkins-Keogh bill, which would grant to self-employed individuals Federal income-tax benefits comparable to those currently enjoyed by employees of corporations under qualified pension and profit-sharing plans.

We respectfully request that you do whatever you can to secure the passage of this much-needed legislation.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. TUTTLE,
President.

DEVELOPMENT OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM—LETTER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the manager of the Manhattan (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce stating that the directors of the chamber of commerce had adopted a resolution approving a conservation pool for the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, now under construction.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Manhattan Kans., January 21, 1957.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: On December 18, 1956, the board of directors of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce unanimously passed a resolution requesting that action be taken to encourage the development of Tuttle Creek Dam with a conservation pool.

The board believes that the conservation of water is as vital as flood control in the conservation of natural resources and, therefore, requests that appropriate action be taken to authorize Tuttle Creek Dam to be completed and operated as a conservation-pool project.

Very truly yours,

LUD C. FISHER, *Manager.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 20. Resolution to authorize one temporary additional clerk for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

S. Res. 35. Resolution extending to June 30, 1957, the authority of the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, and providing additional funds (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 25. Resolution to investigate the administration of the civil-service system and the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 52. Resolution authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States (Rept. No. 26); and

S. Res. 56. Resolution authorizing an investigation of national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 28).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 37. Resolution providing for additional temporary assistants and funds for the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 42 Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate problems of American small and independent business (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 44. Resolution further authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a study of public and private housing, and providing additional funds therefor (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing an investigation of matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy and War Claims Acts (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 51. Resolution authorizing an investigation of immigration and naturalization matters (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 53. Resolution authorizing an investigation of problems pertaining to certain European and Asiatic countries (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to examine the administration of the Patent Office and statutes relating to patents, copyrights, and trademarks (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration (Rept. No. 31); and

S. Res. 58. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage (Rept. No. 32).

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS A. WOFFORD (S. REPT. NO. 13)

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 65), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Wofford, of South Carolina, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

MRS. JANE BROWN

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 66), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mrs. Jane Brown, sister of Thomas M. Greenwood, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR ROBERT HUMPHREYS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 67), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert Humphreys, of Kentucky, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

PATRICIA M. CLEMENTS AND MARY VIRGINIA MITCHELL

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 68), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patricia M. Clements and Mary Virginia Mitchell, daughters of Hal Mitchell, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY MARGARET HARTIGAN

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 69), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret Hartigan, widow of James S. Hartigan, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM R. LAIRD, III

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator William R. Laird, III, of West Virginia, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported

an original resolution (S. Res. 71), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 85th Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 100 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 400 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

PROVISION FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; and Mr. Javits, of New York.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; Mr. Talmadge, of Georgia; Mr. Curtis, of Nebraska; and Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL-BUSINESS ACT OF 1953, RELATING TO INCREASED AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR BUSINESS LOANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably without amendment, the bill (S. 637) to increase the business-loan authorization of the Small Business Administration under the Small-Business Act of 1953, as amended, and I submit a report—No. 12—thereon.

The bill authorizes an additional $65 million for the business-loan fund of the Small Business Administration. The existing authorization of $150 million, which has been outstanding since 1953, will be fully committed within the next few weeks. The passage of this bill is necessary to permit the continuation of business-loan operations, and I am hopeful that S. 637 can be scheduled for early consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 637) to amend the Small-Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, was placed on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 26, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce. This resolution was unanimously approved at a meeting of the committee yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be so referred.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 814. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 815. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 817. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; and

S. 818. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Platounaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 821. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 822. A bill to exempt from Federal income tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is 95 percent derived from tax-exempt Government obligations and 5 percent from Federal Government taxable obligations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Maud Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 824. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 825. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high-water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 826. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod Canal National Park, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Guillermo B. Rigonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 828. A bill authorizing certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 829. A bill to provide for corn-base acreages and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 830. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Hines Service Center, Hines, Ill., and Lincoln Ordnance Plant, Springfield, Ill., to the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 831. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 832. A bill for the relief of Matilda Strah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 833. A bill for the relief of Vida Letitia Baker;

S. 834. A bill for the relief of David Ajuelo, Roza Ajuelo, Victoria Ajuelo, and Lizet Ajuelo; and

S. 835. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 836. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 837. A bill to amend section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 838. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President a National Freedom Board which shall direct the activities of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 839. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 840. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 841. A bill to provide for establishing a price-reporting service for basic forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 842. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation, removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the conveyance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 843. A bill further amending the Securities Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 844. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 845. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 846. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 847. A bill to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 848. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 849. A bill for the relief of Sydney Douglas Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Stavros Manousos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 851. A bill for the relief of Marek Fluss Vzocka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 852. A bill for the relief of Hilda Viola Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Fethi Hepcakici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 854. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayou Lafourche, La., and construction of the Lafourche-Jump Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 855. A bill to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the distribution of surplus property to municipal governments for municipal governmental purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 856. A bill to repeal section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, relating to non-Communist affidavits;

S. 857. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 858. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 859. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 860. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Ernest Hagler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 862. A bill for the relief of Barbara L. Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 863. A bill to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 864. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 865. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 866. A bill authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 867. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 868. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 869. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education and to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education;

S. 870. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools;

S. 871. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and

S. 872. A bill to provide school-construction assistance to the States; to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education; to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education; to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men; to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 873. A bill for the relief of Shu Yen Lin, his wife, Shau Ying Lin, and children, Hang Shan Lin, Gee Chek Lin, Gee Ming Lin, and Chi Fong Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Cornelius Vander Hoek;

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Vuokko A. Bingham;

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Katharina Theresia Beuving Keyzer;

S. 877. A bill for the relief of Donworth V. Gubler;

S. 878. A bill for the relief of Cecyle D. Smack;

S. 879. A bill for the relief of Anna Adora Jensen;

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Necmettin Cengiz;

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Norine Vicenti;

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Pauline Ethel Angus; and

S. 883. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Ray Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 885. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 886. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BLAKLEY):

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution declaring September 17 a legal public holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills which are a part of President Eisenhower's labor program.

These bills are as follows:

One. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Two. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower.

Three. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes.

Four. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination.

Five. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of each of these bills, prepared by the Department of Labor, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. And I also ask unanimous consent that these bills be permitted to lie on the table until the close of business on Monday so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsorship may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the table, as requested, and the explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 814. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 814, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME PAY OF LABORERS AND MECHANICS, ETC.

This bill meets the great need in the field of labor-standards legislation for a single general hours act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which are known as the 8-hour laws. The President, in his budget message, has recommended legislation regarding these laws, which relate to hours of work and overtime pay for laborers and mechanics employed by the Government and on certain Federal contracts. The proposals embodied in this draft bill are designed to carry out these recommendations of the President and are a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The draft bill would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: (1) By replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; (2) by modernizing its hours standards through addition of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for work in excess of 40 per week; and (3) by making the laws' standards applicable not only to direct Government contracts, but also to those federally financed and assisted contracts with respect to which existing Federal legislation provides for the payment of prevailing or minimum wages.

SIMPLIFYING AND CLARIFYING THE EXISTING LAW

The present 8-hour laws, which govern hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors, were enacted at different times between 1892 and 1940. The 1892 statute replaced a statute dating back to the Civil War period. Certain provisions of these laws make it a crime for Government officials or Government contractors and their subcontractors to employ laborers or mechanics more than 8 hours a day. Others, which apply only to contractors and subcontractors, provide a separate and additional contract penalty of $5 for each day's violation with respect to each worker permitted to work more than 8 hours. Many workers are covered by both provisions but there are some who are subject to the criminal statute only and others only to the statute providing the $5 penalty. This bill would consolidate the existing laws into a single statute with simplified provisions which apply in the same way to all contractors and subcontractors performing work coming within its terms.

The bill would also eliminate the confusion and inequities which result from a number of conflicting and ambiguous exception provisions contained in the present laws. Some of the exceptions taking particular work out of the laws' coverage are canceled out by exceptions to the exceptions which put it back in again. And although the language of these laws prohibiting more than 8 hours' work in a calendar day has not been changed, there is still another independent statute that has the effect of relieving most contractors and subcontractors from this prohibition if they pay time and one-half overtime compensation for all work over 8 hours a day. The courts and the Comptroller General are in disagreement as to whether the present language of this law also gives the employees who work overtime the right to collect, by administrative or judicial action, the time-and-one-half compensation if the employer fails to pay it. This bill would make clear the liability of the contractor to reimburse laborers and mechanics to whom he has failed to pay time and one-half for overtime work as required by the bill.

FORTY-HOUR WEEK PROVISION

In addition to a need for revising the language of the 8-hour laws to eliminate complicated and overlapping provisions, the present overtime provisions need amendment. Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. Many responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week (seven 8-hour days) without paying them overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hours standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a requirement for the payment of time and one-half for work in excess of a 40-hour week.

CHANGES IN COVERAGE

The third needed improvement in the 8-hour laws is an extension of their scope to include work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under statutes which require the payment of prevailing or minimum wages. The contract work presently covered by the 8-hour laws is work contracted out directly by the Government. When these laws were developed, this coverage made the hours standards applicable to substantially all the work for which Federal funds were expended. This is no longer so. Many non-Federal agencies now do the actual contracting for work that is financed in whole or in part with Federal funds or with the aid of Federal guaranties but which is, nevertheless, subject to Federal supervision or participation in details of spending

the funds, and to Federal laws providing for payment of predetermined prevailing or minimum wages. The coverage of a revised hours law should extend to this federally aided work. Extension of Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to those contracts already subject to Federal wage standards would not impose any undue burden on the Federal financing agencies, the non-Federal contracting agencies, or the contractor. The draft bill, therefore, provides that its hour standards shall apply to all contracts for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work, which provisions of law are in effect on the date of enactment of the proposed legislation. Section 105 of the draft bill grants the Secretary authority sufficiently broad to issue rules and regulations conforming the Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to the dollar limitation on coverage of such statutes as the Davis-Bacon Act and the Federal Airport Act.

Since the labor standards provided in the bill would be applicable only to contracts and subcontractors, its enactment would terminate the application of the 1892 statute to employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, as was proposed in S. 1926, 83d Congress, 1st session, a bill approved by the Bureau of the Budget. For this reason a necessary amendment to existing legislation relating to Federal employees is included in section 201 of the bill, which follows the language used in S. 1926.

COORDINATION OF ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Inasmuch as the proposed legislation would take the place of labor standards laws with respect to which the Secretary of Labor is given coordinating authority under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, a provision continuing this authority is included in the bill. There is also a provision affirming the applicability, in accordance with its terms, of section 2 of the Copeland Act, as amended, giving the Secretary of Labor certain authority to issue regulations for contractors and subcontractors on work of a character similar to that covered by the bill.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The bill would make it clear that contractors and subcontractors responsible for violations will be liable to employees for the unpaid wages, as well as liable to the Government for liquidated damages in the amount of $5 for each calendar day in which the employee is required to work in excess of the specified hours without payment of the statutory overtime compensation. This latter provision corresponds to the penalty provision of the 1912 act. A criminal penalty is provided for intentional violations, as is now done by the 1892 act.

The draft bill provides for the withholding by the Federal agency concerned of sums due a contractor in such amounts as are administratively determined to be necessary to satisfy liabilities for unpaid wages and liquidated damages. Similar withholding of funds is now authorized under existing law and standard contract provisions. In addition, under the bill the Comptroller General is authorized to make direct payment of such sums withheld for unpaid wages to reimburse underpaid employees.

As is now the case under the 1912 act, contractors would have the right to appeal to the head of the agency for a review of the administrative determination of sums withheld for liquidated damages. The bill is somewhat less rigid with respect to liquidated damages than the 1912 act, which provides no relief from the $5 a day "penalty" once violations are established, except by action of the President under authority limited to a very narrow category of situations. The bill provides that the agency head, in the event of appeal, may issue a final order affirming the administrative determination or, in a proper case, may recommend to the Secretary of Labor that an adjustment be made in liquidated damages or that the contractor be relieved of liability. It is provided that the Secretary of Labor may issue a final order affirming or rejecting this recommendation. Final orders of the agency head or the Secretary would be subject to judicial review by the Court of Claims upon a proper showing.

While no special provision for a similar review of the liability for unpaid wages is contained in existing law or in the bill, where sums are withheld for unpaid wages appropriate provision may be made by regulations under the bill for protecting interests of the respective parties which may depend on determinations of violations or other issues involved in any pending statutory review of liability for liquidated damages.

S. 815. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 815, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PROMOTE, ESTABLISH, AND MAINTAIN SAFE WORKPLACES AND PRACTICES IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

There is a serious urgent need for action by the Federal Government to aid the States in their efforts to prevent industrial accidents. The attached draft bill meets that need by providing for financial and technical assistance to the States in developing and expanding industrial safety programs. The proposal embodied in the bill is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor for 1957.

The proposed legislation would provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws relating to industrial safety programs. Under this proposal, the development of safety codes would be left to the States and the Federal Government would provide assistance to the States in their efforts to develop safety standards and safe practices, to promote voluntary acceptance of the standards and to secure observance of the code.

NEED FOR EXPANDING INDUSTRIAL SAFETY PROGRAMS

The prevention of industrial injuries is a matter of the greatest national importance, both in terms of the general welfare of the working population and in terms of the reduction of the social costs of industrial casualties. According to the National Safety Council the passing of each hour is marked by the death of 2 workers through job accidents; every 17 seconds an American working man is injured on the job. These tragedies occur around the clock—day in and day out. They result in permanent total disability, permanent partial disability, and total temporary disability, as well as death.

Accidents in the course of employment resulted in the appalling total of 14,200 deaths and 1,915,800 injuries during the year 1955 alone. This resulted in a loss of 39 million man days of production. To this must be added time lost from injuries experienced in preceding years, which would bring the total for 1955 up to over 200 million man days. The National Safety Council has estimated that visible and indirect costs of 1955 work accidents to employers amounted to $3½ billion.

If these figures represented the inevitable minimum of annual industrial casualties, there would not be much to do except deplore the human costs of our industrial processes. However, that is not the case. As a result of experience in the field of industrial accident prevention during the past 40 years safety experts generally believe that we know how to prevent over 90 percent of all work injuries. Where sound safety measures have been adopted there has been a substantial decrease in accidental injuries. For example, several of our largest industrial corporations have reduced their accident frequency 90 percent or more in 40 years.

Although many nongovernmental agencies have aided in the development and adoption of safety standards to apply in their respective fields, there must be a great increase in application of safety measures if the problem is to be met. But tested safety techniques have not been fully applied to all American business, especially to the establishments too small to afford full-time safety engineers.

NEED OF THE STATES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EXPANDING THEIR PROGRAM

Except where the national interest is directly affected, as in mining, or where the Federal Government has direct responsibility, such as to longshoremen and harbor workers on navigable waters of the United States, the regulation of industrial safety is a proper function of the States.

However, State labor departments with primary legal responsibility and better access to industrial establishments have not, despite strong and sometimes successful efforts, obtained sufficient funds to employ adequate staffs. Thus, the resources of most State agencies have been totally incapable of carrying out the basic responsibility of the State in this field. More than two-thirds of the State agencies with responsibility for safety programs reported that in 1952 they did not have sufficient staff to make one inspection per plant annually in the industrial establishments coming under their jurisdiction.

A study made for the President's Conference on Occupational Safety in 1949 showed that of 37 States reporting, less than two-thirds spent for industrial safety as much as 10 cents per year per worker. Only 2 States spent as much as 50 cents per year. The range in expenditures per worker was from $0.009 to $1.77, the average for all States being 23 cents per industrial worker. The ratio of safety inspectors to the number of industrial wage earners in these States ranged from 1 to 5,300 to 1 to 236,600, and the number of establishments per inspector ranged from 382 to 16,884.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

The draft bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall allot funds to the States on the basis of the number of wage earners, industrial hazards, financial needs of the States, and such other factors as he deems relevant. The annual allotment to any State would not be less than $15,000.

The annual payments to any State during the first and second years of the program would not exceed 75 percent of the annual expenditures under the State plan during those years. During the third and fourth years it would not exceed 66⅔ percent, and thereafter it would not exceed 50 percent. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to approve a minimum Federal payment up to $15,000 on a per annum basis, without regard to these percentage limitations, if he finds that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of the legislation and of the State plan. This would assist States with approved plans to initiate and maintain safety programs in situations where unusual circumstances might arise jeopardizing the program planned or started because of temporary inability to provide the necessary share of State funds.

Before funds could be disbursed, each State would be required to file with and have approved by the Secretary a plan for a program of industrial safety that accords with certain general requirements set forth in the bill. Among other things, the State plan would be required to reflect an estimate of total cost of the State program and the extent of State contribution, in accordance with the percentage ratios of Federal grants to total costs of the State program, as set forth in the act.

These provisions are administratively sound and would adequately insure the economical use of Federal funds to help achieve the stated purpose of the bill. The program would pay big dividends toward reducing the $3½ billion cost (visible and indirect) caused by industrial accidents annually.

S. 816. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 816, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, APPROVED SEPTEMBER 17, 1916, ETC.

The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the Nation, has the obligation to utilize every means to reduce accidents among its employees. Experience has shown that voluntary efforts on the part of Government agencies can achieve outstanding results in reducing the number and severity of employee accidents. The unfortunate fact is, however, that most Departments and agencies have not developed sufficient concern with the problem to begin and continue effective safety programs.

It has been felt for some time that if the Departments and agencies were made to feel more conscious of the incidence, and the resulting cost, of accidents to their employees, more effective safety measures would be adopted and the accident rate correspondingly reduced.

In furtherance of this objective, President Eisenhower's budget message in 1955 and again this year recommended that the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases be shifted from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. Legislation designed to carry out this objective was introduced during the first session of the 84th Congress (S. 1309 and H. R. 5751). Under the provisions of these bills, Federal agencies would have contributed to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by payment of a premium charge calculated in accordance with commercial insurance practices used in writing workmen's compensation policies.

It was discovered, however, that this type of bill would increase the expense of administering the Compensation Act by at least $1½ million annually. Therefore the premium-charging method was replaced by a less complex system under which each agency would be charged only for actual payments made from the fund on its account. In accordance with the President's budget message of 1956, again urging consideration of this type of legislation, bills embodying this revised system were introduced as S. 3582 and H. R. 10538.

The attached draft bill, which is substantially identical with S. 3582 and H. R. 10538, would amend section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act containing provisions for an employees' compensation fund. At present all compensation and other benefits under the act are paid from this fund, which, in turn, is financed from annual appropriations for the purpose. The purpose of this bill is not to shift the responsibility for the actual paying of benefits to individual agencies but merely to require these agencies to reimburse the fund for money paid out on their account. There would be no danger that lack of funds or administrative delays would prevent anyone from receiving benefits to which he was entitled. Payments would be made from the fund under the continuing administration of the Department of Labor through the Bureau of Employees' Compensation.

All Government agencies and instrumentalities having employees eligible for benefits under the FECA would come within the coverage of this bill. The draft bill reestablishes the employees' compensation fund and provides that all payments under the act shall be made from the fund. At the end of each quarter the total costs of benefits and other payments made in that quarter on account of cases arising after July 1, 1957, would be determined by the Secretary of Labor for each agency. The Secretary would then bill each agency for that amount, and the agencies, in turn, would be required to pay the amount billed. Provisions are included in the draft bill which would require the heads of agencies to pay these charges from appropriations or funds used for the payment of salaries, wages, or other compensation of their employees. The proposed bill would allow for readjustment or correction of the charges billed by the Secretary, and would make an additional charge against corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act for their fair share of the cost of administering the act.

This manner of shifting costs to employing agencies is simple, inexpensive, and entirely consistent with sound business practices. Additional administrative costs resulting from its enactment are estimated at $50,000 annually.

Considerable savings, both in money and, more importantly, in the safety and well-being of Federal employees, are expected to result from its enactment. In addition, the proposed bill would enable the Congress, on a cumulative and comparative basis, to evaluate the progress made by Federal agencies toward safer practices.

S. 817. A bill to prohibit discrimintaion on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination.

The statement, accompanying Senate bill 817, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN THE PAYMENT OF WAGES BY EMPLOYERS HAVING EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN COMMERCE OR IN THE PRODUCTION OF GOODS FOR COMMERCE, ETC.

This proposal is designed to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. It is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures of enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to those now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory wage rates based on sex. In addition to the tangible economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair the prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

It is of great importance that Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce.

EQUAL-PAY PROPOSAL

Section-by-section analysis

SECTION 1. Title of act: Establishes short title of "Federal Equal Pay Act."

SEC. 2. Findings and declaration of policy: Enumerates undesirable conditions in interstate commerce resulting from payment of wage differentials based on sex and intention of Congress to correct such conditions.

SEC. 3. Prohibition of wage rate differential based on sex: Prohibits employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating, on the basis of sex in payment of wages in any place of employment in which their employees are so engaged. The language descriptive of proposed coverage and the supporting definitions in section 10 are phrased to make available precedents established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in determining coverage under the proposed legislation.

SEC. 4. Administration: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpenas, and restrain violations. These provisions are largely adapted from similar provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

SEC. 5. Wage restitution and liquidated damages: Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages of which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The liability in employee suits for unpaid wages and liquidated damages is like that now provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as modified by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

SEC. 6. Enforcement: Authorizes employee suits to recover amount of employer liability under section 5. Authorizes Secretary to supervise payment of wages withheld in violation of the act and to bring suits for such wages in behalf of employees upon their request. The recovery of unpaid wages, but not liquidated damages, is authorized in suits by the Secretary of Labor or by administrative action in supervising employer payments. Establishes a 2-year period of limitation for commencing recovery action after cause accrues.

SEC. 7. Posting: Requires employer to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

SEC. 8. Unlawful discharge or discrimination and penalties: Makes it unlawful to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act. Upon a second conviction for such discharge or discrimination, imposes a criminal penalty. Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this section.

SEC. 9. Injunction proceedings: Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act or regulations issued under it.

SEC. 10. Definitions: Defines terms used in the act principally as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

SEC. 11. Appropriation: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out act.

SEC. 12. Effective date: Provides that act will take effect 120 days after passage.

S. 818. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 818 is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT BY INSURANCE CARRIERS AND SELF-INSURERS, ETC.

The American system of workmen's compensation is not financed out of general taxation but places its costs only on those members of the public who are also employers. In accordance with this concept, employers are charged with the costs of payments to injured employees either as self-insurers or through insurance carriers. In many States employers are also charged with the administrative costs of the workmen's compensation program. Under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, however, a Federal statute which applies to certain private employments in much the same manner as a State workmen's compensation law, the costs of administration are borne by the Federal Government. This places on the Federal Government a burden inconsistent with a basic concept of workmen's compensation.

The draft bill would charge administrative costs under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to the industry covered by that act. Under the proposed bill the funds necessary for administrative expenses (direct expenses and the applicable share of indirect and overhead expenses) would continue to be fixed and appropriated annually by Congress. However, at the end of each fiscal year, the cost of administering the act during that year would be determined by the Secretary of Labor and prorated among insurance carriers writing insurance under the act, and among self-insurers. The Secretary would then assess each carrier on the basis of the total premiums collected by it, and each self-insurer on the basis of the premiums, as determined by the Secretary, that it would have paid had it insured its liability under the act.

It is estimated that this proposal, if adopted, would result in a reimbursement to the Federal Government of over $600,000 a year.

The rights of a self-insurer or carrier would be protected by an administrative hearing on assessments, if requested, and by a right to judicial review on questions of law. The draft bill provides, however, that no stay of payment with respect to an assessment would be permitted.

If it failed to pay the amount assessed when due, a carrier or self-insurer would be liable to fines and interest on unpaid balances. Similar penalties and possible suspension or revocation of its authorization to insure are provided where a carrier or self-insurer misrepresents material facts or fails to furnish information called for by the bill or by regulations of the Secretary.

This proposal would also apply to all extensions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The existing extensions are the District of Columbia Workmen's Compensation Law, the Defense Base Act, and the Outer Continental Lands Act. The reimbursement to the Federal Government, estimated above at over $600,000, includes reimbursement for the administrative costs involved in the Defense Base and Outer Continental Lands Acts.

An additional $200,000, now included in the budget of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, is transferred annually to the Department of Labor for the administration of the District workmen's compensation law. The draft bill would credit to the District government its share of the reimbursement received from the carriers and self-insurers.

The Secretary would also have authority, in his discretion, to establish a single, consolidated administration fund for the act and its extensions, or to have separate administration funds for the act and the respective extensions.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. IVES. On behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. Similar legislation was introduced in the 83d and 84th Congresses in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This bill contains three titles. The first title is designed to eliminate certain serious injustices under the existing law, which were specifically pointed out by the President in a letter to the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] dated December 5, 1953. Among the problems dealt with are the unrestricted authority of Consuls and the Attorney General to give or deny visas without supporting evidence; the repeal of sections 350 and 352–355, which provide for loss of citizenship because of residence abroad for both native-born and naturalized citizens; the restoration of preexamination which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his visa in Canada, and the change in the standard for granting suspension of deportation from "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship" to "serious hardship."

The second title deals with procedural injustices and inequities which have developed in the administration of the law. Among these are the need for the statutory creation of an Administrative Appeals Board in visa cases to review the questions involving the denial of visa and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

The third title modernizes the quota system by establishing the 1950 instead of the 1920 census figures as the basis for determining national quotas. This would go far toward alleviating the serious discrimination that exists with respect to nationalities of southern and southeastern Europe, from which area immigration is practically impossible today. Moreover, it provides for the redistribution of unused annual quotas to those on waiting lists of countries with quotas of 12,000 and under.

I realize that other proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act has been introduced embodying certain recommendations of the Eisenhower administration. This bill should not in any sense be considered to be in any way a substitute for the legislation proposed by the administration. This bill contains many provisions, including the ones which I have herein mentioned, which are not touched upon in the administration's proposed legislation, with the exception title 3. Therefore, I am hopeful that the most important provisions of this bill will be included in urgently needed legislation amending the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the desk until the close of business next Monday in order that other Senators who may desire to act as cosponsors may be able to do so.

I further ask unanimous consent that the text of an analysis of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 836) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONG.)

SHORT TITLE—IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1957

Title I

This title follows recommendations of President Eisenhower as contained in his April 6, 1953, letter to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS proposing a Senate inquiry into the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Section 101: Amends sections 212 (a) (15) and 241 (a) (8) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212 (a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental process the probability of future proscribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287 (a) (1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353, and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss

of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. This amendment thus eliminates the stigma of "second-class citizenship." Section 104 of the bill also repeals sections 350 and 355 of Public Law 414 which provide for loss of citizenship by native-born citizens because of residence abroad. The principle that native-born citizens will lose their American nationality by residence abroad was introduced to our nationality laws for the first time by Public Law 414. To permit that principle to remain in our law, while repealing the corresponding provision as to naturalized citizens, would discriminate against the native-born citizen.

Section 105: Amends sections 101 (2) (37), 212 (a) (28) (D), 241 (a) (6) (D) and 313 (a) (3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244 (a) (1) (2) (3) (4) and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Sections 107 and 108: By repealing section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and amending section 201 (e) of Public Law 414 eliminates provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 109: By amending sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c) and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become generally apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101 (a) (6) of Public Law 414, restored preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose).

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212 (c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235 (c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241 (d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien must now meet.

Section 207: (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360 (a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 360 (c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by the Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360 (b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Title III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 12,000 and under (includes Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, and Eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the most glaring injustices in the Taft-Hartley Act is in the provision of section 9 (c) (3), that employees who have been replaced by an employer during the course of a dispute over economic issues "shall not be eligible to vote" in Labor Board elections.

This has long been recognized as a union-busting provision. Taken together with other provisions of the act, it makes possible a situation in which an employer can petition for a collective-bargaining election during a strike, the striking employees are held ineligible to vote, and their replacements cast the only ballots.

In a speech in 1952, President Eisenhower referred to this provision when he said:

> I know the law might be used to break unions. That must be changed. America wants no law licensing union busting. Neither do I.

Yet, despite the widespread acknowledgment by leaders of both parties that this provision of the act is undesirable, it still remains on the books.

Mr. President, I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], a bill to correct this injustice. It removes the prohibition against voting by employees on strike. It further provides that no election may be held during any lawful strike in which recognition was not a bona fide issue when the strike began. The postponement of elections during economic strikes will give to employees a necessary and deserved protection against decertification of their union during a lawful strike.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 837) to amend section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRICE REPORTING AND RESEARCH WITH RESPECT TO FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for price reporting and marketing research with respect to forest products.

As America emerges from a timber exploiting to a timber-cropping economy, it will more and more need to "farm" its forests. Timber-crop farming carries with it the need for frequent, selective cuttings in which small amounts of pulpwood, sawlogs, and so forth, will be removed and offered for sale at regular intervals. This means systematic forest management on the part of the several million owners of small forest tracts who, in all, control nearly two-thirds of our forest land.

For several generations the United States Department of Agriculture has been reporting prices on nearly every major and minor farm crop except forest products. This service has been of inestimable benefit to farmers in that it has given them an independent source of information upon which to price their products. They have not had to accept the word of a buyer. But in the case of forest products the forest owner still has no reliable independent source of information.

There are several hundred thousand independent sawmill men and logging operators who also offer rough timber for sale. This large group also lacks an objective source of price and market information. And as a result many of the transactions in the timber business are carried on by word of mouth, with abundant difficulties inevitably arising.

There is another major reason for currently reliable prices and workable data. The forest-products economy is not—and will not be—a free economy when such information is possessed by a few large buyers and is used to out-bargain small sellers. If we are to have a free and healthy forest economy—one in which neither people nor forests are subject to exploitive methods—access to objectively collected price data should be available to both sides in the discussion.

Although this bill does not provide for calculation of parity prices—partly because we have no price history upon which to base them—these should eventually be determined. I say this not because I feel that parity price supports would work in forestry, but to give sellers a measure of what would be a fair value. Parity calculations are carried out by the United States Department of Agriculture for nearly all farm commodities, and they furnish one means by which a farmer can decide on whether it pays him to grow one crop against another.

The Senate has recognized this problem by passing measures which I have sponsored designed to provide for forest products price reporting. Members of the House of Representatives are becoming aware of pressures by certain interests which seem to prefer monopoly to free enterprise.

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that forest crops are entitled to the same recognition, long overdue, accorded other farm crops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an article from the Journal of Forestry, dated December 1956, entitled "Some Statistical Needs in Forest Economies," written by Charles H. Stoddard, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 840) providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of improving the management and use of forest resources and in order to provide farmers and other owners of small forest properties with current information on markets and prices and to aid them in more efficiently and profitably marketing forest products, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, including but not limited to standing timber and cut forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood.

SEC. 2. The price reports made by the Secretary under section 1 shall be as to such species, grades, sizes, and other detail, and shall be made at such intervals, but at least quarterly, as he deems appropriate. Such reports shall be by State or forest regions or by such other areas as the Secretary considers advisable, and may, in his discretion, be made as to one or more areas in advance of other areas.

SEC. 3. In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 4. In the conduct of research activities under the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699), and the act of August 14, 1946, title II (60 Stat. 1087), the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as may be necessary.

The article, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, is as follows:

[From the Journal of Forestry of December 1956]

SOME STATISTICAL NEEDS IN FOREST ECONOMICS

(By Charles H. Stoddard)

Over the years foresters have become prodigious collectors of all manner of data on many of the important aspects of forestry. Detailed attention has been given to forest land acreages, timber volumes, growth and drain, and other aspects of the condition of basic resources by the Forest Surveys of the United States Forest Service. The most recent effort, the Timber Resource Review, has added materially to our quantitative measurements of the current American forest situation. Though there are still many gaps in land and timber data, we are at the point where we have a fairly adequate knowledge of the essential details.

In keeping with the fields of agriculture and industry, statistical data on lumber, pulp and paper production, and some other finished forest products, covering such items as wages paid, value added through manufacture, number of employees in manufacturing industries, industry profits, carloadings, and prices of finished and semifinished goods, are regularly reported and recorded. Such familiar sources as the Survey of Current Business, annual Statistical Abstract, Agricultural Statistics, Census of Business, Census of Agriculture and publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics all contain some data on these various phases of forest products generally in their finished or semifinished form. The trade associations likewise publish excellent current production data on finished output.

However, between the time timber is severed from the stump and the time it is sold to a processor for manufacture, value is added through the expenditure of labor and the use of machinery. During this raw material stage many important areas of information are covered inadequately or not at all from a statistical standpoint. It is this aspect of forest economics with which this paper is concerned.

An example of the serious lack of continuous and substantive data on rough forest products is the 1954 Yearbook of Agriculture devoted to marketing which failed to include any mention of the raw material derived from forest lands save brief mention of naval stores. Although foresters have been saying for years that timber is a crop, the Department of Agriculture fails to include it as such in most of its important farm programing.

Little need be said to justify the value that additional statistical material can add to this or any other field. In today's economy where business and Government are engaged in continual efforts to maintain healthy and prosperous business conditions, measurements of rates of change of various sectors are completely dependent upon accurate, regularly collected data. It is taken for granted that in most other branches of our economy, agriculture, most industry, labor, and consumer interests, large bodies of useful data must be available. No case can be made for collection of statistics as an end in itself, and this has sometimes been done, but certainly where clearly objective factual measurement will contribute to greater knowledge and understanding of a situation there can be little doubt as to the value of the effort. Furthermore, a free economy assumes that producer and consumer are fully appraised of changes in the economy in order that they may make informed decisions. To the whole field of forest economics, research and sound basic data are essential raw materials.

Because forest activity is a business as far flung geographically as agriculture, data gathering becomes a difficult and extended effort. Yet for years foresters have said, timber is a crop, while failing to insist on finding out how significant a crop it really is. Production of various kinds of round and rough forest products, points of origin, the prices at which they are bought and sold, employment generated, the wages paid, and the costs of woods production are only a few of the long list of items about which we lack statistical data. Although we have much information on the number of people and enterprises engaged in primary agriculture and the price received for farm products, nothing comparable is collected in forestry.

To obtain a more adequate picture of primary timber production activities many types of data now collected for agriculture would suffice. Without attempting to assign in detail agency or other responsibility for this task a simple enumeration may be useful at this point. The following incomplete list includes some of the kinds of data that would be useful; other types will suggest themselves.

1. In classifying types of farms under the Census of Agriculture timber or tree farms should be given a special grouping. This would provide a measure of the significance of continuous managed tree growing in the total forest land use picture as well as giving recognition to this special type of farming. Game farms, shooting preserves, trout farms, and other wildlife areas used commercially for other than usual farm crops should also be shown.

2. Complete enumeration of logging contracting firms and independent timber producers should be tabulated in the Census of Business in the same manner as other types of business. Included should be data on gross and net income, number of employees, total wages paid, and value and volume of output.

3. In the Census of Agriculture farm income from forest products is shown, but data revealing wages from off-farm woods work and income from sale of forest products cut from stumpage bought from others are intermingled but not shown separately.

4. Current prices of forest products should be collected and disseminated with market reports in the same manner as other farm products in order to keep forest owners and timber producers informed of developments in supply and demand. It is recognized that stumpage prices are more difficult to obtain and present. Further study may be required before actual data can be disseminated. Sawlogs, pulpwood, railroad ties, posts, piling, and rough lumber are all subject to standard grading rules and may be classified for pricing fairly simply.

5. While data on employment, income, and wages in wood-processing industries and company logging camps are collected, none are obtained for self-employed woods workers or those employed in "gyppo" operations. These comprise a large portion of woods workers in the Eastern States.

6. Current and prospective market information should be made available through reports comparable to those now published by the United States Department of Agriculture for many other farm commodities.

The desirability of including parity calculations in forest products price reporting has been advanced by some and questioned by others. Recognized as a useful but highly imperfect yardstick for measuring relative changes in the purchasing power of a commodity, parity prices have been calculated for many decades by the United States Department of Agriculture on about 130 commodities. The concept of price supports as related to parity began in the 1930's and programs have been limited chiefly to a dozen or so basic products.

Forest owners who are only occasional sellers of timber products usually have no basis for judging the adequacy of currently offered prices, in the experience of the writer. Since standing timber can be withheld from the market when prices are low in relation to other commodities, a parity price would be a useful standard for many sellers. But because historical price data for base periods are so inadequate, parity calculation would be difficult. That parity calculations would lead to price supports is highly improbable since cut timber is difficult to store for any length of time. In any case timber does not press on the market the minute it is ripe. Though difficult to determine, parity calculations would be helpful to owners and sellers.

JOURNAL OF FORESTRY

That professional foresters have not urged various agencies to undertake collection of these data long before this may possibly be indicative of the lack of intensive forestry until recently. That enrichment of our field of knowledge should receive the support of everyone interested in forestry activities would appear obvious. But strangely enough, complete agreement does not exist in all quarters. Price reporting in Georgia is said to have been discontinued under pressure. Only in Oregon, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire are continuous efforts made to supply current information to producers. In those States the extension foresters have pioneered in this undertaking with little encouragement. In recent legislative proposals forest products price and market reporting was specifically provided for, but met defeat for a variety of reasons.

Until these and other data needs are met, understanding of the operation of our forest economy will continue to be inadequate. To the extent to which foresters and forest landowners continue to lack basic data just so long will we be unable to carry out research needed to solve difficult problems. And so long as sellers lack the market knowledge possessed only by buyers will this sector of our economy fall short of being completely free. When these conditions are met, timber will be generally recognized and given status as a crop.

PRICE REPORTING SERVICE ON BASIC FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for establishing a price reporting service for basic forest products.

Through the years, I have been especially interested in our small and family farmer and have supported legislation which would give them better opportunities for increasing their income. I believe that our forestry program offers great opportunities to all landowners, including small landowners, and this bill is designed to assist small farmers in obtaining better price information for marketing their timber products. Our national welfare is greatly dependent upon a continuous supply of wood products from the 489 million acres of commercial forest land in the United States. Of this total area, three-fourths is held by 4.5 million private owners. Of these, 3.4 million, or 75 percent, are farm owners, who control one-third of the total commercial forest land area. Approximately 3.9 million individuals, including farmers, hold less than 100 acres of commercial forest land each.

These many small landowners control one-third of the commercial forest land, but they do not have access to current marketing prices for various kinds of standing timber or for many cut products. Their only source of information comes from the timber companies or other persons to which they sell. The Department of Agriculture collects and publishes information on practically every farm product except timber. There is a great need for this type of information to assist our many small farm woodland owners to determine the current value of their wood products. The timber production on small farms is at a relatively low rate when compared with Government and industrial producers. More adequate price information will tend to stimulate more interest in better woodland management. These small timber farmers would be encouraged to undertake reforestation measures and to take better care of their timber stands, which would in turn increase productivity and, in the end, mean a greater profit. I visualize this bill for better price information as a step toward an improved cycle that will contribute greatly to our forestry program.

There is a provision in the bill for studies to be made relative to the marketing of timber products. One important aspect of forest-product marketing that needs study is the establishment of sound, easily applied grades for logs, stave and veneer bolts, and other timber products. Farmers sell many other agricultural crops on the basis of grades which have been established by the Department of Agriculture. The selling of timber products on grade should also be beneficial to timber growers, but for many forest products no grading system has been established. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

Other research which might be conducted includes the developing of methods to increase the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products. More specifically, studies should be made to determine more efficient practices for:

First. Moving logs from stump to mill,

Second. Reducing logging and milling waste of usable wood,

Third. Using mechanical methods of handling bulky wood items, to reduce costs, and

Fourth. Binding lumber, rough staves, and other small semiprocessed wood products for cheaper unit handling with mechanical equipment.

The effect of these and other efficiencies should be to increase the net profit of timber growers and provide a uniform system of marketing.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that this decade will go down in history as a period of reawakening and awareness to the importance of our forests. This industry is making great strides on every front, and timely price information as a guide to market opportunities is critically needed. This bill is a sound approach to providing real assistance to our many small landowners, and I hope the Senate will give it full approval.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 841) to provide for establishing a price reporting service for basic forest products, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to raise the exemption under regulation A of the Securities and Exchange Commission from $300,000 to $500,000.

Accentuated by the tight-money policies, the chronic gap between financing availability and requirements of small business have never been more evident or compelling than in the past year. One means of small-business financing is by use of the securities market. While I recognize that the smallest concerns do not generally make use of this market because of high cost factors, companies of intermediate size should be enabled to consider the securities market as an important source of funds. It is, in fact, imperative that all avenues of finance be kept open for independent business.

I believe that the price rises since the exemption was last raised in 1945, and the rapid expansion of our economy, make it desirable to raise the SEC exemption from $300,000 to $500,000. I note that the SEC, itself, has in times past proposed the same increase. More recently, the President's Committee on Small Business also suggested the $500,000 figure. I hope that we may have speedy action on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 843) further amending the Securities Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of national health insurance.

Fourteen years ago, in company with several of my colleagues, I proposed the enactment of legislation for a comprehensive national health program which would promote the further improvement

of medical science and practice. Several times since then I have joined in the reintroduction of such proposed legislation. The program was designed to make available to all our people the benefits of modern medicine which too often are not accessible because good facilities and doctors are scarce or too far away or too costly.

In these 14 years, medical research and medical technology have recorded miraculous advances. Many new hospitals and other facilities have been built. Research facilities have been enlarged. New drugs and treatments have been discovered. Steps have been taken to augment the number of doctors, dentists, and other practitioners and their supporting personnel, and to help them work more efficiently. Most of these advances—particularly in research and the construction of facilities—have been stimulated or assisted through programs established by congressional action.

On the economic side of medical care, also, there has been a record of improvement during recent years, but it is doubtful whether this has even kept pace with advances in the art and science of medicine itself. In fact, the remarkable improvements in medical techniques have themselves been a factor in pushing the price of modern medical care beyond the financial means of millions of families.

The spread of voluntary insurance partially covering certain types of costs has helped substantially, particularly in enabling many of our people to meet hospitalization expenses and some of the expense of surgery. I have no wish to understate the importance and usefulness of such insurance within the limits of its availability. But the existing insurance programs do not protect against large elements of risk—risks which may prove calamitous for the individual families which may be stricken; and these insurance programs even now finance, on the average, considerably less than a third of the potentially insurable bills for medical care which may confront the average family or a family with income below the average. Large groups in our population, such as our 15 million people over age 65, find themselves with limited or shrinking insurance protection, or entirely excluded from health insurance, at the very period in life when they have the most need for medical services and are least able to budget for the cost. Our farm families generally cannot share the advantages of group insurance; they must rely on higher cost individual insurance or none at all. The self-employed and the employees of small firms also are in most cases subject to similar discrimination.

Voluntary health insurance has done much and it can do more, but there is nothing in its history or promise to support an expectation that this device will ever remove the financial barriers to medical services for substantially all who need ready access to such services. Indeed, even assuming that the recent rate of expansion persists into the future, it will be many years before voluntary insurance will provide comprehensive protection against all significant health risks for even that part of the population now covered by hospital-expense insurance—and about a third of our population still does not have even this basic coverage. Dental care is as urgent, expensive, and difficult to budget for many families as is medical or surgical care; yet the voluntary insurers and the dental profession have barely begun their studies of this problem.

A recent factual study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—published in the December 1956 issue of the Social Security Bulletin—has shown that in 1955 there was indeed a rise of 16 percent in the dollar volume of voluntary health-insurance benefits, as compared with 1954. But the need was rising almost as fast as these expenditures. According to the research report, this rise in insurance benefits "was only sufficient to increase by 1.8 percentage points the coverage of the national-medical-care bill." Merely to keep up with population growth the dollar volume of benefits must rise by 2 percent a year, and, as the Department's study further points out, "If the costs of medical care continue to rise, the volume must increase even more if the same level of protection previously afforded is to be continued."

At their best, then, these existing programs are recording distressingly slow progress in closing the wide gap between actual medical-care costs and potential insurance protection. If the 1955 rate of improvement can be maintained—and this is by no means likely, since the extension of coverage obviously is at its most rapid rate in this early period of development—it will nevertheless be 30 years or more before voluntary insurance can cover the "potentially insurable expenditures" as defined in the Department's study. That is to say, it will be 1986 or later—more than a generation, mind you, Mr. President—before voluntary insurance at its 1955 rate of expansion succeeds in covering payments for services of physicians, hospitals, dentists, and nurses, and one-third of expenditures for drugs and appliances.

Take an even more modest goal: How long would it be, at the present expansion rate, before these plans covered as much as two-thirds of the potentially insurable expenditures? The answer is this: It would take fully 16 years. Not before 1972 or 1973 would we achieve a situation in which only 1 family in 3 would still remain without health insurance protection, or in which the average family could expect to pay, over and above its insurance premiums, not more than one-third of those medical-care costs which are now recognized as "potentially insurable."

Yet all the present Republican administration has been willing to offer is a plan of reinsurance that even the insurance companies rejected. More recently the administration has proposed that small insurers be exempted from the antitrust laws if they choose to pool their risks. These are timid, temporizing proposals. Neither plan would help noticeably to lower the voluntary insurance premiums or significantly increase the groups covered, the range of risks protected against, or the proportion of medical costs insured for the average family. After 4 years of trying, the present Republican administration still is unable to offer a plan acceptable to the health insurance business and the professional health groups and service organizations, let alone a plan that will serve the needs of the public at large. Its reinsurance and pooling proposals are facades for inaction. Their adoption would not even accelerate noticeably the development of the existing voluntary insurance.

Thirty years—or even 16 years—is a long time to live with a problem when an effective solution is already at hand. We need not wait until 1986, or even until 1972, for an adequate program if we but have the vision and courage to take action now, in 1957.

While the administration continues its endless rounds of studies and conferences, insurmountable financial hurdles compel millions of our people to forego, year after year, the health services they need—services which are called for by modern standards of good care, services which are now technically feasible but carry forbidding price tags for many families, services which are already considered "potentially insurable" even by those who continue to delay positive legislative action.

And these unused services do not get into the total of current expenditures for health care. They do not even get into the national income accounts, except in a negative sort of way, for they represent a tremendous, irretrievable loss of productive power—a lowering of the national income below what it would otherwise be. If voluntary health insurance is now paying less than a third of the potentially insurable bills actually incurred for medical care, and the administration's own studies show that it paid under 30 percent in 1955, then obviously such insurance is paying a much smaller fraction of the bills that ought to be incurred if all our people are to enjoy good health.

The Nation cannot afford a small fraction of protection. The cost is too great in terms both of human suffering and lost manpower. An adequate program must cover substantially the whole population and it should protect each family and each individual against all significant risks. An adequate program should distribute each year's costs over the whole population instead of letting it be concentrated on those who suffer illness in that year. It should distribute each person's costs over his working life instead of concentrating the costs in his years of greatest adversity. This is a big order and it calls for correspondingly broad action. It calls for a national health insurance program. Nothing less will do the job.

Through a national health insurance program we can make more and better medical care available to all our people, in a way that preserves the individual's choice of doctors and the doctors' full control of their practice. By instituting national health insurance we can halt the further expansion of the existing large and uncoordinated public programs, financed by general tax revenues,

which have been found necessary to serve particular population groups for whom private insurance coverage has offered little or no help. Unless we adopt national health insurance, we shall be faced with irresistible pressures to add and expand Government-operated health services for additional groups—not only in the National Government, but also in the State, county, and municipal governments. At all levels, the publicly operated systems of medical and hospital care for selected categories of individuals are already substantial.

The bill I am introducing today omits several important features of earlier proposals for a national health program because these provisions or equivalent measures have already been enacted. I am proud to say that a substantial part of this record of accomplishment was achieved under Democratic leadership in the 84th Congress—a Congress which, as summarized in a recent news report, "enacted more health legislation than any of its predecessors in the past decade."

This recent progress toward spelling out the rest of our national health program has enabled me to focus this bill on the insurance problem, omitting from it the following subjects which were covered in earlier comprehensive bills, such as S. 1679 of the 81st Congress:

First. The education of health personnel.

Second. Medical research.

Third. Expansion of the hospital survey and construction grant program.

Fourth. Special aid for rural and other shortage areas.

Fifth. Increased grants to States for State and local health work.

Sixth. Research in child life and increased grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

I do not mean to imply that existing programs in these fields meet all present or foreseeable needs. Much remains to be done, particularly in the further promotion of research and in expanding the protective and preventive services of State and local health departments in rural and suburban, as well as urban, areas. We do not as yet have a separate Federal program for helping rural and other shortage areas to obtain more health personnel and facilities; however, the needs of these areas are accorded special emphasis in the Hill-Burton and other programs.

Thus, a start has been made on each major type of problem other than the question of insurance to cover the major costs of medical care.

The bill which I now introduce would provide the one major missing ingredient of our national health program. The national health insurance system would be a contributory system, similar in conception to our successfully time-tested programs of old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment insurance, and it would be similarly financed and operated. It would spread the cost over the entire working population, safeguarding all from the unexpected impact of unbearable expense. It would not change the practice of medicine, but it would establish a much more solid economic foundation for that practice. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide a better system for financing our free system of medicine, and by this means to correct the existing maldistribution of health personnel and facilities.

How would the program work?

Under the policy of the National Health Insurance Act, insured persons would make payments proportional to their incomes from employment—but no one would pay on more than $6,000 of such income in a year. Employed persons would be charged 1½ percent of earnings but not more than $90 in a year for the highest paid worker; and their employers would match these payments. Contributions by the employers are, of course, an accepted practice in the social security system. Nor is this an innovation in health insurance. Employers are already paying about one-fourth of all health insurance premiums collected under existing plans.

Self-employed persons also would be covered, as would all persons who are entitled to old-age, survivors, or disability benefits under the Social Security Act and all who are entitled to an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Insured individuals and their families would receive benefits as a right, not as charity. The care would include preventive and diagnostic examinations, laboratory and X-ray services, as well as curative treatment in the hospital or at home. Hospitalization would be provided up to a maximum of 60 days a year for each individual at the outset and for a longer period later, if feasible. Dental services and the more costly prescribed medicines would be covered, as would home nursing, special appliances, and eyeglasses.

To assure the availability of a full range of services in each State and health-service area, a program would be developed within each State for achieving the maximum participation and use of health personnel and facilities and to encourage improvement in their number and distribution throughout the State. It would be a positive objective and specific goal of the program to make available in all health-service areas, throughout the United States, the full range of medical, hospital, and other personal health services being underwritten by the insurance system. To this end, the bill specifies that payments for professional services, and the other terms and conditions of agreements with practitioners and others, shall be adequate not only to encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished, but also to provide professional and financial incentives to practitioners to advance in their professions and to practice in localities where their services are most needed.

Each individual would be assured full freedom to choose his physician or dentist and to change his choice as he desires. Physicians, dentists, and other professional persons furnishing services under the act would be assured full freedom in the practice of their professions, including the right to accept or reject patients, except as this right may be restricted by their own professional ethics or State laws. Administration would be based on the American principle of decentralization, with the States and local bodies carrying out the actual operations within the limits of the purposes, policies, and procedures specified in the law. The States would be authorized and encouraged to make service agreements with organizations operating voluntary health service insurance plans or other voluntary health-service plans. The Federal role would be limited substantially to collecting funds for distribution through the States to local practitioners and service organizations, and to establishing broad standards for operation of the system.

The amounts collected from workers and their employers, and from the self-employed, would be set aside in the Federal Treasury in a separate special account to be known as the "Personal Health Services Account." To this fund the Federal Government would—if necessary—add, through appropriations from general revenue as determined by Congress, amounts equaling for any year not more than 1 percent of the covered payrolls. The payments to the States would be made from the special account.

Those persons, including the needy, who do not qualify as insured individuals or the dependents of insured individuals will receive health services under the program through arrangements to be made between the health-insurance system and appropriate public agencies of the National Government or of the several States or their political subdivisions. In such cases, reimbursements are to be paid to the health services account by the appropriate authority, and the bill provides expressly that there shall be available to the States, for the purpose of making such payments, the Federal grants which they receive for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Services furnished to noninsured individuals, including the needy, are required to be of the same quality, be furnished by the same methods, and be paid for through the same arrangements as services to insured individuals.

The national health-insurance bill would not change the practice of medicine, but by changing the way we pay for medical and other health services this program would enable the American people to finance more and better health care for all our people. It would bring the wonders of modern medicine within the economic reach of all. It would encourage preventive treatment, and it would permit earlier and more adequate treatment when illness strikes in spite of all preventive efforts. It would release millions of people from financial worries and intolerable debts which intensify their ailments and retard recovery.

Under this national health insurance system, each individual would go to his own doctor just as he does now. Freedom to choose and change doctors would be guaranteed and protected.

The doctor would treat each patient as he considers best. If laboratory work or specialist services or costly medications were required, the doctor would order them. The bill guarantees the doctor the right to join or not join the program.

It guarantees him political, professional, and economic freedom.

The main differences would be that the bills for services would be sent to the local body representing the insurance fund, rather than to the patient or his family, and the doctor would be free to give the best care the patient needs, without having to ask whether the patient can afford it.

An eminent medical leader has recently observed that, for an insurance payment of $100 a person a year, medical science "could give a service the like of which has not ever been known, a service of a thoroughness, convenience, and efficacy such as to reduce the incidence, the severity, and the cost of present illness in our population."

My bill is more modest. It dos not set the goal that high. But it would channel into the financing of medical care a sum greater than has ever before been devoted to this service in this country. In so doing, it would eliminate for a very large proportion of our population, those economic barriers which cut them off from adequate health services. No longer would those who suffer the misfortunes of illness be simultaneously overwhelmed by financial misfortune. For the population as a whole, all of us who have gainful employment in any year would help to share the cost of providing health care for the entire population in that year. For each individual, the costs of his health care would be spread substantially over his entire working life, rather than concentrated in the years of greatest adversity.

The result would indeed be a quality and completeness of health service the like of which has not ever been known. The results in human happiness, economic productivity, and national well-being will far outweigh the costs and the effort. And in truth, these are not additional costs. If we continue the long wait for voluntary programs to do this job, we shall pay out far more, over the next generation and longer, in wasted manpower, lost productivity, and needless suffering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 844) to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MURRAY, WATKINS, CARROLL, BARRETT, KUCHEL, and ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I believe will be instrumental in helping to preserve a fine, long-standing American tradition—the healthful and alluring appeal of the great outdoors.

We Americans are fond of hunting, fishing, camping, and all the other sporting activities connected with outdoor life. This is a fine tradition, and we want to preserve and foster it. Our outdoor resources will be as important and desirable to our country's future generations as they are to us.

I believe we have a duty to protect and preserve America's outdoor recreation heritage and opportunities. We cannot accomplish this by leaving it to chance or by taking our resources for granted. Outdoor recreation resources, like any other natural resource, can be protected and developed only by sound planning, intelligently based upon the fullest understanding of all the pertinent facts and requirements.

In brief, our Nation is confronted with a twofold situation. First, outdoor recreation activity is increasing at an accelerated pace. This has been caused by increases in population, more leisure time, and better modes of transportation. Last year, there were more than 50 million visits to our national parks and forests. There were more than 183 million visits to the State parks. There are in excess of 25 million licensed hunters and fishermen in our country today, and this does not include the millions more of our youngsters for whom a license is not required. In all phases of outdoor activities the trend is rising toward greater participation.

We are happy to see this increase in activities, but this brings us to the problem at hand. The space and resources upon which outdoor recreation depends are diminishing. The growth of our cities, highways, and industry have taken their separate tolls. More intensive utilization of all other products and resources of our lands and waters has made its force felt also. Of course, we do not propose that such elements of progress be slowed. However, we do suggest that the solution to the problem of greater outdoor recreation demand and diminishing resources requires that we plan wisely to obtain the fullest utilization of our resources for the future.

The proposed legislation would authorize the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which will enable us to begin to solve some of the problems I have mentioned. The Commission's task will be to undertake a comprehensive inventory and evaluation of the outdoor recreation resources of the Nation. It will project as scientifically as possible known trends of population and recreation habits and desires of the public, in order to estimate our future needs for continued outdoor recreation opportunity. Finally, it will develop recommendations for methods and programs which can serve as guides in future planning by the Federal departments, States, and private organizations.

It is not the intent of the measure to duplicate programs and studies now under way by various interested agencies. The bill provides that the Commission shall utilize fully all such material and data available from the Federal departments, State agencies, or other sources. Further, the Commission is directed to make the maximum practical use of the facilities of the various States, univerities, and other competent groups which may best be able to carry out particular phases of the review.

Implicit in the undertaking is the fact that all segments of our Nation have a big stake in the future of American outdoor recreation. Cooperatively, through the suggested review, we shall be able to gain an understanding of the problems and to participate fully in planning to meet the future.

Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the cooperation of other Senators and their staffs in the preparation of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 846) for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to preserve and develop for the American people of present and future generations such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment, and to assure the spiritual, cultural, and physical benefits that such outdoor recreation provides; in order to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and Territories, there is hereby authorized and created a bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) "Commission" shall mean the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission;

(2) "Outdoor recreation resources" shall mean the land and water areas and the products of such areas of the United States, its Territories, and possessions which provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, including but not limited to such pursuits as hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, skiing, mountain climbing, pack-tripping, nature photography, scenic appreciation, boating, canoeing, and other water activities, wherever carried out or potentially carried out, including but not limited to such areas as the national forests, the public domain, Indian reservations, wild, wilderness, and primitive areas; national parks and monuments; wildlife refuge, habitat and management areas, both Federal and State; scenic areas, the marsh and wetlands, coastal beaches, reservoir, and such other land and water areas, irrespective of ownership, which presently provide or may in the future provide outdoor recreation opportunities.

(3) "Outdoor recreation resources" shall not mean nor include recreation facilities,

programs and opportunities usually associated with urban development such as playgrounds, stadia, golf courses, city parks, and zoos.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission hereby authorized and created shall consist of 15 members appointed as follows:

(1) Two majority and two minority members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Two majority and two minority members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to be appointed by the Sepaker of the House; and

(3) Seven citizens, known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resources uses, who shall be appointed by the President, and one of whom shall be designated as chairman by the President.

Vacancies occurring on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members of the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original positions.

(b) The Commission members shall serve without compensation, except that each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual travel and subsistence expense incurred in the services of the Commission and each member appointed by the President shall be entitled to a per diem allowance not to exceed $50 per day when actually engaged in Commission business.

(c) The Commission shall convene as soon as practicable following appointment of its members, to implement the purposes and objectives of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, except that any Federal employees subject to the civil-service laws and regulations who may be assigned to the Commission shall retain civil-service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege.

(b) The Commission shall establish headquarters in the District of Columbia and shall make such other arrangements as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(c) The Commission shall request each Federal agency with a direct interest and responsibility in any phase of outdoor recreation to appoint, and each such agency shall appoint, a liaison officer who shall work closely with the Commission and its staff.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council which shall consist of the liaison officers appointed under section 4 (c), together with 25 additional members appointed by the Commission who shall be representative of the various major geographical areas and citizen interest groups including the following: State game and fish departments, State park departments, State forestry departments, private organizations working in the field of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, landowners, State water pollution control agencies, State water development agencies, private forestry interests, commercial fishing interests, commercial outdoor recreation interests, industry, education, labor, public utilities, and municipal governments.

(b) The functions of the Advisory Council shall be to advise and counsel the Commission in the development of ways, means, and procedures whereby maximum cooperation may be obtained from all criteria for evaluating outdoor recreation resources data assembled and otherwise to advise and assist the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Council, except those employed by the Federal Government and assigned to the Commission as liaison officers, shall serve without compensation except that each shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Advisory Council called by the chairman of the Commission, or incurred in carrying out duties assigned by the chairman of the Commission.

(d) The chairman of the Commission shall call an initial organization meeting of the Advisory Council, a meeting of such Council each 6 months thereafter and a final meeting of such Council prior to transmitting the final report to the President and the Congress.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall proceed as soon as practicable to set in motion a nationwide inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, directly and through the Federal agencies, the States, and private organizations and groups, utilizing to the fullest extent possible such studies, data, and reports previously prepared or concurrently in process by Federal agencies, States, private organizations, groups and others.

(b) The Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation and other factors shall determine the amount, kind, quality and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976, and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs be initiated, at each level of Government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

(c) The Commission shall present not later than December 31, 1959, a report of its review, a compilation of its data, and its recommendations on a State by State, region by region, and national basis to the President and to the Congress. Such report, compilation, and recommendations shall be presented in such form as to make them of maximum value to the States and shall include recommendations as to means whereby the review may effectively be kept current in the future. The Commission on request of the President or the Congress shall prepare interim or progress reports on particular phases of its review.

(d) The Commission is authorized to conduct public hearings and otherwise to secure data and expressions of opinion.

(e) The Commission is authorized to make direct grants to the States, from sums appropriated pursuant to section 8, to carry out such aspects of the review as the Commission may determine can best be carried out by the States, under such arrangements and agreements as are determined by the Commission; and may enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public or private agencies and organizations.

SEC. 7. The Commission, in its inquiries, findings, and recommendations, shall recognize that present and future solutions to problems of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities are responsibilities at all levels of government, from local to Federal, and of individuals and private organizations as well. The Commission shall recognize that lands, waters, forests, rangelands, wetlands, wildlife, and such other natural resources that serve economic purposes also serve in varying degrees and for varying uses outdoor recreation purposes, and that sound planning of resource utilization for the full future welfare of the Nation must include coordination and integration of all such multiple uses.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, which sums shall be available to the Commission until expended but not later than June 30, 1960.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as "The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Act."

RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, today I am joining my distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Members of the Senate and the House in joint sponsorship of a bill which I confidently expect will meet with a large measure of bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress and in the country generally.

The Senator from New Mexico has described the bill in his introductory statement, so at this time I shall not go into the details of the bill. Suffice it to say that the bill, which will be known as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Act, represents a considerable amount of constructive thought and action by the Izaak Walton League of America, which did the basic drafting of the measure. I particularly desire to commend Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, of Wheatridge, Colo., western representative of the league, and one of the moving forces behind this proposal. His fairminded and positive approach to the problems which prompted this proposed legislation, and his awareness of the importance of multiple use of our public lands, will, I am sure, do much to elicit a large measure of public support for this measure.

There are three points which I should like to cover very briefly:

First. This bill, if enacted, will be primarily factfinding legislation. It will set up a public bipartisan commission to ascertain the facts on our greatly expanding outdoor recreational needs and the pressures which are building up on our dwindling resources and facilities. Facts and recommendations arising from this study will assist the Congress and the various State legislatures in future legislation on this subject, and also will aid movements for effective State parks departments in my State and others.

Second. The bill recognizes the importance of multiple use of recreational resources, and of action on all levels of government. An advisory committee provided for in the bill will insure representation of geographical areas and of the various interests using the lands, waters, and other resources affected.

3. Costs will be reasonable, because the Commission will have access to a large volume of material already assembled by Federal and State Governments, by private organizations, and by educational institutions. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks copies of agency announcements and publicity articles which indicate some of the activities already completed or underway in this research field, as follows:

Press release of United States Department of Agriculture dated January 15, 1957, describing Operation Outdoors.

Excerpt from press release of United States Department of the Interior dated January 1, 1957, describing resource conservation progress in 1956.

Press release of United States Department of the Interior, dated August 1,

1956, describing guide to recreational opportunities on western reservoirs.

Article from American Forests, August 1956, entitled "Multiple Use on Private Lands."

Editorial from the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of December 28, 1956, entitled "Where Will Our Children Play?"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Information produced by such studies as the National Parks Service's mission 66 program, the Forest Service's Operation Outdoors, and the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.'s experimental development of public parks on private property—as reviewed in the material I have just submitted—can be collated and evaluated by the commission proposed in the bill.

The problem, I might add for the benefit of my eastern friends, holds far more urgency for the East than it does for the West. In the West we have many millions of acres of lands already reserved for national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas. Here in the East, with a few significant exceptions, there are tremendous pressures for the relatively few remaining acres suitable for public parks, wilderness, and seashore. Furthermore, at present there is no organized program on a State-Federal basis to determine future needs and to take steps to acquire and preserve recreational areas that are not already set aside. This bill will contribute to that end here in the East, and at the same time will give us in the West a better appreciation of the long-term requirements of our reserved recreational resources.

Meanwhile, we invite the city dwellers in the East to plan vacations in the West, where they can escape suburbia and can savor the satisfactions of outdoor recreation in mountain playgrounds and untrammeled wildernesses.

EXHIBIT A

OPERATION OUTDOORS DESIGNED TO DOUBLE NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION FACILITIES

Operation Outdoors, a plan to double camping and picnicking facilities in the national forests within the next 5 years to meet a steadily building demand for such facilities, was announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Recreation visits to the national forests will hit the 66 million mark by 1962, Forest Service officials predict. Their estimate is based on the past rate of rise in recreation use of national forests, the growing population, increased time for leisure activities, and the upward swing in money spent for recreation.

The 5-year recreation plan was released following the President's budget message to Congress which recommended financial support of the project to start this year. The program resulted from the Department's study of various congressional and public proposals to balance recreation facilities with the mounting use. At the request of Congress a comprehensive survey of needs in the 150 national forests throughout the country has been made.

Operation Outdoors is a double-barreled program. First it aims at solving the problem of ever-increasing family outdoor activities such as picnicking and camping in the national forests. A second part will deal with improvement and management of wildlife habitat in cooperation with State game departments. The report released today deals only with the family type recreation program and is designated part 1. Part 2 will be released later.

Some 2,150 new camping and picnicking grounds which will accommodate 40,500 additional families at a time are called for in Operation Outdoors. Tables and fireplaces are to be repaired and sanitary facilities modernized on the 4,900 camp and picnic grounds which now can properly accommodate only 41,400 families. As in the past, it will be left to private capital to provide and operate resorts and other special facilities in the national forests.

"Operation Outdoors is geared not only to correct existing unsatisfactory conditions at national forest recreation areas but also to meet foreseeable use during the next 5 years," Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, said. "At the same time, however, we must keep recreation in balance with the use of other national forest resources, such as water, timber, and forage.

"The American people are seeking outdoor recreation more than ever before. The national forests are feeling this boom with a tremendous increase in visits. Our existing facilities simply can't handle the load."

Recreation visits to the national forests hit an all-time high of 45½ million in 1955 as compared to 18.2 million in 1946. About 39 percent of the people camped and picnicked outside improved areas because existing facilities, largely built by the Civilian Conservation Corps between 1933 and 1941, could not take care of them.

Existing facilities have deteriorated under excessive use. Picnic tables, campfire grates, and sanitary facilities need constant repair. Sections of some popular areas have been closed for indefinite periods because facilities were completely worn out and funds have not been available to replace them.

Many people, unable to find a spot to picnic or camp in established areas, have gone to places where there are no sanitary facilities and no fireplaces. Streams that supply water to nearby towns and cities are being threatened with pollution and forest-fire danger is increasing. Through Operation Outdoors it is expected that these serious conditions can be alleviated.

A copy of the report Operation Outdoors may be obtained upon request to the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

RESOURCE CONSERVATION PROGRESS IN 1956 NOTED BY SECRETARY SEATON

Significant progress in the natural resource programs of the Department of the Interior was recounted today by Secretary Fred A. Seaton in summing up the activities of the Department in the past year.

Secretary Seaton forecast additional solid accomplishments for the Department in 1957. He cited particularly two long-range conservation programs which he believes will make major advances during the next 12 months.

One of these is the mission 66 program of the Department's National Park Service. This comprehensive 10-year program will be in its second year. Its purpose is to provide the Nation in the next decade with a fully protected national park system adequate to accommodate the 80 million visitors anticipated by 1966.

The other long-range program given special mention by Secretary Seaton is a greatly expanded effort to develop and conserve the Nation's wildlife and fishery resources. The Secretary announced inauguration of work on the new program late in 1956. In directing the Department's United States Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a blueprint for the broadened conservation effort, Secretary Seaton declared:

"The challenge of soundly managing our commercial fishery resources to assure a continued harvest and of meeting the growing demand for opportunities to fish and hunt at a time when those opportunities seem to be diminishing must be met headon."

EXHIBIT C

[From the Department of the Interior, August 1, 1956]

RECLAMATION ISSUES GUIDE TO RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ON WESTERN RESERVOIRS

How reservoirs constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States create and improve recreational opportunities for 10 million people a year is told in a newly published Bureau folder, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton said today.

The illustrated folder includes a map locating 140 recreational areas and a comprehensive chart showing the size of the lake and the facilities available. The chart shows the town or city nearest the reservoir and the name and address of the agency which administers the recreational facilities. Swimming, boating, fishing, camping, picnicking, and hunting opportunities are available at most reservoirs. Boat rentals, lodging, drinking water, picnic places, and other public facilities are generally provided by the administering agency or concessionaires.

The administration of recreational areas on Bureau projects is generally transferred to local, county, or State agencies, except where reservoir recreational areas have national significance. Where reservoirs are adjacent to or within Federal refuges, national forests, or national parks, such areas are usually administered for recreational purposes by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, or National Park Service, respectively.

The recreational values of Bureau developments, important byproducts of western water development, are enjoyed both by residents of the areas involved and by visitors from every point of the Nation. In addition to the intrinsic values of relaxation, sport, sightseeing, and other elements of recreational use of water areas in the West, the play areas are an important addition to the national economy.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer said that expenditures by visitors to recreational areas created by Reclamation are conservatively estimated at $59 million a year. This includes money spent for travel, food, lodging, and fishing, boating, and hunting equipment.

The Bureau folder, entitled "Reclamation's Recreational Opportunities," features the outstanding fishing and boating on the man-made water playgrounds. The great value and popularity of Bureau constructed reservoirs is enhanced, states the folder, by the fact that they are located in dry sagebrush country or deserts. Frequently, reservoirs are the only large bodies of water available for recreation for many miles around.

Habitat improvements for fish and wildlife are almost always included in reclamation projects with funds provided by the Congress. The fishing resources are often increased or improved with stock from State or Federal hatcheries.

The outstanding fishing and recreational values of reclamation reservoirs have recently been given wide recognition in articles in sports magazines. The folder quotes from such authorities as Ted Trueblood, Frank Dufresne, and Shep Shepherd.

The popularity of Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs as play spots is indicated by the 2,675,371 persons who visited Lake Mead at Hoover Dam last year; the 909,900 visitors at Jackson Lake, Wyo.; the 750,000 visitors at Buffalo Bill Reservoir, Wyo.; and the 605,024 visitors at Millerton Lake, Calif.

Copies of Reclamation Recreational Opportunities may be obtained from any Bureau field office or from the Commissioner of Reclamation, Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

[From American Forests of August 1956]

MULTIPLE USE ON PRIVATE LANDS

(By Kramer A. Adams)

The late Aldo Leopold, professional forester who became the father of modern game management once said, "Most of our wildlife problems are concerned not with the management of game, but with the management of people."

Those of you who manage the forests realize that there's an increasing amount of human management involved in the business of growing trees. More and more, Americans are turning to their forests—private, State, and Federal—in search for recreation. And there's no indication of relief ahead for the forester.

To the contrary, with shorter work hours, greater mobility through modern vehicles, and added money to spend on recreational pursuits, more people will head for the woods in the coming years.

Most of us are aware that Stanford Research Institute has predicted that the Nation's need for timber products will increase about 25 percent by 1975. But did you know that the Public Affairs Institute has said that the demand for recreation by 1960 will be 36 percent above last year and by 1965 will be 75 percent greater?

Another reliable estimate places the number of people enjoying the outdoors in 20 years as about double what it is now.

Where will the public go in the future while on this recreational spree? Resorts? Golf courses? National parks and forests? Yes, but some facilities there were crowded this year. A recent survey shows that fishing is America's favorite sport. Next is hunting, and of the top 10 participation sports, 7 are primarily woods-type activities.

It is evident that more and more pressure will be placed on the private timber owner to open his lands.

In the words of the current popular song, Something's Gotta Give.

Since the end of World War II, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. has opened increasing amounts of its Oregon and Washington timberland to the recreation seeker. During the current deer-hunting season, essentially all of its 2½ million acres that are not in operating areas bear the "Hunters Welcome" sign. Roughly half of the company's roads are open to hunter vehicle travel.

The company also maintains 11 public parks on its stream or lakeside property in the 2 States. Each offers piped running water, sanitary facilities, picnic benches and tables, fireplaces and free firewood. One has a children's playground and another a boat-launching ramp.

During the year, company lands are visited by more than 50,000 hunters, fishermen, campers, hikers, swimmers, horseback riders, picnickers, archers, rock collectors, skiers, bird watchers, photographers, sightseers, berry pickers, trappers, fern pickers, target shooters, dog field-trial participants, and wildflower gatherers.

Many other tree-farm operators have taken similar steps toward helping restless Americans get away from it all on private forest lands. But how much does this gesture cost? Just what happens when an army of hunters, for example, swarms over the forest seeking deer? Most of you, I'm afraid, know only too well.

To get some sort of a reliable answer to that question, each branch manager of Weyerhaeuser's western Washington tree farms was asked to observe hunter conduct during the 1954 hunting season. Their conclusions and experiences show that the average hunter is neither as bad as he is often pictured by the landowner nor as harmless as usually drawn by his allies.

The questionnaire was designed to provide a point of reference upon which to base future public recreation policies for company lands, and, perhaps, to show both the sportsman and Weyerhaeuser people the way to even better relations.

Here are some of the questions asked:

"Were any fires started that are traceable to deer hunters?"

Only 1 out of 9 respondents said "Yes." This amazing improvement over the normal number of hunter fires was helped in 1954 by the weather. So that, just as this year in the Northwest, it is impossible to tell how much credit goes to the hunter and how much to Jupiter Pluvius.

The threat of fire is still the primary reason across the Nation for barring entry to the forests—public or private.

"Were any roads damaged by hunter vehicles?" Tire chains tore up some soft roads; sheer volume of traffic caused damage at other points; motorcyclists were blamed for damage almost everywhere.

Two tree farms were victims of theft of company property. One forester's volunteered comment on this matter is significant. He said, "As a rule, the hunting season is only a cover for thieves who would be stealing anyway."

Four verified cases of lost hunters were reported requiring many man-hours of company time in the searches.

All areas reported malicious vandalism of some kind, ranging from dirt poured in the fuel tank of a D6 Caterpillar to mutilation of temporary signs. Six tree farms suffered a total of 14 broken locks or gates.

We also asked tree-farm managers, "Were your road signs and warnings generally respected?" The reply offers hope for the future of hunting. Weyerhaeuser people were unanimous in their opinion that hunters last year paid more heed to our road and warning signs.

As to violation of the State hunting laws, the Washington Game Department reported arrests by game protectors for 18 major offenses.

Aside from outright closure of private property, there are two ways to approach the matter:

1. By education of the hunter.

2. By stricter control of the hunter in the field.

Education or hunter control or a combination? Each of these methods will be given a test during coming deer-hunting seasons.

In Oregon, timbermen, farmers, the State game department, and every organization concerned with hunter conduct, have pledged cooperation in the Governor's Red Hat Day program. This is the educational effort designed to better relations between landowners and hunters.

There is every indication that this voluntary program is succeeding in legitimatizing the red hat and opening the gates to happier hunting grounds.

The amazing success of the Smokey Bear campaign, the keep-green programs, and similar efforts prove that public education can be effective.

The other approach, closer hunter control, will be tried next year on one of Weyerhaeuser's tree farm properties in western Washington. Here, four large management units will be operated during the general buck-hunting season. The game department has given tentative approval to taking over one unit. A local sportsmen's group will manage hunters on another unit, and the company will experiment with hunter control on two similar-sized units.

Modern logging methods have created near-ideal conditions for wildlife in some areas, which has brought on an increase in their populations. By law and tradition, the game belongs to the people. What better way to control an increasing wildlife population than by unlocking the gate and allowing the hunter to take the surplus?

"Multiple use" is a much misunderstood catchword that usually means "Federal forests" in the public mind. It has that connotation primarily because of the excellent job done by the Forest Service in making its lands available to hunters and fishermen and in providing campsites and other recreational facilities. Here's the popular appeal; the individual's tangible benefit from the forest.

Most private forest-land owners are now practicing true multiple use. In addition to keeping the forests productive, their management methods protect the watershed, help build the soil, provide room and board for fish and game and protect man and wildlife from fire and stream pollution. These facts are not generally understood.

The unfairness of the public's attitude is highlighted by the fact that millions of acres of easily accessible private forestlands across the country are now open to hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities. Catering to the outdoorsman costs Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. many thousands of dollars each year—with no thought or desire of tangible return on the investment.

Records show that in the Pacific Northwest's Douglasfir region, four big game animals are taken from private forests for every one taken from Federal forests. Mike Hudoba in the March issue of "Sports Afield" states that 85 percent of the Nation's hunting is done on private property.

There are many dangers in this mistaken public viewpoint which draws a line between public forest "multiple use" and the supposed private forest locked gate.

How can we focus public atention on all the important values of the Nation's privately owned forests? They've been told about the economic benefits of a well-managed harvest of timber; they may know about the fire and watershed protection provided by private landowners; and they may be aware of the improved governmental services made possible by huge taxes on private timberlands.

But these are distant colorless things. "Multiple use" has come to mean free public recreation, more than anything else. It's memories of fishing, camping, hunting, skiing, or traveling on so-called public lands.

Opening up of more private lands for recreation—where it doesn't interfere with the major purposes of forest management—is a start toward overcoming this mistaken public attitude on "multiple use."

It would mean recognized cooperation with the public under controlled conditions. By dispersing recreationists, less trouble and pressure would be experienced by the Federal, State, and private lands now opened. During hunting and fishing seasons, it will assure a better utilization of the game and fish crop.

Many of the users of private forestlands are employees of the landowner. Here's an important industrial relations advantage—another "fringe benefit" that makes living and working in the community more desirable. Employees should not, however, be given exclusive privileges, but should have the same opportunity as others to enjoy the forests.

But in opening the woods, how can we assure ourselves that these visitors will not start fires, will not damage roads or property, will not steal equipment nor litter the forest?

In removing the physical and psychological barrier between the recreationist and the private forest, the landowner has taken a great step in solving some of these problems. He has immediately become a friend of the outdoorsman. This generous overture is more often than not rewarded by improved community and public relations, a

greater sense of responsibility on the part of visitors, and a decreasing vandalism rate. We've found that recreation seekers are grateful for the privilege of roaming Weyerhaeuser lands unhindered. Hundreds of commendatory letters testify that hunters are human, too.

This is a display of faith that rubs off on most thinking sportsmen. But this throwing away of the key must be accompanied by suitable publicity to constantly remind visitors that they are on private land and have a trust to protect it and to behave themselves. And we cannot compromise the necessary fire closure laws now on the statute books.

Who are these people on the other side of the fence? Do you know them as well as you should? They don't all wear horns; are not all practicing arsonists or sign shooters.

The forest visitors are your neighbors, living in or near the mill community, who will stick up for a friendly company when it is in trouble.

They are the ones who vote and who influence forestry legislation. They are the citizens who buy our products and who log our woods and run our mills.

They are the sportsmen who pay license fees to manage and plant the game fish in waters on or near our forests; who pay the salaries of the game managers who have the power to control wildlife depredations.

These are the people who can be auxiliary fire wardens—a farflung, voluntary patrol so huge that no landowner could afford to pay for the service.

They are also the people who can prevent theft and vandalism in the woods and damage to roads.

Recreation and forestry are compatible. But just as in this Nation's potential timber production, we have not reached the limits of what might be called recreation production. The demand for, and value of, both products of the forest is destined to increase. When we think of multiple use in the future, let's add plans too, for a sustained yield of good landowner-sportsman relations.

"The forest industry's tree farm recreation program has come of age," said Frederick Billings, Public Recreation Administrator, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., in an address to the National Conference on State Parks. In explaining Weyerhaeuser's development of tree farm recreation areas Mr. Billings continued, "The use of my company's land for timber production, which involves watershed and soil protection as well, must come first, then, with recreational uses of this land following up in a strong second place."

The Weyerhaeuser Co.'s first recognized public park was opened in 1941, Mr. Billings said. "Hunting and fishing privileges had been granted to local sportsmen in our forest areas before this time, but the idea of maintaining a scenic recreational area and providing basic park facilities did not come until shortly before World War II.

"The number of our parks has steadily increased since that time until now, some 15 years later, we have 14 parks in Washington and Oregon.* * * The 14 parks we maintain for tourists provide picnic tables, piped water, restrooms, stone and cement fireplaces, free firewood, as well as receptacles for trash. Swimming and fishing are available at 12 of the parks and overnight camping is permitted at all of them."

Mr. Billings cited the Weyerhaeuser Co's recreation policy: "Recreational opportunities shall be offered to the public through the use of designated tree farm areas for campers, hunters, fishermen, and other recreationists. * * * Whenever possible, sites of historic interest or outstanding scenic beauty shall be preserved for public enjoyment. The company shall cooperate with groups interested in promoting recreational use of forest land in developing programs for the proper use of designated areas. Extending to the public the privileges of use of company lands for recreational purposes will help to achieve a better understanding and appreciation of the benefits to be derived from sound forestry management of privately owned timber lands.

EXHIBIT E

[From the Deseret News of December 28, 1956]

WHERE WILL OUR CHILDREN PLAY?

By 1975, it is generally estimated, the population of the United States will be 221 million, some 50 million more than it is today.

Time was, in the days when Malthus was believed, that this prospect would have been cause for serious economic concern. But technology has overthrown Malthus. Today we know that higher populations can mean continually higher standards of living, almost without a limit.

There is, however, one question that bothers everyone who looks to the future. It is, Where will all these people play? Will the present possibilities of getting next to nature in our woods and lakes wither away in the face of the population boom?

This question gives point to efforts to get through Congress next year laws strengthening the hand of conservation leaders in preserving fish and wildlife and recreational values in and around reclamation reservoirs.

The present Coordination Act, the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) argues, leaves important shortcomings in this respect. While it provides for studies of the effect of Federal dams on wildlife, many projects are authorized before the studies are started and partly built before studies are completed. There is nothing in the law to require modifications to meet needs discovered in the studies. Moreover, the NWF maintains, inadequate land acquisition around some Federal projects can leave the public out in the cold while chiefly benefitting land owners and speculators.

To the credit of Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal officials in this region—and we imagine the same is true elsewhere—strong efforts have been made to take care of these problems in individual projects as they have been authorized.

Land around the Wanship Reservoir-to-be, for example, has been secured and will be developed in accordance with a plan developed with the help of the National Park Service. Cabin site leases and public recreation areas will be handled by Summit County—the first time such a function has been turned over to a county in this region.

The enlarged Pineview Reservoir will be developed in a similar manner, with the exception that the Forest Service will supervise the recreational functions. Recreation at the Big Sandy project in Wyoming will be supervised by the State. The Park Service and Forest Service are jointly working out a recreation plan for major units of the Colorado River storage project.

But these precautions have been taken primarily because the men involved with them have been farsighted enough to recognize the need for more future recreation facilities, and energetic enough to secure these facilities in the individual projects. The law itself as it applies nationwide does not adequately guarantee that such facilities will be secured in all reclamation projects.

Agitation is under way to revise the Coordination Act to provide more sure protection in future development projects. This matter deserves the careful attention of western Members of Congress particularly, because of the tremendous amount of water development that this section will inevitably see during the next few years.

Meanwhile, Utah ought to lose no further time in making its own arrangements to secure adequate recreation facilities around reservoirs and in other locations. One difficulty with the cooperative systems the Bureau of Reclamation has been trying to establish is that the State has no agency qualified to assume responsibility for this function. That is why, for example, the job has to be assumed by Summit County in the case of the Wanship Reservoir or by the Forest Service or other agencies elsewhere.

Utah badly needs a State park organization, to take care of a number of functions. Not least among them is this one. Continuing delay can only lessen the chances that future generations of Utahans will be able to find the kind of outdoor recreation that we of this generation would like our children to have.

INCORPORATION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America.

Mr. President, of the patriotic Americans who served our Nation in the First World War 39 years ago, 3,025,000 were living on November 30, 1956. Their average age was 62½ years. Since the time of their service, nearly four decades ago, much history has been made and other great wars have been fought. In the memory of many Americans alive today the great world war means that which we fought between 1941 and 1945, and another generation of Americans is growing up whose war-veteran husbands and brothers are those who fought for freedom and security in Korea.

Twenty-four years separate the service of the veterans of World War I from the beginning of the Second World War. Yet, many Members of the Senate, who themselves served in the first great war of our century, will understand that, to the veterans of that war, it is a memory to be held and shared in common with their contemporaries.

For that reason, many of them have decided to form among themselves the special organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. Already this organization has over 70,000 members in all 48 States and the Territories. It has 782 barracks posts organized in 45 States.

This organization now seeks a Federal charter of incorporation to help it to bring the memory and the interests of this generation of American veterans to the attention of the American people. Federal charters have in the past been granted to such other veterans' organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Marine Corps League. No reason is apparent to me why an organization of veterans of World War I should not be entitled to equal rights and recognition from the Congress. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for early consideration.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced a similar bill in the 84th Congress, to grant a Federal charter to the Veterans of World War I

of the United States of America, and I trust that the Congress this year will be able to act promptly and favorably on our proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 848) to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills.

These four bills are introduced as amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. All were sponsored in the 84th Congress by the Senator from Montana or myself.

We are pleased to have the junior Senator from Pennsylvania join with us in the 85th Congress as a cosponsor.

The proposed amendments are considered to be necessary in order to help make the National Labor Relations Act less biased. Briefly, the amendments would accomplish the following:

First, repeal section 9 (h) of the act, which makes leaders of organized labor second-class citizens by requiring them to make affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party. The section has been proved both worthless and discriminatory.

Second, amend section 14 (b) of the act, which now permits States to supersede the Federal act by adopting miscalled right-to-work laws which discriminate against workers and unions involved in interstate commerce.

Third, amend the act to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under provisions of the act.

Fourth, to permit, in certain instances, secondary boycotts where a secondary employer is engaged with a primary employer in a labor dispute.

Mr. President, there has long been talk by the administration and others proposing needed changes to the National Labor Relations Act. Thus far, all we have had is talk.

I think the 85th Congress must make a concentrated effort to substitute action for the talk.

These four bills represent, I believe, an absolute minimum program for improving our basic labor-management-relations law.

The Nation cannot expect improvement in labor-management relations under a law having a built-in bias against the working men and women and their unions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. CLARK), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 856. A bill to repeal section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, relating to non-Communist affidavits;

S. 857. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 858. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 859. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements.

RELIEF TO FARMERS AND DEALERS RELATING TO CLAIMS ARISING FROM DELIVERY OF CERTAIN FEED

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief to farmers and dealers in connection with claims arising out of early and late deliveries of feed under the 1954, 1955, and 1956 emergency feed programs.

This bill, if enacted, would permit the CCC, under regulations approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to correct a situation which has arisen in nearly all the States where emergency feed programs were in effect.

Under these programs the farmers were issued purchase orders by the FHA county committees, and were sold feed on the strength of these orders by the dealers during the emergency period; but ASC auditors subsequently determined that the dealers had not made delivery of the feed within the prescribed period, and that they were either early or late in the delivery.

The farmers and dealers in these instances were victimized by inadequate and misleading instructions from the Department of Agriculture. No adequate definitions, guides, or rules covered the problem of ineligible date deliveries while the program was in effect, and subsequently issued regulations were retrospective in application.

Mr. President, the bill, if enacted, would give the CCC the authority to grant relief to dealers and farmers who acted in good faith under the program by recognizing as valid those purchases and deliveries: First, which were actually purchased by the farmer from the dealer on or after the date the Secretary declared the county to be eligible for assistance under the emergency feed program; second, which are found to have been physically delivered to the farmer not later than 12 months from the date when the purchase order was issued to the farmer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 860) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed programs, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appropriation of Federal assistance for public school construction, in the sum of $1,600,000,000 over a period of 4 years.

It may be that provisions of this bill will be incorporated in the proposed legislation to be introduced soon on behalf of the administration, and at the request of President Eisenhower. Nevertheless, I have introduced this bill so that a number of approaches may be studied by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

I also desire to affirm my continuing interest in this field. In 1947, I was one of the four sponsors who joined with Senator Taft in the introduction of his bill to provide Federal aid for teachers and the bill was passed by the Senate.

In 1953, I introduced Senate bill 2601 to provide aid for school construction, and, while the bill secured the unanimous support of the committee, it did not come to a vote in the Senate.

I consider that aid to the States for educational purposes is a basic need and it must be provided at this session of Congress. I would hope that the opportune action of the Congress would lead to a renewed effort by the States, and at all local levels, to provide equal educational opportunities for all children, and to raise the standards of teacher training and of curricula throughout the Nation.

I appreciate very much the generous statements which were made by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the course of his speech, and I commend him for bringing before the Senate many problems which attend the administration of Federal aid for school construction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 365) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADMISSION OF 10,000 REFUGEE ORPHANS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most heart-warming projects on which I ever have worked was passage of our bill, in the first session of the 84th Congress, to permit Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., to bring into the United States eight Korean-war ophans. My greatest thrill and satisfaction since

I became a Member of the Senate occurred on October 14, 1955, at the Portland International Airport, when Harry Holt and his eight adopted Koreans arrived home. Mrs. Neuberger and I have visited the Holt home, and have seen the wonderful care which the Holt family is giving to their new children. Recently I have read the fine new book by Mrs. Holt, Seed From the East, which tells of their great experiences in helping others.

But the Holt family has not stopped succoring the homeless orphans of Korea. The Holt family has made many trips to Korea on behalf of these orphans, and is currently in Korea. Mr. Holt has spent almost $100,000 of his own money in behalf of Korean orphans and in aiding other American families in their adoption of these children.

Harry Holt and his wife symbolize to me the Biblical Good Samaritan. What nobler and more unselfish deed could there be than to bring to the security and comfort of American homes children from the ravaged and tormented country of Korea?

Let me read a recent letter I have received from a family in Portland, Oreg. The letter tells of the joy and happiness brought to the family of Mr. and Mrs. William Burton, of 437 N. E. Monroe Street, by their two Korean sons:

DEAR SIR: We are writing this letter to you, to express our gratitude to the Senators and Representatives of Congress for making it possible for us to have two sons from Korea through the Refugee Act.

We are sincerely praying and hoping that a new bill be passed enabling the operation of legal adoption by proxy to continue so that other families will be blessed with children too.

My husband and I are not able to have children of our own, yet through the help of you and various others, our home has been brightened immensely and we know there are thousands of others who wish to be able to adopt some of them too.

These unfortunate, homeless children, are really our responsibility because the majority are of partial American heritage although they were not born on American soil.

Would you please help other American couples enjoy the real happiness of having those children in their homes, too?

Enclosed is a picture of our sons.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM BURTON.

Many of these orphans should be the direct responsibility of our people and Government, since they were fathered by American military personnel. Few children in the world have futures so bleak as those left behind in Japan and Korea by our military forces. These mixed-blood babies are not accepted; they often are mistreated and humiliated. Some are cruelly abandoned.

But the orphan problem is not solely concerned with Japan and Korea; the problem is also urgent in the Middle East, Greece, Italy, and other countries. Many American families have opened their homes to orphans from all parts of the world.

Mr. President, last year I introduced Senate bill 3753, to extend the orphan provisions of the Refugee Relief Act which expired at the end of last December, and to provide for an additional quota of 5,000 orphans. Such a proposal was reported favorably by the Senate Refugee Subcommittee and the Senate Judiciary Committee. The proposed legislation passed the Senate, but unfortunately was not considered favorably by the House of Representatives.

By the failure of Congress to act, the situation concerning orphans who had been adopted by American families became desparate. With the exhaustion of the 4,000 orphan quota in the Refugee Relief Act, many families were finding it impossible to bring their recently adopted children into the United States.

To help the many families who could not bring their adopted children into our country, I wrote the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, urging immediate emergency action so these children could join their new families in our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 26, 1956, to the Secretary of State, and the replies received from the Department of State and the Commissioner of Immigration, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
October 26, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in the hope that you can take prompt action to admit to the United States war orphans who have been adopted by American families.

The Refugee Relief Act provides that 4,000 war orphans could be admitted to the United States. This law expires at the end of the year and the orphan quotas have long since been exhausted. Many American families have adopted war orphans in the hope and expectation that their adopted children could enter our country. Now that the quotas have been exhausted, these children are not permitted to enter the United States.

In the last session of Congress, I sponsored legislation to extend and enlarge the orphan program under the Refugee Relief Act. This legislation passed the Senate in the closing hours of the session, but was not considered by the House of Representatives. I plan to reintroduce similar legislation in the next session, and I have been assured by the respective chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that such legislation will receive prompt consideration.

Without special action on the part of your Department, these children will not be permitted to enter the United States until after Congress acts next year. These children face a bleak and uncertain future in their homelands, away from their American parents. The situation is particularly distressing for the mixed-blood orphans in Korea and Japan; another cold winter in Korea will spell death for many of these mixed-blood orphans, who were fathered by American military personnel.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, acting jointly, may waive certain of the immigration requirements on the basis of an unforeseen emergency in individual cases, and the Attorney General may, in his discretion, parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States.

I hope that you and the Attorney General will be able to take prompt action to see that these children are admitted at this time to our country. I know that you will receive the blessings of many American families for your action.

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Reference is made to your letter of October 26, 1956, requesting that action be taken to allow war orphans who have been adopted by American families entry into the United States even though the 4,000 visas authorized under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act for orphans have been allocated.

I am pleased to advise you that a procedure has been worked out between the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State under which orphans who are eligible for visas under the provisions of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act but who are unable to obtain visas because of unavailability of numbers will be paroled into the United States pending possible remedial legislation. Instructions were issued to the Immigration and consular officers abroad on October 30, 1956, directing them to proceed with the processing of such cases.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 7, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Secretary Dulles has referred to me for reply, your letter of October 26, 1956, commenting upon enlarging the orphan phase of the refugee-relief program.

Since it became known several months ago that the 4,000 visas provided for orphans by the Refugee Relief Act would be exhausted, there have been brought to the attention of the Department of State scores of cases in which orphans adopted by Americans are now unable to receive visas. The need for additional legislation has been evident for some time. In fact, the President has proposed such legislation on several occasions during the past 2 years.

Several weeks ago, at the suggestion of the President, the Department of State and the Department of Justice explored ways of permitting these orphan children to enter the United States pending further action by the Congress. I am happy to be able to tell you that, after consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, a temporary procedure has been agreed upon and, in the absence of visa numbers, eligible orphans will be admitted to the United States under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The particulars about these admissions will be reported to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, presumably, appropriate legislation will be drafted and submitted to the Congress to regularize the status of these orphans.

I am confident this will relieve the situation about which you wrote. I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum concerning the procedures, which was sent to all the Members of Congress by the Deputy Administrator of the refugee-relief program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under regulations adopted by the State Department and the Attorney General's office, the emergency parole procedures of the Immigration and Nationality Act were used to allow eligible adopted orphans to enter our country and join their new parents, thus alleviating hardships which threatened many American families.

The regulations, as worked out by the Department of State and the Justice Department, provide that the adopted orphans will be able to enter our country without an immigrant visa, by being paroled to their new parents, awaiting enactment by the Congress of legislation to regularize the status of these orphans in the United States. Under current regulations of the Immigration Service, the emergency parole procedure as applied to orphans will expire at the end of this month. The Immigration Service has told me that 213 orphans have been admitted to our country under this procedure.

Mr. President, today I am introducing proposed legislation to reestablish, within the State Department, an orphan program. The bill is quite similar to the provisions of the orphan section of the Refugee Relief Act. My bill provides for a quota of 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas, to be issued to eligible orphans until such time as the quota is exhausted. My bill also increases the age of eligible orphans from 10 years, as provided in the Refugee Relief Act, to 12 years.

The other important section of the bill would grant permanent residence in the United States for the orphans admitted under the emergency parole procedures, and these adopted orphans would thus be on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

Mr. President, in the struggle between the Communist world and the free world, our country's symbol as a haven to the oppressed must endure. I know of no opposition to admitting to our country up to 10,000 war orphans who have been adopted by American families. While our country spends many billions of dollars in the fields of mutual aid, we can strike a blow for freedom by promptly enacting legislation admitting additional war orphans. These orphans definitely are in no danger of bringing to our country any ideologies perilous to the American traditions of freedom and liberty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the bill I am introducing today, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 866) authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 866

A bill authorizing the issuance of not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized to issue not to exceed 10,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans, as defined in this act, who are under 12 years of age at the time the visa is issued; but not more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted abroad or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent separation of brothers and sisters.

(b) When used in this act the term "eligible orphan" shall mean an alien child (1) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption; (2) (a) who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse, or (b) for whom assurances, satisfactory to the consular officer to whom a visa application on behalf of the orphan is made, have been given by a United States citizen and spouse that if the orphan is admitted into the United States they will adopt him in the United States and will care for him properly; and (3) who is ineligible for admission into the United States solely because the nonpreference portion of the quota to which he would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time his visa application is made; but no natural parent of any eligible orphan who shall be admitted into the United States pursuant to this act shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(c) Any visa issued under this act to any eligible orphan who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his business or service.

SEC. 2. All orphans admitted into the United States without visas prior to the enactment of this act by procedures established under section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are hereby granted permanent residence in the United States on the same basis as if they had been issued immigrant visas.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Senate Resolution 62

Resolved, etc., That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the production for sale or use in interstate commerce, the delivery to pipelines and other interstate transportation facilities, and the transportation, distrbution, and sale or use in such commerce, of petroleum products, in order that all possible steps may be taken by the Congress to—

(1) prevent serious economic dislocation with respect to such products;

(2) provide for the proper conservation and most effective use in the national interest of the petroleum resources in the United States;

(3) properly protect commerce among the several States in petroleum products; and

(4) to protect the consumers of petroleum products from the burdens and harmful effects that may be brought about, as a result of the operations and activities of any individual, partnership, association or corporation engaged in the production, refining, transportation, distribution or marketing in interstate commerce of petroleum products, or any combination of such activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent to the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON, subsequently, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported the above resolution favorably, without amendment, and it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "TAX GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate 10,700 additional copies of the Committee Print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business," prepared during the 84th Congress, 2d Sess.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRICES OF CRUDE OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and Senators AIKEN, BEALL, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, CLARK, FLANDERS, HUMPHREY, IVES, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, LANGER,

LAUSCHE, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, PASTORE, POTTER, SMITH of Maine, SPARKMAN, and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for a special committee to investigate the recent increases in the price of fuel oil and gasoline.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and that it lie on the table for other signatures until the conclusion of the session on Monday, January 28.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be composed of 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the majority party and 3 shall be members of the minority party.

(b) The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining—

(1) The reasons, and their justification, for recent increases in the prices of crude oil and of refined petroleum products, including, but not limited to, the effect, if any, of the recent events in Egypt and the Middle East upon domestic supplies and prices of petroleum, and

(2) Whether the enactment of legislation is necessary to provide assurance to American refiners and consumers of adequate supplies of crude oil and refined petroleum products at reasonable prices, and, if the committee determines that the enactment of legislation is necessary, what legislation would be most likely to provide such assurance.

SEC. 2. The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

(b) A quorum of the committee shall consist of three members, except that the committee may provide that, for the purpose of taking testimony, 2 members, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than June 30, 1957.

(b) Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported favorably original resolutions numbered 65 through 72, which were placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees" in Senate proceedings of today.)

HOME LOANS TO VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CHURCH, JACKSON, MCCARTHY, JENNER, CARROLL, and ERVIN be added as cosponsors to S. 726, the veterans' home loan bill which I introduced on January 17, 1947, and that at the next printing of the bill their names be included.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT WITH REFERENCE TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 7, 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN INDIANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], one of the great fighters for the improvement of the way of life of the American Indian, has joined in cosponsoring S. 809, introduced by me on Wednesday. The bill will provide $200 million to bring industries in or near Indian reservations, provide employment for the Indians, and aid the economy of the Indian people. I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for joining in sponsoring this very worthwhile bill. We plan to hold hearings on it very soon.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by him today at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, on the subject Small Business and National Security.

By Mr. JENNER:

Statement by him regarding the President's message on the state of the Union.

NOTICE OF HEARING IN NOMINATION OF CHRISTIAN A. HERTER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States the nomination of Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert Hoover, Jr., resigned.

Notice is given that this nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency on Senate Joint Resolution 38. The purpose of the resolution is to amend and revise the National Housing Act provisions governing the Federal National Mortgage Association. The hearings will begin on Wednesday, February 6, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Jack Carter, staff director, Senate Subcommittee on Housing, 15-A Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone National 8-3120, extension 2179, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Friday, February 1, 1957.

DEFINITION AND PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the 21st of this month I submitted an amendment to the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States which was printed in the RECORD. At this time I ask unanimous consent that remarks I have prepared on the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that a copy of the amendment be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

S. 83, a bill introduced into this body by a large group of Senators, has, as its purpose, the definition and protection of civil rights. I am heartily in accord with the intent of this legislation, and I will ask to be included as a cosponsor of it so that I may better aid in its passage. But, Mr. President, the framers of this bill have forgotten one of the most precious of all rights, namely, the right to work. S. 83 proposes that the national policy protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. It should have included the protection of the individual from discrimination on account of belonging or not belonging to a labor organization.

Mr. President, after the Constitution was written, those wise men who had labored on that document decided that even though the source of our concepts of freedom is God, the day could come when those rights, even though inherent, might be encroached upon if they were not spelled out. The result of this fear was the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in which many of our rights are carefully outlined. The forgotten ninth amendment even went so far as to say: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." We can see then that the Constitution is clear in its intent to protect all of our inherent rights and the right to work is one of these. It is not spelled out in the Constitution—nor is it recognized by amendment, like the right to vote regardless of one's sex. Neither does the Constitution set forth the right to eat or sleep—these actions are part of our daily lives—a part of life itself and therefore they needed no defining. They are God-given rights that are inherent and the right to life is one of them. Remember the words of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The right to life is so basic as to create no argument, but how can the right to life be exercised when the right to work is tampered with? Here is what the Supreme Court said in *Butchers Union* v. *Crescent City, Ill.* (U. S. 746). "The right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right. To deny it is what no legislature has a right to do; and no contract to that end can be binding on subsequent legislatures." That was the Supreme Court speaking. Now let's take a look at what one of the great liberals of our time said about this. I refer to the late President Franklin Roosevelt.

"I tell you frankly that the Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass, legislation ordering a so-called closed shop. It is true that by agreement in many plants of various industries the closed shop is now in operation. This is a result of the legal collective bargaining and not of Government compulsion on employers or employees. It is also true that 95 percent or more of the employees in these particular mines belong to the United Mine Workers Union. The Government will never compel this 5 percent to join the union by Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

Further, let's hear what one of the most distinguished of our modern day liberals said about this subject on January 9 of this year. I refer to the junior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY, whose enthusiasm for the enactment of a proper civil-rights measure will be a credit to him throughout his life.

"By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in the democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to work, the right to education, the right to housing, the right to the use of public accommodations, of health and welfare services and facilities, and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color, ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which government has the duty to defend and expand."

Mr. President, there is much agreement that among our civil rights is the right to work. Frankly, I believe it to be among our most cherished inherent and civil rights.

I will be charged by some extreme members of the liberal bloc in this country and by some of our labor leaders that my only interest in introducing my amendment is to prevent the passage of the entire civil-rights measure. This is not true, Mr. President. I would remind my colleagues that I have maintained a stand against the abuse of civil rights for my entire life. I worked against segregation in the schools of my State; as chief of staff for air in the National Guard of my State, I opened up our Air Guard to people of all colors, race, or national origin.

Mr. President, instead of preaching about it, I have been practicing my antipathy toward discrimination in any form.

Let me remind the extremists that swept under their carpet is the fact that Negro bricklayers in Milwaukee have been denied membership in a union because of their color; let me remind them also that included in the constitution of two unions are requirements that an applicant be white born.

No, Mr. President; my intentions in introducing an amendment to S. 83 are not to wreck unions nor impair their actions, but to make sure that when we in this body outline, define, and protect civil rights we do a thorough and proper job. Let us not try to escape our responsibilities in this field. Let us recognize that a basic inherent and civil right has been and is being tampered with, and let us by our actions call a halt to that tampering.

On page 11 strike out lines 3 through 8 and insert the following:

"(1) investigate written allegations that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their rights to vote or obtain employment, or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures, by reason of their color, race, religion, national origin, or membership or nonmembership in a labor or trade organization."

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 39th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the real and genuine independence that was declared in 1918 with the formation of the sovereign Ukrainian National Republic This anniversary is being observed throughout this land and in other parts of the free world. I join with countless Americans in paying tribute to the patriotic will of the Ukrainian people and nation which was clearly expressed to the world 39 years ago and which continues to express itself in the stubborn and courageous resistance of the Ukraine to the Communist imperialism and colonialism of Moscow.

Rich in resources and strategic in geographical location, Ukraine has been the prime object of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism these past 36 years. Nowhere, perhaps, is the issue of imperialism and colonalism in our day more real and pertinent than in this rich area of Eastern Europe. Those who are wont to apply this issue to other parts of the world, might well study the record of the Ukraine's subjugation by Russian Communist colonialism and begin to recognize the true applications of this issue. Moscow's colonialism and imperialism are unparalleled in recorded history. And the Ukrainian people, who have had the longest experience with this criminal and barbaric brand of colonialism that would seek even to obliterate national entities for its own exploiting purposes, know this perhaps best.

Mr. President, in our own interest as well as theirs, we must do everything possible to support the will and hope of the 40 million Ukrainians for their national independence and true sovereignty. I declare my support of the proposal to proclaim January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day. This would be the beacon of America's hope for a free and independent Ukraine.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

For too many years, the observance of this anniversary has had an unhappy hollow ring, as the Soviets kept their iron fist on the spirit of freedom in Ukrainia and other captured nations.

In the past year, however, we have begun to see the cracks in this domination—cracks that were bound to develop as the freedom spirit rose above even the most brutal Communist oppression.

The honor roll of freedom fighters is long—Hungary, Poland, and East Berlin, to name a few.

While these gallant uprisings against Communist tyranny have captured the headlines, the fight for freedom in the Ukraine continues.

Prisoners in a Russian slave-labor camp revolt. A Communist troop train is blown up. Public protests against Communist domination appear.

These are all signs of the times, and are a prelude to better times, when the Ukraine and the other nations again will have their independence.

OPEN LETTER FROM GEORGE TODT TO VICTOR RIESEL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a column under the heading "George Todt's Opinion," published in the Valley Times, of California, for January 21, 1957. I wish to state that I especially concur in the praise accorded by Mr. Todt to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. He is one of the valued Members of this body, whose courage and ability mean a great deal to our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

AS ONE COLUMNIST WRITES ANOTHER

"Those who never retract their opinions love themselves more than they love truth." (Joubert.)

This column is an open letter to columnist Victor Riesel:

DEAR VICTOR: As you already know, you're a columnist's columnist—and certainly a favorite of mine. I, among many, have come to rely on your integrity in giving the American people such a clear-cut picture of what has been going on behind the scenes in the labor movement today, and I am frank to say that I believe you to be the best informed journalist in this particular field inside the U. S. A.

You've done a lot of good, Vic. Your rugged crusading courage has exposed the

bad along with the good in the organized labor movement, and because of this we shall have improvements—which are badly needed—in the future. When your personal tragedy occurred last year, I believe you will recall, I was in the front ranks of your contemporaries in the fourth estate who responded all out in your behalf.

I mention this as background to indicate that, as you must understand, I approve, in the main, of what you have done in the past, and have only the friendliest feelings toward you as an accomplished writer and gentleman. Nevertheless, I had occasion to disagree with you recently in a vital area of the labor movement, and I want to discuss it with you at this time. It concerns what, in my opinion, is the heart of the problem involved for the citizens of our Nation now, and increasingly in the future. It is the question of arbitrary negation of an American's citizenship rights to compel him to join a union in order to earn a livelihood for himself and his family—without which freedom and liberty are words without true meaning.

In a recent column, you wrote, in part, as follows: "Traditionally the GOP national high command shuts up desk and shop after each election. This time the labor section was not mothballed. Labor Secretary James Mitchell believes that much of labor's vote was successfully wooed over the pitch of the national union chiefs—virtually all of whom were for Adlai Stevenson. Mitchell is reported to believe that this success was due to the White House refusal to attack all labor sweepingly, as has been the practice of many Republican strategists in the past—and some Republicans, such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, at present."

Now, Vic, let's set the record straight at this point. I know BARRY GOLDWATER as well as you do, and we both know that he has never attacked labor sweepingly, at any time in his career. I would like to know of even one instance where he may have done so. If you will be good enough to supply me with the time, place, and what was said by the Senator that could reasonably be considered to attack all labor sweepingly—I will print it forthwith for my readers to see for themselves. In the absence of any such specific data, however, I believe they should not hold the Arizona solon responsible for something I don't believe he has ever done, i. e., attack all labor sweepingly.

What Mr. GOLDWATER has done in the past is merely to champion basic American principles which are bound up within the scope and meaning of the Bill of Rights, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution, itself. In particular he has fought for the right-to-work law—which means that no man should be deprived of his job by reason of having joined, or not having joined, a union. Can anyone point out any instance in any of the 18 States which have adopted right-to-work laws where any workman has been prevented from joining a union of his choice? The answer to this is bound up in the fact that union membership has increased, not decreased, in the States which adopted right-to-work laws.

It is true that Mr. GOLDWATER has fought against corruption and abuse of union members by gangsters and racketeers inside the labor movement—but so have you, Vic. Both of you have been tremendously effective in leveling your guns at the vicious culprits inside the labor movement who have engaged in labor racketeering, violence, and intimidation of the honest rank and file membership. Each of you have called for congressional investigation of this criminal phase of activity inside labor. But does this constitute any sweeping attack on labor by either one or both of you? Of course it does not. And it is the rank and file of union membership who appreciate the most what men like you and Senator GOLDWATER are doing in their behalf. More power to you—and to the Senate investigation which is coming off this month. And let the chips fall where they may.

Oh, yes—one thing more. It is true that Senator GOLDWATER has attacked the abnormal political ambitions of one Walter Reuther—the darling of the Americans For Democratic Action and the World Federalists. In fact, he has attacked him manfully with a two-fisted frontal attack to which Mr. Reuther, curiously, seems to have little stomach to reply.

I feel sure you will agree with me that an attack on Socialistic Walter Reuther, in particular, constitutes no sweeping attack on all labor—or does it? For if Mr. Reuther is the personification of all labor today, that in itself represents one of the most compelling arguments in favor of right to work laws in every State. Can his background stand inspection? How many real Americans want to be under Mr. Reuther now or in the future? Shouldn't they have a choice in the matter?

Sincerely,

GEORGE TODT.

CHRIS MILIUS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Nebraska is losing, by retirement, the services of one of our outstanding farm leaders. He has served well in Nebraska and in the Nation. I refer to Mr. Chris Milius, who has been a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article written by Chris Milius on January 9, 1957, which shows the very sound and patriotic philosophy of this most distinguished Nebraskan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nebraska Union Farmer of January 9, 1957]

THE OPPORTUNITY IS OURS

The State of Nebraska and the Federal lawmakers are in session to pass or reject many bills which may be introduced and to appropriate money to carry on existing government as well as provide money for new bureaus, boards or commissions which may be approved.

As we approach our State capitol, we see carved above the door: "The Salvation of the State is Watchfulness in the Citizen."

We must not hold our privileges lightly and we must regard our obligations very seriously. One sometimes wonders if the Founding Fathers comprehended just what opportunities they were giving us and also what challenge they threw to make the most of these opportunities for ourselves and for future generations.

Isn't it our duty as citizens to make a maximum contribution to keep government and taxation within the people's ability to pay? We are the trustees; may we preserve our responsibility.

High tax rates become ineffective when wealth is dissipated. Isn't it our duty to help provide an opportunity state instead of a welfare state?

Some people think they are getting even with those of wealth by placing these tax burdens upon them, but in reality they are placing a crushing burden upon themselves and an even more severe one upon our children. We are destroying the magnificant heritage received from our fathers. Unless the trend is changed, we are condemning our descendants to misery and want as the increase in taxation can go so far as to confiscate private property.

The men who first planned our constitutional government were convinced that freedom was possible only under a government that protected private property; and therefore, they sought to construct a limited government which would be so checked that it could not confiscate its citizens' wealth.

Are we coming to the point of thinking where the principles laid down by the framers of the Constitution are outmoded—when they had in mind a document for people to protect their inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, and whose primary purpose is to insure freedom.

We are confronted with a compulsory and unnatural system of the totalitarian state advanced by men to achieve their own selfish ends. We often hear the view expressed: "Yes, it is voluntary; but, if you don't do it voluntarily, they want and ask for power to force you to do it."

The state should protect the freedom of its citizens—not become their master nor absorb the citizen or family. Both should be allowed free and untrammeled action so far as is consistent with the common good and the interest of others. Unless sound reason prevails to guide the groping footsteps of those endeavoring to escape from present well-nigh intolerable conditions, the efforts of our forefathers—whose self-reliance, individual initiative and hard work enabled them to save the money which built a strong Nation—can be undone.

CHRIS MILIUS.

CLOTHING CONTRACTS AWARDED BY ARMY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is presently conducting a preliminary inquiry in the matter concerning Robert Tripp Ross, now on leave of absence as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This inquiry began on January 4, 1957, as a result of newspaper stories which revealed that Mr. Ross' wife was president of Wynn Enterprises, Inc., which had just received a clothing contract from the Army. It was also revealed at that time that the brother-in-law of Mr. Ross, namely, Herman D. Wynn, operated several companies in the clothing manufacturing field and that these companies had received numerous Government contracts.

Because of the implication in these stories of a possible conflict of interests on the part of Mr. Ross, this subcommittee, on January 4, requested that the Defense Department furnish for review the documents dealing with the contracts which had been awarded to Wynn Enterprises, Inc., since 1951.

On January 12, we again specifically asked the Defense Department for all contracts awarded to Herman D. Wynn or any other companies with which he is or had been affiliated.

It has been my feeling that, in fairness to Mr. Ross, this investigation should be handled as expeditiously as possible. Those were the instructions given to the staff of the subcommittee. I can tell the Senate it has been my firm intention to conduct an expeditious in-

vestigation; but, unfortunately, we have encountered considerable delays, and these delays, I am sorry to report, have come from the Department of Defense and the military services, including the Army.

First, they have told us that we will not have the material on the Wynn Enterprises, Inc., until January 25 or January 28. Within the last few days we have been informed that they will not be able to furnish the rest of the contracts until February 8. And thus, Mr. President, it will not be until February 8, more than 2 weeks from now, that the staff of the subcommittee will be able even to commence a part of its study.

We have attempted to have the Department of Defense expedite the handling of this matter, but so far it has not provided the material requested. I think it is my duty to make this statement, since there is interest in this issue. The press and the public are inquiring about it, but we cannot expedite the investigation until we obtain the material requested. It is not the fault of the committee that we have not moved faster.

Mr. Ross has taken leave of absence until the congressional inquiry is completed. I make this statement because some time has already elapsed, and future delays are indicated. I felt that we should point out that Mr. Ross' present position, on leave of absence, is due not to the Congress, but to delays which are occurring within the Department of Defense.

INVESTIGATION OF RECENT INCREASES IN PRICES OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly join the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in sponsoring his resolution to create a special committee to investigate the recent increases in the price of fuel oil and gasoline. It is a job which must be done—and done quickly—in the interest of oil consumers everywhere in this country.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague for his interest in this problem and his determination to have a full-scale investigation promptly conducted in order to prevent oil and gasoline consumers from being gouged by profit seekers in the oil industry who are apparently taking advantage of a world situation at the expense of the American consumer.

While I recognize that this resolution provides for the creation of a special committee, I do not preclude or question the competence of any one of our standing committees, whose jurisdiction may cover this matter, to deal with it if the Senate so decides. My chief concern is with the substance and not the jurisdiction of this problem. What committee does the job is of little importance, but it is very important that the job be done thoroughly and expeditiously.

In view of the President's admonition in his state of the Union message against unwarranted price increases, there is every reason for the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice—both of whom have jurisdiction over antitrust problems—to undertake immediately an investigation on their own. This is a big subject, having many ramifications and involving tremendous amounts of money and we should employ all the trained personnel and manpower at our disposal in order to protect the consumer's interest.

The reason I say this, Mr. President, is that during the past 10 days this matter of price increases in the cost of fuel oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products, has been called to the attention of the Senate by a number of my colleagues. Protests are coming in to every Senator's office from all over the country. It is not a regional problem. It affects every State because I believe it is a direct assault upon the consumers of our Nation.

I am in receipt of a letter under date of January 15 from a spokesman for a number of oil dealers in the State of Rhode Island, which graphically points out the growing volume of protests by small-business men as well as consumers who have been adversely affected by these recent oil price increases. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter and the attachment printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and attachment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYSTONE OIL & COAL CO., INC.,
Providence, R. I., January 15, 1956.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: This is to confirm our short conversation on Sunday, January 13, about oil prices.

I have discussed the recent price rise of 1 cent per gallon with several dealers, and they all feel that the increase is too high and unnecessary.

This increase will cause great hardship among the smaller dealers in the industry (2 to 7 truck operators), for this is a credit business, and the excessive cost of carrying accounts will put some dealers out of business.

An organization called the Oil Heat Committee of Rhode Island spent $69,558 for advertising during the past 2 years. This was done on a cooperative basis. Now this program is useless, due to the increase in the price of heating oils.

Any help that you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

Attached is a list of oil dealers that feel something should be done to remedy this situation.

Very truly yours,
KEYSTONE OIL & COAL CO., INC.,
FRANK LANCIA, *President.*

LIST OF DEALERS

Keystone Oil & Coal Co., Inc., Olean Fuel & Appliance Co., L & I Oil Service, Philip Fogarty & Sons, Galego Oil Co., Rocchio Oil Service, White Fuel Co., Hartford Oil Co., Mohawk Oil Co., Johnny's Oil Service, Palmisciano's Oil Co., Mathew's Oil Service.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am deeply impressed by the fact that reliable sources state that there is no basic justification for these price increases on the part of the oil industry. I view the situation as alarming and in direct conflict with the recent forthright admonition of the President in his state of the Union message when he said:

> Business leaders must, in the national interest, studiously avoid those price rises that are possible only because of vital or unusual needs of the whole Nation.

The Suez crisis is said by the oil industry to be the reason for the price increases, but according to a recent industry report of the American petroleum industry published in the Wall Street Journal on January 11, our gasoline stocks now exceed 186 million barrels, or 17 million barrels more than a year ago. Likewise, in the New York Times, on the same date, January 11, it was reported that light fuel oil used in heating homes is in abundant supply, with our reserve stocks of 132 million barrels exceeding by 25 million barrels our reserves of last year. The New York Times goes on to state that reserve supplies of heavy fuel oil amount to more than 42 million barrels, which exceeds by 3 million barrels the supply of a year ago.

These facts, coupled with the recent action of the Texas Railroad Commission in reducing allowable monthly production days from 16 in January to 15 in February, as pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on January 22, gives rise to the growing suspicion that consumers are being victimized by deliberate price gouging. I note that this is the flat position of the National Oil Marketers Association, which represents a great number of independent oil jobbers.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Oil Squeeze in Texas," published in the Washington Post of January 22, 1957, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 22, 1957]

OIL SQUEEZE IN TEXAS

The behavior of the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates oil production in Texas, is surely becoming curiouser and curiouser. In the face of a rising world demand for crude oil, the commission ordered a production cutback last week. It is true that the commission raised daily output limits slightly, but it simultaneously trimmed allowable monthly production days from 16 to 15, meaning that the February output limit is 3.5 percent lower than this month's limit. All this takes place at a time when Western Europe is much more dependent on American oil because of the Suez stoppage.

What kind of game are the oilmen playing? Recent crude oil price increases have been blamed on Suez, yet it may well seem, particularly to the British, that Texas producers have a responsibility along with Colonel Nasser. (Some 45 percent of all domestic oil is produced in Texas.) The railroad commission's ruling does little to still that suspicion. It has been a matter of record that independent Texas oilmen have clamored for lower production quotas in the hopes of getting their long-sought crude oil price increase—which they now have obtained.

In addition, the Suez crisis is also being blamed for gasoline price increases that all of us will pay. Here the situation is even more curious because there is presently a

glut of American gasoline. As of January 11, the American Petroleum Institute reported gasoline stocks of 189.2 million barrels as against a backlog of 171.9 million a year before. (This gasoline surplus offers little overseas relief since Europe wants crude oil which can be refined abroad, saving dollar reserves.) It is little wonder that the oil price increases are stirring congressional attention and a Justice Department probe.

The public is surely entitled to know more about oil economics—Texas style.

Mr. PASTORE. My State is largely dependent upon oil for its industry and home heating. The situation becomes all the more aggravated when we consider that this has been an unusually cold winter. These people are powerless to combat any price increase which the oil industry indiscriminately and without justification chooses to pass on to them. For all practical purposes, these consumers are captives of the oil industry, which seems to be taking advantage of an unusual world situation in order to squeeze out of consumers' pocketbooks the last full measure of profit.

The impact of even a 1 cent a gallon increase upon oil consumers throughout this Nation is no small matter. According to the New York Times of Sunday, January 6, such an increase means an added cost to our Nation's oil and gasoline consumers of about $3,150,000 a day, or $1,150,000,000 a year. This subject, therefore, does not involve small figures. In my view they are staggering and prompt me to challenge the necessity of such an added expense to the already heavily burdened pocketbook of the average consumer.

I understand that on January 11, the president of the American Automobile Association, Mr. Harry I. Kirk, sent telegrams to the major oil companies asking for the justification, if any, of the price increase and, thus far, has received no satisfactory explanation. The American Automobile Association pointed out that with gasoline reserve stocks rising and far in excess of last year's averages, the ordinary laws of supply and demand would seem to require a gasoline price decrease rather than an increase.

In the light of this paradox the American Automobile Association is vigorously challenging the necessity for the added charge being passed on to gasoline consumers throughout the Nation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for January 21 contains a report that our crude oil imports are continuing at near record levels at the very time European nations are crying for crude oil. The figures for the week ending January 11 indicate imports of 1,682,900 barrels a day. So—taken as a whole, this picture is very confusing indeed and the facts appearing on the surface, at least, are sufficient to justify the public demand for putting the searchlight of scrutiny on oil economics generally and particularly on this matter of price increases.

I have no idea as to what the executive branch of our Government is doing in giving meaning to the President's admonition against these unnecessary price increases which have been prompted only because of an unusual world situation. But I do know, Mr. President, that the Congress of the United States has a definite and direct responsibility to the consumers of this Nation in protecting them from unwarranted price gouging.

This whole situation, Mr. President, cries out for our immediate attention, and it is my fervent hope, therefore, that within a matter of days, a full-scale investigation will be initiated by an appropriate committee of the Senate to the end that the oil consumers and the small and independent businessmen interested in the oil industry will be protected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I wish to thank the Senator, and associate myself with his remarks, as I have done with respect to the remarks of other colleagues on this particular subject.

I mention this to the Senator because it was my privilege, as a member of the Small Business Committee last year, to conduct some hearings with respect to the petroleum industry. At that time we made a recommendation to the Federal Trade Commission to look into the pricing practices of the petroleum industry. I introduced a resolution at that time asking for an appropriation to supplement the Federal Trade Commission appropriation, so that additional staff members could be employed.

While I wish to see this investigation proceed in terms of congressional activity, the Federal Trade Commission has a responsibility under the law to check into this very development. It has a particular responsibility because of the authorization under which it operates. Because of the competence of its staff and its technical services, it is peculiarly well equipped to do this job.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. LANGER. For the information of the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has appointed the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to be chairman of the subcommittee to conduct this investigation. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are also members of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTORE. I care not who does the job, but I want to see it done.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MILWAUKEE CIO, PROTESTING INCREASES IN OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a resolution which I received this morning from the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, protesting against the considerable increases in the price of oil and gasoline.

As stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I, with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], have been appointed to serve on the committee which will investigate matters relative to this subject, and shall be happy to cooperate with them.

I believe the resolution to which I have referred makes a most important point, namely, that the consumers of the United States are entitled to get the facts concerning this situation.

We are entitled to know why, with America's gasoline stocks amounting to 189 million barrels, which is more than 18 million barrels larger than a year ago, and when there is definitely no gasoline shortage in the United States, prices should be rising instead of being held relatively stationary.

The fact is, however, that the price of the motorist's gasoline is going up, as well as the price of home heating oil, kerosene, diesel fuel, and other varieties of petroleum products.

We all realize that we are in a relatively inflationary age. We realize that costs have gone up in virtually every industry. We believe that all industries are entitled to a fair return on their investment.

But we also believe that citizens are entitled to know whether they are being subjected to a price gouge.

For that reason, I am pleased that the Antimonopoly Subcommittee is, indeed, going to study this problem.

The study should be fair and the chips should fall where they may.

Obviously, there are important international implications to this whole subject, especially in view of the fact that Europe has such a sizable need for American oil because of the blocking of the Suez Canal.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution, as forwarded by Mr. Fred A. Erchul, secretary-treasurer of the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed thereafter by the text of an editorial from the Tuesday, January 15, issue of the Milwaukee Journal on this same subject—one of several clippings which Mr. Erchul had kindly conveyed.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE COUNTY INDUSTRIAL
UNION COUNCIL, AFL–CIO,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1957.

Senator ALEXANDER H. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, at their regular council delegate meeting January 16, went on record unanimously approving the following resolution:

"Whereas a number of oil companies have announced they are increasing the price of gasoline; and

"Whereas the main reason stated by the oil companies for said increase is the Suez Canal crisis; and

"Whereas the Suez Canal crisis is creating a European shortage of crude oil and has therefore caused an increase of American export of crude oil to Europe; and

"Whereas the production of a gallon of crude oil produces also a gallon of gasoline, which it is reported is creating a surplus of gasoline in America; and

"Whereas with such apparent surplus, the oil companies have announced an increase of gasoline cost by 1 cent a gallon: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council protest this apparent consumer price gouge by the oil companies and submit our protest to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Congressmen REUSS and ZABLOCKI, requesting them to demand a congressional investigation into this gasoline price increase."

Enclosed for your information are clippings from the Milwaukee Journal relative to the matter.

The council urges you to give this matter your most sincere consideration and study to the end that these consumer price gouges by the oil companies will cease.

Very truly yours,

FRED A. ERCHUL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 15, 1957]

MORE GASOLINE, HIGHER PRICE?

More about the boost in gasoline prices, which, as already suggested, has all the looks of a consumer gouge.

This is from the January 4 issue of U. S. News & World Report:

"The American motorist may be blessed in 1957 with an abundance of gasoline so great as to force prices down."

Here's the story, summarized, that the magazine tells:

There was a gasoline surplus in this country in 1956. Stocks climbed about 10 percent during the year. As a result of the Suez blockade, Western Europe is importing petroleum products from this country. But it is importing mostly crude and fuel oil, not gasoline. When United States refineries break down crude oil to produce fuel oil for Europe, they add to the gasoline surplus because, on an average, more than a gallon of gasoline is turned out with every gallon of fuel oil.

"So," explains the magazine, "as fuel oil flows abroad in larger amounts, gasoline stocks here at home are likely to increase, the industry believes."

And it ends the article, after explaining that European demands for oil provide a problem to the American oil industry, with these words:

"Indirectly, these demands open up the prospect of cheaper, more abundant gasoline for the American motorist—at a time when the European motorist is being rationed."

This whole odd oil price business brings to mind the following warning in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message:

"The national interest must take precedence over temporary advantages which may be secured by particular groups at the expense of all the people. In this regard I urge leaders in business and in labor to think well on their responsibility to all the American people. With all elements of our society, they owe the Nation a vigilant guard against the inflationary tendencies that are always at work in a dynamic economy operating at today's high levels. They can powerfully help counteract or accentuate such tendencies by their wage and price policies. Business in its pricing policies should avoid unnecessary price increases. * * *"

Is the oil industry heeding the President's warning? If so, explanations as to how are in order.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the American productive know-how is world famous.

As the standard of living and the demand for goods increases our great industries find new and better ways to increase production and to improve the product.

According to an old economic theory, increased demand, increased production, and more know-how in manufacture result in lower prices.

Apparently, however, this theory is as phony as the Cardiff giant.

I can only draw this conclusion from the penny-a-gallon price increase on gasoline imposed by the oil industry.

Here is what appears to be another classic example of price gouging—a field in which this industry has excelled for years.

I wish to go on record as supporting an investigation into this situation.

Perhaps we will discover that the oil industry needs this increase—if only to pay its lobbying costs.

Mr. President, Mr. Harry I. Kirk, president of the American Automobile Association, recently sent a telegram to the presidents of 16 major oil companies demanding justification for the price increase.

I ask unanimous consent that this telegram, dated January 11, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Automobile Association, concerned over the increasing cost of car operation, has questioned the justification of a gasoline price rise. In a telegram to the presidents of 16 major oil companies which market gasoline in the States east of the Rockies, AAA President Harry I. Kirk said: "Reports of an increase of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline east of the Rockies raise a serious question in the minds of motorists as to the justification for this action, in view of the more than ample stocks on hand and the relatively lower winter consumption of gasoline. The oil industry's own statistics show that nearly 187 million barrels of gasoline are on hand, which exceeds last year's inventory by almost 18 million barrels. This is about a 60-day supply under normal conditions. A 30-day supply is normal. Moreover, stocks are rising; last week they went up nearly a million barrels. The facts indicate a decrease, rather than an increase, in gasoline prices if the law of supply and demand were applied. If there is some justification for raising gasoline prices, of which we are not aware, we should appreciate knowing about it. Otherwise we must oppose the price increase."

THE PRESIDENT'S MIDDLE EAST PROPOSAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been my judgment from the outset of the discussion of President Eisenhower's Middle East proposal that Congress would overwhelmingly approve the President's request for necessary authority. It has been my judgment that Congress would do so, because there is no actual alternative to action by the Congress signifying to the Kremlin that we will not tolerate aggression in this crucial area of the globe.

The record of history proves that the danger of war intensifies not when we are strong and serve clear warning to an aggressor, but when we are weak and indecisive and fail to notify an aggressor of our determination to counter his plans.

This fact was masterfully brought out in a recent article by the eminent columnist, David Lawrence.

He cited instance after instance throughout history to prove the point.

We might well bear in mind these facts as the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees continue their review of this problem.

The headlines of any particular day's news from Capitol Hill may seem to indicate that the President's bill is allegedly foundering. In my judgment, however, despite surface appearances to the contrary, it is still relatively certain that the Senate, like the House, will recognize its nonpartisan obligations to the American people to close ranks with the President.

In the article entitled "United States Wars Come When Congress Hesitates," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1957, Mr. Lawrence asks:

Will history repeat itself? Will Congress hesitate to give the President of the United States power to act in a possible emergency? And will there be another world war due to an enemy's miscalculation of the intent of a vacillating America?

There is a strange parallel with what happened just before World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

On March 4, 1917, the Congress adjourned and a resolution of authority requested by President Wilson to arm American merchant ships failed of passage because of a notorious filibuster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by David Lawrence to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES WARS COME WHEN CONGRESS HESITATES—DANGER NOT IN GRANTING PRESIDENTIAL POWERS, BUT MISCALCULATIONS ABROAD

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Will history repeat itself? Will Congress hesitate to give the President of the United States power to act in a possible emergency?

And will there be another world war due to an enemy's miscalculation of the intent of a vacillating America?

There is a strange parallel with what happened just before World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

On March 4, 1917, the Congress adjourned and the resolution of authority requested by President Wilson to arm American merchant ships failed of passage because of a notorious filibuster.

Just 29 days later the President was asking for and Congress was passing a resolution to ratify a state of war which had begun when the imperial German Government sank American ships without warning. The Berlin government had calculated that America would not intervene.

On May 27, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared an unlimited national emergency and on August 12, 1941, the request of the President to extend the term of service under the Selective Service Act was granted by a margin of only one vote in the

House. Less than 4 months later the President was asking for, and Congress was voting, a declaration of a state of war with Germany and Japan.

In January 1950, Secretary of State Acheson announced that America's defense perimeter did not include Korea but that this would be left to the U. N. to protect. Six months later, the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force were engaging in a war inside Korea to repel aggression.

The language used by President Wilson in asking for authority to place the Armed Forces of the United States aboard its merchant ships in 1917 was almost identical with that of President Eisenhower in his message of Jauary 5. Mr. Wilson said:

"No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers; but I prefer, in the present circumstances, not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do."

What happened? A filibuster led by liberal Republicans, notably the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, resulted in the failure of the Senate to get a chance to vote. When Congress adjourned on March 4, Mr. Wilson issued a statement to the country:

"Although, as a matter of fact, the Nation and the representatives of the Nation stand back of the Executive with unprecedented unanimity and spirit, the impression made abroad will, of course, be that it is not so and that other governments may act as they please without fear that this Government can do anything at * * *.

"A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible."

The importance of this bit of history is that American misfortune has followed every conspicuous exhibition of weakness in Congress.

To his credit, former President Truman has come out flatly in favor of granting the power that President Eisenhower has asked. But will the other Democrats follow him, or will they whittle down the pending resolution and give the impression that the President of the United States does not have the wholehearted support of the Congress?

In July 1939, the late Senator William Borah, liberal Republican, was telling the Senate there wasn't a chance of a world war and he opposed giving the President discretionary powers on an embargo of arms. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee refused to act. About a month later World War II broke out.

Will history repeat itself now? The testimony being recorded this week in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Armed Services Committee has a familiar sound.

AMENDMENT OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction today by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and a group of my colleagues, whom I have joined, of a bill to amend substantially the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, it is to be noted that this bill does not deal specially with refugees and escapees. It is essential to the modernization of our country's immigration policy and to meet the urgent demands of our foreign policy that appropriate legislation be enacted for refugees and escapees. This should be in addition to the measure submitted today. It is expected that shortly the President will make recommendations to the Congress and they will deserve consideration on the highest priority.

The senior Senator from New York and I also expect soon to offer proposed legislation on this subject.

We must now recognize that our immigration policy with respect to refugees and escapees rank as high-level foreign policy. The flight from Hungary of thousands of refugees and its meaning already proves that. One of our most potent weapons in the fight against communism is the establishment of an attractive alternative to those living under communism, offering those seeking escape from behind the Iron Curtain the prospect of resettlement. Indeed, we should adopt a policy that will attract to the free world as many as possible who are gifted and effective, who can make a major contribution to our society, and deprive the Communists of this benefit.

A bill to provide suitably for refugees and escapees needs to recognize also that the problem is recurrent—we have already had two previous Refugee Relief Acts—that it erupts out of major foreign policy issues, and that we have a considerable amount of unfinished business on hand right now. Under the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, which expired December 31 last, approximately 19,000 fewer visas were used than were available. In this connection, I am proud to say that the State of New York has absorbed about one-third of the refugees who have recently come from abroad. Yet many of the main categories of prospective immigrants for whom the act was intended were oversubscribed with over 24,000 more Italians wanting to come here than the law provided for, 11,000 Greeks, and 16,000 from Far Eastern countries. Also, there has been separation of families, some of whose members came in under the Refugee Relief Act, which needs to be corrected. In addition, it is essential to regularize the admission of about 15,000 Hungarian refugees who have been allowed to enter the United States on a parole status.

New problems are coming up, like those with respect to persons of Jewish faith expelled from Egypt, the Palestine-Arab refugees; and there may be yet other eruptions from behind the Iron Curtain creating new waves of refugees. With the necessary provisions for internal security and for our capability to provide housing and jobs, the President needs to be given authority over a period of years to admit refugees and escapees in our own national interest.

TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL CORPORATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 7, I introduced S. 352, a bill designed to bring much-needed tax relief to small corporations. I have since been joined by six distinguished colleagues in the sponsorship of this vital piece of proposed legislation. My cosponsors are Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER. I am delighted to receive the active support of these distinguished Senators at the outset of the 85th Congress, and I trust that when I have completed my detailed analysis of S. 352, the great majority of this body will see fit to lend it their active support so that the bill may be enacted into law at the earliest possible date.

The purpose of S. 352 is simple. It is to bring substantial tax relief to the smallest corporations of this country. The bill accomplishes this purpose by substituting a graduated tax for the present normal and surtax on corporate income. The present law exacts a tax of 30 percent on all taxable corporate income up to $25,000 and a tax of 52 percent on all income over that amount.

S. 352 would substitute the following rates:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	5 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $10,000.	$250 plus 10 percent of the excess over $5,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $15,000.	$750 plus 15 percent of the excess over $10,000.
Over $15,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,500 plus 25 percent of the excess over $15,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000.	$2,750 plus 35 percent of the excess over $20,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500 plus 45 percent of the excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$38,250 plus 55 percent of the excess over $100,000.

The schedule of rates contained in S. 352 accomplishes two very important purposes: It brings the maximum relief to those who need it most, the smallest corporations, and it causes no loss in Federal revenues. In fact, I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that S. 352 would bring about an increase in revenues in the neighborhood of $90 million a year if corporate income continues at its mid-1956 pace. While this revenue gain is significant, I am further informed that it would not be possible to lower any of the rates in S. 352 without causing revenue loss.

I do not intend to lose sight of the revenue gain embodied in S. 352, however. That gain could well be used to offset slight revenue losses implicit in other important small business tax-relief measures which I have introduced and which I shall discuss in detail in the near future.

I have said that S. 352 would bring the maximum relief to the smallest corporations. It would mean a tax saving in excess of 83 percent for all corporations earning up to $5,000 a year. According to statistics compiled by the Treasury Department on corporate income for 1952—the latest year for which complete statistics on corporate income are available—corporations earning less than $5,000 constituted nearly 47 percent of all corporations with net income.

S. 352 would bring a tax saving to all corporations earning up to $375,000 a year. Again citing the Treasury statistics, such corporations constituted nearly 98 percent of all corporations reporting

net income in 1952. In other words, only about 2 percent of all corporations would pay increased taxes, and then in only relatively minor amounts.

For the benefit of my colleagues in their study of this measure, I request that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, the first setting forth a comparison of S. 352 and the present law on corporate income tax, and the second setting forth some detailed statistics on the structure of our corporate economy as of 1952.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of present and proposed corporate income tax laws*

Income subject to tax	Effective rate (percent)		Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
	Present law	Proposed law			Amount	Percent
$5,000	30.0	5.0	$1,500	$250	−$1,250	−83.3
$10,000	30.0	7.5	3,000	750	−2,250	−75
$15,000	30.0	10.0	4,500	1,500	−3,000	−66.6
$20,000	30.0	13.75	6,000	2,750	−3,250	−54.2
$25,000	30.0	18.0	7,500	4,500	−3,000	−40
$50,000	41.0	31.5	20,500	15,750	−4,750	−23.2
$100,000	46.5	38.25	46,500	38,250	−8,250	−17.7
$250,000	49.8	47.7	124,500	120,750	−3,750	−3.01
$375,000	50.53	50.53	189,500	189,500	None	None
$500,000	50.9	51.65	254,500	258,250	+3,750	+1.22
$1,000,000	51.4	53.33	514,500	533,250	+18,750	+3.6
$5,000,000	51.9	54.68	2,594,500	2,733,250	+138,750	+5.3
$10,000,000	51.95	54.83	5,194,500	5,483,250	+288,750	+5.6

TABLE 2.—*Corporation income tax returns for 1952, returns with net income*

Net income classes	Number of returns	Percent of total	Net income (thousands)	Percent of total	Income tax (thousands)
Under $5,000	207,201	46.8	$340,250	0.8	$85,457
$5,000 under $10,000	61,780	14.0	447,571	1.1	119,909
$10,000 under $15,000	37,136	8.4	458,022	1.1	126,748
$15,000 under $20,000	27,752	6.3	483,872	1.2	137,321
$20,000 under $25,000	26,357	6.0	594,566	1.5	171,104
$25,000 under $50,000	33,470	7.5	1,162,855	2.9	388,666
$50,000 under $100,000	20,623	4.7	1,443,968	3.6	582,342
$100,000 under $250,000	15,064	3.4	2,335,476	5.8	1,043,674
$250,000 under $500,000	5,968	1.3	2,080,026	5.1	961,861
$500,000 under $1,000,000	3,243	.7	2,260,864	5.6	1,052,863
$1,000,000 under $5,000,000	3,020	.7	6,351,075	15.7	2,933,348
$5,000,000 under $10,000,000	455	.1	3,129,000	7.7	1,453,751
$10,000,000 or more	508	.1	19,344,152	47.9	8,539,788
Total	442,577	100.0	40,431,697	100.0	17,596,832

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not labor the question of the need for the enactment of S. 352. Small business has received wide attention during the past year. Everyone appears to be in agreement that small business must be given some form of tax relief quickly. The platforms of both major political parties made prominent mention of this need last summer. In October the President endorsed proposals of his Cabinet Committee on Small Business which would have brought tax relief to small business with accompanying revenue losses approaching $740 million. We no longer hear mention of relief for small business of such magnitude, however, for reasons which are clear to all of us.

It is very significant, nevertheless, that in his budget message to the Congress last week, the President conceded that some loss of revenue might be tolerated in just one area of the economy, namely for tax relief for small business. Here are the President's words:

> In the area of taxation, I am especially interested in the problems of small business. Last August the Cabinet Committee on Small Business made a series of carefully considered recommendations in this field. Some relief in the tax burden affecting small business, as recommended by that committee, which will give help with a minimum loss of revenue, should have early consideration by the Congress. Any changes involving substantial loss of revenue should be considered at a later time when a general tax reduction is possible.

Mr. President, I submit that S. 352 will accomplish the maximum benefit envisaged by the President, and by all those who take a sober interest in the welfare of small business, and it will accomplish this most worthy objective without any loss of revenue, in fact with a slight gain.

S. 352 could bring immediate and substantial relief to the overwhelming majority of corporations in business today. And by virtue of section 1361 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, which grants an election to partnerships and proprietorships to be taxed as corporations, it could benefit hundreds of thousands of unincorporated businesses as well.

The melancholy statistics on small business failures continue to paint an ever-darkening picture of the outlook for small business in today's economy. Figures published by Dun & Bradstreet show that thus far in 1957, business failures are running ahead of those in 1956 and 1955. The current average is about 240 a week as against 222 in 1956 and 199 in 1955. There is an undeniable trend toward concentration of productive wealth. The Treasury's own statistics confirm this. Preliminary data on corporate income for 1953 show that there were fewer corporations with net income in 1953 than there were in 1952, but that the combined income of corporations in business in 1953 was in excess of that for the larger number of corporations reporting in 1952.

If small corporations are to stay in business, they must have money to plow back into the business and to meet competition. Earnings of the business are potentially the best source for such funds. But today's oppressive corporate income tax rates make it virtually impossible for a small corporation to retain any significant part of its earnings. And the smaller the corporation, the more burdensome the present tax structure becomes in a company's effort to survive or to expand. S. 352 would give the smallest corporations the wherewithal to survive and to expand and to become truly competitive with their larger competitors. It would enable them to retain significant amounts of the earnings of the business for purposes of improving their products, expanding their facilities, enlarging their markets, to the benefit of all the taxpayers, the consuming public.

It may be true that world conditions have prevented any tax relief for small business which would cause substantial loss of revenue. But that does not discharge us from the responsibility of finding some solution to the problems so clearly confronting small business today. We cannot stand idly by and allow the deterioration of the small business segment of our economy to continue. Small business is the very essence of democracy and the lifeblood of our national economy. S. 352, in my opinion, provides a solution that accomplishes objectives on which I believe all of us can unite—immediate and substantial relief for small business and at no cost to the national revenues.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I offer S. 352 for the Senate's most serious consideration and urge its early passage.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS OF FORTIER HIGH SCHOOL, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today we have as our guests in the gallery 56 students of Fortier High School, New Orleans, La., who have been visiting Washington to attend the inauguration and who have been studying the processes of the Federal Government.

As a graduate of Fortier High School, I wish to welcome these young men and women and to extend to them the greetings of the other Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the names of these young men and women, together with the names of their faculty escorts.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTIER TOUR, JANUARY 18–25, 1957

Linda Adoue, Eva Augustine, Bill Baldwin, Joan Barrett, Kenneth Beoubay, Eddie Berns, Jo Ann Blais, Carolyn Boelte, Evelyn Bordelon, Forrestine Boyd, Noel Breaud, Mary Michael Brierre, Sue Cantrell, Charleen Cormier, Emile Dieth, Frank Dietz, Virginia Dimiceli, Brenda Duhe, Charles Elchinger, Judy Feehan, Barbara Fischer, Shirley Gerber, Lynnda Gerson, Frieda Green, Sybil

Heim, Eleanor Kayman, Martha Kees, Harwood Koppel, Susan Korn, Ann Lacrouts, Ann Lampo, Rochelle Lassen, Linda Lastrapes, Hilberth Leibe, Lynne Lennox, Noel Many, Mary Frances Meyer, Mary Moore, Carolyn Moses, Bonnie Nelson, Sharon Offner, Patty O'Neill, Dorothy O'Reilly, Sandra Pastel, John Pecoul, Mike Porter, Charlotte Redding, Myra Regenbogen, Betty Schully, Sylvia Shannon, Carol Stein, Jeannette Toledano, Frieda Trestman, May Walker, Karen Westbrook, and Emma Young.

Faculty: Mrs. M. L. Renaud, Miss Dorothy Kelly, Miss Elizabeth Vial, and Miss Rose Capraro.

POLICIES PURSUED BY EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the proposed resolution to authorize the use of American forces in the Middle East and to provide for economic assistance in that area is of great importance to the Members of the Congress, as well as to all of our citizens.

I know that Senators, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, desire to have as much background information as possible regarding the policies which have been pursued by the Eisenhower administration in the Middle East. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of articles written by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts and published by the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 6, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—UNITED STATES POLICY SHIFT DATES FROM 1953

(First of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

On the morning of May 12, 1953, newspaper readers around the world saw a picture of Egyptian Premier Mohammed Naguib holding a silver-plated pistol presented to him in Cairo the day before by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The inscription read "To Gen. Mohammed Naguib from his friend, Dwight D. Eisenhower."

The photograph was symbolic of two things:

1. The beginning of the 4-month-old Eisenhower administration's swing away from the pro-Israeli policies of the Truman administration to what Dulles called a more impartial and objective attitude on the Arab-Israeli dispute, then as now the key internal Middle East problem.

2. The pistol incident also was symbolic of what was to become a long series of increasing differences of opinion between the United States and its two chief allies, Britain and France, over the Middle East. For the incident kicked up an immediate storm in London, where Prime Minister Winston Churchill had just denounced Naguib as a dictator whom Britain was prepared to resist with arms if Egypt physically challenged her right to remain in the Suez Canal Zone.

The choice of a pistol for a gift to Naguib was suggested by Henry Byroade, a West Point graduate, then Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East area, later Ambassador to Cairo and now envoy to the Union of South Africa. Ten months earlier, a group of young Egyptian army officers had forced the corrupt King Farouk to abdicate his throne. Led by Gamal Abdel Nasser, they had set up Naguib as their front man. Naguib was ousted by Nasser about a year and a half after the Dulles visit and ever since has been under house arrest.

Dulles, who had never before been in the Middle East, was on a swing through that area when he stopped in Cairo. In a radio-television report on his trip, Dulles advised Israel to cease to look upon itself * * * as an alien in the Middle East; he noted that the Arabs fear lest the United States become the backer of expansionist Zionism, he pledged the Eisenhower administration to the 1950 Tripartite Declaration to guarantee the Arab-Israeli armistice lines, adding that "we cannot afford to be distrusted by millions (of Arabs) who could be sturdy friends of freedom."

That September, Dulles suspended economic aid to Israel for 5 weeks because Israel had refused to stop work on a Jordan River water diversion project as ordered by the United Nations. The next April, Byroade publicly told Israel to drop the attitude of the conqueror and he advised the Arabs to accept Israel as an accomplished fact.

Along with this policy of impartiality between the Arabs and the Jews, Dulles pushed three other main lines of action—a British-Egyptian settlement of the Suez Canal zone dispute, the development of the northern tier defense concept against the Soviet Union and the Jordan River valley plan for economic development.

At the close of World War II, the British and French had pulled out of many Middle East lands which they had held since the breakup of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War. By August 1954, Britain agreed to end her 70-year occupation of all or part of Egypt by coming to terms with Egypt on evacuation of the Suez Canal Zone. Dulles called that pact a new and more permanent basis for tranquility and security of the area.

The State Department said the then American Ambassador in Cairo, Jefferson Caffery, played an important role in the Suez zone agreement—that is, he pressured both Britain and Egypt to settle their differences. American and British officials say that both their Governments at the time felt that once the canal zone issue was settled, the war would be opened to settlement of other disputes such as the future of the Suez Canal (the concession then had 13 years to run) and the Egyptian-Israeli issue, including the Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal against Israeli shipping. Israel pressed in vain for inclusion of the lifting of that ban as part of the Anglo-Egyptian Pact.

The truth is, American and British diplomats now agree, that both were counting on the goodwill of Nasser. Both were content when Egypt agreed to restate at the time the 1888 Constantinople Convention principle of free navigation through the canal. Nasser agreed to that statement only after Britain agreed to recognize Egyptian sovereignty by declaring that the canal was an integral part of Egypt.

In retrospect, many have said that the resultant withdrawal of some 83,000 British troops created a power vacuum. As the London Daily Telegraph put it last November: "We beg Americans to recall that it was their Government which put the heaviest pressure upon us to evacuate the canal (zone)—a step which is at the root of all our troubles."

The facts, however, were that the British Government, like the American, was counting on Nasser now to turn his attention to solving internal Egyptian problems. Dulles declared he was certain the settlement would establish the foundation for even closer collaboration in working out Middle East problems.

The American pressure on Britain was, without doubt, founded on the thesis that British colonialism must give way here as elsewhere in the Middle East. Dulles, in fact, in 1954 ordered a study of how America should deal with this colonialism issue and at one point of frustration with the British and French he was even tempted to cut the United States loose from its allies. But he decided against such a move on the grounds that it would have a catastrophic effect on such Allied ventures as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Instead, Dulles and the President developed the idea that the United States role should be that of a mediator in colonialism issues in order to cushion the inevitable changes.

Subsequently there was a long series of disagreements with London over British colonialism in the area: in Jordan and Saudi Arabia over the Burami Oasis dispute; in Iraq, as well as in Egypt and elsewhere. Dulles likewise displeased the French by the American refusal to stand with Paris at the U. N. in the disputes over north Africa.

At the same time, Dulles' efforts, which as he saw them, were to create a balanced policy between Israel and her hostile neighbors, convinced Israel that the Eisenhower administration was becoming more and more pro-Arab; yet they failed to win Arab friendship because the administration was not publicly anti-Israel nor anti-British and anti-French.

Another Dulles line of action, the northern tier concept, was part of what his critics have called his pactomania; that is, his efforts to surround the Sino-Soviet heartland with a series of military arrangements designed to deter Russian or Chinese Communist aggression.

From his 1953 Middle East trip, Dulles developed the idea of a military alliance among the Middle East's northern tier of states; that is, those states touching or almost touching the Soviet Union—Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. This, Dulles, said in late 1953, would bring the free world's defense line right up on the Soviet border.

Out of this idea came the American arms agreement with Pakistan in December 1953, which so aroused the Indians, and the Turkish-Iraqi Pact which split the Arab world but which evolved, by the spring of 1955, into the Baghdad Pact when Britain joined up. Afghanistan has, however, remained outside the pact.

Dulles feels that his "northern tier" idea was perverted by the British when they persuaded Iraq, an Arab state, to join. One reason the British did so was to undercut the nationalist pressures in Iraq against British bases there. This was accomplished by hauling down the Union Jack and turning the airfields, still used by the Royal Air Force, into Baghdad Pact bases.

Egyptian reaction to the "northern tier" was loud and negative. The Russians called the Baghdad Pact "a stab in the back" of all Arab nations. India's Jawaharlal Nehru repeatedly condemned the pact. The United States refused to join Dulles' own creation despite many pleas from its members to do so.

Now, in a sense, the administration is proposing that the United States take on the responsibility of a pact member without joining that organization. America, of course, is giving arms to the pact's member nations along with economic help.

The Eisenhower administration's economic policy in the Middle East centered on the Jordan River Valley plan. This scheme for cooperative economic development, through American aid, of Israel and three Arab neighbors, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon, had won technical approval of all four nations by late 1955. But it has never won the necessary political approval.

As American policy developed in the Middle East in the years 1953–56, the divergent British and American ways of looking at that area became more and more apparent. To the United States, the key problem was to keep the Russians out. To the British, the

key problem was to shore up their own crumbling position in the area in order to maintain the vital flow of oil to Britain and Western Europe.

From these divergent viewpoints sprang the often-heard Anglo-French complaint that the United States did not understand the vital necessity of that oil. This, however, does not stand up as a fair criticism of Dulles. His argument was that the oil could not be preserved nor could its continued delivery via the Suez Canal be guaranteed unless British colonial policies were gradually modified or liquidated in the face of Arab nationalism fanned by the Soviet Union. Dulles also knew well that some 60 percent of the whole Middle East oil investment is American.

This Dulles policy of attempting to keep Arab nationalism within bounds by concessions to the Arabs—concessions of necessity chiefly by the British and French—not only strained the Atlantic Alliance but it made Israel feel increasingly deserted by the United States.

In February 1955 David Ben-Gurion came out of retirement to launch a more aggressive Israeli policy. Within a week, Israelis killed some 38 Arabs in a heavy raid on the Egyptians in the Gaza strip. Ben-Gurion argued that Israel must defend itself in what amounted to an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth policy of raids and counterraids. He felt the U. N. only talked, that the Arabs were being emboldened by the West, that the United States was adopting, as it was, a policy of no firm commitment to either Israel or her neighbors which meant only a dribble of arms and no real border guaranty to Israel.

The Israeli strike at Gaza turned out to be a historic affair for it set in motion a series of events leading to the Egyptian arms deal with the Russians. By chance, these events coincided with new Soviet tactics.

Looking back on the Eisenhower administration's policies, or lack of them, in the Middle East from Inauguration Day in 1953 until the summer of 1955, two points are worth noting. One, affirmatively, is that the administration struck a new posture of attempting to win Arab friendship, in part on the assumption that Nasser and his colleagues represented a hopeful force in Egypt which was likely, if properly aided, to concentrate on Egypt's internal problems more than on its external quarrel with Israel.

The other point, a negative one, is simply that the Middle East was neglected. In the years 1953–55 the fact was that the administration was preoccupied by a series of major foreign problems elsewhere: ending the Korean war in 1953, halting the Communist advance in Indochina in 1954, escaping from the Communist-Nationalist quarrel over Quemoy and Matsu in 1955, finding a substitute for the European Defense Community in 1954, reopening negotiations with Russia in 1954 and, finally, grappling with the changing tactics of the Soviet Union in 1955 which culminated in the Summit Conference at Geneva.

But the interrelated nature of foreign policy is demonstrated by the fact that those changing Soviet tactics in the spring of 1955 were to play a major role in the Middle East. The new Eisenhower administration Middle East move is, in large part, a response to those tactics and their results thus far.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 7, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—ARAB UNREST DUE TO SOVIET'S POLICY

(Second of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Russian decision to move into the Middle East through diplomatic and economic support for the Arab nations and opposition to Israel was made at an historic Soviet Presidium meeting in April 1955.

It is difficult to disagree with Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, in his estimate that "it may not be too much of an over-simplification to say that the eruption of the Middle East into a complex, dangerous crisis stems" from that Soviet decision.

At the time the decision was unknown, of course, to the Western world, although as early as April 7, 1955, a New York Herald Tribune reporter wrote from Cairo that "there has been talk of armament purchases from Communist Czechoslovakia."

What was known was the ancient Russian desire for an outlet in the Middle East, a desire dating back to the czars and flatly stated by the Communists in a secret 1940 message from Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov to his Nazi allies of the moment in Berlin.

In this message, captured by the Allies and published in 1948, Molotov wrote: "The focal point of the aspirations of the Soviet Union is south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf."

But the first public evidence of the Presidium decisions in April 1955 came in matters related to Europe: The agreement to sign an Austrian treaty, the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to Belgrade to make up with Marshal Tito, the first Soviet disarmament proposals taken seriously in the West and the maneuvers leading up to the Big Four meeting at the Summit that July.

NASSER GIVES OPENING

These events bedazzled the world; the Middle East was hardly in the news. But behind the scenes in Cairo, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser suddenly gave the Kremlin the opening it needed to expand into the Middle East. Nasser's prestige had been inflated by his presence at the April 1955 Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung—and his position at home had been imperiled by the aggressive policies of Israel's David Ben-Gurion.

As Nasser has repeatedly told it since, the Israeli attack on the Egyptians in the Gaza strip in February 1955, was "the turning point, the first time we felt the Israeli threat since our 1952 revolution." By April developments had reached the point the Russians were saying publicly that they would do everything to develop closer relations with Middle East nations "in the interest of peace."

Dulles has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "I first heard" during June that Nasser "might be thinking of trying to get some arms from Czechoslovakia or from the Soviet Union." Dulles testified that "I did not, and to best of my knowledge, the President did not" raise the arms sale issue with the Russians at the Summit Conference in July.

Dulles' justification was that by July "our information was that the Egyptians had dropped the thought of getting arms from the Soviet bloc." Dulles also disclaims having received a report from Ambassador Henry Byroade in Cairo that on June 9 Nassar had told him he had approached the Soviet Ambassador to ask whether Russia would sell arms to Egypt. Other sources in the American Government, however, contend that there was firm information before the Summit Conference on a likely arms deal and that the issue was not raised with the Soviets as the result of an administration decision. The reasons remain obscure to this day.

PRESSURE ON NASSER

Nasser had first sought to buy arms from the United States, but obtained only what Dulles termed insignificant amounts. In July, after the Summit Conference and after his first approach to Russia, Nasser again asked for American arms. He and Dulles have publicly agreed that the chief reason he did not get them was that American prices were too high.

Nasser was under pressure from his army officers to get arms and get them quickly because of the tougher Israeli policies of Ben-Gurion.

The July 26 Israeli election showed gains for the extremists who favored direct action against the Arabs. Nasser contended later that the results increased the threat to Egypt and spurred his search for arms. Five days earlier Dmitri Shepilov, then the editor of Pravda and now Soviet Foreign Minister, visited Cairo and apparently offered to open for Nasser the vast storehouse of Soviet arms, not for cash, but for bartered cotton with years to pay. At the moment, Shepilov's bosses, Bulganin and Khrushchev, were meeting in Geneva with President Eisenhower.

LATE UNITED STATES EFFORT

Just before the Soviet arms deal was announced, but with full knowledge that it was coming, Dulles in a speech said the United States would join in a guaranty of Arab-Israeli borders if the two sides could reach an agreement. And he also promised American help to settle the Arab refugee issue.

But it was too late. Nasser signed with Moscow and announced it to the world on September 27. At this point, however, the news, which already had partly leaked out, was almost lost in the wake of Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack of 6 days earlier.

From the arms deal—announced as being with Czechoslovakia, although Nasser later conceded it was with Russia—flowed a series of reactions and counterreactions. Chiefly, they came down to this:

Dulles dispatched Assistant Secretary of State George Allen to Cairo to see if the deal could be limited to a one-shot affair, but Allen's trip was widely interpreted as American panic and a sign of weakness.

MIXUP IN CAIRO

A curious aspect of the Allen visit to Cairo was the action of an American Central Intelligence Agency employee who, apparently hoping to soften the blow, tipped off Nasser that Allen was bringing him a protest note from Dulles. Nasser later revealed the incident in his speech nationalizing the Suez Canal Co., saying that he had threatened to throw Allen out of his office if he said "something unpleasant." The facts, as detailed in the Washington Post of September 24, 1956, were quite different, however. To the story then printed now can be added the fact that before calling on Nasser the CIA employee had informed the American Ambassador, Henry Byroade, of what he intended to do, although the State Department in Washington was not informed. Lack of time was the excuse. Byroade is said to have interposed no objection.

The President wrote Bulganin about the arms deal and received a reply that it was only a normal business transaction. Dulles and his British and French colleagues, who could get no satisfaction from Molotov at the Big Four Foreign Ministers conference that fall, soon found themselves besieged by the Israeli in quest of arms.

ARMS REQUEST FILED

Dulles held off, arguing that to give Israel arms now would start an arms race that could only end in disaster for Israel or even in a general war. Israel presented an arms shopping list which to this day remains in a Washington pigeonhole. As it turned out, it was the next spring, after Prime Minister Anthony Eden's visit to Washington, that Dulles passed the word to the Israelis to shop elsewhere, especially in France and Canada, with his quiet blessing.

The French, especially, were unhappy at being put in this position but eventually they did deliver jet aircraft to Israel. And as time went on the French, despairing of

American help in their fight with the Algerian rebels, moved closed to Israel, finally to the point of secretly sending many more planes and arms before the attack on Egypt last November.

TWOFOLD BRITISH REACTION

The British reaction to the Soviet arms deal was twofold: Joining the Baghdad Pact and attempting to pressure Jordan into the pact, plus some blunt speaking to Bulganin and Khrushchev during their London visit.

The first effort in December 1955, blew up in Britain's face and in the end led to a pro-Nasser regime in Jordan. Egypt countered also by creation of a joint Arab defense setup and by using Saudi Arabian funds (ironically received from American oil revenues) for subversion in Jordan, Syria, and elsewhere in the Arab world.

The Arab-Israeli dispute was at white heat when Eden came to Washington in early 1956. But little came of that visit beyond a new United Nations peace effort, the sending of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold to the area. His efforts resulted in a few weeks of calm.

DIFFERENCES GROW ACUTE

In early April, Anglo-American policy difference had grown acute. The British were saying flatly that they would go to war to protect their Persian Gulf oil sources though there was practically no mention of the Suez Canal, so soon to be the center of controversy.

Jordan's dismissal at this point of Glubb Pasha, the Englishman who long had commanded the Arab Legion, was a shock to London. Britain was angered too, when Dulles told a press conference that Nasser was "actuated primarily by a desire to maintain the genuine independence of the area—the same desire that I expressed."

The war talk led President Eisenhower to make a public statement that the United States would assist any Middle East victim of aggression under the 1950 Tripartite Declaration, a statement urged by Eden. Next day, April 10, 1956, Dulles met with congressional leaders to alert Congress to a possible request for authority to use American forces in the Middle East. But he said there would be no request "at this time."

At this point, unlike today, the issue was presented as what to do in case of an Arab-Israeli war rather than what to do about Soviet aggression in the Middle East.

RED PEACE STATEMENT

The Russians apparently were surprised at the success of their arms deal in making the Middle East pot boil. Fearing they had gone too far, the Russians, on April 17, 1956, came out for a settlement acceptable to both the Arabs and Israel.

The Soviet peace statement lowered the Middle East temperature. A week later when Bulganin and Khrushchev visited London, Eden told them Middle East oil was vital to Britain and the British would fight for it rather than be strangled by its loss. The Russians made quite a fuss over these sharp words and asked whether Eden was threatening the Soviet Union with war. To this Eden replied, No, just telling you the plain facts so there will be no possibility of miscalculation. Nothing further was said about the matter.

A report of this private conversation convinced Dulles that the Russians had been quite naive about the Middle East, possibly actually thinking they could sell arms without creating the risk of war. Dulles felt they had done a lot of blundering but now had wakened up to the fact they had lit a fuse and therefore were trying to stamp it out. The April 17 Soviet peace statement was repeated in the Anglo-Soviet communique at the end of the London visit.

The relative calm which descended in the Middle East thereafter, partly due to the Hammarskjold mission, was not to last long, however. It ended on July 26 when Nasser announced nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. following the American withdrawal of aid to help build the Aswan Dam.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 8, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—ASWAN DAM DISPUTE LONG IN THE MAKING

(Third of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

One of the Anglo-American steps to c unter the Soviet arms deal with Egypt was the offer of aid to help build the giant Aswan Dam on the Nile River. The story is illuminating.

The arms deal was announced on September 27, 1955. The next month, according to the London Observer, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden summoned an American Embassy official at 1 a. m. to tell him the United States must help finance the Aswan Dam or else Nasser would go over to the Russians.

Eden wanted a quick answer but Washington took 4 weeks to make up its mind. On December 17, it was announced that the United States would put up $54.6 million and the British $15.4 million to make possible a $200-million loan by the World Bank.

The Aswan Dam, a massive project which would take at least 15 years to complete, was a dream of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. He once said that the dam, "more magnificent and 17 times greater than the Pyramids, will provide a higher standard of living for all Egyptians." Its total cost was reckoned at $1.3 billion with the foreign help vital to obtain machinery from abroad.

During the long Anglo-Egyptian negotiations over evacuation of the Suez Canal zone, the United States held back on any aid for the long-discussed project, using it as a lever on Egypt. But not until after the Russian-Egyptian arms deal and rumors of a Soviet offer to finance the dam did the Western Powers agree to help finance it. Yet to this day there is no firm evidence that Moscow ever intended to put up such a big chunk of money.

The American-aid offer was conditional and World Bank President Eugene Black visited Cairo in February 1956 to talk about the project with Nasser. Nasser did not know it but at the time Britain wanted the bank to go ahead without the conditions on which Black was insisting.

Nasser did agree to let the bank see Egypt's books to assure it that the economy was properly balanced—a step designed at least to provide leverage against any further arms deals with the Soviets. By July, just before the United States called off the aid offer and Nasser retaliated by nationalizing the Suez Canal Co., the Egyptian President had worked out a full agreement with the bank.

But meanwhile the British had soured on their own idea and sold Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on allowing the aid offer to lapse.

The British change of mind began with a Cairo incident on March 2. Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd had just returned to the British Embassy after a pleasant dinner with Nasser when he was handed a telegram saying that Jordan had abruptly fired Lt. Gen. John Bagot Glubb, the famed Glubb Pasha who long had headed the Arab Legion. The British say that both they and the Americans soon determined that Nasser had been responsible for Glubb's ouster.

Nothing more was done at the moment about the dam because of a flareup on the Arab-Israeli frontiers.

In either April or May 1956, London asked Washington to agree to call off the dam-aid offer. Dulles by now had come to the conclusion that Nasser was blackmailing the West by his constant hints of taking up the rumored Soviet offer. Nothing was said publicly, however, and in June Nasser told the visiting publisher of the Long Island Newsday that he had been waiting since February for a firm aid offer. He complained:

"The West had neglected us. Russia hasn't."

It may well be that Nasser's diplomatic recognition of Communist China on May 16 settled the dam issue for Washington.

At any rate, word that the United States intended to say "no" seems to have leaked back to Cairo. On July 17, the Egyptian Ambassador to the United States returned to Washington and announced that "we have decided" to accept the western aid offer.

The day before, however, it was revealed that the Senate Appropriations Committee, which had taken closed-door testimony from Dulles on the dam proposal, had ordered the administration not to proceed without prior committee approval. At the time there was some grumbling at the Capitol about helping to build a dam which could increase Egyptian cotton acreage in the face of a massive American cotton surplus.

Dulles promptly stated the administration would refuse to be bound by the Senate committee action, a reflection of the old fight against legislative attempts to invade executive areas of responsibility. But Dulles had told the committee in private, it turned out, that he did not see any likelihood of "an early utilization" of American funds for the dam.

Then on July 19 Dulles informed the Egyptian Ambassador and immediately thereafter publicly announced that it was "not feasible in present circumstances" to help finance the dam. The British Embassy had been trying the previous day to find out what Dulles would tell the Egyptian Ambassador but was informed it could not be told until the actual day of the announcement. London and the World Bank later also withdrew from the project.

In London, Eden heard of the Dulles statement on the news ticker. In Cairo, there was a hue and cry which centered on Dulles' statement that recent events had rendered uncertain Egypt's ability to carry her share of the financial burden.

On Tuesday, the 24th, Nasser in a bitter speech talked of the "shameful clamor raised in Washington and devoid of all principles of international usage" and of "lies, deceit, and delusion that the Egyptian economy is impotent and unstable." He went on:

"I look at them and tell them: 'Die in your rage. You shall not dominate or tyrannize us.' "

Nasser added that he would tell Egypt "on Thursday" how he had "acted so that all its projects—such as this project (the Aswan Dam)—may be projects of sovereignty, dignity, and not those of humiliation, slavery, domination, rule, and exploitation."

On Thursday, July 26, Nasser announced he had nationalized the old Universal Suez Canal Co.

In defending himself against charges that his abrupt "no" to Egypt had brought on the canal nationalization and the subsequent Middle East crisis, Dulles later said he was "quite confident it would have happened in any event" and that Nasser had said he had been planning for it "for over 2 years."

Yugoslavia's President Tito in part confirmed this view by revealing last November that Nasser had told him in January 1955, "that he would have to nationalize the Suez Canal one day because Egypt, as an independent country, could not tolerate foreigners exercising authority on her territory."

What manner of man is Nasser anyway? This question has been argued and debated in Washington, London, and Paris for years with evaluations of him rising and falling like a stock market chart. The State Department long was divided, with Henry Byroade,

then Ambassador in Cairo, bullish, and George Allen, then Assistant Secretary for the area, increasingly bearish. Dulles alternated in his opinion as did many of his subordinates.

Perhaps the best documentation of Nasser's regime was done by Edmond Taylor, long a foreign correspondent. In a series of articles written shortly after Nasser seized the canal, Taylor made these points among many:

Nasser wrote in his Philosophy of the Revolution that the Middle East is waiting for its hero. He foresaw a vast empire, from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. He pictured Egypt as the leader of the Moslem world and of Africa. Taylor noted Nasser had been "elected" President in a familiar totalitarian-type plebiscite by a 99.9-percent vote.

By ruthless sabotage in early 1955 Nasser killed off a promising Franco-Algerian effort to bring about a peaceful settlement in Algeria. He gave sanctuary to the chief enemy of Tunisian Premier Habib Bourguiba and "supplied him with arms and money to launch a fifth column against Bourguiba."

Nasser fired the only two resolutely anti-Communist members still left in his cabinet. He brought back from exile in Switzerland Maj. Khaled Mohieddin, known as the "Red major," and set him up as a newspaper publisher in Cairo. He hired a fairly notorious group of ex-Nazis including Gen. Otto Remer, the man who broke up the 1944 officers' revolt against Hitler; Willy Beisner, former Nazi police chief, and former Goebbels propagandist Johannes von Leers. He tossed out of Egypt a Canadian newsman in search of von Leers' boss, reputedly an even bigger fish.

Nasser uses Radio Cairo to fan trouble all over the Middle East and Africa—anti-French incitements to North Africa, anti-Israel propaganda to the Arabs, a campaign to drive the British out of Aden, incitement to the Mau Mau terrorists in Kenya, separatist appeals to various areas of Ethiopia. (Broadcasts about America have reached the point of declaring, as did one on October 11, 1955, that United States democracy leaves the capitalist free to rule the country while the masses chase dollars and watch baseball. The U. S. S. R. is a true democarcy with rulers taken from the people through the Communist Party.)

Taylor also reported that one of the men named by Nasser as a director of the new Egyptian Canal Authority was Dr. Mustapha el Hafnaui. He had been an Egyptian government scholarship student in Paris in 1950 where for a year he used the old Canal Co.'s records to write a thesis advocating nationalization.

The extent to which Nasser had permitted Russian and Communist penetration into Egypt is difficult to determine. All sorts of Russians, by the hundreds, from military technicians to ballet dancers have turned up. Clarie Sterling, in the Reporter magazine, has written that the Egyptian Industrial Bank's director is the man who made the Arabic translation of Marx's Das Kapital. She wrote last month that communism is more than merely acceptable in Egypt today; it is fashionable.

The extent of Soviet arms poured into Egypt also is difficult to determine. Britain, France and Israel all have declared, after their attack on Egypt, that the Communist supplies were far greater than anyone had suspected, including a million unexplained blankets found cached in the Sinai Desert. American officials have tended to look with a jaundiced eye, however, on these claims, particularly since the Israeli have declined to this day to show the arms to Americans. United States officials do not deny, of course, that Egypt received what, for it, was a massive amount of aircraft and ground weapons.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 9, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—THREE PHASES NOTED IN SUEZ CRISIS

(Fourth of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

When Britain and France heard that Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser had nationalized the old Suez Canal Co., their first reaction was to strike him with military force.

To Britain, Nasser's action was insufferable for it threatened Britain's vital oil supplies in the Middle East. To France, it was additionally insufferable because of Nasser's aid to the Algerian rebels. Both governments were determined to bring Nasser down.

When one looks back to that July day last summer, it now becomes clear that the subsequent Suez crisis fell into three phases.

The first was the immediate reaction, then a quick realization that Anglo-French forces were woefully unprepared to attack Egypt and seize the canal. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, however, was convinced that he prevented military action by flying to London to organize the first Suez Conference.

The second phase grew out of the failure of the Menzies mission to persuade Cairo to accept the 18-nation London plan for international control of the canal. Britain and France once again prepared to fight. Once again, Dulles felt he prevented war by dreaming up the ill-fated Suez Canal Users Association as a delaying tactic. This time he probably was correct.

The third phase grew out of Anglo-French bitterness at Dulles and President Eisenhower, in part over the canal users plan, in part because of a growing feeling that the United States did not understand the problem of the British and French and was letting them down. This phase brought a determination to move on their own, without telling Washington. It ended with the attack on Egypt immediately following the Israeli drive across the Sinai Desert, and with American charges of collusion by the three nations.

MUTUAL RECRIMINATION

The whole period was characterized by a growing rift in the Atlantic Alliance, ending in mutual recrimination as the United States voted with the Soviet Union at the United Nations to order a cease-fire and then for an Anglo-French withdrawal forthwith. It was complicated by a Soviet threat of force against Britain and France—the Russians mentioned rockets—unless there was a cease-fire and a second threat, to send "volunteers" to Egypt unless the British and French withdrew.

When Nasser seized the canal on July 26, 1956, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden at once cabled President Eisenhower that the Allies must stand firm against Nasser over the canal, that they must not let him "get away with it," that the issue was vital both to Britain's position and prestige in the Middle East and to America's position there as well. Eden asked the President to send over a representative (Dulles then was in South America) to meet with him and French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau.

Eden was shocked when Deputy Undersecretary of State Robert Murphy arrived in London with instructions only to listen. By the morning of July 31, Dulles, now back in Washington, was convinced the British and French were planning to attack and so he flew to London. It now appears they very likely would have done so except that they found they were not capable of effective action. No decision to attack was taken.

The Menzies mission, headed by the Australian Prime Minister, was in Cairo from September 2 to 9. On the 5th President Eisenhower reiterated to a press conference that "the United States is committed to a peaceful solution of this problem," a remark about which Menzies later personally complained to the President as having undercut his efforts by removing the threat of force. On the 6th it was reported to Eden that the conference with Nasser would fail.

EDEN'S CABLE TO IKE

That day Eden sent a cable to President Eisenhower, as Marquis Childs has revealed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, stating that the peril to the West's position had become so great that the choice was between using force or "sitting by and waiting to perish." To this urgent message, Child's reported from London, the President replied, as the British saw it, with something like surprise and pique, asking in effect why Britain was getting so excited.

That is the British version. The American version, as told by Dulles to Bob Considine of International News Service last October, was that the Eisenhower reply warned Eden that any immediate resort to force would be "unproductive."

According to this version, Dulles gave the note to the British Ambassador, Sir Roger Makis, at 10 p. m. on September 8, after having gone over it at the White House with the President. The two men also talked over the Suez Canal Users Association plan. Considine quoted Dulles as having said: "It has devolved upon me to find an alternative that won't precipitate war or give Nasser a complete victory. I've been conjuring ways and means * * *."

The means chosen was the Canal Users plan and Makins was told about it when he was given the President's reply to Eden. But Dulles would not give him the text until the next day.

Eden announced the plan in the House of Commons on September 12 and it soon leaked out that it had been Dulles' idea. But Dulles a day later publicly undercut the tough nature of the proposal to virtually take over administration of the canal by saying that no American ship would "shoot its way through" Suez.

IDEA OF TRAFFIC DIVERSION

Eden's concentration was on using the new association to force a showdown with Nasser. Dulles', however, was rather to give Nasser another chance to compromise and, if he refused, to turn the canal into a "dry ditch" by diverting traffic around the Cape of Good Hope. Dulles had agreed to all the details Eden announced but their differing approaches, plus the unwillingness of the British, Scandinavians, Italians, and other Allies to use the costly Cape route, led to recriminations. The United States talked about but never actually offered to pay that extra cost.

Britain and France felt that Dulles had cut the heart out of his own plan. Dulles had won time and prevented war by his maneuver, and that had been his policy. But he did so at the cost of distrust and ill-will—and an Anglo-French determination not to let the United States stay their hand again.

The Anglo-French frustration over the Canal Users Association debacle, plus the pressure from the Labor Party opposition in Britain led the two governments on September 26 to ask for a United Nations Security Council meetings on the canal issue.

Dulles tried to talk them out of this move on the grounds they had no case before the U. N. as yet, at least until the Canal Users Association was in action and had tried to put a ship through the canal with its own pilots. That idea never came off, however.

At the U. N. the British and French found themselves enmeshed in the flypaper of words. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold maneuvered the British, French, and Egyptian Foreign Ministers into a series of secret talks, out of which came six general principles endorsed by the Security Council,

principles in part the work of Dulles. During the secret talks, British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd offered to back down from the demand for international control to one of international supervision. Egypt would accept only international cooperation, though some progress was made on the issue of automatic sanctions in case either side refused to abide by arbitration of a future dispute over the canal.

DETAILS KEPT SECRET

Most of the details of the negotiation were kept secret until after the shooting started. But the progress was enough to make Dulles think the negotiations could continue later. Lloyd and Pineau, however, were embittered at Dulles over the canal users plan, Lloyd especially after a long postmidnight private talk with the Secretary.

The Russians, who had been making as much trouble as possible for the Western powers and encouraging the Egyptians not to compromise, vetoed presumably at Egyptian request, the attachment of the 18-nation London conference plan of August as the means of carrying out the six principles.

Lloyd and Pineau flew back to their capitals to report in person their discouragement over the United States and the United Nations. The last chance for a peaceful settlement, it is now clear, had gone by as far as the British and French Governments were concerned.

On October 12, the day of the U. N. agreement on six principles to settle the canal dispute, President Eisenhower declared during an election campaign radio-television appearance that the news from the U. N. was most gratifying and that it looked as though a very great crisis was "behind us."

The next day, Eden declared in a speech that the use of force could not be excluded in the settlement of the canal dispute. Four days later he, Lloyd, Mollet, and Pineau were meeting in Paris in what now seems to have been the conference at which they decided to go to war.

MOLLET EXPLAINS

Mollet explained, after the attack on Egypt, that the reason the British and French did not tell the United States what they were planning was that "we were afraid that if we had let you know, you would have prevented us doing it, and (to) that we would not agree, you see."

How could the Anglo-American alliance have reached such a point?

Eden became a man obsessed over the canal seizure. He saw in it the pattern of Munich and the Western surrenders to Hitler. In September, Eden repeated to the House of Commons what he had said when he parted with the Chamberlain government in 1938 "because I think it still applies." What he had said was that "I do not believe that we can make progress" by "appeasement."

On November 1, after the shooting started, Eden defended himself against "the personal accusation made yesterday that I myself was too much obsessed by the events of the 30's and was in consequence old fashioned." Eden went on: "However that may be, is there not one lesson of that period which cannot be ignored? It is that we best avoid great wars by taking even physical action to stop small ones."

Today, the latest reports from London have said, Eden still supremely believes what he did was right.

As to this side of the Atlantic, the President and Dulles at every turn tried to prevent Anglo-French action. They felt it would be disastrous for those nations and they feel events have proved them right.

AS DULLES SAW IT

From the day Nasser nationalized the canal Dulles felt that the British and French wanted less to settle the dispute than to destroy Nasser, and there is little reason to doubt it. As Dulles saw it, the problem was one of prestige. Neither Britain, France, nor Egypt wanted anything the other side could claim as a victory. Dulles himself agreed in substance with the British and French that Nasser should not have a victory—but he opposed force to prevent him gaining one.

To Dulles, Suez was part of the American dilemma of being caught between colonialism, which he believes is inevitably passing, and the Atlantic Alliance. By a slip of the tongue at an October 3 press conference, Dulles linked the Suez issue with Anglo-French colonialism, a remark which made the British and French furious. And it added to the determination in London and Paris to go it alone.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 10, 1957]

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—BLOW AT CAIRO BELIEVED DECREED ON LAST OCTOBER 16

(Fifth of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

On October 16, 1956, French Foreign Minister, Christian Pineau, told the French Assembly that American diplomacy is "difficult for us to follow" and that "one often has the impression that the United States does not understand, as we do, the obligations of the Atlantic Alliance."

Pineau went on to say that, "this evening we are to have a Franco-British meeting of major importance," adding later on that, "I may say we have some very considerable trumps up our sleeve."

That evening and into the morning of the next day, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, his Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd; French Premier Guy Mollet, and Pineau met behind locked doors for 4 hours. The 4 men dismissed all their aides and interpreters, though Lloyd speaks no French and Pineau no English.

There is every reason today to believe that in that meeting the British and French Governments determined to go to war against Egypt in order to drive Nasser from power and force a favorable Suez Canal settlement.

Numerous efforts in the House of Commons to elicit from Eden details of that meeting have been fruitless. The most Eden would say was that "roughly from the beginning of August" Britain and France did have "military discussions of some kind" and that "there were a number of discussions on every kind of hypothetical attack in the Middle East." Eden would not answer Labor Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell's demand to know if it was on October 16 (or at a later meeting of the 4 leaders on the 23d) that, as Pineau told the French Assembly, Britain and France decided on the action they would take if Israel began a preventive war.

Eden's contention was that "there was no foreknowledge that Israel would attack Egypt," and, "there were no plans together (with France) to attack Egypt." Eden said the decision to send the ultimatum to Egypt was made 24 hours after the Israeli attack.

The United States Government is convinced these statements are untrue. And the now known circumstantial evidence, including some items which cannot be published overwhelmingly points to October 16 as the day the attack on Egypt was set in motion by Britain and France—and that France was the intermediary with Israel.

Here are some details, many gathered by a team of reporters for the London News Chronicle, others by the London Observer, the London Times, the Manchester Guardian, the Associated Press, and International News Service as well as this reporter.

Eden had barely left Paris on the 17th when Pineau called in the Israeli Ambassador. (An Israeli political leader, not a government member, had been in Paris in September and he is believed here to have been the first Franco-Israeli contact.) Shortly after seeing Pineau, the Ambassador returned to Israel and Premier David Ben-Gurion thereupon told a party council that Israel would soon be able to rely on a "true ally," which was taken in Israel to be France.

On October 20, Anglo-French naval and air task force headquarters moved to Cyprus. On the 27th the overall Allied command headquarters moved to Cyprus. Troops, ships, and planes had, of course, been gathering in the Mediterranean since Egypt had nationalized the Suez Canal on July 26.

About mid-October France secretly began to reinforce Israel with planes, tanks, and guns. Neither Britain nor America were told of the figures. On the 26th a number of Israeli officers arrived in Paris. On October 29, the day Israel struck, at least two French jet fighter squadrons flew into Israel from Cyprus. The same day, reports of an impending Anglo-French invasion circulated in the lobbies of the French Parliament. Several French deputies phoned the reports to the American Embassy in Paris.

Parallel with these military moves—and every effort appears to have been made to keep them secret from the United States—were political activities which the Eisenhower administration is convinced were designed to mislead this country.

Immediately after the Anglo-French meeting in Paris on October 16 there began a blackout of communications between those two countries and the United States, a blackout which continued up to the time of the shooting. American officials in London and Paris found their counterparts evasive. (In fact, Alastair Buchan has written in the Reporter magazine that in this period "a curious atmosphere of furtiveness became apparent" in both London and Paris and "the usual flow of Cabinet minutes and top-secret memoranda among responsible officials dried up.")

About October 24, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles became alarmed at the strange silence. He had been hoping Britain and France would sit down with Egypt in Geneva on the 29th to renew the canal negotiations, although Lloyd on the 20th had publicly indicated that Britain would not agree. Dulles dispatched cables to his Ambassadors in Paris and London ordering them to try to find out what was going on.

The London Observer has printed the statement that on October 26 "American intelligence agencies detected a marked rise in the level of official cable and wireless traffic between Paris and Tel Aviv. It was on the basis of this information, rather than reports that Israel was continuing to mobilize • • • that President Eisenhower issued his warnings of October 27 and 28 to Mr. Ben-Gurion."

At any rate, Dulles' cables to the American envoys in London and Paris were fruitless; neither found out what was up. In London, not only did Ambassador Winthrop Aldrich learn nothing but in making his inquiries he was told by British Foreign Secretary Lloyd on October 28 that Lloyd was very hopeful of a peaceful canal settlement and that he planned to be back at the U. N. on November 12. This statement the United States considers to have been deliberately and totally misleading.

The first hard sign of military action was word of the Israeli mobilization which had begun on the 25th. News of it reached Washington October 26. (It also turned out that American military attachés in Israel had been shunned for some days by their usually coperative British and French counterparts.)

The next day, President Eisenhower cabled Ben-Gurion warning him not to start a war. When no reply was received, a second message was sent on Sunday, October 28, and the world, whose attention then was riveted on Hungary, was given its first news of what

was afoot by a public statement from the President.

On Monday, the 29th, Israel struck into Egypt's Sinai Peninsula, the news reaching Eden late that evening. On the 30th Mollet and Pineau flew to London. Over a working lunch, the four leaders completed plans for the ultimatum to Egypt handed to the Egyptian Ambassador at 4:15 p. m.

The ultimatum, although also sent to Israel, actually applied only to Egypt. For it called on both belligerents to pull back 10 miles from the Suez Canal (that is, within Egyptian territory) and it demanded that Egypt also agree within 12 hours to permit Anglo-French forces to move temporarily into the towns of Port Said, Ismailia and Suez along the canal. The Anglo-French justification was that the ultimatum was designed "to separate the belligerents and guarantee freedom of transit through the canal." Dulles considered the ultimatum one of the most brutal ever delivered by any nation to another.

The American Ambassador in London had been told to be at the Foreign Office precisely at 4:45 p. m. But the British timing was slightly off for as he entered his car to go there an aide handed him a message that five minutes earlier Eden in Commons had announced the Anglo-French ultimatum.

The London News Chronicle reported that at the British Cabinet meeting that morning, before the arrival of Mollet and Pineau, Eden had argued that the allies could reckon on the hostile neutrality of the United States and that the United Nations would be powerless to intervene because of the veto in the Security Council.

Dulles, however, moved fast on hearing the news of the Israeli invasion. He called for an emergency Security Council meeting which began at 11 a. m., about the hour the ultimatum was being announced in London and Paris. At 1 p. m., the British and French Ministers in Washington (both Ambassadors were absent) met with Dulles and urged him to suspend further U. N. discussion until the next day. Dulles refused.

At 7:55 p. m. that night Britain and France vetoed the American resolution calling for a cease-fire and no help to either side by third parties. The Security Council continued to meet through the night, ending with a vote early Wednesday morning, the 31st, to refer the issue to the General Assembly under the "uniting for peace" procedure set up after the Korean war. Anglo-French efforts to prevent the referral were defeated. In all these votes the United States was alined with the Soviet Union.

By now the ultimatum had expired, Egypt having rejected it, and the Anglo-French air bombardment of Egyptian airfields was underway. Early Friday morning the Assembly voted, 62 to 2 (Britain and France) to discuss the issue. At 4:20 a. m. Saturday, November 2, the Assembly ordered a cease-fire by all four nations. The vote was 64 to 5 with 6 abstentions and 1 absentee. Standing with Britain and France were only Israel, Australia, and New Zealand. Canada and South Africa abstained; India and Pakistan voted yes. Thus the British Commonwealth was split. And once again the United States and the Soviet Union voted together.

The rest of the story is too well known to need detailing—the establishment of a United Nations emergency force and its development; the U. N. pressures for a cease-fire while at the same time struggling with the Soviet move to suppress the Hungarian rebellion; the vast chill which settled upon the relations between the United States and its two principal European allies, Britain and France; the violent internal argument which divided families and friends in Britain, and Eden's physical collapse which sent him to Jamaica for 3 weeks rest.

Britain and France agreed to the cease-fire on November 6 and it took place the next morning, Washington time. Anglo-French troops completed their evacuation of Egypt on December 22, 48 days after the invasion and a month after the arrival of the first contingent of the U. N. force.

AMERICA AND THE MIDEAST—RUSSIAN ROCKET THREAT AFFECTED SUEZ CEASE-FIRE

(Last of a series)

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Russians are known to have numbers of 700-mile-range rockets in place in East Germany, aimed at London and other British targets some 450 to 500 miles away. What part the Soviet threat to use them played in the Anglo-French cease-fire decision is one of the intriguing questions of the Middle East story.

That the rockets are in place, and are known to be in place by the British as well as the United States Government, are facts. It also is a fact that Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin late on November 5 sent a note to British Prime Minister Anthony Eden condemning the attack on Egypt which had begun 5 days earlier. In this message Bulganin said:

"In what position would Britain have found herself if she herself had been attacked by more powerful states possessing every kind of modern destructive weapon? And there are countries now which need not have sent a navy or air force to the coasts of Britain, but could have used other means, such as rocket technique.

Bulganin called on Britain to stop aggression. He noted that he had just sent a message to President Eisenhower proposing that Russia and America jointly use military forces to halt the war (a proposal the White House termed unthinkable and which the United Nations Security Council refused even to consider later the same day).

Bulganin concluded his message to Eden this way:

"We are fully determined to crush the aggressors and restore peace in the Middle East through the use of force. We hope at this critical moment you will display due prudence and draw the corresponding conclusions from this."

Eden was awakened in the early hours of November 6, presidential election day in America, to receive Bulganin's threat. About the same time French Premier Guy Mollet was receiving a similar, though less threateningly worded, Bulganin note. And by now Egypt and Israel had told the U. N. they would agree to a cease fire. But the Anglo-French force was still fighting its way along the Suez Canal, its objective as yet only partly seized.

Mr. Eisenhower phoned Eden in London and was told Britain and France had agreed to the cease fire to take effect at midnight. Reports from Paris indicate the French wanted to fight until the canal was all in hand, but gave in under British pressure.

At an election day White House meeting the President ordered a worldwide American military alert. The Chief of Naval Operations has revealed that two-thirds of the Navy was put to sea.

The British and French naturally have denied that the rocket threat played a part in their cease-fire decision. But American Ambassador to France Douglas Dillon commented in a December 10 radio interview that fear of Soviet action was the primary reason for the cease-fire. Later, Dillon put out a statement saying he had not meant to minimize the "moral pressure" of the U. N., but "only to indicate that a number of different elements may have influenced the British and French decision."

RUSSIA TAKES THE CREDIT

The Russians, in due course, took public credit for having brought about the cease-fire. And diplomatic reports from the Middle East indicate that much of the area believes the Soviet rocket threat in fact did the trick.

In Washington at the time, American officials were divided. Some spent a jittery day after the Bulganin message to Eden; others considered it a Russian bluff, carefully timed for the moment when Moscow could be almost certain Britain and France were caving in under worldwide pressure to stop the war.

The question cannot be considered without reference to what else was then occurring. Two days before Bulganin sent the rocket threat, the Red army had launched its attack to crush the Hungarian rebellion and Premier Imre Nagy had appealed to the U. N. and the world for help. On the next day the U. N. voted condemnation of the Soviet armed intervention. And Moscow knew that the following day America was voting for a President.

THREAT OF INTERVENTION

The Russians, whatever their actual intentions, later added to their prestige in the Middle East by their threat to send "volunteers" to fight with Egypt unless Britain and France withdrew their forces. This threat, at the least, speeded the departure of the U. N. Emergency Force to Egypt.

The threat of Soviet intervention also appears to have played a part in Israeli Premier David Ben-Gurion's about-face decision to withdraw his forces from Egypt after having publicly declared he would not do so until real peace was achieved. Ben-Gurion reversed himself on November 8, after receiving a message the previous day from President Eisenhower which amounted to saying that if he refused and were attacked he would have to fight alone.

This story of Soviet threats and their effect constitutes a major part of the background which led the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the decision to ask Congress, for power to use American military forces in the Middle East.

SOVIET MOVES IN MIDEAST

The internal problems of the Middle East, as has been indicated in this series of articles, are old and complex. But beginning in the spring of 1955 the Soviet Union began to move into the area with diplomatic, economic and military support for Arab nations. Little more than a year later these Soviet moves had so heightened Middle East tensions that Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser was emboldened to nationalize the Suez Canal Co.

From July 1956, when Nasser seized the canal, until war came at the end of October, Dulles fought a delaying action to prevent hostilities. He failed. During all those months the Soviet game was to make it ever more difficult for Nasser to compromise with Britain and France, if in fact he might have done so otherwise.

The events in Poland and Hungary in October and November, in the judgment of the President and Dulles, threw the Soviet Government off balance. And to Washington a Soviet Government off balance is a dangerous thing. It might, Washington felt, decide on a foreign adventure in the Middle East to take the spotlight off its satellite troubles. At the least, it did harangue the world with words and threats, including the threats of rockets and volunteers, to divert attention from Hungary.

ADMINISTRATION COUNTERMOVES

The President told Congress in his Middle East speech of January 5 that because of Hungary "international communism needs and seeks a recognizable success," the Middle East is coveted by the Russians and that the Soviet rulers "do not scruple to use any means to gain their ends."

The Dulles deterrence thesis is that if the United States through the Congress and the President lets the Russians know it will fight if they attack the Middle East they will not

do so. This is, in essence, the theory he has applied in Western Europe and against the Red Chinese. Now it is being applied in the Middle East and Congress' assent in advance is being sought.

During the White House briefing of Congressional leaders on New Year's Day there was talk of what would happen if the Soviets did attack in the Middle East. According to one person present, the President somberly stated that, if they did attack, the United States would know where to hit Russia.

IKE'S VIEWS ON SUBVERSION

But what about indirect aggression, the subversion by communism of such lands as Syria and Jordan as well as Egypt?

The President's answer was that indirect aggression "rarely if ever succeeds where there is reasonable security against direct aggression." The answer, he said, was for the United States first to create that deterrence against overt Soviet attack, then to help local government create loyal security forces and to improve economic conditions so "as not to make communism seem an attractive alternative." These are the purposes behind the economic and military aid sections of the new Eisenhower program.

Whether such a program will work, assuming the Congress will vote it, is certainly open to question. The case of Syria is worth examining to see the nature of the problem.

Once part of the Ottoman Empire, Syria was a French mandate under the League of Nations in the years 1923-44. Arab nationalizing forced the French to get out as World War II was coming to an end and the mandate was split into two new nations, Syria and Lebanon. Syria is an Arab state of some 3.7 million persons, chiefly Moslems. It has reasonably good natural resources, though no oil. For years it was run by a group of leading conservative Arab families, some 20 to 40 using the army for control of the nation.

SYRIA MOVES TO LEFT

The rise of Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt and his arms deal with Russia, however, brought forward a group of younger officers who also began to play the Nasser game with Russia for arms and power. Chief of these is Lieut. Col. Abdel Hamid Serraj. Syria alone of the Arab States has a Communist deputy in its parliament, a man named Khalid Bakdash. Together with President Shukri Kuwatly they have pushed Syria closer and closer to the Soviet Union.

At the time of the Anglo-French attack on Egypt, the army (Serraj is head of its intelligence corps) took over effective control of the country. More recently the government arrested a number of leading Syrians, a former president, some members of parliament and former cabinet members, who represented the bulk of the conservative influence in the nation.

The charge against these men, some of whom have escaped the country, was conspiracy with Iraq. But the belief in Washington is that the move, in fact, was part of the Communist-inspired drive to destroy anyone who might stand up against the Soviet Union, whether or not Iraq had a finger in the pie.

On top of this, arms have been passed out by the Syrian army to large numbers of civilians, the estimates ranging from 15,000 to 60,000. This, in effect, is arming the mob, another Communist tactic. (In Egypt, Nasser also passed out arms at the time of the attack, but reports are they have since been taken up.)

RED GAME IN SYRIA

Thus the current reading of Syria is that it is ripe to become a Communist "people's democracy" at any time the Kremlin wants that. American officials tend to feel that Russia will prefer, however, to leave Syria as it is; unstable, violently anti-Israel and generally anti-Western, in short impossible for the United States to deal with.

Syria today has far more Communist-supplied arms than a nation of its size needs. But it does not have enough arms or trained military men, despite some Soviet instructors, to serve as a major Russian base unless Moscow decides to move in directly. To do so, even by means of a base agreement, probably would hurt the Soviet cause elsewhere in the Middle East. Yet to let things ride as they are makes impossible any effective American dealings with Syria. And there can be no conclusive Arab-Israeli peace without peace with Syria.

Syria's game is to back Nasser's nationalism and anti-Westernism. Jordan, once a British mandate, is now under control of pro-Nasser leaders. Nasser himself came out of the Anglo-French-Israeli attack still an Arab hero, whatever the undercover grumbling of some of his rivals at home and abroad. And Anthony Eden, who was a sponsor of the attack, has paid with his political life.

As the Eisenhower administration is about to begin its second term, the Soviet Union is deeply involved in the Middle East. In the past 4 years the Middle East cauldron has simmered and boiled and then boiled over. Now it is back to a boil. To hold it there, then to reduce it to a simmer by eliminating the flame provided by Moscow so the area's internal problems can be solved, is the task for the second Eisenhower administration.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED LABOR RACKETEERING AND CORRUPTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement setting forth my views on the proposed Senate investigation of alleged labor racketeering and corruption.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

I intend to support a resolution calling for a Senate investigation of alleged labor racketeering and corruption, provided the constitutional rights of those involved will be fully protected.

I have always been opposed to racketeering and corruption in any segment of society. The vast majority of American trade unions are democratic in operation and have the worthy goal of improving the working conditions and living standards of their members. If any union officials violate these ideals, I see no valid objection to an investigation by an appropriate committee of the Senate, so long as the investigation is fairly conducted. The funds of dues-payers in unions should be safeguarded from looting and embezzlement.

It is in the best interest and welfare of the trade-union movement itself that any corrupt or dishonest influences be exposed and rooted out. A fair investigation will show, I am sure, that the overwhelming majority of American trade-union leaders are law abiding and respectable citizens.

Any investigation of labor racketeering might well be part of an extensive Senate study of organized crime, rackets and law enforcement in the United States. FBI statistics reveal that there was more major crime in our country during 1956 than at any time in history—a total of 2,534,000 separate acts. This was an increase of 12 percent over 1955. Law enforcement often is lax, inefficient, and even corrupt. We have relatively few adequately trained police departments. Wholesale gambling and widespread use of liquor both contribute to this wave of major crimes. All are part of the loot to be gained from control of the underworld, and they cannot be separated from entrance of unscrupulous criminal elements into a few labor unions—to the detriment of the general public as well as the upright members of those unions.

THE FBI STORY—BOOK BY DON WHITEHEAD

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, several years ago on the floor of the Senate I protested a slanted and irrational account of the FBI contained in a book which in my opinion was a vicious, irresponsible attack designed to undermine public confidence in the FBI.

Today, I have a more pleasant report to make. I have recently concluded the reading of The FBI Story, by Don Whitehead. At last the record has been set straight.

In the foreword J. Edgar Hoover states:

No one person has built the FBI to the organization it is today. It was built by the loyal, sacrificial efforts of the thousands of men and women who have served in its ranks over the years. I tell my associates repeatedly that one man did not build the reputation of the FBI.

The subsequent pages indicate the truth of his assertion. We in America are inclined to take the FBI for granted. This book dramatically portrays the struggles which were necessary before the agency earned the public respect and confidence which it now possesses. The book is far from a dull, dry treatise. The reader will be intrigued by the dramatic facts now revealed concerning certain cases of national prominence.

There is one facet of the activities of the FBI, as discussed in this volume, to which I wish to direct specific attention. Being very much interested in South American affairs, it was of especial interest to me. I doubt that many persons are aware of the amazing exploits of agents of the FBI in the Western Hemisphere during World War II; the story of how Axis agents established a string of espionage bases from Mexico City southward to the Straits of Magellan has never previously been told. The book tells how the FBI organized the Special Intelligence Service, and thwarted the activities of the Nazis in South America.

Throughout the volume we learn of incident after incident which demonstrates the services of the FBI to the American people.

In the foreword by Director J. Edgar Hoover, there are several comments which are worthy of notice. I recommend one, in particular, to the attention of my colleagues. It is as follows:

The acts of the subversive, particularly the dyed-in-the-wool Communist, call for increased vigilance. The security of our country has suffered because too many of our people were hoodwinked by the propaganda which claimed that the Communist Party was a political party like the Democratic or Republican Party. Likewise, too many of our people have fallen for the line that spies, subversives, agents of foreign governments, and Communists who have been convicted and sent to prison are political prisoners.

Political prisoners do not exist in the United States. Those who are prisoners violated the laws of the United States, were indicted by Federal grand juries and convicted in Federal courts. I do not think they deserve the special treatment, with special rights and privileges, which is sought for them by their sympathizers.

I personally am pleased with the publication of this volume, and recommend it to all who desire to know about the outstanding job the FBI is performing in safeguarding our civil liberties and our national security.

THE DROUGHT SITUATION IN TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is in a spirit of deep seriousness that I report again to the Senate on the drought situation in my State of Texas.

During the last few days I have been in communication by telephone with men whose business it is to keep informed about conditions in Texas. Here are the reports they gave me:

From Amarillo, in the Texas Panhandle:

Right now I am looking out the window at a dust storm. There has been no rain here. A few sprinkles have been reported in the Fort Worth area, but the drought is still with us. The credit situation for farmers and cattlemen is growing steadily worse. Private lending institutions are having great difficulty in discounting their loans with the Federal Intermediate Credit Corporation because that institution is in turn having trouble selling its debentures. Against their will, lenders are having to foreclose in many cases.

From San Angelo, in west Texas:

No rain. The credit situation is unchanged, simply because the cattlemen have sold their cattle and are no longer borrowing. Landowners have some income from oil leases. The tenant farmers are in the worst condition because they do not have even this income. They have been able to survive only by getting jobs as oil field roughnecks.

From Johnson City, my home town, in the hill country of southwest Texas:

There has been no rain. Unless we have rain soon, and a great deal of it, no crops will be produced here this year. There is no deep ground moisture. The ground tanks for watering livestock have long since dried up. Farmers and stockmen with notes at the bank are increasing them when they can. The worst aspect of the situation is what is happening to the land. Even after we get lots of rain, the pasture land can't possibly recover for several years. Those who propose that we simply go out and plant grass after we get enough rain don't understand the situation. These pastures are going to have to be left to themselves for a sufficient time—3 or 4 years—if they are ever again to be the same as they used to be.

Mr. President, the statements I have quoted were not made by men who have a theoretical knowledge of the effects of the drought in Texas. These are men who know Texas and the land and people of Texas. They are men who feel a deep anguish as they see what is happening in the State they love.

Both immediate action and a long-range plan are vitally necessary to meet the problems posed by this disastrous drought, which is now in its eighth year in many areas.

I know the Texas situation best, but let me emphasize that Texas is not the only State affected.

The Department of Agriculture reported last month that 2 million acres of land in a 15-State area have already been seriously damaged by winds incessantly blowing away all-important topsoil.

The Department reported further that if conditions remain unchanged in these 15 States during the winter and spring, farmers may lose another 29 million acres of topsoil.

It would be impossible to overstate the gravity of such a loss.

Mr. President, we must spend more money for emergency assistance to drought-stricken farmers and stockmen.

We must direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use authority he already has to bring what relief is possible to these people.

We must set up a deferred grazing program so that cattlemen can be adequately compensated for laying aside their pasture lands for several years after rain comes in order that the productivity of the land may be restored.

We must examine closely the credit policies that hamper the making of loans to victims of the drought.

There are hundreds of thousands of these victims. They have a right to look to the Congress for help. We would not be justified, in my earnest opinion, in refusing help.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. If I may, I should like to join the Senator from Texas in his remarks concerning the drought situation. Coming from the area of the country, as he does, which has been vitally affected by the drought, I am fully aware of the problems which arise by reason of the drought. As the Senator has suggested, it is not a problem that can be solved in a year or two.

Last year and the year before I introduced in this body certain bills designed to liberalize and simplify credit. I should like at this time to make the statement that again I shall introduce those bills for the purpose of simplifying and expanding farm credit as one of the things greatly needed in the drought area.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me, but I did want to join him in his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the statements of my distinguished friend from Colorado. All Members of the Senate have known of his deep interest in this subject, and of the contribution he has made in an attempt to render relief to the people, not only of his own State of Colorado, but of the entire drought-stricken area. I commend him for his interest and attention, and I express my deep appreciation to him for associating himself with my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to make another brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Senator from Texas has the floor.

GAEL SULLIVAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress, our country lost a man who was one of the real political philosophers of our time. He was Gael Sullivan, who passed away at his New York home on October 27, 1956.

Gael Sullivan was my personal friend—and many Members of the Senate could properly claim they had the same privilege. He was a man whose vibrant personality touched many people, always to stimulate them into action.

He was uncompromising in his political beliefs, but he had the quality of human understanding which refused to be bound within narrow views. And he had unbounded enthusiasm for every project which he tackled.

Gael Sullivan was practically unknown when he was named executive director of the Democratic National Committee. His anonymity was due to the fact that he preferred work to publicity—and rarely took time even to have his picture taken.

His performance in the Nation's postal service was legendary, and he was the author of improvements which increased the efficiency of the agency many times. He believed that Government cannot be static in a dynamic world, and must constantly seek new and better methods of operation.

For the past 2 years, Gael Sullivan was the vice president of the Magna Theater Corp. in New York, but the greater part of his life was devoted to public service. In his passing, we have lost a loyal and devoted American, and he will be sorely missed.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to be associated with the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to the life and public service of Gael Sullivan. It was my pleasure to be associated with him, both while he was in the Post Office Department as Assistant Postmaster General and while he was deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and in some of my own political endeavors.

Gael Sullivan was an able man. He had a high sense of public responsibility. He was a wonderful father to his splendid children, and he was a fine husband.

Gael Sullivan was the type of young man we can ill afford to lose. I certainly have lost a friend, and I join in paying tribute to him, and I express my sympathy to his wife and family.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is planned to have printed today, and placed on the calendar, various resolutions which have been ordered reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, so-called money resolutions, providing funds for various committees to conduct studies and investigations. Some of those resolutions are noncontroversial. Some will require considerable time, I am sure, because several Senators have indicated to me that they desired to make a thorough study of the reasons justifying the resolutions.

It is the plan of the leadership to give the Senate an opportunity to proceed to the consideration of some of the resolutions on Tuesday. In view of the fact that they were ordered reported yesterday, we think that if they shall be printed and go on the calendar today, since the Senate will not be in session on Monday, we can take up at least the noncontroversial resolutions on Tuesday.

I shall attempt to accommodate myself to the wishes of Senators in case they ask that the consideration of any of the resolutions be postponed for a reasonable length of time until Senators can study them; but I should like to have the RECORD show it is our plan to consider the resolutions on Tuesday.

We also have a bill——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I may finish this statement, I shall yield to the Senator.

I should like to announce that there has been a bill favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], which increases the authorized lending limit of the Small Business Administration by some $65 million. It is my understanding that the bill was reported unanimously, that it represents urgently needed legislation, and as soon as I am able to confer with the minority leader, it will be my intention, if he clears it, to bring that bill up on Tuesday.

Now I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the distinguished majority leader give assurance that the reports, as well as the resolutions themselves, will be available tomorrow, which will be Saturday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader cannot give that assurance, but he will give the assurance that he will make every effort to see that they are available. If he cannot do that, he will take that into account in scheduling the resolutions for consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am afraid that, tomorrow being Saturday, the resolutions and reports will not be printed in time for us to consider them before Monday. All I desire is merely a few days—a couple of days, anyway—to look them over. As the Senator knows, there are, I think, 19 of them, and perhaps more, and I should like to have ample opportunity to study them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator knows of my deep desire to accommodate him at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will indicate that the reports are at the desk and are ready to go to the Printing Office, as the majority leader has indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express my gratitude to the Chair for his intervention.

THE ARAB-ISRAELI PROBLEM

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have gotten far beyond the 2-minute limitation. I think the Chair ought to get back to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is trying to practice universal good judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the rule not work both ways?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I obtained a special order. I shall be very patient. However, I believe there is a limit beyond which Senators should not go in the morning hour. The distinguished majority leader has suggested the 2-minute rule. It has become 6 minutes and 10 minutes. Certainly it is not quite fair to Senators who are present in the Chamber at the stroke of 12, and who are diligent in their attendance upon the affairs of the Senate, to be compelled, because of a violation of the rule, to give way to Senators who come in later. I shall not be snide about it. However, I think the rule ought to be observed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I quite agree that we ought not to be arbitrary about the 2-minute rule. I encounter this question every time a Senator who is not accustomed to being present during the morning hour enters the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois has been present today during practically the entire morning hour. Generally speaking, if the Senator has been regular in his attendance during the morning hour, he must be aware that we have never, under either leadership, been very rigid in the application of the rule. Upon one occasion Senator Taft attempted to limit statements during the morning hour to 2 or 3 minutes. He tried that for 2 or 3 days, and I believe he finally decided that it would be better not to be too arbitrary in adhering to the limitation.

We have nothing else to do today. The Senate can conclude the morning hour, and then individual Senators will be permitted to speak without limitation.

No Senator has taken more than 6 or 7 minutes during the morning hour. I cannot see that any great damage has been done. I think it is better to maintain a little flexibility than to be too arbitrary. I find that when we try to be arbitrary we usually lose more time than we gain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should have availed myself of the flexibility to which the Senator refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has been recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the position taken by him yesterday before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe his viewpoint should be followed by the committee; our country and our people deserve a thorough study not only of the proposed resolution, but the background of the circumstances which now prevail in the Middle East, and what effect the President's proposal may have.

Much has happened in the past 12 months to cause the conditions which plague the Middle East. It is my considered judgment that there will be trouble in the Middle East so long as the Israeli-Arab question is not settled. For the past 7 or 8 years we have been making money available to both sides, both to the Arabs and to the Israelis, in the hope that the soothing balm of American dollars would heal the wounds caused by this dispute.

When I visited that area 3 years ago I wrote in my notes, and incorporated in my report—which I filed with the Committee on Appropriations and the Department of State, and other agencies—that the Arab-Israeli problem could not be solved by the United States continuing to furnish money and by attempting to appease both sides.

It was kept a secret as to how the money appropriated for the Middle East was to be distributed among the countries of that area. No one on the Committee on Appropriations was advised as to how much would be allocated to Jordan, Iran, or Israel, in fact, any of the countries of that area. It was feared that trouble and dissatisfaction would follow if each country knew what the other obtained. It seems that the same policy is to be followed with the funds suggested since no one can find out how the proposed funds are to be used. Yet, now, according to the proposed resolution, we are being asked to embark upon a program calling for the expenditure of millions of dollars in that area in addition to the funds now being expended. To my way of thinking it is simply a waste of money. The problem which is the cause of all of this trouble will not be solved by money or gifts. If any-

thing, it will be aggravated by the United States Government furnishing the $200 million now being requested. In addition, I feel certain that the sum suggested is only a starter.

I express the hope that the committee will go into this proposal and its background in great detail, and that it will try to determine whether or not there is a plan—other than the application of more dollar balm—by which the dispute between the Arab world and Israel can be settled.

Last October it was my privilege to travel through the Middle East by car. I visited Syria, Jordan, and Israel. I had occasion to talk at length with the President of Syria. I also had occasion to talk with a few members of the cabinet of King Hussein of Jordan, who was then on the front, where several of his troops had been killed in one of the recurring border incidents.

Later, on the same trip, I had occasion to talk with Mrs. Golda Meir, who is the Foreign Minister in Israel, and also with Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel.

Judging from the information which I obtained from those leaders in their respective countries, there is little or no chance at the moment of settling this vexing problem. It strikes me that before any final action on the proposed resolution is taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, it should develop all available information on all aspects of the dispute between Israel and the Arab countries; it should determine whether it is possible to settle the Arab-Israeli question, and if so, by what means, and under what circumstances a settlement can be achieved.

I repeat that, unless and until that problem is settled, we shall continue to have trouble, serious recurring trouble, in that area. Until the friction between Israel and her Arab neighors is eliminated, there will continue to be an open invitation to the Russians and other countries behind the Iron Curtain to intercede there, and thus invite the use of armed force which I understand the resolution as submitted envisions. If we eliminate the dispute which now exists between the Arabs and Israel we shall not need this resolution, in my humble judgment.

I am now in the process of writing my report on my visit to that area and other parts of the world. I spent a period of a little over 3 months abroad this past fall, inspecting our foreign aid and information activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been checking over my diary, which contains more than 250 typewritten pages. Its preparation required considerable time. I am now in the process of writing my report, country by country. It is my hope that by next week, or not later than the following week, I shall be in a position to file my report with the Committee on Appropriations and to deliver to the Senate a personal summary of my findings and conclusions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to thank the Senator for his remarks. I appreciate his endorsement of the effort which the Senator from Arkansas is making to obtain information for the use of the Senate committee and for the use of the Senate, regarding our foreign relations.

In view of the request by the administration that Congress share responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, does it not seem reasonable that we should also share with the administration knowledge of what has taken place and is taking place in this area? That is all the Senator from Arkansas is interested in. We should be informed about the developments which have led to the very distressing condition which causes all of us so much concern.

Mr. ELLENDER. I fully agree with my good friend. I return to the point that I think the committee should also look into every possible angle with respect to this resolution, its background, and conditions in the Middle East with a view toward determining what the root of trouble is, and attempting to solve the problem, not merely treating its symptoms. Of course, we know basically what the difficulty is, but we should endeavor to determine how it developed, and whether or not there are ways and means of solving it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana be allowed 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I repeat, I think it is incumbent on the Committee on Foreign Relations to develop all the facts, and, if necessary, to consider ways and means by which the Arab-Israeli problem can be settled, if it can be settled at all.

I, for one, believe that by merely spending more and more millions of dollars we shall not achieve anything constructive; on the contrary, we will only aggravate the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have one further observation. As the Senator knows, last year the Senate authorized a study of the foreign-aid program by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appropriated $300,000 for that purpose. A very large volume of reports has now been received by the committee, and more are in preparation. We have not had an opportunity to read them. I suppose they were prepared in anticipation of this particular problem. I believe that within a very short time the Senate will have before it a great deal of additional information upon which it should be able to pass sound judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I merely wish to say to my good friend from Arkansas that I have a number of reports which I shall cheerfully turn over to his committee, if it desires them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to an old friend, once a Member of the Senate, C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois.

For some days I have been thinking about my long period of friendship with this fine friend, who departed on the eternal journey at an untimely age.

I presume that the first thing which comes to the minds of his many friends is his distinguished record in the service of his country as a marine. He was wounded many times, and was decorated for valor and gallantry in action not only by his own country but also by the Government of France.

Then there comes to mind his service to the community, State, and Nation, in public life in time of peace. He was a distinguished Member of the Senate.

Then there comes to mind his service to his party, embracing over the years the many efforts he made, against the greatest odds, to carry the torch and preserve the vitality of the political institution to which he was intensely devoted.

All of these activities attest not only his heroism and his willingness to sacrifice life itself for his country but also what I like to refer to as the courage of the commonplace. For this kind of valor in the daily struggles of life there are no medals and no decorations, but it has enshrined him in the hearts of a vast host of friends and associates.

But Wayland Brooks left a far more enduring mark than all this. His life recalls the shining truth which was distilled from the mind of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

On a spring morning 100 years ago Emerson was walking the deserted streets of Concord and then continued his walk along the placid river. Notes on a lecture were quietly incubating in his mind. He thought of his own times and of the departure of his generation from sound principle. He thought of the deviations from basic standards. He thought of slavery, of cruelty, and exploitation.

Then there came into the mind of this great philosopher, on that spring morning, the self-searching questions as to what was, after all, the core of virtue and the real significance of life? What was the noblest contribution an individual could make? What was the real meaning of life and the greatest goal to be achieved?

As the general theme engulfed him, his mental pace quickened and he hastened home to his study to write in short, pithy sentences what was to become his great lecture on self-reliance—a lecture which stirred people for a generation like a clear and certain trumpet call.

And so Emerson wrote:

My life is for itself and not for a spectacle.

He continued:

What I must do is all that concerns me, and not what people think.

Then followed other significant phrases:

Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind. * * * Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

That is a moving phrase—the sacredness of the integrity of one's own mind. There was the real moving force in the life of Wayland Brooks. All who knew him can rise up to attest this durable attribute in his private life and in his public service.

Was he embracing some unpopular cause which elicited sharp criticism? What did it matter? It was conviction which counted. Did some critic malign him for a position he asserted on a public question? It was not important. His life was for itself and not for a spectacle. Did some pliant commentator assail his views and make it appear that he reflected only the thinking of some other person? It was a frothy trifle. It was but an ephemeral opinion. What he must do and say was the only concern. Did some obsequious person riding at the end of history's parade instead of at the head, and venting frustration on those with whom he did not agree, assail him as he took his stand on the challenges of the hour? It was not important. It was only sounding brass.

It was the earnestness in the heart of Wayland Brooks; it was the stoutness in his soul; it was the sacred integrity of his own mind which counted. This is true valor. This is courage. This is self-reliance. This is moral stamina. This is what makes a life endure in the remembrance of his friends and fellow men.

So, Mr. President, as a lifelong friend of the great man who graced the Senate, I salute him as a valiant, self-reliant soldier in war and peace.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). The Senator has the floor.

PROVISION FOR CORN BASE ACREAGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today I introduced a farm bill. It is very short, but exceedingly important. In connection with that bill I would remind my colleagues of that entrancing line from Shelley's poem Ode to the West Wind:

Oh, wind, if winter comes, can spring be far behind?

Mr. President, that is merely another way of saying that in 8 or 10 weeks the plow will go into the fertile soil of the Middle West, and the question now is what will be the planting pattern for the corn farmers?

Let me remind the Senate that on December 11, 1956, the Department of Agriculture, as required by law, submitted to the corn farmers in 894 counties in 24 States the question of whether or not they preferred a base acreage program coordinated with the soil-bank plan or the acreage allotment program. The vote favoring the corn-base acreage program was 269,185. The vote for the acreage allotment program was 168,295. The number of votes for base acreage was 61.5 percent of the total vote cast and fell short of the two-thirds required by law.

An analysis of the vote is revealing. About one-half of all the votes cast for the acreage-allotment program came from the five States of Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota.

It appears also that about 75 percent of the farmers who were eligible to vote did not cast a vote. I do not know why. I wish I could ferret their thinking and ascertain why they were indifferent to the referendum on the 11th day of December.

While the number of farmers voting for the acreage-allotment program constituted 38.5 percent of the total vote, this is, in fact, about 9 percent of the total number of corn farmers who were eligible to vote. It is clear also that by a substantial majority of 61.5 percent, the voting corn farmers favored the corn base acreage program.

The net effect of this action is that for the crop year 1957 and for subsequent crop years there will be a corn acreage allotment of 37,288,889 acres. Price supports at the national average of $1.36 per bushel will be available to those producers who comply with their allotments.

In the noncommercial corn areas the price support level for corn will be 75 percent of the level in the commercial areas. This poses a problem not only for Congress but also for the Department of Agriculture and the farmers of the Middle West. I think something must be done immediately, for if the farmers are going to start to turn the soil in 8 or 10 weeks, they ought to know now pretty well what the planting pattern will be, and whether or not they will be entitled to get the benefits of the soil bank plan and can put 15 percent of their acreage into either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve. At the present time the farmers are at sea simply because there was not a two-thirds vote of approval of the proposal which was placed before the corn farmers.

In my own State of Illinois the vote was 58,592 in favor of the corn base acreage program or the soil bank program, as against 13,949 who favored the so-called acreage allotment program. But the fact of the matter is that, although more than 80 percent of the farmers of Illinois who voted were in favor of the base acreage program, they are now prevented from getting the benefit of what Congress provided in the Soil Bank Act last year. This is true also of other States, where there was a very substantial vote, and where the farmers favored the base acreage plan.

It appears to me that the simplest approach to the problem is the best, and to that end I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 829) to provide for corn base acreages, and other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 829

A bill to provide for corn base acreages and other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) base acreages (based on a total base acreage for the commercial area of 51 million acres) shall be established as provided in section 103 (b) (1) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 for 1957 and for each subsequent year for which an acreage-reserve program is in effect for corn; and

(2) no acreage allotments shall be in effect for the 1957 and subsequent crops of corn;

(3) subject to subsections (a) and (d) of section 308 of such act, price support shall be made available by Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1957 and subsequent crops of corn at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn, and further with consideration of the factors set forth in section 401 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the net effect of the proposal is to give the corn farmers in the commercial corn areas what they voted for by a substantial majority on last December 11.

What the measure does in brief is: First, to discontinue acreage allotments for corn; second, to provide a 51 million acre corn base to enable participation in the soil bank acreage reserve program; third, to furnish price supports at a level which will aid corn farmers in marketing their grain without encouraging the uneconomic production of corn; and fourth, to provide that acreage equal to 15 percent of the corn base acreage be placed in the soil bank as a condition for eligibility for price support. This acreage could be taken out of any cropland on the farm and could be placed in the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve or a combination of both.

I do not believe that the 38 percent who voted in the referendum on December 11, 1956—and who constitute only 9 percent of the corn farmers who were eligible to vote—should by their action prevent the nearly 62 percent from participating in the corn base acreage and soil-bank program. It is a rather extraordinary situation when a minority of the farmers actually voting hold the power to impose a program on the majority against the clearly expressed will of the majority; yet that is precisely the situation which confronts the corn farmer today. I believe that the 80 percent of the corn farmers of Illinois who voted for a corn base acreage and for participation in the soil-bank plan should not be denied the right to participate.

I believe now, as I did when the question was considered on the Senate floor in the previous session of Congress, that if this program can be made effective, it will be of material value in bringing feed grain supplies into better balance with demand, and thereby will benefit not only feed grain producers, but livestock producers, as well.

The matter is extremely urgent. I sincerely trust that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will take

immediate cognizance of the problem, and will give it early and sustained attention.

Farm Bureau leaders in the Middlewest corn States have already come together in Chicago and have urged action by Congress so that the corn producers may make their planting plans.

Resolutions were also adopted at the 38th annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which was held in Miami Beach in December, calling for legislation which will enable corn farmers to participate in a program which is favored by a large majority of the farmers affected.

I talked this morning on this subject with the master of the National Grange, who did not commit himself one way or the other.

I hope the program will have universal endorsement, either in its present form or substantially so, so that it can be consummated at once. If we fail to enact legislation such as that I am proposing, the corn farmers of Illinois and the other States will have to revert to an allotment of 37 million acres; and I fancy they will become pretty vocal and quite articulate if that should happen.

So, Mr. President, I introduce the bill today as a new program in the interest of one of our major farm commodities, in the hope that it will commend itself to the thinking of the Department of Agriculture.

BIPARTISAN FARM POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to hear the comments of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concerning corn base acreages.

I agree with him that perhaps the most pressing farm problem confronting Congress is the necessity for a more realistic corn program in which farmers can afford to participate. Yet we are still waiting to learn what the administration proposes.

Every Senator from the corn-producing States, regardless of political affiliation, is concerned with getting something done. We have a right to expect some views to be made known by the Department of Agriculture.

Perhaps some of the delay has been occasioned by the rather regrettable action of the Secretary of Agriculture in approaching the matter as purely a partisan, political problem, rather than as a serious economic problem which concerns all of us.

Mr. President, on many, occasions spokesmen for the present administration in the executive branch have talked about farm problems not being partisan problems, and have given lip service to the need for a bipartisan approach to the solution of such problems.

Some of us have had to point out from time to time that there is substantial bipartisan opposition to the administration's farm policies—and too much of the partisanship is emanating from the administration's own backyard.

I sincerely regret that the opening of a new session of Congress was marred right off the reel by a flagrant example of the Secretary of Agriculture's own unwillingness to practice the bipartisanship he has preached.

Let me assure Senators that it gives me no personal pleasure to appear on the floor of the Senate so often in criticism of Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Unfortunately, his acts or his lack of action leave me no other course in properly fulfilling my responsibility of seeking to protect the vast agricultural interests of the State of Minnesota, which are the major economic factors in the State.

Before the 85th Congress opened, in discussing publicly some of the challenges we faced as we approached a new session with divided leadership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, I expressed the hope that people of good faith in both parties would put the public's interest above partisanship in seeking to find proper solutions to some of our pressing problems.

On December 11, in an address before more than 6,000 farmers in the City Auditorium of St. Paul, I voiced my hopes for this session by saying, in part:

> Many of us in the Democratic Party—and proud to be Democrats—stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder with enlightened Republicans to achieve the progress America so urgently needs, and to make the dream of democracy's fulfillment come true for all Americans.
>
> Our President has publicly recognized the need for redirection of the Republican Party from some of its paths of the past. He has called for a new brand of modern Republicanism.
>
> Accepting each other in good faith, as Americans first and partisans second, there is no reason there cannot be enough amongst us who share liberal convictions, Democrat or Republican, to work together toward hammering out a constructive forward-looking program of progress for all America.

It was in that spirit that I had hoped to approach farm legislation this year. And it is still in that spirit that I feel compelled to object to the Secretary of Agriculture's rather contemptuous disregard for the fact that the agricultural committees the 85th Congress are under Democratic chairmanship, and to object to his completely partisan approach to a problem that crosses party lines.

On January 2, the United States Department of Agriculture issued a mimeographed note to correspondents announcing that the Secretary of Agriculture had, on that morning, met "with 15 members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture who had been invited by the Secretary to discuss legislative matters which should be considered by the new Congress."

It then listed the names of those present—with not a Democrat among them. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was not included. Neither was the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The release said most of the time was devoted to the corn problems, and added:

> There was general agreement that legislation which would rectify the present situation should be enacted as early as possible.

That was on January 2. So far as I can determine, whatever was agreed upon at the meeting still has not been made known to the chairman of our congressional Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, charged with responsibility for farm legislation.

Mind you, Mr. President, this was not a release from the Republican National Committee. It was an official release from the Department of Agriculture, supposedly representing us all, and serving all of us. Secretary Benson is welcome, of course, to hold partisan conferences with members of his own party in the Congress. But it might have been a far more prudent course for him to include the chairman of the congressional committees in any conference on the legislative program he hopes to get enacted, or at least tell them about what transpired.

The release adds, quoting Secretary Benson:

> I am sure a good basis has been laid for cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Members of Congress.

Apparently, Mr. Benson does not recognize there is anyone in Congress but Republicans. Mr. President, perhaps we should inform him. Perhaps we should send a delegation to inform him that the Democrats have organized the Congress, and have a majority on the committees handling his proposed legislation. It might be well for the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize that if proposed legislation is to be passed by Congress, votes on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber will be required.

Mr. President, this is a regrettable situation, but the farmers cannot be allowed to suffer because of it. I can understand how any committee chairman would have a right to be indignant over such disregard of his responsibilities. Yet the corn producers cannot be penalized just because of the Secretary's narrow attitude. We are still awaiting the recommendations Secretary Benson talked about in that optimistic release on January 2, but we cannot wait much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have sent Secretary Benson, in which I voice the hope that we can get those recommendations some time next week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

JANUARY 24, 1957.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Every Member of Congress from corn-producing areas has been awaiting some indication of your Department's recommendations for changes needed in the corn program this year.

Quite frankly, we and the farmers vitally concerned had expected some administration viewpoint to be outlined immediately to the new Congress so we could get to work on developing a workable program for this year.

The state of the Union message indicated that recommendations for farm legislation would be in the budget message. In his budget message, the President said he had recommended changes in the corn program. But no one, apparently, knows what those recommendations are.

From various sources we understand your Department has been working on a corn proposal, but it seems to be kept under wraps.

I regret that you apparently chose to approach this economic situation strictly from a partisan standpoint, by inviting only Republican members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees down to the Department to talk it over with you, and excluding the chairmen of the two committees in Congress whose responsibility it will be to guide action on any changes.

I understand you have accepted the invitation of our Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to appear before us next Tuesday morning. The purpose of this letter is to express the hope that you will be able, at that time, to definitely outline your Department's recommendations on a more realistic corn program for this and subsequent years, which will afford corngrowers enough opportunity to earn an adequate income so that more widespread participation in the program can be achieved. I feel it would be neglect of a pressing problem to further delay making known your views on this corn situation, so that Congress will have time to give ample consideration to such recommendations along with others originating from among its own members.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the full release from the Department of Agriculture on January 2, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 2, 1957.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson met in his office this morning with 15 members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture who had been invited by the Secretary to discuss legislative matters which should be considered by the new Congress. Present were: Senators AIKEN, THYE, HICKENLOOPER, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS. Representatives present were: ANDRESEN, HILL, HOEVEN, HARVEY, BELCHER, MCINTIRE, WILLIAMS, HARRISON, ARENDS, and SIMPSON of Illinois. Christopher Sylvester, secretary to Senator YOUNG, also attended. Most of the time was devoted to corn problems.

Concern was expressed by the Secretary and Members of Congress regarding the corn program. Excessive corn production, low prices, undue stimulation of livestock production, and inadequate soil-bank participation for corn all are a likelihood, the group agreed.

"Cheap feed grain means more and cheaper livestock," said Secretary Benson. "We need a program for corn that will assure reasonable prices and the opportunity for a successful soil bank."

There was general agreement that legislation which would rectify the present situation should be enacted as early as possible. There was also general approval that the approach should be along the lines voted by a substantial majority of corn farmers in the recent referendum. There was a discussion of the possibility of providing a price-support floor for corn for the duration of the soil-bank acreage reserve.

"We were in general agreement," said the Secretary, "that legislative action should be taken, and we agreed that we are concerned not only with corn but with the whole feed grain-livestock balance.

"We discussed a number of other important legislative items which should come before the Congress. Among these were the need for extending Public Law 480, the need for operating the soil bank in such a manner as to reduce the total harvested acreage of the country, and the need for research to find new crops, new uses, and new markets. I am sure a good basis has been laid for cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Members of Congress. We shall have additional meetings with members of the Agricultural Committees on matters of legislation and administration. It is anticipated that the President's message to Congress on January 10 will deal also with these problems.

"I am looking forward to our later meetings with members of the committees," the Secretary stated. "Our discussions this morning were frank and constructive. I am sure that the harmony and agreement evident today will continue to be mutually helpful and, most important, of still further benefit to our farmers."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because it outlines my own attitude toward both agricultural and other bills during this period of divided control between the executive and legislative branches, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the text of the address to which I have referred, which I delivered before the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, at St. Paul, Minn., on December 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C

FULFILLING AMERICA'S PROMISE

(Address by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at annual meeting of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., December 11, 1956)

It's always good to be back with the GTA. It is an impressive honor to be invited to address this inspiring gathering for the fourth consecutive year.

I'm proud of your friendship and trust, for you are the firmly imbedded roots upon which democracy depends to survive.

Democracy needs such firm roots today, to withstand challenges of our time.

Perhaps you underestimate your own importance.

Alone, you might be a voice crying in the wilderness in the continuing struggle for human justice and equality. Together, your cooperative efforts exemplify democracy in action, and have a significant impact upon the economic and sociological trends of our lifetime.

We urgently need your effective voice, your courageous leadership, your boldness of vision. We need it to keep ever alive our continuing struggle for greater fulfillment of America's promise of human justice and equality. We need it not for our own sake alone, but for the sake of all mankind.

Perhaps you will pardon me, tonight, if I am inclined to look at some of our pressing domestic problems of agricultural policy in the light of the critical situation which confronts our troubled world. I have just come to you from sitting as a United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I must return to that world forum tomorrow, to renew our efforts to preserve peace with honor in a world shaken by unrest and turmoil and open rebellion against oppression and tyranny.

Crises in international affairs may seem somewhat remote to the immediate urgency of economic problems confronting you as farmers, and quite properly occupying your attention at this great annual conclave.

Yet, they are not so remote. Indeed, they are closely interrelated.

On the world front, we are faced with a struggle between moral right and military might.

On the domestic front, we are faced with a struggle between human values and economic might.

We can hardly win one, while ignoring the other.

Neither military might nor economic might are of themselves necessarily evil. They become so only when used without restraint to exploit human resources, without regard for basic, inherent moral rights of human justice and equality.

When that happens, either can create oppression and tyranny.

Yet properly harnessed and used for the benefit of mankind, these same forces can create good instead of evil. Properly used, they can contribute to fulfillment of America's promise of opportunity, equality, and security—not for us alone, but for the world about us.

Our success or failure in controlling these forces will be measured by our willingness to keep uppermost in our minds concern about our fellow man, at home or abroad.

We must really care about people. We must value human resources above material wealth. We must at all times seek justice, rather than selfish advantage.

There can be no double standard. We must achieve fulfillment of America's promise at home, to effectively offer it as a symbol of hope to the rest of the world.

This same parallel was drawn, and these some thoughts were effectively and dramatically expressed, in a significant address 14 years ago, in another time of crisis—when our country was fighting a war to save freedom and civilization as we know it.

It was entitled, appropriately enough, "The American Promise."

It was an address by one of the alltime great voices in the continuing crusade for human justice and equality of opportunity in rural America—a powerful voice for the real meaning of democracy then, and a powerful voice for the real meaning of democracy today. It was an address by your own general manager of the GTA, my friend and yours, M. W. "Bill" Thatcher.

Prophetically, that address looked beyond winning the war to winning the peace that must come, and charted a course for fulfillment of the American promise that could still provide useful guideposts today.

I hope that address can be brought out of the Archives, Bill, and be redistributed. We need its message today, to emphasize the continuing nature of mankind's struggle for progress—and the necessity of keeping our sights firm on just and honorable goals, whatever problems we may encounter.

Democracy is still on trial in the court of world opinion. All mankind is the jury.

What we do to prove its effectiveness may determine our fate, and the fate of all freedom in the world, for generations to come. What we fail to do, to prove democracy is best for the least of us, may influence the fate of all of us.

If we are to inspire hope in areas of the world grasping for hope—if we are to fulfill our destiny of moral leadership in a world sadly needing such leadership—then we must first keep faith with our own people, and make sure democracy works for all.

All the wealth of America, all of our skyscrapers in Wall Street, all of our fancy kitchen gadgets and fine automobiles are not enough to convince the awakening peoples of many underdeveloped areas of the world that democracy offers them the same hope and promise.

They know we are a wealthy land; they are more interested in knowing how we share that wealth among our people. They know we as a country are rich in resources, material possessions, and know-how. But they are more interested in knowing our attitude toward people, about the concern we have for human values.

They are more interested in knowing how farm families are doing out in the Midwest than in knowing how stockbrokers are doing on Wall Street. That's understandable, because more of them are farm families. They

are more interested in knowing how workers in our factories and our cities are doing than in knowing how much profit our corporations are making. That's understandable, too, because more of them must toil for existence than can ever hope to live off the toil of others.

Whatever we do to make democracy more effective at home strengthens our hand abroad, in seeking to build a better world of brotherhood and peace. Whatever we do to prove democracy offers adequate economic opportunity for all of our own people is more effective in combating the insidious inroads of communism than all the shouting from the housetops could ever hope to achieve.

Perhaps we have been too smug about democracy's achievements, and too unwilling to look at our own weaknesses and shortcomings. We might fool ourselves, but we're not fooling others.

It's rather difficult to boast about the great ideals of democracy to an African, only to have him read in our newspapers about a white minister being beaten up for escorting colored students to an American school.

It's rather difficult to boast about the prosperity under our free enterprise system to a visiting official from India, only to have him ask why so many farmers are going broke out here in the Midwest.

We better start practicing what we preach, if we expect to assert moral leadership in the world. We better make democracy work for all, if we expect it to survive in a restless world where many facing hardship are no longer complacent to watch a privileged few enjoy the blessings of plenty.

That's why agriculture's problems are not yours alone.

The fact that farm families are not sharing proportionately in the Nation's general prosperity—the fact that the economic imbalance of agriculture contrasted to other segments of our economy is continuing to grow worse instead of being corrected—is a weak link in democracy's armor that should be everyone's concern.

For that reason I welcome this chance, tonight, to look back briefly over what we have been trying to do toward wiping out that imbalance, to appraise our successes and failures together, and perhaps to reset our sights on the tasks still ahead.

We have been engaged for years in a period of great national debate on farm policy. The end is not yet in sight. Yet we would be wrong today in reckoning our success or failure by the current economic situation in agriculture alone, without considering also where we might be had we never made the fight.

By the very intensity of that national debate, we have emphasized and underlined the vital economic importance of agriculture. We have not resolved all of our problems, but we have increased the public's awareness that all have a stake in them being resolved.

We have exercised our right in a democracy to dissent and debate, and have bolstered democracy in the process by making more people aware that every voice counted. For years your annual meetings have been constructive forums for crystallizing views of Midwest agriculture, and making those views felt in policymaking functions of our Government, both executive and legislative. For the past 3 years, I have been privileged to be a participant in this democratic process of exchanging views. Together, we have sought a common ground for making better progress toward our accepted mutual goal of parity of income for our farm families.

Once again that is our purpose. I need not occupy your time or mine recounting statistics to emphasize what your own pocketbooks and bank accounts tell you best. I do not feel it is necessary to further document trends and events of the past 3 years to justify what I have discussed with you in years gone by. The facts speak for themselves, and it serves no constructive purpose to indulge myself in a few "I told you so's."

Neither do I feel it necessary to recount my own efforts in your behalf over that span of years. By now, I'm quite sure, most of you are familiar with my convictions about agriculture, and the effort I have put forth to exemplify them. I shall leave it to you to judge my stewardship of the trust you have bestowed upon me.

You know the story of what happened during January, February, and March of 1956. It was another showdown effort in agriculture's long fight for equality—and I believe one of the most historic episodes in that long struggle.

We developed, and enacted, a good farm bill—in the face of many obstacles.

It was rejected by the President, upon the recommendation of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

That was their right—and it is their responsibility for the consequeces.

We didn't give up. We did the next best thing we could do—we enacted a new compromise bill they would accept. With all its weaknesses and omission, it was better than nothing for you.

Our fight—your fight—wasn't entirely in vain. Without the effort put forth to dramatize the seriousness of agriculture's plight, and expose many of the propaganda myths surrounding it, you would be even worse off today.

However, my purpose tonight is to emphasize your role in this economic struggle, not my own.

Throughout the past 3 years, midwest agriculture has made its voice and influence effectively heard and felt in the policymaking process of our democracy. And no force has been greater in mobilizing and effectively presenting the voice of midwest agriculture than your Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

Without the persistence and altertness of your able leadership, far less heed would have been paid to your economic troubles.

Without the forceful mobilization of sentiment by the GTA, midwest agriculture would have been faced with an even faster skid down the economic ladder.

Without your support, we could never have won many of our closely contested farm votes in the Senate, nor emerged with the few gains we were able to retain after vetoing of the farm bill we worked for together.

From my vantage point in Washington, I have had ample opportunity to judge the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, of spokesmen for American agriculture. And I want you to know tonight that no witness before us has earned more respect, nor carried more weight and influence, than your Bill Thatcher—and no organization has more capably and dramatically presented its case than has your GTA.

Whether they agree or disagree with his views, no one in or out of Congress can successfully challenge the sincerity of Bill Thatcher's convictions, nor his dedication to his purpose of serving you and other family farmers of America. In my opinion, no man could have more effectively carried forward the continuing uphill fight in your behalf than Bill Thatcher has done and is still doing, with an amazing vigor that belies his years.

Together with Jim Patton, of the National Farmers Union, his guidance and counsel have made a tremendous contribution toward sound liberal progress for our democracy.

While down through the years Bill Thatcher and the GTA have made many able and effective presentations to the Congress, I'm convinced none was more successful, more timely, nor more convincing than the GTA family farm survey laid before Congress this year—just at the critical hour we were confronted with serious decisions concerning the future of every American farmer.

I want to commend all of you tonight, officers and members alike, for the valuable contribution of that factfinding study. It provided the evidence we needed, to carry forward your objectives. Its findings could not be refuted. It cleared the air of myths and propaganda, and laid a firm foundation of fact upon which we could base our appeal for more just treatment of farm families in our economy.

I could not pass this opportunity, tonight, to pay the deserved tributes I have voiced to your organization and its leadership, for its effective service to all agriculture. Yet I do so for a more serious purpose than mere compliment, or just recognition where recognition is due.

I have tried to emphasize the influence you wield because I recognize it as a force for good, a force for progress, a force for making democracy work—and above all, a force that must not be stilled nor allowed to wither and die.

This is no time for retreat. Neither is it a time to permit ourselves to be diverted into only rearguing the past.

However great the challenges and problems, it is a time to keep moving ahead. With our eyes holding steady to our goals of justice and equality for farm families, we must continue seeking and embracing more ways of achieving those goals.

I call upon you tonight to press forward with renewed faith and renewed vigor, toward the fulfillment of America's promise—for farm people, as well as for all people.

Because they are right and just, our goals need not be changed, nor our sights lowered.

The underlying concept of parity income for America's farm families—of equality of economic opportunity, of the right to share fully and fairly in our Nation's progress and prosperity—that concept must become an accepted fact in our national life.

We must refuse to retreat from that common objective. Without it, we face an unfair and unjust double standard within our democracy, that denies the same fulfillment of America's promise to all.

We can and must move together toward our goals by every means at our command, strengthening agriculture's bargaining power until it can compete with full equality in an expanding economy. If we find some paths to our goals blocked, our challenge is to find new paths—and more of them—bringing us to the same end objectives.

The American people have recently exercised their right, under a democracy, to select the people of their choice to lead them for the next 4 years. By the free choice of a democracy, they have chosen a Republican President, yet given a vote of confidence to the Democratic Party in Congress.

In returning a popular President to office they have refused, for the first time in over a hundred years, to return his unpopular party to office with him. Presumably, they did so because they liked his personality, but preferred our programs.

My remarks are not intended to be partisan. We simply must look realistically at where we stand today and what the election should mean to us.

It would be tragically wrong and dangerous for either party now to ignore or misinterpret the mandate of the people—to Democrats and Republicans alike.

That mandate makes clear that initiative for development of a new and effective legislative program for the 85th Congress must be shared between the Democratic Party and the President, and each must accept the sober responsibility of measuring up such a program against the criteria of proving to the world that democracy works for all our people—for farmer and city man alike, for young and old, for rich and for poor.

Regardless of the overwhelming proportions of the President's victory, it would be a sad mistake for either the President or the Republican Party to accept that vote as a simultaneous stamp of approval for his agricultural policies of the past term.

Most objective observers without partisan bias agree that the biggest defection from President Eisenhower was in the Nation's farm areas.

The shift of farm vote away from the President in traditionally Republican areas should at least encourage the executive branch to reappraise its farm policies and to cooperate with the Congress toward developing new and better answers to the serious economic problems that continue to plague farm families.

Perhaps it is too much to hope for a complete reversal of the administration's policies, particularly if Ezra Taft Benson is retained as Secretary of Agriculture.

But farm people at least have the right to expect, and to insist upon, open minds and fair consideration by the executive branch of further improvements in our farm program, regardless of whether they are of Democratic or Republican origin.

There is much that needs to be done, and much that can be done, despite the divided authority in Washington.

We need to reexamine the soil bank, after its first year in operation, to see where either the law itself or administration of it needs to be corrected and strengthened.

We need to see what can be done piecemeal, commodity by commodity, to strengthen farm income protection, if we cannot achieve it by overall revision of our basic farm legislation.

We shall most certainly take a careful new look at our corn program, in the light of the outcome of today's farmer balloting.

We can, and should, explore further bolstering of feed markets by shifting income-protection efforts toward end products using such feed, such as offering premium incentives of lighter weight hogs.

We must at all cost protect farmers' cooperatives from new attacks that would further undermine agriculture's bargaining power and deprive farm people of an effective means of working together to help themselves.

We may need tightened safeguards against unrestrained and price-depressing dumping of Government-held stocks of feed grains in the domestic markets, under the misnomer of getting rid of the surplus. We must make clear that any cheap feed philosophy can only lead to lowered livestock income, adding to the vicious downward squeeze on all farm income.

We must seek ways to increase consumption, instead of just displacing existing sales by Government domination of markets.

We have such opportunities at home and abroad, both through a domestic food-stamp plan to improve dietary standards of our own underprivileged people and through use of food to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

May I say in passing that recent international developments should give cause for pause and reconsideration, among those who have deplored our abundance as a curse instead of a blessing. In a world of turmoil, food and fiber can be a more effective weapon of peace than guns or dollars. Our abundance offers us tremendous opportunities to prove democracy's humanitarian intent, and our concern for the well being of all people everywhere.

For example, how better could we show our deep concern for the plight of courageous freedom fighters escaping from Hungary, than to offer quickly to provide the food and fiber needed for their sustenance to any country offering them safe haven?

It is not my intent tonight to try and spell out all the ways we might move forward toward our goal of parity for family-farm income. I only want to emphasize that there are still many paths open, and make clear the urgency of exploring them all.

To you that urgency, above all else, is protecting your own livelihood, and providing more adequately for the needs of your families.

But to all America, that urgency is strengthening of our democracy, and proving it works for all. In that respect, the challenge that confronts us in agriculture also confronts us in other aspects of our national life.

We must prove democracy can provide the answer to all such challenges.

Communism cannot be wiped out by mere indignation against its abuses and outrages. It can only be crushed by effectively proving a free people under a democracy can better cope with their social and economic problems, and can better translate into reality the hope and aspirations of all people for a better life.

Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence. Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change—and we must constantly continue to exemplify that proof before the world.

We can't do it by timidity, or complacency, or self-satisfaction with the status quo as always being "good enough."

We can do it only by recapturing the boldness and zeal of our forefathers, and moving aggressively forward on an enlightened, liberal program of new social gains, new progress, new opportunity, new goals that stir the imaginations and hopes of all people everywhere.

That's the challenge we face, as we approach a new session of Congress with divided leadership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Yet that division need not discourage us, for that challenge exists for Republicans as well as Democrats—and the urgency for bold answers must rise above all partisanship, for the sake of our own country and the sake of the world.

I want to assure you tonight that many of us in the Democratic Party—and proud to be Democrats—stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder with enlightened Republicans to achieve the progress America so urgently needs, and to make the dream of democracy's fulfillment come true for all Americans.

Our President has publicly recognized the need for redirection of the Republican Party from some of its paths of the past. He has called for a new brand of modern republicanism.

Accepting each other in good faith, as Americans first and partisans second, there is no reason there cannot be enough amongst us who share liberal convictions, Democrat or Republican, to work together toward hammering out a constructive, forward-looking program of progress for all America.

We urgently need such a liberal coalition in American public life today, with the courage to assert leadership for the common good, and the boldness to break tradition or ties with the past where necessary to achieve our common goals.

We need not look far for issues where the demand for action in the public's interest is far more urgent than mere partisanship or political advantage.

The plight of agriculture is but one of such challenges. As farm families with deep concern for America, you also have a vital stake in all the rest.

We must at long last move aggressively toward eliminating discrimination of all kinds, whether economic or because of race, color, or creed. There can be no second-class citizenship in a democracy. We must wipe out the inequities and injustices of our immigration laws that belie the humanitarian spirit of our democracy. We must improve our refugee-relief legislation, to make meaningful to the rest of the world the symbol of our Statue of Liberty.

By all means, we must provide more adequate school facilities for our children and generations yet to come, knowing the future fate of our democracy must rest on an informed and understanding citizenry.

We must prove democracy has a heart, by more adequately providing for the aged and handicapped in our midst. We must safeguard ourselves and generations yet unborn by moving ahead on medical research and in assuring more adequate medical care and hospital facilities, particularly in rural areas.

We must see that adequate housing is made available within the means of our citizens, and must stimulate and encourage slum clearance and urban redevelopment in the rotting hearts of our great cities.

We must continually expand our horizons of possible economic growth, assure creation of new jobs to match our population growth, and provide ample opportunity for independent business to keep alive the real spirit of competitive free enterprise against the inroads of monopolistic concentration of industrial wealth and power.

We must protect the great heritage of our natural resources for the benefit of all our people, conserving them against commercial exploitation that would rob future generations of their birthright and risk the future of our country.

And by all means, certainly not the least of our goals for America must be preservation of the family farm pattern of agriculture, with equality of economic opportunity through whatever bargaining power necessary to achieve full parity of income. Certainly we as a Nation cannot rightly take pride in a supposed prosperity that ignores the economic plight of agriculture and relegates our farm families to the most ruthless regimentation of all—the regimentation of poverty.

These are basic, fundamental goals we must achieve, regardless of who is in the White House, and who is in the Congress.

It is an American program, for which all Americans should cry out for leadership and action.

For these things we must do, to make the American promise come true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because it is typical of farm reaction in the corn belt to Mr. Benson's partisan approach to proposed legislation this year, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a transcript from a GTA radio newscast carried over 11 midwestern radio stations on Monday, January 7.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

Good afternoon. You'll be hearing a lot—in the next few months—about a bipartisan approach—in Congress—to the various problems which beset the Nation—and that includes the farm problem. What does bipartisan mean? Simply a true effort—on the part of both Democrats and Republicans—to put their heads together, and work out sound solutions.

Now farmers are wondering which way the new Congress will go. A true bipartisan effort could write a decent farm program—and a bipartisan attitude in the White House could put the President's signature on such a bill. Congress wrote such a bipartisan bill last year—but the President didn't see eye-to-eye with Congress—and vetoed the bill. Farmers wonder whether he'd do the same thing again.

Certain legislation deserves the support of both political parties—and of the White House—too. We're thinking of a bill dropped in the hopper by Representative

GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, 5 minutes after he was sworn in. The former editor of the South Dakota Union Farmers—Bob Nelson—who's on MCGOVERN'S staff now—says in a telegram to the GTA radio newsroom, that the bill was written in cooperation with other Congressmen. It calls for an investigation of the high cost of living and widening margins between farm and consumer prices. It would set up a permanent seven-man committee—to make recommendations for increasing prices to farmers—and lowering food prices to consumers. The bill also asks Congress to declare a national policy of abundant production with fair returns to farmers.

Will measures like this get bipartisan support? We hope so—but early indications from the executive branch of the Government are not good. For example, President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture—Ezra Benson—has called a conference of 15 members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees. They'll meet in his office tomorrow—Tuesday. According to newspaper reports—all 15 are Republicans. Benson left out the 27 Democratic members on the two farm committees.

Newsmen interpret Benson's action as a rejection of the plea for a two-party coalition to work out the farm problem—made by Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota—when he spoke at the GTA annual meeting in St. Paul last December.

Congressmen, of course, will resent Mr. Benson's unfortunate partisanship. We report this to you today—because Secretary Benson may have opened an early rupture—in bipartisan efforts to work out decent farm legislation in this session of Congress. We'll keep you posted on developments in Washington—as they take place—on this daily radio program—a public service of GTA—the co-op way.

THE YOUTH OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I turn now to another matter. Today I am introducing a bill providing for a youth opportunity program. It is a program on which I have worked for well over a year, in consultation with a number of advisers throughout the country. I believe that if this bill is enacted, the program could be of considerable help to the young people of the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to discuss a few aspects of this area of national interest. It deserves the most dedicated attention from us all.

The problems and requirements of our Nation's youth confront us with a mounting challenge and responsibility which we can no longer afford to shirk. Public planning and public action are urgently required if America is to continue to provide an adequate opportunity for self-development to its youth, regardless of their race, religion, family economic background, geographical residence, or comparative abilities.

It has always been a central point of my political and social philosophy that the two critical periods in the life of every American are his youth and his old age. In recent sessions we in Congress have acted—although not as comprehensively as I would have liked; nevertheless, we have acted—to improve our social security system and extend other existing legislation designed to fulfill our responsibility to our elderly people. We have much more to do, and I trust that at this session of Congress we shall proceed with that business. But we have postponed long overdue attention to the subject of what we, as a people, can do to assist the youth of our Nation in their crucial, formative years.

Mr. President, we need only read the daily newspapers to know that there are two fundamental divisions of the all-encompassing problems today facing American youth. The division is largely between problems of an academic nature, on the one hand, and problems of a nonacademic nature, on the other. In both areas, legislative action has now become imperative if we are to escape from a condition which is already beginning to take on the dimensions of a national catastrophe.

We need only consider the wide range of problems facing us in the academic field to know how serious the challenge there is: able youths prevented by economic hardship from attending institutions of higher education; the soaring enrollments which, despite the financial lack, are flowing from an increased population in the younger age brackets; the central problem of school construction; the serious deficiency in the quality and quantity of our teachers; and the financial crippling of many of our academic institutions under the load of the new demands placed upon them.

Mr. President, those are some of the academic challenges which lie before us and are plaguing us at this very moment.

When we turn to the other, nonacademic, side of the coin, the challenge is equally obvious: How to provide recreational facilities for youthful activities in healthy surroundings; how to bridge the gap between high school and employment for those who are not going on to further education; how to explore new methods for the rehabilitation of delinquent youths and for the gradual elimination of the causes of delinquency by striking at its economic and psychological roots.

Mr. President, we Americans of adult age talk a great deal about our young people, but we do far too little about the subject we discuss. As a father, a husband, a citizen, and a public official, I have a genuine concern over the lack of proper attention to the problems of America's young men and young women. I am particularly concerned when I know that the young people of the Nation are our greatest natural resource. This great natural resource is receiving far too little attention.

Apparently we are more interested in the erosion of land than we are in the erosion of people. Mr. President; I do not mean to indicate in any way that the erosion of our land is not indeed a serious problem. On other occasions I have said that a nation that permits its land to be eroded and its young people to suffer from inadequate opportunity is a nation which is doomed to trouble and ultimately to suffer calamity. I am hopeful, however, that the United States of America will place its emphasis first upon its youth and upon the possibilities for achievement by young men and young women in whatever line of endeavor they may wish to dedicate their lives.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed, and I may even say I have been tormented, by the urgency of these matters, as I know most of my colleagues have been. During recent months I have tried to consider the possibilities of a broadly based legislative approach which would attempt, in however inadequate a way, to meet some of the varied aspects of the problems I have just mentioned. I certainly do not want it to appear that I believe that legislation is the entire answer. It is not. All that legislation can do is supplement and help. The proposed legislation to which I refer is designed to strengthen community activities in the field of youth opportunity. Legislation can be helpful to mothers and fathers in their work of providing better homes and better community life for their young men and young women. But legislation can be helpful in the field of education, and I am going to speak in the Senate as long as I have the strength to do so, in behalf of a program of expanded educational opportunities for young Americans.

It is almost inconceivable that this Nation can spend more on commercial recreation than it does on education. But it does. It is almost inconceivable that this Nation can spend more on control of diseases of plants and animals than it spends on control of diseases of human beings; but that is what it does. It seems to me almost inconceivable that the Federal Government can spend more for the reclamation of soil than it spends for the reclamation of humankind; it does. Someday perhaps we shall put first things first, and when that day arrives some of the problems we now face may fade away into insignificance.

Mr. President, I am about to send to the desk six measures comprising what I should like to call a youth opportunity program. I offer it as the beginning of an answer. I do not for a moment suggest that it is original or is profound, and surely it is not beyond criticism. This program is but a beginning. It is a sincere attempt soberly made to solve a tremendous problem.

I solicit criticism and amendment, and I offer this program only in an effort to break what seems to be an intolerable logjam, a logjam which must be broken in the interest of both the immediate and long-term needs of our country.

Let me now turn to the first division I mentioned, the situation facing us in the educational sphere. I am convinced that Walter Lippmann, distinguished American columnist and political commentator, did not underestimate the problem facing us when he recently declared in words which I should like to quote at some length:

> We have to do in the educational system something very like what we have done in the Military Establishment during the past 15 years. We have to make a breakthrough to a radically higher and broader conception of what is needed and of what can be done. Our educational effort today, what we think we can afford, what we think we can do, how we feel entitled to treat our schools and our teachers—all of that—is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor.

> In 1940 our Armed Forces were still at a level designed for a policy of isolation in this hemisphere and of neutrality in any war across the two oceans. Today, the Military Establishment has been raised to a different and higher plateau, and the effort that goes into it is enormously greater than it was in 1940.
>
> Our educational effort, on the other hand, has not yet been raised to the plateau of the age we live in. I am not saying, of course, that we should spend $40 billion on education because we spend that much on defense. I am saying that we must make the same order of radical change in our attitude toward education as we have made in our attitude toward defense.

Those are the words of Mr. Lippmann, Mr. President, and they are a remarkably effective statement of the problem of education which is before us today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always happy to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. First, I should like to commend the Senator for bringing this subject to the Senate floor today for discussion. I sincerely hope the committees to which the bills will be referred will give prompt consideration to the measures.

I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that the concern he has, which I am sure many Americans throughout the country share, is over the use of brainpower by our young people today. Reports coming to us from great and learned men show that the Soviet Union, through the force of dictatorship, can channel the brainpower of men into the various categories into which the state may want it channeled. In this country there is a waste of the brainpower of our young men today. Unless a young man has the economic background, he cannot afford to attend one of our major universities. Perhaps the young man comes from a home whose necessities force him to work early in life. We as a Nation lose more than the individual loses, because we lose the development of his brainpower, which is essential today because of the conflict between free people on the one hand and dictatorial states on the other. We are losing the race in the scientific field because we are not properly using the brainpower of our young people. Does the Senator concur in that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do concur in the Senator's statements. Those statements are truths that we have simply got to face up to. It is all very well for us to say we hope everything will turn out all right. But is it not amazing how quickly we respond when we hear that the Soviet Union has developed a new plane, or that the Soviet Union has developed a new technique in armament? Yet, when we hear that the Soviet Union is turning out thousands of trained technicians and trained scientists, many thousands more than we are turning out despite our head start, when we hear that kind of news, we say, "Well, that's too bad. It is interesting. It is something alarming, but pardon me while I turn over and take another nap."

What the Senator from Michigan is saying, first, is that we ought not to allow others to get the advantage over us scientifically, technically, and intellectually. Second, that we should utilize all our resources for our own account. Even if there were no Communists, we should do so. We ought to do it because it is the right thing to do.

In my opinion, one of the challenges we face is what free people can and will do when we ourselves meet these problems. We happen to confront the threat of the Communists on the one hand, who are a challenge to us; but the question should be what we ourselves as free people should do to meet the situation.

Mr. POTTER. Will the Senator yield further for an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do; indeed.

Mr. POTTER. I am concerned with the problem of arousing greater interest on the part of young people to further their knowledge in the scientific field and offering greater incentives to them. I am working on proposed legislation that will provide for an Academy of Science, which, like our academies for the branches of the armed services, will provide a resource which must be further developed in this country. Perhaps that in a small way will aid in bringing about the training and development of scientists who are so badly needed in our country today.

I wish to commend the Senator for a worthwhile and interesting statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I shall look forward to his proposals, and study them with great care and interest.

I now continue to read from the remarks of Mr. Lippmann. They express so precisely and concisely what I should like to be able to express that I shall use his words:

> We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated.
>
> There is an enormous margin of luxury in this country against which we can draw for our vital needs. We take that for granted when we think of the national defense. From the tragedies and the bitter experience of being involved in wars for which we were inadequately prepared, we have acquired the will to defend ourselves. And, having done that, having acquired the will, we have found the way. We know how to find the dollars that are needed to defend ourselves, even if we are to do without something else that is less vitally important.
>
> In education we have not yet acquired that kind of will. But we need to acquire it, and we have no time to lose. We must acquire it in this decade. For if, in the crucial years which are coming, our people remain as unprepared as they are for their responsibilities and their mission, they may not be equal to the challenge, and if they do not succeed, they may never have a second chance in order to try again.

Mr. President, no matter where we turn the evidences of contemporary life lead us to Mr. Lippmann's conclusion.

American society is deteriorating in the sector most critical for future progress and well-being. The quality of the future depends on education at all levels and the quality of education depends on its top leadership. Our society is now in a period of rapid change. We are face to face with increasing complexities and hazards, both technical and moral. It is absolutely essential that we bring into education a sufficient share of the highest talent of each generation so that each succeeding generation will be the better prepared to deal with the challenges of its own time.

We can view the problem, if we wish, from the dramatic perspective of our competition with the Soviet Union. Most of us are familiar with the increasingly frightening reports about the serious manpower shortage facing us in the scientific, technical, engineering, and other professional fields. I mention only one—the almost unbelievable statement made last summer by Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Admiral Strauss said:

> Last year for all the high schools of the United States, we produced only 125 new teachers of physics. Think of it. Only 125 for 28,000 high schools.

I know a little about this problem, as I have 4 children in school—2 in junior high school, 1 in senior high school, and 1 in elementary school. The chance of any community obtaining teachers in the field of science is becoming more and more remote. Only a few days ago I sat at breakfast with Secretary of the Army Brucker. He told Members of Congress that much of our military strength today is being threatened with complete disintegration because of the inability of the Government to retain in the service people of skill and competence once they have fulfilled their terms of enlistment. The Army of the United States requires brainpower as well as firepower. When a young man receives his education in the Army and learns how to do some of the intricate and complex things that must be done with modern weapons, industry is waiting at that very point to offer him a job.

Educational establishments cannot obtain the services of such people. They cannot pay enough. One of these days we shall be in the situation of not having sufficient manpower in our Military Establishment properly to utilize our complex mechanical equipment, or the necessary manpower in our educational establishments to train the kind of enlightened citizenry we need.

This is only one graphic illustration of what we are up against in the professional manpower shortage. I might add parenthetically, Mr. President, that last fall I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a detailed and comprehensive report on the Shortage of Scientific, Engineering, and other Professional Manpower, summarizing and analyzing the numerous and occasionally conflicting statements which have recently been made by various authorities in connection with this problem. I am hopeful that the first half of this report will be available for release within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

I spent 2 years making a study of the shortage of scientific manpower. My re-

port too is being updated, doublechecked and I hope it may be useful in connection with the Library of Congress study.

Mr. President, I am even more concerned about the failure of education than I am about the possibility of an attack in the Middle East. If as many Members of Congress could become excited about what is happening to our educational structure as are excited over hearing Mr. Dulles in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, we would really be accomplishing something.

We may also, Mr. President, look at the problem from the perspective of the handicap placed on native ability by financial incapacity.

It is estimated by educational experts that there are at the present time more than 150,000 young men and women in the United States who rank in the upper 12 percent of the population's intellectual range, but who cannot go to college because they lack the necessary means.

As everyone knows, the next few years will find us in an even more serious situation as the number of American youths of college age swells to a figure more than 50 percent larger than it is today. Yet, we prepare for these youths by annually spending less on education than we do on alcoholic beverages and cosmetics, and many Americans prepare to meet this nationally serious problem by relying on 19th century thinking and methods. The educational needs of our youth can no longer be considered only as a State or local problem. It is high time that effective cooperation of all governmental units be utilized to face our Nation's educational challenge.

Mr. President, I think it would be startling for many Americans to know that today the Federal Government actually contributes less to the aid of education than it did 60 years ago. In 1895, the Federal Government provided over 5 percent of the funds used nationally for education, while today it supplies only 2.6 percent.

Mr. President, it is a great waste of one of the most valuable resources of our Nation to let our young people with outstanding mental ability be deprived of a college education because of financial difficulties or other reasons. Apart from the increase in individual satisfactions and development resulting from such an expansion of educational opportunities, it is obvious that the future well-being of our entire Nation would be greatly enhanced by this overall enlargement of our national capabilities.

We may also, Mr. President, view this whole problem from the perspective of increased enrollments in the context of decreased State and local capabilities of meeting them.

Recent reports from State after State—and I cite in particular my own State of Minnesota—are typical of the national problem. In Minnesota, earlier this month Governor Freeman's committee on higher education, headed by one of our most distinguished citizens, Mr. Samuel Gale, told the Minnesota Legislature that—

> An increase in college enrollment in Minnesota can be expected by 1970 to be some 80 to 100 percent above present enrollments. Soaring enrollments offer no alternative but very substantial increases in public funds for higher education, increases which are needed immediately by all types of public higher education.

The Minnesota report also cites demands for trained scientists and engineers and states that—

> The number of graduates from these fields is far from sufficient for local demands.
>
> Every effort should be made to see that opportunity is available for preparation for such work to every Minnesota youth who is qualified.
>
> The rural youth who expects to remain on the farm will need more training than his father, since the entire process of farming now demands considerable technical know-how and business management skill.

The committee called the shortage in teachers "the greatest manpower problem of the State at this time." It pointed out that at present, Minnesota is losing more teachers than it is training.

"The financial rewards of teaching must be brought into line with those of other professions," it stated.

I point out to every father and mother in the galleries, and every Member of this body, that if we have children who are very young, we can rest assured that they will receive a worse education than those who are a little older. We are running short of teachers. We are training fewer teachers every year, to meet an increasing school population. We are putting more and more children in classrooms, with fewer and fewer teachers, and still hoping to have an educated citizenry. It will not work.

I face this problem in my personal life as a father. I resent it, because I am willing to pay the price of good education for our children. As a United States Senator, I think it is high time that I did something to try to rectify the situation, if it is within my power as a public official.

The teacher shortage is the No. 1 national manpower problem. If we have a No. 1 national manpower problem, we ought to do something to solve it. I propose that we do something, partly by means of the proposed legislation which I introduce today.

As I have stated, the Committee on Higher Education in Minnesota reported that "the financial rewards of teaching must be brought into line with those of other professions." Not long ago I was in a certain community. I shall not mention its name, because I do not wish to bring it into disrepute. However, in that community the man who delivered beer to the door of the tavern received more income than the principal of any elementary or secondary school in the State. This seems to me to be a lack of a sense of values. I believe that if we want an adequate number of trained principals of high schools and of elementary schools, or superintendents of high schools and of elementary schools, we had better maintain economic, social, and other kinds of rewards and incentives which are good enough and big enough not only to keep such people on the job but also to bring other people into those fields.

Mr. President, it is becoming very difficult indeed to keep good teachers on the job. In the metropolitan area of Washington, in the county in Maryland in which I live, teachers are compelled to work at night as accountants, clerks, and taxicab drivers in order to obtain adequate income with which to sustain themselves and their families under the present high cost of living.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is not true that he is speaking of Montgomery County in Maryland.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and that county has a very good public school system.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator apparently is speaking of a county which has 1 of the 10 best school systems in the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. It has one of the finest school systems in the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is not referring to some school system that is far down the line from the standpoint of high educational standards. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not talking about an area of our country which is obviously hard pressed. In Montgomery County there are many people who are in the so-called middle-income group. Their resources are greater. They have a school system which is considered one of the best in the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is considered to be 1 of the 10 best in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. But even there the rewards are anything but enticing.

Mr. President, I have great admiration for these self-sacrificing teachers. I want every Senator to know that. I have never in my life seen a group of people who are more willing to give so much and receive so little in terms of appreciation or monetary rewards as the American schoolteachers.

They need a few champions; and although I am not appointing myself as their champion, I shall certainly espouse their cause, if for no other reason than that of self-protection. I have at heart the interests of the families of America because I have a personal interest in my own family. I am concerned with this problem because I know the truth about the problems caused by the growing school population of this country.

Mr. President, if we know nothing else in the Senate we should know how to count. If we can count and if we can add, we know that more schoolteachers and better school facilities are needed.

I am not at all impressed when I read in the newspapers that a new office building is being built downtown. I am impressed, however, when I read about the contsruction of a new school building, complete with cafeterias which are adequate to give service to the number of schoolchildren who will go to that school, so that the children will not have

to eat during the noon hour at the desks at which they sit all during the school hours, in overcrowded classrooms, with harassed teachers. If this country should reach the point where it cannot longer afford to provide adequate places where our children can eat, we had better think again about some of our other expenditures.

Mr. President, steeply rising enrollments and the certain prospects of their continuation at the secondary level are two of the central facts about American schooling that confront us today.

Serious as it is, Mr. President, even the teacher shortage, mentioned in the Minnesota report, is not the end of the matter. At the primary and secondary level, schools must be constructed. We know that somehow assistance must be brought to increase higher educational facilities also if the new burdens of increased enrollment are to be met. This is a problem affecting public and private institutions as well, but particularly the latter which have been increasingly deprived of sources of support which they enjoyed a generation ago. We all know that endowed colleges and universities have been unable to increase their endowment income proportionately to their increased demands and increased expense. Sharp increases in income and estate taxes have reduced the capital accumulations from which endowments formerly came.

Somehow, somewhere, facilities assistance must be provided to help meet this need.

Last October Adlai Stevenson released a comprehensive paper entitled "A Program for Education," which summarized the five great problem areas in education in America today. He analyzed clearly the shortage facing us: the shortage of buildings, the shortage of teachers, the shortage of talent, the shortage of facts, and the shortage of policy.

Far from being merely a campaign document, Governor Stevenson's statement is as valuable now as it was when he made it.

While I do not purport to cover all of the points he stressed in that program, I sympathize with them, still find them instructive and worth restudying, and consequently ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Stevenson's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW AMERICA

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

A PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION

The dream of a new America begins in a classroom.

This is as true today as in the days of the little red schoolhouse. The giant steps our Nation has taken toward the goal of universal educational opportunity has, more than anything else, given us the technical and economic progress we enjoy today. Public education in America has been the great lever by which we have lifted a whole society by lifting each person toward his own full potential.

These educational achievements of the past have put us now on the threshold of a new America. But whether we can cross this threshold and seize the brilliant opportunities that lie beyond depends heavily upon what we now do to advance American education ever further. The passport to a better society is better education, for one and all.

Better education for all American youth is thus an imperative for a new America, but it is also an extremely difficult assignment. Our schools and colleges are today up against severe obstacles and handicaps. We must work hard just to keep from losing ground in education; we must work doubly hard to gain new ground.

We must identify our most critical problems in education and come directly to grips with them. If we make one set of decisions, we can look with confidence to a future in which our children and grandchildren will have a chance to realize their talents and fulfill their promise.

If we make another set of decisions—or if we make no decisions at all and let drift take over the superintendency of our schools—then we can anticipate only the growing misuse and waste of our human resources, only the frustration of the American promise.

Unless we are prepared to do something about the crisis of our schools, there is simply no use even of talking about a new America.

Crisis and success

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, education was an aristocratic privilege. But the logic of American history has meant a steady widening of educational opportunity. "If a people expects to be both ignorant and free," said Jefferson, "it expects what never was and never will be." Today there are 33 million young people from every walk and station of life in our schools. Truly now education belongs to all of us.

This triumph of the educational idea in America, coupled with the sharp rise in births during and since World War II, has filled our schools so full that they are today bursting at the seams.

And the great rush has only begun. Five years from now our already overcrowded elementary schools will have to serve 3 extra children for every 10 now in school. By 1970 our high schools will have 7 extra students for every 10 now in school. College and university enrollments will double during the next 10 to 15 years.

These are not speculations; these figures come from counting the noses of children already born.

Crisis and quality

The crisis in education is not just a problem of overcrowding. The kind of world we live in has compounded the crisis.

At home we are entering a period of rapid technological and social change—a period which will test our ideas, our knowledge, and our creativity. And abroad we confront a world in ferment, where the aspirations of long-submerged peoples, as well as the dogmatic fanaticism of the Communists, have created tensions that the rising generation must know and master. "Human history," H. G. Wells wrote, "becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." The faster trouble runs in the world the better the job our schools must do, if we are just to keep ahead of disaster.

But keeping ahead of disaster is not enough. The problem is more than one of giving desks and primers to the boys and girls flooding into our schools. We look to education not just to keep us out of trouble; we look to education to keep advancing us toward a fuller and more fruitful life.

Summary

This is our educational crisis in broad outline. It would be irresponsible to promise quick and rapid solutions. We cannot produce overnight an abundance of modern, well-lighted school buildings with plenty of capable and devoted teachers, where every child is free to realize his best self. The short-run task of rehabilitating our schools is one for a generation. The whole task of education will never be finished.

But what I do consider possible—what I believe to be long overdue and now imperative—is that we stake out the generation-long task and start doing something about it at once.

I want to emphasize at the outset that education is primarily the responsibility of the community, of the local and State government. And full credit must be given for the encouraging developments in our communities. Most local governments have been enlarging their support of education; citizens' groups are working valiantly to improve our schools; private foundations are providing aid and leadership in the fight for improved teacher training and for better salaries.

When the local community can improve conditions no further, however, and there is still much to be done, we are right to look to the Federal Government for assistance.

But in the end, success or failure in meeting the educational challenge will rest largely in the community. It must make the maximum financial contribution within the limits of its resources. It must provide efficient and economic operation of the schools. All the Federal Government can do is to make it possible for the community to discharge its reponsibilities.

But to do this, the Federal Government must take a number of steps as swiftly as possible.

Proposal No. 1: The establishment of a national policy of Federal aid to education where local and individual resources cannot meet the need.

Proposal No. 2: Assumption immediately by the Federal Government, of a share in meeting the present urgent financial requirements of our educational system, particularly those for more classrooms and for more, qualified teachers.

Proposal No. 3: A program designed to help insure against able students being denied a chance to have a college education because they can't afford it, and to encourage such students to enter teaching or other lines of work where there are serious personnel shortages.

Proposal No. 4: Expansion of the exchange programs which in the last 7 years have sent thousands of American students and teachers overseas and have brought foreign scholars to this country.

Proposal No. 5: Development of new approaches to the challenging oportunities in vocational and adult education.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

There are six great problem areas in American education today.

1. The shortage of buildings:

Many of you know from your experience with your own children the shortage of school buildings which has led to such grave overcrowding of existing facilities—to classes too large for effective teaching, to children attending schools in shifts, even to the use of unsafe buildings.

A careful congressional study showed that in 1952 we needed new classrooms equivalent in size to a 1-story building, 50 feet wide, stretching from New York to San Francisco. And the deficit now is vastly greater.

We should be building 100,000 new classrooms each year.

Actually we have been building only about half that many.

In other words, we are losing ground at the rate of nearly 50,000 classrooms a year. And we are losing ground precisely where we can least afford it—in the poorer districts of the country.

2. The shortage of teachers:

Today's ominous shortage of qualified teachers had its beginnings in a great national mistake—our failure to give teaching as a profession sufficient reward and

honor. Now as the wave of children born during the war begin to grow up, we are paying the price for neglect of our teachers. We do not have enough good teachers—we do not have enough teachers at all. This teachers' shortage may reach proportions of disaster for our culture and our economy.

Today young men and women—many who would like to serve their fellowmen as teachers—are taking jobs in industry and in other professions. Why? Because they earn more in the vital 5 to 10 years when they are hoping to get married and to establish families of their own; because there is a ceiling, and a rather low one, on what they would earn, both in money and prestige, even after many years as teachers; and because their initiative might not be fully challenged in education, where responsibility does not increase with experience and ability and promotion often results less from superior performance than from length of service and the earning of various credits.

Unless we do something to improve the status of our teachers, fewer and fewer of our able and ambitious young people will go into the teaching profession. This can result only in a gradual downward drift of the level of teaching and hence of our whole level of educaiton. It is not just that we need more teachers. It is that we need more good teachers—that we need, indeed, the best teachers in the world. Our children deserve nothing less.

How well equipped are we to meet the needs of the next few years?

We know that enrollments will increase at a predictable rate.

Although I find a baffling confusion in the statistics in this field, it is clear that we are falling tens of thousands of teachers short every year. The most reliable figures indicate that right now we are short about 75,000 to 90,000 teachers in the total teaching force.

We know, too, that we will need about 50,000 more school teachers every year to take care of the new children coming to school. And we know that we need perhaps twice that many new teachers every year to replace experienced teachers who drop out of schools—to get married, to raise children, to go to higher-paid jobs in business, or to retire.

When the schools opened this September, they had to hire some 90,000 (another source reports 78 to 80 thousand) emergency teachers—that is, inadequately trained teachers. The rest of the slack was taken up by crowding more children into already overcrowded classrooms.

And this year our colleges turned out only 2,600 qualified new mathematics teachers and 228 new physics teachers. At that rate of supply, how can we expect our 80,000 high schools to turn out children equipped to live in the world of modern science?

In the colleges and universities, the situation is even more serious. In the next 10 or 15 years, enrollment will probably rise by 100 percent. For every teacher now employed, two new ones will have to be found in the next 15 years.

It will not be easy to meet this shortage. It has developed because we have failed to give teaching the dignity and status this vital function deserves. To be blunt about it, we have not paid teachers enough.

We have all heard it said, perhaps said it ourselves, that money isn't everything to a teacher; that teaching is a life of service. But who can doubt that a truly professional standing based on a truly professional salary would make all the difference in the world in attracting fully qualified people into teaching.

"The teachers of this country," said William James, "have its future in their hands." The national neglect of the teaching profession may do incalculable harm to us all.

3. The shortage of talent:

We can already see the consequences of our educational shortages. Recent studies by the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training have demonstrated that our schools and colleges are not meeting the growing demands of our country for specialists, men and women trained to do the important jobs of our society. Business and Government, society as a whole, needs more scientists, engineers, doctors, social scientists, technical experts, psychologists; above all, we need more good school and college teachers.

It is too bad that it takes a divided world to bring these shortages home. In the first 5 years after 1950, the number of young people who earned engineering degrees in this country dropped from 52,000 to 23,000, while in the same period in the Soviet Union the number of graduates from technical schools offering courses equivalent to those of our engineering schools grew from 28,000 to 63,000. Russia's gain practically equaled our drop, and Russia is now producing 2 engineers for each 1 we turn out.

I do not suggest that we should set our sights or determine our needs by comparison with the Soviet Union. But I do suggest that the growth of Communist power may be explained as much by Communist investments in education as by any other one thing. And I think we might well ask ourselves whether a free people by free decision will also be prepared to make this best of all investments—investment in the education of its youth. The answer must be "Yes."

The shortage of trained technicians is by no means our only, or perhaps even our greatest, want. In a free society, where the will of the citizen is determining, we need, above all, citizens with a good liberal arts education. We need businessmen and working men and women who know our history and our literature and the values of our civilization; we need specialists and experts, to be sure, but specialists who know far more than their specialties, who are, first of all, educated people. We need poets as well as public rewards—yes, and we need politicians. A group of scientists at the California Institute of Technology recently concluded that the most critical bottleneck to future national growth would be, not natural resources, but "brain power."

And I want to say that I see these shortages as causes for concern, but surely not for dismay. They reflect the fact that our dynamic society has an insatiable appetite for capable, well-educated people. As we feed that appetite, we move toward the new America.

4. The shortage of facts: What the Office of Education can tell us about our schools and colleges is shockingly little compared to the facts that other Federal agencies can give us about agriculture, banking, and industry. Your Congressman can send you more information about hoof and mouth disease than he can about the challenges confronting our educational system and the terrible wastage of human resources that an inadequate educational system inflicts. We simply do not have clear, accurate, and up-to-date facts to answer some basic questions about our schools. This is highly unsatisfactory.

5. The shortage of policy: The fact is that the Eisenhower administration has utterly failed to develop a comprehensive national policy for education. It has not set up the administrative machinery to produce such a policy. It has not probed or put into perspective the facts of the educational crisis. It has failed to offer strong leadership in the cause of our most valuable resource—our children.

In 1955, President Eisenhower convened a White House Conference on Education. For nearly 2 years, the prospect of this Conference has been used as an excuse for inaction.

The Conference had been billed as an effort to define the relationship of the Federal Government to education, but it did not do so. Its report supported limited Federal grants for school construction but left open other questions. In short, our schools were asked to wait through 3 years of gathering crisis for a definition of the Federal role, only to emerge with no definition.

Not until after the Conference did the Eisenhower administration act. The action then was to put forth a weak bill for Federal aid limited to school construction alone.

When the House of Representatives took up the 1956 school aid bill, the President sat by while 96 Republican Congressmen first supported an antisegregation rider to the bill and then voted against the bill itself. Indeed, in the midst of the debate, a Republican Congressman read a letter from Mr. Eisenhower in which he wrote: "In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the Central Government." A majority of Democrats supported the school bill; a majority of Republicans opposed it. It was defeated.

The record of the Eisenhower administration is a record, so far as education is concerned, of words and of conferences—but of little action, and no results.

The failure in conception, the failure in action, is a symptom of a deeper failure. It is a symptom of incapacity or unwillingness to see the problem of education in human terms—in terms of boys and girls with abilities and aspirations, children who may either be held down and defeated by a poor educational system or be given new possibilities and new goals by a good one. Who can watch a child go off on his first day at school without wishing him everything he needs to equip him best for life and assure the most complete personal fulfillment?

I cannot believe that the American people hold anything superior to the future of their children. I know that the Nation which can afford the best automobiles, the brightest television sets, and the biggest aircraft carriers in the world can also afford the best schools. The need is for leadership—leadership which is interested, determined, and imaginative; leadership which cares about our children; leadership which cares about the kind of world they will build; leadership which understands that, in the end, all human achievement begins and ends with people.

A NEW ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

Together these shortages have produced the educational crisis. The problem now is how to meet the crisis—and how to meet it in a way consistent with our traditions and our ideals.

It is essential that we be absolutely clear in our minds about two things; how we decide what our children shall learn, and how we pay for their learning.

From the start, we have thought it best to let the citizens of local communities decide what kind of education they wanted for their own children. In time, the State governments began to work with the local authorities, insisting that the communities meet certain standards and encouraging local initiative to improve the schools. But operation and policy have remained essentially in local hands—and this is the way it should be. A healthy educational system can grow only from local roots.

The Federal Government and education

But let us also be clear about one other thing: This tradition has not prevented the Federal Government from taking an interest in education and from supporting our educational system in a variety of ways—ever since the Army, under General Washington, began to provide general instruction in 1779. In 1862, when President Lincoln signed the bill establishing the landgrant colleges, the Federal Government laid down the basis for our State colleges and

universities. In 1867, Congress set up the Bureau now known as the Office of Education. Beginning in 1937, Federal funds were made available for vocational education in local school districts. In the past 20 years, largely under Democratic leadership, the Federal Government has provided monies to initiate and support a considerable number of school activities—the school-lunch program for pupils and the GI education program being perhaps the best known.

In short, the Federal Government has for a long time been giving money for education purposes without dictating what the schools should teach.

A new situation

Two great social changes make it imperative that we look now to the Federal Government for a much larger part of the support of our schools.

One change is the fantastic expansion of our school population. This has led to an enormous increase in the school bill.

We are now spending more than three times what we spent in 1938 and more than 36 times what we spent in 1900.

Annual public-school expenditures by State and local governments stand at near the $10 billion mark in 1956. Estimates indicate that during the decade ahead the education bill will rise to $15 billion just to meet our minimum needs, and to perhaps as much as $20 billion if educational standards are raised to what it is generally agreed they ought to be. And this does not take into account the cost of private education.

The second great change is that for various reasons the local communities have been less and less able to foot this bill.

In the past, local communities have relied mainly on property taxes to pay for schools—taxes on land and personal possessions.

In recent years the local communities have been having a very hard time realizing enough money for schools from property taxes.

There are several reasons for this. For one thing, assessments have rarely reflected the true value of the property. More importantly, property values have not gone up proportionately with the rise in national income and production, so that property taxes have not yielded nearly so much, for instance, as income taxes. In relation to the national product, the general property tax yields only one-quarter as much as it did 25 years ago.

It will thus be necessary in the years ahead to depend more and more on the taxing power of the State and Federal Governments for the money for our schools.

Some State governments are in a position to contribute more than they have in recent years. Some are not. In any case, State revenues are reaching their limits, especially when they are not directly affected by an enlargement of income. So it has become increasingly up to the Federal Government to provide the money to set our school system on a solid basis.

We should face this problem squarely and promptly.

As I have said, the best information available indicates that it will cost us, as a nation, from $500 million to $1 billion more each year for the next 10 years to build the schools and hire the teachers our rapidly growing school-age population needs.

We have three choices:

1. We can do without the new schools and new teachers we need, or

2. We can leave it to the States to do the best they can to match the means to the needs, or

3. We can raise part (at least of the added requirements) through Federal taxes, primarily the income tax.

These choices are not going to be easy ones. To me, the first one is out of the question. The second one, for the reasons discussed above, appears in most cases to be almost impossible; there just isn't this much more give in the local property tax and the State revenue sources.

The prospect of increased Federal expenditures, for anything, is one that any holder of national office or any candidate for such office must face with stern anxiety.

But I say this: Any opposition to increased Federal expenditure for education is honest, under today's circumstances, only if it includes a clean-cut decision that we do not need more schools and more teachers than local sources are providing. I don't believe any responsible person thinks this is true.

I hope, as part of this series of papers, to make bluntly clear the economic and fiscal consequences of any enlarged Federal welfare programs. I am setting forth here only what I think are the goals America has in mind. We always want and need more than we can have at any given time. And we shall have to decide which of these things we feel we can afford and which ones we can't.

PROPOSALS FOR EDUCATION IN THE NEW AMERICA

Proposal No. 1, a policy:

A Democratic administration will set the highest priority on the establishment of a clear-cut national policy for the improvement of educational facilities.

The goal of our national policy should be to permit the fullest possible development of each individual's capacities and talents through strong and equal educational opportunities. It should aim, not just at getting more children into more classrooms for more years, but at making each child's education a richer and more challenging experience than ever before.

A necessary step toward the development of such a policy is to remove the United States Office of Education from its present hiding place and to give it higher status.

At the present time the Office of Education is a stepchild of our Government. A survey not long ago revealed that less than 1 percent of the Federal funds actually spent on education was channeled through the Office of Education. The chief of this office has less importance than second- and third-rank officers in other departments.

It has been frequently proposed that there should be a separate Department of Education in the President's Cabinet. I think this should be given consideration, but I think we should be sure that it would not aggravate the administrative problem in our Federal Government. And I think we would also want to be careful that such action would not introduce a political element which would be undesirable and shift the center of gravity in this field from the local to the National Government level. In any event, however, a fundamental reorganization of the Federal Government's administrative machinery for the handling of the problems of education seems imperative.

Proposal No. 2, Federal aid to the States:

There is substantial agreement today that some form of Federal financial assistance to the States for educational purposes is required. The real issue now is not where there should be Federal assistance, but rather what form it should take and how much it should be.

This program should include aid for school construction. The Kelley bill, which was before the House of Representatives this year, represented a substantial step toward this end.

But I do not think that the Federal-aid program can advisedly be limited to grants for school construction. The building shortage is the most obvious one, but the hidden crisis—the shortage of teachers—is surely as important.

The priority needs differ from community to community and from State to State, and the Federal Government is not in the best position to judge these individual needs. Some communities desperately need new classrooms, but others are more immediately in need of more and better teachers, more books, or a richer curriculum. It seems to me we should consider a program of general aid, leaving the States and communities free to assign their own priorities in using supplemental funds from the Federal Government.

There will be the question of whether the Federal grants should be made outright or on a matching basis. There are advantages and disadvantages to both forms. The matching grants offer certain safeguards. Yet they may also mean a disruption of broader State and local fiscal programs. Although such a decision would have to be worked out on the basis of full explanation and discussion, and ultimately by Congress, my own present thinking is that at least a part of the Federal-aid program should be on a nonmatching basis.

There would, of course, have to be means of positive insurance that Federal funds would not be used to reduce or supplant State or local support for education.

I would think that Federal grants would take into account both the number of school-age children and the element of economic need in the various States.

Many States already follow an equalization principle in distributing State aid among their communities; a Federal program embodying the same principles would give further encouragement in this practice. The Federal and State Governments alike should be concerned with reducing the severe educational handicaps presently suffered by youngsters who, through no fault of their own, happen to live in economically underprivileged communities.

I would feel that Congress should adopt legislation that leaves little room for administrative discretion in the fixing of the amount or terms of the Federal grants; thus any attempt to inject Federal control would have to be thrashed out in the open on the floor of Congress and could not be tucked away in the fine print of some administrative regulation.

It must be recognized that this program will be costly.

President Eisenhower proposed a school-construction program of $250 million a year, totaling $1.25 billion over 5 years. The Democratic-sponsored Kelley bill would have authorized $400 million of construction grants annually, for a total of $1.6 billion over 4 years.

We must expect that as the school population keeps on rising and as we turn to meeting not only the school construction need but also the teacher shortage, these figures will have to be raised. I have already referred to the estimates which have been made indicating the inevitable increase during the next 10 years in the total amount of educational costs in this country. We must decide how much of this should be borne by the State and local governments (as 96 percent of it is now), and how much we should shift to the Federal Government.

It is impossible to fix a price tag on a Federal-aid program without having first made a determination as to how much of this added burden the States and local communities can and will bear, whether Federal participation should go beyond school construction costs (as I think it should), whether the Federal grants should be on an outright grant or a matching-grant basis, and so forth.

But I do want to suggest that just as a business matter every dollar we spend on educating American boys and girls will be returned—with interest—in terms of their increased productivity; and further, that if we decide to skimp on education, every dollar we save will probably be lost twice over in terms of things like the costs of juvenile delinquency, boys unable to meet the standards for military service, the unavailability

of scientists and engineers, and increased relief rolls.

Proposal No. 3, grants for higher education:

It is estimated that each year at least 100,000 of our ablest high school students stop their formal education for primarily economic reasons. The record is also clear that there is today a serious shortage of young men and women adequately trained in certain fields, such as teaching, science, and engineering.

I think we should seriously consider, and probably explore at least on an experimental basis, some of the proposals that have been made to meet these problems.

One of these proposals which seems to me to commend itself is for the establishment of a limited number of federally supported undergraduate scholarships or loans to students who want to go to college, are qualified to make good use of a college education, and will otherwise be denied this opportunity.

I think we should also consider the granting of fellowships, on a basis of merit and need, to specially qualified students who are prepared to commit themselves to service in teaching or in other fields of particularly acute shortage.

I realize that these proposals present many problems and implications which must be carefully and fully explored.

One of these is the desirability of so administering this program as not to affect the balance between public and private institutions. It has been urged, in this connection, that any program of scholarship or fellowship grants which may work more to the benefit of private than of public colleges and universities should be balanced by grants to States for aid to higher education in public institutions. The point is an important one and, whether in the suggested form or some other, should be taken into account.

If a loan, rather than a scholarship and fellowship, program appears advisable then I should think that arrangements would be worked out for making these loans through local banks, with appropriate government protection.

The problems of determining need and qualification would have to be met.

Any scholarship program of this kind would have to be carefully drawn and restricted to prevent abuses by the unworthy and also to prevent any displacement of the private philanthropy which has been and will continue to be indispensable to the development of our colleges and universities.

To avoid the political and administrative complications that such a program might entail, it might be well to place its administration in the hands of an impartial, competent organization outside the Federal Government, just as has been done with the eminently successful Fulbright program of awards to scholars for study abroad.

Both to avoid excessive costs and to permit adequate tryout of the operation of such a system I would recommend, as I have indicated, that it be undertaken originally on an experimental basis. But I cannot urge too strongly that something of this perhaps bold character will be required if we are going to meet the problem of high costs of higher education on the one hand and serious shortages of adequately trained young men and women on the other.

Proposal No. 4, expansion of exchange programs: I think we should continue and expand the exchange programs under which, in the last 7 years, over 42,000 grants have been made to enable Americans to study abroad and foreign students and scholars to visit the United States. At a time when this country has had to assume leadership of the free world, these programs have been of great value in giving our citizens fresh understanding of conditions abroad. They have also helped dispel myths and misunderstandings about this country overseas.

Proposal No. 5, expansion of vocational and adult education:

The Federal program of assistance for vocational education should be expanded. The present administration has sought on 2 occasions to cut the program, by 25 percent 1 year and by an additional 6 percent the next. Yet vocational education is given to only about one-half the students below the college level who need and want it; more than 5,000 high schools serving farm children lack programs of vocational agriculture.

The rapid pace of change in the world and the prospect of increased technical development and a shorter workweek, is driving home to us the important fact that a person's education should not and must not end with a school diploma or a college degree; it only begins there.

Opportunities for continuing education, all through life, must be an important ingredient of the new America. Already there are some 50 million Americans engaged in one form or another of adult education—more than the total enrollment of our elementary and secondary schools. The need and the demand will mount rapidly. What should we be doing to meet this important need? Obviously there are no easy answers. We must seek them out, try them out, apply them on an adequate scale.

A strong system of adult education will do many things for us as a nation. Not least of all it can liberate us from old passions and prejudices, it can help us as citizens find wiser answers to new and pressing public problems, and it can make us impervious to artificial answers in the form of hucksters' slogans.

This is another major educational challenge to which we must turn our attention, another national challenge calling for leadership at the highest level.

"In proportion as a Government gives forth to public opinion," said George Washington, "it is essential that public opinion shall be enlightened." Education is one of the pillars on which our freedom rests. When we neglect education, we weaken the whole foundation of free society. And when we neglect education in an age of global conflict, we risk the very safety of our Nation and the future of freedom in the world.

But, more than this, education is one means by which the individual can realize his own highest capacity.

It is essential, therefore, that education be available equally to all, without distinction or discrimination based on race or creed or color or economic condition.

The crisis in our schools is not only a challenge to democracy and to national security. Above all, it is a challenge to conscience—to our moral conviction of the worth of individual human beings, to our love and hopes for our children, and to our faith in America.

Thus far we have responded to the challenge by pious words, by conferences, by token gestures, by promise and postponement.

The time has now come to respond by deeds, courageous, decisive and strong, in the tradition of our Nation and in the spirit of our democracy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a comprehensive attempt to meet these basic educational problems is made in 3 of the 6 bills which I send to the desk today. These three are the School Construction Act of 1957, the Student Aid Act of 1957, and the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1957. Let me summarize these bills briefly.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

First of all, Mr. President, let me say that I am sure other proposals along these lines will be made, as others have already been made, by my colleagues in the Senate. I know that my good friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] introduced on the very first day of this session a school construction bill, which calls for Federal assistance for school construction. I know that the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has introduced in the past, and will introduce again, bills for Federal aid for school construction.

I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I well remember in the 83d Congress the determined fight made by the Senator from Kentucky for Federal aid for school construction. It gladdens my heart to know that he is with us, ready to fight for that kind of program again this year. It is a program in which he believes.

The first of my bills, Mr. President, is entitled the "School Construction Act of 1957" and is similar to S. 480 which I introduced in the 84th Congress.

This bill results from extensive hearings in both the Senate and the House during the past several years. It would authorize Federal financial assistance to build schools, but it would leave responsibility for administering the actual construction with the State and local school authorities who are acquainted with local needs. Its requirement for State plans to be approved by the United States Commissioner of Education will insure that the Federal funds will go where they are most needed in each State.

It was my privilege as a Senator to hold the first hearings ever held in the United States Congress on the subject of Federal aid for school construction. I held those hearings in the spring of 1949, as a very junior Senator and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The first act authorizing Federal assistance for school construction was the result of those hearings. That act was passed in the 81st Congress, and provided for Federal assistance for communities which were under what we called Federal impact. It was designed to assist communities with Federal installations which increased the school populations in those areas.

Under that Federal School Construction Assistance Act literally hundreds of millions of dollars have gone into communities in which there are located Federal military reservations, defense plants, and large numbers of Federal employees. In fact, the metropolitan area of Washington, including the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia, benefit from that school-construction program.

In that connection, I should like to pay tribute to the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, who joined me, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in pressing for the passage of that legislation. I remember very well when we were able to get a $5 million appropriation with which to make a nationwide study of school needs. That nationwide study was completed by the end of the 82d Congress. The study was put on the desk of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. That study was complete with respect

to every State and Territory of the United States. It was accomplished through the splendid cooperation of the local school districts and State school officers and authorities. That study is available to any citizen who wishes to read it. All he need do to get a copy is to communicate with his Representative or Senator, or ask for a copy of it at the office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, that study is as accurate today as it was 2 or 3 years ago, except that the problem is more pressing and the need for effective action is far more urgent.

I will continue to do some harassing along this line until worthwhile action is taken. Apparently the way to get something done in Washington is to bother the living daylights out of all concerned until they finally give up and do something about it. So, Mr. President, I will start the bothering process right now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is referring only to this one issue, as I understand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comment, because there are other bills that we also need to pass. I know I will have the cooperation of my friend from Oregon in bringing this issue to the attention of our colleagues and the country.

Mr. President, the bill will do what the Federal Government should do to help solve one of our most pressing national domestic problems.

The amount of Federal funds to be expended is left unspecified in the bill; this amount would be as determined by Congress. The funds would be distributed to the States according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age in each State. The States and local school districts would be required to match the Federal funds dollar for dollar.

In order to make certain that the Federal funds will not be substituted for State and local funds which would otherwise be spent for school construction, each State educational agency would be required to submit a State plan of operation. This State plan would describe the program developed in each State, provide for full fiscal accountability by the State agency to the Federal Government for all Federal funds, provide for the establishment of standards for locating, planning, and constructing school facilities, and provide for reports to the Commissioner of Education concerning how the Federal funds have been expended.

The most important aspect of the State plan required by the bill, however, would be that each State would be required to set forth principles for determining the relative priority of school facility construction projects, taking into account the relative financial resources of local school districts, the relative local efforts which have been and are being made to meet school needs out of State and local funds, and the relative urgency of local needs for the school facilities according to the extent of overcrowding, the extent of lack of facilities, and the extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are currently in use.

Following the approval of each State plan by the United States Commissioner of Education, the administration and allocation among local school districts would be conducted by the State agency for education.

Under the provisions of the bill, it would be impossible for any Federal agency to control in any way the programs of instruction in schools. The Federal Government would be a financial partner with the States and local school districts in constructing schools where they are most needed in each State, but the actual planning and construction of the schools would be left to the State education agencies and to the local school districts within each State.

Mr. President, particularly after the unfortunate record of inaction on school construction in the 84th Congress, the need for early action is obvious. It is long overdue. Members of the Senate may recall that during the 81st Congress I was chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on School Construction. Our hearings even then—8 years ago—demonstrated an urgent demand for action by the Congress to help to alleviate the pressive school construction problem. The hearings before our committee even then disclosed that untold numbers of children were attending school in unsafe buildings, many of them fire traps, and were going to school in shifts like factory workers—indeed, a sorry reflection on the values of our society. These findings have now been confirmed many times, the problems have multiplied, and the situation is becoming progressively worse.

Information collected last year by the White House Conference on Education indicated that there is a shortage of at least 200,000 classrooms, about 150,000 of which represent the backlog needs and 50,000 represent the rooms required annually to handle increased enrollment.

President Eisenhower in his latest state of the Union message asked Congress to give high priority to a school construction bill. I may be pardoned if I suggest that I hope that the President himself will also give high priority to leadership on this issue among the recalcitrants and waverers in his own party, or in my own party, without whose active help we shall have another year of unbuilt schools. I commend his bill to the attention of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and hope that hearings may speedily begin on this and similar measures so that we in the Congress can fulfill our responsibilities on this matter without further delay.

I am not concerned about whose bill is reported. I am not concerned about who is the author of the bill. What I am concerned about is having a bill reported which will meet the school construction needs of our country.

FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. President, now let me say a word about Federal scholarships. My second bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, would, among other things, establish a Federal scholarship program and would provide annual appropriations for it.

The appropriations would begin in fiscal 1958, with $40 million. They are to increase by $40 million each year. The authorization is for $160 million in 1961. At this figure, the appropriations would remain static.

I do not want to hear anyone say that that is going to be a lot of money. I have been hearing testimony within the past few days to the effect that we may send more money than that to countries which have oil royalties running as high as $200 million or $300 million. So $160 million for Federal scholarships for the young people of America is indeed a modest sum.

The scholarships are to be awarded to high school students everywhere in the United States for higher education, free, of course, from discrimination for reasons of sex, creed, or race. Each State is to have its quota of scholarships based on a formula providing that one-half of the total number of scholarships shall be allotted among the States in percentages equal to the percentage the State's high-school graduates bear to the national total of high-school graduates for the year. The remaining one-half are to be allotted in the proportion that the State's population between 19 and 21 bears to the national total population of that age.

Any high-school graduate would be eligible to apply for a scholarship. From among those applying, those showing greatest promise would be granted certificates of scholarship. Stipends would be granted to the neediest among these scholars, the amount of the stipend varying with the demonstrated need of the recipient, but not exceeding $1,000 per academic year, for a maximum of 4 years. The recipient could attend any bona fide college or university of his choice which would admit him; and so long as he continued in good standing at the educational institution, his stipend would be paid directly to him in installments suited to the demands of the academic year.

During a time of active hostilities, or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, at least 60 percent of the stipends must go to students engaging in studies which are determined in a manner prescribed by the President to be related to the national defense or defense-supporting activities.

The only further qualifications for scholarships are that the recipient must first, have a certificate of graduation from a high school of that State or, if graduated from an out-of-State high school have followed the course of studies recognized as adequate by his own State; second, he must not be eligible for veterans' educational training; third, the recipient must apply for the scholarship in accordance with State rules; and fourth, he must not have had any Federal scholarship under this or any other act vacated except for good cause.

The bill contemplates that when the program is in full operation approximately 50,000 to 60,000 men and women

will enter college or university each year with the aid of Federal stipends of varying amounts.

The scholarship commissions in each State would receive applications from students, conduct the objective examinations to select the abler among the applicants, assess the financial need of those qualifying as scholars, and allot the amount of the stipend in each case.

Provision is also made for consultation between the Office of Education and the various Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense, which operate special programs of aid to undergraduate and graduate students so as to assure full coordination of their Federal scholarship program with other federally supported programs.

While the bill, if enacted, is to be administered by the Commissioner of Education, and while he will be assisted by the National Council on Student Aid of 12 members to represent organizational and professional interests, nevertheless the bill makes it very clear that there will be no Federal direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution.

The student scholarship recipient makes his own choice of the institution of higher learning which he wishes to attend.

FACILITIES ASSISTANCE

Clearly, Mr. President, institutions already burdened with swollen enrollments ought not to be expected to handle additionally expanded student bodies, as a result of the new scholarship program, without some consideration being given to easing the pressure on existing facilities by assisting in their expansion. Legislation ought not to ease the financial burden currently barring talented youth from college attendance while ignoring the disproportionately increased load placed on the educational institutions by the increased attendance. We do not solve our total problems by solving a difficulty at one end of the spectrum which will create a new one at the other.

Hence, Mr. President, I have tried in this bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, to suggest a means of compensating the institution itself for its estimated costs of providing education to the new scholarship holder over and above the amounts it receives from the student for providing the education. Under title IV of this bill, the Commissioner of Education is instructed to work out a formula with each institution on a cost-of-services-rendered basis, including an amount for instruction, plant operation, administration, library costs, and any other costs reasonably allocable to providing educational services. The student himself would technically be the carrier of this grant, not to exceed $500 per year per scholarship student. The grant would follow from his choice of institution and would be payable to that institution on a basis worked out separately between the Commissioner and the institution.

The cost-formula technique admittedly leaves some discretion in the hands of the Commissioner who, incidentally, will also be advised by the National Council established in the bill. The formula feature has nevertheless seemed advisable, because it has appeared to be desirable to go beyond any simple "cost of instruction," "teaching salary," "flat grant," or "customary fees and charges" basis for reimbursement for institutional costs. Past experience, under the GI bill particularly, has proved these factors to be highly ambiguous, unstable, and unsatisfactory. I frankly offer this proposal on facilities assistance, aware of the difficulties involved, in the hope that the proposal may be further refined and improved. Of its fundamental equity and necessity, I have no doubt at all.

STUDENT LOANS AND TEACHER'S WRITEOFF

Mr. President, another feature of the bill, the Student Aid Act of 1957, establishes a long-term, low-interest loan program for college students, authorizing insurance of up to $25 million in loans each year, with a maximum loan of $1,000 per student in any academic year and a total maximum of a $4,000 outstanding loan to any one student.

The loan-insurance program would eventually be self-financing, with the participating colleges and universities paying insurance premiums into a revolving fund established in the United States Treasury, out of which 80 percent of the loss on each insured student loan would be paid. One million dollars is the initial authorization for this fund. The interest rate charged the student would be geared to the average interest paid on marketable United States Treasury obligations. The institution would be permitted to charge the student this rate plus an additional amount of not more than 1 percent, plus the insurance premium charged by the Federal Government.

The student would not have to start repaying the principal of his loan until 4 years after he completes his education, and then would be given an additional 6 years to repay it. The institution could charge an additional 1 percent interest beginning at the time payments on the principal become due. Not contemplated in previously proposed legislation in this field is a form of compensation for the loan which emphasizes a point I have stressed earlier: the teacher shortage.

In its report, Teachers for Tomorrow, issued a year ago, the Fund for the Advancement of Education pointed out that about one-fifth of all 1954 graduates of 4-year colleges entered schoolteaching. But during the next 10 years one-half of all college graduates of every variety would have to enter schoolteaching in order to fill our needs, even assuming a high projection of college graduates.

In other words, one-fifth of the number of students graduated would enter the teaching profession, but 50 percent are needed. Obviously, we are not going to obtain that percentage, but we can do what is possible to close the gap.

Mr. President, a special feature of this bill is an incentive to graduates to enter the teaching profession, by forgiving the average amount of money borrowed by the student in any one academic year for every full academic year of teaching which the graduate completes in a public or private secondary school or in an institution of higher learning.

In other words, if the graduate borrowed $4,000 and then taught for 1 year, one-quarter of his loan would be forgiven. If he taught for 4 years, all of his loan would be forgiven. That would give a person an incentive to enter upon a teaching career.

Thus a student awarded a loan to advance his education may repay the loan in part or in full by teaching. It may reasonably be expected, too, that the Government scholarships which require no repayment—those to especially gifted needy students—may also yield the country a new, badly needed supply of instructors and professors in the higher institutions of learning. Thus, in this feature the bill seeks to achieve two goals: provision for education of the gifted by scholarships, and of the worthy by loans, and the consequent increase of our teacher personnel from both groups. Loan repayments may be forgiven by teaching in primary schools, in secondary schools, or in colleges. If this phase of the project works out as contemplated, we shall have gone a measurable way toward easing our teacher shortage, at least in its more acute emergency stages.

INCOME-TAX CREDIT

Mr. President, up to this point the scope of this proposed legislation has helped to build schools. It has opened the door of higher learning to our youth. It has given consideration to the new needs of higher institutions of learning for facilities assistance. It has made a hopeful dent in the teacher shortage.

At this point the proposed legislation reaches out beyond the student, and includes the parents, in an overall attack on the problems of financial hardship and inducement. Embodied in my next bill, the Educational Tax Credit Act of 1957, is a 30-percent credit against the income tax for payments made by the taxpayer to educational institutions during the taxable year for the cost of tuition and fees for students above the 12th grade. A $450 limit is imposed on this tax credit per year.

This provision, in other words, would permit any individual to charge off against his net income tax 30 percent, but not to exceed $450 in any taxable year, of the cost of tuition and fees which that person may pay for the education of himself or any other person.

In other words, Mr. President, if a citizen has an income tax of $1,000, and if he has paid $450 in college tuition for his son or daughter, the taxpayer will subtract the $450 from his tax. Under the bill there will be a maximum credit of $450, because those who can afford to send students to much more expensive institutions are generally persons of higher income and greater means. This program is directed toward inducing parents in the middle-income group and the lower-income group to send their sons and daughters to college, and to help contribute to their college education. When the parents make

a contribution toward such college education up to a maximum of $450 a year, they will be entitled to that payment as a tax credit.

Some persons no doubt will say that this bill will cost a great deal of revenue. I have investigated that situation, Mr. President. In a larger sense, the bill will not cost any revenue at all, of course, because the way to create revenue is to create brainpower; and if, as a result of enactment of the bill, a number of additional trained students graduate from college, we may expect greater income for the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe the purpose of this bill is self-evident. Both as an inducement for higher education and as a relief measure for the family budget, we shall be removing a serious handicap for many American families by enacting this bill. It is similar to proposed legislation already pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. I introduced the bill in the hope that Senate committee consideration may begin prior to House action.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY

So much, Mr. President, for the formal educational aspects of the proposed legislation I introduce today. Earlier in my remarks, I stressed that there were nonacademic aspects of our youth problem, as well. No one can concern himself with the field of youth opportunity without considering our mounting national problem of juvenile delinquency. This whole area has been given careful consideration by Congress in previous sessions. One of the misfortunes of the 84th Congress was the failure of the House of Representatives to act upon S. 4267, a bill which passed the Senate.

In the report on that bill by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate are statistics that provide a harrowing picture. The testimony before the committee showed that 1 out of every 13 children in the Nation between 10 and 17 years of age was in trouble with the law in 1954. About 1⅓ million, this testimony reported, were picked up by the police. Of these, the police referred 335,000 to the juvenile courts. This group, together with the 140,000 coming to court from other sources, made a total of 475,000 appearing in court. More than 40,000 were committed to training schools for delinquent youth.

We have it on the basis of this report that "unless the spiraling increase in juvenile delinquency can be arrested, the number of children between the ages of 10 and 17 getting into trouble with the police will increase to 2 million by 1960."

The first move, of course, is to prevent youngsters from taking the first misstep. We should anticipate and prevent. The second move is to help out of trouble the youngsters who have gotten into it, and put them on the road, as last year's report puts it, to "rehabilitation and useful citizenship." The checking of all this is well within the compass of Federal legislation. Juvenile delinquency, as last year's report made clear, is not a big-city problem. The evil increased 58 percent nationwide between 1948 and 1954. But the number of juvenile offenders appearing in courts serving populations of less than 100,000 increased 63 percent in the same period. And juvenile crime is not confined to slums.

What I am saying is that the problem is Federal in scope, and needs Federal attention, as well as State and local attention.

Consequently, Mr. President, I reintroduce the Delinquent Children's Act because it is a superb proposal, dealing on a highly enlightened level with a problem that concerns us all. Here, as in the related measures I have been itemizing, the broadest possible allowances are made for local direction, local autonomy, and local decision. A Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency is created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its function is to advise the Secretary and to present programs for decreasing the delinquency problem and for its control and treatment. The Council is to submit an annual report, and such other reports as it deems fit, in discussing the problem, the progress made in attacking it, and recommendations for the future. The bill authorizes the Council to comment upon applications for special projects, and authorizes the Secretary to utilize the services of Council members. Appropriations are authorized for State and local programs. These call for $5 million for the fiscal year 1958; $7,500,000 for the fiscal year 1959; and $10 million for the fiscal year 1960; and for each of the following 4 fiscal years, such sums as the Congress may determine.

The allotments to each State are to be made on the basis of the ratio its child population bears to the total child population of all the States. Each State is to be permitted a minimum allotment of $50,000. For the first year that the bill is in force, there is authorization for the appropriation of $5 million for the purpose of making grants for the training of personnel in nonprofit institutions of higher learning and for developing courses for such training.

Other financial provisions made in the bill are customary in legislation of this nature. These seek to make its administration economical and fair to all the States and the Federal Treasury, and are aimed at fulfilling the major purpose of diminishing, controlling, and treating juvenile delinquency in the United States. The Secretary is thus authorized to render technical assistance to the States, to disseminate reports and information, and to give out the results of investigations. The Secretary may make payments under this title in advance or by way of reimbursement.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate will proceed to the speedy repassage of the Delinquent Children's Act, and that the House will concur during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York, our esteemed friend, was the sponsor of this measure, and reported it to the Senate, which passed it. Before he left Washington, I talked with Senator Lehman, and asked him whether I might reintroduce this bill. He gladly consented. Hence, I am glad to say that I have done so with his blessing.

YOUTH CONSERVATION

Mr. President, the Delinquent Children's Act itself recognizes the fact that we have come into an age enlightened enough to treat the misdemeanors and felonies of children, not on the basis of punishment, but on the basis of prevention and rehabilitation. No child is born delinquent. We believe as we do not only for the sake of the children, who, of course, come first in our calculations, but also for the sake of the kind of society in which we want to live. This is the motivating factor behind all of the youth opportunity programs which I present today.

Our purpose must always be to provide a healthy avenue for the outlet of youthful energies. Youngsters must be given an opportunity to enjoy their youth, while at the same time serving productive purposes. One of the great seed ideas of our generation was the Civilian Conservation Corps. All of us know it as one of the most successful programs of its kind in the history of this form of legislation.

Mr. President, back in the 1930's some of our most able citizens went into the CCC camps, as boys. Members of Congress by the dozens were then young men, back in the 1930's, in the CCC camps; they will testify to the effectiveness of that program. It may be a useful concept for us to restudy, in our efforts to provide a youth opportunity program in a climate of achievement and well-being.

Mr. President, it is with all this in mind that I introduce my fifth bill today, entitled the Youth Conservation Act of 1957. The bill will establish a Youth Conservation Commission consisting of representatives of the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Commission will do three things:

First. Study the practicability and advisability of using programs for the conservation of natural resources, including forest-stand improvement, forest insect and disease control, streambed stabilization, park construction and improvement, wildlife cover improvement, public recreational facilities construction and improvement, and other similar programs, as a means of providing training for young men.

Second. Advise the Director of the pilot Youth Conservation Corps established under this title with respect to the programs carried on by, and the operation of such corps, and study and evaluate such programs and operation for the purpose of making recommendations with respect to the continuation and expansion of such corps.

Third. Report the results of its study and pilot Youth Conservation Corps experience, together with its recommendations, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for transmittal, not later than January 1, 1959, to the President and the Congress. In making its study, the Commission shall give consideration to cooperation with State agencies in State conservation projects, and

shall consider the advisability of using the Youth Conservation Corps for personnel recruitment and training for Federal conservation activities.

The Youth Conservation Corps, mentioned above, will operate as a pilot project under the supervision of a Director, appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Director will have authority:

First. To establish and carry out a program for the corps in order to carry out the purposes of this act;

Second. To formulate rules and regulations for the operation of the corps;

Third. To appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, the principal subordinate officials of the corps; and to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations, such other civilian personnel as he deems necessary for the efficient and economical discharge of the functions of the corps, the compensation of all such appointees to be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

Fourth. To enter into agreements and otherwise cooperate with the National Park Service, of the Department of the Interior; the Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture; and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and with States and political subdivisions thereof, as well as with private organizations, in carrying out the purposes of this act; and

Fifth. To formulate such other rules and regulations, establish such other procedures, enter into such contracts and agreements, and generally perform such functions as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. President, under this bill the initial enrollment of the corps shall be not more than 500 persons and shall be open to unmarried male citizens of good character and good health, between the ages of 16 and 19 years. In order to enroll, any such person must agree to comply with the rules and regulations promulgated by the director for the government of the members of the corps.

(b) Enrollment in the corps shall be for a period of 1 year or such lesser time or times—including vacation periods for study—as may be established by the Director.

In addition to compensation of $75 a month, enrollees will be furnished with such quarters, subsistence, equipment, medical services, and hospital services as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

The bill authorizes $1 million for the fiscal year 1958, and such amounts thereafter as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. President, what I am trying to do is establish a few of these conservation corps camps as pilot projects, not necessarily modeled on the CCC, because that was established for a period which has long since passed. I hope the Commission will work with State, Federal, and private voluntary agencies to help establish pilot youth camps, so that young men between the ages of 16 and 19 can work in the forests and parks and contribute something constructive to our country, and something good for themselves in terms of their physical, mental, and spiritual health.

It is suggested that this program be tried on an experimental basis for a few large cities which have serious juvenile delinquency problems. The opportunity to work out of doors at useful tasks under the supervision of men of good influence would open up horizons not heretofore available to underprivileged youngsters.

I have even thought we could utilize the services of high school or college athletic directors who are not employed full time in the summer, and thus enable them to supplement their income and to aid the young men who would have this great experience of outdoor activity. If we will recall our own youth, we will remember the sense of admiration we had for our football, basketball, or baseball coach or the youth director in our community groups. These men could be mobilized as a part of a great corps of instructors.

All I am asking is that the Federal Government concentrate its attention on working with State, local, and private groups in establishing these pilot youth conservation projects, where God's finest product, His young, and the wonders of nature can work together. When that happens we shall have some improvement in the general physical and emotional health of our young people.

A greater degree of self-reliance, of practical know-how in getting along in the out-of-doors and with other people, a release from destructive idleness to constructive activity, would be some of the important results which could be expected. This bill provides an investment in America's future we cannot afford to pass up.

In summary, Mr. President, the purpose of this youth-opportunity program is to supplement existing agencies, both private and public, in the job of furnishing the Nation with a body of citizens prepared to master the problems they and their children are bound to inherit. In the deepest imaginable sense, it is a national defense program on the educational, preventive, and rehabilitative levels to provide for the survival of a free society.

I propose to open the door to higher education in America for every American with intellectual qualifications—the uniquely gifted and the competent alike—whose financial limitations now render this impossible.

The purpose of the youth-opportunity program is not to emphasize one phase of our educational lack to the neglect of another, and thus produce some overplus or imbalance 4 or 8 or 12 years hence. The intent of the composite of measures encompassed in the bills is to provide a balanced program, augmenting what we already have, and fitted to the conditions we are seeking to cure and the national misfortune we propose to avert.

I seek to build schools.

I seek to provide scholarships, by Government appropriation.

I seek to provide, for the institutions where the scholarships are to be exercised, added facilities compatible with the institutional needs the scholarships create.

I seek by a simple and practical devise of loan and inducement to help eliminate the present desperate teacher shortage.

I seek to provide liberal tax write-offs for parents who send their children to higher institutions of learning.

I seek to attack our problem of juvenile delinquency, both by prevention and rehabilitation.

I seek to provide healthy out-doors, constructive work for boys in the late teens—conservation projects in our national parks and forests.

This youth opportunity program provides the Senate of the United States with an opportunity to accept its responsibility on an extremely crucial and compelling front involving the Nation's greatest single asset—its youth. We could, through these proposals, discharge a long-delayed duty to our Nation by acknowledging our responsibility to youth and to the future. From another aspect, we could do here for the youth of America what we have already accepted as our responsibility in the matter of retired workers and the aged. With these measures we could complete the cycle of properly utilizing Government, within the limits of the principle of personal initiative and private property, for the public welfare.

Great issues at home and abroad confront our people. It is my conviction that, with the adoption of this youth opportunity program, history could well say that the Senate of the United States accepted one of the major challenges now facing the Nation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk 6 bills, the 5 I have summarized, and an omnibus measure combining them all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 867. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 868. A bill to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 869. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education and to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education;

S. 870. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools;

S. 871. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and

S. 872. A bill to provide school construction assistance to the States; to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education; to

provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education; to provide a 30 percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men; to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; and for other purposes.

THE 1957 BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently President Eisenhower submitted to Congress his unparalleled and monstrous 1957 budget for spending the money of this country's taxpayers.

In this budget he seeks more money for more giveaway programs. He seeks relief for unfriendly nations. He seeks funds for ungrateful lipservice allies. He seeks money for the agricultural development of millions of acres of foreign arid lands. He seeks almost unlimited credit for people all over the globe.

I notice that the President does not seek any money for the needy farmers of this Nation.

This terrifying fiscal monster, which even frightened the Secretary of the Treasury who helped create it for the President, carries no additional relief at all for any American citizen.

Only the other day the President was asked by the press if he felt it could be cut. The President replied that if it could be cut, he wished the Congress would find out where and tell him.

Mr. President of the Senate, I am here to tell the President not only how to cut this budget and where, but also how to help halt the inflation he worries so much about and does nothing about, but talk.

I remember 4 years ago he abolished wage and price controls and said they were unnecessary. Then for 4 years wages and prices—the latter always several laps ahead of the former—spiraled and spiraled. Last fall the President said inflation was a thing of the past and had been halted. Yet, within 2 months after his reelection, he was before Congress making it the key battle cry of his state of the Union message.

But this was not inconsistent enough for the President. In the face of all his pleading with the American people to stop spending, he sent to us the biggest spending-spree budget of any peacetime President in the Nation's history—even bigger than former President Truman's Korean war budget.

Mr. President, I know of no President in my lifetime who has been so ambiguous in his statements, so inconsistent in his policies, so effortless in aiding the people of his own country, and so successful in helping foreign countries as Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The President asked us where this budget can be cut. Why he does not know is beyond me. It is his budget. He wants this spending orgy. He says he wants to halt inflation. He says he wants to reduce the bigness in Government. Frankly, he wants too much.

I think the first thing we should do is to cut taxes. That is where all the money Eisenhower is spending is coming from. I mention that because some people seem to have forgotten that fact.

If we want to stop a little boy from buying too much candy, we cut his allowance. In this case, let us cut the Federal income and give the little taxpayers a break.

As I have preached for many years, I think we should increase tax exemptions from $600 to $800 for the individual taxpayers. This is the place to begin.

Then we should reduce our iniquitous foreign aid giveaway programs. We are giving away billions to nations all over the globe. And for what? It has been aptly proven too many times that money spent on foreign economic programs with no true military purpose is resented and makes enemies rather than friends. The President, in my opinion, is attempting to accomplish in the Mideast, with American taxpayers' money, and at the risk of American military involvement, that which the British and the French would have accomplished at their own financial expense and with their soldiers. The Eisenhower policy in the Mideast has made a hero out of our enemy, little Hitler Nasser, at the expense of and to the humiliation of our best friends.

We should immediately halt pouring hard-earned tax dollars down such drain holes.

Mr. President, I cannot think of a worse slap in the face to the farmers of the Midwestern States, who are begging for help in their desert plight, than to have this Government give $200 million to the Mideast for irrigation and water development projects, and in the same breath say that we cannot help our midwestern farmers as much as they should be helped.

But that is what we are doing. Last Sunday the Secretary of the Interior said on television that the proposed drought relief program of the administration for the Midwestern States was probably not enough to do the job but was enough for Government to do. I do not understand that type of philosophy. It seems we cannot do too much for antagonistic dictators of foreign countries but we can do too much for our own people.

In these Halls I have heard a great deal of criticism in my day of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. But under all those programs the welfare of the people of the United States was placed first, and not that of some foreign government, as is the case under the Eisenhower "raw deal."

We must cut taxes. We must cut down, not increase, foreign giveaway programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excellent article entitled "Ike's New Program," written by Henry Hazlitt, of Newsweek, and published in the January 21 issue of that magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE'S NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Eisenhower's state of the Union message is a curious document, praising free enterprise and Government economy in general terms while recommending more Government controls and special spending.

His discussion of inflation was typical. He admitted the Government's duty not to become "profligate in its expenditures." But then he called upon business to "avoid unnecessary price increases" and upon labor to refrain from "wage increases that outrun productivity." He implied that, if these two groups do not exercise "self-discipline," the Federal Government might be forced to return to price and wage controls.

The truth is that Government policy, particularly fiscal and monetary policy, must bear nine-tenths of the responsibility for inflation. Businessmen could not get higher prices for their goods unless Government policy provided consumers with more money to buy the goods. Labor could not get excessive wage rates without bringing about unemployment unless Government policy pumped out enough new money and credit to pay higher wages and raise prices. And it is inconsistent for the Government to ask unions to refrain from higher wage demands while it retains a network of Federal statutes which make it almost impossible for employers to refuse to yield to higher wage demands.

INVESTIGATING THE FED

The President went on to recommend creation of a commission to inquire into the "nature, performance, and adequacy of our financial system." Any assumption that such a group would consist of disinterested experts without already formed conclusions, and that they would discover hitherto unknown truths, is unrealistic. Once membership of the commission is known, it should not be too difficult to make a shrewd guess concerning its findings. We will be fortunate indeed if the proposed commission does not advocate reforms that would only make inflation easier.

But the most important immediate decision before Congress, even from the economic point of view, is still the President's proposal for discretionary power to commit American troops to "protect the territorial integrity and political independence" of any Middle Eastern nation requesting aid against Communist "armed aggression." This proposal seems to be a belated effort to correct the disastrous blunder the administration made when it voted with Egypt and Soviet Russia in the U. N. to demand that Britain, France, and Israel, as "aggressors," withdraw from Egypt, and do so without any assurance whatever of a settlement of the Suez Canal problem or the problem of Egyptian-Israeli relations.

WHAT WE DID AT SUEZ

Had we kept out of the situation altogether (or had we at least insisted on a two-sided resolution for the withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli troops from Egypt at the same rate as Russian troops withdrew from Hungary), it is probable that the canal would now be under the control of the British and French, and that Nasser, instead of Eden, would be "discredited." As it is, Nasser has become impossible; the canal is still blocked; huge oil reserves are cut off and in grave peril of falling under Russian control. The President seems to be proposing to try to do with American money and at the risk of American lives the very things he prevented Britain, France, and Israel from doing with their own money and at the risk of their own soldiers' lives.

There is grave doubt, even so, that the lone-hand policy now proposed by the President is the best alternative left to us. A much better course might be our simple adherence to the Baghdad pact. In any case there is no need whatever to authorize a bigger and special foreign-aid program. Resumption of Suez Canal traffic and the enormously profitable oil production and oil flow will give the Middle East all the economic aid

it needs. If Congress does feel obliged to give the President discretionary power to commit foreign troops abroad, that power should be as restricted and temporary as it can be made. There is no good reason why every foreign crisis should lead to more powers for the executive branch at the expense of Congress—particularly when it is the executive branch's blunders that have helped to produce the crisis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe this article well explains the ridiculous proposition now placed before the Congress by the President, as regards his budget, his foreign-aid program, and taxes.

Later I shall have more to say on foreign giveaway, on tax reductions, and our foreign policy. At this time I should like to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his forthright and fearless statement before the joint committee meeting yesterday regarding the administration's foreign policy. I am glad that the Senator from Arkansas has placed the issue squarely before the people. I feel there has not been enough of such fearless discussion regarding the white-elephant policies that have been developed by the ivory-tower leaders of the present administration.

I feel that the gloves are now off, and I hope we shall see in this Congress a return at last to our own peoples' interest by reducing taxes and foreign-aid spending.

Should we fail in this endeavor, I fear for the future. The road down which we are heading is that which many a previous great nation has stumbled. Unless we turn back, we shall destroy the goose that is laying the golden egg.

I hope these remarks will be read by other Senators and by the public. I believe that consideration of this problem at this time will bear fruit in the future, in the form of a reduction in spending and giveaways to foreign countries, and a disposition to give greater consideration to our own needy people in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH K. CARSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 20, 1956, a distinguished public servant from the State of Oregon passed away in his sleep. I refer to Joseph K. Carson, who not only was a distinguished public figure in my State, but a very close and dear friend.

In the late campaign in Oregon he was chairman of the statewide veterans committee working in behalf of my reelection.

In behalf of Mrs. Morse and myself, I wish to express publicly in the RECORD the sentiments which we have already expressed privately to Myrtle Carson, the wife of Joseph Carson, and to the members of their family. I wish to express our very deep sympathy over this great loss which they and our State have suffered.

Because I think it is the most fitting tribute I could possibly pay to this great Oregonian, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Oregonian of December 22, 1956, paying tribute to Joe Carson; also an editorial of December 21, from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, likewise paying tribute to this great citizen of our State.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of December 22, 1956]

JOSEPH K. CARSON, JR.

When Joseph K. Carson, Jr., took office as mayor of Portland in January 1933 he was largely unknown by the people he was to serve. Many questioned his ability to fill the shoes of the veteran George L. Baker, one of the greatest showmen in American municipal politics.

When he retired undefeated 8 years later, at the end of his second term, however, everyone knew him, and he rivaled Mr. Baker in public affection. He was the kind of man who naturally was called Joe, a man with a friendly grin on a cherub face. But he had proved in those 8 years also that he was an able executive.

A mayor could face no tougher test than Joe Carson surmounted in his 8 years of office. The depression was at its depth and free spending by Government agencies was prescribed as the cure. Democrat Carson, however, was critical of that phase of his party's national program. As nonpartisan chief of Portland he took the opposite tack, balanced the budget and reduced the debt from $50 million to $30 million. On top of that, the city during his administration started two farsighted improvement programs, sewage disposal and the Front Avenue project.

Mr. Carson was beset also by unprecedented violence in the labor field which he met with firmness and fairness. The longshore strike of 1934 was the most unpleasant event of his years in office, he said on retirement. The teamster goon cases, too, occurred during his administration.

Joe Carson served his country and community in many fields besides city hall. He was a soldier in both world wars, a member of the Maritime Commission from 1947 to 1950, a past State commander of the American Legion, and a worker in many civic enterprises. He will be remembered chiefly in Portland, however, as our mayor in a trying time, and as a likable, bouncy man whose nickname fitted him to perfection. It seems unjust of fate that death should claim him unexpectedly at the comparatively early age of 65.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of December 21, 1956]

CARSON REMEMBERED WITH AFFECTION

The passing of Joseph K. Carson brings to an end the career of a man who headed Portland's city government during one of its most turbulent periods and a man to whom politics was one of the most important parts of living.

Carson had considerable of the little giant about him and in or out of office his lance was set and he was tilting at something—sometimes at windmills but always at something.

For a man who had this deep and abiding love of politics, the satisfactions were few and far between. He lost races for the legislature, for Congress, and for the governor's chair and found his greatest success in the nonpartisan office of mayor.

This is an uneasy seat at best and being mayor during the depression years and the years of major strife on the labor front proved that little Joe was a fighter.

Probably most people have forgotten, but in those years when money was extremely dear, Carson reduced the city bonded debt some 25 percent.

It was during his years in office that some of the major reforms in city election practice were instituted. Among them were the numbering of city council positions and the primary elimination and November runoff system.

Prior to these changes, city council elections were something of a grab-bag affair with all candidates, in effect, running for all seats and the top men getting the vacancies.

The former mayor served with honor in two world wars and on the United States Maritime Commission.

He was combative but his fights rarely extended beyond the political arena. Those who knew Joe Carson remember him with affection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now wish to turn briefly to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESOLUTION ON MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I approach this subject with a sad and heavy heart, because in my judgment the subject matter involves the most important issue that will face this session of the Congress.

I refer to the resolution, known as the President's resolution on Middle East policy, which is pending for joint consideration before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have raised my voice in opposition to the extension to the President of the United States of what amounts to in fact unlimited discretionary powers. This is not the first time I have raised my voice in defense of the Constitution of the United States as I understand the meaning of that great document.

Not so long ago, Mr. President, I stood on the floor of the Senate, almost alone, supported on that occasion by only two colleagues, in opposition to the extension of a similar blank-check authority to the President of the United States in the Formosa Straits.

I warned then, as I do today, that it would be a precedent to extend such powers to the President. I warn today that if we adopt this second precedent, it will lead to a third and a fourth and a fifth precedent.

It is of the utmost importance that the American people understand what is involved in the proposal. Confident am I that if they understood it and were given an opportunity to pass judgment by popular referendum on the subject now before Congress, it would go down to overwhelming defeat at the hands of the people of the country, who would die by the millions if we were to lead them into what appears to be the great danger of unnecessary war in the Middle East.

FORMOSA RESOLUTION

I know full well that when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and expresses the deep convictions I shall express this afternoon, and rededicates himself to the constitutional concepts as our Constitutional Fathers intended them, he must expect, until the people

get the facts, to be criticized, castigated, and misunderstood.

The record shows that when I protested the Formosa Resolution, it was said on the floor of the Senate that my position might endanger the security of the Seventh Fleet. It was said that the point of view I expressed followed the Communist line. As the record shows, I refused to dignify with an answer such attacks.

MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION LACKS SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

I believe in meeting the merits of these issues. Therefore, the first point I wish to make this afternoon is that I am waiting for the first scintilla of evidence to be presented by the Secretary of State that there is any danger of an armed attack by the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

I say to the American people that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States telling them so does not make it so.

I have grown a little weary of the sanctimonious, pontifical, political, and hypocritical pronouncements of this administration in the field of foreign policy. In my judgment the time has come when the American people are entitled to know the facts, and all the facts, about American foreign policy. I believe they are entitled to know the facts, and all the facts, about why we find ourselves confronted with this situation in the Middle East.

That is why I so heartily joined the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday during the joint meeting of the Committees on Foreign Relations and on Armed Services, in the courageous and statesmanlike pronouncement he made, when he called upon the Secretary of State to supply us with a white paper on the events that led up to the debacle which now characterizes American foreign policy in the Middle East.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION REQUIRES CAREFUL DELIBERATION

I wish to say to the American people, from this desk on the floor of the Senate, that all the forces of the reactionary press of this country, backing up this reactionary administration, will blaze in their headlines, "Emergency!" and will castigate those of us who urge that we take the time to find out the facts.

Whenever this administration wants to roll over us with a steamroller, as it is attempting to do again in this situation, it raises the cry, "Emergency! No time!" That cry is always raised.

Well, Mr. President, this administration has had plenty of time to change to a course of action which, in my judgment, would have given us an entirely different picture in the Middle East today if only it had changed that course of action.

I am not impressed by the testimony of the Secretary of State about emergency and urgency and the necessity, according to him, of avoiding so-called delay.

I want no more delay than is necessary to have that due deliberation which is required in order to get all the facts to the American people. I ask the American people: What do you know about American foreign policy? The answer is that the average citizen knows very little about American foreign policy. That is so because, for the most part, the average American citizen has been fed the clichés and slogans and propaganda of this administration. He has not been told the facts behind American foreign policy. The line is taken that he must not be told those facts because such telling would disclose secrets, and the enemy might get those secrets; therefore, it is not safe to tell the facts to the American people.

Well, Mr. President, I believe that even my bitterest critic will give me credit for this, that I have no desire at any time to follow any course of action which will disclose publicly a true secret which would truly endanger the security of our country.

However, I wish to point out again that we have gone too far in America toward police state techniques, too far in keeping from the American people information they ought to have about this country's foreign policy.

I believe that the American people are entitled to the kind of white paper which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] called for yesterday in committee, so that we might know the true situation in the Middle East before we in Congress are called upon to act.

During the historic debate which is about to open in the Senate of the United States, I shall raise my voice time and time again calling for all the facts.

CONGRESS MUST BE CONSTRUCTIVE AS WELL AS CRITICAL

I know of no time in my 12 years in the Senate when I have offered criticism without being willing at the same time to offer a constructive and affirmative program, as my judgment gives me the ability to see what I believe to be a constructive and affirmative program, to correct the problem I criticize. I believe I would fail in the public trust which I owe to the people of the sovereign State I represent if today in my first speech on the subject, I should offer criticisms of the Eisenhower resolution and not offer what I consider to be an affirmative and constructive substitute for the resolution.

Therefore, in this brief speech today, I offer, and will at the close of my remarks send to the desk, a substitute resolution which I believe will accomplish all the legitimate purposes of the President's resolution, and yet will keep faith with the pattern of our constitutional checks. At the same time it will serve clear notice on Russia that if she attempts military aggression against any free nation, she will have us to deal with, and also, I hope, with our allies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon, during the course of his remarks, will read the text of his resolution into the RECORD, so that we may become familiar with what he is discussing and have the benefit of it in listening to the balance of his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss it in detail, section by section.

COMMUNIST MENACE REQUIRES CONCERTED ACTION FROM FREE NATIONS OF THE WORLD THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, I yield to no one in the Senate in my concern and fear about Russia's nefarious designs. I believe she is playing for the long pull of decades. I believe she intends over the long pull of the decades to follow courses of action which, she hopes, will finally subvert all the world to the totalitarianism of communism.

That is why I have been heard to say so many times—and I repeat it today—that I believe the free nations of the world should act in concert against this totalitarianism, and I believe they should act in concert through the United Nations, and not outside the United Nations.

One of my many criticisms of the Secretary of State is that his record is a sorry record of almost invariably, in the first instance, when a new crisis arises, of bypassing the United Nations, but finally, on some occasions, finding himself in a position where ultimately he has to try to operate through the United Nations.

When the Middle East crisis first arose, there were some of us who urged immediate action by the United Nations. We were told by the State Department and the White House that it was not the appropriate time. Subsequent events showed that it was not the appropriate time, apparently, because Mr. Dulles had not yet completed his manipulations, or attempted manipulations, to maneuver around the United Nations. But his actions boomeranged on him.

Several weeks after some of us had urged that the United Nations ought to be called upon to take jurisdiction in the matter, and had urged that the United States ought, by way of a resolution, to try to have called a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations immediately following the call of the Security Council meeting to take cognizance of the problem, this administration did follow that course of action. But it was too late. I say "too late," because, in the meantime, we had affronted great allies. In fact, they apparently had so little confidence in the foreign policy of the United States and in those responsible for it that two of those great allies—Great Britain and France—acted and worked in secret, so far as the United States was concerned, in the Middle East.

MIDDLE EAST DEBACLE REVEALS FAILURE OF WHITE HOUSE AND STATE DEPARTMENT TO MAINTAIN THE CONFIDENCE OF OUR MAJOR ALLIES

I would have the American people remember what I say here this afternoon: If they want any proof as to the low ebb to which American foreign policy under the present State Department has sunk, they have only to keep in mind the fact that Great Britain and France acted in secret, so far as the American Secretary of State is concerned—and he so testified before our committee. He did not even know what Great Britain and France were up to. Only as late as the Saturday before the Monday when Israel revealed her intentions did our State Department have a suspicion, apparently, that Israel was up to some

drastic course of action, such as was shown by the mobilization of her forces.

Oh, Mr. President, a great vacuum was created in the Middle East. A part of the cause of that vacuum rests squarely on the doorstep of the White House itself and on the doorstep of the Secretary of State because of their delay, because of their failure, to use the position of American leadership in the world through the United Nations in respect to the Middle East crisis.

Now where are we? All the camouflage of language, all the pontifical pronouncements by the President and the Secretary of State will not change the fact that the United States now stands practically alone in the Middle East. That is evidenced by the fact that the slightest suggestion any of us have made in the hearings that the United States should see what can be done to get England and France to join with us and to pledge their boys, along with ours, to defend the Middle East against Soviet aggression is met by the Secretary of State with such vague answers and generalities as to indicate that he does not think such a proposal would be acceptable to other countries in the Middle East.

Have we reached the point where we are going to let other countries in the Middle East call the tune and determine for us who our allies will be under a program as drastic as the program proposed by the resolution which is under consideration? What kind of resolution is it? It proposes unilateral action on the part of the United States outside the United Nations. All the talk by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in regard to article 51 of the United Nations Charter is a diversionary tactic, and they know it. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter does not in any way make the resolution an instrument of the United Nations. The resolution is a unilateral instrument of the United States acting outside the United Nations.

No matter what criticism befalls me, let me say on the floor of the United States Senate this afternoon that I shall never vote for a resolution which puts my Government in a position where unilaterally the United States pledges American boys to save the oil lines for Western Europe without a pledge at the same time by the nations of Western Europe to use their boys.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL IS ACTUALLY PLEDGE TO PROTECT ARABIAN OIL WITH AMERICAN BOYS

I mentioned the oil lines. The American people had better face the reality. Some would call it the ugly fact. I call it the economic reality; the reality that, when all is said and done, the resolution, boiled down to its essence, means we are serving notice on Russia that she is not going to get the oil of the Middle East without a fight with us. That is what it means.

Mr. President, the resolution spells three letters—o-i-l. Let us take a look at the economic reality of those three letters.

The testimony before us is that the economy of Western Europe is dependent upon the maintenance of a supply of oil from the Middle East to Western Europe. No one can doubt that. That is an economic fact. Cut from Western Europe the supply of Middle East oil, and in not too great a length of time the economy of Western Europe will be in a serious depression.

That will have direct effects upon the United States. The prosperity and the standard of living of the American people are dependent in some measure upon the economy of Western Europe. Certainly, we have learned in the last 20 years that we cannot live unto ourselves economically. Certainly, we have learned that we must look now upon the economics of the world as really the economics of both our front and back doors. I recognize that.

If Western Europe loses her supply of oil from the Middle East it will be necessary for the United States to supply the oil to her from our own resources—and they are limited; they will not last in perpetuity. If we supply Western Europe with our oil, it will be at a terrific security cost to the United States.

Therefore, as a liberal, I say to the liberals of America from this desk today, "You cannot ignore the fact that the economic and political security of America is more dependent upon oil than some would like to admit."

But, Mr. President, is it our obligation alone? Is it our responsibility alone? Is it only American boys who are to be pledged to defend those oil lines? Not with my vote.

In the resolution, which I shall read shortly, I have a section which seeks to cover this point, because I think we have the right to call upon our allies in Western Europe to pledge that in case of Russian military aggression in the Middle East they will join with us in meeting that aggression.

I do not propose to let any Arab dictator exact from my Government a resolution which does not mention Western Europe, but mentions only a unilateral American pledge. I would have the Arab dictators keep in mind the fact that the economic and military program envisioned by the resolution is one which protects their survival; because without us, and without Western Europe, it would be only a matter of time, if Russia so decided, before they would find themselves under the conquering heel of communism.

ADMINISTRATION RESOLUTION WOULD PROTECT ARAB TOTALITARIANISM AT EXPENSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Speaking only hypothetically, and only for illustrative purposes, and not with the purpose of proposing it seriously, Mr. President, I would make this comment, however: Sometimes in reflection upon this problem, I say to myself, "I wonder whether it would not teach these Arab dictators something about the true meaning of human freedom and liberty if they had to spend a decade or two in the boiling oil of communism and totalitarianism, where human liberty and human freedom burn to ashes?"

Mr. President, there is nothing about the protection of human liberty and the dignity of the individual in the great majority of these Arab dictatorships, that causes me, figuratively speaking, to bleed at the heart for their survival. In fact, Mr. President, something can be said in criticism of an American policy which seems always to find itself in a position where it is protecting and securing totalitarianism of the Fascist monarchial type. I happen to think that the police-state techniques of Fascist dictatorships and absolute monarchial dictatorships closely resemble the techniques of the police-state methods of communism, because there is no dignity for the individual under any kind of dictatorship.

So, Mr. President, let us face it: When we make the pledge under the resolution, for the most part we are pledging to make secure, in so far as governments are concerned, shocking dictatorships in the Arab world. In the entire area, perhaps the only state of which it can be said that human freedom is protected to the degree that we in this country seek to protect it, is the State of Israel, a child of the United Nations; a country for whom I hold no brief, in so far as its transgressions against the United Nations Charter are concerned, but a country whose transgressions can better be understood if we take the time to study the provocations which led to them; and a country which today is greatly concerned about this resolution because it does not provide a single guarantee to the protection of Israel from invasion by the Arab States.

The only protection is a guaranty that if Israel were about to be overrun by military action by Russia, we would go to Israel's assistance. Certainly I think that as of now, that danger is most remote. In fact, without disclosing committee confidence that I am not permitted to disclose, I will say in this broad, general statement that in recent days I have listened to testimony of expert witnesses, representatives of our Government, who have had long experience in the Middle East; and when I asked one of them, "Do you think there is any present danger of a military attack on the part of the Soviet Union against any Middle East country?" I received the only reply which any facts which have been submitted to us to date justify; and the reply was "No."

Yet the Secretary of State takes the stand, crying "Wolf, Wolf" again, talking about urgency and emergency, seeking to frighten the American people into believing that if the resolution is not adopted as of yesterday, we shall be jeopardizing the security of the United States.

Mr. President, we in political life know part of that strategy. Part of the strategy is to try to scare the constituents back home; and then when a voice is raised in protest of an administration policy, the hope is that the speaker will be flooded with letters and telegrams in which he is urged to back the President. Then, when we respectfully ask our constituents, "What do you know about the President's proposal," they are quick to confess that they do not know about it, but they think it should be taken on faith.

Mr. President, I did not take the oath of office at your desk to take on faith any proposal of any President of the United States, and I do not intend to do

so. I will take my positions in the Senate on the basis of what I honestly believe the facts to be. When a President does not give me the facts, I intend to do the best job I can of smoking out the facts.

Mr. President, I have pointed out that under the President's resolution, there first would be unilateral action on the part of the United States. Secondly, under the President's resolution, there would be a pledge of the use of American boys, if necessary, to protect the oil lines so vital to the economy of Western Europe. In the third place, Mr. President, I have pointed out that the states we seek to protect and make secure are, for the most part, totalitarian. In fact, in some of them the institution of human slavery still exists. I wonder whether that is why this administration has not seen fit to join in an international compact against human slavery.

Mr. President, there once lived a great American by the name of Abraham Lincoln, who symbolizes in American history the ideal that the American people do not stand for human slavery. This administration can roll out the carpet, if it wants to, to foreign dignitaries from totalitarian governments that still foster human slavery; but I do not propose to pay them either public or private homage, because I say that in this battle for freedom around the world, it still is not too late for my country to make clear to the millions of people among whom this fight for freedom is to be won that we believe in practicing the ideals we profess. But, Mr. President, we do not practice the ideals we profess when we follow a course of action in the Middle East that tacitly underwrites or countenances or tolerates an institution of human slavery.

Then the resolution, in the fourth place, Mr. President, proposes economic aid to these Arab countries. Mr. President, let me say to the taxpayers of America that the resolution proposes the making of grants to these Arab countries. That is why some of us, in asking our questions, in recent days, of the Secretary of State, stressed a point which I wish to stress in this speech, namely, the importance of implementing any resolution we adopt with a condition that where the wealth of the country concerned permits of it, the aid shall be in the form of loans, not grants. Mr. President, I say that because, as I put in the record of the hearings yesterday afternoon, the wealth of many of these countries is tremendous. I asked, through the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, to have the Library of Congress prepare for me an analysis of the potential revenues from oil of the group of Arab countries which have great oil reserves. I placed that analysis in the hearing record. Mr. President, do you know how much it is? Based upon 1955 production and 1955 prices it is $98,400,000,000. Mr. President, I say to President Eisenhower, "Tell this to the taxpayers of the United States." I say to Secretary of State Dulles, "Modify your resolution, because you cannot in good conscience, you cannot from the standpoint of political morality, justify asking the American people to grant taxpayer dollars to Arab countries which have a potential revenue from oil of $98,400,000,000."

Mr. President, if the President thinks he can, let him submit this matter to a referendum of the American people. There is no urgency about it. Let us have a public debate for 2 weeks. Then let us set a special election in the United States, and let the President take the question to the people of the country. Then some interesting questions will be asked of him; he will be asked why there has been such a change in his talk subsequent to November 6, as compared with what he had to say on this matter prior to November 6.

No, Mr. President, this is an oil resolution. Oil is vital to the economic prosperity of Western Europe and of the United States, but even oil can cost too much, and I do not propose to pay for it the price of human liberty and freedom. I do not propose to sacrifice an ideal of human dignity. I do not propose to support unilateral action on the part of this President or any other President because oil is worth so much economically. What does it profit a man if he loses his ideals, Mr. President, but keeps a high standard of living? In the judgment of history, Mr. President, he will be condemned if he follows that course of action.

ADMINISTRATION RESOLUTION IGNORES GRAVE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

I turn to my fifth and last point before I present the resolution, Mr. President. I have already alluded to it. It is a constitutional question. The Secretary of State, under examination, admitted that the Congress cannot delegate the power to declare war. But he is a very interesting witness. After making that admission, then, typical of his testimony, he seeks to divert attention away from that admission by saying, "Wars are not declared any more, after all. A state of war is upon us, and what we do is recognize that a state of war exists."

One gets the impression, Mr. President, that that was something new in international relations. But the fact is, as I pointed out, in the hearings, that in each and every one of the recent wars in which we have participated in recent decades, save and except the Korean war—and it was a mistake not to do it then, and I said so the next day after the troops were ordered into Korea, and I said so on the side of the aisle opposite from the side on which I now stand, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—there was a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. Certainly, attacks have been made upon us as at Pearl Harbor, and by the policies of Hitler, but even so we passed a formal declaration of war when we resisted them.

How important that is in our constitutional system, because it is at that point, Mr. President, that the constitutional fathers guaranteed to the American people a check upon the President of the United States. The remark might be made, "Oh, Mr. Senator, you speak hypothetically, speculatively. It must be assumed that when the situation of an attack exists, a declaration of war is going to follow." I think so, too, Mr. President. Yet it is of vital importance that the Congress exercise that check, because it is conceivable that something might happen to these democratic processes of ours in the decades ahead whereby, sometime in the future, we might have a President against whom that check should be exercised. But here, Mr. President, as I said in the hearings and as I said at the time of the discussion of the Formosa Resolution—the President is asking for predated action by the Congress of the United States. He is asking for approval in advance. He is asking for a blank check, knowing that if he gets it, whatever decision he renders, Congress will consider itself estopped from imposing a check. I think that is constitutionally dangerous. I have not changed my opinion, since the debate on the Formosa Resolution, as to the constitutional aspects of the request. Oh, I know, Mr. President, we shall never get the question before the Supreme Court squarely for a decision; but I am satisfied that, from the standpoint of constitutional law, we do not have the constitutional authority to give a President a blank check to commit an act of war.

There is another facet of this constitutional question, which the transcript of the record will show, about which the Secretary of State was particularly evasive. I put the question in the form of a hypothesis. I put it in the RECORD today. Suppose, Mr. President, that a President of the United States, under his emergency powers, orders American troops into combat prior to a declaration of war. Does the Congress of the United States have the constitutional authority to rescind that action, or is it limited, under the Constitution, to the procedure of impeaching the President?

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that, under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress has the authority to order the troops back home. If the President does not recognize and accept that action of Congress, then, and only then, the question arises as to whether or not he is in such defiance of the constitutional rights of the Congress that an action for impeachment might exist.

So you will see, Mr. President, as I read my resolution, that I have covered this constitutional point because I want to make clear that I recognize, and have always recognized, and have argued many times on the floor of the Senate in the last 12 years, that the President of the United States has broad inherent emergency powers, but they are not absolute, and that, as Commander in Chief, he has the duty and the obligation and the power to proceed to protect America's vital interests anywhere in the world until such time as he can get his course of action before the Congress for review and approval. He does not have absolute power. Our constitutional fathers were very careful to see to it that a President of the United States did not get absolute power. Do not forget, they had just come out of some sorry experiences with a line of kings that exercised absolute power, and they revolted against that tyranny.

You see, Mr. President, I am talking here about a constitutional abstraction of vital importance to the welfare of the American people in terms of constitutional history. I am raising my voice today, as I will in the weeks ahead, forewarning the American people that these precious checks of the Constitution should not be given up for a Dwight Eisenhower or any other President of the United States at any time. So, I think it is important, Mr. President, that when the President exercises his emergency powers he proceed forthwith to present the reasons for his course of action to the Congress, giving the Congress the opportunity then to check his course of action.

Mr. President, that is not what the administration leaders want. When this problem is put to Secretary Dulles, Mr. President, he makes clear that is not what they want. And that is all the American people should need to know. I think all the American people need to do is read the testimony of John Foster Dulles on this point, and then give the Eisenhower administration their clear answer: "We want to back you up," as I want to back him up, "but we insist on backing you up under the checks of the Constitution. We are against giving to any President a blank check and unbridled power such as the discretionary authority provided for in the resolution would give to this President." Thus, in my resolution I cover that point.

ADMINISTRATION REQUEST COULD RESULT IN AN ATTEMPT AT PREVENTIVE WAR BY AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

The last point I wish to make is with regard to the preventive-war issue. I am very grateful to the Secretary of State for the statement he made this morning in answer to a series of questions I put to him in regard to the preventive-war issue. But his statement this morning is different from his testimony in closed session at the time of the Formosa Resolution. That is the point I wish to drive home.

At the time of the Formosa Resolution the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored and testified in support of a power to order an armed assault against the mainland of China before an act of aggression had been committed against the United States by Red China. Of the many reasons why I took the position I took against the Formosa Resolution, that was the most controlling. But the American people did not know about it at the time. The people of my State did not know about it at the time. I suppose that never in the political history of the State of Oregon was a United States Senator so castigated, attacked, and abused in a reactionary press than in my case in respect to the Formosa Resolution. My political enemies licked their chops. They thought, "Now we have him." But what they overlooked was the intelligence, the fairness, and the understanding of the great electorate of Oregon once they got the facts. So when, in the late campaign, up and down that State, I challenged this administration to send into the State anyone it wished to send to debate with me the Formosa Resolution—because it was perfectly obvious that my opponent would not discuss it—I was met with silence. It was perfectly obvious that once the people of Oregon came to understand that what this administration proposed behind closed doors was an authority given to the President to order a strike against the mainland of China if he should decide it was necessary, they recoiled.

I remember that when I cross-examined the Secretary of State in those hearings upon that subject he replied, "What would you do if an air force on the mainland of China was about to take off the ground and fly to places where it would jeopardize vital American interests?" In essence, I asserted that I would stay within the framework of international law, and I would have my air force powerful enough to meet the enemy at the point of aggression; but I would not propose to make an outlaw nation of my country.

Had we followed the original plans of the administration under the Formosa Resolution, to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, we would have been an outlaw nation, and for the first time in our glorious history we would have committed an aggressive act of war, and the rest of the world would have condemned us.

I have been worried about this resolution on this score, knowing the position that Dulles and Radford took on the Formosa Resolution. So this morning I asked the Secretary of State, by way of a hypothetical example, if it was his position that in this case a concentration of military might within the Soviet Union prior to an act of aggression would justify or empower the President to order an attack upon such concentration of power. I was pleased and grateful to get the answer, "No; the resolution would not cover that situation, or grant the President that power."

However, I was disappointed that the Secretary of State hedged when I discussed with him the position which he took at the time of the Formosa Resolution. He did the hedging; I did not. So I say here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the record of the committee hearings sustains the position I took. So far as I am concerned, I welcome making the record available to the American people. It ought to be made available. There was no reason at the time why it should not have been made available.

As my colleagues know, I think too many transactions relating to our foreign relations are conducted in secrecy. There is no cause or need for it. We can protect the security of the country without keeping from the American people as much as we do about the foreign policy and military position of the United States. I have served on both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. In my judgment, 80 or 85 percent of the information which is kept behind closed doors ought to be made available to the American people. Such information involves their foreign policy and their military. It does not belong to the President. It does not belong to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It belongs to a free people, and they ought to have it. If they had it, there would be many changes in American governmental policy. Of that I am convinced, as I am convinced that if they had all the facts behind this administration resolution, that resolution would be drastically amended before it passed the Senate.

MORSE RESOLUTION

In conclusion, I turn to my substitute resolution. Section 1 of the resolution expresses the support of Congress of the declared policy of the United States to use its power and influence to preserve peace in the Middle East, and it states that it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) That the President should embark on a long-range economic aid program for an area within and without the United Nations. It emphasizes the need for social and economic progress in the Middle East.

(b) The resolution proposes that the President take steps, through the United Nations and other means, to stop the arms race among the nations of the Middle East. It proposes that he seek the prohibition or control of arms shipments.

It proposes that in the event that any nation or group of nations in the Middle East is in danger of unprovoked armed attack, the President should undertake such military assistance programs as in his judgment may be necessary to deter or resist aggression, and should declare the determination of the United States to use arms in aid of a nation subjected to an unprovoked armed attack, with prior notice to the Congress. If an emergency prevents such notice, then the President should submit his action to the Congress forthwith for approval or disapproval. The resolution provides that the President should arrange with the free allies of the United States with vital interests in the area for their active military support in the event it becomes necessary to employ the Armed Forces of the United States. I dwell on the point that we should not be expected to "go it alone" militarily in the Middle East.

The resolution provides that the President should seek effective guaranties for passage on terms of equality through Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba.

The resolution provides that pending the conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States, the President should take steps, first, to reduce tensions between Israel and the Arab States; second, to stabilize their relations and prevent the use or threat of force in violation of the United Nations Charter; third, to resettle refugees; and, fourth, to keep United Nations police forces interposed between Israel and Egypt to guard the Gaza strip and the Gulf of Aqaba.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION REQUIRES SETTLEMENT OF ITS LONGSTANDING POLITICAL PROBLEM

I digress long enough to point out that there are three great political issues in the Middle East which will have to be settled before there will be any hope for peace in the Middle East. One is the Suez Canal problem, which, when all is said and done, is naught but a problem of international law and rights. If we eliminate all the emotions, we find that the

fact is that the Suez Canal problem raises a question of the comparative and respective rights of certain powers which claim rights in the canal, principally Egypt, Great Britain, and France. There are others, but those are the three major ones.

What is so complex about the problem? We talk about a system of international justice through law. We talk about working toward the goal of mankind settling threats of war by resort to rules of reason. Where has my country been in the Middle East crisis over the Suez Canal? It has not been exercising the leadership it ought to exercise in the United Nations by pleading with the disputants to support a resolution submitting the respective international law rights either to the World Court and the judicial processes of that court, or to the mediation and arbitration procedure provided for within the United Nations.

I believe we ought to take note, that we have a second great political problem in the Middle East, the problem of the Arab refugees. More than a million fellow men and women are living under the most deplorable conditions in what can most kindly be described as detention camps. Whose responsibility is it? Is it the responsibility of Israel? Is it the responsibility of the Arab countries?

I happen to believe it is the responsibility of moral men and women around the world. I believe it is the responsibility of every human being who believes that we ought to practice the great spiritual teachings which characterize us as a moral Nation, and that the spiritual mandate that we are our brother's keeper is not a cliché, spiritually or politically.

I believe that all free men have some moral obligation in connection with the Arab refugee problem. When I think of the millions of dollars we spend around the world for one cause or another, it is not asking too much that we exercise our leadership in an attempt to get the free nations to join in attempting to get Israel and the Arab countries to come to some humanitarian and moral settlement of the Arab refugee problem, and to lead them economically. I believe that the American people generally would be very glad, indeed, to contribute some of their tax dollars to the solution of that problem; and that they would recognize that those dollars might have a better chance of promoting peace than the dollars spent for jet planes sent to Pakistan, or to any Arab state.

We must face the Arab refugee problem. I certainly believe that when we adopt the resolution, we should serve notice, at least on the Arab States and on Israel, that we intend to use the position of our leadership in the world to seek to get them to enter into a treaty at an early date for the settlement of this problem.

Next, Mr. President, we have the political problem in the Middle East of the protection of the boundaries and territorial integrity of Israel. From the distance of these many thousands of miles we Americans cannot ignore that problem, although it is easy to take that isolationist attitude. In Israel the people read almost weekly wild statements made by Arab dictators of their intention as soon as possible to wipe the free State of Israel from the map. Then they read of a resolution which has as one of its purposes the supplying of military and economic aid, under the flexible discretion of the President of the United States, to Arab countries. Many of these people raise the question: "What assurance do we have that those guns will not be turned toward Israel, rather than the Soviet Union?"

Having said that, I wish to make clear, as I mentioned before, that I hold no brief for any violations of international law by Israel. However, I understand their provocation. That is why I propose the establishment of a buffer zone between Egypt and Israel and that we use our leadership to get the United Nations to man that buffer zone with a United Nations police force which will be an effective police force.

MORSE RESOLUTION INCLUDES ECONOMIC AID

Section 2 of the resolution authorizes the use of $200 million of mutual security funds without restriction in the area.

I believe that with the other checks which I have provided in section 1 of the resolution, the President should be given that authority which he seeks.

Section 3 provides that a report be made by the President to Congress in January and July.

Section 4 provides that the resolution shall expire upon the vote of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 42

Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East

Whereas the declared policy of the United States in its relations with other nations within and outside the United Nations is to develop and sustain just and enduring peace and security for all, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

Whereas there have been breaches of the peace and continuing threats to the peace in the Middle East which have not only disturbed the peace and security of the peoples of the area, but have obstructed the movement of vital commerce upon which the economies and welfare of not only countries in the area, but of many other countries throughout the world are dependent; and the continuance of these disturbed conditions in the Middle East creates an imminent threat not only to the peace and economic welfare of the area, but the peace of the world; and

Whereas imperialistic communism has exploited the disturbed political and economic conditions in the Middle East seeking not to allay but to stir up strife and unrest and seeking, by shipment of arms, by the proffer of volunteers, by economic inducements, by varied forms of internal subversion, and by other means to create and use governments in the Middle East as the witting or unwitting instruments of its own imperialistic designs: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc.—

SECTION 1. The Congress expresses its support of the declared policy of the United States to exert its power and its influence, within and outside the United Nations, to preserve peace and security in the Middle East, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the terms of the United Nations Charter, and in particular declares that it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) The President should devise and put into effect economic assistance programs including the support of programs of United Nations or other international agencies to cooperate with and assist nations or groups of nations in the Middle East dedicated to the maintenance of peace and independence to strengthen their economies and to improve their living standards. Such programs so far as feasible should be geared to sound long-range development which will provide the basis for orderly progress. Without orderly social and economic progress there can be no political stability in the Middle East, and without political stability there can be no stable peace.

(b) (i) The President should take steps through the United Nations, and by other means, to stop the arms race among the nations of the Middle East and to prohibit or rigidly control the shipment to them of arms not necessary for their self-defense. If, however, any nation or group of nations in the Middle East is in danger of unprovoked armed attack against its territorial integrity and political independence, the President should undertake such military-assistance programs with such nation or group of nations as in his judgment may be necessary to deter or resist aggression.

(ii) Furthermore, in order to contribute to the maintenance of peace, the President should reaffirm, with particular reference to those areas in the Middle East the peace and security of which is vital to world peace and security, the determination of the United States to employ the Armed Forces of the United States, if necessary, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the United Nations Charter in the event of any unprovoked armed attack, provided that such employment shall be consonant with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations. Prior to the employment of Armed Forces the President shall give notice to Congress. If, in the judgment of the President, an emergency arises in which such notice to Congress is not possible, he shall upon the employment of Armed Forces forthwith inform Congress and submit his action for its approval or disapproval. Such employment of forces under article 51 shall be immediately reported to the Security Council, and the General Assembly and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council or General Assembly to take at any time such action as either body deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace or security. The President should arrange with the free allies of the United States with vital interests in the area for their active support in the event it becomes necessary to employ the Armed Forces of the United States.

(c) In order to assure all nations the equal protection of international law, and in furtherance of the traditional policy of the United States to foster international trade and the unobstructed international movement of the world's commerce, the President should take steps through the United Nations and by other means to secure effective international guaranties and safeguards of free and unimpeded passage on terms of equality, in war and in peace, through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba for all nations.

(d) To safeguard world peace and security under the United Nations Charter pending the conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States the President should take steps through the United Nations and by other means (i) to reduce tensions between Israel and the Arab States, (ii) to stabilize their relations and prevent the use or threat of force in violation of the Charter, (iii) to resettle the refugees, (iv) to keep United Nations police forces interposed between Israel and Egypt to prevent border clashes and the remilitarization of the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza strip, and at critical areas about the Gulf of Aqaba to prevent the obstruction of commerce and navigation.

(e) The President should concert United States policy in the Middle East so far as is consistent with the purposes and principle of the United Nations Charter with the policy of other nations of the free world. When we invoke the Charter against our allies, we must see that they are protected in their rights under the Charter and international law;

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200,000,000 from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

SEC. 3. The President shall, within the months of January and July of each year, report to the Congress his action hereunder.

SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall expire when the Congress by a majority vote of both houses shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying in all sincerity that I have sought today to offer what I consider to be a constructive and affirmative program which will accomplish the legitimate objectives of the proposal of the President, but will provide those checks and restrictions and modifications which in my judgment the perpetuation of a sound constitutional system of government in the United States clearly requires.

I know there will be strong differences with the points of view I have expressed this afternoon. I am fully aware of the type of attack that will be made against me in some quarters for the position I have taken. However, let me make clear in closing that I believe Russia would fear much more the type of resolution I have proposed than the resolution which has been offered by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution submitted by me as a substitute for the other resolution be referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, sitting jointly, now considering the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 29, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert Hoover, Jr., resigned.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Catherine B. Kelly, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years vice Nadine Lane Gallagher, term expired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 25, 1957:

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER

William Kelley, of Florida, for promotion to class 3.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Small Business and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1957

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered this morning at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on the subject Small Business and National Security.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(Address of Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1957)

Throughout our Nation's history, small independent business units have been recognized as a basic and indispensable element of our free enterprise system. The inherent strength of our industrial life is a direct result of the freedom of opportunity for every citizen, possessed of the necessary energy and talent, to strike out for himself, to start his own business. While more attention is given this subject now, we can go back to 1890 to find, in the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act, legislation designed to preserve the competitive structure of our economy. The question of the position of small business in our economy is neither new nor is it partisan. It is, however, vital.

The interest in small business which has been generated during the past decade has been based on a very real concern that our competitive system is weakening. I would like this morning to point out where these weaknesses have occurred, examine some of the attempts which have been made to help small business and, finally, to suggest to you further steps which should be taken.

WHAT IS SMALL BUSINESS?

Let us first delineate the area for discussion—what is small business? There have been many definitions of small business—the Defense Department has one, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has another for its purposes, and the Small Business Administration has still another.

(The Department of Defense considers for procurement purposes that all firms with less than 500 employees, including affiliated, are small. This particular definition originated in the Selective Service Act of 1940 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.), which stated that a business enterprise would be determined to be small business if (1) its position in the trade or industry was not dominant; (2) the number of employees did not exceed 500; and (3) it was independently owned and operated. I do not believe that under this definition the test of dominance has ever been made. This particular definition has been used not only by the Department of Defense but by the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Services Administration, and other civilian agencies having a procurement function.

I am informed that the Bureau of Census considers all manufacturing establishments with less than 100 employees as small, while the size of distributing firms is determined by volume of sales.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue in its statistics on income separates the small from the large at the figure of $250,000 of total assets.

The Small Business Administration, in its financial assistance program, considers manufacturing concerns as small in relation to their position within the industry. This has been translated into employment figures so that in some industries a small firm would have less than 250 employees and in others less than 1,000 employees. A small retailer is one which has annual sales of $1 million or less, while a small wholesaler is one which has less than $5 million in annual sales.)

Only this month the Small Business Administration in cooperation with military and civilian procurement agencies promulgated a new definition for procurement purposes. This definition provides that all concerns with under 500 employees can certify that they are small. Firms with more than 500 employees may apply for a certificate to the effect that they are small and, on protest a firm with less than 500 employees may even be declared not to be small business.

An examination of congressional and administrative definitions of small business reveals two important things. First, that Congress cannot and should not attempt to legislate a specific detailed definition. Legislation can only establish the broad criteria upon which a definition can be made. Secondly, any definition of small business must be flexible, with particular consideration given to nondominance within a particular industry and independence of ownership and operation.

The most important thing is to understand the problem of small business. Our aim is to maintain a vigorous competitive system with unlimited opportunity to establish new enterprises and through the prevention of unfair competitive practices, the opportunity to compete in every market and to grow. More than ever before, we must bulwark our competitive system by guaranteeing small business an equal opportunity to compete.

SCOPE OF SMALL BUSINESS

It is only when we consider small business in terms of total numbers that we can make a start toward understanding the essential significance of the community of independent enterprises and their vital contribution to our Nation's welfare.

Since 1939 our business population has increased in step with our population, the increase being respectively 28 percent and 27 percent. At the start of 1956, our vast industrial and commercial complex was made up of about 4,250,000 firms. Of these, more than 95 percent are classified by definition as small business. For the purpose of our discussion today about small business and national security, I shall dwell only upon what I conceive to be the proper place of the small manufacturing segment of our economy in any defense mobilization program.

In the aggregate, these small companies account for a staggering 98 percent of all plants. They provide the payrolls of more than half of all workers employed in manufacturing.

CAUSES OF SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Why is it that the competitive status of small firms has become such a serious problem in the past decade? Two wars, partial mobilization for defense and unprecedented demand for civilian goods have all combined to increase our productive capacity as a Nation and to unleash new and intensify old competitive forces. During the World War and the Korean war small business had particular difficulties. In each instance, the full mobilization of productive facilities with emphasis only on implements of war as the end product meant hardships for small business. Specifically, this mobilization for defense meant curtailment of civilian production and the imposition of controls on manpower, strategic materials, prices and wages.

Larger firms are better able to convert quickly from civilian to military production. Small business was less able to compete for scarce materials and for skilled labor or to expand plant facilities.

Larger business, with greater physical resources, and abundance of engineering skills and financial resources, caused procurement officers to award the vast majority of prime contracts to larger firms.

The construction of productive facilities with Federal funds and the abandonment of competitive bidding in the awarding of contracts are procedures which certainly violate our concepts of free enterprise, even though they may well have been necessary in time of war. These procedures acted against the interests of small business.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SMALL BUSINESS

I should like to discuss some of the characteristics of the small business concern and some of the problems confronting this type of company today. These characteristics are, in part, the basis for many of the difficulties encountered by small business concerns.

Small business is subject to greater fluctuation in its profit rates. This characteristic also makes it difficult for a small business to accumulate long-term investment to put back into the firm, thus making frequent borrowing necessary. Outside investment is discouraged.

While small firms have the advantage of great flexibility in varying their operations, they are also hampered by lack of specialized knowledge on the part of management in comparison to larger firms.

Perhaps the greatest problem of small firms today lies in long-term financing. This difficulty results from both the impact of taxes and the difficulties in obtaining credit. Local banks are often not in a position to advance long-term credit, both through legal limitations and their own requirements to remain liquid. These obstacles have acted as a hindrance to greater participation by small business in Government procurement.

I also doubt if small business has participated fully in the use of progress and advance payments supplied by procurement agencies. Many small businesses producing for the Government cannot meet the criteria governing issuance of such payments.

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

During the period 1940–50 temporary small-business committees had been established in each Congress. In 1950 during the 81st Congress, the late Senator Kenneth Wherry sparked a successful effort to make the committee permanent. As a member of the committee since its beginning, I am convinced of the wisdom of establishing it. It has operated in a nonpartisan fashion and has worked in cooperation with other permanent committees where interests overlapped.

For many years now the Senate Small Business Committee has carefully reviewed military procurement policy and procedures. Its studies and recommendations have been conducted in a nonpartisan fashion and have been made to not only insure more efficient procurement but to insure a better opportunity for small firms. It has been our philosophy that given an opportunity to participate, small business, in many instances, can compete with larger firms on a price basis.

We have found, however, that small firms have difficulty in securing adequate information on proposed procurements or in securing specifications and bid sets. It is certainly to the advantage of the Government to insure the widest possible dissemination of information. Procurement agencies must provide small firms with every opportunity to be placed on bidders' lists or to have their products placed on qualified products lists. While military departments insist that negotiated procurement procedures do permit competition, I doubt that they permit full competition. I have constantly worked to try to get procurement agencies to seek additional sources of supply among small business concerns.

Our committee has continually recommended that negotiation be reduced in as many instances as possible and that advertised procurement become the rule rather than the exception. Admittedly, there are billions of dollars worth of procurement which may not be susceptible to performance by small business concerns acting as prime contractors. This is perhaps particularly true today in the age of electronics and guided missiles. In such instances the role small business must perform is that of a first or second tier subcontractor.

It is necessary, with a weapons system concept of procurement, that everything possible be done to encourage subcontracting to small business concerns. There has been a tendency, however, for many prime manufacturers with Government-furnished equipment to retract work which had formerly been performed by independent small business concerns. As a matter of fact, current renegotiation procedures do not encourage subcontracting. I believe the entire subcontracting program within particular industries would bear intensive study. For instance we should determine what duplicate facilities have been established by prime contractors, what relative costs are between use of Government-furnished equipment and independent subcontractors, and if sufficient inspection of administration of prime contracts has been exercised by procurement agencies.

Another problem which confronts small firms bidding on Government contracts is the size of various procurements. While the bid as let can be performed only with the facilities of a large concern, multiple awards would permit small firms to enter the picture. I realize that this is difficult to do.

Similarly, unrealistic delivery schedules preclude small firms from participating. During the national emergency such delivery requirements may be understandable; today, many of them cannot be justified. Too frequently an invitation to bid is placed on an emergency basis with delivery required in 30 to 60 days. For one reason or another, the bid has been canceled, readvertised, and delivery actually has run into 6 months or more.

One of the greatest hurdles any small-business man or association of small-business men has to surmount is the reluctance of contracting officers to go along with an untried company. This antipathy may be a basic element of human nature and not, as some small-business men believe, an acquired administrative attitude.

Much has been said recently with regard to the participation of small firms in research and development work. I believe that an intensive study can be made with a view to increasing the share of small business in this field. Here again proprietary interests developed in wartime are carried over into peacetime economy, altering the competitive structure of many industries. Small firms must, to remain strong, share in these benefits.

By the nature of things, a research and development contract for a new product is important for any company to acquire. Should the product developed be one that the military will eventually use in large quantities, the developing company will often find that it has a long head start over its potential competitors for a profitable production contract for the new item.

For the period July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956, small firms obtained less than 6 percent of the more than $2,341,000,000 which was spent by the Department of Defense on research and development work. Here then, is a specific area of procurement which presents a challenge to Government procurement officers. It should not take much effort to expand the small business share of research and development contracts—an objective, I feel certain, which is both desirable and obtainable.

The military agencies and other agencies of the executive are constantly making plans for the mobilization of the Nation's productive resources. It is most important that such plans provide for the greatest use of the small business potential. They must provide for equitable allocation of scarce materials, machine tools, manpower, with serious consideration given to the impact of any controls which will be considered necessary. Consideration must also be given to the need for financial assistance and tax

benefits. Above all, these plans must be formulated well in advance. In both World War II and the Korean conflict, consideration for the particular needs of small business came too late to prevent damage to their competitive position in the economy.

Finally, in regard to procurement, I wish to state most emphatically that the consideration which will be given small business depends not just on the laws enacted by Congress, but primarily on the attitudes of the men who administer these laws. A constructive attitude must prevail from the highest echelon down, through the contracting officer and the plant inspector. It is most important that all in authority understand the vital and essential role of small business in our economy. They must understand that small firms require at least equal opportunity, free of man-made impediments. In such a climate they can, with their own know-how, compete in many instances with much larger concerns and contribute significantly to our defense efforts. It is also most important that every man having a procurement function understand the impact on our economy of contract awards amounting to billions of dollars a year.

TASK BEFORE US

When we think of small business in terms of a future emergency in which our entire industrial potential must be mobilized, it can be seen that the task before us is twofold. Obviously, the first phase of our problem is to do everything we possibly can now to help maintain an economic climate in which small businesses prosper and stay strong. This is essential for the reason that when the time becomes necessary for the Government to call upon the facilities of small manufacturers either as prime or subcontractors, those facilities should be as vigorous as a profitable peacetime economy can make them.

The second phase of our task should be to take advantage of the present to prepare small producers to assume their responsibilities in the event they are needed, as they have been in the past, for some future emergency. In brief, the present should be utilized as a period of training for small business in the theory and practice of becoming suppliers to the Military Establishment.

Here again the best teacher is experience. Smaller businesses, therefore, can become much better sources of supply for the Government during a future emergency if they can learn how to before the emergency develops.

It is abundantly clear that in order for small business to fully share in defense procurement, a great responsibility rests upon the contracting officers and procurement policy officials of the Department of Defense.

The defense official must take more than a localized interest in the welfare and prosperity of small business. I have described in the last few minutes some of the difficulties which small business has in sharing opportunities with larger companies for defense procurement. Now, perhaps with some repetition, here are several points which should be considered by defense officials in respect to small-business procurement.

One. In the all-important matter of attitude, it is essential that those responsible for spending the procurement funds which Congress appropriates have confidence in the ability of small business. It is only natural for a contracting officer, who is responsible for the success of a particular development or production project, to look to the most experienced large producer. It is necessary to take what may be termed a calculated risk at times in selecting a smaller business when it is capable so as to better establish its capabilities for defense work. The need for a wide mobilization base in time of national emergency dictates that contracting officers and procurement officials exercise great care and judgment in awarding, wherever possible, contracts to small companies, even though we may have a greater degree of confidence in the larger and tested ones. Every effort should be made to cooperate with the Small Business Administration in the latter's effort to provide new sources of supply.

Two. Contracting officials for the Defense Department must bear in mind the inherent limitations of small business to cope with the administrative complexity of Government contracting. We can greatly assist the role of small business in our defense picture if we keep to the simplest form the amount of administrative and paperwork demanded of our suppliers.

Three. Defense officials should become thoroughly familiar with and utilize to the maximum extent possible the established small-business set-aside procedures. These are designed not only for the benefit of small business but for the benefit of our entire Defense Establishment.

Four. Every attention should be given to the possibility of rendering financial assistance through established contracting procedures to small businesses who compete for Government work.

Five. Delivery schedules should be as realistic as possible with particular care in peacetime to the limitations of small business to adapt to emergency programs. This should be watched with the utmost care.

Six. Advertised procurement is, of course, the most desirable method except when circumstances will not permit it. Great care should be given to the maximum use of advertised procurement. When negotiated procedures are deemed necessary, contracting officers should insure as much participation as possible by small business.

Seven. When amendments and changes are made to a contract which is being handled by a small business, every effort should be made to administer these changes with the greatest dispatch inasmuch as the company may not be able to sustain the financial burden involved for a protracted period.

And finally, procurement officials can help tremendously by educating all of their personnel as to the importance and need for developing the potential for small business and supporting them where they take the responsibility.

Much progress has been made during the past decade, through legislation and through administrative programs, in our efforts to develop a sound and strong small-business segment in our economy. Much still needs to be done.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Many acts of Congress have provided legislative authority for financial assistance programs, procurement programs, and even agencies specifically designed to be of assistance to small business.

To devote special attention to the maintenance of small business and our free-enterprise system, Congress has created the Senate Select Committee on Small Business as a permanent committee.

Congress has expressed its concern for the survival and welfare of small business by incorporating small-business provisions in every basic procurement statute enacted since the end of World War II. These provisions clearly established a policy with respect to the utilization of small-business facilities in defense and civilian production. The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.), the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.), the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152 and 754, 81st Cong.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.), and others have all provided that small business must receive a fair share of Government contracts. Congress has not legislated, nor does it seem advisable to do so, what is to be considered a fair share of Government contracts. The percentage of military net procurement going to small firms has fluctuated annually between 32 and 16 percent since the end of World War II. It is clear that Congress does believe that every effort must be made to open up and to increase the small-business share in every type of procurement.

Three times Congress has established an agency to deal specifically with the problems of small business. During World War II the Smaller War Plants Corporation assisted small firms to secure Government contracts and financial assistance. In 1952 as an amendment to the Defense Production Act, the Small Defense Plants Administration was established to assist small firms during the Korean emergency. Believing that financial, procurement, technical, and managerial assistance was necessary in peacetime as well as during emergencies, Congress established the Small Business Administration in 1953.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

Through various directives the Defense Department has broadened its cooperative relationship with the Small Business Administration and it has instituted the beginnings of a small defense subcontracting program.

In many instances the use of emergency procurement and short delivery schedules have been corrected. Wider dissemination of procurement information has been accomplished. I believe that throughout all the military procurement agencies there is now a greater realization of the need for consideration of the problems of small business.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

May I devote a few minutes to a discussion of the operations of the Small Business Administration for it is this agency which is the culmination of congressional attempts to render all types of assistance to small business? Primarily the SBA was designed by Congress to be the spokesman for small business among the executive agencies. Small-business concerns cannot afford to have representatives either in Washington or at procurement centers throughout the country. It is for this reason that Congress designed the SBA as an independent agency, not affiliated or within any other department or agency. I believe that past experience dictates the need for such independence.

Of primary importance to small business is the SBA financial-assistance program. Recognizing that small firms are frequently unable to secure intermediate and long-term credit, Congress provided that SBA may make working capital loans, loans for the purchase of machinery and equipment, and loans for expansion of plant and facilities with maturities as long as 10 years. Since the taxpayers' money is being used and since this is not a subsidy program, SBA legislation stipulates that all loans must be of such sound value and so secured as to reasonably assure repayment.

In 3 years of operation the SBA has approved business loans for a total of $235,750,000. In fiscal year 1954, 473 loans were made for $27,739,000; in fiscal year 1955, 1,172 loans were made for $55,975,000; in fiscal year 1956, 1,915 loans were made for $81,977,000. To date in fiscal 1957, 1,600 loans for $70,059,000 have been made. Almost two-thirds of the 5,160 business loans approved have been in participation with local financial institutions. Congress itself desired that the local bank be encouraged

to extend at least part of the financial assistance desired by small business, for in such a fashion can lines of credit be established for future purposes.

In addition to making loans, the SBA financial specialists engage in financial counseling, enabling a firm to rearrange its accounts or to better present its case before a local bank so that a Government loan is not needed. I firmly believe that as long as private financial institutions are unable or unwilling to provide adequate credit to sound, though weak creditwise, small business, the Congress will insist on the existence of a Government program to fill this credit gap.

The SBA has developed a cooperative program whereby it may assist small firms to secure tax amortization certificates. Agencies in charge of issuance of such certificates have agreed to allow SBA to secure and present additional information which will more adequately reflect the need for such a certificate. As a matter of fact, I personally feel that this agency should be given a more positive role in the issuance of such certificates.

When a small business has been declared by a procurement officer to be ineligible to receive a contract upon which it was low bidder, the SBA is authorized by law to issue a certificate of competency when it believes this firm to be both financially and technically competent.

Once such a certificate is issued by SBA, the law provides that contracting officers must accept it as conclusive so far as financial and production requirements of the contract are concerned.

So far, contracts have been awarded to 250 small companies for a total of $30,546,000 as the result of this program. These certificates of competency were issued to the small producers, all of whom were low bidders or within negotiating range, after a thorough investigation by SBA showed that they were in fact, by reasonable standards, both financially and productively capable of performing the contract in question.

It goes without saying that for the SBA to override the judgment of procurement officers on the competence of a small company places a very heavy responsibility on the certifying agency. SBA meets this responsibility by maintaining a continuing interest during the full life of any such contract. Should the contractor encounter difficulties in meeting production schedules because of technical or other problems, SBA stands by to offer such assistance as may be necessary.

From the point of view of national security, what does this certification procedure mean? As I see it, it means that here are some 250 small companies, most of which were undoubtedly an unknown quantity to military procurement officials, which now are gaining invaluable experience as suppliers to the Army, Navy, and Air Force in peacetime.

The Small Business Administration is authorized by law to examine particular procurements to determine which are suitable for performance by small firms. Upon agreement by the contracting officer, all or part of the procurement may be set aside for exclusive bidding by small firms. From August 1952 through September 1956, $1,250,000,000 worth of Government purchases have been set aside for small business as a result of this joint determination procedure. Perhaps this is a major reason why, in the case of the Department of Defense, prime contract awards to small firms have been proportionately greater in the past few years than during the Korean war. In 1954, net military prime contracts to small businesses were $2.9 billion; in 1955, $3.2 billion; and in fiscal 1956, $3.5 billion.

SBA procurement specialists have been most active in assuring small firms adequate information concerning procurements on which they are capable of bidding. Referrals of both prime and subcontract opportunities are made. In addition, the agency assists small firms to get on bidders' lists or qualified products lists.

Finally, the SBA has been most active in providing small firms with the latest information on technical and managerial subjects.

It can be seen that all of these programs have been designed to assist small firms in those areas where they have encountered difficulties.

President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress on the economic report, has recommended that the Small Business Administration, which is due to expire on next July 1, be continued beyond that date and I sincerely hope that this proposal is approved.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

As a member of the legislative branch and as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I was most pleased to see the establishment of a President's Cabinet Committee To Study the Problems of Small Business. I also believe that the recommendations published in its first progress report, dated August 7, 1956, will be of help in guiding the various agencies concerned. Among other things the Cabinet Committee has recommended that the need for advance and progress payments should not be treated as a handicap in the awarding of a contract. Consideration is also given to the need for adjusting our thinking on renegotiation to the public policy of increased subcontracting. Of particular interest is the recommendation that there be a comprehensive review of procurement policies and procedures.

The President's Cabinet Committee also contains constructive proposals with regard to tax relief and continuation of the Small Business Administration.

FREE COMPETITION FOR SMALL BUSINESS — CONCLUSION

I have tried in this discussion to give emphasis to what I consider to be a few basic aspects of small business, chiefly small manufacturers, in relation to our national security. As you know, New England has a higher density of small independent business than any other section of the country. As suppliers, present or potential to the Government, they have one quality which many larger companies lack—that is, flexibility. They are easy to work with and can adjust themselves quickly to specification and schedule changes because they are not burdened with a corporate bureaucracy. Those familiar with the production record of small plants during World War II and Korea are not inclined to belittle the contributions made by small companies.

I believe that the role of small business in our economy is best summed up in these words from the Small Business Act of 1953: "The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed."

The free enterprise system, from which we derive our strength and upon which depends our national security, has always been anchored and must always remain anchored to the welfare of the millions of small and independent companies which are the bedrock of our industrial democracy.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 25, 1957

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on the President's state of the Union message. My statement emphasizes what I believe to be the most important problems before Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's report on the state of the Union lays significant emphasis on the increasing threat of inflation. He does not, however, stress the dominant role of Government spending in feeding the fires of inflation. Our Government spending and our tax levels are far too high for economic health or the continued vitality of our political system.

The President's proposal on Federal aid for school construction presents clearly our most fundamental political issue: Shall we continue to route the great bulk of our tax payments to the Federal Government, and then let the Federal Government take over more and more of the duties of the States, or shall we reroute our tax payments so that our States will once again have the share they need, so can take care of problems like education which should be managed locally?

I am pleased to hear of the President's interest in a broad national inquiry into our financial system. Such commissions, however, deal with legislative issues and should be set up, I believe, as advisory commissions to Congress, never to the executive branch. The President's statement that out of their findings and recommendations the administration would develop and present to the Congress any legislative proposals that might be indicated, crosses the line marking the constitutional separation of legislative from executive powers.

It is vitally important that Congress preserve its full responsibility for all steps in the legislative process, including the collection of information. Keeping the legislative power independent of the executive power is essential if we are to preserve limited government under law.

On foreign policy, the President said many true and useful things, especially about our community of interest with every nation in the free world. I should be extremely hesitant, however, to trust in international machinery to regulate and guide that community of interest. Our trade has always been international, without any need for an international supervisory agency. Our intercourse with underdeveloped nations has been continuous, without the need of a supervisory international agency to tell us how our money is to be spent, or our business carried out, or what aims we should seek.

The President's emphasis on a friendly and generous attitude to other nations, which are not bent on conquest, is in the true American spirit. The emphasis in the message on trying to achieve these ends

through greater control by international agencies than we have ever permitted to our own Federal Government, is a reflection of a passing fashion of the time which grows out of World War II.

I hope the period ahead will see our country take the lead in dismantling the war-born machinery for international control of finance, investment, trade, agriculture, foreign policy and all similar activities of our people, and return to the true American spirit of private and voluntary initiative in achieving both national and international goals.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the only source of wisdom and strength, we thank Thee for the high privilege of having a part in the great task of finding the right solution to life's many perplexing problems, personal and social; local, national, and international.

Show us how we may break down all the manmade walls of partition between nations and between the members of the human family.

Grant that everywhere we may be the channels of Thy gracious spirit, bringing faith where there is doubt; hope where there is despair; love where there is hatred; harmony where there is discord; light where there is darkness, and joy where there is sadness.

Inspire us with the unshakable confidence that beneath the surface tumult of the world there runs deep and strong the mighty current of God's eternal and beneficent purpose.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 24, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointments to various boards, commissions, and committees, which were read by the Clerk:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the part of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JENKINS.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAHO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ENGLE, of California; Mr. UDALL, of Arizona; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana; Mr. VORYS, of Ohio.

THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 393 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER.

JAMESTOWN-WILLIAMSBURG-YORKTOWN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROBESON of Virginia; Mr. POFF, of Virginia.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. ROONEY, of New York; Mr. RODINO, of New Jersey; Mr. COUDERT, of New York; Mr. REECE, of Tennessee.

THE WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 705, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HARRISON, of Virginia; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi; Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following members on the part of the House: Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey.

THE BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 75, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission the following member on the part of the House: Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. O'BRIEN of New York; Mr. DEROUNIAN, of New York.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York; Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4, Public Law 106, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. VORYS of Ohio, Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 304, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Government Security the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

And the following from private life: Mr. James L. Noel, of Texas; Hon. Edwin L. Mechem, of New Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

Pursuant to the provisions of section 105 (c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members of the House: Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 954, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. MCGREGOR of Ohio.

FORTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 42d annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1957.*

STATUS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In several previous messages to the Congress, I have called attention to the status of American education—to accomplishments of the past and to certain problems which deeply involve the national interest and welfare.

Today, more Americans are receiving a higher level of education than ever before. Progress has been made in building more and better schools and in providing more and better teachers. And yet problems in education still persist, and time has more clearly defined their scope and nature.

The educational task in this country is basically a State and local responsibility. Looking ahead, that task is unprecedented in its sheer magnitude. Elementary and secondary schools already are overflowing under the impact of the greatest enrollment increase in our history. The number of pupils in public schools has increased by 5½ million in the past 5 years, and will further increase by about 6 million in the next 5 years.

We have already reached an all-time peak in enrollment in colleges and universities. Yet, in the next 10 to 15 years, the number of young people seeking higher education will double, perhaps even triple.

Increasing enrollments, however, by no means represent the whole problem. Advances in science and technology, the urgency and difficulty of our quest for stable world peace, the increasing complexity of social problems—all these factors compound our educational needs.

One fact is clear. For the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions to provide the teachers and buildings and equipment needed from kindergarten to college, to provide the quality and diversity of training needed for all our young people, will require of them in the next decade the greatest expansion of educational opportunity in our history. It is a challenge they must meet.

State and local responsibility in education nurtures freedom in education, and encourages a rich diversity of initiative and enterprise as well as actions best suited to local conditions. There are, however, certain underlying problems where States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough, and where Federal assistance is needed. But the Federal role should be merely to facilitate—never to control—education.

TEACHERS

Solutions to all the other problems in education will be empty achievements indeed if good teaching is not available. It is my earnest hope that the States and communities will continue and expand their efforts to strengthen the teaching profession.

Their efforts already have accomplished much. Progress has been made in reducing the teacher shortage. There are encouraging increases in the number of persons training to teach and the proportion of those so trained who enter the profession. Still, this year, thousands of emergency teachers with substandard certificates had to be employed. Far more needs to be done in our various communities to enhance the status of the teacher—in salary, in community esteem and support—and thereby attract more people to the profession and, equally important, retain those who bear so well the trust of instructing our youth.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

By providing statistics and analyses on trends in education, and by administering other services, the United States Office of Education performs a valuable role in helping public and private educational institutions better to perform their tasks.

A significant first step was taken last year toward strengthening the Office of Education. The appropriation for the Office was increased to implement a cooperative research program, and to expand statistical and professional advisory services and studies.

This year I am asking for increases in funds for these activities, because they hold such promise for real progress toward solving some of the basic and long-standing problems in education.

EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

If the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions are successfully to meet, in the next decade, the increasing needs for education beyond the high school, their effort must begin now. The Federal Government, however, can take certain appropriate steps to encourage such action.

Already the Congress has enacted legislation for long-term loans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to help colleges and universities expand their dormitory and other self-liquidating facilities.

Last year I appointed a Committee on Education Beyond the High School, composed of distinguished educational and lay leaders, to study and make recommendations in this field. The committee's interim report of last November delineates issues that should have the most careful attention.

It pointed out that much more planning is needed at the State level to meet current and future needs in education beyond the high school. The Congress at the past session enacted Public Law 813, which authorized Federal funds to help the States establish State committees on education beyond the high school. The funds, however, were not appropriated. I recommend that the Congress now appropriate the full amount authorized under this legislation.

The State committees can do much to promote discussion, define problems, and develop recommendations. Their recommendations, however, must be supplemented by detailed plans to meet specific needs for expansion of physical facilities, enlargement of faculties, and other adjustments which may provide new or different institutions. Such detailed planning requires the coordinated effort of both public and private education in each State—and time, personnel, and funds.

I recommend that the Congress amend Public Law 813 so as to authorize grants to the States of $2.5 million a year for 3 years for these purposes.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Of all the problems in education, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. The lack of physical facilities is a temporary emergency situation in which Federal assistance is appropriate. Unquestionably, a very considerable portion of the shortage is due to World War II restrictions on all types of civil construction including schools. With Federal help the States and communities can provide the bricks and mortar for school buildings, and there will be no Federal interference with local control of education.

I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

Today there are enrolled in our public schools about 2¼ million children in excess of the normal capacity of the buildings in use. These children are forced to prepare for the future under the handicap of half-day sessions, makeshift facilities, or grossly overcrowded conditions. Further, many classrooms which may not be overcrowded are too old or otherwise inadequate. They should be promptly replaced.

The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory, but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said—realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years, and the States and communities have notably increased their school building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet, in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage accumulated over many past years. The rate of State and local construction is spotty, with noticeable lags in areas where needs are expanding most rapidly.

I propose, therefore, a comprehensive program of Federal assistance. The program is designed to accomplish in 4 years what last year's proposal would have done in 5, since 1 year has already been lost. I urge the Congress to authorize:

(1) Federal grants to the States for school construction, at the rate of $325 million a year for 4 years, a total of $1.3 billion.

(2) The authorization of $750 million over the 4-year period for Federal purchase of local school-construction bonds when school districts cannot market them at reasonable interest rates. These loan funds would be made available to

the States on the basis of school-age population. The State educational agency would determine the priority of local school districts for Federal loans based on their relative need for financial aid in the construction of needed school facilities.

(3) Advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. This would facilitate the issuance of these bonds to finance schools which would be rented and eventually owned by local school districts.

(4) The expenditure of $20 million in matching grants to States for planning to strengthen State and local school-construction programs.

As I indicated in my message on the state of the Union, I hope that this school-construction legislation can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Certain basic principles must govern legislation on Federal grants for school construction, if they are to serve the cause of education most effectively.

First, the program must be recognized as an emergency measure designed to assist and encourage the States and communities in catching up with their needs. Once the accumulated shortage is overcome, if State and local autonomy in education is to be maintained, the States and communities must meet their future needs with their own resources and the Federal-grant program must terminate. The States and communities already are building schools at a rate which clearly shows their ability to do this.

Second, Federal aid must not infringe upon the American precept that responsibility for control of education rests with the States and communities. School-construction legislation should state this policy in no uncertain terms.

Third, Federal aid should stimulate greater State and local efforts for school construction. Many States now make no contributions to school construction, and in some States which do contribute the amount is relatively small. Further, to increase total funds for school construction, Federal grants should be matched by State-appropriated funds after the first year of the program.

Fourth, the allocation of Federal funds among the States should take into account school-age population, relative financial ability to meet school needs, and the total effort within the States to provide funds for public schools. An allocation system based solely on school-age population would tend to concentrate Federal aid in wealthy States most able to provide for their own needs. An allocation system which provides more assistance to States with the greatest financial need will help reduce the shortage more quickly and more effectively.

Fifth, in distributing grants under this program within each State, priority should be given to local districts with the greatest need for school facilities and the least local financial ability to meet the need.

In a nation which holds sacred the dignity and worth of the individual, education is first and foremost an instrument for serving the aspirations of each person. It is not only the means for earning a living, but for enlarging life—for maintaining and improving liberty of the mind, for exercising both the rights and obligations of freedom, for understanding the world in which we live.

Collectively, the educational equipment of the whole population contributes to our national character—our freedom as a nation, our national security, our expanding economy, our cultural attainments, our unremitting efforts for a durable peace.

The policies I have recommended in education are designed to further these ends.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1957.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman could inform the House what legislation is proposed to be covered under the unanimous consent request which he seeks.

Mr. COLMER. I will be glad to. The Committee on Rules now has under consideration an application for a rule making in order the so-called Mideast Eisenhower doctrine or whatever you want to call it.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman further inform me if the Committee on Rules has reached a decision as to whether this will be an open rule or a gag rule under which this resolution will be considered?

Mr. COLMER. That matter is now under consideration by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 121) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, 78th Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration, to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 115, 78th Congress, and House Resolution 121, 85th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers: Mrs. GREEN of Oregon; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 122) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 122

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committee of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Burleson, Texas; Mr. Hays, Ohio; Mr. LeCompte, Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; Mr. Burleson, Texas; Mr. Jones, Missouri; Mr. Smith, Mississippi; Mr. LeCompte, Iowa; Mr. Harrison, Nebraska.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 28

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs is authorized until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional employees to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 1, following the word "That", insert "effective January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 117

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1957, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $305,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 1, strike out "January 3, 1957" and insert "January 4, 1957."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he would care to tell the House how the amount here compares with the amount that the committee used heretofore.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman will recall that we had a discussion on that point in the committee. The subcommittee carefully went over the budget furnished by the Committee on Un-American Activities and one of the main reasons given by the Committee, through its chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] was the fact that they are considerably behind on their filing. They are more than 2 years in arrears on their filing. That is occasioned by the heavy demand made on the committee, principally by other departments of the Government. It is a very serious matter for the committee, so they convinced the Committee on House Administration. That is the reason they gave for some increase in their appropriation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman agrees with me that it was voted out unanimously after the committee had stated the fact.

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSED VISIT OF TITO TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years we have been spending billions of dollars in a so-called cold war to halt and curtail the spread of communism. There is no doubt that had our Government not made this terrific sacrifice, Europe, Asia, and possibly Africa might be under the Communist tyrants today.

For several weeks, news publication reports reveal that our Government is strongly considering extending an invitation to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to visit the United States as an official guest. A visit of this kind would necessitate our elected leaders and the State Department to extend all courtesies and gestures of official friendliness and other governmental protocol which would magnify this malicious and vicious Communist tyrant in the eyes of the Communist world as well as millions of people throughout the nations of the free world.

Millions of freedom-loving and anti-Communist people now held in slavery in captive countries along with enslaved people within the Russian borders would interpret this visit as an endorsement of Tito's tyranny, slave-labor camps and antireligious persecutions.

I have joined with Congressman GORDON MCDONOUGH, of California, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Congressman KEATING, of New York, in causing a petition to be circulated among Members of the House opposing any invitation to Marshal Tito to visit our free Republic. These petitions are now in circulation among Members and some are in the Speaker's lobby, and can be signed by any Member who desires to express his thoughts on this important matter.

PETITION AGAINST TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has announced that there is a petition in the lobby for the Members of the House to sign who care to, a petition to the President of the United States protesting the invitation to Tito to visit the United States.

I think it is unnecessary to enlarge upon this question to the Members of the House. I believe the sentiment has been expressed by the previous speaker. I think it would be an embarrassing situation to the people of the United States if such an invitation were issued and Tito were to come to the United States for a visit.

Mr. Speaker, when the State Department announced that an invitation to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to be an official guest of the United States was contemplated sometime in April, the immediate reaction throughout the Nation was violent objection which has increased and mounted to angry protests to the State Department and to President Eisenhower.

There is justifiable ground for this nationwide resentment to such an invitation because of Tito's long record of friendly affiliation with the Kremlin and his avowed support of the Soviet Union against the Western democracies, especially the United States.

In order to give the Members of the House of Representatives an opportunity to express themselves I have prepared in cooperation with Representative KENNETH KEATING, Republican, New York; Representative RAY MADDEN, Democrat, Indiana; and Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, a petition to President Eisenhower protesting the proposed invitation to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to visit the United States as an official guest.

The petition has been placed in the House lobby today for all Members of the House of Representatives to sign who desire to do so.

We have issued the following joint statement in sponsoring this petition:

It is not our purpose to embarrass the President by submitting this petition to the House membership. On the other hand, we do not believe the millions of good people of the United States should be embarrassed by an invitation to Tito to come here as an official guest of the United States.

We do not believe that national or international communism can be compromised.

We do not think that the high prestige of the United States should be lowered nor Tito's prestige raised by sending an invitation.

We have spent billions to prevent the expansion of communism throughout the world.

The Congress has three times unanimously resolved to oppose Red China's admission to the United Nations.

We fought the Korean war to save Korea from Communist domination. It seems to us inconsistent now to glorify an avowed Communist dictator.

We believe no good and much harm would be done to the United States by inviting Tito to come here as an official guest of our Nation.

The text of the petition is as follows:

We, Members of the House of Representatives, representing both parties, expressing our own individual opposition and responding to widespread and emphatic protests, respectfully urge you not to extend an invitation to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to be an official guest of the United States.

If such an invitation has been extended, we respectfully urge you to reconsider this action.

We do this with full knowledge of your responsibilities as Chief Executive. We believe, however, that Marshal Tito's record and affiliation with communism and the Kremlin, his position as Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, his persecution of Cardinal Stepanic, his attack on American fliers which killed five American airmen, his forceful return of escaped Hungarian freedom fighters to their country for execution as well as countless other despicable acts, have made him repugnant and detestable in the eyes of the American people.

We further believe that the high position to the United States among the free nations of the world would be compromised if such an invitation were issued by you as President of the United States. Furthermore, such action would lend to Tito a dignity and standing to which his conduct distinctly does not entitle him.

We respectfully request your favorable consideration of our petition.

The resentment to Tito by Members of Congress comes from leaders of both parties.

Here is a news release containing a statement by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois:

DOUGLAS TO ABSENT SELF IF TITO VISITS

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said today that if Yugoslav President Tito visits here and addresses Congress he plans to stay away.

DOUGLAS said on a TV program he would not question the motives of President Eisenhower if he invites the Yugoslav Communist dictator to visit the United States but said:

"Tito is a tyrant * * * an antidemocrat. I personally would not be happy being in a

parliamentary body which he addressed as an honored guest."

The State Department has not announced publicly that Tito has been invited to this country, but well-informed sources say he will visit here in late April.

The national commander of the American Legion, Dan Daniel, expressed the views of that great veterans' organization recently:

Recent reports in the Nation's press indicate that the administration is considering the possibility of inviting Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to visit this country for conferences with President Eisenhower at the White House. I cannot believe that the President would ever give serious consideration to such an invitation.

To invite Tito to this country for any purpose, let alone to confer with the President or other officials of our Government, would be to confer upon him recognition and respectability which he does not deserve.

There may be those who seriously believe that Marshal Tito, if he visits this country, can be persuaded to aline himself actively with the free world in opposing Russia. Those who believe this deceive themselves.

Tito has proven by his words and deeds that he is a godless, and fanatically as ruthless a Communist as Lenin and Stalin. He is an unprincipled opportunist to whom murder, imprisonment of church leaders, and double crossing diplomacy are but a means to an end.

If there are any among us so naive and so ignorant of very recent history to believe that we can do business with Communist Tito, I would ask that they review this record:

July 7, 1946: Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch, leader, of Serbian nationalist resistance against Germany, executed for collaboration with the enemy.

December 3, 1946: Greek Government informs U. N. Security Council that Yugoslavia, under Tito's leadership, supports guerrilla warfare waged by Communist rebels in northern Greece.

September 18, 1946: Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic prelate of Yugoslavia, arrested and subsequently sentenced to 16 years at hard labor for collaboration with the enemy.

July 21, 1948: At Yugoslavia Communist Party Congress, Tito declares that Yugoslavia Communists remain loyal to the Soviet Union.

April 9, 1949: At a mass meeting, Tito calls Yugoslavia an ally of the Soviet Union.

June 25, 1950: North Korean Communists invade South Korea. Two days later Yugoslavia is the only member of the U. N. Security Council to vote against the United States resolution to assist South Korea.

November 29, 1952: Vatican announces that Archbishop Stepinac will be appointed cardinal.

December 17, 1952: Yugoslav Government severs diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

October 1, 1954: Soviet economic blockade against Yugoslavia is ended by trade agreement.

May 26–June 3, 1955: Bulganin and Khrushchev visit Yugoslavia. Joint declaration by Bulganin and Tito:

A. Calls for peaceful coexistence regardless of ideological differences.

B. Calls for admission of Communist China to the United Nations and transfer of Formosa to Communist China.

C. Asks for removal of embargo on trade with Communist countries.

July 25, 1955: Tito tells a visiting American group:

A. Yugoslavia Communist Party is ready to resume relations with Soviet Communist Party.

B. The Soviet Union sincerely wants peace.

C. Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey may relax their defensive efforts because the danger of a Soviet attack is no longer imminent.

September 27–30, 1955: United States Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy and Tito reach agreement by which Yugoslavia will "permit" the United States military mission to "visit" rather than "inspect" American military equipment shipped into Yugoslavia. In return, Yugoslavia will get $40.5 million already appropriated as well as 6 million tons of wheat. This is in addition to the more than $1 billion in American military and economic aid already given Yugoslavia since September 1949.

January 19, 1956: United States-Yugoslavia aid agreements signed in Belgrade. United States will give Yugoslavia $95 million in economic aid by June 30, 1956, most of which will be a direct gift. On same day, a Soviet-Yugoslavia credit agreement is published in Belgrade. Soviet credit up to $110 million will be given Yugoslavia over the next 10 years. Yugoslavia's Government radio station calls the Soviet agreement "more favorable * * * than any that Yugoslavia has been able to make with other countries."

January 28, 1956: Soviet-Yugoslavia agreement is signed to cooperate in the field of nuclear energy.

June 11, 1956: Tito, speaking to a crowd in Stalingrad during Russian visit, said: "In peace as in war, Yugoslavia must march shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union toward * * * the victory of socialism."

June 17, 1956: Tito, still in Russia, declared: "No one can ever separate the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia."

November 4, 1956: Milovan Djilas, former vice president of Yugoslavia, published an article in the New Leader (New York): "The Hungarian revolution blazed a path which sooner or later other Communist countries must follow. The wound which the Hungarian revolution inflicted on communism can never be completely healed."

November 19, 1956: Milovan Djilas was arrested and sentenced to 3 years in prison on charges of spreading propaganda hostile to the Yugoslavian regime. Foreign journalists were excluded from attending the trial.

November 21, 1956: Yugoslavia opposes U. N. resolution ordering withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. Abstains from voting on resolution to send U. N. observers to Hungary.

Noting that "this is only a part of Tito's sordid record of duplicity, deceit, and diplomatic double dealing, American Legion National Commander Dan Daniel declared:

"I cannot believe in light of this record that the American people need worry about the possibility of Tito being invited to this country."

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, expressed his views against Tito in the following editorial of January 20, 1957:

WE DISCARD FACTS IN TRUSTING TITO

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This is the day when President Eisenhower raises his right hand and swears to protect and sustain the Constitution for another 4 years, so the compiler of these weekly notes thought he would get himself down to Washington to observe—and possibly participate—in the festivities.

These have been going on now at an increasing tempo since Friday night and, of course, they will reach their social climax tomorrow night at the four big inaugural balls which will bring out the chivalry and the beauty of the Republican Party.

With such crack newspapermen as Bob Considine, Jim Bishop, Dorothy Kilgallen, and Ruth Montgomery reporting the various events—not to mention a lady who lives with me and writes under the name of Austine—it would seem superfluous for me to add to the reportorial accounts.

Just one sour note has intruded on the general harmony prevailing in this town. It's the fact that the administration is apparently going forward with its plan to ship those jet planes to President Tito, of Yugoslavia, and then invite him to Washington for a state visit this spring.

I simply cannot understand the logic of this policy. Heaven knows there's nothing personal about my opposition to it. As Will Rogers used to say, "All I know about him is what I read in the papers * * *," and very little of that has been favorable.

I've been arguing against military help to Tito long before he barred me from Yugoslavia last fall as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In fact, my opposition was what led to my being refused admittance.

Responsibility for the decision to trust Tito rests squarely on Secretary of State Dulles, who, in my opinion, is not only ignoring the lessons of the last few years but also the lessons of World War II.

In fairness to the State Department, however, I will try to present here what I am told are its reasons for risking popular disapproval by inviting as an American guest the dictator who has never apologized for the shooting down and murder of five American airmen on a peaceful mission over Yugoslavia.

The State Department argues that Yugoslavia is following a foreign policy that is independent of the Moscow line. It is said that Tito proved this by his attitude during the Polish and Hungarian explosions last autumn.

The Department says that his independent attitude has encouraged resistance to Russia in the satellites and that his example prompts leaders like Gomulka in Poland to believe they can defy the Kremlin and escape retaliation.

State defends its intention to resume the shipment of jets to Tito with the assertion that Yugoslavia needs a strong enough armed force to discourage Moscow from attempting a quick liquidation of Tito.

The policymakers claim that a visit to America will have a salutary effect on Tito's understanding of how a democracy works. He will begin to see, they maintain, the various forces that go into the making of American policy such as the press and public opinion.

COMMITTING FDR MISTAKES

Now all this sounds very well if you forget the fact that we are committing our old mistake of trusting a Communist. Wasn't it the way the late FDR trusted "good old Joe" that prompted so much criticism of his foreign policy from Republican spokesmen like Secretary Dulles?

This is wishful thinking of the worst sort, in my opinion. Tito's trouble with the Kremlin is an internal Communist matter and the honeymoon has been on-again, off-again several times in the past.

By inviting him here the administration will surely antagonize all chuchgoing, anti-Communist Americans to say nothing of the misconceptions it will arouse among our good friends and allies around the world, such as Magsaysay, of the Philippines; Diem, of Vietnam; Rhee, of Korea; and Chiang, of Formosa, to mention only a few.

The invitation from President Eisenhower is bound to be construed as a friendly gesture on our part.

The record is clear that Tito's first loyalty is to international communism, regardless of his personal difficulties with the Kremlin. I'm going to mention a number of instances on which he has made his feelings plain.

HIS VIEW ON UNITED STATES HELP

Tito declared in January 1951 that American aid to Yugoslavia would in no way "change the character of our Communist

revolution" and that "every machine brought into the country helps to build socialism [that is, communism]."

In January 1951 Tito publicly expressed his contempt for the West, as well as his basic agreement with Stalinist policies and tactics when he said:

"We see that Bolsheviks were right when, in former times, they asserted that socialism could be built with the help of capitalist countries. Magnitogorsk was built with the assistance of American engineers and nobody ever doubted the Bolsheviks' loyalty to communism. The same thing is true of the aid given us by Western capitalists."

SUBJUGATION PLAN CHARGED

When the January 8, 1952, agreement was signed with the United States for more aid to Tito, Foreign Minister Edvard Kardelj said in Belgrade that Washington's aims in assisting Yugoslavia were "to prepare the ground for the expansion of the American monopoly and economic and political subjugation of Europe." Kardelj agreed with Tito that:

"The more help we get from the West and the quicker it is forthcoming, the faster we shall be able to build the Socialist order in the country." (In Yugoslavia, he meant.)

A statement from Marshal Zhukov last June 21, 1956 (this during Tito's visit to Moscow with Tito listening in):

"Soviet and Yugoslav military forces fought shoulder to shoulder against German fascism. Soviet and Yugoslav military forces are struggling to maintain peace, but should war be imposed upon us we will struggle shoulder to shoulder for the benefit of mankind."

Had enough?

The Coordinating Committee of the Nations Under the Communist Yoke adopted the following memorandum at their recent meeting, December 19, 1956, at Cleveland, Ohio, against Tito and appealed to the United States Government and the United Nations to consider their petition:

MEMORANDUM

It being our sincere intention to inform the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations of the dual part played by the dictator of Communist Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, in regards of the revolution in Hungary, we the Coordinating Committee of the Nations under the Communist Yoke have unanimously accepted the following memorandum at its fourth consecutive meeting, December 19, 1956, in Cleveland, Ohio.

We wish to call the attention of the Government of the United States of America and of the United Nations to these facts:

1. That the Government of Yugoslavia issued several orders to obviate the possibility of a revolution in its own state by confiscation of all radios capable of receiving within the radius of 100 kilometers.

All men and women who formerly have been sentenced for political reasons must report themselves to the local militia daily.

New state "Volunteer Works" have been created only to have the anti-Communist elements under the eye.

This clearly indicates that Tito does not fear destruction from without, but from within.

2. Tito, after having simply turned back to Hungary the great majority of the Hungarian refugees who tried to escape to the West through Yugoslavia, on November 29, 1956, signed once again an agreement with the Kadar government for the repatriation of the remaining refugees naturally on a voluntary basis, simultaneously authorizing the dreaded Hungarian secret police to screen refugees.

Tito's government has refused the inspection of its borderline between Yugoslavia and Hungary by the United Nations observers to prevent them from observing the true conditions in Croatia.

3. To please the Western democracies Tito has publicly voiced his disapproval of the Russian military intervention in Hungary as a foreign power and has protested to the Kremlin for the arrest of Nagy, who supposedly was under Tito's protection. To appease the eastern Communist world, Tito stated in a speech delivered in town Pula, that Nagy himself is to blame for the intervention of the Russian Army because Nagy failed to protect the lives of the Communist comrades and, instead of opposing the contra-revolutionary movement of the anti-Communists, he identified himself with them. In the same speech, Tito justified the Russian intervention as a lesser evil because they will save a socialistic (read communistic) state. Tito also said that to his knowledge Kadar and the members of his government are the most honest comrades in Hungary.

4. Tito's delegation to the United Nations voted against the withdrawal of the Russian Army from Hungary and entirely abstained from voting on the resolution condemning the Russian massacre of the Hungarian people. Meanwhile, the Yugoslav press has carefully suppressed the news of the liberation of Cardinal Mindszenty and the development of the anti-Communist revolution because they are still holding the Croatian Cardinal Stepinac in detention and Bishop Chule in prison. The whole Croatian Nation considers itself a prisoner of communism. Furthermore, the Yugoslav press claims that the establishment of the Kadar government was a normal procedure.

Because of this dual role, we agree with Mr. George Gale, news correspondent for the Daily Express, London, who wrote on November 27, 1956, the following: "Nobody can help Tito's Yugoslavia." "Yugoslavia will act her shabby part a while longer."

5. The undersigned, as representatives of various national organizations in the United States, respectfully request of the Government of the United States of America and the Assembly of the United Nations to:

(a) Give up definitely the policy of cooperation with Tito's Communist Yugoslavia.

(b) Cease any further economic and military aid to Yugoslavia.

(c) Abandon the erroneous idea that Titoism could be an able formula to assure the liberation of the peoples oppressed by Soviet Russia.

(d) Recognize the fact that peace and order in the Central-European area cannot be restored until complete destruction of communism and opportunity of self-determination be given to the oppressed peoples of Yugoslavia.

(e) Condemn the conduct of the Yugoslav Government toward the Hungarian refugees, as completely incompatible with the basic human rights and with the accepted international customs and laws.

We wish to declare that we do respect the efforts of the United States Government and the United Nations to avoid war at any reasonable cost, but this time again we wish to affirm that there cannot be peace in Europe unless the United Nations refuse to recognize those states who came into existence by the cunning forces of communism and against the will of the people.

The accepted principles of all free nations, such as democracy, freedom, and self-determination, should not be only empty words of propaganda, rather the United Nations must find a way to help those seeking these principles. For such rights the people of Hungary are sacrificing their lives today and tomorrow it may be in Croatia, Poland, East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Ruthenia, Rumania, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraina, White Russia, and other nations within the boundaries of U. S. S. R.

The above-named nations once before went through the bloody mill of Communist conquest and now they are ready to go through it again to gain freedom.

The Polish Poznan, the massacre of Croatians at Bleiburg, and today the fight for freedom in Hungary have become a landmark in the struggle of all peoples under Communist rule.

We place our trust only in God and the solidarity of the anti-Communist fighters.

It is further agreed that a copy of this memorandum be presented to the President of the United States, United States Secretary of State, Secretary General of the United Nations, chairman of Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, chairman of Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives, United States Senators from Ohio, United States Congressmen from Ohio.

RUDOLPH ERICH,
Chairman.
ANTHONY PIVAC,
Secretary.

Representatives for Hungarian Liberation Committees, Gyula Kovacs, Elemer Homonay, Anthony Leibach, M. D., Frank Marias, Kalman Elek; American Hungarian Federation, Stephen F. Focht; National Committee of Hungarians of Czechoslovakia, Lasclo A. Sirchich; Polish American Congress, State of Ohio, Walter Dworakowski, K. J. Zielecki; Alliance of Poles of America, Z. P. Zakrzewski, J. A. Zebrowski, M. Dlugokeski, Joseph Ptak; Polish Veterans, Ninth Division, Joseph Sparzynski, Joseph Bogdanowicz, Dr. Tadewsz P. Kolodynski; Union of Poles of America, B. Jaroszewski; Council 6, Polish National Alliance, A. A. Kopczynski; Polish Legion of American Veterans, T. Holtz, J. K. Galika; Slovak Liberation Committee, Joseph C. Trubinsky; Latvian National Group, Teofils Crikelise, Augustus Heinsons; League of Estonian Liberation, Inc., Ants Traks; Lithuanian Group, Jonas Dangela, Lionginas Lekuckas; Sub-Carpatho Ruthenian Liberation Movement, Michael P. Pancelos; Danube Schwaben American, Anthon Rumpf, Fred Wintergerst; United American Croatians National Representation, J. F. Skafec, Rudolph Erich, Ante Pivac, Stephen Crnicki, B. Begovich.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was on the floor a few moments ago and did make objection to a similar request.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have talked with the gentleman from Iowa and he has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If he has cleared it with the majority leader, that is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF SAFER AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, highway death statistics for 1956 are even worse than usual. While the final total is not yet in, it is now certain that the 1956 total for the United States will be in excess of 40,200. This is an increase of 1,700 over 1955 and the greatest number of traffic deaths in 1 year in our Nation's history. Even prior to this ghastly addition there have been more Americans killed on United States highways since 1900 than have been killed in all our wars from the Revolution through Korea, inclusive. Those battlefield deaths have been 1,130,393 and as of today the American highway death toll since the year 1900 has now reached 1,189,614.

The House recently received an excellent report from its special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, of which the chairman was our able colleague from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. One of its recommendations for reducing the shocking highway toll was the construction of safer automobiles. I have felt for some time that this is an aspect of the traffic-safety problem which can be handled most effectively by Federal law. On the first day of this session, I introduced a bill, H. R. 561, to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce.

Experience of the public-spirited manufacturers who incorporated a number of safety features in their 1956 models has shown dramatically that a conscious effort to make automobiles safer reduces the number of deaths and injuries. For instance, according to Cornell Medical School researchers, studies of thousands of accidents show that chest injuries were cut in half by the safety-steering wheel. These studies further show that if all cars, new and old, had certain recommended safety features, each year a half-million persons would escape injury, and many of those now being killed would escape with only injuries.

My bill, H. R. 561, would direct the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe minimum safety standards for automobiles manufactured for use in interstate commerce, and manufacturers would be required to observe these standards on their new cars. Among the automobile features to be subject to such minimum safety standards would be speed capacity, safety padding, steering, and other vehicle controls, bumpers and other shock absorbing equipment, lights, brakes, visibility aids, and tires. Imported automobiles would also be required to meet these standards. Exempt from the proposed law would be vehicles manufactured for export and sold in a foreign country and those manufactured for and sold to a law-enforcement agency, fire department, or ambulance service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this proposal can be fully considered and enacted before the end of this session. Its prompt enactment will save many of our fellow Americans from death and injury.

SOIL AND WATER RESEARCH LABORATORIES

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill calling for the establishment of four regional research laboratories authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish four soil and water research laboratories in four different regions of the United States, the Western Irrigated Region, the Great Plains Region, the Northeastern Region, and the Southeastern Region.

This bill has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. Its purpose is to bring about study in a field that we think is extremely important and becoming increasingly so throughout the country.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I read in the Palatka Daily News, Palatka, Fla., one of the fine newspapers in my district, an interesting article by an English instructor in the Palatka Senior High School, Mrs. Mary Louise Thomas.

Five years of my life were spent as a public school teacher and during that time I taught, among other subjects, the subject of English. I was particularly interested in the article by Mrs. Thomas, since it dealt with an important matter with which all teachers are concerned. That is, the problem of how a teacher can provide for the individual differences among the students in the classroom. Soon we shall hear pleas for Federal aid to education. I expect to hear many of my colleagues talk of the great need for more classrooms. I do not disagree with the desperate need for more classrooms, but I shall maintain this year, as I did last year when we discussed this important matter, that even more than classrooms we need more teachers, better pay for teachers, and for the future of America some way to give greater opportunities to our students of superior abilities.

Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic things about public-school education is the fact that we are not making provisions for students of outstanding abilities. In fact, we have been so much concerned with students of retarded abilities, that we speak of them now as exceptional children. This would seem to be a perversion of what I sincerely believe Webster indicated the word meant. Many people have distorted the word "democracy" to mean that everyone has equal abilities and everyone, therefore, should receive the same type of education. This, of course, is far from the truth. Our children do not have equal abilities. They ought to have equal opportunities to learn, but the gifted children should not have to suffer at the hands of those who have lesser abilities.

Mr. Speaker, we have the future Einsteins, Edisons, and Franklins in the classrooms of America. How important it is that we strive in every way possible to surround them with an environment and a teaching method that will be challenging to them.

I want to congratulate Mrs. Thomas and the many thousands of wonderful schoolteachers all over this great country of ours who recognize this problem, and I am particularly pleased to submit the complete article by Mrs. Thomas entitled "How Can a Teacher Provide for Individual Differences?" It is stimulating, and I hope each Member of Congress will have an opportunity to read this excellent article:

HOW CAN A TEACHER PROVIDE FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES?

(By Mrs. Mary Louise Thomas, English instructor, Palatka Senior High School, Palatka, Fla.)

"The meek and the gentle,
The ribald and rude,
They took them as they found them
And did them all good."

Perhaps this last line does not apply to me. As a teacher I have always sincerely wanted to meet the needs of all my students and be of service to each one of them, whether he was a poor student intellectually or a very smart one. I am sure that I have failed in more than one instance, and yet over against the failures there have been some cases of success.

At the very outset I must be frank and say that my heart and love for teaching have always been with the gifted student, and I have always tried in some measure to meet the challenge of that type of student. Is this fair? I do not honestly know. I know only that whatever quirk of conscience causes me to wonder sometimes if I should not perhaps spend more time with the slow learner, it is not strong enough to keep me long in the throes of endless repetition and countless drills. I know only that my heart and my mind tell me that the gifted child is both an asset and a responsibility—that he is of incalculable value to society—that his potentialities for good are difficult to overestimate. I keep remembering that our country, both on a national and international level, demands leadership of the highest quality and keenest intelligence. Where else may we look for this type of leadership except among those of intellectual superiority? It is the aim of education, of course, to prepare the student for the place in society for which he is best fitted—and so I ask myself—is it any less important that the young man or woman of superior mentality be prepared for leadership?

It is the part of wisdom, I am sure, to prepare these boys and girls for the important social responsibility which will some day be theirs. It would seem to me that the lessons of history would not only justify but demand that these superior students be prepared to develop into the leadership our country needs for the tremendous tasks that lie ahead.

For those of us who teach, it is easy to spot very shortly the mentally gifted student. He is so different from the average. From my teaching experience I have noted these special characteristics:

1. He has learning characteristics that make it quite undesirable to use with him the teaching methods applicable to the instruction of normal or slow-learning pupils.

2. He has a superior reading ability and a rich vocabulary recognition. (This is most easily recognizable.)

3. He learns more rapidly than the average student.

4. He sees relationships and thinks very logically.

5. The amount of drill necessary to the average student is distinctly boring to him.

6. He is impatient with too much routine and, in fact, is often driven by it to daydreaming. (And who can blame him?)

Lita Hollingsworth says, "He must be taught to suffer fools gladly," but it is often very obvious that he does not suffer fools gladly. The following incident did not happen in one of my classes, but it could have well enough, for I have had students who I know have felt the same way and I realized it at the time. A not even average student gave a report to his class—or attempted to give a report in 15 minutes of bungling effort. When he had finished, the usual opportunity for discussion and criticism brought forth the impatience of one of the boys who served to boost the I. Q. of the school. "It is not a good report because most of it is not true, and besides, I do not like to waste my time in listening to such a report." Amen. I know just how he felt.

Now perhaps this impatience on the part of the student is not so consciously felt for the particularly inept student giving the report, but rather at the lagging method of instruction on the part of the teacher. The resentment is justified. After the first such experience in one of my classes I resolved that it would never happen again, and it hasn't. Now is this wrong—is this an injustice to the inferior student or a blessing to the superior? My sympathy is with the latter.

The drilling that a teacher finds necessary in a class of wide range of ability brings an unconscious revolt and resentment from her mentally superior students. I firmly believe that this lack of challenge in the method of instruction may make a mediocre student out of a possible genius. You and I know that the pages of history are filled with the names and deeds of men of great minds whose school records say that they were poor or average in their work. Such a student was Dwight David Eisenhower. Undoubtedly, many more who were in school at the same time failed to reach their potential and failed to accomplish.

Who knows the number of students in our schools today whose intelligence is potentially equal to the greatest minds of our times, but who will live and die humble members of a community whose only public praise will be "My, but he's smart for a garbage collector." How many individuals of extraordinary intelligence will walk the streets of Palatka, their ability unrecognized, their usefulness partly or wholly wasted, because we have failed to recognize the brilliant man of tomorrow who is a student in our class today, and have not done our part in helping to mold him properly?

HOW HAVE I ATTEMPTED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF MY GIFTED STUDENTS?

I have found it extremely difficult as a teacher and yet at the same time extremely important to help highly gifted students to develop constructive attitudes and insights. He simply must learn to feel for humanity or he may use his powers destructively.

Fortunately for me as a teacher of 10th grade English and literature, there is available a tool which makes possible this insight into life which is so important to people, leaders, and followers alike. This tool is books. Only through wide, constant, and increasingly mature reading can the superior young mind gain information and taste of experiences that would not otherwise be his and broaden his mental and emotional outlook on life.

And thus it is that I consistently encourage my students of gifted abilities to find in books the answers to their hungry questions. I try to guide them into reading on subjects in which at first he seems to have no interest. I try to guard him against the narrow confines of a certain type of reading—whether it be the sport story that he thinks his mind craves, the detective story that never fails to whet his interest, or the many other types of narrow specialization. I cannot help feeling that if he learns to read widely and deeply—that his taste at the Pierian Springs will lead him to a fuller and richer enjoyment of life, and that he cannot help using this newfound gift, not only for his own happiness, but for the good of mankind. Might he not some day express himself in his own sermon from some pulpit, his own philosophy in some classroom, his own tender touch in healing the sick—yes, even his own inaugural address?

I cannot take refuge in the fact, as do some teachers, that in the process of being educated the gifted student will take care of himself. If left to himself it is entirely possible that he could become the proverbial bookworm with his nose so buried in his books that he is not benefited by the content of them because he has no time, or at least makes no effort at contact with life about him. Or perhaps he is not exposed to an adequate supply of reading material.

This is an inadequacy I have attempted to overcome. This is part of my project.

In my own classes we have a library of our own. I have brought many of the books from our library at home, fully realizing that I may never see some of them again, and yet at the same time realizing that if my students will read them it will be my gain as well as my loss. What types of books? Historical novels on the Revolutionary and Civil Wars and many other periods in history; books with a Biblical background such as The Road to Bithynia and The Silver Chalice; biographies on Eisenhower, Andrew Jackson, Judah Benjamin, and others; poetry such as The White Cliffs of Dover, Sonnets of the Portuguese, Best Loved Poems, and others. These are but samples, and this classroom library is but a supplementary one to the very nice and quite adequate high school library.

Each class has a librarian of its own and each student who reads a book must sign his book out with the librarian of his class. What a joy to see these students come in before school, between classes, and after school looking for these books. The problem is keeping enough of them on the shelves of the bookcase.

We also have two magazine tables that are constantly being replenished because the magazines become worn from so much leafturning.

All students must read 1 book each 6 weeks but any student who plans to make an "A" for the course must read 2 books and more if possible. This is so because students must be exposed to wide and deep and rich supplies of reading material; they must be guided in their selections; and they must be given an opportunity to discuss the material read. Consequently, we reserve 1 day out of each 6 weeks period for those who want to report to the class and bring up for discussion any book they have read. This is a day the whole class seems to enjoy.

I have found that lovers of literature are not made by the reading of a classic in class and then making a critical analysis of it—rather a method must exist that will encourage the gifted student to enrich his reading experience and thus to reach for the classic of his own free will. I am sure that it is possible to teach a knowledge about literature without developing any love for it—that it is entirely possible to learn a great many facts about authors, types, periods, and influences and still have only the barest insight into what riches literature has to offer. So it is that I felt my raison d'etre as a teacher is to inspire the genuine interest and to develop the love for literature that lies latent in every student of superior mentality who sits in my class.

Each of these students, able as he is, has something to learn. He may be prone to make careless selections in his reading. He may lack a sense of literary form, reading for example a poem as if it were a literal statement, or a play as if it were an essay. Yes—he has something to learn, and as a gifted student he has the capability, but the question is, Do I as his teacher rise to the challenge? Will I inspire him and aid him in closing the gaps of his literary background of the Bible, mythology, English, and American literature, and even the history of our country and the world?

Although other students may also learn to enjoy literary technique, it is the gifted who will make use of it. But they must be led—not driven. If guidance in individual reading is part of the answer, I hope to meet the challenge. May lack of challenge in one of my classes never make a mediocre student out of a possible genius.

THE NECESSITY FOR EDUCATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me timely after listening to the reading of the President's message stressing the need for Federal aid to education to bring to the attention of the House the news that fills several pages of this morning's Chicago newspapers. This news relates to the reported confession of the murder of 2 young sisters, a crime that had horrified the people of Chicago, following as it did the brutal murder some months ago of 3 young men.

The reason I am bringing this now to the attention of the House is because of its relationship to the need of Federal aid for education. The young man who purportedly had confessed to the murder of the 2 sisters, one 13 and the other 15, is 21 years of age and he has been a resident of Chicago for only 4 years. According to the Chicago newspapers he can neither read nor write.

This would indicate something amiss with the educational opportunities and the educational system in the State wherein he was born and spent the first 16 years of his life. Had he been born and raised in Chicago under the educational system that there obtains, he certainly would have been able to read and write and he would have been the beneficiary of the schooling in the grades and in high school by the time he had reached 16 or 17.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the lack of education is always or usually a cause of crime. I am saying, however, that the total lack of education, and the inability even to read or write seriously handicaps one moving in a society wherein all of the other persons in that society have had the educational opportunities that are offered by the city of Chicago.

I am bringing this to the attention of the House because it illustrates how in our closely knit United States of today the lack of proper educational facilities in any State has serious repercussions upon the society and the life in other States and communities where the educational standards are high.

There is no greater responsibility of the Federal Government than to give Federal aid to education to the extent that there shall be no disadvantages among the youth of America and the communities wherein the educational standards are high may reasonably expect newcomers from other States to be approximately on the same level of education as those in the State to which they migrate.

That there may be no misunderstanding I think I should make plain that in the instance that I have been mentioning there is no race issue.

POLITICAL LARCENY

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by reminding my colleagues on the right-hand side of the aisle that I warned you in 1949 that they were going to do it. I have been watching for the last 4 years for the final consummation of the grandest larceny that has ever been perpetrated in the United States since the time of the 13 colonies, and it is just about finishing. The Republican Party has stolen the Roosevelt New Deal, the Truman Fair Deal, the Marshal plan and Harry Truman's point-4 program. Now that point-4 program is going to be extended to every nook and corner of this earth and it is going to be known as the Eisenhower doctrine. I could see it coming even in 1949 and the fact that it will cost for the 5 years—the 4 years that the Republicans have already had control of this Government and the year that the proposed budget is laid out for, the coming fiscal year of 1958, the fact that it is going to cost over $73 billion more of the taxpayers' money to do it does not seem to faze the Republicans a bit.

Now, at this point I would like to draw your attention to the last five Truman budgets from 1948 to 1952, inclusive, as compared to the Eisenhower budgets from 1953 to 1956, together with the proposed budget for 1957 which is to cover the 1958 fiscal year. A study of these figures might prove very enlightening because they show the 5 Eisenhower budgets $73.6 billion in excess of the 5 Truman budgets.

Budgets

	Billion
TRUMAN	
1948	$37.5
1949	39.6
1950	44.0
1951	65.4
1952	74.3
Total Truman budgets	260.8
EISENHOWER	
1953	$67.8
1954	64.6
1955	64.3
1956	65.9
1957 (estimated)	71.8
Total Eisenhower budgets	334.4

Eisenhower budgets exceed Truman's by $73.6 billion.

From the budget report.

I recall very vividly, and I am certain many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recall also, the numberless times the Democratic Party, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S Truman, and their programs were characterized in the well of this House as a system of tax and tax, spend and spend, lend and lend, give and give. Republican orators always left the inference quite clear that it was their belief that if the voters would exercise enough intelligence in the polling place to return the direction of the executive branch of this Government to the Republicans, that trend would be reversed.

The budget figures just quoted speak for themselves quite eloquently. Of course, the present budget request should not be viewed as inflationary spending as it would be if a Democrat had been President of the United States. It cannot be inflationary because it has Ike's blessing and no one could be more opposed to inflation than the President. Of course, it does mean there can be no tax cut this year because that would be inflationary, but Ike does want Congress to pass a natural-gas bill like the one he vetoed last year because the boys were caught spending money to freely to get it passed. That gas bill would only add one-half billion dollars to the consumers' cost for that fuel—that would not be inflationary; it would merely drive the cost of living still higher.

The President has also requested a jump in interest rates on GI home loans. That will help to further deflate the veteran who would like to buy a new home.

It should also be remembered that during the period, January 1, 1956, to December 1, 1956, the Consumers' Price Index—cost of living—rose 2.8 points. This means, according to figures submitted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that it will cost the American people $6,720,000,000 more in 1957 than it did in 1955 just to live. This is assuming that the cost of living does not rise further in 1957, and official circles in Washington seem to be of the opinion that the cost of living is more likely to go up than down in the year just ahead.

When it comes to spending, lending, and giving away the taxpayers' money, the Eisenhower administration is making the New Deal and the Fair Deal look like ultraconservatism.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include some relevant material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on 4 or 5 occasions there have been published reports concerning the disposition of H. R. 6888, a bill to amend the immigration laws which we passed during the early days of the last Congress. I am inserting in the RECORD my correspondence with the head of the Anti-Defamation League in order that the people may know the true facts concerning the disposition of this legislation.

(The correspondence is as follows:)

JANUARY 8, 1957.

MR. HERMAN EDELSBERG,
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EDELSBERG: I was surprised to see you quoted in the press as having said in one of your recent public appearances that I have "blocked," or "stopped," or "prevented from being enacted" some liberal immigration legislation in the closing days of the last session.

Knowing how carefully you observe the Washington scene and particularly what is going on in the Congress, I would assume that you were fully familiar with the facts. Thus, I believe that you are aware of the fact that the legislation to which you apparently referred in your talk was conceived, prepared, and recommended by none other than myself. It passed the House and it took the Senate more than a year to get around to it. In the last day of the 84th Congress, July 27, 1956, to be specific, the Senate has attached to the bill, H. R. 6888, a rider which provided not only for a fundamental change in our basic immigration code, but for an unprecedented and very drastic departure of our immigration structure as it was embodied in our immigration laws since 1921.

You are aware, of course, of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate had terminated its work a full week prior to the date above mentioned and that the House was in session while the Senate took the action which I briefly described above. You are also aware of the fact that it was not possible to assemble the Committee on the Judiciary of the House on that date and that the committee, therefore, had no opportunity to discuss this basic change in our policy and in our laws, not to speak about holding hearings and conduct even a perfunctory study of its implications.

Being well cognizant of the rules and practices of the House, you know that legislation drastically amended by the Senate could not be sent to conference without that committee of the House which was in charge of such legislation, having been given an opportunity to pass upon the Senate amendment.

In view of the foregoing, I wonder what was your purpose in telling your audience something which was so far remote from the truth.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1957.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL WALTER: I hasten to reply to your letter of January 8 in which you criticize my recent comments on your role in immigration legislation. Needless to say, I am sorry and disappointed that you take such issue with my report. I had hoped you knew that regardless of our differences in viewpoint I would not wittingly do anything that might prejudice the continued development of mutual respect and good will. I should have thought that you would want to take note of the report's praise for recent actions of the Un-American Activities Committee—but perhaps you considered that beside the point.

I said you stopped the modest immigration amendments sponsored by the Senate majority leader and passed overwhelmingly by the Senate in this specific context:

"WALTER, more than any Member of Congress, has the effective say on whether America will liberalize its immigration laws and temper the harshness of the national origins quota system. He saw at firsthand the hardships of the Hungarian situation and helped to correct them. It is to be hoped he will review the old law in the light of his new experiences, and find that the law can be liberalized without sacrificing America's genuine security interests."

I can understand why for reasons of modesty you would not want to admit the soft impeachment that you have the effective say on immigration legislation—but I don't know why you should want to deny it. It is a compliment that your leadership in the House gives you this power—a power which you refused to exercise on behalf of the Senate bill.

If you seriously disagree with my judgment on this, I shall say only that my judgment is shared by some very eminent colleagues of yours in both Houses. Surely you don't think that Majority Leader JOHNSON and Senator WATKINS walked across Capitol Hill to see you about the Senate bill just for the exercise? They thought—and I think—that if you had accepted the Senate version that bill would now be law, even if your Republican friends did insist on a record vote. If I am wrong about this, I would like to talk with you and be straightened out.

Perhaps you think I slighted your contributions to the remedial provisions in the Senate bill. I know you were the original sponsor of all those provisions with the exception of the pooling feature, and I have publicly praised your proposals as useful even though I consider them minor.

Your letter makes a number of technical and legalistic points about the powers of conference committees. I cannot argue with a parliamentarian of your experience concerning the limits that you feel should apply to a conference committee in which you participate, but I am sure you know that there are literally scores of precedents for doing what Senator JOHNSON hoped would be done. It is a well-settled practice for conference committees to add or subtract much more than was involved in the Senate proposal.

More important, when you get around to working up your amendments in the light of your recent experiences I want you to know that you can count on our support of every provision that will bring good people into our country and keep subversives out.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

HERMAN EDELSBERG.

JANUARY 15, 1957.

Mr. HERMAN EDELSBERG,
Director, Anti-Defamation League
of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EDELSBERG: I have your letter of January 10, and I wish to keep it as a near perfect example of doubletalk used for the purpose of evasion.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

WHO IS SPENDING THE MONEY?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is crying about the fact—he thinks it is a fact anyway—that the Republicans stole the New Deal, Democratic, giveaway international platform.

The spenders and the internationalists who would first socialize us and then surrender at least a part of our sovereignty to some one-world organization, prided themselves on their discovery of this political heresy. They backed us from what was a fairly sound economy into national bankruptcy. The platform of which they now complain was their pride and joy. They—at least the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER]—still seem to think it the best of all political philosophy.

Well, they should have had it copyrighted or patented or something, if it was any good, and apparently he thinks so, because he has supported it all the time and now he is crying, seems to be envious, because, under the Republican version of that policy, he thinks we are spending too much money, and he finds himself supporting what is now known as "modern republicanism."

But he belongs to the group which originated this policy and he should not waiver in his loyalty to it just because some Republicans recognize its unsoundness.

Having originated it, the New Deal internationalists should not now complain. If the program was good under one administration, it should not now be considered bad just because some other group has adopted it.

A few days ago, the Porter Hardy Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations came in with a report showing how we have been wasting our money in Iran—millions upon millions of our dollars.

It was my suggestion that we get rid of these fellows who are doing the spending, even though they are Democrats who have been in for a long time under the previous administration. We should get rid of them because, look, here is the way they find a way to spend our money:

On page 979 of these hearings, this gentleman, Mr. Warne, who is spending the money, who is now in Korea, looking for more opportunities to spend, seeking new ways to spend, was asked how the money was spent in Iran.

He said, "I spent nearly 4 years in Iran where we had to scratch to find anyone who could receive technical assistance,"—that is to say, we appropriate the money and the people put in office by the gentleman over here hires someone to find someone to take it. Now, what do you know about that?

Many a big ad is published, not only in our newspapers, but in our magazines—pages upon pages of pictures and print, designed to promote the sale of automobiles, of electric household equipment, of almost everything under the sun; but this is the first instance that I recall in my short 81 years where it became necessary to advertise the giving away of dollars.

Now, it may be that, with the purchasing value of the dollar cut in two—that is, halved—we shall be forced to appropriate additional sums to get rid of them.

If inflation continues, merchandise will be less bulky than the paper currency required to purchase it.

PRESIDENT TITO OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have protested before, and do so again with the arguments that are so well known, against any invitation to President Tito of Yugoslavia to be the guest of the United States Government. There is little doubt that I speak for the overwhelming majority of the people in my district in opposing any such invitation. In order to attempt to clarify this situation and put an end to this speculation, I have addressed a letter to the President of the United States asking whether or not an invitation has already been extended.

I think the American people are entitled to know if this is mere speculation or rumor. I have heard the arguments given by the State Department as to why there would be some possible good in extending such an invitation to Tito. Weaker and more fallacious arguments I have never heard. Any invitation for a visit by Tito to this country could do us no good, but tremendous harm. It would be an insult to the persecuted people in Yugoslavia, as well as to the enslaved people of Hungary, and all of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

It is hard to find mere words to express my feelings that such a step would even be contemplated.

THE LATE HONORABLE ELMER H. WENE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to bring to the attention of the House the passing away of our former colleague, Hon. Elmer H. Wene, on January 25, 1957. I do so at the request of many of his friends as

well as my own desire. As is generally known, the Second Congressional District of New Jersey has no representation in the Congress owing to the recent death of T. Millet Hand, former Representative from that district. Mr. Wene represented the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, comprising Cumberland, Atlantic, and Cape May Counties, in this body.

He was elected for his first term in the Congress of the United States in 1936, as a Member of the 75th Congress. In the Roosevelt landslide of that year he defeated the Honorable Isaac Bacharach, Republican, who had served 11 terms in this House. Mr. Wene was defeated for reelection in 1938, but was elected again in 1940 and 1942 to the 77th and 78th Congresses. During his membership in the House he served with distinguished and marked ability in the House and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture of that body.

In 1939 he was elected Cumberland County's first Democratic freeholder from Landis Township in more than 40 years. In 1944 he was a candidate for the United States Senate and, although defeated, polled a very flattering vote. In 1947 he was a delegate to the New Jersey Constitution Convention. In 1949 Mr. Wene was defeated for Governor of New Jersey by Alfred E. Driscoll, Republican, after a hard-fought campaign. In 1953 he ran in the Democratic gubernatorial primary, but lost to the present Governor, Robert B. Meyner, by a comparatively very few votes.

In between campaigns for statewide or national office, Mr. Wene served as a State Senator from Cumberland County. He was elected to that office in 1946.

Mr. Wene, born on a farm outside of Pittstown, Hunterdon County, N. J., on May 1, 1892. After attending the Pittstown public schools, he took special courses in agriculture and poultry husbandry at Rutgers University in New Jersey. On graduation, he served as research assistant for the State Agricultural College at Rutgers for 6 years. At the same time, he took an evening course in business administration.

Mr. Wene went to Vineland, Cumberland County, N. J., from his native Hunterdon County in 1917 and over the years built up one of the largest chicken hatcheries in the United States. The Wene Chick Farms at Vineland and the Wene Breeding Farm in Hunterdon County for years comprised a cornerstone of New Jersey's $100 million a year poultry industry.

Mr. Wene worked throughout his life to improve egg production and his laboratories produced better vaccines to protect the health of poultry flocks. He was known as an authority on the cross-breeding of chicks and the development of chicken hybrids.

Mr. Wene served for 15 years as president of the Cumberland County Board of Agriculture. He was a member of the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture for 9 years and president for 5 years. He also was president of the New Jersey and the International Baby Chick Associations and was associated with agricultural groups all over the country.

Elmer H. Wene was one of the most prominent and widely liked Democrats in the State of New Jersey. He was highly regarded for his honesty, integrity, and ability by all who knew him. He had a host of friends because of his personal qualities and his happy disposition at all times. His friendships in this House were not divided by partisan affiliation. He had friends on both sides of the aisle. He had the reputation of being "true blue" to all who knew him. His ability and knowledge of matters agricultural, and particularly relating to poultry, gained for him a recognized position of leadership in these matters and in the Committee on Agriculture, where he served so faithfully and well.

I will miss Elmer as one of my best friends. I am certain that all who knew him will likewise miss him and mourn his going. To his sister, Mrs. Beulah Fitzer, of Pittstown, and other members of the family who survive him, I extend my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of Elmer Wene. Those who served with him admired him for his industry, his charming personality, his likeability, his attractiveness, and I join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] in every remark he made about our late friend. To Mr. Wene's loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that all Members may have permission to insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the passing of our late colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with others here today in expressing on behalf of our people in Hudson County, and on behalf of his friends everywhere, my regrets at the sad news of the death of the Honorable Elmer H. Wene, one of New Jersey's distinguished citizens.

Mr. Wene was a great fighter and a hard campaigner. He was loyal to his party, loyal to his friends, and dedicated to his supporters. Elmer knew no turning back. His ready smile and quick handshake made him many friends. We salute a great warrior. His passing saddens us. God rest his soul. Elmer was a fine man.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION PRACTICES

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly interested in developments in connection with H. R. 11 and other similar bills.

Last year I was urged by the Washington State Pharmaceutical Association and the Washington State Gasoline Retailers Association to sign a petition to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from consideration of H. R. 11. I received hundreds of letters from small independent businessmen saying this legislation to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act was needed to protect them from large monopolistic chain merchandisers.

I took the position, as I always do with discharge petitions, that until a committee has had ample opportunity after public hearings to consider and report out bills, I would not sign a petition. Subsequently it became apparent that the full House of Representatives would not have an opportunity to vote on this bill unless the committee was forced to discharge H. R. 11, so I signed the discharge petition and later voted for this legislation when it came to the House floor because I thought it would protect our small enterprises.

Recently, however, I have been receiving correspondence in opposition to H. R. 11, and I have noticed that in certain cases these telegrams and letters were from the same parties formerly supporting H. R. 11. Circumstances led me to suspect that a large producer and distributor of petroleum products in my district might be using duress to generate opposition because those independent retailers depend on it for their products and have short leases on their stations. I am told these lessee retailers can be forced out of their stations on a few days' notice, and so they are expressing opposition views under pressure.

The big oil companies have a full right to testify and express their views, but if they use their control over small independent retailers to preserve monopolistic price discrimination practices it is something that should be stopped. In any event, the House Judiciary Committee should instigate an immediate investigation.

MY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DROUGHT AREA

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I am J. FLOYD BREEDING, Congressman, Fifth District of Kansas. I am a farmer stockman living on my own ranch in the southwest corner of Kansas, approximately in the center of the huge drought area of our United States, a country whose lifeblood is wheat, livestock, and milo maize. I have seen the country in worse condition in the thirties, but never before as dry as it is at the present time.

The people there are not pessimistic about the future as some writers would have you believe. They are optimistic about the future of their country, otherwise they would have left it long ago.

We know that with sufficient rainfall the country can produce like a Garden of

Eden. We know also that wheat principally is our lifeblood. We know that it is home to thousands of people with their fine schools, churches and community life. We are proud of our country, proud of the fact that we were called upon during two world wars to produce more food and fiber to help feed the people of the United States and our friendly allies the world over. Because of our ability to produce, we feel that we are essential to the defense of our country. We can produce more wheat than any other area of like size and dimensions in the world. Now we are faced with this drought condition which is caused by an act of God, a drought over which we have no control, and which we can do very little about. We in the high plains area are a proud people. We are not asking for a handout or charity but a little help to tide us over until conditions improve. We have been penalized for producing too much food and fiber over the past years in peacetime. During the good years, we were penalized by the income-tax laws whereby one-fourth of all our net income was paid out for Federal income taxes and in some cases up to 50 percent of our income. We know that for every dollar of Government payments in the past which has come to our area that through our income-tax system we have repaid it tenfold.

Now we are asking as any good neighbor would, for a little help until our country again gets back to an economic normal condition. Here are some of the requests that many in our area are asking for. The requests that I make here are not only my thinking but that of my two sons, my neighbors, many friends, and farmer stockmen over the entire area.

We recommend that a program of erosion control be endorsed for necessary operations of all plowed lands where needed; that the qualifications be supervised by A. C. S. county committees; that the rate per acre be set at $1 per acre for listings, and at 50 cents per acre for chiseling; that this program be retroactive to October 1, 1956, to cover farms already controlled, and to run to May 1, 1957; that a payment of $1 per acre be made for retaining cover crop on land which presently has a cover on it.

That payments be made immediately, or as soon as compliance has been determined, on the acreage reserve portion of the 1957 soil-bank payment; and that all checks for compliance be completed by April 1, 1957.

That announcement of 1958 soil-bank program be made by April 1, 1957, and urge that 100 percent of wheat allotments be made eligible for Acreage Reserve in drought areas, so that summer fallow operations will not be started.

That eroded grassland should be made eligible for conservation reserve payments.

Realizing that wheat is the principal crop in the high plains area, we urge the Department of Agriculture to give us an increased wheat acreage base and an increased normal yield. Wheat is our lifeblood, without it we perish, and we grow it better than anywhere else in the world.

We recommend that emergency public works programs be established in drought counties. We further recommend that the Small Business Administration make direct emergency loans to the small businesses that are suffering in this area.

We recommend refinancing program on existing indebtedness by means of long-term loans, with interest rate not to exceed 3 percent. This should be applicable to the farmer, the livestock man, and to small businesses.

We believe that the regulations pertaining to the Farmers Home Administration long-term credit are too restrictive to cover the problems in the High Plains area. The present attitude of those administering the Farmers Home Administration program with respect to a very limited amount of refinancing prevents the farmer and rancher from consolidating his obligations with a single lending source with sufficient low-interest rates and long-term repayment periods to enable him to work out of his most difficult situation.

Worthy individual farmers on units presently defined by the Farmers Home Administration as those who are not an economic unit should be considered and approved on his ability to pay instead of a preconceived idea in connection with total resources needed for an economic unit.

Drops in agricultural values, with practically no production, has caused many individuals to lose equity to the point that he has relatively small or no net worth. This fact alone is used for the refusal and delaying of approval of loans to farmers urgently in need of all kinds of credit to carry on an efficient farm business. The program is not being administered on a factual basis of accepting a worthy and eligible farmer in the position with which they find him, and then step by step aiding him in making the necessary adjustments to reduce risks and till the soil, so he will have the greatest possible chances to obtain a crop or acquire additional resources, or to develop new resources essential for a stabilized farm business. Lending agencies of the Government have in effect withdrawn further assistance to many farm families. This situation must be immediately corrected. Oftentimes, collections are demanded which destroy the basic farm business. Short-term budgets disregarding such items as family living, including doctor and hospital bills, become unworkable and cause various credits to make immediate demands upon the farmer and businessman. This further prevents the farmer and businessman from having sufficient available funds to properly carry on his business.

The tight-money policy has practically eliminated the availability of funds for the insured loan programs. Additional direct appropriated funds are urgently needed.

Repayment periods for loans made for chattels should carry a repayment period of at least 15 years, the loan limit per borrower to be as high as $50,000.

Refinancing should definitely be included and permitted in all of the loaning programs.

Loans to grazing associations, livestock breeders, farm partnerships, irrigation companies, and related small businesses should be a permanent, rather than an emergency, part of the Department's loaning program.

These important and necessary programs must be geared up and made simpler and more usable immediately.

We recommend that the Great Plains program be administered by farmer-elected ASC county committees. We are definitely opposed to a Government land-purchase program being put into operation, and that no attempt be made to classify land as to its capabilities during a drought period.

We recommend that the capabilities of the area be surveyed by the Government with a view to establishing industries in the area; that a portion of the cost of establishing industries in the area be financed by the Federal Government.

We further recommend that we establish a committee representing farming, ranching, industry, and small business; that such a committee be selected by interested leaders in the area; that the headquarters for the committee be located within the area; said committee to be for such purposes as making recommendations for a long-term program, changes in methods of taxation, improving financial services, making a greater use of underground water supplies, obtaining a supplemental income through placing small industry within the area, the establishment of additional institutions and services which would specifically benefit the High Plains area.

We recommend that a definite and specific underground water program be established, funds to be made available for the purpose of cooperating with farmers on land above areas where underground water is believed to be present. This will enable them to drill wells on the outer edges of such an area to establish the underground water boundary. The repayment of the funds made available to the farmers for such purposes should be required only on the actual value of the development. In those instances where no water is found, no repayment should be required.

We recommend further that a series of dams be constructed for the purpose of establishing stream flow and replenishing the underground water supply, the construction of these facilities to be considered a part of a much-needed public-works program, because of lack of income within the area.

We recommend that a new procedure of income-tax collection be worked out to coincide with the cycles of weather. That income be worked out to spread over a period of a wet cycle and a dry cycle, which over the years has been 7 to 8 years dry and 7 to 8 years wet, or a total of 15 years, thereby distributing the income over a period of years which would help greatly to stabilize the economy of the area.

It is the general feeling of the people of this High Plains area that parity of income with other segments of our economy under normal conditions would be the No. 1 step in preventing these

emergencies from recurring in the future.

We strongly recommend that all programs be administered by local elective committees, and we are against any move to take this privilege from us.

THE PLIGHT OF THE INDEPENDENT SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, time is running out for the independent small-business man. Despite the fact that we enjoy prosperity, if the current rate of business failures continues, 1957 will see the greatest number of bankruptcies since depression years.

Everybody talks about small business—particularly during a political campaign—but little time remains to do something. Yet the present trend must be halted or we shall officiate at the interment of free enterprise. Instead we shall have monopoly capitalism as our economy, which shall lead inevitably to fascism or state socialism.

God forbid either.

Only the Congress can take the initiative in solving this problem. The administration is abdicating. Despite its rosy campaign talks, the only deed has been the President's recommendation for tax relief to the small-business man. Unfortunately, the man who speaks for the administration in this area, Secretary Humphrey, is opposed to any tax relief to any group for any purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I am not deliberately trying to scare anyone, but I find the figures frightening. A recent compilation of statistics made by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., shows that for the few brief weeks of 1957, business bankruptcies are averaging 240 a week. If we project that figure conservatively, as did financial reporter Sylvia F. Porter in a recent column, failures will run about 13,000 this year.

Obviously, a few of these businesses would fail in the best of economic climates, but only a small percentage may be attributed to incompetence or shiftlessness. Most small-business men are being caught in a squeeze that is not of their own making.

Big companies are merging and medium-sized companies are merging. The small independent in retailing, wholesaling, and manufacturing is operating at an increasing disadvantage.

Added to this, he must seek capital in a tighter market. This hurts. The lender naturally prefers the safer, more established firm over the little fellow. The higher interest rates, which tend to dry up the money supply, may be more easily absorbed by big industry, with rapidly rising industrial prices.

As Miss Porter remarked in her column published in the New York Post on January 21:

> That small business should be in this crisis after the most prolonged period of unparalleled prosperity in history is terrifying:

Moreover, the present crisis belies the fundamental assumption behind the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business, about which we heard so much last fall, and about which we have heard little since.

In its progress report of last August, which became the campaign Bible of the administration, the Cabinet committee found—

> that the fortunes of small businesses have ordinarily varied with the fortunes of the economy at large. When production, employment, and the flow of incomes have risen, as has been the case in recent years, the majority of smaller enterprises have shared in the economic expansion.

President Eisenhower, in his Economic Report last week, boasted of our healthy economy, the number of people at work, and the increase in gross national product. Obviously, then, the assumption of Small Business Committee must be wrong, or else the President's optimistic Economic Report is in error. It offers some explanation for the abdication of the administration, for it has only the imagination to believe that what is good for General Motors is good for small business, which is approximately what the Cabinet Committee's assumption means.

Mr. Speaker, the small-business man is the warp and the woof of our economy. The competition which the small-business man has fostered and encouraged has enabled this country to have a dynamic, expanding capitalism, a capitalism that has brought benefits to all the people, in contrast to the monopoly capitalism that has given growth to different economies in other nations of the world.

If the small-business man dies, American private enterprise dies.

The small-business man is sick and dying. Congress must act and act quickly. Measures to restore the proper climate for the independent businessman must be given highest priority. The 14 recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business are an absolute minimum must list. I repeat them.

First. That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 percent to 20 percent on incomes up to $25,000.

Second. That business be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any 1 year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Third. That corporations with, say, 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Fourth. That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

Fifth. That the President arrange for a comprehensive review of procurement policies and procedures of all departments and agencies, including the legislation pertaining thereto, with a view to facilitating and extending the participation of small businesses in work on Government contracts.

Sixth. That the President direct departments and agencies engaged in extensive procurement to adopt procedures which would insure that a need for advance or progress payments by a bidder will not be treated as a handicap in awarding a contract, and which would facilitate and accelerate the making of such progress payments as may be requested by small suppliers under Government contracts.

Seventh. That the Renegotiation Board clarify the fact that, although a contractor who subcontracts work may not reasonably expect to be allowed as large a profit thereon as if he had done the work himself, the practice of subcontracting—especially the extent to which subcontracts are placed with small businesses—is encouraged by giving it favorable consideration in determining allowable profits.

Eighth. That the life of the Small Business Administration, which is now scheduled to expire in mid-1957, be extended at the earliest opportunity.

Ninth. That the maximum amount of an issue of corporate securities which the Securities and Exchange Commission may exempt from registration be increased from $300,000 to $500,000.

Tenth. That the President call a conference on technical research, development, and distribution, for the benefit of small business.

Eleventh. That legislation be enacted to enable closer Federal security of mergers.

Twelfth. That procedural changes be made in the antitrust laws to facilitate their enforcement.

Thirteenth. That wage reporting by employers for purposes of social-security records and income-tax withholding be simplified.

Fourteenth. That the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget undertake a comprehensive review of the reports and statistics required of small businesses.

I respectfully but urgently call on Republicans and Democrats alike to be active in insisting that these goals be reached on the congressional and executive level in the immediate future.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1934

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, another incident in a succession of heavy body blows to American industry which began with

adoption of the reciprocal trade agreement of 1934 has occurred in West Virginia. I quote from an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Charleston Daily Mail of January 23, 1957:

PADEN CITY, W. VA.—President Merrill Sondles, of the Paden City Pottery Co., has announced that the 43-year-old factory will be liquidated within the next 2 or 3 months.

Sondles said yesterday that the firm, which makes dinnerware, has suffered a loss of more than $1 million since 1950.

He blamed the low tariff on imported pottery for the losses. The shutdown will affect about 400 workers.

George Henthorn, president of Local 146, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, said his union decided at a meeting last night to offer employee aid if the plant is kept open.

Plant officials, however, said that the pottery would not go back into operation. They declared that the building and equipment would be for lease or sale after the company is closed.

Operators of this concern, no doubt, along with many others, have continued to operate their businesses in the hope of relief through legislation. Instead of relief, tariff policies have been adopted which favor producers abroad who use generally inferior materials and cheap labor and flood our domestic markets to the fatal disadvantage of American manufacturers.

It is increasingly difficult for any citizen of West Virginia to understand why foreign nations are favored in glutting our markets with inferior goods produced by the cheapest labor in existence when American industry, with its superior technology, could successfully compete if the protective cloak of a low tariff were removed from foreign imports.

PROHIBITING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR TRAVEL OR ENTERTAINMENT OF JOSEF BROZ, ALSO KNOWN AS MARSHAL TITO

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which I hope will have the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. This resolution will provide as follows:

Whereas Americans are heavily burdened by the requirements of the largest peacetime military and foreign-aid expenditures in the history of our Nation; and

Whereas such expenditures are justified by Communist threats to internal security and world peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated shall be used for the expenses of travel or entertainment for Josef Broz, also known as Marshal Tito, or the travel or entertainment of any official, representative, or citizen of a foreign Communist state in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we cannot afford to tax the American people for entertaining or bringing to the United States those who are known Communists. I hope my resolution will have the immediate and sincere consideration of all Members of the House.

USDA WILL BUY EGGS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, I wrote Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, urging that the Department reenter the egg market to reverse a slide in egg prices which had become extremely harsh in my district. I also took a few minutes time in the House that day to explain to my colleagues the implications of the egg market.

I learned a few days later that the Department was giving serious study to my recommendation and to the whole egg market situation. Then, last Friday afternoon, I received by special messenger a copy of a release by the Department announcing that egg purchases would be resumed. I am including that release at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Secretary of Agriculture is to be commended for his prompt action on this problem which has had such an adverse effect in the Midwest. It is no small matter to us as we produced about 1,123,000,000 eggs in 1955 in the seventh district of Minnesota. Our egg sales have been running between 17 and 20 million dollars a year, and every 5 percent drop in market prices means a loss of about a million dollars in income to the farm families in my district.

The Department advises me that the school-lunch program uses about 50,000 cases of eggs a week. I hope this purchase program will be broadened to include other outlets and thus permit the purchase of at least 100,000 cases a week until the market is restored to a fair level.

USDA RESUMES PURCHASE OF SHELL EGGS

WASHINGTON, January 25, 1957.—The United States Department of Agriculture announced today that it will resume the purchase program for shell eggs which was discontinued last December 6, when enough eggs were on hand to meet requirements through January. These purchases are designed to help stabilize producer prices and will be limited to eggs that can be immediately distributed for school lunch uses, with purchase rates geared accordingly. Offers are invited on a weekly basis until further notice. Purchases will be made with section 32 funds.

First offers in carlot quantities should be received by USDA not later than 1 p. m., e. d. t., Tuesday, February 5, for acceptance by USDA by telegram as soon as possible but not later than 8 a. m., e. s. t., Friday, February 8.

The USDA request calls for delivery of United States procurement grade No. 1, large size—45 pounds average net weight per 30-dozen case—shell eggs. Delivery of eggs under the initial offer must be made during the week of February 18. The eggs must be graded by Federal or licensed State graders at point of origin, and grading at destination will be USDA's option.

Further details are in announcement LD-216 and invitation to bid No. 4 to this announcement, both of which will be mailed to interested persons not later than January 29. Offers are to be submitted to: Livestock and Poultry Operations Branch, Livestock and Dairy Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Quantities purchased and approximate dollar cost for last fall's egg-buying program, which provided for purchase of United States procurement grade No. 1, medium size—39½ pounds average net weight per 30-dozen case—instead of the large size asked for today, are in USDA release 3772-56, dated December 6.

MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Committee on Rules has adopted a rule bringing this so-called general area of the Middle East resolution before the House under a closed rule. It is almost unbelievable and completely unthinkable that this committee of Congress, on a resolution of such overwhelming importance, should send it to the House floor under a gag rule. I assure you if I have anything to say about it, you will have an opportunity tomorrow to vote down the previous question and amend the rule to the end that all Members of the House may have the opportunity to work their will on this legislation as they must have if this Republic is to be perpetuated.

POSTPONEMENT OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that the Republican conference called to meet in this Chamber on tomorrow afternoon has been postponed until a later date of which due notice will be given.

EXPORT OF SCRAP IRON AND SCRAP STEEL

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the 84th Congress, on March 12, 1956, I presented to the House a statement in regard to the export of scrap iron and scrap steel. On that occasion I pointed out the fact that local industry and, especially, the semiintegrated steel plants were confronted with prices for scrap iron and scrap steel which made it diffi-

cult, if not impossible, to compete with products imported from the countries who now receive our exports of scrap iron and scrap steel.

This is due to the fact that in the United States we have an equitable and high labor rate and most of the countries to which the scrap iron and steel is exported have such a low labor rate that they, in turn, can process this material, ship it back to the United States, and undersell our own producers and processers.

It is very true that the Department of Commerce in its International Affairs Division has attempted to study this matter on various occasions. They have advised that they require certification of availability from exporters; also, that they give them only a 90-day validity period on their licenses; and, finally, that they require the submission of evidence of recent past shipments with applications for new licenses.

However, under the Export Control Act, more severe restrictions can be placed on the export of this material. It only seems fair to the local industries that such restrictions should be considered very carefully because we want to keep our industries at work and, thus, continue the full employment program that has brought unprecedented prosperity to this country.

Furthermore, the results of these exclusive exports of scrap iron and scrap steel to other countries have produced shortages and a resultant price inflation in this particular field. This is another condition that we most oppose. I am hoping that other Members will join in a request to the Department of Commerce and other proper governmental agencies to take cognizance of this situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has addressed the House on a very important matter. I have been following it very closely for the last 2 or 3 years. I am very much concerned over the tremendous increase in exports of scrap for the past 3 or 4 years. They rose last year from about 500,000 tons to over 5 million tons and this year the figure is estimated to be close to 6 million tons.

There is another point, and that is from the angle of a monopoly that is developing in this country that is very disturbing, where one company has a practical control not only of the domestic business but 75 to 80 percent of our exports. I am sure the gentleman is aware of that fact.

Mr. BEAMER. I am very appreciative of it. I also want to point out that this works a hardship on the laboring people of this country, because manufacturers are unable to compete with foreign products that come back here made out of our own scrap, which was exported to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has addressed himself to a very important matter to which attention should be paid.

MIDDLE EAST DEFENSE RESOLUTION

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 123, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be offered to any section of the joint resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 24

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $627,000, including employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "627,000" and insert "575,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his point until I make an observation?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that this has been cleared with the minority leader. I might advise my friend from New York that it was held off at the request of the minority leader when it had been proposed to bring it up earlier today, but later he had an opportunity to look into the matter and not only told me, but told the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], and I am sure the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], and I can assure the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that he personally told me that it was all right to bring it up. I hope, under those circumstances, if the gentleman's point of order is directed to this resolution coming up, that he will not press his point of order.

Mr. TABER. The point of order was directed to the fact that this resolution was called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that it has been cleared.

Mr. TABER. I understood that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I withdraw the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT McKINLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of the Members of the Congress, especially those who have been Members for some time, know that every year for the past 20 years we ask leave of the Speaker to take a few minutes to show respect for our great Ohioan, and I mean former President William McKinley. Mr. McKinley was a very able man in many respects.

Mr. McKinley as a soldier distinguished himself greatly on the field of battle. So distinguished was his service that the great State of Ohio erected a costly monument at the spot where he demonstrated great physical courage and great military genius. Again, the people of Ohio showed their appreciation for this great man by electing him twice to be Governor. Further, the people of the United States elected this great man twice to be the President of the United States. In his second term he was assassinated. The whole country mourned his death. So personal was he that all who knew him loved him. It was said of him that the children of his home city cried in the street when they heard that he had been assassinated.

I maintain that the greatest work of this great man was achieved right here on the floor of the House of Representatives, because in his day and by reason

of his efforts the economy of the Nation was almost turned around by reason of his legislation. He was not only a great soldier, a great governor, and a great President, but he was outstandingly a great legislator. For that reason I have for more than 20 years asked permission each year to pay respect to this great legislator. That is one of the reasons why today you see the carnations here. The women of Ohio because of their respect for this great man saw to it that his favorite flower was made the favorite flower of the State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVID DENNISON, who represents a part of the district from which Mr. McKinley came.

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the Members of the House, and particularly my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], for your kindness in granting me time to pay tribute to the memory of President William McKinley, a great son of Ohio and a great American whose birthday we celebrate today.

William McKinley became a person of stature and consequence in this very House when first as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and a leader of the Republican Party, he fought for the development of a dynamic economy secured in the tradition of conservative policies. For 14 years he was a distinguished leader and Member of this body. He was twice Governor of Ohio and was twice elected President of the United States. His second term was tragically cut short by the act of a ruthless assassin. As President he was mighty in war, generous in peace, and faithful to the soundest principles of American democracy which still illumine our way today.

So much is known to every school child. Much more is known by scholars and revered patriots. But in Ohio where I come from McKinley is remembered best as a hard-working lawyer, a devoted husband, a devout churchman, and a man who fought for what he thought was right regardless of the consequences. As it happens I was born and spent much of my youth in a house that had once belonged to McKinley's family where he spent a great deal of time as a boy. His neighbors were my neighbors.

McKinley was born in the year 1843 in Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio. The house where he was born has since been swept up before the great onrush of industrial expansion in northeastern Ohio and a giant shopping plaza now stands on the site. The busy feet of a teeming population of steelworkers and factory workers now hurry over the old farmland. McKinley, who worked so hard for the growth and prosperity of our economy would not object to this for he, himself, was a product of the soot and grime and the coal and the steel of the Mahoning Valley. One of his grandfathers was manager of a charcoal furnace for making pig iron, the other, the owner of an iron foundry. His father was a partner in Campbell, McKinley & Dempsey Iron Manufacturers, the predecessor of one of the great steel companies of today.

McKinley distinguished himself with service in the Civil War, joining as a private the first 3-year company to go out from Ohio and receiving a discharge as a brevet major from President Lincoln himself who cited him for gallant and meritorious service. He first saw combat at Antietam and there assisted in supplying the front lines in the bloodiest day of the entire war. At Kernstown, as a lieutenant on the staff of Gen. Rutherford B. Hayes, he distinguished himself with gallantry in riding through grape and canister to bring reinforcements during a raid led by that incomparable southern Gen. Jubal Early.

General Hayes, also an Ohioan, greeted McKinley's return and the reinforcements with delight shouting, "I never expected to see you again in this life. You did your duty well."

McKinley was willing to assume great responsibility. At the battle of Opequam he was sent to a general with a verbal order. The general refused to act without a written order. McKinley, though only a lieutenant, drew a deep breath, squared his shoulders, and issued the order himself. The general complied. The mission was successful and the day was saved. Though of this Sheridan later said characteristically:

> It turned out well and therefore it was good. If it had turned out ill, it would have been very bad.

After the war, McKinley determined to study law. In his studies he was not so much brilliant as thorough. In fact, he was known as Studious William, a distinction he is said rather to have enjoyed. This trait was early fostered by his parents who constantly sought sound education for their children. Thus it was that each evening after supper every member of the family circle, and by the way there were nine McKinley children, would take turns reading aloud from the classics.

He was admitted to the bar in my hometown of Warren, Ohio, in March of 1867, and began his practice in the city of Canton. His first case was referred to him by a lawyer named Belden. Realizing that the case would go to trial the very next day, McKinley demurred, but at Belden's insistence he accepted the assignment. McKinley stayed up all night preparing the case and won it. He so impressed Belden that the two later became partners.

McKinley was a man of honor. On one occasion a rival lawyer asked him to postpone a trial because he had lost some documents important to his case. McKinley agreed. Studying in the library one night McKinley came across the missing papers which he immediately returned to his opponent. Subsequently at the trial, McKinley lost the case. McKinley's sole consolation was a tribute to his integrity from the other lawyer who gratuitously stated that had McKinley read the papers he could easily have won.

McKinley's rise in politics is too well known to be repeated here. However, one of the lesser known facts of McKinley's political experience was his vigorous campaign in 1867 throughout Stark County, Ohio, stumping for the 15th amendment, providing for Negro suffrage. His stubborn and aggressive adherence to that great cause attracted the notice of Republicans with such success that in 1869 he was elected to his first political job as prosecuting attorney of Stark County at the age of 26. In 1876, McKinley was nominated for Congress from the 18th Ohio district. Though the district was gerrymandered twice and was considered to be a Democratic district, McKinley continued to be elected until 1890 when he became Governor of Ohio.

McKinley was, of course, a strong protectionist and a sound-money man and generally reputed to be the friend of American business. This is but part of the story, for McKinley had a deep-seated faith and confidence in the workingman of this country and of his right to assert his grievances and to enjoy some of the rights which have since come to be recognized as indispensable to effective, amicable labor relations.

I am reminded particularly of the occasion in 1876, when he defended this principle at the risk of his entire political future. A strike was in progress at the Tuscarawas Valley Coal Mines in Ohio, which were owned by Mark Hanna, later his friend and mentor. The pay of the men had been cut and as might be expected a bitter strike developed with many unfortunate incidents and considerable violence. As a result thereof, 23 miners had been indicted by a grand jury. Public sentiment was so inflamed against the miners that no local lawyer would take the case. Strong in courage and compassion, McKinley assumed the representation of the miners and obtained the acquittal of all but one of them.

McKinley was a man of vision. He guided the fortunes and destinies of this great new sprawling Nation in the Spanish-American War, from which time most authorities date this country as a world power. It behooves us today to consider the implications of his judgment and guidance in that pregnant period.

As we enter upon a great debate to consider our proper position in world affairs, we might well consider the eloquent advice of McKinley given over 50 years ago when he said:

> God and man have linked nations together, no nation can any longer be indifferent to any other.

The prayer and hope in our hearts today was his in his last public utterance at Buffalo only minutes before his assassination. He said:

> Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict: That our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. May all who are represented here be moved to higher and nobler effort for their own and the world's good. • • •
>
> Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of earth.

From that moment on William McKinley has belonged to history.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us who are at present Members of this great body to see history in the making, but we know that history is being made all the time. For example, in these trying days, as we are gathered at this moment, history is in the making. So it was in the days of William McKinley. History was in the making in those days. We now have an opportunity of looking back and appraising the leadership of William McKinley and evaluating from hindsight the history that was made during his tenure of office as Chief Executive of our country.

I believe it will take another generation or so to really to appraise this administration objectively, but as we look back we have enough evidence to realize that one of the turning points in the history of our country in all probability took place during his administration to which the preceding speaker so ably and eloquently referred. That really was the advent of the United States from its atmosphere and cloak of isolationism, or noninternationalism, if I may call it such, although others may care to use some other phrase: but we began to take an active interest in world events. Certainly as a result of the Spanish-American War the United States has had to take a more decided interest in international and world affairs. That was one of the natural and probable consequences resulting from the Spanish-American War, and we have seen a constant expansion of that necessity on the part of our country. Many doubt the wisdom of it; many others do not, but the fact is that during William McKinley's administration the Spanish-American War took place. The results that followed, the brushing aside or disregard by America of isolationism, or whatever you wish to call it, is descriptive of the philosophy that set America apart from the rest of the world. That is one of the great events in the history of our country.

It is well for us to pause and reflect on the birthdays of men who have served as President of the United States and who have taken the journey into the great beyond. It is good not only for ourselves but also for the people of the country. I am glad, therefore, to participate in the remarks today and the need for what you might call memorial exercises for one of the few men in the history of our country who attained the great office of President of the United States, a man whose distinction and ability, having in mind the problems that confronted him in his day, set him apart, and under whose leadership one of the greatest decisions in connection with the future of our country had to be made.

I join with my friends of the Ohio delegation in honoring this outstanding American.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the splendid remarks of my distinguished colleague, the Democratic leader in the House. I agree with him in his appraisal of the work of Mr. McKinley when he was a member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in yielding me this time. I also want to express my appreciation to him for his thoughtfulness in obtaining the time for this ceremony this afternoon.

I am certain we were all inspired by the very eloquent speech of our new colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DENNISON]. His remarks here this afternoon and the manner in which he made them foretells, I believe, that we Ohioans have a fine new Member from the 11th District.

We are pleased this afternoon to be wearing the red carnation, not only the State flower of Ohio but also the favorite flower of the late President McKinley, whom all Americans loved and who gave so much to America.

It is significant that we mark his 114th birthday here in this Chamber where he devoted more than a decade of excellent service to the betterment of his Nation.

McKinley had a humble beginning in Ohio, but from that beginning he made great contributions to this country. He rose to be a rural schoolteacher. He served in the War Between the States with distinction in the 23d Ohio Volunteer Regiment. He practiced law in our State until 1869 when he was elected prosecuting attorney for Stark County, his first experience in public service. His rising career then brought him to this Chamber where he served brilliantly for many years.

McKinley lived and was active in the tumultuous postwar years of that day which are somewhat similar to the years through which we are now moving. Many of the problems of his era were similar in nature and gravity to the problems which we today face here in Washington. They were as they are today the problems of progress, because in his era it was a progressive America then as it is a dynamic America today. His Nation was confronted with the pains and struggles of growth, for America was growing and expanding in those days as it is today. Great industrial development and physical changes in the Nation were being wrought then as they are today.

I think most important of all—his Nation of that day was faced with maintaining freedom and maintaining the right of freedom of individuals. McKinley's principles included an abiding faith in sound freedom of enterprise which he recognized as the economic application of those individual freedoms which are woven so deeply into the fabric of the American philosophy. Never did he distort or compromise this principle by seeking solutions from political philosophies alien to American doctrine. In this, his career here in this Chamber is an inspiration to us today.

McKinley faced the enemies of our Nation and the enemies of what it represents with courage. His very life was taken from him by one who was an enemy of America and an enemy of Americanism. Though his last breath was so taken, the example of his life was one which strengthened in his contemporaries an undying belief in American principles. His death gave to us another great symbol with great meaning for us still—that America must remain strong and remain American.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DENNISON], who has addressed the House today on the life and accomplishments of William McKinley. It is Mr. DENNISON's honor to represent the district in Congress in which Mr. McKinley was born. It is my honor to represent in this House the congressional district that was represented by William McKinley.

The history of McKinley's services in the House is of great interest. It has been said here that he served a number of terms, which is true. William McKinley served three consecutive terms. He was elected to what he thought would be his fourth term in the Congress, but a contest was filed, and he did not serve the full term. Someone else took his place. Then Mr. McKinley was reelected after being out of the Congress for 1 term and served 3 more terms in the Congress, at which time he was again defeated. Had he not been defeated he probably never would have been President of the United States.

I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in the expression that the greatest service of William McKinley was here in the House of Representatives and in his work as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. I think it is a great thing that throughout all of these years our own colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has filled the place as a member of the Ways and Means Committee once so ably held by William McKinley. Mr. McKinley became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Back in the 51st Congress, known as the fighting 51st, William McKinley was a candidate for Speaker of the House at the time that Mr. Reed of Maine was elected Speaker. I think Mr. McKinley's love was here in the House of Representatives. That thought has been passed down to me somewhat by my own father who succeeded McKinley as prosecuting attorney in Stark County and later was associated in the practice of law with William McKinley. Many of the stories of McKinley, and his residence and the love of the people of Canton for him came to me through my father who was associated with him.

So far as the economy of the country in the days of McKinley as compared with those existing today are concerned, I believe you will all be interested in seeing a lease that hangs on the wall of my office over in the House Office Building. My father took over the law offices of William McKinley when he became President. There were 3½ very nice rooms; some of the nicest rooms in the city of Canton. The rental of those rooms, according to this lease, was $17.50 a month. We have made some changes since the time of McKinley in our budgets, in our rents, and in other ways, but

the wisdom and foresight of William McKinley established a sound economy in this Nation in his hour of crisis. And, I know if he were to advise us today, his advice to us would be to watch the economy and the stability of our Nation and to protect America always in its economy and its industry.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point and that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East doctrine comes up for debate and for a vote on the House floor this week, and although the resolution is well-meaning it poses some very important constitutional questions as well as economic spending policies which are causing grave concern among many of our citizens.

Based upon the information available to me about the Middle East situation and based upon constitutional principles, I cannot support the resolution being presented to the Congress at the present time.

On Thursday, January 3, I took an oath here in this Chamber and on Friday, January 25, was required to sign this same oath of office of Representative in the Congress of the United States, 85th Congress. This oath read:

> I, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The Constitution definitely provides for a division of the Government into three branches, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, and defines the powers and duties of each branch.

In Article I, section 8, the Constitution states:

> The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

There is no question in my mind that the Constitution and the Founding Fathers reserve this power exclusively for the Congress. Alexander Hamilton, who so ably expressed the thinking behind the Constitution in the Federalist papers stated:

> It is the peculiar and exclusive providence of Congress when the Nation is at peace to change that state into a state of war, whether from calculations of policy or from provocations or injuries received; in other words, it belongs to Congress only to go to war. But when a foreign nation declares or openly and avowedly makes war upon the United States, they are then by the very fact already at war, and any declaration on the part of Congress is nugatory; it is at least unnecessary.

Our Constitution and our Founding Fathers have given us a Government by law, the supreme law of the Constitution, and not a Government of discretion by one man or a group of men.

By asking Congress for the passage of this resolution, the President who knows that this power belongs to Congress, requests that we surrender or abdicate this constitutional power to the executive branch.

Yet, in his special message of January 5, the President states that his use of this power would have to be "submitted to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council, in accordance with the Charter." In other words even if Congress is childish enough to vest its power to declare war in the Presidency, the President could be overridden by the U. N. Security Council.

This then amounts to an undated declaration of war subject to final action by the United Nations. It seems to me we are begging for trouble, both from an internal constitutional standpoint and from an external meddling standpoint.

The President publicly states Russia is our enemy, yet we continue to recognize and negotiate with the murderers and gangsters who run the U. S. S. R. This Middle East policy is but a sham toward facing the realities of the world situation. Therefore, as a Member of Congress, I oppose surrendering our prerogatives and constitutional duties, because it eliminates the people and their duly elected representatives from a voice in the making of war and peace.

Approval of the proposed Middle East doctrine would negate the use of the United Nations because the United States would be adopting a program of unilateral action. It also raises the question of our sincerity in condemning France, England and Israel when they took action against Egypt.

The second phase of the Middle East doctrine which concerns our economic spending policies is full of inconsistencies and its value is debatable.

Last year in a public-opinion poll in my 11th District on the northwest side of Chicago I asked a representative cross-section of my constituency this question: "Do you favor the proposed $4.9 billion foreign aid bill?" 72.4 percent of those replying answered in the negative and the voters in my district have consistently been against foreign aid.

Accordingy to my information, very few of the oil producing countries of the Middle East are in need of money. True, these oil royalties go to a few individuals, many of whom are of the ruling class, and these people do not help their own country. If people do not help themselves, why should they expect us to help? Through last June, the United States gave over $2.4 billion in economic aid to Middle East countries and now we are asked to give more.

To highlight the ridiculousness of additional aid, it is my understanding that a considerable amount of money is still set aside for use, but has not been spent. The International Cooperation Administration reports $2.233 billions have been allocated through June of last year, and $1.926 has been spent. Jordan is now asking for $30 million per year with no strings attached.

Marx and Lenin always felt that the capitalist countries would eventually bankrupt themselves and by pursuing such spending policies as we are doing, we will be playing right into their hands.

Many times we actually help countries to buy arms and ammunition from Russia and her satellites for use against our friends, and perhaps eventually, against us. We have allocated aid to Egypt to the tune of $62 million and Egypt has, in turn, purchased arms for money—which could and should have been used for her own economic welfare.

From reports I have heard about our operation of the foreign giveaway programs, I can only compare our action to that of the proverbial inebriated sailor throwing his money away, and then finding himself without money and without friends.

Therefore, on constitutional grounds, and on economic grounds, and in the protection of our own taxpayers, I must oppose the Middle East resolution. If Russia should interfere in this area it would then be up to Congress to determine what final steps should be taken. The average citizen is called upon to fight and pay for wars, then why not give him something to say about his life and his pocketbook, through his elected representatives at the proper time.

MIDDLE EAST DOCTRINE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to talk briefly about House Joint Resolution 117, which will be presented to us tomorrow. Along with most of my colleagues I expect to cast my vote for this resolution. I do so, however, with many misgivings. The resolution ought not to be necessary. The executive department really needs no additional authority, and that which this resolution would convey ought not to have been requested. In voting for this resolution I shall do so with a profound conviction that although we have no choice but to give it our approval, its very necessity is an indictment of an inept foreign policy, an admission on the part of our Secretary of State of the bankrupt situation of his diplomacy.

If you will carefully read the Secretary's prepared statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee you will see that there is but one reason why the administration so desperately wants the Congress to act, and to act with blind haste.

It is to dispel doubt in the Middle East, and perhaps the Soviet Union, that the United States would react with force if Communist-controlled governments used force to conquer the Middle East.

"Only if Congress quickly dispels doubts," said Mr. Dulles—only if it puts the stamp of approval on this resolution will the world be reassured.

What a strange doctrine this is. Does it not say that our diplomats abroad are no longer effective in their traditional tasks of presenting America's position to the capitals to which they are accredited? Does it not say that in the critically important area of the Middle East we—the Members of the legislative branch of the Government—must come forth and not only lend our prestige, but also do it hurriedly and without asking too many questions?

Does it not clearly ask us to assume the burdens of our Secretary of State—that of representing America abroad—to ourselves enter the lists to bolster a sagging diplomacy? This resolution we will be asked to pass is not a vote of confidence in our diplomacy, and no one among us should be confused on this point. What it is in its essence is a most extraordinary admission of diplomatic failure.

I shall vote for this resolution. I shall do so not because this administration wants it, nor because Mr. Dulles has pleaded for it, but because the security of this country is involved, and to do otherwise would add fuel to propaganda indicating that we are a divided Nation.

I shall do so, as no doubt many of you will, because we in this body have no wish to give even the appearance of playing politics with our national security.

Do you remember the rash of phrases which have been bandied about during the past few years? Phrases like "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," "massive retaliation," "liberation of enslaved peoples," and "agonizing reappraisal"? Is it possible that these were phrases meant only for American ears? Is it conceivable that they had any domestic political connotations? I hope not, but whatever domestic purpose they may have served is it possible that such pronouncements as these have discredited us abroad? Obviously we are discredited, for our Secretary of State tells us that our diplomats are ineffiective and that "only if Congress quickly dispels doubts" will America's foreign power pronouncements be accepted at face value?

"Only if Congress quickly dispels doubts." Doubts about whom? About the American people? Who is there who knows anything about Americans and their support of freedom loving people everywhere who can doubt America's readiness and willingness to act and to act speedily when the situation calls for it? Doubts about whom? About the Congress? What grave and unprecedented action where the welfare of this Nation was clearly involved has the Congress not supported overwhelmingly when it was presented with the facts? Doubts about what, then? Could it be doubts about the reliability of our diplomacy itself?

We are told that nothing new has been added. No new powers granted and none taken away. In brief then, this whole thing is a gesture presumably to get the world to take such notice of America's policy as one would suppose our diplomats were quite capable of making clear.

I, apparently, am ready to place more faith in Mr. Dulles' words than he believes people abroad are. I will take on faith his statements to the effect that a real danger exists in the Middle East at this time. I will accept this as true even though it was only 3 months ago—while the words "peace, progress and prosperity" were flying around the land—that we were hearing soothing words about the Middle East.

I will accept as true his statement that "only if Congress quickly dispels doubts, only if it puts the stamp of its approval" on this resolution can we preserve peace in that area. But I do so with a heavy heart and the full realization that if this congressional action is necessary it can only be because American diplomatic prestige is low. And the responsibility for this is not that of the Congress.

Let me be specific about one part of this resolution which is utterly incomprehensible to me. I refer to the provisions to make available to the President authorization to expend $200 million in the next 5 months, as he sees fit, in the Middle East for economic programs.

It is an especially interesting figure to me since it affords a contrast with efforts ICA and its predecessors have made to spend about $250 million in one Middle East country in the last 5 years. The country is Iran, and the International Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has just completed a year-long study of that operation, and has just filed a report on it. We found some startling things. First, it is not an easy task to get rid of even a few million United States dollars in the form of constructive economic aid. It takes time—it takes planning—it takes people—it takes cooperation by the government receiving the aid.

What does this provision authorizing the use of $200 million in the next 5 months really mean? We are told that it does not represent new money. We are told that it merely authorizes the President to add to those funds already programed for the Middle East $200 million of available funds not already so programed. From our committee's study of aid operations in Iran there is every reason to doubt that we can usefully or wisely spend money already allocated to the Middle Eastern area. Now, under this resolution, we are to authorize the expenditure of $200 million more. I say to you that this money cannot be constructively used in the remaining 5 months of this fiscal year. It can be thrown away with a prodigal hand, or it can be used for such value as the announcement of its availability may have.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. REUSS. Is the gentleman familiar with the testimony of Secretary Dulles given in the last few days before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and particularly with the answer he gave there to Senator JOHNSON, who asked, "Now, what types of projects do you expect to be undertaken under this economic aid?"

Secretary Dulles' answer was:

I suspect that there will have to be some shift away from what have been long-term economic projects, involving building roads and things of that sort, into something which will have a more immediate impact on the economy of the country because of the threats which many of them are under of having to forego oil royalties, taxes, and the like, and because of the cessation of certain types of aid which they had been receiving from certain European countries who are not in position any more to do it. Therefore, I suspect that the character of the aid may have to shift somewhat more to a budgetary and short-term basis rather than a long-term basis which seemed more desirable a year ago.

I would like to ask the gentleman if that proposal of Secretary Dulles is not, in effect, a proposal to do those very things which the report of the gentleman's Subcommittee on Iran indicated ought not to be done, and a proposal not to do those very things which the report indicated should be done.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the point which the gentleman brings up. He is a very able and valuable member of our subcommittee. The report of the committee was filed today, and, as you know, it touches very strongly on this matter of budget aid. It discusses in detail the purposes for which our money has been spent in Iran. It points out that over the last 3 years we have been contributing at the rate of about $5 million a month to the governmental budget of Iran on a great many items, which previously they did not include in their budget. In many respects it was a waste of money, insofar as the purposes for which these funds would normally be expended. I commend to every Member of the House a reading of the report which will be available tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This resolution then, in effect, is not only a delegation of power to the President to use combat troops as he may see fit, but I deduce from the colloquy between the gentlemen here that this is also in the nature of legislation by executive decree, particularly with respect to the handling of funds.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is speaking about the virtually unrestricted use of the additional $200 million. I am going to touch on that a little more fully in the remainder of my remarks.

Our report shows further that one of the reasons why the money was thrown around in Iran, and it was thrown around with considerable profligacy—that there was apparently legislative authority already in existence for the money to be used in that manner. Existing legislation is so loosely drawn that there are almost no restrictions on how the money can be spent. The only real control is the prudence of the executive branch. That is under existing law, and I am not even talking about any emergency. But, why all this talk about freeing the President's hands—and that is what we have been hearing—what is that all about? They are already so free of congressional restraint that the compelling need is for greater and not less restrictions. Is this part of the requested resolution then just a psychological showpiece? How can we free the

executive branch from nonexistent fetters? Is not the real intent to give the world another bit of evidence that our already slack pursestrings are to be loosened still further? Is it to invite the countries of the Middle East to believe that we stand ever more ready to solve our diplomatic problems simply by writing out more checks drawn on the United States taxpayer?

This House, I feel sure, would like to see bold policies developed by this administration to recoup our badly battered international position. Perhaps, this is a bold step. But, does not its boldness lie principally in the fact that it asks this Congress to stand hypnotized and be counted in favor of a program which the administration not only cannot describe but admittedly does not have?

And when a few months from now some concrete action may be taken pursuant to this resolution, how are we to attempt to exercise our constitutional duty of reviewing and criticizing it? Will we not be silenced by the simple reminder that this is what we voted for? And who can dispute it? Because we will be voting to add $200 million to an emergency fund that can be spent virtually without regard to any existing law. Why is it that now, when we are a most powerful, secure, and well-armed Nation, we must act in blind and fearful haste? Even more, why must we hide our thoughts and on the floor of this House utter only the most innocuous of comments about matters of foreign policy, lest we offend someone abroad or jeopardize our security?

In so doing are we to believe that the men in the Kremlin, knaves though they are, are also fools? Is it the position of the administration that there are great and sinister schemes afoot in Moscow and elsewhere in the world which are being held in abeyance until this Congress casts its vote on House Joint Resolution 117? And if we vote it up, those schemes will be put aside, but if by some chance we vote it down, the schemes will go forward apace? I, personally, find this hard to believe; but I do have reason to believe that we are about to endanger one of the greatest elements of our national security when we pass this resolution. I think we are about to abdicate—and I pray that it will only be temporary—we are about to abdicate a bulwark of our freedom; the right of the Congress to debate, to investigate, and to criticize executive branch policies.

It is a blank check we are signing.

There can be no debate about that. One day I hope we shall find out how it was filled in, and what it accomplished. But even that is in doubt, for I can only point out to you that in our review of United States economic aid operations in Iran we learned again and again that the Congress never did find out how the money was actually spent, although we voted year after year for that program. I have voted for foreign-aid programs almost consistently. Unless we can develop some better congressional control of the expenditure of these funds, unless we can be assured of fuller, more adequate, and timely information from the Department of State and the ICA, I am going to have to reverse my position.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders today I may address the House for 20 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly consider a resolution of historic importance, House Joint Resolution 117 approving military and economic assistance to nations in the Middle East area.

The customs and rules of the House, give control of the time for debate to the members of the committee reporting legislation. I fear that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will use all the time for general debate on House Joint Resolution 117, themselves, leaving no time for other members. They have done so in the past. I understand there is a possibility that no amendments, even pro forma amendments, may be offered so that a Member may not even express his views in a 5-minute period allowed to discuss an amendment. Accordingly, I asked for some time today to put in the RECORD my views on this most historic problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman aware that a gag rule has been reported out on this bill, or a rule which in effect is a gag rule?

Mr. MEADER. I understand it is likely that such a rule will be reported out. I am not aware that action already has been taken.

Mr. GROSS. The committee has voted it, although I do not know whether the report has been made to the House. In any event a closed rule will be reported out on the bill.

Mr. MEADER. If there is such a rule prohibiting amendment, barring any change, it will even prevent Members from expressing their views to their colleagues in the House and perhaps contributing something to the thinking of the membership of the House on an all-important issue.

Personally, I do not see why there was any reason for preventing the 433 Members of this House of Representatives from expressing their views to their fellow Members. They might just possibly be able to persuade someone who may not be a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or even some of them, to change their views. I do not think we ought to assume that no Member of the House except members of the committee knows anything about the subject and has nothing to contribute and arbitrarily foreclose him from participating in the discussion.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right at that point?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. That is the only reason I thought it necessary to take the floor this afternoon. I recognized the fact that there will be no chance for anyone to get the floor tomorrow and express his views. As the gentleman knows—and he has been very intimately concerned with the investigation conducted by our committee into the Iranian matter and into the operation of other programs in the Middle East. Therefore it might be that we have a few thoughts on the subject worthy of expression and consideration by the House.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I intend to comment a little later in my discussion on the work of the gentleman's committee on which I was privileged to serve.

My interest in this particular area of the world goes back to the time when I served a Senate committee as its counsel and had the privilege of being exposed to some of the problems in this very important area of the world in connection with the investigation of the national defense program in World War II.

I visited the Middle East area with two members of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, one of whom now serves with distinction as an Associate Justice on the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Harold Burton, and the other the former Senator from Delaware, Senator James M. Tunnell.

It was my privilege at that time to meet in executive hearings with some of the important American officials who were dealing with problems in the Middle East and the threat of Russian aggression in that area at that time. You may recall that during World War II, when we had the Persian Gulf command and used the Persian Gulf as a channel for sending lend-lease aid to Russia, Russian, British, and American troops occupied Iran. And I might say parenthetically that at the end of World War II the United Nations accomplished what I regard as its most effective single achievement to date when it was the vehicle through which the Russians were forced to remove their troops from Azerbaijan after we and the British had removed our troops from the southern part of Iran.

Therefore this area, which, of course, is one of the oldest civilized areas of the world, which has been the historic crossroads between East and West, and which is so critical to the future defense of the

free world, has an especial interest for me.

I am convinced that if Russia were to achieve an age-old ambition of reaching warm water on the Persian Gulf and should absorb the area which the resolution we are shortly to act on is designed to protect, we would find the cost of recovering the equilibrium of the free world in the decades to come a staggering one.

Not only is the Middle East the avenue of communication and trade between Asia and Europe but it is fortunate in possessing a cash crop at tidewater, which some have rightly described as the lifeblood of Europe, the petroleum resources of the Middle East. Should Russia control that most important resource and should she control the avenue of communication and trade between East and West, she would realize a gain far greater than her aggrandizement in World War II and shortly thereafter.

We in the United States cannot, in my opinion, stand by and do nothing. We have a responsibility of leadership in world affairs which in these modern days we can no longer ignore. Who else under present conditions can assume leadership?

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word which I have not heard said before in defense of the conduct of our foreign relations in the latter part of 1956 when the War in Egypt broke out with Israel, the British and the French descending on Egypt.

I have heard it said repeatedly—I heard it during the campaign and I have heard it since, during discussions on this resolution—that we have reached an all-time low in our relations with our historic allies, Britain and France; that we have broken up the NATO Alliance and that we have parted company with France and Britain apparently for all time to come.

It seems to me that anyone who is even casually familiar with the history of the United States and its relations with the rest of the world where imperialism and colonialism were involved would have to say that the actions our Government took in October and November of 1956 were in line with our historic policy.

We ourselves were the first ones to break away from the British colonial empire and so far as I know no significant act on our part has ever been taken throughout our entire history to perpetuate and strengthen a colonial empire.

In the early decades of the last century President Monroe announced the doctrine that this hemisphere was no longer open for colonization. In the latter part of that century we put an end to the Spanish empire in this hemisphere. Yet we have renounced any colonial or imperial ambitions of our own. Cuba is free. The Philippines are free.

We stand before the world sincere in our belief in the self-determination of peoples and the abolition of slavery and colonialism. So when the British and the French last October decided to use armed force to achieve what, no doubt, is a very important objective, namely, the maintenance of the Suez Canal as an international artery of commerce, it seems to me we had no other course than to stand up and say: Force shall not be used under these circumstances. We have never given our funds or employed our military strength for the purpose of protecting and preserving British or French imperial holdings.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have followed closely the remarks the gentleman has just made with reference to the position which our President took during October of the past year when an attack was made by the British, the French, and the Israeli upon the Egyptian sector. Will the gentleman agree with me that the statement which the President made had popular support, namely, that we would not go into that area? Would the gentleman not agree that that statement had the overwhelming support of the people of the United States and had a terrific impact on the results of the past election?

Mr. MEADER. My own belief is that the gentleman is correct. I do not know how you can say what the sentiment of the American people is, but certainly thereafter an overwhelming vote of endorsement was given to the President.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Now, if we had not upheld moral force, if we had not taken the lead in the United Nations to repudiate the use of armed force, even though it was believed to be necessary for their self-preservation by important friendly nations, we would not now be in the position of having the respect of the newly awakened peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, who have so long been subject to colonialism and who hate it so.

As the Secretary of State has said so aptly, who else is there who can move into the Middle East and give support to these nations to stand up and defend themselves if we do not do it? Do you suppose they will invite the British in, or the French? Where else are you going to find support except for the rather nominal troops that the United Nations has assembled from various countries? We must, it seems to me, act. Inaction may be costly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, if we follow the resolution, and that action taken is in consonance with and on the recommendation of the United Nations, you are certainly inviting the French and British in on the deal; is that not correct?

Mr. MEADER. I believe the Secretary of State has pointed out that the reason we must do this by action on our own and not through the United Nations is that not only are the British and French represented in the United Nations, but also Russia, the very nation against whose possible aggression this resolution is directed.

Now, having said this, it seems to me that it does not mean that because we have to do something, that we do just anything. Our leadership should be intelligent and our administration of American tax funds should be businesslike. That is why the report on aid to Iran of the Committee on International Operations of the Government Operations Committee filed today is so timely and why its recommendations and conclusions should be heeded by the Congress and the administration in connection with the aid proposed in the program immediately before us.

I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], under whom I served on that subcommittee, for the diligence and the impartiality with which he pursued the investigation of our aid operations in Iran. The report, it seems to me, merits the attention of the entire membership of the House. I hope the Members will have time to read it before they make their decisions on this important Middle East resolution, not because it will cause them to vote for or against the resolution, but because there should be a caveat issued that the administration of this broad authority which we propose to give the President will be carefully scrutinized by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

I urge my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the chairman of this subcommittee, to direct the attention of this committee to the exercise of the authority which the Congress will shortly grant in the Middle East. I believe it will be only by a day-to-day following of the procedures, and the decisions made in the administration of these funds, that any effective influence can be exerted by the Congress of the United States on the character and effectiveness of this program. It seems to be impossible to draft a formula which you can write into a law which will prevent foolish and improvident spending of our public funds.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said that perhaps this resolution should be adopted as representing our opportunity to be helpful in these areas. That would contemplate the sending of American troops into Middle Eastern countries. Can the gentleman advise me on what status our forces would go into the Middle East? Would our Constitution follow them? Would the flag of the United States follow them? Or are we going to turn them over to the courts in foreign lands to be there tried?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the gentleman's interest in the Status of Forces Treaties. I have no special knowledge of any arrangements that may exist in this area with respect to the punishment of military personnel who are guilty of offenses. Perhaps the gentleman, having had such an intense interest in this subject, knows more than I do about it. But I would rather not engage in an extensive discussion of that problem, which is a knotty problem in itself, at this time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. BOW. If this resolution comes to the floor tomorrow on a closed rule, it will be impossible to attempt to protect these men and to have the Constitution follow them wherever they may go.

Mr. MEADER. I think there is no doubt about the gentleman's statement. It would probably not be in order for the gentleman to offer the amendment which he has offered on previous occasions with respect to the Status of Forces Treaties.

I am inclined not to agree with the gentleman, and I have voted on the opposite side on those amendments that he has offered in the past. But I think he ought to have the opportunity, as should all the Members of the House, as long as we believe in democratic processes, to make a mistake if they want to. So I again say that I deplore the fact that this type of measure is to be brought before us under a closed rule.

I want to say in addition to what I have said about the work of the Hardy committee that this particular investigation in Iran resulted in a record of something over 1,200 pages of testimony after a great many hours of hearings with people who were informed on the subject. The sum total of the investigation could lead to no conclusion except that a quarter of a billion dollars that we spent in Iran in the 5-year period between 1951 and 1956 was very poorly administered, to put it mildly, and some might say that it was squandered.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am going to insert the conclusions and the recommendations of this report. In addition, I want to call the attention of Members of the House to an article in the current February issue of the Readers Digest. It is the lead article, by Mr. Bernard S. Van Rensselaer entitled—"How Not To Spend Foreign Aid." That article takes a somewhat different tack than the committee report, since it deals in personalities, while the committee's report did not. But the article was based in large part on the facts developed in the committee's hearings and also on the report of the General Accounting Office which audited the aid operations in Iran.

If this investigation taught the committee and the Congress anything, it taught them that there should be rigid accountability for public funds used for a public purpose; that there should be more stringent controls; clearer guiding principles and criteria and a higher standard of conduct on the part of our administrators spending these funds abroad.

I do not hold with those who think that if we spend $1 and $1 is enough to accomplish the purpose, then we should spend $2 dollars or $5—just to throw it around. I think the legitimate purposes of aiding our allies to strengthen themselves can be better accomplished with the minimum amount of money.

The more underdeveloped countries have to strain to strengthen themselves and grow and develop, the sooner they will become stable, the sooner they will be able to stand on their own feet. Then they will be a real help to us as allies. They are not nearly so much help when we have to carry them on our backs.

I have consistently urged the Congress and the administration to do those things which will create a climate in which a private enterprise economy can be developed and flourish in underdeveloped countries. As long as we lavish funds on them, underwriting their mistakes and perpetuating their weaknesses, as long as we foster socialism, socialistic institutions in those countries, we are defeating rather than promoting our objective of helping them so to strengthen themselves that they can effectively resist aggression.

If we have to go into battle carrying some weak man on our back we are not nearly so strong as if we were fighting alone. That is why it seems to me that a completely different pitch has to be put on these aid programs. This philosophy is completely in harmony with the conclusions and the recommendations of the Hardy committee report. We should insist upon rigorous honesty in the handling of American dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the resolution, which the gentleman apparently supports, is not the Mutual Security Act suspended as to the allocation, disposal, and spending of funds? You do not even have the guaranty set up in the Mutual Security Act in that respect.

Mr. MEADER. I believe the gentleman is correct, but I do not know that I want to get into the details of that aspect of the resolution. I think that will be discussed in the general debate on the bill by those who are more familiar with the details of it than I am.

Let me just stick to this one point. I think we have a right to insist that these funds, whether there is a detailed statement on how they are to be expended, or whether there is great flexibility, be administered in an honest, businesslike, economical, and efficient way. I think we have the right to expect that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I concur in the last statement the gentleman has made with reference to the resolution that will come up tomorrow. The committee has a committee amendment which somewhat restricts the broad powers that were requested in the original resolution, and does not waive all the provisions of all laws such as the general accounting laws, and so forth; so that those laws do apply to this provision. It does permit the use of these funds under section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act, with which the Congress can be presumed to be familiar.

However, I call the gentleman's attention to one paragraph in our report which I think is somewhat in line with what he is saying. It is on page 12:

The committee is cognizant of the reasons for granting the President greater flexibility in the expenditure of the funds specified in the resolution than is allowed under the Mutual Security Act and under the Battle Act, but it is the opinion of the committee that the standards established in the restrictions listed above be adhered to wherever practicable.

That, you might say, is not a very strong caveat, but we must bear in mind that the authority granted winds up on next June 30 as far as the money is concerned, and before that time I feel confident that our committee will make a very thorough study, as we have already made a somewhat cursory study, of the Hardy committee's report upon Iran and that the program and the legislation will either incorporate or certainly reflect the purpose in the recommendations contained in that committee's report.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I simply would like to say that I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will do something to tighten up the limitations that are imposed with respect to accountability for these funds. Actually, there is not any way in the world to determine what happened to the money that was spent in Iran and so far as I have been able to learn, there was not anything illegal about it. Now, we are in a most difficult situation when even with the General Accounting Office examining these things, we cannot find out what happened to the money. They have reached a balance. After 5 years, they have established some sort of balance with respect to the funds, but it is done in a manner in which there is not any way to determine what the money was spent for or what good purpose it served. I will say again, as I have mentioned to representatives of the State Department that if in fact, there was not wholesale dishonesty in connection with the administration of the Iranian aid program, it is a tribute to the integrity of our own people because they certainly had the opportunity.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the conclusions and recommendations of the Hardy subcommittee in its report on United States Aid Operations in Iran:

CONCLUSIONS

1. United States aid and technical-assistance programs in Iran which, between 1951 and 1956, totaled a quarter billion dollars, were administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner.

2. The so-called expanded technical-assistance program which began in January 1952 and resulted in United States obligations of over $100 million in a 5-year period, was neither technical assistance nor economic development, but an ad hoc method of keeping the Iranian economy afloat during the years of the oil dispute.

3. The expenditure of technical-assistance funds during these years was undertaken without regard to such basic requirements of prudent management as adequate controls and procedures, with the inevitable consequences that it is now impossible—with any accuracy—to tell what became of these funds. The resulting opportunities for waste and loss of funds were considerable, but the extent to which loss and waste actu-

ally occurred cannot be determined since management practices and control procedures were so poor that records of the operation, especially in the early years, are not reliable.

4. Amounts requested for United States aid to Iran seem to have been picked out of the air. There is no evidence that they were based on advance study of what the Iranian economy needed, the amount it could absorb, or programs which could be intelligently administered by the United States personnel available at the time to expend the funds.

5. The conduct of the United States operations mission's affairs appears to have been based on the assumption that as long as United States aid funds were spent promptly it was not a matter of great consequence as to what they were spent for. Members of the mission who openly objected to the uncontrolled nature of the operation were either disciplined or labeled as incompetent. To those familiar with the involved and time-consuming processes for financing public works in the United States, in whole or in part with Federal funds, the cavalier, free-wheeling casual fashion in which huge sums of United States funds were committed in Iran must necessarily be shocking.

6. The participation of Iran in sharing the expense of the program appears to have been little more than nominal, and it is clear that, from the Iranian standpoint, the program's virtue was that it supplied a source of foreign exchange. It was not United States know-how but United States dollars which was Iran's chief gain.

7. Under the expanded operations begun in 1952, about $10 million in direct aid was furnished for a series of industrial, or capital improvement projects. Under statutory criteria the eligibility of the projects is questionable. United States officials sought to justify these expenditures on the grounds that the various plants involved were not only badly needed for the economy of the country but would supply excellent demonstrations of the feasibility of such undertakings. However, the more important of these enterprises still are not fully operating after 4 years, due to poor planning and faulty engineering. Thus their value in terms of economic development has been almost nil, and as demonstrations they appear chiefly to be monuments to a fumbling aid program.

8. A major effort on the part of the United States mission in 1953 to promote the construction of a multi-million-dollar dam on the Karadj River has resulted in virtually nothing but the relocation, at a cost to the United States Government of nearly $3 million, of a road around the proposed site; while not only has there been no construction started on the dam, the Iranian Government has not even concluded a firm contract for its financing.

9. Among the programs undertaken was one of supplying nearly $5 million over a 4-year period to support Iranian students who were completing their college training abroad. Involved in the program was a $2 million subsidy, through a special exchange rate for dollars, to the well-to-do sponsors and parents of these students. The nature and scope of the program were not revealed to the Congress and the Comptroller General has ruled that the expenditure of technical assistance funds for this purpose was unauthorized.

10. On top of annual grants of about $20 million for technical assistance, the United States began, in 1953, to supply supposedly temporary budgetary assistance to the Iranian Government at a rate of $5 million a month. In spite of the alleged temporary nature of this increased aid, the United States has continued to make budget aid grants and loans at about this same rate for 3 years.

11. United States control over what Iran did with this budget aid was practically nonexistent and the subcommittee notes that Iranian budget deficits increased rather than decreased during this period.

12. United States aid, alleged to be granted on the basis of austerity levels of Iranian Government expenditures, was utilized to pay for many extraordinary items, like the payroll of the National Iranian Oil Co. The fact that these items had not previously been considered appropriate charges against the Government budget casts doubt upon the propriety of treating them as budget items to be supported with United States aid dollars.

13. Whatever Iranian efforts may have been made to solve their own difficulties through appropriate reforms in Government spending and tax collection, their successes in this regard do not appear to have been noteworthy during the period when United States aid was financing Iranian budget deficits.

14. Iran's oil revenues are, and have been for some time, adequate to finance both the Government's operating budget and their ambitious development plans. Thus, their chronic budget deficits appear to be an outgrowth of financial management methods rather than lack of resources.

15. A factor in continued United States aid appears to be an aversion on the part of Iran to receive help in the form of United States loans, even though such loans are feasible and Iran is in a good position to repay them.

16. Each year's allotment to Iran has been justified as a temporary measure for a given set of reasons which have changed each year while the level of aid has remained about the same throughout. Presentations to the authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress have been vague and misleading. This may be due, in part, to the paucity of factual information available to those testifying before the committees of Congress. It may also be due to awareness that a clearer picture would have led Congress to reduce the program by eliminating items of expenditures which could not be reasonably justified.

17. Program presentations to the Congress have consistently failed to point out that Iran was and is an essentially solvent country.

18. The use of the so-called illustrative method of presenting budget requests to the Congress is a major factor in the almost complete loss of control by the Congress over spending in this type of program. Under this system the Congress is given a description of a hypothetical program which might be carried out if requested funds are furnished. However, when funds are granted by the Congress, there is no commitment by the executive branch to expend them for any of the activities used as hypothetical illustrations.

19. Congressional control over expenditures in this type of program is further defeated by the fact that information supplied Congress on how funds granted on the illustrative basis were actually spent consistently omits the elementary facts needed for an intelligent postaudit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee recommends—

1. That the Congress give concentrated attention to the entire problem of foreign aid with a view to determining the extent to which it has departed from its economic role and has become a vehicle for dealing with diplomatic problems simply by writing out annual checks drawn on the United States taxpayer.

2. That the Congress require the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration to take whatever measures are necessary to reverse the present pattern of deciding on dollar commitments first and actual programs and projects later. Requests for aid and technical assistance funds should be more closely scrutinized before they are authorized and appropriated. To this end the Congress should require the executive agencies to make their requests and their supporting presentations earlier in the session to avoid dealing hastily with these programs in the hectic days at the end of a session. The congressional committees should require detailed factual information in justification of sums requested and should abolish the practice of presenting illustrative programs.

3. That the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration obligate aid funds to the specific programs only when definite provision has been made for the timely availability in the field of sufficient competent personnel, both technical and administrative, to assure proper and efficient conduct of these programs.

4. That the Congress require detailed and meaningful reports of how local currency generated by United States financed imports was actually expended within the recipient country. Reports which show merely what commodities were bought in the United States tell only half the story. Such reports should be required in sufficiently clear terms to allow congressional judgment to be exercised on the efficiency and economy of such expenditures.

5. That the Congress require unequivocal and frank reports from the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration on the extent to which aid-receiving countries can and do help themselves. United States funds should not be used to finance projects which foreign governments are able to finance themselves. Where the program can be handled as a loan it should not be given as an outright grant. Grants should be pared to the minimum with the maximum portion of the program financed by the country receiving the benefit.

6. That the General Accounting Office establish and require the use of accounting systems by the International Cooperation Administration which will insure accurate end-use accounting for the expenditure of foreign economic aid funds. The General Accounting Office should also expand and strengthen its audits of economic aid expenditures to assure timely, accurate, and fully detailed reports to the Congress.

7. That the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration identify the individuals responsible for the waste and lax administration described in this report and take prompt action to insure that they shall no longer occupy positions of trust and authority in the expenditure of United States aid funds.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit communism to take over the vitally strategic Middle East, but American tax moneys, trust funds, must be administered prudently, economically, and honestly and with full accounting to the American people. Squandering our money in the Middle East or elsewhere and, by excessive generosity, encouraging those governments to perpetuate their weaknesses will not further but will defeat our objective—helping them to become self-sufficient and stable enough to resist Communist aggression.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I certainly agree with the gentlemen, both the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Michigan, that there is a need for better

supervision and more administrative responsibility in this foreign-aid field. On the matter of administrative responsibility I was shocked and surprised today to read on the ticker of the United Press that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson had charged that the National Guard was "a sort of scandal" during the Korean war when he said that it was used as a "draft dodging business" by youths to escape fighting in Korea. I have no personal knowledge of any men who have dodged the draft in time of fighting by going into a particular service, but I do have first-hand knowledge of a great National Guard division, the 45th Division, which stood on the front lines in Korea and faced the fire of the enemy. To me it is administrative irresponsibility to make this kind of blanket charge which reflects against all units in the National Guard, including units with great combat records in all wars. I hope that the Secretary of Defense will clarify his position and remove this cloud which he has cast over a great fighting organization. Of the 45th, Gen. George Patton said in World War II that it was "a division second to none in the annals of warfare."

Let us hope Secretary Wilson will speedily set the record straight in all fairness to American fighting men of the National Guard.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the observations made by the gentleman who has just spoken, I may insert certain extraneous material, and that his comments on the National Guard may be separated by an appropriate heading from the remarks on the Middle East.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MAJOR OIL COMPANIES ORGANIZE FALSE-FRONT LOBBY TO OPPOSE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress Members began receiving a flood of telegrams and letters from gasoline jobbers and retailers concerning the equality-of-opportunity bill, H. R. 11. Contrary to the position we would expect independent jobbers and retailers to take, these wires and letters have not asked for support of H. R. 11, but have asked for its defeat.

Since I am one of the authors of this legislation, several Members have asked me to look into this pressure drive and try to find out what is behind it. As most Members know, H. R. 11 was designed to help small-business people, including gasoline jobbers and retailers. Furthermore, retail gasoline dealers have, for several years, been pleading for this legislation. So naturally Members have wondered why it is that small-business people who would be helped by the legislation are participating in a drive to defeat the legislation. I am now prepared to give the answer.

MEETING AT THE BLACKSTONE HOTEL, CHICAGO

The drive was organized by the major oil companies on October 1 of last year. I have here a photostatic copy of a private and confidential letter of that date which invites certain members of the industry to an organizing meeting in Chicago, at the Blackstone Hotel, on October 12. I believe that the content of this letter will leave no doubt in anyone's mind that the "legislative proposals" referred to in the letter, as being the purpose of that organizing meeting are in fact the various forms in which the equality of opportunity bill have been presented.

I also have here some recent letters and other literature which the oil companies have been sending to their jobbers and retail dealers, which letters and literature advise these jobbers and retailers that passage of the equality of opportunity bill would be contrary to their interests.

Finally, I will present for the Members' attention a wire from one gasoline retailer who wired his Senator asking him to oppose H. R. 11, and then 2 days later, this retailer wired his Senator again explaining that he had not sent the first wire voluntarily, but had been pressured into sending it by his supplier, the Standard Oil Company of California. The second wire ends by asking the Senator to support H. R. 11.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL INVITATION LIST

Coming first to the letter which announced the October meeting, we may notice that it is signed by one J. G. Jordan. It is marked "private and confidential." It is written on plain paper, without a letterhead, and there is nothing on the face of the letter to indicate who J. G. Jordan is or what organization he is with. There is attached to this letter however, a brief reply form which the recipient of the letter was to mail in to indicate whether he would or would not be present at the meeting. The reply form was to be mailed to room 3801 at 50 West 50th Street, New York 20, N. Y.

My references show that 50 West 50th Street, New York, N .Y., is the address of Rockefeller Plaza, and that the 38th floor is occupied in part by the American Petroleum Institute. The American Petroleum Institute—or API, as it is called—is the organization of the oil companies, not the oil jobbers or the retailers. All of the big oil companies are members, and its influence is worldwide.

WHO IS MR. JORDAN?

Now who is Mr. J. G. Jordan?

Room 3801 is listed as the office occupied by Mr. J. G. Jordan who is vice president in charge of marketing of the Shell Oil Co., and who is also vice president for marketing of the American Petroleum Institute. Mr. Jordan is also listed as a member of the board of directors of the API and a member of its executive committee—which, I am told, is no small seat of power in these United States or anywhere that the streams of world commerce flow.

Mr. Jordan's letter is of course too discreet to mention the equality of opportunity bill by name. It simply warns the reader of what is called legislative proposals affecting the marketing segment of the oil industry. The letter also says of the these proposals that, and I quote, "Their importance and potential effects are such as to require an organization of all interests of oil marketing." This letter makes clear that the formation of such an organization is the purpose of the October meeting.

I ask that Mr. Jordan's letter, which I have marked "Exhibit I," be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, together with the reply form and the invitation list which are attached to this letter.

ALL MAJOR OIL COMPANIES INVITED

Needless to say, the invitation list contains the names of all of the major oil companies.

But others appear on the list too. Indeed, it would not have been necessary to call a special meeting and send out invitations if the business of this meeting was merely to mobilize the major oil companies against H. R. 11. The purpose of the meeting was to bring in certain oil jobbers and retailers, and particularly the State and national heads of oil jobber and retail associations, to try to sell these groups on the idea that small jobbers and retailers would be hurt by this legislation.

THE THREAT THAT H. R. 11 WILL PASS

As most of the Members know, small business people in the gasoline business, and, I believe, in every line of business, have been pleading for the "equality of opportunity bill" for several years. Not a few began asking for such legislation as early as 1951, right after the Supreme Court put the loophole into the antitrust laws which this legislation is designed to plug. That loophole was created by the Court's opinion in the Standard Oil—Indiana—case. Since that time the meaning of the loophole has become clearer, and the loophole has been enlarged by later decisions of the lower courts and the Federal Trade Commission. In the last term of Congress, the House passed the equality-of-opportunity bill by a vote of 393 to 3. This was near the end of the session, however, and the Senate did not have an opportunity to take up the bill, authough the Senate committee reported it. Clearly, there is a commitment to pass this legislation in this session. We all understand now the necessity for it, and small-business people expect, and assume, that Congress will pass this bill promptly. Predictions have been made in the trade press that this bill would be taken up and passed as about the first order of business.

OIL COMPANIES SHED TEARS FOR THEIR DEALERS

All of this is clear to the major oil companies too, as it is to big business in other fields. The bill puts a curb on abuse of power. It takes away some of the artificial advantages of bigness. And it would thus make big and small competitors compete on more equal terms. Naturally, big business does not like the bill. We are witnessing then, a highly deceitful program by which the major oil companies are trying to lead their jobbers and retailers to believe the legislation will hurt small business. And in some instances the major oil companies are actually pressuring their jobbers and

retailers to send in wires and letters opposing the bill.

Now I would like to call to the Members' attention photostatic copies of literature which some of the major oil companies have sent out to their dealers. Here is a letter on the letterhead of Pure Progress, a publication of the Pure Oil Co. It is dated simply "January 1957" and is signed by W. J. McAfee, editor, Pure Progress. This letter reads as follows:

JANUARY 1957.

DEAR PURE OIL DEALER: Your success and ours—your opportunities to progress and ours—are inseparable. That's why we want you to know about a common problem that may soon face us both.

The new session of Congress is reviving consideration of legislation which outlaws the right of a supplier to help its dealers meet price competition in good faith. This legislation is pretty complicated, but we have boiled down the essentials in the attached.

If this legislation is passed, we honestly believe that Pure Oil dealers—and all service station dealers—will eventually suffer. That's why we're calling it to your attention now.

Thanks,

W. J. MCAFEE,
Editor, Pure Progress.

H. R. 11 AS EXPLAINED BY PURE OIL COMPANY

Then there is attached to this letter a 6-page statement which bears the following title: "What the Proposed 'Anti-Good Faith Competition' Legislation Would Do to Dealers." I will not read this statement in full; a few selected paragraphs will be sufficient to indicate the flavor and purpose of it. The first two paragraphs read as follows:

At the 1956 session of Congress, legislation outlawing the good faith meeting of price competition passed the House of Representatives but failed in the Senate. Thus, many businessmen—large and small—narrowly escaped being suffocated by an altogether unworkable law. Although this legislation would have injured the whole range of industries, the oil business would have been hit very hard because it is more competitive than most other businesses.

In fact, had this legislation passed, one whole branch of the oil business—independent jobbers—would have been practically eliminated by act of Congres. Service station operators, who were represented by some groups as favoring this legislation, would have found their position undermined by this bill.

Then the next paragraph deals with what is called the threat that the equality-of-opportunity bill will be revived in 1957. Then here are some sample paragraphs which purport to explain how the retail-gasoline dealers would be hurt by passage of the equality-of-opportunity bill:

Price cutters would be protected by bill: Far from preventing gasoline-price wars, the objectives of the proponents of this legislation would encourage them. The legislation is intended to create what is a perfect atmosphere for the instigator of a price war: A price-cutter's dream.

* * * * *

This would encourage price cutters by ruling out any defense against their operations in the retail-gasoline field. The price cutter could move into a market with the assurance that he could draw to himself as much business as his pumps could handle, that no matter what he did his competitors would have no defense against him.

* * * * *

Once the price war got raging, dealers throughout that area would, of course, feel the effects through a big drop in their gallonage. They would appeal to their suppliers to reduce their tank wagon price to the invading refiner's level. They would warn that if they could not get this relief, the price cutter would force them out of business, causing their supplier to lose them as customers just as completely as if a competitor had taken them away.

RETAILER WIRED HIS SENATOR INVOLUNTARILY

The wire from the retailer I mentioned reads as follows:

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

About 7:30 p. m. last Friday, January 18, I sent you a wire which I desire to explain the true circumstances about.

I did not send this wire voluntarily but was pressured into sending it by representative of my supplying company, Standard Oil Company of California, who told me that H. R. 11, the equality of opportunity bill, would be injurious to service-station operators.

I have since learned that this is wholly untrue and that our national organization and State association are both unanimously supporting this legislation.

I ask you to support this legislation in the interest of service station operators and to be on the watch for this propaganda lobbying campaign by which major oil companies are victimizing and pressuring service-station operators to send wires against the operator's own interests.

RAY EYLER,
Ray Eyler's West End Service Station.
RENO, NEV.

STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA REQUESTS DEALERS TO WIRE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

A second statement was sent in by a retail-gasoline dealer of Salt Lake City, Utah. This dealer has written that the statement was given to him by one Mr. Al Mills, merchandiser for the Standard Oil Company of California, on January 16, 1957. This dealer has further written as follows:

Mr. Mills requested me to use this document in meetings with other service-station operators in an effort to persuade them to oppose H. R. 11, the equality-of-opportunity bill, and to get them to send wires and letters to their respective Congressmen and Senators in opposition to such legislation.

In this instance the statement is broken down into two shorter pieces. One piece is titled "What the 'Anti-Good-Faith Competition' Legislation Would Do," and another is titled "Why, Anti-Good-Faith' Legislation Would Hurt Gasoline Retailers." It is apparent furthermore, that these two statements came from the same source as the statement sent out by the Pure Oil Co., which I have already mentioned. Many of the paragraphs are identical with the paragraphs in the Pure Oil statement—word for word, and ccmma for comma. For example, I will cite one paragraph from the statement titled "Why 'Anti-Good Faith' Legislation Would Hurt Gasoline Retailers," and as may be seen this is identical with the paragraph I have already read from the statement circulated by Pure Oil:

This would encourage price cutters by ruling out any defense against their operations in the retail gasoline field. The price cutter would move into a market with the assurance that he could draw to himself as much business as his pumps could handle, that no matter what he did his competitors would have no defense against him.

A. P. I. IS COMMON SOURCE OF OIL COMPANIES' STATEMENTS

What then is the common source of statements circulated by two different major oil companies, the Pure Oil Co. and the Standard Oil Company of California? The answer to this is supplied by the statement sent in by the Salt Lake City retailer as having been given to him by a representative of Standard of California. In addition to the two statements I have already mentioned, there is a third, briefer, statement which carries the notation that it is, and I quote, a "condensation of A. P. I. C. brief what the proposed 'anti-good-faith competition' legislation would do to the oil business—December 7, 1956."

Then in this brief statement there are several paragraphs which appear verbatim in the longer statements circulated by both Standard of California and by the Pure Oil Co. For example, the condensation from the A. P. I. C. brief contains this sentence:

The legislation would have injured industry generally, and had it passed, service-station operators, who were represented by some groups as favoring this legislation, would have found their position undermined.

Note then the points of identity in this paragraph from the Pure Oil statement which is pitched somewhat more at jobbers than retailers. The paragraph reads as follows:

In fact, had this legislation passed, one whole branch of the oil business—independent jobbers—would have been practically eliminated by act of Congress. Service station operators, who were represented by some groups as favoring this legislation, would have found their position undermined by this bill.

I believe that we can assume then that both of these statements from the Pure Oil Co. and Standard Oil of California had a common origin in a brief which was circulated by a committee of the American Petroleum Institute.

I hope this will satisfactorily answer the questions of the Members about where the pressures are coming from which have been made to appear as coming from independent oil jobbers and retailers.

The letter signed by Mr. Jordan which I have referred to as exhibit I is as follows:

EXHIBIT I

OCTOBER 1, 1956.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

As you may be aware, there has been considerable activity at local, State and national levels in various forms of legislative proposals affecting the marketing segment of the oil industry. Many of these proposals are of particular interest to suppliers (large and small), jobbers, refiners, and dealers.

Their importance and potential effects are such as to require an organization of all interests of oil marketing. Therefore, it is proposed that a meeting be held in Chicago on Friday, October 12, at 9:30 a. m. in the Blackstone Hotel, Crystal Ballroom, and Hubbard Room to be followed by luncheon. It is hoped that you will be present to aid

in the review, discussions, and plans toward an approach to the solution of these problems. It is expected that adequate legal counsel will be in attendance, and in addition to them the attached list reflects those invited to attend.

Kindly advise me of your intention to be present.

Very truly yours,

J. G. JORDAN.

The reply form attached to Mr. Jordan's letter is labeled exhibit Ia, as follows:

EXHIBIT IA

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 1956.*

Mr. JORDAN: I shall (shall not) be present at the meeting in Chicago on Friday, October 12, at the Blackstone Hotel, at 9:30 a. m.

Finally, the invitation list attached to Mr. Jordan's letter is labeled exhibit Ib as follows:

EXHIBIT IB

BLACKSTONE HOTEL, CHICAGO MEETING, OCTOBER 12, INVITATION LIST

A. L. Frame, Cities Service Refining, New York; Herbert Willette, Socony Mobil Oil Co., New York; M. F. Breeckel, Sinclair Refining, New York; J. G. Jordan, Shell Oil, New York; Bronce L. Ray, Esso Standard Oil, New York; T. A. Aldridge, American Oil, New York; J. G. Jimines, Tidewater Oil, New York; C. J. Guzzo, Gulf Oil, Pittsburgh; Frank R. Markley, Sun Oil, Philadelphia; Dwight T. Colley, Atlantic Refining, Philadelphia; S. C. Bartlett, The Texas Co., New York; S. N. Elliott, Standard Oil (Ohio); Harry J. Kennedy, Continental Oil, Houston; Howard G. Vesper, Standard Oil (California); W. G. King, Jr., Richfield Oil, Los Angeles; Arthur C. Stewart, Union Oil, Los Angeles; Frank A. Watts, Humble Oil and Refining, Houston; T. E. Fitzgerald, D–X Sunray Oil, Tulsa; Merrill H. Utley, Standard Oil (Kentucky); Robert N. Scholl, Esso Standard, New York; Wm. F. Kenney, Shell Oil, New York; Hillyer Brown, Standard Oil (California); Oscar John Dorwin, The Texas Co., New York; Austin T. Foster, Socony Mobil Oil, New York; Archie D. Gray, Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh; Thomas. E. Sunderland, Standard Oil, Chicago; Lloyd F. Thanhouser, Continental, Houston; Joseph P. Walsh, Sinclair Oil, New York; Jesse Stickel, Crown Central Petroleum, Baltimore; Everette F. Wells, Ashland Oil and Refining, Kentucky; C. D. Hill, Carter Oil, Billings, Mont.; Robert W. Lee, Husky Oil, Cody, Wyo.; Ted Martin, Lion Oil; I. L. Goldman, Aurora Gasoline, Detroit; J. A. Doctor, Champlin Refining, Oklahoma; Samuel Rosenwasser, S. R. Service Station, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Nels Stover, Ohio Oil, Findlay, Ohio; Dwight F. Benton, Standard Oil (Indiana); Lisle W. Sweet, Pure Oil, Chicago; E. N. Lyons, Phillips Petroleum, Bartlesville; Jess Knowles, Skelly Oil, Kansas City; Howard Cowden, Consumers National Cooperative Refining Association, Kansas City; John Divine, New York City; John Harper, Harper Oil, New York; Robert M. Jenney, Jenney Oil, Boston; Harry Milton, Milton Oil, Clayton, Mo.; J. B. Fisher, Kendall Refining, Bradford, Pa.; Rayburn L. Foster, Phillips Petroleum, Bartlesville; Charles E. Hardwick, Ohio Oil, Ohio; Wm. A. McAfee, Standard Oil, Cleveland; R. L. Milligan, Pure Oil, Chicago; Henry L. O'Brien, Cities Service, New York; Joseph L. Nolan, Farmers Exchange, St. Paul; B. L. Majewski, Great American Oil, Chicago; Calvin Houghland, Direct Oil, Nashville; Robert O. Anderson, Malco Refining, Roswell, N. Mex.; L. R. Kamperman, Leonard Refining, Michigan; Don Dickey, Wayzata, Minnesota; Royal E. Decker, Plymouth Oil, Detroit; Leslie R. Neal, San Antonio, Tex.; W. Tom Jones, Montgomery, Ala.; Geo. C. Sheehan, Portland, Oreg.; Sam Bohlen, Snyder Oil, Ohio; Russel S. Williams, Gaseteria, Indianapolis; B. E. Devere, Pathfinder Petroleum, Los Angeles; Stanton K. Smith, Smith Oil and Refining, Rockford; Stan Breitweiser, Vickers Petroleum, Kansas; Raymond Tollette, Cosden Refining, Texas; Norman Foley, Fresno, Calif.

ACTION ON H. R. 11 IS UP TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The equality-of-opportunity bill, H. R. 11, has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. This committee reported the bill favorably in the last session of the past Congress under the title H. R. 1840. I hope therefore that the committee will act promptly in reporting the bill favorably again. I have written the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER] to this effect, and for the information of the Members I would like to have my letter inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1957.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My purpose in writing you is to express some thoughts I have about the equality-of-opportunity bill, H. R. 11, which I introduced January 3, 1957, and which was at that time referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration and report.

It is my hope, and I know the hope of countless small-business men and their representatives, that the Committee on the Judiciary will find it possible to complete its consideration and report H. R. 11 at the earliest possible date. I do not mean by that to indicate that the bill should be reported without adequate consideration. Much consideration was given it by your committee and indeed by the House of Representatives during the 84th Congress. That consideration was based upon the record of extensive hearings and the reports thereon. So extensive have been the hearings on the bill that many small-business men and their representatives have expressed the thought that additional hearings on it are unnecesary. However, I am aware that representatives of oil jobbers and some other business firms have requested that they be given an opportunity to be heard on H. R. 11. I believe that anyone who wants to be heard on the bill, and who is able to present new additional information which would assist in the consideration of the bill, should be heard. That is a matter for consideration and decision by you and your committee. I merely express my hope for an early consideration and a reporting of the bill.

I am concerned about the fact that Members are being flooded with telegrams and other communications ostensibly from independent small- and medium-sized business firms objecting to H. R. 11 and protesting against it being reported without each of them being heard on it. From the information which has come to me about those protests, it appears that almost all of them are from oil jobbers and a few from retailers who distribute gasoline and oil at retail.

An examination of the protests from the retail distributors of gasoline and oil has revealed that most of them have come from "captive" service stations, that is, stations that are under contract with and are subservient to major oil companies, such as Standard Oil Co. of California. In other words, protests have come in to Members from retail gasoline service stations which are "captives" of the major oil companies. They are "captives" because the major oil companies own the stations and have merely contracted with the operators to sell the products of the oil company through the facilities of the station, but only so long as the arrangements and the relationships are pleasing to the major oil company. Under such circumstances, it is clear that the subservient "captive" retail operator would not like to do anything or fail to do anything that would displease the major oil company involved.

In recent days we have learned that major oil companies which have "captive" subservient retail filling station operators have made arrangements for the retail operators to flood Members of the House of Representatives with wires objecting to H. R. 11 and demanding to be heard thereon. Instances were called to my attention where such "captive" stations of the Standard Oil Co. of California followed up by sending wires to Members. In addition, we have received information which will be documented in the very near future to the effect that representatives of major oil companies met in Chicago during October of 1956 after I announced that I would reintroduce H. R. 11, and there mapped a program and campaign to oppose H. R. 11. Some evidence of participation in such campaign by the major oil companies has already become available and will be presented in the very near future.

Likewise, we are informed that Members are now being flooded with wires from oil jobbers, who are located in their respective districts, objecting to H. R. 11 and demanding to be heard thereon. These wires fit a pattern, and we understand that they are being sent at the urging of a national organization. The arguments presented bear strong resemblance to the arguments which have been made in the past by major oil companies to laws which prohibit price discrimination. Therefore it is clear that these wires from the oil jobbers are furthering the cause of the major oil companies in opposing laws against price discrimination. That is true whether or not the oil jobbers are acting at the present time at the urging of the major oil companies in opposing H. R. 11.

It is unfortunate that the oil jobbers and retailers of gasoline and oil have been led to believe that H. R. 11, if enacted into law, will adversely affect them. Certainly I want no part in anything that would operate to the damage of small and independent business firms. Therefore I would not now be supporting H. R. 11 if I had any idea that it could adversely affect any small and independent business firm which wants and tries to do business in a fair and nondiscriminatory manner.

Frankly, the truth of the matter is that oil jobbers and retailers who sell gasoline and oil have been led into the erroneous belief that House Resolution 11 will adversely affect them. In the first place, the Robinson-Patman Act, as amended by House Resolution 11, would apply only to sales made in interstate commerce. We know that with very few exceptions oil jobbers and the small business firms engaged in the retail sale of gasoline and oil are not engaged in making sales and shipments in interstate commerce. In other words, they do not as a rule ship their products from one State to another. Therefore, with respect to their sales, House Resolution 11 could have no application.

Now, what about the purchases made by oil jobbers and others from the major oil companies? Of course, in many instances those purchases involve interstate sales and shipments by the major oil companies.

Examples of interstate sales and shipments by major oil companies to oil jobbers were those involved in the case of the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Standard Oil Company of Indiana* (340 U. S. 231).

The circumstances which gave rise to the Standard Oil Company of Indiana case were these: The Standard Oil Co., had 358 customers in the Detroit, Mich., area. Almost all of these customers were retailers who were engaged in buying gasoline directly as retailers from Standard and reselling it to the consuming public at retail. In the area Standard also had customers who were true oil jobbers. They bought directly

from Standard at the lower prices, available only to oil jobbers. They resold the gasoline at higher prices to their retailer-customers who were in competition with the retailers buying directly as retailers from Standard. In addition, Standard had four customers who were neither true oil jobbers nor true retailers. These four customers included what is known as jobber-retailers. Such dual and hybrid operators were in effect chainstore retailers. They purchased their supplies directly from Standard at the lowest possible price available to any jobber or wholesaler. However, they were not jobbers. They were retailers. But they were favored by Standard with price concessions not available to other competing customers of Standard. This unfair advantage that Standard gave its favored customers had telling adverse effects on all of its other customers in the area, whether they were oil jobbers or retailers. Consequently, the Federal Trade Commission ordered Standard to stop favoring that limited number of its customers with that unfair advantage, when at the same time it was refusing to give similar advantage to other competing customers.

Standard objected to the Federal Trade Commission order. It contended that if it had not discriminated in favor of one of these chainstore retailer organizations and against its other competing customers in the area, it would have lost the business of the large chainstore retailer organizations to one of Standard's competitors.

Should Standard Oil of Indiana in that instance be permitted to continue discriminating in price with damage to a majority of all of its customers, simply because one of Standard's competitors had lowered its prices in the area with the resulting prospect that the Standard Oil Company of Indiana would lose some business? That was the question that Standard sought to have decided in its favor. The Supreme Court accommodated Standard Oil Company of Indiana by deciding that question as Standard wanted it decided.

Standard did not prove that the lower price of its competitor in the Detroit area was discriminatory. Therefore, in effect, the Court's decision in favor of Standard is to preclude a smaller competitor of Standard from lowering its prices to all of its customers in an area such as Detroit, without facing the prospect of Standard discriminating in price by lowering Standard's price in the area where that competitor does business, while at the same time holding the level of Standard's prices to its customers in other areas at a higher level.

Faced with that threat of annihilation by Standard through its practice of price discrimination, its competitors are likely to prove reluctant to lower their prices to their customers in the public interest as they see fit.

Thus, the deadly practice of price discrimination as used by Standard Oil Company of Indiana and other such large sellers permits them to tighten their monopoly grip over interstate commerce. With that grip tightened around Standard's competitors and its oil jobbers and oil retailer customers, there can be no free and open competition. Any customer of Standard's who is an oil jobber or an oil retailer will be permitted to exist only as Standard decides. Unless the law is strengthened Standard will remain free to use the practice of price discrimination to destroy not only its competitors but to destroy any of its oil jobber customers or oil retailer customers it chooses to destroy. That price is too high to pay in order to permit Standard to maintain temporarily at its pleasure and jobber-retailer, chainstore organization it chooses to favor through the practice of price discrimination.

It appears from a recent inquiry that less than 5 percent of the oil jobbers in the country can be classed as oil jobber-retailers. Even their selfish interest for temporary existence should not be at the expense of the other 95 percent true oil jobbers and the thousands and tens of thousands of oil retailers.

I am sure that as the small and independent business firms which operate as true oil jobbers and as retailers in the distribution of gasoline and oil realize how H. R. 11 will help protect them from this deadly practice of price discrimination. They will join with the small and independent business firms in urging the Committee on the Judiciary to promptly report the equality of opportunity bill favorably.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress.

NEW CORN LEGISLATION PROPOSED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to alleviate a critical situation in the corn-producing Midwest. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is introducing an identical bill.

It is generally conceded that some form of constructive action is necessary and it is needed now. Our bill should have the support of all our colleagues, regardless of the stand they may have taken in the past on price-support or other farm legislation.

I will not take the time of the House to go into detail as to the economic blight that has been cast upon my district and the Midwest by low farm prices. Our predicament is by now well known and the remaining argument, if any, has to do with methods and courses to be followed in overcoming the problem. One thing bears repeating on this economic question, and that has to do with the adverse effect of our economic slump on the nonfarm economy. It is not just the farmers of the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota who are feeling the pinch. The merchants, service establishments, and other professional and business people in our area are equally affected. By the same token, the mills, factories, and commercial establishments serving as our sources of supply for manufactured and processed goods are likewise feeling the effects of the reduced volume of sales in the agricultural Midwest.

Farm legislation is, of course, intended to have its primary impact upon agriculture and farm people. However, I again urge our colleagues from nonfarm districts to keep in mind the effect of slumps in purchasing power of rural areas on their business and industry. The small-business men in my district know that their economic status is tied directly to the level of the farm economy in their trade areas. It is well to occasionally remind businessmen in other areas that they, too, have a real stake in the farm economy.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower again recognized the urgent aspects of the farm-income problem. He said:

Our concern for the well-being of farm families demands that we constantly search for new ways by which they can share more fully in our unprecedented prosperity.

Although my bill does not provide anything like all the answers, it does provide a plug for a big gap now threatening our farm economy. It offers a good beginning for our movement toward what I believe must be our ultimate goal of full economic parity for farm people.

This bill contains five important features which I shall briefly describe.

FIFTY-ONE MILLION ACRE MINIMUM CORN ALLOTMENT

First, it meets the problem of an unrealistic acreage allotment for corn. Unless we take immediate action, I am told that only a small percentage of farmers in the commercial corn area are expected to comply with the present allotment of 37 million acres. The result will be wide open production of corn, the glutting of the market if we have reasonably good crops, and a possibly disastrous effect on the feed and livestock economy.

By providing a minimum acreage allotment for corn of 51 million acres we can hope to accomplish many things. Foremost among these, of course, will be widespread compliance with the allotment program and a material reduction in corn production. Additionally, we will be giving to corn a fair minimum acreage allotment as we have done for certain other basic commodities.

CORN ALLOTMENT APPORTIONED ON BASIS OF TILLABLE ACREAGE

Under the present program basing corn acreage allotments on previous planting histories, inequities are perpetuated and many good farmers are penalized. Corn production in the commercial area is unique in this regard. I am convinced and I believe the vast majority of farmers agree with me that tillable acreage is the only fair, equitable, and sensible basis for apportioning corn acreage allotments. Since this is a detail of administration and has no material bearing on any other aspect of the legislation, there should certainly be no objection to the provision directing that corn acreage allotments be apportioned solely on the basis of tillable acreage. This change is in the best interests of the program, the farmers involved, and the land itself.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY SUPPORTS FOR FAMILY-SIZE FARMS

Virtually everyone gives lip service to the ideal that family-size farms should be given maximum economic protection. Critics of the price support programs almost invariably point to the very large operators as the beneficiaries of such programs. They cite the extremely large CCC loans as horrible examples. Then they claim that "price supports actually are not for the benefit of the small farmers anyway so we might as well do away with them." These arguments I reject, but I do share the belief that the fundamental objective of price support programs is to help the little fellow—and this provision of our bill does just that.

This third, and very important, provision is to the effect that 90 percent of parity price supports shall be made available on the first 4,000 bushels of corn

produced on each farm eligible for such supports. That will take care of most of the family-size operations.

At the same time, the big operators will also have the protective benefits of this "umbrella" over the smaller operations. First, they will have the 90 percent of parity protection on their first 4,000 bushels of production. Second, they will have the general protection of the market-strengthening effects of this price level plus the stabilizing effects of the surplus-reducing results of this and other sections of the bill.

My district is a major corn producing area. I have several counties each of which produced in excess of 8 million bushels of corn in previous years. We are virtually all corn farmers. According to the census, the average size farm in my district in 1954 was about 233 acres. By rough calculation, the average farm would have about a 50-acre corn allotment. With an average yield of 60 bushels to the acre for a total of 3,000 bushels, that average farmer in my district would see his corn protected at a minimum of 90 percent of parity or at a price between $1.50 and $1.55.

We want and need this protection for our smaller or family-size farmers and I know of no valid reason why we should not have it.

CROPLAND EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF ALLOTMENT MUST GO INTO SOIL BANK

The fourth provision is to the effect that a farmer must put cropland equal to 20 percent of his corn acreage allotment into the soil bank in order to be eligible for the price supports provided in the previous section. We recognize that we must make a major contribution to the solution of our own problems and the best way we can do that is to help reduce the surplus. We propose to do that by putting land into the soil bank as a condition of eligibility for the price support. We are asking for something, and we are willing to give something in return. I am firmly convinced of the fact that farmers throughout America are willing to make some sacrifices, if necessary, provided equivalent protection is given their economy. This is a most equitable provision of the bill and it is deserving of unanimous approval along with the other provisions.

ALL FARMERS MADE ELIGIBLE FOR CONSERVATION RESERVE

The fifth point, Mr. Speaker, is one on which I personally have very strong convictions. As you know, I was the first Member of Congress to advance the soil bank idea. I was joined by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] in the introduction of the first bills on the subject. The soil-bank bill which passed the Congress last year was the culmination of years of study and effort on my part. Although it was in such form as to be quite different in many respects from my original concept of the program, I gave the bill my support so as to get the soil bank in operation. We must now seek to perfect it on the basis of experience.

When that bill came before us it contained a cross-compliance provision on corn which was not at all to my liking. That section provided that any farmer in the commercial area who was not in compliance with the corn base or allotment could not participate in either section of the soil-bank program. Now, this simply did not make sense as it tended to defeat the fundamental objective of the program; namely, to get surplus-producing land out of production. Corn is not our only surplus commodity—we have a similar and companion problem in all of the other feed grains.

At that time I prepared and planned to offer an amendment striking that provision from the bill but was prevailed upon to refrain by the leadership on both sides of the aisle who did not want the bill opened up for amendments.

There is no justifiable reason for keeping this provision in the present law. Experience has shown that it is no inducement whatsoever to farmers to obtain their compliance with corn acreage allotments. At the same time, it has kept untold acreages out of the low-cost conservation reserve and in the production of surplus feed grains like barley and oats.

By eliminating this restriction, which accomplishes nothing of value, we will open up the conservation reserve to thousands of farmers who may then put surplus-producing lands into the soil-bank program. There should be no objection from any source to this change in the law.

ILLUSTRATION OF NEW CORN PROGRAM

In conclusion, let me give you a simple illustration of how this new program would work. Let us take a typical half-section farm in southwestern Minnesota or Iowa. If the provisions of this bill are not enacted, that farm is apt to produce 100 acres of corn and another 100 acres of competing feed grains. None of its acres will be eligible for the soil bank.

Approve this bill quickly, and this is the likely result on that same farm: With an estimated corn acreage allotment of 80 acres, 60 acres will go into corn and 20 acres may go into the acreage reserve. That farmer will reduce his corn production about 40 percent and with an average yield will receive the full 90 percent of parity price support on all of his corn. In addition, he will also be eligible for the conservation reserve and if a fair payment is established by the United States Department of Agriculture, I am hopeful that he will put another 40 acres or so into soil-conserving crops under the conservation reserve and thus reduce by that much his production of competing feed grains. At the end of the crop year, that farmer will have earned more money, he will have reduced his surplus production, and everyone will be ahead.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. In order to make the soil-bank program effective we must do two things. First, we must make it possible for more farmers to participate. The bill we are offering does just that. Second, we must set the payment rates high enough to attract participation. This is a matter for administrative determination and I am urging the Department to take appropriate steps in that direction. Last year, some of the payment rates were too low and they must be adjusted in this year's program.

I am very pleased to be joined in the introduction of this bill by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] who has for so many years rendered outstanding service to farm people and American agriculture in the Congress. I commend the bill to our other colleagues who are equally interested in this problem and urge that they join us in the sponsorship of this legislation. For that purpose, I am inserting the bill at the conclusion of these remarks.

We hope the whole Congress will heed our plea for very early action on this proposal. Time is running out on the farms of the Midwest even as we lay our case before you. These are our own people. Their cause is just, and they have every right to expect understanding and action.

A bill to amend the acreage allotment and price-support provisions for corn, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the acreage allotment for corn for any calendar year beginning with 1957 shall not be less than 51 million acres."

SEC. 2. Section 329 of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 329. The acreage allotment for corn shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the commercial corn-producing area on the basis of the tillable acreage in such counties. The acreage allotment to the county for corn shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of the tillable acreage on such farms. Not more than 3 percent of the county allotment shall be apportioned to farms on which corn has not been planted during any of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made."

SEC. 3. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional paragraph:

"(8). Price support made available for any crop of corn (beginning with the 1957 crop) to cooperators on any farm in the commercial corn-producing area shall be not less than 90 percent of the parity price therefor on the first 4,000 bushels. This provision shall not affect the level of price support made available to cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area."

SEC. 4. Section 408 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following:

"For the purpose of price support in the commercial corn-producing area for any crop of corn for which an acreage-reserve program is in effect, a 'cooperator' shall be a producer who (1) devotes an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage-reserve program for corn or the conservation-reserve program equal to 20 percent of such producer's farm allotment for corn, and (2) does not exceed that farm-acreage allotment for corn."

SEC. 5. Section 114 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by deleting the words "under this title" and substituting therefor the words "under the acreage-reserve program."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. WALTER) for the remainder of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HARDY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. MEADER today for 30 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, today, for 10 minutes, and to include a statement on a corn bill introduced by Mr. JENSEN of Iowa and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and also to include a copy of the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. UDALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. POLK.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in four instances.

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NIMTZ.

Mr. MACK of Washington in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, if desired, to include extraneous matter: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] in two respects, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 29, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

365. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 5, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Eel River Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

366. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on upper Naugatuck River above Torrington, Conn., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate and House of Representatives, adopted September 14, 1955, and June 13, 1956, respectively (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

367. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 19, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on and preliminary examination and survey of Barataria Bay Waterway, La., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted September 25, 1945, and authorized by the Flood Control Act and the River and Harbor Act approved December 22, 1944, and March 2, 1945, respectively (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

368. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 10, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 28, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

369. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Mo."; to the Committee on Agriculture.

370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

371. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to the proposed transfer by the Department of the Navy to the city of Gainesville, Ga., a 36-foot aircraft rescue boat, hull No. C-7627, to be used for the purpose of fire fighting on Lake Lanier, etc., pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 7308); to the Committee on Armed Services.

372. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid during the 6 months period ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to 10 United States Code 1552 (f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

373. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government for the second quarter of fiscal year 1957, pursuant to Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

374. A letter from the Chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting a report on the official operations of the Council from January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to an act approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

375. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on House Administration.

376. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

377. A letter from the Director, Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, pursuant to Public Law 182, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

378. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the anthracite experiment station operated by the Bureau of Mines at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., during the calendar year 1956, pursuant to the act of December 18, 1942, (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

379. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 645 of title 14, United States Code, relative to the settlement of claims incident to activities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

380. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion rendered in the case of *Maurice Mumford d/b/a Potomac Aircraft Corporation* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 1–55), pursuant to the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 193, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

381. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

382. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report of positions in the Small Business Administration in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of January 24, 1957, the following joint resolution was reported on January 25, 1957:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 117. Joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence; with amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted January 28, 1957]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3109. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans; with amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2528. A bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207; with amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 121. Resolution providing for appointment of members to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 122. Resolution electing various members to joint committees of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to employ two additional employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 7). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 117. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 8). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 123. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. First report of the Committee on Government Operations on United States aid operations in Iran; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 3728. A bill to amend the acreage-allotment and price-support provisions for corn and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 3729. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3730. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 3731. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 3732. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 3733. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 3734. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 3735. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3736. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3737. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 3738. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 3739. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3740. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3741. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8742. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3743. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3744. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 3745. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 3746. A bill to amend section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to provide that payments in lieu of taxes shall be made with respect to Wherry Act housing acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3747. A bill to grant school lands in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 3748. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3749. A bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deductions for a self-help meat-promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 3750. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance who are in need, through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food and fiber products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3751. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide a revised rate of duty on certain jute fabrics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 3752. A bill to regulate the practice of physical therapy by registered physical therapists in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 3753. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 3754. A bill to provide for Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 3755. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3756. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3757. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution in any part of the United States and its possessions and in other nations, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressive price levels, and to establish a board and corporations for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3758. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3759. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 3760. A bill to provide for Federal assistance, on a dollar-matching basis, to State and local governments and agencies thereof for planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining water conservation and water storage projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3761. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3762. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3763. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3764. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3765. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H. R. 3766. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retired pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from June 1,

1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3767. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study the effects on the private shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government shipyards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 3768. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons, having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3769. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 3770. A bill to rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas, as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 3771. A bill to provide for the transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of Indian irrigation or power project works to water users' associations or irrigation districts organized under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3773. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water-carrier certificates or permits under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3774. A bill to amend section 218 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require contract carriers by motor vehicle to file with the Interstate Commerce Commission their actual rates or charges for transportation services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3775. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock-modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3776. A bill authorizing the transfer of that portion of Camp Joseph T. Robinson, known as the Baptist College tract, to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 3777. A bill to amend Public Law 314, 78th Congress, to provide that retired members of any component of the Armed Forces may waive receipt of all or a portion of their retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3778. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the stream valley parks in Maryland; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3779. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where adoption proceedings were commenced before such individual's death and are subsequently completed by his spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3781. A bill to provide for the recovery of erroneous payments made under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, regardless of any waiver of the recovery of such payments, where the proceeds of such payments can be traced; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 3782. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 3783. A bill for the adoption of 10,000 eligible orphans, under 12 years of age, and to grant permanent residence to orphans admitted to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3784. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3785. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3786. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the excise tax on automotive windshields, side windows and rear windows be imposed on a square-foot basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 3788. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3789. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navaho Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3790. A bill relative to the jurisdiction over criminal offenses or civil actions committed or arising on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3791. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3792. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 3793. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3794. A bill to amend section 6 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3795. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on pencils and pens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3796. A bill to amend certain subsections of subchapter B of chapter 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3797. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide that certain officers and employees of the Federal Government who are disabled veterans shall be entitled to accrue sick leave at the rate of 20 days per year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. R. 3799. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3800. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3801. A bill relating to income-tax refunds for the taxable year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3802. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" for purposes of Veterans' Administration laws, and to provide that remarried widows may return to the compensation rolls upon termination of their remarriage by divorce without fault on the part of the wife, or by death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 3803. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to increase its benefits in the case of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3804. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act with respect to its application to producers of flue-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3806. A bill to modify and extend the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3807. A bill to provide that 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans; to increase the maximum loan entitlement of veterans under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to expedite action on certain applications of veterans for direct home loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3809. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be reduced from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3810. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 3811. A bill to provide that the United States district judges for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico shall have the same tenure of office and retirement rights

as all other United States district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3812. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3813. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3814. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3815. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3816. A bill to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3817. A bill to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3818. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3819. A bill to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3820. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 3821. A bill relating to the determination of the permanency of active pulmonary tuberculosis in certain pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3822. A bill to extend a presumption of line of duty in certain cases for purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3823. A bill to assure that the addition disablement or death of a veteran pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation training resulting from the carrying out of the recommendation of an instructor or training officer shall be treated as if service-connected for the purposes of veterans' laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3824. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Transportation World's Fair to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3825. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the convevance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3827. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 3828. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 3829. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Newnan, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3830. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agenices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 3831. A bill to establish recreational use of, and wildlife habitat management on, the national forests and other lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3832. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 3833. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3834. A bill to authorize the preservation of the U. S. S. *Olympia* and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 3836. A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3837. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 3838. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3839. A bill to modify the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 3840. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interest therein acquired for the Grapevine Reservoir project located in the State of Texas, by reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the benefits of section 1231 shall be available with respect to livestock held for any purpose by a taxpayer for 6 months or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3842. A bill to amend section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 3843. A bill to provide for the establishment of four soil and water conservation laboratories; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3844. A bill to provide for a survey to be conducted to determine the feasibility of deepening, widening, and straightening the Red River and certain of its tributaries from its mouth through Shreveport, La., to Denison, Tex., and through Caddo Lake to Jefferson, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3845. A bill extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3846. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3847. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3848. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3849. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 3850. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service in 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 3851. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to credit for service in post offices which are reclassified from third to fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Servce.

H. R. 3852. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 3853. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 3854. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3855. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3856. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3857. A bill to amend section 605 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans, and that the interest from such loans in excess of the average rate of interest on the portion of such fund invested in other obligations shall be used to pay the costs of administering such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3858. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3859. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 3860. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by Act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 3861. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide more flexibility in refinancing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 3862. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during month of December; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3863. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the tax on toilet preparations from a retailers excise tax to a manufacturers excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3865. A bill to provide for further research and technical assistance required for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable of adversely affecting the health and welfare of man; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3866. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to extend for 2 years the period during which visas may be issued thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 3867. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that persons who are awarded the Purple Heart shall be deemed to have a 10 percent service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 3869. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide current insured status for certain additional individuals who served as employees of the State of Wisconsin and to whom social security coverage was retroactively extended in 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3870. A bill to provide a research program for a better potato to be raised in Long Island soil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3871. A bill to provide for the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the use of interest from such investments for scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3872. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 3874. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to amend section 84 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of funds for travel or entertainment of Josef Broz, also known as Marshal Tito; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Transportation World's Fair to be held in Chicago, Ill., in May of 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the Transportation World's Fair to be held in Chicago, Ill., in May of 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution providing that the day on which the presidential election is held shall be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to provide direct aid to States and Territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate the cost of living and the widening spread between retail prices and prices paid to farmers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to establish the Multiple Uses of Public Lands Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of the Congress for the action of certain railroads in reducing certain freight rates in the southwestern drought area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 124. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents occurring in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 125. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 126. Resolution providing for certain additional employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 127. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to continue the study and investigation begun under House Resolution 262 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 129. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Independent Unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 130. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. Res. 131. Resolution to request the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Budget to prepare and submit to the Congress, legislation to establish a Columbia River Basin account for irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 132. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the causes of the present trend toward inflation; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 3875. A bill for the relief of Pioneers, Inc., a corporation, and Jess M. Ritchie, individually, and as an officer of said corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Miss Zmirah Mittelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3877. A bill to validate a patent issued to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, for certain land in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3878. A bill for the relief of Chien-Wu Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H. R. 3879. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Deutch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Tzouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Peter Henry Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 3882. A bill for the relief of Aomas Marrana Louregi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3883. A bill for the relief of Emilio Lezaniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3884. A bill for the relief of Jacinto Basterrechea Irastorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3885. A bill for the relief of Nicasio Mendia Orueta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3886. A bill for the relief of Julian Lequericabescoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3887. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Schubert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 3888. A bill for the relief of Man Yee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3889. A bill for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Elsa Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3891. A bill for the relief of General and Mrs. Yeh Nan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Ennio Gerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Antonio Crivici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Ornella Buratto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Chryssoula Fotinatos (Stevens); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Katija Bozanja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Gannoa Boggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 3899. A bill for the relief of William E. Heilmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Michael Wehby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3901. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eula Floyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3902. A bill for the relief of Mariano Soares Brandao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3903. A bill for the relief of Franziska Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Nunik Firjanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3905. A bill for the relief of Sanford A. McGavern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3906. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Schubert, his wife, Lenke Schubert, and his son, Tamas Schubert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Vincent LaBella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Icek Cudzynowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Essie Mae Clarke and Beverly Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3910. A bill for the relief of Jean N. LeBlond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3911. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cascio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3912. A bill for the relief of Alice Blumenthal and her minor child, Arlene Blumenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Chan Yak Shing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3914. A bill for the relief of Fatulla, Agha Bibi, Albert, and David Amini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 3915. A bill for the relief of Teruko Miesse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3916. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. West, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 3917. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catarina Perez deGuillen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3918. A bill for the relief of Louis Rodriquez alias Rudolfo Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 3919. A bill for the relief of Vicente San Joaquin Garcera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 3920. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3922. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie A. Dablias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abdullah Cem Bayar and Mrs. Sermin Okyanus Bayar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Stephen S. T. Pan and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Pelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3927. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vassilike J. Daskalake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of Maximo C. Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Mariano Soria Cabero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 3930. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Di Gregorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of Jan Oro'-Florensa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chih-Ree Sun, and his wife Helen Leehwa Yu Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Verulo M. Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 3934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Patricia B. Altenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution for the relief of Mrs. Natalija Djurovic Bogojevich; to the Comittee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

54. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of St. Felix Friary, of Huntington, Ind., in protest of rumored visit of Marshal Tito, Yugoslavian dictator, to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. Also, petition of Charles W. Bailey, of Anderson, Ind., in regard to the rumored visit to the United States by Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the members of the John Adams Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Quincy, Mass., urging the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Adele Martin and others, Oro Vista, Calif., relative to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. Also, petition of Edna M. Roberts and others, Pacoima, Calif., relative to requesting a statement as to how much money from the United States Treasury has been paid or loaned to Britain and France during the past 11 years, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. Also, petition of the secretary, the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., relative to requesting the approval of legislation that will prohibit the serving of alcoholic liquors on all American commercial flights, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

60. Also, petition of the clerk, city of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to opposing the passage of legislation designed to limit the power of the Federal Power Commission in regulating the price of produced gas moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

To Correct an Injustice in the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how would you like to earn $80 and lose up to $108.50 in so doing? Do not think it is not happening. It is.

A considerable number of our fellow Americans, at this season of the year, are making out their income tax—social security earning reports.

Under the social-security law a person who receives a social-security pension may earn in any calendar year up to $1,200 over and above his social-security pension without having his pension reduced. But under the present law if he earns above $1,200 in any calendar year he must forfeit 1 month's social-security pension for each $80 or part thereof he earns above the allowable $1,200.

Under this rule if the pensioner earns $1,200.01 to $1,280 he loses 1 month of his social-security pension; if he earns $1,280.01 to $1,360 he must forfeit 2 months of his pension, etc.

The pensioner, in many cases, is entitled to a pension of $108.50 and has been drawing this. If he earns 1 cent to $80 above the allowable $1,200 he forfeits the $108.50 for 1 month. This, it seems to me, is unfair.

But even the $80 he earns above the $1,200 really is not $80 of take-home pay. The worker must subtract from it the carfare and lunch money spent to make it possible for him to earn the $80. Also he must pay withholding taxes for social security on this $80 and also probably some income tax.

On the whole the social-security law is a good law. It does have some weaknesses that need correction and the provision which causes many pensioners to lose up to $108.50 because they earned $80 above the allowable $1,200 ought to be corrected.

In order to correct this weakness and injustice in the social-security law I introduced this week a bill (H. R. 4288) allowing social-security pensioners to earn up to $125 above an allowable $1,200 before he would lose 1 month of his pension benefits.

Under the present law if a social-security pensioner earns $1,200.01 he loses 1 month of his pension. Under my bill (H. R. 4288) he would not lose that 1 month of pension benefit until his earnings reached $1,325.01.

This is a very modest reform in the law and, it seems to me, should be approved immediately by Congress to correct the existing injustice to social security pensioners.

The following table shows the number of monthly pension checks one will forfeit because of earnings about $1,325:

Annual earnings under present law	Annual earnings under Mack bill	Number of monthly checks held back	Number of checks pensioner will be paid
$1,200 or less	$1,325 or less	0	12
$1,200.01 to $1,280	$1,325.01 to $1,450	1	11
$1,280.01 to $1,360	$1,450.01 to $1,575	2	10
$1,360.01 to $1,440	$1,575.01 to $1,700	3	9
$1,440.01 to $1,520	$1,700.01 to $1,825	4	8
$1,520.01 to $1,600	$1,825.01 to $1,950	5	7
$1,600.01 to $1,680	$1,950.01 to $2,075	6	6
$1,680.01 to $1,760	$2,075.01 to $2,200	7	5
$1,760.01 to $1,840	$2,200.01 to $2,325	8	4
$1,840.01 to $1,920	$2,325.01 to $2,450	9	3
$1,920.01 to $2,000	$2,450.01 to $2,575	10	2
$2,000.01 to $2,080	$2,575.01 to $2,700	11	1
$2,080.01 or more	$2,700.01 or more	12	0

Visit to the United States by President Tito of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Associated Press carried an article which indicated that Tito may receive an invitation for a state visit while Congress is idle during the Easter recess. I strongly support any action to discourage the issuance of such an invitation, and in that connection have signed a petition to the President urging that no invitation be extended. You may be sure my seat, for one, would be vacant in the event he would be invited to appear when we are meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I have received scores of letters from my district protesting a rumored visit of Tito to this country. In response to this storm of protest, I checked with the State Department to determine the authenticity of these rumors. The reply I received, and which I assume many of my interested colleagues have also received, was the usual guarded doubletalk so dear to certain members of the State Department. The meat of the statement, which is entitled "Visit to the United States by President Tito of Yugoslavia" is contained in the last paragraph, and I quote:

> Any proposal for a visit to this country by President Tito would certainly be carefully considered in the light of all these factors.

That statement is enough for me, and I am satisfied that this proposed visit has gone far beyond any rumor stage. In fact, it would not surprise me to pick up my newspaper any day and be greeted by a public announcement of this proposed visit.

I realize at this point that there is little to be gained by opposing what is apparently already an accomplished fact, as far as the State Department goes. However, I hope my protest is heard. Have we forgotten so soon the murdered patriot General Mihailovich and the persecuted religious leader Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac? We certainly do remember that only a few weeks ago he handed back to almost certain death a number of Hungarian patriots who had crossed the border seeking political asylum, openly and publicly condoning the unprecedented orgy of murder that the Soviets had just committed in Hungary. And then go back a decade. Need I remind my colleagues of what transpired on August 19, 1946? On this date, with Tito's full knowledge and approval, Yugoslavian pilots deliberately murdered five American airmen by shooting down their unarmed C–47 transport. We did not even get an official regret or excuse from this international gangster for these cold-blooded murders. The bodies of those American victims are interred in the hallowed soil of Arlington National Cemetery only a few short miles from the spot where our Government officials might clasp the bloody hand of this godless murderer in false friendship. Mr. Speaker, if it is not already too late, I beg those responsible to reconsider and not commit this monstrous folly. It is enough that we have compromised our national honor in the interests of world peace by extending economic and military aid to this man; let us not raise him in the eyes and stature of his own people and thus help to preserve his Communist dictatorship and career of crime.

Second District of Illinois Continues to Set the Pattern of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and with pride that I rise to inform the House of another notable record soon to be made by the amazing Second District of Illinois in setting for all the world a pattern of brotherhood.

Ghana, said to be the ancestral home of the majority of our fellow Americans of the Negro race, flourished several centuries before the birth of Christ. On March 6 this West African kingdom, long a colony of Great Britain, is to receive a new dominion status in the British Commonwealth and take again its proud and ancient name of Ghana. In casting off its colonial status, it will become the first independent Negro ruled nation within the British Commonwealth.

Present at this historic ceremony, bearing to the rulers and the people of the restored Ghana the congratulations

and the felicitations of the men and women of all races and all religions of our community, will be four of the outstanding citizens of the Second District of Illinois. This delegation from the Second District at the happy ceremony in Ghana will be the largest from any congressional district in the United States.

The delegation will consist of John Johnson, the dynamic publisher of Ebony and Jet; Earl Dickerson, president of the Supreme Liberty Life Insurance Company; Sidney Williams, former executive secretary of the Chicago Urban League; and Aaron Payne, the famous trial attorney and orator.

Bill Seeks 4,000 Additional Visas for Greek Veterans, Relatives, and Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. JAY NIMTZ
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, with the eyes of the world centered on the crisis in the Middle East, I am sure that every Member of Congress shares with me a feeling of gratitude and assurance for the longtime friendship and loyalty of Greece, our strongest NATO partner in the Mediterranean area.

I am also sure that many Members number among their friends, as I do, some of the nearly 1½ million Americans of Hellenic extraction who reside in the United States and Alaska. These citizens, many of whom are community leaders, serve as perhaps the strongest link in our historic friendship with Greece.

During the past several years, I have followed with interest and admiration the excellent work and patriotic activities of the Order of Ahepa, not only in Indiana but throughout the United States.

I have followed with particular interest the work of the Ahepa Refugee Relief Committee under the chairmanship of my fellow Hoosier, Leo J. Lamberson of South Bend, Ahepa's past supreme president. I feel that the efforts of the committee in assisting Greek orphans and refugees is commendable and should be encouraged in every possible way.

With this in mind, I have introduced legislation which will assist in carrying the Greek refugee program to a successful conclusion. My bill, H. R. 3642, proposes to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, by providing that any special nonquota immigrant visas allotted to aliens which were unissued on January 1, 1957, shall be made available for issuance to the following:

First, not more than 2,500 to aliens who served honorably in the military forces of Greece during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.

Second, not more than 1,000 to aliens who are the parents, brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States, and

Third, not more than 500 to eligible orphans who are under 14 years of age.

The bill provides that these 4,000 visas for Greek veterans, relatives, and orphans shall be issued before December 31, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this emergency legislation be acted upon without delay. Such action will serve to strengthen the ties of friendship between the United States and Greece at this most critical time in history.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have observed that we have no real serious farm problems anywhere in this country wherever sufficient moisture has been available to grow crops. Furthermore I have seen many farms in the drought area that have continued to grow enough feed to sustain livestock despite the scanty rainfall.

I do not want to minimize the serious damage and suffering throughout the drought area in the Southwest. I do want to call attention to two programs that have helped thousands of farmers during this prolonged dry period. Those farmers who have kept the rain water on their fields and farms through moisture conservation practices have fared much better in this drought than those who did not. Moisture conservation practices made the difference as far as the growth of vegetation is concerned. Therefore, I want to call attention to the fundamental soundness of the application of soil and water conservation to the farmlands of the Nation. This program costs little. It is one of making available technical assistance to farmers through the Soil Conservation Service and of assisting them in applying practices with cost sharing.

Experience gained in the past 21 years under the Soil Conservation Act of 1935 laid the groundwork for the watershed program which is the second point I wish to call to your attention.

Since 1935 we have demonstrated beyond question that soil and water resources can be protected and improved on individual farms and ranches. We have learned that land and water are inseparable, that water is collected not alone in the major streams but from all the land of the watershed, beginning at its uppermost limits. It has been made clear that water is first of all an agricultural resource, that its use and management in the initial stages is an agricultural problem, and that land management is one of the keys to water management. It has been established that more than half the Nation's estimated $1.2 billion average annual floodwater and sediment damage occurs on the headwater streams and small tributaries, and that about seven-tenths of this damage is agricultural.

The watershed protection and flood prevention program is soundly conceived. It places on the local people the responsibility for initiating projects, carrying them out, maintaining them, and sharing in their cost, with technical and financial assistance from the Federal Government.

The program has been widely accepted by the people. I have been advised that as of January of this year 617 local groups had applied for assistance under the act. Of this number, 240 proposed projects had been approved for planning, and 31 had been authorized for operations.

The program is being administered ably. The Soil Conservation Service is upholding its reputation as one of our finest governmental service agencies by assuming its new responsibilities under the Watershed Act with efficiency and dispatch. And it is continuing to provide its excellent technical services to individual farmers and ranchers in the Nation's 2,700 soil conservation districts.

The Congress and the administration have every right to be proud of our soil and water conservation and watershed protection and flood prevention programs and the way these programs are going forward. These programs offer the best protection against future droughts.

Visit of King Saud to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have a natural antipathy toward letting King Saud come to the United States because of his undemocratic policies and his discriminatory practices, particularly as they pertain to Americans of both the Jewish and Christian faiths. We know that King Saud does not permit Americans of the Jewish faith to serve with our Armed Forces stationed at the United States airbase in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. He also insists that Christian chaplains serving with our forces there should not wear the cross or otherwise be identified with the Christian faith.

Nevertheless, as a Member of Congress I am in no position to raise legal objections if the President of the United States wishes to meet with the head of a foreign state or to conduct negotiations with him which are in the interests of our country.

In this instance, however, all freedom-loving Americans must insist that in any negotiations conducted with King Saud the question of religious discrimination in his country must be raised by the President. Our President, likewise, must insist that as vital as other matters may be, the moral principles involved are equally important.

As the greatest democracy in the world and the moral leader of the free

nations, it does not befit us to enter into agreements without reservations with any nation which discriminates against our citizens and humiliates them on religious grounds. Our traditional policy and our record of the past 180 years demand that we maintain our fight for these rights and that nations desiring to be associated with us should respect our citizens of all faith.

Newsprint Prices Go Up, Up, and Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a total of 226 American daily newspapers and 1,475 American weekly newspapers have gone out of business since 1936.

There were 2,189 daily newspapers published in the United States in 1936 and this number had been reduced to 1,963, a decline of 10.3 percent, by October of last year.

The number of weekly newspapers published in the country shrank from 11,288 in 1936 to 9,813, a decline of 13.1 percent, by October last year.

These figures and all others in this speech have been compiled for me at my request by the research department of the Library of Congress.

The heavy death rate among both daily and weekly newspapers during the past 20 years, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, is in large part due to the exceptionally heavy and unjustifiable increase in the wholesale price of newsprint, which is the principal raw material used in the production of newspapers, and for their supply of which American newspapers are almost wholly dependent upon Canada.

The wholesale price of newsprint, delivered at New York, which was $40 a ton in 1936, had increased by the fall of 1956 to $130 a ton, a 225 percent increase, and since that date has been advanced by Canadian producers another $4 a ton to $134.

This almost 250 percent advance—from $40 to $134 a ton—in the price of newsprint by the Canadian producers, I think, will be found unjustified by increases in either the cost of raw material or of labor that has taken place during the same period.

The principal raw material from which newsprint is produced is timber obtained from the forest. Lumber and plywood both are produced from this same material.

It is significantly noteworthy that while lumber prices in the United States advanced less than 31 percent in the 10-year period between 1946 and 1956 and plywood prices less than 3 percent in that 10-year period, that newsprint, made of the same raw materials as lumber and plywood, increased in price 83 percent in those 10 years and again was raised by $4 a ton this year.

This obviously unjustifiable increase by Canadian mills in the price of newsprint demands, it seems to me, a thorough investigation by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate and the prompt working out by these committees of corrective measures—even to the taking of steps to encourage the building of more newsprint mills in the United States and Alaska to the end that our American newspaper publishers will not be so dependent, almost entirely, on Canada for their supply of newsprint.

The forcing out of business of American newspapers by exorbitant newsprint prices imposed by foreign producers not only has deprived thousands of American printers, pressmen, stereotypers, reporters, editors, and others of their employment, but also has deprived the American people of the ample coverage, from different viewpoints, of the news and editorial opinions. Without the maintenance of widespread diversity of opinion through the press, the very foundations of American democracy are threatened, for good government in a democracy depends on a well-informed electorate.

Twenty-Four-Hour Quarantine Inspection Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4692, to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division.

H. R. 4692 would amend the Public Health Service Act by establishing overtime, Sunday, and holiday pay for certain quarantine inspection personnel of the Public Health Service. These employees, performing duties including the operation of vessels in connection with inspection and treatment of passengers and crews or goods and public conveyances arriving by land, water, or air in the United States, would be entitled under my bill to rates of overtime compensation the same as customs and immigration inspectors. The hours of duty would correspond, under this measure, to established working hours of the collateral Federal Government inspectional services engaged in similar duties.

The purpose of this legislation is because all the three Government services, namely customs, immigration, and quarantine, are all historically under a similar pattern. Special rates of compensation for these services are justified by the irregular, sporadic, and unpredictable nature of their overtime and close proximity of the respective inspectors.

The recent emergency supplemental budget request, together with the fact the President's budget for fiscal 1958 also includes funds for operation of quarantine inspectional service after 5 p. m., and other than during the present regular hours, makes this bill desirable, and I hope it has prompt consideration.

Under the present operation when a vessel arrives after 6 p. m. it is required to anchor at quarantine and wait until the following morning for inspection. The average cost of the delay to the steamship is approximately $5,000 per day. About 41 percent of all vessels inspected arrive after 6 p. m., and the cost to the steamship industry is estimated at $10 million a year. Since a great deal of our foreign shipping in American-flag vessels is subsidized by the Federal Government, the cost of delaying ships overnight is paid indirectly by the Federal Treasury. Twenty-four hour quarantine service would therefore indirectly result in great savings to the American taxpayer.

Construction of Heliports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement prepared by me in connection with my bill directing the Secretary of Commerce to make an investigation and study of the feasibility of constructing heliports in connection with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Heliports are, in my opinion, a vital link in the chain of modern transportation. I shall not go into the many aspects of connecting land travel to air travel, but I most honestly believe that in zoning plans for the orderly development of business areas around the Interstate System interchanges, we must take into consideration the desirability for reserving heliport space. When our highways are completed to 1975 requirements, then we shall see the saneness and preception of correlating heliport service with other services.

In keeping with my thinking along these lines, I have just introduced legislation in the Congress authorizing construction of heliports to serve our Nation's Capital.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. FALLON, IN CONNECTION WITH THE BILL HE INTRODUCED TODAY (H. R. 6320)

I have today introduced legislation calling for a comprehensive investigation and study to be made by the Secretary of Commerce regarding the feasibility of constructing heliports as an integral part of the development of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Without going into the many aspects of the economic justification for a close integration of air and highway travel, it is now apparent that in the overall planning and zoning required for the Interstate System, we must take into consideration the desirability for reserving heliport space. When the great Interstate System is completed, about 13

years hence, there will then be a great need for helicopter service as a vital adjunct to highway-air travel.

As an example of this reasoning, I might point out that a heliport in the vicinity of Bethesda, Md., connected with the projected expressways to downtown Washington, would make the use of Baltimore's Friendship Airport more feasible; at the same time provide better service to the Nation's Capital.

The design of the Interstate System provides many natural areas for heliports. The Interstate System will include from 15,000 to 18,000 major interchanges, the loops of which will contain approximately 30 acres. It requires only two acres to construct a heliport.

Great economies can be effected in the development of a system of heliports by making the necessary plans for the future at the time the Interstate System is being developed. In many instances, the necessary land will be part of the highway right-of-way and will involve no additional cost, and in other instances, the acquisition of additional land may be required and can be obtained at a negligible cost. Such will not be the case after the Interstate System is built. I am reliably informed that helicopters of tomorrow, now in the design stage, will carry 25 passengers and by 1975 the volume of traffic will be sufficient as to afford competitive rates with other air transportation for short hauls. Through advanced planning and early construction heliports can be built more cheaply. Such nominal investments during the development of the Interstate System will pay handsome dividends in the future. To all people who travel, as well as the industries developing along the Interstate System, these heliports will be very useful.

India Celebrates Seventh Anniversary of Independence, January 26, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations on friendly terms with the United States. January 26, 1957, is the seventh anniversary of the independence of India, and I rise to felicitate that country.

I would like to congratulate the people of India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, and His Excellency Gaganvihari Lalubhai Mehta, Ambassador of India, upon the celebration of this occasion.

Born of the many vicissitudes of a long history, India stands forth today after long slumber and struggle, awake, vital, free, and independent. Seven years have passed since the achievement of independence. In this period, the Government has endeavored to lay the foundations of a stable, prosperous, and progressive democracy. Even though clouds surround India and many of her people are sorrowstricken and difficult problems encompass her, the Indian nation rejoices in her freedom. Realizing that freedom brings responsibilities and burdens and that they have to be faced in the spirit of a free and disciplined people, the Indian people have shown considerable enthusiasm in doing their part. In this unique period of her history, it is the privilege of every son and daughter of India to contribute whatever lies within his or her power to help in the democratic movement of national reconstruction.

Urging the Indian nation to its utmost efforts, Prime Minister Nehru declared:

> Let us be rid of everything that limits us and degrades us. Let us cast out fear * * *. Let us build up a free and democratic India, where the interest of the masses of our people has always the first place, to which all other interests must submit.
>
> We stand for peace. * * * The only war that we want to fight with all our might is the war against poverty and all its unhappy brood.
>
> It is this war we have to fight, the war against economic crisis and to rehabilitate the disinherited. In this war there is no hatred or violence but only service of our country and our people. In this war every Indian can be a soldier. This is no time for individuals or groups to think of narrow self-interest, forgetting the larger good. This is no time for wrangling or the spirit of faction.
>
> And so I appeal to all my countrymen and countrywomen who have the love of India in their hearts and the passion to raise her masses, to cast aside the barriers that separate them and to join together in this historic and magnificent task worthy of a great people.

India is facing up to the hard work of nation building. "There is no resting for any one of us until we redeem our pledge in full, until we make all the people of India what destiny intended them to be." The people of India are citizens of a great country on the verge of bold advance, and striving to live up to the high standards they have set for themselves.

In the words of Nehru, "The future beckons to us. Whither do we go and what shall be our endeavor? To bring freedom and opportunity to the common man, to the peasants and workers of India; to fight and end poverty and ignorance and disease; to build up a prosperous, democratic, and progressive nation; and to create social, economic, and political institutions which will ensure justice and fullness of life to every man and woman."

To India I send greetings and again pledge my cooperation in furthering peace, freedom, and democracy. May the bright torch of India be ever held aloft, undimmed and untarnished, so that its light reaches everywhere, bringing faith, hope, and courage.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. Its people still yearn for freedom. Communist suppression has not wiped out their deep feeling for a free society.

We have not forgotten them in America. We can never forget the "fighters for freedom." We pray that their liberation is near at hand.

Six Thousand Certificates Granted by Defense Department Granting Tax Write-offs of $7 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has recently issued a staff report relative to the desirability of continuing the tax-free subsidy program of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The ODM certificates authorizing a 5-year tax amortization writeoff to the big business interests of the Nation should be discontinued. Legislation authorizing such accelerated tax writeoffs was first enacted during World War II and it has continued to date—long after the cessation of hostilities. Although the excess-profits tax imposed during the same war period has expired the tax writeoff amortization authority has been continued favoring the private utilities and big corporate interests of the Nation.

The report pointed out that since peace was declared in 1953 more than 6,000 such certificates have been issued covering tax writeoffs of $7 billion. It is estimated that there will be a loss of approximately $5 billion under the most recent subsidy grants. This is a hidden cost for which no appropriation is authorized by Congress. The continuation of these tax subsidies to favored industries certainly makes it difficult to balance the budget and to reduce the tax burden of the Nation. Besides the inequality and favoritism which such procedures permit. Although there has recently, I understand, been some modification of procedures under the act, the report points out the necessity for the complete repeal of section 168 of the Revenue Code of 1954 except insofar as the section applies directly to national defense.

I commend this report to the attention of Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter of transmittal of the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, chairman, Senate Committee on Finance, be reproduced in the RECORD.

The covering letter of this report follows:

THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: I have the honor to submit a report by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated December 27, 1956, relative to the desirability of continuing in its present form section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, authorizing a 5-year tax amortization writeoff on

the basis of certificates of necessity issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The 5-year amortization provision was first enacted during World War II in connection with the imposition of an excess-profits tax. At that time it was estimated that World War II might last for a period of at least 5 years and that the provision was necessary to provide adequate facilities for the prosecution of World War II. During the Korean war an excess-profits tax was again imposed, and the 5-year amortization provision was again enacted to speed the construction of facilities essential to the prosecution of that war. The Korean excess-profits tax expired under the terms of the law on December 31, 1953; however, the 5-year tax amortization program of the Korean war has been continued in the code, in spite of the fact that more than 3 years have elapsed since that war was terminated.

It has been stated that the amortization provision is necessary to encourage construction of facilities which it is estimated will be needed in a future war. Necessarily, such estimates are highly speculative and subject to frequent changes. When a certain goal of expansion is reached today it may be modified tomorrow. Considerable hardship might occur from a competitive standpoint in granting a certificate of necessity to one manufacturer and denying it to another. After peace was declared, in 1953, 6,000 certificates of necessity were issued by the Department of Defense, covering investments of $13 billion and tax writeoffs of $7 billion. This greatly exceeds the World War II figures.

The report clearly demonstrates that section 168 of the Revenue Act of 1954 should be modified, if not repealed. On the basis of certificates issued between the years 1950 to 1956, it is estimated there will be a loss in revenue of approximately $5 billion, none of which can begin to be recovered until 1961. This is a hidden cost for which no appropriation is required by the Congress. Its effect makes it more difficult to balance the budget or reduce the tax burden of taxpayers not receiving such a benefit. The granting of such broad powers to the Office of Defense Mobilization is not, in my opinion, in the public interest.

I favor the repeal of section 168 of the Revenue Code of 1954, except insofar as it applies to facilities directly connected with the national defense.

Respectfully,

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance.

The Honorable Edward G. Rohrbough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] of the death of the Honorable Edward G. Rohrbough brings deep personal sorrow to those of us who were privileged to serve with him in previous Congresses. He was not only much beloved in the State of West Virginia but highly distinguished in the field of education in which he rendered such a notable service. I had the honor some years ago of being the commencement speaker at the Glenville State College, which he served as president for 34 years, and I learned from that visit of the great esteem and affection in which he was held. I wish to join my colleagues from West Virginia in the tribute to a good man whose influence will continue to live, and to his wife, who contributed so substantially to his educational and legislative achievements.

One Hundred and Ninety-sixth Birthday of Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, not least among those who chartered the course for American democracy during the critical postrevolutionary years of the young Republic, Albert Gallatin, Swiss-born American patriot has earned our deepest gratitude. Born 196 years ago on January 29, 1761, in Geneva, Switzerland, he came to his adopted land when only 19 years old, aflame with the spirit of freedom and democracy.

We do well to honor his name and his accomplishments today. Senator, Congressman, and Secretary of the Treasury, it was largely due to his ceaseless efforts that the credit of the United States was established in the money markets of the world. Owing to his high devotion to the principle of sound commercial relations with friendly nations and to his understanding and skill in financial and commercial questions, the prestige and prosperity of our country in the opening decades of the 19th century were at an unprecedented peak.

As Gallatin saw it, the development of commerce in an atmosphere of peace and mutual trust was the true cornerstone of economic prosperity for the United States. His concept of trade as the foundation for international friendship and progress has been the inspiration and guiding light for our own reciprocal trade programs, upon which a great part of our foreign policy has been secured for so long.

The trade treaties which we have formulated with foreign nations are the direct outgrowth of his sound commercial policies and are, in a sense, a practical monument to his fundamental principles. The Swiss-American Trade Treaty of 1930, for example, has paid enormous dividends for this country with the tremendous increase of American goods purchased by the Swiss since the treaty was signed. As a matter of fact, Switzerland is our best cash customer in Europe.

I mention Switzerland because in her case particularly we have departed from Gallatin's proven concept of sound commercial dealings between nations. In addition to the watch tariff increase of 1954, our administration has since instituted other harsh measures aimed at restricting watch imports into this country. It is ironic that these basic principles should be violated in connection with this tiny democratic nation, land of Gallatin's birth.

As a Congressman from the State of New York, where most of the watch importing and assembly firms are located, I am acutely aware of the injurious and threatening effects these disruptive trade measures are having on an important segment of the jewelry industry. Since watches constitute the most important commodity group exported by Switzerland to the United States, any decrease is bound to have a depressing effect on future Swiss spending for American products.

This was not Gallatin's way, nor should it be ours today. There is a profitable lesson for us in reaffirming his principles of commercial friendship. But we must be bold enough to undo those harmful acts which cause great anguish to our friends overseas and fail to serve our best interests, too. Today this was never more true, when the question of allies and nations friendly to our cause assumes prime significance in world affairs.

Farmers of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 I introduced H. R. 4521, a companion bill to H. R. 3061 introduced recently by Congressman KING, of California. The purpose of this legislation is to correct an unfair provision in the Internal Revenue Code which requires the fishermen of this country to estimate and pay at least 17½ percent of their year's taxes by April 15, and similar payments by June 15 and September 15. Failure to correctly estimate and pay their year's anticipated income results, of course, in the assessment of additional fines and penalties.

One of the leading trade publications for the fishing industry on the west coast, the Fishermen's News, published in Seattle, Wash., which is a part of the district I have the honor to represent, refers to the fishermen in an editorial on November 15, 1956, as the farmers of the sea. The term was used in connection with this problem, and I think it is extremely apt. They are indeed the farmers of the sea, and as such are subject to the vagaries of nature to an even greater degree than their counterparts on the land. Both are confronted with similar problems of harvest yields, subject to the variations and whims of Mother Nature, and both are subject to price fluctuations. The farmer, however, operating as he does in a controlled market under Government subsidy, is in a much better position to forecast his anticipated income. Nevertheless the law permits him to delay payment of two-thirds of his estimated tax until January of the following year.

It is not my purpose to quarrel with or attempt to change the law as it applies

to the land farmer, but rather I am seeking through legislative action to equalize the law for the sea farmer who is equally or more deserving of a delay in estimating his taxes.

In introducing this bill I join with my colleague, Congressman KING, in seeking early action on this legislation so necessary to the sea farmers of our Nation.

A Public Works Program That Will Provide the Nation Better and Safer Roads and Assure Continued Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's $50 billion expanded highway program which was enacted by the Federal Congress last year will make American highways safer for American travelers. Also, it will give the green light to the maintenance for years to come of the present high level of employment and prosperity now prevailing in this country.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads estimates that there will be 424,000 American workers directly employed this year and 442,000 next year in the construction of new highways. This is about 120,000 workers more than were employed last year in actual highway construction jobs.

But the number of workers engaged in actual road construction tells only part of the story. Several hundred thousand others will be employed in producing the increased quantities of raw materials—iron ore, steel, gravel, asphalt, cement, lumber, clay tile, explosives and other materials—required to construct the increased mileage of highways which are to be built. Others will be employed in road building machinery plants.

The Bureau of Public Roads has supplied estimates of the quantities of various materials that will be required to carry out this 13-year program. Here are some of the quantities of materials which the Bureau of Roads says will be needed:

Steel: 49 million tons.
Cement: 1,399 million barrels.
Bituminous material, 128 million tons.
Lumber: 7,194,000,000 feet.
Concrete pipe: 48 million tons.
Explosives: 1,812 million pounds.

The magnitude of this greatest in the history of mankind public works program, the manpower it will require and the huge quantities of material it will need assures that prosperity is here to stay for a long time.

This gigantic roads program will create a total of almost a quarter of a million new and additional jobs at good wages for construction workers, producers of road building materials, and in the making of increased numbers of roadbuilding machines.

One of the finest features of this President Eisenhower roads program is that it will not cost motorists anything because it will pay for itself out of the savings it will make possible to the automobile, truck, and bus owner.

Yes, additional taxes are being levied to finance this gigantic road building undertaking—$850 million a year in new and additional taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, tires to finance the program. But all of this tax money and more, too, will be returned to the motorist in the savings that the better, wider, and safer highways will make for him. There will be savings in wear and tear on tires and motor equipment; savings in medical and hospital bills for better roads will lessen the number of accidents; savings, also, in the lower insurance rates that motorists will enjoy as the accident rate diminishes. For the bus and truck owners there will be the savings in time and to commercial vehicle owners savings in time means savings in money.

Because of its benefits in the saving of lives and the making of prosperity, it may well be that future generations will look backward to the Highway Act of 1956 as the greatest piece of domestic legislation enacted by the American Congress in this century.

The Model Rules of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many impartial observers have expressed the opinion that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is one of the most efficient and smooth-working committees of the House. One reason this committee functions so well is that it operates under a set of rules which promotes action and ensures fair play.

Of course, these rules complement the rules of the House which relate to all its committees.

I have asked leave to extend my remarks in order that I might spread in the RECORD the rules for self-government adopted a few days ago for the 85th Congress by this committee:

A. RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS (85TH CONG.)

PART I—RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Rule 1. Time, place of meetings: Regular meetings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be held in room 1324, New House Office Building, starting at 10 a. m., on each Wednesday while the 85th Congress is in session, and special meetings at such other times and places and in such manner as provided in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 2. Rules, procedure: The Rules of the House shall be the rules of the committee, and procedure in the committee, where not otherwise provided, shall follow the procedure of the House.

Rule 3. Journal: The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal and shall show those present at each meeting, to include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

Rule 4. Quorum: A majority of the voting members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting committee business, except that the presence of a majority of the voting members of the committee shall not be required for the sole purpose of taking testimony and/or receiving evidence so long as at least 1 voting member of the majority party and at least 1 voting member of the minority party are present.

Rule 5. Proxies: Proxies in writing may be recognized and voted, except that no general proxies shall be given or recognized. Proxies may not be counted to make a quorum and shall not be used unless a quorum is present.

PART II—SUBCOMMITTEE: JURISDICTION, COMPOSITION, AND POWERS

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall consist of the five standing subcommittees hereinafter named, and all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing subcommittees named below shall, except as provided in rule 15, be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

Rule 6. Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

(a) Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

(b) Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

Rule 7. Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs:

Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.

Rule 8. Subcommittee on Mines and Mining:

(a) Mining interests generally.
(b) Mineral resources of the public lands.
(c) Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
(d) Geological survey.
(e) Mining schools and experimental stations.
(f) Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

Rule 9. Subcommittee on Public Lands:

(a) Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

(b) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(c) Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

(d) Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

(e) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

Rule 10. Subcommittee on Indian Affairs:

(a) Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

(b) Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

Rule 11. Composition of subcommittees:

(a) The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation shall consist of 28 voting members, 15 of whom shall be members of the majority, and 13 members of the minority party.

(b) The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs shall consist of 25 voting members, 13 of whom shall be members of the majority party, and 12 members of the minority party.

(c) The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining shall consist of 18 voting members, 10 of whom shall be members of the majority party, and 8 members of the minority party.

(d) The Subcommittee on Public Lands shall consist of 19 voting members, 10 of whom shall be members of the majority party, and 9 members of the minority party.

(e) The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs shall consist of 17 voting members, 10 of whom shall be members of the majority party, and 7 members of the minority party.

The chairman of the committee shall be ex officio an additional voting member of all subcommittees, standing, special, and select.

Rule 12. Special or select subcommittees: The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized, after consultation with the committee, to appoint, in party representation approximately proportionate to that of the full committee, such special or select subcommittees as he deems advisable for the purpose of carrying out the responsibilities and functions of the committee.

Rule 13. Powers, duties of subcommittees: The subcommittees are hereby authorized to hold hearings, receive evidence, hear witnesses, and report same to the committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be required by the committee.

Rule 14. Subcommittee chairmanship: The chairmanship of the standing subcommittees shall be selected by seniority, commencing with the ranking member of the majority party under the chairman. The chairman of any select or special subcommittee created under these rules shall be appointed by the committee chairman.

Rule 15. Reference of legislation: All legislation shall be referred by the chairman to the respective subcommittees, including resolutions and other matters properly coming within their jurisdiction, except that by vote of a majority of the members of the committee, any bill or other matter properly before the committee may be withdrawn from subcommittee or held for consideration ab initio by the committee, or may by the same means be referred to a special or select subcommittee.

Rule 16. Subcommittee rules: The rules of the committee, where applicable, shall be the rules of the standing subcommittees, and all select or special subcommittees.

PART III—DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN WHEN COMMITTEE TAKES FAVORABLE ACTION

Rule 17. Whenever the committee authorizes favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the committee, the chairman is authorized and directed to report the same or to designate some member of the committee to report the same, and he is further authorized and directed to use all parliamentary methods to secure passage thereof, without such additional authority being set forth particularly in the motion to report each individual bill or resolution.

U. S. S. "Long Beach"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Secretary of the Navy announced the first nuclear-powered guided-missile surface ship of the Navy, a cruiser, will bear the name U. S. S. *Long Beach*.

The decision to name the cruiser after the southern California city which I have the honor to represent was made after a long and careful study of many names which had been proposed for the ship by individuals, groups, and associations, all of whom have manifested the keenest interest in the remarkable new Navy being created for our country's defense.

It is a long-standing custom to name cruisers for cities of the United States, but no cruiser has ever borne the name of *Long Beach* before. The area for which the new ship has been named is the site of one of the earliest seaboard settlements on the Pacific coast. Richard Henry Dana, in his classic "Two Years Before the Mast" describes early commercial shipping activities in the then sparsely settled area, where Yankee merchant skippers loaded hides and tallow from the ranchos served by the harbor area.

Long Beach has long been a major center for naval operations on the west coast and the city and its suburbs have been home for many years to the officers and men of the fleet and their families. The port has expanded and been improved over the years, and now includes a naval shipyard, a naval station and serves as the headquarters for various commands both afloat and ashore. Long Beach currently is the home port of the greater part of the active cruisers of the United States Pacific Fleet.

The relationships between the Navy and the people and civic government of Long Beach have been excellent through the years. It will be remembered that last August the city joined with the Fleet Reserve Association and the Navy to organize and conduct a "Mrs. U. S. Navy" contest, which served as a means of recognition of the important part Navy wives play in helping the service to fulfill its mission.

There has been only one United States warship, a World War II frigate, to bear the name of *Long Beach* before. Built in Wilmington, Calif., immediately adjacent to Long Beach, she served in the Pacific area during World War II with a distinguished combat record. She was taken from the Reserve Fleet in 1953, recommissioned, and is now on lease to the Japanese naval defense force.

The new cruiser is being built by the Bethlehem Steel Co., at Quincy, Mass. Her atomic reactors are being built by the Westinghouse Corp. and her ultramodern steam turbine by the General Electric Co. She is scheduled for completion in late 1960. She will have the dual distinction of being the first United States cruiser to be designed and built from the keel up since World War II, and the first surface ship to be armed with a main battery of guided missiles and powered with a nuclear powerplant.

The *Long Beach*, marking a milestone as she does with her distinction as the first nuclear-powered surface ship, will not only be a forerunner of the constructive use of nuclear power to propel not only warships, but peacetime ships across the seas as well. She will be a graceful craft about 700 feet long with a displacement of around 14,000 tons. She will have a distinctive topside appearance because of the absence of conventional naval artillery. Her long decks will be smooth and unobstructed to permit most efficient firing of her missile batteries.

The ship's $87.5 million cost, including $18.3 million for her reactors, will be recovered by the Nation not only in her value as a defense weapon in being, but also as a testing ground for the many new tactical and strategic concepts which will be developed to permit most effective use of this revolutionary development in naval warfare. At no time since Rear Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan, United States Navy—1840 to 1914—developed the importance of sea power in his Influence of Sea Power on History and other writings have more bold possibilities for the implementation of national policy through naval instrumentalities been presented than with this, the forerunner of our nuclear-powered Navy.

For the city of Long Beach, the naming of the vessel means the coming of age of the city as a Navy town. But not only is it a matter of prestige. There are tangible benefits that go with the distinction of having a ship named after a city. Every time that ship is involved in the news, the name of the home town is publicized. As the world's first atomic powered, guided-missile cruiser, the U. S. S. *Long Beach* will be mentioned frequently in the news as long as it remains in commission and as long as naval war equipment remains significant. It is a prototype ship and will be mentioned in connection with all future ships in the same classification. They will be known as ships of the *Long Beach* class. Such national notice simply could not be purchased by the city through any kind of promotional campaign.

Almost the day plans for the cruiser were announced many civic groups and individuals in the city of Long Beach began work to claim the name. Possibly the idea was generated by Harry Fulton, a correspondent for the Long Beach Independent newspaper in which columns a suggestion of the name first appeared. The Independent Business Men's Association, the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard Employees Association, the Long Beach City Council, and other civic groups were constantly alert to forward naming of the ship after the city.

The Washington correspondent of the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Virginia Weldon Kelly, carried on a ceaseless campaign among her many friends in high naval and civilian circles in Washington to gain victory in what turned out to be a high-spirited sweepstakes amongst many contending cities for the name. Not only were cognizant naval officials themselves bombarded by Mrs. Kelly, but their all powerful spouses also fell within the Kelly line of fire. Wife of a retired admiral herself, she apparently shared his homework in the science, tactics, and strategy of successful warfare, for her part in forwarding the name U. S. S. *Long Beach* was played with consummate skill, redoubtable courage, and unflagging perseverance.

However, all the hopes and aspirations of the city of Long Beach and its citizens might have gone unrealized had it not

been for the magnificent assistance freely offered by some eighty Members of the House of Representatives who joined me in asking the Secretary of the Navy to designate this name. Of both parties and from all sections of the country, these eighty Members in their considered judgment believed the ship should be named the U. S. S. *Long Beach* and went on record by saying so. These men and women have the sincere gratitude of my city and myself.

In closing these remarks, I assure you that as long as the U. S. S. *Long Beach* sails she will have every assistance and support that the people of her namesake city can give the ship, and her officers and men.

The Pacific Northwest Needs More Hydroelectric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions since the Eisenhower administration came into their position of governmental responsibility and leadership there has been much debate on its program to provide adequate hydroelectric power for the increasing needs of the Pacific Northwest.

However, since Mr. Seaton was appointed Secretary of the Department of the Interior much in the way of personality clashes and partisan political differences have disappeared. The problem can now be discussed with less emotional friction and fiction and more on the basis of objective engineering data and impartial facts. Neither side in philosophical difference or partisan advocacy has ever disagreed on one issue—the inadequacy of existing facilities and those in process of construction to meet the projected future needs of the area occasioned by normal population growth and business expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported authorization and encouragement by appropriation of Federal multipurpose dams, and likewise the fullest possible development of local public utility districts and municipal and private generation projects where possible. The so-called partnership plan seemed to dovetail with such an overall program, and to be necessary if a future power shortage was to be averted. I have said time and again a policy of Federal monopoly would cripple the growth and ruin Washington, Oregon, Idaho and the other States in the area, just as a policy of private monopoly would, because from a practical standpoint neither one could obtain financing in entirety fast enough to carry out the complete program. Congress has appropriated an average of $130 million a year during the past decade, and it seems unrealistic to believe this average amount could be increased substantially and most certainly not increased to an amount required to meet the area need. Partnership, it seems to me, offers the one means suggested thus far to fill the gap. Without it we are left with the risk of critical shortage in the future.

In the January 26, 1957, issue of the Argus, a highly regarded weekly periodical published in Seattle, I read a news item which gave a picture of the situation in a few words. I wish, Mr. Speaker, those who have opposed partnership power in the past would in as few words say where the money is coming from to construct dams and generating facilities to the tune of $4 billion a year for 10 years. A realistic look at Congress, regardless of the political party in power, clearly shows it will not be from the Federal Government. So let us forget partisanship and seriously give partnership a chance. Otherwise, for one I will be glad to support an alternative if someone has one. Meanwhile Members might well peruse the excerpt which I referred to from the Argus:

> In reviewing the power situation, Mr. Seaton said estimates by the Federal Power Commission showed that additional power necessary to meet demand of the next 10 years would cost $40 billion.
>
> The $40 billion figure, the Secretary said, would be but the cost of generating enough power to keep up with expansion needs. He added that $94 billion would be necessary to meet additional power demands in the next 20 years.
>
> And that, said Mr. Seaton, is "why the partnership policy is essential. It is just impossible to get that much Federal money."

Church Attendance Goes Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging signs in these internationally troubled times is the present-day trend in the United States toward more church building and more church attendance.

Nationally, $775 million was poured into new and enlarged churches of all denominations in 1956. The experts now predict a whopping investment of $875 million in church structures in 1957. The sale of bibles is at an alltime high. A veritable tidal wave of children are entering Sunday schools and a phenomenal increase in church membership is taking place.

One reason for this rebirth of interest in Christianity and the church, of course, is the fine example that has been set by the First Man and First Lady of the Nation, President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

Another important reason for this rebirth of interest in churchgoing in all denominations is that man realizes his impotence against the powerful destructive forces which he by his own scientific knowledge and inventiveness has created. Man, at long last, has come to know that the security and safety of mankind—in fact his very existence—now depends upon guidance from a wisdom far greater than any humans possess. Man in the mass is turning, as each individual does in time of great personal tragedy—to the church and religion to seek a way out of the labyrinth of disasters that seems to threaten him.

Whither Goest Thou?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, today at the open hearings of the Committee on Armed Services I asked Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson a valid, pertinent, and fundamental question.

Secretary Wilson, in all candor and frankness, gave me a direct and responsive answer.

His answer to my question has added to the concern which is being shared by many millions of Americans throughout the country today.

The question and the answer should be of concern to every American who is interested in the survival of constitutional government in this Nation. The question which I asked the Defense Secretary involves the very basic concept of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I asked Secretary Wilson this question:

> Mr. Secretary, if you were asked to make a decision which involved a specific policy or law spelled out by the Congress which was opposite and in conflict with the Bureau of the Budget or any other part of the executive department, to which one of the two would you look for guidance?
>
> I ask the question based on experiences of the past whereby the Congress has said one thing emphatically and specifically and the Department of Defense has done the exact opposite.
>
> By the question, I mean to inquire, From whom would you take your instructions and make your decision in order to resolve the conflict?

Secretary Wilson replied in substance: "I would go to the President. He is my boss. I would decide in accordance with his ruling."

"You mean you would place his decision above the expressed will of the Congress"? I, in substance, asked.

"Yes; I work for him," in substance, replied Secretary Wilson.

I pause here to say that these were not the exact words used either by Secretary Wilson or myself and most certainly are not intended to be direct quotes as to language but most certainly they are accurate in substance and conclusion.

I realize that Secretary Wilson, under the circumstances, could not have replied otherwise and I have no quarrel or criticism of him for so replying.

I do criticize, however, and do have a quarrel with the implications of the answer which he gave which only echoes the tendency in our Government today

which is gnawing away at the foundations upon which this Government was built as so many termites gnaw away at the foundations of buildings which as a result eventually collapse. As buildings fall so do governments fall when foundations decay.

Let us examine carefully and closely what the question and answer to this vital and important question really means to those of us who believe in a constitutional Government where the governed are controlled only by the consent of the governed.

Briefly and factually our form of Government is this: There are three separate and distinct branches of the government—the executive, the judicial, and the legislative.

The legislative branch is composed of individuals elected by the popular vote of the people. It is their responsibility to enact the laws under which those who elected them live. It is also taxation with representation. This is representative government in its purest sense. The existence of every American is subject to the laws enacted by the legislative branch. This is a government of law not of men. The law is supposed to be supreme. All branches of the Government are supposed to be subject to the laws enacted by the Congress. The executive and judicial branches are the creations of the laws enacted by the legislative branch and that branch in its conduct is also subject to the laws which it itself enacted in the name of the people.

The President is the executive head or administrative head charged with the duty and responsibility of enforcing the laws enacted by the Congress. It most certainly is not within his realm or his authority under the Constitution to go contrary to the law or the expressed will of the Congress. At this very time he recognizes this as he is requesting the authority and approbation of the Congress to grant him powers which many of us believe he already has. There is no provision in the Constitution or any law which gives to the President the right to say that one law shall be respected and another law shall be ignored.

Under the Constitution and the three separate branches of Government, it is the duty and the responsibility of the Supreme Court to interpret the laws enacted by the Congress. It is not within the constitutional province of the Supreme Court to write the law of the land. It is one of the tragedies of our time and a travesty on constitutional government that during recent years the Supreme Court has taken unto itself the power of writing the law instead of the Congress. This has been accomplished by going beyond its expressed authority in recent decisions.

If the form of government as enunciated by Secretary Wilson in the reply to my question is to be accepted as the kind of government under which we are to live then representative government is in a most unenviable position and the people had better begin evaluating the situation more seriously.

My question was prompted by incidents of recent years.

I am fully cognizant and acute to the situation which prevails as far as the Supreme Court is concerned. The Congress has been compelled to play second fiddle to this branch of the Government.

In the realm of defense several years ago the Congress has said there should be built a flush-deck aircraft carrier. The Department of Defense said there would be none built and none was built.

The Congress has said that the Marine Corps shall have a strength of 214,000. The Department of Defense has said that it shall have a smaller number. It has a smaller number.

From time to time the Congress has authorized a specific number of wings for the Air Force which have been different to what the Department of Defense has urged. The number advocated by the Department of Defense has been the number in flight.

These are but a few of the instances where the executive department has gone contrariwise to the law and the intent of the Congress and which prompted my question on to who really is running this country.

The executive department has compelled the Congress to again play second fiddle.

Now comes the Secretary of Defense who frankly states that in conflict between the Congress and the President he will follow the instructions of the President because the President is the boss.

It is the first time I have ever known of a responsible Government official being so frank and open in his appreciation of the position he holds. I feel certain that the American people feel that there is no boss in this Nation with the right to supersede the law written and enacted by their elected representatives.

With the Supreme Court already repeatedly superseding the Congress and responsible officials admitting they would defy the Congress when the chips are down where does constitutional and representative government stand in this day and age?

Of course I do not expect this Government to collapse today, tomorrow, or the next day or even during the next decade but coming events do cast their shadows before them.

These matters may be shrugged off by many people. They might appear to be insignificant but the little noticed ripples of today become the tidal waves of tomorrow. The hole in the dike easily becomes the uncontrollable crevasse if not recognized for its destructive potential at its inception.

We are not blameless in this unhealthy situation.

The Congress itself has not properly discharged its responsibility or exercised effectively its authority. We have stood idly by and allowed government by elected representatives to become government by unelected bureauracy.

If this trend continues the fault lies not on the steps of the Supreme Court or the lawn of the White House. The fault lies at our door.

Of course I am concerned, deeply concerned as should all of you. Those of us who have the authority and are in a position to challenge this trend of usurpation in government fail our oath to uphold and defend the Constitution if we remain silent and fail to raise our voices in protest.

A serious fundamental and basic question is involved.

"Whither goest thou?"

Is Our Foreign Policy for the Middle East Realistic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 28, 1957

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will begin debate on the so-called Eisenhower Middle East resolution. Before the debate begins, I wish to call attention to an enlightening news report entitled "Facing Blunt Facts in Foreign Aid," by Max W. Thornburg, which was printed in the Reader's Digest of November 1952. Many important events have taken place in the Middle East since 1952 but the fundamental situations and conditions described by Mr. Thornburg are much the same today as they were when this article was written.

For 16 years, except for 3 years when he served as petroleum adviser to the Department of State, he has lived in the Moslem world. He represented great oil interests, negotiated their agreements with the Arab rulers and stayed on the scene to insure that the pacts were carried out to the satisfaction of both sides. He also served as adviser to the Shah of Iran.

I should like to read to you some excerpts from the article by this noted authority wherein he tells what can and cannot be done in repressed and crucial Middle East countries:

> You do not have to know 1 word of the language of any of the 20 or so countries of the Middle East to get some understanding of the conditions of life of 100 million people and the way the people react to those conditions.
>
> As soon as you stop in the midst of the cluster of mud huts of the typical small village the 10 or 15 families will form a silent ring around your car. As you look into their blank faces you can feel a potential hostility.
>
> But if you give them 1 smile instantly it will be reflected in every face in the group, and 2 minutes later you will be pushed inside the head man's hut, with tea and thin wheat bread offered by a dozen hands.
>
> One such experience will tell you much.
>
> Or, again, if you go to one of their villages when the crops are ripe, and find every man, woman, and child down with malaria, so they cannot harvest the crop, even the small share of it they would have been permitted to keep; or another village where they are all stricken with typhoid and unable to work; or one in which every child has his eyes matted closed with trachoma—half of them blind in 1 eye by the time they are 10 years old—then you will begin to understand.
>
> If you go into the highland regions, say in Azerbaijan or Kurdistan or eastern Anatolia

when the snow is knee deep, and see 4- and 5-year-old children naked except for thin and ragged cotton shirts over their shoulders, following their mothers groping through the snow to find dried cow dung for fuel—not to heat their stone huts, for that isn't to be thought of, but to cook a few pieces of coarse bread. * * *

Imagine yourself in the same conditions, and ask yourself what kind of ideas you would have about your Government, or about anyone else you thought was responsible. You can be pretty sure that these people are thinking just what you would be.

Poverty, disease, and starvation are physical things. Maybe we can imagine how we would react if we were exposed to them. But when we come to those other scourges of a backward people—ignorance and superstition—it is more difficult for us to imagine how we would behave. Still, this is the most important thing for us to understand.

Once, in the back country, I pulled up near a scraggly apple tree, into the forks of which had been wedged many small stones. I asked my driver, a smart young man, "Makhmud, why do people put those stones in that tree?"

"Sahib," he replied, "they put the stones in the tree to make it bear fruit; but"—he went on with a deprecating smile—"these people are very ignorant. Anyone with good sense knows that one stone, put in the right place, would do the same thing."

There are millions of Makhmuds in the Middle East, and they are not yet interested in listening to our retired college professors tell them about the phosphate deficiency in their soil. Our first work must come closer to their daily lives.

I had dinner recently with a wise and distinguished man at his home in Amman, the capital of Transjordan. All evening we discussed various Middle East problems. As our conversation neared its end, he summed up his view.

"Your American principles of democracy," he said, "furnish the best guide the world has ever had for the objectives of a freedom-seeking people. But may Allah preserve us from those Americans who try to tell us how to achieve those objectives within our own country."

May Allah preserve us Americans from them also—until we have made up our minds what it is we are trying to accomplish in the Middle East and find out how to go about it.

The Middle Eastern countries have three common qualities of particular importance. All of them have been under the domination of some foreign power; all have been oppressed by governments of their own which were corrupt and indifferent to the people's welfare; all of them are backward.

But there is a fourth common factor more portentous than all of these together. This is the widespread revulsion among these 100 million people against their condition—a rebellion against oppression, whether foreign or internal, and against poverty. All over the Middle East people have been awakening to the belief that they don't have to be this way any longer. We have told them that, the United Nations has told them that, and the Communists have told them that. They haven't yet learned what they can do about it, but they have determined to break with the past.

During the past year or so crises in the Middle East have been making the headlines: The Iranians forcing the British Bank out of their country, and the suicidal nationalization of their oil industry; the refusal of several Middle East countries to accept well-intended offers of loans: the refusal of Egypt to join NATO; the rebellion against having British troops in Suez; the dispute over the Sudan; the assassination of a king and of half a dozen prime ministers; student riots; the recent abdication of another king.

Unfortunately, these crisis have been treated on our official levels as unrelated episodes. They are not unrelated episodes. They are all manifestations of the common wave of rebellion which is sweeping over the entire Middle East.

This is a reaction. A reaction is essentially against something. It is essentially psychological and emotional. It is unreasoning.

Now, with these things in mind, let's go back to the question of an American policy.

Since the initial source of trouble is an emotional one, characterized by unreason, our first objective must be to bring about a change in the psychological climate, in order that distrust may begin to give away to confidence, that despair may be replaced by hope.

We cannot buy such a psychological change by going in with $100 million and building vast hydroelectric dams—like the one I visited a short time ago in Kurdistan. Such projects when completed are likely only to make the rich richer, to subsidize the very groups those countries are trying to get rid of. What does a hydroelectric project mean in the daily life of a peasant?

On the other hand, a village which has just been sprayed with DDT to rid it of malaria and lice, and which knows another village has just had its water supply improved to eliminate typhoid, another a dirt road built over the hill so its surplus crop can be taken out to a market, another supplied with simple agricultural implements, another visited every 2 weeks by a nurse to treat the sick—and knows that other similar things are taking place throughout the country—that village can be persuaded that from now on things are going to get better.

These first things must all be small; and their cost can be relatively modest. The psychological change comes the moment these people discover, through tangible evidence in their daily lives, that someone is not only thinking about their welfare, but is doing something about it. This change can come in a single day.

Can we put such a program of action into effect? I think we can. Judging by actual accomplishments which I have watched in various of these countries, I think our first objective can be reached by the end of 1953.

But we must find a vast multiplier which can be applied to the village technique, so that word of our efforts will reach the daily lives of millions of people and persuade them that a change for the better has begun.

We can find such a multiplier. We must execute our program through institutions, of types which have the capacity to reach people in their villages. A Ministry of Health is such an institution, or a Ministry of Agriculture, or of Education, or of Public Works.

The Development Bank created in Turkey by the World Bank, financed largely by the Turks, touches the daily lives of hundreds of thousands of Turks. Perhaps a similar bank could be created for the rest of the Middle East, and financed by the surplus oil revenues of the countries which are now receiving more money than they need or know what to do with.

The 7-year plan, which Iran spent 3 years organizing in preparation for the oil royalties which Iran never got, was such an institution. So are some of the other development plans which other Middle East countries have been trying to organize. The World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations are other examples. Many more could be devised to supplement normal agencies.

But any such institutions must be supported by the governments concerned, or they cannot operate successfully. At present, with the exception of Turkey and Iraq, there is not a single government in the entire Middle East that has given evidence that it really wants to do these things for its own people.

This leads us to the conclusion that widespread political reform throughout the Middle East is an essential prerequisite to the success of any such program as we are talking about.

But what can we do about this?

Much. In every one of these countries there is a growing group of responsible and public-minded men who want just such things in their countries as we are talking about. Surely when we do bring aid it could be of the kind that supports the reform efforts of these groups, instead of merely subsidizing the corrupt oligarchies which suppress them.

But what happens when such political reforms are mentioned in Washington? The answer is "No," with a selfrighteous explanation that this would constitute political intervention, which does violence to a traditional principle of American foreign policy.

Well, I suggest that the time has come for this principle to be reexamined as to its validity in the world as it is today. Why our statesmen should deliberately evade an opportunity to exercise their statesmanship—because of some legendary principle—but remain willing to send young Americans into war when conditions inevitably deteriorate to the next stage, is quite beyond my understanding.

The Middle East is moving rapidly, and so are we, and each week new problems will arise for our appraisal. I have tried to give a pattern for thinking about these problems, which boils down to this:

The Middle East people are now in violent reaction against three chief things, foreign domination, oppression by their own corrupt governments, and their own miserable conditions of life. This reaction is psychological and unreasoning. If we wish to stop the disintegration of the Middle East, in order that it may not slide into the Communist orbit or for other reasons, we must give a very large part of these 100 million people tangible evidence of our intention to relieve their hardships—political, economic, and social.

Therefore our first objective should be to bring about a change in psychological climate—say by the end of 1963. We can do this if we apply our resources through institutions which are capable of touching the daily lives of millions of people.

To accomplish this will necessitate political reforms. This will require that we modify our traditional principle of nonintervention.

Thus Mr. Thornburg ends his news article. May I reemphasize a few of the points he stresses by repeating a few of his sentences relating to an American policy. He says:

Since the initial source of trouble is an emotional one, characterized by unreason, our first objective must be to bring about a change in the psychological climate, in order that distrust may begin to give way to confidence, that despair may be replaced by hope.

We cannot buy such a psychological change by going in with $100 million and building vast hydroelectric dams. Such projects when completed are likely only to make the rich richer, to subsidize the very groups those countries are trying to get rid of.

On the other hand, a village which has just been sprayed with DDT to rid it of malaria and lice, and which knows another village has just had its water supply improved to eliminate typhoid, another a dirt road built over the hill so its surplus crop can be taken out to a market, another supplied with simple agricultural implements, another visited every 2 weeks by a nurse to treat the sick—and knows that other similar things are taking place throughout the

country—that village can be persuaded that from now on things are going to get better.

With the exception of Turkey and Iraq there is not a single government in the entire Middle East that has given evidence that it really wants to do these things for its own people.

The Middle East people are now in violent reaction against three chief things, (1) foreign domination, (2) oppression by their own corrupt governments, and (3) their own miserable conditions of life.

We come now to the question, How will the Eisenhower Middle East resolution solve the many problems in this area of the world?

First. We are asked to give our prior approval to the President to send our Armed Forces into the Middle East at any time he thinks necessary.

Second. We are asked to give our approval to a vast spending program—$200 million to be spent during this fiscal year without knowing how the money will be used, and untold additional millions of dollars for future years.

Who will receive this money? I fear that most if not all of it will go to the local governments which are corrupt and indifferent to their people's welfare and to the privileged few who are already receiving very large sums of money from oil revenues. We are told that unless we grant all the authority asked for in this resolution the Communists will take over the Middle East. I am as strongly opposed to communism and all of its nefarious, wicked, immoral practices and policies, as any Member of the House of Representatives, but before I vote for this resolution I must be convinced that what we are asked to do here will have the desired effect of stopping communism in the Middle East. Communism thrives on oppression, poverty and ignorance. Unless the living conditions of the masses of backyard, poverty-stricken, superstitious people of the Middle East is improved they will be a fertile field for communism. What assurance do we have that the soldiers we may send to the Middle East or the authorization for millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money will have any appreciable effect in breaking down the feudal system in the area? How will our soldiers and our money be used? Will they be used for the benefit of the existing corrupt governments, protecting and enriching those already powerful and wealthy who for centuries have oppressed the masses of the people, or will they be used to help bring food to hungry people, medicine and medical care to the sick and diseased, education and enlightenment to the ignorant and superstitious, and systems of government for the benefit of the governed? These are questions that must be answered satisfactorily to me before I can support the pending resolution.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1957

The Reverend Lawrence D. Folkemer, Ph. D., pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, in the few precious moments of this prayer period, make each of Thy servants aware of Thy unseen presence throughout this session. Be in their minds to enlighten them, in their hearts to sanctify them, in their wills to strengthen them. Let Thy holy angels keep constant vigil over them, that they may say nothing they may later regret or do anything that were best left undone.

Be daily present with each of them, that in all of their action and legislation they may be graciously delivered from any narrowly partisan or selfish interests, and that under their wise governance, the people of this land may be guarded and directed in righteousness, unity, and service. Bless their homes and families, and may they know the secret joys of lives consecrated to the service of their country. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 25, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (SEN. DOC. NO. 1)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 42d annual report of the committee covering the fiscal year 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1957.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. JENKINS of Ohio to fill, on the part of the House, the existing vacancy on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mrs. GREEN of Oregon and Mr. CORBETT of Pennsylvania as members, on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, and Mr. VORYS of Ohio as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ENGLE of California, Mr. UDALL of Arizona, and Mr. RHODES of Arizona as members, on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee on Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas, and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. VORYS of Ohio, and Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts, as members, on the part of the House, of the joint congressional committee on construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCULLOCH of Ohio, as members, on the part of the House, of the Commission on Government Security, and the following from private life: Mr. James L. Noel, Jr., of Texas, and Hon. Edwin L. Mecham, of New Mexico.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed himself, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. RODINO of New Jersey, Mr. COUDERT of New York, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee, as members, on the part of the House, of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. MCGREGOR of Ohio, as members, on the part of the House, of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mrs. O'Neill, of Massachusetts, as a member, on the part of the House, of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'BRIEN of New York and Mr. DEROUNIAN of New York as members, on the part of the House, of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York; and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio, as members, on the part of the House, of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, and Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho, as members, on the part of the House, of the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, as members, on the part of the House, of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROBESON of Virginia and Mr. POFF of Virginia, as members, on the part of the House, of the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. MILLER of California as a member, on the part of the House, of the National Historical Publications Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota, as members, on the part of the House, of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO FEDERAL ELECTIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 41)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 25, 1957, Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported, on January 28, 1957, an original resolution (S. Res. 73), and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) The election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) Corrupt practices;

(3) Contested elections;

(4) Credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally;

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate massages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board;

Lawrence Gridley Derthick, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of Education;

Leroy E. Burney, of Indiana, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service;

James T. O'Connell, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Labor; and

Stanley J. Sarnoff, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADOR TO ITALY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the case of this nomination, we received a request from the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] that he be notified when the nomination was coming up. Personally, I am in favor of confirmation of the nomination, and I so voted in the Foreign Relations Committee. However, upon the request of one of the Senators, I ask that the nomination go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION FOR EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration for Evaluation in the Department of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

BRUSSELS UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1958

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard S. Cullman, of New York, to be United States Commissioner General to the Brussels Universal and International Exhibition, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry routine appointments or promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that before we proceed

to the consideration of any business on the calendar or any general orders, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, so that all Senators may be on notice.

In the meantime, since the Senate has met today following an adjournment, there will be a morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with morning business items be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROVISION FOR CORN BASE ACREAGE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for corn base acreages and other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF AIRCRAFT RESCUE BOAT TO CITY OF GAINESVILLE, GA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of Gainesville, Ga., had requested the Navy Department to transfer an aircraft rescue boat for the purpose of fire fighting on Lake Lanier and adjacent property thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the Vice President, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES—THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations on that council, from January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO ANTHRACITE EXPERIMENT STATION, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Anthracite Experiment Station operated by the Bureau of Mines at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., during the calendar year 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID DUE TO CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering claims paid on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel, during the 6 months' period ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Committee, for the period January 1–December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMISSION ON MENTAL ILLNESS AND HEALTH

A letter from the Director, Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, Cambridge, Mass., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTIMATE OF CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions under the Classification Act of 1949, in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Legislative Resolution 6

"Whereas there is pending in the Senate of the United States a bill designated as Senate bill 581; and

"Whereas the bill provides for transfer to the Department of Agriculture the Government-owned alcohol-producing facility at Omaha, Nebr.; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill will be of a great benefit to people living in the grain States of which Nebraska is one, because it will permit the continued research into new and improved uses of surplus grains for industrial uses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled:

"1. That the Members of Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be urged to use their efforts to secure favorable action on Senate bill 581.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
"President of the Legislature.

"I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 6, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 68th regular session on the 23d day of January 1957.

"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Bronxville, N. Y., favoring United States diplomatic relations with Hungary, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Paul Hopewood, of Rochester, N. Y., relating to national security; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to limit the power of the Federal Power Commission in regulating the price of produced gas moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, at Pasadena, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages on commercial airlines, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Burrell Franklin Gadsden, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Alfred J. Jacobi, of New York, N. Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Stella Serafin, of Yonkers, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to proclaim January 22, 1957, a national holiday to commemorate the independence of Ukraine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERFORMANCE OF CREDIT FUNCTIONS BY FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION—PETITION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to present a petition, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a petition from more than a thousand citizens of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone Counties in Montana requesting that the Farmers' Home Administration in that area "perform its authorized credit functions" for the hard-pressed farmers of those counties.

The petition is not signed by farmers alone. It was initiated by businessmen and is signed by a cross section of the citizens of the five counties—farmers, bankers, lawyers, merchants, garagemen—citizens from all walks of life. For the benefit of my friends across the aisle, I might add that it is also signed by a considerable proportion of citizens who identified themselves as Republicans when I was running for the Senate in 1954.

The petition is extremely modest in that it only requests that a Federal agency do what it is supposed to do. It reads:

We, the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request that the Farmers' Home Administration be required to—

(1) act at once to perform its authorized credit functions for the farmers in the counties of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone in northeastern Montana;

(2) administer the program so that farmers in those counties to whom bank or other commercial or private credit is not available, may receive loans promptly and with a minimum of redtape;

(3) secure qualified personnel sufficient in number to process applications for loans, so they may be acted upon speedily;

(4) administer the "disaster" loan program so that the needs of farmers in the area are served promptly and so that such loans are processed in substantial quantities rather than in the negligible numbers now being accepted for processing;

(5) if necessary, expeditiously review and revise its administrative policy and procedure to assure immediate, prompt, and effective credit service to the farmers of these counties.

There follows an explanation that continued poor crops and the lack of an efficiently functioning Farmers' Home Administration in the area makes extensive foreclosures and ruin for farm families inevitable unless the petition is heeded.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this petition to our Government appear at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request that the Farmers' Home Administration be required to—

(1) act at once to perform its authorized credit functions for farmers in the counties of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone in northeastern Montana;

(2) administer the program so that farmers in these counties to whom bank or other commercial or private credit is not available, may receive loans promptly and with a minimum of redtape;

(3) secure qualified personnel sufficient in number to process applications for loans, so they may be acted upon speedily;

(4) administer the disaster loan program so that the needs of farmers in the area are served promptly and so that such loans are processed in substantial quantities rather than in the negligible numbers now being accepted for processing;

(5) if necessary, expeditiously review and revise its administrative policy and procedure to assure immediate, prompt, and effective credit service to the farmers of these counties.

We respectfully make this request because of the urgent need of many farmers in these agricultural counties for credit not otherwise available to them. This credit need arises from the generally poor crops in major areas of these counties in 1956. The lack of an efficiently functioning Farmers' Home Administration credit program is working severe hardships on many of the farmers and businessmen in these counties. Both Main Street and the farmers are at the crossroads of economic survival in the worst price squeeze since the 1930's. Without this program in active, constructive operation, many farmers and businessmen in these counties will suffer depression conditions. A policy of foreclosure and repossession is being urged by some commercial lenders, which means ruin to individual farmers and businessmen. Farmers' Home Administration credit could forestall this situation.

Your help in making the Farmers' Home Administration an effective, speedy, and efficient source of farm credit is needed and asked. Your help will benefit the people of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone Counties. We are confident that you can and will help us.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is a shocking thing, Mr. President, that citizens of five hard-pressed counties should have to petition the Government to require one of its agencies to do its duty.

But never in my experience in government has there been such disrespect, disregard, and even open defiance of the will of Congress as we are witnessing from the present administration. We have seen it from the Interior Department, which disregards statutes governing water projects, cost allocations, and power marketing criteria to boost public power rates for the benefit of the administration's favored private power friends. We saw it in the notorious Dixon-Yates deal, which was an administrative attempt to change the basic nature of the Tennessee Valley Authority without congressional approval.

We have seen disregard of the wishes of Congress repeatedly in Department of Agriculture administration of drought relief programs.

The Congress has approved funds for emergency hay and feed programs for drought areas. We have approved funds for disaster and emergency loan programs to the full extent requested. But the administration has been callous, slow, inefficient, and niggardly. And it has played the cruelest sort of politics with the drought programs.

Last July, my distinguished colleague, Senator MANSFIELD, and I urged the Department of Agriculture to act promptly and favorably on the recommendation of the Republican Governor of Montana, his State drought relief committee, and county drought committees, and designate more than 20 Montana counties as drought relief areas.

The Secretary subsequently issued an order permitting grazing of soil-bank lands in a few of the counties. This order came too late for some, as indicated by an Associated Press story which appeared in the Great Falls Tribune. Farmers had given up and many had plowed the soil-bank lands before the belated order was issued.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the Associated Press story, which typifies what happened in this respect.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER GETS WORD TOO LATE

BROADUS.—Powder River County Thursday was notified by the Agriculture Department that it has been declared a critical disaster area due to the dryness but the word was a little late for one farmer.

The "critical" classification means that ranchers and farmers may use grain planted for grazing by livestock.

Ironically, one farmer was reported to have already plowed under 64 acres of barley in the belief he would have had to do so under the soil-bank program.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, significantly, hay and feed relief programs were withheld from the Montana farmers at the time.

On July 31, 1956, I again called on the Secretary of Agriculture, as vigorously as I knew how, to do something about drought relief in the distressed area, and institute a meaningful program for the farmers there. I had been told that a cooperative hay program might be worked out, but no such program was started. So I sent the Secretary a telegram which suggested that farmers in the northeastern Montana area were sinking for a third time and that help was urgent. I ask unanimous consent to put the telegram in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All aboard *Andrea Doria* would have perished if rescue had followed your drought relief pattern. Hundreds of Montana farmers and thousands in the Nation are being forced to liquidate herds and going broke while you pass buck between States, White House, and your Department. Farmers need hay, feed, and credit now—not redtape, promises or flying visits. Cattle can't eat redtape or promises to governors.

You should today institute hay, feed, and credit programs and empower all drought county farmer committees to authorize grazing on soil bank land at their discretion to meet feed emergency and prevent liquidation of herds.

Responsible farmer committeemen on the scene can determine need and propriety of relief measures better than agricrats 2,000 miles away.

Farmers are sinking third time while you investigate and reinvestigate their eligibility for lifebelts.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, what happened in response to my wire?

Nothing at all. In mid-August the Department announced that "after reviewing all the data assembled and available to the Department, including that resulting from a survey by field representatives of the Department" it was the opinion of the Department that not even a grazing authorization on soil bank lands was advisable.

The outlook was bleak indeed in Montana about the time the political conventions were held. Subsequently, the sky became illuminated with golden promises.

The Agricultural Credit Service let it be known it expected to work out a cooperative State-Federal hay program for the Montana drought areas.

Farmers' Home Administration disaster loans were promised.

The Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune blared forth with a five-column streamer: White House Assures Governor Aronson of Aid for 19 More Drought-Hit Counties. I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE ASSURES ARONSON OF AID FOR 19 MORE DROUGHT-HIT COUNTIES

HELENA.—Gov. J. Hugo Aronson said Wednesday he had gotten assurance from the White House of help for 19 more drought-plagued Montana counties for grazing privileges under the soil bank program. This would bring to 22 the number of Montana counties affected.

In a move to speed a decision from the Agricultural Department, the Governor called the White House in Washington. He explained the Montana situation to Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams.

He told Adams that drought conditions, especially in eastern Montana, are worsening. What is needed is permission for ranchers to be allowed to graze grain acreage that will not produce in commercial amounts this year, the governor said.

He explained this will help prevent the flood of cattle to markets, save breeding stock for the ranchers, and prevent the plowing up of thousands of acres of farmland that could easily be eroded by wind.

Aronson said he was assured that Adams would personally call officials in the Agriculture Department immediately.

Three Montana counties, Fallon, Wibaux, and Dawson, previously were declared drought disaster areas. An appeal has been made to add Jefferson County to those needing assistance under the soil bank program.

Aronson said he told Adams that, "It is imperative that a decision on the matter of drought assistance be forthcoming within the next few days."

Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana Democrats, said the Agriculture Department advised them Wednesday, "It is possible that conditions in Fergus and other Montana counties have further deteriorated," since the President designated the three eastern Montana counties as disaster areas July 14.

"In such instance," the Department said, "the county drought committee should make surveys of conditions as they now exist and submit a report to the State drought committee for their consideration and forwarding to the Department with their recommendations."

"We will act promptly when such a recommendation is received," the Department said. "The county drought committee's report should show as a minimum the present pasture and range conditions as compared with the normal, hay-cutting yields per acre and yields of small grain crops, if harvested, as compared with the normal, and the condition of growing crops.

"Rainfall data for the past few months, as compared with the normal, also will be helpful."

The Senators said that counties in which drought conditions have become worse should get this data through channels to Secretary Benson, or to them for referral to Benson.

Representative Orvin B. Fjare, Republican, of Montana, advised Wednesday that he has conferred with White House officials urging the inclusion of the balance of Montana's drought-stricken counties for immediate assistance.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the story explains that Governor Aronson called Mr. Sherman Adams at the White House and was assured of action in the immediate future.

Department of Agriculture's top crusaders have a phrase they appear to enjoy repeating these days.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson first used it September 14, 1956. He said:

Never before in history has the future been as near to us as now.

It sounded pretty good then, when drought relief had been promised in the immediate future.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Butz used exactly the same phrase in a speech he made January 10 of this year:

Never before in history has the future been as near to us as now.

Whatever the Secretary and his plagiarist, or their common huckster meant by this sentence, the people of Montana now know that a promise of aid in the immediate future by the present Republican administration is not worth the newsprint it blackens.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks at this point a story from the Great Falls Tribune of November 30, 1956. This article is headed "Drought Conditions Deal Double Blow to Stockgrowers in Eastern Montana." The headline should have read "Eisenhower, Benson, and Drought Deal Triple Blow to Stockgrowers in Eastern Montana."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROUGHT CONDITIONS DEAL DOUBLE BLOW TO STOCKGROWERS IN EASTERN MONTANA

BILLINGS.—Drought dealt a one-two punch to eastern Montana cattlemen this year—slimming down both their cattle and their wallets, the Agriculture Department said Thursday.

Cattle receipts soared by the thousands at Billings' markets during late summer and fall. But despite price increases triggered by a temporary shortage of longer-fed cattle most cattlemen in the area lost money because grazing conditions forced premature shipment to market.

Many of the stock marketed at Billings—the largest livestock outlet in Montana and Wyoming—weighed from 50 to instances of 150 pounds less than their market counterparts a year ago.

And, as William J. Marshall, head of the Agriculture Department's local market news branch, pointed out, leaner cattle meant leaner pocketbooks.

He said that "in general it was not a good year" for cattlemen in the area when compared with 1955.

Drought caused a shortage of range grass in the area. Cattle herds had to be culled and yearlings began moving to market in July—6 weeks earlier than normal fall shipments. Receipts thus increased sharply.

Through October, Marshall said, 146,450 cattle were sold locally. For the same 1955 period receipts totaled 124,534.

November seemed to follow the same pattern. Through Wednesday, sales amounted to roughly 27,000. Last year, November sales were 24,713.

Meanwhile, a temporary shortage of longer-fed cattle brought an increase in prices. Feeder cattle prices, which normally follow fed cattle trends, also went up.

Fed cattle prices began rising in August and hit a local peak of $24.15 per hundredweight for choice slaughter steers in early September. A year ago at that time, comparable beef brought only $22. Since the September high, prices gradually declined to about $20 here this week.

A bumper corn crop in the Midwest also had an effect on demand and prices, Marshall said and helped take up some of the slack in the demand for cattle that had to be moved from drought-afflicted Montana ranges.

Marshall said a proportionate increase in calf shipments also was noted this fall. But lighter weights again cut into profits.

Sheepmen, on the other hand, fared somewhat better than cattle producers in the drought-seared areas. As of November 28, feeder and slaughter lambs sold locally at $17.50 per hundredweight—about 50 cents to $1 more than the price a year ago.

Weights, by comparison, also were better than those of cattle from the same area. Marshall noted that it takes five times the area to graze a cow as it does a ewe.

He added that wool incentive payments were a determining factor in the generally stronger sheep market. Demand for ewe lambs also was greater, he said, and these generally bring more money at market.

Hog producers, however, had a rough time of it until this fall. Prices were below those of a year ago until an upward trend began in August. In September, they were about equivalent to the same month of 1955. In October and November, they were higher.

On November 5, 1955, U. S. 1 and 2 butchers weighing between 180 and 240 pounds brought $13.25 per hundredweight. The same date this year—and the day before election—they sold for $15.50. Late this month similar hogs commanded $15 in comparison to $11.75 a year ago.

Marshall explained that generally lower prices for the first 8 months of the year resulted from large farrowings in 1955. He said the favorable price increase this fall was the result of decreased farrowings in 1956.

Local markets draw mostly from a radius of 150 miles but are indicative of conditions in most of the States east of the Continental Divide. Prices reflect eastern and west-coast market conditions.

"Billings is primarily a shippers' market," Marshall said. "When prices are low on the west coast and high in the East, livestock moves to the eastern markets."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Benson "immediate future" has never come for Montana stockgrowers. Indeed, the State drought committee was so discouraged over the prospect of Benson keeping the preelection pledges of action in the "immediate future" that it again petitioned the administration in December for relief—a feed program. I ask consent to place in the RECORD an article from the December issue of the Montana Stockgrower reporting this fact.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROUGHT AID

The Montana State Drought Committee on recommendations of county committees has recommended 20 counties to be included under the USDA emergency feed grain program. Approval by the National Drought Committee is necessary before any program can become effective. Assurances have been received that a representative from this national group will visit Montana in the near future to determine the severity of the drought conditions.

If such a program is approved, any rancher desiring assistance will apply to his local Farm Home Administration for a certification of the quantity of feed grain needed to maintain his basic breeding herd. The local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee then will issue purchase orders valued at $1.50 per hundredweight for feed grains, primarily barley, and feed mixtures purchased from any feed dealer. This proposal does not include the disaster hay program which has been effected in a few disaster-designated States.

Counties recommended for the feed assistance were: Blaine, Carter, Custer, Daniels, Dawson, Fallon, Fergus, Garfield, Golden Valley, McCone, Musselshell, Petroleum, Phillips, Powder River, Prairie, Richland, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Valley, and Wibaux. Frank A. Cleland, Missoula, is chairman of the State drought committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, what happened to this recommendation?

It went up to the national drought committee. That group sent out to Montana the same fieldman who had previously made a whirlwind tour of the State and piously reported against any aid.

Let me tell you about his first visit as field representative of the United States Department of Agriculture to check the need for drought aid: An unimpeachable Republican source in Garfield County advised me that this man spent approximately 1 hour consulting with 2 people in Garfield County. That was his investigation.

I was also reliably informed that he was returned to Montana to do the recent inspection over the protest of our Republican State Commissioner of Agriculture. But back he came. He looked around a little bit and then, in effect, reported that the Montana Drought Committee and all the local drought committees did not know what they were talking about. He recommended that none of the 20 counties get an emergency feed-grain program. The National Drought Committee has sustained his recommendations. As things now stand, there never will be an immediate future or even a remote future for the eastern Montana ranchers. It is untrue that "the future has never been closer than now" as the Secretary and his echo proclaim. The future when this administration deals sympathetically and decently with the victims of drought disaster has never been so clearly remote as now.

It is clear that the campaign promises are not to be kept.

It is clear that even authorized aids—the credit aids for which the people of the five Montana counties are petitioning—will not be forthcoming without the utmost pressure and insistence that the Department of Agriculture do as Congress intends it to do.

I am loath to believe, as has been suggested to me, that retribution is being inflicted on hundreds and thousands of good farmers in eastern Montana because the State sends a 100-percent Democratic delegation to Congress. I know of no Member of this body who would engage in such a vengeful practice.

I am loath to believe it largely because Secretary of Agriculture Benson's administration of farm programs has been uniformly callous and heartless; he has invariably arrived with too little too late to help the farmers, whether it be in the field of price supports or drought relief. In the extreme cases where he did let a little disaster-loan money out, he attemped to squeeze the victims for the administration's banker friends by boosting the interest rate on disaster loans. The Congress stopped that interest boost and it is apparent that Congress is again going to have to take a hand if drought aid is to meet a fraction of the need.

President Eisenhower's much-publicized trip to the drought areas was a great publicity stunt, but it brought forth only a mouse in the way of real help even for the drought areas which he visited.

If the President of the United States would allocate a fraction of the money being given bankers as increased interest on Federal debt by this administration, we would begin to meet real drought needs.

A fraction of General Motors' billion-dollar net profits in a single year would do it.

The millions that Benson squandered in the virtual giveaway of his own accumulation of dried-milk solids in 1954 and the illegal cheese deal of 1955 would help out.

The millions in export-subsidy money now being paid to get out of this country rotten wheat from the Burrus Co. tents at St. Joseph and Fort Worth would be quite useful in drought aid.

It is too bad that we do not have some officials who spend their lunch hours worrying about disaster victims and fewer who spend them negotiating Government contracts for their private firms.

It is too bad that we do not have even a master of brinkmanship heading the Department of Agriculture. Benson has agriculture at the brink of bankruptcy, with thousands of farmers tumbling over the precipice. But unlike Secretary Dulles, except for a brief period prior to the 1956 election, there has been no sign of even a desire to snatch agriculture back from the abyss.

I sincerely hope that our Agriculture Committee, which has opened hearings on the farm situation, will investigate failure of drought relief programs, including the request contained in the petition I have just put in the RECORD, and develop a realistic drought aid program mandating Mr. Benson to carry it out whether he likes it or not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished senior Senator in the request and remarks he has made. In addition to the 23 drought counties in the State of Montana to which little attention has been paid by this administration, there is also the soil bank problem under which farmers in eastern Montana get less than half what is received by farmers in adjoining counties in North Dakota. In addition to what my distinguished colleague has said, I hope that we shall also ask Mr. Benson and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to look into the disparity in soil bank payments as between Montana and the neighboring States.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with what my distinguished colleague has said.

AMENDMENT OF RULE, RELATING TO CLOTURE—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in the instance of my colleagues, I have received from the people and organizations of my State a great many messages on the subject of some constructive change in the Senate rules, for the purpose of enacting civil rights or any other proposed legislation which would otherwise be prevented by uncontrollable filibuster.

It is my hope that the 85th Congress will indeed, after careful debate, proceed to make the Senate rules a more effective instrument for majority rule, without in any way impairing the necessary rights of the minority.

I welcome, in particular, the announcement, which was made some time back, concerning the intention of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] and the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] to bring before us an important proposed rule change. It would permit cloture on the votes of two-thirds of the Senators voting and present, rather than, as at present, on the votes of two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate.

As an indication of the deep feelings of a great many Wisconsinites, I present two items. The first is the text of a resolution on a proposed change in the rules of the Senate, which was adopted by the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor at its convention at Superior, last August.

The second is a resolution from the Milwaukee NAACP, urging early and specific action on civil-rights legislation itself. I should like to point out that I am glad to be a cosponsor of a bill, S. 83, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for this very purpose—namely, to accomplish President Eisenhower's civil-rights program.

I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 10—INTRODUCED BY THE OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Whereas rule 22 has made a mockery of majority rule in the highest legislative chamber of the United States by permitting one-third of the Senate membership to indiscriminately thwart the will of the remaining two-thirds to vote on a measure; and

Whereas the Founding Fathers of our Government clearly revealed their intention that majority rule should prevail by expressly outlining that there were to be only five exceptions to this regulation; and

Whereas the United States Senate is the only legislative body in the world where the duly elected representatives of the people can be denied the right to vote on a measure; and

Whereas the requirement that there be an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate before a filibuster can be stopped and a measure voted upon is so unreasonable that it has been accomplished only four times in the past 35 years; and

Whereas minority rule in the Senate is a constant threat and danger to all labor, liberal and social legislation of concern to organized labor and to the vast majority of the people; and

Whereas it is essential for our domestic welfare, our foreign policy and our international position as a leader among free nations that the Senate be restored to majority rule and reasonable debate procedures; and

Whereas an affirmative vote by 49 Senators who are committed to democratic procedures and majority rule will be needed in order to make this change: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in convention assembled in the city of Superior, Wis., August 20 through 23, 1956, call upon the Members of the United States Senate to eliminate the destructive power of the filibuster by restoring majority rule; referred to committee on legislation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 25, 1957.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We were happy to note in your recent newsletter of your hopes for civil-rights legislation. We understand that Senator THOMAS HENNINGS made an effort on January 22 to get action on civil-rights bills in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He asked that hearings on this legislation be brief and that a definite date be set to end the hearings. This seems a realistic approach.

In view of this we are asking you to be present at the next meeting of the Judiciary Committee. We hope the meeting will not be adjourned for lack of quorum.

We also ask you to vote to support Senator HENNINGS' motion for definite hearing date and definite time for ending hearings.

We ask further that you work to get a civil-rights bill out of committee which contains the following provisions mentioned by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message:

(a) Creation of a bipartisan commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights and to make recommendations;

(b) Creation of a civil-rights division in the Department of Justice in charge of an Assistant Attorney General;

(c) Enactment by Congress of new laws to aid in the enforcement of voting rights; and

(d) Amendment of the laws so as to permit the Federal Government to seek from the civil courts preventive relief in civil-rights cases.

Very truly yours,

LUCINDA J. GORDON,
Executive Secretary.

PETITION FROM WISCONSIN FARMERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Nicholas Meyer, of Madison, Wis., enclosing a petition, signed by a great many farmers in many communities of my State, on various important subjects confronting our Nation's agriculturalists, ranging from an adequate supply of farm labor to encouragement of markets for United States farm products abroad.

I believe that Mr. Meyer's comments, and the text of the petition, to which were appended literally hundreds of signatures, will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *January 22, 1957.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: In my daily work among farmers it was my privilege to circulate this petition which I am sending to you now.

You may rest assured that the views expressed are those of farmers everywhere.

The farmers are upholding President Eisenhower's proposals on foreign aid, for they realize it is essential to the safety of our Nation, as well as a means of prosperity to all American people in time to come.

I would like to take this opportunity to tell you that we in Wisconsin feel with all our hearts that you have done a remarkable job in the Senate and that you have given unsurpassed support and courage to our great President. In fact, your campaign upheld the tradition and precedents put forth by Bob La Follette when he almost single-handed challenged the political machines of this State.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS MEYER.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, ask Congress—

To investigate every possibility to increase the export of farm products to all nations willing to pay cash; and to work into the foreign-aid program, for the friendly, needy nations, a sufficient surplus to raise prices to a full parity level at the market place.

To investigate the spread between producer and consumer to protect the consumer from paying unnecessary middleman's profit.

To continue a workable farm draft deferment law as a means of meeting farm labor demands; to increase the enlistment pay and to abolish peacetime draft as soon as possible.

(Followed by several hundreds of signatures.)

RESOLUTION OF MINOT (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minot, N. Dak., Farmers Union local, relating to sliding-scale farm programs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of the Minot Farmers Union Local, gathered at this crucial time with agriculture standing at the crossroads. We must continue to improve and expand the position of the agricultural segment of the national economy by exerting an effort to keep the ownership of the farm and ranches in the hands of the men who operate the land. We therefore present the following resolutions:

1. We believe that present sliding-scale farm programs favor large land owners over the family size farm. In order to prevent concentration of land ownership in fewer and fewer hands we urge Congress to place a limit of $10,000 on the total of Government commodity loans for one operator.

2. Whereas we believe that the policies of this administration in the field of credit (the hard-money policy), the proposals to raise interest rates on REA loans are attempts to destroy all progress made in the past 20 years and a blow below the belt to the farmers and entire economy who need credit and low-cost REA power.

We, therefore, urge that Congress enact laws which will lower interest rates and prevent Federal employees from arbitrarily raising rates as dictated by the hard-money policy.

HENRY HILLINS,
President.
WESLEY NIEDEMON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil Compact Commisson, at Miami, Fla., relating to the imports of foreign crude products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 8

"The Interstate Oil Compact Commission has several times before called attention to the fact that the imports of foreign crude products could be a detriment to the State conservation programs.

"The present crisis caused by the closing of the Suez Canal has proved the unreliability of importing crude oil and products.

"The free world today is dependent upon the excess producing capacity of the United States that has been caused by the conservation programs of the individual States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress, Office of Defense Mobilization, and the President be furnished a copy of this resolution calling attention to the fact that our security cannot be dependent upon importing crude and products, and in order for the States to continue their conservation programs when the crisis is over, imports should not supplant domestic production."

I, Earl Foster, executive secretary of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission duly assembled in business session at Miami Beach, Fla., December 8, 1956.

[SEAL] EARL FOSTER,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF FLORIDA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Panama Canal Society of Florida, St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation to create an independent interoceanic canals commission, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF FLORIDA,
St. Petersburg, Fla., January 16, 1957.

RESOLUTIONS RE PANAMA CANAL

Whereas the Panama Canal situation has been dangerously simmering for over 2 years without constructive results; and

Whereas the inadequacy of the Panama Canal to meet increasing traffic requirements has become more and more acute and the absolute need for a speedy determination of the overall subject is of the most vital importance; and

Whereas there is developing a determined movement to force the Congress into authorizing a sea-level canal and to which radical change practically all engineers familiar with local Canal Zone conditions are unalterably opposed as a dangerous and costly experiment not warranted or supported by experience gained over 42 years of Panama Canal operation and maintenance: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Panama Canal Society of Florida at its annual reunion at St. Petersburg, January 15–16, 1957, as follows:

1. That the society respectfully and most earnestly urges the Congress of the United States to enact, without further delay, legislation providing for the creation of an independent interoceanic canals commission to study and review all the problems involved in the matter of increased capacity for the canal, with recommendations in the premises.

2. That copies of this resolution be furnished the press and the Members of Congress.

3. That copies of this resolution also be furnished each of the 2,400 former members of the original canal construction force now comprising the membership of the Panama Canal Societies located throughout the United States, with the request that these members utilize every opportunity to support in the public press and through their congressional representatives the action recommended in this resolution.

TROY HAYES, *President.*
MRS. LUCILLE S. JUDD,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION, ROCHESTER, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I received a resolution recently from the Rochester, Minn., United Nations Association expressing their views on the state of affairs in Hungary. The resolution was adopted at their annual meeting held on December 11, 1956, during Human Rights Week. The members of this association are concerned with the aggressive action taken on the part of the Soviet Union in their interference in the internal affairs of Hungary and of the later action on the part of the Hungarian Government in refusing the admission of Secretary General Hammarskjold. They urge prompt and appropriate action be taken by the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in this Human Rights Week, a member of the United Nations is using its armed forces to suppress the human rights of the people of another member nation contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and to the declaration of human rights: Be it

Resolved by this annual meeting of the United Nations Association of Rochester, Minn., That it urges the United Nations to condemn Russia for its warlike intervention in the affairs of Hungary and for its barbaric kidnaping of Hungarian people completely in violation of human rights;

Whereas a member nation of the United Nations agrees to cooperate with the United Nations and all its agencies, including the Secretariat, in carrying out the work of the United Nations; and

Whereas the Government of Hungary has refused to allow the entry of the Secretary General in the course of his duties: Be it

Resolved by this annual meeting of the United Nations Association of Rochester, Minn., That it urges the United Nations to reprove the Hungarian Government for its repudiation of the Secretary General and prevention of the performance of his duties.

CECELIA BUSKOWIAK,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 887. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 888. A bill for the relief of Alex P. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. POTTER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THYE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 889. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Redentor Ligot Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheung Nung Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 892. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 893. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Chillemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 894. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by civilian agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 895. A bill for the relief of Josefa Kusiak; and

S. 896. A bill for the relief of Theodore E. Straus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 897. A bill to provide for the construction of a fish and wildlife marine laboratory and experiment station in the Gulf Coast area of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 898. A bill to prohibit the imposition by any State of migratory water fowl hunting restrictions which discriminate unduly against citizens of other States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 899. A bill to amend section 1 of the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 915; 28 U. S. C. 631) as amended to provided for appointment of a United States Commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park; and

S. 900. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 901. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 902. A bill to transfer certain land to the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 903. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 904. A bill for the relief of Chrisoula Antonios Chegaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 905. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits;

S. 906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the amount of income tax payable in the case of an individual 65 years af age or over who sells his home and does not acquire a new one; and

S. 907. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from seventy-two to sixty-eight the age required to be attained by individuals in order that their benefits not be subject to deductions on account of earnings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 908. A bill for the relief of Kuo York Chynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 909. A bill to provide compensatory time off for rural carriers who are required to work on holidays designated by Executive order; and

S. 910. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Englessos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 912. A bill to enlarge the special assistance functions of the Federal National Mortgage Association to include the purchase and the making of commitments to purchase of insured or guaranteed mortgages securing loans not exceeding $14,000 in principal

amount which bear interest at a rate not in excess of 4½ percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 913. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S. 914. A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations, and for other purposes;

S. 915. A bill to further amend section 14 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended, to permit publications printed in imitation of typewriting to be accepted as second-class matter, and for other purposes;

S. 916. A bill to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the Office of the Disbursing Officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes;

S. 917. A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust the postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes; and

S. 918. A bill to revise the law relating to the dispatch of mail from post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 919. A bill relating to holiday work by rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 920. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $100 of political contributions made each year to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 921. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 922. A bill for the relief of the Sanitary Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 923. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 924. A bill to establish a Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 925. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BLAKLEY):

S. 926. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 927. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 928. A bill to amend the Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the stream valley parks in Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 929. A bill to protect borrowers against excessive cash requirements and minimum terms in the case of home loans guaranteed under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or secured by mortgages insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 930. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 931. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 932. A bill to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice; to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners; to provide for admission to and control of practice; to establish a Legal Career Service for improvement of legal services in Government; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 933. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the State of North Dakota to provide for the extension of the insurance system established by such title to service performed by certain policemen and firemen in such State; and

S. 934. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain coverage requirements upon which eligibility for disability insurance benefits thereunder is conditioned; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 935. A bill for the relief of William R. Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 936. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 937. A bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

S. 938. A bill to amend section 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to prevent the use of arbitrary stock par values to evade Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction.

S. 939. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

S. 940. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes;

S. 941. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to revoke, amend, or suspend water carrier certificates or permits under certain conditions;

S. 942. A bill to amend section 9 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, and for other purposes; and

S. 943. A bill to amend section 218 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require contract carriers by motor vehicle to file with the Interstate Commerce Commission their actual rates or charges for transportation services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 944. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1954, "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 945. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 946. A bill to authorize hospitalization and medical treatment for persons who have served as acting assistant or contract surgeons or contract dental surgeons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 947. A bill for the relief of Bronislawa Chomicz;

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Adolf Wieder;

S. 949. A bill for the relief of Louise Marguerite Whitmyer;

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Milutin Jovanovic;

S. 951. A bill for the relief of Stasys Sereika; and

S. 952. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 953. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 954. A bill to establish a more satisfactory and equitable procedure for making withdrawals of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 955. A bill for the relief of Stephanos Styris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 956. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide additional authority for distribution of loans among States and Territories; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 957. A bill for the relief of Calogero Maniscalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 958. A bill for the relief of Arthur L. Peirson, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 959. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to

exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 960. A bill for the relief of Fotina (Theresa) Wardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 961. A bill to extend the period within which Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 962. A bill to provide for certain regulation of hunting, trapping, and fishing in military installations and facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 963. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on their lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 964. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 965. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; and

S. 966. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery, to provide for the international interchange of art and craft works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. POTTER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 967. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 968. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 969. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution relative to the use of Armed Forces by the President to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to establish the Civil War Centennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would create a select committee composed of eight members, who would be charged with the duty of conducting an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. As the Senate knows, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has already conducted some investigation and held some executive and public hearings concerning a part of the area covered in this resolution. I wish to make clear that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations definitely had jurisdiction to go into the area covered by the hearings that were held a week ago. However, Mr. President, as I have often said before, it is apparent that if a thorough, complete, and full investigation of every phase of the problem that might be encountered is to be made, any committee, including the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, would have to have more jurisdiction and authority than any committee of the Senate now has. Therefore, the resolution is submitted in the hope that a select committee will be established by the Senate, with full authority and directions to cover all areas of the question that may be involved in such an inquiry.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to join the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in the submission of the resolution. I definitely believe that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has certain jurisdiction in the matter. I think we all recognize the need for a complete and thorough investigation, as provided in the resolution. I am sure we all want to see an investigation which will be fair to all parties. I believe the resolution submitted will result in a thorough, complete, and fair investigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. We have had conferences with respect to the present jurisdiction of different committees. We have concluded that this was the best approach to the question, to create one forum, one committee with broad enough jurisdiction to cover completely all phases of this situation.

I ask that the resolution be printed, and that it lie on the desk for whatever disposition the leadership desires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for action by that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall not object—I think it quite proper that the resolution take the normal parliamentary course. Inasmuch as the resolution seeks money to enable the committee to function and carry out its assignment, I think it is quite proper that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am glad the majority leader has made that request.

However, I remind Senators that from the information which has already been developed and is now in the possession of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, it is apparent that there is considerable urgency about this investigation. I trust that the Committee on Rules and Administration will report the resolution favorably at the very earliest opportunity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed this subject with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and he has assured me that that committee will give prompt attention to the resolution. The request I am making is the usual request which is made in connection with all money resolutions. As Senators can observe, there has been no great delay in connection with any of the resolutions which have been referred to that committee. I have no doubt that the committee, in its wisdom, will act promptly and properly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I concur in what our distinguished major-

ity leader has said. I am confident that the membership of the Committee on Rules and Administration is quite as desirous of having this investigation proceed as any of the rest of us. I am confident that there will be no delay.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I concur in the observations of the Senator from Arkansas with regard to the desirability of proceeding with this investigation without any undue delay. I say that because certain individuals, corporations, and institutions, including certain unions in my State, are under allegations as a result of the work the committee has already done. I believe that in fairness to them there should be the earliest possible disposition of this subject by way of the judicial hearing which I am sure the committee will conduct.

Furthermore, in my judgment, the people of my State are entitled to have the facts publicly presented to them. I say again that there is no substitute for public disclosure when we are dealing with allegations of misgovernment, whether it be by a governmental organization, a corporation, or a trade union. Therefore, I urge the earliest possible handling of this question consistent with fairness and justice to all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1958, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

(b) Upon the filing of its final report the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contigent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable, and (9) with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the select committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 Members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $350,000, and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM PERSECUTION BY EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 76), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas persistent reports, accompanied by documentary evidence, indicate that individuals resident in Egypt, who are tied by race, religion, or national origin with Israel, France, or the United Kingdom, have been subjected to arrest, forced exile, confiscation of property, and other punishments, although not charged as individuals with any crime or other wrongdoing which threatens the safety of the Egyptian nation; and

Whereas the punishment of innocent individuals as hostages, for crimes committed by others related to them only through race, religion, or national origin, is a violation of the principles of equity and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate requests the President to instruct our chief delegate to the United Nations to take whatever steps may be necessary to propose and urge the prompt dispatch of a United Nations observers team to Egypt with a view to obtaining at the earliest practicable date a full factual report concerning (1) any attempt by the Government of Egypt to rescind the legal privileges of citizens, or other residents, of foreign origin as a result of the recent armed hostilities in Egypt, and (2) any punishment (including arrests, confiscation of property, forced exile, or other punishment) visited by the Government of Egypt upon any persons who are connected by race, religion, or other ties with any nation involved in such hostilities, but who are not charged as individuals with any crime or wrongdoing and do not constitute any actual danger to the Egyptian nation.

PREVENTION OF BORDER RAIDS AND BLOCKADES OF INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my senior colleague, [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The resolution deals with the effort to implement the Middle East position of our country in order to try to bring real peace to the Middle East.

We all recognize that the Arab-Israel tensions in that part of the world have within them the seeds of a repetition of hostilities which can very materially change even the existing situation at the moment under such serious debate by the United Nations.

Mr. President, the resolution states the views of a number of Members of the Senate as to what needs to be done in terms of foreign policy of our country, to deal with the international tensions which make the Middle East the tinderbox of the whole world.

I hope very much that in our country we may make our contribution to real and permanent peace in that area generally and in the Arab-Israel situation. We can do that only by way of implementing Middle East policy with the same courage on the part of our country and willingness to accept responsibility, which we have shown on other occasions in the face of crises.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the desk for 1 day to permit other Members of the Senate to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The resolution (S. Res. 77) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower has declared that it is the policy of the Government of the United States to deter and prevent Communist aggression in the Middle East, and

Whereas the Secretary of State has made it clear that our Government is firmly opposed to the restoration of the conditions out of which the outbreak of hostilities in the Sinai Peninsula on October 29, 1956, came about: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that our Government should support effective action both in and outside of the United Nations, which will guarantee that there will not be a resumption of border raids and blockades of vital international waterways and other activities which might erupt into new hostilities in the Middle East; and

That, pending an effective guaranty that there will not be a restoration of the conditions out of which the hostilities in the Sinai

Peninsula came about, our delegation at the United Nations urge measures to assure that the United Nations Emergency Force take up positions to separate the forces of Israel and Egypt and to prevent repossession of bases for the operation of guerrilla bands, and the interdiction of international shipping, including Israel's, through the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

STUDY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF SOVIET UNION AND CERTAIN EASTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MALONE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the critical raw materials and resources of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, as well as other countries in the Eastern Hemisphere which are supplying critical minerals and materials to the United States; (2) to gage the economic strength of these countries in order to show how the United States may lessen its dependence upon these countries, and to strengthen its own economy and security to be prepared for emergencies; and (3) to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date, not later than January 31, 1958, the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to utilize the information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, with the consent of the heads of such departments.

OPPOSITION TO VISIT OF MARSHAL TITO TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution in regard to the proposed visit of Joseph Broz, alias Marshal Tito, to the United States.

If the Senate will bear with me, I should like to read two lines of the resolution, not the whereas clause, which is rather lengthy:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that American soil should not be desecrated nor our free air polluted by bringing such an anti-American Communist dictator as Tito to the United States.

I sincerely hope the Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings on the resolution in the very near future, because it does concern the people of the United States very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and will be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas Josip Broz, alias Marshal Tito, has a record of crime and killings in Yugoslavia which is notorious; and

Whereas among his killings were those of one of the greatest patriots of our times, Mikhailovitch, and Mikhailovitch's compatriots; and

Whereas he is the jailer of the spiritual leader of the Yugoslav people, Cardinal Stepinac, and is the persecutor of all religion and the enemy of human rights and the God-given liberty of men; and

Whereas he has been guilty of shooting down American airmen and squandering aid from America to build up his Communist dictatorship; and

Whereas he acted as a bloody accomplice of the butchers of Budapest, and arrested and returned to the bloodbath in Hungary the patriots who sought asylum in Yugoslavia; and

Whereas his is the record of a vicious man who opposes everything for which freedom-loving and decent people stand; and

Whereas Tito has proclaimed himself repeatedly as a true Communist: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that American soil should not be desecrated, nor our free air polluted, by bringing such an anti-American Communist dictator as Tito to the United States.

POLICY OF UNITED STATES IN ACHIEVING INTERNATIONAL PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly:

Whereas peace with justice and the defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms require international cooperation, through more effective use of the United Nations and otherwise; and

Whereas peace with justice is not now assured in the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirm the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security in the Middle East so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest and that the President be advised of the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional processes, should particularly pursue the following objectives in the Middle East within the United Nations Charter:

One. In furtherance of the traditional policy of the United States to foster international trade and the unobstructed international movement of the world's commerce, negotiate arrangements which will assure free passage, on equitable terms, in war and in peace, of the Suez Canal to all nations.

Two. In furtherance of the United Nations Charter, strive for a reduction in tensions between Israel and the Arab States, assist as may be possible in the negotiation of mutually acceptable boundaries, the resettlement of refugees, the protection of holy places and the conclusion of treaties of peace, and until these purposes are accomplished seek the continued intervention of United Nations police forces between Israel and Egypt.

Three. In support of programs developed by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and otherwise, contribute its fair share of resources, including technical assistance, to long range economic development and to the development of independent and progressive social institutions in the Middle East area.

Four. Contribute to the maintenance of peace by reaffirming with particular reference to the Middle East the determination of the United States to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the United States Code to extend protection for employees and enforcement officers of certain departments of Government now unfortunately excluded from such Federal laws.

The bill would include protection—now afforded other Government employees in similar positions—for officials and employees of the Departments of Labor; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; the General Services Administration; and Federal probation officers under the Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, to be followed thereafter by the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 887) to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. WATKINS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by striking out "or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States," and inserting in lieu thereof "any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, any officer or employee of the Department of Labor authorized to perform duties in connection with investigatory or enforcement functions under provisions relating to labor in any law of the United States, any officer, guard, or special policeman who is designated either by the Secretary of Commerce or by any person authorized by him to make such designation, or who is designated by the Administrator of the General Services Administration or by any person authorized by him to make such designation, to guard and protect property of the United States under the administration and control of the Department of Commerce or the General Services Administration, or any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as involving functions in connection with the enforcement (including any investigatory or inspection activities in connection with the enforcement) of the food and drug or public health laws administered by such Department,".

SEC. 2. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "correctional institution," the words "any probation officer of a United States district court."

The statement, presented by Mr. WILEY, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

At present, section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, rightly makes it a crime pun-

ishable under Federal law for anyone to kill any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a post-office inspector, officer or employee of the National Park Service, or any of many other Government officials and employees specified in that section, while engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Section 111 of title 18 also makes it a Federal crime for anyone forcibly to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any person specified in section 1114 while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties.

The purpose of this legislation today is to broaden the categories of Federal employees so included.

It will be recalled that in the 84th Congress, I had introduced a similar bill to extend protection of Federal law. That bill, however, included protection only for enforcement officers of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, since that is the only agency which had at that time brought this serious problem to my attention.

OVER 5,000 EMPLOYEES AFFECTED

In the interim, it has been agreed by the Departments that there were and are employees—approximately 5,240—of several Departments who, also, need to be included under this particular proposed Federal law. I am delighted to make sure that the coverage is now ample enough to meet this problem wherever it exists.

When the performance of official duties in carrying out the provisions of Federal laws subjects an employee of the Government to the dangers of assaults or homicidal acts by others, there is, I feel, sound reason for extending to these employees the protection of laws, punishing such assaults or homicides as Federal offenses.

Consequently, I believe it only fair and just that we immediately amend the statutes, extending Federal protection to these worthy public servants.

The bill, of course, affects personnel coming from, and working in, almost every State in the United States.

The administration supports this proposal for extending additional protection to these employees. The bill has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill should be regarded as part and parcel of Federal laws in the interest of those who serve our Government faithfully, and often with considerable risk.

PROTECTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

As a specific example, the proposed bill would provide protections for officers or employees of the Department of Labor while in the performance of investigative or enforcement duties under provisions relating to labor in any law of the United States.

The departmental personnel primarily affected if the bill were enacted would be: Wage-hour investigators conducting investigations under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; and field representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security who conduct investigations as to compliance by employees with the terms of the agreement between this country and Mexico relating to the employment of Mexican farm labor.

While assault against the person is a crime in all States, experience has demonstrated that this is not a sufficient deterrent to prevent interference with Federal employees performing investigative and enforcement duties. Reports from this Department's investigators clearly indicate that knowledge brought home to those contemplating interference that violation of a Federal criminal statute may be involved can operate effectively to cool off a heated temper.

The numerous instances in which this Department's investigative and enforcement personnel have been assaulted or threatened with assault while performing their duties plainly show the need for providing them with the same protections available to persons engaged in similar activities under other laws of the United States.

PROTECTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The proposed bill also would extend protection of the Federal law of crimes and criminal procedures, to officers and employees of the Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration, whose duty it is to guard property under their respective administration and control.

Employees of the Department of Commerce protect property consisting of warehouses, terminals, shipyards, and reserve fleet sites (water areas and shore properties). Property protected by the General Services Administration consists of public building and storage areas situated throughout the United States.

The new legislation would cover officers, employees, guards, and special policemen, whose duty it is to protect property from loss, damage or injury, by theft, fire, burglary, negligence or other causes.

PROTECTION OF FOOD AND DRUG AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Increasingly during recent years, employees of this Department engaged in the enforcement of the food and drug laws have, during the performance of their regular duties, been exposed to the risk of assaults and other injuries. On numerous occasions, their routine work has placed them in personal jeopardy.

For example, many perishable foods such as crab meat, eggs, and fresh vegetables are shipped by truck and move at night so as to reach the markets the following morning. To collect official samples and make analyses before the foods are sold, FDA employees must often stop trucks at night on the highway. Sometimes the truckdrivers are uncooperative and, on occasion, belligerent to the point of assaulting the employee attempting to make the inspection.

The danger of personal harm, however, is particularly acute in the investigation of deliberately concealed violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. For example, one employee who was investigating a barbiturate racket was assaulted with a blackjack and suffered a fractured skull while another was held at gun point for several hours.

Often during one particular investigation, Food and Drug inspectors operated for weeks under cover as truckdrivers in circumstances which subjected them to great danger of physical injury or death. Duties of this kind are increasingly being required of our food and drug inspectors. While ordinarily the great United States trucking industry provides invaluable cooperation, culprits may, of course, be found on the fringes of this or almost any industry.

Similarly, Federal employees are engaged in investigatory, inspection, or other activities in connection with the enforcement of our public health laws and regulations. I refer for instance, to the interstate and foreign quarantine laws, designed to prevent the spread of communicable diseases into this country from abroad or from one State to another. Frequently it is necessary to deal with uncooperative persons attempting to evade the laws or regulations or otherwise to interfere with their enforcement. In such cases also, there is danger of personal harm.

PROTECTION FOR PROBATION OFFICERS

The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended that legislation be enacted to add probation officers to the list of certain officers and employees of the United States protected by Section 1114 of Title 18, United States Code.

Section 1114 and by reference Section 111 cover in addition to judges of the United States, officers or employees of the United States penal and correctional institutions. Probation officers of the United States district courts are subject in the performance of their duties to similar hazards, and therefore in the opinion of the Judicial Conference of the United States are entitled to the protection of the provisions.

The Federal probation officers are appointed by the United States district courts which they serve (18 U. S. C. 3654). They have two general classes of duties: one, the supervision of offenders on probation or parole, and two, the making of pre-sentence investigations of offenders convicted by the courts for the purpose of furnishing information to the judges which will be helpful to them in determining the sentences.

On June 30, 1956, the number of persons under supervision by the probation officers (who themselves then numbered 388) was 31,376, of whom 23,618 were probationers, 5,133 were civil parolees, 1,532 were persons on conditional release, and 1,093 were military parolees being supervised for the Army and the Air Force. In the fiscal year 1956, 30,511 investigations were made by the probation officers, of which 22,365 were pre-sentence investigations, 7,099 were civil pre-parole investigations, and 1,047 were military pre-parole investigations.

The duties of supervision and investigation of offenders which devolve upon probation officers, subject them to personal hazards above those of ordinary Government officers and employees. In their investigations, they regularly call at the homes and upon the associates of persons guilty of Federal crimes in order to obtain information about them.

Although such inquiry is designed only to assist the judges to deal intelligently with the offenders in the matter of sentence, and often works for the offenders' benefit by indicating possibilities of rehabilitation on probation which might not otherwise be known, the inquiry may nevertheless appear to be hostile. The probation officers are often thought of by the offenders and their relatives and friends as police officers.

Also, if the facts shown by the pre-sentence reports indicate to the judges that probation cannot prudently be granted and the offenders are sentenced to prison, they may blame the probation officers for the outcome. This tends to make the offenders hostile when they come out. If the probationers or parolees do not conduct themselves properly and commit serious violations of their probation or parole, it is necessary for the probation officers to report the violations to the court or the Board of Parole, as the case may be. In fact, under section 3653 of title 18 of the United States Code it may be their duty to arrest the offender.

The hazards which are inherent in the work of probation officers are thus very real. There are recurring examples of actual menace in experience and there is always a potential danger. A few illustrations may be given.

EXAMPLES OF ATTACKS AND THREATS

A former parolee called at the home of a probation officer who previously supervised him and immediately shot and killed the officer's son, a young man, when he answered the door.

A probation officer in a large city detecting on the street a probation violator for whom the police were looking, arrested him

and the man was sentenced to 2½ years in prison. He said that when he got out, he was going to get the probation officer.

Another probation officer going into the woods remote from any settlement to call on a probationer, met a barrage of shotgun fire, and had to take refuge behind some trees. On one occasion, a probation violator broke away from a probation officer and was captured by the officer before he had gone far. At a later time, the offender shot and killed a policeman for which he was sentenced to be electrocuted. If he had had a weapon on him at the time of his previous attempt to escape, the probation officer might not have come off unscathed.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are some of the sound reasons why I believe this bill should be enacted. Not only would it fill a loophole in the present law, but extend justice and fairness—as well as much-needed protection—to a fine group of public servants.

INCREASED PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill implementing President Eisenhower's school-construction proposals for 1957, as outlined in the special message which the President transmitted to the Congress yesterday. The bill would authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to the States and local communities, to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction. The bill may properly be designated as the administration's bill.

At the outset of my remarks, I wish again to express my hope that the bill will receive strong bipartisan support. I believe that the drastic shortage of classrooms compels us to act swiftly and without partisanship to provide adequate schoolrooms for our children, in whose hands lies the destiny of our country. This is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation which will come before the Congress at this session; and, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie at the desk until Thursday, January 31, in order that other interested Senators may join in sponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress numerous bills providing for Federal assistance in the construction of public schools were introduced, but all failed of enactment. Today, the classroom shortage persists undiminished. Although the school-construction efforts of States and localities produced a record high total of 63,000 new classrooms during the past school year, no noticeable inroad was made upon the backlog of needed classrooms. The rate of construction attained last year would, if maintained, enable the States and communities to keep abreast of the need for new classrooms each year, but it cannot erase the backlog of classroom needs which accumulated in earlier years.

Mr. President, the primary responsibility for meeting classroom needs as pointed out yesterday by the President, rests squarely with the States and local communities. This has been and is the policy of this administration. However, it is clearly detrimental to the national interest to permit conditions to persist where approximately 2.3 million pupils are enrolled in excess of the normal capacity of the existing public-school facilities.

The education of all its citizens is one of the most fundamental cornerstones of democratic government. In the years ahead, complex decisions of crucial importance to the future of the world, and perhaps to its very existence, will have to be weighed and decided by our people. We cannot permit the educational facilities of our States and communities to become so obsolete and inadequate that the quality and effectiveness of public education in this country will become impaired. The current classroom deficit must be dealt with quickly through an emergency program of Federal assistance to the States and communities.

The bill which I have introduced today embodies the essential provisions of the measure which I introduced last year, S. 2905, 84th Congress, and provides a comprehensive four-point program designed to accelerate progress in meeting classroom needs.

I ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and outlining the general provisions of the bill and the differences between this bill and the bill which I introduced last year, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET ON THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1957

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

A shortage of classroom facilities in the public elementary and secondary schools first began to develop when school construction was restricted during the economic depression of the 1930's. Then, during World War II, labor and material shortages further restricted school construction. Thus, there was a substantial shortage of classrooms as much as a decade ago.

Against this backdrop, in more recent years there have been by far the greatest enrollment increases in history. The enrollment in public schools increased about 5.5 million in the past 5 years and is expected to increase 6 million in the next 5 years. From 26.6 million in the school year 1951–52, total enrollment is expected to increase to about 38 million in 1961–62. It is 32.2 million this year.

STATE AND LOCAL EFFORTS

As enrollment mounted and labor and materials became available after World War II, school construction picked up year by year. The number of classrooms built increased from about 9,000 in 1946–47 to about 63,000 last year, and this year's construction is estimated by the States to be still higher. In 1954–55 the total was 60,000 and the year before that, 55,000.

Despite these notable increases in construction during the last decade, the requirements of the Nation's growing school population have not been adequately met.

EXTENT OF THE SHORTAGE TODAY

The extent of the classroom shortage cannot be measured down to the last schoolroom, because what is meant by such terms as "overcrowded" and "unsatisfactory" facilities inevitably will vary in some degree from person to person, from place to place, from one period to another, and in different circumstances. The rate of obsolescence is particularly difficult to estimate, since it will vary according to the standards employed.

All reliable studies, however, show a continuing, substantial, and widespread shortage.

The country entered the present school year with approximately 1 million elementary and secondary school classrooms. But enrollment exceeded the estimated normal capacity of these schools by some 2.3 million children—approximately the same as estimated last year. The result has been obviously overcrowded classrooms, split sessions of half-day schooling for many children, and emergency use of makeshift quarters. State educational agencies estimate that approximately 80,000 new classrooms are needed specifically to correct these conditions.

In addition, the States have estimated that the Nation's existing school plant includes at least 79,000 classrooms which are obviously unsatisfactory and which need immediate replacement.

Thus, the latest estimates by State education agencies place the total classroom shortage at approximately 159,000 at the start of this school year. This does not take into account future replacement needs or the further large enrollment increases yet to come.

FUTURE NEEDS

With the net annual increase in enrollment running at about 1.25 million pupils, approximately 45,000 new classrooms are required each year for enrollment increases alone. The extent of the need for replacement of facilities which will become obsolete in the future cannot be as precisely determined. Year by year, however, replacement needs resulting from obsolescence, population shifts, school consolidations, and losses due to fire or natural disasters are a considerable factor. State agencies have reported that 14,000 classrooms were abandoned last year, despite the current shortage. With over 1 million classrooms now in use, some authorities estimate the normal replacement need could run to about 20,000 classrooms a year. Using a range of 14,000 to 20,000 for annual replacements, 59,000 to 65,000 new classrooms may be needed each year simply for increased enrollment and annual replacement.

Thus, although there has been a notable increase, the current rate of construction barely keeps pace with the new needs developing each year. It permits little progress in reducing the backlog of shortage accumulated over many past years. At this rate, a serious classroom shortage would continue to

handicap education in many communities for many years to come.

THE PURPOSE OF FEDERAL AID

The basic objective of the administration's school-construction proposals for 1957 is to encourage greater State and local effort to build more schools, and to supplement these efforts to help overcome the existing deficit within a period of approximately 4 years. The States and communities are now building schools at a rate which indicates that, once the deficit has been removed, they can finance from their own resources the construction needed for future new enrollment increases and normal replacements.

Four kinds of aid are proposed:

1. Grants to the States: A total of $1.3 billion would be authorized for Federal grants to the States at the rate of $325 million annually for 4 years, for assistance in the construction of public schools in financially needy school districts. The principal features of the grant proposal are:

Allotment of funds among the States according to numbers of school-age children and State income per school-age child. This method would provide the greatest help where there are the least resources for meeting classroom needs.

Matching requirements. Federal funds would be matched in the first year from State or local sources, or both, and thereafter from State sources alone. This proposal takes into account the fact that many States either make no contribution to school construction or contribute only small amounts. Thus, the requirement for State matching serves to further increase total funds for school construction and encourage greater State participation in this field. Under the proposal, the States with the lowest income per child would add $1 to every $2 in Federal grants received, for use within the State, while the States with the highest income per child would add $2 to every $1 in grant funds.

A priority plan within each State. The combined Federal-State funds would be allotted by the State to needy local districts, giving priority to projects to relieve half-day sessions, overcrowding, and other major deficiencies resulting from lack of local resources.

Recognition of effort commensurate with ability. The annual allotment would be reduced proportionately for States which are below the national average both in the proportion of their income devoted to schools and in their dollar expenditures per pupil. This provision is designed to increase the incentive for some States to support school construction and thus carry out the principle that State and local effort is fundamental to a sound program of Federal aid for school construction—that Federal funds should supplement, not displace, State and local funds.

State educational agencies would administer the school construction program in each State.

2. Bond purchases: A total of $750 million would be authorized over a 4-year period for the Federal purchase of all or part of an issue of bonds which local school districts have sought unsuccessfully to market at reasonable rates of interest.

The limit on the amount of school bonds that would be purchased in any State would be determined by allocations to the States on the basis of relative school-age population. Each State would determine for its local districts the order of priority for the Federal purchase of bonds within the State's allocation.

Bonds would be purchased at the interest rate borne by long-term United States Treasury obligations plus one-half of 1 percent.

3. State school-financing agencies: Federal advances would be authorized to assist States to support bonds issued by State school-financing agencies to finance school construction.

Under this lease-purchase plan, which has been widely used for other public construction, any State electing to do so would set up an agency coordinated with the State education department and empowered to issue bonds.

With the proceeds of its bonds, the State agency would finance the construction of schools and the local school districts in turn would rent or lease them from the State agency. After a period of years, the schools would become the property of the local school districts.

Federal funds would be provided for advances to the reserve funds of State school-financing agencies, to help assure more favorable interest rates for the bonds of these agencies. The budget for fiscal 1958 authorizes $20 million for this purpose.

4. State planning to strengthen school construction programs: Appropriations totaling $20 million over a 4-year period are proposed for allocation to the States for development of State programs dealing with the planning and financing of school construction. Funds would be allotted on the basis of relative school-age population and would be matched by the States. Funds could be expended only for administrative costs of such State programs.

The proposed legislation, like last year's proposal, contains a specific prohibition against interference with State or local control of education.

[From U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education]

Allotments to States, matching requirements, and amount of combined Federal-State grants under 1957 proposal

[Calculations based on data available in Office of Education on Jan. 1, 1957]

Region and State	Final Federal allotment		Matching requirement— [1]		Combined Federal-State [1] grant to school districts
	Total	Per child	Minimum funds required to match full final Federal allotment	State share [1] of combined Federal-State grant	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Thous.		*Thous.*		*Thous.*
Aggregate United States [2]	$325,000	$8.81	$320,087	----------	$645,087
Northeast:					
Connecticut	2,011	4.56	4,023	$0.6667	6,034
Maine	1,932	9.33	1,311	.4043	3,243
Massachusetts	6,782	6.96	10,779	.6138	17,561
New Hampshire	1,074	9.10	932	.4646	2,006
New Jersey	5,489	5.25	10,980	.6667	16,469
New York	15,765	5.21	31,535	.6067	47,300
Pennsylvania	18,803	8.12	22,898	.5491	41,701
Rhode Island	886	5.40	1,316	.5977	2,202
Vermont	1,007	11.31	597	.3722	1,604
North Central:					
Illinois	11,125	5.96	22,253	.6667	33,378
Indiana	8,021	8.51	8,965	.5278	16,986
Iowa	5,813	9.82	4,849	.4548	10,662
Kansas	3,744	8.55	3,635	.4926	7,379
Michigan	12,102	7.69	16,233	.5729	28,335
Minnesota	7,047	9.95	5,742	.4490	12,789
Missouri	5,885	6.96	6,424	.5219	12,309
Nebraska	2,856	9.62	2,493	.4661	5,349
North Dakota	2,013	12.66	1,006	.3333	3,019
Ohio	11,321	6.07	16,352	.5909	27,673
South Dakota	1,881	11.83	982	.3431	2,863
Wisconsin	7,365	9.14	7,153	.4927	14,518
South:					
Alabama	11,148	13.48	5,573	.3333	16,721
Arkansas	6,620	13.51	3,310	.3333	9,930
Delaware	381	4.95	762	.6667	1,143
Florida	6,309	8.97	5,437	.4629	11,746
Georgia	11,926	12.63	5,962	.3333	17,888
Kentucky	8,917	11.63	4,458	.3333	13,375
Louisiana	9,204	12.34	4,601	.3333	13,805
Maryland	4,496	7.86	5,809	.5637	10,305
Mississippi	7,772	12.95	3,885	.3333	11,657
North Carolina	14,615	13.01	7,306	.3333	21,921
Oklahoma	5,998	11.38	3,496	.3682	9,494
South Carolina	8,727	13.51	4,363	.3333	13,090
Tennessee	10,144	11.99	5,071	.3333	15,215
Texas	19,842	9.79	13,846	.4110	33,688
Virginia	9,275	10.92	6,018	.3935	15,293
West Virginia	6,699	12.64	3,349	.3333	10,048
District of Columbia	1,333	9.01	1,333	.5000	2,666
West:					
Arizona	2,524	10.79	1,692	.4013	4,216
California	14,180	5.58	28,364	.6667	42,544
Colorado	3,009	9.04	2,989	.4983	5,998
Idaho	1,801	11.54	1,009	.3590	2,810
Montana	1,405	9.56	1,242	.4692	2,647
Nevada	203	4.72	406	.6667	609
New Mexico	2,643	12.35	1,321	.3333	3,964
Oregon	3,099	8.63	3,368	.5208	6,467
Utah	2,317	11.59	1,287	.3571	3,604
Washington	4,298	7.77	5,663	.5685	9,961
Wyoming	674	9.36	622	.4801	1,296
Outlying parts of the United States:					
Alaska	487	13.51	487	.5000	974
Guam	189	13.51	94	.3333	283
Puerto Rico	10,551	13.51	5,275	.3333	15,826
Territory of Hawaii	1,171	9.01	1,171	.5000	2,342
Virgin Islands	121	13.51	60	.3333	181

[1] In the 1st year of the program, the matching requirement may be met by State or local funds; thereafter State matching is required.

[2] Includes the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Virgin Islands.

PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES FROM LAST YEAR'S PROPOSALS

The newly proposed program is designed to accomplish in 4 years what last year's proposal was intended to do in 5 years. For this reason, it is proposed that the limitation on the annual appropriation for Federal grants to States for school construction be increased from $250 million to $325 million.

The general increase in the spread between the interest rates on municipal bonds and the interest rate on long-term Federal obligations which has occurred since the submission of last year's proposal has made it necessary to make certain changes in the provisions governing the Federal purchase of local-school bonds. These changes provide for a more equitable allocation among the States and communities of the funds authorized for this purpose and bring the operation of this proposal more in line with current bond-market conditions.

The limit on the amount of school bonds that could be purchased in any fiscal year in a State is determined by allocations to the States, on the basis of relative school-age population rather than by the 15-percent maximum limitation for any one State, as in last year's proposal. The spread between the long-term Federal interest rate and the interest rate at which such bonds would be purchased has been increased from three-eighths of 1 percent to one-half of 1 percent.

The appropriation ceiling on initial Federal advances to basic reserve funds, in support of obligations of State school-financing agencies, is fixed at $150 million in order to express in more definite terms the maximum Federal appropriations which can be made for such advances. This approximate ceiling was implicit in last year's proposal which limited to $6 billion the face amount of bonds that would be supported. Audit by the General Accounting Office of transactions of the Commissioner of Education in support of obligations of State school-financing agencies has been expressly authorized, and the authorization in last year's proposal for national banks to purchase the obligations of such agencies has been omitted.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill, and a detailed analysis of its provisions prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be published in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 889) to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 2. (a) It is the purpose of this act to authorize a 4-year program to assist States and communities to overcome the shortage of public school facilities, through—

(1) Federal grants to the States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, financially unable to do so, to finance urgently needed school facilities;

(2) purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance the construction of needed school facilities where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest;

(3) advances of funds by the Federal Government to reserves established by the States (and to which the States also make advances of funds) to help assure payment of obligations issued by State school-financing agencies to finance the construction of school facilities so that local educational agencies may obtain needed school facilities upon payment of current rent or the equivalent and without capital outlay; and

(4) Federal grants to the States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction.

Assurance against Federal interference in schools

SEC. 3. In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

TITLE I.—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS NEEDING AID TO FINANCE URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 101. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed $325 million in any fiscal year, as the Congress may determine, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title.

Allotments to States

SEC. 102. (a) (1) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the school-age population, and effort for school purposes, of the respective States. Subject to the provisions of section 103, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for such year as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) A State's allotment pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available for reservations of funds pursuant to section 105 (b) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

(b) For the purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that (A) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (B) the allotment ratio for Hawaii and the District of Columbia shall be .50, and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for purposes of this title.

(3) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive.

(4) The term "continental United States" does not include Alaska or the District of Columbia.

(5) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age (in the State and continental United States, respectively).

Maintenance of State and local support for school financing

SEC. 103. (a) The allotment of any State under section 102 for any year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year. The total of such reductions shall be reallotted among the remaining States by proportionately increasing their allotments under section 102 for such year.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) The "State school effort index" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the State's school expenditures per public school child by (B) the income per child of school age for the State; except that the State school effort index shall be deemed to be equal to the national school effort index in the case of (i) Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia, and (ii) any State for which the school expenditures per public school child are not less than the school expenditures per public school child for the continental United States.

(2) The "national school effort index" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the school expenditures per public school child for the continental United States, by (B) the income per child of school age for the continental United States.

(c) (1) The school expenditures per public school child for any State for purposes of determining its State school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof for elementary and secondary education made from current revenue receipts derived from State and local sources in the State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data for the several States are available to him, by (B) the number of children in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools in such State, as determined by the Commissioner for such most recent school year.

(2) The school expenditures per public school child for the continental United States for purposes of determining the national school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by the States and subdivisions thereof for elementary and secondary education made from current revenue receipts derived from State and local sources in the continental United States, as determined by the Commissioner for the same school year as is used under paragraph (1), by (B) the number of children in average daily attendance for such year in public elementary and secondary schools in the continental United States, determined as provided in paragraph (1).

(3) The income per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States shall, for purposes of subsection (b), be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the incomes per child of school age for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

State plans

SEC. 104. The Commissioner shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(b) sets forth standards and procedures for determining eligibility of local educational agencies for payments under the plan and the amounts thereof, the need for the facilities to be constructed, and the order of priority for projects under the plan, which standards and procedures will assure (1) that the highest priority will be given to local educational agencies, which, upon making an effort relatively commensurate with their economic resources, are unable, solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of the school facilities needed to relieve or prevent overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful or hazardous conditions, and (2) that in other respects the order of priority will be based on relative need for financial aid in the construction of such school facilities and the relative urgency of the need for such facilities;

(c) describes the steps taken toward making full and efficient use of school facilities and State and local financial resources, including the steps taken toward—

(1) providing qualified personnel to counsel and guide local school agencies in formulating sound long-range school-construction programs for meeting their school facility needs;

(2) achieving economy in the planning, construction, and financing of school facilities;

(3) developing a long-range plan for attaining a more efficient organization of school districts in the State;

(4) modifying or removing restrictive debt and tax limits and other obstacles to the financing of construction of urgently needed school facilities from local tax sources;

(5) developing plans for aiding school districts, in need of such aid, to finance the construction of needed school facilities, through extension of grants, loans, State credit, or otherwise;

(d) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

(e) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and constructing school facilities;

(f) provides that no school facilities will be constructed with the aid of any payments under this title unless consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies and in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards;

(g) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title; and

(h) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title.

In the case of any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the foregoing provisions of this section to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Reservations of funds and payments

SEC. 105. (a) In the case of each project for the construction of school facilities for a local educational agency with respect to which the State educational agency requests any funds under this title, the State educational agency shall include in its request—

(1) a description of the school facilities project with respect to which the request is made;

(2) its estimate of the cost of construction of such project and a statement of the amount of the Federal-State grant proposed to be made by the State educational agency with respect thereto under the plan;

(3) a certification that—

(A) it has determined, in accordance with the standards and procedures in the State plan approved under section 104, that the local educational agency is eligible for payments under the State plan and the project is entitled to priority over other projects within the State;

(B) State funs to cover the State share of such Federal-State grant will be available.

(b) Except as provided in section 106, the Commissioner shall issue, to each State educational agency furnishing a statement in accordance with subsection (a), a commitment reserving, out of the State's allotment, for each project included in the statement, the amount requested by the State educational agency for that project. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State educational agency and receipt of an amended statement from such agency, but only to the extent the change is not inconsistent with other provisions of this title. Upon certification by the State educational agency that the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of the project has been arranged, the Commissioner shall pay the amount reserved to the State educational agency in such installments as he may determine. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was reserved.

(c) In lieu of certification by a State educational agency pursuant to subparagraph (B) of subsection (a) (3) with respect to a project, the Commissioner may accept certification by such agency that an amount equivalent to the State share of the payment with respect to such project has been arranged through provision for State payments toward the debt service on the loan (if any) to help finance part of the construction of such project, provision for waiver of payments due the State or any agency thereof with respect to such project, or other provision which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, is (or is estimated to be) equivalent to such State share.

(d) If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner, the State to which such payments were made shall repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

Matching by States

SEC. 106. (a) The Commissioner may issue or modify a commitment under section 105 with respect to any project only if the amount to be reserved under the commitment, plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this title to the same State educational agency, does not exceed the Federal share for such State of the sum of (1) the Federal-State grant toward the cost of constructing such project and (2) the total of the Federal-State grants toward the cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued. Until actual construction costs are available, cost determinations under this section shall be made on the basis of the estimates furnished under section 105 (a) and revised estimates furnished in compliance with section 104 (h).

(b) For purposes of this title—

(1) The "Federal share" for any State is the allotment ratio for such State, except that (A) in no case shall it be less than 0.33⅓ or more than 0.66⅔, and (B) in the case of Alaska it shall be 0.50.

(2) The "Federal-State grant" for any project means the total of the Federal and State funds (including the equivalent thereof as provided in section 105 (c)) paid or to be paid under the State plan toward the cost of construction of such project.

(3) The "State share" of a Federal-State grant with respect to any project is the difference between such grant and the amount paid to the State with respect to such project under this title.

(c) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this title, the Commissioner may, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, issue or modify under section 105 a commitment of funds from a State's allotment for such year if the amount to be reserved under the commitment plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this title to the same State educational agency, does not exceed the Federal share for such State of the sum of (1) the cost of constructing such project and (2) the total cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued, and if the State educational agency certifies that the remainder of the cost of constructing the project in question will be paid from funds other than funds paid by the Commissioner under the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), as amended. The cost determinations under this paragraph shall be made on the same basis as is provided in subsection (a).

(d) In the case of any project to which subsection (c) is applicable—

(1) the amount of the Federal share and the amount of any other payments toward the cost of constructing such project shall be disregarded for purposes of determining under subsection (a) the amount of the commitment for any project which may be reserved during any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958;

(2) the statement required by section 105 (a) (2) shall be a statement of the amount of the reservation of funds requested with respect to such project instead of the amount of the "Federal-State grant";

(3) instead of the certification required under subparagraph (B) of section 105 (a) (3), the State shall certify that funds from State or local sources, or both, equal to the non-Federal share of the cost of construction will be available; and

(4) the requirement in section 104 (b) for standards and procedures assuring highest priority to certain local educational agencies shall be deemed met if such priority is assured subject to the matching requirements of this section.

Labor standards

SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not make any payments under this title to assist in financing the construction of any school-facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

TITLE II.—FEDERAL PURCHASE OF OBLIGATIONS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Authority to purchase; limitations

SEC. 201. (a) In order to assist, as provided in this title, local educational agencies to finance the construction of needed school facilities, the Commissioner may purchase obligations of such local educational agencies pursuant to applications therefor filed under section 203 during the period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1961.

(b) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the next 3 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $750 million, as may be necessary for the purchase of obligations as authorized by this title.

(2) the sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Commissioner to the States on the basis of the school-age population. The amount allocated to each State for a fiscal year shall bear the same ratio to the sums so appropriated for such year as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of all the States.

(3) The total of the obligations of local educational agencies in a State, purchased by the Commissioner pursuant to applications filed under section 203 during any fiscal year may not exceed the allocation to such State under this section for such year. The sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for any fiscal year shall, subject to the limitation in the preceding sentence, remain available for 90 days after the close of such year for purchases by the Commissioner pursuant to applications filed under section 203 during such year.

Terms of obligations

SEC. 202. (a) Obligations purchased under this title may be either general or special obligations of a local educational agency, shall be purchased at par or face value, shall include such provisions as may be agreed upon by the State educational agency and the Commissioner, shall be repaid within a period of 30 years or less, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the quarterly rate which the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify as applicable to the calendar quarter during which the application for purchase of such obligations is filed under section 203, plus one-half of 1 percent.

(b) The quarterly rate applicable to each calendar quarter shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month, and by adjusting such estimated average yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

Conditions to purchase of obligations

SEC. 203. Obligations of a local educational agency may be purchased under this title only upon application by the State educational agency to the Commissioner stating the amount of the obligations which the Commissioner is being requested to purchase and certifying that—

(a) such local educational agency is, as evidenced by a public offering of such obligations, unable to obtain the funds necessary to finance the cost of construction of the school facilities involved from other sources upon reasonable terms and at the interest rate applicable to obligations purchased under this title;

(b) there is an opinion by a qualified attorney, a copy of which shall be submitted with the application, that such obligations have been legally authorized and are binding on such local educational agency;

(c) the school facilities to be constructed with the proceeds from the sale of the obligations are needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments, are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and will be undertaken in compliance with applicable State construction laws and standards;

(d) such local educational agency is entitled to priority over other local educational agencies in the State with pending requests for purchase of their obligations under this title (with respect to which obligations the requirements of paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) are met);

and including such additional information as may be necessary to make a reasonable showing that the local educational agency issuing the obligations is financially able to pay them as they become due. The priority under paragraph (d) of a local educational agency in any State shall be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with standards and procedures, established by the State and approved by the Commissioner, which are designed to assure reasonable opportunity for local educational agencies to request purchase of their obligations under this title and which take into account (1) relative financial resources, (2) relative urgency of need for school facilities, determined according to conditions of overcrowding or lack of facilities, or use of unhealthful or hazardous facilities, and (3) relative difficulty in marketing their obligations at reasonable rates of interest. In the case of any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities, the provisions of paragraph (d) shall be inapplicable.

Disposal of payments

SEC. 204. Payments of principal and interest by local educational agencies on obligations purchased by the Commissioner under this title and the proceeds from the sale or exchange of any such obligations shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Administrative provisions

SEC. 205. (a) The Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) sell or exchange at public or private sale, upon such terms and at such prices as he may fix, any obligations purchased by him under this title; and

(2) subject to the specific limitations in this title and where necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States, consent to the modification of any term of any obligation purchased or otherwise acquired by him, or any agreement entered into by him, under this title.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE III.—FEDERAL CREDIT ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL-FINANCING AGENCIES

Authorization to enter into agreements

SEC. 301. The Commissioner is authorized, as provided in this title, to enter into agreements, on behalf of the United States, with State school-financing agencies for making advances to reserve funds established by such agencies to help assure payment of obligations issued to finance the construction of school facilities for use by local educational agencies.

Basic conditions to entering into agreements

SEC. 302. The Commissioner shall enter into an agreement with the State school-financing agency of any State only if—

(a) such agency is empowered to enter into an agreement with the Commissioner under this title and otherwise comply with the provisions of this title; and

(b) in States where the State school-financing agency is not the State educational agency, the governor of such State certifies to the Commissioner that methods for securing effective coordination between the two agencies have been provided.

Establishment of reserve funds

SEC. 303. (a) An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that the State school-financing agency shall establish and thereafter maintain a basic reserve fund and a supplemental reserve fund with respect to each issue of obligations, which funds, so long as any such obligations remain outstanding, shall be held in trust for and irrevocably pledged to the payment and retirement of such obligations and for payments as provided in section 308.

(b) Where so provided in the agreement at the request of the State school-financing agency, such basic reserve fund, or such fund and such supplemental reserve fund, may be established with respect to two or more issues of obligations; and in such case such issues shall, to the extent provided in the agreement, be regarded as a single issue of obligations.

State advances to basic reserve fund

SEC. 304. Such agreement shall provide for establishment of the basic reserve fund with respect to an issue of obligations on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof, and for deposit by the State therein, upon establishment of such fund, of an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on such obligations. The amounts so advanced, plus any amounts subsequently advanced by the State thereto, together with any interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "State account."

Federal advances to basic reserve fund

SEC. 305. (a) In the case of any State school-financing agency which has entered into an agreement as provided in this title with respect to an issue of obligations, the Commissioner shall advance to such State school-financing agency for deposit in the basic reserve fund for such issue an amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on such obligations. Such advance shall be made on or before the date of delivery of any such obligations to the purchasers thereof. The advance so made, plus subsequent advances by the Commissioner, together with interest thereon or increments thereof accrued, shall be known as the "Federal account."

(b) If any funds are withdrawn in any year (other than the year in which occurs the latest maturity date of the obligations) from the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to an agreement under this title, the Commissioner shall make an additional advance to such account in an amount equal to that withdrawn.

(c) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all advances contracted to be made to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund pursuant to this title.

(d) Advances by the Commissioner to the Federal account in a basic reserve fund, together with any other sums in such account, shall be invested, as provided in the agreement—

(1) in interest-bearing securities of the United States or securities guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States; or

(3) in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

Payment to supplemental reserve fund

SEC. 306. An agreement pursuant to this title shall provide for payment into the supplemental reserve fund established with respect to an issue of obligations of all sums collected for such purpose pursuant to section 309 (d) (2).

Use of supplemental and basic reserve funds

SEC. 307. The agreement pursuant to this title shall provide that if, after payment of the other expenses specified in section 309 (d) (3) with respect to any school facilities, the payments for the use of such facilities, and other funds available for the purpose for any year are insufficient to meet the annual debt service for such year on any issue of obligations—

(a) the State school-financing agency shall use the sums, if any, in the supplemental reserve fund established for such issue for meeting such debt service;

(b) if such sums are insufficient for this purpose, such agency shall use the sums available in the basic reserve fund established for such issue;

(c) withdrawals from the basic reserve fund for this purpose shall be equally divided between the State account and the Federal account in the fund, to the extent the balance in the State account is adequate therefor; and

(d) if such balance is not adequate, the amount of any remaining deficiency shall be withdrawn from the Federal account to the extent of any balance therein, except that the total of the withdrawals from such account with respect to such debt service may not exceed one-half of such debt service.

Repayments of advances

SEC. 308. (a) An agreement under this title with respect to any issue of obligations shall provide that if, at the end of any year, the aggregate of the sums in the basic and supplemental reserve funds, including interest or other increments from the investment thereof, exceeds two times the maximum annual debt service on such issue for any of the ensuing years, the State school-financing agency shall pay to the Commissioner, first (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, subsequent to the original advance made by him, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances, have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of such subsequent advances bears to the sum of such advances plus the sum of any payments made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund in addition to the original amount of such State account; and second (and until all advances made by the Commissioner, together with interest or other increment received from the investment of such advances, have been repaid), an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such excess as the sum of all advances made by the Commissioner bears to such sum plus the sum of all payments made to the State account.

(b) Whenever any portion of an excess is repaid to the Commissioner under subsection (a), the remainder, if any, of such excess shall be paid to the State or left in the basic or supplemental reserve, or shall be disposed of in such other manner as may be provided, at the request of the State school-financing agency, by or pursuant to the agreement.

(c) Amounts paid to the Commissioner under subsection (a) shall be used to redeem any outstanding obligations of the Commissioner issued pursuant to section 312 and any excess shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Additional conditions of agreement

SEC. 309. In addition to the foregoing provisions and such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States, each agreement entered into by the Commissioner with respect to any one or more issues of obligations of a State school-financing agency shall provide—

(a) that (1) all such obligations shall mature in not more than 32 years from the earliest date of any of such obligations and the first payment of principal shall become due not later than the end of the third year following such earliest date, and (2) the proceeds of the sale of such obligations shall be used to finance the cost (including interest prior to, during, and for such period not exceeding 1 year after completion of construction as may be provided in the agreement, and other necessary carrying charges) of construction of school facilities by the State school-financing agency, the local educational agencies, or otherwise, for use by local educational agencies requesting such facilities;

(b) that such school facilities shall be limited to those certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or reasonably anticipated enrollments and to be consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies, and that construction thereof will be in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards;

(c) that such school facilities, upon completion of construction, shall (1) be made available for use by the local educational agency for the school district in which the school facilities are located, (2) if the State so desires, be conveyed to such local educational agency upon the making of adequate provision for repayment of advances made by the Commissioner with respect to the issue of obligations and for retirement of such issue or an agreed upon portion thereof, as provided in the agreement; and

(d) That the payments for the use of such facilities shall be fixed, charged, and collected in amounts which will in the aggregate, together with other sums available for the purpose, provide sufficient funds to pay, to the extent payment is not otherwise provided for, (1) the annual debt service on the issue of obligations, and (2) in each year until the latest maturity date of such issue of obligations, for deposit in the supplemental reserve fund, an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 percent of the original principal amount of such issue of obligations, and (3) the cost of the maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance of such facilities, and administrative and other expenses of the State school-financing agency in connection with such facilities or the financing thereof.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 310. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the next 3 fiscal years, such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $150 million, as may be necessary to provide the initial Federal advances authorized by this title to be made to basic reserve funds.

Period during which obligations issued

SEC. 311. Federal advances may be made pursuant to this title only with respect to obligations issued in the period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1961.

Obligations issued by Commissioner

SEC. 312. To obtain funds for additional advances under section 305 (b), the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The total amount of such obligations issued in any year may not exceed the aggregate amount needed for such additional advances for such year.

(b) Obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having comparable maturities. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities isued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations hereunder. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made by State school-financing agencies hereunder, for payments on obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

Administrative provisions

SEC. 313. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to other powers conferred by this act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements made under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title; except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under this act.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

Suits against the United States

SEC. 314. Any State school-financing agency with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title, or any holder of obligations with respect to which a reserve fund has been established under this title, may bring suit against the United States to enforce any duty of the Commissioner under this title or any undertaking of the Commissioner under an agreement under this title. In any action arising under this title to which the United States is a party, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amounts involved. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff, or any of the plaintiffs if there are more than one, resides, or has his principal place of business or, if he does not have his principal place of business within any such judicial district, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

Tax exempt status of obligations

SEC. 315. Obligations of any State school-financing agency, including interest thereon, with respect to which advances are made pursuant to this title, and income of such agency in connection with the school facilities financed by such obligations, shall be exempt from all taxes (other than estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

TITLE IV.—FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, $7 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, $5 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and $3 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, for grants to States to assist them in meeting their administrative expenses in the development and initiation of State programs designed to increase public-school construction and promote efficiency in such construction.

Allotments and payments

SEC. 402. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 401, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of all of the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $25,000 (or, in the case of Guam or the Virgin Islands, which is less than $12,500) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to such State 50 percent of the State's administrative expenses in the development of any State program for increasing construction of school facilities or promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law, including the development and initiation of programs such as those to—

(1) provide sufficient qualified personnel to counsel and assist local educational agencies in formulating sound long-range construction programs, and extend State technical assistance to the local educational agencies in the planning and financing of construction of school facilities;

(2) extend State financial aid to local educational agencies, through loans, grants, or otherwise, in the construction of school facilities;

(3) adjust or modify unduly restrictive debt or tax limits or other obstacles to adequate and economical financing of construction of school facilities, including the basing of debt or tax limits on the full value of real property; or

(4) achieve a more efficient organization of school districts in the State.

(c) No payment may be made under this title with respect to any program unless the State plan approved under section 403 includes such program or has been modified to include it and unless the State educational agency certifies that it is a new program for the State (which, for the purposes of this title, includes an addition to an existing program of the State). In the case of any program of the State (or any addition to a program) initiated after December 31, 1956, the continuation thereof shall be considered a new program for purposes of the preceding sentence if submitted under this title by the State prior to July 1, 1958.

(d) Payments under this section with respect to any program may be made during a period of not to exceed 3 years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such program from an allotment under this section, but only if such program has been submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1959.

Approval of State plans

SEC. 403. The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this title if such plan—

(a) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for carrying out programs under the plan, either directly or through arrangements with other agencies of the State;

(b) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of programs under the plan;

(c) provides for the making of such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title; and

(d) sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so.

Method of making and computing payments

SEC. 404. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to section 402 shall be as follows:

(a) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such section for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Commissioner may find necessary.

(b) The Commissioner shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such section was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such section. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

(c) Any funds paid to a State under this title which are not used for the purposes for which paid shall be returned to the Commissioner for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE V.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 501. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands and, for purposes of title I only, the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the officer or agency primarily responsible for State construction or supervision of construction of such schools, whichever may be designated by the governor or by State law.

(d) The term "State school-financing agency" means the single agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality of a State, which is authorized to construct, or finance the construction of, school facilities for use by local educational agencies in the State.

(e) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; except that, in any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities, it means such State agency. If a separate public authority, other than a State school-financing agency, has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(f) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(g) The term "debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations.

(h) The term "annual debt service" means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest on and principal of each issue of obligations becoming due in each successive 12-month period designated in accordance with the agreement under title III.

(i) The term "school facilities" includes classrooms and related facilities for public elementary and secondary education; initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public. For purposes of title I, such term does not include interests in land, or off-site improvements.

(j) The terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

Withholding of funds and judicial review

SEC. 502. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under section 104 or 403, as the case may be, has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of such section; or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement:

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 102 or 402, as the case may be (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects or programs under the State plan affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under such section (or shall limit payments to projects or programs under the State plan in which there is no such failure). The foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount reserved under section 105 (b) with respect to any school facilities project not affected by such failure, except that, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 105 (b) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

(b) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (a) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the

circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States.

(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

Utilization of other agencies

SEC. 503. In administering the provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution concerned.

Delegation of Commissioner's functions

SEC. 504. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

Appropriation for administration

SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for administration of this act.

The analysis, presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, is as follows:

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

A. BRIEF SUMMARY

The bill, in addition to a section containing the declaration of purpose, has four substantive titles (there is a fifth title with definitions and miscellaneous provisions). All are a part of a 4-year program designed to assist the States and local communities to overcome the shortage of public-school facilities.

Title I authorizes grants to States to assist them in helping local educational agencies to finance construction of urgently needed school facilities, with highest priority being given to local agencies which need such help after making a financial effort commensurate with their resources.

Title II authorizes Federal purchase of obligations of local educational agencies issued to finance the construction of needed school facilities where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest.

Title III authorizes Federal advances of funds to reserves established by States (and to which the States also make advances of funds) to assure payment of obligations issued by State school-financing agencies to finance the construction of school facilities for the use of and eventual ownership by local educational agencies.

Title IV authorizes grants to States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing State programs to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction and of initiating such programs when authorized by law.

The bill would be administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education.

Federal interference, in the administration of the bill, with the personnel, curriculum, or program of any school would be prohibited.

B. DETAILED ANALYSIS

Title I—Federal grant assistance to States for school districts needing aid to finance urgently needed school facilities

Appropriation

Annual appropriations of $325 million for the fiscal year 1958 and each of the next 3 years would be authorized for grants to States to cover the Federal share of payments by the States to local educational agencies in need of assistance to construct urgently needed school facilities.

Allotments

Allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year under this title would be made on the basis of three factors—the relative State income per child of school age, the relative number of such children, and the relative State effort for school purposes. Subject to adjustment on account of the State's school effort index, each State's allotment for the year would be equal to an amount bearing the same ratio to the appropriation for that year as the product of (1) the State's school-age population, multiplied by (2) the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

A State's allotment ratio would depend on the income per child of school age for the State as compared with the income per child of school age for the United States, with the ratio for the State at the national average being 0.50 and the ratios for the other States varying inversely with their relative incomes per child of school age between a minimum of 0.25 and a maximum of 0.75.

The income per child of school age for any State would be the total personal income for the State divided by the number of school age children in the State. The income per child of school age for the continental United States would be similarly computed.

The allotment ratios will be promulgated as soon as possible after enactment of the bill. They will be based on data averaged for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

State School Effort Index

Allotments determined as provided above would be reduced by the percentage (if any) that the State's school effort index was less than the national index; and the total of the reductions would be added to the allotments of the States not so reduced, in proportion to their original allotments for the year, determined as provided above.

A State's school effort index would be determined on the basis of the ratio of school expenditures per child in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools to the State's income per child of school age. The national index would be based on these figures for the continental United States (which excludes Alaska and the District of Columbia).

The State and national indexes would be deemed equal for Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia and for any State whose expenditures per child in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools were not less than those for the continental United States.

The school expenditures referred to above would include expenditures by States and subdivisions for elementary and secondary education made from current revenue receipts derived from State and local sources. These would be determined by the Commissioner of Education for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data from the States are available to him. The number of children in average daily attendance would be similarly determined.

The income per child of school age for the States and the continental United States (mentioned above) would be determined on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

State Plans

State plans would be approved under this title if they—

(1) provide for administration by the State educational agency;

(2) set forth standards and procedures, relating to eligibility for aid, amount of aid, need for school facilities, and order of priority for projects, which assure highest priority for local educational agencies unable, after making a financial effort commensurate with their resources, to finance school facilities needed to relieve or prevent overcrowding, double shifts, or unhealthful, or hazardous conditions, and which also assure an order of priority based on relative need for financial aid in constructing such facilities and relative urgency of the need for such facilities;

(3) describe the steps taken toward making full and efficient use of school facilities and of State and local financial resources;

(4) provide for establishment of State standards for school facilities' planning and construction;

(5) restrict aid to facilities which are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans or policies and are in accord with applicable State construction laws and standards.

The State plans would also have to provide for a hearing for unsuccessful project applicants, for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures, and for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Any of the above requirements for approval of State plans could be modified or made inapplicable to the extent appropriate in the case of any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities.

Payments From Allotments

For each school-facilities project for which the State educational agency requests Federal funds, it would have to include in its request a certification by it that (1) the local educational agency is eligible for the proposed payment (of Federal and State funds) and entitled to priority over other projects under the standards and procedures in the State plan (relating to eligibility, amount of payments, need for facilities, and order of priority), and (2) State funds to cover the State share of the proposed payment to the local agency are available.

Subject to the provisions on matching describe below, the Commissioner would reserve, from the State's allotment, the amount requested and would pay that amount, in appropriate installments, to the local educational agency upon certification by the State educational agency that the rest of the financing of the cost of constructing the facilities had been arranged.

Matching From State Funds

The Federal share of the Federal-State grant toward the cost of construction of projects in a State will be determined on a cumulative basis. Under the bill, the reservation of funds for a project after the first year (see below for discussion of special provisions applicable to the first year) plus the amounts reserved for earlier projects after the first year could not exceed the Federal share for such State of the sum of the following—

(1) the combined Federal-State grant toward the cost of construction of the project in question, plus

(2) the total of these combined grants for the earlier projects.

As indicated above, the "Federal share" for projects in the State after the first year will be a proportion of the "Federal-State grant" of funds toward a project. In short, the amount of Federal funds which may be reserved and paid toward the cost of construction of projects in a State would depend on the amount of State funds paid toward the cost of that construction. The total cost of construction in the case of any project would not affect the Federal share, although, of course, no Federal funds would be paid unless there is assurance of sufficient local funds to meet the balance of the cost not met from the State and Federal funds.

The "State share" of the combined "Federal-State grant" could be provided in several ways. It would ordinarily be provided through payment of funds to the local educational agency to help meet the cost of construction of the project. However, if the State did not wish to provide its share in this manner, the Commissioner could accept, as an alternative, certification by the State educational agency that it had provided its share through arranging for payments toward the debt service on a loan secured to finance part of the cost of construction, through waiver of payments due the State on account of the project, or through any other provision which the Commissioner judged to be equivalent to the State share.

The Federal share for any State would be the same as the allotment ratio (described above under "Allotments") for the State, except that there would be a maximum of 0.66⅔ and a minimum of 0.33⅓ (instead of the 0.75 and 0.25, respectively, applicable to the allotment ratios), and Alaska's Federal share would be 0.50 instead of its allotment ratio of 0.75.

Special Provision on Matching in First Year

The provisions for determining the Federal share for a project during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, would differ in several respects from those applicable to subsequent years. In the case of projects for which Federal funds are reserved during this first year, the Federal share would not be related solely to the amount of State funds to be paid toward the cost of projects. It would, instead, be related to the total cost of such projects, with the balance or non-Federal share of the cost being comprised, as the State might determine, of State or local funds, or a combination of both. As is true in the case of projects for which Federal funds are reserved in future years, the matching provisions applicable to the first year would be applied cumulatively, with the amount of funds reserved for a project being limited to an amount which, when added to the Federal funds previously reserved for projects in the State during the year, does not exceed the Federal share of the cost of construction of the project in question and the earlier projects. In addition, during this first year, no Federal funds could be reserved or paid for a project under the bill if Federal funds are or will be paid toward the cost of such project under Public Law 815, 81st Congress (relating to financial aid for school construction in federally affected areas).

Abandonment of Facilities

The Federal share (or lesser amount determined to be reasonable by agreement or Federal district court suit) would have to be repaid to the United States if the construction of facilities with respect to which the Federal funds were paid is abandoned or not completed within a reasonable time.

Labor Standards

The Commissioner would not be able to extend any assistance under this title for financing the construction of school facilities except upon assurance that labor standards, relating to payment of prevailing wages and overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours per week or 8 hours per day, would be observed in such construction.

Title II.—Federal purchase of obligations of school districts with marginal credit

Eligibility

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to purchase obligations issued by a local educational agency to finance the cost of constructing school facilities upon certification by the State educational agency that the local agency is unable, as evidenced by a public offering of its obligations for the purpose, to obtain financing from other sources at rates on terms comparable to those applicable to obligations purchased under this title.

Such purchase by the Commissioner would also be conditioned on certification by the State educational agency that—

(1) the facilities to be constructed with the proceeds of the obligations are needed to meet current or future enrollments and are consistent with any applicable State redistricting plans and policies and will be constructed in accordance with State construction laws and standards; and

(2) under the opinion of a qualified attorney (a copy of which must be submitted), the bonds are legally issued and binding; and

(3) the local educational agency is entitled to priority over others with pending requests for purchase of their obligations by the Commissioner.

The requests of the other local educational agencies would be considered to be pending only if the above requirements, relating to inability to obtain financing for the facilities from other sources, need for the facilities and their consistency with State redistricting plans and policies and with State construction laws and standards, and legality of the obligations involved in the requests, were met.

The above priority of a local educational agency over other agencies in the State would have to be determined by the State educational agency under standards, established by the State and approved by the Commissioner, which are designed to assure reasonable opportunity for local educational agencies to request purchase of their obligations and which take into account relative financial resources, relative urgency of the need for facilities, and relative difficulty of marketing the obligations at reasonable rates of interest. In a State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for financing construction of public elementary and secondary schools, the above provisions on priority would, for obvious reasons, not be applicable.

The State educational agency could also be required to submit additional information to show the financial ability of the local educational agency, whose obligations the Commissioner was being requested to purchase, to pay its obligations as they become due.

Appropriations

Appropriations aggregating $750 million would be authorized for the 4 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1961.

Obligations of local educational agencies in a State could be purchased under this title pursuant to applications therefor filed with the Commissioner by the State educational agency during this 4-year period.

Purchases in Single State Limited

The total of the obligations of local educational agencies in any one State which the Commissioner could purchase would be limited through use of an allocation formula based on school-age population. The allocation for a State for any year would bear the same ratio to the appropriations for that year as the school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of the United States. The Commissioner could, until 90 days after the close of a fiscal year, purchase obligations of local educational agencies in the State for which application had been filed during that year; but the total of the obligations so purchased could not exceed the amount of the State's allocation for that year.

Interest and Other Attributes of Obligations

The obligations purchased under this title could be any general or special obligations of the local educational agency. They would have to be purchased at par or face value, be repaid within 30 years or less, include such provisions as the Commissioner and the State educational agency agree upon, and bear interest at the quarterly rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (on the basis of the rate for United States obligations with a maturity date of 15 or more years) to be applicable to the calendar quarter during which the obligations are purchased, plus one-half of 1 percent.

Administrative Provisions

The Commissioner would be authorized to sell or exchange the obligations purchased and agree to modifications in the obligations to protect the financial interest of the United States. His financial transactions under the title, while subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, would be conclusive on all other Government officials.

Title III.—Federal credit assistance to States school-financing agencies

Agreements With State School-Financing Agencies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into agreements with State school-financing agencies for making advances to reserve funds established to help assure payment of obligations issued by such agencies to finance the construction of schools for use by local school districts. This State agency could be a State school-building agency or any other single State agency, official, governmental entity, or instrumentality empowered to construct, or finance the construction of, school facilities for use by local educational agencies.

The agreement could be made with respect to any one or more issues of obligations and could be amended from time to time, as agreed upon by the State school-financing agency and the Commissioner.

Where the State school-financing agency is not the same as the State educational agency, the agreement would be conditioned upon certification by the Governor that methods of securing effective coordination between the two agencies had been provided.

Basic Reserve Fund

An amount equal to one-half of the maximum annual debt service on any issue of obligations under the agreement would be advanced by the State. A like amount would be advanced by the Federal Government. The amount advanced by the State would be known as the State account and that advanced by the Federal Government would be known as the Federal account. These two advances, plus interest and increments, would constitute the basic reserve fund.

Supplemental Reserve Fund

There would also be a supplemental reserve fund for each issue of obligations, consisting of amounts deposited in such fund by the State school-financing agency out of payments collected from the local educational agencies for which it provided school facilities. As indicated below, the payments, in the aggregate, should be sufficient to cover, among other items, a deposit in this reserve of one-quarter of 1 per-

cent of the original principal amount of any issue of obligations.

Combination of Issues

At the option of the State school-financing agency, a single basic reserve, or a single basic reserve and a single supplemental reserve, could be established for any two or more issues of obligations of the State agency. In case of such a combination of issues, the agreement would provide the extent to which the issues combined would be treated as a single issue.

Conditions of Agreements

Under an agreement, all obligations in any issue for which a basic reserve fund is established would be required to mature in not more than 32 years from their earliest date, and the initial payment of principal would have to be due within 3 years from such date. The proceeds from the sale of the obligations could be available only for construction of school facilities for use by local educational agencies requesting them.

The agreement would have to provide that the school facilities constructed would be certified by the State educational agency to be needed for current or anticipated school enrollments, to be consistent with applicable State redistricting plans and policies, and to be in accord with State construction laws and standards.

The agreement would also have to provide for payments, by the local educational agencies using the facilities, which in the aggregate produced sufficient funds (together with other funds available) to pay, to the extent not otherwise provided for, the annual debt service, one-quarter of 1 percent of the original principal amount of the issue of obligations (for payment into the supplemental reserve fund), and the cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance of the facilities, as well as the administrative and other expenses of the State school-financing agency.

Additional Advances and Use of Reserve Funds

If the payments for the use of school facilities collected for any year by the State school-financing agency are insufficient to pay the costs and expenses specified above (in the preceding paragraph) and the annual debt service with respect to any issue of obligations, the State school-financing agency would draw on the supplemental reserve to pay the portion of the annual debt service not covered by the collections. After exhaustion of that reserve, the State and Federal accounts in the basic reserve fund would be equally available for payment of the annual debt service. If the State account were inadequate to bear its share of the unpaid annual debt service, the deficiency could be made up from the Federal account, to the extent of any balance therein. In the case of no year, however, could the Federal account be drawn upon for more than one-half of the annual debt service for that year.

After any withdrawals from the Federal account in the basic reserve fund for any year, the Commissioner would be obligated to restore the account to its original balance.

Borrowing Authority for Additional Federal Advances

The faith of the United States is pledged to the advances contracted by the Commissioner to be made under the title; and the Commissioner would be authorized to issue obligations to the extent necessary to make the additional advances. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to purchase such obligations. Obligations so issued would bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after considering the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with comparable maturities.

Repayments of Federal Advances

Whenever, at the end of any year, the total of the sums in a supplemental reserve and a basic reserve fund, including interest and accruals, is more than twice the maximum annual debt service in any ensuing year on the issue of obligations involved, the excess would be required to be applied to repayments of the advances made by the Federal Government under this title. Repayments would first be made to the extent of any additional advances made by the Commissioner after the original advances to the basic reserve funds. These repayments would be made from the excess in the proportion that such additional advances bore to any additional advances made by the State to the State account in the basic reserve fund, after its original advance to that account.

After the subsequent advances of the Federal Government had been repaid, any excess over twice the maximum annual debt service for any ensuing year would be used to repay the Federal Government's original advance to the basic reserve fund in the proportion that the total of all advances by the Federal Government under the title bore to the total of all advances made by the State to the State account for the purpose of establishing and maintaining that account.

Repayments to the Federal Government as above provided would be used to retire any obligations issued under the Commissioner's authority to borrow funds, and any excess would be deposited in the Federal Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Whenever repayments are made to the Federal Government from excess funds as described above, any remaining excess funds would be payable to the State, to be disposed of as the State school-financing agency might determine.

Appropriations—Duration of Program

Appropriations would be authorized for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the next 3 years to cover the amount of the initial Federal advances to basic reserve funds. Such appropriations could not, however, aggregate in excess of $150 million. These initial advances could be made only with respect to obligations issued during these 4 fiscal years. Obligations so issued, however, could (as indicated above) have maturities of up to 32 years after the earliest date of the obligations in the particular issue.

Administrative Provisions

The Commissioner would be authorized to waive and compromise claims. His financial transactions under the title, while subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, would be conclusive on all other governmental officials.

Investment of Funds in Federal Account

Funds in the Federal account of basic reserve funds would have to be invested in United States securities, or United States guaranteed securities, or obligations which are lawful investments for public funds of the United States. The distribution as between these various types of interest-bearing securities, and the maturities thereof, would be provided in the agreement.

Court Action

Suits would be authorized in the district courts of the United States, by the State school-financing agency or any bondholder, to enforce any undertaking of the United States under the title.

Exemption From Taxation

Obligations of State school-financing agencies covered by agreements made pursuant to this title, and the income of these agencies in connection with facilities, financed therefrom, would be exempt from all Federal taxation, except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

Title IV—Administrative expenses of State programs to increase school construction

Appropriation

Five million dollars for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, $7 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, $5 million for the next fiscal year, and $3 million for the next would be authorized to be appropriated under this title for grants to States to assist in meeting their administrative expenses in developing State programs designed to increase school construction, and in initiating such programs when authorized by law.

Allotments and Payments

The appropriation for any year under this title would be allotted among the States on the basis of school-age population but with a minimum allotment of $25,000 ($12,500 for Guam and the Virgin Islands). Each State allotment would be available for paying half the cost of the State administrative expenses in the development of State programs for increasing construction of school facilities and promoting greater efficiency in planning or financing the construction of such facilities, or in the initiation of any such program when authorized by law.

Programs Eligible

To be eligible for Federal support under this title, a program would have to be a new program, or an addition to an existing program, initiated after December 31, 1956, and submitted under this title prior to July 1, 1959 (prior to July 1, 1958, if initiated prior to enactment of the bill). The program would have to be included under a State plan approved by the Commissioner.

The types of programs, for the development or initiation of which grants under this title would be available, would include programs such as those providing personnel to aid school districts in formulating sound long-range construction programs and extending technical or financial aid in planning or financing school construction, and those to achieve more efficient school district organization or to adjust or modify unduly restrictive tax or debt limits.

State Plans

In addition to setting forth the programs to be carried out and the general policies for doing so, a State plan, to be approved by the Commissioner, would have to designate the State educational agency to carry out these programs, provide necessary accounting and fiscal methods, and provide for making necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Duration of Payments

Payments under this title could be made for only 3 years with respect to any one program.

Title V—General provisions

Definitions

This title defines a number of terms used in the bill. These terms are Commissioner, State, State educational agency, State school-financing agency, local educational agency, school-age population, debt service, annual debt service, school facilities, and construct, constructing, and construction.

Withholding of Funds and Judicial Review

Notice and hearing to the State educational agency would be required before grants to the State could be withheld under title I or IV for failure to comply with the required provisions of approved State plans under those titles. A State agency dissatisfied with such withholding action could obtain judicial review thereof in the Federal circuit court of appeals.

Miscellaneous

The title also authorizes utilization of other agencies in the administration of the bill and delegation of the Commissioner of Education's functions under the bill to personnel of the Office of Education.

SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET FOR LOW-COST HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a secondary mortgage market for low-cost housing. In offering this measure, I should like to briefly discuss some of the reasons why such a law is needed at this time.

It has become increasingly evident over the past year, through spiraling interest rates and the so-called tight money policy sanctioned and condoned by officials of this administration, that once again the average income citizen finds himself a victim of the old adage, the poor only get poorer while the rich get richer, or if you please, another example of the big fish eating the little fish.

Over the past year it has become almost impossible to secure money on the open market from private lending institutions for long-term financing of housing for the average income citizen.

Even what little money is available is offered at such tremendous discount rates that if accepted the borrower winds up with what amounts to astronomical interest rates. And mind you, Mr. President, this interest rate, fee, premium, or whatever other name one may want to call it, is extracted by the lending institutions by excessive discounting, servicing charges and the maximum interest rate allowed, of a fully insured mortgage by the United States Government. Yet even with all of that, the lending institutions are no longer interested in anything but short-term financing. And, believe it or not, the only solution this administration has offered so far is to allow the interest rate to be raised even higher.

We have just gone through a period of hearing how the Federal National Mortgage Association was pumping additional money into the housing market to remedy this situation. But every builder who has conferred with me has been of the opinion that the result obtained by this action was primarily to allow private lending institutions which were holding long-term housing mortgages to sell as many as possible to the Federal National Mortgage Association and use the money derived from such sale for purposes other than reinvesting in housing mortgages. So actually the result achieved was to take more money out of the housing market, rather than its intended purpose of pumping more money into it, as was announced to the public.

Now I read again where the one so-called bright prospect in the bleak housing mortgage picture was advanced by the president of the Federal National Mortgage Association in a speech before the home builders in convention at Chicago this month, in which he told the builders that an additional $1 billion in home mortgage funds will be made available for the calendar year 1957, providing such legislation is passed by Congress. But again, unless specific legislation is enacted regarding how this money can be used as I have requested in the provisions of the bill I have introduced, I can only see a repetition of what has already taken place as stated above. And may I remind you once again that neither by proposal nor suggestion have I heard any concern expressed by the administration regarding stabilization of interest rates; but, on the contrary, all proposals are to allow the interest rates to be increased.

Spiraling, unchecked interest rates that we face today, regardless of any and all theories advanced, is one of the most dangerous forms of inflation that could be allowed to continue. It is especially devastating to the large majority of our citizens in the average income group.

It is meaningless to use the yardstick of supply and demand as the cure-all for this situation.

I should like to ask how the average home buyer can compete with big business in this market of ever-increasing interest rates. Big business can afford to pay these high rates on short-term loans because of being allowed swift amortization, many different kinds of so-called Government "write-offs," and taxes, which in the end actually cost big business only a fraction and in some instances nothing at all, compared with what the average home buyer is now required to pay.

As to the need for housing, the latest figures available show that only a little more than half of our estimated 43 million families have been able to purchase their own homes. In other words, almost half of our people are without homes of their own today, and our population is increasing by leaps and bounds. I think everyone would agree that the overwhelming majority of those who have not been able to purchase their own homes would be in the group most affected by this bill. I am sure I need not recite the many ways our people and Nation would benefit by home ownership.

I agree wholeheartedly with the opinion expressed by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in that the Nation would be "courting disaster" if the volume of new housing units falls below the 1 million mark this year; but I further say that the most urgent needs for the majority of new housing are for those in the average and low-income brackets.

I should like further to point out that nine-tenths of the decline in housing last year was in these brackets.

Let us look briefly at a few reasons why our home-building industry is related to our national economy. Latest reports available give these statistics which I wish to impress upon the Senate today:

One out of every 10 nonfarm wage earner owes his or her livelihood to the building industry.

This industry consumes a third of America's 40 billion board-feet of lumber produced.

It uses 63 percent of our 5.9 billion clay bricks produced.

It uses 73 percent of our 700,000 tons of cast-iron soil pipe.

It uses a third of the 850,000 tons of wire nails and staples.

I could go on and on relating different allied industries that are directly affected by the building industry which are very vital to our national economy; however, suffice it to say that of the $44.3 billion spent last year on construction, $13.5 billion went for new housing units.

This is proof that not only from a humanitarian standpoint but from a practical business standpoint this vital industry to our national economy must not be allowed to be stifled by inflationary interest rates, excessive discounting of mortgages, and lack of long-term mortgage money, as is now the case.

I repeat that we cannot allow the needs of a large segment of our people to be trampled upon by money interests engaged in a cold and ruthless fight for ever higher and higher profits, with no regard for the Nation's real housing needs.

I am well aware of the different guises that opposition to this bill will take. Some powerful special interests will go so far as to call it socialistic, but I am also aware that much similarly branded legislation has stood the test of time and proved its need and worth, such as social security. But, at least this is for housing Americans and not some distant foreign people. Then there will be others who will cry out, "Keep Government out of business!" To those I would answer, the cause and reason for a bill of this nature are to be found in the fact that private capital has either been unwilling or unable to sustain this much needed part of our economy.

No one would rather see private capital do this job and fill this great vacuum of need that exists than I; nor would this bill in any way preclude private capital from doing the job. However, the record speaks for all to see.

Only this month when the question was asked at a meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America in Chicago: "Would tight money as we know it today pinch off the postwar housing programs?" This answer was given by the president of the association: "We will have to live with conditions as they are now, and as they are likely to be, for some time." In that answer I can find no hope that private capital will or could do the job so urgently needed at this time.

I, for one, do not propose that we sit idly by and allow this need to grow larger and larger because of spiraling interest rates, excessive discounting of Government mortgages, and lack of long-term mortgage money, so that private capital can make more and more money at the expense of the people who need help the most.

I think all of us would commend the Federal Housing Authority and Veterans' Administration programs that have enabled so many of our people to acquire homes who otherwise would not have been able to do so, and I, for one, believe their work has only begun. However, if the only solution as offered to this date for those departments to continue to function effectively is for the interest

rates to be increased so as to compete with private lending institutions, disregarding the added protection of a United States Government guaranty, then I agree again with Senator SPARKMAN in saying "It would appear to suggest that both the FHA and the VA housing programs have outlived their usefulness and are no longer needed."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 912) to enlarge the special assistance functions of the Federal National Mortgage Association to include the purchase and the making of commitments to purchase of insured or guaranteed mortgages securing loans not exceeding $14,000 in principal amount which bear interest at a rate not in excess of 4½ percent, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEDUCTION, FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES, OF CERTAIN POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President: I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices. Earlier in this session, on January 9, I introduced a bill, S. 426, to revise the Federal election laws. S. 426, if enacted, will do a great deal to elevate the status of politics as an honorable profession, but it will not correct all the evils which exist in the Federal elections system. What we need is to broaden the base of political participation in this country, and the bill which I am introducing today is designed to do this by encouraging greater financial participation by the ordinary citizen. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 920) to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $100 of political contributions made each year to candidates for elective Federal offices, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"(a) Allowance of deduction: In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made within the taxable year. A political contribution shall be allowable as a deduction only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Limitation: The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $100 for any taxable year.

"(c) Definition of political contribution: For purposes of this section, the term 'political contribution' means a contribution or gift to—

"(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"(2) a committee acting in behalf of one or more individuals described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual or individuals."

(b) The table of sections to part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"SEC. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATIVE TO WITHHOLDING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to recognize the public's right to information and to strengthen the free speech and press guarantees of the first amendment.

This bill proposes to amend section 22 of title 5 of the United States Code so that it will be clear that the authority given to the head of each Federal department to prescribe regulations for the custody, use and preservation of departmental records and papers does not include authority to withhold information from the public. Specifically, the bill would add the following language to section 22: "This section does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public."

The need for this amendment has been amply demonstrated during the past year in studies made by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I have the privilege of being chairman.

It has been shown that in recent years both the public and Congress have suffered time after time from arbitrary secrecy rulings by executive departments and agencies. In many cases, the section of the code now proposed to be amended has been cited by departments and agencies to justify withholding information to which the people clearly have been entitled and which has been necessary for the full protection and effective exercise of their constitutional rights.

This proposed legislation will not interfere with the proper classification of military secrets, nor will it jeopardize defense security in any way. Its effect will be to force the departments and agencies to rely on other statutory warrant, or Presidential directives of indisputable constitutionality, when they seek to keep information from either the public or Congress.

No longer should Federal officials be permitted to read authority to act as censors into what originally was intended to be merely a housekeeping statute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 921) to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

COMMISSION ON THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. The purpose of the Commission would be to study three recurrent questions relating to the Presidency and Vice Presidency: (1) the procedures to be followed in the event of the inability of a President to perform the powers and duties of his office; (2) the Electoral College method of selecting the President and Vice President; and (3) the role of the Vice President in the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared concerning the bill, the text of the bill itself, and three editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald dealing with these questions may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 924) to establish a Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that doubts have arisen with respect to certain aspects of the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. It is the purpose of this act to provide for a thorough study and investigation of the possibility of resolving those doubts by—

(1) providing procedures to be followed in the event of the disability of the President so that the powers and duties of the Office will devolve upon the Vice President;

(2) clarifying the role of the Vice President in the conduct of the Government; and

(3) providing for a method of electing the President and Vice President in a manner that will better meet the needs of the people

of the United States and the constitutional form of the Federal Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE PRESIDENCY AND THE VICE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: Members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and consider the constitutional and practical problems involved in the event of the disability of the President and the devolving of the powers and duties of the office of President upon the Vice President; shall study and consider the role of the Vice President in discharging the functions of the Government; shall study and investigate the present system of electing the President and Vice President; and in each instance shall make recommendations in accordance with the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary and shall submit a comprehensive final report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before

at which time the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Chairman of the Commission shall have charge of the final liquidation of the affairs of the Commission after , including the printing of reports, the payment of bills, the transfer of records and documents to the National Archives, and the disposition of furniture and other equipment of the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission shall designate such members of the staff of the Commission as he deems necessary for these purposes. Such liquidation shall be completed within a period of not to exceed 90 days after , and the funds of the Commission shall remain available for necessary expenses during such period.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

The statement and editorials presented by Mr. PAYNE are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREDERICK G. PAYNE

Today I am introducing a bill to establish a Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. This would be a high-level, nonpartisan, 12-member commission. Very frankly, the first and second Hoover Commissions served as the model for this proposal. Both Hoover Commissions, as my distinguished colleagues know, were created to study the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the recommendations of each met with a remarkably high degree of acceptance, by the general public and within the Federal Government itself. Although we still have a long way to go in implementing some of the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, I am confident that in due time appropriate action will be taken on the majority of the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency, proposed in the measure I am introducing, would be authorized to study three phases of the Presidency and Vice Presidency: (1) The procedures to be followed in the event of the inability of a President to perform the powers and duties of his office; (2) the electoral college method of selecting the President and Vice President; and (3) the function of the Vice President in the Federal Government. While these matters have all been considered in the past, none has been conclusively resolved. The Commission would be required to submit a comprehensive report of its studies and make appropriate recommendations for legislation, constitutional amendments, or administrative action. It is expected that the Commission would follow the procedures used by the Hoover Commissions in setting up task forces and seeking expert advice on each subject.

The Constitution of the United States provides for the Office of President and the Office of Vice President in deliberately flexible terms. Flexibility is one of the most outstanding characteristics of our American Constitution; and it is only because of this flexibility, which enables the Constitution to meet the changing circumstances of the Nation, that the Constitution is as great a document today as it was when it was ratified 168 years ago. In order to provide flexibility the Constitution was phrased in terms which for the most part carefully avoid detail and which in some instances were consciously vague. The Constitution has been molded into a working instrument through supplementation by statutes, Supreme Court decisions, Executive orders, and in some instances by custom and usage.

Yet there are today a few portions of the Constitution that remain as vague as the day they were written and on which no effective action of clarification has ever been completed. In particular, I am referring to the section of the Constitution which provides that in the event of the disability of the President the powers and duties of his office shall devolve upon the Vice President. Article II, section 1, clause 6 of the Constitution reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Throughout the history of the United States sporadic attention has been given to the question of what happens when the President is unable to perform the duties of his office. The question was first raised at

the Constitutional Convention in 1787 but was given little attention and no conclusions were reached. Thereafter the latter lay dormant until the assassination of President James Garfield in 1881. During the period while President Garfield lay mortally wounded, considerable discussion took place as to whether the Vice President should exercise the duties of the Presidency; but it was finally decided, apparently contrary to fact, that President Garfield was not constitutionally unable to discharge the duties of the office.

President Garfield's death brought an end to the urgency for resolution of this problem, and the matter was again dormant until President Woodrow Wilson's illness in 1920. Although Congress then gave this question some consideration, it took no final action; and in retrospect it appears that the White House itself had determined that President Wilson was not constitutionally disabled.

After President Wilson's retirement the matter again receded from public attention and congressional awareness, and interest was not revived until a year ago when President Eisenhower suffered a heart attack. Fortunately President Eisenhower's illness did not prevent him from carrying on the duties of his office, but it did serve to focus attention once again on the need for establishing definite procedures to be followed in the event of presidential disability.

Today it is patently obvious that executive leadership of the United States must be a continuing thing and that we cannot afford to have any lapse. Any such lapse could well be disastrous not only to the United States but to the entire free world. The 2d session of the 84th Congress devoted some attention to the question of the procedures to be followed in the event of the incapacitation of a President. Several bills and constitutional amendments on this subject were introduced in the House of Representatives, and I introduced a bill (S. 2763) in the Senate. A study was undertaken and hearings were held by a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Representative EMANUEL CELLER of New York. Although the subcommittee did an excellent job of developing information on this question, no substantive action was taken to resolve the problem.

As I outlined, the entire history of the question of disability of the President has been one which has received limited consideration during a time of potential presidential disability and then complete lack of attention until the next time the situation arises. Yet, I believe it is safe to say that this problem is generally accepted as one of a very serious nature and one of great urgency. President Eisenhower at a press conference in January 1956 firmly expressed his belief that steps should be taken now to clarify the procedures to be followed in the event of presidential inability and properly placed the responsibility for taking such action on the Congress. The President made the following statement:

"Well when you are as closely confined to your bed as I was for some time, you think about lots of things, and this was one of the foremost in my mind.

"I do believe that there should be some agreement on the exact meaning of the Constitution, who has the authority to act.

"The Constitution seems to be clear the Congress cannot only make the laws of succession, but it can determine what is to be done, and it says 'In the case of so-and-so and so-and-so,' but it does not say who is to determine the disability of the President. And we could well imagine a case where the President would be unable to determine his own disability.

"I think it is a subject that, in its broadest aspects, every phase of it should be carefully studied by the Congress, advised with the Attorney General, and any kind of advice they want from the executive department, and some kind of a resolution of doubt reached. I think it would be good for the country."

With regard to the second aspect of the Presidency and Vice Presidency to be studied by the Commission—the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President—the Constitution is neither vague nor flexible. It is, indeed, very clear and specific, and this in itself is a striking example of the durability of the Constitution as a whole for there is today a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the electoral college, and if the entire Constitution had been drafted in an equally specific form it would probably have been replaced in toto long before this. In passing it should be noted that the original electoral college provision was modified to some extent by the 12th amendment.

The present system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States has operated with a considerable degree of success for more than 160 years. It has not, however, worked in the way envisaged by the Founding Fathers when they devised the elaborate system of an electoral college which, as it has evolved over the years, has resulted in the so-called winner-take-all method of bloc voting by the electors in a State. At the time of the Constitutional Convention, it was widely believed that a variety of favorite son candidates would necessitate throwing the election into the House of Representatives—"10 times out of 20," as James Madison put it. History seemed destined to bear him out until after 1825, when the two-party system began to take firm root.

From that time on, with a few exceptions, presidential elections in the United States have been contests between two candidates, each representing a national political party. Thus, the very nature and certainly the intent of the electoral college has been strikingly modified by the growth of political parties which have, in effect, amended the electoral provisions of the Constitution.

But we still use the form of the electoral college—as cumbersome and unwieldy as it may be. And we still use the winner-take-all device, which at first glance hardly seems to be a democratic method of electing a President, who represents all of the American people. In recent years the Congress has devoted a good deal of attention to proposals to change the method of electing the President and Vice President, but in almost every case the cure has been found to have potential dangers worse than the disease. After hours of debate during several Congresses, no proposal has been able to command the two-thirds vote required for submission to the States for ratification.

The third question to be referred to the Commission would be that of the role of the Vice President in the conduct of the vast enterprise that makes up the present-day Government of the United States. Although this matter does not have as many of the historical aspects of controversy which surround the other two problems to be studied by the Commission, it has come to have practically equal importance. Moreover, it is a matter that is closely related to and to some extent stems from both the question of disability of a President and the electoral college system of election and is one to which increasing attention has been paid in recent years.

The office of Vice President is specifically created by the Constitution, and by definition of the term it would appear that the Vice President was the No. 2 executive of the Nation. Yet the Constitution imposes only one duty on the Vice President, that of presiding over the Senate. As a result, throughout much of our history there has been a tendency to regard the Vice President as only a titular position. It is at this point that the question of the role of the Vice President becomes intertwined with the problem of the method of election of the President and Vice President. Probably the most striking example of the traditional role of the Vice President is the story that is told about Teddy Roosevelt. During the nominating convention of 1900, Roosevelt was supposedly "kicked upstairs" to be McKinley's running mate by the party leaders, not so much on the basis of his competency for the job, but rather as an opportunity to get him out of the hair of the party leaders. Fortunately for the Nation Teddy Roosevelt was in fact a good candidate and became one of our great Presidents.

In the years since World War II the office of Vice President has become one of very real responsibility. This has been largely due to the character of the men who have filled the office and to the views of President Truman and President Eisenhower, both of whom believe that the Vice President should be a key figure in the Government. The Vice President is the man who succeeds to the Presidency in any of the situations enumerated in the Constitution, and, therefore, it would certainly seem that his office today should put him in a position of familiarity with the conduct of the Government so that he would be prepared to assume the duties of the Chief Executive on a moment's notice.

Some consideration was given to the role of the Vice President last year during hearings held by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Government Operations Committee on the proposal to create an Administrative Vice President to relieve the President of some of the routine duties of his office. At the conclusion of the hearings the subcommittee issued a report (S. Rept. 1960, 84th Congress) in which it found that there was no necessity for creating the post of Administrative Vice President. On the matter of proposals relative to the duties of the elected Vice President, the subcommittee report reviewed the testimony taken at the hearings. Then the report of the subcommittee states (p. 8):

"From the foregoing it is clear that there is considerable divergence of view concerning the suggestion to transfer the elected Vice President from the legislative to the executive branch. In any event, before a constitutional change of this radical nature is undertaken, there should be extensive and thorough consideration of all aspects of the matter."

Extensive and thorough consideration of all aspects of the matter is exactly what the Commission, which my bill would create, would be able to provide and it would do so in an atmosphere free of partisan politics.

These three problems—succession to the Office of President during the disability of the President, the method of election of the President and Vice President, and the role of the Vice President in the Government—are questions which can best be described as politically loaded. The Congress of the United States is quite properly the forum of partisan politics, but unfortunately this very desirable characteristic makes any proposal dealing with the above problems which originates in the Congress immediately suspect. Proponents of proposals dealing with any of the problems are likely to be motivated by partisan or regional considerations while opponents are also likely to be motivated by similar factors. Obviously any proposal dealing with any of three problems, and all three are of a very delicate nature, will have to be very carefully conceived and thoughtfully balanced to avoid conveying an advantage or disadvantage to any one group. In the final analysis any such proposal must be weighed and tested by the men who properly represent partisan and sectional interests—the Members of Congress. But on the basis of past experience, I firmly believe that no proposal relating to these problems can get to first base

without having a great deal of prestige behind its conception.

I come then to the very heart of the matter, the bill which I am introducing today to create a Commission on the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. The phenomenal success enjoyed by the two Hoover Commissions is in large part due, I believe, to the very great prestigue of the members of the two commissions. In view of the fact that the above mentioned problems are of such gravity and of such a controversial nature, it seems to me that the best hope for an ultimate resolution of them lies in a high level, nonpartisan commission whose recommendations will carry the necessary prestige. Accordingly, my bill would create a 12-member commission, 4 appointed by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to study and investigate the question of succession to the Presidency in the event of disability of the President, the system of election of the President and Vice President, and the role of the Vice President in the conduct of the Federal Government. It is my hope that the living former Presidents of the United States would be invited to serve on this commission. Recommendations from a group including such eminent Americans as President Hoover and President Truman would not be under political suspicion. They would come before Congress for approval or disapproval with a prestige that would enable congressional consideration of a plane above mutual suspicion or party politics.

In conclusion, let me say that all three of the problems which I have discussed in this statement involve aspects of the Presidency and Vice Presidency about which there are serious doubts and dissatisfaction. In the case of what happens when a President is disabled there is a high degree of urgency, since in these times when the United States is an acknowledged leader in world affairs and world conditions are subject to change overnight, it would be disastrous for the United States to be without a Chief Executive for even the shortest period of time. All three of the problems are to some extent interrelated and, it, therefore, seems appropriate that they be considered simultaneously.

For the reasons set forth, I firmly believe that until the problems can be studied and recommendations originated outside of the Congress by some organization such as the commission proposed in my bill, we will never be able to even get on the road toward a practical resolution of the problems.

The future welfare of the United States may well depend on the practical resolution of these problems. If we wait for the emergency to arise it will be far too late to act. The Nation deserves to have these aspects of the Presidency and Vice Presidency clarified, and accordingly, Congress has a duty to the Nation to take whatever action will lead to a final decision on these difficult and complex aspects of the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 25, 1956]

VOTING FOR PRESIDENT

Now is the time to focus attention on the defects of the presidential electoral system. When changes are sought on the eve of a national contest, they are inevitably appraised from the viewpoint of immediate advantage to the two parties; so nothing is done. Yet political scientists, journalists, statesmen, and legislators continue to point to grave refects in the means by which we choose our Presidents.

Out in Minneapolis the other day Dr. George Gallup suggested national primaries for the selection of presidential candidates and division of the electoral votes of each State in accord with the standing of the candidates in the popular poll. His proposed remedy for the hit or miss primaries and/or conventions in the States will be regarded as extreme, but it illustrates a growing dissatisfaction with the existing means of nominating presidential candidates. Even in the States that have primaries, the leading candidates may run or not run as the exigencies of political strategy dictate. Or they may be overshadowed by favorite son candidacies.

In the States that hold conventions to choose their delegates to the national party conventions professional politicians are usually in control. The voice of the people may or may not be heard. We doubt that the States would consent to national presidential primaries, but much could be done to improve the State primaries and to pass model primary laws in States now relying upon the convention method.

The final choice of the President and Vice President through the casting of electoral votes by States is an outgrowth of a system created to prevent the people from choosing the President. Many citizens would like to abolish it entirely in favor of a popular presidential election. This seems impossible because the small States which benefit from the present system can prevent amendment of the Constitution. But the electoral votes now allotted to the Sates could be divided among the presidential candidates in proportion to their strength in the popular polling. A constitutional amendment for this purpose has come close to acceptance several times in recent years.

What seems to be needed is a study group appointed by the President to bring in recommendations for improvement of the presidential electoral system. Such a group could also be asked to analyze the role of the Vice President in the big Government of today and to wrestle with the problem of how the Vice President should function when the President is temporarily disabled. Only recommendations from the White House based on expert findings are likely to carry enough prestige to bring action in this sphere. President Eisenhower could confer lasting benefits on the country by setting in motion the broadest sort of study of the presidential electoral system.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 17, 1956]

VICE PRESIDENT AS ACTING PRESIDENT

It is difficult to follow the reasoning of the House Judiciary Committee members who ordered the drafting of a bill under which the Vice President would decide when he should step into the shoes of a disabled President. The need for some orderly means of carrying on the functions of the Presidency when the President is incapacitated has long been felt. In practice the Vice President has not functioned as a substitute President during presidential illnesses because no one has been specifically authorized to order such a transition and no assurance has been given that a Chief Executive so relinquishing his authority could regain it. But what reason is there to think that the initiative could properly be left to the Vice President?

Some if not all of our Vice Presidents have been ambitious to step up to the commanding position. Some have been sharply antagonistic toward the President. In these circumstances it would be tempting human nature to let the Vice President decide that a presidential illness would justify him in assuming the presidential power. A Vice President working in harmony with the President probably would not exercise such power, and a hostile Vice President should not.

There is a safety valve in the bill reported to be taking shape in the House committee. The President could at any time regain powers assumed by the Vice President by simply announcing that his disability had passed. But if the Vice President had formally proclaimed his accession to power, as contemplated, and the President had not fully recovered, this might give rise to a struggle for power between the two. It is difficult to imagine a more dangerous threat to our constitutional system than a fight between 2 officials each with some reasonable claim to the presidential power.

The ideal situation would be to have the Vice President serve as acting President any time the President might be seriously ill or out of the country. But this should be done, if possible, at the President's request. If it were routine practice for the No. 2 man to take over in the President's absence, then he could probably be trusted to carry on, with the consent of the Cabinet or perhaps of Congress, in the event the President were so incapacitated that he could not request the Vice President to function in his place. In any event, the Vice President would have only an "acting" status so long as the President might live, and therefore it would be a mistake to have his assumption of the presidential power ceremoniously proclaimed.

Even more important than making use of the Vice President in time of emergency is protection of the presidential office itself against possible encroachments. Certainly this could not be done by inviting the Vice President to decide when he should displace his chief, even temporarily.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 17, 1956]

OUTMODED ELECTION DAY

Few people will take the trouble to reflect that this is, in fact, our presidential election day. The 62 million voters who swarmed into polling places last November 6 are complacent in the belief that they reelected President Eisenhower, although in fact they chose only 531 electors who meet in their respective States today to elect the President and Vice President. The fact that these dummy electors will prove faithful to the instructions given them on November 6 does not mean that all is well with our electoral system.

So long as the people vote for electors instead of the actual candidates for President and Vice President the possibility of an upset will exist. Some event between election day and the casting of the elector's votes could, in a close contest, swing enough electors to the losing side to defeat the will of the people. Even though such a possibility may be remote, it is nonetheless frightening.

With an easy remedy at hand—abolition of the office of elector and division of each State's electoral votes between or among the candidates in proportion to the popular votes cast—it is amazing that the electoral system has not been modernized. One great service that President Eisenhower could render to his country during his second term would be to appoint a commission of experts to survey our electoral system, including the presidential primaries, and bring in recommendations for changes in keeping with 20th century thinking about the Presidency.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce 3 bills, and I ask unanimous consent to speak on them in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills designed to promote the na-

tional development of the arts. The first of these would establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts; the second would broaden the activities of the already existing Commission of Fine Arts; and the third would provide for the transfer of the District of Columbia Civil Service Commission Building to the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery. Let me describe these bills briefly:

I. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

Mr. President, 2 years ago, President Eisenhower, in his 1955 state of the Union message, proposed the creation of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. President Eisenhower said at that time:

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

In the 84th Congress, pursuant to the President's request, a number of bills were introduced in both the House and Senate to achieve this result. Following hearings by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, S. 3419 was favorably reported—Report No. 2409—on July 3, 1956. The bill passed the Senate on July 6, 1956, but was defeated in the House Education and Labor Committee by a vote of 16 to 7. Only one Republican voted for the measure in the House committee, despite the White House request for the legislation.

In an effort to meet objections raised by the House committee, consultations have been held with interested Members in both Houses. Consequently, the bill introduced today is a slightly revised version of S. 3419 as it passed the Senate last year. The fact that President Eisenhower has again called for the establishment of this Commission, as recently as his Budget message of 2 weeks ago, should lend added impetus to speedy Senate action.

Passage of this legislation would authorize no direct subsidy to artists, but would set up a mechanism by which the advisability of financial support could be studied. A 24-member Commission, entitled Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, would be established. It would function within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the role of encouraging cultural and artistic endeavors, nationally and internationally, and at the same time would stimulate in the American public a greater appreciation of the arts.

Twenty-one members of the Commission are to be drawn from 7 arts categories, at least 2 from each, and 3 are to represent museums or similar institutions. The 7 fields are as follows: First, music; second, drama and dance; third, literature; fourth, architecture and allied arts; fifth, painting, sculpture, graphic and craft arts, and photography; sixth, motion pictures; and seventh, radio and television.

Mr. President, I am delighted to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who was particularly interested in this legislation when it was before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee last year, and the Senator from New Yoirk [Mr. JAVITS] join me in sponsoring this legislation.

II. ENLARGING THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. President, the second bill I introduce concerns the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts. It in no sense conflicts with the previous proposal to create a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Labor. The Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910, at which time it was directed by Congress to advise generally on questions of art when required to do so by the President, or by any committee of either House of Congress. In practice, however, this Commission has concerned itself primarily with architecture and the allied arts in the District of Columbia, having power to pass on the exterior of design of public buildings and private buildings in certain sections of the District.

Mr. President, our national concern with the arts, however, has grown to such proportions that the 1953 Report to the President on Art and Government, initiated by President Truman, took 141 pages just to describe in the briefest manner some of the present-day art activities in which the Federal Government is engaged. As one informed critic has pointed out, however:

> The study was made by the present Commission of Fine Arts on which the living arts of music and the theater have never been represented. So it is not surprising to find that no mention at all is made of the many great bands and orchestras of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. Nor, for that matter, is the fact that the Division of Special Services of the Army is responsible for some 40,000 soldier theater productions each year mentioned. If any note were to be taken of the music and theater arts engaged in by the Federal Government the unfairness of denying the living arts representation on the present Commission of Fine Arts would become plain to all. So they just aren't mentioned.

Consequently, Mr. President, the bill I introduce today would provide for representation of the living arts on the Commission of Fine Arts. The bill would recognize music, drama, poetry, dance, the graphic arts, motion pictures, radio, television, literature, and the craft arts in the composition of the Commission. Music and the living arts are as deserving of representation on this 47-year-old, tax-supported Federal agency as those presently represented. The living arts have been seeking representation on this Commission for years. Important national organizations, like the AFL–CIO, have adopted resolutions demanding that "representatives of the heretofore neglected fine arts" be appointed to the Commission. The bill I introduce today would achieve this result.

III. A NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS AND A NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

Mr. President, the third arts bill which I send to the desk is a revision of S. 2420, which I introduced in the 84th Congress. The revisions are relatively minor, but seem desirable following consultations with experts, both in and outside the administration. A statement listing the provisions of the bill and the need for it was made when I introduced it during the 84th Congress, and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 10, pages 13238–13241. I will not repeat that statement here, except to say that the bill would convert the historic Civil Service Commission Building into an art gallery, as suggested by the General Services Administration last June. It seems to me that this would be a most appropriate disposition for this 120-year-old building, one of the finest examples of Greek revival architecture in the Capital.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation would also provide for the international interchange of American craft works, and would dovetail with previous proposals for a wider cultural exchange between all nations, America and the other nations of the world.

Having mentioned that subject, I take this occasion to protest the inactivity of the Secretary of State in setting up the Advisory Committee on the Arts which was authorized by section 10 of Public Law 860 in the 84th Congress. This public law resulted from bills introduced by myself and Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, to whom I want to pay special tribute for his splendid initiative in the whole field of arts legislation. Public Law 860 was designed to help expand our cultural counteroffensive following evidence from a number of experts that the American image abroad has been suffering from the lack of attention given to cultural presentations.

One of the reasons for Public Law 860, Mr. President, was the previous failure of the State Department to comply with the repeated recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, that such an Advisory Committee on the Arts be established. The State Department last year, as in years prior, has defended its inactivity on the grounds that it was in the process of establishing such a committee and had discretionary authority to do so without legislation. The record of tardiness was already so obvious last year that Congress, in Public Law 860, specifically directed the Secretary of State to set up the Advisory Committee on the Arts.

But, Mr. President, apparently the State Department is as slow as ever. The latest information we have is that the Advisory Committee on the Arts, directed to be established by section 10 of Public Law 860, will be established within the near future. It was also the clear intent of section 11 of Public Law 860 that the Government's top cultural officers be seated on the International Agency Cultural Committee which has the final word with respect to the cultural presentation program. I think it is correct to say that this provision of Public Law 860 has also been violated by noncompliance. Frustrated by years of quiet noncompliance on this matter, Mr. President, I think we in Congress are

entitled to ask how much longer we must wait.

If the administration refuses to take the leadership on these critical questions, Congress must do so. Consequently, I close by urging speedy action on the bills which I send to the desk today so that appropriate congressional attention may be paid to the increasingly important role of the arts in American life.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 930. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 965. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; and

S. 966. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery, to provide for the international interchange of art and craft works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to reduce the Federal employee accident rate and the cost of accidents in Federal employment, both financially and in terms of human suffering, by providing for the promotion and establishment of improved safety educational programs and new safety inspection procedures.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by creating within the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Division. This division would be responsible, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Labor, for the direction and coordination of all safety educational programs and related loss-prevention procedures conducted by the various Federal agencies in furtherance of existing legislation to encourage safety and accident prevention, and for all of the functions now vested in the Federal Safety Council. The Federal Safety Division would be headed by a Director, appointed by the Secretary of Labor, who would perform his duties under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

This bill is identical in every respect with S. 3517, which was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Government Operations following hearings and careful consideration, and which passed the Senate by unanimous consent on the call of the calendar on July 26, 1956, too late to permit action by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I desire to stress the point that this measure is of the utmost importance not only to the well-being and efficiency of Federal employees but also to all American taxpayers. Information developed at the hearings during the last Congress revealed that during the 5-year period between January 1, 1950, and December 30, 1954, 427,129 civilian Federal employees were injured in line of duty. Of this number, 199,997 were disabled for work, 1,115 were injured fatally, and 15,250,554 days were lost. Direct and indirect costs during this period, on account of occupational accidents alone, have been estimated at more than $622 million. During this period production time lost, due to disabling injuries, represented nearly 1 year's loss of the services of approximately 50,000 workers, from whom the Government received no production benefits; and since more than 87 million production man-hours were lost, and the average Government hourly rate for this period was $1.83, the monetary waste amounted to in excess of $159 million. These statistics, I might add, are from the official records of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor.

During 1954, the last full calendar year for which statistics from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation were available at the time of the hearings, 83,285 Federal civilian employees were injured, of whom 37,974 were disabled for work; medical and leave expenses amounted to $9,274,576; disability compensation totaled $9,078,069; fatal accidents took the lives of 191 workers at a cost of $7,385,599, or approximately $38,668 for each fatality. The total direct cost of Federal employee accidents during calendar year 1954, exclusive of material or equipment damage and other hidden expenses, amounted to $25,738,244, which is equivalent to $10.81 per employee covered. During this same period production time lost as a result of these injuries amounted to 2,917,220 chargeable days, equal to a production loss of approximately 17 million work-hours. Since the average Government hourly rate in 1954 was $2, production time lost amounted to more than $33 million in actual cost, which is equivalent to 9,060 employees of the Government from whom the Government derived no production benefits, based upon an average Government employee's working year of 230 days.

Finally, between 1944 and 1954, the accident frequency rate of the Federal Government was reduced 30 percent, as compared with a reduction of 50.1 percent in private industry during this same period. Between 1950 and 1954 the Federal Government accident frequency rate was reduced only 10.5 percent, as compared with a reduction in private industry of 22.4 percent.

Mr. President, during the 84th Congress 12 Members from both sides of the aisle joined with me as cosponsors of S. 3517. At this time I am happy to announce that 14 Senators have joined with me as cosponsors of the measure I am now presenting. The urgent need for improvement of safety programs and procedures in the Federal Government has, I believe, been amply demonstrated by the statistics I have just quoted. I sincerely hope that additional Senators from both political parties will join with me in support of this important humanitarian measure. In order to allow further time for additional cosponsors, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be held at the desk until Friday, February 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 931) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE ACT OF 1957

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, at the request of the American Bar Association, to be known as the Federal Administrative Practice Act of 1957.

Mr. President, this bill is so far-reaching and encompasses so many aspects of administrative law practice and procedure that I cannot be committed ahead of time to support all its terms, even though I am delighted and feel honored to be invited to be a principal sponsor.

Studies by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I have been privileged to be chairman, in both the 84th and the present Congress, have made me increasingly aware of the impact on the rights of Americans resulting from the operation and decisions of administrative agencies, tribunals, and regulatory bodies. An examination of the American Bar Association's present recommendation, and others to be forthcoming in the near future, should prove profitable to our work in protecting the sacred rights guaranteed our people in the Constitution of the United States.

I am certain that this proposal will receive the most serious study and consideration by the Congress. A tremendous amount of time, effort, and skill has gone into its preparation. The American Bar Association is composed of such highly respected law practitioners, judges, and legislators throughout our country that I know their recommendations are entitled to and will receive much more than passing attention by the Congress of the United States. And, further, I understand that this bill is a top priority item in the ABA's broad legislative program for this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, in the body of the RECORD, a brief summary of the provisions of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 932) to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice; to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commis-

sioners; to provide for admission to and control of practice; to establish a legal career service for improvement of legal services in Government; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The analysis, presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

TITLE BY TITLE ANALYSIS—THE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES ACT OF 1957

This bill would provide for the improvement of administrative procedures and practice by establishing an Office of Federal Administrative Practice, an independent agency, which would initiate centralized coordination of procedure and practice matters; administer an improved Hearing Commissioner program; establish a new legal career system for Government legal services and provide for the admission and control of practice and representation of persons in the conduct of proceedings or matters before the various Federal agencies.

The Office of Federal Administrative Practice, under title I, would be headed by a Director and Deputy Director appointed by the President, with consent of the Senate, for terms of 10 years and 5 years respectively. The office would have three major divisions administered by Assistant Directors; namely, Division of Administrative Procedure, Division of Hearing Commissioners, and Division of Government Practice. The Director would report directly to the Congress on any matter for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Government operations in the area of procedures and practice. The office mainly would operate at interagency level and would provide machinery for the coordination and direction of procedures and practice on matters of concern horizontally and uniformly among the agencies. It would perform needed and indispensable service to citizens, concerns, and industries in their day to day dealings with agencies of Government.

Title II would provide new and improved measures for the recruitment, appointment, and administration of Hearing Commissioners. Trial examiners now serving would be given Hearing Commissioner status and continued duty with the agencies where they now serve.

Title III would establish for the first time a legal career service for civilian lawyers in Government service and promote the efficiency of Government legal services. The present system is haphazard and confused. The proposed bill would facilitate the recruitment, employment, and retention of lawyers of outstanding character and ability in the legal career service, and assure the performance of the legal work of the Government in accordance with high professional standards.

Title IV assures the right of persons to representation in matters or proceedings before Government agencies. It provides for both attorney practice and lay representation and imposes standards of conduct for both in the handling of matters before Government agencies. The bill would assist attorneys throughout the country by providing for centralized admission to practice. Detailed provisions are made for disciplinary proceedings and control of unprofessional conduct.

The bill is almost entirely new legislation. It provides the basis for an orderly improvement of procedures and practice of far-reaching importance to the Federal agencies, to the Congress and to all citizens having matters before the Federal agencies. The bill provides a new approach to proposals which have been of increasing interest to the Congress and to the public for more than a decade; as to most of the provisions, there is general recognition of the need for legislation of some sort.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] in sponsoring a bill entitled "The Federal Administrative Practice Act of 1957." It would improve administrative practices before the Federal Government and within it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement concerning this bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Federal Administrative Practices Act of 1957, which I am cosponsoring today, is the same as H. R. 3349 and H. R. 3350, introduced on January 22, 1957, and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. This bill is designed to accomplish four principal purposes.

PURPOSES

The first purpose is to establish an office of Federal administrative practice, which shall be an independent agency.

The second is to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners. They would have tenure and independence so long as they performed their functions properly.

The third major purpose of this legislation is to provide for admission to practice before the Federal Government, and for regulation of that practice. I understand that the pertinent provisions are intended to take into account the many forms of practice before Federal agencies.

The fourth, and certainly not the least important purpose, is the establishment of a legal career service for the improvement of legal services in the Federal Government. The legal work of the Federal Government can be no better than the skill and integrity of its lawyers. And this title of the bill would better achieve that end by setting up a legal career service.

SUPPORT

I believe that each of these subjects deserve the serious and thorough consideration of the Senate.

I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity and honor of cosponsoring this bill.

I am informed that the provisions of this legislation have wide approval by members of the American Bar Association. The appropriate committees of that great association of lawyers have considered the matter at length and have devoted their skill and a great deal of their time to the preparation of the draft of this bill. As a matter of fact, I am cosponsoring the bill at the suggestion of the chairman of the American Bar Association committee charged with the function of coordinating and proposing legislation of this type.

Many distinguished members of the bar have contributed their thoughts to the preparation of this legislation. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission on this subject have been taken into consideration, as have the recommendations of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure.

SHOULD HAVE HEARING

It is my earnest belief that the bill deserves an early hearing. The Judiciary Committee through its proper subcommittee should, in my opinion, conduct public hearings on this legislation as soon as convenient. At that time, the American Bar Association and others with expert reactions to this legislation would have a full opportunity to present their views.

That would include any opponents. They would have ample opportunity to oppose or to point out any defects in this bill. It has been drafted, I am informed, with the thought in mind of not interfering with any established rights or privileges of persons conducting approved practice before the Federal Government. There has been a sincere attempt, I understand, to meet the problems of accountants who do work on behalf of private citizens before the Government.

Although I definitely favor legislation of this type, I want it clearly understood on the record that, in co-sponsoring this bill, I reserve the right to question particular provisions and to come to a final decision on the version of that bill which is ultimately reported. I will by then have had a full opportunity to consider the evidence at the hearing and to take into consideration all of the views expressed with reference to the legislation.

HEARING EXAMINERS AND LAWYERS

It is time that serious and constructive thought be given by the Congress to the question of practice before the Federal Government and the place of hearing examiners and lawyers within the Government.

The present situation is intolerable.

Lawyers for the Federal Government do not have the full protection of the Civil Service Act. When working in attorney positions, they are excluded from most of the protection of the civil-service system. The Civil Service Commission is, as I understand it, not provided with funds to enforce the Civil Service Act with reference to lawyers. A result of this situation is that legal positions are not protected for career people.

The Government, therefore, cannot attract, as it should, the highest type of lawyer interested in making the Government a permanent career. This is not to say, of course, that lawyers working for the Government under the present situation are not men of ability and integrity. It merely means, I think, that those of capacity should be protected through a career service and that the Government should be able to offer an honorable and permanent career to lawyers willing to devote their lives to the Government, usually, I may add, at a smaller remuneration than they would be able to attain in private practice.

VETERANS

Of course, the veteran has certain protection under the Veterans' Preference Act. Some of these veterans are lawyers. However, the Veterans' Preference Act is not specifically a protection to the lawyers as the civil service is a protection to other Government career people.

GREATER INDEPENDENCE

The bill is also intended to give greater independence to hearing examiners and hearing commissioners who consider the cases of our citizens before Federal agencies. These hearing commissioners are, in a real sense, acting as quasi judicial officers charged with applying the law and deciding the facts in an unbiased way, even though they are paid by the Federal Government. This independence will be achieved under this bill by having the Office of Federal Administrative Practice established and by its administration of the system for the selection of high-grade hearing commissioners. These commissioners would then be assigned to the particular Federal agency whose cases they would consider. Of course, their recommendations and decisions would be subject to review within the agency to which they are assigned, just as they are now under the statutes governing the actions of these agencies.

SAVING PROVISION

There is a saving provision for all of the hearing examiners now in office.

SUMMARY

High standards

One of the basic principles of our legal system is that the legal officer, whether he be hearing commissioner or judge, must be unbiased in considering any controversy before him between an American citizen and his Government.

Another basic principle of our Government is that the lawyers doing legal work for it must maintain the highest standards of ethics and legal responsibility that have been common among members of the bar. All lawyers are, of course, officers of the court and must comport themselves as such, no matter what they are engaged in doing.

Bill is new

This bill is almost entirely new legislation. It would not, however, change any of the rules or regulations of any Federal agencies. It would, in my opinion, improve the conduct of administrative practices within and before the Federal Government.

CLAIMS ARISING FROM DELIVERIES OF CERTAIN FEED GRAINS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant certain relief to farmers and feed dealers.

This relief would be granted with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under the emergency feed programs.

Mr. President, the situation is this: Under the emergency feed relief program as carried on during the last 3 years, it would be announced by the Department of Agriculture that a certain area was entitled to emergency relief. Several weeks might then be required for official notification and official forms to reach the area.

Meanwhile, a farmer or stockman in the area would go to his dealer and say, "I must have feed now. I cannot wait for the certificates. We can make the necessary adjustment when the certificates arrive." The dealer, knowing his customer's desperate situation, would agree.

Unfortunately, the dealer would learn later that, under official regulations, he could not collect for the feed he had advanced. Or, if he did collect, a later audit would show he had advanced the feed and he would be called upon to refund the money he had collected.

It should be noted that representatives of the Department of Agriculture on a number of occasions held meetings with feed dealers after an area had been included in the program and urged them to act without delay to make feed available, with the necessary adjustments to come later.

Feed dealers and farmers work closely together, particularly in small communities. At times dealers have temporarily stored feed for customers. In some cases the feed was still in possession of the dealer when the program expired in his area, and the dealer then was prohibited by regulations from releasing the feed.

Mr. President, this bill would simply permit these inequities to be adjusted in a fair manner without deviating in any way from the intent of the law authorizing the emergency feed program. I may add that this is the same bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives by two members of the Texas delegation, Representatives POAGE and FISHER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 926) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BLAKLEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I am introducing for appropriate reference seven bills which contain proposed amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. The bills are accompanied by the letters of transmittal signed by the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent to include the letters in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 937. A bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 937 is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 8, 1957.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, together with a statement of justification therefor. The draft bill is designed to give effect to legislative recommendation No. 2, which will appear in the Commission's 70th Annual Report to Congress, as follows:

"We recommend that section 4 (1) be amended so as to eliminate the necessity of securing prior approval of the Commission for the publication of rates over circuitous routes equivalent to the going rates over direct routes of the same type of carrier when, in the managerial discretion of the carriers, such rates are necessary because of competitive factors."

The requirement in question has proved to be excessively burdensome to all concerned, and the Commission, after careful consideration, urges that it be eliminated from section 4 (1). Elimination thereof would not affect the primary purpose of the fourth section; that is, control of departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over direct routes.

The Commission would be very grateful for your assistance in introducing the bill and giving it early consideration.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,
Chairman.

S. 938. A bill to amend section 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to prevent the use of arbitrary stock par values to evade Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction.

S. 939. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 939 is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 15, 1957.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am transmitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills designed to give effect to legislative recommendations Nos. 3 and 14 which will be made in the Commission's 70th Annual Report to Congress. A statement of justification is attached to each of the draft bills.

Recommendations Nos. 3 and 14 will appear in the Annual Report as follows:

"3. (a) We recommend that section 22 be amended so as to make the provisions thereof permitting the performance of transportation services for Federal, State, and municipal governments free or at reduced rates applicable only during the time of war or national emergency.

"(b) In any event we recommend that section 22 be amended to enable the appropriate agencies of governments and the carriers to negotiate rates on a firm and unassailable basis.

"14. We recommend that section 214, which makes the provisions of section 20a applicable in certain cases to the issue of securities by motor carriers, or to the assumption by them of obligations respecting the securities of others, be amended so as to prevent evasion of the Commission's jurisdiction by adoption, with respect to stock issues, of arbitrary par values having no reasonable relation to actual values."

These recommendations have been given careful consideration by the Commission and we are firmly of the view that enactment thereof will be in the public interest.

We shall be grateful for your assistance in introducing these bills and for scheduling early hearings thereon, if possible.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,
Chairman.

S. 940. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 940 is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 25, 1957.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills to amend sections 20b, 218 (a), and part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, respectively, together with

statements of justification therefor. The draft bills are designed to give effect to Legislative Recommendations Nos. 7, 15, and 16 which will appear in the Commission's 70th annual report to Congress as follows:

"7. We recommend that section 20b be amended so as to permit controlled or controlling stockholders of a railroad corporation which is undergoing voluntary modification or alteration under that section to register their assent to such modification or alteration, subject to the power of the Commission to increase the prescribed percentage of assents required in such classes for approval of a proposed plan as it may deem just and reasonable in the light of the circumstances presented in the particular case. We also recommend certain minor amendments to paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 20b as described below.

"15. We recommened that section 218 (a) be amended so as to require contract carriers by motor vehicle to file with the Commission schedules showing their actual instead of their minimum rates and charges for transportation services.

"16. We recommend that part III of the act be amended by adding after section 312 a new section (312a) containing provisions for revocation of water-carrier certificates or permits for nonuse."

The Commission would appreciate your assistance in introducing these bills and giving them early consideration.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,
Chairman.

S. 941. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water carrier certificates or permits under certain conditions.

S. 942. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 942 is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 18, 1957.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration and introduction 20 copies of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act. The draft bill will give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 1 which will appear in the Commission's 70th Annual Report as follows:

"We recommend that section 1 (15) be amended so as to authorize the Commission to direct the assessment of penalty per diem charges as an aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency."

This is a renewal of the Commission's request for legislation which would enable it to deal more effectively with freight-car shortages.

We would appreciate your assistance in introducing the bill and scheduling early hearings thereon.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF ACT AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of August 30, 1954, to authorize and direct construction of bridges over the Potomac River and for other purposes. The object of the bill is to authorize construction of a tunnel under Roosevelt Island instead of a bridge above the island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 944) to amend the act of August 30, 1954, "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO MONTHLY INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide insurance benefit payments for dependent parents of individuals now entitled to old-age insurance benefits.

The present provisions of the Social Security Act do not provide for the payment of additional insurance benefits to old age insurance benefits recipients who are responsible for supporting dependent parents.

It will be realized, of course, Mr. President, that there are not many persons eligible for old age insurance benefits whose parents are still living. The number is further reduced when consideration is given to the fact that in some of these unusual cases the parents of the recipient would not be dependent on the recipient for support. I have been informed by the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors' Insurance that the number of cases which this proposed amendment would affect would be approximately 2,500 as of July 1 of this year. The Bureau staff did not prepare an estimate of the cost involved because it would amount to less than .01 percent of total payments.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that the restricted number of cases which would be affected by this amendment should not detract from the consideration for the hardship incurred when a retired person takes on the added burden of supporting a dependent parent. The plight of such a case should be contrasted with the insignificant cost which would be involved in a provision which would lighten the burden on the individual.

Mr. President, I should like to point out further that this already insignificant cost will still further decline in the years ahead as more and more people earn coverage under the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance program, and the possibility of a recipient's parents being dependent becomes less probable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 953) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age insurance benefits, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 28, 1956, I addressed the 33d annual convention of the American Municipal Association in St. Louis, Mo. My topic on that occasion was the problems of Federal-State-Local Fiscal Relations. In my remarks I tried to canvass the whole background and context of the so-called payments-in-lieu-of-taxes legislation, an issue which has been of concern to a growing number of Members of Congress in recent year. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks at that convention be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in that speech I announced that I would reintroduce in the 85th Congress S. 4183, the compromise bill which was reported from the Senate Committee on Government Operations last July. My colleagues will recall that this measure was given limited consideration on the final night of the session, July 27, 1956. The remarks which I made on the floor of the Senate at that time are quoted in my St. Louis speech I have just referred to, and I will not repeat them here.

Mr. President, I am greatly heartened by the fact that many Senators on both sides of the aisle support the principle of the payments-in-lieu-of-taxes legislation and have agreed to cosponsor this compromise measure with me today, even though this bill does not go as far as many of us would like. I think there is general agreement among the proponents of this type of legislation that the enactment of this bill would be a step forward, and it is in that light that we wish to move ahead with it. In his Budget message, President Eisenhower seemed to agree. I am confident that we will obtain early action in the Government Operations Committee, but for the remainder of this week I ask that the bill be allowed to remain at the desk for the signatures of additional cosponsors who may wish to join.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. POTTER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. WILEY, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How long does the Senator from Minnesota care to have the bill remain at the desk?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Until the end of the week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 967) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments

with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXHIBIT A

REMARKS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE 33D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO., NOVEMBER 28, 1956

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members and friends of the American Municipal Association, It is a genuine pleasure to be with you today to discuss a subject which is very close to my heart—Problems of Federal-State-Local Fiscal Relations.

Standing before this wonderful audience of mayors, city managers, and other municipal officials, I feel that I am once again face to face with the very bone and sinew of American democracy. Often in the rather distant and detached atmosphere of Washington, I remember with nostalgia the most vital and vigorous days of my public service—the time when I was mayor of the great city of Minneapolis.

National and State officials play a vital role, of course—even Senators do! But the problems of the national official are nationwide and world-wide. Those of the State official are State-wide and only incidentally local. It is the municipal government official, however, who is primarily the foundation-stone of American democracy. These dedicated and devoted men and women represent democracy in action as they persevere tirelessly from day to day, meeting their responsibilities.

As municipal officials, they are faced by the endless demands of their respective communities and their taxpayers. They struggle along under archaic laws and outmoded State constitutions, which require them to turn to often unsympathetic State legislatures for authority which should rightly be vested directly in them and in their constituency. They must fight for adequate funds to enable them to perform even their most basic tasks. They must carry on the endless search for sources of revenue which are necessary, if they are to furnish even minimal services against ever-increasing encroachment on there sources not only from their own State governments, but also by the mammoth Federal Government. Truly, these men and women are the unsung heroes of the American way of life. For it is in these communities, and in their municipal councils, where a solvent, efficient, democratic system is essential to the welfare of every man, woman, and child in America.

A note of sadness is injected into this distinguished gathering today by the absence of a man who, for many of us, symbolized the dedicated, devoted, and tireless municipal government official. I refer, of course, to the untimely death of the late Mayor Claude Porter, of Adrian, Mich., whose outstanding service and endless labors have had a tremendous impact on the continuing struggle of municipal governments for fiscal integrity. It was Mayor Porter who fought constantly over these many years to bring about a recognition on the part of the Federal Government of the serious responsibilities which that Government must bear with respect to the fiscal soundness of our more than 16,700 cities, 3,000 counties, and the other local governmental entities throughout the land. I served with him on the study commission on payments in lieu of taxes and shared revenues of the commission on intergovernmental relations. Mayor Porter's work on that commission alone entitles him to special recognition for a unique contribution to the cause of local government. That was only one of his many contributions, however, and I know that you all share my feeling of sadness and regret that his energy and indomitable spirit are not longer available.

The subject of Federal-State-local fiscal relations is not new to me and I know that it is not new to you. As Mayor of Minneapolis, as a member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and, at one time chairman of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues, I have been studying these matters for many years.

Year after year, the demand for municipal services continues to rise, with a consequent need for increased municipal expenditures. Year after year, municipal officials have had to make every effort to meet these demands and find new sources of revenue to cover the cost. Year after year, municipal authorities are faced with the necessity for providing funds for police, fire, highway, sanitation, welfare, education, health and hospitals, recreation, housing, etc. The problems are tremendous—the solutions, to the extent that solutions exist—are neither simple to grasp nor simple to achieve.

It is my purpose here today to discuss the efforts which have been made and which are continuing today to restore to municipalities some of the vital revenues of which they have been deprived as the result of Federal acquisition and control of real and personal property and the impact of Federal immunity from State and local taxation on local governmental revenue resources.

First, however, in the words of a famous former governor, "Let's look at the record."

THE PROBLEM

During fiscal year 1955, total revenues of cities in the United States having 25,000 or more inhabitants, reached a record level of $8,019 million, representing an increase of more than 6.5 percent over 1954. By total revenue, I refer, of course, to all revenue received from external sources by municipalities and their dependent city agencies, including utilities and employee retirement systems. It may be noted that general revenue—i. e., revenue excluding utility and employee retirement amounts—was $6,374 million in 1955, or nearly 7 percent more than the 1954 amount. Of this latter amount, $4,158 million represented total tax revenues. It is highly significant, however, that of the total amount of general revenues ($6,374 million), $3,047 million or 47.8 percent were derived from property taxes, which includes general property taxes relating to property as a whole real and personal, tangible or intangible, and taxes on selected types of property, such as motor vehicles.

Total city expenditures in fiscal year 1955 amounted to $8,363 million, or 6.5 percent more than the 1954 expenditures. General expenditures, which excludes spending for utility and retirement purposes, amounted to $6,524 million, or nearly 7 percent more than the 1954 expenditure. Significantly enough, these figures reflect a continuous upward trend in both expenditures and revenues. Also significant is the fact that State legislatures have followed a practice of ignoring local needs and refusing to permit municipal governments to enlarge their taxing authority so as to enable them to tax persons receiving numerous benefits but over whom they have no taxing jurisdiction. Finally, with the acquisition by the Federal Government of more and more taxable property, thus operating to remove it from the tax rolls, local governments are more hard pressed than ever to meet the demands made upon them. If it has not happened already, local taxable property will soon reach a saturation point beyond which assessments and tax rates cannot be raised.

Recent studies reveal that the Federal Government owns almost 410 million acres, or almost one-quarter of the total land in the United States. These lands vary enormously in physical characteristics, value, utilization and importance to the community. They range from large areas with relatively worthless desert expenses and mountain peaks to small tracts containing highly developed and valuable industrial plants.

As of June 30, 1955, the real property in the United States owned by the Federal Government consisted of 11,777 installations, containing 384,916 buildings, covering a total of 2,196,320,063 square feet of floor space, and costing $32.5 billion. This total cost is comprised of (a) $2.4 billion, or 7.4 percent, for land; (b) $14.5 billion, or 44.6 percent, for buildings; and (c) $15.6 billion, or 48.0 percent, for structures and other facilities. These figures, of course, do not include costs for public domain for national parks, forests or other conservation uses, historical sites procured other than by purchase, and trust properties.

Let us consider for a moment, what all of these figures mean in terms of municipal government and administration. It seems to me that what all this shows is an enormous amount of Federal ownership of property which constitutes the major source of revenue to the cities and other local governmental entities of the Nation. It means that in the face of continuing demands for local governmental services by local taxpayers, the base of the most important source of revenue—the property tax—is being continually reduced by the ever-increasing acquisition of property by the Federal Government, resulting in the removal of that property from the tax rolls and the denial to local taxing authorities of vital income.

It is true that in some instances, an overall benefit results to a community from the presence of Federal installations. In many other instances, however, the community is required to furnish additional services to such installations, thereby burdening the community further, at the same time that substantial portions of its revenue-producing property are removed from taxation.

We know, too, that various efforts have been made over the years to analyze and evaluate this problem.

Let us acknowledge here and now that from time to time, the Congress has recognized in principle its responsibility for reducing the adverse effects of these acquisitions upon local government revenues and fiscal structures by enacting numerous statutory provisions which authorize payments by certain Federal agencies and departments or upon certain types of properties. Thus, according to the latest information I have been able to acquire, there are now some 55 Federal laws dealing with Federal payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue arrangements. Of this number, some 20 provide for a sharing of revenue between Federal, State, and local governments; 18 authorize payments in lieu of taxes; and 17 authorize the payment of direct taxes.

However, the great majority of Federal agencies have no general authority to make payments on their properties. Furthermore, existing provisions of law are quite diverse and result in different treatment for similar properties of various agencies. Thus, those provisions of law which do exist fail to present any clear-cut, uniform policy. On some classes of properties, some agencies pay taxes; others make payments in lieu of taxes; and still others make no payments at all.

The seriousness of the general problem appears to have been magnified by the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950, when large-scale Federal acquisitions of defense production facilities throughout the country resulted in the removal of substantial parcels of real property from local tax rolls. In addition, local taxing authorities have been and are still being deprived of personal-prop-

erty tax revenues on inventories of such properties as a result of provisions in procurement contracts under which title to such inventories passes to the Federal Government prior to completion.

During the past 20 years, the fiscal problems of local governments resulting from Federal acquisition and control of real property, and the impact of Federal immunity from State and local taxation have been the subject of almost continuous study by governmental, quasigovernmental, and private groups which have filed numerous reports with recommendations.

The first of these was initiated by the President of the United States in 1935 when he appointed a committee consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and directed them to undertake a study of Federal ownership of real estate and of its bearing on State and local taxation. This committee made a brief study and submitted its report and recommendations to the President in 1938 (Federal Ownership of Real Estate and its Bearing on State and Local Taxation, H. Doc. No. 111, 76th Cong.).

Following one of the recommendations of this committee, the President established a Federal Real Estate Board to study and make appropriate recommendations regarding the situation in different communities adversely affected by the loss of tax revenues on land acquired by the Federal Government. This Board submitted a 50-page report with recommendations to the President and the Congress in 1943 (Federal Contributions to States and Local Governmental Units With Respect to Federally Owned Real Estate, H. Doc. 216, 78th Cong.). The Board continued in a quiescent state until 1951, when it was finally dissolved.

During much of this same period, the Treasury Department, through a special committee, was conducting a study of the entire subject of Federal-State-local fiscal relations, including payments in lieu of taxes. This committee submitted a 595-page report (Federal, State, and Local Government Relations, S. Doc. 69, 78th Cong.).

In January 1948, the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (Hoover Commission) retained the Council of State Governments to make a comprehensive study of the entire field of Federal-State relations. The Council submitted a 297-page report to the Commission in July 1948, which report was transmitted to the Congress in March 1949 (Federal-State Relations, S. Doc. 81, 81st Cong.).

In April 1949, the Secretary of the Treasury invited representatives of State and local governments to a conference on intergovernmental tax problems. Payments in lieu of taxes to State and local governments was one of the subjects under discussion, and the conference requested the Bureau of the Budget to work out comprehensive recommendations on this subject.

During the same month, the Treasury Department prepared a staff memorandum which it submitted for committee consideration. (Payments to State and Local Governments on Federally Owned Real Estate, April 5, 1949, joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 81st Cong., pp. 238–248.)

In September 1952, the Associate General Counsel, Housing and Home Finance Agency, prepared a 61-page study on the subject of payments to local governments in lieu of taxes, for the section on municipal law of the American Bar Association (mimeographed memorandum prepared by Joseph Guandolo).

In May 1954, a detailed, comprehensive study of the whole subject of Federal land ownership and the public land laws was prepared for and issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives (Preliminary Report on Taxes and Other In-Lieu Payments on Federal Property, Committee Print No. 23, 83d Cong.). This 133-page report contains a comprehensive analysis and factual presentation of virtually every phase of Federal-State-local relations as relates to Federal payments of taxes or in lieu thereof to local governments, and includes all of the pertinent statutes on the subject.

In March 1955, the General Services Administration submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations an inventory report on Federal real property in the continental United States, as of December 31, 1953, prepared at the request of that committee, a summary of which was issued as Senate Document No. 32, 84th Congress. This inventory covers all land, buildings and other structures and facilities located within the continental limits of the United States, title to which is vested in the United States or in wholly owned Government corporations.

In February 1956, the General Services Administration submitted to the Committees on Appropriation and Government Operations a second inventory report covering Federal real property in the continental United States as of June 30, 1955 (S. Doc. 100, 84th Cong.). This 112-page summary report reflected refinements in the data submitted earlier and stated that considerable progress had been made in improving real property records throughout the Government.

Probably the most important was the 311-page report of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations filed in June 1955. It was accompanied by 15 additional volumes, totaling in all, approximately 2,200 pages. One of these volumes, was a 197-page report entitled "Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues," which contained an exhaustive study of the entire subject, with detailed recommendations concerning future Federal policy with respect to payments to State and local governments for Federal property holdings located therein. The Senate Committee on Government Operations, to which these reports were referred, had an index to them prepared. It is published as Senate Document 111, 84th Congress. Copies may be obtained by addressing a request to the Committee clerk.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The appropriate House and Senate committees have concerned themselves with various aspects of our problem for at least a decade. During the past 7 years, while I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, we have had bills pending before us during every session of Congress dealing with Federal-State-local tax relations in general, and of payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes, in particular.

Following a meeting of members of congressional committees and governors, called for the purpose of studying Federal-State tax relations, held in Chicago on September 26, 1947, the Senate Committee on Government Operations (then the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments) was designated to conduct a special study of the problems of Coordination of Federal and State of Texas, with the objective of strengthening the tax structures of local and State governments and compensating them for losses of revenue from former sources of taxation. In its report to the Senate (S. Rept. 1054, 80th Cong.), stress was placed by the committee on the importance of assuring that Federal, State and local tax systems are adequate to the job assigned to them, and on the need for determining whether they fit together into a combined tax system which is equitable, administratively efficient and economically sound.

During the past 7 years, the Committee on Government Operations, on which it is my privilege to serve, has had pending before it numerous bills dealing with various aspects of Federal-State-local tax relations, in general, and of payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes, in particular.

In 1949, during the first session of the 81st Congress, the committee considered three Senate measures relative to the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which would have been required to study and make recommendations with respect to various aspects of the subject, including intergovernmental tax immunities. Joint hearings were held by the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of both the Senate and House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. As the hearings, which lasted for 5 consecutive days, 267 pages of testimony and exhibits were received, and more than 20 witnesses were heard. A new committee bill, of which I was a cosponsor, S. 1946, was reported favorably on June 13, 1949, but failed of passage following an objection on the call of the Senate Calendar.

In 1950, the committee considered S. 3147, which I introduced on behalf of myself and 42 other Senators, and which was substantially similar to S. 1946. This bill was reported favorably on June 22, 1950, but failed of passage following an objection on the call of the Senate calendar.

In 1951, during the 82d Congress, I introduced S. 2268, which had been prepared and submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget, after extensive study, in fulfillment of the assignment it had accepted at the 1949 intergovernmental relations conference, previously referred to, when the Bureau of the Budget had agreed to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations on this subject. This bill was a broad, comprehensive measure designed to establish a uniform policy throughout the Federal Government with respect to payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes. It would have replaced some 20 piecemeal statutory provisions with 5 broad types of payments to State and local governments on federally owned real estate, and included payments on a limited category of tangible personal property. No action was taken on this measure in the 82d Congress.

The committee also had before it a bill, S. 1166 of which I was a cosponsor, recommended by the Hoover Commission, which proposed to establish a temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which would have been required to study the subject and report its recommendations to the Congress within a limited time. Since the committee members preferred to have the benefit of the report of the proposed Commission, it decided to take no action on S. 2268, but reported favorably S. 1166 on July 12, 1951. The bill failed of passage, following an objection on the call of the Senate calendar.

During the 83d Congress, the committee devoted considerable time and effort to the subject of intergovernmental relations, with special reference to payments in lieu of taxes. Early in 1953, hearings were held on S. 1514, and related bills, to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, required to study, report, and submit recommendations relative to various phases of Federal-State-local fiscal and other relations, to the President and the Congress. This bill was reported favorably on May 4, 1953, passed the Senate on May 6, and became Public Law 109, 83d Congress, on July 10, 1953.

The committee also had before it in the 83d Congress three bills which were designed to provide varying measures of relief to hard-pressed communities. S. 788, identical to S. 2268 which I had introduced in the previous Congress, was designed to establish a uniform policy throughout the Federal Government with respect to payments in lieu of taxes. S. 2473, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, was designed to provide a permanent, continuing system for payments by the Federal Government to State and local taxing

units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities. H. R. 5605 was designed to furnish temporary relief for local taxing authorities who were under an undue and unexpected burden as the result of the transfer of taxable real property from a Government corporation to another Federal department or agency, which transfer operated to take such property out of taxation.

The committee held hearings on S. 2473 in 1953, and again in 1954 in connection with its consideration of H. R. 5605. Following considerable further study and deliberation, the committee decided to defer action on S. 788 and S. 2473, first, because their broad scope and coverage required further analysis, and second, because the committee was advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the President would formulate no policy with respect to the subject matter of these bills until he had an opportunity to review the final findings and recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which was then engaged in an intensive study of the areas covered by those measures. The committee decided, however, that the financial plight of the very small number of local taxing authorities which would be covered by H. R. 5605 entitled them to some measure of relief. Accordingly, it reported the latter bill favorably on July 21, 1954, but it failed of final passage following an objection on the call of the Senate Calendar.

It was during the last Congress, however, the 84th, when the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations stimulated the most energetic activity in our Senate committee on this whole subject.

During 1955–56, the committee had before it 12 pertinent bills, which fell into the following 5 major categories:

(1) The establishment of permanent and overall policies and procedures with respect to payment by the Federal Government of taxes or in lieu thereof, such as S. 1566, which I introduced for myself and Senators KUCHEL and GOLDWATER.

(2) The establishment of a limited program of payments by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes with respect to Federal real and personal property acquired during and subsequent to the Korean war.

(3) The establishment of a temporary, short-term, limited program for the relief of local taxing authorities, designed to alleviate their acute fiscal difficulties pending a more permanent solution—one of these was the committee bill which I introduced following the hearings on these measures, S. 4183.

(4) The establishment of a program authorizing payments of a very limited type, such as special assessments for public improvements.

(5) The elimination of certain types of Federal tax immunity with respect to State sales taxes on personal property.

In 1955, Congress passed Public Law 388 on August 12, 1955. As you all know, this act provides temporary relief to local taxing authorities by restoring to the tax rolls certain real property which had been held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was subject to local taxation, but which was taken out of taxation by the transfer of such property to other Government agencies.

In July 1955, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, authorized me to preside over committee hearings on the pending bills. Accordingly, preliminary hearings were held on the seven bills then pending before the committee. Further action was deferred, however, pending an opportunity to examine and evaluate the report and recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the receipt of the administration's comments and views on the pending bills. The preliminary hearings were held largely to accommodate representatives of your sister organization, the National Association of County Officials, which was holding its annual meeting in Richmond, Va., and had requested an opportunity for some of its members to be heard while they were in the vicinity.

Following this hearing the staff was directed to make an exhaustive analysis of the pending bills and the pertinent recommendations of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission and its Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues, which had been referred to the committee on June 27, 1955. This study was embodied in a 17-page staff memorandum, to which was attached a 52-page appendix, all of which were incorporated in the record of the hearing. The bulk of the testimony received at that hearing was from individuals and groups concerned with payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes to State and local taxing authorities. Since the executive branch agencies had not yet formulated a policy on this subject, they did not desire to present their views at that time.

In the second session of the 84th Congress, hearings on the bills then pending before the committee were held on April 19 and 20, 1956, and your association was most ably and persuasively represented by the late Mayor Porter. Although we had invited all of the executive branch departments and agencies to participate, with the exception of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, they preferred to submit their views in the form of written statements for the record. For the most part, these statements contained detailed analyses of the effect of the various bills on the reporting agency, and evidenced much painstaking effort. The position of the executive branch was presented by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense in the form of oral testimony, supplemented by supporting materials submitted for the record.

THE ADMINISTRATION POSITION

At the hearings, a representative of the Bureau of the Budget stated in effect that the administration was fully aware that large-scale Federal acquisition of real property, and Federal tax immunity may, and often does, result in serious financial hardship to local governments. However, the presence of Federal installations often results in benefits to a community which more than offset the burdens. Furthermore, care must be taken to preserve the traditional Federal immunity from local taxation. Accordingly, it was the view of the administration that the solution was not to inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of taxes, which might involve the expenditure of huge sums of money, but rather to seek an accommodation which would lessen the severity of the Federal tax immunity, while avoiding a major breach of existing immunities and incorporation of adequate safeguards against unnecessary or excessive Federal payments.

It was the position of the administration that the basic principle of an appropriate system must be that in a particular taxing jurisdiction, there is a demonstrable hardship caused by the recent removal of Federal property from the tax rolls, and that the hardship is of such depth and importance that special Federal financial assistance is warranted.

The administration spokesman stated that "the magnitude of the problem has led us to conclude that a limited and careful start should be made, through suitable legislation toward making payments where communities demonstrate financial distress because of revenue loss directly attributable to the removal of taxable real property from the tax rolls as a result of Federal acquisition."

Based upon these considerations, the administration was unable to support any of the major bills pending before the committee, but was prepared to support legislation which would achieve what they referred to as "a proper balance between a fair payment to the recipient local government and a fair charge to the National Government." It was their position, however, that such legislation should include (1) a limited designation of the kinds of acquired Federal properties which may be the subject of payments; (2) precise definitions of eligibility for particular categories of property; and (3) rules for charging for special services rendered to the National Government and crediting special benefits conferred by the National Government. With such an approach, the administration felt it should be possible to define and control the policy commitment and the resulting financial obligation of the Federal Government, in those cases where a substantial impairment of the finances of the local government is directly attributable to the removal of property from the tax base as a result of Federal acquisition.

Summing up its position, the representative of the Bureau of the Budget stated:

"We recommend that legislation be enacted now to provide the authority and mechanism for payments, during a period of 4 or 5 years, in cases of demonstrable hardship involving the recent removal of real estate from the tax rolls by reason of its acquisition by the National Government for industrial or commercial purposes, and including provision that during that period there should be detailed field studies of specific local situations. We believe that additional legislation should await a reasonable period in which to acquire experience in administering this limited policy."

RECENT COMMITTEE ACTION

Following consideration of the testimony contained in the 477-page record of the hearings, the committee concluded: (1) there was an urgent need for immediate legislative action to relieve local taxing authorities from unjustified and inequitable burdens and hardships which have been imposed upon them as the result of large-scale Federal acquisition of various types of property which has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls.

(2) Because of the complexities inherent in the subject, and the large number of variables involved, it was unable to recommend favorable action on any of the pending bills.

(3) Since the factual pattern varied in the 16,778 cities and 3,049 counties in the United States which might possibly be affected by Federal tax immunities, the only approach which would furnish a measure of relief to those local governments which were hard pressed as a result of Federal acquisition, was through a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, coupled with a case-by-case consideration by an administrative board of the relative merits of individual cases.

(4) A more comprehensive approach at this time was likely to result in huge expenditures of Federal funds and possible windfall payments to communities which have actually benefited rather than been harmed by the presence of Federal installations.

(5) The only equitable program which was possible was one in which payments are based upon individual cases and situations as they are presented and documented, and as information relative to each situation is compiled, evaluated, and assessed on its merits.

(6) Any further legislative action would have to await the accumulation by such a board of information concerning specific local needs and situations, compiled on a case-by-case basis, following field studies.

(7) No amount of general study, unrelated to the specific variable factors in each individual case, would serve any useful purpose.

The committee was supported in these conclusions by the major sponsors of the pending bills who testified before the committee that, in their judgment, bills proposing to establish broad, comprehensive programs had not been acted upon favorably through the years because such an approach is simply not feasible.

Now I am going to let you in on some inside information.

Following the hearings last spring, I directed the committee staff to prepare a draft bill authorizing a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, with a view to developing a measure which would embody concepts acceptable to the sponsors and proponents of the pending bills, as well as to the administration.

Now I was fully aware of the fact that the very limited approach just described would not afford to local governments the full measure of assistance which they require or to which they are entitled.

I was also acutely aware of the political realities involved. Not only was it necessary to obtain the support of an adequate number of Members of Congress, but administration approval was also needed to insure against a possible veto.

Now as conferences between the committee staff and the representatives of the administration progressed with respect to a draft bill, it became apparent that the type of measure which they were willing to support was so limited in scope and coverage that it was doubtful whether any payments in lieu of taxes would ever be actually made during the 5-year test period proposed. In fact—and I hope I am not betraying a confidence—at one time during these conferences, an administration spokesman openly admitted that if the administration's version became law, only the members of the projected administrative board would ever receive any money.

After examining the first draft, embodying the administration's position, I instructed the staff that it was entirely unacceptable to me and that negotiations should continue toward the drafting of a bill which would actually afford a measure of relief.

The version which finally emerged out of these negotiations, introduced by me and reported by the committee as S. 4183, authorized for a 5-year period:

(1) A very limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950;

(2) Payments of special assessments levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if such assessments were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and

(3) Payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts, if such property were owned by a taxable person.

The program would be administered by a 5-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. A taxing authority would have been required to file an appropriate application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim and the period for which the claim is made (not to exceed 12 months in any single application). The Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim, and conducting a hearing if a basis was found to exist, would have been required to determine and certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority.

In the case of industrial or commercial real property, however, the applicant would have been required to make a showing that Federal acquisitions of such property resulted in a financial hardship of the community in question. The actual payment to be made was to be based upon the amount of local taxes which would have been payable had the property been privately owned, increased by any additional expenditure incurred by the taxing authority in furnishing services to the Federal property, and diminished by the aggregate of local-type governmental services furnished by the controlling Federal agency, further diminished by any additional credit against Federal liability resulting from any exemption, immunity or reduction in the tax rate or amount, if such are available, under State or local law, to private persons as an inducement to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the particular taxing authority. The Board's decisions were made final and conclusive upon all taxing authorities and Federal agencies.

The bill provided further that the Board conduct a comprehensive study and make a case-by-case analysis of virtually every phase of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of existing programs. The Congress was to receive semiannual reports from the Board on the operation of the program and, within 2 years after the date of enactment, a comprehensive report, accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation, detailing the Board's recommendations on the necessity for a continuing policy. Nothing contained in the bill would have had any effect upon existing payments or revenue-sharing arrangements already authorized by law.

Now, my friends, I think you all realize by this time that the version which finally emerged, S. 4183, was certainly not the bill I would have liked to have seen reported. However, it did represent a modest beginning. It was acceptable to the administration and was, therefore, not likely to run into a Presidential veto. Finally, it was sufficiently limited in scope and coverage to allay the fears of those of my colleagues in the Senate who were concerned about the possible expenditures of Federal funds and so-called windfall payments.

I worked hard for this bill and I believe it is probably the best we will be able to get during the next session of the Congress, when I intend to reintroduce it. It provides for a modest program on a 5-year trial basis. It would permit modest payments in limited areas and, in its major aspects, would permit payments only to those taxing authorities which are able to show that, after weighing the benefits resulting from the presence of Federal installations against the burdens imposed on local taxpayers and local taxing authorities, they were still suffering financial hardships.

This is what I had in mind when I said on the Senate floor, during the debate on this measure, on the final night of the session last summer, July 27, 1956:

"The purpose of this bill is to move into the field on a limited scale and, at the same time, to provide a continuing study with pragmatic tests. Applications from local taxing authorities would be considered by a competent Federal administrative board. Unless this is done, there would be nothing more than a study in the theory of government, and nothing could be done about its practical application.

"This bill makes a beginning in manageable proportions, so that we will know what we are doing; so that we can proceed case by case, locality by locality, on the basis of the facts, and not in any way overextend our responsibilities at the Federal level. At the same time, we will not ignore the crying needs of community after community which at the present time find their tax base whittled away by the acquisition of property by the Federal Government.

"Let me be very candid with my colleagues. I wanted what I thought was a more generous and comprehensive bill. I argued for weeks to bring out a better and more generous bill; but I thought if we could accomplish something, it would be better than to accomplish nothing. I thought if we could get the Bureau of the Budget and the President and the departments of Government to agree on this limited advance, it would be worth while. I am convinced that once the Federal board of five members for which the bill provides, is established, we shall see an improvement in the legislation in the years to come.

"We shall see it cover wider areas and meet more definite problems. But I think we should recognize that we cannot pass such a bill—which enters into a new field of activity—on a regularized basis unless the President and the administration are in support. In this instance we have their support. If the bill passes, the President will sign it."

Finally, in closing my remarks on the Senate floor, I stated:

"Mr. President, the time has come when we must face this problem in a forthright, realistic manner. We have studied this subject to death. What we need now is action. Certainly, a modest, experimental approach to this serious problem for a 5-year period, such as this bill would establish, with a report being made every 6 months and an exhaustive report within 2 years, is not too much for hard-pressed communities to expect from the Federal Government."

Unfortunately, the bill came up for debate on the last night of the 84th Congress. Due to the pressure of other business and—shall I say—the "misunderstanding" of certain of my colleagues with respect to the objectives of the measure, it was laid aside. I hope for better luck in 1957.

In closing let me summarize my own thoughts about where we should go from here:

First, as I just said, we must direct our efforts toward the enactment of a law, early in the next session of the Congress, which will, at the very least, accomplish what we had intended to accomplish with S. 4183.

Second, we must make every effort to bring pressure on the Federal Government, not only to relinquish some of its enormous real property holdings in these cases in which it has no real need for them, but also to weigh carefully future acquisitions of real property. If such a program is given proper impetus, large parcels of federally owned lands and buildings may again be restored to the tax rolls.

Third, conversely, if Federal agencies are required, in proper cases, to make payments to local governments for certain types of real property, it should serve as an incentive to these agencies to dispose of numerous substantial holdings of commercial and industrial real property which should be in the hands of private industry and on the tax rolls of the communities in which they are located.

Fourth, your efforts should be directed toward working out arrangements with your respective States whereby local governments will be able to exercise taxing authority, or whereby certain nonproperty taxes are made available by the States to their local subdivisions.

Fifth, and finally, some additional revenues should be forthcoming from a strengthening of the property tax by promoting better assessment practices and more effective equalization of assessments. This would, in many instances, necessitate assistances from your State legislatures, but it should be considered.

Finally, I can assure you that as long as I remain in the United States Senate, I shall continue my efforts to obtain the enactment of legislation which will insure the fair and equitable treatment of local taxing authorities. Some progress has been made. I am confident that we will attain a further measure of success in the very near future.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY COOPERATION WITH NATIONS IN GENERAL AREA OF MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East.

These amendments are proposed for the purpose of bringing the joint resolution which is before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, into harmony with the statements made by the President when he spoke to the Congress in his message of January 5.

I have observed with some surprise that some of the statements made by the President in his address to the Congress, which I think should be a part of the resolution which Congress is called upon to pass, have been omitted. I am sure that the committees and the country will desire to take note of these apparent lapses.

I submit the amendments, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO FREE IMPORTATION OF AMORPHOUS GRAPHITE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. CHAVEZ, to the bill (H. R. 2783) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1957,

The names of Mr. MORSE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LANGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 774) to provide an improved farm program, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) on January 23, 1957.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1957,

The name of Mr. ANDERSON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 809) to provide economic assistance to the American Indians, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. THYE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MANSFIELD) on January 23, 1957.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 25, 1957,

The name of Mr. ALLOTT was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 816) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PURTELL) on January 25, 1957.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 25, 1957.

The name of Mr. ALLOTT was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 818) to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, and Mr. PURTELL) on January 25, 1957.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 25, 1957,

The name of Mr. JAVITS was added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 64) establishing a special committee to investigate recent increases in the prices of crude oil and refined petroleum products, submitted by Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. SPARKMAN) on January 25, 1957.

HOME LOANS TO VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators SCOTT and HENNINGS be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 726), the veterans' home-loan bill, introduced by me on January 17, and that their names be added when the bill is next printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS IN METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINES AND QUARRIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 828) authorizing certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries, introduced by me for myself and other Senators, on January 25, 1957, the next time that bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] may be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by me on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 17, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], have been reappointed as members of the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The committee has also reappointed to the Board of Visitors of the Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Report by him to the people of Wisconsin, Report No. 12.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States the following nominations:

John Hay Whitney, of New York, to be Ambassador of the United States to Great Britain, vice Winthrop W. Aldrich, resigned.

John M. Allison, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Indonesia, vice Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., reassigned.

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Year of 1956 has come and gone. The Nation's response given to this celebration, which was provided for by a joint resolution of the Congress, has been enthusiastic and overwhelming.

The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, on which I have had the honor of serving with my esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] during the past 2 years, has served as a clearing house for all activities taking place.

These activities range from the simple but nonetheless important programs of schoolchildren to the publishing of articles and books that shed new light on the Wilson era. Women's clubs, farm groups, government departments, patriotic organizations, labor unions, churches, libraries, colleges and universities—groups representing every facet of American life—took part. Even our friends in foreign countries have cooperated with us in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great man.

Since a record of these activities and publications is now being compiled by the Commission for its report to the Congress, it is suggested that any information concerning such events be sent to the Commission as soon as possible, in order that due recognition may be given all participants in the congressional report. Newspaper clippings would be especially helpful. Details are wanted from all participating groups—date and place of the program, what group or groups arranged it, what it included, who took part in it, and how many persons saw or heard it. Copies of any 1956 or 1957 article, paper, address, sermon, or book on Wilson are wanted, or information as to where copies may be obtained. These are to be included in a special Woodrow Wilson Centennial collection of 1956 materials on Wilson that is being assembled. The collection will be placed in the Library of Congress as a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

All such information and materials should be sent direct to the Commission. Address: The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, I wish to join my esteemed colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in urging all organizations participating in the Woodrow Wilson Centennial to send reports of their activities to the Commission.

I take special interest and pride in the dedicated role the great Commonwealth of Virginia has played in this centennial celebration. The Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission and the Woodrow Wilson Birthplace Foundation, Inc., have been exceedingly active in sponsoring commemorative events. These events were highlighted in April by a week-long pilgrimage to the Staunton, Va., birthplace of Woodrow Wilson.

In addition, I should like to point out that one of the most significant books on Wilson to be published during the centennial year, The Greatness of Woodrow Wilson, was edited by a fellow Virginian and member of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, Mrs. Em Bowles Alsop, of Charles City, Va. The introduction to this book was written by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Full recognition also must be given to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation of New York for its magnificent service and cooperation.

The Commission desires to cover fully in its report to the Congress all activities of participating groups or individuals. To make that possible, the kind of cooperation which my colleague and I have asked today is essential.

ADMISSION OF 10,000 REFUGEE ORPHANS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 25 it was my privilege and opportunity to introduce proposed legislation providing for the admission of 10,000 refugee orphans to the United States. This bill is S. 866. CHARLES O. PORTER, the new and distinguished Representative from Oregon's Fourth District, has introduced an identical bill, H. R. 3783, in the House of Representatives.

The person foremost in urging upon me such a proposal was Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., who has done more than any other person to call to our attention the crying human need for us to accept our responsibility for the care and upbringing of the babies left behind in Korea by the men of our Armed Forces. Mr. Holt and his wife Bertha have spent a great deal of their own fortune—as well as risked their own health and that of their children—to bring to our shores many of these little halfcaste boys and girls, many of whom are adopted by other families and some by the Holt family.

The entire heroic feat of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, and of their associates in this worthy and needed cause, has been described in a series of effective and informative articles written for the Oregonian, of Portland, by William Hilliard, church and religious editor of that daily newspaper. Mr. Hilliard not only studied the problem from the perspective of our own shores, but himself visited Korea in the company of Harry Holt.

The Oregonian and its editors are to be commended for making it possible for William Hilliard to undertake this extensive survey of an urgent human problem.

So that Members of the Senate may be fully informed on the whole question of expanding our quota of refugee orphans who may immigrate to the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the series of 11 articles written by William Hilliard for the Oregonian, which were published from December 12, 1956, through December 28, 1956, may appear in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks.

Mr. President, I also desire to call attention to the excellent article by the Reverend H. P. Sconce which appeared in the September 1956 issue of Guideposts. This article tells the humanitarian and heart-warming story of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt and their eight new Korean children.

My greatest thrill and satisfaction since I became a member of the Senate occurred on October 14, 1955, at the Portland International Airport, when Harry Holt and his eight adopted Koreans arrived home. Mrs. Neuberger and I have visited the Holt home and have seen the wonderful care the Holt family is giving to their new children.

Reverend and Mrs. Sconce have an outstanding religious radio program, Christian Celebrity Time, which is heard by people throughout the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Operation Baby Lift," by Rev. H. P. Sconce, appear in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks. The Oregonian articles are for the following dates: December 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, 1956. The article from Guideposts is from the September 1956 issue.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Guideposts of September 1956]

OPERATION BABY LIFT

(By H. P. Sconce, Hermiston, Oreg.)

"The most expectant mother in the world." So Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., was called last year as she awaited the arrival of octuplets. She and her husband were already the parents of 6 children. Now they knew they were to have 8 more—4 boys, 4 girls, all orphans from Korea.

In mid-December 1954 the Holts heard a lecture during which Dr. Bob Pierce and Dr. Frank Phillips of World Vision, Inc. (an organization meeting the needs of orphans, and war widows the world over), showed a film called "Dead Men on Furlough." The movie, which touched the Holts deeply, depicted the desperate plight of children left behind by GI soldiers in Korea.

"I couldn't forget those undernourished bodies, those tiny outstretched arms," Mr. Holt says today. "Neither of us could. And then, suddenly, without either of us mentioning it to the other, we knew we could and should do something about those little unwanted creatures."

The Holts were secure financially. Though there had been some years of severe struggle when they first came from South Dakota in 1937, a sawmill Harry built had prospered and now they lived comfortably on a large farm in a 13-room home called the Pink Mansion. It was here that they held a family meeting to talk about the Korean orphans.

The family in conclave decided at first to sponsor several orphans by sending funds to Korea. But gradually the Holts concluded that they should adopt a Korean child and bring him to this country. Harry flew to Korea.

There he traveled by jeep throughout the war-shattered country. He saw children starving to death on the streets and even in orphanages. He learned that many of the children were being hidden by their ashamed mothers. The Koreans had never had a race problem, but when these fatherless children played with other Koreans, trouble ensued. The Korean kids often mobbed their playmates of mixed blood and in some cases murdered them, leaving their bodies to be

found in irrigation ditches or to be washed up on the beaches. Harry Holt decided that he must personally bring home as many as possible of these pathetic youngsters and get others to do the same.

He had a problem, however, because the Government would not permit an American family to adopt more than two foreign children. Harry wrote his wife. She, in turn, got 78 of her neighbors to help petition Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER to sponsor a bill in Congress which would authorize the bringing home of at least 8 orphans. The Senator responded vigorously by personally contacting Senators and House Members and arranging for a special meeting of the Judiciary Committee. Exactly 7 minutes before midnight of the day Congress adjourned in 1955, the bill was passed by a unanimous vote of both Democrats and Republicans.

But then Harry Holt faced an obstacle more difficult than the last. Which children should he choose? Some were automatically disqualified because they could not pass the physical requirements, but the others, all of them, tugged at his heart. One day a little girl called Betty came over to him.

"She's the ugliest girl in the orphanage," someone whispered.

"I'm not very pretty myself," Harry replied, and then and there Betty was chosen.

Another little girl Harry chose died before he was ready to leave for the States. There is a tombstone in Korea today inscribed with the words, "Judy Lee Holt."

By October 1955, Harry had gathered together 12 little ones. Arrangements had been made for a family in Michigan to adopt one of them. Another was going to a couple in Corpus Christi, Tex., and two children were ready for adoption by a family in Portland, Oreg. All the rest were to belong to the Holts.

With the help of an Irish nurse, Harry and his charges headed for home. It was a topsy-turvy trip. Some of the brood got stomach flu. A 3-year-old lost his shoe, a 16-month-old fell out of a chair in a Tokyo airport. All of them seemed to have colds; their noses ran. Diapers were changed on an ever-rotating assembly line. A typhoon held up the plane for 2 days. Engine trouble sent it back to Wake Island for the loss of still another day.

Finally they landed at Portland. More than a thousand people were there to meet them. There were newsmen, radio and TV people. And Mrs. Holt was there with her son and five daughters.

That evening it was 1 a. m., before quiet came to the Holt farm. But just before they retired, Harry and his wife tiptoed into the nursery. Stepping between the rows of cribs, Harry gathered up an infant and cradled her lovingly in his arms.

"Lord," he prayed, "you know how much we love these children. I've done my best to care for them so far. Help us to take care of them in their new home and bring them up for Thee."

"And dear God," whispered his wife, speaking for all the new little ones, "remember our parents by birth, our soldier-fathers and Korean mothers. Teach them that Christ died for their sins, that believing on Him they may have eternal life. Save us, too, so we can meet them in heaven."

For many months the Holts and tots and the farm have been thriving. Stewart, 22, is now off working in a sawmill. Harry Holt leased out his own mill after his heart attack in 1950. Wanda, 21, cares for the dairy cows on the 350-acre ranch. She also does all of the cooking, bookkeeping, and much of the sewing for the childen. Mollie, 20, is a senior nurse at a Eugene, Oreg., hospital and Barbara, 19, helps plow and plant the grain and has had as many as 100 sheep of her own. Suzanna, 13, and Linda, 9, are both in school, but are not without duties at home. All in all, the Holts are a working, loving, happy family to which the advent of eight children has been a blessing and a joy.

The Holts are now directly supporting 36 orphans in Korea and have an office force there for other adoptions. Mrs. Holt and a neighbor handle American details at the farm. More than 350 adoptions are now in different stages of completion, and about 150 families are waiting home investigations.

Occasionally Mrs. Holt will be asked to show the birth announcement the family sent out to friends last October. A large stork carrying eight children in its bill is superimposed upon the outline of an airliner and the name of each infant is listed about a note of welcome and thanksgiving. But the spirit of the Holts' contribution is crystalized in the three verses from Isaiah printed at the bottom of this card:

"Fear not: for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the end of the earth; * * * for I have created him for my glory" (Isaiah 43: 5, 6, 7).

[From the Oregonian of December 12, 1956]

OCEAN FLIGHT GETS LONELY—WRITER WARNED OF KOREAN COLD

(By William Hilliard)

EN ROUTE TO KOREA.—Passengers on an airplane are like members of a big family. It gets pretty lonely "up there" and having someone to talk to while flying high above the clouds can be mighty soothing—especially after you pass that point of no return. Purpose of the writer's flight to Korea is to witness and assist in the biggest "baby lift" of Oregon farmer Harry Holt, who has arranged already for adoptions of 220 Korean orphans of Korean-American parentage.

The latest—and largest—flight of orphans sent to the United States by Holt, and World Vision, Inc., will include 68 tots ranging in age from 18 months to 5 years. Foster homes have been found for them in the United States.

JAPAN STOP PLANNED

The youngsters will leave Seoul on a giant Pan American World Airways DC7C, and will fly nonstop to Honolulu, and thence to San Francisco.

The present flight of this writer's will stop first at Japan before going on to Seoul and the baby-lift operation.

One of the passengers on this flight is Mrs. Charles Bacon, Bartlesville, Okla., en route to Itazuke Air Base in Fukuoka, Kyushu, to join her husband, a corporal in the Air Force. Her stay in Japan will be for 15 months.

Returning to Pusan after studying telephone communications in several American cities is Chan Woo Lee, minister of communication in Pusan. Chan said he is glad to be returning to his family in South Korea and warned this writer of the bitter cold in his native land about this time of the year.

SOUTH KOREANS ADJUST

South Koreans have just about adjusted themselves to the reality of GI babies, according to Chan.

"Many GI babies are still in Korea," said Chan, "and most of the Korean people accept them. Acceptance is almost full in the large cities, but people in the villages are still somewhat reluctant to receive these children and their mothers."

American forces in the Philippine Islands left many babies behind, too, according to Gabriel R. Pasual, Manila businessman.

"GI go home and forget about babies," recalled Pasual. "United States won't grant visas to Philippine mothers of GI babies because the mothers might try to find GI father of children in States, I think."

[From the Oregonian of December 13, 1956]

WRITER EN ROUTE TO KOREA VISITS WITH GOODMAN'S BAND

(By William Hilliard)

(This is the second of a series of articles by William Hilliard, staff writer, the Oregonian. Mr. Hilliard will return from Korea with a planeload of 68 children, orphans of Korean-American parentage, being brought to United States foster homes by Harry Holt, Oregon farmer, and World Vision, Inc.)

EN ROUTE TO KOREA.—To be different, but to be different logically is the desire of Rex Peer, a 28-year-old trombonist from Sioux City, Iowa, who doesn't like to conform to the general routine of living. Rex was one of 15 members of the great Benny Goodman's band traveling to Tokyo aboard a Pan American clipper. This writer was on the plane, also, to visit Korea and witness the biggest baby lift of Harry Holt, Oregon farmer, who is finding United States homes for Korean-American children.

Goodman and his crew are currently on a State Department-sponsored good-will tour of the Orient, a tour that will take them to such places as Bangkok, Rangoon, Singapore, and Tokyo.

The group was scheduled to play in Tokyo before leaving for Bangkok, but Japan Air Lines plane trouble in Honolulu put the group 1 day off schedule; nevertheless, a sizable crowd was on hand at Tokyo International Airport to greet Mr. B. G. and his boys when they arrived.

Quite a group, this Goodman aggregation. Nothing like the general stereotype of jazz musicians.

Take Peer, for example, a graduate of Morningside College in Sioux City, who has a wife and two children in Sioux City and who had to take a leave of absence from Columbia University, where he is working on his master's in music, to take the tour with Goodman.

Peer sees jazz as an art now finally accepted on the concert stage by the American public, an art at last removed from the dens of iniquity.

"Most jazz artists are intelligent people," said Peer. "What we are trying to do is not fully understood by the general public. Jazz is the only true culture of America."

Peer admires such members of Goodman's band as Israel Crosby and Hank Jones, two of America's top musicians and old veterans in the happy world of jazz.

"You've got to admire guys like Israel and Hank," stressed Peer. "Here are two fine musicians, both Negroes, who have to put up with all the inconveniences and embarrassments of social life in America, but somehow manage to escape in their own minds and continue to perform in true artistic fashion. Real great guys."

Crosby used to play bass for the Ahmad Jamal trio and first recorded for Goodman in 1935. Jones is recognized as one of America's top jazz pianists. Both Crosby and Jones were with Goodman when he appeared in Portland Thanksgiving night.

Peer is an ex-member of the very modern Sauter-Finegan orchestra, an outfit Peer calls "years ahead of its time."

"These are real inventive people," said Peer of Sauter and Finegan. "They have the only new sounding group the country has heard in the past 10 years. Most groups still play the Glen Miller style, but Sauter and Finegan have refused to succumb to commercial music and have suffered financially as a result."

[From the Oregonian of December 15, 1956]

HOLT PUSHES WAIF AIRLIFT—CRESWELL FARMER RACES AGAINST TIME, GOVERNMENT REDTAPE, IN MERCY PLAN

(By William Hilliard)

(This is the third in a series of articles by William Hilliard, staff writer, the Oregonian,

who will accompany 68 children of Korean-American parentage from Korea to the United States. The children will be brought to American foster homes by Harry Holt, Oregon farmer, and World Vision, Inc.)

SEOUL.—Harry Holt, the Creswell, Oreg., farmer is racing against time to get his newest Korean baby airlift to the United States, and possibly to return for still another planeload before a December 31 deadline. During his preparations for departure, Korean mothers are leaving GI children at the rate of 2 a day at the nursery.

This latest airlift, the largest of all of those flown by Holt and World Vision, Inc., will leave Seoul Sunday at 2 p. m. (Korean time) with 68 youngsters of Korean-American parentage aboard the Pan American World Airways super DC–7 airliner.

The big plane will make a nonstop flight to Honolulu and is due at San Francisco International Airport at 8:30 p. m. Sunday, making the transPacific trip on the same day because of the gain of a day in crossing the international date line.

LINE SENDS ATTENDANTS

Aboard the flying nursery, a real stork if there ever was one, will be Holt, a multiple Pan Am crew of 14 to 20, including attendants for the children, and this Oregonian reporter.

Holt, who suffered a heart attack on his last trip from Korea to the United States with mixed-blood children, has set a torrid pace for himself and his Holt adoption program staff. The race was to process all the children in the Holt and World Vision orphanages in Korea in time to get them to the United States before December 31.

That is the date to which President Eisenhower extended the special entry measure for mixed-blood children. Any other entry to the United States of the unwanted children will have to await new legislation by Congress. Holt is praying this new legislation will be enacted in 1957.

MOTHERS LEAVE CHILDREN

For the past 30 days tearful mothers have left mixed-blood children at his reception center at the rate of two a day.

The Korean public has refused to accept these offspring of foreign troops and Korean women and as a result both the children and their mothers suffer undue hardships. Many of the mothers leave their children on the streets, even in the bitter cold of December.

Only Monday, when the mercury in Seoul dropped to 10 degrees and never rose above 25, five infants were abandoned on the dirty streets of the city. Incidentally, Koreans Monday celebrated the eighth anniversary of the proclamation of the universal declaration of human rights.

Holt still has about 60 more children to process for the trip to the United States. Redtape caused by both the United States and Korean strict regulations on adoption procedures daily cause unforeseen delays.

The dedicated Oregon farmer, ever thankful to his God for the service he is performing for humanity, hopes he may return to Korea for another planeload of children before the year end.

RULES DELAY PROCESS

His 21-year-old daughter, Molly, a registered nurse, will remain at the Holt orphanage here while her father returns to the United States and his Creswell farm for a brief rest.

Both the Holt family and World Vision, Inc., a religious organization with a worldwide missionary and evangelistic program, are sponsoring Sunday's airlift, probably the first in which a plane has been chartered exclusively to transport children to a new home in a new world.

AIRLINE LISTS NAME OF TOTS

Eighteen children of mixed Korean-American parentage, part of a Pan American World Airways charter planeload of 68 due at San Francisco Sunday at 8:30 p. m., will arrive at Portland International Airport Monday at 1:15 p. m. aboard a United Air Lines plane. They are destined for foster homes in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

This list, supplied by Pan American, includes the new names of the adopted children, their Korean names, and names of the foster fathers.

Kim Babb (Kyung Kim Hee), female, 4; Thomas Babb, route 1, box 637, Lake Grove.

Becky Bigham (Shin Im Yung), female, 1 year; Dale Bigham, Jr., 9106 Northeast Schuyler Street, Portland.

William Burton (Keun Chang Dae), male, 2, and Michael Burton (Wong Kim), male, 4; William W. Burton, 437 Northeast Monroe Street, Portland.

Jane Burgess (Hwa Chang Mi), female, 4; Frank R. Burgess, Bellview, Wash.

Dorothea Ditton (Soon Lee Kiung), female, 1 year; James H. Ditton, St. Maries, Idaho.

Leroy Daley (Choon Kim Yung), male, 4; Howard G. Daley, Parkdale, Oreg.

Cho Dawson (Dong Cho Bok), male, 2; Allen Dawson, 13705 Southeast Callahan Road, Portland.

Mark Fournier (Ki Paik Sung), male, 3; Roy H. Fournier, 1712 Southwest Bridge Street, Grants Pass.

Mary Harting (Sook Hong Bok), female, 3; Paul W. Harting, box 92, Philomath.

Kim Hinds (Ok Bae Tae), female, 2; Earl E. Hinds, Philomath.

Samuel Harson (Jonny Park), male, 4; Eugene Harson, McCready Springs, Oreg.

Ema Miller (Ok Lee Hae), female, 2; Charles A. Miller, Payette, Idaho.

Quentin Platt (Nam Lee Kyu), male, 2; Hampton C. Platt, 4435 MacCleay Road, Salem.

Martha Surdam (Bai Park Bo), female, 7 months; George A. Surdam, route 2, box 738, Creswell, Oreg.

Beatrice Willoughby (Hee Lin Chong), female, 4, and Robert Willoughby (Kim Park Man), male, 2; Lawrence A. Willoughby, route 2, Alderwood Manor, Wash.

John McKeon (no Korean name listed), male, 2; A. J. McKeon, route 1, box 175, Stayton, Oreg.

[From the Oregonian of December 16, 1956]

THIEVES FURTHER DELAY KOREAN BABY AIRLIFT, ALREADY HARASSED BY REDTAPE

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—William Hilliard, the Oregonian staff writer, wrote the following story while awaiting departure from Seoul, Korea, for San Francisco, aboard the Harry Holt-World Vision baby airlift.)

SEOUL, KOREA.—Life has been one setback after another for Oregon farmer Harry Holt, daddy of the baby airlift of orphaned Korean-American children since his arrival at Seoul 6 weeks ago to process his eighth load of mixed-blood babies to new homes in America. He has been hustling to get as many of the children as possible to the United States before the December 31 cutoff on further admissions. He is about 4 weeks behind schedule because of the time consumed in physical examinations required of all children adopted by American couples.

Safety regulations necessary for the long flight made it necessary to reduce the passenger list of his "Christmas package" plane leaving here Sunday from the 88 he planned to 74. And he has been having more than his share of personal troubles.

A few days ago Holt befriended a beggar in a grocery store and the scoundrel walked away with Holt's money and all his groceries.

"I should have known better," growled Holt.

EXAMS TIME-CONSUMING

Only a week or so previously a pickpocket neatly cut open Holt's pocket and disappeared with all his credentials and an airplane ticket.

"Lucky for me he didn't get my passport," said Holt, who had to take a new series of shots because his record of inoculations was among the stolen credentials.

The Holt orphanage had a jolt Tuesday when 2-year-old Lee Duk Bok drank a glass of kerosene and had to have her stomach pumped. The little girl is in serious condition, but is expected to recover, thanks to the attention of Molly Holt, 21-year-old daughter of Holt. Molly, who is a registered nurse, will remain here to operate the orphanage when her father leaves Sunday.

Biggest obstacle to the orderly processing of the adopted children is the mountainous redtape caused by regulations of both the Korean and United States governments. Adoption papers must be filled out for both governments.

CASE EXPENSIVE, EXHAUSTING

Exhaustive physical examinations of the children are time consuming, especially since the American Government recognizes only one hospital in Seoul. This is the Seventh-day Adventist hospital, which also administers to hundreds of Korean patients daily. Sometimes the Holt youngsters have to wait as long as 8 hours to get their physicals, which is an agonizing delay for the man who is fighting the calendar to get the youngsters processed.

When you see the children in Holt's orphan home, you can't help but admire the work of this Christian man who has dedicated his life to finding happiness for innocent youngsters unwanted by the public because of their mixed blood.

For the past month mothers have left their children at the Holt orphanage at the rate of two a day. Many of these children are sick and, as Holt puts it, "Like flies, their stomachs bulge from the worms inside."

Holt and his staff do all they can for the youngsters, which is an expensive and exhausting undertaking. Many are in pitiful condition when received at the home. Many are covered with body sores. They have measles, tuberculosis, and numerous other illnesses brought on and aggravated by the filthy living habits of mothers who have nothing left in life, with no fathers for their children.

The mother of a GI baby is an outcast in Korea unless she has lots of money. Many of them who have been deceived and abused by both their lovers and the Korean public love their children dearly, but their struggle to live is a desperate one and almost impossible unless the child is given up.

Two weeks ago a Korean mother came to the Holt home and left her Negro-Korean baby. She was in tears. A few days ago she returned and said to Holt: "I must have my baby back. He is all I have so dear to me."

Tragic scenes like this are repeated many, many times at the Holt orphanage.

"I always return the children to their mothers. We are not kidnaping anyone's child," Holt said.

Accommodations in Seoul are grossly inadequate by American standards. The city is very cold, with temperatures ranging between 10 and 30 degrees daily this month. The city has not had such cold weather for 30 years.

With costs sky high, it is financially impossible for children to enjoy the warmth, food, and recreation we take for granted in the United States. Little children run around in their bare feet on the cold, and often wet concrete floors. Their clothing is scant and barely adequate. Their noses are sore from constant wiping.

All they want is love and affection, something most of them have never had. They

all run after you with outstretched arms asking to be picked up and hugged and kissed.

HOLT TO LEAVE SUNDAY

These children are a pitiful lot and want only their own mother and daddy. Many of them will be lucky, for in a few days the arms of a wondrously happy couple will warm them with the love and affection that will bring real life to their little bodies.

Holt will leave here, with his daughter Barbara, on the "Christmas package" airlift aboard the Pan American World Airways DC–7 superliner Sunday at 2 p. m. (Korean time) with arrival scheduled at San Francisco at 8: 30 p. m. the same day. He plans to return to Korea before December 31 to take one more load to the United States before the deadline.

[From the Oregonian of December 18, 1956]

MOTHERS OF MIXED BLOODS HAVE HARD LIFE IN KOREA

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—Oregonian Staff Writer Hilliard flew to Tokyo and Seoul earlier this month to acompany Harry Holt and his brood of GI babies on their trip to America. This story was written in Seoul, before the flight.)

Not all of the Korean children brought to America by farmer Harry Holt are real orphans. Many of them have been given up by their mothers, most of them reluctant to let their children go. These mothers are left behind to find a new life in Korea, for with their mixed blood children they are outcasts. The act they had committed was an ignominious one. Many of them have turned to prostitution to make a living. Korean mothers of mixed blood children are a dolorous lot.

Although many of them can blame themselves for their plight, a great many others can place the blame squarely on the shoulders of many deceitful foreign troops, and not all of them American.

In a visit to the Seventh-day Adventist sanitarium in Seoul last week, I met one of these mothers, an attractive 24-year-old native of Pusan.

She was at the hospital to see her 11-month-old daughter, Carol Diane, who was seriously ill. She had left the youngster in an orphan home when she went to visit her parents a few months ago in Pusan.

Miss Kim Soon Ja was afraid to take her child with her because her father did not know that she was married and had borne a child by an American soldier. Now she was at the hospital and she wanted her baby back. She was almost in tears as she told me her story.

Miss Kim had her first contact with the American soldier in Pusan shortly after the end of World War II. She had worked as a typist for a battalion there. Later she moved to Seoul, where she got a job with another battalion.

"It was while working with this group that I met my husband," recalled Miss Kim. "I tried hard not to like him because Korean woman should marry Korean. We are proud people. But all the time he tell me he love me, so we go to the chaplain.

"But the chaplain cannot marry us without consent of the company commander. The commander would not let his men marry Korean woman.

COMMANDER REFUSES

"I love this man very much and he all time say he love me. Pretty soon I going to have a baby. We go back to the chaplain and beg him to marry us. So he does marry us, but we do not tell the commander.

"Soon my husband tell me he has to go back to the States, but he says he will come back to Korea and get me.

"He leave for States in November 1955 and baby born in January 1956. He does not see baby but he all time write and send money. His folks send baby clothes.

"I get letters from him until last June. For 2 months I get no letter, then in September I get letter, last letter.

"In letter my husband say he is in love with American girl, and that he cannot have two loves. I write him, but he does not answer.

"In Korea it is very hard for mother of GI baby to live. People all time point finger at her.

"I must work, but it is hard to find job. I have nothing left but my baby. I love my baby and want to live with her the rest of my life. I loved my husband so much. He was my first love. Now I have only my daughter."

[From the Oregonian of December 24, 1956]

HARRY HOLT IGNORES DOCTORS TO MAKE HOMES FOR KOREAN ORPHANS

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—This is another in a series of articles by Mr. Hilliard concerning his experiences in the recent airlift of 89 mixed-blood children from Korea to adoptive homes in America, directed by Harry Holt of Creswell, Oreg.)

When Harry Holt, temporary father to more than 100 children of mixed blood in Korea, lay on the ground for 2 hours in 1950—unable to move because of a near-fatal heart attack—he decided then and there he would devote the rest of his life to humanity. The 51-year-old Creswell farmer has had to take life easy since then, but the pace he has set in bringing the mixed-blood children of Korea to adoptive homes in America is a frantic one.

HOLT FELT ASHAMED

Doctors told Holt in 1950 he would have to slow down drastically, even sell a part of his farm. For a time Holt was a man of leisure. He no longer got out of bed at sunrise, but slept sometimes until 9 a. m. and had breakfast in bed.

"I was kind of at loose ends then," remembers Holt. "I had to quit my business—a little gypo sawmill and a logging operation. I pretty near died from that severe heart attack."

It was in 1954 when Holt first saw motion pictures of the plight of the mixed-blood children in Korea. He and his family had gone to Eugene, about 15 miles from Creswell, to hear Dr. Bob Pierce, president of World Vision, Inc., and view his documentary pictures of the life in Korea.

After seeing the film, Other Sheep, a documentary which dealt primarily with the war widows and orphans of Korea, Holt left the high school auditorium feeling ashamed and burning with a desire to help "take care of those poor miserable babies."

This night was a turning point in the ever-active life of Holt. Although he has curtailed his chores on the farm to the satisfaction of his doctor and family, he has so stepped up his Korean "babylift" that the worry over his health and welfare has been renewed.

Since Holt first went to Korea in 1955 to adopt 8 Korean orphans—all 8 now happily settled on the Holt farm in Creswell—he has crossed the Pacific Ocean 8 times.

His entire family—his wife and four daughters and a son—has taken part in this gigantic family effort to provide real homes for the mixed-blood children of Korea. A daughter, Molly, a registered nurse, remains at the Holt orphan home in Seoul taking care of the children who are left at that haven at the rate of two a day.

The efforts of this Oregon family have been responsible for more than 200 homes for the unwanted children of Korea. Holt, himself, has chaperoned well over a hundred of the children to America, all by airlift.

Even a heart attack suffered by Holt while flying over the Pacific in August of this year failed to stop this seemingly indefatigable man who is extremely self-abnegating in his sincere efforts to better the plight of these mixed-blood children.

HOLT HAS ANSWER

Holt has an answer for the people in America that look with suspicion upon his adoption program.

"These kids are innocent victims," said Holt. "Some of their fathers were Americans, some were fighting men from other countries who made up the United Nations Army here. It is impossible for us to tell who fathered these children and we don't care.

"These children need help. Any life in the United States is better for them than this miserable existence here.

"We have a private investigation agency in the United States check the prospective parents of these children and it is after we receive their approval that we place these children in an adoptive home."

LATEST BABYLIFT LARGEST

Holt had no idea that he would go into the adoption business, but "the thing began to mushroom after I returned home with my eight new babies and received some publicity," recalls Holt.

"People started writing us, asking how they could adopt some of the Korean children. You can't help but get kind of interested in these children after you see their pictures.

"Sure didn't know what I was getting into. This is a lot harder on your heart in more ways than one."

Holt's latest babylift was his largest. The big Pan American World Airways plane that landed in San Francisco last week left Seoul with 91 children. Two of the youngsters were left in Honolulu where they began a new life in that warm territory, a far cry from the bitter cold they left behind in Korea.

[From the Oregonian of December 25, 1956]

AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN KOREA DRAW PRAISE

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—This is another in a series of articles by Mr. Hilliard, who flew to Tokyo and Seoul earlier this month and accompanied Harry Holt, farmer at Creswell, Oreg., and his planeload of Korean mixed-blood children on their trip to adoptive homes in the United States.)

American Christians can be proud of their missionaries in foreign lands—especially in those lands where living conditions fall way short of the cherished standards in this country. I witnessed just a small portion of the wonderful work of these dedicated people in Seoul, Korea. This big city with a population of 1,500,000 still shows the aftermath of the terrible Korean conflict despite fortitude of its remarkable citizenry.

In Seoul the lights are either too bright or too dim, many times they are out. The water supply is rationed. Oil is hard to purchase. The American dollar is worth more on the black market than it is at the official rate of exchange. Most of the cars were built in the 1930's. Except for the main roads, traveling is a hazardous as well as a shaky experience.

The missionaries don't seem to be perturbed by these inconveniences. They have become Korean and seem to enjoy their work and the Korean people and country with all sincerity.

The missionary work I witnessed in Korea was among the orphan and abandoned children, both of mixed parentage and Korean.

One religious group in Seoul, World Vision, Inc., helps support 105 orphan homes in Korea. This organization was founded in Portland by Dr. Bob Pierce and has as its executive secretary, Dr. Frank C. Philips, ex-director of Portland Youth for Christ.

In addition to its orphan homes, World Vision supports schools for the blind and deaf, homes for war widows and their children and a home for children of leper parents.

PRESBYTERIANS IN LEAD

Rev. Erwin W. Raetz, a missionary who was under house arrest by the Japanese in China for 6 months during World War II, is in charge of the World Vision's program in Korea.

Rev. Mr. Raetz said Korea, though small in size, is still a giant spiritually and contains the largest per capita Christian church membership in the Orient.

"The Presbyterian church supports the largest missionary group here," reported Rev. Mr. Raetz. "Next comes the Methodist and then the Oriental Missionary Society."

People in the United States provide virtually all the funds which support World Vision projects in Korea. Persons in America contribute $10 a month to support a child in one of the World Vision orphanages.

The child is cared for until he is 15. He then leaves the home and is under the supervision of the missionaries until he can make his own way in Korea's more than rugged life.

In Seoul there are three neat cottages for orphaned and abandoned children at the World Vision reception center. These are all new brick homes. Two of them were paid for by Harry Holt and his family. They were dedicated by Billy Graham.

This center is the finest orphan home I saw in Korea.

Holt's orphan home is a brick building with four rooms and is located on the Church of Christ Mission compound in Seoul. The land for this temporary orphanage was donated to Holt by the mission compound which is under the direction of Haskell Chesshir, missionary from the Church of Christ, Nashville, Tenn.

Holt plans to give the home to the mission compound when he has completed his baby-life efforts in Korea. The structure is 25 by 80 feet and was built in June at a cost of $3,500—cost of the material.

One of the bigger missionary projects in Korea is the hospital work of the Seventh-day Adventists.

ADVENTISTS HAVE SANITARIUM

The Seventh-day Adventists operate the Seoul sanitarium and hospital just out of Seoul, one of the finest hospitals in all Korea, and a sanitarium in Pusan.

In charge of the Seoul sanitarium where complete physical examinations for all babies scheduled for adoptive homes in the United States are given, is Dr. and Mrs. George Rue, parents of Dr. George Rue, Jr., a member of the staff of the Portland sanitarium.

Dr. James Kiger and his doctor wife Betty, supervise the work at the sanitarium in Pusan.

Dr. Rue, 57, sees an average of 150 patients on a busy day at the sanitarium. His day starts at 6 a. m. and isn't over until around 7 or 8 p. m. He and his wife, Grace, went to Korea in 1929.

ADOPTED CHILDREN PLACED

On the staff of the Seoul sanitarium are three doctors, two resident physicians and three internes. One of the doctors is a Korean woman.

The 125-bed hospital was built in 1935. Included in its buildings are lodging for 71 children—many of whom are adopted by American families. The mixed-blood children go to the United States and the Koreans are placed in adopted homes in Korea.

About 75 children this year have been adopted by couples in the United States and about 60 by Korean homes. An international social service investigates the homes before any of the children are placed in them.

Holt uses the facilities of all these organizations in his huge orphan operation in Seoul. He will accept children for adoption from all homes and from many mothers who have given up on their care for them. Many American servicemen use Holt's program to get waifs they have "adopted" to good homes in the States.

The history-making flight of Holt and 91 of his children from Seoul to Honolulu aboard a chartered Pan American World Airways plane included children from at least four different homes in Korea.

[From the Oregonian of December 26, 1956]

MISSION IN KOREA KEEPS HOLT MOVING CONSTANTLY TO ARRANGE FLIGHT DETAILS

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—This is another in a series of articles by Mr. Hilliard, who flew to Tokyo and Seoul earlier this month and accompanied Harry Holt, farmer at Creswell, Oreg., and his planeload of Korean mixed-blood children on their trip to adoptive homes in the United States.)

What does Harry Holt do in Korea?

Trying to keep up with this humanitarian is like trying to follow a football being handled by a clever quarterback. He is on the move all the time and is always one move ahead of anyone trying to check his pace.

Holt went to Korea for the fourth time in early November to pave the way for the gigantic "babylift" that brought 89 children from Seoul to San Francisco last week aboard a chartered Pan-American World Airways plane.

SPECIAL OFFICE OPENED

The Creswell farmer, who already has two scars on his heart, worked feverishly in Seoul preparing more than 100 children for the long trip to America and a new home.

Holt has set up his own adoption office in Seoul and also operates his own orphan home. He is seldom in his office. Molly, his 21-year-old daughter, who is a graduate of Sacred Heart Hospital in Eugene, is in charge of the orphan home.

Holt is up early in Seoul, and after a quick breakfast takes off in a 1956 station wagon borrowed from World Vision, Inc., with a load of mixed-blood children.

PHYSICAL TESTS TEDIOUS

Before the sun was down Holt covered at least 50 miles. His trips took him to the American Embassy, the Norwegian Tuberculosis Hospital, the Korean Government office, the Seoul Sanitarium and Hospital, 2 or 3 other orphan homes and the Pan American agent in Seoul.

Holt drove the station wagon and did most of the repairs on the machine, one of the few late model cars in Seoul. The station wagon took the bumps in the corrugated Korean roads much smoother than the popular jeeps did.

Biggest headache for Holt was getting complete physical examinations for all the children. Both the Korean and American Governments demanded thorough examinations and were particularly interested in tuberculosis tests reports.

Since the public-health service physician for the United States made few trips to Korea, the complete examinations of the children to the satisfaction of the United States Government posed quite a problem for Holt.

The United States recognizes only the Seventh Day Adventist Sanitarium in Seoul and Holt had to take all of his children there. Some days this meant going to the hospital with as many as 30 children.

Since some of these children did not pass their physical examinations, others had to be taken. Still many more had to have additional X-rays taken.

The sanitarium was a busy place. At least 70 patients had to be handled by the staff in addition to the Holt children.

The trip to the sanitarium took about 30 minutes. Once at the hospital, the children were ushered into a 9-by-5 waiting room, where the wait sometimes was as long as 8 hours.

Watching the active children, many of whom were frightened, was quite a chore. It included changing diapers, rocking, feeding, and playing games. When it came time for the inoculations and blood tests, you had to pitch in and play nurse. You learn to be patient at the sanitarium and Holt was the most patient of all.

When Holt returned to the orphan home—also his home in Seoul—he spent most of his time walking around playing with the children and discussing the progress of the babylift project with his staff.

Holt has a staff of three men and a woman, all Korean, in his Holt adoption program office in Seoul. A staff that varies from 4 to 6 women assists Molly at the orphan home.

Holt's business card, printed in both English and Korean, carries this quotation from the Bible: "For the children whom the Lord hath given."

[From the Oregonian of December 27, 1956]

GI'S WELCOME AT ORPHAN HOMES IN KOREA—SOME SERVICEMEN ADOPT FORGOTTEN WAIFS

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—This is another in a series of articles by Mr. Hilliard, who flew to Tokyo and Seoul earlier this month and accompanied Harry Holt, farmer at Creswell, Oreg., and his planeload of Korean mixed-blood children on their trip to adoptive homes in the United States.)

The GI is a good guy, both at home and abroad.

The American serviceman in Korea has seen the demoralizing devastation of that far-away-from-home peninsula. He knows the suffering that lies ahead for the mixed-blood children, and many of them have taken steps to either alleviate this suffering or eliminate it.

All of the orphan homes in Korea are open to the GI. Their visits are regular and eagerly awaited by the youngsters of these homes. Candy, other sweets, and clothing are distributed in the homes by the GI.

If there is one American word the Korean orphan can say, it is "GI."

Most of the American servicemen—they make up the bulk of the United Nations forces in Korea—are with the 8th Army in Seoul or are stationed with the Air Force at Kimpo Air Base, a short distance from Seoul.

A few of the servicemen adopt children in Korea and take them home. This is not very common, since most of the service personnel in Korea are single.

But even the single serviceman shows more humanitarianism than most people at home credit to him.

Typical of one of these GI's is Airman Charles L. Finn, 24, of Fayetteville, Tenn. Finn "adopted" a Korean youngster 15 months ago. He fell in love with the boy, and wrote his parents about him.

Since Finn is still single, he isn't eligible to adopt his "son" legally, but his folks, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Finn, of Fayetteville, are, and they're doing just that through the Harry Holt adoption program.

Finn is to get married when he returns to Fayetteville, and then he and his wife will adopt the boy.

AIRMAN DELAYS RETURN

He first met the youngster at Ang Yang Ni in Korea when he was stationed with the 440th signal aviation construction battalion.

A KP working in the compound brought the boy to the company.

Finn was to leave Korea for home in August, but he had not finished the adoption procedure for his son, so the Air Force gave him an extension to complete the program and take his boy home with him.

He had hoped to be one of the escorts on the special Pan American World Airways plane that brought 89 mixed-blood children to San Francisco from Seoul last week, but there were still papers to be filled before his son could leave the country.

Holt has helped many of the American servicemen adopt children. Another GI who came to Holt's orphanage while I was there was SP3c. Robert Adams, Cleveland, Ohio. This soldier has adopted a girl. Holt will see that the girl gets to the United States.

The stories in the Korean papers of mothers deserting their babies in the streets and at the gates of orphan homes—many of these children are not found until it is too late—have touched the hearts of these young Americans.

They are doing what they can to bring happiness to the life of these unwanted children of Korea.

[From the Oregonian of December 28, 1956]

CANDY, GUM, TOYS QUIET HOWLING TOTS ON AIRLIFT TO AMERICA

(By William Hilliard)

(NOTE.—This is the last in a series of articles by Mr. Hilliard, who flew to Tokyo and Seoul earlier this month and accompanied Harry Holt, farmer at Creswell, Oreg., and his planeload of Korean children of mixed parentage on their trip to adoptive homes in the United States.)

There was nothing but confusion at Kimpo airbase in Seoul, Korea, the day Harry Holt showed up with 91 orphans, offspring of Korean women and United Nations servicemen.

It was another cold day in Seoul and the little children were well-dressed in their mismatched, secondhand clothing as they awaited their first plane flight—a flight to a new land and a new home.

Pan American World Airways' chartered plane that took Holt and the children to the United States had to take off from Kimpo because of the heavy load of passengers and fuel.

The youngsters were both confused and happy over the proceedings, but once aboard the airplane and fastened to their seats with safety belts, they became a howling lot, too confused to know what was about to happen and afraid that they would be left alone.

ONLY 74 TOTS ALLOWED

Holt had been told by Pan American representatives in Seoul and Tokyo that he would be allowed to take only 74 children aboard the plane because of safety precautions.

Holt was hopeful, however, that more children would be allowed to make the flight. He had more than 100 processed and ready to make the trip and took 91 to the airport with him.

"A crowded plane is much better for these children than having to stay here in Seoul," he bellowed.

When Capt. Richard Campbell, pilot of the plane, looked over the cute youngsters at the airport and checked the physical condition of the 14 escorts, he decided it was safe to take along the additional 17 youngsters, including 24 bassinet passengers.

ESCORTS HELD RESPONSIBLE

He made it plain to the escorts, however, that they were to be responsible for the children.

On board the plane for the nonstop flight to Honolulu—a first for a commercial airline plane—were a crew of 10, 14 escorts, including this writer and Holt, and 91 children.

Of the 14 escorts, 7 were women who were in charge of the infants and smaller children. The men had in tow the older, more active youngsters, with about 6 children to each man.

Except for takeoffs and landings, the trip consisted mainly of taking the youngsters to the toilet and changing diapers. On the takeoffs and landings the children were fastened in their seats with safety belts—a condition that seemed to frighten them terribly.

Pan American provided toys, comic books and fruit for the children and between Seoul and Honolulu they kept themselves busy playing with the toys, tearing up the books and eating the fruit.

The trip to the toilet was a never-ending one. When you thought you had a boy, you suddenly discovered you had a girl and things had to be done a little differently.

The children were well trained, however, so there were few accidents.

From Seoul to Honolulu the crew and the escorts had the situation well in hand, but gradually the youngsters began to take over. By the time the plane arrived in San Francisco, the children were on top. The escorts were dead tired from lack of sleep and could not offer much in the form of resistance to a band of excited youngsters.

Korean-Hawaiians and many volunteers met the plane in Honolulu and took charge of the children while the escorts took it easy.

These people gave the children candy leis, gum and a variety of other sweets. Their reception for these youngsters was as enthusiastic and as emotional as the one the children received in San Francisco.

From Honolulu to San Francisco, escorts were busy cleaning gum from their shoe soles and from faces of youngsters.

The youngsters soiled more than 1,000 diapers and consumed 8 gallons of formula on the trip from Seoul to San Francisco.

They took the flight well, despite the newness of it all to them.

THE FBI STORY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have recently read the book The FBI Story by Mr. Don Whitehead, and I should like to make a few comments for the RECORD concerning this volume.

In recent years there seems to have been waged a campaign of falsehood and vilification against the FBI by persons who, because of ignorance or for personal self-interest, have sought to discredit this agency.

Personally, I have always supported the FBI in the past, and I intend to do so in the future. In my opinion, the brief foreword to the book written by Director J. Edgar Hoover is sufficient to justify the publication of the entire volume.

However, from the brilliant pen of Mr. Don Whitehead, who is well known to many Members of the Senate, there flows a vivid account of the growth and activities of the FBI from its inception. Because of the very nature of its operations the FBI has been somewhat mysterious to most people. This book therefore is invaluable to those who would like to understand the day-to-day untiring efforts of this agency on behalf of our national security.

Hitherto unrevealed facts about the fight against the Communist conspiracy are disclosed. The sordid trail of the atom spies is detailed. The struggle for law and order against the kill-crazy gangs of the Dillinger era is recounted.

This is an exciting volume, and a heart-warming one in that it demonstrates that free people can actually provide an investigative agency for their own protection without allowing that agency to assume any of the undesirable characteristics of a gestapo.

My reaction to the entire book was that it reflected throughout its pages the devotion of the 14,000 men and women to the motto of the FBI: fidelity, bravery, and integrity. I earnestly recommend that each Senator take the necessary time to become acquainted with this factual account of the finest investigative agency in the world.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another notable book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

THE CITADEL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the recently published book The Citadel by William S. White, of the New York Times, is a searching and definitive work on the Senate—its traditions, its customs, its operations, and its personnel, present and former.

Here is an authoritative inside picture of the Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body. The book is objective, and gives the reader an impression of the Senate and its Members which cannot be obtained from a casual perusal of its daily proceedings.

Mr. White has brilliantly presented the story of the Senate today, against the historical backdrop of earlier Senates, and in so doing, has provided a continuity which affords a great appreciation of what the Senate is.

The book is incisive in recognizing the supersedence of common good over partisanship. It senses the high purpose of the Members of this body.

I believe that the book—The Citadel—will be a most important and most valuable source for political students of the future as well as the present.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ALBERT GALLATIN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the history of the realization and growth of our country as a democracy is in large part the history of men who came from other lands to give their full talents and devotion to that cause. Such a man was Albert Gallatin, Swiss-born American patriot, whose birth 196 years ago, on January 29, 1761, we commemorate today. As a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, I am especially proud to pay him tribute, for Albert Gallatin made many of his contributions to our country as a Senator from Pennsylvania.

At the age of 19 young Gallatin arrived in Boston in 1780 from Geneva, where his aristocratic family figured prominently in the political life of that city. But Gallatin was fired with the spirit of democracy and liberty. After entering business here and later teaching French at Harvard, he turned to real estate in the Pennsylvania backwoods, where his democratic views won him the support of the people. His first political task in

redrafting the Constitution of Pennsylvania found him fighting for popular government, freedom of the press, and popular suffrage.

As Senator from Pennsylvania he fought Hamilton's concept and management of the fiscal affairs of the nation. Because he strongly believed in the right of the American people to know how and where the government was spending their moneys, he succeeded in bringing about the creation of the House Ways and Means Committee, and was its first chairman.

As our second Secretary of the Treasury, under Jefferson, Gallatin worked to extend commercial treaties with other lands. In his dealings with England and France, as our ambassador to both those countries, his basic belief that sound commercial relations between nations was the key to international amity and prosperity won for us the lasting friendships of these and other nations.

Together with Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and many others, this great patriot is indeed deserving of the rank of one of our foremost Founding Fathers. Of all his concepts the one which has the most meaning to us today is this: Harmonious commercial dealings with the nations of the world are infinitely more fruitful than trade wars and commercial enmity.

In this light it is appropriate that we consider how America's commercial relations with free nations could be improved. This would be particularly fitting in the case of Switzerland, one of the oldest democracies and the land of Gallatin's birth. It has been subjected to a number of unusual and severe trade measures, specifically the watch tariff increase of 1954, and most recently in the demand for watch import quotas.

These harassments are, of course, in direct contradiction to President Eisenhower's policy of trade, not aid, and cause harm to our country as well as our friends abroad. In the tradition of Gallatin, let us seek mutually profitable trade relations, not only with Switzerland which gave us this great genius and patriot, but with all friendly nations. That is the best tribute we can pay Albert Gallatin.

DEATH OF WILLIAM ROSS WALLACE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise to mark the passing of one of Utah's great citizens, a man who is known to many of my colleagues because in his own State he was known as the Father of Reclamation. I refer to Mr. William Ross Wallace, who passed away yesterday at the age of 91. He was deeply interested in the work which culminated in the authorization of the Upper Colorado River storage project. I am sure that the successful end to his lifelong effort in that respect brought him great satisfaction.

He was also deeply interested in and willing to invest his own funds in many minor irrigation projects in the State which have been developed for the help of the people over a period of many years.

I think I should also remark that he might have been a Member of this august body. He was a candidate for the Democratic nomination to the Senate in 1932. By a different turn of the wheel of fortune he might have had a distinguished career in the Senate.

We in Utah have lost a devoted, unselfish servant. His last service was as chairman of the Utah power and water board. All those who have benefited from his service to reclamation mourn his passage today.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the January 24 Minneapolis Star. This editorial expresses the interest and approval of the people of Minnesota for the Department of Agriculture's program for expanding the recreational facilities of our national forests.

This program called Operation Outdoors, has my full support and approval. Operation Outdoors will mean much to the lovers of the outdoor life in Minnesota where we have two large national forests. It will have the long-range effect of encouraging among our people a greater appreciation for our Nation's beautiful and bounteous forest resources.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 24, 1957]

OPERATION OUTDOORS

The importance of national forests in ministering to outdoor recreation should not be overlooked—and isn't. In 1955 nearly 46 million persons visited national forests for recreation. That's almost as many as the 50 million who visited national parks the same year.

So it's good news that the department of agriculture is starting a five-year program, called Operation Outdoors, which is designed to double camping and picknicking facilities in the forests within the next 5 years. More than two thousand camping and picnic grounds will be added to accommodate 40,000 families at one time. The existing 4,900 camp and picnic grounds, which can adequately handle 41,000 families, will be rehabilitated.

Existing facilities were largely built by the civilian conservation corps between 1933 and 1941. They were excellent, but they have deteriorated under excessive use. In 1946, the first year after World War II, 18 million recreation-minded persons visited the national forests. By 1962 the number may be 66 million.

National forests are readily accessible to many areas which have no national parks. Minnesota, for instance, has no national park but has two large and beautiful national forests—Superior and Chippewa. Superior has 43 campgrounds and 425 wilderness campsites, all well patronized. New facilities are designed for 650 additional families. As elsewhere, resort development will be left to private interests.

Operation Outdoors sounds like a grand idea. And it should be even more successful if the million-acre wilderness area of northern Minnesota, which is within Superior Forest, is protected from commercial exploitation.

RADIO BROADCASTS OF FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two radio broadcasts of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the radio broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1956

A copy of a telegram has just come across our desk, asking us to contribute from $25 to $1,000 to a fund to sell Secretary Benson to the farmers. Naturally, we were surprised, and we figured you will want to know about this telegram because the money collected will be used to spread the flexible farm price program and the philosophy of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson. Needless to say, none of the farmers' money will be in that fund. In a minute, we'll tell you the names of the men who signed this "farm the farmers" telegram. But first, let's read what the telegram says.

It starts out by praising Secretary Benson's book, which he didn't write himself, and which he calls, "Farmers at the Crossroads". The telegram says the book is "the most important document of this period—clears widespread misunderstanding—outlines sound nonpolitical farm solution." And, it explains that "the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation—a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization is giving Secretary Benson's book nationwide distribution."

The telegram quotes Mr. Benson himself as saying that, "In this book, I have tried to outline principles that must be the guide to a sound nonpolitical farm problem solution so far as possible within our free enterprise system." And, Mr. Benson then urges the "mass distribution of my book as a public service." The tax-deductible money raised as a result of this telegram will be earmarked to peddle Benson's book. The telegram explains that the Foundation has already mailed out 850,000 abbreviated versions of the book, and intends to send 3 million more to farmers and city leaders.

We read Secretary Benson's book a long time ago. There is nothing that can be said except that it sells price-flexing and free markets. Every farmer caught in the vise of the cost-price squeeze is familiar with the effects of this policy. The thing that will interest farmers most is not the fact that the book is being distributed en masse, but rather the group of signers to this telegram asking for contributions. We'll read those names to you now. Here they are:

Donald J. Cowling of Minneapolis, former president of Carlton College.

Roy W. Larsen, president of Twin City Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Oliver L. Hale, president of W. S. Nott Co., Minneapolis.

William E. MacGregor, Minneapolis attorney.

Frank J. Anderson, Chairman, Foley Bros., general contractors, St. Paul.

Louis T. Kenny, President, Kenny Boiler & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul.

J. R. Borchert, president, Borchert-Ingersoll, Inc., contractors equipment and supplies, St. Paul.

W. R. Youngquist, president, First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Minneapolis and Saint Paul.

F. Peavey Heffelfinger, president, F. H. Peavey & Co., Minneapolis.

H. L. Donahower, president, Standard Conveyor Co., St. Paul.

The telegram points out that the business affiliations of these men are given "for identification only." It asks that contributions be sent to Midland National Bank of Minneapolis, and emphasizes that all contributions for distribution of Secretary Benson's book are deductible on income tax returns. We thought you might like to know, when Secretary Benson's book, expounding flexible farm prices, arrives in

your mailbox, free and postpaid, who footed the bill.

This information is brought to you by GTA, The Co-Op Way—owned and operated by grain farmers of the Midwest.

JANUARY 17, 1957

A shadow has been cast over all the prevailing talk about America's fantastic prosperity. It happened the other day when the Department of Agriculture handed over to Congress a study of possible uses of a food stamp plan. Congress had directed the Department to make such a study and to offer detailed plans for putting a food stamp plan into effect. When Congress put this provision in the 1956 farm bill, news dispatches reported the Secretary of Agriculture as unhappy with the idea of a food stamp plan, but he had to follow congressional orders and get a report ready on it. Under such a plan, those eligible to participate would be issued stamps, good for the purchase of designated foods. The purchasing power provided by the stamps would be designed to supplement normal food expenditures.

Among other things, Congress wanted to know how many people would benefit from a food stamp plan. The report of the Department gave the answer to that question. It said that 25 million Americans might find such a food stamp plan beneficial. Roughly figuring, it is estimated that you probably would not benefit from the plan if your family income totals $13.75 or more a week for each member. But if your family income falls below that figure, you'd probably be eligible.

The 25 million making up the group that could use the food stamp plan includes 6 million getting State and Federal assistance. The other 19 million are not getting welfare grants, but they do not earn enough to provide them with an adequate low-cost diet, based on the Department's minimum standards. What does it cost to get those minimum standards? The Department estimates that it would cost about $5.50 a person, on a four-member family basis, to buy a week's supply of food patterned after the minimum standards.

There are 25 million who aren't able to buy food to meet that minimum standard. That's a key finding in this report, which the Secretary of Agriculture handed in to Congress. The Department estimated that it would cost the Government an average of $100 a year for each person participating in the program. But, as Congressmen supporting the food stamp plan point out, it would help reduce the Government holdings of farm crops—cutting costs of those programs.

The Secretary had no recommendations. He has frowned on the idea in the past. But, it is up to Congress to decide what is to be done. The study has shown that in this land of plenty and prosperity, 25 million Americans aren't getting a diet meeting the minimum standards. Is it in the public interest to do something about this? Many Congressmen—we don't know how many—think so. In any event, some leading Senators from both political parties reintroduced a bill calling for a food stamp plan.

This report on happenings in Washington comes from GTA, the Co-Op Way.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last Saturday night I had the honor of speaking to the Ukrainians of the city of Philadelphia. The Ukrainians have become outstanding and leading Americans and have been a great force in advancing the ideals of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the body of the RECORD a copy of my address.

I also ask unanimous consent to print in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short sketch relating to Ukrainian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the address and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The independence of Ukraine and the union of all Ukrainian territory into one national state has been for centuries the ideal of the Ukrainian people. It has its origin in the memories of the independence and unity of the old Kievan State of Volodymyr the Great (979–1015) and Yaroslav the Wise (1019–54); it was the high point in the careers of Ukrainian Cromwell-Hetman Bohdan Khmelnitsky (1648–57) and of the great Ukrainian patriot—Hetman Ivan Mazeppa (1687–1709). It continued to be alive during two centuries between the fall of Hetman Mazeppa and the First World War.

This centuries old dream, however, was not realized until on those 2 wintry days when in the square of Saint Sophia in Kiev the Ukrainian Independent State was established January 22, 1918, and the unity of all Ukrainian territories was proclaimed January 22, 1919.

It would be noteworthy to point out that the Ukrainians occupied the leading place among the revolting peoples of the Tsarist Russian Empire. In 1917 through a strange coincidence the Revolution began on the 56th anniversary of the death of the great Ukrainian poet, national prophet and patriot, Taras Shevchenko (1814–61). On this day (March 10) the first regiment of the Russian Imperial Army which passed over to the side of the Revolution was the Volhynian Regiment of the Guards. It was composed exclusively of Ukrainians. Thus the Ukrainians within the ranks of the Imperial Army effectively helped the Tsarist regime to fall and the peoples of the Empire to enter the roads of freedom and independence.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL

From the very start, the Revolution was not only conducted in the name of social ideals, but also meant a national disintegration of the Russian Empire. Acting promptly the Ukrainians created a Ukrainian Parliament—Ukrainska Centralna Rada (Ukrainian National Council). It was the strongest political force in Ukraine during the period between the fall of the Tsar and the seizure of power by the Bolsheviki (November 7, 1917). It was organized in Kiev and enjoyed a wide popular support. In the elections to the Russian Constituent Assembly of 1917, the Ukrainian parties supporting the Ukrainian Rada assembled 66.7 percent of all votes in Ukraine. In some provinces (e. g., the Kiev province) the percentage of Ukrainian votes amounted to 77.2 percent. The president of the Ukrainian Central Rada was the well-known professor and prominent Ukrainian historian, Michael Hrushevsky.

FOURTH UNIVERSAL

As after the seizure of power by the Bolsheviki the chaos in Russia increased, the logic of events demanded that Ukraine proclaim itself independent and free of Russian rule. Accordingly, the Ukrainian Central Rada issued its "Fourth Universal" on the 22d of January 1918, in which it proclaimed Ukraine an independent and sovereign state. "People of Ukraine," announced the Universal, "by your power, desire, and will there has been created on Ukrainian soil a free Ukrainian National Republic. There has been realized the old dream of our fathers, who struggled for freedom and rights of the working people. In a difficult hour, the freedom of Ukraine has been born. From today the Ukrainian National Republic becomes the independent, free, sovereign state of the Ukrainian people."

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

The hour, indeed, was difficult. Although Lenin hypocritically recognized the right of the Ukrainian people for self-determination and his Council of People's Comissars recognized the Ukrainian government in Ukraine, the Red Army troops were sent into Ukraine to bathe the Ukrainian independence in blood. From the very beginning of Communist rule, Ukraine and its population have been used as a gigantic laboratory for future Soviet conquests. It is in Ukraine that the Soviet masters worked out their program of disintegration, infiltration, exploitation, and russification that they have employed so successfully since the end of World War II. It has cost the Ukrainians dearly to serve as this laboratory for they have perished by millions in defense of their freedom.

UNION

Meanwhile, the Ukrainian Independence War (1917–1921) continued. One year later, on the 22nd of January 1919, on the first anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic, the union of the two Ukrainian republics, Ukrainian National Republic, headed by the Directory in Kiev, and Western Ukrainian National Republic, founded after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire on the first of November, 1918, and headed by the Ukrainian National Rada in Galicia, was proclaimed. The proclamation accepting western Ukraine into national union with eastern Ukraine which was read to the assembled people in the square of Saint Sophia in Kiev on January 22, 1919, ended with the words: "From today, until the end of time, there will be one, undivided, independent Ukrainian National Republic."

The Ukrainian independent united state founded on those two wintry days in the square of Saint Sophia in Kiev could not endure. It was overthrown by common efforts of the Red and White Russians, the Poles, and the Rumanians. Democratic Ukraine was too weak to defend itself alone against all these land-hungry neighbors. Having no outside aid it fell after 4 years of desperate fight against the aggressors.

However, both acts proclaimed in the square of Saint Sophia in Kiev have immense importance for the formation of Ukrainian national idea. They have become the basic dogma of every modern Ukrainian, and millions of Ukrainians have sacrificed their lives for the realization of Ukrainian independence and unity. The heroic deeds of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) of our days as well as the desperate struggle of the Ukrainian political prisoners in the Soviet concentration camps witnessed by many foreigners prove that the Ukrainians prefer death as free men to life as slaves.

WESTERN ALLIES

Ukraine has always turned to the West for assistance. In the days of the great Ukrainian War for Liberation (1917–1921) the great powers of the West declined to consider the Ukrainian situation, and thus allowed the Communists of Moscow to remain the masters of Ukraine. Today when the West is threatened as never before it is but an act of prudence to assist the Ukrainians in their struggle and to help them to become a free and independent nation.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA AT THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE, SPONSORED BY THE PHILADELPHIA DIVISION, UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, IN TOWN HALL, PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY 26, 1957

It is a great honor to address this meeting of free men and women, assembled in rededication to the sacred cause of liberty.

We meet to salute the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence — an anniversary which stirs the heart of every American who hopes and prays for a world of peace, freedom, and brotherhood under God.

We meet to honor the freedom fighters of every land and every generation who suffered and died to advance the cause of human liberty.

Here in the great and historic city of Philadelphia, American independence was proclaimed. Here the foundation of American greatness was established by heroes and patriots who prized liberty above life itself.

It is therefore most appropriate, here in Philadelphia, to reaffirm our firm and abiding faith in the eventual liberation of all enslaved nations that suffer under Communist tyranny and oppression.

The struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history.

After centuries of foreign domination this ancient land of high cultural and spiritual development reached full freedom as an independent Republic January 22, 1918.

Its courageous and resolute people fought valiantly in defense of their liberty but were overwhelmed by the superior military might of Communist aggression. For 37 years they have been enslaved and persecuted under the iron yoke of Russian imperialism. But they have kept alive the spirit of their national independence. They have never abandoned hope for the reestablishment of their land as a free, sovereign, and independent nation.

As Americans we hold sacred the fundamental principle that all men are equal in the sight of God—equally endowed with the divine blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

All of us honor and revere those immortal words from the Declaration of Independence. They express the ideals which have shaped the course of the American Republic. They have guided the United States on its historic mission as the world's foremost champion of human liberty. They have been the bright beacon of hope for the persecuted and the oppressed.

Our love of freedom inspires in our hearts the deepest sympathy for those who bear the intolerable burden of Communist terrorism. No matter what our ancestry may be we have the highest admiration for the valor of the Hungarian patriots who faced the Soviet tanks, bombs and machine guns with the only weapons at their command—their bare hands, their flesh and their blood. In all the history of man's struggle to be free there has been no more soul-stirring chapter.

The ideals for which they gave their lives are the same for which Washington's ragged Continentals suffered and died on the frozen battlefields of the Revolution. They fought for the same liberty, the same independence, the same freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly and of religion—the same way of life in pursuit of happiness under a form of government chosen by their own free will.

The revolt in Hungary, the uprising in Poland, the fearless resistance movement in Ukraine, all have their foundation in the indestructible spirit of freedom. The yearning of men to be free, as ordained by the Creator of the universe, lives forever. It survives, even though it is crushed to earth by mass murder, large scale deportations, brutal torture in slave labor camps, the suppression of religion and the destruction of all human rights.

A little more than a week ago there was a report in the press of unrest among Ukrainian students. It was reported that Soviet tanks had been called out to suppress demonstrations in Kiev.

As it appeared in the newspapers it was a small item. It was not given prominence but it was an important and highly significant piece of news. It brought out clearly that among the youth of the Ukraine, just as among the young people of Hungary, Poland and other captive nations, the Communist system of education and forced indoctrination had failed.

It was further proof that the boys and girls, who are our hope for a free world of tomorrow, have not been victimized by the propaganda of the Soviet dictators. It was another sign to the world that the flame of liberty has not been extinguished but awaits the day when it will burst forth to illuminate the dark corners where freedom has been denied. Last Monday, in his magnificant inaugural address, President Eisenhower thrilled the Nation when he pledged that our objective today, as always, is "the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails."

The words of our President were most impressive as he declared, and I quote:

"The building of such a peace is a bold and solemn purpose. To proclaim it is easy. To serve it will be hard. And to attain it we must be aware of its full meaning—and ready to pay its full price.

"We know clearly what we seek and why," the President continued. "We seek peace—knowing as all ages of man have known, that peace is the climate of freedom."

In these words our great President not only gave a message of encouragement to every nation held captive behind the Iron Curtain, but also called upon every one of us to do our full duty as Americans.

We must be ready to pay the price of peace and freedom—not only for ourselves but for the generations that will follow us far into the future.

We must be ready to pay the price if we are to sustain and support the aspirations of those nations that long for freedom.

We must be ready to pay the price of victory in the worldwide conflict between human liberty and the godless forces of enslavement.

Let us consider briefly the world situation confronting the United States today.

The course of history has placed on the American people the responsibility for peace and progress in the world.

We recognize that the only threat to peace and freedom comes from the ambition of Soviet imperialists to dominate and enslave the entire world.

We have learned by tragic experience that the Russian imperialists look upon compacts and agreements as mere scraps of paper. Not once since diplomatic recognition was extended to their gangster government have they honored the terms of any agreement.

Communist Russia has sabotaged every effort for peace and will continue to do so.

The savage brutality exhibited by the Russians against the Hungarian patriots should wipe out forever the illusion of peaceful coexistence.

The United States stands as the one strong barrier against further aggression against free people—the one power on earth that can rally free men in resistance to tyranny and the preservation of human liberty.

We have learned that there can be no compromise with communism—that strength is the only language that the Kremlin understands.

Therefore, my fellow Americans, it is our duty, today more than ever, to renew our allegiance to the enduring principles of American patriotism. We must do all within our power to strengthen the structure of American greatness.

First, let me point out that we Americans are a peace-loving people. It is our proud boast that we are the most powerful Nation in all history—yet we have never imposed tyranny upon any people of the earth. We have never fought a war of conquest. We have never sought territorial gain by force of arms.

Whenever we have been forced into armed conflict we have fought on the side of honor, justice and freedom. We have made terrific sacrifices in blood and treasure to liberate oppressed and persecuted people.

Our sole objective in war has been to uphold the integrity of free nations, to preserve the principle of individual freedom and to protect the right of free people to live under the form of government chosen by their own free will.

For 150 years we have been able to keep our shores free from armed invaders. Of all the world's great nations we are the only one that has escaped the desolation and destruction of war.

In these days, when human liberty faces its most desperate challenge, we must be alert, watchful and vigilant.

The jet-propelled plane, the atomic weapons and the hydrogen bomb have changed the whole picture of offensive and defensive war. They have revolutionized the whole concept of military science. They give tragic emphasis to the fundamental truth that the world must live in peace or bring about its own destruction.

We know, however, that enduring peace cannot be achieved by force alone. It can be realized through truth, honor, justice, and devotion to high moral and spiritual standards.

But until these ideals are accepted by the whole world, including the Communists, we must face facts that cannot be ignored.

To save the world from the total disaster of war, America must be strong—not in arms alone—but strong in the spirit of our forefathers, strong in patriotism, ready and willing to do our full duty in peace and in war.

Unfortunately there are too many misguided Americans who do not understand and do not appreciate the real meaning of America.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our security and our progress.

Good citizenship is the basis of patriotism. That is why I am constantly urging every individual to take a more active, intelligent and patriotic part in government.

We will not attain our full strength as a Nation until every American has a clear understanding of his individual responsibility for the future of the United States.

We must have a revival of faith in the American concept of individual freedom.

We must teach the glories of the American way of life and what it has accomplished.

We must develop a stronger and more willing spirit of public service, civic mindedness and moral leadership.

We must think more of our duties as citizens rather than our rights and privileges.

We must safeguard the national economy against abuses by big business, big labor and big government.

We must strengthen the moral and spiritual vitality of our people. We must practice honesty, self-reliance, thrift, tolerance and above all, faith in God.

We pray that America may never turn away from its historic mission—to defend liberty, to oppose oppression, to stand

against injustice and to support the aspirations of all men of good will for a world of peace.

We hope and pray for the day when all nations will lay down their arms and live in brotherhood under God.

But until that happy day dawns we must be prepared to defend the God-given freedom that we hold sacred.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS OF URSULINE ACADEMY, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on last Friday, January 25, 1957, we had as our guests in the gallery, 33 students of Ursuline Academy of New Orleans, La., who were visiting the Nation's Capital as a part of a trip that also took them to New York and St. Louis.

It is interesting to note that this institution of learning is generally considered the oldest girls' boarding school in the United States and that its faculty, the Sisters of the Ursuline Order, not only are among New Orleans' first citizens but also won the city's admiration and eternal gratitude for their service during the Battle of New Orleans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the names of the young ladies who visited us, as well as the names of the religious and lay chaperones who accompanied them.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Religious chaperones: Mother Mary Francis, OSU; and Mother Mary, OSU. Lay chaperones: Miss Adele Kelly, Miss Irma Smart, and Miss Sylvia Probst.

Students: Suzanne Artigues, Marily Ciaccio, Sandra Corbin, Dorinda Downes, Adrienne Gueymard, Michelle Kane, Anita Minor, Marigen Pallares, Rudona Regan, Lynn Roubion, Dorothy Titus, Loretto Babst, Joan Levy, Rita Deichmann, Myra Elston, Lise Eltz, Jean Gay, Suzette Kempff, Kay Parent, Marie Louise Riviere, Martha Ann Schmidt, Mary Virginia Tormey, Adele Allain, Connie Cahill, Jo Ann Fazzio, Anne Generes, Courtney Kuntz, Patricia Mackel, Carmen Perez, Myrna Rivet, Alma Soignier, Walida Treuting, and Andra Capaci.

OPENING DAY PRAYER BY THE CHAPLAIN (S. DOC. NO. 16)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opening day prayer delivered by the Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, on January 3, 1957, be printed as a Senate document. I have cleared this request with both the majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RELATING TO THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the contents of a telegram which I have received from a citizen of my State, Mr. F. H. Hoefke. He is a major of infantry, and lives in Portland, Oreg. He telegraphs as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 29, 1957.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I vehemently object to Defense Secretary Wilson's irresponsible and erroneous remarks regarding the National Guard. The record of Oregon's 41st National Guard Division was outstanding in World War II and the division was ready during Korea as it is today to demonstrate its combat efficiency.

F. H. HOEFKE,
Major, Infantry.

This is not the first time that I have expressed my displeasure with the Secretary of Defense; nor is this the first time he has demonstrated such clear justification for my opposition to him at the time of the confirmation of his nomination 4 years ago.

I wish to say that once again he has displayed gross ignorance of a subject concerning which he ought to have knowledge before testifying in regard to it. He has brought an undeserved insult upon the National Guard.

The American people are greatly indebted to the patriotism of thousands upon thousands of National Guardsmen who have served their country in every national crisis which has arisen.

The Secretary's testimony before the House committee was entirely unjustified. It was erroneous. It was uncalled for. It again demonstrates what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, namely, that the Secretary of Defense was never qualified for his job in the first place, and he is not qualified to be continued in that job in the future.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH F. McDONALD, OF RENO, NEV.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on January 1 of this year, one of my closest personal friends, Mr. Joseph F. McDonald, of Reno, Nev., retired from his post as president of Reno Newspapers, Inc., and publisher of Reno's two major newspapers. With his retirement, Mr. McDonald ended 42 years of active newspaper work in Nevada. During this time he saw and wrote of Nevada and its people as the State grew from little more than a frontier area of mining camps and scattered ranches to the great thriving domain it is today.

Mr. McDonald started his career in the booming mining camps of Goldfield and Rawhide shortly after the turn of the century. He grew in stature with his adopted State, and is beloved by hundreds of friends whom he wisely advised and assisted throughout the years.

In contributing to the growth of his State and its institutions, he unselfishly gave many hours of his time. Recognizing his accomplishments in the journalistic field and his valuable counsel to many students on their way up the ladder, he was honored last year by the University of Nevada, when a degree of doctor of journalism was bestowed upon him.

Throughout his entire career in the newspaper business, he recognized as prime importance, a newspaper's responsibility as a public trust.

A life-long Democrat, Joe McDonald was the confidant of the leaders of the Democratic Party and was known as the spokesman and wheelhorse of the conservative wing of the party for many years.

Needless to say, Joe McDonald's wisdom and advice during the years had much to do with the success of the Democratic Party in Nevada. Laudatory editorials in honor of Mr. McDonald's service to the State were printed in many Nevada newspapers, including the Nevada State Journal, the Reno Evening Gazette, the Nevada State News, Elko Independent, Elko Daily Free Press, the Las Vegas Morning Sun, Las Vegas Review-Journal, the Mason Valley News, and Mineral County Independent.

DROUGHT RELIEF IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 17 and again on January 23 I presented to the Senate documentary proof of the discriminatory policies being employed against the farmers of Missouri in the administration of the drought-aid legislation as enacted by Congress.

I pointed out some of the tragic drought conditions in Missouri, and made the record with respect to this discrimination.

Despite the repeated requests to Mr. Benson that he recognize the plight of the drought-stricken areas in my State, his department continues to deny the farmers there most of the same aid he is granting, in heavy quantities, to the farmers in adjacent States.

The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] criticized my plea to end the discrimination against Missouri farmers. In so doing he gave some figures about Missouri which were misleading.

In this connection, I have waited for the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona to appear on the floor, but he was out of town the last time the Senate convened and, I believe, the time before that. I cannot wait any longer to make this statement.

Let me assure my colleague from Arizona that all of us appreciate his interest in the farm problems of Missouri, but when the Senator from Arizona gives the Senate $16,512,525 as the amount allocated to Missouri for feed grains during the period July 1, 1953, through November 1956, in the interest of fairness and accuracy he should have added that not 1 cent of this money was available after June 30, 1955.

Secretary Benson, and those who would attempt to justify this discrimination, should judge on the basis of what the situation is now—not 3 years ago—and not on the basis of what was done in the years before 1956.

In the fiscal year 1954, the State of Missouri paid $7½ million in outright grants to its farmers for emergency drought assistance. During the same period the Federal Government assisted with some $2 million for hay, and also $16½ million in discounts on Government-owned, surplus grain.

What other State has any such high percentage of State drought aid as against Federal aid?

The junior Senator from Arizona asserted that certain Missouri crop yields were above average in 1956.

That is true. But does the fact that some Missouri farmers on the 35 million acres of farmland in the State had relatively good crops mean that we should average their success with that of farmers in desperate need of drought relief, and then utilize those averages as an excuse for not furnishing drought aid where it is needed?

The junior Senator from Arizona discussed the grain and hay problems of Missouri. Here are some facts which should add to his knowledge.

Missouri is geographically divided so that about half of its agricultural areas are suited to the production of grain crops. Other portions of Missouri, especially the southwest dairy area, are better adapted to the grazing of cattle.

The drought situation in southwest Missouri in 1956 is far different from the same problem in the same area in 1953.

Contrary to the entire dry year of 1953, in 1956 there was some rain in the spring and early summer.

As a consequence, a fairly good yield of spring small grain and hay crops was obtained in this area.

One might assume this meant a full grain bin and hay barn for the winter feeding period.

Normally, such might have been the case, because beef and dairy farmers would have kept their hay and grain for winter feeding, which usually begins in the late fall and lasts until spring pasture.

But that plan of feeding depends upon cultivated fall pasture, or summer and fall roughland pasture, which has been conserved for winter's use; and neither of these materialized during 1956 because of the intensely dry summer and the dry fall growing months.

Some rain fell in the latter part of the fall, but this was too late to bring up fall-sown pasture, or nurture the late summer and early fall growth of rough pastures composed of the Ozark native grasses and lespedeza, upon which so many of the southwest Missouri farmers depend.

As a result, the spring harvest was used in the early fall period when the livestock had to be put on feed.

In 1953 southwest Missouri farmers experienced a drought through the entire growing season. To provide livestock forage, they cut timber in the summer of 1953, so that their livestock could eat the leaves. Thus the livestock farmers started in the 1953 fall and winter feeding period with practically no homegrown grain, or hay, or roughage, on the land.

In that year the drought conditions were so obvious that it was not difficult to initiate a relief program in the early fall months. Long before the hard winter feeding period hit, hay and feed had arrived by truck and rail, so that the farmer was able to purchase it at about half the market cost.

In addition, most of the farmers had some available cash or ready local bank or Federal agency credit, so they were able to purchase their hay as it arrived.

But what of today? Many of these farmers are still burdened with the debt acquired in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956.

Thus today the livestock farmer who grew nothing in 1953, but something in 1956, actually is in worse shape to last out the present winter feeding period, because, first, there was no early hay relief program; and, second, cash reserves and local credit have practically vanished.

Today there is little winter pasture in the southwest Missouri area and there is a shortage of homegrown grain and hay. If those livestock farmers can obtain aid to get their herds through to spring grass, it will be a good investment for all.

What I have just said illustrates the deceiving nature of the present situation if it is simply evaluated in loose overall terms of annual rainfall and crop production. It proves conclusively that more help is needed now—and needed quickly—than was needed in the fall of 1953.

In the southwest area of my State the production of feed grains is relatively unimportant. For example, in many of the counties in question the amount of farm acreage devoted to corn for grain is less than 1 percent. The farmers of the area, therefore, depend on the production of roughage—pasture, hay, and silage—for feed for their cattle.

This production has been severely hurt by the recent drought.

According to Mr. Benson's reports, pasture conditions in Missouri on November 1, 1956, were 74 percent below normal.

The junior Senator from Arizona probably knows that in his own State, where every county has been declared eligible for feed and hay assistance—and presumably is getting that assistance—in the July 1 to December 31, 1956, period, pasture conditions as of November 1, 1956, were only 36 percent below normal, or less than half as bad as the Missouri situation.

On January 1, 1957, hay on Missouri farms ready to be fed to livestock was 19 percent below the 1946–55 average.

By contrast, the supply of hay on farms in Arizona January 1, 1957, was 51 percent above the 10-year average, 1946–55.

Yet while livestock and livestock products account for only 25 percent of farm receipts in Arizona, they account for 66.4 percent in Missouri.

All these figures come from the Department of Agriculture.

When all the facts are examined with respect to conditions now facing the farmers of Missouri, they no longer appear to be quite so simple and easy of solution as the Senator from Arizona implies.

The Senator from Arizona suggested that Missouri farmers can easily buy hay from neighboring States where production is normal or above normal. He specifically mentioned Illinois and Iowa as a source of hay.

He did not point out that the farmers in drought-stricken Missouri have to compete for this hay with the farmers of Kansas and Oklahoma, who are being assisted by a Federal hay program plus a 50-percent discount on freight rates offered by the railroads.

A farmer who has struggled through 5 years of serious drought conditions does not have the finances to ship bulky, expensive hay 300 miles to feed to his cattle. The Government programs of assistance were designed to aid in such emergency situations; and this is exactly where the Department of Agriculture has failed in its administration of the program in Missouri.

Again, what perplexes me is not only that the junior Senator from Arizona used figures based on 1954 and 1955 expenditures, which do not mean anything if we are talking about 1956, but also that he apparently thinks the farmers in the drought counties of my State should not receive any assistance, and therefore should be forced to give up their foundation herds because other Missouri farmers, in other parts of the State, had good crops.

Mr. President, I spent many years in the cattle business in Arizona, and therefore know something of its varied land, including the Salt River Valley around Phoenix, one of the most fertile parts of our Nation.

Yes, Mr. President, for two reasons the cotton farmers of Missouri know much about that fertile valley.

First, they know that as taxpayers they helped to pay for that valley's irrigation, and therefore in places turned the desert into fertility.

Secondly, they know that, as a result of this irrigation, in 1956 Arizona's cotton production averaged 1,113 pounds of cotton an acre, whereas Missouri's averaged only 592.

Other farmers in other States also know the competition which comes from federally developed irrigated land. In 1956 Arkansas averaged only 506 pounds of cotton an acre; Louisiana, 501; Mississippi, 486; Tennessee, 484; North Carolina, 393; Virginia, 376; South Carolina, 364; Georgia, 336; Texas, 278; Florida, 232; and Oklahoma, trailing the list, averaged 175 pounds an acre.

Mr. President, I am most certainly not against further development of our water resources, nor am I necessarily against any particular proposed development; but I think it unfair for those who have benefited so tremendously by irrigated lands to criticize the efforts of the representatives of farmers in other less fortunate States.

Mr. President, I am told by my friends in Arizona that the only part of that State which has even a moderate growth of grass, in addition to the lush irrigated Salt River Valley previously referred to, is around Huachuca and Nogales.

This fact brings back nostalgic memories to me, because my own ranch was in that part of that great State.

We did get more rain—in fact, the name of our ranch was Rain Valley.

When we got the rain we were glad and happy. But as we daily moved down the road into the lower desert country around places like Sonoita, and Tombstone, and Tucson, we did not feel simply because our land was getting rain to the point where our cattle operation was successful, that our success should be averaged with that of the less successful

stockgrowers in the lower country, where water at times was so scarce that some were running only a cow a section.

Mr. President, I have known cattlemen in that part of Arizona for many years; and I believe they would join the farmers of Missouri in demanding justice for all, not favoritism for the lucky few.

Let me assure my friend from Arizona that I appreciate his interest in the problems of Missouri farmers; that as a member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and one who knows from personal practical experience many of the farm problems of Arizona, I intend to reciprocate by watching closely all programs for his State of Arizona, so that I can help in obtaining for Arizona the same kind of fair and just treatment we believe we have a right to ask for in Missouri.

Mr. President, on January 17 the junior Senator from Arizona inserted in the RECORD some of the statements made before the drought meeting at Wichita, Kans., on January 15. But the Senator did not insert a statement presented at that meeting by Dr. John H. Longwell, dean of the Missouri College of Agriculture.

Dean Longwell spoke at the Wichita meeting for the Missouri State Drought Committee. This committee is composed of representatives of all the farm groups and all USDA agencies in Missouri, and bases its recommendations on the same reports, facts, and figures used by the Department of Agriculture.

Regarding pasture conditions, Dean Longwell reported as follows:

The Agricultural Marketing Service shows the conditions of Missouri pastures for the past 5 years to be as follows: November 1, 1952, 36 percent of normal; November 1, 1953, 15 percent of normal; November 1, 1954, 58 percent of normal; November 1, 1955, 73 percent of normal; November 1, 1956, 26 percent of normal.

Dean Longwell continued:

Small grain pasture normally makes up a large proportion of the fall, winter, and early spring roughage supply for livestock in south Missouri. According to A. C. Brittain, agricultural statistician, "Conditions of small grain in Missouri on December 1, 1956, was the poorest on record for this date."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the balance of the statement presented at Wichita by Dean Longwell.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROUGHT SITUATION, 28 COUNTIES IN SOUTHWEST AND SOUTH CENTRAL MISSOURI, JANUARY 11, 1957

Years with deficient rainfall have been the general rule in southwest Missouri for nearly 5 years. The dry period in this area had its beginning in May of 1952, and it has continued since then with only minor breaks. During this 56-month period, at Springfield, Mo., 41 months have had below average precipitation, and, more important, only once has there been 2 consecutive months with above average precipitation.

The past 5 years have been drier at Springfield, Mo., than any other period for the length of time that weather records have been taken. Below are listed for the past 5 years the annual precipitation, its rank so far as dryness is concerned during the past 52 years, and its departure from the average.

Year	Annual precipitation	Rank in 52 years	Departure from average
	Inches		*Inches*
1952	29.28	5th driest	11.71
1953	25.21	Driest	15.78
1954	37.99	23d driest	3.00
1955	28.61	3d driest	12.38
1956	28.72	4th driest	12.27
Total departure			55.14

It is significant that although Springfield reported near average annual rainfall in 1954, the disaster area experienced very serious drought condition, especially in the northern portion.

At Springfield during the summer months, a dry period of over 100 days occurred in 1954. Below are listed the most significant dry periods during the growing seasons for these 5 years. It should be kept in mind that during summer months, rapidly growing crops require 15 to 25 inches of water during a 100-day period.

Year	Dates of dry period	Length in days	Rainfall (inches)
1952	Apr. 13 to Aug. 6	116	5.88
1953	June 2 to Oct. 3	124	1.54
1954	June 8 to Sept. 19	104	5.59
1955	June 28 to Sept. 21	86	4.62
1956	June 22 to Oct. 2	102	6.87

In the counties in this area, the major source of farm income is from the sale of livestock and livestock products—mainly dairy and beef which are roughage-consuming livestock. For example in Douglas County in 1954, 93.4 percent of the farm income was from the sale of livestock and livestock products. Eighty percent of the total farm income was dependent on roughage-consuming livestock—dairy, beef, and sheep.

HAY AND ROUGHAGE SITUATION

County agents in the 28 county area estimated in December that 25 percent of the farmers would be out of hay by January 1, 1957, and that 62 percent would have no hay by March 1. The individual county figures for both roughage and grain is shown in the table below:

County	Percent of farmers out of hay, Jan. 1, 1957	Percent of farmers out of hay, Mar. 1, 1957	Percent of farmers out of grain, Jan. 1, 1957	Percent of farmers out of grain, Mar. 1, 1957
Barry	10	30	----------	----------
Benton	25	80	10	50
Camden	40	90	90	90
Cedar	25	60–75	15	60–75
Christian	10	45	----------	----------
Dade	10	50	20	75
Dallas	25	50	65	65
Douglas	30	60	80	90
Greene	50–60	80–90	75	90
Hickory	10	40	50	75
Howell	10	85	80	95
Laclede	50	90–95	90	95
Lawrence	25	35	10	15
Miller	25–33	80–90	5–10	25–33
Morgan	20	50	25	60
Oregon	5	75	40	90
Ozark	30	60	90	95
Pettis	10	40	None	10
Phelps	15	45	5	37
Polk	25	55	35	60
Pulaski	40–50	80	60	80
Shannon	25	30	----------	----------
St. Clair	15	60	10	25
Stone	25	60	80	80
Taney	20	50	30	60
Texas	40	85	95	97
Webster	30–35	80	85	[1] 95
Wright	15	75	90	98
Average	24.7	62.2	53.1	68.9

[1] Or more.

It should be stressed that due to lack of fall pastures a much higher amount of hay was fed in November and December than normal.

At the November drought meetings held in southwest Missouri, it was consistently reported that the accumulated effects of the drought had been serious in three aspects.

1. Longer than normal feeding periods because of the lack of permanent and small-grain pasture.

2. Repeated failures in obtaining stands of permanent pasture and alfalfa. This aggravated the feed situation and also depleted cash reserves.

3. The continued drought through the last 5 years had made the present situation acute.

Following the drought meeting in Laclede County, Frank Wright, county extension agent, reported that 90 percent of the farmers would be out of hay by January 1, 1957. This situation, he reported, was caused largely by their failure to get small grain seeded for late fall pasture.

At the Texas County drought meeting, the majority felt that a grain program would better fit their needs. James Ross, county extension agent, reported, "The majority of the folks who testified felt that a grain program could better fit their needs. They felt, with additional grain, they could stretch their hay and there would be less price rise on the grain than on hay. As to hay, many felt that it would go even higher with a hay program."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Missouri drought committee report read by Dean Longwell closed as follows:

It is our recommendation that this 28-county area be declared a drought disaster area and that the emergency grain program be put into effect in the area immediately.

On January 22, Dean Longwell wrote me presenting additional information in support of the request by the Missouri drought committee for emergency designation of the 28 counties in Missouri, so that these drought-stricken farmers would have the benefit of the $1.50 per hundred discount on Government-owned surplus feed.

Dean Longwell not only has at hand all of the USDA records, but also is in close touch, through the Extension Service, with farm agents in every county in the State. In his letter he emphasizes the point that southwest Missouri produces very little corn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from Dean Longwell's letter inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The reasons for the committee's recommendation that grain be made available rather than assistance in securing hay, are:

1. More feed nutrient units can be secured for the money in grain than in roughage.

2. Additional amounts of grain will permit the farmer to feed less hay or silage, thus extending the time during which his limited supply of roughage will last.

3. Quality of hay available for purchase at this season usually is not good.

4. Application of public funds as subsidies for the purchase of hay usually results in an increase in price of hay equal to the subsidy. Thus the farmer pays the same amount of his own money for the hay as he did before the subsidy and the seller receives a price that is higher by the amount of the subsidy.

5. Southwest Missouri produces very little corn. Even though the State produced more

than the normal amount of corn in 1956, this does not help farmers in the southwest Missouri drought area.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 17 in the Senate the junior Senator from Arizona said:

So that we can get a true picture of the conditions in Missouri, let me give you the official Department of Agriculture figures showing feed production in Missouri in 1956 compared with 1955 and with the 1945–54 10-year average.

The Senator from Arizona then inserted figures showing he felt Missouri had good crops last year in corn, wheat, oats, soybeans, and barley, and also an 82-percent crop of hay.

But the Senator did not point out that the 28 counties listed by the Missouri Drought Committee as the counties now suffering most from the drought raise but an infinitesimal acreage of those grains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a table compiled from the 1954 Census of Missouri Agriculture, and showing for each of the 28 counties the acreage in farmland, the acreage in corn for grain, and the percentage.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Missouri counties most seriously affected by drought as listed by Missouri Drought Committee, Jan. 11, 1957

County	Acres of land in farms	Acres of corn for grain	Percentage of farmland in corn
Barry	382,007	1,914	0.5
Benton	385,757	14,670	3.8
Camden	221,366	793	.3
Cedar	273,485	5,829	2.1
Christian	264,277	638	.2
Dade	287,838	854	.3
Dallas	266,767	987	.3
Douglas	389,946	1,701	.4
Greene	358,990	914	.2
Hickory	219,733	1,047	.4
Howell	388,000	4,628	1.2
Laclede	347,870	2,775	.8
Lawrence	348,158	1,056	.3
Miller	304,957	4,674	1.5
Morgan	263,423	8,537	3.2
Oregon	316,679	2,235	.7
Ozark	290,172	1,156	.3
Polk	362,539	1,526	.4
Pettis	417,231	35,085	8.4
Phelps	298,971	5,289	1.8
Pulaski	192,612	3,366	1.7
Shannon	216,797	2,376	1.1
St. Clair	361,911	11,683	3.2
Stone	252,180	436	1.7
Taney	253,732	334	1.3
Texas	494,500	3,708	.7
Webster	326,817	587	.2
Wright	365,872	1,029	.3
Total	8,852,587	119,827	1.4

Compiled from 1954 Census of Missouri Agriculture.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with further respect to giving the "true picture of conditions in Missouri," it is regrettable the junior Senator from Arizona neglected to present the latest available figures on pasture conditions for Missouri, as compared with the 12 States favored with emergency drought assistance in hay, grain, and credit programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those figures for the 6 States visited by the President, for the 6 other States designated for assistance, and for Missouri, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pasture—Condition, Nov. 1

[In percent]

State	Average, 1945–54	1955	1956
Arizona [1]	80	85	64
Colorado [1]	73	64	45
Kansas [1]	72	61	27
Nebraska	78	59	37
Nevada	82	79	91
New Mexico [1]	66	80	41
Ohio	74	85	77
Oklahoma [1]	64	69	26
South Dakota	77	53	55
Texas [1]	62	59	26
Utah	79	75	67
Wyoming	78	81	66
Missouri	67	73	26

[1] States visited by President on drought tour.

Compiled from Crop Production, November 1956, Crop Reporting Board, AMS, U. S. Department of Agriculture, p. 28.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it should be noted that no State viisted by President Eisenhower on his recent drought expedition has pastures farther below normal than Missouri. It is also interesting to note, first, that President Eisenhower visited Arizona; and, second, that Arizona pastures last November were 64 percent of normal, whereas Missouri's were nearly 2½ times worse. These figures come from the Department of Agriculture.

Do not misunderstand, Mr. President; I do not question the provision of many hundreds of thousands of dollars, of which Missouri taxpayers are contributing their share, for drought relief in Arizona. But I do protest the fact that Mr. Benson repeatedly refused to allow 1 cent of comparable relief for Missouri during 1956.

Mr. President, of the six States visited by President Eisenhower on his recent drought inspection tour, only Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma farmers were farther below normal on hay supplies January 1, 1957, than were Missouri farmers.

Kindly note, Mr. President, that whereas Missouri had only 80 percent normal hay supply on January 1, Arizona had 151 percent of normal supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, a table based on the Crop Production Report, USDA, showing hay stocks on farms January 1, 1957, for the 12 States receiving emergency drought assistance, plus Missouri.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hay stocks on farms, Jan. 1, 1957

State	Average, 1946–55	1956	1957	Percentage of 10-year average
Arizona [1]	205	390	310	151
Colorado [1]	1,618	1,625	1,586	98
Kansas [1]	1,929	2,207	1,362	71
Nebraska	3,845	4,131	3,465	90
Nevada	424	297	465	110
New Mexico [1]	206	329	189	87
Ohio	2,471	2,691	2,722	110
Oklahoma [1]	1,075	1,344	665	62
South Dakota	3,172	3,274	4,155	131
Texas [1]	966	1,488	555	58
Utah	748	925	891	119
Wyoming	1,063	1,228	1,288	121
Missouri	3,283	3,248	2,642	80

[1] States visited by President on drought tour.

Compiled from Crop Production, January 1957, Crop Reporting Board, AMS, U. S. Department of Agriculture, p. 17.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, no other reports speak more clearly of the family farmer in the drought area of Missouri during the past few years, than do the figures on the number of farmers who have been forced out of business by the drought, increased costs, and falling farm prices.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an Associated Press story which appeared in the Jefferson City Tribune of November 28, from West Plains, Mo.; it is entitled "Due to Drought in Last 5 Years Agriculture Officials Learn 600 Leave Farms in 1 County."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST PLAINS, MO.—In Howell County alone 600 farms have gone out of business in the past 5 years because of drought, Federal and State agriculture officials were told here last night.

The latest census shows 2,600 farmers in the county now, compared with 3,200 farmers 5 years ago.

Also, the Howell-Oregon REA Cooperative has lost 1,800 customers in the 3 counties it serves.

LITTLE GRADE A MILK

And out of the 207 persons from Howell and Oregon Counties at the meeting, only 17 said they were able to produce grade A milk. One man explained that he couldn't afford the $3,500 barn he needed to qualify for grade A.

Taylor Allen, a USDA field man; Linder Brown and Vance Henry, representing State agencies, have been holding such hearings in southern Missouri since Monday.

They will report to Washington and a decision will be made there, possibly next week, on whether to extend drought aid to farmers.

Charles Fite, of Lanton, told the group he had reduced his herd from 265 head to 100 head of cattle and still was doubtful of his feed supply.

NO GRAZING

Mark Sanders, of Rover, reported that he kept 100 head for 100 acres of pasture, but there is no grazing for the herd now.

Half the farmers present said they already were buying grain, and 30 percent of them would be out of hay by January 1. Only 5 percent said they had enough hay for the winter.

The farmers emphasized that they didn't want charity or handouts. Most said they needed help in getting feed grains.

Since Monday the officials have held other hearings in Marshfield, Hartville, Houston, and Ava.

Today they were scheduled to visit Lebanon, Galena, Half Way, and Ozark.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the meeting reported in this story was one of several held in the last week of November, when Mr. Harvey Dahl, of Nevada, and Mr. Taylor Allen, of Utah, were inspecting the Missouri drought area for the USDA. They made their recommendations soon after that trip; but to date the Department of Agriculture has not taken action to declare these counties eligible for emergency drought disaster assistance, including the $1.50 per hundred discount on Government-owned grain surpluses.

After repeated assurances by USDA officials that the plight of drought-stricken Missouri farmers is being reviewed, we now learn that another USDA inspector is being sent to Missouri to take another look.

Mr. President, in my presentation to the Senate on January 17, in regard to the drought situation in Missouri, I inserted an article from the Benton County Enterprise telling of a meeting of farmers in that county when representatives of the USDA made their drought inspection there the latter part of November.

As I reported to the Senate previously, despite the information presented to these inspectors on their tour of Missouri, Secretary Benson contined to refuse to extend to Missouri's drought-stricken farmers assistance comparable to that given in other areas which were suffering to no greater extent.

Mr. Harley Speed, associate county agent, Benton County, Mo., wrote me on January 18, and I call attention to Mr. Speed's words:

As the associate county agent I know conditions of this county as well as anyone. The Federal representatives were given the facts. There was no begging or pleading, but a sober group told of the forced sales of livestock and falling milk production due to the prolonged drought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Speed and the attached table of rainfall be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARSAW, MO., *January 18, 1957.*

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SYMINGTON: As you know, drought hearings were held in Missouri during the latter part of November. Three hundred farmers in Benton County attended this meeting. As the associate county agent I know conditions of this county as well as anyone. The Federal representatives were given the facts. There was no begging or pleading, but a sober group told of the forced sales of livestock and falling milk production due to the prolonged drought.

We have a weather station in Warsaw, Mo. I have collected information in regard to the amount of rainfall for the years of 1955 and 1956. Also, I have the data on the amount of rainfall for the years of 1934 and 1936 which were considered very dry years. I hope this information may prove useful to you in your work.

Respectfully yours,

HARLEY SPEED,
Associate County Agent,
Benton County, Mo.

Government official rainfall for 1956 at Warsaw, Mo.

	Inches	
January	0.40	
February	1.29	
March	.62	
April	1.44	
May	2.36	
June	2.00	
July	8.37	[1] 12.15
August	3.78	
September	1.70	
October	1.15	
November (1 to 15)	.17	
Nov. 15 to Dec. 31	3.27	
Total, 12 months	26.55	
Normal	44.91	
Deficiency	18.36	
Total, 12 months 1955	29.52	
Deficiency	15.39	
Total, 12 months, 1934	29.19	
Total, 12 months 1936	29.35	

[1] 45 percent of total for year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, members of the press covering the President's recent drought inspection tour of Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Kansas were given books portraying the background of prolonged drought and the steps that have been taken to alleviate the suffering in those 6 States.

Although Missouri was not included on the President's drought tour, a fact which we regret, and although Missouri's representatives at the Wichita meeting were not allowed to present their problems either to the President or to the Secretary of Agriculture, the press book for the tour shows that our State has suffered just as much as many of the States on the tour, and more than other States not on the tour but receiving drought assistance for many months.

Included in the press book are a number of maps. One shows that most of Missouri suffered 35 to 40 months of below normal rainfall in the past 4 years.

Another map shows that as of November 1, 1956, in most of Missouri pasture feed conditions were below 35 percent of normal, a condition described by this USDA official map as "extreme drought."

It is significant that Missouri is the only 1 of the 7 States the major portion of which is designated "extreme drought," where drought-stricken farmers did not receive assistance from the Federal Government, last year, on the purchase of Government-owned surplus grain or assistance on the purchase of hay. This map shows why southwest Missouri dairy farmers, reeling from 5 years of drought, feel they are being discriminated against by the United States Department of Agriculture. Federal emergency drought feed programs assisted farmers in 12 States, but not in Missouri.

The other 6 States which carry this designation, "extreme drought" are Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska, Colorado, and New Mexico. Not one of these States has a greater percentage of its area so designated than does Missouri.

Six States with a less serious drought condition than that reported by the USDA for Missouri on November 1, did receive assistance under the emergency feed program in the July to December, 1956, period. Four of the six—Arizona, Nevada, South Dakota, and Utah—were given Federal allocations of money for emergency hay programs.

These benefits were not available to drought-stricken Missouri farmers, despite repeated urgent requests by the Missouri Drought Committee, as submitted by our Governor, and supported by the Missouri congressional delegation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In a New Drought Survey," appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 26, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN A NEW DROUGHT SURVEY

The drought resurvey of Missouri which the United States Department of Agriculture is making should settle once and for all the apparent paradox of distress amidst plenty. It is this paradox which evidently has blinded the department thus far to the plight of large sections of the State, particularly the great dairying region of southwest Missouri.

Federal officials continue to repeat, as justification for doing no more than they are doing, that Missouri enjoyed in 1956 fine crops of wheat, rye, barley and oats, the biggest corn crop in 33 years, and a near-record of soybeans. What they neglect to add is that since these crops were made, Missouri has had little rain; pastures have burned up and repeated efforts at reseeding them have failed; and cattle owners had to start feeding their herds much earlier than usual, out of a short hay crop, and with bleak prospects for spring range.

The Federal officials also emphasize that Missouri has done little through its own State government to alleviate the current condition of its own distressed farmers, dairymen and beef raisers. This is a legitimate point. True, the State spent $9 million for self-help in the 1953–54 drought, to provide hay; Senator SYMINGTON believes that is the largest sum spent by any State on its own drought relief. At the same time, the State government would be in a stronger position to demand more Federal assistance for 1957 if it could show that it had already set in motion plans to do all that it can do on its own initiative and at its own expense.

What are the salient indexes of drought in Missouri today?

Senator SYMINGTON has cited the Agriculture Department's own figures showing that in most of Missouri little more than a third of the normal amount of pasture feed is available.

A mid-January letter to him from Murray C. Renick, president of Rolla Feed Mills, Inc., says that "we have combed the country for hay to take care of our farmers" and "within a 2-week period there will be no hay left in our vicinity."

Of 300 livestock farmers who gathered at Hartville 2 months ago in the Agriculture Department's first survey, only 3 said they had enough grain to feed their herds until spring grass appeared. Wilson Watt, of near Mansfield, who has a 1,200-acre dairy farm, said he had put up only half the normal supply of roughage last summer, his pasture was burned out, and he had just been forced to sell 100 of his 300 head of cattle for lack of feed. The Mountain Grove News reported that his case was "typical of most of the farmers at the meeting."

Missouri needs more than temporary relief. Like all the rest of the drought-stricken area, it needs measures of permanent conservation.

That is why emphasis is being placed on rehabilitating pastures and on improving old farm ponds and establishing new ones.

Agriculture produces close to a billion dollars a year of Missouri income. It is vital to the economic health of all Missouri, our cities and towns as well as our rural areas.

What should be the governing consideration both at Jefferson City and at Washington is, not so much the state of statistics, but the state of health in which Missouri agriculture will confront a new crop year next spring.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, has the Senator from Missouri received from his State any complaints about emergency loans?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I answer the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina by saying that we have received a great many complaints of that character; but only in the past 10 days, as a result of the constant pressure from authorities and civilians in my State, especially farmers, have we been designated for emergency drought loans.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say that the same is true

of South Carolina; and if I am any judge of what is going to happen if something is not done in that State, 25 percent of the small farmers will not be able to carry on farming this year. I believe that will happen unless some remedial action is taken in the immediate future. I do not know, but it looks as if Missouri and South Carolina are being penalized. My colleague knows how our States voted in the recent election. I hate to bring up that point; nevertheless, that is the case.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the distinguished Senator from South Carolina agree with me that apparently, all over the United States, the Department of Agriculture is following a policy of eliminating the family-size farm in favor of large factory farms?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is true. Certainly that policy is being carried out in my State. Whether the Department of Agriculture wishes to do so or not, it is doing it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not also true that falling income on the family-size farms has a most serious effect on both the small towns and the middle-size towns in both South Carolina and Missouri?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also true. As one drives through some of the smaller towns of my State at the present time, he will see store after store closed; and I imagine the same is true in Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, last week in Missouri, many people told me that business is falling off badly, not only in the small towns but also in the large cities. It is an accepted fact that in the past all depressions have been farm bred and farm led.

FARMER COMMITTEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow in St. Paul, Minn., a hearing will be held on the appeal of a Lyon County farmer against his dismissal as chairman of the farmer-elected committee supervising the ASC program.

The man involved is Mr. Earl Jefferson, a fine Minnesota farmer who for quite a few years has devoted his time, energy, and judgment to making our farm programs work effectively. His neighbors have shown their confidence in him by reelecting him as county chairman.

But the State ASC committee—an appointed group, not an elected group—has dismissed him on rather vague and general charges, that he has devoted too much time to his job, that he had done some of the work his subordinates should be doing. The State chairman says he is taking this action "for the good of the program."

Mr. President, I have advised Mr. Jefferson to insist upon the appeal hearing now scheduled, even though his hearing is before the same group who dismissed him, under Department of Agriculture regulations. If they do not reinstate him, I have advised Mr. Jefferson to carry his appeal directly to the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

There is a principle involved in many of these ousters around the country that cannot be ignored. I do not like to see the expressed will of the people treated so lightly by any appointed officials. As elected officials ourselves, none of us would long put up with a situation where we were subject to abrupt dismissal at the whim of some appointed Cabinet member who felt that in his opinion it would be for the good of the program as he viewed it.

The effectiveness of our farm programs depends upon farmer cooperation and farmer participation. The purpose of the farmer-elected committees was to give farmers themselves confidence in the program and thereby encourage their participation. I submit that it certainly creates little confidence on the part of the farmers to have the men they select tossed out of office by appointed bureaucrats.

Mr. President, nearly 1,500 Lyon County farmers have signed petitions addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture calling for reinstatement of Mr. Jefferson, thus showing the strong unity of the farm community behind him. I fail to see how it can be for the good of the program, as the State ASC chairman professes, to repudiate 1,500 farmers the program is intended to serve.

I have expressed my concern over similar incidents many times before on this floor, and conducted hearings into a situation in Missouri where an array of flagrant abuses of authority by appointive officers of the Department of Agriculture was testified to under oath. We have earnestly endeavored, but with little constructive result, to work with the Departmentment of Agriculture toward cleaning its own house and restoring some semblance of morale to the farmers serving on these farmer-elected committees. It is apparent that legislation is needed to protect the rights of these elected farmers. No one wants to halt removal for cause where cause is ample and proven, and where opportunity is given to answer the charges. But it is time a halt was called to arbitrary dismissals brought about only because some appointed State chairman does not like an elected county committeeman. I shall introduce proposed legislation for that purpose shortly, based upon findings of our subcommittee hearings.

I digress to point out that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has just addressed the Senate on problems relating to agriculture in his State. He has been a very fine member of the subcommittee directing its study to the farmer-elected committees.

Meanwhile, I desire to voice the hope today that better judgment will prevail in the Department of Agriculture, and that Mr. Jefferson will be reinstated after his hearing tomorrow—a hearing to which he and his witnesses have to travel at their own expense, while the expenses of those ousting him are paid by the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the petition signed by Lyons County farmers in support of Mr. Jefferson, as evidence of their faith in him and high regard for his capable services as county ASC chairman.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lyon County (Minn.) Independent]

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
United States Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY: We, the undersigned farmers of Lyon County, Minn., hereby earnestly and irrevocably protest the action taken by the State A. S. C. committee in the dismissal of Earl Jefferson, our Lyon County A. S. C. chairman, without justification.

The impeachment of our duly elected county chairman without a hearing or recourse nullifies and violates every principle of democratic procedure and decency. His dismissal is not only a reflection upon the honesty and integrity of our chairman, but it also is a rejection of the honest purposes and sovereignty of our voting farmers in this county.

We therefore demand in the interests of justice and democracy that you, Ezra Benson, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, take immediate action for the restoration of Earl Jefferson to the position of Lyon County A. S. C. chairman, to which he was duly elected by us.

Oren Monsen, Clarence M. Monsen, Frank Buck, Mervin Edwards, Rolland Hanson, Edward Lenertz, Laurence Lenertz, Peter Lenertz, Philip R. Nelson, Melvin L. Klein, John Haney, Lawrence Schons, Irwin Schons, Leonard Lanoue, Louis Prouty, Dale Scott, John J. Sass, Julius De Pyper, Heye Lamfers, Raele E. Moon.

Francis Verdeck, George K. Marcotte, Rodney W. Morgan, Oscar Versaevel, Mrs. George K. Marcotte, Mrs. Oscar Versaevel, Mrs. Rodney Morgan, Robert Christopherson, Mrs. Robert D. Christopherson, Ronald Christopherson, John Labat, George J. Laleman, Mrs. George J. Laleman, August Coudron, Mrs. August Coudron, Mrs. Dewey Tubbs, Richard Tubbs, Virgil Christopherson, Mrs. Virgil Christopherson.

Francis Hoffbeck, Mrs. Francis Hoffbeck, James L. Calvin, Mrs. James Calvin, Mrs. Walter Meulebroeck, M. G. Hodges, Walter Meulebroeck, D. W. Maxwell, Mrs. D. W. Maxwell, Fred A. Fligge, John Maxwell, Herb Ladwig, Louis Catirn, Marvin W. Gilb, Lloyd Burmeister, Edwin A. Drury, Sr., George A. Drury, Mrs. Edwin Drury, Sr., Grace Drury, Louis Soenen.

Mrs. Louis Soenen, J. M. Connell, Mrs. J. M. Connell, Henry Fuhrmann, Omer Meulebroeck, Harold Fuhrmann, Carl Maronde, Frank Marks, Dave McFarland, Leo Kerkaert, Mrs. Leo Kerkaert, Mrs. Dave McFarland, Louis Willems, Mrs. Louis Willems, Melvin Miller, Mrs. Melvin Miller, Julius Stattelman, Mrs. Julius Stattelman, Vernon A. Christianson, Charles DeRuyck.

Mrs. Charles DeRuyck, Forrest Christensen, Kenneth Lord, Marvin Castle, Edward Schmidt, Mrs. Edward Schmidt, Aksel Have, Ronald Weidauer, Orville Weidauer, Alfred Geiser, Hilbert Christensen, Robert F. Simmons, James F. Schmidt, Henry Polman, Roy M. Rankin, Vic Welvaert, Ernest Tanghe, Alois Vroman, Merle Turner, Mrs. Carl Maronde.

N. E. Bengtson, Mrs. Bud Truax, Vincent Garrow, Mrs. Vincent Garrow, Joe VanDePutte, Robert J. Vandeputte, Loren Pihl, Newell Ree, Neil E. Bengtson, Jr., Dudley Farmers Elevator, Don S. Molter, manager; Mrs. Francis Verdeck, P. M. Meehl, Edna L. Meehl, Harry Mecklenburg, Charles Mecklenburg, Edna Mecklenburg, Maurice Castle, Alois R. Doom, T. H. Donnyhue.

Morton Johnson, Allan Burckhardt, Donald Sand, Roland Peterson, L. C. Fifield, Ralph Bakke, John R. Vvorak, Edward Lang, Calvin Cadwell, Alvin Seiler, Delmer Lutterman,

Willard Petersen, Charles Neel, Carl Hass, Wesley Wixon, Harry Miles, Sherlyn Nelson, Ralph Pochardt, John L. Anderson.

R. G. Welsand, Donald Cupp, Louis Green, L. J. Heinis, Eugene Heinis, Robert Kadus, Lee Williams, Harlan Bakke, Alfred Williams, Lloyd Klukas.

Lawrence Fedde, Carl Pagel, Carl Kleinsasser, Jay Kirk, Walt Wendland, Malcolm Nord, James Dayland, Joe Harvey, Wilfred Wendorff, Caryl Robinson, E. F. Robinson, Harvey Wendland, Alvin Jones, Robert Bock, Delton D. Silberstein, Clarence Hanson, Walter Fedde, Emil Hobert.

Earl Kiley, Everett E. Hansen, Leo Knoblauch, George Leversedge, Berkeley Townsend, Lester Anderson, Ernest Payne, Ward Mann, Lester Robinson, Gerald Garvin, Fred D. West, Warren Turner, Melvin Koch, Bill Williams, Richard L. Nelson, John H. Nelson, Raymond Danielson.

Marvin Helgeson, Joe Schrieber, Laurence Traen, Alfred Gilgert, Donald Esping, Anton Traen, Torkel Esping, Harry Buysse, Joe Sussner, Carrie Hovland, Wilfred Buysse, Truman Tollefson, Albert Benson, August Verschelde, Kenneth Helgeson, Kermit Anderson, Allan Josephson, Louis Wyffels, Floyd Hettling, Bernard Tillemans.

Harold Klaassen, Ferdinand Wambeke, Vernon Klaassen, K. H. Klaassen, Andrew VanDerostyne, Knute Anderson, Nils Anderson, Max Kosmalski, John A. Janssen, Edward A. Swedzinski, Gabe Swedzinski, Antan Winter, John G. Ahern, Maurice J. Ahern, E. B. Anderson, Joe McMahon, Kenneth A. Conger, Merwin B. Conger, George A. Sarazyn, Wendell S. Larson, Richard Meulebroeck, Mrs. Ann Traen.

John Fier, Alfred Larson, Ray Swedzinski, Fred Gudmundson, Louis Hovland, J. G. Johnson, Leo Tillemans, Albert Wyffels, Henry Hamerlinck, Jens Johnson, Gilbert Johnson, John H. Wigner, Frank Oland, Norman Torgerson, Orvin C. Hanson, Jens Dovre, E. J. Kerr, Ole Esping, John Esping.

Joseph Robay, Paul VanKeulen, Maurice VanHecke, Francis VanHecke, Stanley Kosmolski, Jerard Vlaminck, John J. Polejewski, Clarence Swedzinski, Alex Sumerfelt, Henry Nuy, Albert Carrette, Mrs. Harry Stassen, Joe E. Claeys, Walter A. VanOverbeke, Edward Lozinski, Pete Berends, Norbert Lanners.

John A. Regnier, Donald Kerkvliet, Julius DeVos, Eloi Stassen, Elric Ethel Lanoue, John H. Hochstatter, Mrs. Gertrude Hochstatter, Norman T. Carrow, Mrs. Norman Carrow, Alfred Dale, June Dale, Roger Dale, Emerence Labat, Albert DeJaegher, Charles Louwagie, Carole Louwagie, George Gagnon, Mrs. Teresa Gagnon, Hector Carrow, Mrs. Hector Carrow.

Gerard J. Louwagie, Gordon Erickson, John Erickson, Murl Hovland, Teddy Todnem, Lawrence Driessen, Oscar Louwagie, Emil Louwagie, Hector Louwagie, Camiel J. Louwagie, Robert N. Determan, Germaen Blomme, Leon Louwagie, Henry Labat, Rene Louwagie, Maurice Louwagie, Roger Louwagie, Maurice Blomme, Frances Dieken, Mitchell Dieken.

Gaylord Moseng, Abel Dieken, John Dieken, Robert Derynck, Gust DeSleer, Frank DeSleer, Harry J. DeVos, Henry J. Blomme, Jr., Cyril J. Blomme, Jack Kelly, Ramie Bossuyt, Florence Bossuyt, Francis Teerlinck, Kathleen Teerlinck, Roy J. Dierickx, Jose Dierickx, Virgil Engels, Eugene Stassen, Margaret Stassen, Lawrence Stassen.

Beverly Stassen, Albert Verly, Anna Verly, Robert VanOverbeke, Mae VanOverbeke, Emil Caron, Lucille Caron, Vernon Prairie, Dora Prairie, Ambroze Prairie, Emma Prairie, Harold Lanoue, Genevieve Lanoue, Eva Regnier, Louis Regnier, Vincent Kerkvliet, Mrs. Gordon Tholen, Gordon Tholen, Mrs. Ralph Tholen, Ralph Tholen.

Mrs. Robert Brewers, Bob Brewers, Mrs. Don Kerkvliet, Mrs. Robert J. McLaughlin, Robert J. McLaughlin, Frank Deutz, Auguste Deutz, Victor DeVos, Maureen DeVos, Otto Swanson, Mrs. Otto Swanson, Hubert Boerboom, Mrs. Hubert Boerboom, William Schlorf, Anna Schlorf, Jens Williamsen, Andrea Williamsen, Joe Deutz, Gertrude Deutz, Tom R. Carrow, Albert VanOverbeke, Martha VanOverbeke, Charles Farasyn, Mary Farasyn, Joseph R. Halbur, Susan Halbur, Eugene Adler, Eva Adler, Tim Hahn, Mae Hahn, Alphonse VanOverbeke, Julia B. VanOverbeke, Bernard Kerkvliet, Mrs. Bernard Kerkvliet, Edmund Polfliet, Mrs. Ed Polfliet, Art H. VanOverbeke, Leonard J. Caron, Lorrette M. Caron, Homer A. Paradis.

Archie Noyes, Mrs. Archie Noyes, Elmer Regnier, Mrs. Elmer Regnier, William Senden, Francis Claeys, Henry Van Dorpe, Raymond Rogge, Mrs. Herman Rogge, Francis Senden, Don Boerboom, Jules VanKeulen, H. A. VanKeulen, Ed VanDorpe, James A. Claeys, Mrs. Louis H. Claeys, Mrs. James A. Claeys, Louis H. Claeys, Emile VanHee.

Mrs. Emile VanHee, Joe Jennen, Mrs. Joe Jennen, Wayne Kiel, Mrs. Wayne Kiel, Gerard Kerkvliet, Mrs. Eugenie Senden, Mrs. Joe Senden, Mrs. Gerard Kerkvliet, Mrs. Mary Verkinderen, Frank DeCock, Mike DeCramer, Henry Cauwels, Cyril VanLeeuwe, Harold Van Keulen, Joe DeLanghe, Delia DeLanghe, Valere Vandendriessche, Walter DeCock, Vincent Hennen.

Mrs. Art Loyson, Art Loyson, Emil VanAcker, Mrs. Emil VanAcker, Bernard Morisette, E. N. Morisette, Mike Thangne, Albert Wischer, John A. Boerboom, Ferd Berends, Hubert H. VanKeulen, Harry C. Boerboom, Richard Welvaert, Orville Hennen, Mrs. Orville Hennen, Ralph L. Hennen, Harry J. Boerboom, Jules Noyes, Raymond Noyes, John A. VanKeulen.

Donald Javens, David H. Maertens, Hero J. Maertens, Sr., Julius DeSaer, George DeSutter, Herman Hofman, Remi Feryn, John C. VanKeulen, Ivo I. Determan, Harry J. Nuytten, George DeVos, Louis Senden, George Noyes, Emil Goossens, Jim Clark, Frank Welu, Camiel Noyes, Alfred VanKeulen, Archie VanHee, Mrs. Archie VanHee.

Joe Engels, Mrs. Celesta Engels, Vincent Boerboom, Mrs. Vincent Boerboom, Charles W. Bot, William Monnet, Henry Kor, Jarry A. Kor, Albert DeBruyckere, Angel DeBruyckere, Edward Wyffels, Jr., Edward DeBaere, Mrs. Edward DeBaere, Florence VanKeulen, Joseph H. Senden, Cyriel Noyes, Henri Noyes, August DeCock, William Stassen, William Boerboom.

Leo A. Balle, Theodore Anderson, Norman Larson, Martin Gillund, Ralph Hass, Earl McConnell, Alfred Eisenmenger, Clifford Peterson, Charles Kerkaert, Lawrence E. Hochstatter, H. Walter Pochardt, Louis Pochardt, H. Marie Wewetzer, Lewis E. Wewetzer, Murl Hendrickson, Ruth G. Hendrickson, Emil Evans, Alma Evans, Don E. Wiese, Hugh J. Kerr.

Floyd L. Harris, Arlun B. Harris, Lester Mangusen, Robert M. Green, Shirley E. Green, Elmer Furgeson, Lawrence Pochardt, Gerhardt Stelter, Roy Wilson, Jr., Andrew J. Kerkaert, Emil E. Doom, Fred Wyffels, Henry Phillips, John Spielman, John St. Aubin, Mrs. John St. Aubin, Marvin Sandberg, Mrs. Marvin Sandberg, Waynard E. Wiegers.

Dale E. Wilson, Mrs. Maynard Wiegers, Willis Wilson, Gustoff Buysse, George VanOverbeke, Joe VanOverbeke, James Naber, E. A. Ross, Elmer Ufken, Victor Sinave, Cyriel Sinave, Edward Nelson, Ed Wild, Floyd Wild, Mrs. Floyd Wild, Art Dandurand, C. S. Blair, Carroll Williams, Mrs. Carroll Williams, Glen H. Ericson, Jewel C. Ericson, Gerard Soenen.

Mrs. Gerard Soenen, Laurence Farasyn, Edward DeLanghe, Mrs. Edward DeLanghe, Edward Cauwels, Francis Giefer, Laurence Naber, Mrs. Laurence Naber, Vincent Wyffels, Mrs. Vincent Wyffels, Mrs. Albert Schneider, Albert Schneider, Francis DeMay, Mrs. Francis DeMay, Gerard Verly, Mrs. Gerard Verly, Robert Pearcy, Mrs. Robert Pearcy, Ray Vandendriessche, Robert Vandendriessche, Mrs. Kenneth Doty, Kenneth Doty, Erving Friend, Mrs. Erving Friend, Mrs. Robert Meyenburg, Alois Coudron, Mrs. Alois Coudron, Vincent Coudron, Charles E. DeMeyer, Henry McKigney, Mrs. Lawrence Neuse, Jerome A. Mercie, John Chandler, Oscar VanOverbeke, Mrs. Alex Polfliet, Alex Polfliet.

Ed J. Paradis, Henry Paradis, Hubert Stassen, Mrs. Hubert Stassen, Alphonse St. Aubin, Lester A. Vandeputte, Mrs. Lester Vandeputte, Hero E. Maertens, Jr., Mrs. Hero E. Maertens, Jr., Elias Soenen, Mrs. Elias Soemen, Joe Dickerman, Mrs. Albert Christensen, Albert Christensen, Richard Marcotte, Gerard Jacob, Mrs. Gerard Jacob, Carl V. Nelson, Mrs. Carl V. Nelson, Joseph Doom.

Julius Polfliet, Mrs. Julius Polfliet, Mrs. John Boyer, John Boyer, Mrs. Emil E. Doom, James DeMeyer, Mrs. James DeMeyer, Mrs. Jules Dirckx, Jules Dirckx, Mrs. Francis Dirckx, Francis Dirckx, Frank Wilke, Carl Fuhrmann, Mrs. Joe Nuytten, Joseph R. Nuytten, Arvid Lund, Robert E. Olson, Herbert Nelson, John Kroger, William Versaevel, Joe Clark, John Hirmer, Will Minneman.

Frank Minnehan, Ed Snyder, Bill Snyder, Alfred Fenger, G. A. VandeVoorde, Alan A. Swennes, Clarence Runholt, Robert L. Lines, Henry VanMaldeghem, Ray VanLerberghe, Camiel VanLerberghe, Lowell Pederson, Virgil Palmer, Milton Rebers, Joseph A. Pederson, Leroy Timm, Roland Bros., Orin Ericson, Leonard Bede, Andrew Boerboom.

Thorsvin A. Belling, Peter Sather, Olaf Sather, Walter Fenger, Edwin Bjornebo, Franz Kruger, Kay Knudson, Dennis Vien, Ray Vien, Norman Grande, Murl Anderson, Oscar Doom, Joseph G. Loe, Edwin J. Loe, Cyriel VanDeVeire, Harold Fratzke, Clifford Peterson, Art Lee, Clark Volden, Floyd Hendrickson.

Mrs. Ernest Tanghe, Frank Bollmann, Glen VanWinkle, Henry Wendland, Henry Joosten, Lawrence Wendland, Vincent J. Engels, Marvin Johnson, Mrs. Ray Vandendriessche.

Henry Klysen, Robert Theuninck, Edward Richters, Charles Bierman, Mrs. Harold Kiel, Julius VanNevel, Mrs. Julius VanNevel, Edward C. DeVos, Mrs. Edward C. DeVos, Clarence Swanson, Mrs. Clarence Swanson, Delbert Evans, Mrs. Delbert Evans, Charles Banks, Perry Banks, E. C. Bierman, Mrs. E. C. Bierman, Leo Demuth, Mrs. Leo Demuth, Robert Schrunk, Bernice Schrunk, William Girard.

Mrs. William Girard, Emil Bjugard, Ralph Vinke, Harold Walkup, Mrs. Birdie Walkup, Joe Swanson, Jr., Henry DeSmet, Mrs. Henry DeSmet, Philip Swanson, Mrs. Margaret Harris, Lloyd J. Johnson, Mrs. Lloyd J. Johnson, Vernon Runholt, Harold Mellenthin, Joe Swanson, Robert Mellenthin, G. F. Londgren, Mrs. G. F. Londgren, Mrs. Vernon Runholt, Mrs. Walter Mellenthin.

Arnold Buesing, Alfred C. Andersen, John Heinz, Gust Carlson, Julius Walters, George Besse, Harold Dwire, William Binnebose, Gordon Moat, Walter Wendschuh, Leonard Wittry, Louie Christensen, Ralph Johnson, George Gollmer, Louie Bentson, Maurice Giefer, Kenneth Madden, Edward VanNevel, Rufus Hastings, Allen Cady.

Lloyd Dwire, Paul Vercruysse, Marvin DeVries, Arthur Rode, Joe Demuth, Arnold Buesing, Jr., Clarence Rustand, P. L. Garton, Ivan Anderson, Van Lavoie, F. W. Cooney, Henry Arndt, Willes Sothman, Virgil Lang, Don Hively, Jake Langmoe, Norman Evans, Albin Swanson, C. F. Boerner, Ingvold Lee, C. A. Huck, Vernon DeVries, Tom DeVries.

Harold Binnebose, Warren Walter, John A. Walter, Henry Haase, Tom Engesser, Joseph Laleman, Ray Hively, Kenneth Hively, John Schlenker, Adolph Longstrom, Lyle Harris, M. A. Kiel, Lester J. Vogt, Henry Baer, Harley Schultz, Oscar W. Lindstrom, Blake Nehls, Glen Horsman, Andrew Wixon, Marvin Rialson.

Kenneth Williams, Charles C. Wyffels, Lester M. Anderson, Hector R. Anderson, Julius VanHauwaert, Donald Griffith, Armour McClain, Agnes McClain, G. F. McClain, Clyde McFarland, Eugene A. Regnier, Roger Wil-

liams, A. R. Mathews, Russell M. Mathews, Tom Walters, Harry Doble, Gordon Wyffels, Lloyd H. Raymond, Eric Lourvers, Tifons Lourvers.

Maynard Williams, Chauncey A. Muedeking, Lester Morgan, W. B. Morgan, Nels B. Anderson, Harold J. DeSchepper, Arthur Holstein, Harold Hook, Lowell Bornitz, Darrell Madsen, Earnest Gilb, Wildred Zens, Frank Virstraete, Ray Bjorklund, Fred Fischer, E. F. Fischer, Floyd Persons, Ralph Jewell, Edwin Schmid.

George Cooreman, Harry Retzloff, Myron Schmidt, Elmer E. Weedeman, Mrs. Jim Fetter, Leo Makousky, Gerald Rykhus, Emory Sweely, Wayne Finger, Mourice Maeyaert, Bruce Mowery, Elmer M. Klein, Florence M. Klein, Emil A. Carlson, William A. Carlson, John A. Kass, James Wreath, Charles Maeyaert, Lewellyn Johnson, Harvey Peterson.

Sig Gordon, Raymond Holden, Clyde Horsman, Neil Horsman, Roy Allumbaugh, Paul LaRocque, Dor. Rolling, Harold Rolling, Harold Schoer, Royal Krueger, Ray Evans, Morgan L. Johnson, Gerhard Olson, Oscar J. Helgeson, John O. Rialson, Ferd W. Wilage, Julius Rialson, R. K. Ruthenbeck, Paul Knoblauch, Sr.

Richard O. Daniels, Donald E. Daniels, Robert Bjorklund, Alfred Lanoue, J. A. Jensen, Edson C. Starr, O. C. Buckingham, Forrest Wixon, Mrs. Frye Hatch, J. B. Wyffels, Arthur G. Kelcher, Don Hammer, Ronald Peters, Len VanDenBrocke, Harvey C. Ligneel, Edmund A. Sumerfelt, Henry Hammer, Allan Hammer, George Hammer, John Geurts.

Peter Geurts, Frank A. Josephson, Lyle Anderson, William DeWitte, C. F. Christensen, Herbert Fricke, Ulysses L. Marcotte, Jr., Glenn Bunniss, Rene Timmerman, U. L. Marcotte, Sr., Rudy Ehlers, Marvin Loeck, Arnold Ziemke, Warner F. Johnson, Warren R. Johnson, Ed Rathje, Floyd Nixon, Newton Dayland, H. Rasmussen, Orville Hillquist.

W. J. Stewart, Sr., Don Schoenberger, Arnold VanWinkle, Merlin Nelson, Harold Wood, Patrick Burns, Donald Goltz, Gene M. Goltz, Ludwig Ludtke, Dow Christensen, Floyd Knapper, Martin Swan, Ed DeGroat, Richard Breening, John Clark, Jr., M. B. Breening, J. M. Lee, Art Dennin, Charles Munson, Donald Greenfield.

Henry W. England, Orville Wendland, Howard Nelson, Ray Swift, Doris DeWitt, Levain Mitchell, James Bakker, A. E. Lake, William K. Jensen, Bert DeWitt, Virgil Bedow, Lloyd H. Johnson, Joe Houselog, Jr., Charles Bakker, Mrs. Clara Bakker, Henry Hamersma, Henry J. Schmidt, Lloyd Blegen, Harold M. Nielsen, Clarence E. Johnson.

Tony Spenas, Axel V. Petersen, Clarence Chandler, Arthur Sutherland, Elmer Benson, Axel Johnson, Oscar Buchert, Harvey Rustman, Harry Youngdahl, Ed Fuhrmann, Ed Habben, William Lavoie, William A. Rellmann, Chester Johnson, Kenneth Lavoie, Robert Castleman, Neil Harstad, H. W. Habben, Jacob Newton, Camiel A. Polle.

Virgil VanDusen, Clifford O'Toole, Ole Jensen, Ray VanGelder, Ube Lutterman, H. A. Tate, Raymond Lutterman, Donna Mosch, Jack Mosch, Vernon Peterson, Shirley Peterson, Charles L. DeMeyer, Mrs. Charles L. DeMeyer, Aiko A. Kor, Jr., Mrs. Aiko Kor, Claus Kor, Mrs. Claus Kor, Howard Swanson, Betty Swanson, Mrs. Ervin Metz, Ervin Metz.

George Vercruysse, Mrs. Bernard DeBaere, Lucien Decrock, John C. Wittry, Louis DeBaere, Bernard DeBaere, Mrs. Louis DeBaere, Lloyd Albee, Mrs. Lloyd Albee, Mrs. H. J. Brosseau, H. J. Brosseau, Albert Kindler, Merton Johnson, Waynel Johnson, John Albee, Mrs. John Albee, Reuben Schrupp, Mrs. Reuben Schrupp, Richard Vandendriessche.

Albert Gesquiere, Oliver Albee, Mrs. Oliver Albee, Louis Herbert, Mrs. Louis Herbert, Vernon Willard, Mrs. Vern Willard, Porter Willard, Mrs. Porter Willard, David Walters, Marie Walters, Ronald Strom, Harvid Evans, Mrs. Harvid Evans, Kenneth Firmage, Agnes Firmage, Gena Firmage, Gust Rosen, Esther Rosen, Allen Rosen.

August Burckhardt, Mrs. August Burckhardt, Richard M. Evans, Mrs. Richard M. Evans, Clarence Jensen, Melvin Buck, Harvey L. Greeley, Mrs. Clarence Jensen, Matt Tegels, Harold Greeley, Leroy Greeley, Mrs. Mavis Williams, William Weidauer, Mrs. William Weidauer, John Engels, Mrs. John Engels, Verdun Hanson, Walter Jandl, Allen J. View.

Mrs. Allen View, L. A. Luchtel, M. Thieren, Mrs. Norma Hill, William Balke, Jr., William Cooney, August Weidauer, Bill Andrum, Mrs. William Andrum, Mrs. Ray Pagel, Ray Pagel, Mrs. August Wiedauer, Clarence J. Barck, Mrs. C. J. Barck, Ted Ruppert, Mrs. Ted Ruppert, Jr., Glenn Andres, Mrs. Glen Andres, Albert W. Buesing, Wallace Buesing, Mrs. Albert Buesing.

Walter Buck, William F. Sabinske, Gerald P. Runio, John D. Sass, Mrs. John D. Sass, Henry Maeyaert, Mrs. Henry Maeyaert, Francis Logue, Thomas D. Holland, Mrs. William J. Stewart, Jr., William J. Stewart, Jr., Mrs. Joe Vercruysse, Oscar Swanson, Mrs. Oscar Swanson, Herman Beckley.

Mrs. Herman Beckley, William Christian Lille, Mrs. Ed J. Edwards, August Lamote, Henry R. Hanson, Mrs. Henry R. Hanson, W. R. Gritman, Mrs. W. R. Gritman, Vincent Determan, Mrs. Vincent Determan, Charles Berry, Mrs. Charles Berry, Mrs. Anthony Breczinski, Mrs. Anthony Breczinski, Donald V. Vroman, Mrs. Donald V. Vroman, V. Jappi, Kenneth Weidman, Cecil Breczinski, Gorden Breczinski.

Alfred Breczinski, Andrew Breczinski, Mrs. Andrew Breczinski, M. C. Forbes, Mrs. M. C. Forbes, Marvin St. Aubin, Albert St. Aubin, Richard St. Aubin, Mrs. Richard St. Aubin, Merlin Meinzer, Rolland Meron, Marcella Meron, Bertha Paradis, Edwin Paradis, Robert Babcock, Mrs. Robert Babcock, Mrs. James Brandt, James Brandt, Louis St. Aubin, Mrs. Louis St. Aubin.

Verneil Addison, John C. Boerboom, Herman Zellmer, Hubert Tholen, Lloyd Javens, Henry Versaevel, Buss Sterler, Virgil Sterler, Herbert Connell, Walter Kramer, John J. Coudron, Roy E. Traux, William Geistfeld, Mrs. John Bierl, H. A. Marcotte, Neil E. Marcotte, George P. Marcotte, Julius Coudron, Cornelius Boerboom, Leroy Verdeck.

Raymond Christopherson, Werner M. Nelson, Andrew Tholen, Mrs. Andrew Tholen, Wilfred Byer, Mrs. Wilfred Byer, Roy W. Herring, Mrs. Roy Herring, LaMoine Meyer, Walter Heiser, Mrs. Walter Heiser, Harold Maronde, Mrs. Harold Maronde, Kenneth Maronde, Ralph Verdeck, Harvey Brosseau, Jr., Arthur Vierstraete, Roy DeVos, Earl Babcock.

Clem Allex, Mrs. Clem Allex, Sherman Norwood, Denis J. Matthys, Donald Coudron, Erwin Bitker, Francis Coudron, Mrs. Francis Coudron, Alvin Knutson, Peter Matthys, Jim DeVos, Leslie Maxwell, Melvin Coudron, Harold Gee, Marcel Meulebroeck, Donald D. Rosa, Mrs. Donald D. Rosa, John Goossens, Cyriel Goossens.

James Cravens, Ray Keepers, Mrs. Ray Keepers, Francis Polfliet, Mrs. Francis Polfliet, Marcel Louwagie, Mrs. Marcel Louwagie, Henry Meulebroeck, Mrs. Henry Meulebroeck, Richard Polesky, Mrs. Richard Polesky, Albert Viaene, George Polesky, Robert A. Pehrson, June L. Pehrson, Kenneth E. Pehrson, Dennis M. Pehrson, Emil Coudron, Walter C. Jensen, Mrs. Herman Zellmer.

Norman Fuhrmann, Erich Fuhrmann, Harry Pedersen, Percy Drake, Herman Grannerman, Alvin Johnson, William Polesky, Elmer R. Johnson, Myron Cox, Kenneth Farr, Selmer Sanderson, Herb Buckholtz, John O. Larson, Carl William Johnson, C. H. Jenkins, Gordon Stafne, Orval Anderson, Edward Lutterman, Bertil Johnson, Lund Gerlach.

Floyd Hovdesven, Earl LaVoy, Peter Dandurand, Gust Bastoen, Peter E. Wyffels, Richard Bot, Roland M. Derynck, Jules Verschelde, Weinhold Bros. by C. Weinhold, Burton Mauland, Camille Hoflock, William Caron, Isadore Peltier, Tony Holland, Harold LaVoy, Bernard DeMay, Rolland Morisette, Sr., Rolland Morisette, Jr., Clarence Ueland, Hardin Ueland.

Alfred Reishus, Marvin Erickson, Bernard Geyer, Gerald Aamodt, Stanley Aamodt, Tom Huso, Harry Koch, Weldon Koch, Clarence E. Mohn, U. S. Meyer, H. J. VanUden, J. Cromhecke, Earl Boerner, August B. Labat, Dalin Herigon, Robert Cregoire, Orville Caron, John Kesteloot, John Fligge, Andrew Timmerman, Emil DeMartalaere, Victor Kesteloot.

Ted Versluys, Ted Driessen, Elmer Blanchette, John Koch, Virgil Gregoire, LaVerdos Pape, Ben Burczek, John Driessen, Arthur E. Thange, Cyriel DeVos, John W. Bot, Camiel DeVos, Nick W. Kerkvliet, James L. Fredricks, Jens Barstad, Odin Broughton, Norman Orsen, Arnold H. Hennen, Cecil Hofteig, Orvin Kompelien.

George Scheer, Selmer J. Lien, Oluf A. Thompson, Orlando Johnson, Kenneth Thompson, Merlin Johnson, Gordon Johnson, Joseph J. Stassen, Laurence Engels, Cyriel VanWhenen, Arthur Rogge, Clarence Stassen, Ben Pohlen, Garfield Broughton, Otto Kompelien, Henry Miller, Harold Wegener, Julian Gislason, Marvin Stensrud, Edward A. Brewers, Archie Timmerman, Gerard Nuytten.

Maurice VerKinderen, Jules Gossen, Herman Josephson, William Gislason, Joe Gitman, Irven Orsen, Joe Josephson, Joe Gislason, Jerry I. Regnier, Harry Erickson, Henry Lootens, Leonard J. Richards, Lawrence Buysse, Joseph VanKeulen, Edward G. Caron, Cyril Langswierdt, Maurice Verschelde, Alden A. Johnson, Harold Askdal, Pat Van Moorlehem.

Hans Kompelien, Carl Kompelien, Donald Kompelien, Harry Guza, Victor Josephson, Bert Olevson, Roy Velde, George Olevson, Leonard Wambeke, Henry Coequyt, Theo Sanders, Carl W. Swanson, Ted Hanson, J. P. VanOverbeke, Henry Buysse, Francis Sussner, N. M. Orsen, Ed J. Hennen, Dr. William W. Merritt, Hermun Verschelde.

Roger Belsaer, Bernard Moorse, Andrew Matthys, H. J. VanKeulen, Henry DeSutter, C. B. DeSutter, John Van Uden, Clarence Tholen, John Tholen, Joe Arends, Edward Savoie, Louis Buysse, Joseph VanUden, Raymond Loyson.

Don Farasyn, Lambert Boerboom, Lawrence Dwire, Frank H. Senden, John J. Senden, August VanDorpe, Delbert Breyfogle, Leger Devlaminck, Albertine Devlaminck.

Camiel Coquyt, Clarence Buesing, L. Joe Claeys, Mrs. L. Joe Claeys, Edward Boerboom, Raymond Rogge, Laurence Rogge, Mrs. Herman Rogge, Herman Rogge, Norbert Bolster, Theodore M. Gregoire.

Paul Meyer, Jr., Victor Paradis, Walter Paradis, Rudolph Odder, Francis VanOverbeke, Oscar M. Runholt, Mrs. Ellen Lovsness, G. H. Belling, R. J. Roby, Donald J. Roby, Walter Mellenthin, Harold Kiel, Roy Nicholson, Lorren Simon, L. E. Simon, Ray Schrunk, Helmer Dale, Edgar Marcotte, Henry Wiegers, Don Brosseau.

Pat Clark, John Clark, Ray Sharratt, Lester Baird, Louis Girard, Rene Maeyaert, George Landuyt, C. W. Raine, Walter Raine, H. F. Callow, Charles Mortier, W. Casper Fischer, Fallas Fischer, William Fischer, Robert H. Middleton, Gust A. Carlson, Cyriel Desmedt, Art Theuninck, Cyril Buysse, Wesley Carver.

Myron M. Bornhoff, Alden T. Swanson, Fred Bollman, Bernhard Berg, Oscar Mitchell, Gordon Wendorff, Millard Rokeh, Orville Erickson, Arnold Storlie, C. J. Drake, Wiefred Sanderson, Kermit Pagel, Andrew Wieme, Kenneth Mealman, Floyd Wizton, Edwin Lavoie, Dale Peterson, Louis Sanderson, Saunder Sanderson, Simon I. Sanderson.

Murl Erickson, Orville Michaelson, Myron Holland, Orville Kompelien, Fred Aamodt, Leonard Meyer, Alfred Roti, C. M. Pilotte,

Lud Huson, Harold Huso, Remi Doom, Sylvere Laleman, George H. Laleman, John Aamodt, George Aamodt, Rolland G. Boehne, Gordon Dahl, Martin E. Reishus, Leonard Akima, A. O. Broughton.

Norbert Meyenburg, Mrs. Oscar VanOverbeke, Mrs. Edna Muedeking, Mrs. George Vercruysse, Mrs. Francis Logue, Mrs. LaMoine Meyer, Roy Rosa, Erling Kompelien.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator will be willing to yield for the purpose of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, because I know the Senator's speech is an important one, and I am sure more Senators than are now present would like to hear it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to speak this afternoon on foreign policy and the Democratic majority.

Two weeks ago the President of the United States addressed the Congress on the state of the Union. Last week he spoke to the entire Nation on the occasion of his inauguration. These statements both dealt in significant measure with the problems of war and peace. There was concern over the one. There was eloquent hope in the bright promise of the other.

It was to be expected that the President would turn his attention to these matters. The problems which confront us in our relationships with other nations are the most fundamental of our times. To say that is not to minimize the importance of domestic issues. Adequate education for our children, decent living standards for all Americans, conservation of natural resources, power development, farm income, all these and others, are of the greatest consequence to the people of the United States. They are issues which will occupy most of the time of the Senate during the current session. But they are issues which we shall debate not in an atmosphere of secure peace. We shall debate these issues in the ever-lengthening shadow of nuclear warfare, that unfolding science of certain human extinction.

The fact is that foreign policy, once remote, now intrudes into every aspect of our national life. It has come to exercise the most intimate influence over the welfare and the future of every man, woman, and child in the United States. It has become the life and death factor of civilization in this second half of the 20th century.

I hope that Congress, no less than the President, will give adequate attention to foreign policy during the current session. The legislative branch is not without constitutional responsibilities and powers in this connection. It is to the Senate that the President must turn for advice and consent in fundamental foreign questions. It is Congress which appropriates the vast public funds to support our defense establishments. It is Congress which approves or disapproves foreign-aid programs. It is Congress which provides for the Department of State and the numerous other agencies of Government involved in activities abroad. It is Congress which, if circumstances were so to require, would declare war, and if circumstances were ever again to permit, make peace.

In stressing the importance of the Senate and of the Congress in foreign relations, I have no desire to detract from the significance of the President in these matters. If our responsibilities are great, his are greater.

The President alone speaks for the entire Nation in our relations with others. He alone leads us—Republicans and Democrats alike—in foreign policy. The President may lead well or he may lead badly. Regardless of party, however, no American can escape the consequences of his leadership.

Nor can the President abdicate his responsibilities of leadership in foreign relations. The Vice President will not serve for the purpose. No member of the Cabinet, not even the Secretary of State, can substitute. Nor can the National Security Council, or any manner or number of special Presidential commissions, committees, and counselors. All these, and especially the Secretary of State, may be helpful. In the end, however, it is the President who either gives or fails to give effective direction to the course which the Nation pursues abroad. In this age of synthetics the way has not yet been found to synthesize the Presidency of the United States.

The point I wish to make is that, under the guidance of the President, the functions of foreign policy are shared functions, shared between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. They can be effectively discharged only when there is leadership in the Presidency and when there is a mutual will to cooperate between the executive branch and Congress.

I know of no Senator on this side of the aisle who does not believe the country would be better off under a Democratic President. By the same token, however, I know of no Democratic Senator who will not sustain the President when he speaks or acts in our relations with others on behalf of the United States. Let me say then at the outset that so long as President Eisenhower leads wisely and without partisanship he shall have the cooperation he needs from the Democratic majority in Congress.

Some may call this attitude bipartisan or nonpartisan. As for myself, I have no particular attachment to these terms. They have for too long been used by the executive branch to beat the drums for precipitate action in foreign relations. For too long they have served as a club to silence responsible criticism in Congress. These terms, in short, have been twisted and distorted by misuse.

I shall never be party to a bipartisan silence when conscience requires me to speak out on foreign policy. I hope the Senate shall never subscribe to a glib bipartisanship as a substitute for independent thought by this body.

Whatever the word we may use, however, the course which the Democratic majority will pursue in questions of foreign relations during this session is clear. It is the course of responsible cooperation. What applies to the Democratic majority ought to apply no less forcibly to the Republican minority. And with all due respect, it must also apply to the Republican President and the Republican Secretary of State.

The need for responsible cooperation places upon us all an extra measure of restraint in dealing with matters of foreign policy. It requires us—all of us—to lift above party the international interests of the United States. It constrains us—all of us—to great care in the consideration of questions which involve these international interests.

Let me say again, however, that the restraints of cooperation apply with equal force to the Republican minority and the Republican President. The Democratic majority in the Senate—this majority of 2 votes—cannot carry the burden alone. If there is going to be cooperation, it will have to come from all sides. If it is not forthcoming, the people of this country are capable of assessing responsibility for the failure.

We have already had one example in this session of how not to promote responsible cooperation. I refer to the President's proposed resolution on the Middle East. I shall speak frankly in the hope that we may be able to avoid in the future a repetition of this ineptitude.

The Middle Eastern proposal was a matter presumably of the highest national importance. The President believed the cooperation of Congress was essential in handling it, and has sought that cooperation. Yet his proposal was allowed to trickle out of the executive branch days before Congress received any official notification of it. I, myself, learned all of its details from the newspapers long before the Secretary of State gave us the same details in a secret session of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The resolution raises issues of tremendous constitutional significance. Yet we have still to determine what congressional leaders were consulted in its formulation. We have still to determine whether they were consulted by the executive branch before or after parts of the press of the Nation were taken into its confidence.

This resolution was presented on the basis of urgency, but what suddenly gave rise to the urgency has never been explained by the executive branch. Months before they erupted in the clash at Suez, the accumulating dangers in the

Middle East had been noted by Members of Congress in both parties and by citizens outside the Government. Many proposals for prompt and constructive action were made to the administration. Throughout a long election campaign, however, the administration permitted these dangers in the Middle East to fester in the warm promises of peace and the noninvolvement of the United States. Now, the administration has suddenly discovered that there is no peace, that there must be deep involvement and that Congress must authorize the involvement.

We are told that we face the most dangerous situation in 10 years; that it is more dangerous than the Berlin blockade, than the collapse of China, than the Soviet direct threat against Western Europe, than the Hungarian crisis. This great danger—and let me say that I believe it is a great danger—this great danger is discovered by the administration only a short time after the election results are in and a few days before the new Congress is scheduled to convene.

It is so great a danger that the President sees fit to intrude the matter into the orderly and established procedures of the Government. It is presented to the Congress with the fanfare of crisis before the state of the Union message and before the new Congress has even had an opportunity to complete its organization.

I do not know who advised the President on this procedure. I do know that he was ill-advised. The handling of this matter by the executive branch—this matter of the highest national importance—this greatest danger in 10 years—has had all the earmarks of a blatant press agentry.

Responsible cooperation in foreign policy requires that this body give careful consideration to any proposal advanced by the President of the United States. It does not require us to pamper the public-relations experts of the administration. I am glad to note that despite the clumsiness of its introduction, the Senate is proceeding in this Middle Eastern question as it should in all matters which affect the lives and future of the people of the United States.

So far as the Democratic majority is concerned, we shall give the fullest regard to the views of the President, as he has presented them to the Congress. We shall pay the most careful attention to the evaluations of the Secretary of State and the President's other assistants, as they have been expressed at appropriate hearings.

We shall weigh these views in the light of the interests of the people of the United States, as we see those interests. We shall weigh them in the light of independent evaluations of the Middle Eastern situation as they are advanced in the press and elsewhere. We shall weigh them in the light of the personal knowledge and experience of Members of this body.

We shall proceed, in short, as the Senate ought always to proceed in vital matters of foreign policy. We shall proceed in independence but with full deference for the leadership of the President. I am confident that Members on the other side of the aisle will approach the question of the Middle East or any question of this kind in the same fashion.

What is the alternative? Can we do less? Can we blithely consign to the President, not merely to President Eisenhower, but to any Presidents who may come after him, powers which under the Constitution repose in the Congress? Can we establish in careless haste precedents which may strip the office of the Presidency of power to direct the Armed Forces as may be necessary in the interests of the United States? Can we share responsibility with the President, as he asks us to do in this Middle Eastern matter, without grasping the full implications of what it is that we are asked to share and without a conviction that it is a responsibility that we can, in good conscience, share?

The resolution on the Middle East is an interpretation of a critical international situation by the executive branch of the Government. It is also a remedy advanced by that branch as to how the situation ought to be met. The Senate knows from past experience that the executive branch is no more infallible than is the Congress. That branch can be wrong in its grasp of international developments. It can be wrong in the measures it proposes for dealing with them.

Under a government of separate powers, the orderly processes of the Senate and Congress as a whole can act to correct possible distortions both in the interpretations and the remedies to which they give rise. In the past, Congress has repeatedly exercised this function of correction. We must continue to exercise it or face frankly the prospect of fundamental changes in our constitutional system. And we must, if we are to exercise it well, not be driven by the whip of urgency after months of inaction by the executive branch, a branch which presumably was in full possession of the facts.

I appreciate the efforts the President has made to guide the course of American policy in these dangerous times. He is a man of peace, and he has so impressed much of the rest of the world. His intentions are of the best, whether or not they are always fruitful. The Secretary of State, too, has worked tirelessly and selflessly to safeguard the interests of the United States as he sees those interests. With all due respect to both the President and the Secretary of State, however, it seems to me that the need for a constructive contribution to foreign policy from the Senate at this time is very great.

There is a need for the Senate to bring the whole international situation—not merely the Middle East—into perspective and to keep it in perspective. To the extent that the executive branch should fail to see the realities abroad which confront the Nation, then the Senate must try to illuminate these realities. To the extent that we believe foreign policy as advanced by the executive branch is inadequate, ineffectual, or ill-adapted to the needs of the Nation, then it is incumbent upon us to state our beliefs; it is incumbent on us to dissent, and it is incumbent on us to advise constructive alternatives when we do dissent.

These powers of the Senate in foreign relations are far-reaching powers. They can work great good for the Nation or they can work great harm. They should always be exercised with restraint and care. When necessary, however, they must be exercised.

Mr. President, throughout the last session of Congress, I made an effort to keep the international problems which confront the Nation and our foreign policies under independent review in the Senate.

I recall that the outstanding leader of our party in the Senate, the distinguished, hard-working senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] gave of his time and energy to this subject on many occasions, and, in a forthright, candid manner, expressed the views of the responsible opposition.

Other Members of the Senate did the same. I recall that the distinguished scholarly Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the able and conscientious minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] turned to this subject many times. So, too, did the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and many other Senators. All these Senators made contributions indicating their great interest in the subject.

During the second session of the 84th Congress, I delivered a series of speeches in the Senate on the international situation and foreign policy. In these remarks, I sought to spell out what I hold to be essential in the relationship between the President and the Congress in carrying on the foreign policy of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks today, I may be permitted to incorporate in the RECORD three statements which I have made on the Suez and Middle East situation since August 11, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is, I believe, little that is partisan in these speeches. In any event, their intention was not partisan. They question neither the patriotism nor the motives of the President of the United States and his chief advisers on foreign policy. They give credit to the administration where credit was due. They accept the permise of leadership by the President in foreign relations and urge only that he exercise it more clearly and firmly.

There is support in these speeches for some aspects of the administration's policies. I tried not to oppose merely for the sake of opposition. Where I found it necessary to dissent, I sought to offer constructive alternatives. It is gratifying to note that over the months since I began this series last January some of these alternatives have been incorporated into the understanding and actions of the Executive Branch. I claim no special credit for any of these changes. The impetus for them came from many sources, including other Members of this body and the Congress as a whole. I merely point to the fact in order to emphasize that the Senate can make a contribution to the course of American policy by the process of independent review.

I do not know, Mr. President, how often I shall be able to turn to the subject of foreign relations in discussions on the floor during the current session. Before we were much advanced into the legislative schedule for the year, however, I did want to set forth my understanding of what the Nation's interests required, beyond party, in the way of responsible cooperation between the President and the Congress in foreign relations.

I also wish to set forth at this time my understanding of the current situation abroad and what I believe to be the principal inadequacies of the administration's policies in meeting that situation.

Mr. President, we are confronted not merely with one difficult situation in the world, that of the Middle East, but we are confronted with many, and all must be faced. Some of these situations are critical, as is the case in the Middle East and Eastern Europe. Others, dormant for the moment, may become equally critical or more so in the near future. That is true, I believe, of the situation in Western Europe and the Far East. Still others, like that in Latin America, are what I would regard as neglected situations. Finaly, there are those areas of the world which represent, in my opinion, improved situations. I would include in this category southeast Asia and parts of north Africa.

As I have already noted, I have been deeply disturbed by the manner in which the administration has handled Middle Eastern developments. There were steps recommended months ago which, had they been taken, might well have prevented the outbreak of the Suez conflict. They were not taken, or were taken too late. Each delay has acted to increase the dangers in that region and the potential cost of meeting the dangers. In the resolution which the President has sent to the Congress, we now have the cumulative price of inaction, of empty campaign slogans of peace where there was no peace.

It is a heavy price. It may now involve the commitment of American military strength of unforeseen dimensions in the Middle East. It may now involve the beginning of military and economic assistance activities in new and perhaps questionable channels in that region. The administration does not even guess at the ultimate scope or cost of these activities.

I have never opposed economic or military assistance to other nations if, in my judgment, it held realistic promise of promoting responsibilities and stable government, peace, and international commerce, with consequent benefit to this Nation. It is still not clear, however, that the changes in the foreign-aid legislation as sought in the President's resolution will serve that purpose. Further, the resolution ignores the immediate difficulties which have upset peace in the Middle East, the Suez situation and the Arab-Israeli dispute. It may even act to intensify these difficulties.

Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I desire to make clear that I believe action by this Government—cooperative and constructive action by the President and the Congress—in the Middle Eastern crisis is essential. I want to make equally clear, however, that I do not believe that the proposal presented by the executive branch in its original form provided for that kind of action.

Before work on the President's resolution is concluded by the Congress, I hope that we will have acted to make clear the following points:

First. That this country will not stand idly by if there is Communist aggression in that area, and that such aggression if it comes, will be met within our constitutional processes.

Second. That this country will sustain with such material aid as may be needed the efforts of the United Nations Emergency Force to maintain the truce in the Middle East.

Third. That any new aid programs—military or economic—in the Middle East are only stopgap unless they are related in some manner to easing the economic and political difficulties that have been caused by the Suez dispute, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the other basic problems of the area.

Fourth. That this country will redouble its efforts through the United Nations to curb a principal cause of the intensification of the crisis in the Middle East, Soviet and other arms traffic.

Mr. President, I now introduce a joint resolution which I hope will help to clarify these 4 points. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly for such use as they may make of it in connection with the consideration of the President's proposal on the Middle East.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly as requested by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) relating to the use of armed forces by the President to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the joint resolution I have just introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) was read as follows:

Whereas the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East is vital to the interests of the United States;

Whereas the welfare of the United States and other nations is related to the prevention of further hostilities in the region of the Middle East, and the resumption of passage of ships of all nations through the Suez Canal;

Whereas the present truce maintained by the United Nations in the Middle East may prove temporary if there is no lasting settlement of the Suez dispute and the Arab-Israeli conflict and if economic instability in the region persists;

Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

Whereas such danger now exists in the general area of the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., 1. That the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations;

2. Notwithstanding any limitations in existing law, the President may use appropriations made pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to furnish facilities and military assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East;

3. The President should call upon the United Nations General Assembly to establish at once a Special Commission on Arms Traffic in the Middle East with a view to recommending measures for regulating the flow of military materiel into that region;

4. The President should recommend to the Congress an economic program of specific nature, amount, and duration, which, in his judgment, will facilitate a settlement of the Suez dispute and the Arab-Israeli conflict and otherwise promote stability in the Middle East and the peaceful progress of the nations of that region.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Is the joint resolution introduced by the Senator in the nature of a substitute for the measure now under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that I am introducing the joint resolution for the consideration of both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the

Committee on Armed Services in the hope that some of the points enumerated in the resolution will be taken into consideration by those committees, I feel that those points may reach some of the basic difficulties which the resolution presented by the administration, and which is now before the committees, seems to ignore.

No less critical than the developments in the Middle East is the situation in Eastern Europe. The display of courage in Hungary has evoked universal admiration. The growing pressure for freedom in Poland and elsewhere, and even in Russia, has astonished those who with little comprehension of the power of liberty believed that only military force applied from without could shake the grip of tyranny within the Soviet enclave.

It is all very well, Mr. President, to stand on the sidelines and express admiration for the Hungarians and astonishment at the surging forces of freedom in Eastern Europe. It is all very well, Mr. President, to concentrate our attention on the relief of refugees from the terror in Hungary or to present boldly worded resolutions of condemnation in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

But there are also other implications which emerge from the stirrings in the Soviet Empire. There are new challenges which confront us, and I trust the administration will lose no time in meeting them. Our interest with respect to Eastern Europe and even the Soviet Union itself is not merely in the tearing down of tyranny. It is not in the spread of chaos and destruction from which new tyrannies may well emerge, well fed on the blood of martyrs to freedom.

Our interest with respect to Eastern Europe, our fundamental interest, is in the building up of stable, responsible, and humane governments—peaceful governments—which can take their rightful place in a peaceful Europe and in a world at peace. This task of building lies preponderantly with the peoples of Eastern Europe, and each will bring to it those unique characteristics which are the marks of nationhood.

What we and others do or fail to do in our policies, however, will have an impact on the process. Our policies will hasten or delay the building. That is why I urge the administration to go beyond the immediate repercussions of the crisis in Eastern Europe. It is time to recognize that we are dealing not only with the monolithic structure of international communism in that region. We are also dealing with a many-sided situation in which old, new, and frequently obscure political forces are at work.

It is time to note, and to note carefully, that political developments in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Poland are following different patterns, and that those which are likely to take place in Bulgaria, Rumania, and elsewhere may be equally dissimilar. It is time to find out why. It is time to develop policies which recognize these differences, policies which in each case offer the best hope of the emergence of stable, responsible, humane, and peaceful governments. A single policy, a single attitude toward the entire region of Eastern Europe, in my opinion no longer serves the interests of the United States.

It is time, too, to consult intensively and to cooperate closely on this matter with the nations of Western Europe. Those nations have lived for a long time in more intimate contact with the troubled regions to the East. Tyranny is an old story in that part of the world, and the West Europeans are not unfamiliar with it. Their views on this question, as expressed in NATO and elsewhere, warrant our most careful attention.

The concern of the European democracies in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe is more direct and is deeper than ours. That is the case for many reasons. The most significant, however, is that developments in Eastern Europe are closely linked with the central problem of Western Europe, namely, the unification of Germany. The time may be rapidly approaching when there will arise the greatest challenge since the end of World War II, not only to our foreign policy, but to the policies of the nations of Western Europe. That challenge will be to relate the solution of the problem of German unification to the unfolding developments in Eastern Europe in a manner which will insure the independence and the tranquillity of all the nations of that tormented Continent. When that moment comes, I hope the administration will be prepared for it and will have the courage to face it. It may be the last chance in this century to insure a lasting peace and the survival of recognizable human civilization on earth.

In anticipation of that moment, this Nation must redouble its efforts to encourage a deepening unity in Western Europe. Further, this Nation must maintain and strengthen its ties with that region, in the interests of common security and common progress.

Mr. President, I do not accept the bland assurances of this administration that all is right with these ties. The handling of the Middle East crisis has set in motion new impulses of division. These come on top of others which have plagued our relations with Western Europe in recent times. They hasten the process of erosion of unity which has gone on for several years.

It is true that a common revulsion against the Soviet atrocities in Hungary has brought the nations of the Western World once again more closely together. To equate this momentary seeking of sanctuary on common ground with genuine unity, however, to assume that it is evidence that all is right with that unity, borders on the irresponsible.

I have said it many times, and I repeat it now: The unity of the Western nations, welded in the agony of two wars, supported at enormous cost by the people of the United States, is in grave danger. If it is to hold, it must be sustained by something more than a common revulsion, by something more than a common fear of Soviet brutality. Unless this unity rests on a mutual appreciation of its vital necessity to each, unless there is a will to cooperation in the solution of common problems and the national forbearance which makes cooperation possible, unless there is inspired leadership toward new goals of common progress, unless these positive elements are present, the process of disintegration will go on. In time, if anything at all, only the look of unity will remain in such institutions as the European Union and NATO. These institutions, however, will be devoid of substance.

If there are grave dangers underlying the situation in Western Europe, others are buried in the situation on the other side of the globe, in the Far East. A calm appears to have settled over that region, and a silence amounting virtually to censorship has characterized the administration's handling of developments in that region. We may well ask ourselves, of what is the calm composed? What is the significance of the silence?

The calm, Mr. President, is composed of three tenuous truces: the truce in Korea, the truce in Formosa, and the truce in Indochina. These are truces which act to maintain an unstable status quo in the Far East, but they settle nothing. It is this status quo, this calm, this outward calm, this questionable calm, that has been presented to the people of the United States as an achievement of peace.

How long will the calm last? Will the urge to unification in Korea, in Indochina, soon put an end to it? What of the continuing threat to Formosa? What is likely to emerge from the vast and churning maw of the Communist mainland? What has been achieved in the conversations between the Chinese Communist delegate and the President's representative which have gone on for years in Geneva? What will follow the restored relations—trade and other—between Japan and the Communist mainland? Have these been counterbalanced by tightening ties between Japan and other free nations?

We do not even begin, Mr. President, to have adequate insight into these and other important questions concerning the Far East. Yet, in that region, no less than elsewhere, and in some ways more, the forces of change are constantly at work. We shall be in a position neither to understand them nor to deal with them if the people of this country are lulled into a false sense of security about the Far East. The need is neither for a seeming calm nor for a curtain of silence. The need, in the first instance, is for facts, facts which the administration alone can supply. It is a need for action based on those facts, action designed to strengthen security and peace as they may be threatened in the Far East, not only for the moment, but for years to come.

In Latin America, from which I have recently returned, our relations are still, on the whole, friendly. The Fulbright, and other exchange-of-persons programs, technical cooperation, Export-Import Bank loans, and other measures have made a great contribution to the building of these relations with the neighboring American Republics. Over the years of the good neighbor policy, a substantial reserve of good will was established in the nations to the south.

The reserve, however, is not inexhaustible; and in recent years we have used up much of it. Our relations are suffering from neglect and ineptitude in their administration. In this field there is a pressing need for creative leadership which will search out, in the Organization of the American States and in other ways, methods of revitalizing the meaning of pan-Americanism. What is needed is a broad advance to new ground in the cooperation of the Western Hemisphere, so that this cooperation will yield greater progress and greater satisfactions to all the peoples of the Americas. I thought that when this administration several years ago substituted the term "good partner" for "good neighbor," we would have that kind of an advance. It has not been forthcoming. We have not formed the partnership, and we are in danger of alienating the good neighbors.

Elsewhere in the world—in southeast Asia, south Asia, and Africa—there has been some improvement in the understanding of the executive branch, both in regard to the realities of these situations and as to the measures of policy for meeting them. I may say that in the case of Indochina, this improvement came only after half the country had fallen to communism, and just in time to avoid a disastrous involvement of American Armed Forces. I have not been in the region of Indochina since 1955; but available reports indicate a remarkable diminution of the Communist threat there, notably in Vietnam.

Continuing improvement in our relations with southeast Asia and the other so-called underdeveloped areas, however, cannot be taken for granted. These relations require constant and sensitive cultivation if they are to grow to mutual advantage. A key factor in these relations is the aid programs which are now under study by a committee of the Senate. From personal knowledge of the operation of these programs in Asia, I know that they are in great need of adjustment if they are to help, rather than hinder, our relations in that part of the world.

Mr. President, in this résumé I have touched on only some of the most salient circumstances which confront us in the world. I believe I have said enough however, to make clear that in broad perspective the international situation remains essentially as I described it some months ago. It is neither black nor white; but, here, at the beginning of the year 1957, it is many shades of gray.

The actions of each nation and the interactions of all contribute to this total pattern. And beyond these factors are vast forces—physical, economic, religious, and others—which move the long flow of human history. They push the pendulum of mankind, in its broadest arc, toward universal progress or universal destruction.

The influence which this country or any single country can exert on these transcendental forces is limited. Let us recognize that fact and, in recognizing it, avoid the conceited and dangerous delusion of omnipotent world power.

Because that is the case, let us not conclude that we can or should do nothing. Recognition of the limits of our world influence is not a call to retreat into the nonexistent insulation of isolation. It is not a license to ignore the international responsibilities which this generation of Americans must assume if future generations are not to be plagued by our irresponsibility.

Recognition of the limits of our influence, in short, is the first step in the responsible use of that influence. It is a call to wield that influence, as it is expressed in foreign policy, with care, with restraint, and with economy.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that we are using the influence of the United States in that fashion when we permit dangerous and largely unnecessary divisions to disrupt our relations with Western Europe. We are not using our influence wisely when we pursue in the Middle East what appears to be, not a policy of isolation, not a policy of internationalism, but a policy of isolated internationalism.

We are not using it wisely when expensive aid programs begin to work at cross-purposes, as in India and Pakistan. We are not using it wisely when these aid programs tend to produce dependency rather than independence in other countries, when they become the means for irresponsible governments to prolong their irresponsibility to their peoples.

We are not using it wisely when the multiple agencies of the executive branch pull in different directions in foreign relations.

We are not using it wisely when public relations is substituted for policymaking.

We are not using it wisely if drift, dodge, and delay replace decision.

We are not using it wisely when old policies are persisted in after they have outlived their usefulness.

These are some of the ills of our foreign policy as I see them, Mr. President. They suggest their own remedies. There is a need to restore and to strengthen close working relationships with independent democratic countries abroad, on the basis of mutuality of interest and mutuality of sacrifice. There is a need to complete the various studies of foreign aid now in progress as rapidly as possible and, if I may emphasize the point, to apply the findings of these studies in legislative and administrative action.

There is a desperate need to streamline and coordinate the operations of the numerous departments and agencies engaged in foreign activities. The step is essential not only to provide for a more economical use of available resources, but even more important to reduce the damage which the bureaucratic conflicts and idiosyncrasies inflict on our relations with other nations. There is a need throughout the executive branch to talk less and to do more.

There is a need to return not only the formulation of foreign policy, but its conduct, to where it belongs—to the President and his Secretary of State. There is a need, finally, to encourage the flow of new blood and new ideas—some of which I trust will be Democratic, and, based on ability—into foreign policy.

And beyond all else, there is a need for clear, continuous, and constructive leadership from the President of the United States—leadership which will point the way towards peace in a world where there is no peace. Few men, Mr. President, in our history as a Nation have ever been in a better position to provide that kind of leadership than has Mr. Eisenhower. He begins his second term with a great personal mandate from the people of the United States. He has the confidence of the peoples of many nations, not excluding those in Eastern Europe. He is a Republican, but his reputation and much of his achievement were registered under Democratic administrations. Not eligible for reelection, he can raise the office of the Presidency beyond politics. He has, in short, an unparalleled opportunity to perform a great and lasting service to this Nation and to the entire world. Let him lead from the generalities of peace which characterized his first administration and his recent inaugural address to the realities of peace in this, his second administration. If he does so lead, he will not lack for responsible cooperation from the Democratic majority in Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement, not exceeding 3 minutes, without the Senator from Montana losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Montana has analyzed, with clarity and precision, the responsibilities that rest upon the Executive in the foreign policy field. He spoke in the tone of a man seeking solutions to the problems of America rather than the problems of partisanship. I want to express my very deep personal appreciation for the overly generous personal references he made to me.

It is not necessary to embrace every comma and every semicolon in the distinguished Senator's statement to realize that it is one of the most significant speeches on foreign policy made in recent years in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that the majority has sought consistently to follow the policy of responsible cooperation, as has been so well enunciated by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana today. We have realized, I think, from the beginning, that it is our function not to obstruct the Executive, not to harass the Secretary of State, but to attempt to present constructive criticism and constructive contributions and constructive alternatives. We recognize clearly that the President has a special role to play in the field of foreign policy, as has been so well stated by the Senator from Montana. We realize that the President must conduct the affairs of the Nation on a day-to-day basis, and in the ultimate analysis, he is the man who must speak for our country in its dealing with other countries. But this does not mean that the sole role of the Senate is acquiescence in or rejection of policies already announced by the President. We must never become

merely a set of rubber stamps marked "yea" and "nay."

A foreign policy cannot have force and effectiveness unless it has the support of the people through their representatives. That support is not gained unless the policy has been examined carefully and unless the Senate has offered to it the contributions which seem to the Senate wise and prudent.

I was rather surprised the other day when the suggestion arose that an effort to examine a policy carefully was deemed an effort to harass and to obstruct. The suggestion appears to be that once a policy has been declared by the President, Congress must approve rapidly and without detailed analysis.

Personally, I have no desire to delay consideration of the President's Middle Eastern resolution. I am ready to resolve the issues, and I think they can be resolved in language acceptable to the Congress and to the President and to the country. But my willingness to do that does not imply a willingness on my part to go along blindly without first examining all the facts. The announcement that a new policy is being shaped appears in the headlines, without any effort to discuss it with Congress first. How it appears in the headlines is a mystery which no one has yet attempted to explain, and I hardly think it can be justified.

The theory appears to be that Congress has too much of a sense of responsibility to tell the world that our country is divided; therefore the Congress has no choice but to approve, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t". It would be better for all of us if instead we recognized our mutual responsibilities and carried them out.

The President has the responsibility of conducting the foreign policy through his Secretary of State. This responsibility involves gathering the information upon which foreign policy must be initiated and shaped.

Congress has the responsibility to examine the facts, to weigh them in the light of past experience, to determine whether the policy is justified, and to decide whether there are constructive alternatives which would unify the country.

All Americans seek unity behind policies which will insure our integrity, our independence, and our freedom. We shall achieve such unity if each branch, the legislative and the executive, not only exercises its rights and prerogatives, but discharges its obligations.

There is no political capital to be made out of foreign policy. There are only obligations to serve the country.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Montana for speaking in that vein today. I suspect that this is the kind of debate for which the Senate and the Nation have been yearning for so long.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. In reply, let me say to him that I am extremely happy he has emphasized the fact that every Senator, in his own right, has an individual responsibility which he must face, just as the President must face his responsibility in the office which he occupies. I hope Senators will never forget the fact that theirs is a great responsibility, and that we cannot accept something on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It is up to us to do our own thinking, our own probing, our own questioning. I hope we shall always remember that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Once more I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Montana for speaking in such an able fashion about a subject which he knows so well. It is a privilege to listen to him.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Montana whether, to the best of his knowledge, there is any present situation requiring the use of our military forces in the Middle East.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, no information has been forthcoming before either of the two committees which would indicate such to be the case.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Montana, would the passage of the Mideast resolution create a situation urgently requiring the use of our military forces?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know. There seems to be no urgent need for the use of our forces at the present time. There seems to be no urgent need in connection with the resolution which the administration has requested.

I cannot answer the question, because the facts have not been made available to enable me to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What would our position be under the proposed resolution if, at the request of either Israel or Syria, the Soviet Union were to furnish troops for either country?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If either of them requested the Soviet Union to furnish troops, there would be nothing we could do, according to the testimony advanced.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is there a parallel situation between the Mideast resolution and the Truman doctrine with respect to Greece and the Eisenhower resolution with respect to Formosa?

Mr. MANSFIELD. None at all, because, so far as the Greek situation was concerned, the British were withdrawing, leaving a vacuum, and they asked us to fill it. The Greeks asked us to come in, and on that basis, with due notice, we went in.

So far as the Formosa resolution of 2 years ago is concerned, both Eisenhower and Truman repeatedly declared that if Formosa were ever attacked, this Nation would come to its defense. So when we were asked for the Formosa resolution, we were asked to put into writing what our leaders had said publicly over a period of several years. So far as I know, up to this time there has been no request for the present resolution from any country in the Middle East.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator believe that the Mideast resolution would arouse expectations which would be doomed to disappointment, and would also arouse national rivalry in connection with the division of aid, and perhaps contribute to the growth of hostility against our country?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a possibility. I do not know how we would apportion the moneys for which the administration is asking. I do not know what would happen if there should be a slackening in the payments, or a cutting off for a temporary period of time. I do not know what would happen if one country were to receive a large sum and another a small sum, and they became envious of each other. We have had such experiences during the entire aid program. I believe this resolution would open up a Pandora's box of difficulties, as I am sure Senators are aware; and I hesitate to say much beyond that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his cogent remarks, and the way he has proved what so many of us have been saying for so long, that in this country someday, sometime, we must begin to create policies which, in turn, will establish events, instead of constantly allowing events to create our policies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Missouri. In my opinion the resolution before us does not constitute a policy. At best it is a prelude to a policy, because we do not know what the policy is. We have not been told.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Senator from Montana if the proposed resolution would not also establish a precedent in Congress in connection with appropriations for foreign aid? As I understand the testimony of the Secretary of State, he said, "We are not asking for any money beyond the $200 million."

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Secretary said, "We are merely asking that you take $200 million out of the $750 million appropriated for the fiscal year for the Middle East and give it to the administration without any strings." Does the Senator from Montana believe that that might establish a precedent for all future foreign aid, namely, that we could take out certain sums and give them to the Executive without strings?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That might be the result. However, I doubt it, because I am quite sure that in the next mutual security aid bill, which will come before the Congress in a few months, we shall expect and require a statement of specific projects and plans. If anything is allowed at this time, it will be on a temporary basis. I am sure the Senator joins me in the hope that such a policy will not become a permanent fixture in connection with our appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Appropriations Committee of the House has already begun hearings on the question of the

amount of money for foreign aid in the Middle East next year. The Senate committee will begin hearings in a few weeks, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out. Was there anything in the testimony which pointed out any great emergency requiring the distribution of $200 million between now and the time the Appropriations Committees can act on the request, as suggested by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in my opinion. Ambassador Richards, in whom I have unbounded confidence, and who is a great American, has not even been sent to the Middle East to find out what we should do.

Some of the distinguished members of the committee, including the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and our majority leader the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], have asked for a postponement until the mission returns, so that we, as well as the State Department, may know just what it is intended to do with the moneys which are being requested at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that Mr. Richards has been appointed Ambassador for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and he is an excellent man.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many of us know him well from having served with him in the House. It has been suggested that Mr. Richards wait until Congress acts on the resolution before he goes on his mission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator and to all other Senators listening to this debate that by the address he has delivered the Senator from Montana has performed a great public service, the magnitude of which will not be known until many days have passed.

I have listened with interest to what he has said. I have listened to a reading of the resolution. Of course a reading of it does not give a full understanding of its meaning. However, it does guarantee that this question will be considered by the committee of which he is a member. There is no doubt that Congress will look at the resolution which has been submitted. I did not know the Senator was preparing to draft a resolution, and therefore this morning I dictated some amendments to the resolution pending before the committee, for the purpose of clarifying what seem to me to be completely contradictory provisions between the resolution and the President's speech.

Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me now, I should like to claim the floor for myself, unless the Senator has something additional to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wonder whether the Senator would permit me to yield to other Senators first.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I have to say in a way comments on the Senator's speech, and I wish to make my statement at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I promised to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts and to other Senators. I promised to yield to them for questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I listened to his speech, and I read it as he delivered it. I have a high regard for the conscientiousness and fairness with which he considers any subject before he speaks it on the floor of the Senate.

Of course, I do not agree with all the premises on which he bases some of his statements. I should like to make two points at this time, and in the course of time I shall analyze thoroughly his speech.

The first point I wish to make—and I believe he will agree with me about it—is that President Eisenhower certainly is conscientiously trying to exercise his leadership in foreign affairs to the best of his ability, and that he is endeavoring to carry out his policies with the assistance and guidance and advice of the Secretary of State. I believe it is very clear that he is concentrating at the present time on the Middle East questions. However, that does not mean that he is not following up problems in the other parts of the world, namely, in Europe and in the Far East. I am confident the Senator will agree with me on that point.

The other point I respectfully make to the Senator is this: I believe the President of the United States—and I think the Senator will agree with me—has the utmost regard for the independence of Congress, and, in fact, the independence of all three coequal branches of our Government. I am sure the Senator will also agree that no action on his part contemplates having the Senate rush through any matter to which it should and can give proper consideration.

I ask the Senator if he does not agree with me on the statement I have made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to say to my distinguished friend that I very seldom disagree with him, because he has a way of expressing himself which makes it extremely difficult to do so.

However, I believe it ought to be brought out that there has been a suggestion of urgency placed on the resolution, for the President came before Congress with a special message even before his state of the Union message, and since then we have been told time and time again that speed is of the essence, although we have not been told what the speed is all about.

I am sure the Senator will agree with me when I say that in the exercise of our constitutional responsibility we had better be careful and that we had better go cautiously and that we had better know what we are doing and know what we are getting into.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will agree with the Senator from Montana that we should know what we are doing and what we are getting into. At the same time I would perhaps put a little different emphasis on urgency, and I would say that we should keep the machine constantly rolling at its highest speed in order to work out these policies jointly with the leader of our foreign policy, the President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My distinguished colleague and I disagree only in degree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that I bespeak the feelings of all our colleagues and certainly express for the vast majority of them the great sense of respect and gratitude we have for the Senator from Montana for his dissertation—not merely a speech—on foreign policy.

The Senator has obviously had to touch lightly and only briefly on many areas of the world. However, he has certainly aroused the genuine inquisitiveness of the Members of the Senate on the whole question of foreign policy, and in that way has directed our attention to them and to their importance.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana, first of all, that we are indebted to him for the resolution, which he does not term a substitute, but a resolution de novo for consideration by the committee.

I wish to say particularly that the Senator from Montana has not only pointed out the objectives of the Presidential resolution, but in his resolution has done what he states the Presidential resolution does not do, namely, outline the broad basic steps toward a policy or a set of policies that meet the needs.

That is what the Senator's resolution does.

I should like to ask him one question with reference to this situation. The Senator refers to a United Nations special commission on arms traffic. Would he also agree that it might be well to consider the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices commission, to seek relentlessly and patiently to bring about political settlements between the Arab States and Israel?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The answer to the distinguished Senator's question is yes. I should like to express the hope that the United Nations expeditionary force now in the Gulf of Aqaba and in the Gaza strip would remain there until difficulties between Egypt and Israel over these two areas are settled.

Furthermore, I would express the hope that our Government would take the lead, on the basis of this first and temporary U. N. police force, to do what it could do in order to bring about the establishment of a permanent U. N. police force, and thus obviate the necessity of making it necessary for the United States to carry the burden in every quarter of the globe. We must recognize our own limitations both in manpower and in resources, and we must recognize the fact that we cannot, no matter how much some may advocate it, police the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Montana is aware of the fact that in the United Nations General Assembly this year there are resolutions proposed by our Government which call for the United Nations to give immediate con-

cern to the settlement of the Suez Canal problem and to the overall political problem. However, those resolutions are not being pressed. They have been permitted to take a lower status on the so-called priority list of "must" resolutions in the General Assembly.

The Senator is also aware of the recent resolution in the United Nations relating to the state of Israel and the fact that our Government has insisted that Israel withdraw from the Gaza Strip and that the situation which prevailed previously in the Gulf of Aqaba area be restored.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that resolution shall be agreed to, it means to return to the status quo ante, in my opinion, and will make a difficult situation that much worse.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish again to express my concurrence with the Senator.

Is it not true that not only is Israel at the moment in defiance of the original resolution of the United Nations, but that the state of Egypt has been in defiance of the Security Council resolution, with respect to the Suez Canal, since 1951?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. They are both guilty, differing in degree and covering different subjects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say to the Senator that his reference to the German reunification problem is a word of caution to this chamber and to this Government that must not go unheeded.

I wish to commend the Senator for noting again that the most explosive area in Europe, possibly in the world, is the area of Central Europe, East Germany particularly, and the relationships of East Germany to West Germany. I understand the proposal is not in terms of specifics, but it is for the purpose of assuring that we shall not be caught short without a policy which may be urgently needed at some unknown date in the future. Is that the Senator's proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have attempted to interest the President and the Secretary of State in this problem with the help of our Subcommittee on Disarmament, but I regret to say that not much interest in it has been demonstrated.

I regard the remarks of the Senator from Montana today to be outstanding and of statesmanlike character. They were, in a sense, echoed last night by Henry Ford II, the president of the Ford Motor Co., who delivered a remarkable address on foreign policy before the annual convention of the automobile dealers in San Francisco. Mr. Ford was a delegate to the United Nations in 1953.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I received a copy of that speech this morning, as, I think, did all Members of the Senate. I looked over it in a hurry, and I was very much impressed by it. It was a far better speech, I believe, that the one which I made this afternoon. I noticed in that speech Mr. Ford likewise raised a number of questions concerning the Middle East, the answers to which he did not know and which we do not know.

I should appreciate it if the Senator from Minnesota would read that particular paragraph at this time to lend some further substance to the discussions we have been having this afternoon concerning that particular area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in compliance with the Senator's request I read from Mr. Ford's speech:

> In the Middle East there's a whole bill of particulars that needs filling out. * * * There has not been much, as yet, to indicate just what we want to do to settle the Arab refugee problem, to bring about a just and lasting settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes and to assure the free international use of the Suez Canal. The American public is just as much in the dark about what we propose to do in these situations as anybody else in the world. All we know for sure is that no one but us can ultimately bring about a solution of these problems—except possibly the Russians. Neither the U. N. nor any free nation can act effectively here until they know where the United States stands.

Mr. President, that is strong and meaningful language by one who has been interested in our foreign policies, a great businessman, and a friend of the administration and of the President. The speech was delivered in a nonpartisan manner and in the spirit of a searching mind, by an American who wishes to know the answers when his country is faced with dire problems.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit, I should like to ask that Mr. Ford's speech be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in our discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to have the speech incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY HENRY FORD, II, PRESIDENT OF FORD MOTOR CO., BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, AT THE CIVIC AUDITORIUM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., ON JANUARY 28, 1957

Today I would like to discuss with you some matters that may seem far removed from the day-to-day business of making and selling cars. Yet they are matters which are certain to have a direct effect on your business and mine—and no less effect on our pocketbooks—not 5 or 10 years hence, but this very year of 1957—matters which ultimately mean literal life and death to us all as businessmen, of course, but more importantly, as husbands, fathers, mothers, human beings.

Coming events cast their shadows before them, and today our secure and rich land is crossed and recrossed by shadows of events that are yet to come—events in far-off corners of the world that will inevitably shape our future for better or for worse. The earth-shaking events of the past 6 months cast shadows, too, but most of us just didn't see them.

So I would like to take off, if you will, on a short shadow-chasing mission. I would like to talk about some things that have been happening in the world about us, what consequences they seem to hold, and how we might possibly go about meeting those consequences.

I want to talk about foreign affairs with you this afternoon because I think it is the most important problem facing this Nation today and one which is vital to every individual citizen.

I want to talk foreign affairs because I believe it is everybody's business, and that there should be much more talk and discussion on this subject. It is not only the right but the duty of every citizen who takes a real interest in such matters to speak his mind and contribute to public discussion of such issues—even at the risk of turning out to be wrong.

Nobody seriously believes that we become good Republicans or Democrats, or good citizens for that matter, just by exercising the franchise or voting the straight party line. We can't delegate our own ultimate responsibility for national and international affairs to the people we send to Washington. It's our responsibility to let them know what we think—not just on election day but on a continuing basis. In the realm of foreign affairs, particularly, an informed public opinion, based upon open discussion and adequate information, is an absolute essential

At the same time, however, it is equally essential that we have a foreign policy that looks at the long range rather than the immediate future. Only through clear and continued enunciation of such a long-range policy can the State Department hope to avoid the difficult problem of trying to sell new solutions to meet new crises to an uninformed electorate.

It is that basic principle that I am concerned with today. I have no desire to place blame for the events of recent months abroad. But I feel very strongly that this is a time for all of us, regardless of political belief, to take a vigorous hand in the shaping of foreign policy.

My comments this afternoon are based on three premises which I think would be readily accepted by most people.

First, the events of the past few months have presented us with a fundamentally changed world situation, in which many of our most cherished notions no longer hold true.

Second, as a result of this big change, we face problems that urgently demand action—problems we can no longer evade—and that entail both tremendous possibilities and tremendous risks for our future.

Third, in order to meet and beat the challenge of this new hand of cards, we are going to have to come of age fast in international affairs—as a Nation, as a Government, as a people—and act with uncommon sanity, wisdom, and unity.

I think the first of these points is obvious. You cannot help but be aware of the tremendous curiosity and concern people everywhere have been showing about the events in Hungary and the Middle East. Hungary was a particular shock to most of us. We felt somehow a great sense of inadequacy. We were reminded bitterly of a truth that lies deep in our American consciousness: you don't play freedom safe. Freedom literally means: "Give me liberty or give me death." And when Cardinal Mindszenty and other Hungarian patriots pleaded for help and we wouldn't, or couldn't, come through, we felt somewhat as if they were fighting our fight all over again. But also, as we watched them stand firm for days and then weeks in the face of insurmountable odds, it began to look as if something were happening more profound than we had realized.

As we tried to make sense of Hungary, the Middle East exploded in what was a thoroughly confusing sequence of events. Britain and France, our old wartime allies, and Israel—virtually an American protege—were on one side. We, the Kremlin, and Nasser appeared to be on the other. And we found ourselves urging on the U. N. a course of action that had the effect of saving the neck of a dictator whose provocative actions against the vital interests of our oldest and nearest friends had brought the crisis to a head.

Out of these two events have come unmistakable signs of profound changes in the relations among nations.

For years the Soviet bloc has represented itself as an unshakable alliance of Communist nations resolutely united in purpose and obedient to the Kremlin. But now that is changed. First Yugoslavia pulled away, next came the riots in East Germany, then in Poland, and then Hungary.

And now comes the news that in last week's Polish elections, the entire slate of Nationalist candidates has been elected against the opposition of the Polish pro-Soviet bloc.

Rumbles continue to be heard from the other satellite countries, and we wonder who will be next. Surely all these satellite peoples, and even some of their leaders, must be reevaluating their relations with the Kremlin. And Russia, too, must be undergoing that well-known agonizing reappraisal. Whom among her allies can she trust? What dependence can she place upon the satellite armies—or, indeed, upon her own forces—when they are used to suppress peoples in foreign lands?

At the same time, the Middle East crisis is revealing some sizable cracks in our own armor. The western alliance of nations has had a severe shock, both politically and economically, and we have a priority job to do in rebuilding that alliance on a realistic basis of trust and confidence.

Even more serious is the immediate possibility of further Soviet penetration of the Middle East. In this crucial area, a minor shift in the political sympathies of a few highly unstable governments could give the Soviets, any day now, effective working control of the oil and the trade routes of the Middle East. With such control, they could ultimately dictate the policies of Europe just as surely as if the Red army patrolled the streets of London, Paris, and Rome. Very quickly the vast riches of the African continent would be theirs for the plucking, without so much as firing a shot. And all of the yet-uncommitted peoples of Asia would, in time, fall under immense economic pressures from Moscow.

A setup like that would put a tremendous squeeze on us and our friends in the Western Hemisphere. Moscow would have monopoly control of more than half of the world's resources. And we would have to meet their price or submit our economy to slow strangulation. Let's not forget that we are fast becoming a have-not nation in many important raw materials. Furthermore, our ability to make and sell cars depends not only on such imported materials but on consumer income that is increasingly based on international trade.

Atomic war might be the worst thing that could happen; but it's certainly not the only thing that ought to be on our minds.

This whole picture seems to me a graphic example of what historians mean when the talk about a fundamental shift in the balance of world power. It seems to me that is exactly what is dangling in the Middle East today—and dangling by a very thin thread. For over a century, Russian designs in the Middle East were frustrated by the British and the French. Today the British and the French are gone. How that fateful shift in world power takes place is up to us, and to us alone. There's no one else who can do anything about it.

One more aspect of the transition in world affairs which I think should be mentioned is a basic shift of Soviet tactics in their struggle for world domination. While they have not abandoned that basic goal, they do seem to have changed their way of trying to achieve it. There is much more emphasis on political and economic infiltration. The cold war is being carried on today more in the realm of international trade, economic aid programs, and political ideas.

Instead of expansion by conquest, we find the Soviets sweet-talking their new targets. In rapid succession, Moscow has offered new trade and mutual-aid agreements to satellite and other nations on the Soviet perimeter as well as to underdeveloped areas in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Latin America. When I was a delegate to the United Nations in 1953, the Russians denounced the U. N. technical assistance program as sinister American imperialism. Since then, however, they have become ardent supporters of the idea. They have also announced their support of a special U. N. economic development program, SUNFED, which our country has thus far refused to do. The Russians are accelerating their program of technical aid to underdeveloped areas. In those programs, they now have a rapidly increasing number of dedicated Marxist technicians selling the Soviet way for all they're worth. And the Soviet propaganda mills continue to roll—on a budget roughly ten times that of our Voice of America—blowing up Soviet economic growth and the benefits of mutual cooperation promises beyond recognition.

Any one of us could offer some good reasons why Russia has so sharply altered tactics that were working pretty well in a number of places. One of the best reasons could be simply that the Soviets have at last stumbled on a bit of ancient wisdom: You can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar. It's better to have other nations docile and perhaps even grateful under your sheltering wing than seething with resentment under your heel. It's a lot easier to govern the world by hidden control of a few strategic points than by trying to hold down a world empire by armed force.

All of these things make up the great change which has presented us with great opportunities and great perils. We are faced with a series of problems, some new, some old familiar ones in a new guise, which we cannot ignore or brush aside any longer. The stakes are too high. We are going to have to ask the hard questions, and find the hard answers, not next year or the year after but starting right now. Vacillation before the urgent pressure of these events can only lead from one disaster to another.

We can no longer afford to take a passive stand and merely react to things after they happen in a sort of fire-alarm diplomacy. We've got to get out ahead of events and try to lead and shape them to the best of our ability. There is no dodging the fact that the United States is the natural leader of the free world. In that role it will star gloriously or flop miserably before the judgment of history.

Let's look at some of those hard questions that we as a people must ask ourselves and our Government—keeping a completely open mind.

In the Middle East there's a whole bill of particulars that needs filling out. We have talked about recourse to moral force and support of the U. N. as our basic approach to the problems of this area. We have put ourselves on record as ready to defend with arms anybody attacked by a Communist nation, and have made various other moves to discourage the Soviets as the House Foreign Affairs Committee has suggested. There has not been much, as yet, however, to indicate just what we want to do to settle the Arab refugee problem, to bring about a just and lasting settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes and to assure the free international use of the Suez Canal. The American public is just as much in the dark about what we propose to do in these situations as anybody else in the world. All we know for sure is that no one but us can ultimately bring about a solution of these problems—except possibly the Russians. Neither the U. N. nor any free nation can act effectively here until they know where the United States stands.

In another realm, I think we've got to take a new look at our relations with the Communist satellites. Thus far, we have tended to apply economic sanctions in the form of drastic trade limitations and laws which largely prohibit us from offering them economic help. Even to suggest that we should help out some of these people or do business with them has been to risk the charge of being soft on communism. But it appears that our policies have tended to play right into the Kremlin's hands to the extent that they make the satellites more dependent on Moscow. I think we need to be realistic and decide whether our trade-and-aid policies toward such satellite areas as Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and even Red China are really in our own best interests. Maybe the people of Red China are just as anxious to get rid of the yoke of communism as the Hungarians have demonstrated they were. Shouldn't we give them the chance—or at least some alternative to their present ties with the Kremlin?

What is to be our policy toward the Western Alliance? The Suez crisis has caused such a severe economic strain in Britain that she may be forced to cut back on the highest relative military burden borne by any NATO nation and withdraw her forces from Western Germany. You will remember that she was forced to withdraw from Greece for economic reasons in 1947, and we moved in to replace her. Are we prepared in 1957 to pick up her share of the tab in West Germany? What can we do—what should we do—to help compensate for the prestige loss and the economic loss of Western Europe in the Middle East? How far should we be willing to go in seeking a settlement of the critical question—of uniting East and West Germany? Some day—and not too far away—Germany will be united again. But under whose sponsorship will that take place—ours or the Russians? So far it looks as if the Russians are trying to use our kind of program all along the line.

Finally, I would ask how do we propose to go about meeting the new Soviet economic and political aggression on a worldwide front? We obviously cannot compete solely with armaments and military aid. Basically, we must accept the challenge by devising realistic and long-term programs of trade and aid.

This is a struggle for which we are uniquely fitted both by tradition and experience. If American know-how and ingenuity have anything to contribute to the progress of mankind, it is precisely in the areas of this conflict. If we don't step up and meet this test, then the Russians will have licked us at the game we know best.

Both Government and private enterprise have important roles to play in that struggle. I would not presume to comment on the public role, except in very general terms.

I believe we must, for example, have consistent and long-range policies in foreign aid, if they are to be effective. I think we should be willing to be venturesome and imaginative in our economic aid thinking—where a big investment promises to pay off big in terms of reaching our goals of peace and prosperity, we ought to be willing to take chances. I think we ought to develop a more realistic and unemotional approach to foreign aid. We should look upon our wealth and military power as sharp tools that may be used coldly and logically to pursue national ends—ends that we believe are right and humane.

We should get rid of the childish notion that we are out to buy love or friendship. Our foreign aid money should be spent in such a way as to represent the best we have to offer in ideas, in people, and in portraying the strength of our society to peoples abroad. But we should recognize that no one is going to love us for what we give them. We are much too big, too rich and powerful for any-

one to love us. What we should expect is for other nations to realize our friendship is to be desired and our antipathy to be avoided in their own best interests.

As a businessman, I am naturally concerned with this situation from a business viewpoint. I feel, for example, that an enlightened trade and aid outlook is sound not merely because of the Soviet threat but because it is in our own best long-run business interests to strengthen the economies and raise the living standards of the people we want to do business with all over the world.

Because we have a stake in that, we businessmen also have an obligation to help our Government promote its economic objectives. Private capital, for example, is an increasingly important tool for developing the less advanced countries, and there's a lot that can be done by cooperation between industry and Government to expand such foreign investment activities. Industry can lend its people and its specialized skills to United States and United Nations agencies of economic development.

Much of the responsibility for encouraging the growth of American foreign investment abroad lies with the foreign countries themselves. If they want American dollars, they should accept the fact that respect for contracts is absolutely fundamental to our private enterprise system. Arbitrary actions in violation of agreements, such as Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal, pull the rug right out from under international investment.

But we ourselves are not without sin in some other respects. We sometimes fail to practice what we preach to our friends abroad.

One of the great continuing paradoxes of our country is its outlook on foreign trade. For years and years, it has been evident that the United States can contribute greatly to the strength of the free world by encouraging a maximum freeing of trade among nations. We have insistently urged others to relax their trade barriers. Though the present and preceding administrations have recognized the importance of liberalized trade and fought for it, the United States still remains outside the international agency, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, of which we ourselves were the main sponsors, to provide a vehicle for orderly international cooperation in the lifting of trade barriers.

In recent years, despite the fact that we are enjoying unprecedented national prosperity, there has been a steady rise of protectionist sentiment in the land. The high tariff people—a small but vociferous group—are still wagging the dog of American foreign economic policy, and still asking for and getting what amounts to a subsidy from every American consumer. We've got to keep in mind the fundamental and simple truth that, on the whole, protectionism is an unnecessary and expensive luxury for this particular great Nation with its great responsibility for leadership in the world.

In summary, then, it seems evident that today we are up against a world situation of both immense possibilities and immense dangers. It is a situation so delicately poised that we probably can't afford to luck our way through it. We've got to play this one heads up. We are going, as I suggested a while ago, to have to act with a sanity, wisdom, and unity without parallel.

You may very well ask whether any people has the wisdom, the skill, and the ability to meet so difficult a challenge. I say we have that potential, if ever a people did have it. But acting like effective world leaders will require the same kind of dedication and unity of purpose that characterized our people during the course of World War II. We've got to get our individual noses out of the everyday rut and take a livelier interest in the world about us.

In my opinion, we have to stop defining our day-to-day actions in terms of rigid absolutes. We should be on guard against hypocrisy in determining whether or not we will deal with certain nations and their leaders on the basis of morality. The experience of the past two decades certainly ought to have taught us that there can be few absolutes in international affairs. Yesterday's implacable enemies are today's friends. Too often today's heroes are tomorrow's villains. Things do constantly change and there's no sense in swearing that we will never take up arms in a certain cause or do business with a certain country or system—because tomorrow may make liars of us.

I think our posture of world leadership above all requires that we make a real effort to take foreign policy out of partisan politics—and I mean Republican as well as Democratic politics. I suggest that we cannot afford to take a vacation from world realities every 4 years just because we happen to have an election running at home.

We cannot afford to be caught asleep at the switch in the field of foreign relations. All of us must share some blame for the problems that might have been foreseen and prevented: the Government, where it failed to look far enough ahead, failed to keep people informed, or vacillated in the face of political opposition; the Congress, where it slid into a rather complacent mood and obstructed many important policies of the administration; the businessmen and farmers and housewives of America who became a little weary of the pressures of world events and took a few years' vacation from reality. All of us, in short, who decided to stop worrying about those distant troubles—troubles too big, it seemed, for you and me to do anything about—and who said "Let George do it," or "Let Ike do it."

It's time that we returned to the realities of the world we live in. I have no doubt that if we do we can once again assume a position of leadership in the world commensurate with our strength and with the greatness of our institutions.

I believe if the people of this country—private citizens like those of us here—will get interested more deeply and get into the heart of this struggle for a more effective foreign policy, then we shall be getting at the basic key to success.

Only a conviction that this is so would have persuaded me to talk at such length on such a very serious subject at 4 o'clock in the afternoon before the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana 1 or 2 questions relating to the Strait of Tiran and the so-called Gaza strip.

Is it not true that if the Israeli troops are compelled to withdraw from the positions commanding the Strait of Tiran and the Egyptian troops are allowed to move in, they will immediately reerect the shore batteries which they formerly had located there and will prevent Israeli ships from going into or out of the Straits of Aqaba, and, therefore, will prevent an alternative or supplementary pipeline being built from the head of the gulf over to the Mediterranean, and that thus we shall have lost any alternative to Mr. Nasser's control over the Suez Canal and over Syria which otherwise we might have?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is correct. I understand the pipeline is about one-third completed. If the Strait of Tiran which guards the Gulf of Aqaba is turned back to the Egyptians, because of the Israeli withdrawal, it means a restoration of the situation before the outbreak of hostilities; and that means that Israeli ships will not be allowed to go into or out of the Straits of Aqaba.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From the press reports this morning I understand that the American delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Lodge, is taking the position that the Israeli troops should withdraw, and that thereafter the Assembly will consider whether or not the United Nations forces will move in. Is my understanding of the position stated in the New York Times correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe it to be correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What would happen if the American position should be adopted? Is it not true that, if the Israeli troops move out and no decision is reached pending the United Nations discussions, the Egyptian troops will inevitably move into that area, because there will be no opposition, and that the United Nations can pass whatever resolutions it wishes, but it will be faced with an accomplished fact? The Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba will be controlled by Egyptian forces, and the possibility of an alternative pipeline will be out of the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. The situation is that it would be the same as it would be in the Gulf of Aqaba; in other words, a return to the status quo ante, and a bad situation would be made that much worse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be much more constructive if the United States followed the policy outlined yesterday by Mr. Pearson, representing Canada, that at the time the Israeli troops move out the United Nations troops should move in?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be the best possible solution at this time, as I see it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One further question, and then I shall conclude. The question relates to the Gaza strip. Is it not true that Egypt launched a series of guerrilla raids upon Israel from the Gaza strip, and had several hundred nonuniformed guerrillas in her pay; and that if the Israeli troops are forced to withdraw from Gaza and the Egyptian troops are allowed to move in, almost immediately there will be a resumption of the border raids and reprisals, and war will be quite possible?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is correct. That would simply emphasize the fact that, if the events which he envisages come to pass—and well they may—there may be a restoration of an old situation, which will be more difficult than ever to handle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the vote in the United Nations, in all probability, will take place very shortly, is it not highly desirable that the American representatives should change their policy and should follow the lead of Canada, instead of following the policy which they are now embracing?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; because the American representatives could not, for example, follow the lead of Canada.

They have to follow the instructions laid down by the State Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should not the State Department instruct our representatives to support Canada, instead of urging the policy which we are now asked to adopt, and which, if carried out, will result in Egypt taking control of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza strip?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think such a suggestion would be conducive to better results.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to compliment the Senator from Montana upon his excellent presentation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. First, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Montana upon his statesmanlike utterances and his statesmanlike proposals; then I wish to ask him a few questions with respect to the urgency of action on the resolution.

I wish to ask the Senator if the testimony before the two committees which are considering the President's proposal is not to the effect there is no present indication that Soviet Russia is preparing any invasion of the Middle East, and that, in consequence, there is no urgency in passing the resolution, so far as Soviet Russia is concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the basis of the evidence presented to us, in public session, the answer is, that there is no present indication.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the evidence of the Secretary of State, given in open session, to the effect that there is not now a single country in the Middle East which is controlled by international communism?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from North Carolina is correct; there is no country in the Middle East which is at the present time, under the control of international communism. However, there are several countries which the Soviets have penetrated to a certain extent.

Mr. ERVIN. There being no urgency, so far as Soviet Russia is concerned, and there being now no country in existence in the Middle East which answers the description of a country controlled by international communism, does not the resolution proposed by the President, in effect, ask Congress to authorize the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States at some time in the future in the Middle East against a nation which is not now in existence in the sense that it is controlled by international communism?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The answer is yes; and, of course, the resolution is aimed outside the Middle East. One of the things which worries me about the resolution is the President's apparent willingness to share his constitutional responsibility with Congress on certain specific occasions. I think that one of the difficulties which he is creating is the possibility that if enough Formosa and Middle East type resolutions are passed, we will, based on precedent and custom, both of which, I understand, eventually become law or have the force of law—I am not a lawyer—be limiting the power of the President, which is his under the Constitution as commander in chief of the Army and Navy. I do not like to see the President limiting his power and his authority and sharing them, in this particular respect, with Congress, because I believe that, if such a policy becomes established precedent, in time Congress will be taking over more and more power, and the President will become less and less powerful.

Mr. ERVIN. I was struck very forcefully by the Senator's reference to what he calls isolated internationalism. As I understand, there are 15 nations in Europe outside the Iron Curtain which have a combined total population of approximately 270 million, and which are primarily dependent upon the continued flow of Middle East oil for their economic welfare.

I ask the distinguished Senator if the proposal of the President that the United States pledge the lives of its sons and the resources of its taxpayers, if need be, for the preservation of the continued flow of oil, without calling on any of the 15 nations to contribute a single one of its sons or a single penny of its money to that task, is not a magnificent example of what the Senator has termed isolated internationalism.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are European countries which have great investments in oil in the Middle East area. I think the Senator has touched upon one of the weak spots of the resolution, namely, the idea of having the United States act on a unilateral basis.

We had the responsibility, in part at least, for turning the French and the British out of that area. Now we are asked to go in and fill the vacuum which their departure created. I think we should recognize, as I have tried to indicate, that the United States is not unlimited, so far as resources and manpower are concerned. I think if we can develop a policy on a multilateral basis, say, through a permanent United Nations police force or in some sort of accord with the nations of Western Europe which are dependent for their economy on the Middle East oil, we would then be in a far better position than the doctrine envisages at present.

Mr. ERVIN. I commend the Senator for one aspect of his proposal. The Senator proposes, as I construe his remarks, that Congress should request the President to give us a statement of his plan with reference to foreign aid in the area affected, so that we can pass on the wisdom of it before we take action. I commend the Senator in that he thinks we should look before we leap. Whereas the Secretary of State, on the contrary, thinks we should leap before we look.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; I agree with him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to commend my colleague from my neighboring State for his scholarly address. I desire to ask him this question: Is it not the major contention of the President's proposal that if we make our position in the Middle East crystal clear in this dramatic way, as to exactly where the United States stands with respect to further Communist penetration in the Middle East, such action will serve as a deterrent, and thus will prevent the penetration that might otherwise lead to war in that area?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the administration's point of view, and it is a point of view which has merit. But whether it is a valid point of view is open to question.

Mr. CHURCH. May I ask a further question: Is it not implicit in this point of view that the position of the United States in the Near East had not been crystal clear heretofore?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. We have occupied a position of secondary importance, and have allowed the British, primarily, and the French, to a lesser degree, to assume the major responsibilities in that area.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to ask a further question: If our position had been as clear as the administration would now make it, would the Senator from Montana agree with me that a year ago or 2 years ago there would have been much less likelihood of the development in the Near East of the crisis which has caused the President to make this proposal at this time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would most certainly concur with my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Idaho; he is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHURCH. If the Congress in its wisdom chooses to grant the President the authority he requests, the Senator from Montana would not regard that as an expression of approval on the part of the Congress of the past foreign policy of the United States in the Near East; would he?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all; and I think the Congress—and especially the Senate—because of its constitutional affiliation with the field of foreign policy—ought always to maintain a questioning attitude, and ought always to try to ascertain, to the best of its ability, just what has been done in the past, so that perhaps we can profit from any mistakes, and can do a little better in the future. I think that is a part of a Senator's responsibility, and I certainly think it is the Senate's responsibility.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MANSFIELD, AUGUST 11, 1956

THE SUEZ SITUATION—I

A week before the 24-nation conference on the Suez situation is a good time to assess and evaluate the Suez incident on the basis of the known facts. President Gamal Abdel Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal has posed a difficult question to which the whole world must find an answer. There is no doubt but that President Nasser had the right to nationalize the canal. There is no question but that since the seizure, with one exception, normal transit of vessels through the canal has been allowed to continue in the same old pattern, which is in accord with the Constantinople Convention of 1888. The one exception is the continuation of the 8-year-old Egyptian boycott of Israeli ships. There is a question as to the threats used by the Government of Egypt to keep the foreign technicians on the job in the canal zone, and there is a question of legality insofar as taking over the assets of the Suez Canal Co.

are concerned. The Suez Canal Co. has a lease with the Egyptian Government which expires in 1968, at which time its holdings automatically revert to the Government of Egypt. President Nasser's reported contention that the receipts from the Suez Canal tolls will average $100 million a year, and that this $100 million could be used on a yearly basis to build the Aswan Dam, is incorrect on the face of it. The fact is that the yearly gross proceeds from the canal average somewhere in the vicinity of $100 million while the net proceeds are approximately $30 million a year. There is, it must be remembered, a constant drain on the toll funds to dredge the waterway to keep it in operation; and, with the building of bigger tankers, it will have to be further widened and deepened in certain localities.

I believe that Secretary Dulles did the right thing in finally turning down the Aswan Dam proposal because it would have meant the creating, on a gratis basis, of a moral commitment to the tune of hundreds of millions of United States dollars to build this project. This project, if it is ever to be built with United States contributions, should be on a long-term-loan low-interest-rate basis and in accord with and in line with the objectives of American foreign policy. The mistakes leading up to the Suez crisis must, in part, at least, be credited to the United States. I say this, not so much in criticism but on the basis of hindsight which, while a convenient peg to hang onto, does not excuse anyone personally for not recognizing the possibility of a mistake at the time of the event. We know now that (1) we should not have exerted the pressure we did to get the British out of the canal zone, although at the time it was done I considered it a good policy; (2) we should not have made the proposal last January to begin the financing, on a grant basis, of the Aswan Dam with this country contributing $56 million toward the start of this project and the British offering $14 million. However, that is water over the dam.

We are now faced with a reality which calls for cool and considered action on the part of the Western Big Three and by all other nations as well. Neither the West or Nasser can afford a defeat on the question of the Suez Canal. The answer to this difficult question does not lie in the use of aggressive tactics or in war. The answer lies in the use of diplomacy and the development of new policies and ideas. The emphasis on rearming and the calling up to the colors of reserves by both Britain and France is understandable in view of their economic interest and dependence on and in the Middle East, as well as other factors, but their emotionalism in this situation is, in its own way, as bad and as dangerous as Nasser's.

To illustrate the importance of the Suez Canal and the questions related to it, it is well to keep in mind that Western Europe depends for 90 percent of its oil needs on the Middle East and that in the next 10 years those oil needs will be doubled. Seventy percent of the world's oil reserves are in the Middle East; the loss of Mideast oil either through closure of the Suez Canal or by nationalization or expropriation of the Middle East wells and pipelines would bankrupt Western Europe, bring about its economic collapse, and pave the way for Moscow to move in. We must remember that through the Marshall plan we have spent $15 billion to rehabilitate Western Europe; we have been responsible for and have to a large extent spent a great deal of our treasure in keeping NATO functioning; we have, through the use of Mutual Security Administration, Foreign Operations Administration, and International Cooperation Administration—all successors to the Marshall plan—poured additional billions of dollars into Europe to keep it a going entity. Surely, we do not want to see what we have contributed to the welfare of Western Europe, in our own defense and in our own security, go down the drain because of the situation in the Middle East. We cannot afford it.

President Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal Co. was not a move made on the spur of the moment. Nor was it made only because of the United States refusal to make a grant to Nasser to allow him to start on the Aswan Dam. It appears to be that Nasser's seizure was a carefully worked out plan which was moved ahead of its scheduled timetable and used as a means of offsetting the United States refusal to grant funds for the Aswan Dam. In other words, in my opinion, even if the United States funds had been granted, it would have only been a question of time before the seizure of the Suez Canal Co. would have taken place. We cannot afford to become hysterical or emotional over Nasser's action because we have to remember that out of his seizure may come events which might imperil the Middle East oil and pipelines. Therefore, what we should do is to go slow, tread water cautiously, and plan now for the future. Serious consideration should be given to the following possibilities:

(1) The London Conference called for August 16. Secretary Dulles is to be commended for pouring oil on the troubled waters of the Suez question when he visited London on August 1 to confer with Foreign Minister Pineau of France and Prime Minister Eden of Britain. He was able, at that time, to quench some of the fire which these and other leaders were fanning and to come up with a proposal for a 24-power conference to convene on August 16 in London to consider the question of the Suez. His success in this matter did much to calm the situation and to allow Messrs. Nasser, Eden, Mollet, and Pineau, as well as others, to take a second look at their hole cards; to reassess the situation and to revise their original views. The purpose of the conference beginning August 16, as I understand it, will be to try to modernize the treaty of 1888 and to make sure that, if possible, internationalization of the Suez Canal is made secure. It is to be noted that both India and the U. S. S. R. have accepted invitations to attend the conference. Even though they have expressed reservations it is significant of their interest in this particular question and an awareness, on their part, of its ramifications and complications. It is significant to note that this is the first invitation, to my knowledge, to the U. S. S. R. to participate in a conference affecting this particular area and a recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union has penetrated the Middle East. In my opinion, it is there to stay. Incidentally, we must recognize that the U. S. S. R. is now an exporting oil nation entirely on the basis of its own oil production and exclusive of the Rumanian fields at Ploesti. We should recognize that the cold war has now developed into an economic struggle between the U. S. S. R. on the one end and the United States on the other. We should not try to outbid or outbuy the U. S. S. R. We should do only what is primarily in our own interest.

(2) There is a question in my mind as to whether President Nasser or Egypt alone can be absolutely depended upon to keep the canal open from here on out. As an illustration, all Israeli ships for the past 8 years, as well as other nationalities carrying goods to Israel, have been refused transit through the Suez Canal.

(3) The Western World, including ourselves, must begin to lay emergency plans now to export oil, if necessary, from the United States, Canada, and Venezuela to Western Europe:

(a) We should allow United States oil companies to expand and develop their oil production in the United States.

(b) We should encourage, through subsidies and otherwise, the building of 70,000- to 80,000-ton tankers. With their speed, tonnage and reduced comparative costs, they could go around the Cape of Good Hope and nullify in part, dependence on the Suez Canal. They could also be used to export oil from the Western Hemisphere.

(c) We should give consideration to the possibility of the construction and support of a new canal from the Mediterranean through Israel to the port of Aqaba off the Red Sea.

(4) We should recognize Egypt's right to nationalize the Suez Canal, but if no solid international agreement can be worked out, we should begin work on the alternatives already suggested. Even if an agreement can be worked out, we must be prepared to have an alternative very possibly along the lines already suggested.

(5) The stakes connected with the question of the Suez are of the greatest importance, because they affect the economic welfare and security of a large part of the rest of the world. Some of the grave questions raised are:

(a) The canal itself and all it means to the economic lifeblood of the world.

(b) Mideast oil and all its implications and complications.

(c) North Africa and its effect on France's future.

(d) Europe's economy and its dependence on the Suez Canal and Mideast oil.

(e) The possibility that the Mideast situation may, if it expands, either bring a final breakdown of NATO or at long last, a final recognition that if it is to survive it must pull itself together, reassess its condition and recognize its importance as a European defense alliance and its possible significance as an economic unit.

(f) The question of Israel.

(g) The question of Cyprus.

(h) South of the Sahara Africa is and will be affected more by events growing out of the Mid-East crisis.

War is not the answer to the Suez incident. While the exasperation and emotionalism of France and Britain is understandable, it should be recognized that gunboat diplomacy in this day and age would only exacerbate the situation and make it worse. What we have to do now is to work with the present, but think and plan for the future.

We should, in addition to the conference to be held in London, consider the possibilities, in the light of subsequent circumstances, of referring the Suez question to the International Court of Justice in the Hague and, if aggressive action is undertaken by either side on an unwarranted basis, taking the question immediately to the United Nations Security Council.

Aggression and force are not the answers. Reason, not passion—restraint not fireworks—must prevail.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MANSFIELD, OCTOBER 16, 1956

THE SUEZ SITUATION—II

Foreign policy in the Suez crisis seems to be based on waiting for the sands to settle. The sands will not settle of their own accord. We will either act to secure a just settlement of the Suez problem or we will stand by idly as the provocation in Suez leads to other provocations and ultimately to the catastrophe of open conflict which will lay the Middle East in ruins, tear apart what remains of Western unity, and open the channels for further Soviet penetration into Africa and Europe.

The people of this country need to know what is involved in this crisis in Suez and have not been told. We have seen the sudden and callous seizure of the Suez Canal Co. by Egypt, in a gesture both petulant and arrogant. We have seen the British and the French mobilize forces on Cyprus and in

the Mediterranean to defend what to them are vital and immediate interests in the canal. We have seen the Secretary of State, with the best of intentions, move into the gathering war clouds on four occasions in attempts to stop the storm.

So far no shots have been fired on Suez. So far ships continue to move through the canal. Superficially, I suppose, that can be regarded as a major achievement. Is it the case of actuality? If it is, why do the editorials of virtually every newspaper in this country continue to display an uneasiness over the Suez situation?

I think it is because they reflect the concern of the American people. They reflect an awareness that a genuine solution of the crisis has not been achieved just because shots have not been fired. What has been obtained in the Suez situation is only a prevention of a clash as of this moment and we have paid a terrible price for it. It has been paid for in something very close to appeasement of the arrogance which emanates from Cairo, an arrogance which if it goes unchallenged will make itself felt elsewhere in the Middle East. It has been paid for by a further blow at the stability and unity of the free nations of Western Europe, nations in whose survival in freedom the United States has invested more than $26 billion in aid since the war, plus heavy wartime losses in men and material. In short, what has been obtained in the Suez crisis is a temporary respite at the price of putting off the day of reckoning. What has not been obtained is a just and lasting solution of that crisis. I hope that now it may not be too late.

Almost 6 months ago, in a speech in the Senate on April 16, I urged the administration to act at once to forestall a crisis in the Middle East. I pointed out the need to bring together as many nations as possible pledged to preserve peace in the Middle East in these terms: "We should begin now, in cooperation with others, to plan the measures which may be necessary to prevent a major outbreak of violence in the Middle East or to stop one if it should occur. The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, in my opinion, is inadequate to the needs of the present situation. Dangerous and difficult measures may be required to keep the peace and the sacrifices entailed should be shared on the widest possible scale." I urged the administration to call an immediate conference on the petroleum supply problems which might result from a crisis in the Middle East in these terms: "We should call at once a conference of the Western European nations which depend on Middle Eastern petroleum and the oil-producing nations of this hemisphere. If the peace is to be kept in that area, measures may have to be taken which will shut off, at least temporarily, Western Europe's major source of petroleum. The immediate problem is to find alternatives not only to the oil but to the income which the production and processing of oil represents to certain Western European countries."

Months went by and nothing was done while the tension continued to mount. Then when the crisis was upon us, action along these lines was at least taken, belated and halting action. Had the administration acted firmly and clearly six months ago, it is likely that we would not now be hunting for last-ditch remedies. The present crisis might never have arisen.

We have no choice now but to acknowledge the damage which has resulted from delay and vacillation in dealing with the Middle Eastern situation. We have no choice but to face the fact that we are confronted with a new situation, one which contains greater risks, one which will cost more to cope with. We had better recognize, too, that if we do not act now, it will become even more risky and costly in the near future.

The principal fact in this new situation is that President Nasser is in possession of the Suez Canal Co., on dubious legal grounds perhaps, but nevertheless he is in possession. He will not be quickly dislodged except by military force which, if used by the Western Powers, is likely to solidify the Arab world under his leadership and win for him, however reluctantly, the support of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

There is another fact in the situation, however, a fact which works for a just solution of this problem. For a long time Suez has been a route of unhampered international passage. In that sense, it is international. World opinion will not acquiesce in the misuse of the canal by Nasser or anyone else to further nationalist political ambitions. World opinion can be made to bear fruit in this situation if it is effectively mobilized and led.

Secretary Dulles in the Suez negotiations has adopted the role of the "honest broker" between the West and Egypt on the one hand and on the other he has been able to keep together a Western united front of sorts. The result is that while he has not won friends on either side, his analysis before the Security Council of the United Nations, in drawing attention away from Egypt's act of nationalization and pinpointing the issue upon ways and means of guaranteeing free international access to the canal, has been reasonable, understanding, and could, if followed through with good intent by both sides, produce successful results.

On the basis of these facts and possibilities, therefore, it seems to me any hope of a peaceful solution to the Suez crisis must be sought along the following lines:

1. Acceptance of the right of Egypt to nationalize the canal, with just compensation of the present Suez Canal Co. owners, provided Egypt allows free and unhampered right of passage to ships of all nations in time of peace or war in accord with the convention of 1888.

2. If an agreement is not reached in the U. N., the Users' Association, so-called, which Mr. Dulles has formed, must be strengthened into an organization of sufficient cooperation and resources to see to it that it will be Egypt rather than the rest of the world that suffers from a failure to keep the canal open to all nations.

The Users' Association should be urged to consider negotiations on the adoption of the following measures in case of the failure of the U. N.

1. Establishment of a Suez sealift to move Mideastern petroleum around the Cape of Good Hope, based on a cooperative use of the tanker capacity of member-nations; release out of mothballs of 35 United States tankers; and a crash building program on 70,000- to 100,000-ton tankers.

2. The intensification of petroleum production in this country and the Western Hemisphere generally.

3. A crash program on the application of nuclear energy to power production.

4. The establishment of a $1 billion interest-free revolving fund contributed by member-nations, in accordance with their capacity, to alleviate nations hard hit by measures taken by the Users' Association to preserve the international right of transit through the Suez Canal.

The need for these measures, which are costly and difficult, has been occasioned by the impasse which now faces the Western nations in the conduct of their foreign policies. I hope we have seen an end to the stalling and the failure which has marked our efforts to date. If we have not, the next price to be paid may well be a bloodbath in the Middle East made to order for the cheap extension of totalitarian Communist influence in that region.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MANSFIELD, NOVEMBER 11, 1956

THE MIDDLE EAST

The breakdown of peace at Suez originated in the real or imagined conflicts of interest and fears on the part of Israel, France, Britain, and Egypt. To say that is not to condone the failure of policy on the part of the United States and other members of the United Nations. Nor is it to condone the dangerously mischievous role of the Soviet Union throughout this crisis.

The entire world shares in the responsibility for the outbreak of the conflict in the Middle East. Members of the United Nations, including this country, from beginning to end have confused form with substance in connection with the Suez problem. We have been unwilling to face the fact that there has been no peace in the Middle East not merely in past weeks but over the past decade. There has been at best only a truce and a badly maintained truce. The realities of the situation have been submerged in legal obscurities. We have failed to do what needed doing in preference to the easier course of putting off unpleasant responsibilities until tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Many of us have repeatedly noted the likelihood of developments taking the course which they have now taken in the Middle East. Months ago I advocated measures in the Senate (April 18, 1956, a Constructive Policy in the Middle East) which had they been taken then may well have prevented what has transpired. They were not taken and it is too late now to go back.

We are faced with a new situation. It will require new measures if we are to have a real settlement and not merely another postponement of unpleasant decision.

A policy of peace in the Middle East for this country and, in truth, for all the United Nations will not be built on the hurling of sterile epithets like "aggression," and "imperialism." It will not be built on obscure legalities which credit international law and the United Nations with far more power than either now possesses. It will not be built on a pursuit of the shadow of peace while ignoring its substance.

A policy for peace in the Middle East must be built on the realities of the situation in that area. It must start with a frank recognition of the fact that there are two sets of motives which may have impelled all of the belligerents in the Suez crisis to resort to arms. However much we may deplore the use of force, I believe that an effective policy for that area must begin by distinguishing between these two sets of motives.

It is one thing for Israel to resort to arms to put an end to belligerent raids on its territory and to insure its very existence as a state and the lives of its citizens. That is self-defense and with that motive we can have only the deepest sympathy. It is another thing, however, if the Israelis use arms to enlarge their territory at the expense of Egypt or any other state. With that motive we can have no sympathy.

It is one thing for France and Britain to have used arms to safeguard Suez and to guarantee the right of unhampered passage through the canal for their own ships and the ships of all nations. In protecting their own vital interests in this connection they are protecting the interests of civilized mankind. It is another thing, however, if their use of force has as its purpose the domination of Egypt or the conquest of any part of its territory.

It is one thing for Egypt to have employed arms to defend its territory and sovereignty against incursions by Israel, France, or Britain. It is another, if Egypt's recourse to arms is a prelude to the political manipulation of the right of passage through the Suez Canal, the extermination of Israel and the domination of the entire Middle East.

I know that it is possible to argue that one set or the other set of motives underlies the action of each of the belligerents. Egypt will find its defenders and detractors. So, too, will Israel, France, and Britain. The debate can go on interminably within the United Nations and outside the United

Nations. In the end, we shall be no closer to a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The motives in Suez, it seems to me, should be measured by what the belligerents do. They should be measured by the manner in which Israel, France, the United Kingdom, and Egypt accommodate themselves to the needs of each other, to the essentially decent motives which may have motivated each in resorting to arms. In the same fashion American policy and, in truth, that of all of the United Nations should be measured by the efforts the contending parties make to bring about such an accommodation.

A cease-fire has been obtained in the Middle East. The time may well be now or never to enlarge this respite into a lasting peace. I believe there is a chance to obtain that peace if we work from principles which sustain the decent motives of all the belligerents—motives with which all mankind can sympathize—as against those which can have no place in an orderly world. I suggest, therefore, that those who seek a peace with justice in the Middle East will ascribe to and work for the adoption of these principles of settlement:

1. The belligerents shall withdraw from occupied territories of Egypt whenever a United Nations force is prepared to assume responsibility for temporarily maintaining order or whenever a settlement satisfactory to the belligerents is achieved.

2. Machinery will be established to insure Egyptian sovereignty over its territory and at the same time guarantee unhampered use of the canal to the ships of all nations; this machinery shall be operative before control of the canal zone by United Nations forces is relinquished.

3. Egypt shall renounce its policy of extermination as regards Israel and the two nations shall negotiate a nonaggression pact.

4. The border between Israel and Egypt shall be guarded by United Nations forces until such time as both nations agree to the withdrawal of such forces.

5. Members of the United Nations shall entertain requests for assistance for reconstruction and development in Egypt and neighboring states.

It is easy to become indignant over the use of force in the Suez crisis. It is easy to deplore the tragedy of open conflict. It is easy to resort to legalistic resolutions which resolve nothing. It is easy to make grandiose gestures while fishing for trouble as the Soviet Union has done.

It is not easy to work for principles which will make a just settlement possible in Suez, a peace which will serve the decent needs of the belligerents and of all nations. Yet that is the course I hope the United States will take. It is the only course which will serve the permanent interests of this country, because it is the only course which promises a lasting peace in the Middle East.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In several previous messages to the Congress, I have called attention to the status of American education—to accomplishments of the past and to certain problems which deeply involve the national interest and welfare.

Today, more Americans are receiving a higher level of education than ever before. Progress has been made in building more and better schools and in providing more and better teachers. And yet problems in education still persist, and time has more clearly defined their scope and nature.

The educational task in this country is basically a State and local responsibility. Looking ahead, that task is unprecedented in its sheer magnitude. Elementary and secondary schools already are overflowing under the impact of the greatest enrollment increase in our history. The number of pupils in public schools has increased by 5½ million in the past 5 years, and will further increase by about 6 million in the next 5 years.

We have already reached an alltime peak in enrollment in colleges and universities. Yet, in the next 10 to 15 years, the number of young people seeking higher education will double, perhaps even triple.

Increasing enrollments, however, by no means represent the whole problem. Advances in science and technology, the urgency and difficulty of our quest for stable world peace, the increasing complexity of social problems—all these factors compound our educational needs.

One fact is clear. For the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions to provide the teachers and buildings and equipment needed from kindergarten to college, to provide the quality and diversity of training needed for all our young people, will require of them in the next decade the greatest expansion of educational opportunity in our history. It is a challenge they must meet.

State and local responsibility in education nurtures freedom in education, and encourages a rich diversity of initiative and enterprise as well as actions best suited to local conditions. There are, however, certain underlying problems where States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough, and where Federal assistance is needed. But the Federal role should be merely to facilitate—never to control—education.

TEACHERS

Solutions to all the other problems in education will be empty achievements indeed if good teaching is not available. It is my earnest hope that the States and communities will continue and expand their efforts to strengthen the teaching profession.

Their efforts already have accomplished much. Progress has been made in reducing the teacher shortage. There are encouraging increases in the number of persons training to teach and the proportion of those so trained who enter the profession. Still, this year, thousands of emergency teachers with substandard certificates had to be employed. Far more needs to be done in our various communities to enhance the status of the teacher—in salary, in community esteem, and support—and thereby attract more people to the profession and, equally important, retain those who bear so well the trust of instructing our youth.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

By providing statistics and analyses on trends in education, and by administering other services, the United States Office of Education performs a valuable role in helping public and private educational institutions better to perform their tasks.

A significant first step was taken last year toward strengthening the Office of Education. The appropriation for the office was increased to implement a cooperative research program, and to expand statistical and professional advisory services and studies.

This year I am asking for increases in funds for these activities, because they hold such promise for real progress toward solving some of the basic and long-standing problems in education.

EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

If the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions are successfully to meet, in the next decade, the increasing needs for education beyond the high school, their efforts must begin now. The Federal Government, however, can take certain appropriate steps to encourage such action.

Already the Congress has enacted legislation for long-term loans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to help colleges and universities expand their dormitory and other self-liquidating facilities.

Last year I appointed a Committee on Education Beyond the High School, composed of distinguished educational and lay leaders, to study and make recommendations in this field. The committee's interim report of last November delineates issues that should have the most careful attention.

It pointed out that much more planning is needed at the State level to meet current and future needs in education beyond the high school. The Congress at the past session enacted Public Law 813, which authorized Federal funds to help the States establish State committees on education beyond the high school. The funds, however, were not appropriated. I recommend that the Congress now appropriate the full amount authorized under this legislation.

The State committees can do much to promote discussion, define problems, and develop recommendations. Their recommendations, however, must be supplemented by detailed plans to meet specific needs for expansion of physical facilities, enlargement of faculties, and other adjustments which may provide new or different institutions. Such detailed planning requires the coordinated effort of both public and private education in each State—and time, personnel, and funds.

I recommend that the Congress amend Public Law 813 so as to authorize grants to the States of $2.5 million a year for 3 years for these purposes.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Of all the problems in education, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. The lack of physical facilities is a temporary emergency situation in which Federal assistance is appropriate. Unquestionably, a very considerable portion of the

shortage is due to World War II restrictions on all types of civil construction, including schools. With Federal help the States and communities can provide the bricks and mortar for school buildings, and there will be no Federal interference with local control of education.

I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

Today there are enrolled in our public schools about 2¼ million children in excess of the normal capacity of the buildings in use. These children are forced to prepare for the future under the handicap of half-day sessions, makeshift facilities, or grossly overcrowded conditions. Further, many classrooms which may not be overcrowded are too old or otherwise inadequate. They should be promptly replaced.

The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory, but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said—realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years, and the States and communities have notably increased their school building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet, in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage accumulated over many past years. The rate of State and local construction is spotty, with noticeable lags in areas where needs are expanding most rapidly.

I propose, therefore, a comprehensive program of Federal assistance. The program is designed to accomplish in 4 years what last year's proposal would have done in 5, since 1 year has already been lost. I urge the Congress to authorize:

(1) Federal grants to the States for school construction, at the rate of $325 million a year for 4 years, a total of $1.3 billion.

(2) The authorization of $750 million over the 4-year period for Federal purchase of local school construction bonds when school districts cannot market them at reasonable interest rates. These loan funds would be made available to the States on the basis of school-age population. The State educational agency would determine the priority of local school districts for Federal loans based on their relative need for financial aid in the construction of needed school facilities.

(3) Advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. This would facilitate the issuance of these bonds to finance schools which would be rented and eventually owned by local school districts.

(4) The expenditure of $20 million in matching grants to States for planning to strengthen State and local school-construction programs.

As I indicated in my message on the state of the Union, I hope that this school-construction legislation can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Certain basic principles must govern legislation on Federal grants for school construction, if they are to serve the cause of education most effectively.

First, the program must be recognized as an emergency measure designed to assist and encourage the States and communities in catching up with their needs. Once the accumulated shortage is overcome, if State and local autonomy in education is to be maintained, the States and communities must meet their future needs with their own resources and the Federal grant program must terminate. The States and communities already are building schools at a rate which clearly shows their ability to do this.

Second, Federal aid must not infringe upon the American precept that responsibility for control of education rests with the States and communities. School construction legislation should state this policy in no uncertain terms.

Third, Federal aid should stimulate greater State and local efforts for school construction. Many States now make no contribution to school construction, and in some States which do contribute, the amount is relatively small. Further, to increase total funds for school construction, Federal grants should be matched by State-appropriated funds after the first year of the program.

Fourth, the allocation of Federal funds among the States should take into account school-age population, relative financial ability to meet school needs, and the total effort within the States to provide funds for public schools. An allocation system based solely on school-age population would tend to concentrate Federal aid in wealthy States most able to provide for their own needs. An allocation system which provides more assistance to States with the greatest financial need will help reduce the shortage more quickly and more effectively.

Fifth, in distributing grants under this program within each State, priority should be given to local districts with the greatest need for school facilities and the least local financial ability to meet the need.

In a Nation which holds sacred the dignity and worth of the individual, education is first and foremost an instrument for serving the aspirations of each person. It is not only the means for earning a living, but for enlarging life—for maintaining and improving liberty of the mind, for exercising both the rights and obligations of freedom, for understanding the world in which we live.

Collectively, the educational equipment of the whole population contributes to our national character—our freedom as a Nation, our national security, our expanding economy, our cultural attainments, our unremitting efforts for a durable peace.

The policies I have recommended in education are designed to further these ends.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1957.*

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ATOMIC SCIENTISTS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

During the delivery of Mr. MANSFIELD's speech,

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield very briefly to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the request I shall make be printed in the RECORD after the address of the able Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the gallery are 34 young scientists from other lands. They have come to this country to study the peaceful uses of the atom and to take the knowledge they may glean back to their respective countries, in order that it may do great benefit to the people of their lands as well as to the people of other lands.

All of us in this country owe a great debt to other lands for such men as Einstein of Germany, Fermi of Italy, and von Neumann and Szilard of Hungary.

This group of young men may play a very important part in this field in the years to come, as they take back home with them the knowledge they acquire in this country.

I also wish to have them, as our guests today, take along with them a remembrance of the Senate of the United States.

I will appreciate it if the students in the gallery who are to attend schools in our country will rise so that the Senate may greet them.

(The group rose and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Montana, and say to him that I am glad these young men have had an opportunity to listen to his very fine address this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Chair wishes to say to these young men that it is a great pleasure for the Chair, on behalf of the Senate, to extend a welcome to them. The Chair hopes that, when they return to their own countries, they will extend our greetings to their fellow citizens.

VARIANCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AND HIS MIDDLE EAST JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator from Nevada will pardon me for a minute, please.

Mr. President, I sought the floor not only to compliment the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the very excellent speech he has made today, but

also to draw the attention of the Senate and of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the fact that the President's speech of January 5 and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) now before the committee are totally at variance with one another in some very important places or particulars.

CONTACT WITH CONGRESS

I have before me a copy of the President's speech and in section 8 of the speech I find these words:

If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

I heard that statement by the President when it was delivered, and I regarded it as a statement not only of the purpose he expressed, but also of the purpose which would be expressed in the joint resolution itself.

Upon reading the joint resolution, I was amazed to find that the draftsman of the resolution apparently had no intention whatsoever of carrying out the promise of the President, but that the draftsman of the resolution was going to ask the Congress to overlook the promise of the President, and to pass a joint resolution by which the Congress itself is bypassed.

Let me read from the joint resolution. Of course, Mr. President, one can never understand a piece of proposed legislation unless he reads it; and if he reads it, if it is offered merely for the purpose of gaining speedy results, one is likely to find some gaps in the language. I read now from section 2 of the joint resolution which the administration desires the Congress to pass:

The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

Furthermore—

And, Mr. President, let us bear in mind these words of the joint resolution, for either in the committee or upon the floor we shall be called upon to endorse them. I hope the committee will reject them, but this is the way the second sentence of section 2 of the joint resolution reads:

WHOSE INDEPENDENCE?

Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of—

Of what? Of the United States? Of any State? Of any property of the States? Of any insular possession? No; Mr. President, it has nothing to do with the United States.

Instead, we are asked to give him authority to—

protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations—

And now have we stated all of it? Not at all; there is another phrase, as follows—

requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism—

DELEGATION OF POWER

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress of the United States the sole and exclusive power to declare war. But in this joint resolution we find a proposed delegation of power by the Congress to the President to declare war. This does not raise the argument which often has been made, namely, that the President has the right to order the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere he pleases, to defend the vital interests of the United States. Not at all; that question is not in any way involved in this case. The question involved here is whether the Congress has the right to authorize the President, at the request of some foreign nation, to send the Armed Forces of the United States into action.

Mr. President, can anyone deny this interpretation of the language of the joint resolution? That is what it says. It is a grant of congressional power greater than ever before was attempted in the history of the United States. In the past 50 years, Congress has been granting away congressional power to the Executive, under the pressure of war. But now we are asked to grant away the power of the Congress to declare war at a time when we still have ringing in our ears the assurances of the administration that these are times of peace and prosperity and that no war anywhere threatens us.

PRESIDENT'S PROMISE

Mr. President, let us remember the promise of the President, which I have read from his address of January 5 to a joint session of the Congress. We remember that his promise was:

I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

Is that what we are asked to approve? Listen to the only limitation:

Provided, That such employment—

That is to say, employment of the Armed Forces—the men in the Army, the men in the Navy, the men in the Air Force, the men in the Marines—

shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to—

To the Congress, Mr. President? Not at all, but—

to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necssary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Why is no report to Congress required of the administration by this resolution? How does it happen?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to ask the Senator a question or two on the constitutional point. I wish to get the floor in my own right later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator speak up so we on this side of the aisle may hear?

Mr. MORSE. I desire to raise a question or two on the constitutional point the Senator from Wyoming has brought out. The Senator has pointed out that the power to declare war is vested in the Congress.

RESOLUTION AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt the Senator from Oregon long enough to say that earlier in the morning, not having known that the Senator from Montana was going to introduce a substitute joint resolution, I submitted several amendments to the pending resolution, and one of the amendments, if the Senator will look at page 2, line 17, is the insertion of about six words before the phrase "with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations." Those are the only two documents with which the President's employment of our forces must be consonant. So I asked to insert after the words "consonant with" the words "the Constitution of the United States."

Can anybody say that the United Nations, or the Charter of the United Nations, or any single other institution, or any other document takes precedence over the Constitution of the United States, to which every Member of this body has raised his hand in solemn oath to support and defend? I stood at the entrance of the Capitol of the United States when the President was ceremonially inaugurated—he was actually inaugurated the day before—and I saw him take the oath to support and defend the Constitution. I am sure, if the President had ever seen the statements contained in Senate Joint Resolution 19, he never would have given them his own approval.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First let me say that in my opinion, the amendment which the Senator proposes would greatly improve the Eisenhower resolution. In view of what the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said this afternoon, I hesitate to offer criticism, but later I shall do so, because I think his resolution is inadequate, and, in my judgment, very little if any, improvement over the President's resolution. On these very points the resolutions have constitutional defects, because the Mansfield resolution does not come to grips with the constitutional defects of the President's resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought the Senator was going to ask me a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am going to ask a question, but I wanted to lay a foundation for it before I asked the question.

The Senator knows a foundation has to be laid before a question can be asked.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The rules of the court do not apply to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator if, under the Constitution, although the President has authority to send American troops into action to meet emergencies, there is a residual power of Congress subsequently to approve or disapprove the President's course of action and rescind the sending of the troops.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only that, but the Congress has constitutional power to deny appropriations to carry on the attack, or what may euphemistically be called defensive action, at the request of other nations.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator find any language in either the Eisenhower or the Mansfield resolution that safeguards those constitutional powers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not had the opportunity of reading the Mansfield resolution, although I listened to it; but having a great deal of confidence in my friend from Montana, and having a great deal of confidence in his intellect, and, above all, in his good faith, I think we shall find in his resolution some food for thought and consideration.

Mr. MORSE. I have the same high regard for the Senator from Montana, but on the point the Senator from Wyoming is making he will find himself in complete error.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Who will be in error?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wyoming, if he thinks those powers are safeguarded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the Senator debate with the Senator from Montana, and not with me.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wyoming reached a certain conclusion with respect to the Mansfield resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said I have such respect for the Senator from Montana that there is food for thought in anything he says.

Mr. President, I was speaking about the commitment which was made by the President of the United States, in his message to Congress, on the Middle East crisis, to maintain contact with the Congress of the United States. The words were eloquent and they were very assuring:

> I would, of course, maintain hour by hour contact with the Congress.

Is there any reference in the pending joint resolution to "hour by hour contact"? There is no provision in the joint resolution for immediate report, as there is with respect to the United Nations and the Security Council.

But Congress has not been completely overlooked. We find in section 4 a very simple statement:

> The President shall within the month of January of each year report to the Congress his action hereunder.

REPORT AT CONVENIENCE

Once a year, whenever it suits the convenience of the Executive, a report shall be made to the Congress after the fact.

Then there is section 5, which everyone who is called upon to consider the joint resolution should carry in his mind. I was here as a Member of this body throughout World War II and throughout the Korean war. The Congress enacted many laws granting to the President extraordinary powers, powers which belonged to the Congress. But such grants were always limited by the Congress in point of time. There were special phrases inserted in the grants of power which were calculated to restore congressional power to the Congress.

What is proposed in the present instance? I read from section 5:

NO FIXED TERM

This joint resolution shall expire—

When Congress says so? No. On any particular date? No. There is no fixed term for the grant. It is an indefinite grant.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment.

I read from section 5:

> This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise.

Nowhere is there the slightest reference to the peace and security of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the point which he raises was raised in the joint hearings of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be surprised if it had not been raised.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The very point which the Senator has made was made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], myself, and other Senators, that in connection with the grant of war powers during the war, it was customary to provide either a date of expiration or that the powers should expire upon the adoption of a concurrent resolution.

That question was put to Secretary Dulles. In response to a direct question on that point, he said that he would have no objection to placing in the joint resolution a provision for the expiration of the powers upon the adoption of a concurrent resolution.

In my discussion with him, the question was raised whether it should be a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution, and I observed that a concurrent resolution would not require the signature of the President, so that a concurrent resolution could be adopted by majority vote and become effective. Secretary Dulles agreed that there would be no objection.

SECURITY OF UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to note that the Secretary of State agrees that there is no objection. Mr. President, there cannot possibly be any objection to it. It is a power of Congress, which neither the Secretary of State nor the President of the United States can question. It is one of the amendments which I have offered today. I am happy to note that the committee has anticipated my request. Now I should like to make one more reference to the resolution. It is section 3, which reads as follows:

> The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States—

That is the first time that anything is said about the security of the United States—

> to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

That simple sentence strikes out every regulation contained in the original appropriation of $200 million. It not only strikes out every regulation which Congress wrote into that law, but it strikes out also every regulation which the Government has written, by authority of Congress, to govern the expenditure of those funds.

COMPLETE AUTHORITY

So that by the language of the joint resolution itself we are asked to give to the President complete and exclusive authority, without regard to any other law and without regard to any existing regulation, to spend $200 million in the way that he determines it should be expended.

Is Congress so lacking in knowledge of critical affairs affecting the Nation that it must surrender to the President the authority to spend such a huge sum of money, particularly when we know that the President himself is not the person who will determine how the money will be spent?

The testimony of the Secretary of State before our committees shows that Mr. Richards, whoever he may be, is the man who will go into the Middle East and decide that question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that the Mr. Richards, whoever he may be, as the Senator said, is the distinguished former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and one of the leading Democrats of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I know that Mr. Richards' appointment was not confirmed by the Senate, and he was not given the authority by the Senate to spend that money. I know there is no authority of law by which he could spend it. I know that according to the testimony of Secretary Dulles, great as was Mr. Richards' ability in the House as a Democrat and as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he does not now know how this money is to be spent. If Mr. Richards does not know and if Mr. Dulles does not know, who can say that Congress does?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I believe it might be enlightening to the Senate in connection with what the Senator from Wyoming is pointing out, to recognize that even behind closed doors in secret session the Secretary of State has not as yet been able to tell us a single project that is proposed to be carried out with any of this money.

BLANK CHECKBOOK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if we pass the joint resolution in its present form, we will give to the Secretary of State or his delegate, whoever he may be, a blank checkbook to put in his inside pocket and roam the Middle East and decide for himself to whom to give the money of the American people out of the Treasury.

Again I say I am grateful to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for raising this issue. It is an issue that ought to be made clear to every citizen of the United States. In my opinion it is no criticism of the President of the United States and it is no criticism of the Secretary of State if Congress insists upon taking its time to perform the constitutional duty which every Member of the Congress pledged himself by oath to perform.

WORD-BY-WORD STUDY

There should be no hesitation upon our part to examine the joint resolution word by word. The reading this afternoon of the sections which I have selected for reading from the resolution demonstrates the fact that not only is the grant of power it makes unconstitutional and in conflict with the pledge the President made in his speech on the Middle East, but it involves the delegation to those who surround the President and the Secretary of State, by their own choice, of the power to exercise a duty of Congress.

Mr. President, I shall never, by my vote, say to the mothers and fathers of the young men of Wyoming that as a Senator from the State of Wyoming and as a Senator of the United States, I was willing to delegate to one branch of the Federal Government the power to do what it pleases with the men and the money of the United States.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I am somewhat puzzled by the differences between the Formosa resolution and the resolution which is now under discussion. As I recall—and I have the Formosa resolution before me—that joint resolution was passed because of the great emergency this country faced in view of the threat of a direct attack on Formosa, which attack would be inimical to the interests of this country.

In the pending joint resolution I see no word about "direct attack." I see a general statement of a general threat.

I wonder whether that is why the Senator from Wyoming said it would be an unconstitutional delegation of the war-making power if we passed the joint resolution under discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is one of the reasons. It gives to the President unlimited discretion to order our Armed Forces, at the request of a foreign nation, into warfare, if the Communists attack.

FORMOSA NOT PARALLEL

There is no similarity, as I see it, between the Formosa resolution and the Middle East resolution. In the case of Formosa, the fact is that, with the consent of Congress for several years, the right of the United States there was clear. In the first place, Formosa was taken from China by Japan in an ancient war. We, in turn, took it away from Japan during World War II. The Formosa resolution dealt with a specific place, which was occupied by our troops, and in which we allowed the Chinese Nationalists to take refuge. Of course, Congress said that the President could send troops there. The two are utterly different situations.

Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield the floor?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there has been some discussion today relative to the power of the Congress, under the Constitution, to declare war. I believe every Member of the Senate and every Member of the other body fully understands the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress in this regard. But I may say it is the purpose of the President of the United States and it is the purpose of the Secretary of State not to propose a declaration of war, not to propose the making of war, but the purpose is to prevent the outbreak of war.

On several occasions in the history of mankind, even within the memory of those living and in this Chamber today there have been great miscalculations. If Imperial Germany had known that this Nation and the other free nations of the world could not tolerate the overrunning of all Western Europe, not in the interest of Western Europe alone, but in the interest of our own survival, the German Government might not have miscalculated and plunged the world into World War I.

There are many students of history who believe that prior to World War II, if Nazi Germany, under Hitler, had understood that this Nation could not tolerate the overrunning of Western civilization by nazism, that regime might not have plunged the world into World War II.

There are many students of history who believe that if the North Korean Communists and the Chinese Communists had not miscalculated what they may at least have thought to be our apparent indecision and the Acheson statement of January 1950, that Korea was outside the defense perimeter of this country, the Communists might not have plunged Korea into the Korean war.

I use the word advisedly, Mr. President, because that was a war fought without any declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. It was the fourth most costly war in the history of this Nation.

Mr. President, I submit, and the record will substantiate my statement, that under President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles there have been more bipartisan consultations with the leaders of both parties in the Congress of the United States than in any previous administration in our history. This I shall document for the Congress of the United State within the next few days, so that all fairminded Members of this body, Republican and Democrats, and all citizens of this country, may judge for themselves whether that be the fact.

In listening to some of the remarks in the Senate today, and those made before the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which I am honored to serve, and which is now sitting with the Committee on Armed Services, one would almost think that the problems of the Middle East originated under President Eisenhower, that there were no problems in the Middle East before January of 1953, and that they have all, phoenix-like arisen in this brief period of time.

Any fairminded student of history on either side of the aisle knows that is not the case. The tensions and problems of the Middle East date back thousands of years. The immediate problems of the Middle East date back at least 2 decades. The more recent problems of the Middle East date back at least to 1946, and perhaps considerably farther back than that.

So, Mr. President, let us not either deceive ourselves or the American public into believing that the problems of the Middle East are a creature of the President of the United States, or his responsibility, because every Member of the Senate knows that is not true.

Mr. President, the basic question which the American people will have to answer is, Is it in the vital interests of the people of the United States in the interest of the survival of this Republic, and the preservation of the free world, to have the Middle East pass into Communist hands?

If we can complacently say that it is no concern whatever of ours whether the Soviet Union takes over the entire Middle East, that those nations are remote, and that we have no particular interest in whether they survive outside the Communist Iron Curtain or not, perhaps we can satisfy ourselves with such a position. But I cannot in good conscience satisfy myself that it would be either in our national interest or that it would be anything but highly detrimental to our national interest and to the survival of our allies and associated free nations in Western Europe and the very survival of this Republic as well. For, Mr. President, if the Middle Eastern area falls within the tender mercies of the men in the Kremlin and a series of Kadar-like governments should be established in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Syria, Lebanon, and the other states of the Middle East, would that serve our national interests or the interests of freedom? The answer, of course, is "No."

Mr. President, many well-meaning persons in the Congress and throughout the country rightfully ask the question,

Inasmuch as we are charter members of the United Nations, why can we not depend upon that great world organization to preserve the peace rather than to take the action proposed by the President of the United States? It is a good question.

I see on the floor today my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He and I, as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, in accordance with the policy which has been followed for the past several years, were assigned to go as senatorial members of the American delegation to the United Nations when the present General Assembly met in the City of New York. I believe all of us, when the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco, in my State of California, hoped that this organization might be an agency to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and for our children. I was not then serving in the Senate of the United States, but was serving overseas in the armed services of our country; yet all of us, whether we were abroad or at home in the armed services, whether we were privileged to serve in the Senate of the United States at that time, or whether we were ordinary citizens, hoped that the United Nations might be the basis for the preservation of peace under international law. But in the developments which have taken place in more recent years we have found that the United Nations has, if not a fatal defect, a near-fatal defect, namely, the built-in veto by the Soviet Union.

I do not claim that the Government of the United States did not have some responsibility when in 1945 it agreed to the veto in the Security Council. I do not claim that because there was a Democratic administration at that time the responsibility rests upon that party alone, for we were privileged to have serving in the United Nations representatives of the Republican Party; and with the knowledge of conditions which existed in 1945, I certainly do not condemn or unduly criticize the decision which was made by the then Democratic administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. As soon as I have had a chance to make my statement.

I do not condemn the action taken by the then Democratic administration, because it was not a partisan matter. Undoubtedly the overwhelming sentiment in Congress among Republicans and Democrats alike was that, as a matter of protecting our own constitutional rights, the veto was necessary. But I do not think that any person, Democrat or Republican, thought the veto would be abused as it has been abused by the Soviet Union in the intervening period of years.

I listened with some astonishment in the hearings being held by the Committees on Foreign Relations and on Armed Services to the statement by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), who is one of the leading Members of this body, and who has now come into the Chamber, in which he was highly critical of the Secretary of State because the Secretary did not foresee each development that has taken place.

No; I admit that the Secretary of State had no crystal ball into which he could look and predict all the events which would take place in the future. When the Secretary of State testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, he made clear, as he did again yesterday, that he testified as to conditions as they existed, in his judgment, at the time he was meeting with the committees. But he did not claim then, and he does not claim now, that he had the power to prophesy, or that he had a crystal ball into which he could gaze and predict the events which would take place in the future.

I am not critical in a partisan sense, because another President of the United States, President Truman, miscalculated in 1950. I quote from a statement by former President Harry Truman on June 1, 1950, in which he told his regular news conference:

> The world today is closer to peace than at any time during the past 5 years.

President Truman did not have a crystal ball. Yet within 24 days of his optimistic statement the North Korean Communists had come across the 38th parallel and had made war upon the little Republic of Korea, which had been established under the auspices of the United Nations and the United States.

Congress was then in the city of Washington, though, because of the weekend, it was not in session. President Truman ordered the intervention of American troops without consulting with Congress and without having asked for a resolution in advance, at the time, or subsequent thereto. But the United States became involved in the fourth largest war in our history. There were 140,000 American casualties, including 35,000 deaths.

I should say, based on these historic precedents, that what President Eisenhower is trying to do is not to get a declaration of war from Congress; he is not seeking to make war by Executive power. What he is attempting to do is to prevent the outbreak of a war which may be brought on by the miscalculations of potential aggressors and potential enemies.

The President of the United States, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, bears an awful burden. He never escapes from the responsibilities of his office. He cannot be away on a brief vacation without being constantly alert to the fact that at any hour of the day or night messages from the far corners of the earth may involve vital decisions, affecting the safety of this Republic, the lives of our people, and the preservation of the free world.

But President Eisenhower has made one thing clear from the start, and I think in this he should have the support of every Member of Congress, Republican and Democrat alike, namely, that in the event of trouble anywhere in the world, he will promptly call Congress into session, if it is not already in session. If the emergency is so great that he must act first, he will then call Congress into session as rapidly as it can assemble, so that Congress can have the matter presented to it.

We do not know what the conditions might be. It might be that the United State was under direct attack. The Nation's Capitol might or might not be standing. Congress might have to meet at some other place than the city of Washington, D. C. But we do have the word of the President of the United States that as quickly as Congress could assemble, it would be called into session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this time, if the Senator from Wyoming please.

What is the basic defect in the United Nations, which I think my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], will confirm? It is that by the built-in veto, the Soviet Union is able to negate the collective action of the nations of the world against aggression. The Soviet Union did not veto the operation in Korea because, as it happened—and we do not know all the reasons for it—the Soviet Union was not represented in the Security Council on the day of the outbreak of the Korean war. But we know from our experience in the Middle East that the United Nations was able to function with an emergency force in the Suez crisis. Why? Because Israel, Great Britain, France, and Egypt, having a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as expressed by a United Nations resolution, consented to the admission of the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East. If they had not consented to it, that force would not be there today, because there is not a Senator in the Chamber who believes that the small, limited United Nations emergency force could have landed anywhere against hostile opposition on the part of any of the four powers which were involved in the Middle East.

So the United Nations is functioning today because the nations involved in the Middle East dispute heeded the resolution and had, as I have said, a decent respect for opinions of mankind.

But one of the great coincidences of history is the fact that, simultaneously, with the outbreak of the crisis in Suez, the people of Hungary rose to strike, almost with their bare hands, at the most godless tyranny the world has ever known. They pled to the United Nations for help. The then government of Mr. Nagy sent to the United Nations—not once but several times—cablegrams asking for help. Immediately the Security Council was called into action, at the request of Ambassador Lodge, acting on instructions of the Government of the United States. The Soviet Union used its built-in veto against any action against its aggression.

Ambassador Lodge, acting on instructions of our Government, then called for a meeting of the General Assembly. The General Assembly met, and passed a resolution asking the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces. Did the Soviet Union have a decent respect for the opinion of mankind, as represented by the overwhelmingly endorsed resolution of the General Assembly of the United Na-

tions? The answer comes resoundingly out of the pages of recent history: The Soviet Union did not have such respect.

The General Assembly of the United Nations passed 1 resolution; it passed 2 resolutions; it passed 3 resolutions; it passed 4 resolutions; it passed up to 10 resolutions. But the Soviet Union has not yet shown a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as represented by the United Nations' resolutions.

In the face of that record, is there within the sound of my voice any person who would risk the security of our country upon dependence on having the Soviet Union pay attention to a resolution of the United Nations? Mr. President, is there within the sound of my voice any person who would want any free nation to have to depend for its survival upon a resolution passed by the United Nations? Therefore, when someone asks, "Why could not the United States adopt that course?" the answer is clear for any reasonable man to see. Nations can lose their freedom while delegates at the General Assembly talk.

In World War II, Belgium was invaded, overrun, and surrendered to Nazi Germany in 20 days. Holland was invaded by Nazi Germany, overrun, and surrendered in 6 days. Yet it took the United Nations 45 days to pass 10 resolutions, none of which was respected by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, all the Middle East—not only 1 country or 2 countries, but all the countries of the Middle East—and also a part of Africa could pass behind the Iron Curtain during the time in which the United Nations might be debating whether the Soviet Union should respect the opinions of mankind.

I believe it was for this reason, and acting in what I believe was in conformity with section 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, that the President of the United States felt it was important, in advance of any aggression, that clear notice be served that we could not be unconcerned by any overt Soviet aggression in the Middle East. I believe that in laying this matter before the country and before the Congress, the President was carrying out the highest obligations under his oath of office as President of the United States.

He is mindful of the fact that we are a constitutional Government. With the vast responsibilities which are his, with the sources of information which flows to the President of the United States—information which no other man either in or out of Government has, and with the tremendous responsibilities resting upon the President, he has said, in language that is very clear, that it is his belief that it is not in our national interest to permit the Middle East to pass into the Soviet orbit. He has said, in language which is as clear as any man can use, that he believes that prompt and early action is necessary to prevent in that area of the world a disintegration which might be fatal to the nations situated there. He has done that under his great responsibilities as President of the United States. He has been backed up by his Secretary of State. He has been confirmed in his judgment by the highest military authorities of this Government. He has been requested to do it by nations in that area of the world that recognize the dangers which exist because of the power vacuum which has been created in that part of the globe. All this he has laid before us.

In the face of that overwhelming record, if the Congress of the United States wishes to say, "We will tie the hands of the President of the United States; we will ignore his warning; we will not give him this support and thereby demonstrate to the potential aggressor a united country which he believes he should have in dealing with these grave problems," and if the Congress wishes to accept responsibility for what happens in that area of the world, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives are at liberty to make that choice, individually. However, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, based on the record, based on the facts, I intend, insofar as my vote and my voice may permit, to uphold the hand of the President of the United States.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that some of our colleagues have statements which they desire to make today. For that reason, the leadership does not plan to call up today, on motion, any of the resolutions which we had previously planned to bring before the Senate today. I shall not make any exception, Mr. President; we shall have to bring them up tomorrow, because the session today is likely to last until late in the evening, inasmuch as certain Senators have informed me that they desire to speak before the session today ends.

We shall be in session tomorrow; and, therefore, on tomorrow we shall proceed to the consideration of bills and other measures on the calendar; at that time we shall have that opportunity.

PROHIBITION OF BILLBOARDS ALONG THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect our interstate highway system from being defaced by billboards.

Mr. President, with the $50 billion Federal-aid highway program which Congress enacted last year, we are about to enter upon a new era of highway transportation in America. Over the next 13 years, a new network of highways will be constructed, to connect every corner of the country with modern, fast roads. A total of 41,000 miles of this network will constitute the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This is a system of high-speed, limited access, almost wholly four-lane separated roads which will carry the bulk of the long-distance automobile and bus travel throughout our country.

The construction of these thousands of miles of new highways gives us once more the opportunity to preserve the aesthetic—as well as the merely economic—values of such travel through the American landscape. The opportunity, if lost now, will not soon come again. The new highways, once built, will not be relocated in this generation. Unless we give thought now to the question of what the traveler is to see, as he cruises through the fields and forests and mountains and prairies of America, we know that he will see what we see along other highways today: Signs and billboards, large flat boards placed to capture his attention, designed with all the skill commercial artists can muster, to hammer into his consciousness the virtues of a cigarette, a whisky, a brand of automobile or gasoline.

Mr. President, I believe the traveler on these future highways, in his car or bus, should be able to see the beauty and the grandeur of our country without the insistent and garish distractions of commercial advertising—whether the road takes him past the symmetry of cultivated fields, through the light and shadows of tall evergreen forests, or overseemingly limitless miles of desert bordered by distant mountains on the horizon. For that reason, I introduce today a bill which will make it possible to avoid the construction along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways of the artificial thickets of billboards and signs which we have almost come to take for granted along our present automobile roads.

I might mention, Mr. President, that as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, I sought to have a provision on the same subject included in the highway bill when it came before the Senate last year. However, the language which was in the bill as it was reported by our committee was eliminated before its enactment, due to certain misgivings about the possibility that the provision might interfere with traditional State conrol over the highways. To avoid any misunderstandings on this subject, I shall explain at this point what my present bill provides; and I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 963) to provide for the control of certain advertising on Federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote a national policy for the protection of

scenic beauty and safety of travel on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to prepare, publish, and disseminate a set of recommended standards for implementation of such a policy through the control of signs in areas within 500 feet of the rights-of-way comprising this system, as provided in this act with respect to federally owned or controlled lands and by action of the States with respect to nonfederally owned or controlled lands. The national policy standards so recommended shall limit signs in such areas to (1) signs necessary for highway directional information and official notices; (2) signs indicating the availability for sale or lease of the property on which they are located; and (3) signs located in commercial areas adjacent to and accessible from such highways and advertising a business conducted on premises in the commercial areas.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act the term "sign" shall mean a billboard, a sign, or any other similar public advertising.

SEC. 3. With respect to federally owned or controlled lands, the Secretary of Commerce shall carry out this national policy by regulations applying his recommended standards, promulgated after consultation with the heads of the Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over lands affected thereby.

SEC. 4. To promote this national policy by action of the States with respect to lands not federally owned or controlled, the right to control signs in areas within 500 feet of the rights-of-way of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, in accordance with the standards prepared under the first section of this act, shall, under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, be considered an interest in land which may be acquired for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with a project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is a short bill. Under section 1 of the bill, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to prepare a set of standards of limitations on the erection of billboards, to carry out a national policy of protecting scenic beauty as well as travel safety along the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

These standards will be recommendations and advisory only, insofar as highways built on land under the control of the several States are concerned. My bill will not force any State to accept these standards, if the government of the State does not want to do so. However, if the State wishes to accept these standards and to exclude commercial advertising billboards along its new, limited-access interstate highways, it will be able to do this in its agreement with the Bureau of Public Roads, under which it receives in Federal funds 90 percent of the cost of the highway. The cost of purchasing the advertising rights within 500 feet of the right-of-way will be includable in the highway costs, and 90 percent of it will be reimbursable from Federal funds. This is provided under section 4 of the bill. Under section 3, the standards prepared by the Secretary of Commerce are to be translated directly into regulations applicable to federally-owned or controlled lands, after consultation between the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal officer or agency having control of the Federal land in question.

The standards themselves are to restrict signs within 500 feet of the right-of-way of the interstate highways to three kinds of signs: Those necessary for highway information and directions, those advertising property adjacent to the highway for sale, and those advertising services available to the motorists on premises adjacent to and accessible from the highway. I expect that the Secretary of Commerce will promulgate standards of size, location, and design for permissible signs, consistent with the policy objectives of section 1.

MOTORISTS' TAXES CREATE SIGNBOARDS' VALUE

Mr. President, America's highways could be scenic corridors through the beauty and the variety of our land, uninterrupted by unsightly billboards. But the tourist, instead of seeing a vista of green hills and white-foamed rivers, is pursued everywhere by blatant demands that he buy this or that chewing gum or some particular brand of soap or liquor or shoe polish. The motorist pays for the road with his fuel and vehicle taxes. He ought at least have the right to glimpse the grandeur which the Almighty created throughout our countryside.

Let me emphasize that it is the motorist's money which makes the billboard site of value. If the highway were not there, the signboard would be worth less than a continental dollar. The highway, paid for by the motorist, makes valuable the signboard which the motorist is forced to look at while traveling through the land. Surely our Federal and State Governments owe it to the touring public to keep the magnificent American outdoors from being scarred and marred by a vast confetti of billboards.

Mr. President, I have seen propaganda from the billboard industry which informs us that the industry is performing a public service by preventing lazy motorists from falling asleep at the wheel, hypnotized by the natural scenery and the road. Imagine such effrontery. In other words, if the billboards were not there, the driver might nod at his post because all he then could look at would be the spectacle of sky and mountain or lake or field or forest. Have we become so dependent upon artificial stimuli, so addicted to drugs of the advertising industry, that we must be saved by its billboards from falling to sleep over the view of our country as bountiful nature gave it to us?

Mr. President, my bill would not wipe out all the billboards already placed along the roads and highways of America. There may be many places, in cities or in the midst of industrial developments, where billboards may not seem out of place. This is for the Secretary of Commerce to determine by the standards he promulgates under my bill.

Let me turn, in conclusion, however, to a point on which Senators themselves can play a role.

Mr. President, I think it would be a constructive step if candidates for public office, including Members of the Senate, would pledge themselves never again to use, in future election campaigns, billboards in the open country where they blot out the scenery. In this way we could demonstrate our own concern for the lovely outdoors which billboards often disrupt and desecrate. We could show that there was no hypocrisy in our attitude when we speak about conservation of outdoor vistas. I am proud to say that when I ran for the Senate in 1954, I practiced what I preached. My wife and I had supported billboard control during our service as members of the Oregon State Legislature. Not one single billboard ever was purchased in my behalf by the committees backing my candidacy. Signboards advertising my opponent dotted Oregon from the Snake River to the sea, but not one such sign heralded the candidacy of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. Yet I believe my total lack of billboards helped to convince thousands of conservationists and outdoor enthusiasts that I was sincere when I spoke against the desecration of scenic majesty.

NATIONWIDE SENTIMENT FAVORS BILLBOARD CONTROL

Mr. President, since my effort last year to include some control over billboards along the interstate highways in the huge new Federal highway program, I have received letters from all over the Nation supporting such a step. I shall not take the time here to review the wide public interest which has developed in this measure. Many Members of the Senate may have seen the article called The New Superhighways: Blessings or Blight, by Mr. Robert Moses, of New York, in the December issue of Harper's magazine, which was recently abridged in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 27.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a letter to the Portland Oregonian of December 15, 1956, by Mr. E. B. MacNaughton, of the Oregon Roadside Council; an excellent editorial from the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of January 21, 1957—quoting Ogden Nash's prophetic couplet:

> I think that I shall never see,
> A billboard lovely as a tree.
> Perhaps unless the billboards fall,
> I'll never see a tree at all.

An editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 21, 1957, and an editorial from the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman of January 17, 1957.

These cogent editorials are representative of American press opinion which seeks to prevent billboards from defacing our new system of interstate highways.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of December 15, 1956]

MENACE TO BEAUTY

To the EDITOR: In a recent issue of Harper's magazine, Robert Moses of national fame made a vigorous protest against cluttering up our enlarging system of national throughways with billboard advertising. Reese H. Taylor, president of the Union Oil Co., now states that his company in the future will drop billboard advertising on highways in eight western States. He reports that the Union Oil Co. has been spending $1 million a year on such advertising.

Gradually but surely the public is being aroused to this menace to the beauty of our highways. The Oregon Roadside Council has been in the forefront in developing similar sentiments within the limits of Oregon. These great throughways, constructed with the public's money, must have their scenic beauty protected and maintained.

The present State law made some improvement but does not go far enough. It is hoped that the Oregon legislature will take cognizance of this matter and make the law more effective than is presently the case. The tourist dollar is a matter of great importance to this State. Also, safe driving on these throughways must be improved.

Mr. Taylor of the oil company said that its decision rests first on the question of traffic hazard, which many experts believe is increased by billboards, and secondly, an apparent growing resentment on the part of many people and residential communities to obscuring our natural beauties with this type of advertising.

E. B. MACNAUGHTON.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, January 21, 1957]

SCENERY VERSUS SIGNS

We have been watching with interest the comments of Willamette Valley newspapers on the new Baldock Freeway between Portland and Salem, and how gradually, little by little, billboards are taking over what was once a beautiful, pastoral section of highway.

They don't like it.

Neither do we.

At the last session of the legislature a law was passed limiting, but not banning, billboards on Oregon's freeways. Billboards are allowed not more frequently than every 1,000 feet. But at 60 miles per hour, that's one billboard every 12 seconds.

The Oregon Statesman says:

"We do not oppose outdoor advertising; but do object to it where it mars the scenic view or creates traffic hazard."

That puts it in a nutshell. The fact is that with the new Federal highway bill, much of the wide new highways will be through unspoiled, uncrowded areas, which will be both a delight to the eye and a temptation to billboard advertisers.

Bills to protect the freeways from billboard encroachment will be under consideration in both the State legislature and the Federal Congress. It is to be hoped that members of either or both can resist the pressures of the billboard lobbies and offer protection to areas which are more valuable for their scenic beauties than they are for gargantuan pictures extolling the virtues of beer, cigarettes, or mayonnaise.

Let us close with that Ogden Nash verse we have quoted before:

"I think that I shall never see
A billboard lovely as a tree.
Perhaps unless the billboards fall,
I'll never see a tree at all."

May that verse not be prophetic.—E. A.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 21, 1957]

OUT OF A BILLBOARD FOREST

Will the Nation's new Interstate Highway System, just now going into construction, eventually wend its way through files of unsightly advertising billboards?

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks mentioned this problem in his recent highway progress report to Congress. "There is widespread feeling throughout the country that advertising adjacent to the Interstate System should be restricted in order to preserve the beauty and character of the natural landscape and in the interest of highway safety," he said. He added that legislation would be needed and the problem was under study.

Other highway officials and planners have expressed similar concern. Robert Moses, writing in Harper's magazine, warned that unless Congress acts, new highways will run between "continuous rows of offensive advertising."

Congress itself considered the matter when it debated the highway program, but finally rejected a proposal to permit acquisition of rights for sign construction within 500 feet of the road right-of-way. So the Federal Government is presently powerless to prevent commercial decoration of its new highways though it will spend $27 billion for them.

Some States restrict advertising along their roadways. The Missouri Highway Department has plans to limit commercial establishments along the new interstate pikes to the turnoffs at the traffic interchanges. But it is unlikely that the States will spend much of their own money to limit advertising along new Federal roads.

Before too long Secretary Weeks should have some specific idea of how to keep a forest of billboards off the superhighways of the future. And Congress should heed him.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman of Thursday, January 17, 1957]

FEDERAL ACTION ON BILLBOARDS?

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER has introduced a bill for control of outdoor advertising along the Federal interstate highways. And Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, told the Senate Public Works Subcommittee that Congress might be asked to restrict billboards along the new system. He reported "widespread feeling" that advertising near the interstate system should be curtailed to preserve beauty and character of landscape and to maintain highway safety. The leverage is found in the comment that the Federal Government puts up 90 percent of the funds—so it should have a say on preserving scenic beauty and highway safety.

Failure of the State to act adequately shows up in the Baldock Freeway. The last legislature limited billboards bordering this fine expressway to each thousand feet. Now they are beginning to punctuate the roadside and mar the lovely pastoral scene. Then we cry over loss of States rights when the Federal Government moves in to cover our own failures to meet responsibility.

We do not oppose outdoor advertising; but do object to it where it mars the scenic view or creates traffic hazard. The roadside beauty people will be in Salem again to press for protection of our scenery. We shall see whether this legislature is responsive. If it isn't then we'll have to transfer our hopes to NEUBERGER and Weeks and the Congress.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1957

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CARROLL, I introduce for appropriate reference an area redevelopment bill to help relieve areas throughout the United States suffering from long years of excessive unemployment and underemployment. The bill provides assistance to these areas primarily through self-help measures.

More than 10 years ago Congress recognized the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to utilize its resources and shape its policies to establish conditions which assure that maximum employment, production, and purchasing power would prevail through out the United States. It did so through the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946.

A large number of communities, however, have failed to share in the prosperity that has generally prevailed throughout the country during the succeeding years. Chronic unemployment and underemployment of the type weighing upon so many American cities, communities, and rural sections tend to stifle the economic life of entire areas. This undermines the education, health, community institutions, and living standards of many persons. It loses for the Nation a wealth of added goods and services it might otherwise have. It increases the taxpayers' burden for welfare and assistance costs. In short, it seriously affects every branch of our society.

The responsibility of the Federal Government to aid these areas is commonly acknowledged and is no longer a matter of partisan controversy.

A program for redevelopment of these areas should be flexible and adaptable to the diverse needs of the many communities, both industrial and rural, which suffer from chronic unemployment and underemployment. The bill I am introducing, with the welcome support of so many other Members of the Senate, provides such a program. It does this by establishing an Area Redevelopment Administration which is authorized by means of loans for new and expanded business and commercial enterprises, by loans for special public facilities, and by grants for such public facilities, to help these redevelopment areas to help themselves. Technical assistance for redevelopment, retraining facilities, retraining subsistence payments, procurement contract aids, and industrial rebuilding in urban renewal areas are also provided in this measure for depressed areas.

I also emphasize that such a program of Government assistance to deal with unemployment and underemployment is not inflationary. This is because it calls out idle resources and brings extra production. Thus, it does not enable persons to bid up the prices of labor and existing resources.

Many of these pockets of depression which this bill would aid have existed for a period of years. Some are of long duration. Industries upon which they once depended for a living have declined. Industrial replacement programs have not made up for the jobs lost. Textile mill areas, coal mining regions, railroad shop communities, farm machinery, and ordnance centers, and underdeveloped rural areas, are typical of such drains in our pools of opportunity. Current labor statistics show little real change in employment in these areas from that existing 1 year ago.

Courageous local efforts to bring in new industry or to expand existing businesses have been made, but these have failed to meet the urgent needs. The opportunity which this bill places before the Senate is to make available the resources

of the Federal Government to help these pockets of unemployment and underemployment to cure themselves by the only real cure, which is employment and the making of a contribution of goods and services to the people of our Nation.

The needs of the low income rural areas are no less urgent than those of the distressed industrial areas. Many rural communities in the United States have average per capita income of as little as one-fourth that of the average for the country.

The problem of underemployment in rural areas has been the subject of intensive study by Government departments and by the Joint Economic Committee. It seems evident that the following programs would help the low income farm families:

First. Expanded private and government credit for low income farm families.

Second. Extension-type education for farm families and of farmers who work off the farm part time.

Third. Research to fit farm units to changing conditions. Federal-State research to determine needs for aid and for off-farm employment.

Fourth. More training and educational opportunities for farm youth in both agricultural and nonagricultural skills.

Fifth. Better health services and practices.

Sixth. More information to underemployed farmers of job opportunities in urban areas.

Seventh. Encouragement by Federal, State, and local agencies for development of industry in rural areas.

Eighth. An increased use of trade area and community improvement programs to raise the standard of living.

Ninth. Broader participation by farmers in the social security program.

It especially emphasizes the expansion of job opportunities in nonagricultural pursuits. Any program of this type should be on a self-help basis. The bill I introduce meets that test.

Among other benefits available to rural redevelopment areas under the terms of this bill are loans and grants for:

First. Development of resources, processing and marketing facilities of the area.

Second. Construction, rehabilitation, and alteration of industrial plants or commercial facilities of the area.

Third. Purchase of machinery or equipment for use in area.

Fourth. Encouragement of local private and public credit extension.

Fifth. Technical and professional assistance to local communities.

Sixth. Needed public facilities to improve opportunities for industrial and commercial construction and expansion.

Seventh. Vocational training needs.

Eighth. Retraining subsistence payments.

During the 84th Congress a bill similar in scope and purpose was considered by the Senate and was passed by a vote of 60 to 30. The House, however, in the short time remaining in the session, did not take it up.

The bill passed by the Senate had been the subject of extensive hearings in Washington and in the field, in areas experiencing the problem. The need for this type of legislation was, in the opinion of the sponsors and the committee, conclusively established by the hearings. The bill considered by the Senate was given healthy bipartisan support, and many Senators sitting on both sides of the aisle gave of their valuable time and talents to the development of the bill in its final form. I believe this bill, which with few changes follows the outline of the Senate-passed bill, deserves similar support.

The modifications from the Senate-passed S. 2663 are as follows: (a) protections against Federal assistance being used merely to relocate unemployment (sec. 7 (a) (4) and 7 (d)); (b) administrative authority to designate several counties, or municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality as a "redevelopment area" (sec. 5 (e)); (c) the committee-approved procurement provisions of S. 2663 (sec. 16); and (d) Housing and Home Finance Administration authority to use slum clearance and urban renewal projects for industrial and commercial rebuilding and to make planning grants in "redevelopment areas" (sec. 17 and sec. 18—taken from provisions in House-committee approved H. R. 11811).

I believe that the passage of this measure by Congress and its wise and careful administration will bring a new day of hope and opportunity to many areas and to literally millions of our people who want nothing more than a chance to work and to live in self-respect and decency.

This bill proposes no easy handout. It holds out the prospect of work, of new jobs, of increased production, of expanding business and commerce, of more healthy community life, and above all, of a fuller utilization and development of the Nation's most precious resources, its human resources.

It is a domestic point 4 program which we badly need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an abstract of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the abstract will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 964) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The abstract, presented by Mr. DOUGLAS, is as follows:

DIGEST OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS (FOR HIMSELF AND MESSRS. CLARK, KENNEDY, GREEN, MURRAY, NEELY, CHAVEZ, LANGER, SPARKMAN, MRS. SMITH, MESSRS. ANDERSON, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, HENNINGS, MANSFIELD, PASTORE, NEUBERGER, MCNAMARA, AND CARROLL)

1. Purpose: To assist communities, industries, enterprises and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to expand their productive activity to alleviate excessive and prolonged unemployment and underemployment by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas.

2. Organization:

(a) Creates an Area Redevelopment Administration with an Administrator appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation.

(b) Creates Advisory Committees to assist Administrator:

(1) Government Advisory Committee consisting of heads of major interested Federal Bureaus.

(2) National Public Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of business, labor and agriculture.

(3) Administrator also authorized to confer with parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over extended period of years, causing high levels of unemployment in redevelopment areas.

3. Redevelopment areas defined:

(a) Industrial Redevelopment Areas are defined as "those within the United States in which Administrator determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time."

Areas shall be so designated where unemployment is not less than:

(1) 12 percent for preceding 1 year period.

(2) 8 percent for 15 months of preceding 18 month period.

(3) 6 percent for 8 months in each of 2 preceding years.

(b) Rural Redevelopment Areas are defined as "those rural areas within United States in which he determines that there exists the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment."

Administrator shall consider in making determination:

(1) Number of low-income farm families in rural areas and proportion such low-income families are to total farm families in such areas.

(2) Relationship of income levels of families in such areas to general levels of income in United States.

(3) Current and prospective employment opportunities in such areas and availability of manpower there for supplement employment.

(c) Administrator may designate several counties or municipalities or a part of a county or municipality as a "redevelopment area."

4. Local committees: Once a redevelopment area is determined, local redevelopment committee shall be appointed by Administrator consisting of at least 7 residents of area, representing management, labor, commercial, industrial development and agricultural groups. Committee shall submit plans and cost estimates for:

(a) Development of resources, processing and marketing facilities of area.

(b) Construction, rehabilitation and alteration of industrial plants or commercial facilities of area.

(c) Purchase of machinery or equipment for use in area to attract new industry and stimulate economic activity.

Local committees shall enlist support of local residents and private and public lending agencies in financing such plans. Administrator shall furnish technical and professional assistance to local committees.

Administrator may appoint regional advisory committees on same basis as above to represent two or more redevelopment areas.

Funds for local committees: Not more than $1,500,000 of sums available to Administrator may be used to aid regional and local committees for administrative expenses only—salaries, and traveling expenses of committee members excluded.

Loans:

(a) On application approved by a local committee, Administrator may make loans to assist in financing (1) purchase or development of land for industrial usage; (2) construction, rehabilitation or alteration of industrial plants or other manufacturing, commercial or processing facilities; and (3) purchase of machinery or equipment for use in area, if he finds:

(1) Project planned is reasonably calculated to provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment;

(2) Funds requested not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) Amount of loan plus private funds available are adequate to insure completion;

(4) There is reasonable expectation of repayment;

(5) Borrower will not transfer business operations to such plant so as to effect a significant reduction of employment in any other area within the United States.

(b) No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate cost, or for more than 40 years. Interest rate shall be at cost to Administrator plus one-half of 1 percent per annum.

(c) Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by (1) States or subdivisions thereof, or (2) local interests. Federal lien has first status. 5 percent of aggregate cost for which loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources. Financial condition of area to determine amount of local contribution to costs. (Balance if any needed for 100 percent of loan would have to come from other sources outside the area.)

(d) "Borrower" includes lessees, subcontractors, or persons or firms under common control.

(e) $100 million authorized for making industrial redevelopment loans, on revolving fund basis. $100 million appropriated for rural redevelopment loans, with limitation of $6 million to any one State, on revolving fund basis.

6. Assistance to public facilities:

(a) Loan for public facilities: Upon application of any State or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, private or public redevelopment organization, Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities in redevelopment areas, if he finds:

(1) Project provides more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment and will tend to improve opportunities in area for successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) Funds requested are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) Amount of loan plus amount of other available funds are adequate to insure completion;

(4) There is reasonable expectation of repayment.

No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate cost, or for longer than 40 years. Interest rate at cost to Administrator plus one-half of 1 percent.

Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by State or political subdivision as equity capital or loan. Federal lien has first position. Financial condition of areas to determine amount of local contribution to cost. (Balance if any needed for 100 percent of loan would come from other sources inside or outside area.)

Seventy-five million dollars authorized for public facility loans, on revolving fund basis.

(b) Grants for public facilities: Administrator may conduct studies of needs and probable costs in redevelopment areas for needed land acquisition for public facility usage and for construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities. May receive proposals from States, Indian tribes, organizations, etc., showing plans, costs, and contributions to be made to proposal and Administrator may make grants where he finds:

(1) Proposal will provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment and proposal will tend to improve opportunities of area for establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) Local groups will contribute to cost of project in proportion to their ability to contribute;

(3) Project will fill a pressing need of area, and there is little probability project could otherwise be undertaken.

Amount of grant for any project shall not exceed difference between funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including loan under sec. 8 of this act) and amount necessary to insure completion.

Administrator shall provide supervision to prevent waste of Federal funds.

Appropriations authorized not to exceed $50 million for making grants.

7. Funds for industrial plants and public facilities: Administrator with approval of President may issue notes and obligations not exceeding $275 million. Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase and may sell such notes.

8. Establishment of revolving funds: Creates revolving funds for industrial redevelopment loans ($100 million), for rural redevelopment loans ($100 million), and for public facility loans ($75 million).

9. Information: Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing assistance, technical information, market research, advice, etc., obtainable from Federal Government agencies. Administrator shall also supply Federal procurement agencies with names and addresses of redevelopment area firms desirous of obtaining contracts from United States Government.

10. Technical assistance: Administrator authorized to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas, including studies of need and potentials for economic growth. Administrator may provide use of his staff or services of private individuals, firms, or institutions under contract. Appropriation authorized for these purposes in amount not in excess of $4,500,000.

11. Powers of Administrator: These include all ordinary and necessary powers to employ and compensate staff; hold hearings; secure data from other agencies; make, extend, service, modify, collect, and liquidate loans; acquire, manage, and sell property in collection of loans; employ experts; and establish rules, regulations, and procedures.

12. Termination of eligibility for assistance: Whenever Administrator shall determine that area designated as redevelopment area no longer meets requirements for such designation of section 5 of act, no further assistance shall be granted. But an area may be redesignated as a redevelopment area if requirements of section 5 of act again prevail.

Contracts or undertakings previously entered into shall continue to be valid.

Administrator shall advise Federal and local agencies of changes.

13. Procurement by Government agencies: Each department of the Federal Government engaged in procurement of supplies shall:

(a) Use best efforts to award negotiated procurements to contractors in redevelopment areas.

(b) Where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation with firms in redevelopment areas.

(c) Provide bid matching opportunities for redevelopment area's firms.

(d) Assure that firms in redevelopment areas have opportunities to be bidders and get notices.

(e) In event of tie bids, all other things being equal, award contract to firm in redevelopment area.

(f) Encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas.

(g) Cooperate with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to achieve objectives set forth.

14. Financial assistance under Housing Act:

(a) Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to use slum-clearance and urban renewal projects in redevelopment areas for industrial and commercial rebuilding without regard to requirements of existing law that project area be predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This is, however, subject to the limitation that not more than 10 percent of the funds authorized under existing law for loans or capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section.

(b) Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized also to make urban planning grants for planning in redevelopment areas.

15. Vocational training: Secretary of Labor shall:

(a) Determine vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals in redevelopment areas and cooperate with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and State and local agencies engaged in vocational training to assure that all facilities are available to such unemployed persons.

(b) Determine additional facilities needed to meet vocational training or retraining needs. Secretary of Labor shall then so advise Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall furnish assistance, including finances, to State agencies to meet needs. If State agencies are unable to meet vocational training and retraining needs, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may contract for such services with public or private institutions. Secretary of Labor shall provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeymen and other job training needed in locality.

16. Retraining subsistence payments: Secretary of Labor shall:

(a) Enter into agreements with redevelopment area States whereby the States as agents of the Federal Government make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation (exhaustions or not insured) and certified by Secretary of Labor to be taking training.

(b) Make retraining payments to such individuals for not more than 13 weeks in amounts equal to average unemployment compensation payments payable in State making payments.

17. Penalties:

(a) Knowingly false statements or willful overvaluations of security for purpose of influencing Administrator or obtaining loan, etc., are punishable by fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Whoever being connected with Administrator embezzles, misapplies, etc., any funds, or with intent to defraud the administrator or other body politic makes false statements, entries, reports, etc., or with intent to defraud participates or receives any profit or benefit through any loan or act of the Administrator, or gives unauthorized information concerning future action or plan of Administrator which might affect the value of securities or invests, speculates, etc., in securities of company receiving a loan or assistance from Administrator, shall

be punishable by $10,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

18. Employment of expediter and administration employees: No loan shall be made to business enterprise unless owners (a) certify to Administrator names of attorneys, agents, etc., employed for purpose of expediting application and fees paid for service, and (b) execute agreement binding such business enterprise for period 2 years after assistance rendered by Administrator to it to refrain from employing any person who on date assistance was rendered or within 1 year prior thereto shall have served as officer or employee of Administrator in position involving discretion as to granting assistance under this act.

19. Annual report: Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to Congress of his operations for each fiscal year. Report shall also, show among other things:

(a) Number and size of Government contracts for furnishing supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas; and

(b) Amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts.

Governmental agencies shall furnish Administrator such information as may be necessary for purpose of this section.

20. Appropriations: Authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out provisions of the act.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to accommodate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. As soon as he is ready for the accommodation he may interrupt me at any time. I understand he is awaiting a certain response. In the meantime, without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to Congress his third special message since 1955 on the great need for Federal assistance to States for school construction.

While he was tardy in recognizing the need, the President apparently now is firmly convinced that the classroom shortage has reached epidemic proportions.

This recognition, although late, is to be congratulated.

However, one could now wish that the President would back up his awareness with something more than the token aid contained in his latest proposal.

To put it bluntly, the President's proposal to spread $1.3 billion over a 4-year period is totally inadequate.

I think it is interesting to trace the administration's proposals for school aid in the 2 years during which the President has shown any constructive interest in the subject—other than holding unnecessary conferences.

In 1955, the administration's proposal was for about $67 million a year for 3 years, a ridiculously small figure.

In 1956, the request was for $250 million a year for 5 years.

Now the President proposes $325 million a year for 4 years.

I suppose we can derive some satisfaction from the fact that the President has been edging upward each year in his proposed annual allocations. But at the rate he is moving up, our present first graders will be eligible for social security before he gets near a realistic figure. Each year he putters around with the subject, our great shortage of classrooms grows even more acute. Action—and not mere gestures—is clearly demanded.

The President also trots out his old need formula for allocating Federal funds—turning down flat grants because they would concentrate aid in the wealthy States.

Mr. President, this is not a question of total State wealth. It is a question of school districts, and their ability to pay for new school construction. I am sure we shall find—and I am not pleased to say so—proportionately as many impoverished school districts in my State as in any other. The only need involved here is the need of the children for proper classrooms.

Mr. President, the President can propose all he wants—even if he wants to propose $5 billion a year. What we need now is action—action to enact a school construction bill.

I think the place to start is in the Senate, and the time to start is now.

INCREASED LOAN AUTHORITY FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have cleared this matter with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

There is on the calendar order No. 2, Senate bill 637, reported unanimously from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who will be out of the city tomorrow. It was his hope that the first bill of the year could be passed today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2, Senate bill 637.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available for business loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the purpose of making a brief statement in explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for yielding the floor in order that this bill may be considered by the Senate; and also my deep appreciation to the minority leader for having agreed to a unanimous-consent request that the bill be taken up at this time.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Eisenhower administration. It proposes to increase by $65 million the business loan authorization of the Small Business Administration. The present authorization is $150 million. The proposed authorization is $215 million.

A hearing was held before the Subcommitte on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be chairman. Testimony was taken from Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, the Small Business Administrator. Mr. Barnes was of the view a year ago that he had adequate authorization to make small business loans, and therefore opposed an increase in the amount of total authorization by $100 million—which, nevertheless, was granted by the Congress—and while Mr. Barnes was of the same view in September of last year. However, the brief report which is before Members of the Senate discloses that the number of applications for small business loans from the Small Business Administration has increased to such an extent that, as Mr. Barnes told us at the hearing, unless this additional authorization were granted the Small Business Administration would run out of money to make loans by the end of February.

I should like to make it clear that this is merely an emergency measure. The bill is unanimously favorably reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is for the sole purpose of putting the Small Business Administration in a loan authorization position so that it may continue to make loans at its present rates and under its present policy until the end of this fiscal year.

There will come before the Senate during the next few months recommendations from the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the extension of the Small Business Administration, which expires by statute at the end of this fiscal year. This bill is merely to provide that agency with funds so that loans at the present rate and under the present policy may be continued, in order that the small-business men of the United States may be able to look to the Small Business Administration during the next few months of the fiscal year to the same extent as they have done previously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the fifth sentence of section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $215 million shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (a)."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (b) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$375 million" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$440 million".

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, Senate Resolution 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 71) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy.

Mr. MORSE. I assure my friend from Texas that it is a pleasure to cooperate with him.

As my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] leaves the floor, I wish to congratulate him upon the passage of the first substantive piece of legislation in this session of Congress. I commend him for the nature of the legislation.

In the late campaign, the subject of small business was a very important issue in my State. In the previous session I occupied the position which the Senator from Pennsylvania now occupies on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I well remember the adamant opposition of the administration to any increase in our loaning powers in connection with small business. As the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out, Administrator Barnes was against an increase of $100 million in the loan authorization. As the record before the committee will show, I tried to convince him that an increase of at least that much was needed.

During my campaign I said to a great many small business groups in my State that, come the next session of Congress, I would do what I could to increase the loan authorization. Little did I realize that the action would be taken so soon. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for the service which his leadership has made possible.

Mr. CLARK. I express my very deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon for having yielded, and for his most complimentary remarks. I hope I shall be able to carry on in his shoes—although my feet are smaller—some of the work on the Banking and Currency Committee which he left for other and more arduous duties.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's remarks, although I say jocularly that if we were to trade shoes I could not fill his.

Mr. President, let me make one further comment on the subject of small business before I proceed to discuss the subject which I rose to discuss.

I hope the Eisenhower administration has learned as well with respect to some other issues which were discussed during the campaign as it has with respect to the Small Business Administration.

I think the election results made very clear the issues about which the administration should have learned. I hope the change in its position in regard to small-business funds will be only the forerunner of a change of position of the administration, for example, in connection with the need for complete reappraisal of its policies in the entire field of natural resources.

I would say good naturedly and respectfully, but very pointedly, that the election results bear upon that issue, as well as upon the small-business issue.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make the second in a series of speeches I intend to make before the debate is over on the Middle East resolution. I made my first speech last Friday. In that speech I sought to analyze what I believe are the basic issues involved in this historic debate.

I had not intended to speak again today, except for three events which occurred. One was the testimony of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the hearing of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. The second was the action which the committees took on the revised Fulbright resolution. The third was the presentation this afternoon of the speech by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], accompanied by a proposed resolution.

I shall deal with the latter matter first. I believe it is well known in the Senate that I have an exceedingly high regard for the Senator from Montana. He is not only one of the most able men in the Senate, but he is one of the best informed men on the question of international affairs.

Therefore, it is with regret that I file a few dissents in the RECORD this afternoon, particularly in connection with his resolution. With most of his speech, I find myself in enthusiastic agreement. To the resolution I find myself unalterably opposed. I would no more vote for his resolution than I would for the Eisenhower resolution, because in my judgment it completely fails to meet the problem which I believe confronts the Senate on this very serious matter.

I believe the speech of the Senator from Montana is an excellent diagnosis of our international ills, with special reference to the feverish condition in the Middle East. However, I believe the prescription contained in the Mansfield resolution does not even have the aspirin quality of relieving a headache in the Middle East. On the contrary, I believe it may very well further impair the health of an already desperately sick American foreign policy.

MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION SHOULD COVER BASIC AREA PROBLEMS

I say that because I believe that at the time we pass any resolution whatever, we ought to meet the causes of the great unrest which exist in the Middle East. I say respectfully that the Mansfield resolution does not meet the causes of the great crisis which confronts us in the Middle East.

NO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED OF ATTACK THREAT

Therefore at the outset of my speech I would stress the fact that I do not believe we should hasten into action on any resolution on the Middle East issue until the administration comes forward at least with one competent witness who can testify before our committees and submit at least a scintilla of evidence that there is an imminent threat of an armed attack on any Arab country by the Soviet Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has said about the resolution I introduced this afternoon, I believe I made it plain that I was offering it for the consideration of the committees sitting jointly, and that it was not a cure-all. I hoped that it would touch on some of the basic difficulties apparent in the Arab-Israeli dispute, in the Suez Canal question, in the matters of the arms traffic, and in the matter of the President's constitutional power as Commander in Chief.

I wish to say that probably there is very much that is wrong with the resolution, but I believe it can well be considered in committee, along with the Senator's resolution and other resolutions. I am hopeful that as a result of such consideration we will be able to get a resolution which will be more direct and more effective and more comprehensive than the one which is now before the committees and which was presented by the administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say to my friend from Montana that I do not have the slightest question as to his motivations and intentions. I hope that his goal and objectives will be reached. However, I do believe that one of the purposes of the floor of the Senate is to serve as the place where we may hammer out our differences on the anvil of debate, in the hope that we may reach the perfectly legitimate goals which the Senator from Montana has outlined.

I respectfully say to him that I do not believe that the language of his resolution will accomplish his objectives. It is important, at the time the resolution is offered, that those of us who have reservations should express them. We owe

that to the Senator and we owe it to the country. That is exactly what I propose to do during the course of my speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to say to the Senator that his frankness is always refreshing and always worth while.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that before I have concluded my remarks they will be considered more than an expression of frankness, and that I may be able to offer some suggestions which, at least, from my standpoint, will improve the resolution.

I certainly hope that those suggestions will help us attain the Senator's goal, to which I am as much dedicated as is the Senator from Montana.

I wish to make it clear on the record that to date not one witness of the administration, including the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, has been willing to testify that he has any proof that there is any immediate threat of a military attack on any country of the Middle East.

ADMINISTRATION CRIES "WOLF"

We are being told in "Wolf! Wolf!" terms that this matter is so urgent that Little Red Riding Hood will be in trouble unless we proceed to pass the resolution forthwith. I have seen that tactic used before.

Some of us have the duty to stand on our hind legs in the Senate and put up a few warning signs. I have a few that I shall try to erect today against the steamroller tactic of the administration.

I listened to the speech of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I agreed with parts of it. However, in substance, it adds up again to taking the administration on faith and to taking the President and the Secretary of State on faith.

I speak very respectfully when I say that when it comes to my duty to carry out my oath under the Constitution, the fact that the President and the Secretary of State make a statement that we ought to do it, because, in their opinion, there is a great emergency, does not make it so.

SENATE HAS OBLIGATION TO DEMAND ADMINISTRATION PROOF

I still have the duty of saying, in effect, "Mr. Secretary, let us see the color of your proof."

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He well knows that there came before the two committees sitting jointly the other day a most distinguished authority on the Middle East. We cross-examined him for at least 2 hours. In the course of the cross-examination I asked him, "Do you have any evidence which shows or indicates that Russia is contemplating any immediate military aggression against any country in the Middle East?" His answer was "No."

ROLE OF PRESS

I dare say that if any of us were walking among our constituents today, they having read the scare headlines of a press which, by and large, is doing such an effective job of covering up for this administration throughout the country, we would find an overwhelming majority of our constituents say that it is necessary to get quick action on the resolution because apparently Russia is about to move its armed forces into the Middle East. I repeat that some of us have the obligation of putting up some "Go Slow" and "Danger" signs.

I happen to think, Mr. President, that Russia is too cunning, planning too far ahead in terms of decades, to make the mistake of starting an armed aggression in the Middle East at this time. Not that I do not think if the time ever comes when the free nations of the world allow themselves to become so weak that she might think she would be able to wipe us out by an attack, she would not try it. But that certainly is not now.

NO PROOF OF EMERGENCY PRESENTED

So, Mr. President, I wish to say again that one of the great holes in the case the administration has made is that it has offered no proof of an emergency. Therefore, I think it is of the utmost importance that we have the kind of discussions the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] gave us today, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] gave us last week, and which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has been giving us over the platform and over television for some time past. Let us get the facts about the situation in the Middle East.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened with attention, as always, to the Senator from Oregon, with reference to the very point he is making as to the urgency of the situation in the Middle East. That is a matter which was discussed by several of the members of the Armed Services Committee and of the Foreign Relations Committee with the Secretary of State.

I would say at this point, with the Senator's permission, that I think we can examine the record of testimony and not find any place where the Secretary was willing to state that there was any evidence as to any impending military aggression.

Mr. MORSE. He specifically testified that he did not have any such evidence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly to the contrary; that is correct.

I think it also should be noted that under cross-examination the Secretary testified that he has not called a meeting of his ambassadors in the Middle East. Furthermore, there had been no consultation with or any orders to the program planners of the International Cooperation Administration, the ICA relating to the so-called economic projects for which the President's resolution calls.

I cite this only to note that apparently the call of urgency, the three-alarm firebell which has been heard throughout the land, was not being rung in the Middle East through our representatives. It has been a bell which has been heard by Congress and the American public, but apparently not one that was to be heard by the diplomatic service of the United States, our ambassadors, our heads of mission under the ICA or the USIA. If they heard it, there is no evidence to indicate it.

Mr. MORSE. It all adds up to a decision of the administration that they want the power, and, to enable them to get it without thorough consideration, they cry "urgency, urgency, urgency."

I happen to think it is our duty in the Senate to go slow until we get the evidence; go slow until we find out what the situation really is, so that there will not be a repetition of the debacle which occurred in the Middle East during the election campaign, when the administration was telling us how well things were going, and we woke up to discover that people were shooting and killing each other in the Middle East because two of our most powerful allies, France and Great Britain had failed to communicate with us, had not even advised our State Department of their plan. We can put all the interpretations we want to on that, but my interpretation is that it adds up to only one thing, namely, that they had so completely lost confidence in our policies in the Middle East that they did not even feel obliged to keep the United States Government advised as to their plans in the Middle East.

And then we followed a course of action which put us in a position of alienating our two most powerful allies and of the only free nation in the Middle East, Israel. The administration thought it had to do something to step into that vacuum; so it proposed this unilateral action outside the United Nations.

If that is supposed to be a sound basis for an American foreign policy, then let me say that we are headed for a great disaster in this country. We are going to have to stop acting unilaterally. We must stop the growing threat of the subversion of other nations by Soviet Russia. There lies the threat, not in military aggression, but in subversion. I shall have something to say about that before I finish my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator agree with me that one of the reasons why the resolution before us may have seemed necessary in the eyes of the President and his advisers was that prior to the Middle Eastern crisis our Government had for all practical purposes renounced its power by declaring its noninvolvement, and therefore, after the crisis grew in dimension, into almost uncontrollable proportions, a month and a half or 2 months later it was deemed necessary to announce the fact that we were a great power and to reannounce that we had vital interests in the Middle Eastern area of the world as well as in other areas, and that both of these actions were really uncalled for and unwise. A great power does not renounce its power, and a great power does not agitate and irritate others by announcing its power. It has a way of utilizing its power for effective and constructive purposes without flexing its muscles or in-

dicating to the world that it is about to assert its strength.

This is not an original thesis with the junior Senator from Minnesota. Walter Lippmann, a great political scientist, in an article about a month ago, which I read in the meeting of the committees, cited the fact that there was a growing feeling in some areas of the world that our Government was tending toward pacifistic actions rather than asserting the kind of strong leadership which was required.

Does the Senator from Oregon agree with that?

Mr. MORSE. I think the analysis of the Senator is completely unanswerable on this point.

I agree with his analysis and with the observations of the Lippmann article which some of us discussed when the Senator presented it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator permit one other observation?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have in my hand an article entitled "Middle East Policy: II—The Reasons for Action," written by C. L. Sulzberger, and published in the New York Times of January 9, 1957. I read a sentence from the middle of the column, as follows:

American Middle Eastern policy has been so confused since World War II that one might almost call it nonexistent.

A little further in the article Mr. Sulzberger says:

One of Dulles' closest advisers observes privately: "The Secretary had absolutely no policy in the Middle East prior to the Suez invasion. His trouble is that although he is a brilliant acrobat—totally self-contained and flexible in the way he operates—he neither heeds the advice of others nor reads the telegrams from his ambassadors."

Would the Senator from Oregon say that the person who made the observation which I read was making an analysis of the Secretary which was fair and proper?

Mr. MORSE. I am afraid the observer is right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1957]

MIDDLE EAST POLICY: II—THE REASON FOR ACTION

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, January 8.—As enunciated, the new Eisenhower policy for the Middle East seems essentially a crash program. That is to say, it deals more with immediate outside threats to the area than with fundamental internal problems.

The effect the President seeks again to shore up the faltering Baghdad Pact—without joining it. He wants congressional authority to help frustrate if not intervene against demonstrably communistic coups d'etats. And he appears to desire advance permission to dispatch United States combat teams to the Levant if this is wished by any local government.

What is encouraging about these demands is their demonstration of Washington's awareness of the need to forestall chaos benefiting only Russia. What is lamentable is that it took so long to see the necessity for drastic action. But the region, unlike China, has not yet vanished down the drain.

American Middle Eastern policy has been so confused since World War II that one might almost call it nonexistent. Under both Democrats and Republicans it was compounded of moral preachments, wishful thinking, illusions, and delusions.

At various times we have supported Israel's birth and development, Egypt's revolution, creation of the Baghdad Pact and Saudi Arabia's case against Britain in Baraimi. Never has there been apparent awareness of the full consequences of our attitudes.

We backed and filled with Nasser on armaments aid, financed help for his high dam, and a Suez Canal users' association. These vacillations helped provoke our principal allies, Britain and France, to an act of folly for whose cataclysmic failure the West is now paying.

DULLES AND HIS DEPARTMENT

One of Dulles' closest advisers observes privately: "The Secretary had absolutely no policy in the Middle East prior to the Suez invasion. His trouble is that although he is a brilliant acrobat—totally self-contained and flexible in the way he operates—he neither heeds the advice of others nor reads the telegrams from his Ambassadors."

Not that the State Department has been receiving any outstanding shrewd counsel from its Middle Eastern envoys. Our diplomats have placed entirely too much reliance upon confidential expressions of friendship by Arab statesmen and entirely little upon their harsher public pronouncements.

Furthermore, the State Department is still organized in antediluvian fashion to deal with the pace of Levatine events. A single subdivision headed by one Assistant Secretary handles reports from the entire volcanic area of the Near East, south Asia, and Africa, everything from Kashmir to Syria, Egypt, Cyprus, Israel, Morocco, and the witch hunts of South Africa.

Each day the pigeonhole of this departmental aberration resembles Pandora's box. And during the period of greatest crisis, last summer and autumn, the man sitting just above the overwhelmed Assistant Secretary was Herbert Hoover, Jr., renowned for vigorous anti-British bias.

MAKING A START

The President has now taken charge of the mess. One must be thankful. There will be no easy solution, but at least a start is to be made. The first job is to warn Moscow out of the area and make plain that armed putsches, so traditional in the Middle East, will not be allowed as a Communist weapon against such friendly governments as those in Iran and Iraq.

Why is it particularly necessary to act now? There are two reasons. First of all, even the vestiges of influence remaining to Britain and France have been ejected from the area. A vacuum must be filled if Russian power is to be kept in check. Secondly, the Baghdad Pact is in the process of being outflanked from the south—through Syria and possibly Jordan and Egypt.

The Syrian situation is especially critical. If Damascus becomes an outright Soviet agent, new upsets and assassinations may sweep the Middle East. NATO's standing group recently compiled a secret study of Russian armaments shipments to Syria demonstrating that they exceed the country's military absorptive capacities.

Turkey reports Soviet specialists there and adds: "One cannot fail to arrive at the conclusion that present Soviet influence in Syria has attained a stage of advanced control. It would no longer be an exaggeration to state that Syria is no longer master of its acts."

Gen. Ali Abu Nuwar, a young man much impressed by Nasser and naive about Russia, is now the principal political force in Jordan. And Nasser hopes to resume aggressive dispositions around Israel, making up recent arms losses with weapons seized from British Suez stockpiles left under the treaty Cairo just denounced.

Clearly Eisenhower is right to dramatize the crisis. There is no point in recriminations on just how much responsibility for events we ourselves must bear. It is time for strong action to seal off the area. Only then can we resume our search for more permanent solution to some of its complex indigenous problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator recall my discussing with him a report from the United States Ambassador in Cairo, and my showing the Senator a report indicating a lack of coordination and consultation between the State Department and the Embassy?

Mr. MORSE. I recall that confidential report which the Senator showed me, and I make this suggestion to the Senator from Minnesota: The report contains exactly the type of information which I think the American people should know, because, as the Senator has heard me say before, I think American foreign policy belongs to the American people, not solely to the President of the United States. I think the American people ought to have the kind of information which is contained in that report, and I hope that in one of his early speeches the Senator will include a section dealing with the criticism of the Secretary of State and the administration of the State Department under him, which this informant in our embassy in Cairo submitted to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator read the articles in the press of yesterday and today relating to a Mr. Charles Edmundson, one of the United States Information Agency officials in Tokyo, who issued a prepared statement in which, first, he criticized the so-called Middle East resolution as being, to put it in the vernacular, the wrong medicine for the disease which afflicts the area; and second, in which he criticized the aid program in Korea, pointing out specifically that fertilizer which has been purchased by American dollars for Korean farmers was handed over to a Korean agency which in turn charged the Korean farmers 2½ times the price which the fertilizer cost, even though the fertilizer had been paid for out of United States taxpayers' funds?

Mr. MORSE. I read it; and I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall ask that that man be brought before the committee as a witness to testify, first, in connection with the Middle East Resolution; and then again, at a later time, when we come to a discussion of the foreign aid bill this year, because, in my opinion, he should be subjected to a very stringent cross-examination on the very

serious charges he has made. If he can offer the proof which supports these charges, then I think the course of action we take on both these matters ought to be greatly influenced by the contributions he can make to the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There has been considerable criticism of those of us in the Senate who have demonstrated a willingness and a determination to be somewhat critical of the foreign policy of the administration in the Middle East and other areas. We have been criticized particularly because we have dared even to voice deep concern and to ask questions concerning the proposed Middle East resolution.

I may say for myself that until the Secretary of State, or someone else in a responsible position, can answer the questions, not simply of HUBERT HUMPHREY, but of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and other Senators, questions as to which no definite answer was given—I exclude the questions asked by the junior Senator from Minnesota lest anyone think I was asking only to get answers to the questions which may have been in my mind—

Mr. MORSE. I will include them, because they were among the most penetrating questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To me, it is an amazing thing that if anyone appears who wishes to question the foreign policy of this country, particularly when that policy has ended in a catastrophe and a debacle, he, somehow or other, is suspect.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Minnesota raises any question about the Eisenhower doctrine in the Middle East, and if he has not already been charged, he had better be ready to meet the charge that he is pro-Russian.

Let me make it very clear that because I am so anti-Russian, because I am so fearful of the designs of Russia in the decades ahead, I want to see my country join with other free nations in a united program in the Middle East against Russia, and not a unilateral program which may very well result in the sacrificing of thousands of American boys in the Middle East, while other nations stand by and watch the contest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his brilliant dissertation and address of the other day. I had the opportunity to hear only short parts of it, but I read all of it in the RECORD and recommend its reading to others. It is an excellent lesson in constitutional law and in foreign policy.

I shall not interrupt the Senator further. I simply wish to compliment him upon his thought-provoking analysis of what I consider to be one of the most fundamental questions which have confronted Congress.

I want the record to be clear. I do not intend to be stymied by any official of the Government. I do not intend to have my motives questioned, because the motives which impel me are the motives of deep concern for the welfare of our country. I should say the burden of proof rests upon the Secretary of State and the President. Surely, the burden of proof rests at least upon the Secretary of State in his presentation as to whether or not the formula and the alleged policy which are now being considered will meet the crisis which everybody knows is evident.

Again I express what I have said quite publicly, namely, that I believe a number of persons have lost confidence in the policies of the Secretary and how they are administered, and in the policies of the administration and how the Secretary administers them.

I think that is being generous in my treatment, because it is surely no secret today, to anyone who wants to ascertain the facts, that the people and the press of Great Britain and France have become ever more anti-American in their criticism. Certainly there is no doubt, I should imagine, in the mind of anyone that certain Members of Congress have become exceedingly dubious concerning the validity of some of the policies which are being pursued by this administration.

I have made no bones about my opinion. I have lost confidence in the capacity and the ability of the Secretary of State to administer and conduct policies which will bring us out of this sad impasse. I think it is better to say so honestly than to hide behind any kind of subterfuge. I can still be respectful. I admire the Secretary of State for his capacities, but I suggest that he, too, can be in error, and that he, too, can make mistakes, as did Sir Anthony Eden. Both the Secretary of State and Sir Anthony may very well be victims of the tremendous tension and the dreadful toll of the cold war.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota about my dissertations of last Friday and today on this subject. I associate myself with his remarks in regard to the Secretary of State. In fact, I think I was one of the first in the Senate to suggest, many months ago, that he had outlived his usefulness as Secretary of State. I thought it was important to say so at the time, and I did.

I wish to join the Senator from Minnesota in his high commendation of the speech made today by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have already indicated my enthusiasm for the contents of that speech. Of course, I realize that because this afternoon I am registering certain dissents from certain parts of his joint resolution, there will be those who will try to play that up as a great rift between those of us on this side of the aisle. Mr. President, when any Democratic Senator rises to express a divergence from the point of view which other Democratic Senators have regarding the language which they think should be used in order to achieve a common goal, one would think a battle had broken out between us, and was about to create an irreconcilable conflict between and among the Democratic Senators. However, I speak good-naturedly about this.

My difference with the Senator from Montana is only in regard to certain sections of his joint resolution which I do not think will accomplish the very legitimate goals he has already announced he has in mind.

UNITED STATES OPPOSITION TO RED AGGRESSION ALREADY KNOWN

Mr. President, my next point is that not only has no proof been offered that Russia is contemplating any immediate military aggression in the Middle East, but I submit that not only Russia but every other nation in the world, either Communist or non-Communist, knows that the United States is not going to stand idly by while Russia overruns freedom with military aggression anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, part of the case of the administration is that it must get this blanket authority from the Congress now, so that the world will know, and particularly so that Russia will know, what the United States will do in case of military aggression by Russia. Mr. President, that is an insult to our intelligence and also to the intelligence of our allies. Every thinking person in the world knows what we will do. We do not intend—and we have demonstrated it clearly—to stand by and let freedom be overrun by military aggression by Russia or by any of her puppets or satellites.

FREE NATION UNITY NEEDED

So I wish to say that that argument of the administration is a typical diversionary tactic on its part. There is no need for notice to anyone regarding what we will do. We have demonstrated clearly what we will do. But I plead that we take time now to go into the matter together with other free nations, because in such unity is to be found the strength which I believe is needed in order to make perfectly clear to the Communist segment of the world that the free nations intend to stand together.

So, Mr. President, this afternoon I ask, What does the administration know about the views of Secretary General Hammarskjold in regard to this proposal for unilateral action by the United States? What diplomatic conversations or negotiations, if any, have occurred between our ambassadors at the United Nations or our Secretary of State and the Secretary General of the United Nations? Was there given to the Secretary General of the United Nations or to our allies in the United Nations any indication that we were about to propose this unilateral action? Mr. President, I submit that good-faith dealing with our allies in the world called upon us to enter into such conversations. How many times have I heard criticism by the press of the United States and by my colleagues in the Senate, and even some plaintive complaints by representatives of the State Department, that Britain and France and Israel followed their course of action in the Middle East without ever letting us know in advance what they proposed to do. True, it can be said that we have not yet moved into the Middle East. That is true, Mr. President, but we announced to the world what the President's desire was. I wish to know what conversations, if any, on the diplomatic level we have had with our allies about this matter.

Or are we going to take the attitude that our friends in the United Nations, and the United Nations itself, can find out in their own turn what we propose to do, after we announce to the world what we propose to do?

Mr. President, I think we weaken the United Nations when we make unilateral proposals, such as this one, without at least extending the courtesy of trying to get some understanding and, I hope, some agreement among our allies in the United Nations before we take such proposed action. Mr. President, I think the American people need to have impressed upon them the fact that this proposal is one for unilateral action. I think they need to have impressed upon them the fact that there is no pledge from any other nation—other than, of course, the assumption that a nation in the Middle East which might ask us to come in, could be counted upon to be of some assistance—but no pledge whatever from any nation outside the Middle East that it will stand with us in this proposed action.

That leads me to comment upon an incident which occurred over the weekend, in connection with my examination of the Secretary of State. Last week I made the suggestion—which I wish to stress in my remarks today—that we should seek to get the support of France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and the other countries of Western Europe whose economies are so dependent upon the supply lines bringing Arabian oil into their countries. It was then that the Secretary of State made his most unfortunate remark to the effect that, under the circumstances, if he were an American boy in the Middle East, he would not want to have a British soldier or a French soldier on either his right or his left.

Mr. President, I am a lawyer. The Secretary of State was making his case, and I was laying the foundation for mine. When a witness testifies, I believe his testimony should be permitted to stand. But the foreign correspondents caught the significance of that remark by the Secretary of State, as did I. All of us know the unfavorable reaction abroad to that remark—as was perfectly justified. Yet I was interested in how quickly the reactionary press of this country came to the assistance of the State Department in an alibi that they issued when the foreign reaction became manifest; namely, a statement to the effect that the Secretary of State was speaking in jocular terms. Mr. President, I thought there was such a clear duty on the part of the American press to live up to what I consider to be its greatest ethical obligation; namely, the obligation to print the truth, knowing that only by the presentation of the truth can the American people remain free, that I issued a press release in which I commented upon the failure of several newspapers which I think were typical in this instance, to make clear to the American readers that there was nothing jocular or humorous about the answer the Secretary of State gave to my question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the press release which I issued on Sunday, in which I commented upon the failure of the press, in my judgment, to tell the American people the truth about that incident.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just read in the New York Times and Washington Post typical statements of these newspapers trying to cover up the incompetency of the Eisenhower administration.

In this instance they try to cover up for Secretary of State Dulles' critical comments about my suggestion that British and French troops as well as American troops be pledged for defense of Arab oil.

I was doing the examining of Mr. Dulles at the time when he testified that if he were an American soldier in the Middle East he would not want a British or French soldier on his right of left because of the attitude in the Middle East of the Arab countries toward the French and British.

The attempt of the State Department to explain away Mr. Dulles' remark as a humorous remark or, as the New York Times puts it, a remark made "in jocular terms," is an unadulterated lie. Dulles spoke in complete seriousness.

The foreign correspondents were completely right in their reaction to the Dulles statement. It is too bad that such newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post now attempt to misrepresent Dulles' statement as being a jocular one when it clearly was not. However, more and more people in our country are beginning to recognize that we are moving away from a free and honest press in America.

EFFECTS OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is an assumption—which I fear is a false one—on the part of the administration that the granting of the blank-check authority requested by the President in the joint resolution will cause Russia to fold up, insofar as any continuation of an arms race in the Middle East is concerned, from the standpoint of offering to sell arms to the Arab countries. I am waiting for some logical explanation from the Secretary of State or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which would cause a reasonable man to reach that remarkable conclusion. It seems to me that sometimes we do everything we can not to put ourselves in the position of the Russians.

I recognize the great difference between the oriental frame of mind and the occidental frame of mind; but, Mr. President, put yourself in the position of the Russians for a moment. The United States announces this unilateral policy in the Middle East. Do you think, Mr. President, that is going to cause you, as a Russian, to follow a course of action that will reduce your military preparedness, or do you think that is going to cause you to attempt, by subversive tactics, propaganda tactics, and divisive tactics that are so characteristic of Russian methods, to buy off some Arab leaders, if you can, and try to create more turmoil and more unrest in the Middle East?

PRESIDENT RESPONSIBLE FOR RESOLUTION

I make this point, Mr. President, because what I fear is the Eisenhower resolution; and I do not happen to be one in the Senate who is putting the responsibility for it on the Secretary of State. I put it where it belongs, right on the shoulders of the President of the United States. He is the one responsible for it, and he should be held to that responsibility.

I submit that this proposal of the President raises the great danger of speeding up the arms race in the Middle East and increasing the danger of military struggle in the Middle East, rather than decreasing it. It can put us in a position where Russia will see us as alone, in the Middle East, and will try to get the people of some countries—such as France and Italy, and, yes, in Britain, too—where she is busily at work with her termite activities of trying to subvert large segments of their population, take the position, in case of trouble breaking out in the Middle East, "We will let the United States and Russia go it alone for a while."

As I said in committee recently, do not forget there are still some old wounds in public opinion in France and Great Britain, going back a great many years, based upon some resentment that we stood by too long while they bled, both in the case of World War I and World War II.

DANGER OF UNILATERAL ACTION IN MIDEAST

Mr. President, I think it is a dangerous thing to commit ourselves to unilateral military action in the Middle East, with no pledges at the same time from our allies, when we all know, and it cannot be successfully disputed, that the primary underlying purpose of the resolution is the protection of the oil lines of the Arab States to Western Europe.

PARTICIPATION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES SHOULD BE ASSURED

Of course, we have an economic interest in that. I developed that point at length last Friday, and shall not develop it again in this speech, but shall only mention it by reference. Let us not forget that, under the resolution, the proposal of the President of the United States is to send American boys to die, if necessary, in the Middle East, to protect Arab oil for Western Europe, in case Russia attacks a Middle East country. Well, I am not at all moved by the Secretary of State's announcement that we cannot negotiate a pledge from Great Britain and France, for instance—although I think every other country of Western Europe should be included in the pledge—because the Arab countries do not like them. Let me say to the American mothers and fathers of boys of military age in our country today that I do not intend to vote to send boys to the Middle East, at the call of the President of the United States, to protect Arab oil, without pledges from our European allies. Nor do I intend to vote for a resolution that, in effect, puts us at the dictate of Arab dictators, who, by the way, are among the most totalitarian in the world, and as unreliable as any dictator.

MANSFIELD RESOLUTION DOES NOT SCRATCH SURFACE OF PROBLEM

The Mansfield resolution does not even scratch that problem. Oh, in the whereas clause it says, "Whereas, the welfare

of the United States and other nations is related to the prevention of further hostilities." I agree it is related. It is so related, I will say to the Senator from Montana, that he ought to be asking in his resolution for a pledge from those other nations that have such a vital interest in the Middle East.

PLEDGES FROM EUROPEAN ALLIES NEEDED BEFORE RESOLUTION

We can have all the language that is proposed in the Mansfield resolution, such as section 2, or section 3, about a special commission on arms traffic, or section 4, a recommendation for an economic program specific in nature; but all that is after the fact. Let me pound that thought home, Mr. President. I do not, as a lawyer, propose to support a resolution that gets all the commitments from Congress and the United States first, and then has nice, high-sounding language that deals with proposals after the fact. The time to cover those points is before the resolution is passed. Get the commitments and the pledges then. Now is the time to have our allies face with us, and to have the Arab States face with us, the political issues in the Middle East that are causing the worst threat to peace, and giving the Soviets such a fertile field for the planting of the seeds of subversion and division. That problem is not touched in the Mansfield resolution. No, Mr. President; let us get these commitments before the fact, not after the fact.

ROLE OF ARAB COUNTRIES

I ask the question, if we do not commit ourselves to unilateral action in the Middle East, does it mean that the Arab countries will try to play us against Russia and threaten to go over to Russia? Is that the play, Mr. President? If it is, call it what it is—international blackmail, so typical of the diplomacy of dictators. Well, I am not going to vote for a resolution that has in it any kind of international blackmail.

Why all the scarecrow argument about the danger of Russia getting control of the oil wells of the Arab States? I do not know why I have been voting billions and billions of dollars over the past 12 years for the United States Air Force if we have gotten ourselves into a position in which Russia could get control over those oil fields. I should like to think—and I have reason to believe it is true—that if we were to get into a war with Russia tomorrow, those oil fields would be out of commission in a matter of hours.

FEAR ARGUMENTS USED FOR RESOLUTION

When we are up against an administration which is using the technique of the scarecrow argument and the appeal to fear, knowing that there is a tendency for public opinion to panic when fear overtakes it, it is difficult to persuade people to pause long enough to face a military reality such as I have just announced. Could Russia get control of the Arab oil fields? Let the Arab countries face the fact that if Russia follows a course of action which results in a third world war, an atomic war, no one will get those oil fields. So I will not be scared into hasty action on this resolution by the fear argument of the Secretary of State, that we must not let the Russians get the oil.

UNDERLYING MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS NEED ATTENTION

What we must do is come to grips quickly with the causes of turmoil in the Middle East. That is why I pleaded last Friday that we exercise the leadership to cause the United Nations to face up quickly to the three great issues in the Middle East which are really endanbenefit from the resolution to submit the world and giving Russia such an opportunity as she now has to divide, hoping that on the basis of the strategy of divide, she can rule.

The first issue is that of the Suez Canal. I believe that any action we take on any resolution passed by the Congress of the United States should be based upon a previous commitment on the part of the nations which are to benefit from the resolution to submit the Suez Canal issue to the arbitration, mediation, and judicial processes of the United Nations.

Second, there is the Arab refugee problem, no longer a problem of Israel and the Arab states alone. In my judgment it involves a moral obligation on the part of all the nations concerned. Before we pass any resolution we should obtain a commitment on the part of the three principal nations concerned to submit the Arab refugee problem to the mediation, arbitration, and judicial processes of the United Nations for determination; and a commitment also from the other nations—Great Britain, France, Italy, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, and the others—that they will come in and assume their fair share of economic responsibility, which I think must be assumed if there is to be a fair resettlement of the Arab refugees, numbering well over 1 million.

The third issue involves the territorial integrity of Israel. I refer to it briefly only because I developed it at such length last Friday. These points must be stated and restated, time and time again in this debate, because I well know what a minority I now represent. Arguments on the other side will be presented in this debate by many Members of the Senate. Only a small handful of us, as of now, are willing to stand up and lead with our chins, so to speak, and forewarn the American people of the great dangers which confront us in connection with this resolution.

So, at the risk of all the criticism which goes along with repetition, I intend to restate these points from time to time, because the American people must have their memories refreshed about these questions.

FUTURE OF ISRAEL

Let us not forget that the State of Israel is a child of the United Nations. Let us not forget that we are a party to bringing into existence the only free nation—in our sense of freedom—that exists in the Middle East today, surrounded, for the most part, by medieval feudalism, which, under the terms of this resolution, we go to aid and assist, even with American blood, if necessary, to protect oil lines to Western Europe.

What a chapter will be written in American history 50 years from now. In my judgment it will not be one which will be very pleasant reading for American boys and girls of that generation.

What has happened to us that we are willing to go so far away from what I have always considered to be great constitutional checks and guaranties to a free people? We have responsibilities in connection with Israel. We can pass all the resolutions we wish, condemning this little bridgehead of freedom in the Middle East for her response to provocation after provocation and attack after attack upon her territorial integrity.

I do not condone her transgressions of international law, but I can understand her response to provocation. Now what are we saying to her? We are saying, through our delegation in the United Nations, "Just bare your chest again. Lay down your arms again, and go back, and we will try to do something about it."

If I were an Israeli, I think I, too, would be just a wee bit skeptical of all the high-sounding pronouncements by American spokesmen who have been so inadequate in delivering.

ISRAEL-ARAB BUFFER ZONE INDISPENSABLE

We have not protected Israel. There are powerful reactionary forces in this country which do not wish to do so. So, Mr. President, before I vote for any resolution which seeks to give the President any authority in connection with the Middle East, I shall insist that there be included in such resolution an amendment that the parties to the Israeli-Arab dispute will accept a minimum of a buffer zone between the conflicting parties, manned by an adequate United Nations police force to maintain peace in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab States. I think it is essential to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

The Mansfield resolution does not scratch the surface of that issue either. It has some fine-sounding language in it about what it is proposed to do after the fact. But Israel has had enough experience with after-the-fact action by the United States and the United Nations. She would like to see a little delivering before the fact.

MANSFIELD RESOLUTION DOES NOT DEAL WITH CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

Lastly, I wish to touch briefly upon the constitutional question involved, because here, again, the Mansfield resolution does not even come near the issue, although the distinguished Senator from Montana states that he sought to raise some constitutional problems. He certainly did.

Let us go to the bottom of page 1 of his resolution, in section 1:

That the United States regard as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the nations in the Middle East.

We all agree.

To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international com-

munism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

By no stretch of the imagination can we construe that language as raising the constitutional question involved. We must come to grips with it. I am one Senator who will never vote for any resolution which gives to the President of the United States blank-check authority to send American troops into any part of the world without being required to submit the sending of those troops to Congress for ratification. Under the Constitution, that is a clear requirement.

At least, Mr. President, we reach this common ground of agreement, that under the Constitution on article I, section 8, Congress solely has the power to declare war, and that power cannot be delegated. The Secretary of State admitted it under my cross-examination the other day. That is some progress, I believe. We have had a little difficulty in the recent past even getting that much of a commitment out of the State Department. The Secretary of State said, however, that he did not consider the resolution as a predated declaration of war, but, rather, merely—and I paraphrase him—a statement of assurance on the part of Congress that it would back up the President if he decided in his opinion it was necessary to send troops into the Middle East. I happen to believe that constitutionally that cannot be done.

As one who has some familiarity with this question—and of course I may be quite wrong about it—I do not intend, just because I walk into the Senate, to walk out on what constitutional law I have learned. I have studied, as well as my limited mental ability gave me the power to study, the long history of American Presidential action in sending troops into various incidents where the President thought vital American interests were at stake. There is no question in my mind that under the Constitution of the United States the President has the inherent power to do just that. He not only has the inherent power to do it, but he has the clear duty to do it, if, on the basis of the facts in any given case, it is his judgment that that is the only way in which he can protect vital American interests. It is not an absolute power. It is not a power that is not subject to review. It is a power which, in my judgment, is subject to constitutional checks.

Mr. President, I hold to the point of view that Congress cannot delegate its power to check, but must exercise that power, or reserve the power to exercise it, on the basis of the facts in each incident as it arises.

Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to discuss this matter as I did with the Secretary of State, by way of a hypothetical situation. Let us assume that a situation develops in the Middle East, with or without the passage of a joint resolution—because there is no need for a resolution in order to exercise this power—in which the President decides that vital American interests can only be protected by sending troops into the Middle East.

POWER AND DUTY OF CONGRESS

Is that power absolute? Is it uncheckable? As I said to the Secretary of State, is the only resourse of Congress to impeach the President if Congress thinks he has committed an error? I think not. I believe we can not escape the constitutional doctrine that under such circumstances the President is under a duty to report forthwith to Congress his exercise of an inherent power, for approval or disapproval by Congress.

If the President should not so report, then I believe it is the duty of Congress to act accordingly and itself review the propriety of his course of action.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the Korean incident. I believe that some of my colleagues in the Senate should refresh their memory on the record of the Korean incident. It is true, as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] pointed out today, President Truman sent troops into Korea. It is also true that the very next day on the floor of the Senate there was discussion of that course of action. The great leader of the Republican Party, Bob Taft, stood on the floor of the Senate and discussed it at some length, as the RECORD will show.

I do not understand how anyone can escape the conclusion that after the debate that occurred over the President's action there was tacit approval in the Senate of what the President had done. No resolution was passed. I recall that very distinctly. I also recall very distinctly the position I took. I said we had the authority to approve or disapprove.

I said that was no police action, but a war. I said when American soldiers walk onto a battlefield and die under the flag that stands behind the Presiding Officer's desk, we are at war.

I believe we made a mistake then. I am the first to admit it. I believe we should have offered a resolution. I believe there should have been some formal action taken by Congress. However, because I participated in the commission of one mistake, I do not intend to use that fact as a precedent for a second mistake.

I felt at the time, and I believe I was mistaken about it, that we had made a sufficient record in protecting this constitutional principle. In retrospect I believe we did not. However, in this instance I want to see in the resolution, and I will not vote for it unless it is in there, a definite requirement that if the President orders troops into the Middle East he shall forthwith notify Congress, for our approval or disapproval of his action.

I do not accept the argument, Mr. President, that we have a check with the pursestrings. In my judgment, that is not the check our constitutional fathers had in mind for protecting our people from the absolutism of a monarchy. Let us not forget that the Constitution was written and ratified by Founding Fathers who were very fearful of absolutism in Government. That is why this glorious system of checks was written into the Constitution.

That is why this check was reposed in the Congress of the United States and not in the President of the United States. And the Mansfield resolution does not touch it, Mr. President, with any effectiveness whatsoever. To the contrary, in my judgment, it gives the President, so far as this point is concerned, the same unlimited power the President asks for in his own resolution.

So, for those reasons, Mr. President, I can no more support the Mansfield resolution than I can support the Eisenhower resolution.

I plead with the American people that they wake up, before it is too late, to what is happening to them. I plead for a quick enlightening of the American people, because I am satisfied that if the people of this country saw the dangers as I have undertaken to outline them here today, they would make perfectly clear their overwhelming disapproval of the resolution.

Oh, Mr. President, I suppose it can be said that my mail is not representative. I suppose it can be said that because I opposed the Formosa resolution it is to be expected that I should hear predominantly from critics of this kind of grant of power. Yet, Mr. President, my mail is interesting. It is coming to me from every corner of this country. It is coming to me from men and women in every walk of life, and it is so overwhelmingly opposed to the Eisenhower doctrine that I would tell the President this afternoon, "I believe you are completely out of step with the will of the American people already formed." And they have not begun, Mr. President, to get all the facts about the dangers of the Eisenhower doctrine.

I say to the American people, "You had better see to it that you are heard very quickly, because I have gone through these debates before. I have sat on a joint committee and heard colleagues raise objection after objection and make devastating criticism after criticism."

But I have said to myself, Mr. President, "Well, there is considerable support for this one." But after they had spoken themselves out most of them fell into line under the crack of one whip or another and cast a vote that students analyzing the record could not possibly begin to explain in light of the arguments that the very same Senators had made earlier.

I hope to be wrong this time, but I am not greatly moved by criticism of the Eisenhower resolution. I still ask myself the question, "Well, Brother, I wonder how you are going to vote."

THE PEOPLE HOLD THE ANSWER

I think the answer to that will be found not in what my colleagues say, but what the American people say to them in the days immediately ahead.

So, Mr. President, I close with a plea from this desk to the American people that the time has come for them to act upon their representatives in the Congress of the United States and make it clear to them that the people want them to support this precious system of constitutional checks that cannot be reconciled with giving to any President, Republican or Democrat, at any time, the kind of unchecked blanket power that

Mr. Eisenhower is asking for in his resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

WHY PARTNERSHIP IS NOT THE ANSWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a speech which I had intended either to read or to quote from at length on the subject of Why Partnership Is Not the Answer, which was delivered by me before the East Side Business Men's Club of Portland, Oreg., on October 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY PARTNERSHIP IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Speech by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, East Side Business Men's Club, Portland, Oreg., October 30, 1956)

Since this administration took office it has attempted to freeze Federal power development. That freeze is as bad for Oregon as the fall rain and winter snow are for the lumber industry, the most important industry of Oregon.

The people of Oregon know the facts of our economic life. Every year Oregon's economy goes into virtual hibernation when the rains come. They are here again and logging is shutting down for the winter. We have already suffered from a slump in lumber sales and prices because of the Republican administration's high interest, tight money policy which has caused a national slowdown in home building.

Now we are faced with another winter of relative inactivity. Lumber mills have been on a 4- and 3-day week. The winter slowdown, which is as inevitable as the weather, means 5 to 6 months of marking time economically. Jobs become scarce, payrolls get slim, purchasing power shrinks, work is short, take-home pay is slim; every merchant in the State knows what this means—sales are slow.

Experience shows that we need year-around industry to break out of our seasonal economy. We know that with high transportation costs our principal means of attracting that industry lies in adequate supplies of low-cost power. The potentialities of our rivers are our hope for the future.

Starting with Bonneville Dam and then Grand Coulee, we have seen that industry does come to our region with low-cost power. Under the Federal program initiated by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and carried forward with bipartisan support by men like Charles McNary and Senators Dill and Bone, Democrats, of Washington, we were making great progress in building the Federal multipurpose dams that give us the low-cost power we need. Since my election to the Senate I have supported that program—which also gave us McNary and Chief Joseph Dams. It was my privilege to persuade President Truman to start construction of the Dalles Dam when its postponement had already been decided. That decision was reversed at my insistence in 1951 and construction of the Dalles began in 1952.

We know what that means. The Harvey Aluminum Co. is building a plant at the Dalles, which means a major new year-around payroll for Oregon at the plant and additional jobs and profits for providing the needs of the plant and its workers. We shall attract more such private-enterprise payrolls only with continued progress in providing low-cost power.

The Eisenhower-McKay freeze on Federal development attempted to stop new Federal starts. They had to carry forward with construction of the three major dams started by the previous Democratic administration—McNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles. But these were to be the last under the Eisenhower-McKay partnership program. This is not a political charge. This is the proven record of 4 years in which the administration proposed not one single new start on a Federal multipurpose dam and fought funds for any new start.

PARTNERSHIP MEANS BREAKING UP REGIONAL POWER PLAN

Let us see what partnership means. My opponent has claimed that partnership means virtually no difference in operation and costs of any new dam.

The press which supports him hails Priest Rapids as a magnificent example of partnership. I opposed the Priest Rapids so-called partnership bill because of my belief that it would be bad for Oregon and the region.

It means breaking up comprehensive coordinated development upon which depends achieving maximum development at the lowest cost. Priest Rapids will not be operated as a regional asset as it would as a Federal project as originally planned. It will instead mean that this dam will be operated first to serve its immediate area with surplus power moving outside the Grant County PUD only after the local need is met. As a Federal project it would be operated as an integral part of a regional system providing power on a regional basis where it is most needed on a postage-stamp basis.

As I predicted in 1954, a major share of the power is going to private utilities. Only when agreements were reached with private utilities was it possible to arrange financing. That is what I predicted in 1954.

PARTNERSHIP MEANS HIGHER COST POWER

Let us look at the financing. It means high-cost power. It means that the dam will have to be paid for three times.

Here are the facts based upon the bond prospectus for Priest Rapids.

The cash cost of the dam itself is $125 million. Before any work could be done, before a nickel of financing was forthcoming, Grant County PUD had to borrow $166 million.

The first $17 million went to the bankers floating the bond issue and other financing costs. So, the PUD actually started with $159 million—but has to pay back $166 million. Under Federal financing these costs would be saved.

Here is the breakdown of those costs:

Direct construction costs, including engineering and approximately 15 percent reserve for contingencies	$124,900,000
Working capital	3,000,000
Deposit to reserve account in bond fund	6,432,500
Bond discount and other financing expenses	7,074,962
Interest on bonds during construction (1,900 days)	33,484,379
Less: Estimated interest earned during construction	8,891,841
Net interest during construction	24,592,538
Total	166,000,000

But the $7 million excess cost is the start of it.

The bankers insisted that the PUD borrow all of the moneys required before anything further was done. Under Federal financing money would be set aside—borrowed if you will—only as needed. This means that interest must be paid for a far longer period under partnership than under Federal financing.

Anyone who buys a house knows that interest charges and how long you must pay them are the major cost in home buying. The same thing is true of dam building. Under Priest Rapids partnership, the PUD has to pay interest on the whole loan for 5½ years, instead of borrowing each year what it needs for construction that year. But the Federal Government would borrow as it builds and save the enormous difference in interest payments.

In addition, the Priest Rapids loan was made at 3⅞ percent interest as compared with a Federal rate of 2½ percent. After reinvesting its idle loan during construction, the net cost of interest during construction only is $24,592,538—almost one-sixth of the loan.

These two items during construction only mean that Priest Rapids will cost $15 million more than under Federal financing. The other additional charges listed above would not be necessary under Federal financing—which explains where the addition $41 million over the cash cost of the dam is going.

That is not the end. The higher cost of interest during the 40-year repayment period means 55 percent more in interest payments (3⅞ percent minus 2½ percent equals 1⅜ multiplied by 40 equals 55 percent).

That means that the extra cost of partnership at Priest Rapids is $31.6 million during construction plus 55 percent in interest charges during the 40-year repayment period.

If you apply these figures to the estimated $280 million capital investment in John Day power facilities, partnership at John Day would increase power cost by 67 percent (more if repayment is over 50 years).

Taking into account that John Day construction costs would be repaid in 50 years, instead of 40 years, partnership financing at John Day would cost between $275 to $290 million more than Federal financing.

Who makes that extra money? The financial institutions and bondholders. Who pays that extra money? The power consumers.

HIGH-COST POWER WILL NOT ATTRACT INDUSTRY

Let us remember that it is low-cost power we need in order to attract industry. Our region suffers from high transportation costs, a relative scarcity of minerals—as we have seen at Al Sarena—and the other factors that attract industry.

Our principal hope for industry is to offer low-cost power that pays for itself.

We are not looking for another Pittsburgh or Detroit. But we do need new plants to offset our seasonal economy—from which employers, working people, retailers, farmers, commercial interests all now suffer.

HIGH-COST PRIVATE POWER AT HELLS CANYON

This then is the power cost picture at Priest Rapids and John Day—an increase of 67 percent. Bad as that is, it is worse at Hells Canyon under the McKay program.

The Federal Power Commission examiner found that the Federal high dam would produce power for 2.65 mills a kilowatt-hour. In sad contrast the Idaho Power Co. smaller dams would cost 6.7 mills—more than 2½ times as much. That is why the Federal Power Commission examiner recommended that all three company dams not be authorized. Power at that high rate could not be disposed of in large amounts.

My opponent in testimony on Hells Canyon Dam admitted that when he withdrew the Interior Department's opposition to the company license applications he had not computed the differences in power costs. That is highly significant. For the cost of power is a crucial factor. By eliminating the factor of power cost my opponent walked out on the best interests not only of Oregon, but of the Nation as well. If his action remains unreversed, we will lose full development of the best remaining dam site in the

country and we will lose low-cost power development and the economic expansion which it would spark.

This action by my opponent was either extremely callous or extremely negligent. A man who had been governor of Oregon should have known better. Whether he acted from ignorance or from irresponsibility, the results are equally bad for Oregon.

PARTNERSHIP CLAIMS

In the clamor of campaign propaganda my opposition has made some pretty tall claims. I wonder if the people of Oregon noticed how those claims were shifted with just 5 days.

On October 22 in a full-page ad in the Oregonian it was claimed that so-called partnership during the past 4 years "started" 4,600,000 kilowatts. What they were we can only guess—the evidence was not put forward.

But in a smaller ad in the Journal on October 27 the claim was changed to "The 4 Eisenhower partnership years have seen the start of authorization of 4,600,000 kilowatts in non-Federal projects in the Northwest."

That's quite a difference—where are all of these kilowatts? What projects are involved? What does "the start of authorization" mean? I suggest that it means very little.

If it includes the three Idaho Power Co dams in the Hells Canyon region I suggest that the private utilities and McKay do not count their chickens. The company has said it will not proceed with further construction until the Supreme Court decides the case. The next Congress can still save the site for full development with the high dam. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress would do that job.

The Federal Power Commission and company have already indicated that the third dam will probably never be built in any case.

So what has partnership to boast about—underdevelopment at Hells Canyon with power costs 2½ times that of a high Federal dam and less flood control? Priest Rapids partnership with 67 percent higher costs for power?

Let the people of Oregon see the list to back this phony claim which was changed in only 5 days.

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS ACHIEVED NEW STARTS

Despite the Republican administration and McKay no-new-start policy, the Democratic Congress achieved great successes.

The 83d Republican Congress defeated the first funds for John Day Dam voted by the Senate after I proposed them.

In 1955 the administration saw that it could not hold back completely. So it asked inadequate funds. The Senate increased these by 20 percent and the final bill had a 10 percent increase. In 1956, the Democratic Congress almost tripled John Day funds. It is a Federal multipurpose project—authorized in 1950 by a Democratic Congress. With the right kind of administration and Congress construction can be begun next year.

The Democratic Congress got Ice Harbor Dam construction under way in 1955 and increased the administration's too little too late fund request this year.

In 1955, the Democratic Senate, at my request, provided the first construction funds for Cougar and Hills Creek Dams and the first planning funds for Green Peter Dam—all of these funds were not requested by the administration.

Again this year, appropriations for these multipurpose projects were increased by the Democratic Congress.

We have been held back by the Eisenhower-McKay policies. A Democratic victory in Oregon and Washington will show what the people want—resumption of the comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development.

The private utilities have prospered under this program. More than half the power they sell—at a profit—is federally generated. They have power sites to develop that do not damage these comprehensive multipurpose plans and ocnservation interests—at Eden Ridge and the upper Snake, for example. Let them do so. I'll help them do so.

But let them and their political allies like McKay stop their attempted raids upon the public's multipurpose sites.

These are the facts of life on power. Shall we continue to hibernate each winter? That may be good for bears—it is not good for the people of Oregon.

We can grow economically to the benefit of all groups. Let us go forward with the Federal multipurpose dam program that has already done so much for Oregon.

Let us build High Hells Canyon, John Day, the lower Snake Dams—develop power facilities at Hanford. These are our hopes for the future. Let us exercise our human intelligence, let us not retreat into the caves for each winter's idle and costly sleep.

Let us use God-given resources of flowing water for a better Oregon and a fuller life for the people of Oregon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Hay Whitney, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

John M. Allison, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Joseph A. Jenkins, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1956.

JUVENILE COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be Judge of the Juvenile Court for the District of Columbia for a term of 6 years, vice Edith H. Cockrill, term expired.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

John R. Plaggmier, effective January 28, 1957.
Leonard S. Baker.
Eugene W. Richards.

To be lieutenants

Kenneth A. MacDonald.
Edwin K. McCaffrey.
Clifford W. Tupper.
Richard H. Houlder.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Kelly E. Taggart, effective February 1, 1957.
Robert J. Black.
Albert J. Hamlett, Jr.
Oscar L. Doster.
Lavon L. Posey.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated:

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, to Egypt.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, to Japan.

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION FOR EVALUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration for Evaluation in the Department of State.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms as indicated:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, for 3 years expiring January 27, 1959.

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona, for 3 years expiring January 27, 1959.

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, for 3 years expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified. (Reappointment.)

BRUSSELS UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1958

Howard S. Cullman, of New York, to be United States Commissioner General.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1, and to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
James Frederick Green, of Maryland.
Paul T. Meyer, of New Jersey.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Louis Mason Drury, of Maryland.
Roy L. Wade, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Willis C. Armstrong, of Maine.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry C. Boudreau, of Maine.
Harvey A. Buffalo, of Arkansas.
Joseph Carwell, of New York.
Roger Dow, of Virginia.
John T. Fishburn, of Maryland.
Richard Friedman, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph Godson, of New York.

Herbert N. Higgins, of Texas.
Mrs. Margaret H. Potter, of the District of Columbia.
Gordon B. Strong, of Virginia.
George A. Tesoro, of Maryland.
Kenneth J. Yearns, of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Charles Bridgett, of Connecticut.
Aaron R. Coleman, of Washington.
Dennis A. Collins, of Ohio.
Frank D. Collins, of Kansas.
Walter J. Marx, of Maryland.
Christopher A. Norred, Jr., of Maryland.
Edwy L. Reeves, of Virginia.
Herbert Reiner, Jr., of Vermont.
Morris Rothenberg, of Maryland.
Joseph S. Sagona, of Maryland.
Simon N. Wilson, of Maryland.
Hugh W. Wolff, of Maryland.
Carroll H. Woods, of Massachusetts.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Miss Hilda M. Anderson, of New York.
Norman J. Bentley, of California.
William F. Courtney, of Michigan.
Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.
Virgil M. Elliott, of Florida.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.
Miss Elizabeth G. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Natalie Grant, of California.
Mrs. Helen A. Gray, of Massachusetts.
Richard V. Hennes, of Illinois.
Benjamin F. Houck, of Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth N. Landeau, of New York.
Allen H. Lester, of Massachusetts.
Bernard W. Lewis, of Utah.
Donald A. Lewis, of New York.
Herman Lindstrom, of Florida.
Miss Mary E. Lyddane, of Maryland.
Samuel A. McIlhenny, Jr., of Texas.
Miss Roberta McKay, of Michigan.
Basil F. Macgowan, of Tennessee.
Mrs. Andrée P. Maddox, of the District of Columbia.
Robert H. Marsh, of California.
George E. Palmer, of California.
George E. Ranslow, of California.
Irvin C. Scarbeck, of California.
Max L. Shimp, of Ohio.
Robert Gill Walker, of Maryland.
Mrs. C. Carey White, of Arizona.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 6, and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:
Edgar F. Garwood, Jr., of Florida.
Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Miss Jane S. Abell, of New Hampshire.
Miss Leona M. Anderson, of Iowa.
Miss Ruth S. Anderson, of Connecticut.
Melvin J. Anthony, of Illinois.
Robert S. Ashford, of Virginia.
Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
Miss Helen M. Bailey, of Virginia.
Miss Eleanor Bello, of New York.
Jack Beni, of West Virginia.
Philip B. Bergfield, of California.
Dale K. Betts, of California.
Miss Helen Biggane, of California.
Miss Helen M. Bonnell, of Michigan.
Norman L. Cansler, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph D. Capri, of California.
John S. Connolly, Jr., of Virginia.
John J. Degan, Jr., of New York.
Gilda R. Duly, of New York.
Henry E. Dumas, of California.
Paul S. Dwyer, of Ohio.
Miss Imogene E. Ellis, of Washington.
Miss Marybel Eversole, of Illinois.
Robert E. Ferris, of Oregon.
Gordon R. Firth, of New York.
Miss Edele P. Hauber, of Minnesota.
Mrs. Hallye A. Heiland, of California.
Frederick A. Hill, of California.
Paul J. Hoylon, of Maryland.
George O. Huey, of Illinois.
Mrs. Ellen C. Johnson, of Missouri.
Miss Bernice T. Jones, of California.
Thomas A. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Katherine Lee Kemp, of Maryland.
Miss Madeline R. Kernen, of Colorado.
Miss Alice E. Kinnars, of Illinois.
Miss Inez E. Larson, of Minnesota.
David E. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
Eric G. Lindahl, of Michigan.
Miss Ingeborg M. Lueders, of Virginia.
Miss Helen K. Lyons, of California.
Francis P. McCormick, of Massachusetts.
Miss Clorene A. Miller, of Texas.
Robert H. Miller, of Washington.
Miss Marion K. Mitchell, of New York.
Kiyonao Okami, of Maryland.
Miss Nancy Ostrander, of Indiana.
Miss Eleanor R. Paulson, of Washington.
Miss Marjorie L. Pea, of Indiana.
Ernest O. Pederson, of New Hampshire.
George W. Phillips, of Florida.
Miss Brynhild C. Rowberg, of Virginia.
James T. Rush, of Rhode Island.
Goodwin Shapiro, of Maryland.
Miss Jean V. Smith, of Minnesota.
Edward D. Sokol, of New Hampshire.
Miss Cecil Sporn, of New York.
Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.
Mrs. Edith A. Stensby, of Tennessee.
George H. Strunz, of Arizona.
Raymond J. Swanson, of California.
Miss Theresa M. Takacs, of New York.
Miss Tomena Jo Thoreson, of North Dakota.
Carl I. von Hellens, of Washington.
Mrs. Marjory M. Wallis, of California.
Frank J. Walters, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Dorothy H. Webb, of California.
Miss Jessie L. Webb, of Tennessee.
Miss Joanne V. Winn, of New Hampshire.
Hubert L. Zwald, of Pennsylvania.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Anthony C. Albrecht, of New York.
Philip M. Allen, of Virginia.
J. Bruce Amstutz, of Massachusetts.
Robert G. Anders, of Wisconsin.
Bryan H. Baas, of Texas.
Benjamin W. Bacon, of New York.
William R. Baker, of Tennessee.
Oler A. Bartley, Jr., of Delaware.
William M. Beck, of Illinois.
Frank C. Bennett, Jr., of California.
Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
David A. Betts, of New York.
Howard I. Blutstein, of New Jersey.
H. Eugene Bovis, of Florida.
Everett E. Briggs, of Maine.
Bazil W. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William A. Brown, of Massachusetts.
John R. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Harry A. Cahill, of New York.
Richard F. Calhoun, of Illinois.
Miss Martha C. Carbone, of Washington.
Charles R. Carlisle, of Florida.
Miss Mary Ann Casey, of New Jersey.
Gordon Chase, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Collins, of California.
Richard T. Conroy, of Tennessee.
Goodwin Cooke, of New York.
Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California.
Walter L. Cutler, of Maine.
Richard S. Dawson, Jr., of California.
Miss Stella M. Deinzer, of New York.
Robert P. DeVechi, of Pennsylvania.
Lloyd L. DeWitt, of California.
William C. Dixon, of California.
Maurice A. Dopp, Jr., of New York.
Robert W. Drexler, of Wisconsin.
Miss Regina Marie Eltz, of Alabama.
Martin Ewenstein, of New York.
Roy S. Ference, of Indiana.
Miss Jeannette M. French, of Rhode Island.
Bruce A. Flatin, of Minnesota.
Robert L. Fonner, of Illinois.
Robert L. Funseth, of New York.
Milton E. Ganger, Jr., of Ohio.
Paul F. Gardner, of Texas.
Richard J. Gibson, of Michigan.
Marion L. Gribble, of New York.
John B. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Hannaher, of Minnesota.
Alan M. Hardy, of New Jersey.
Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
Charles R. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Douglas G. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Maxwell S. Heigho, of California.
John J. Helble, of Wisconsin.
Gerald B. Helman, of Michigan.
Edgar P. Henderson, Jr., of Indiana.
Thomas J. Hill, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Roger P. Hipskind, of Illinois.
Thomas J. Hirschfeld, of New York.
Herbert Eugene Horowitz, of New York.
Michael P. E. Hoyt, of Illinois.
Edward Hurwitz, of New York.
George W. Jaeger, of Missouri.
Robert E. Jelley, of California.
James T. Johnson, of Montana.
Donald R. Jones, of Alabama.
Edson W. Kempe, of California.
Walter F. Keville II, of Florida.
John W. Kimball, of California.
Barrington King, Jr., of South Carolina.
Robert M. Kline, of Connecticut.
Tadao Kobayashi, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Roy E. Koch, of New York.
Sam E. Lesher, of Colorado.
Miss Joan Evelyn Lewis, of Ohio.
Gerald Floyd Linderman, of Ohio.
Robert Gerald Livingston, of Connecticut.
Richard J. Loosbrock, of Indiana.
Peter P. Lord, of Massachusetts.
Roger S. Lowen, of New York.
James Gordon Lowenstein, of Connecticut.
Arthur L. Lowrie, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary E. McDonnell, of Massachusetts.
Francis Terry McNamara, of New York.
Francis J. McNeil III, of Florida.
Melvin M. Marcus, of Michigan.
Edward Marks, of California.
John W. March, of Illinois.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
James K. Matter, Jr., of Michigan.
Frank A. Mau, of Wyoming.
Miss Mary L. Merges, of Pennsylvania.
Jay P. Moffat, of New Hampshire.
Richard B. Moon, of Missouri.
Richard M. Moose, of Arkansas.
Minot P. Nettleton, of New Jersey.
John L. Offner, of Pennsylvania.
Lancelot P. Olinde, of Louisiana.
Russell E. Olson, of Illinois.
Theodore K. Osgood, of Massachusetts.
George A. Pavlik, of Iowa.
John G. Peebles, of Texas.
Miss Emily Perreault, of Illinois.
John G. Peters, of Maryland.
Mark S. Pratt, of Rhode Island.
Charles T. Prindeville, Jr., of Illinois.
Datus Proper, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick D. Purdy, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia.
Cecil S. Richardson, of New York.
Miss Ann C. Roper, of Ohio.
Orville H. Schmidt, of Minnesota.
Stephen E. Schneider, of California.
Eugene L. Schou, of New York.
Glenn E. Schweitzer, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Nancy L. Sells, of Michigan.

Arthur P. Shankle, Jr., of Texas.
Robert Lee Shuler, of Virginia.
David E. Simcox, of Kentucky.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph L. Smith, of Indiana.
R. Peter Spicer, of Ohio.
Michael Sterner, of New York.
Joseph O. Streicher, of Illinois.
Miss Joanne Sugnet, of New York.
Daniel P. Sullivan, of Virginia.
John J. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Roger W. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Gerald M. Sutton, of California.
Francis J. Tatu, of California.
Thurston F. Teele, of Massachusetts.
Harry E. T. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Thurston Thomas Thurber, Jr., of New York.
D. Dean Tyler, of California.
Robert von Pagenhardt, of California.
Edwin Lee Wade, of New York.
William Watts, of New York.
Benjamin Weiner, of New York.
Harry Weiner, of New York.
Miss Winifred S. Weislogel, of New Jersey.
Miss Duane White, of Colorado.
James P. Willis, Jr., of California.
William M. Woessner, of New York.
Brooks Wrampelmeier, of Ohio.
William B. Young, of New Hampshire.
Albert L. Zucca, of New York.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:
Royal D. Bisbee, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Darrell I. Drucker, Jr., of Minnesota.
James A. Elliot, of New York.
Allan J. Funch, of Maryland.
Miss Nona L. Gardiner, of Louisiana.
John S. Getchell, of California.
William M. Harrison, of Missouri.
Joyce R. Herrmann, of Indiana.
Erich W. A. Hoffmann, of Wisconsin.
Arthur H. Hopkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Emile W. Juhasz, of New Jersey.
Alfred J. Pedersen, of Massachusetts.
Edward E. Post, Jr., of North Carolina.
Heinrich B. Siemer, of the District of Columbia.
John H. Stumpf, of the District of Columbia.
Angus MacLean Thuermer, of Illinois.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:
Edward B. Beidleman, of Maryland.
John S. Farrington, of Oregon.
Roy L. Malcolm, of California.
John C. Stoddard, of Connecticut.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Einar T. Anderson, of Illinois.
Richard W. Barry, of Virginia.
William R. Freeman, of Illinois.
Valentine O. Goodell, of New York.
John L. Hart, of Illinois.
William F. Rowland, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:
Howland Bancroft, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Thomas P. Carney, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Cicala, of Connecticut.
Herbert A. Erf, Jr., of Ohio.
Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.
Robert H. Heron, of Maryland.
John H. Hoskins, of Maryland.
C. Oliver Iselin III, of Virginia.
Andrew J. Molnar, of Illinois.
John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.
Richard F. Simpson, of Maryland.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
F. Kinloch Bull, Jr., of Illinois.
John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut.
Frederick W. Latrash, of California.
Michael C. Sednaoui, of Colorado.
Roger W. Severt, of Iowa.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
W. Kenneth Bunce, of Ohio.
Walter L. Campbell, of California.
Harry S. Casler, of Maryland.
Leo F. Gentner, of California.
Rolfe Kingsley, of Maryland.
Oscar M. Powell, of California.
Alfonso Rodriguez, of Michigan.
G. Lewis Schmidt, of California.
William H. Weathersby, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:
LaVerne Baldwin, of New York.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of the District of Columbia.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
William P. Maddox, of the District of Columbia.
David M. Maynard, of California.
Gerald A. Mokma, of Iowa.
T. Eliot Weil, of California.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:
Willard F. Barber, of Maryland.
John O. Bell, of Florida.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Clarence E. Birgfeld, of the District of Columbia.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
Edward G. Cale, of Maryland.
Robert M. Carr, of California.
Andrew V. Corry, of Montana.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
Jerome T. Gaspard, of Virginia.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
Owen T. Jones, of Ohio.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Ridgway B. Knight, of New York.
William C. Ockey, of California.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Gardner E. Palmer, of Michigan.
Andreas G. Ronhovde, of Montana.
Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas.
Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Edward G. Trueblood, of Wisconsin.
Harry R. Turkel, of California.
John W. Tuthill, of Illinois.
Laurence C. Vass, of Maryland.
Harold C. Vedeler, of the District of Columbia.
Eric C. Wendelin, of Massachusetts.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Indiana, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.
Milton Barall, of New York.
Herman H. Barger, of Virginia.
John A. Birch, of Maryland.
V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William L. Blue, of Tennessee.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
Turner P. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
Robert G. Cleveland, of New York.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of Washington.
Harry Conover, of New Jersey.
Raymond F. Courtney, of Delaware.
William J. Crockett, of Nebraska.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
William N. Dale, of New York.
John Dorman, of the District of Columbia.
Robert Eisenberg, of Virginia.
Arthur B. Emmons 3d, of Massachusetts.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Russell Fessenden, of Virginia.
Dennis A. Flinn, of Illinois.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
G. McMurtrie Godley, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
John C. Guthrie, of Virginia.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Francis W. Herron, of Iowa.
John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Henry A. Hoyt, of California.
Philip W. Ireland, of California.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.
Charles J. Little, of New Mexico.
Robert C. Martindale, of California.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John Gordon Mein, of Kentucky.
Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois.
Charles K. Moffly, of Michigan.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
Boland More, of Ohio.
David G. Nes, of Maryland.
Charles H. Owsley, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Plakias, of Illinois.
John C. Pool, of Delaware.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Charles E. Rogers, of Connecticut.
Claude G. Ross, of California.
Alexander Schnee, of New York.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Frank G. Siscoe, of New Jersey.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
Francis L. Spalding, of Massachusetts.
Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph Sweeney, of California.
Edward J. Thomas, of Ohio.
Irwin M. Tobin, of Maryland.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Robert E. Wilson, of Arizona.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Bruce Buttles, of California.
Donald G. Schuler, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:
Francis O. Allen, of Maryland.
Sverre M. Backe, of California.
Douglass K. Ballentine, of Texas.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
William L. Brewster, of Texas.
Gene F. Caprio, of New Jersey.
Stanley S. Carpenter, of Massachusetts.
Albert E. Carter, of Tennessee.
Antonio Certosimo, of California.
Arthur A. Compton, of Missouri.
William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Wendell B. Coote, of Virginia.
James N. Cortada, of Florida.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
Thomas R. Favell, of Wisconsin.
William Dale Fisher, of California.
Julian P. Fromer, of New York.
Joseph A. Greenwald, of Illinois.
Harold E. Hall, of Utah.
L. Douglas Heck, of Maryland.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
Charles E. Higdon, of Tennessee.
J. Roland Jacobs, of California.
Valdemar N. L. Johnson, of Florida.
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Lacey, of Maryland.
George T. Lister, of New York.
Donald S. MacDonald, of Massachusetts.
David E. Mark, of New York.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
John A. McKesson 3d, of New York.

Edward W. Mulcahy, of Arizona.
Miss Helen R. Nicholl, of New York.
David L. Osborn, of Arkansas.
Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.
Alexander L. Peaslee, of Ohio.
Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.
William E. Price, of Arkansas.
Earle J. Richey, of Kansas.
John Frick Root, of Pennsylvania.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Richard L. Sneider, of New York.
Donald S. Spigler, of Pennsylvania.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
James S. Sutterlin, of Kentucky.
Charles W. Thomas, of Illinois.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.
Oliver L. Troxeel, Jr., of Colorado.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
William L. Wight, Jr., of Virginia.
Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 3:
John E. Crawford, of Minnesota.
Kennedy M. Crockett, of Texas.
Juan L. Gorrell, of New Hampshire.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
Herbert B. Leggett, of Ohio.
Vernon L. Merrill, of West Virginia.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Malcolm Toon, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
William H. Dodderidge, of Kansas.
Richard C. Hagan, of Illinois.
Harold W. Jacobson, of Illinois.
Carroll M. Meigs, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Shaw, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:
Rodger C. Abraham, of Maryland.
Charles C. Adams, of New York.
Theo C. Adams, of Texas.
Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.
Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
William O. Anderson, of Indiana.
John A. Armitage, of Tennessee.
Laurin B. Askew, of Tennessee.
Powhatan M. Baber, of West Virginia.
Clifford O. Barker, of Virginia.
William J. Barnsdale, of California.
Frederic H. Behr, of New Jersey.
H. Reid Bird, of Utah.
James J. Blake, of New York.
George F. Bogardus, of Iowa.
Davis Eugene Boster, of Ohio.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Delmar R. Carlson, of Colorado.
Paul B. Carr, of California.
William B. Cobb, Jr., of North Carolina.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
Oliver S. Crosby, of Washington.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
Anthony Cuomo, of California.
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Donald M. Davis, of Virginia.
Jonathan Dean, of New York.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
Robert B. Dreessen, of Missouri.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
David H. Ernst, of Massachusetts.
Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of Minnesota.
Asa L. Evans, of South Carolina.
Charles C. Finch, of Kansas.
Mrs. Florence H. Finne, of California.
John W. Fisher, of Montana.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Arthur D. Foley, of Michigan.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr., of Ohio.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Robert C. F. Gordon, of California.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Philip C. Habib, of California.
John K. Hagemann, of Maryland.
Arnlioth G. Heltberg, of California.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Converse Hettinger, of Wisconsin.
Thomas F. Foctor, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
Edward W. Holmes, of Washington.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Rogers B. Horgan, of Massachusetts.
John M. Howison, of Texas.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
John J. Ingersoll, of Illinois.
Allan G. James, of the District of Columbia.
Walter E. Jenkins, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
William M. Johnson, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Thomas G. Karis, of Virginia.
Miss Sofia P. Kearney, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Joseph T. Kendrick, Jr., of Oklahoma.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
Walter E. Kneeland, of Texas.
Miss Francis H. Lafferty, of Delaware.
J. Alfred LaFrenière, of Massachusetts.
Francis X. Lambert, of Massachusetts.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Miss Anita C. Lauve, of Maryland.
Frederick D. Leatherman, of Ohio.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Seymour Levenson, of California.
Robert S. Lindquist, of Michigan.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Guy O. Long, of Pennsylvania.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Frederic K. Lundy, Jr., of Virginia.
Michael B. Lustgarten, of New York.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
David J. S. Manbey, of California.
Allen F. Manning, of Maryland.
Eugene C. Martinson, of Michigan.
Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.
Paul D. McCusker, of Colorado.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.
Neil C. McManus, of New Jersey.
Sanford Menter, of Texas.
G. E. Robert Meyer, of Ohio.
Bruce H. Millen, of Louisiana.
John H. Morris, of Arizona.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
John G. Oliver, of California.
Lynn H. Olson, of Minnesota.
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.
James P. Parker, of Connecticut.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
G. Etzel Pearcy, of California.
Harold D. Pease, of California.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
David Post, of Pennsylvania.
Edward P. Prince, of New Hampshire.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Miss Françoise G. Queneau, of the District of Columbia.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
Robert J. Redington, of Connecticut.
Edwin C. Rendall, of Illinois.
Miss Marie E. Richardson, of Arkansas.
Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
William A. Root, of Maryland.
J. Philip Rourk, of California.
Kenneth J. Ruch, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor W. Sandford, of Massachusetts.
Cecil B. Sanner, of Florida.
Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Miss Louise Schaffner, of Pennsylvania.
Robert R. Schott, of Oregon.
Norman V. Schute, of California.
Ray Sena, Jr., of New Mexico.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.
Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.
W. Angie Smith III, of Texas.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.
Mrs. Lucille M. Snyder, of Missouri.
Sidney Sober, of New York.
G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
Charles J. Stanley, of Ohio.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
William N. Stokes, of North Carolina.
William J. Supple, of Kansas.
Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina.
Charles H. Taliaferro, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Tambone, of New York.
Henry L. Taylor, of Washington.
Mrs. Musedorah W. Thoreson, of Tennessee.
Edward J. Thrasher, of New York.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Charles M. Urruela, of Ohio.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
William H. Wade, of California.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Rollie H. White, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
George D. Whittinghill, of New York.
Louis A. Wiesner, of Michigan.
Miss Jean M. Wilkowski, of Florida.
Elbert R. Williams, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.
Park F. Wollam, of California.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.
Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.
Donald L. Woolf, of California.
Parker D. Wyman, of Illinois.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Mrs. Montana W. Zbinden, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
A. José DeSeabra, of the District of Columbia.
William B. Hussey, of California.
James W. Kelly, of Maryland.
Stuart D. Nelson, of Virginia.
M. Gordon Tiger, of Virginia.
Orson W. Trueworthy, of Virginia.
Charles W. Wonder, of Utah.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:
Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois.
Wallace Clarke, of California.
Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.
Gordon D. King, of Texas.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.
Daniel J. Meloy, of Maryland.
J. H. Cameron Peake, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:
Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
Elwood B. Acker, of Connecticut.
James E. Akins, of Ohio.
Robert Anderson, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas G. Andrews, of New Jersey.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
John G. Bacon, of Washington.
Michael P. Balla, of Pennsylvania.
William R. Beckett, of Michigan.
William E. Berry, Jr., of Virginia.
S. Cole Blasier, of Michigan.
David B. Bolen, of Colorado.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
William G. Bowdler, of Virginia.
William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
Robert A. Brown, of California.
North C. Burn, of Washington.
William J. Bushwaller, of Iowa.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.
William D. Calderhead, of Texas.
John P. Call, of California.
Frederic L. Chapin, of the District of Columbia.
Elwyn F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Marjorie L. Cheatham, of Washington.

Edward R. Cheney, of Vermont.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
Miss Alice W. Clement, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Marian C. Conroy, of Pennsylvania.
Carleton S. Conn, Jr., of Massachusetts.
M. Lee Cotterman, of Ohio.
Franklin J. Crawford, of Ohio.
William R. Crawford, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
Miss Virginia I. Cullen, of Pennsylvania.
John E. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary W. Cutler, of the District of Columbia.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
Robert W. Day, of Maryland.
Rudolph Days, of Maryland.
David Dean, of New York.
Francois M. Dickman, of Wyoming.
John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
Arthur R. Dornheim, of Maryland.
Richard E. Dove, of Maryland.
Robert E. Dowland, of Tennessee.
William B. Dozier, of South Carolina.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Miss Ollie G. Edmundson, of Missouri.
Xavier W. Eilers, of Minnesota.
Athol H. Ellis, of Maryland.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
James J. Ferretti, of Connecticut.
Guy Ferri, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Weikko A. Forsten, of Washington.
Theodore R. Frye, of Ohio.
Jack B. Gabbert, of Missouri.
Richard D. Geppert, of New Jersey.
Robert J. Gibbons, of Ohio.
Ramon M. Gibson, of Missouri.
Wayne R. Gilchrist, of Missouri.
William H. Gleysteen, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Gerald Goldstein, of New York.
John W. Gordhamer, of California.
Robert F. Griggs, of New York.
Ernest S. Guaderrama, of California.
William C. Hamilton, of Connecticut.
Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.
Gordon G. Heiner 3d, of Maryland.
Theron S. Henderson, of Massachusetts.
John H. Hermanson, of Massachusetts.
Gerrit J. W. Heyneker, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Hodgson, of Michigan.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
Robert C. Huffman, of Washington.
Leaman R. Hunt, of Oklahoma.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Miss Margaret Hussman, of Idaho.
Borrie I. Hyman, of California.
Miss Helen Jean Imrie, of Rhode Island.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Miss Olive M. Jensen, of Iowa.
Miss Thelma M. Jenssen, of Minnesota.
Miss Marie A. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Richard E. Johnson, of Illinois.
William C. Jones III, of Texas.
Wesley E. Jorgensen, of Washington.
Herbert Kaiser, of Maryland.
Andrew John Kauffman II, of Maine.
George R. Kenney, of Illinois.
Miss Virginia L. King, of Nebraska.
Donald E. Larimone, of Illinois.
Raymond W. Laugel, of Ohio.
John C. Leary, of Massachusetts.
Henry Lee, Jr., of Massachusetts.
William W. Lehfeldt, of California.
Arthur C. Lillig, of Oregon.
Kenneth W. Linde, of Connecticut.
Philip M. Lindsay, of California.
John L. Loughran, of Pennsylvania.
Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.
Robert J. MacQuaid, of Pennsylvania.
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.
Robert J. Martens, of California.
Parke D. Massey, Jr., of New York.
Edward E. Masters, of Ohio.
H. Freeman Matthews, Jr., of Virginia.
John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
Allan F. McLean, Jr., of Texas.
Warren H. McMurray, of Georgia.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
John A. Moran III, of New Jersey.
James F. Moriarty, of Massachusetts.
Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.
Albert D. Moscotti, of New Jersey.
Miss Alice G. Mulhern, of Massachusetts.
Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
Howard F. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
Edward P. Noziglia, of New York.
Anton N. Nyerges, of Indiana.
Harry I. Odell, of New York.
Glen S. Olsen, of Utah.
David B. Ortman, of Maryland.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.
Lyle R. Piepenburg, of Wisconsin.
Onesime L. Piette, of Virginia.
Miss Janice Plowman, of Missouri.
Virgil E. Prichard, of Oklahoma.
Joseph H. Quintanilla, of Texas.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
Lloyd M. Rivers, of New Jersey.
Miss M. Adelaide Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
Woodward Romine, of Maryland.
William R. Roof, of South Carolina.
Kenneth F. Rose, of Florida.
Arthur H. Rosen, of Missouri.
H. Earle Russell, Jr., of Michigan.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
Stanley D. Schiff, of New Jersey.
Irving I. Schiffman, of Virginia.
David Scott, of Maryland.
Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
Edwin E. Segall, of Nebraska.
William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
Robert K. Sherwood, of Nebraska.
Thomas P. Shoesmith, of Pennsylvania.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Richard G. Smith, of Florida.
J. Harlan Southerland, of the District of Columbia.
Christopher A. Squire, of Virginia.
Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
Andrew Stalder, of New York.
Monteagle Stearns, of New York.
Robert A. Stein, of New Jersey.
Mrs. Virginia C. Stryker, of Washington.
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.
Michael H. Styles, of Virginia.
Sidney V. Suhler, of Texas.
Joseph M. Swing, of Washington.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Miss LaVerne L. Thomsen, of Washington.
Raymond Thomsen, of Colorado.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.
Charles P. Torrey, of California.
Miss Irene Toth, of California.
Vladimir I. Toumanoff, of New Hampshire.
Philip F. Vandivier, of Indiana.
August Velletri, of Maryland.
Harold C. Voorhees, of New Jersey.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Aloysius J. Warnecki, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.
Merrill A. White, of Massachusetts.
Miss Bernadine Whitfield, of Oregon.
Frank S. Wile, of Michigan.
Robert B. Williams, of Kentucky.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
William D. Wolle, of Iowa.
Robert A. Wooldridge, of Indiana.
Jean E. Zimmerman, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert R. Bliss, of the District of Columbia.
Philip Ernst, of New York.
Dale E. Good, of Ohio.
Robert W. Harding, of Florida.
Nicholas Hardy, of Pennsylvania.
Johannes V. Imhof, of California.
Miss Virginia E. Massey, of Ohio.
Charles W. Russell, of Maryland.

Benjamin L. Sowell, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Laurence E. Ainsworth, of California.
Robert B. Allen, of Virgina.
Robert J. Allen, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Dwight R. Ambach, of Rhode Island.
Robert F. Andrew, of California.
George R. Andrews, of Maryland.
Sam G. Armstrong, of Texas.
Marion Augustus Baldwin, of Alabama.
John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
S. Morey Bell, of Virginia.
John T. Bennett, of California.
Roger N. Benson, of Wisconsin.
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
C. Arthur Borg, of New York.
Robert B. Borin, of Nebraska.
A. Dane Bowen, Jr., of Texas.
Roger C. Brewin, of Ohio.
Edward W. M. Bryant, of Massachusetts.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
James L. Carson, of Oregon.
Harvey J. Cash, of Texas.
Miss Katharine S. Chase, of Connecticut.
Robert W. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Ward Lee Christensen, of Oregon.
Douglas McCord Cochran, of Pennsylvania.
Theodore M. Collier, of California.
Walter F. X. Collopy, of Connecticut.
John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
James C. Curran, of Virginia.
Martin A. Dale, of New Jersey.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
Harold L. Davey, of Nebraska.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Thomas W. Davis, Jr., of California.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Anton W. DePorte, of Oklahoma.
Morris Draper, Jr., of California.
John T. Dreyfuss, of California.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
Harold F. Eberle, Jr., of California.
Raymond W. Eiselt, of California.
Michael E. Ely, of New York.
Hunter L. Estep, of New Mexico.
Stockwell Everts, of New York.
James D. Farrell, of Kansas.
Harvey J. Feldman, of Illinois.
Richard W. Finch, of Ohio.
Robert H. Flenner, of Pennsylvania.
Arva C. Floyd, Jr., of Georgia.
Francis L. Foley, of Colorado.
G. Ryder Forbes, of Virginia.
C. Jefferson Frederick, of Washington.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Mark J. Garrison, of Indiana.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Harry B. Glazer, of the District of Columbia.
Dirk Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
David R. Gottlieb, of New York.
Robert P. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.
Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
C. Norman Hanley, of Washington.
Miss Elizabeth J. Harper, of Missouri.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
John J. Harter, of California.
James D. Hataway, Jr., of Georgia.
William A. Hayne, of California.
Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.
Erland H. Heginbotham, of Utah.
Brewster R. Hemenway, of New York.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Robert C. Herber, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Herdeck, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Johnson, of California.
Chadwick Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Richard C. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Ellis O. Jones III, of Connecticut.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Roger Kirk, of the District of Columbia.

Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
P. Wesley Kriebel, of Pennsylvania.
Elmer G. Kryza, of Michigan.
Owen B. Lee, of Massachusetts.
John Donnelly Leonard, of Michigan.
Burton Levin, of New York.
Jack Liebof, of New York.
Joe Lill, of Kansas.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
J. Daniel Loubert, of Maine.
John W. MacDonald, Jr., of New York.
Miss Mary Manchester, of Texas.
William G. Marvin, Jr., of California.
James D. Mason, of Indiana.
Hugh J. McCall, of New York.
John M. McIntyre, of Illinois.
William H. McLean, of Kentucky.
William F. McRory, of the District of Columbia.
Calvin E. Mehlert, of California.
Miss Alethea Mitchell, of Tennessee.
Leo J. Moser, of California.
Carsten D. Muller, of New York.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Philip C. Narten, of Ohio.
Miss Marian L. Nash, of Louisiana.
Leonardo Neher, of Illinois.
Joseph B. Norbury, Jr., of New York.
A. Gregory Nowakoski, Jr., of New Jersey.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
J. Theodore Papendorp, of New Jersey.
James A. Parker, of Maryland.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Raymond L. Perkins, Jr., of Colorado.
Paul J. Plenni, of West Virginia.
Arthur L. Price, of Illinois.
Harry A. Quinn, of California.
Kenneth M. Rabin, of Massachusetts.
Virgil P. Randolph III, of Virginia.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nancy V. Rawls, of Georgia.
John Reed, of California.
Miss Elizabeth J. Rex, of Pennsylvania.
Edward B. Rosenthal, of New York.
Richard Rueda, Jr., of New Jersey.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
Howard B. Schaffer, of New York.
Frank E. Schmelzer, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Carl G. Seasword, Jr., of Michigan.
Harry W. Shlaudeman, of California.
Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur M. Stillman, of Illinois.
Yancey M. Taylor, of Tennessee.
Edward H. Thomas, of New Jersey.
John Means Thompson, of New York.
Ross P. Titus, of Illinois.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.
Nicholas A. Veliotes, of California.
Peter F. Warker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John P. Wentworth, of Washington.
Samuel G. Wise, Jr., of New York.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.
William Marshall Wright, of Arkansas.
Charles T. York, of New York.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Sara L. Andren, of Michigan.
Patrick H. Armijo, of New Mexico.
Miss Elinor L. Campbell, of California.
Miss Mary T. Chiavarini, of Massachusetts.
J. Stewart Cottman, Jr., of Maryland.
Bryan N. Cowherd, of Kentucky.
Mrs. Betty Ann Craig, of Illinois.
William J. Cunningham, of California.
William E. Dwyer, of New Mexico.
Edward B. Fenstermacher, of Pennsylvania.
John R. Ferchak, of Virginia.
Miss Helen E. Geen, of Texas.
Miss Jane E. Grunwell, of the District of Columbia.
Frank J. Haughey, of California.
Miss Viola Johnson, of Indiana.
Munro P. Jones, of North Carolina.
Richard W. Kautsky, of Arkansas.
Miss Gladys Knutzen, of Washington.
Charles J. Konya, of Pennsylvania.
Miss M. Margaret McCoy, of Colorado.
Allen P. McNeill, Jr., of California.
Henry J. Manning, of Colorado.
Mrs. Margaret I. Niles, of Maryland.
Miss Maxine Phillips, of Kansas.
Sol Polansky, of California.
Leslie D. Polk, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Lois J. Roork, of Oklahoma.
Miss Marjorie L. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Charles F. Stoppani, of California.
Miss Maida F. Stotts, of California.
Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands.
Miss Corabelle Tolin, of Kansas.
Gabriel Urgarte, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry M. Angelus, of Massachusetts.
John M. Barta, of California.
Norman E. Barth, of Virginia.
Gordon R. Beyer, of Virginia.
John P. Blane, of Alabama.
Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Michael Calingaert, of New York.
Jack M. Carle, of Colorado.
William P. Deary, of New York.
Theodore B. Dobbs, of Virginia.
James T. Doyle, of Florida.
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, of Wisconsin.
Alan A. Gise, of Indiana.
Donald H. Habbe, of Wisconsin.
Frederick T. Kelley, of the District of Columbia.
Raoul Kulberg, of the District of Columbia.
Sherrod B. McCall, of Illinois.
Miss Eleanore Joan McGroarty, of New York.
Robert S. McLellan, of New York.
Richard C. Matheron, of California.
Stanley R. Miller, Jr., of Florida.
Theodore C. Nelson, of Connecticut.
Allen G. Noble, of New York.
Richard F. Nyrop, of Minnesota.
Alver R. Roan, Jr., of Georgia.
J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania.
Gilbert H. Sheinbaum, of New York.
Miss Elaine Diana Smith, of Illinois.
James W. White, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Rudolf E. Cahn, of New York.
Louis L. Kirley, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

J. Foster Collins, of Virginia.
Arthur F. Rall, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Nicholas Andronovitch, of Virginia.
Joseph A. Donohoe III, of California.
Edward D. Goloway, of New York.
Robert E. Haynes, of Virginia.
Harry G. Jacobson, of Nebraska.
George A. Rady, Jr., of Maryland.
Joseph W. Smith, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Howard T. Bane, of Virginia.
Stephen Duncan-Peters, of New York.
Joseph F. McManus, of Massachusetts.
Jerry C. Rucker, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

John C. Murray, of Pennsylvania.
Clifton R. Strathern, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert H. Cunningham, of Ohio.
Stannard K. Short, of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our companion and counselor, Thou knowest that our Speaker and the Members of Congress are charged with the solemn responsibility of legislating in a time of great crisis.

We humbly pray that they may be blessed with clear insight, intelligent appreciation, and sympathetic understanding as they earnestly endeavor to put forth a determined and courageous effort in behalf of a nobler world order.

May the decisions which they are making in this Chamber be radiant with the promise of the dawning of a better day when the common welfare of the human race shall be the concern of all alike.

We fervently beseech Thee that the nations of the earth may extend to one another the overtures of peace and good will and learn to walk and work together as trustworthy friends and partners.

Grant that the mad scramble for personal advantage and the ambition of self-interest, which have so often ruled in the sphere of international relationship, may be supplanted by the spirit of mutual regard and brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. This legislation, if adopted, would provide for the stating of appropriation estimates on an annual accrued expenditures basis, in accordance with the Hoover Commission's recommendation No. 7 in the Commission's Budgeting and Accounting Report. This legislation is a key measure in achieving the Commission's highly recommended revision of our complicated financial structure.

Mr. Speaker, many experienced and responsible Members of the House in their hearts agree with the accusation that "Congress has lost control of the purse strings." Although in the 84th

Congress, by passage of Public Law 863, providing for improvements in the budgeting, accounting, and allotment systems, we did take a wise step forward, a basic revision of the appropriation process is even more necessary.

I would point out that this legislation, previously introduced in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY and others, is in line with the President's recommendation for enactment of appropriate legislation to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendation on this matter and that it has the endorsement of the highest financial officers of the Government, and is itself the product of long research and analysis by technicians of the General Accounting Office, of the Department of the Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget. While time does not permit me to present here a detailed analysis of the bill, I would point out that under it appropriation estimates would be determined on an annual appropriation basis "to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President," and "in such manner and at such times as may be determined by the President," thus insuring flexibility to the President in the use of his authority. A further great advantage would be the subsequent elimination of the tremendous carryover of balances from previous appropriations and the provision whereby both the Congress and the Government departments would have the necessary information for wise financial planning and management.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

Andresen, August H.	Elliott	Powell
Avery	Ford	Prouty
Bailey	Garmatz	Rabaut
Boggs	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Bowler	Jensen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Buckley	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Chelf	Magnuson	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Morgan	Rutherford
Dorn, S. C.	Morrison	Taylor
	Passman	Williams, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MIDDLE EAST ECONOMIC AND MILITARY COOPERATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 123) providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be offered to any section of the joint resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as a reading of the resolution states, this is a closed rule. Personally, I think it was a mistake to bring this important matter in under a closed or so-called gag rule. I opposed it in committee, but I found myself in the minority. Since it has been seen fit to consider this matter under a closed rule, and one that provides only for 1 day of general debate, I shall not attempt to change this rule by any parliamentary procedure because, in my judgment, that would only result in further limiting the precious hours that we have to discuss this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am even more convinced that the objective sought by this resolution is a correct one as I am that the type of rule is a wrong one. I see no great difference in this resolution and the so-called Formosan resolution. With your permission I am going to read just briefly from my remarks here on the floor when the so-called Formosan resolution was under consideration.

I said in part:

The decision made here today will reverberate around the world. That decision can only be a firm one. It should be a unanimous one. We must either give the President the authority which he seeks or we must get out of the Western Pacific. There is no choice. Mr. Speaker, the only criticism to be made of the President's request for authority, seems to me, is that it has been so long coming. As one who for the past 10 years has been advocating a firm policy in dealing with the Communist masters, I welcome the first opportunity I have had in those long 10 years of appeasement to go on record for an affirmative foreign policy. Too long we have followed a Chamberlain-like appeasement of the Kremlin masters and their stooges. Too long have we, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, suffered the grossest type of indignities in an effort to appease the Communist leaders. Our ships have been circumscribed in their sailings on the high seas. Our vehicles have been stopped and searched on the international highways. Our aircraft have been shot down from the free airways. Our soldiers and citizens have been seized and incarcerated in the vilest dungeons while undergoing mental torture worse than the Spanish inquisition and held for ransom.

Mr. Speaker, if those remarks were appropriate a year ago on the Formosan resolution, then I say they are pertinent and equally apropos on this occasion.

It is generally agreed that the President already has the authority this resolution would grant. If this be true, what valid argument can be made against the Congress backing him up and giving him an endorsement of his foreign policy? Particularly is this true when we realize that he has already announced this policy. We cannot make foreign policy in the Congress of the United States; that would be impossible. You know where that would lead to. So we must rely upon the Chief Executive and those who advise him. In fact, under our system of government it is the constitutional duty of the President to make our foreign policy. If he already has this authority, then what would we accomplish by denying our endorsement to the policy he is advocating? What would be the result? Suppose it went out over the ether waves today that this House, composed of representatives of all of the people of the United States of America, had rebuked the President of the United States in his announced policy? It would be tantamount to a vote of no confidence. What tragic results would that bring about? It would mean an open invitation to the Kremlin masters to move further into this area of the world. I do not see how we can do anything but give our President this endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, it would be nothing short of a monumental tragedy for the Congress to deny the Chief Executive a vote of confidence on this momentous question of foreign policy. I know there are those who have grave misgivings about this—and those views I respect, because it is a momentous question—but I call your attention to the fact that I have repeated for the past 10 years from time to time on the floor of this House that you cannot win a diplomatic game, you cannot win a war, you cannot win a football game by always being on the defensive. Our foreign policy has been too much like a football game where we permitted the Kremlin to call the signals and we ran the defensive plays. You cannot follow the Chamberlain-like appeasement policy which has been our policy ever since World War II with the exception of Korea and the Formosan declaration, and win this fight with the Communists.

The criticism that I have long made of our foreign policy is that it has been a negative one. Here is an opportunity

to adopt an affirmative policy. This resolution appeals to me because at long last it offers a positive approach rather than a negative one. The only complaint I have here today is the one I indicated at the beginning of this talk. I am unhappy about gagging this House on such a momentous issue. I cannot subscribe to the inferiority complex which seems to be so manifest here by those who are unwilling to trust the House membership to fully debate this issue and be given an opportunity to offer amendments. Personally, I don't relish the idea of further impoverishing this country by embarking upon a new spree of foreign aid. An opportunity should be given to that large and growing number of the membership who feel that we are only playing into the hands of Russia by spending ourselves into bankruptcy. For, once the economy of this country is destroyed, the Communists will take advantage of the economic chaos and move into this country as well as all of those free countries that we have striven so valiantly to save. However, it is comforting to know that those of us who apprehend that danger will have an opportunity when the appropriations come to the floor to vote against them. So far as this resolution itself goes, it proposes to use the funds for the next year that have already been appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat another oft-stated statement of mine here in the past decade to the effect that the Kremlin neither wants war nor peace. Make no mistake the Russian masters are still following the Lenin doctrine of trying to force this country to spend its way into bankruptcy, then to take over in the resulting economic confusion and chaos which would follow.

I again call your attention to the fact that every time we have shown a positive policy, the Kremlin has backed up, because they know that they cannot win a war in this modern jet age with the modern weapons of warfare that now exist.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman is making a very forceful statement. Would he not agree with me that the resolution will prevent the men in the Kremlin from miscalculating our will and capacity to deter aggression?

Mr. COLMER. I am happy I yielded to the gentleman because he has said in a very few words what I have been trying to say in 10 minutes. The psychological effect will be most effective.

In connection with the airlift they did not shoot our planes down when we insisted on going through with them. They backed up in Korea, they backed up in Formosa, and Formosa stands today just like it stood before adoption of that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the gravity of this situation, but with all of the earnestness and conviction of my soul I say to you that we cannot do anything other than back the President of the United States in this matter. The die is cast.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of the Members here appreciate the splendid contribution made by the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I question whether there will be a more fair or a more honorable statement made today on this subject.

First of all I want to speak on the rule. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has stated, this is a closed rule. To the new Members of this House may I say that the rules of the House provide for such a closed rule. I know there are many here who will say that they have always opposed a closed rule, yet if the leadership had not through the years determined that there were times when it would be necessary to have a closed rule, the rules of the House would be different. Perhaps they might have confined closed rules strictly to consideration of tax bills. However, the fact remains that for many years the rules of the House have provided for a closed rule.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi referred to the Formosa resolution back on January 25, 1955, and he read parts of his speech at that time that I was going to read today. For instance, he started off by saying in his speech of that day:

> Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my approval and appreciation, for whatever they are worth, of the splendid spirit of unanimity with which this very grave and important matter has been considered up to this time. Particularly I want to commend the Speaker of the House, the minority leader, the majority leader, the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, on the lack of partisanship demonstrated in this grave hour of the Republic.

Today he mentioned that the subject matter before us now in regard to the Middle East is equally as important as the matter contained in the Formosa resolution. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], closed debate on that resolution, which came up under a closed rule—the same type of rule that we have here today—and at the end of his speech on the rule he did not ask, on account of it being a closed rule, that we have a rollcall. In regard to the Formosa resolution, he mentioned nothing about a closed rule, and there was no rollcall on the rule on the Formosa resolution. And, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the problem before us today is just as serious as the problem confronting us at the time the Formosa resolution was passed, and I am hoping today that my good friend will go ahead in that same spirit, with the leadership on both sides of the House requesting a closed rule. The Committee on Foreign Affairs held 2 weeks of public hearings and I think 4 executive meetings, and by a vote of 24 to 2 asked for a closed rule. The Committee on Rules, favored and passed a closed rule by an overwhelming majority. So, I hope that my good friend who did so much in that spirit of fair play and unanimity back at the time of the Formosa resolution will not ask for any rollcall today because of the closed rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just hope the gentleman will not take too much of his valuable time paying attention to what my attitude was. I thought I made myself quite clear here a moment ago what my attitude is about this legislation, and that was that I was not going to yield to anybody to try to change the rule because I thought the limited time we had here should be used for debate rather than getting into a parliamentary squabble. But, the gentleman, I think, in fairness to me, will agree that my whole philosophy from the time I have been on the Committee on Rules with him has been in opposition to these so-called gag rules.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. And the gentleman will not say now that I did not oppose in the Committee on Rules a closed rule on the Formosa resolution as I did in this case.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Now, in regard to the seriousness of this problem as compared with the Formosa resolution, I spent considerable time reading the hearings before that committee and particularly important to me is the statement of Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I quote three objectives stated by him which I think is the heart of this whole thing:

> The free world, of which we are a part, should have three main objectives in the Middle East: first, the nations of the Middle East must be kept independent of communist domination; second, the strategic positions and transit rights in this area must be available to the free world; third, the resources, strategic positions, and transit rights must be kept from slipping behind the Iron Curtain.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think is the meat of this whole resolution which I repeat is of equal importance to and of perhaps more importance than the Formosa Resolution which passed this body a year ago last January by a vote of 409 to 3.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been said several times in the debate before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that there is a very great danger of conflict in this area if the President does not have this authority, and that there is very much less danger if he does have it. Therefore, I am in favor of the President being vested with the authority contemplated in this resolution.

I favor a closed rule because the very essence of the authority invested in the President depends upon the clarity with which the power and the authority are stated and if the President's right to act on the economic and military front is confused, restricted, limited, or unnecessarily hampered by this body or by the other body, the President's influence in the use of those powers will be similarly weakened and limited in his relations

with that part of the world and with Communist Russia.

I wish that this resolution had included in it some reference to the obligations of the United States under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 so that the intention of the United States to participate more fully in steps toward peaceful solutions and toward the prevention of internal aggression among the nations in the area might also be spelled out. But I favor the resolution and I favor the closed rule as the best procedure indicated under all the circumstances.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, a statement attributed to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson by the public press is indeed shocking. As I understand it, Secretary Wilson, in giving testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in referring to the National Guard, said: "It was sort of a scandal during the Korean war, a draft-dodging business."

This gratuitous insult to the thousands of men who are now and who have in the past been enlisted men and officers in the National Guard of our Nation is in my judgment contemptible conduct on the part of a high public official. To be sure, Secretary Wilson has apparently been too concerned with his vast industrial interests during the two great wars in which this country was engaged to be familiar with the true history of service of the National Guard of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if Secretary Wilson's attack upon the National Guard is not just another attempt in what appears to be the scheme of destroying some of our established institutions and to carry down with that destruction the time-honored principle of States rights.

In the Articles of Confederation—article VI, section 4—it was provided that each State should keep a body of disciplined men "sufficiently armed and accoutered." This set up the principle of a State militia and that principle has been carried forward under the Constitution of the United States—that great and now battered document which has until recent years been the guiding star of governmental activity in this Nation.

I am wondering if Secretary Wilson is subscribing to that philosophy which has become so manifest in recent utterances of our Supreme Court, and finds its way into legislation which is now pending in the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives that the various States shall not have their right of self-government and to maintain their respective institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, with the vast military budget available to the Defense Department of this Nation, if somewhere in that Department the Secretary of Defense has not been able to find one soul who could make a casual examination of the military history of this Nation.

If he had done so he would have found that the militia units of the Thirteen Original Colonies formed the backbone of the Continental Army of Gen. George Washington. A little research would have further shown that it was the State militia units which bolstered the sagging Regular Establishment in the War of 1812.

Volunteer militia troops supported our effort in the war with Mexico in 1845, and I am sure the Secretary should remember—because it was from his own State of Michigan that many of these boys came—the fact that President Abraham Lincoln called for 75,000 militia troops to suppress the so-called rebellion in the South after the guns had fired on Fort Sumter in April 1861.

And in his own lifetime he should recall the valiant effort made by the National Guard troops, some of whom were from my own State of North Carolina, who went into Mexico in 1916 to suppress Pancho Villa. It is general knowledge that it was the National Guard units that formed the nucleus around which the then untrained and inexperienced draft armies of World Wars I and II were formed.

On occasions too numerous to mention the National Guard units of this Nation have been called upon in time of peace and in time of war to preserve law and order in hundreds of cities and towns and counties of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that concerns me about this unwarranted attack upon the great institution of the National Guard is that we have as Secretary of Defense a man who is willing to destroy the interest and zeal which so many dedicated men have in the military life of this Nation as is reflected by the thousands who are now attached to National Guard outfits throughout this land of ours.

In recent days I have had the privilege as a Member of Congress to nominate and to appoint young men to our great military institutions of learning in this Nation. Several of these young men are active members of the National Guard in their local communities.

Their enlistment in the National Guard constituted one of the principal qualifications, in my opinion. It was on the basis of their manifested interest in the military service that I gave several of them more favorable consideration than I could give to young men who had not been affiliated with the National Guard.

I merely mention this, Mr. Speaker, to show that either Secretary Wilson or I have been in great error in our appraisal of the value of the training and service rendered by our National Guard in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Secretary of Defense bears the reputation of being an impetuous and garrulous individual. I further realize that his background of experience and training has perhaps failed to suitably equip him for the high duties which have been placed upon him.

But, be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that ordinary politeness would dictate to any man of judgment that gratuitous insults upon any group of people by one in high public office, or one in business life, can never be countenanced by men of good will and Christian character.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I utter the hope and the prayer that the Members of the Congress of the United States will take due notice of this unfortunate conduct on the part of the Secretary of Defense and that at the same time they will steer a straight course, in keeping with established policy of this Nation, and do nothing in the legislative halls which would in any way diminish the function and service and patriotism of the members of our National Guard in every State in this Union.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the reasons which have been given in behalf of this closed rule overlook some important factors, and in my opinion put this House in an unfortunate light.

Members of Congress have the obligation to fully express doubts they may have as to the wisdom of the resolution, in present form, and, most importantly to ask questions of the Committee in an attempt to seek clarification of the confusion and vagueness of the public testimony of Secretary Dulles and other Administration witnesses.

Unless we have a liberal rule, most, if not all, of the time will be used by the Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, all of whom I respect, and all of whose explanations I anticipate with great interest.

I do have serious doubts about the wisdom of doing what we propose to do in the manner in which it is proposed that we do it. In fact, in response to a direct question by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I testified for the record that I would have difficulty in voting for the resolution as it had been introduced.

I believe other Members may share my sentiments. An open rule is needed so that we may have the opportunity to discuss the amendments which have been adopted, as well as those which might be proposed. Perhaps we may then vote for it with a clear conscience.

The possibility of a large negative vote is, I believe, the most compelling reason for a liberal time allowance for general debate. Members, whether they cast an affirmative or negative vote on the resolution, should have ample time to make the record clear and emphatic that such a vote in no way may be interpreted at home or abroad, and especially in Moscow, that the Congress or any portion of it, is not firm in its opposition to Communist aggression, whether overt or otherwise.

While I seriously question the legislative course President Eisenhower seems

to think is necessary, I do endorse his goal. I, for one, hope to have the opportunity to make this perfectly clear and emphatic.

I hope the House will insist upon a rule under which full and complete discussion shall be possible. I believe that such a rule should be seriously considered under any circumstances, but at this period in the session, when our legislative calendar is light, the conditions exist for providing fully ample general debate.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, who is also our Commander in Chief, has asked us for powers which he says he will only use in case of an emergency to protect the best interests and security of the United States. He says he will not involve us in an act of war without consulting and getting the approval of the Congress.

We have not been given the details, nor the reasons for these extraordinary powers, nor have we been given the benefit of the President's top secret or classified information on this subject allegedly for security reasons.

In short, the Chief Executive is asking the Congress to trust him with a blank check in order to perform what he describes as a vital service to the American people.

I have the greatest reservation to the granting of these unusual powers, and I am also mindful of the fact that Congress may have to be bypassed but, I repeat, the President says this is an emergency and for security reasons the matter cannot be openly discussed.

Under the circumstances, I feel that it is my duty, not as a Congressman, but as a citizen to take the word of the Chief Executive and trust him with the powers he asks. If the President has certain information which will enable him to act in a given undisclosed situation in a manner to prevent war, who am I to deny him that power? Of course, he must take full responsibility for this course of action, as he alone has retained the facts with which to make a proper evaluation.

I am sure the President has the prayers of every mother, father, and child in this country that he use these powers wisely.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi very much.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to take the floor today in opposition to the position of some of my good friends in the leadership on both sides of the aisle. However, I do so because my sense of duty, and feeling of responsibility to all the House, compels me to oppose the pending closed or the gag rule which, by its adoption, would make in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117 without the possibility of any amendments being offered to it by any Member of the House except amendments directed to be offered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am not opposing here at this moment House Joint Resolution 117, the joint resolution requested by the President and his administration. I realize fully, as I am sure you do, that House Joint Resolution 117 is a most important and far-reaching one.

I know the Members of the House will probably be required to vote upon it today. I have no desire to delay a vote on this joint resolution. But all of us who must vote on House Joint Resolution 117 will be in a very peculiar position. To fail to vote for will leave a Member open to the charge he is favorable to communism or friendly to Russia, or that he is helping the spread of communism. It will lay him open to the charge he has no confidence in the President, and has voted to repudiate our Chief Executive. It will also lay him open to the charge that he has destroyed, or helped to destroy, American prestige throughout the world by his vote.

On the other hand, I appreciate the fact that if the joint resolution is adopted, and things do not turn out as happily as we all desire, then he will be open to the charge of having delegated the constitutional authority of the Congress to the President, and with committing, in a way, not directly, perhaps, but indirectly, the American people to the making of huge expenditures for foreign aid in the future. So it is a very serious question, and a very difficult problem we have before us.

As many of you know, especially those who have served here before I have always opposed, except in the few cases of special tax bills, all gag or closed rules. I do not believe, in this particular instance, we can spread liberty and freedom and democracy to the other parts of the world by voting to destroy, or restrict, them here in the House of Representatives of the United States through adopting a rule saying to the Members of this House, "You cannot pass upon this legislation in your own right."

Of course, you will be told that this joint resolution is of such unusual importance that it cannot and should not be amended on the floor of the House, and that amendments thereto cannot be offered, and cannot be considered. Yet I want to point out many amendments were offered, and considered, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Several were adopted by that committee, while other amendments which were offered were defeated by very narrow vote margins.

I have the greatest respect for the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They are brilliant, wise, intelligent, and able persons. Yet I refuse to believe there is no one else in this House of Representatives who does not have some judgment, some intelligence, and some ability to pass on this great Middle East problem for which we will be responsible to our own people. If the Foreign Affairs Committee can amend the joint resolution without doing harm, perhaps the House would do no injury should it be permitted to work its will. Let me remind you when this resolution comes to the floor of the other body, there will be full and free debate. There will be every kind of amendment offered, and each will be debated fully for as long as any Member of the other body wishes to discuss it.

I refuse to believe the House of Representatives is an inferior body, unable to express its own judgment, or to vote its own will, on important legislation of this type. I believe we are just as patriotic as the other body—and just as able, too, for that matter. Therefore, when the time comes that the previous question is moved, I hope the House will see fit to vote down the previous question. When this is done the parliamentary procedure will be simply this: It will then be in order for those of us opposed to this gag rule to immediately offer an amendment, which I propose to do forthwith, to substitute for this gag rule an open rule which will permit the House to debate this resolution for 1 full day and to thereafter offer any and all germane amendments, and to discuss them freely under the 5-minute rule. Now that is a very simple and very clear proposition. It is now entirely up to the membership of the House to determine what it wishes to do; whether it wishes to gag itself, and to say to the country and to the world that this body is impotent, and all wisdom rests in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of our House of Representatives, or in the other body across the way. Each of you have the right to vote away your own privileges, rights, and freedom as an individual Member of this House if you wish to do so, but such action may someday be difficult to explain to the people you represent, or to the rest of the world for that matter.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I oppose House Resolution 123 providing for a closed rule for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117.

I am firmly opposed to a closed "gag" rule because it prevents amending House Joint Resolution 117 which authorizes among other things the use of the Armed Forces of the United States against an enemy whose identity is as yet unknown to us, at some indeterminate time in the future, and in a vast area whose boundaries have not been fixed.

This, in my estimation, is a bad precedent for Congress to set. I want to point out that there is no similarity between the Middle East situation today and the conditions which prevailed at the time when Congress considered and authorized the use of our Armed Forces in Greece, in Turkey, and in the defense of Formosa.

In those earlier instances, we had every evidence that aggression had been perpetrated, and that the attacked governments desired and sought our assistance. In the case of Greece and Turkey, we had ample evidence that force was used and that the governments and the independence of those countries were directly threatened. In the case of Formosa, the Chinese Communists were bombarding the offshore islands and openly threatened to invade Taiwan.

The circumstances which prevailed in those instances fully warranted imme-

diate consideration by Congress of legislative authorization to use our Armed Forces in those specific areas.

The conditions which prevail today in the Middle East are entirely different. There is no evidence that armed aggression from any nations controlled by international communism has been perpetrated, nor that it is even imminent. Further, the area covered by the term Middle East as used in House Joint Resolution 117 is so vast and so undefined that Congress, in approving the resolution in its present form, would be setting a grave precedent in authorizing the use of our Armed Forces on an extremely broad and indeterminate basis.

I had attempted to amend House Joint Resolution 117 in the committee and I feel that there should be an opportunity for Members to amend it on the floor. The closed rule will deprive the House of Representatives of its right to fully express its will. It is undemocratic and it will prevent those Members who are wholeheartedly in accord with the intent of the executive branch's proposal to aid the nations of the Middle East in prefecting the legislative vehicle for carrying out these objectives.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand that the gentleman would prefer to wait until they move in, and then for us to take some action?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, I do not. But I do not think we should give the President a blank check to use our Armed Forces in an area that has not been thoroughly defined, and as referred to in committee comprises an area that covers a vast portion of the globe.

The Congress has a solemn duty to jealously guard and protect its prerogative, its constitutional power to declare war. This blank-check resolution delegates that authority to the Executive. For this and other reasons I hope the rule will be amended or defeated in order that this august body can work its will as the other body most certainly shall.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we are considering serious business, but if you will permit me a personal note at the outset, this is a memorable day for me for more reasons than one. It so happens that 22 years ago today, January 29, I was first elected to this body at a special election in Indiana. Little did I dream then that I would still be here, and certainly little did I dream that I would be here on such a momentous occasion as this is, speaking in the well of this House.

First of all, I want to commend the Democratic leadership of this Congress and the members of the committee, as well as all members on my side, for the expedition with which this very important matter has been handled.

It takes me back to a time when the situation in Washington was slightly reversed. I was Majority Leader of the Republican 80th Congress. Senator Taft was the leader in the other body. Senator Vandenburg was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and Dr. Eaton was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House. I recall when we as leaders were called to the White House. President Truman was President. He outlined for us a program involving this very same area, aid to Greece and Turkey.

I am sure many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will recall that we moved to the accomplishment of that objective even as we subsequently moved to the accomplishment of interim aid to France and Italy and the Marshall Plan, without bitter partisanship. I am happy that the House of Representatives is proceeding that way today.

As a matter of fact, the committee in its report refers to the Greek-Turkey Assistance Act of 1947 in these words:

> The national integrity and survival of these nations (Greece and Turkey) are of importance to the security of the United States and of all freedom-loving peoples and depend upon the receipt at this time of assistance.
>
> This resolution is a projection of that concept.

I want to address myself for a moment to this rule. In the first place, this measure came almost unanimously from our great Committee on Foreign Affairs. I say to you that this kind of rule is necessary in circumstances such as this, a fact recognized by you. The committee pointed out that there are many tensions in the Middle East, but this resolution is designed to take cognizance of just one of these, the threat of international communistic aggression in that area.

Then the committee in its report goes on to say, speaking of the purpose of the resolution:

> The resolution does not set forth a detailed plan or program for dealing with all the major problems in the Middle East. It deals with courses of action relating to immediate military and economic threats. Other basic problems causing tension in the area are not dealt with in the resolution. The solution of the Arab-Israel controversy, the resettlement of refugees, the reopening of the Suez Canal, with the establishment of adequate safeguards for the interests of its users, and other problems, are of grave importance, and should be given continued attention by the Executive.

Then they say that they want reports on those problems submitted to the United Nations, submitted to the Congress of the United States. What does that mean? If you open this rule, as the gentleman from Ohio asks you to, I say it would be a mistake, because you would be called upon to vote tomorrow on these other problems on which we have not yet had Executive reports, and therefore have not given careful study. We would be voting on measures in a vacuum. I do not think that is the way to legislate. We had better proceed with this matter that is before us, and that alone. That is the reason this rule should be adopted.

I would like to point out one other thing——

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Before the gentleman leaves that subject, the gentleman has made a very strong statement, with his usually good line of reasoning—at least to the gentleman's satisfaction. I do not mean that as any reflection on my friend.

Let me ask the gentleman whether the same argument he is making about not opening this up over here in this House of Representatives applies to the other body? Does the gentleman not realize that this matter will be debated over there for possibly 30 days, and every opportunity will be given for the Members of that body to express themselves? Over here even if we had an open rule we would be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me remind the gentleman that the rules of procedure governing consideration of legislation are very different in the two bodies. The rules which we are operating now are very different from those in the other body.

Sometimes the impression is sought to be created that this is an inferior body, but I have always said that I could take 96 Members of the House and meet 96 Members of the other body anyplace in the road and still stand them off. As a matter of fact, some of the best people they have there graduated from this body, and it has been good for them over there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not mean graduated?

Mr. HALLECK. I take that back, transferred, I would say.

But getting back to the subject in hand, I hope we do not have to call the roll today. If that vote were close it would go all over the world as evidence of great disunity on a fundamental principle. People in other lands do not know what the previous question is. It will be interpreted as a vote against the rightness of this resolution and the result would be that the vote tomorrow would be lost in the reaction that would follow.

I will just say, to my mind this resolution is a declaration of courage and not of fear; it is a declaration of determination and not of equivocation; it is a declaration of peace and not of war; it is a declaration asked of us by a President who in my opinion—I do not care what your politics is—has demonstrated that he wants to keep peace in the world. He recognizes that the best way to keep out of war is to keep war from starting. He recognizes the vital necessities of the area with which we here deal; yes, the President is a man who has demonstrated his adherence, his deep conviction in the rightness of the great constitutional principles of our Government, constitutional principles which recognize that in the Congress of the United States rests the power to declare war.

He has said to us, and everything that he has done up to this point would indicate that he means exactly what he says,

that if a critical situation should there develop he would immediately come to the Congress and that if the Congress were not in session he would call us into session.

A moment ago the question was asked: If the President already has the power why the necessity for this resolution? Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be overwhelmingly adopted and that everybody on both sides of the aisle will follow our great leader, the great leader of all of us, in this course because it is right. But I say that the adoption of this resolution will prove, as similar action proved in the adoption of past resolutions along this line, that the people of the United States together with the Congress of the United States, the direct representatives of the people, stand with the President of the United States. Being a declaration of purpose and courage, then, no potential aggressor can ever miscalculate our intentions. I think history proves that many times wars get going—they have in my time I know—because the would-be aggressors thought the people would not stand up. I think we have lived long enough to know that when you serve notice on them then you have got the best chance to stay out of war.

So I say again this is a resolution for peace and not for war. It has been given careful consideration. I know not what is going to happen in the other body, but I do know that the whole free world will be electrified tomorrow when the House of Representatives, speaking for the people of the United States, declares our combined purpose that has to do with the security and integrity first of all of the United States of America and, secondly that the whole free world is to be protected so far as we are able to do so by the action we here take in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said here today by various speakers that this resolution is for peace and not for war. It has been given careful consideration by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in whom I have the utmost confidence. However, I think one important thing has been overlooked in arguing whether or not we should adopt the closed rule and that is the fact that we will be giving congressional authority for spending huge sums for foreign aid. I want to do everything I possibly can to ward off communism wherever it may be found. However, since spending 2 years in combat overseas during World War II, I have always taken the position that we cannot buy friendship with money and actually I think some of our trouble in the Middle East today is due to the fact that we have found ourselves in an auction, bidding against each other. I am going to vote "no" when the previous question is ordered because I believe that this rule should be open so we can delete foreign aid. It is my firm conviction that we can ward off communism in the Middle East by offering to help protect any country from aggression, without pouring millions of dollars down a rat hole in economic aid.

Mr. Speaker, on final passage, I intend to vote for the resolution giving notice to the communistic world that we do not intend to tolerate aggression, however, I am very hopeful that an open rule may be adopted whereby the resolution can be amended to strike out foreign aid.

I represent the 25th District of Illinois where there are 30,000 persons unemployed and I have pledged to my constituents that I will not vote one thin dime in foreign aid until our own people have been provided for. In my opinion too much emphasis has been given to foreign countries instead of trying to provide for our own people. Just last week I was advised by a number of county officials in my district that Government surplus food to the needy was being drastically reduced. On contacting the United States Department of Agriculture, I was told that the reduction in surplus foods was due to the Department's ability to dispose of surplus food commodities by other means. I am just wondering how much surplus food is being taken away from needy Americans and sent overseas to foreign countries? I have been trying for some time to get the Congress to pass a distressed areas bill in order to give some Government assistance—not handouts—to areas of high unemployment in this country, but most of my argument has fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are entitled to an answer to one question: "Are we going to forever forget the needs of our own American people while continually pouring millions of dollars into foreign countries?"

I hope that after a dedication of purpose has been given, this Congress can soon turn to the problems of America for a change.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this may be the most important vote that we will cast this year. Its importance easily outweighs our various domestic problems. Upon this resolution may hang the question of war or peace. We cannot underestimate its importance to America and the nations of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is sought by President Eisenhower because of his firm belief that it will be a deterrent to war. He believes it will be a contribution in his noble fight for peace. The resolution comes before us backed by the leadership of the House of both political parties. We believe it should be passed as it emerged from the Committee on Foreign Affairs with promptness and we hope that the vote will be overwhelming. If it is, it will strengthen the hands of the administration in the struggle for peace and tranquility in the important Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, some mention has been made here of how the bill will be handled in the House and Senate. Let me recall that in connection with the Formosa Resolution, after hours and days of debate the Senate adopted exactly the resolution that was drafted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. They did not change it at all.

We talk about Communist aggression. All of us may well fear Communist aggression because we all should know that the Soviet policy never changes. Its purpose is to spread its ideology so as to engulf the whole world. Here we have a genuine, bold effort to see that that Communist aggression is checked.

The resolution simply outlines, so there can be no misunderstanding, and says that if the Soviets attack the free nations of the Middle East they may well expect to face the United States Armed Forces. It is not intended to apply to any disagreements that might arise between the several nations of that area. They can well adjust their own difficulties with each other without outside aid and they can do it. The resolution is a notice of our intention to the one country, the Soviet Union, which might have ideas of aggression and conquest, that the United States will give the full weight of its support to the little nations that want to be free. These small nations, if they are to continue in the free-world orbit, must have assurances that they will not be left alone and helpless before Soviet aggression. We know we would not leave them to be swallowed up because the great heart of America would demand we reach out to protect those free nations which were attacked. We offer this boldly now as a deterrent to the ambitions of the Soviets. We want them to know how America feels about the desirability of freedom for all countries, big and little. We want them to know what they might expect. Our position clearly defined can work for peace.

The resolution carries no additional moneys. It does provide that the administration shall be permitted to use money now available, now appropriated, to be expended in any country in the region where it can be expended to the best advantage in the fight for security and freedom.

What is wrong with that? We have appropriated the money to bring peace and economic security to that area of the world; why should we object if the President believes it is essential for the peace, for the welfare of the world, to make some changes in the distribution of that money? That is the way we want it expended. That is the reason we made the appropriation in the first instance, to strengthen the forces on our side in the fight for a free world.

The principle expressed has been successfully applied in Western Europe, the Far East, and Southeast Asia. The Red Chinese did not press forward after the Formosa resolution, when they knew what would be the certain course of the United States. That resolution was a war deterrent, and I honestly believe that this resolution as framed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be a war deterrent. Certainly this resolution will not be provocative of war. If there should be any Soviet aggression afterward, it would simply mean the Soviets deliberately wanted to provoke war and nothing could sway them from that de-

cision. Certainly they would have no misunderstanding as to what would be the attitude of the United States. With existing conditions in the Soviet world where people clamor for food and freedom they will not risk tangling with a strong Western World.

Now, let us consider for a moment what would be the situation if we rejected the resolution. I hesitate to even think of the disastrous results that would ensue if we rejected this resolution. It could well be interpreted to mean that in our refusal to pass the resolution overwhelmingly we would be giving the Soviets an invitation to proceed against the little nations in the East. Failure to pass the resolution would bring doubt and despair to the countries, who are our friends and allies. The failure of this resolution could well swing these little nations to the Soviet side. If we failed to give them these assurances, Soviet propaganda constantly at work might break down the regard of those Asiatic countries for the United States. Self preservation would be the first thought.

My colleagues, I believe that the best interests and the future welfare of the United States and the free world will be advanced by a quick and emphatic endorsement of this resolution. President Eisenhower stands before the world today as the greatest champion of peace. He believes that this resolution can be of tremendous value toward this end. His is the responsibility in those far off countries, and who are we to go contrary to the solemn judgment of the President of the United States? He knows better than we the real situation. We certainly should not put our personal views or prejudices above the man entrusted by the people of this Nation with the awful responsibility of guiding our destiny in this critical period. I do not think that we will. I believe we will give the President the support he asks for, and I believe with him it will avert the struggle that if it came would shake the whole world and destroy much of the civilized progress of past generations.

We must not forget that Soviet ambitions are for world conquest. We would not want to be forced to fight the battle for freedom alone. We must keep strong other peoples who share our desires for freedom. With their help we can win the battle for freedom for all people. Divided it is not a pleasant picture which unfolds.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the ordering of the previous question, because I believe that it is the orderly way to handle this problem. I shall support the rule and at the conclusion of the debate when the committee arises I shall support the resolution. Through these votes I believe I shall uphold the noble efforts of President Eisenhower to bring stability, economic recovery and peace to the Mid East. Through these votes I confidently hope to avert war and bring the blessed peace all mankind needs badly.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to address myself to the adoption of the rule itself. This is not only a serious but a very solemn occasion. There have been many great debates in the history of this body. The atmosphere of the room is filled with the great debates of yesterday. I feel the impact of them. This is one of the solemn and serious occasions in which the House considers a matter which might be of vital importance in the history of our country and in the future history of the world.

We are a very practical body. We obtain results. A closed rule is the rare exception; we all know that and responsible leadership resorts to it only on rare occasions.

I can remember, when tax bills have come up, that no Member objected to a closed rule. Yet here is a resolution which concerns the national interest of the United States, far more important than a tax bill, important as that is to our domestic economy and our domestic life.

This is a resolution which is of transcendent importance. I cannot foresee its operation in the future but I try to see what may be the natural and probable consequences of the passage of this resolution. I hope it will be for affirmative action, for strength. I hope it will be not based on fear, uncertainty, vacillation. I know this much; it is of primary importance to the national interest of my country and certainly those who have never objected to a closed rule in connection with a tax bill, for example, in my opinion cannot justifiably advance an argument against a closed rule in this case, when every one of us recognizes that it concerns the national interests of our own country.

Therefore I hope that if an attempt is made to prevent the previous question being ordered it will be defeated; that the previous question will be ordered and the rule as reported out of the Committee on Rules will be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recognizing my friend from Ohio as a very versatile Member of the House, I yield to him with considerable reluctance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I just want to remind him that he and I have joined once or twice in opposing some of the arbitrary actions of the Committee on Rules in connection with tax legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that I ever opposed a closed rule on tax legislation. My friend's memory may be better than mine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure it is.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I should like a bill of particulars. As far as I am concerned, I think I have always supported a closed rule in connection with tax legislation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It has been said by some that because amendments were offered in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, therefore they ought to be offered and debated and voted upon here in the House. But is it not true that in the Committee on Foreign Affairs those amendments were offered and debated in executive session, that there was no public discussion of all the reasons in detail, involving some of our allies as well as our enemies, why it would be most unwise, even dangerous, to adopt those amendments? Is that not the truth? If we were to discuss all those amendments here in public, it would be like General Eisenhower and his staff at SHEAF during the war, holding their meetings in public when they were deciding what to do and how, where, and when, in order to win that war. You cannot have staff discussions in public if you want to win a war, and the plain fact is that we are in a war which we must win by the measures under consideration in this resolution, if we are to avoid all-out shooting war.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate my friend's logic and his eloquence, but I have very little time left.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say there are many things taken up in executive session, of course, that in the national interest of our country cannot be made public at a particular time. But I reiterate to those who have voted for closed rules on tax bills that certainly there are some commanding reasons why we should vote for a closed rule on this resolution.

Let me say to my friends on the Democratic side that nobody has been more critical of the present administration and the conduct of foreign policy than I have been. I criticized the President's statement back in July 2 years ago about Geneva, when he said the Communist leaders were sincere in their desire for peace. I have criticized the lack of action. I have criticized inaction. I know that inaction is the road of appeasement, and appeasement is the road to war. I would rather take the calculated risk of action than the calculated risk of inaction. I know if my country does nothing the Communists gain, not that we intend it. I know if we for any reason follow the course of inaction it is beneficial to the Kremlin and harmful to the United States and other countries who want to be free under their own law.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] made a great speech, and, as he so ably said, this is affirmative action. There is a calculated risk in connection with it, of course there is, but in my opinion there is a greater calculated risk in connection with inaction.

Let me remind my friends on my own side, and we are considering this as Americans, not Democrats or Republicans, that tomorrow is the seventy-fifth anniversary of one of the greatest men that ever lived, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In his first inaugural speech in 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt among other things said:

> First of all, let me assert my firm belief that the one thing we have to fear is fear itself.

He also said:

The Nation calls for action and action now.

He was referring to the internal conditions existing in our country at that time, but his words are applicable today to the world situation that confronts us.

Let me asert, in the words of Roosevelt, "my firm belief that the one thing we have to fear is fear itself."

There are many persons in America who are fearful of what the Communist leaders say. I think it is about time we let the Communist leaders worry about what we think and what we say. It is about time we got affirmative.

I realize that this is more or less of a delayed action. I realize that if certain things had been done three months ago we probably would not be in this predicament; but that is water over the dam. We are faced with the situation that confronts us today.

One of the speakers said it requires courage. Yes; it requires courage in this Chamber to vote on some occasions. You and I, today, are charged, and in our time we are charged with the direct responsibility as Members of the Congress of the United States not only to do those things which would preserve our country for ourselves, but also to preserve our country for our children and our children's children—for future generations of America. And knowing the Communist mind, as I do, with its mind of hate—with its mind of viciousness—with its mind of world destruction—of world conquest and world domination—knowing that mind I know the only way it can be frustrated is by affirmative action—not by delays, not by weakness, not by inaction—only by action. This resolution represents affirmative action on the part of our country in connection with a very important part of the world which directly concerns the national interests of the United States. I could criticize—yes; many things—more than those who oppose this. I could probably make more critical statements than those who oppose it. But, that is not going to do any good. We are faced with a situation—a condition and not a theory. I hope we will meet that situation today by overwhelmingly passing the resolution which has been reported to us by the Committee on Rules and on tomorrow by overwhelmingly passing the resolution reported to us by our Committee on Foreign Affairs. This is not a vote of confidence for President Eisenhower—to me it is a vote of confidence in the United States of America.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that such Members as may desire may extend their remarks as this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely doubtful that more important legislation than House Joint Resolution 117, in all its ramifications and potentialities, will come before Congress this year.

It follows, therefore, that this proposed closed rule, which prohibits individual Members from offering amendments and imposes a heavy gag upon full and free debate, constitutes an unwarranted and unthinkable encroachment upon the democratic process of legislation.

Who seeks to impose this rule? A comparative handful of the total Members of the House as represented by some, but not all, the members of the Rules and Foreign Affairs Committees, unquestionably aided and abetted by an even smaller handful of those designated as leaders of the House.

What is the meaning of the action upon which we are about to embark? If it is to have true moral meaning, it must reflect the great freedoms and safeguards enunciated in our Constitution, not the least of which is a representative government wholly dependent upon the separation of powers and the untrammeled functioning of the legislative branch.

Several years ago, as a new Member, I listened and was deeply impressed when our present distinguished Speaker told us of the proud traditions of this deliberative body—this House of Representatives; of its closeness and responsiveness to all citizens of the Nation.

Yet under this proposed rule, on grave questions of constitutionality and delegated power, it is proposed to effectively strike down that deliberative process and substitute therefore the will of a comparative few.

Within a few days this resolution or one of a similar nature will undoubtedly be considered by the other body. Surely it will not be contended that the other body will enact this or any other resolution of such grave import without full debate and the opportunity for individual amendments.

Then who among you is prepared to say that this House is less capable or lacking in courage than the other body in working its free will upon this or any other legislation?

With Congress in session and available to meet any real emergency, I cannot vote to ram through the House under this proposed procedure legislation of such staggering importance.

I urge the House to vote "No" on the previous question, amend the rule, and proceed to the orderly and democratic process of considering this legislation.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this rule for a variety of reasons. In spite of this, I shall support and vote for the resolution under consideration. I shall support it because serving notice that we will not permit further aggression by the Soviet is long past due.

Along with many of my colleagues, I have been urging direction and firmness for many months. It has been said, and is worth repeating, that the Soviet bear understands strength, and only strength. Sincerity of purpose in effecting fair compromise is always considered weakness by those who would stoop to conquer.

While I recognize that there are some instances in which debate should be limited, this rule should have been an open one with full and free discussion, and completely open to amendment. Too many questions remain unresolved by this resolution. Our State Department's constant appeasement of the tin-horn tyrants of the Middle East must be stopped immediately. The problem of subversion from within must be considered if we are truly interested in stemming the tide of communism. A determined stand must be taken to get the Arab States to recognize and accept Israel as a de facto and de jure state. The Arab States should forfeit all rights to aid, economic as well as military, if they do not agree to negotiate a real peace with Israel. The United States should forthrightly pursue a course, in and out of the United Nations, to insure passage of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal.

These are the root causes of the unrest in the Middle East, and we are just kidding ourselves if we do nothing about these problems.

This closed rule destroyed a great opportunity to really dig into the basics of the problem.

It is a pity that the leadership on both sides saw fit to lose such an opportunity.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether House Joint Resolution 117 should be considered after free debate or with debate controlled only by the proponents of the resolution and with no opportunity for amendments to be offered is purely and simply a procedural question for the House of Representatives. It is not, as some have sought to present it, any indication of the support of the Congress for the President's proposal for action in the Middle East. So to construe it would be a grave distortion.

I intend to vote for the Middle East resolution and to vote for the rule making it in order, even though the rule is not amended, as I believe it should be, to permit free and full debate. The only way I can make clear my views, both on the method of debate and the legislation itself, is by voting against ordering the previous question. If someone chooses to distort and misinterpret my position and is successful in selling such a distortion to anyone else, then they ought to be equally able to make anyone believe that black is white and that my vote for the resolution was actually a vote against the resolution. I am sorry this argument was raised by responsible leaders, because if that philosophy should govern our deliberations here there is no point in considering national policies on the basis of fact and logic and the principles we believe should guide the welfare of our Nation under that philosophy. We would just vote on the basis of our calculation of what distortions may possibly be believed by others.

Another fallacious argument, presented by the majority leader, was that because we vote frequently for limitation of amendment on tax legislation we should not hesitate to vote for shutting off discussion and amendment on this resolution, which, as the majority leader stated, was "far more important."

This would seem to be based upon the principle that the more important the legislation is, the less discussion there should be about it. The truth, of course, is that, as every Member knows, revenue measures which affect an endless variety of products or classes of incomes, and provide exceptions and exemptions, require technical consideration of the pros and cons and a balanc-

ing of equities so that the cost of governmental functions does not bear disproportionately on any segment of the population or any area of our national economy. To permit amendments on the floor of the House on tax measures would lead to endless proposals for the benefit of this or that segment of our economy or our population, with possible trading and backscratching, and would result in the likelihood of a complete breakdown in the orderly consideration of tax legislation. It is my understanding that this untoward result was precisely what led to the custom of considering revenue measures under a closed rule, a custom with which I find no fault even though it perhaps places undue authority in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and is not paralleled in the consideration of revenue measures in the other body.

The measure before us is in no way similar to revenue measures and the considerations which make it appropriate to limit amendments on complicated tax bills are in no way applicable here.

The general public, perhaps, does not appreciate that one of the effects of the closed rule on legislation of the kind here under consideration is that not only does it prohibit the offering of amendments which might change the meaning of the legislation, but it deprives Members of the opportunity to express themselves to their colleagues, regardless of whether they are for or against the legislation. This rule provides, as do all rules for the consideration of bills, that the time for debate be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority Member of the committee sponsoring the measure. It is within the power of these two Members to allot time for discussion of the measure only to those who are in favor of it or to those whose views are in harmony with their own. It is the usual practice to divide the time among the Members of the committee and quite frequently no one else is permitted to speak.

What, then, is the effect of this method of considering legislation? Is it not obvious that it leads to the presentation of a distorted case? It does not give Members who must make their individual decisions the benefit of the arguments pro and con. It provides them only with the arguments in favor of the position the committee has taken. A similar situation would be presented in a court case if the plaintiff were permitted to offer all the testimony and make the only argument and the defendant were prevented either from challenging the reliability of the facts or the validity of the reasoning of his opponent and at the same time were denied the right to offer facts or reasons in his own behalf. This is not in harmony with the American concept of fair play. It is not in harmony with the determination of policy by elected representatives after a full and free discussion of both sides. It is not, in my opinion, in harmony with democratic processes, but, on the contrary, is similar to the rigged and staged procedures of totalitarian governments.

What, might I ask, do the leaders fear? Are they afraid that some individual Representative who is not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee might have a thought or a suggestion or an argument which might influence the action of the House of Representatives? Do they have such a low opinion of the general membership of the House of Representatives that they cannot trust them to exercise responsibility and judgment on a matter which they, the leaders, assert is of such great consequence to the future of our country? Are they willing to admit that democratic processes and the determination of national policy by the elected representatives of the people are no longer to be trusted?

It was suggested during the debate that a vote in favor of an open rule and against a closed rule would be a vote against President Eisenhower. I cannot follow this line of reasoning. The rules of the House and the manner under which we consider legislation are, under the Constitution, clearly and exclusively the responsibility of the House. The President is given no authority, directly or indirectly, over the determination of the rules of the House, and this has been a principle which has prevailed in parliamentary bodies from the time the English House of Commons won its independence from the Crown.

I regret exceedingly that the leadership and the Rules Committee have seen fit to attempt to bring this matter before the House on a closed rule. I believe the psychological effect of the action of the Congress on House Joint Resolution 117 would have been far more beneficial to the program if we could say to the world that this policy had been approved after full and free discussion and consideration than will be its value if we railroad it through the House and deny elected Representatives of the people the right to participate in debate.

Mr. Speaker, because I anticipated that I might have no opportunity to present my substantive views on the Middle East resolution otherwise, I addressed the House yesterday under special order and my remarks appear on pages 1030 to 1033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1957.

I hope the previous question is voted down.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my misgivings about this resolution and the inability of the House to amend and improve House Joint Resolution 117.

I fear that unless the form of this resolution is changed we will set a precedent which, in the long run, can only weaken the office of the Presidency and endanger our national security.

In 1799 Chief Justice John Marshall declared that the Executive is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations. This, today, is, I believe, still the last word on the division of powers by our Constitution.

Unless I misread the terms of House Joint Resolution 117, it invites the Congress to underwrite the principle that, absent a delegation of authority by the Congress, the Executive is not authorized to implement our foreign policies by the use of military force or otherwise.

This new principle may, I fear, be fraught with peril for our country. In the years ahead our Presidents, to properly defend our interests—or the interests of the world community—may have to act overnight with swift decisiveness. I forsee circumstances where the precedent we may set here today may deter future Chief Executives from acting when the national interest requires a course of bold action.

This is the prime matter which I should have liked to see the House debate during the consideration of this resolution. May I express the hope that our colleagues in the other body will consider and clarify this vital question.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I vote "No" on the "gag" rule because the resolution might be improved from possible amendments and in any event, in the end, would more accurately depict the sense of the House.

At most, an open rule would have meant only a day or two of further debate, a time interval that would not in any way impair the force of the resolution. In my opinion, a fully considered resolution would be stronger and more effective.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 146, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—262

Adair	Cole	Griffin
Addonizio	Collier	Gubser
Albert	Cooper	Hagen
Allen, Calif.	Corbett	Hale
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Halleck
Anfuso	Cramer	Harden
Arends	Cretella	Hardy
Auchincloss	Cunningham, Iowa	Harris
Avery	Cunningham, Nebr.	Harrison, Nebr.
Ayres	Curtin	Harvey
Baker	Curtis, Mass.	Haskell
Baldwin	Curtis, Mo.	Hays, Ark.
Baring	Dague	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Dawson, Ill.	Hess
Bates	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Baumhart	Delaney	Hillings
Beamer	Dellay	Hoeven
Backworth	Dempsey	Holland
Belcher	Dennison	Holmes
Bennett, Fla.	Derounian	Horan
Berry	Devereux	Hosmer
Blitch	Dies	Huddleston
Boland	Diggs	Hyde
Bolling	Dixon	Ikard
Bolton	Donohue	Jackson
Bonner	Dooley	James
Boykin	Dorn, N. Y.	Jarman
Boyle	Doyle	Johnson
Breeding	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Brooks, La.	Eberharter	Judd
Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson	Karsten
Broomfield	Elliott	Kean
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Kearney
Brown, Mo.	Fallon	Kearns
Broyhill	Fascell	Keating
Burleson	Fenton	Kee
Bush	Fisher	Kelly, N. Y.
Byrd	Flood	Keogh
Byrne, Ill.	Fogarty	Kilburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Forand	Kilday
Canfield	Frazier	Kilgore
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	King
Carnahan	Fulton	Kirwan
Carrigg	Gary	Kluczynski
Cederberg	Gathings	Laird
Chamberlain	Gavin	Landrum
Chenoweth	George	Lane
Chiperfield	Gordon	Lanham
Christopher	Gregory	Lankford
Coad		Latham
Coffin		LeCompte

Lesinski	Patterson	Simpson, Pa.
Loser	Pelly	Smith, Va.
McConnell	Perkins	Spence
McCormack	Philbin	Springer
McDonough	Pilcher	Staggers
McIntire	Pillion	Stauffer
McIntosh	Poff	Steed
Mack, Ill.	Preston	Sullivan
Mack, Wash.	Price	Taber
Madden	Prouty	Talle
Magnuson	Radwan	Teague, Calif.
Mahon	Rains	Thompson, Tex.
Mailliard	Ray	Thomson, Wyo.
Marshall	Reece, Tenn.	Thornberry
Martin	Rees, Kans.	Tollefson
May	Reuss	Trimble
Merrow	Rhodes, Ariz.	Ullman
Metcalf	Richlman	Vanik
Michel	Roberts	Van Pelt
Miller, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.	Van Zandt
Miller, Md.	Rodino	Vinson
Miller, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.	Vorys
Mills	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
Moore	Rooney	Wainwright
Morano	Sadlak	Walter
Mumma	St. George	Watts
Natcher	Saund	Weaver
Nimtz	Saylor	Westland
Norblad	Schwengel	Wharton
Norrell	Scott, Pa.	Widnall
O'Brien, Ill.	Scudder	Wigglesworth
O'Brien, N. Y.	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
O'Hara, Ill.	Selden	Withrow
O'Neill	Sheehan	Wolverton
Osmers	Sheppard	Wright
Ostertag	Sieminski	Young
Patman	Simpson, Ill.	Younger

NAYS—146

Abbitt	Green, Oreg.	Nicholson
Abernethy	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Minn.
Alexander	Griffiths	O'Konski
Alger	Gross	Pfost
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn	Poage
	Haley	Polk
Anderson, Mont.	Harrison, Va.	Porter
	Healey	Powell
Andrews	Hébert	Reed
Ashley	Hemphill	Rhodes, Pa.
Ashmore	Henderson	Riley
Aspinall	Herlong	Robeson, Va.
Barden	Hiestand	Rogers, Fla.
Barrett	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Bass, Tenn.	Holifield	Rutherford
Becker	Holt	Santangelo
Bennett, Mich.	Holtzman	Schenck
Bentley	Hull	Scherer
Betts	Jenkins	Scott, N. C.
Blatnik	Jennings	Scrivner
Bosch	Johansen	Shelley
Bow	Jonas	Shuford
Bray	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Keeney	Siler
Brownson	Kitchin	Sisk
Budge	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Burdick	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Byrne, Pa.	Krueger	Smith, Miss.
Celler	Lennon	Smith, Wis.
Chudoff	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Church	Long	Teller
Clevenger	McCarthy	Tewes
Colmer	McCulloch	Thomas
Cooley	McFall	Thompson, La.
Davis, Ga.	McGovern	Thompson, N. J.
Denton	McGregor	Tuck
Dingell	McMillan	Udall
Dowdy	McVey	Utt
Durham	Macdonald	Whitener
Engle	Machrowicz	Whitten
Farbstein	Mason	Wier
Feighan	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Fino	Meader	Willis
Flynt	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Forrester	Minshall	Winstead
Fountain	Morris	Yates
Friedel	Moss	Zablocki
Granahan	Moulder	Zelenko
Grant	Multer	
Gray	Neal	

NOT VOTING—23

Andresen, August H.	Davis, Tenn.	Morgan
	Dollinger	Morrison
Bailey	Dorn, S. C.	Passman
Boggs	Ford	Rabaut
Bowler	Garmatz	Rivers
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Tex.
Chelf	Jensen	Taylor
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Williams, N. Y.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. HEALEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks on the purposes and contents of House Joint Resolution 117, I want to explain some of the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this measure. President Eisenhower appeared before the Congress in a joint session on January 5 to direct our attention to the extremely grave situation in the Middle East and to ask our cooperation. That was on Saturday. On the following Monday, January 7, our committee began hearings on the draft resolution that accompanied the President's message. At that time our committee had not even been formally constituted. But all of us thought the matter so important that we proceeded on an informal basis until the committee was chosen by the House. I state this point simply to show that we lost no time in considering the President's request.

The questions raised by this resolution are the kind that can only be answered after a searching examination. For that reason our committee held lengthy hearings during which it heard from witnesses in the executive branch as well as from other individuals whom we felt could contribute to our analysis of the problems involved or who asked to be heard. We had 15 sessions at which witnesses appeared. Included in that number were executive sessions in which Secretary of State Dulles and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, gave more complete answers to the many questions on our minds. After these executive sessions I urged upon both the witnessses to lean over backwards to make as much of their testimony available as they could possibly do. I think the published hearings will show that only a small portion of their answers has not been made public.

After the hearings were concluded, we wasted no time in marking up this resolution. The committee had four long sessions, going over it word by word. As a result of these deliberations, we added five amendments to the original resolution. This resolution was reported out by a vote of 24 to 2, with 1 Member voting present. Needless to say, this measure has the bipartisan support of our committee. I hope that the vote on final passage in the House will be just as conclusive a demonstration of bipartisanship. Then we had two more sessions during which we wrote the report. I commend the report to the Members of the House. In it we tried to answer many of the questions about which we were troubled and which, I think, are probably bothering many Members.

I want to pay tribute to my colleagues on the committee. This is the first measure that I have handled as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Had it not been for the consideration and cooperation of the members, my job would have been much more difficult. No matter how long the sessions, how late the hour, or how vigorous the discussion, we were all motivated by a common purpose—to do what each of us thought best to respond to the emergency confronting us.

Finally, I want to express my own deep appreciation—and I think I can speak for every member of the committee on this point—to the men and women of our staff. After our day's work was done, theirs began. They worked night after night, often until the early hours of the morning. Without their loyal cooperation and devoted efforts this resolution would not have been reported out as promptly as it was.

This resolution deals with courses of action in relation to the immediate and critical military and economic threats in the Middle East. It does not deal with the many long-standing local tensions and conflicts in the area. All of those are complicated and certainly not capable of solution by legislation.

I direct the attention of the Members to pages 4 and 5 of our committee report that spell out the 3 primary objectives of the resolution:

First, it puts the Soviet Union on notice that the United States intends to use its Armed Forces if necessary to secure and protect any nation or group of nations of the Middle East requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism, thus minimizing the possibility of war by miscalculation.

Second, the resolution is intended to make clear to the governments and the people of the Middle East the attitude and the policy of the United States toward them. The United States makes clear its vital interest in the status of that area. The United States also makes clear, however, that it believes that its interests can best be protected if the nations of the Middle East are able to main-

tain their independence and integrity, and that the United States policy toward the area and its readiness to provide assistance contemplates no infringement of the sovereignty of any nation.

Third, the resolution removes certain restrictions on the use of mutual-security funds by the President which are contained in existing law. No new money is authorized. The events of the last few months in the Middle East have not only increased the need for assistance to certain nations in that area, but have also made necessary a revision of other programs. The resolution gives the President greater discretion as to the use of funds already appropriated.

One of the most debated parts of the resolution in our committee concerned the economic provisions contained in section 3. The committee amended that section to clarify the language in the original version. It cannot be stated too emphatically that this resolution authorizes no money. It simply removes certain existing legal restrictions on the use of funds already appropriated but not yet spent. The new language makes clear that such funds, not to exceed $200 million, are available for the balance of this fiscal year, that is, up to June 30, 1957. Many of us were concerned that with such a large sum available without any limitation on the amount to a country we might become involved in gigantic projects like the Aswan Dam. Our Government would then have a moral, if not legal, obligation to complete the project. By making the money available under section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act, there is a limit of $30 million on the amount that can be used in any one country.

The committee asked the Secretary of State and Mr. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, what they had in mind as to the countries that would receive assistance and what kind of assistance would be given. On a geographical basis a country in the "general area of the Middle East" would qualify. That does not mean that all of them will automatically get economic assistance. It simply is impossible at this time to state what countries will receive aid. Each situation will have to be examined on its own merits. There must, of course, be a real and pressing need for economic assistance. A country must want it and be able to use it. In no case will we give assistance until the President has determined that it is in the security interests of the United States.

The purposes for which we give economic assistance cannot be foretold now. After all, this is an emergency program and will have to be dealt with as such. The closing of the Suez Canal has disrupted the area's economy as has the blowing up of oil pipelines. So in some countries our aid may simply be budgetary support to tide the government over until its usual revenues can be restored. In other cases we may have to assist in some development projects that will stimulate the country's economy. I do not expect that any long-range economic development programs will come out of this resolution. In his message the President stated that he will ask $200 million additional for each of fiscal years 1958 and 1959 for programs in this area. We know nothing about what he is going to suggest. But when he does make his request, we will examine it carefully.

Any military assistance given under section 3 as the committee amended it can be done without regard to existing limitations set down in the Mutual Security Act. The principal restrictions that are waived by this section so far as military assistance is concerned are these: First, the conditions specified in section 105 of the Mutual Security Act; second, the requirement in section 105 (b) that when military assistance is furnished for regional defense purposes it may be furnished only in accordance with plans and arrangements which shall have been found by the President to require a recipient nation to take an important part in the defense of the area; third, the Presidential finding required in section 141; and fourth, the requirement that no military assistance and defense support assistance can be furnished until the nation receiving such assistance shall have agreed to the items specified in section 142. The principal reason for these waivers is to make it possible for countries, as Secretary Dulles said, to "maintain loyal forces they can depend upon to maintain law and order."

One factor that influenced my judgment about this whole program is the fact that our former colleague, Dick Richards, is making a study of the area's needs and problems. All of us remember him as a thoughtful and prudent man when it comes to spending public money. I have complete confidence that he will not approve any program that is not going to give the American people full value.

This is an emergency program. That is why the President is asking for this authority. In my opinion the only way to deal with such a situation is to give him the flexibility he needs to deal rapidly with the problems in the Middle East. It is my earnest hope that if they can be handled successfully, he will not have to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Like every Member in this House, I am concerned about the use of our military forces. The President's message gives some assurance on this point. He told us that if our forces had to be used, he would maintain close contact with Congress and call us back if we were not in session. Moreover, the resolution itself specifies the terms under which our forces would be used. Three conditions are laid down: first, there must be overt armed aggression; second, such aggression must come from a nation controlled by international communism; and third, the nation or group of nations attacked must request our military aid. This rules out our intervention in local conflicts and border raids.

Each of us can think up hypothetical situations that could give rise to the employment of our Armed Forces. There is no use trying to catalog these. There is no single or simple formula by which it can be determined that a nation has committed an act of overt armed aggression. The same is true when you try to identify whether a nation is controlled by international communism. Each of these requires the exercise of judgment based on particular circumstances at the time the issue arises. Finally, while a nation may request our military assistance, we are not obligated to give such assistance if in our judgment it is not desirable. This is a unilateral determination to be made by our Government; it is not a treaty obligation.

As a further assurance to the world and particularly to the peoples of the Middle East that we will not indiscriminately use military forces, our committee added another proviso that any use the United States may have to make of its Armed Forces in the area "shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations." The resolution already contained a proviso that such action "shall be consonant with the charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations" and as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Thus, we reaffirm our adherence to the principles of the United Nations without denying ourselves the inherent right of self-defense.

Two other committee amendments should be mentioned. Instead of an annual report, as the Executive proposed, we adopted an amendment to require reports in January and July of each year. While I have no doubt that the Secretary of State will keep us fully informed about developments in the area, I think the information contained in a semiannual report will be helpful in keeping the public better informed.

Our committee also provided that the resolution could be terminated by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. This follows a practice used in previous legislation. Some consideration was given to including a specific date for the expiration of the authority in the resolution. But the Secretary told us that to work out this situation—in the Middle East—may take an appreciable amount of time. If Congress feels that there is any abuse of authority, it can always terminate that authority by its own action.

After all the analyses and explanations have been made, the fact remains that all that the Congress is doing in this resolution is joining with the President to speak with unity and firmness in cooperating with the peoples of the Middle East to maintain their national independence. As a Nation we have viewed with sympathy, and have given support to, their efforts to establish their own governments. Now that their hard-won independence is threatened by Soviet colonialism we stand ready to help them. We want none of their territory. We do not want to convert the area into a sphere of influence. Its economic progress and security can only be assured by the nations of the area itself. If Soviet intrigue can be eliminated or minimized, there is a reasonably good chance that tensions among the nations can be reduced and local problems worked out. This resolution certainly does not deal with all the area's problems. It is the responsibility of

the President and the Secretary of State to formulate specific policies that will contribute to their solution. Through this resolution we are serving notice on the Soviet Union that we are not indifferent to its machinations in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me remind you that this resolution deals with a situation in the Middle East which is of direct concern to the security of the United States. I would like to take a few minutes to indicate the nature of that emergency and to point out why immediate action by the Congress is necessary.

I am well aware that the statement has been made, and repeated from time to time, that we are dealing with old conflicts which have gone on for years and that there is no occasion for the action which the President has recommended.

Let me point out, however, that a situation is continuing to develop in the Middle East which, if not arrested, will result in the taking over of that area by the Soviet Union.

I want to make clear that there has been no evidence presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee that a military attack on any nation of the Middle East is imminent. The Soviet Union has made no threat of this sort and there is no evidence of any massing of troops to accomplish such a purpose.

The committee should consider, however, that the Soviet Union has the means at hand to make an attack on the Middle Eastern area on very short notice. It maintains, as it has for years, substantial forces on its borders adjacent to that area. Its shipment of arms to two countries of the Middle East might indicate a desire to develop armed satellite forces which could do its bidding in the future.

The greatest military danger probably exists because of the disturbed conditions in certain areas where governments have been weakened by internal dissension to the extent that the Soviet leaders might feel that they could safely march in and take over without serious opposition.

The testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicated, however, that the principal Soviet threat to the Middle East was subversion rather than overt armed aggression. Soviet activity in the area has increased during recent months. Tension in the area is very great, and certain governments are confronted with problems which appear to them to be almost insoluble. Furthermore, as a result of the Suez fighting, the remaining ties connecting the United Kingdom and France with the nations of this area have been severed. For many years the peoples of some of the Middle Eastern countries have been inclined to turn to these European nations for assistance and guidance when confronted with a crisis. Under present conditions they are not likely to do so. The Soviet Union is actively inviting the nations of the Middle East to look to it for support.

ACTION NECESSARY

The United States is confronted with the fact that the seeds of the malignancy of international communism have been planted in the Middle East and that they will develop until the entire area succumbs unless effective action is taken. It is necessary to act promptly not because the Soviet Union will take over tomorrow or next month if we do not act, but because every day we delay initiating countermeasures the problem of arresting the growth of communism becomes more difficult, and the chances of our success diminish.

The first action provided in the resolution is to put the Soviet Union on notice that the United States is ready to use its Armed Forces to meet overt armed aggression against any nation of the Middle East upon the request of such nation for our assistance. I do not believe that the Soviet leaders will be tempted to send their armed forces into a small country beset with internal troubles if they know that they will have to fight the United States.

It is of equal, if not greater, importance to give assurance to the nations of the Middle East that we are ready and able to give them economic support. General Gruenther, in testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, as I recall it, when asked to choose between being deprived of the military provisions of the resolution or the economic provisions, said that was like asking him to choose whether he would rather lose an arm or a leg, but that if forced to make a choice, he would choose the economic assistance as more important than the military.

There are important differences between the situation which confronted the United States in connection with sending military and economic assistance to Western Europe and the situation that exists in the Middle East. The countries of Western Europe were fully aware of the Soviet danger and had a clear understanding of their economic problems. They also had complete confidence in the good intentions of the United States and earnestly desired our help.

In the case of a number of countries in the Middle East, these conditions do not prevail. Let me make clear that this is true of only certain countries. As we all know, Turkey is a member of NATO and is formally and firmly committed to the side of the free world. There are other countries in the area, particularly those bordering upon Soviet territory, which are fully conscious of the danger and desire our assistance.

On the other hand some of the Middle Eastern countries are much more concerned with the national independence which they have recently obtained and preoccupied with their internal political and economic affairs and are motivated more by considerations of national pride and dignity than by fear of Communist aggression. These nations are not pro-Communist, they merely have had little opportunity to make a critical evaluation of what international communism is and has done and are inclined to regard the Soviet Union as having little connection with their immediate problems.

Several of these nations are inclined to resent any offer of assistance by a Western nation. They do not wish to become protectorates of any country. Some of them are reluctant to accept economic aid. They remember that only a few years ago their government offices were filled with European officials. They fear that the acceptance of economic aid may mean that foreign officials may again assume a voice in their internal affairs.

For these reasons we are confronted with very difficult problems in dealing with the governments of this part of the world. It is not in our interest to suggest that they choose sides immediately, and offer our help only to those ready to aline themselves with us. Our primary objective is to keep the potential of the area from falling under Soviet control.

It is essential that we convince the countries of the area that we are ready to come to their aid if they are subject to military attack and that we are ready to help them to meet their pressing internal problems. At the same time we must also convince them that we respect their independence and integrity and have no desire to impose on their sovereignty in any way. It will take great tact and skill, as well as great flexibility in the administration of our programs if we are to succeed in these purposes.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

I am sure that there are some who will say that even though we acknowledge that the emergency exists and that action along the lines outlined is necessary, we still do not see why Congress should pass a resolution. Does not the President have the authority to do what is necessary and should he not assume responsibility without asking the Congress to commit itself?

Let me emphasize, in the first place, that I do not believe that the President needs this resolution in order to be able to tell the Soviet Union that we are ready to use our Armed Forces to meet armed aggression in the Middle East. The statement on page 7 of the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee sets forth my views exactly:

> This resolution does not detract from or enlarge the constitutional power and authority of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.
>
> Likewise, the resolution does not delegate or diminish in any way the power and authority of the Congress of the United States to declare war, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.
>
> The committee does not in any way seek to interpret the Constitution of the United States with regard to the power of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.
>
> We emphasize that the resolution is a declaration of the solidarity of the people of the United States expressed through their President and the Congress on our policy of cooperation with the nations of the Middle East.

There is no doubt in my mind, however, that it is essential for Congress to state its position on this matter in order that the Soviet dictators can be sure that Congress stands with the President and to remove any possibility that they might launch an attack because they did not

correctly evaluate our intentions. I am sure, also, that the countries of the Middle East which we want to help will be reassured if the proposal made by the President is endorsed by the Congress.

Aside from any constitutional question, the resolution in section 3 does remove certain restrictions on the expenditure of funds which are contained in existing law and which would constitute a serious handicap to the program during the remaining months of the present fiscal year.

One of the most important of these is the provision in section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act that not more than 20 percent of any appropriation may be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year. The intent of this limitation is clear and under normal circumstances I believe it to be justified. However, the developments which have occurred in the Middle East have created a very difficult situation. In several countries where we have had mutual security programs in operation it was necessary for us to suspend the programs and to bring home our personnel. While we hope to resume some of these programs before the end of the fiscal year, it will be essential that authority be granted to obligate more than 20 percent of the funds after April 30. In other cases it will be necessary to inaugurate programs in countries which have not received United States aid heretofore and to make substantial changes in programs contemplated for other countries. This is particularly true where we may find it desirable to provide budgetary assistance to a few nations whose revenues have been drastically curtailed as a consequence of the interruption to the flow of Middle Eastern oil. In cases such as these the planning of programs is just being started and it will be impossible to obligate funds until late in the fiscal year.

The resolution also authorizes the President to waive the requirements for agreements by nations receiving our assistance. This does not mean that the President expects not to require agreements, but considering the conditions which exist in the area it is desirable that he have discretion as to the sort of commitments to be included.

Section 3 also removes the requirement that 80 percent of funds appropriated for development assistance must be made available on a loan basis. Again, it is expected that a substantial amount of the assistance provided under the resolution will be in the form of loans. There has been some indication that countries in the area would prefer to have aid supplied to them in that manner. Nevertheless it is desirable to permit discretion in this matter. Under present conditions some governments are not in a position to enter into loan commitments.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again that the primary objective of the resolution is to prevent the nations of the Middle East from falling under the domination of international communism. I believe that action along the line proposed under the resolution will prevent this from happening without involving the United States in military conflict. I do not think that we can expect the course of action outlined by the President to be effective if the Congress fails to approve the legislation which the President has requested. It is my judgment that the President should and must take the initiative and assume responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy in the Middle East. By the passage of the resolution before us we place that responsibility firmly upon his shoulders.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting House Joint Resolution 117 because I believe it is the best way to maintain peace, stability, and security in the Middle East, which in turn will enhance the security of the United States and the free world.

Secretary Dulles when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee stated the objective of the resolution very simply when he said:

> The purpose of the proposed resolution is not war. It is peace.

The so-called Eisenhower doctrine has two purposes. The first is a determination on our part to prevent international communism from conquering any part of the Middle East by overt armed aggression. If a country does not want to be dominated by the Communists and asks our help against an armed attack, we will give it to them. The second is our willingness to give economic aid to those countries in the Middle East who ask for it and who can profitably use it for the benefit of themselves and the free world.

By notifying the Soviets in advance what our action will be if they attempt to use overt armed aggression against any country in the Middle East we put them on notice that the United States intends to use armed force if necessary to secure and protect any nation that is attacked, thus minimizing the danger of war by miscalculation. We cannot wait until an attack actually occurs but we must make our position known in advance.

While such action does not guarantee against war it does warn the Communists as to the consequences, and it is hoped it will be a sufficient deterrent to prevent war.

Although this resolution does not deal with subversion within a country, it is thought by giving economic aid and stabilizing the economies of those countries and helping them to raise their standards of living it will enable them to develop their strength and authority to resist communism, and subversion from within will be less likely.

We already have treaties with 42 nations, stating in substance that an attack on any one of them would be considered an attack on the United States. We have the NATO program in Europe and the SEATO program in southeast Asia. But there is a large gap in the Middle East where we do not have such arrangements.

Since the withdrawal of the French and English from the strategic Middle East it leaves a power vacuum in this area subject to Russian threat. For this reason it now becomes vitally necessary to pass this resolution so as to put a military umbrella over this area. We successfully did this in the Formosa area when we passed a similar resolution in 1955.

There has been no attempt to define the Middle East area just as there was no attempt to define the area to be defended under the Formosa resolution. There is no point in deliberately telling our enemies just how far they can go.

There has been some criticism that we are attempting to defend this area alone. But the resolution provides that the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of nations in the general area of the Middle East "shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations, and that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations."

So the resolution clearly shows our intent to cooperate with the United Nations wherever possible but we are making certain that the Soviet veto in the United Nations cannot prevent us from doing what we think necessary.

In my opinion authorizing the President to use Armed Forces to help Middle Eastern countries to maintain their independence does not grant the President any additional power, nor does the Congress in any way abdicate its power to declare war. The committee in its report found:

> This resolution does not detract from or enlarge the constitutional power and authority of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.
>
> The resolution does not delegate or diminish in any way the power and authority of the Congress of the United States to declare war, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.

It has been argued that by undertaking the defense of this area we are spreading our forces too thin and beyond our capabilities. I asked Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, this very question:

> In your judgment have we sufficient military strength or capability to successfully carry out any obligations which we might undertake under this program?
>
> Admiral RADFORD. I think we do, sir.

There can be little doubt economic aid provided for under this resolution is equally as important as military aid. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former Supreme Commander, Allied Forces, Europe—SHAPE—in his testimony on economic aid said:

> I feel strongly about the economic side in this area especially. If I were told that I could have either the economic or the military aid, I would feel that the choice is between cutting off the right leg or left arm, but I would say, "I will take the economic and suffer the handicap of not having the military assistance portion."

The immediate funds for such aid in this area have already been appropriated and no funds are provided for by this resolution. But we are told additional economic funds will be requested. Congress must see to it that such requests are entirely justified and keep them to a minimum. However, even if such a program required a large outlay of funds, if it helps to prevent war it would be well worthwhile as it would still be but a fraction of the cost of such a holocaust.

This resolution also has a psychological effect. By giving these nations military and economic aid it is hoped it will strengthen them to resist communism both from within and from without because they know they will not be alone in defending their freedom and independence.

The resolution does not attempt to cure all the ills in the area. It is limited in its scope. Problems between Egypt and Arab refugees, the Jordan question, and so forth, are serious ones and we should give all the help we can to solve them, but the proper way, at least at present, is through the United Nations.

The committee has seen fit to provide for the termination of this resolution by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. This provides equal authority to terminate the program between the Congress and the executive branch.

The only way this resolution can be effective will be if there is as much unanimity between the Congress and the Executive as possible. The American people have given President Eisenhower a vote of confidence much greater than was given most Members of Congress. Now the Congress should not impair his efforts to preserve the peace but approve this resolution overwhelmingly and show a united front to the whole world.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay my tribute to our new chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GORDON, for his able conduct of our deliberations in committee, and to our indefatigable committee staff for the work they have done in the preparation of this matter for consideration by the committee and on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we are launching a new concept in the historic Middle East today, but using methods that have been tested, and found successful in other areas.

The Middle East is the cradle of our civilization. Its people had great cities and temples and art and learning when the Greeks and Romans were still barbarians, and our own ancestors were savages. Much of the territory has been conquered again and again by Egyptians and Greeks and Romans and Arabs and Mongols and crusaders and Turks and British and French, but never by Russians. Now there is a vacuum of power that invites Russian conquest. There are 185 million people in the area, with a gross national product, where it can be figured, of about $123 apiece per year. They are poor, but proud. We don't want to conquer them. We don't want anyone to conquer them. We want them free and independent, but it has been hard to stay free and independent very long in the Middle East during the last 4,000 years.

So we are offering to protect them, on request, from Communist conquest, and we are offering aid to strengthen them economically, on request. Their oil, their land and water, their independence, are important to our own security in our deadly cold-war struggle with communism. So we are offering, instead of conquest, cooperation. All we want is for them to be free and strong and independent of Russia, of Britain, of France, of us. We want this, not because we suddenly love them so much, but because it means good business in peace, good protection in war, for us.

And we can start this by two steps, that have recent, successful precedents. First, standby authority to employ our Armed Forces, as in the Formosa resolution 2 years ago; second, military and economic assistance similar to, but less in amount than, Greek-Turkish aid 10 years ago.

Now there are people who are against communism—except when there is a chance to vote to do something about it, where communism is causing real trouble—in the undecided part of the world. Then they are against doing it, because what is proposed is not strong enough, or weak enough, or clear enough, or perfect enough to suit them. They apparently understand these things better than the President, the Secretary of State, the Joint Chiefs, and the committees that have studied them. No matter what is proposed, they are against it.

I confess that I am not that smart. I see problems and trials and tribulations ahead under this policy; it does not pretend to solve all the problems of this area; it will be administered by mere men, but I think it is a wise and brave and important and historic step, that will help hold international communism from our shores, and I hope it receives overwhelming support from those of us who have ordinary American commonsense, and faith and courage and confidence in ourselves and our elected officials and our system.

THE AREA

This resolution covers "the general area of the Middle East." Our committee report gives rough boundaries of the area by countries and then says: "this identification of countries does not rule out the inclusion of other countries around the perimeter." We are profiting by tragic experience. In 1950 high officials put Korea outside our defense perimeter, and shortly the Reds invaded Korea. This time, we are not going to accommodate our enemies by marking out our defense perimeter. In this area, Turkey on the west is in NATO and Pakistan on the east is in SEATO, and by treaties, we have said an attack on either of them will be considered as an attack on us. Between these two are thousands of miles of Soviet borders, and many countries with which we do not have treaty or mutual security agreements. This resolution is as near as we can get now to similar action, to fill this gap and is no more warlike than these treaties we have made—hearings, page 33.

ARMED FORCES AUTHORITY

The resolution authorizes the President to employ our Armed Forces in the area, upon request, against overt armed aggression.

This is not a declaration of war, dated or undated. It is rather a declaration of peace, to prevent hot war by Soviet miscalculation, to prevent cold-war Soviet subversion, through fear and disorder and economic chaos. We cannot delegate our congressional power to declare war, but modern wars are not declared. As a matter of history, although Congress has passed 5 war resolutions in the 148 fracases in which our forces have been involved, Congress has never declared war, but has always declared that war already existed. The nearest we came to declaring war was in 1812 when we said, after many incidents had taken place, "War be and the same is hereby declared to exist."

This resolution states that the President "is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States" in the area for certain limited purposes. Nearly every Member of Congress has his own idea of the way to state the constitutional authority of the President as to our Armed Forces. Many feel he already has the authority described in the resolution. Therefore the words "he is authorized" are satisfactory to these people. Others, like myself, and the Secretary of State and the President, feel that there are things in this resolution he cannot do without congressional approval—see page 25, hearings. I want to give him this necessary, limited authority, and no more. I do not want to approve in advance what he does. I do not want to say he should or shall employ our forces. The words in the resolution "he is authorized," are satisfactory to people like me, and to the President. These words were used in the Formosa resolution which has worked well as a declaration of peace. If we changed those words, we might be considered as giving less or more authority than in the Formosa resolution, either detracting from the warning, or making it sound too warlike. By using these exact words again we can avoid a big constitutional debate at a time when unity in action is so important.

Our Founding Fathers in the Constitutional Convention first gave Congress power to "make war," then changed it to "declare war," leaving to the President the power to make war when we were attacked. As a practical matter, the President cannot make war without congressional action for very long. In this instance, since our purpose is preserving the peace, not making war, I think Congress is using its rarely discussed constitutional power "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces"—article I, section 8. In any case, acting with the President, we are presenting a united front to deter Soviet aggression, direct and indirect, by this resolution.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

This $200 million limitation is not a blank check we are giving the President. It is money we have already appropriated to him. Under the Gordon amendment, we merely permit him to use up to that amount, if necessary, under discretionary powers already authorized by law, in section 401a, of the Mutual Security Act.

Some of our colleagues wish all reference to foreign aid had been omitted from this resolution. If this had been done, as much foreign aid would have been available, but with less discretion as to its use—see hearings, page 76. In order to eliminate foreign aid from this program, we would have had to incorporate repeals of existing mutual security law provisions. That would have sounded the death knell for countries in economic trouble. That would have told them: We will protect you from outside Soviet aggression, while you fall apart inside until you are taken over by Communist agents.

General Gruenther, a tough military man, said that if he were forced to a choice, "I will take the economic and suffer the handicap of not having the military assistance portion." Some of these countries are hard put to keep going at all, economically, because of recent dislocations. Either we help these countries to get on their feet, or the Communists will help get them to their knees, in servitude to the Soviet system. This resolution merely makes it possible to use more effectively funds already available to promote stability and independence.

TIMING

Action has been delayed on this resolution by those who wanted to take time to argue that this action has been delayed too much. We have listened to partisan attacks on this policy from those who never proposed a Middle East policy that would work. The last administration tried to set up MEDO, a Middle East defense organization like NATO, and I was in favor of it, but it flopped. Partisans are claiming the Executive misled the American people during the campaign. We have a chronological summary of events in the Middle East at the committee table, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. The record shows that Secretary Dulles and the President repeatedly warned the public of the dangers and, from the Israeli attack on October 29 and the Franco-British ultimatum October 30, on to the election a week later the people were kept informed of events, day and night, by newspapers, radio and television, and every step was subjected to violent partisan attacks on our policies, past, present, and future. The result was an overwhelming vote of confidence by the people in the reelection of President Eisenhower. No Democrat suggested action like this last year. The timing of this move is just about right. Let us get together. In the words of the old hymn let us—

> Forget the steps already trod,
> And onward urge our way.

Let us join to speed our former colleague, Dick Richards, on his mission for our President, with a united vote of confidence in both men.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I speak as one who intends to support the resolution, so these questions are in a friendly vein. In the first place, is there not a distinction as to the present authority of the President between the provisions of section 2 and section 3? Is there anyone who claims that he has the authority now to do what he is authorized to do under section 3?

Mr. VORYS. As to section 2, a number of our brethren have urged such language as being unnecessary because, they say, the President is authorized under the Constitution to use armed force under the circumstances.

Mr. KEATING. No. That is under section 2, covering the use of armed force. What I am referring to is the economic assistance under section 3. Is it the contention of anyone that he has this authority?

Mr. VORYS. He has the authority to spend exactly the same amount of money but without the discretion afforded by section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act. That act only applies to $150 million at present. Section 3, as amended, would make $350 million available subject to discretionary power under 401. That is all this section 3 does.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I ask the gentleman from Ohio what the answer was in the consideration of this matter as to why mutual assistance pacts were not sought individually with members in this area such as have been sought and consummated in 42 different instances.

Mr. VORYS. Well, such pacts can be sought without this legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then, why were they not sought? I realize that. That is why I am asking the question. Why were they not sought rather than resorting to this particular procedure?

Mr. VORYS. This procedure is not resorted to in order to make it possible to have such mutual security pacts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand that.

Mr. VORYS. It has been the policy of this administration not to make any mutual security agreements with nations in the Middle East where there is any present conflict or turmoil among themselves. This resolution has no effect on that policy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sorry. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. VORYS. My answer apparently is not satisfactory.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. This resolution obstensibly protects against an armed Soviet or Communist invasion by a Communist controlled nation. What happens in the event that some of the nations in the Middle East, such as Egypt and Syria, invite Russian participation in the affairs of those countries either through military assistance pacts or through trade associations? Will this resolution prevent those nations in any respect from welcoming the Soviets into their nations?

Mr. VORYS. No. This resolution does not authorize interference in the internal affairs of a nation. If any nation would bring in Soviet arms, that is just as lawful as bringing in arms from our country. If, however, the nation in that area became Soviet controlled and launched an attack against any of its neighbors, then the authority in this resolution would come into force.

Mr. YATES. What is meant by the term "Soviet controlled"?

Mr. VORYS. There are a number of elements that have to be taken into consideration. I will not take the time to point them out. They are set forth by the Secretary of State in our hearings. There are a number of elements, such as their connection with the Soviet Union, their vote in the United Nations; a number of other elements. But, that heavy and grave decision would be left to the President to make under this resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let us say a nation such as Iraq, which would not be considered to be under Communist influence, should attack the State of Israel, is it true that under this resolution that aggression is not condemned or the President is not authorized to answer the plea of Israel to resist that aggression?

Mr. VORYS. The authority under this resolution would not apply to such a case. There is, of course, a question whether the President would have such authority without this resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think it should be emphasized that there seems to be some understanding that the $200 million is already authorized currently under the Mutual Security Act. This will simply free that money from any restrictions, one of which is the restriction under section 105 of the Appropriations Act that not more than 20 percent of the amount appropriated in the current fiscal year can be spent within 2 months of the expiration of the fiscal year by obligation. You cannot obligate more than 20 percent, then, in May or June of this year. For example, in section 102 (b) on development assistance funds, 80 percent of those funds must be by loan.

Mr. VORYS. I want to remind the Committee that the original section 3 had broader authority than is contained in the Gordon amendment which is substituted for the original language.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I wish to compliment and to commend our new chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON], who so ably and courteously conducted the hearings and the deliberations of the

committee on this resolution. Then, too, I desire to express my personal deep appreciation to him for the eminently fair treatment I received on the substitute concurrent resolution approach which I proposed in the committee.

I believe that it is regrettable and unfortunate that the executive branch selected the legislative vehicle of a joint resolution in its effort to demonstrate the solidarity of the American Nation in its determination to assist the free nations of the Middle East in preserving their integrity and independence against the advance of international communism.

I firmly believe that such unity of purpose is present in our Nation. There should be no doubt in the mind of the Executive that the Congress—as it has done in the past—will do its utmost to meet the threat of Communist aggression. For this reason, it is difficult to understand why the Executive has insisted that anything short of a joint resolution, couched in terms suggested by the President, will be inadequate to enable our Government to cope with the Middle East situation.

A joint resolution has the force of law. In this respect, it reaches beyond an expression of solidarity. It invests the Executive with specific powers, and with a specific mandate. In this particular instance, House Joint Resolution 117 has far-reaching implications. It proposes to give the President a free hand in spending $200 million to further the economic development of the Middle East, and the authority to undertake programs of military assistance to the nations of that area.

I might add right here, in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that the President needs this particular authority to use the $200 million of unspent mutual-security funds as he sees fit; that is, to use these funds without any limitation, without regard to any law on the statute books, without regard to the Battle Act, and without regard to the limitations of the transferability clause in the Mutual Security Act. The $200 million provision is a blank-check authorization for the Executive to use these funds without any accountability.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, no one could conceivably argue that the authority under section 3 already exists in the President. He could not do the things which are set forth in section 3.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. He could not do them to the extent that he wants to do them, to the extent that he desires authority to do them; that is, to use the funds without any limitation, without any restriction, in any area, taking them from any other area.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The only difference is that under this language he can do it and have $200 million more than he now has, under existing law.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; and, in the future, he may ask for $200 million, or $400 million, or $600 million more. That is why some of us are concerned. True, he would have to come to Congress for such additional funds and authority. But if you give it this time, then he can come again and again, and the argument will again be made that if we do not show confidence in the President, we are inviting aggression in that area. Let us think about that.

To continue:

Over and above the $200 million, and the authority to undertake programs of military assistance, House Joint Resolution 117 proposes to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces against an enemy who has not been identified, at some indeterminate time in the future, and in a vast area whose boundaries have not been fixed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman could identify this perimeter area to which he has referred.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If I could identify the perimeter area I would not be concerned about the definition of the Middle East.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wonder if the Committee on Foreign Affairs is as much in the dark about how the President intends to spend these funds as the President professed the other day to be.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am not in a position to express an opinion on how much in the dark the Committee on Foreign Affairs is, but I might refer to myself, and say that I am thoroughly confused. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, he will notice that the committee received conflicting testimony from the executive branch on the subject of the transfer and dispersal of these funds.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Ohio, and as a matter of fact those who favor the joint resolution, almost without exception have talked about the need for this legislation as seeking to correct a vacuum that exists in the Middle East. He talked about the conquest of various peoples over the Middle East. He says now there is a vacuum there, implying that Russia may fill the vacuum in terms of conquest.

Is not this rather a misconception of what actually exists not only in the Middle East but in Asia, that there is no vacuum other than a big power vacuum, and that what we are really hiding is a nationalistic urge on the part of the people of Africa and Asia to seek to make their own way in the world? Are we not well advised to sit on the sidelines rather than seek to fill a vacuum, and seek only to keep others from filling a vacuum?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If we are to accept the self-analysis of the nations and states in that area who claim there is no vacuum, I think the gentleman's observation is correct.

This authorization, if approved by Congress and signed by the President, will have the force of law. Surely, then, it will constitute more than just an expression of solidarity on the part of the American Nation with respect to our sincere desire to stem the advance of international communism, and our intent to aid the nations of the Middle East in the event of overt aggression.

SUBSTITUTE OFFERED

Because of these considerations, and because House Joint Resolution 117 may establish a far-reaching precedent, I had proposed a substitute approach to the issue at hand. My proposal was embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 63 and House Joint Resolution 152.

House Concurrent Resolution 63 states that it is the sense of the Congress that our Government, by constitutional process, should particularly pursue the following objectives in its policy in the general area of the Middle East:

First. Cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in that area in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

Second. Undertake military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area requesting such assistance.

Third. Contribute to the maintenance of peace in that area by making clear its determination to secure and protect the integrity and independence of any nation or group of nations in that area by the employment, if necessary, of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Fourth. Concert United States policy to the maximum extent possible with that of other nations of the free world.

Fifth. Employ the Armed Forces of the United States in a manner consonant with the Charter of the United Nations and other treaty obligations of the United States.

My House Concurrent Resolution 63 was supplemented by House Joint Resolution 152, which would have the force of law, and which proposed to authorize the President to use $200 million of mutual-security funds to attain the economic development and other objectives outlined in House Concurrent Resolution 63.

I believe that the approach which I suggested would have strengthened—rather than weakened—the President's hand in dealing with the Middle East situation. It would certainly provide the expression of solidarity which the President requested. It would give the President a free hand in using $200 million of mutual-security funds in the Middle East. At the same time, because it did not involve the issue of legislating constitutional authority in advance, on broad, indeterminate basis, it would have avoided the controversy which has arisen over section 2 of House Joint Resolution 117.

How better could we express confidence in the President of the United States and show that we are in harmony with him in his intent to deter war and to stop Communist aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure that in 2 minutes I cannot conclude my statement. I regret that this resolution came to the consideration of the Congress under a gag rule. I further regret that even my own committee is going to deter me from presenting my entire case by limiting debate to this extent. Under the circumstances, I shall ask unanimous consent to place the remainder of my prepared text in the RECORD.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The impression has been given that the committee was almost unanimously agreed in the action which brought this resolution to the floor. Recognizing the principles of propriety involved in not divulging information which may have been brought out in executive session, is it not true that there was a much closer division on the amendment which the gentleman has talked about and other amendments which were offered?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do not desire to transgress any of the rules of the committee, but let me say in answer to the gentleman's question that I was not as happy with the support which my resolution received in the committee. But, it was not as roundly defeated as overwhelmingly the joint resolution was given approbation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement because while I disagree with him, he did firmly and aggressively put forth the idea of a concurrent resolution. I do feel from the committee viewpoint that we should have discussed affirmatively and strongly the difference between the joint resolution being law, which can only be overruled by two-thirds majority of this Congress, if we want to change it without the concurrent provision contained in it. So that you do have a point. Once the Congress gives this power, it can be vetoed by the President and it requires a two-thirds majority of this Congress in both Houses in order to change the course of the policy. So I want to compliment the gentleman. While I disagree with him, I do feel he has a real point.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman believe that the foreign policy of the United States is better served by passing this resolution or by voting it down in this House of Representatives at the present time in view of the fact that no amendments are possible?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is a most difficult question to answer. You are practically asking me how I am going to vote in the final analysis. I am very disturbed about the manner in which the resolution has been presented to the Congress—not only about its form, but also about the procedure that the administration has chosen to present it to the Congress. I am unhappy that the Congress is not given an opportunity to work its will by amending this resolution—as the other body, I am sure, will. Nevertheless, since the administration wants this resolution in the form that it has requested it—perhaps because it has some information that it did not thus far share with the Congress—I am still keeping an open mind in spite of the fact that my conscience dictates that I should not vote to delegate congressional authority on such broad, indeterminate bases, even if the administration claims that the passage of House Joint Resolution 17 may avert war.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman have confidence that it will?

ATTEMPT TO CORRECT SHORTCOMINGS OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 117

Mr. ZABLOCKI. When my efforts on behalf of the substitute approach proved of no avail, I had—with reluctance and reservations—voted in the committee for House Joint Resolution 117 in the hope that the committee report, and floor amendments, would correct its shortcomings.

In particular, I had hoped that the final text and the legislative history of this resolution would clearly show that the Congress did not intend to establish new precedents by delegating to the President the authority, reserved by the Constitution to Congress, the authority to decide when, how, and under what conditions our Armed Forces would be used in event of a Middle East war.

Secondly, it was and is my hope that the legislative history of this resolution will clearly demonstrate that Congress is not content to deal with the Middle East situation through a series of emergency, stop-gap measures—such as those embodied in House Joint Resolution 117—but that, instead, Congress favors the development of a comprehensive program aimed at the solution of the basic problems of that vital region.

I am pleased that, in the preparation of the House Report No. 2 accompanying House Joint Resolution 117, the Committee on Foreign Affairs saw fit to incorporate in that document the language suggested by me and by other members, which at least partially achieves the objectives that I had just outlined.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 117 IGNORES BASIC PROBLEMS

The committee report, for instance, takes cognizance of the fact that House Joint Resolution 117 does not address itself to the fundamental problems of the Middle East. Going a step further, the report strongly recommends that—and I quote:

> Positive and comprehensive measures for dealing with the fundamental problems of the Middle East should be prepared and presented by the Executive to the United Nations and to the Congress.

In my opinion, here is the crux of the matter: Until the basic problems of the Middle East will be resolved, it will be futile to hope for peace, and for political and economic stability in that area. Our Government must address itself to the solution of the Arab-Israel controversy, to the resettlement of refugees, to the reopening of the Suez Canal with the establishment of adequate safeguards for the interests of its users, and to the other basic problems of the Middle East.

These basic problems have generated a tremendous amount of animosity, fear, and insecurity which plague the Middle East, and which have rendered that area vulnerable to Communist penetration. We cannot hope to remedy this situation through emergency, stopgap measures such as those proposed in House Joint Resolution 117. We must work for a solution of those basic problems through a positive, comprehensive program. Since the administration has failed thus far to work out such a program, it has become necessary for the Congress to prod the Executive on this score.

The committee report, which I have quoted a few minutes ago, does just that. It stresses the absence of a comprehensive Middle East program, and it calls on the Executive to present one to Congress as soon as possible. I believe that we should stress this point time and again in our consideration of House Joint Resolution 117: This resolution, even if it should be approved by Congress, will prove of little value unless our Government decides to resolutely tackle the basic problems of the Middle East.

THE AUTHORITY TO USE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn now to the second feature of House Joint Resolution 117, the one which concerns me even more than this measure's failure to deal with the basic problems of the Middle East.

I am referring to the language of section 2 which states that the President is—and I quote—"authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."

This language has serious implications because it appears in a joint resolution which has the force of law. As I read it, it gives the President a free hand to employ our Armed Forces in any Middle East war if the attacking nation is, in the President's opinion, controlled by international communism, and if the attacked nation requests help. This would be a permanent authority within the provisions of this resolution, and it would apply to a vast area of the Middle East which has not been even defined.

This broad language has troubled many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. To allay concern, the committee report contains the following reservation. I quote:

> This resolution does not detract from or enlarge the constitutional power and authority of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.

Further:

> Likewise, the resolution does not delegate or diminish in any way the power and authority of the Congress of the United States to

declare war, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.

The passages which I just quoted appear on page 7 of the committee report. They express the opinion and the intent of the committee on this vital question. The fact remains, however, that the words—and I quote—"authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States" are in the text of the resolution before us, and, personally, I would much prefer to see some other language.

If House Joint Resolution 117 does not invest the President with any new powers, then why should we include this specific authorization in it? Surely we could use some other words. We could say that "it is the sense of Congress that the President may use the Armed Forces of the United States in accordance with our constitutional process." Such wording would dispel any doubt about the intent of Congress in passing this resolution. At the same time, it would not deprive the President of any powers that he already has.

THE CLOSED RULE

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to have an opportunity to propose this amendment to section 2 of House Joint Resolution 117. The closed rule, under which this measure was brought to the floor, precluded this opportunity. I had opposed the adoption of the closed rule for this very purpose, because I am certain that my concern about the implications of section 2 of the measure before us is shared by many other Members, and by many people throughout the land.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned about the implications of the resolution before us, and I am disturbed because the closed rule makes it impossible for this House to alter and improve its language.

I am not at all certain to what extent the administration is responsible for the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East during the last 6 or 8 months. The fact remains that the situation has deteriorated. It behooves us, therefore, not to dwell upon the past, but to look to the future; we must realistically appraise the gravity of the Middle East situation, and to take the necessary steps to meet the threat which the Communist designs upon that vital region have presented to the free world.

I assure you that I have conscientiously listened to the testimony presented before our committee, and that I have earnestly and carefully considered the Executive's views. The Executive contends that the passage of the resolution before us is necessary to meet an emergency situation in the Middle East. This contention was advanced by the majority of witnesses appearing before our committee.

I do not dispute the contention that a serious situation exists in the Middle East. This situation must be dealt with. In all sincerity, however, I cannot concede that the resolution before us—House Joint Resolution 117—is either necessary or suitable to meet that situation.

To put it bluntly, it seems to me that the resolution misses its target.

I say this for two reasons:

In the first place, the resolution is neither intended to, nor capable of attacking the basic causes of Middle East instability, and vulnerability to Communist penetration.

Secondly, the resolution seeks to give the Executive broad authority to deal with overt aggression when—by Secretary Dulles' own admission—overt Communist aggression is only and one and the one least imminent, of the threats facing the Middle East.

These facts stand out clearly. What remains is for us to decide whether the recommittal of this measure, with all its shortcomings, will jeopardize the security of our Nation and the cause of the free world with respect to the Middle East.

I, for one, am reluctant to assert that this is the case, and that the reconsideration of the Executive's request, and the passage of this proposal in an amended, improved, and strengthened form, will damage our cause.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with pleasure that I join with the other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in expressing appreciation of the quiet, dignified and effective manner in which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable TOM GORDON, has taken up the reins of authority as chairman of our great committee.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me get to our subject.

We are here today to consider House Joint Resolution 117, introduced some weeks ago by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. THOMAS GORDON, of Illinois, to implement the administration's program. Your committee has spent many hours listening to testimony taken in 11 open, and 4 closed, hearings, followed by 4 sessions of marking up the bill, and 2 on the report.

Our discussions have been, if that were possible, even more clearly without party bias than ever. We have brought to you today a resolution similar to past resolutions. We need not recall to you those pertaining to Greece and Turkey, and to Formosa.

Some anxiety has been expressed relative to the constitutionality of the President's proposal. This will undoubtedly be discussed here today by the many lawyers in our midst. How fortunate we are to have them, knowing as we do their zeal in guarding our individual rights under our great Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep interest and attention to the many arguments brought to our committee table. I grant you I am not a lawyer, Mr. Chairman, but I am a woman with 17 years in this body, 16 of them on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with the rich experiences of wife, mother, grandmother, and responsible citizen, as background. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, with a lawyer son I have a more than usually keen appreciation of the need lawyers have of splitting hairs, of toying with semantics, of arguing every conceivable aspect of a case. Splendid as this is, one cannot but marvel at their ingenuity and their capacity to complicate what seems so simple.

I have studied and restudied the language of this resolution. Grateful as I am to those who argue that the Congress would abrogate its constitutional prerogatives, rights and responsibilities if it agrees to House Joint Resolution 117. I am just not interested in trying to find out how many angels can dance on the point of a pin.

House Joint Resolution 117 simply means we will help the people of the general area of the Middle East stop Communist invasion if requested, and will help them help themselves economically, also if requested.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I have great confidence in our President and I am ready to strengthen him in this particular resolution inasmuch as he so desires it.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I believe I know the lands and the people of this Middle East. I have spent time in their homes and they in mine. We correspond, we are friends. They are different from us. Their traditions, their attitudes stem from a far older culture than ours. To them we are a strange people, even as they seem strange to us. What we both need is to know and understand each other better. We need to learn what it is to have confidence each in the other.

I believe that if we keep away from complicated language, if we express ourselves in ways they will recognize as our heartful desire toward them, as I believe this resolution attempts to do, they will understand.

In reality we are just saying: "Friends and neighbors, we are just not going to stand idly by and let an outsider run over you—and he might as well know this right now. We want nothing for ourselves but we do want you to keep your national independence in a free world."

It is not a little thing we want to do, though it is basically very simple. As a woman seeing the picture as a whole, and looking far into the future, I am ready to give President Eisenhower this additional evidence of our confidence in his judgment that once again such an expression from the Congress will be a strong weapon in his hand as a deterrent to war.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution will be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, when the Ottoman Empire collapsed at the end of World War I, Britain and France came to hold a highly influential position in the development and stabilization of the Middle East. As the people of this region gradually gained their independence and sovereignty, however, the Anglo-French grip weakened. We have recently witnessed the culmination of these events with the final ouster of the two powers from Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. In the in-

terim, Russian influence has grown by means of clever manipulation of the diplomatic instruments of propaganda, military weapons sale, and economic aid. The deterioration of Western influence since the Communist arms shipment to Egypt and Syria has been acute, and we now face the complex problems raised by the Israeli-Arab conflict, the Egyptian seizure of Suez, the armed intervention of England and France, and the continuing Communist infiltration of the area. These problems are made more severe by the shortage of oil in Western Europe and the loss of oil revenues in the Middle East, due to the stoppage of Suez traffic and the destruction of major pipelines. It is my own feeling that the fate of Western civilization may well depend upon the things that happen in the Middle East during the next few years. Basically that is my reason for supporting this resolution in spite of some reservations.

THE NEW ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Into this picture the United States has reluctantly stepped, compelled by the force of events to assume the leadership of the free world. We did not want or seek this role, but the status became something of a fact before we were aware of it. Now that we are aware of our international responsibilities, we must constantly reassure our allies and inform the rest of the world of our intention to remain a major force for the defense of freedom and the preservation of the peace. Our history gives clear evidence of our respect for national sovereignty. That was the reason, of course, for the Monroe Doctrine. It might be fair to describe this new Eisenhower Doctrine as an extension not only of the Truman Doctrine, but a sort of 20th century expression of the Monroe Doctrine; in any event no one can any longer question our tremendous stake in the Middle East.

I listened enthusiastically to what the President said in his inaugural address. I think it was one of his finest utterances. The President said:

> The economic need of all nations—in mutual dependence—makes isolation an impossibility; not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people, seeking such shelter for themselves, can now build only their own prison.

I think we owe it to the President to strengthen his hand in this critical situation. Mr. Truman put is very well in asking support for the resolution when he said:

> Congress has no alternative but to go along with the President in this program to prevent the Russians from taking over the whole strategic Middle East, so vital to the economy and peace of the world. The situation is too dangerous to delay action on these requests for any partisan or political considerations.

I believe he is right. He is right in this simple assertion that without American military and economic power, this menacing threat of Soviet expansion will not be removed. Let us make no mistake about that.

AMERICA'S NEED FOR ALLIES

An important justification for our action in the Middle East is the preservation of the economies of our closest allies, who are more deeply dependent on commerce in this region than we, and who cannot survive without the oil now denied them. When England and France elected to move into the Suez without consulting with us, it was obvious evidence of the desperation of their position. Despite our policy differences, we cannot permit Soviet gains at the expense of our NATO allies, and this joint resolution has been warmly received in Europe as evidence of our determination to bolster the economic and military strength of our stanchest friends. While we cannot deny that recent events have caused us to reassess our structure of defense relationships, nevertheless, the maintenance of the NATO alliance is still a significant objective of American foreign policy. That policy has been confused and hesitant in the past few months, and we must not permit this drift to continue. We still need these strong and dedicated allies, whose fate is inextricably interwoven with the fate of the Middle East This warning to Moscow may be interpreted as serving notice that the United States will not countenance Soviet strangulation of Europe and the free world.

You know, an interesting thing about democracy is the right to differ with those on whom we rely and who rely on us. Our differences are always debated out in the open; they are debated in the open here and they are debated in the councils of state on the international level. In the United Nations we find ourselves at times taking violent issue with those who in the final analysis will be our allies.

I hope this debate will leave nothing to be desired in the way of evidence that we will stand by these ancient allies, and that in substance we are with them, for Britain and France still have roles to play in the Middle East. And yet with regard to all nations, let it be pointed out that it is the genius of America that we can become an associate with other nations in the defense of freedom and independence in the true sense of partnership.

COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

Now, that has certain implications in terms of legislative skill. Our language must convey that sense of partnership. For that reason I was glad when the committee accepted the amendment I offered in company with my friend from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] which appears early in the resolution with regard to use of troops:

> That the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations.

My purpose in adding this language was to make use of this weapon for world peace for our own country's sake as well as for that of the free world. We have thus given support to the rule of international principle and law, while gaining in the exchange the alliance of our U. N. cohorts in the face of any Soviet encounter. The Communists are also deprived of their major propaganda charge that we are acting unilaterally to further any selfish ends.

HISTORICAL SUPPORT FOR THIS ACTION

Mr. Chairman, I understood a little better the President's reason for asking this authority after I weighed what President Wilson asked the Congress to do in 1917 in the way of granting for power to arm the merchant ships. I give you his exact language:

> No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers, but I prefer, in the present circumstances, not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do.

Congress failed to grant that power before adjourning and just 29 days after its adjournment the Congress was called back to acknowledge that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany.

It is not an idle waste of time to talk about constitutional power. We would jealously guard our own authority, and I trust would just as jealously guard the President's authority.

Without attempting to interpret the Constitution with regard to the power of the Legislative and Execuive branches of our Government, I can still say that I believe that this resolution serves to meet a definite need. We can no longer interpret the dangers to peace in the terms used by the Founding Fathers. We are now aware of a significant difference between wars "declared" to achieve certain ends and the wars we have been involved in in recent times. The authors of our Constitution debated the difference between "making" and "declaring" wars in quite a different context from our own, such a context as in the War of 1812 when we made a positive decision to try to end the annoyances of interference with our international commerce. In modern times, however, wars have been imposed upon us, not made by the deliberate action of our legislative bodies.

COMMUNIST THREAT PERSISTS

The evil which the Soviet system represents is very great. We are entirely familiar with their global aspirations. It bears reiteration, of course, because, as the Communists gave some evidence of a desire to avoid nuclear war, we might have assumed that their aspirations for domination of the world had moderated. But that is not the case. Their ideology and goals persist.

So I consider the economic aspects of this resolution as important as the military; in fact, they may be more important. This, it seems to me, is an answer to what my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has said. A declaration of the sense of the Congress might have sufficed for some features, but when the economic aspects of the question are considered it is evident that, except for the powers by law proposed to be granted here, it would be necessary for the House to move speedily with amendments to the Mutual Security Act

to give the President adequate economic powers. So I trust that the economic emphasis will not be lacking in the action that the Congress takes upon this measure.

FURTHER STUDY REQUIRED

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is logical for us to proceed with this simple declaration without overruling those who advocate a full-scale review of past events. I hope that we can make this a clear and powerful declaration and at the same time in the true spirit of bipartisanship and the American tradition stand for the kind of review that will enable us to deal constructively with economic-aid problems.

This does not seal the lips of the opposition party, but we should differentiate the criticisms of Congress for legislative purposes from those political criticisms designed to hold the party in power responsible for its actions.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this observation. One of the most penetrating things that a great Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, ever said was that if the present takes up a quarrel with the past, we might lose the future. Our course of action then, it seems, is to pass this legislation and then work hard toward development of a foreign-aid program that will get the rest of the job done.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does not the gentleman feel that rather than a full-scale review of the past, we should follow the recommendation of our committee for a full-scale review of the future, citing the committee language:

> Positive and comprehensive measures for dealing with the fundamental problems of the Middle East should be prepared and presented by the Executive to the United Nations and to the Congress. Sufficient legislative authority already exists for the settlement of many phases of these problems. Our country should lead in boldly pursuing and implementing policies and programs to bring peace, security, and economic stability to the Middle East.

That a demand for a full-scale look at the future is more important now than such a detailed study of the past.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The situation is, in my judgment, as critical as the gentleman indicates, yet, to deal properly with the future, an unimpassioned study of the mistakes that have been all the way back might be very helpful.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to express my gratitude, as usual, to the chairman and the members of our committee who have always been so courteous to me, notwithstanding the fact that I am, at times, on the opposite side of these questions.

I would like also to say that I associate myself with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], regarding his amendment to this resolution, which, unfortunately, in my opinion, is not before us this afternoon. We have been talking about solidarity. I submit to you that had this resolution been before us this afternoon, when the final vote came, it would have been unanimous in support of the President. It is not here, but I am very glad that I can associate myself with him.

Are we united in our opposition to international communism? Is there any doubt in the minds of any of us as to where we stand? Well, the Library of Congress has furnished me with some interesting information. Since 1946 the executives in our departments have on 18 different occasions said that we will resist international communism. So, I think this afternoon we are straining at a gnat. We are rehashing a matter and laying great emphasis upon the point that there must be solidarity. Why, there is no question about solidarity on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, under the resolution we are asked to authorize a predated declaration of war. I am serious about that. This is unprecedented and I believe unconstitutional.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the President "is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary," and so forth. That can only mean absolute authority in the President to declare war upon final passage of this resolution without further reference to the Congress.

The committee report states that the resolution is a declaration of the solidarity of the people of the United States. A simple, short resolution, such as suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, could have accomplished that objective, but obviously the sponsors of the resolution did not want to present that simple question to the Congress. Solidarity in that instance would have been expressed by a unanimous vote, I am sure.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the authority to use military force is, in effect, a request at this time for a declaration of war.

Is there any evidence of a threat of overt Communist aggression? In all candor the record is void of any testimony to support the statement there is a threat of overt armed aggression. It is true that in some areas there is a concentration of military strength, and this has been true for some time, but I heard no testimony by the military experts that there was a threat of aggression notwithstanding these forces. Of course, the potential for attack is there.

Now what is proposed in this resolution? Section 2 provides that our Armed Forces are to be used to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism. I have quoted part of the language in that section. If that is true, are we to remain inert until a request is made by those nations for their protection? Has any nation or group of nations requested such aid? In all fairness it should be said, perhaps, that the Bagdad pact countries in Asia have indicated a desire for such protection, but no other country, as I recall it, which is located in the area where tensions have increased. It would appear that we are going to play "Mother Cluck" to those nations that we think need some mothering. The record, again, is silent as to what countries will be considered. There is an air of mystery about all of this.

And, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of offering military aid and assistance, what nations do we intend to help? Are we going to help Syria, Egypt, and Jordan, or Israel, Iraq or Lebanon? Does anyone here today know who is to get this assistance? I would like to know. The people of this country are entitled to know.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us does not get to the heart of the real trouble in the Middle East. Peace in the area will come only when the conflict between Israel and the Arab nations is resolved. This resolution ignores that issue completely. Why? I think it was the Secretary of State who testified that this was an issue to be handled in the United Nations. In my opinion this is a very weak and ineffective approach to this pressing basic problem.

The Arab-Israel issue is a most difficult one but it is one we cannot duck if we are really interested in peace in the Middle East. As I see it, time is of the essence and the nations involved must yield to public insistence that the area conditions be stabilized in the interest of world peace.

This very day in the United Nations we find Egypt and Israel deadlocked over the withdrawal of Israel troops from two areas. The United Nations is obviously at a loss to know what to do about the situation; it offers no solution.

Mr. Chairman, the hatreds that have been engendered in the Middle East since the creation of Israel are bitter and intense. One must visit the area to really understand the depth of the hatreds that exist. Arab refugee conditions are beyond description and they are a disgrace to the civilized world. Yet Israel is a recognized member of the family of nations and no doubt it is here to stay. But the Arabs are convinced and determined that some day they will drive this little nation into the sea.

Mr. Chairman, the United States cannot avoid its responsibility in this situation to the Arabs or to Israel. The need is to meet the issue forthrightly and now. The situation will not wait. House Joint Resolution 117 offers no solution to that tragic situation.

Mr. Chairman, the real threat to peace in the Middle East is not one of active military aggression but of international communism. The threat, as we all know, is the advancement of international communism by infiltration and subversion. Does the resolution before us offer a plan to meet that threat? It does not. International communism has moved steadily throughout the world since the end of World War II by subversion. It has never fired a shot; it has never lost a man, but, says the Secretary of State, we are going to stop it in the Middle East by the use of economic aid. The Secretary is usually a serious individual and when he testified that we would build the economies of the Middle East coun-

tries in order to stop subversion I was amazed. That is a 50-year job. And how is this economic aid to be distributed? Will it be invested to build an Aswan Dam? Will it be distributed to build highways, irrigation projects, power dams, and so forth? Do we honestly believe that economic aid is a program or an answer to the problems in the Middle East? I do not believe so.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of economic aid, as we have been scattering it throughout the world, is receiving greater attention by the American people. One writer recently said that "our so-called foreign economic aid program has, from the beginning, been based on a mishmash of political confusions and economic fallacies. Politically, it has not promoted good will or gratitude or stopped the growth of communism. On the contrary, it has engendered suspicion of our motives precisely in the countries to which we have given most. Its effect has been actually to breed anti-American policies on the part of foreign governments eager to prove to their own people that their receipt of aid from us has not made them subservient.

We on our side no longer dare to ask for any political quid pro quo for our aid, or even to insist that the recipient governments follow sound internal economic policies. We are afraid of being accused of attaching strings or conditions—although without such conditions our aid must fail to achieve the only results that could justify it. In fact, by freeing foreign governments from making the internal economic reforms that would be necessary to assure and attract foreign private investment, our foreign aid has merely subsidized and prolonged inflation, socialism, and repressive controls in the countries receiving it. Our economic aid has probably on net balance actually retarded recovery in the countries to which it has gone.

In this resolution we are asked to give to the Executive a blank check for the spending of $200 million without submitting a blue print of his program. We are asked to approve his request as a matter of good faith and I believe the Secretary of State has said that once the resolution is finally approved a special mission will go abroad to investigate the situation and thereafter recommendations for spending the money will be submitted. To me, that is placing the cart before the horse.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a reading of the resolution indicates unequivocally that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations seek to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent. In other words, international communism is the deadly enemy of the United States. And I believe it is.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, do our officials believe that to be the fact? How consistent are they in this matter? I repeat, I believe international communism is our deadly enemy—but how can we reconcile our conduct with our protestations against this menace?

Today, Mr. Chairman, our policies are to do business with international communism. We belong to the same organizations. We permit an espionage system to function three blocks from the White House. We invite them to our parties and they invite us to theirs and a Supreme Court Justice accepts their invitations. Yes, we invite a confessed dyed-in-the-wool Communist—Tito—to come to our country and accept our hospitality. He very likely will be a guest in the Blair House.

On the economic front it is an obvious fact that we are supplying the forces of international communism with strategic materials to advance their cause against us. How inconsistent can we be? In the light of our present practices of doing business with the Red empire, I submit there is precious little left in the Battle Act which was to restrict trade with Communists and which this Congress passed overwhelmingly just a few years ago.

Mr. Chairman, while some of us may be confused, disappointed, and disillusioned, the most rabid internationalist must be in his glory. No nation has ever in the history of mankind been so involved all over the world as we are today in global undertakings of every nature and description.

We have had the Truman Doctrine of containment, the Marshall Plan to restore the economy of Europe—which suddenly has taken a nose dive—we went to war in Korea and our divisions are still there, our Seventh Fleet guards Formosa and our soldiers are in 43 places around the world. I submit we have commitments which cannot be fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached a state of utter confusion in our international relationships. The greatest need at this hour is not House Joint Resolution 117—our greatest need is for a modern Moses to lead us out of a political and military wilderness.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has said, "If anybody knows what the purposes of this money will be and what countries it will go to, let him stand up." I stand up as we do know generally what is being considered for tentative programing.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; the gentleman misunderstood me. I raised the question as to knowledge that anybody might have as to where the military assistance is going, military aid.

Mr. FULTON. I understand then that the gentleman is not asking that question on the economic aid, because I did not want it inferred that those of us on the committee do not know where the general proposals are tentatively aimed for economic aid. The committee members do know generally. We cannot tell for security reasons. There are many people who would like to find out, and of course on military aid, all the more so. We cannot tell. When you ask us to demonstrate, we just cannot advise even generally for security reasons.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We are completely in the dark on both those issues.

Mr. FULTON. I believe that many members of the committee are not in the dark on the tentative proposals for economic aid, on the use of the $200 million, nor is it in the dark on the use of the military aid in this area through the Mutual Security Act where these funds come from. However, in both instances, for security purposes, because other people would like to know and could get quite a bit of direction out of it, none of us can tell.

I think that we Members all have full confidence in the President of the United States. That is why the Congress would free the President from restrictive limitations on the proposed $200 million aid under this proposal.

He laid out the area, the general area of the Mideast; that is correct.

Well, we felt for security reasons if it were to be given to you, it would be given to some other people, too, and for the benefit of the United States, we did not tell anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will take the time to tell the gentleman that if he will look at page 2 of the committee report, a definition of the area concerned is laid out.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does it name the countries exactly in detail? Does it name the exact countries where the money is going to be used?

Mr. CARNAHAN. No; it does not definitely name the countries.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Well, that is what I am talking about.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would ask the gentleman to read the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 2 of the committee report.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But, we still cannot find out what we are doing.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thought I saw in the press someplace where either President Eisenhower or Secretary of State Dulles, one or the other, said he was going to send Dick Richards and his commission over there to see what to do with all this. I am somewhat confused because I understood that no one in executive session or anywhere else had ever given the information as to just where this would go.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The committee has not been told definitely in what country and how much of these funds was going to be used. That was not presented to the committee.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I misunderstood the statement then.

Mr. FULTON. The general policy was outlined as to where this money will go for military and economic aid, but it was not definitely stated as to exact amounts, and so forth.

Mr. WINSTEAD. But, the fact remains that after we pass this resolution, Dick Richards and his commission will be sent over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. WINSTEAD. If I may finish the statement I was making, I understand that if we pass this resolution today and then when the other body passes it, after all this goes on, Dick Richards and his commission will go over to the Middle East and determine just what this policy is so far as spending this money is concerned. Is that your understanding?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Is the gentleman making that as a statement?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I am making that as a statement, and I am asking you if I am correct in that impression of what I have seen in the press.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I have the impression from the press also that Mr. Richards is going into the area to study the situation.

Mr. WINSTEAD. And this will not be determined until he and his commission makes that trip?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would not say that that is exactly true, but I certainly would hope that his commission would have some influence in determining what is going to be done in the area.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I will say this, I trust him as much as any man that I know to make that decision.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I agree with the gentleman in that trust.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment our new chairman. I would encourage him to exert strong leadership in pursuing the following recommendation made by the committee and contained in the committee report:

> Positive and comprehensive measures for dealing with the fundamental problems of the Middle East should be prepared and presented by the Executive to the United Nations and to the Congress. Sufficient legislative authority already exists for the settlement of many phases of these problems. Our country should lead in boldly pursuing and implementing policies and programs to bring peace, security, and economic stability to the Middle East.

I want to take this time to show my bipartisanship by complimenting the Representatives from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI and Mr. SMITH]. I think both of them have told the House today the exact status of this resolution—in fact, they used every argument that I had hoped to set forth. Now, I want to disagree with my able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I have long sought a positive, constructive policy for the Middle East and I believe it is long overdue. I disagree with him that this is the time for this resolution. I believe that 1955, at Geneva, the deterioration of the Middle East policy was begun, and I so told our Secretary of State when I was at the Geneva Ministers Conference, and urged him at that time to leave the Conference and to show to the world that while we were at the Conference we, the free world, particularly the United States, were being stabbed in the back by the U. S. S. R.

I am sorry to say that I find myself in a very unusual position on this resolution. I do not find one constructive beginning of hope in the policy for the Middle East. In the first place, according to section 2, the United States will employ the Armed Forces of the United States, if invited and if the President deems it necessary, if there is an overt act by international communism or by any nation controlled by international communism. You and I know that if there is an overt act by an international Communist nation that is the beginning of world war III. There is no mistake about it. There is no mistake about what the United States will do if there is an overt act of aggression by an international Communist nation in any part of the world, let alone the Middle East.

My disappointment in this resolution is that it does not deal in any form or manner with subversion, which is the new look of the U. S. S. R., so stated by the present administration; so recognized by the leaders and the governments of the Middle East, and I think recognized by our Government. But I want to ask the Members of this House to turn to the hearings on page 23, to the answer of the Secretary of State which shocked me completely when I asked the Secretary a question. I want to say at this moment that any criticism I make of the Secretary of State or any other witness who came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs is my direct criticism of the policy of President Eisenhower. It is not a criticism of that person, for the simple reason that this is President Eisenhower's administration, and it is his responsibility and this foreign policy is his responsibility.

Now, turning to page 23 of the hearings, I asked the Secretary of State:

> Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Secretary, you emphasized international communism breakthrough in this area. Since the U. S. S. R. established herself in the Middle East during these 2 years in Egypt and Syria, and so forth, and since we are not going to deal with this indirect aggression, are we not accepting the establishment of national communism by saying that if those nations accept aid from Russia we will stand by and let them, and thereby perhaps establish national communism?
>
> Secretary DULLES. The Soviet influence, of course, is in the area. It has been there for a long time in fluctuating degrees. But we do not believe international communism has yet gained control of any Middle Eastern state, and this program that we outline is designed to take all the measures which I think are available to prevent that happening, or, if it happens, to be sure it is of very brief duration.
>
> I indicated that I do not think we should attack any country by armed force because we think it has a government controlled by communism. We are not going into the business of using armed force to accomplish that purpose. There are other ways it can be done.
>
> Mrs. KELLY. Does this administration agree on the establishment of national communism in the area?
>
> Secretary DULLES. If it should happen there were national communism, we would accept it as we do in Yugoslavia. But I can say this: You know the area, and the last thing that will happen in that part of the world is national communism coming in as an indigenous force. People in this area hate communism. They are deeply religious, they know communism is atheistic, and there is not a country in the area that wants communism to come there. Communism will not come in as a national phenomenon, certainly if the countries are not reduced to complete economic distress.

Now, what happened in Poland? What happened in Czechoslovakia, and in Hungary? Do you mean to tell me that those people are not religious, and were not opposed to communism—national or international? I say to you today that it does not take courage to vote for this resolution. It takes courage to vote against it. We do not need courage to vote against communism. I hope that not too many will vote against this resolution. I hope that no one will vote against it, because Secretary Dulles has publicly stated: "Congress would have to take the responsibility for the risk that the Middle East area would be lost in a great and maximum disaster unless it backed the President," and because I believe and hope, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said, that the Foreign Affairs Committee will endeavor to take up resolutions, such as my House Joint Resolution 45, and hold hearings. This resolution seeks the solution of the basic problems facing this area, which are the causes of the tension, which are the causes of the critical situation in that area. In that way we can direct our representative at the United Nations to demand that the people in this area sit down at a peace conference and settle their differences now.

In the section dealing with the economic authorization, let me say that I am not worried about $200 million, and I do not think anyone in this House is; but I want to say that not one on the committee knows how it is going to be spent, and I daresay the administration itself does not know how it is going to spend the money. I want to remind the Members of this House that for economic development and assistance to these areas you have authorized and appropriated in the last few years, I would say about half a billion dollars, and at this moment much of that money is unexpended. So I say to you my fear is that under this flexibility clause we will be paying for the clearing of the Suez Canal, and the shoring up of the budgets of those nations who are obstructing peace in this area. I resent this, and I certainly wish that all of us might have had the opportunity to vote for the Zablocki resolution, or a resolution in that form. But when we are told that any adverse action here today will be misconstrued throughout the world as proving that the people of the United States are not concerned with the Middle East nations and that Congress will not support our President when he is seeking to establish a foreign policy in the Middle East area, I feel we have no alternative but to support the President in the authorization he seeks.

In our endeavor to present a constructive approach to the settlement of the basic issues in the Middle East I had the following correspondence with President Eisenhower:

DECEMBER 17, 1956.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 10, 1956, I introduced House Joint Resolution 600 which

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The resolution reads as follows:

"Resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference

"Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to maintain impartial friendship for the countries and peoples of the Middle East, including the Arab States and Israel; and

"Whereas there exists in that area a critical situation between the Arab States and the State of Israel which constitutes a threat to the achievement of peace and security in that area, and a threat to the free world; and

"Whereas it is the traditional policy of the United States to achieve a just and lasting peace primarily through, or in accordance with the principles of, the United Nations, which organization has a vital interest in the Middle East: Therefore be it

"Resolved, etc., That the President be and hereby is requested to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference to discuss and to bring about an adjustment of the problems between the Arab States and the State of Israel which affect the peace and security of the area, including Arab refugees, boundaries, and economic blockades.

"SEC. 2. The President is further requested to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to make such other recommendations to the Security Council or any other appropriate organ or body of the United Nations as will assist in alleviating the deteriorating situation between the Arab States and the State of Israel pending the convening of the peace conference referred to above."

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable James P. Richards, received a letter from the Department of State, dated May 24, 1956, containing the views of the Department on the resolution as follows:

"DEAR MR. RICHARDS: With further reference to your letter of April 18, 1956, I submit herewith the views of the Department of State on H. J. Res. 600, 'Requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference.'

"The Department of State is sympathetic with the ultimate objective of the resolution, namely, a final settlement of the dispute between Israel and the surrounding Arab States. Throughout the long history of the Palestine dispute it has been the consistent determination of the United States that permanent peace shall be established in the area. Had the parties to the dispute acted in full compliance with their obligations under the Charter to settle their differences by peaceful means, peace would have come to the Palestine area a long time ago. The unhappy fact is that despite the efforts of the United States through the various agencies of the United Nations, and through direct contact with the parties concerned, the dispute has continued and will continue until the parties are prepared to live up to their Charter obligations.

"The proposed resolution appears to assume that it is possible for the Security Council to convene the Arab States and Israel in a peace conference without delay. The history of the case and the positions of the various parties provide little basis for this assumption. Unless or until the Government of Israel and the governments of the surrounding Arab States are prepared to compromise even on the basis for negotiations we cannot expect them to come to the conference table, even assuming that the Soviet Union did not exercise its veto and a Security Council resolution such as that envisaged by H. J. 600 were passed. Given the increasing interest of the Soviet Union in the affairs of the Near East, a resolution calling for the convening of a peace conference between the Arab States and Israel 'and other interested nations' would have to be a resolution which was acceptable to the Soviet Union. We must presume that the Soviet Union would insist not only on its participation in the conference but also on terms of reference for the conference best suited to achieve Soviet objectives in the area.

"Having set forth the difficulties above, the Department would like to assure the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that it does not rule out the possibility that at some time under conditions most conducive to a final settlement a peace conference between the Arab States and Israel can be convened. For the present, however, it would appear that progress toward peace in the area must be taken through such steps as the mission of the United Nations Secretary General to reduce tensions along the border between Israel and the Arab States, to strengthen the enforcement machinery of the armistice agreements, and to provide an air of greater confidence and security between the parties which may be conducive to an ultimate settlement by the parties. For its part this Government is determined that every feasible means in the United Nations, and consistent with the United Nations Charter, will be resorted to to achieve a just peace in Palestine at the earliest practicable date. As the Secretary stated on May 8, 1956, 'Past efforts to move toward a settlement of the substantive issues in the Middle East have encountered serious obstacles. The task remains complex and no real solutions will be easily come by. But progress there is as necessary as it is difficult and there are grounds for hope that it may be possible to maintain the momentum now established by Mr. Hammarskjold's current efforts.'

"The Department warmly welcomes the sentiment for a settlement of the Palestine problem which the committee and Members of Congress have from time to time evidenced, but it does not feel that any useful purpose could now be served by the adoption of the resolution under reference.

"The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT C. HILL,
"Assistant Secretary
"(For the Secretary of State)."

The clear impulse behind my resolution was to unite the Congress with the President in the assumption of strong and effective leadership within the framework of the United Nations to alleviate a deteriorating situation, as it was then, and to prevent its breaking forth into a tragic situation, as it now is. No action was taken on the resolution because there were those on the committee, unlike myself, who felt that the United Nations Secretary General's efforts in that area might lead to a lessening of the critical situation.

What I feared in the absence of the exercise of vigorous United States leadership, has come to pass. The steps taken by the executive branch of our Government up to the time of the recent hostilities between Egypt and Israel, during those hostilities, and at the present time, do not indicate that our Government, to quote from the Department of State letter referred to above, "is determined that every feasible means in the United Nations, and consistent with the United Nations Charter, will be resorted to to achieve a just peace in Palestine at the earliest practicable date." While I feel that an expeditious and wise implementation of my resolution would have helped to avert the recent hostilities, I feel that the action called for by its provisions is still timely. The recent withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli forces does not cure the basic and fundamental problems between Israel and the Arab States. If the United Nations can act to bring this about, surely it is competent to call the parties to the conference table to discuss and bring about an adjustment of their problems in the interest of peace and security in the area. If the Arab States refuse to abide by any such United Nations action, then it will be determined who desires peace in the area and who does not desire peace in the area.

In the meantime, I feel there is certain vigorous and forceful action which the United States can take unilaterally with respect to Egypt and the other Arab States. The same moral purpose alluded to by you in pronouncements with respect to Britain, France, and Israel at the outbreak of hostilities in Egypt should be invoked when Egypt is systematically violating the human rights of those of the Jewish faith within its boundaries, and when it reiterates its dedication to the obliteration of the State of Israel whose creation we supported and whose creation was made possible by the United Nations. The same moral purpose, while I believe it was misdirected in the case of Israel, would impel the invoking by our Government of economic sanctions and other actions which will clearly indicate to intransigent Arab States that we are, from the moral point of view and from the point of view of world peace and security, and indeed from the point of view of their own best interests, opposed to an inflexible attitude of hatred, bigotry, and fanatic determination to obliterate Israel which is willing to sit down with them at a peace conference.

Since you have emphasized moral principles in our Government actions and attitudes in that area, I feel that it is essential to avoid being unmoral by failure to take a vigorous stand and by failure to press our position on the absolute necessity for calling the parties to a peace conference within the framework of the United Nations and for doing everything within our power unilaterally to show that we mean business.

To this end, I recommend that you instruct the representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, to implement the provisions of my resolution and to press vigorously for a peace conference without which there can be no moral, just, and lasting solution to the tragic problems of the Arab States and Israel.

Respectfully yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 7, 1957.

The Honorable EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: It is a pleasure to refer again to your December 17 letter recommending instructions to the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to implement the provisions of your House Joint Resolution 600 of April 10, 1956.

As mentioned in Secretary Hill's letter to Chairman Richards, quoted in your letter, our Government is determined to resort to every feasible means in the United Nations, and consistent with the United Nations Charter, to achieve a just peace in Palestine

at the earliest practical date. Yet our Government feels that an essential prerequisite for progress in this direction is a willingness of Israel and the Arab States to compromise at least on the bases for negotiation. As you fully appreciate, a dependable peace with justice cannot be forced but must be based on will.

When military intervention in Egyptian territory by French, Israeli, and United Kingdom troops occurred during late October and early November, our Government vigorously took the lead in the United Nations to meet the crisis. Thereafter, as a result of U. N. action, a cease-fire was achieved and steps were taken to bring about a withdrawal of foreign troops and the reopening of the Suez Canal.

At the same time Ambassador Lodge, our representative to the United Nations, introduced two draft resolutions directed to the more basic issues in the Middle East. One of these, in the words of Ambassador Lodge, proposed a new approach to the settlement of major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel, with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in the area. A new approach was deemed necessary in view of the repeated failures to reach a settlement through the Palestine Conciliation Commission, the United Nations agency charged with assisting in achieving a final settlement of all questions outstanding between Israel and the Arab States. The United State Government had hopes that the crisis in the Middle East would have aroused sufficient apprehension to enlist strong support of a new approach to the basic problems, especially on the part of the nations most directly concerned.

Unfortunately, the present atmosphere there is not sufficiently conducive to bringing about such a settlement at an early date. Nevertheless, the United States Government will continue in its endeavor to advance the cause of an understanding between Israel and her Arab neighbors through every feasible means.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

JANUARY 10, 1957.

Hon. BRYCE N. HARLOW,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARLOW: I acknowledge your letter of January 7.

I consider your answer most unsatisfactory, unrealistic, and evasive.

I am fully aware of the situation and the contemplated action by the executive department but I feel that conditions in the Middle East necessitate concrete and firm action rather than a hope to enlist strong support.

A truly new approach is welcome but "hopes that the crisis in the Middle East would have aroused sufficient apprehension to enlist strong support of a new approach to the basic problems, especially on the part of the nations most directly concerned" is vascillating.

A call for action now, such as contained in my resolution, will turn hope into action by a solution rather than perpetuating a critical situation as you suggest.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

JANUARY 25, 1957.

Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee on House Joint Resolution 117, it was clearly indicated by the witnesses for the executive branch, that the basic problems affecting the Middle East are not solved by this resolution, but that they would be dealt with by the United Nations.

I urge you to call House Joint Resolution 45 for immediate consideration by the committee since it deals with the solution of the basic controversies in the Middle East area.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, this is a most significant and historic occasion in the life of the Republic of the United States. The mid-20th century continues to present our Nation with many varied and vexing problems. Within the last few years we have seen crisis succeed crisis, necessitating decisions and actions as we strive not only for a continuation of our own freedom but an expansion of freedom in a world where the tyrannical forces of international communism are ever moving to crush all semblance of human liberty.

SERIES OF ACTIONS

The economic plight of Western Europe after World War II, the increasing military preparations for war by the Soviet Union coupled with their adamant refusal to accept any practical disarmament program, the peril which confronted Greece and Turkey in 1947, the blocking of the Berlin corridor by the Communists, the invasion of South Korea, and the Chinese Communist threat to Formosa and the related islands caused us to act vigorously.

We responded with the Marshall plan which saved Western Europe, the development of our military strength to deter any possible attack upon us, the initiation of the Truman doctrine which prevented the Communists from seizing Greece and Turkey, the inauguration of the airlift to Berlin, the sending of armies to Korea at the behest of the United Nations, and the passage in January of 1955 of a resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for the protection of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories in that area.

THE PRESENT CRISIS

Today one of the most crucial issues in international affairs is the situation confronting us in the Middle East. So important is this area that President Eisenhower, in a precedent-breaking address, came before a joint session of this Congress on January 5, and standing on the rostrum of the House, rose to heights of leadership and statesmanship seldom equaled, as in clear and unmistakable language he set forth his proposals to meet the current crisis in the Middle East

No statement can make the proposed action clearer than the words employed by the President.

The action which I propose—

He said—

would have the following features: It would, first, of all, authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. It would, in the second place, authorize the Executive to undertake in the same region programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid. It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.

NEED FOR ACTION

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has conducted extensive hearings on the reoslution now before us which embodies the policies set forth by the President. On January 24 the Committee approved House Joint Resolution 117 by a vote of 24 to 2, and I hope the House will adopt the measure today with an overwhelming vote. Such action, Mr. Chairman, has become imperative because of the repeated affronts to human dignity and to human freedom being made by international communism. The whereas section of this joint resolution states that—

The peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek, by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent.

We need only to view in retrospect the unfolding events of the last few years and particularly the last few months to become fully aware of the fact that international communism, by subversion, by economic pressure, by unwillingness to make any agreements designed to establish a peaceful world, by refusal to join any practicable disarmament program and by constant threat and use of military power is firmly bent upon conquest by any means possible and are determined ultimately to dominate the world. It, therefore, has become necessary for the United States, the leader of the free world, to develop our policies so as to make crystal clear our position on matters of grave international import.

This is a divided world and even a cursory review of current history demonstrates beyond contradiction the correctness of a statement made by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Anthony Eden, and President Eisenhower in the declaration of Washington dated February 1, 1956.

We are—

They stated—

conscious that in this year 1956 there still rages the age-old struggle between those who believe that man has his origin and destiny in God and those who treat man as if he were destined merely to serve a state machine.

Substituting the year 1957 brings this up to date, and, in fact, the statement is as apropos today, if not more so, than at the time of its formulation.

MILITARY STRENGTH

Because of the problems of security and survival made excessively difficult by the recalcitrance of international communism, it has been and it is necessary for us to strengthen ourselves and

our allies militarily. This we are doing, and, I might add, that at the same time we are keeping the budget in balance.

As recently as January 16, 1957, the Chief Executive in his budget message to this Congress said:

> Our nuclear weapons and our ability to employ them constitute the most effective deterrent to an attack on the free nations.

Furthermore, in his analysis of the budget the President referred to the same subject again, stating:

> One mission is to maintain ready nuclear-air-retaliatory forces so strong that they will deter a potential aggressor from initiating an attack.

Our policy in reference to protection is perfectly clear and one has only to note that in the budget for the next fiscal year, begining July 1, 1957, $45.3 billion, or 63 percent of the $71.8 billion projected expenditure, is for protection, and $38 billion of the $45.3 billion is for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force of the United States. Our position in this area of policy is abundantly clear.

I recall that on December 15, 1947, I said on the floor of this House that:

> Any nation contemplating an attack on the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knockout, devastating retaliatory blow from the air. * * * With air supremacy and atomic supremacy any aggressor would not entertain the idea of an attack upon us.

The budgetary figures to which I have referred eloquently emphasize our position in world affairs and portray more dramatically than any words which can be used the position, the strength, and the influence of this Republic.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ARRANGEMENTS

In considering the resolution now before us it is well to recall that the United States has many treaty provisions relating to the use of United States forces for mutual defense, such as the Rio Treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Security Treaty between the United States and Japan, the Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea, the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China, and the relationship of the United States to the United Nations.

PROVISIONS OF THIS RESOLUTION

The Middle East is not covered by these arrangements and the resolution which we have before us today is for the purpose of making our position in this area unmistakably clear. The resolution authorizes the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the area of the Middle East" provided they desire such assistance for the purpose of developing their economic strength and provided they are dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he thinks necessary to "protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism." The measure further provides the use of $200 million by the Executive for economic and military assistance out of funds already appropriated. The committee further provided in this resolution that the authority granted should "be carried out to the greatest extent practicable by the President through the United Nations" and added a provision for the termination of the resolution by concurrent resolution.

The adoption of this resolution, just as the treaty arrangements which I have already mentioned clarifying our position in other areas of the world, will make our policies perfectly clear in the Middle East. We herein take a definite stand and this stand will avoid miscalculation on the part of those under the direction of international communism who might, in the absence of such a clarification of our policy, decide to embark on overt aggression for the purpose of destroying freedom and independence.

I am fully aware that analyzing the past is always easier than attempting to predict the future, but it is entirely possible that if our position had been clarified on various issues during the last few decades much trouble could have been avoided. This resolution clearly informs the world that we will not stand idly by and allow the Middle East to be dominated by international communism, and that we will oppose overt aggression by any nation or group of nations under the control of international communism whenever our assistance is requested.

For several years it has seemed to me that we ought to be very careful to make perfectly clear what we intend to do in certain areas where aggression by the Communists might be contemplated. As early as April 27, 1948, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 190 which, among other things, states that:

> If a democratic nation threatened by a Communist minority which is either directly or indirectly aided, abetted or controlled by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asks aid of the United States, assistance should be extended, be it economic or military.

I, furthermore, in this resolution said that we should "state clearly that when there is encroachment on areas of strategic positions the integrity of which the United States deems essential to its security and survival the nation making such encroachment will meet the immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance of the United States."

In this connection I am pleased to note that Secretary Dulles stated during our committee hearings that he had a copy of my resolution before him when the administration was preparing the legislation we are now considering. I applaud the administration for taking a firm stand in the Middle East. This action is in complete consonance with our policy of becoming a party to the various treaties already mentioned and with the virtually unanimous action on the Formosa resolution. In fact, this resolution employs language similar to that of the Formosa resolution.

WE OPPOSE TYRANNY

We have made our principles, our policies and our ideals perfectly clear by numerous statements of our Government. In exercising leadership of the free world, in this divided world, we covet no territory. We have no desire to dominate anyone. We do not wish to impair the sovereignty of any nation. We seek peaceful solutions to all international problems. We will not tolerate the spread of tyranny and we intend to oppose the domination of this earth by international communism. We are motivated in our leadership by the burning desire to erect a world of freedom and democracy. We will oppose slavery and tyranny with all our strength.

Let us not view the unfolding future with pessimism. As long as we are right we have no reason to be other than optimistic. As long as we are right we have no reason to doubt the ultimate victory of our policies and ideals over the sinister forces of darkness and tyranny. We must not temporize. We must not hesitate. We must make our stand perfectly clear.

A nation's greatness is not measured by its wealth alone but by the ideals it lives by. We have an opportunity for leadership. The President has made clear the policies he wishes adopted. The opportunity of the Congress, my colleagues, is now greater than at any time in our history. By the adoption of this resolution we rise to fulfill our position of destiny and we will be doing that which Providence expects of us as we strive to preserve not only our own liberty but that of countless millions who detest and hate tyranny as ardently as we abhor any action to dominate free peoples.

The passage of this resolution will present to the world a united front on the part of the executive and legislative branches of the United States Government and will inform all peoples that we are dedicated to peace. It will inform all nations that we will resist with armed force, if necessary, over aggression by international communism, and, thus, by clarifying our position, the historians of the future, I am confident, will record our action as one of the great decisive steps in bringing enduring peace to this troubled earth. In this resolution it is the voice of a determined United States which speaks. I know of no greater deterrent to the spread of tyranny and no greater power for peace.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution. The closed rule gives one little choice. However, I should like to make a few observations.

I believe that the testimony reveals that Mr. Dulles is a luxury that we can ill afford to maintain much longer. He cannot cope with the burdens that seem to overwhelm him and his difficulties I believe will grow in geometric proportion. See the results of his mental gyrations and hear the cacophony of his opinions

during the last 6 months. His shilly-shallyings caused our allies, Britain and France, grave concern.

Yes, Mr. Dulles has lost caste all over Europe. He has lost the confidence of the leaders of Britain, France and every single one of the NATO countries—all our Western allies. His usefulness, therefore, unfortunately is at an end. His replacement by a former distinguished Member of this House, Christian Herter, would be most comforting and refreshing.

Mr. Dulles' egregious blunder was his urging Britain to evacuate the Suez Canal. If Britain had remained there we would not be confronted with this resolution.

Recently he painted the Middle East in rosy hues. "All is well in the Suez," he said. "We need not fear." And he lulled us into a sense of security. Shall I say his attitude, to say the least, was unintentional deception? Now a little later we are told of immediate dangers. Whence spring these perils? They do not come full grown suddenly. They are usually long in forming and in coming.

Where was the CIA? Where were Mr. Dulles' agents, his intelligence arm?

He put forward his plan of the Suez Canal Users' Association and as quickly withdrew it, thus causing confusion and consternation. Then he said the United States would defray the extra expenses of rerouting the tankers around the Cape of Good Hope, only to withdraw the offer almost as soon as it was accepted. Small wonder our allies lost patience with him and invaded the Suez zone without his advice and counsel. Nasser was veritably at the jugular vein of Britain and France, their life line of commerce. What were they to do? Wait until that jugular vein was severed? Israel was beset by hostile neighbors. Her life was in the balance. Was Israel to commit suicide by inaction and trust Mr. Dulles? She had to spring to self-defense. She had to make the thrust into Sinai. And then Mr. Dulles wanted to bring sanctions and did bring sanctions against Britain and France and little Israel.

But the very crux of this problem, as the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, is the Suez and the relations between Israel and Egypt. But this doctrine says that these questions shall be relegated to the United Nations. How unrealistic. And that is an understatement. That is just tossing the problem under the rug. That is just ducking the responsibility. These are problems for us to solve. Remember the U. N. is only just as strong or just as weak as we desire.

How can the United Nations solve those problems? First you have the veto of the Soviet Union which in and of itself would preclude a solution. And then, if you relegate it to the Assembly, you must get a two-thirds vote. How in thunder can you get a two-thirds vote in the presence of the Afro-Asian-Communist bloc? That is impossible. And therefore this Eisenhower doctrine is not going to solve very much in the Middle East.

Where is the money to be spent? I do not think Mr. Dulles knows. I think he and the President are speculating. They are just like a blind man looking for a black cat in a dark room. They do not know. They are just waiting.

Why do we not wait until Mr. Richards returns? We have confidence in him. There is no immediate danger—certainly no danger from overt Communist Russian aggression. Soviet Russia is too busy with her satelites at present. I cannot conceive of armed aggression now. Otherwise we would know about it long since. As I said, these perils just do not spring forward suddenly, and until we get some knowledge of where the money is to go I want to hesitate before spending it. I would have hoped that there would be a division here and that the military would be separated from the economic aspects of this resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, my approach to this problem is somewhat different from that of my colleagues who have spoken who speak of war. My approach is a fair approach by the United States to the problem of maintaining and making more just what peace we have in the world. And this approach excludes no part of the world in our aim to harmonize differences and to try to work out a better and more secure future for all the peoples of the world. We must not aim at dividing the peoples of the world into antagonistic camps and groups, and then prepare for destruction and try to scare the life out of all of us.

When we look at this resolution we find that the first section deals with economic aid to those nations of the Mideast desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. The emphasis under this resolution, even by General Gruenther, has been on economic aid, to maintain independence and promote progress and development. I agree with this approach.

If you will look at the second section you will find that is the military-assistance part of the program, where the President can employ the United States forces. Actually, you will notice, it is a limited military assistance because it can only be where there is a direct request from the nation involved that is the victim of an overt military aggression from a Communist-dominated country. It should be specifically noted that the resolution as worded would bar the use of volunteers who might cross borders from Communist-dominated countries.

Then follows the phrase:

Provided, That the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations.

That means that this is a peace resolution, and all practical steps are to be taken to implement the resolution for defense through united action and peaceful means of United Nations agencies. I would ask you to consider the resolution much more in that frame of reference and to forget about overemphasizing all these ideas of war and the threats of war. I think we in this Congress, the President, and the United States people are aiming for peace. Secretary Dulles likewise said we are aiming for peace many times in his statements before our Foreign Affairs Committee.

We in this generation should not forget that we like the Russian people. I do. I do not want to fight the U. S. S. R. or any of her satellites, or China. We people of sense must work hard to avoid extremes that end in war and destruction, and must work to provide the climate and conditions for a just and lasting peace.

I have friends and relatives in Western Europe and Eastern Europe, and I do not want to fight them, either. I am of a family that has been in this country over 300 years, but we have many religions mixed in our family and many nationalities. We have all been able to live well together, and enjoy the varied and wonderful customs and celebrations that a family of American citizens of varied backgrounds really cherish together.

So when we look at this resolution let us not always be talking about this jingoism of getting ready for the next war. Let us not be talking of brandishing the sword, pulling on the old boots, and getting out the old cavalry horses and starting them snorting again. That is not this kind of resolution. If it were, I would not be for it.

I urge the House to pass this resolution, House Joint Resolution 117 as a reasonable approach to a difficult area.

As a matter of fact, this resolution is directly aimed against colonialism. I stand so much against colonialism I do not even want to adopt the term "Middle East," in the resolution as descriptive of the area covered, as it is originally a British colonial or imperial designation. The United States State Department has not officially adopted the phrase until this year. The term should be "Mideast," the American term, just like "Midwest."

If you will refer to page 2 in the second section of the resolution, you will find that military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance are provided, but the provision does not say "located in that area." The nations to receive assistance under House Joint Resolution 117 must be located there.

I asked the Secretary of State at the hearings whether the language meant that we could provide military assistance directly to Great Britain or France. Secretary Dulles said explicitly "No," so that no colonial power simply having possessions in this area can get military assistance under this program.

As a matter of fact, the President is given such discretion and leeway in the resolution that, if you look closely, you will find, under the language, he does not have to employ our Armed Forces even pursuant to our United States treaty obligations. The only provision is "consonant" with the United States treaty obligations. Should the President have this broad power by joint resolution, because we must remember that the Sen-

ate, with the treaty ratification power, is agreeing to this resolution if it passes. But must it pass the Senate by a two-thirds vote to have such a broad power in the President not even pursuant to United States treaty obligations?

Finally, let us look at the point of communism.

Communist imperialism is the force which is trying to obstruct this area and close it off to trade, industry and to commerce. Our position in the United States is that we want these nations to be kept free and independent and on their own without outside dictation or interference. We would hope these nations would prepare either individually or by group action economic development programs for the areas. We, in the United States, say, "We will help you to help yourselves in the light of your own customs, and religions." We are saying likewise that for the benefit of the world, the Mideast area must be kept open. We are simply saying that no one by any overt force from any country controlled by international communism can close it off. So I want it said on the record that we welcome the Russian and satellite people as long as there is no attempt to subjugate these rising and independent nations by a new imperialism or colonialism. We welcome the satellite nations to this area for trade and for commerce without colonial exploitation or purposes of military dictation. We favor for the open use of the Suez Canal for every nation of the world, and we specifically mean, including Israel. We should give notice by this resolution to our Israeli friends and our Arab friends that there is a prime reason why in that area the Western World must have security and stability. It is in all our interests to keep free nations in the Mideast, free from colonial domination, and to keep them free from armed overt aggression from any nation dominated by international communism; yes, and to keep them free for the sake of their own independence and their own economic development.

In conclusion, I like the tone of this resolution, in opening up the $200 million of funds already authorized and appropriated so that the President has all the redtape and strings cut off this individual amount for prompt action and quick progress through the just appointed Richards mission. There has been no firm or final programing and no firm commitment or obligation as yet of these funds, so that the President could act as these nations come up with their plans. This fund gives the Mideast nations the chance to carry over until the end of the fiscal year, currently June 30, when the United States will again come up with a mutual security and economic aid program for the next fiscal year. So, as one Congressman from Pennsylvania, who represents between 30 and 38 nationalities in his district, I am saying to the people of the Middle East—or the Mideast—in this general area. "You make your plans for your own progress and we will cooperate with you on economic aid, and let us with this large umbrella of our power guarantee your independence without interference in your internal affairs. You go ahead with planning and development. You go ahead and plan into the kind of a world that we all want to live in." That kind of an idea will take hold and work, and we must make sure that U. S. S. R. and the United States do not simply become two large powers fighting and pulling over the area, and trying to block each other at the expense of the local people in the area, and the eclipse of their present and future.

We must meet international communism as an idea, even though it is completely against every one of our principals of democracy and based on dictatorship. I feel we should not be afraid to discuss international communism. Let the people of the Mideast area look at it and see it for what it is. Show them through the Voice of America and other agencies, the system we have and how our system by free trade and free commerce can work in this area without colonialism or exploitation. We can enlist the peoples of the Mideast in willing cooperation to make maximum use of the land bridge of three continents, and likewise the greatest water passageway that the history of this world has ever known. By this area and these resources being open to everybody in the world, we in America will be prosperous and so will Europe and so will the countries behind the Iron Curtain and so will first, and above all, the countries of the midwest that we are talking about. It is time that being located at any of several of the world's great crossroads and at the source of the world's great mineral, or natural resources, is removed as a cause for repeated decimation or pillage and wanton destruction, not only of the great assets, but of the very families and poverty stricken, exploited peoples themselves so unfortunately and fortunately, located. Mirabile dictu.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry to whether it would be in order at this time to request that general leave be granted for all Members who desire to do so to extend their remarks in the body of the general debate after the remarks of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. That is on the pending resolution?

Mr. VORYS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be in order.

Mr. VORYS. Then, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of our able chairman, I make that request.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to ask unanimous consent as soon as we went back into the House, that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks, but if it is in order at this time, I join with the gentleman in making such a request.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order at this time for Members to extend their own remarks on the pending resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Then, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman make such a request.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, does that mean that no Member who has been assured of time may speak if this goes through?

Mr. VORYS. No, no; let me say my sole purpose was to accommodate the number of Members who are anxious to give us their views, but who have conflicting engagements. They have been waiting for an opportunity to present their remarks by unanimous consent and if they can so extend their own remarks, it would be a good thing if that matter were disposed of at this time.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to insert their own remarks in the body of the RECORD on the pending resolution, during general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay my tribute of appreciation to the chairman and the senior members of the great Foreign Affairs Committee who so graciously received the new members of that committee among whom I was numbered. I am glad of, and grateful for, the opportunity given me to serve on that committee and to be present at the hearings and the executive sessions having under consideration this resolution.

I wish to commend the able chairman, the Honorable THOMAS GORDON, for the masterly manner in which he assumed the large responsibilities that the voluntary retirement from Congress of the former chairman, the Honorable James P. Richards, placed on him. We know that it had been Dick Richards' hope that after a long and distinguished career in public life he might in private life find more time for relaxation in the society of his delightful family and among old friends in the home community. The crisis in the Middle East which has brought before us the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117 as the first urgent business of the 85th Congress has changed the path of the life of Dick Richards from that which he had mapped with such warm longing of the heart only a short time ago. It is proper to remark here that the fact that the proposed program is to be under the supervision and direction of the Honorable James P. Richards, who enjoys the confidence and the affiection of the Members of both bodies of the Congress and who at the call of duty was willing to make sacrifice of cherished personal plans, has been a major factor in the dissolution of doubts.

Chairman GORDON has proved himself a worthy successor of the beloved gentleman from South Carolina and of the others who in the past during periods of stress and crisis carried the large responsibility of leadership in the committee of the House having jurisdiction over legislation in the field of foreign affairs. In the public hearings and in the executive sessions Chairman GORDON adhered strictly and impartially to the 5-minute rule even when the witness before the committee was the Secretary

of State so that all members of the committee had free and equal opportunity to inform themselves and to develop such points as to them seemed pertinent and vital. I stress this to give emphasis to the important fact that the approving vote of the committee reflected the individual thinking of the members, all of whom had been given full opportunity of participation in the examination of witnesses and in the discussions that followed in executive sessions.

MISGIVINGS AND UNEASINESS

I anticipate the resolution will be adopted in the House as it was recommended out by the committee, and in the same spirit and for the same reasons. There will be among many the same misgivings on the use of the ultimatum in the clarification of our position and the pinpointing of the zone from which in our national security we cannot retreat. There will be the same uneasiness that always attends the making of momentous decisions wherein there is the element of great but calculated risk. There will be the same regret that the President in the conditions of a gathering storm did not find it expedient to consult in advance and on a bipartisan basis with the leadership of the Congress.

But I anticipate that among the Members of the House, as among the members of the committee, this sense of misgiving, uneasiness, and regret will be dissolved in the realization that to win the peace of our prayers we must show to the world the same national unity that is expected in time of war.

It was said long ago that politics end at the waterline. As with families, so should it be with nations. The authority of the family as one contributing factor in building a community of wholesome character is destroyed by the public airing of domestic differences and squabbles. The appearance of disunity in the presence of a grave international crisis between a Chief Executive elected as a Republican and a Congress controlled by those elected as Democrats could result only in our embarrassment and ruin of any hope that at the end of the road we now are asked to follow will be awaiting us the peace for which we pray.

DIFFERENT POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS

I am not of the President's political party. Not many weeks ago in the heat of his own campaign for reelection, and to further the interest of the political party to which he was indebted for his nomination in 1952 and his renomination in 1956, the President asked for the defeat of every sitting Democratic Member of the Congress, including those whose percentage of support of the key measures of his first administration was larger than that of many members of his own party. I think that the President for party advantage should not have taken that position. But if he did, it was only when we were having a private family squabble within our own national home. In prudence we cannot permit it now to be used to the advantage of our enemies and the endangerment of our security by presenting a picture of disunity.

President Eisenhower is my President, the President of the Members on this side of the aisle as he is the President of the Members on the other side of the aisle. No man attains the Presidency of the United States of America who does not devoutly wish his administration to be remembered in history for its contribution to the prosperity and the happiness of the American people and to the welfare of mankind. When his foot steps over the threshold of the White House, he has entered the office of highest authority and highest honor in the world. For 4 years, or for 8 years, he will remain the occupant of the White House, knowing that ahead are no promotions and that when he leaves it will be to take his place in history.

The place of Dwight Eisenhower in the history of war was made when he commanded and directed to triumph the largest army ever massed in all recorded time. His place in the history of peace, I think, is now the subject of his first and deepest concern.

The attainment of that peace concerns us all for every hour of our days we live under the threat of an atomic power that, loosened by the triggering of an incident relatively minor, can destroy both us and our civilization. The President presents to us in the program provided in House Joint Resolution 117 that which he believes is the surest guarantee against such tragic eventualities. He fears that if the Middle East, with its vital oil supplies and its geographical advantages, is permitted to fall piecemeal and by attrition into communistic hands in another 2 years our control over events determining peace or war would be gone.

DESIGNED TO PROMOTE PEACE

Secretary of State Dulles in his testimony before our committee said:

All our treaty and legislative action has been designed to promote peace by making clear our position in advance, and thus to deter aggression and to prevent dangerous miscalculation by would-be aggressors. Also, in each case, our resolve has been impressive because of the national unity which expressed it. Also in each case where we have so acted, we have in fact preserved freedom—page 3, hearings of Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Later the Secretary said:

The purpose of the proposed resolution is not war. It is peace. The purpose, as in the other cases where the President and the Congress have acted together to oppose international communism, is to stop world war III before it starts—page 6 of hearings.

In reply to a question of mine, the Secretary said:

I think that the failure of the program would lead with a high degree of probability to a major war—page 145, committee hearings.

Thomas K. Finletter, the former Secretary of the Air Force, in the introduction of whom Chairman GORDON made reference to the many times Mr. Finletter had helpfully testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the past, said:

Indeed, the Secretary has gone so far as to say, as I understand it, that the alternative to the administration's proposal would be a very great likelihood that United States troops would have to fight in the Near East; whereas there would be very little likelihood of such an event if Congress approves the administration's resolution, including the section about the $200 million. Now, sir, with that testimony of the Secretary of State before the Congress, I respectfully suggest that the authority relating to the $200 million also be approved as submitted—page 446, hearings.

Later Mr. Finletter said:

I am very much affected by the record, as I understand it, before this committee, and certainly before the Senate, of Mr. Dulles, that as this resolution goes, so goes the likelihood of American boys fighting in the Near East or not fighting in the Near East. And with that testimony before the legislature, I think we must approach with considerable diffidence the idea of making changes with it—page 458, hearings.

Mr. Finletter thought the resolution should be strengthened to include resistance to covert as well as overt aggression. When I asked him if he would recommend support of the resolution if a strengthening amendment was not included, he replied "Yes"—page 461, hearings.

AS PICTURED BY GENERAL GRUENTHER

The testimony of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross and former Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe—SHAPE—was especially helpful to the committee. Much of this testimony is deleted from the printed hearings for security reasons. I quote a portion of General Gruenther's testimony that was not deleted and which furnishes an index of his thinking:

The NATO area extends from here to the eastern borders of Turkey—a distance of 4,000 miles. In NATO we have always been concerned about our right flank, here, where it reaches toward the Middle East. Coming to the Middle East area itself, I, as a United States commander and a United States citizen, have always felt that, from a strategic standpoint, it is of great importance to the security of the United States.

The Soviets, as you know, now have a tremendous submarine fleet. They have more than 400 submarines. So that this number is meaningful, you should know that the Germans, when they went to war in 1939, had fewer than 75. The Soviets last year built more than 80 submarines.

Mrs. BOLTON. Where do they build them?

General GRUENTHER. They have shipyards here (pointing) and they build them here (pointing). Strangely enough, some of them have been built here and then the parts have been moved at great expense and moved to ports here (pointing).

That submarine fleet of 400 is a force that disturbs me very much. One can explain why the Soviets have an army. They couldn't be controlling the satellites without it. An army has a very definite cold war value. You can explain why they have an air force also as a cold war instrument. But when you come to explain why they pouring so much money into a submarine fleet, which is basically a war instrument—there is little explanation because such a fleet has a very small use in times of peace. There is no cold war value to it—you never see submarines. The Soviets have spent a great deal of money to keep them up, and it is a very, very heavy burden. Considering all aspects then—military, political, and economic—I would say that the security of the United States and of the free world would be seriously endangered if the Middle East should fall under the domination of international communism.

IMPORTANCE OF OIL SOURCE

In this connection, I should like to discuss the importance of Middle East oil to the West and particularly to Europe. Europe, as you know, is tremendously dependent on Middle East oil in peacetime. The oil reserves in the United States now are estimated at approximately 30 billion barrels. The oil reserves of the Middle East area are estimated now at about 230 billion barrels.

Before the use of the canal was interrupted, approximately 2 million barrels of oil a day were being shipped from the Middle East to Europe. Europe receives about 80 percent of her oil from this area. Many of the European countries are heavily dependent on oil as a source of energy. For example in Greece, 73 percent of the energy requirements are in oil. In Denmark, 46 percent of the energy requirements are for oil. These are not wartime requirements; this is in time of peace. Germany is least dependent with a requirement of about 9 percent. You have noticed probably in the press that there is no oil rationing in Germany now. This is because Germany has mainly a coal economy.

Not only is Europe now heavily dependent on the oil from this area, but estimates of requirements for the next 10 years indicate that this dependence will become much greater.

The coal veins of Europe are, generally speaking, running thin. Atomic power is still too far away to make a significant contribution.

In 1950 the oil consumption of the free world was 10 million tons. In 1955, it was 15 million tons, and by 1965 it is estimated that the requirements will be 25 million tons. The great bulk of these requirements must be met from this area.

In view of all of these factors it is evident that the area which you are considering in connection with the joint resolution is vital to the free world.

General Gruenther stressed the importance of economic aid, suggesting that it perhaps was even more important than the military phase. He thought the administration of the program should be flexible. From the standpoint of psychological impact, he thought it "of tremendous importance that it be a unified declaration by the Congress and by the Executive so that the United States shall serve notice, a notice which the Soviets understand very well."

GENERAL SPEAKS AS A FATHER

He continued, page 361, hearings:

I know that the question arises: "Well, in this risk doesn't it mean that American boys are apt to have to go out there?" That is possible, although I think the risk is substantially reduced by making clear what our position is in this matter. I say this as a father because we have a son who is a captain and a paratrooper. If trouble broke out in the Middle East, he might well be among those sent there. He has a wife and 4 children, the oldest one 6. He was wounded seriously in Korea. I know of the cold shudder that came into my heart the day that the message was handed to me reading, "The Secretary of the Army regrets to announce that your son has been seriously wounded in Korea."

For some 8 days his life hung in the balance. So I think I am quite sensitive to this reaction of American boys going there because Mrs. Gruenther and I suffered the agony of a near tragedy in our own family. I think that this proposal gives us reasonable insurance. I don't say it gives us a foolproof insurance, and I don't try to oversell it. I say that it is necessary action. I say that the alternative is such a grim one that it is a risk that we have to take. The risk will be significantly less if we follow this procedure than if we do not. I say that as a father, aside from my military interest in this area.

PLEDGE TO PROTECT ISRAEL

There was concern in my mind, a concern shared with other members of our committee, that to obtain the acceptance of our program by the Arab States and their cooperation concessions might be made harmful to the interest of the State of Israel. When Secretary of State Dulles was testifying at an executive session of our committee I asked him the question point blank. I am quoting from page 145 of the hearings:

Mr. O'HARA. As the success of this program depends on its acceptance by and the voluntary cooperation of the Arab States, is there a possibility in obtaining that acceptance and voluntary cooperation there may be a lessening of our position in upholding the sovereignty of the State of Israel?

Secretary DULLES. I can assure you, sir, that we shall not in any application of this policy or any of our discussions with the Arab countries do anything whatsoever that would detract from the statements so often made by this administration and others and by the Congress that the preservation of the State of Israel is a vital part of the United States foreign policy.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder, Mr. Secretary, if the statement you have just made, and if agreeable to our distinguished chairman and the committee, could be made public? There is among my constituents, and I am sure among many others, a keen interest in the welfare of the State of Israel.

Secretary DULLES. I would think there is no reason why the statement should not be made public.

The security of the State of Israel is entwined with that of our own country. Israel in a troubled area is an outpost of an industrial order that in our own country in the building up of our large cities has given buying power for the products of our agricultural regions. So will it be in that now troubled area when experience has dissipated the Arab fear of that which is new and from the growth and prosperity of industrial Israel the Arab states will reap benefits beyond calculation. It is to our own interest, as well as being true to the moral law that always must guide our relations with other lands and other peoples, that the Arab states at the very commencement of negotiations under the program provided in House Joint Resolution 117 should understand that the protection of the sovereignty and the interest of the State of Israel is riveted so deeply in the foreign policy of the United States that no American administration in honor and in respect for American public opinion can use it for bartering purposes. I am glad that Secretary of State Dulles in his answer to my question gave reaffirmation of this and that by agreeing to lift the secrecy of an executive session to permit publicity to his words he gave to his words the character of an open pledge to the American people.

MONROE DOCTRINE IN MODERN GARB

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time in our history when the President of the United States has asked the Congress in the protection of the security, the interest, and the honor of the country to bypass the question of relative constitutional powers to give to our position in the face of a grave international crisis the appearance and the strength of national solidarity in the acting together and jointly of the President and the Congress.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] with penetrating understanding of the earlier foreign policy of this Nation, has suggested a similarity between the Monroe Doctrine and the Eisenhower Doctrine. The suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas is that the doctrine now advanced by President Eisenhower is in reality the Monroe Doctrine in modern garb. What I understand the gentleman from Arkansas to contend is that the same fundamental principles are embodied in the Eisenhower Doctrine as originally were defined in the Monroe Doctrine and that the difference is only in the narrowness of the world today, in travel time, as compared with the broadness by the same measure of the world in Monroe's time.

The Monroe Doctrine was applicable to conditions as they existed in 1823. It was proclaimed in the protection of our own interest and security, but also in the protection of the system of representative democratic Government that we had established on the American hemisphere and which later had been adopted by the countries of Latin America once the colonies of Spain.

This is important to emphasize. The present world conflict between democracy and communism as forms of government, and which occasioned President Eisenhower's request for the passage of the pending resolution, had its counterpart in 1823 in the then conflict between monarchy and democracy.

In 1823 Spain had proposed a conference of the allied powers of Europe to promote the design of the Spanish monarchy to regain its revolted American colonies. This the American people could not contemplate with complacency since the security of our own Republic would be endangered if by force our sister republics on this hemisphere were overthrown and their domains returned to the status of colonies of a European monarchy.

What the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine did not state in specific language but what was its clear meaning and import was that the two conflicting systems of government could not in respect for our independence be permitted to compete for hemispheric power. I need not dwell upon how differently might have been the course of history if in 1823, when the United States was young and relatively small territorially compared with its present expansion, the monarchies of Europe had taken over the free governments of Latin America. Certainly there would have been hurdles to our progress.

FREE GOVERNMENT THEN AND NOW

In 1823 the American people were willing to take the calculated risk of war to preserve free government in the hemispheric area wherein was their interest and security. Today the interest and security of the United States is bound up

with that of free and independent nations the world around. In travel time the most distant nation now is closer to our shores than Washington to Mexico in the days of Monroe.

The Monroe Doctrine was applicable to conditions as they existed in 1823. Our best protection from the troubles of Europe then was in hemispheric isolation. Democratic government still was not so strongly established in this hemisphere that, in our own national interest and safety, we could contemplate with complacency the design of the Spanish monarchy of regaining its sovereignty over its revolted American colonies. When Spain in the furtherance of this design proposed a conference of the allied powers of Europe, the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed.

There was an apprehension in this country that the reestablishment of the power of Spain, bringing back to her sovereignty the countries that had thrown off the Spanish yoke and established themselves as free and independent republics, might endanger our own people and the integrity of our own institutions.

Another object of the Monroe Doctrine was to contain European occupation of territory on the American Continent to that already occupied. This objective was accomplished. Thereafter no territory in the American hemisphere was considered as derelict or unoccupied and the practice previously pursued by European powers of seizing such territories was ended.

CLEVELAND DOCTRINE OF 1895

But nothing, Mr. Chairman, remains status quo. The rule of nature and of life is change. From one plateau mankind goes to a higher plateau. There is change in the scenery, change in the focus of higher vistas, but the rule of progress that guides mankind on its climb upward alone remains unchanged.

It will be helpful to us now, in our determination of whether the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1957 is not in its spirit and in its portent the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, regarbed and modernized, to give to the Cleveland Doctrine of 1895 a consideration that seems to have escaped the observation of most of our modern historians.

The gentleman from Arkansas has not mentioned the Cleveland Doctrine of 1895. In my questioning of former Secretary of State Acheson, which will be found on page 199 of the committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 117, I made some mention of the Cleveland Doctrine, which was brought before the 54th Congress in a manner not much different from that at the present time.

Last night, on the eve of the debate in which we now are engaged, I read again the record of the proceedings in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States on December 18, 1895. The same questions were raised then as have been raised today, including that of constitutional powers. The Congress responded by passing the measure proposed by President Grover Cleveland even though in the minds of most of the Members of the Congress, as in fact of most of the American people, was a conviction that the result would be a war with Great Britain.

The national unity reflected in the unanimous acceptance by the Congress of the President's doctrine, despite the uneasiness and misgivings of some Members, was effective in bringing about an understanding and the abandonment of Britain's designs to enlarge her holdings in the American Hemisphere through boundary disputes in which Britain would be the sole and self-appointed arbiter and the exercise of sovereignty in the names of claimants, the validity of whose claims were recognized solely by Great Britain.

SIMILARITY IN 62-YEAR LAPSES

The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed in 1823. It was 62 years later that it was brought up to date by the Cleveland Doctrine, which broadened its application to cover new conditions that had come with the passage of the years. Now after a lapse of another 62 years comes the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1957. It is interesting, if not significant, that the lapse of years in each instance is the same, 62 years between the Monroe Doctrine and the modernizing Cleveland Doctrine, 62 years between the Cleveland Doctrine and the Eisenhower Doctrine of today. In tracing the historical sequence we may discover the outlines at least of a foreign policy to which the United States has adhered for 134 years.

Because of the rapid sweep of great world reshaping events in the closing years of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, the Cleveland Doctrine of 1895 is not familiar to a generation born since its adoption and with a valuating perception of the events of the past dulled by the succession of dynamic events in its own generation.

With the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine colonization on the American hemisphere was restricted to the countries on this hemisphere then in the colonial status. The doctrine that further colonialization on this hemisphere was inimical to the interest of free democratic government, and this was of legitimate concern to the United States as affecting its own security, received universal acceptance.

But in the late decades of the 19th century Great Britain, while professing acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine, embarked upon a program calculated vastly to increase her American domains and eventually to build on this hemisphere a colonial system rich and strong enough to compete with the democratic system of our creation. The success of this design, as we look back now with the appraising eye of a generation remote from the times, certainly would have placed hurdles in the way of our progress. It might have changed the course of history on this hemisphere. Conceivably if we consider the contribution of the United States in two world wars and in the rebuilding period that followed it might have changed the course of the history of the world.

As I have stated, Great Britain openly recognized the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and joined with us in compelling its respect by her neighboring powers in Europe. But while giving open recognition she herself sought to crawl under its protective curtain under a strategic of indirection.

NICARAGUA A VITAL AREA

Nicaragua then was a nation of great importance to us, partly because Bluefields on the eastern coast was a trading center in the Caribbean area and the heart of the banana industry, but more so because it then was the expectation of our Government to build across Nicaragua a sea-level canal uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific. Indeed work on this already had started and American dredges had dug the canal some mile or more from the sand-bar harbor at San Juan del Norte, called Greytown by the British. It must be remembered that at that time the Panama route had been dismissed from consideration on the finding of its utter unfeasibility by engineers.

Great Britain sought to fix her hold on this area, most vital to our national interest as well as that of democratic government in this hemisphere, under color of an alleged protectorate of the Carib Indians. She proposed to take over not in her own name but as the protector of King Clarence, then domiciled in Jamaica as royalty in exile and maintained by the British in a palace with regal attendants and all the trimmings of monarchy.

KING CLARENCE AND THE CARIBS

The Carib Indians were in fact a group of seafaring persons living for the most part in Belize in the British colony of British Honduras. They manned the small sailing vessels, usually made from dug-out logs, that furnished the means of sea transportation from one Caribbean port to another. This type of small sailing vessel was named after them and was identified by everyone as the Carib craft.

How the British discovered the tracing of King Clarence's royal line and the basis for the claim that as the regal head of a dynasty he had the right to sovereignty over the eastern part of Nicaragua lying on the Caribbean must be left to conjecture and logically to the unravelling by Sherlock Holmes, who as a loyal British subject could be depended upon to come up with a good British answer.

But the serious part was that King Clarence had placed himself under the protection of the British and had delegated to Britain the mission of seizing and ruling in his name the domain he claimed. As Jamaica seemed a more likely background for the enwrapment of King Clarence in royal robes than British Honduras, where the seafaring Caribs were unconscious that they had a king of their own, the transfer of domicile preceded the eventful day in Bluefields when British Vice Consul Hatch took over the seat of local government at Bluefields and in the name of King Clarence and the Carib Indians proclaimed sovereignty over all the Nicaraguan eastern coast extending north from Bluefields.

The Nicaraguans unceremoniously put British Vice Consul Hatch in handcuffs and further brought down upon them-

selves the hot wrath of Britain by hauling him, still in chains I understand, the slow and tedious route up the coast to San Juan del Norte, up to the San Juan River in one of Mr. Pellas' steamboats and so to lodgings in the jail in Managua, the capital city.

Great Britain resented this affront to the dignity of her consular service and this defiance of her authority, to say nothing of that of King Clarence, languishing in luxury in his palace in Jamaica, by forthwith dispatching warships to Bluefields. This was nothing new in those parts. How many times San Juan del Norte, called Greytown by the British, further south on the Nicaraguan coast had been shelled, I do not know. As a boy at San Juan del Norte, my Nicaraguan playmates often would show me big round shells, lying unexploded in the earth, so often indeed, that I got to thinking San Juan del Norte was ringed around with such big round unexploded shells as a sort of chain of monuments to British visitations.

This time, however, also came American gunboats. Grover Cleveland, a rugged man, then was President. The issue was coming to a head.

BOUNDARY TROUBLES IN VENEZUELA

Meanwhile in Venezuela there was being waged a onesided boundary dispute. Under cover of resetting the boundary lines of British Guiana and Venezuela, Britain was endeavoring to seize as part of her colonial estate much of the choicest and richest part of the territory of the Republic of Venezuela. She refused to submit the dispute to a board of impartial arbiters. She insisted that the settlement of the dispute must be left to an all-British board with no representation thereon of the Venezuelan Government.

The Venezuelan incident, combined with that in Nicaragua and some others of lesser importance, made it clear to President Cleveland that Great Britain in indirect violation of the Monroe Doctrine was seeking to destroy piecemeal, free government on this hemisphere and to reestablish the expanse and the power of colonial government.

The essence of the Cleveland Doctrine was that the United States had ample and moral justification in interference in a situation on this continent wherein the interest, security, and honor of our country was at stake, that such interference was not in the nature of interference in the domestic affairs of another country and was not an undertaking to protect another state except insofar as the protection of that state was incidental to the preservation of our own national interests, security, and honor.

I have taken the time of the House to go into the past on matters germane to our present discussion but not bearing directly on the present issue. This has been done in an attempt to find by these tracings if we do not have a fixed American foreign policy that we have pretty well adhered to, with slips now and then, throughout the years.

UNITY AND ACCORD DEMANDED

I am supporting House Joint Resolution 117 because to win the struggle for peace and to assure our own security against those who may seek not peace but conquest there must be unity and accord with the President and the Congress. No one believes that President Eisenhower and those about him for one moment would think of plunging this country into an atomic war certain to destroy our civilization. They may be wrong in their thinking and in their calculations. The calculated risk may prove to be the risk of grim reality. But I for one shall not contribute to a show of disunity that adversely might effect the stout chance for peace that the President believes is held in the legislation now before us. And in the past of our history whenever we showed firmness in standing on the moral law, affirming our position and not counting the consequences, the hour of understanding has been hurried and the dangers we might have feared have evaporated.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, the crisis in the Middle East has been growing ever since the end of World War II. The recent seizure and nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt, the military action in Egypt by Israel, France, and Britain, and the theratened use of Soviet volunteers are only the most obviously serious and imperative aspects of this crisis. The President has proposed a resolution to Congress as a dramatic way of making this crisis clear to the American people and of announcing to the world that the United States will use both its money and its men, if necessary, to prevent Communist aggression and the growth of Soviet influence in the Middle East. To understand the need for this resolution we must ask ourselves what is actually involved in the Middle East crisis and how it concerns the vital interest of the United States.

It would be an understatement to say that the situation in the Middle East is either simple or that it involves problems that will be easily solved. It is rather inordinately complex and will surely require the commitment of the energies and resources of the United States for many years to come. There are three main parts to the situation, each of which is related to and affected by the others.

The first is the continuing tension between Israel and her Arab neighbors that is frequently punctuated by open warfare. The Arab states do not accept the existence of the Jewish State of Israel. As is well known, Egypt, Jordan, and the others have vowed to wipe Israel from the map and replace her with an Arab State. The UN Truce Supervision Organization has received complaints of several hundred incidents along the Israel border just in the last 2 years. Many of these so-called incidents have meant the death of scores of Arabs and Israelis. This is a problem in itself, but it is related to the President's proposal by the fact that there is considerable danger that an Arab attack on Israel in the future might involve aggression by a nation dominated by international communism. Thus, in addition to the proposed resolution, a real solution to the Middle East crisis must involve an effective guarantee by the United States of the border between Israel and the Arab States and the resettlement of the growing number of Arab refugees from Israel. President Eisenhower is seeking to do this through the United Nations.

The second major aspect of the Middle East crisis that is related to the President's proposed policy statement is the growth of Arab nationalism in the hands of often unstable local rulers. In recent years the Middle Eastern countries have struggled to free themselves from the control of foreign countries, notably Britain and France. They have been largely successful but the result has been the development of local governments that in some instances do not have firm control over their own countries. There is great political unrest and poverty in the area in the midst of great wealth from the subterranean oil reserves controlled by a very few persons. There is practically no tradition of democratic government there. The United States has sought to help these peoples develop in freedom and independence. We have favored the withdrawal of Britain and France from the area. We have extended economic, military, and technical assistance aid to these peoples. But the problems are so great that there is a very present danger of massive Soviet penetration into the area, a goal Russia has cherished for a great many years.

Russia has associated herself with the aspirations of the Middle East peoples for the elimination of so-called Western colonial influences. She has sent extensive shipments of arms and military training personnel to such countries as Egypt, Syria, and apparently also to Yemen. Very recently Soviet Russia has undertaken a program of increased trade with Middle Eastern countries, the extension of loans, and the arrangement of technical assistance for them. The net result is a vast increase of Soviet influence in the Middle East, in alliance with Arab nationalism and in opposition to the western nations.

This situation is made worse by what appear to be the personal ambitions of President Nasser of Egypt for Middle East authority and influence. He has nurtured the Arab-Israeli dispute in order to make himself leader of the Arab world and has stimulated for the same reason the spirit of pan-Arabism. It is thus vitally important that the United States extend increased economic and military aid to the Middle East governments if their independence is to have any meaning and if they are to be able to resist the pressures of international communism. The discretionary authority requested by the President is necessary to enable him to respond to immediate crises in a way that will be effective. It is important that the longer range United States program of economic aid to the Middle East be thought through very carefully as various congressional groups are now doing. Economic and military aid must be administered in such a way that they will meet the particular conditions and problems of the country.

Finally, there is the general problem of the decline of the historic British and

French power in the Middle East concomitant with the rise in Soviet influence. Since the end of World War II Britain has given up her mandate in Palestine, withdrawn her forces from Greece, lost her power in Egypt and the Sudan, and now has been forced out of the Suez Canal. French influence is waning fast in North Africa and the Middle East in general. The Soviet Union is now attempting to fill the power vacuum left by their departure. The President has correctly stated the crisis. Unless the United States is willing to commit its moneys and its men to strengthen local Middle East governments to fill the power vacuum themselves and unless we stand ready ourselves to use military force in their support, the Middle East will most certainly come under decisive Soviet domination. As the President said in his inaugural address, we must be aware of the full meaning of peace and "ready to pay its full price." That full price is the willingness to help free Middle East governments defend themselves against both internal and external Soviet aggression and subversion. This involves immense difficulties and frustrations but it is the price we must pay if the President's resolution is to have real meaning in the defense of the free world.

Finally, let me say to the House that I believe with all of my heart that we must fulfill our place in the world. We cannot ignore our responsibility. If we are to find peace and security it will be by helping other nations. It will not be by withdrawing from the areas of stress and pressure.

In the world of today there is no possibility of going isolationist. From now on we will have alliances, treaties, and agreements—not one but many.

Peace we must have and certainly the best minds in our country believe this resolution offers the best chance of attaining permanent peace and security.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the members of that great committee for the hearings that were held and for the study that has been made in connection with this resolution. I am very happy to support it. I think it offers the only real hope of peace for the Middle East in the immediate future.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues, I first want to thank the chairman of the committee for giving me these few minutes. I had hoped, because I believe that these men come fresh from the people and fresh we must return on whatever we have done here, that we would have open debate, because I am mindful of the fact that only Saturday night I was handed the report of the committee containing the various statements made by those either in favor of the resolution or against it, and having had to study that resolution, as it were, over the weekend, except for the Sabbath Day, I am now called upon to pass judgment without being able to test the merits of this resolution by what is known as an amendment. I believe we should always, where possible, give the President of the United States a vote of confidence. In keeping with that idea I had prepared, in the hope that the door would not be shut in the face of the people of my district, an amendment which I think would encompass the idea without committing this Congress to things beyond its constitutional authority or things entirely unnecessary. I would like to read that proposed amendment which I would like to have had the opportunity of having this House pass on:

Strike out all after the resolving or enacting words and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) That the President of the United States, and other authorities under his direction or command, be and hereby are authorized to cooperate with and help any nation or group of nations in the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

"(2) That the Congress of the United States herewith signifies its confidence in the President of the United States in the selection of and constitution of a proposed mission from the United States to the Middle East, for purposes of assistance to the general area of the Middle East, the development of economic strength, the maintenance of a national independence, and the preservation of the dignity of the peoples of the Middle East.

"(3) The Congress reaffirms the friendship and regard of this Nation for the people of the Middle Eastern area."

Mr. Chairman and distinguished gentlemen, if we but had this amendment, perhaps it would give those of us some thought who are thinking of the boy next door, the mother down the street, whose home we must pass, if this commits us to war at the direction of one man. We have a solemn obligation. And, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that before we commit the troops of this country to the judgment of one man or one department, we should be mindful of the checks and balances of the Constitution which provide that the power to declare war shall be returned to the Congress, because the people are represented in the Congress by the Representatives on this and that side of the aisle. I am mindful also that across this great Capitol there is a debate going on which will last for perhaps 30 days, and we are confined to 1 day. Because I am an American I believe there are certain American privileges which should not be denied the voice of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I think something should be said here about the people at home whom we represent. They have no voice here in this House, except by the representatives here seated. When I think of the people in the wonderful district I represent, I am humble to the realization that I have the responsibility to think and to speak for them on this grave question, which for political expediency, or of a truth, is termed an emergency.

In a most un-American fashion, a parliamentary rule has been invoked to limit and cut off debate. Are the proponents of this resolution scared of the tests of amendment which is the test of fire, or are they afraid of debate? If either be true, they are less than the fear with those of us who are entitled to hear and be heard. I can only think of a closed rule as a gag rule, and I am distressed that, in the consideration of the first piece of major legislation which a number of us as new Congressmen are required to pass upon such a rule has been invoked. We have no right under this rule to express our views, or thoughts, or our criticism by way of amendment. We are shut out and shut off and it is as if a voice of freedom is denied its place here in the Congress of the free people. I am ashamed to go back to my people and tell them that the men who are in charge of their Nation use such methods to stifle the cry of the man back home, or hear his expression on so vital a subject. Even at worst, the loyal opposition is entitled to be heard.

We are treading on dangerous ground. We are giving the President a power to declare war by troop movement instead of by declaration of war. The Constitution of this country reserved to the Congress the right to declare war, and we are being asked to surrender this right, and forced into it by steamroller tactics which are certainly not worthy of a democratic nation.

I am mindful of the fact that it may be the neighbor's boy down the street that may be sent to war and that the neighbor has no voice except through his Congressman and yet we are being asked to surrender the life or future of our neighbor's boy to the judgment of one man rather than the judgment of the Congress. It is a serious thing and worthy of great debate rather than limited consideration.

I have read the testimony of Mr. Dulles and others and may I call your attention to some of the things he said? This is the Dulles who has proudly boasted that he has taken us to the brink of war. On page 8 of the record of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee in answer to a question by Chairman GORDON about the danger of increasing tension, he answered:

I think, Mr. Chairman we must recognize that this action may temporarily, at least, increase tension with the Soviet Union.

Then is this an invitation to the Soviet Union to go all out, because of what Mr. Dulles terms on one hand a vote of confidence and on the other hand "consonant with the U. N. Charter"?

Appalling, also, is the fact that we are playing a guessing game. When Mr. MORGAN, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, asked whether the plan would be accepted by Syria and Egypt, Secretary Dulles answered, on page 9 of the hearing, "That is my guess." Again, on page 42, when questioned by Mr. MORGAN, Dulles replied:

I do not share the view, if that be the view, that these governments are at the present time under the control of international communism. There is no doubt that there is a certain amount of Communist influence in the countries. I think that there is a reasonable chance these countries will cooperate in this program, although actually that would depend upon further exploration, explaining the plan to them and getting their views. I would not want to seem to prejudge that or take for granted one or another choice that they might make.

And so there is only a reasonable chance that these countries will cooperate. Then how can we be asked to commit our troops upon the judgment of a President, beloved though he be, whose State Department has pursued the policy so vacillating as to lose for us not only the territories formerly friendly, but the respect of most of the world.

Again, the plan does not ask for a dollar more than is already appropriated but it occurs to me that when anyone asks for troops or weapons, his logistics or supply and the problem of transportation would be included. These are terribly expensive so we are committing more of the taxpayer's money to a hazard guess that this present plan is a panacea for all of the failures for our so-called diplomacy in the Near East.

However, the plan does not deal with the two most important problems: First, settlement of international use and operation of the Suez Canal; and second, establishment of a just peace between Israel and the Arab nations, including settlement of a refugee program. Secretary Dulles, on page 22, avoids these questions by saying that this plan has everything else.

The resolution is unnecessary. The authority asked for is the authority which the President already has to a limited degree. This was already admitted in answer to Mr. MORANO. Never before in the history of this country has economic aid and miltiary aid in peacetime been combined in an act of Congress.

I am opposed to giving any branch of the Government a blank check to use American troops or to spend American lives and blood for foreign countries who, so far as the record before us reveals, have offered us no guaranty, no sign of appreciation.

I feel that we have a terrific obligation to those who sent us here. Down home my people are tired of being milked to finance a war when the world does not offer us anything for our help. So far as I can determine the approach is unilateral. What indication is there that these countries involved, who want this declaration from us, are needed?

Last September and October, as pointed out by Mr. HAYS of the committee, the administration stated that everything was fine in the Near East. Less than 60 days later the Suez crisis was brought to a head.

If they want some expression, let us give an expression or a vote of confidence but let us not say to the boy down the street, the bride on a husband's arm, or a mother who has gone into the valley of the shadow of death for her son, that we are going to commit our troops, our money, in such a manner that there can neither be a review of the situation by the Congress constituted for that purpose nor do we have any of the constitutional checks or balances on this proposal.

If the time for spending the $200 million is about dissipated, let us extend the time. There should be some limitation on the power of the President, not only on spending but in other matters. Else, why the Congress? Else, why the checks and balances of the Government? Else, why the Constitution?

It is impossible for one who has not been on the Foreign Relations Committee for a number of years to cover the entire field, or discuss every question, which arises in this matter, in the limited time allotted. Let me, however, touch on a few of the high spots.

On page 45 of the hearings, we find Secretary Dulles saying that we have no evidence of a planned attack on the area by the Soviet, but there is the ability to attack. This then, is no different from the situation that existed 2 to 5 years ago, for we know that the Soviet military machine has been and is able to attack this area at its will.

On the same page, we find the Secretary telling Mrs. KELLY of the committee that he does not know if the British or French will help or not. If he does not know, he should know. And if we are spending millions of dollars to help them then it is time we receive some information if they are our allies.

On page 52, Secretary Dulles states to Mr. BYRD, "We must be prepared to fight brush fire wars." Then, my colleagues, what good is the United Nations organization, except to police and stop brush fire war?

On page 59 the Secretary gives as the purpose of this resolution, "We want to help them keep free from international communism." And yet, if I am correctly informed, this same State Department is pouring tax money from God-fearing and Christian taxpayers into the hands of a Godless Tito and thinking of inviting him to this country. What must the world think of us as a Christian Nation, a Christian people, or foe of communism?

According to Congressmen REUSS, and this has not been denied, this is a unilateral action, and as such we must bear the sole responsibility for any mistakes, even the mistake of war, to which the Secretary has taken us to the brink, according to his statement.

We find the phrase "consonant with United Nations" on page 117. And as indicated by the able Mrs. CHURCH and our Mr. REUSS, we might have to withdraw if the United Nations wished us to. If the United Nations has the power to cause us to withdraw then it must or should have the power to police a brush fire war.

Finally, we are denied free debate. This, of itself, writes a black chapter into this phase of our stumbling, bumbling, vacillating diplomacy. The late Senator Vandenburg believed that every foreign policy should be totally debated, that there was such a thing as "loyal opposition," and that "loyal opposition" was under obligation to contest. He stands out as a magnificent figure in the history of our bipartisan policy of the past. I have no quarrel with the bipartisan idea but surely the voice of the people is entitled to be heard and heard in full.

I thank you for your courteous attention.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is typical of President Eisenhower and his great love for democratic principles that he initiated the resolution before us. We are all aware of the purposes of the resolution as set forth in its preamble, but the real purpose is to unite the American people, asking them to speak out in one firm voice through the Congress of the United States.

In brief summary, the President wants the world to know in advance that both the President and the Congress of the United States want to help the nations of the Middle East maintain their independence. To help them, he wants authority to aid in developing their economic strength. To protect them while they are developing, he would offer them military-assistance programs.

The Middle East contains the largest oil reserves in the world. Neither we nor the Soviet need that oil. But without it Europe would die as an area of modern western civilization. Without Europe we face international communism alone. The Soviet would like nothing better. The need for keeping communism out of the Middle East and for preserving peace in that area is as simple as that.

President Eisenhower in his wisdom knows that he needs the backing of the people and the Congress if his policy is to succeed. The best way to get that is by approval in advance, and not after the fact. It is for the Congress to decide when the Armed Forces are to be used and that again is the President's intention. But our President must be able to act and act swiftly in any emergency. Most important, the President wants the world to know where we stand. Advance warning is the best way to stop aggression. Such a policy might well have prevented the Kaiser from starting the First World War, Hitler from starting the Second World War, and the Communists from starting the fight in Korea. Certainly we have proof that the policy was successful in the case of the Formosa resolution.

The resolution before us contains the tools by which we can combat such action against any aggressor in the Middle East. I urge the adoption of this resolution by a unanimous vote as the greatest contribution toward world peace, and as the greatest expression of unity and rock-bound solidarity of our people.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. COFFIN.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel toward this resolution like an elderly man toward a new stepchild. The child is not his own blood. He is not too bright. He is far from handsome. But the child is all he has got or is likely to get.

This resolution is like that stepchild. We did not sire it. At best we have tried to polish off the rough spots in committee—teach it manners, so to speak. There is hardly a member of that committee of 32 who does not feel strongly that he or she could have written a better resolution. But this is what we have.

Like the stepchild this resolution came late in life—long after we had been lulled into thinking the problems of the Middle East were either behind us or safety passed on to the United Nations. And it

came only after our allies—in the absence of clarity, communication, and determination on our part—took a desperate military gamble. But, late or not, here is the beginning of a demonstrated concern in a vital area.

This resolution will by no means cure the cankers in the Middle East. It does nothing to foster a stable peace between Israel and Egypt; unrestricted use of the Suez Canal; fair resettlement or compensation of the Palestinian refugees; resumption of normal trade; and economic progress. All it does and all it tries to do is, on the one hand, to raise a warning signal to Russia, and, on the other hand, to give courage, stopgap economic aid and military assistance to the Middle East nations.

This resolution recognizes the arch threat of subversion. Paradoxically, it offers no direct program to deal with this threat. Yet I am convinced that for the time being there is no alternative. An undesirable love affair—and subversion is close to it—seldom does anything but grow in the face of direct interference by anyone. This resolution seeks to strengthen the hand of those who must carry the burden of resistance to subversion by minimizing the threat of attack from without, shoring up the structure of government from within, and, at least temporarily helping to strengthen their economy. To legislate against subversion is to find oneself in the darkness of 1001 Arabian nights.

This resolution may well be, in the strictest sense, unnecessary. There is probably nothing here given the President which he could not himself do—even in the matter of finding funds which would be suitable and adequate for the immediate job to be done. But the request has been made and dramatized the world over. The situation changes. Acceptance or rejection after the fact carries far weightier implications than a decision reached in private before anything has been done.

All I am saying is that when all is said and done, the strongest argument for this resolution is the complete absence, at this time and under these circumstances, of any alternative. For example, should we reject the resolution? This tells the world that the Middle East can go hang for all we care. And who among us dares take the responsibility of saying nothing need be done in the Middle East?

Should we delay any longer? Due deliberation adds weight to any action this House takes. But beyond a point further discussion would blunt the edge of a tool which all must admit was not too sharp when it left the machine shop.

Should we hold up the President's request for a military assistance program? If the President insists on congressional authority to employ troops, do we dare take the risk of denying it? No, we dare not. But we must insist that the United Nations is the prime force for peace and that the employment of troops, if such is necessary, be carried out to the greatest extent practicable through the United Nations.

Should we hold up the provision for financial aid? Unhappy as we may be over the waste of the past and possible waste under this resolution, the alternative is to leave our Government in the position of a Don Quixote charging the deserts of Araby armed only with the unwanted sword. We cannot buy friendship with dollars, but we can preserve the integrity, the stability, and self-respect of nations long enough to help them to gain genuine independence.

Should we speak more strongly against subversion? Then we convince the suspicious Middle East that we are prepared to use our troops in the internal affairs of other countries.

To say that there is no alternative is indeed to coat this resolution with faint praise. But it is not to damn it.

Given a wise supervision this stepchild may yet do well his limited, urgent, hazardous job, leaving us with happier alternatives in the future.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I confess that this is for me an unique experience. This is the first time in my 6 years in the Congress, and I admit it to you, that I have purposely risen to my feet with no intention of trying to convince anyone, let alone persuade him. To my mind, the issue before us today is so keenly drawn, the decision to be made so grave, that I would frankly leave to each of you—to his good judgment, to his common sense, to his devotion to the cause of peace—his own prayerful consideration of House Joint Resolution 117. But I would like to make a brief statement, Mr. Chairman, although the time allotted does not permit a full or formal discussion of my position. There is no one in the Congress, and I do not think that I need to say so, who more thoroughly abhors Communism and everything for which it stands; there is no one in the Congress who would more willingly follow the President of the United States in a bold attempt to fight Communism when the plan is outlined; there is no one in the Congress who has greater respect and love for the present President of the United States—no one in the Congress who is more willing to say over and over again that when it comes to military tactics and understanding he stands first. I could not possibly fail to trust, of course, his military judgment, his patriotism and his devotion to the cause of peace.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago I stood on the floor of this House and fought for the Formosa resolution, against which there were finally cast only 3 dissenting votes. For that reason I have recently sat through 2 weeks of committee hearings in prayerful, and again I repeat the adjective, in prayerful consideration of evidence and testimony put before us, with just one hope. My hope—my most sincere hope—has been that we could come out with a resolution which would so eliminate ambiguity and questionable delegation of constitutional authority as issues, that we would this time achieve complete unanimity in this House of Representatives.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us today will not—and cannot—receive such a unanimous vote. Ambiguities and deep constitutional problems remain unsolved.

I would have preferred to make this speech when the rule was under consideration, but I was not allotted time. In seeking an open rule, permitting a responsible and thoughtful House to consider amendments, I was mindful of the fact that the final reported vote by the committee—24 to 2, with 1 abstention—did not present the entire picture.

There were two relatively important amendments offered in committee which lost only by the votes of 10 to 13 and 10 to 14, with most responsible and high ranking members voting for both. One amendment sought to remove the constitutional problem by substituting the word "approve" for the word "authorize." The other sought to remove the ambiguity seen by some in the section which puts the actions of the President "consonant * * * with the recommendations of the United Nations." The third important amendment, which also received a substantial vote, sought to put a termination date on this authority, thus requiring a periodic review. I would have liked the House, Mr. Chairman, to have had an opportunity through an open rule to express its opinion on at least these three amendments, which had actually won a substantial vote in the committee.

I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, there is no difference of opinion as regards our aim of putting communism on notice that we intend to stand firm—but there has been differences of opinion, even within the committee, as to the form and substance of this resolution. I mention these differences now in the earnest hope that the other body in its wisdom will take into consideration and act upon the points which have troubled us.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I take my congressional responsibilities too seriously, but I happen to represent 600,000 citizens in my district who expect me to use my best judgment and who are lenient with me, even when they disagree, if they think that I am sincere and consistent. If I am troubled by weaknesses in this resolution, they would not expect me to sit idly by, but rather to seek amendment. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this resolution is, first of all, full of ambiguities. Even though it be admittedly a blank check, this resolution is far more blank than it needs to be. I know the serious world situation. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for 4 years, I know why all conditions and facts cannot be told; but I equally think that we should have a more definite definition of the Middle East area than was given by the Secretary of State, particularly since he adds to the original broad definition the statement that other areas alcng the perimeter may also be included. Secondly, I think that we could clear up more helpfully just what we mean by a "government controlled by international communism." Thirdly, in the face of conflicting answers given during the hearings, I think that we should remove the ambiguities admittedly existing because of the inclusion of the words "consonant with the actions and recommendations of the United Nations." To

remove these ambiguities would in no sense weaken the purpose or the implementation of the resolution; it would merely permit us, and the world, to understand our intentions.

The greatest ambiguity, however, distresses me even more. In no way, even while seeming to hold out an offer of protection to endangered countries, do we really guarantee to supply it. Four years ago on this floor, after I had paid my first visit to the countries of Asia, I stated my fear that it was unreasonable and unbecoming for us to ask those countries to take their stand for the free world without assuring them of what we would do in return, if trouble came to them. In this light, though I can see the reason why the proposed action in this resolution has not been made mandatory, I would nevertheless remind everyone in this House that any nation which would like to depend upon this resolution for assurance that it will get our protection, if it asks for it, will not find that assurance in the resolution. We are merely substituting the discretion of the executive branch for the discretion of the Congress, as to which country we shall give our future defense help by our own forces, as well as present military aid and economic assistance. I do not think that we should take the responsibility of saying to any country in the future, "Oh, yes. House Joint Resolution 117 was supposed to indicate that you might receive aid if you asked for it—but for reasons of our own, we do not think it best now to join your defense." Nor do I think that it would add to the good will of the world if such countries were so told, having previously assumed through the passage of this resolution that they would be defended, upon their request.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, and to this point in particular I hope that the other body will address itself, only. I have not been able, try as I may, to get away from the whole question of constitutionality, of the delegation of congressional authority, as has already been discussed. Perhaps my mind goes in too straight a line. As I said in the committee the other day, when I urged an amendment which would have removed this question from consideration, and which in my mind left the resolution as strong, if not stronger, I do not see how you can have it both ways. If the President already has this authority, as contended by some, then certainly we are putting a future limitation on future Presidents who might hesitate to use such authority, even in emergency, if by this resolution we appear to indicate that they must first get authorization from the Congress.

By the same token, no amount of fair and powerful words in the committee report can convince me that constitutionality is not a question at issue. To my mind, and that of many great constitutional lawyers, it is; and the oath that I took 3 weeks ago precludes any light delegation of my own congressional responsibility. For that reason, and because I definitely feel an additional sense of responsibility to the people who elected me and to whom I have said over and over again that I would give such matters consideration, I repeat my hope that the other body will also address itself to this great constitutional problem.

I wish indeed that the committee had brought in a "sense resolution," strong as it could be made. I would have fought for it. My own hope now is that the other body will so remove ambiguities and so resolve the question of constitutionality that, when the resolution comes back to us, we will have before us a measure which everyone in the House can support and will support. As much as I wish with all my heart to do so, out of loyalty to my President, out of my realization of the dangerous world in which we are living, out of my desire to speed the end of communism, I am not able to vote for the resolution now before us with any measure of conviction or approval.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I have heard many statements on the floor of this House, but that is one of the most profound and best statements I have ever heard coming from the well of this House.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman very humbly.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in congratulations to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I only wish that everyone had been able to hear that clear and concise statement of the difficulties in which so many of us find ourselves today. I think it is probably true that when final action by the House is taken, it can be said that there will scarcely ever have been a resolution which has so few friends that will get so many votes in this House.

Mr. Chairman, with great reluctance I shall vote for this resolution but, like so many of my colleagues, I voice my conviction of its inadequacy, lack of necessity, and the potential dangers which it contains.

As much fault as I find with this resolution, I cannot take the risk of having any vote I cast in this great body give aid and comfort to the designs of the Kremlin.

I shall, therefore, cast an affirmative vote, even though I am aware that such action may, and probably will, be interpreted as a pledge of confidence in the way in which foreign relations have been conducted by the administration.

Let me make two things crystal clear. There is no pledge of confidence so given nor so intended. If the issue were drawn on such lines, I should be clamoring to express my utter lack of confidence. The mere fact that we are asked to express ourselves by this resolution, the manner in which both President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have tried to justify their request to the Congress, both provide grounds for disillusionment.

Secondly, I wish it plainly understood that the people of the 26th Congressional District of California, their Representative in the Congress, and the President are united in our opposition to military and political aggression, in our desire for a just and lasting peace, and in our abhorrence of totalitarianism, Communist and otherwise, and that we favor firm policies and programs to deal with such problems, because we know that our own security is involved.

The type of rule under which this resolution is considered prevents changes. We can only hope, then, that improvements will be made over in the other body, and that these will be accepted by the conferees.

One of the gravest questions posed by this resolution is that the President has seen fit to ask Congress to authorize his use of a power he already has as Commander in Chief. I should prefer, then, to see the portion of this resolution dealing with use of armed forces to be a separate, simple concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that we approve of a firm policy, and hope the President uses every means at his disposal to carry out such a policy.

We have seen, in recent years, many attacks by the legislature on the power of the Presidency. Here we see the Presidency virtually giving over to Congress power which properly does not belong to the Congress. All such attempts are awkward in that the net effect is to graft the parliamentary system to our own.

There are those who hold that the parliamentary system is preferable to our own. I am not one. But if we are to have a parlimentary system, then let us scrap the one we have first, then establish the parliamentary system.

A forced grafting produces neither fish nor fowl.

In this vital instance, we establish a precedent that could have fatal results if we should have one of our weaker Presidents. What if a future President felt he had to obtain the consent of an absent Congress—or even a sitting Congress in adjournment or recess over a weekend—to meet the contingencies of a Pearl Harbor?

A simple resolution, rather than one having the weight of law, would, in my opinion, be preferable. This present resolution, however, could be more acceptable if we changed the word "authorize" to "approve." We then, at least, would avoid the difficulties attendant upon weakening the powers of the presidency.

Certainly, if we had a simple resolution here on the whole phase of policy affirmation and expressing the sense of the Congress, we could then handle the request for economic aid at a later date, when the administration gives us additional information.

According to testimony by Secretary Dulles before the joint Foreign Relations-Armed Services Committees of the other body, detailed information on how we are to spend the $200 million awaits the completion of a special study mission headed by our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable James P. Richards. But Mr. Richards does not even have a date set for his departure on this mission.

If the administration now sends Ambassador Richards to determine the needs of this area, how then did it arrive at the $200 million figure in the first instance? How may it be sure that this

amount is enough, or perhaps too much? Is it a figure pulled out of the hat—together with the $400 million requested for the next 2 years in the regular foreign economic aid program? Pulled out of the hat in desperation, because something had to be done? The Congress ought to know. Those of us who firmly believe economic assistance, properly administered, and properly used, to be one of our best cold war weapons, need desperately to know. For, if this is just a program quickly designed as an expedient to cover up the glaring errors of past years, it could result in wrecking the whole program for economic cooperation. One of the greatest tragedies of this whole procedure, however, is that it is not designed to do the job for which it is intended.

This program, according to the President and emphasized and reemphasized by Secretary Dulles, will result in the use of armed force only if the Soviet Union, or one of its puppets, takes open, aggressive action in the area vaguely defined as the "Middle East," or, to use the American term, the "Near East," which might or might not include India and Indochina, or might be confined to what our geographies used to call Asia Minor.

Then it is pointed out that the threat of overaggression is virtually nonexistent, so that what we shall deal with is infiltration, and that is why we need an economic-aid program.

But Secretary Dulles himself has pointed out the inherent weakness of the Eisenhower doctrine, so-called, in dealing with the problems of the area.

Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on January 7, Secretary Dulles said in part:

> This particular program * * * does not deal explicitly with the intra-area difficulties. * * * The whole purpose of the Soviet Union, so far as we can judge from what it has done and from what it has said, is to make that area an area of turbulence and of turmoil by stoking the fires of difference between the member states.

This testimony appears on page 8 of the printed hearings, and was given in response to a question put by the chairman.

Neither the use of armed force nor of economic aid will provide a solution to the intra-area problems, and yet Secretary Dulles himself admits that these very problems are the very tools with which the Soviet Union hopes to accomplish its control over this vital and important area.

This resolution should be much broader, so that a program for meeting the intra-area difficulties could be developed.

One of the most serious and difficult of these intra-area problems is the tension between the Arab States and Israel. In my statement before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I said:

> The published and spoken words of Colonel Nasser and many other governments of the Middle East, including some of those within the orbit of the Baghdad Pact, have repeatedly declared that their primary aim, now and always, would be to drive the people of Israel into the Mediterranean Sea. I cannot believe that the American people would want to contribute in the slightest manner to such a possible catastrophe. Indeed, I believe they realize the importance to our own country and to the principles of freedom everywhere that Israel shall be protected from aggression and encouraged to contribute her already proven ability to raise the standard of living of all the peoples of the Middle East.

I wish with all my heart that the resolution had made clear that no aid, economic or military, should ever be used against Israel.

Some of the more pressing current problems were outlined in a letter addressed to Secretary Dulles by 70 Democratic Members of Congress. I am proud that I was a cosigner of this letter. We posed a number of questions relevant to peace in the Middle East. The answers to those questions are eagerly awaited.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, what about the Suez Canal? Is it advisable to have the U. N. protect its security and guarantee its free use? I believe it is. If so, how can the U. N.'s small force in that area do the job without reinforcement from the United States?

If such a course is deemed advisable, this present resolution is inadequate.

What about the problem of the refugees? They must be cared for until the question is settled. Is the small appropriation from the U. N. sufficient? Does the present resolution's economic assistance authorization include help for them? We and others can only guess.

Secretary Dulles has clearly indicated that he is aware of the intra-area problems. But he testified that—

> They are primarily being dealt with by the United Nations.
> We are—

The Secretary told our own committee—

> giving to the United Nations and its Secretary General our strong, wholehearted support.

Mr. Chairman, I believe strongly in the United Nations. But it is only as strong as the member nations make it. As a practical matter, it is only as strong as the big powers make it. In this area two of the big powers are more or less ineligible. That leaves the United States and Russia.

How much strength, then, are we lending to the United Nations in its efforts to solve the intra-area difficulties? How firm can the Secretary General be in assuring free access by all nations to the Suez Canal? What may he do to restore the pipeline blown up by the Syrians so that oil may flow once more?

Are we backing the U. N. as we did last November, when the Secretray General had to go to Colonel Nasser, hat in hand, and let the Egyptian dictator set the terms by which he would permit the U. N. force to occupy areas then held by British and French troops?

Does anyone think for a moment Colonel Nasser would have been successful in his cavalier treatment of the United Nations if American forces had been a part of the U. N. army? Colonel Nasser probably listened to that broadcast in which the pledge was made that American troops should not become involved in the Suez crisis.

And so also at this point I have a question I would like to ask, if I may, which I would like to have clarified by some member of the committee: What assurance is there in this resolution that the funds voted for economic aid, or that the military forces which may be used, could not be used, for instance, by one of the recipients for aggression against the State of Israel? Is there anything, if I may ask the gentleman from Ohio on the minority side, is there anything in this resolution that would at all express the intent of the House that none of these funds could be used or should be used for possible aggression against any other nation in the Middle East?

Mr. VORYS. This resolution has to do with overt armed aggression by any Communist-controlled nation against a nation in the Middle East. The terms of this resolution exclude any reference to aggression between the nations in the Middle East. The provisions of the Mutual Security Act might apply to such aggression, but this resolution very carefully and explicitly omits dealing with that; as we say in our report, that is a matter that we are now pursuing in the United Nations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then if, for instance, Egypt should apply for funds and be granted them we have no assurance that those funds would not possibly end up by being used against the State of Israel?

Mr. VORYS. We have the statement of the Secretary of State that it is not the purpose of the administration to provide arms for an arms race in this area. That has been their policy for some time, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But there is still no definite assurance or no statement of policy that a careful restriction or a careful prohibition of some kind will be instituted to see that our aid will not be used against Israel by the nations who have openly said that they are prepared to make as their first aim the use of force to wipe out the State of Israel.

That, very frankly, worries me, and I hope that at some future time either the Foreign Affairs Committee or perhaps the other body will find a way in which these points will be made very, very clear.

Finally, unfortunately, there is nothing in House Joint Resolution 117 which expresses as the sense of the Congress, nor grants the administration any additional means to strengthen the hand of the United Nations. We have here only the narrowest of concepts.

I sincerely hope and pray, Mr. Chairman, that all at home and all abroad fully realize what we really do here. This is an expression of opinion, not a doctrine, a policy, nor even a program. To the international Communists it says we may differ with the President on how best to do what we want to do, but there is no difference of opinion in what we want to do.

Finally, I hope it is understood that this is only the beginning to the formulation of action programs in the Middle East—and every other area, for that matter—designed to bring stability and justice.

I particularly hope and pray that this is understood in the executive branch.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, from a reading of this resolution and the reports that accompanied it, it would appear that its purpose is to assist the administration in preventing the further spread of Russian influence and Communist ideology throughout the entire area of the Middle East and even areas contiguous to what traditionally we have considered to be the Middle East. If this is the purpose, surely every Member of Congress would be for it and the American people would give it overwhelming support. I would like to ask a few questions pertaining to it in order to receive assurance as to the precise intention of this resolution.

I note that the term "international communism" is used consistently throughout the resolution. I recall that on October 15, 1956, pursuant to section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, President Eisenhower made an official determination, the effect of which is to declare that the Communist Dictator Tito is not a part of the international Communist conspiracy, and Tito's brand of communism is not inimical to the security interests of the United States. It is obvious, therefore, that the Eisenhower administration considers that there are different types of communism at work in the world today, some of which are dangerous to our national security and others which do not endanger the continuation of our free way of life. Every Member of Congress knows that Secretary Dulles is a devoted, if not fanatic, advocate of a plan whereby our Government would encourage the international Communist conspirators to become so-called national Communists and that thereby his theory of political evolution would be demonstrated. Obviously the end result of this maneuver is to solidify the Communist leaders in power at a time when the entire empire of communism is tottering and bursting at the seams. For these reasons, I ask whether a vote for this resolution is by implication a vote favoring support for so-called national communism or so-called independent communism, or Titoism.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I may say to the gentleman I would not so interpret a vote for this resolution.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to have and I appreciate the assurance received from the committee, Mr. Chairman, that nothing in this resolution implies or even vaguely suggests approval of the ill-conceived notion that there is such a possibility as so-called independent communism or national communism.

I have another inquiry, Mr. Chairman, having to do with the question of international communism and to Secretary Dulles' concept of so-called national communism. As I read this resolution, Tito can engage in any actions he pleases throughout the entire Middle East, ranging from political action to subversion and armed aggression, and the terms of this resolution would not authorize President Eisenhower to take action against him. I say this because of the Presidential determination made on October 15, 1956, removing the guilt of international communism from the Dictator Tito, and at the same time recognizing a new type of national communism which President Eisenhower determined was not a threat to the security of the United States. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of this resolution to give Tito a free hand for political action and subversion in the Middle East area?

Mr. CARNAHAN. No; it is not the intention to give Tito such a free hand.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am certainly glad of that assurance.

I should like to offer a few general comments on the resolution itself. The hearings of the committee have brought out very clearly the fact that we still do not have an overall plan to defeat the conspiracy of communism. We are still improvising from one day to another in the conduct of our foreign affairs. It also appears that our policymakers do not have the courage to think and plan beyond the archaic concept of containment. All the testimony offered in support of this resolution by the administration points up nothing more than a holding action in the critical area of the Middle East. It is reasonable for Members of Congress and the American people to assume that if the Communists choose to make trouble in other parts of the world, crisis similar to that developed in the Middle East will be put on the doorstep of Congress. We cannot expect to defeat world communism if we have not developed a national policy which says this is our objective. We cannot expect to defeat communism if, in the conduct of our international affairs, we allow our destinies to become involved in the Kremlin's new look at communism which involves so-called national communism, so-called independent communism, or Titoism. I do not believe this administration will be able to fool the American people much longer into believing that it opposes communism when at the same time it is taking the taxpayers money to feather the nest of the Communist leaders. I certainly hope the Foreign Affairs Committee will immediately launch a full-scale inquiry into the conduct of our foreign affairs in order to determine what policy, if any, we do have with respect to the threat of communism and whether or not any overall plan is being prepared by the Government to meet this menace.

There is another implication in the language in this resolution which I find distasteful. That is the belief that we can buy friends in the Middle East or elsewhere. The hearings reveal that there is no question whatever that the President has the authority to take whatever military action is required in the Middle East. Testimony points out the great care exercised by the committee to make certain that action taken on the pending resolution will not become a precedent which would reduce the authority of the Chief Executive to take such action in the future to defend our interests. I am sorry to say that the great emphasis put upon the need for $200 million by proponents of this resolution makes it appear that that is the real reason why they come before Congress on this issue. We should have learned by this time that we cannot buy friends no matter how much money we are prepared to put on the line. The only way we can make and hold friends in this world is to stand by our principles and principles cannot be bought for any sum of money. I believe that Congress should keep a very close watch over the expenditure of the taxpayers' money for any program developed in the Middle East. That is the only way Congress can absolve itself of the charge being made that we are handing the administration a blank check.

I shall vote for this resolution, but with the grave misgivings which I have stated here today.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the gravity of the problem which is here presented to the House. Almost certainly each of us, if he had individually drawn House Joint Resolution 117, would have presented it in form and content somewhat different from that in which it appears before us now. It is the result of recommendations by the executive department to which a great deal of study and thought and discussion were applied by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. With some amendments, the committee then favorably reported out this resolution.

I shall vote for the resolution for several reasons. First, because I think it is a long step in the direction of the maintenance of a strong foreign policy without appeasement. It has for a long time been my view that we, as a Nation, have done best in our relations with other nations throughout the world when we have had a fair, honorable, and just foreign policy which was clearly enunciated and understood both at home and abroad. This resolution, I feel, contributes measurably toward such a policy and, therefore, I believe it deserves our support. It does not by any means indicate an aggressive attitude on our part, but does rather point out our firm determination to see that justice prevails in the world.

Next, we Americans are and have been traditionally anticolonial. We recognize the terrible danger of Communist colonialism and the unspeakable tragedies which it brings to those peoples who are by it engulfed and submerged. Since a number of the countries in the Middle East are endeavoring mightily to maintain firm governments of their own choosing, anything we can do to prevent this worst of all colonialism—that is Communist colonialism—is certainly of greatest benefit to those peoples and to all peoples of the world. If we take this action, I believe we are raising a safeguard against Communist aggression, subversion, and colonialism. Our Nation has no aggressive intentions—but desires that people everywhere have freedom and self-government.

Thirdly, not long ago, this Congress took action on the so-called Formosa resolution. While there are obvious points of difference, yet it seems to me that basically there are great similarities in the two situations. Here, as there, a

part of the world is threatened with aggression which, once started, might conceivably spread over a large part of the globe. Strong, forthright action on our part prevented war at that time, and I believe it will also prevent it here. In other words, I regard the action we are taking here today as action designed to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent the vast conflagration which would be world war III with its attendant misery, suffering, and loss of life. I am convinced that by approving this resolution the Congress will be saving the lives of American men. The leaders in the Kremlin understand this language.

Of the many other arguments that could be made for the adoption of this resolution, one is preeminent. That is the need for unity of action by the President and the Congress of the United States. It has been said by some that if the Congress passes this resolution it is abdicating its power to the President. I do not so regard it. Rather do I feel that here is a case in which a Chief Executive, who knows the full horrors of war, has foreseen the possibility of conflict in a strategic and important part of the world. He has pointed this out and asked the Congress for cooperation and authority to take preventive steps. This is certainly a far different situation than that in which a Chief Executive plunges us into conflict and then makes the Congress and the American people aware of it. Those of us who have objected to the manner in which we were thrust into the Korean war must be particularly aware of this different approach to a highly inflammable situation. Because of those factors and further because both the President and the Secretary of State have given assurances that the Congress will be continuously informed and consulted, this is not an abrogation of congressional rights and obligations. It is rather a proper working together of the two branches of government. It is of the utmost importance that we demonstrate to the whole world that there is unity of mind and heart and purpose in this great country of ours for the preservation of an honorable peace and the prevention of a Communist-inspired war.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. McDONOUGH. The Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short statement?

Mr. BYRD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have here an AP dispatch which reads as follows:

> Yugoslav President Tito will not accept an invitation to visit Washington in view of anti-Yugoslav statements in the United States, newspaper Borba reported in Belgrade tonight.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, 400 years before the Christian era, Pericles, the noblest of Athenians addressed his countrymen thusly, "Fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country and remember that her greatness was won by men with courage, with a knowledge of their duty, and with a sense of honor in action." The greatness of our own Nation can be attributed to these same qualities possessed by our own forefathers. They possessed the courage to face the storms of adversity. Their knowledge of duty was a knowledge that never wavered from its course, and their sense of honor was one which shall, to the end of recorded time, remain unblemished, untarnished, and unstained.

The resolution we have before us today is one which demands courage, one which we must and will approach with a knowledge of our duty, and the implementation of which will be pursued with the same sense of honor that has marked our nation's course since the beginning of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, in less than two decades we have witnessed a territorial expansion of the power of the Soviet Union, the like of which the world has never before seen. The conquests of Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and Alexander the Great have been dwarfed in comparison to the accomplishments by the rulers of the Soviet Union during the past 18 years. In 1939 the U. S. S. R. controlled a territory of 18,176,000 square miles with a population of 170 million people, but during the eventful years that have followed, Stalin and his successors have methodically and systematically extended the sway, the domination, and the influence of Communist control, until today the Communist world consists of many nations and, where it once controlled an area of 8 million square miles, it now embraces an area of over 14 million square miles; where once the Communist ideology held in its grip 170 million people, today nearly 900 million human beings have been enslaved and have had their governments taken over either by subversion or by military force, or by a combination of the two. The Soviets have consistently violated the broad principles enunciated in the Declaration by the United Nations on January 1, 1942, and their every act and deed should prove, even to the most doubting Thomas, that they intend to stop at nothing less than the complete mastery of the world. Their methods may vary, but their objective remains the same. Dimitry Manuilski, no doubt, had this objective in mind in speaking at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow nearly 30 years ago when he said: "War to the hilt between capitalism and communism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So, we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fists." The world has seen in no uncertain terms the gradual implementation of this statement. Geneva has come and gone, and with it the captivating atmosphere of sweetness and light. The great peace movement referred to by Manuilski has long since gotten under way, and the leaders of many nations, the foremost of which have been our own, have been anesthetized by its attractive, but no less potent, siren call to the Mermaid Island of destruction.

This administration has too long looked at the international situation through rose-colored glasses and our people have been misinformed regarding the dangers we face. Every attempt was made to create an issue of peace during the election last year, and the true facts regarding the perils of the Middle East have either been unknown to administration leaders or have been coated with a mild veneer. Our ship of state has been steered recklessly through stormy international political waters, seemingly, without direction and purpose. We have lacked firmness in dealing with the Communists, we have blown hot and then cold, we have bluffed and then backed down, we have reacted rather than acted, we have failed to exercise the leadership demanded by events, we have at times lost the respect and the confidence of our friends, and we have witnessed a gradual deterioration of the forces of the free world. At the same time our own people have been led to believe that all is well.

And, so, while there are some features of this resolution to which I do not particularly subscribe, I am happy to see this indication that the administration is at last facing up to the realities of the peril that confronts us. The attitude of administration spokesmen at this time is, of course, quite a contrast to that which was voiced just prior to the last general election. Remembering Lot's wife, however, we probably gain little by looking backward. "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." So, we must look forward from where we stand today. I am confident that the Communists understand strength and that alone. That is perhaps the foremost reason why it is necessary that this resolution be passed by the Congress. I am supporting it because it will indicate to our enemies, as well as to our friends, that America intends to stand firm in dealing with any attempts toward Communist expansion in the Middle East.

There has been a great deal said in the press and elsewhere about the constitutionality of the resolution, but it is the conclusion of my committee that the resolution does not enter this field of controversy and that, with the President and the legislative branch acting together, there can be no doubt that all the constitutional powers necessary to meet the situation are present. My committee feels that the resolution does not detract from or enlarge the constitutional powers and authority of the President as Commander in Chief, nor does the resolution delegate or diminish in any way the power of the Congress to declare war.

The resolution is a declaration of the solidarity of the people of the United States, expressed through the President and the Congress, on our policy of cooperation with the nations of the Middle

East in meeting the threat of Communist expansion. Two-thirds of the known oil resources of the world are located in the Middle East. For centuries this area has been the crossroads connecting Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is the cradle of three great religions—Christian, Moslem, and Hebrew. For centuries the Russian czars have looked with covetous eyes toward this "pearl in a cup of emeralds." Were the Middle East to fall to international communism, the United States would be forced to fight a war of survival. The Middle East is absolutely vital to the security of the free world. Without its oil the industries of Western Europe would be paralized, the NATO military machine would be rendered helpless, and Western Europe would fall without a war. Our air bases in Western Europe and in certain other areas would be completely erased as a factor in the military equation. These facts were brought out in the hearings conducted by our committee. The present Secretary of State, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, and the former Supreme Commander of the NATO Forces, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, were in absolute agreement that the Middle East is vital to the security of our own Nation and that the communization of the Middle East would be nothing less than the fulfillment of a dream within a dream as far as the rulers in the Kremlin are concerned.

This resolution does not pretend to be a panacea for all the ills that confront us. But it is a step in the right direction. Its passage will mean that America speaks from strength not weakness. When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.

That is the underlying purpose of this resolution. It is hoped that it would be a step toward peace because the Communists will be put on notice regarding our determination to use force to meet any overt act of aggression in the Middle East. The Communists miscalculated in Korea; they must not be permitted to miscalculate in the Middle East.

The resolution would permit our Government to give economic assistance to the governments of middle eastern countries. It would permit our Government to give military assistance, and it would make clear to the world that the President lacks no authority to use American troops to combat overt aggression in that area by any nation controlled by international communism. The resolution states that our military forces would be used only at the request of a government attacked. Some objection has been made to the resolution because it does not specifically provide for action against covert aggression. However, by assuring the governments of the Middle East that they will be secure against overt attack and by strengthening their economies so as to enable those governments to more stoutly resist subversive elements, it is believed that the dangers of infiltration and covert aggression will be greatly lessened.

The resolution removes certain restrictions contained in existing law on the use of mutual security funds by the President. It gives the President greater discretion as to the use of funds already appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have seen the military and economic sections of this resolution separated, but they have not been. Perhaps there is no member of this body who is more sensitive than I on the subject of economic aid to other countries. I come from a district that has experienced great hardship during the past 4 years. My district is the largest coal producing district in the United States, and thousands of my constituents have lost their jobs because of the ills that have beset the coal industry. All over West Virginia men have been thrown out of work. At one time during the past 4 years nearly 300,000 persons were receiving Government surplus food commodities in West Virginia. A little over a year ago when the national average was a fraction less than 1 jobless area per State, my State of West Virginia had 13 labor distress areas. Out of a total population of less than 2 million people, 284,478 of my fellow West Virginians in March 1955 kept body and soul together by virtue of their receiving Government surplus commodities.

Nonetheless, my people realize that the security of this Nation comes first and, if additional economic programs will save the lives of American boys and keep America free, then we are willing to pay that price. If all other efforts fail, West Virginians, true to their motto: "Mountaineers are always free," will be willing to pay the price necessary to maintain the safety, the well-being, and the security of our land. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to cast my vote for the passage of the resolution. I believe that the spirit which created this Republic and which made America great still lives. The spirit that moved at Valley Forge, and the spirit that moved a great Virginian once to say "Give me liberty of give me death" still lives within the bosoms of Americans. That spirit has motivated the creation of this resolution; it will motivate its passage; it will motivate its implementation.

Let us in this decisive moment proclaim to the world, friend and foe alike, that America's dedication to the preservation of liberty and freedom is as strong today as it was when the embattled farmers at Concord fired the shot heard around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the vote for passage of this resolution will be so unanimous that the leaders of communism in Moscow and in Peiping will have no doubt as to the complete and unswerving unity and determination of the American people to support any action which may be required in the defense of free governments and freemen.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there have been many occasions in the long history of our country when a new Congress, not fully organized, was called upon by a President to deal with an issue so vital to the peace and security of the United States.

The assignment of new members to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had not even been completed when the hearings on the resolution now before us got under way. Yet, the message of the President carried such a note of urgency that we felt it was necessary to give the resolution the highest priority.

The interrogation of the witness who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee was, I believe, thorough, and the questions covered every conceivable aspect of the Middle East situation. If our hearings and executive sessions were long, it was only because we wanted to dispel as much as possible the concern that we had over the contents of the resolution now before us.

Even the most casual newspaper reader could recognize that during the last few months of 1956 a critical situation was developing in the Middle East. The events that took place in and around the Suez Canal were only one indication of the disturbed conditions in that part of the world. Almost all of us sensed that this dispute was symptomatic of the unrest which was sweeping that area and that behind it lay more fundamental problems and conflicts.

President Eisenhower's message to the Congress of January 5 brought into focus these more basic problems, and the blame for these problems was placed on the Soviet Union.

The reason for Russia's interest in the Middle East—

He told the Congress—

is solely that of power politics. Considering her announced purpose of communizing the world, it is easy to understand her hope of dominating the Middle East.

When Secretary of State Dulles appeared before our committee, he elaborated on the Soviet Union's penetration into the area and what it means for the United States. He stated:

Few, if any, of us doubt that it would be a major disaster for the nations and peoples of the Middle East, and indeed for all the world, including the United States, if that area were to fall into the grip of internationalist communism.

It would be a political disaster for the nations of the Middle East because then those nations like the European satellites would lose the national independence which they so ardently desire and which now they are beginning to exercise in full measure.

It would be an economic disaster to them. The principal economic asset of the area is petroleum and only the free nations offer an adequate market.

It would be a disaster for the peoples of the Middle East because they are deeply religious peoples and their spiritual suffering would be grievous if they were subjected to the fate of other religious peoples who have fallen under the rule of atheistic, materialistic communism.

The disaster would spread far beyond the confines of the Middle East itself. The economies of many free world countries depend directly upon natural products of the Middle East and on transportation through the Middle East. And, indirectly, the entire free world economy is concerned. Western Europe is particularly dependent upon the Middle East. The vast sacrifices the United States has made for the economic recovery of Europe and military defense of Europe would be virtually nullified if the

Middle East fell under the control of international communism.

Finally, a Communist breakthrough in the Middle East would encourage the Soviet rulers to resort everywhere, at home and abroad, to more aggressive policies. It would severely weaken the pressures within the Soviet world for more liberal policies.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson recognized the existence of the danger in the Middle East, although he did not agree with the approach provided by the joint resolution. "It is wise and desirable," he told the committee, "that there should be a declaration of American policy with regard to this area."

The judgment of distinguished military men was given to the committee. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told us:

We know from a study of history that the Russian nation has for 100 years, at least, coveted parts of the Middle East as an outlet to a warm-water port. We know that Russian communism feeds on conditions of tension and economic imbalance such as exist in that area today. Finally, we know that a military vacuum has been created in the area by the withdrawal from that area, whatever the reasons, of our allies. Both nature and communism rush in to fill vacuums. It follows that from a military point of view the present situation presents a dangerous situation to the United States, a condition against which we must have an effective defense.

Finally, we heard from General Gruenther, former Supreme Commander, Allied Forces, Europe, who only recently left that post:

The Soviet interest becomes transparent indeed when considered in the light of currently prevailing circumstances. In peace and in war the Middle East is of vital concern to the free world. There must be a free and friendly economic and political relationship between the two areas; this is equally important to both the free world and the Middle East. If the Soviet Union can disrupt and indefinitely interfere with this relationship, it has seriously weakened both areas and opened a route leading toward extending the area dominated by world communism. If the Soviet Union is permitted to continue its troublemaking unchallenged—and under present conditions the United States is the only possible challenger—the cost to the United States and the whole free world would be beyond measure.

Certainly the evidence is overwhelming that the Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to capitalize on the unsettled conditions in the Middle East. If I interpret the testimony of the witnesses correctly, Soviet activities today are more an acceleration of interest than any sudden new pressure in the area. The sale of Soviet military equipment to Egypt was known in the fall of 1955. The sale of military equipment to Syria has been public information for months. Similarly, Soviet economic penetration into the area has been going on for several years.

In my judgment, the President should have acted earlier. But this is not the time nor the place to reexamine the shortcomings of our Middle Eastern policy. All we are called upon to do today is to express by a "yea" or "nay" vote our willingness to cooperate with the President in making clear our intention to meet the Soviet menace in this important area and our desire to give assistance to the nations of the area that want to remain free from Communist domination. Bearing in mind these limited objectives, the size of the vote on this resolution is of unusual importance. Anything less than an overwhelming affirmative vote will, in my opinion, destroy the psychological effects that this resolution seeks to accomplish.

Section 2 of the resolution now before us authorizes the President to do certain things under certain conditions in the general area of the Middle East. First, he can act only in the case of overt armed aggression. Second, the aggression must come from a nation controlled by international communism. Third, the nation or group of nations attacked must request our aid. The purpose of this section, as I understand it, is to serve notice on the Soviet Union of our intentions and thereby reduce the danger of any miscalculations on their part.

The question that immediately arises when section 2 is discussed is what it means in terms of sending our Armed Forces into the Middle East. Our Sixth Fleet is presently operating in the Mediterranean. We have important air bases in the general area. But we have no combat ground forces in that part of the world. During the hearings, I asked Admiral Radford this question:

If this resolution is adopted and this new policy goes into effect, will it be necessary to station overseas additional components of our Armed Forces?

The admiral's reply was this:

I would say it would have little effect upon our deployments.

While no one can state categorically that the passage of the resolution now before us would avert war, the testimony that was presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs would indicate that its passage would lessen rather than increase the likelihood of war in the area of the Middle East. The Soviet Union has shown time and again that it respects only strength and determination. Hence, if we act firmly now we may—and I underscore "may"—avert military conflict.

Section 3 of the resolution deals with the use of funds in the area of the Middle East. While this section gives the President greater discretion as to the use of funds already appropriated, it should be emphasized that no new funds will be authorized by its passage.

In my opinion, the original language of section 3 was loosely drawn and far from satisfactory. Although this section has not been perfected, it has been improved by committee amendment. Originally, there was no limitation in section 3 on the amount of the $200 million that could be spent in any one country. Also, the termination date on the funds authorized was uncertain. The committee amendment makes it clear that the exceptional authority granted the President is only for the balance of the present fiscal year and it limits to $30 million the amount that can be spent in any one country.

Last fall our committee made a study of the foreign aid program. One of the recommendations contained in the draft report submitted by our former chairman, Hon. James P. Richards, was that all economic aid be on a loan basis with a few limited exceptions. In line with this report, I offered an amendment that would have made all funds that are covered by the resolution, other than military, available only on a loan basis. I regret that the committee failed to adopt the amendment. However, the President has informed us that in the Mutual Security programs for the next 2 fiscal years he will request $200 million for each of the years "for discretionary use in the area, in addition to the other Mutual Security programs." When these proposals come before our committee, I plan to renew my efforts to limit to a loan basis, with some necessary exceptions, the funds requested for economic aid.

It would be a mistake to maintain that this resolution is our Middle Eastern policy. It is a "holding" operation and provides the framework around which a policy must be evolved. The President himself stated that:

This program (contained in the resolution) will not solve all the problems of the Middle East. Neither does it represent the totality of our policies for the area.

After our committee heard all the evidence, we came to the same conclusion. Our report contains this statement:

The resolution does not set forth a detailed plan or program for dealing with all the major problems in the Middle East. It deals with courses of action relating to immediate military and economic threats.

We placed the responsibility for devising policies for the area where it belonged—on the Executive. We called for positive and comprehensive measures on the part of the Executive. The Members of this body, like the members of our committee, recognize that the problems in the area are complex and often long standing. We are not unrealistic enough to expect quick solutions. But we have a right to expect diligence and imagination in the search for solutions. This resolution, if adopted by the Congress and put to full use by the Executive, should provide a point of departure for the creation of such policies.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, the circumstances which prompted the drafting and introduction of this resolution have had a heavy impact upon public opinion in this country.

Recent events in the Middle East have awakened us to a realization that the cold war is getting colder, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say it is getting warmer. I think, too, that the death knell must have been sounded for any important remaining vestige of isolationist sentiment in this country. For what has happened during the past several weeks has made it abundantly clear to Americans, with the possible exception of some whose thinking is overly dominated by nostalgic memories of the past, that the United States can no longer go it alone or remain indifferent to

the sometimes seemingly insoluble problems throughout the world except with great risk to our own security.

The Middle East crisis has demonstrated that now, as in the past, when the chips are down and danger threatens Americans can unite in a common front.

From the first, the Democratic leadership in the House and Senate has cooperated with the administration to the fullest extent possible in getting this resolution before the Congress. Former President Truman, an intense partisan on occasion, has given public expression to his support of the proposal and has evinced that, when circumstances warrant, he is capable of a high order of statesmanship.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has considered this question on a completely nonpartisan basis. One of the amendments adopted, I believe unanimously, was at the suggestion of the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force during the Truman administration.

The new chairman of the committee, Mr. GORDON, of Illinois, has had his baptism under fire but has been wholly equal to the task and has approached it with a high degree of impartiality and a deep sense of patriotism.

Likewise, I believe the administration has cooperated completely with the Democratic leaders in Congress to the end that they have been given all information pertinent to the pending resolution, together with reasons why it should be adopted speedily if it is to achieve its maximum purpose. Moreover, at the administration's invitation two of the Nation's most distinguished and respected Democrats, the Honorable Walter F. George and the Honorable James P. Richards, formerly chairmen of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, respectively, have consented to serve in posts vital to the implementation and development of American Foreign policy.

A few members of the majority party in Congress have seized upon a consideration of the pending resolution as a means of questioning the efficacy of the Eisenhower foreign policy generally but, for the most part, their attack has not been directed against the resolution as such. And it might be well to point out that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a Commission appointed by the President are presently engaged in far-reaching studies and appraisals with respect to the objectives, methods, and results of current foreign policies.

Mr. Chairman, even if we possessed the innate modesty of a Lincoln at Gettysburg though none of his genius for rhetorical expression, we would perceive that the world will note and remember what we say and do here. How long it will recall is a question that may be determined by the course of this debate.

For the action we take or fail to take on this resolution will certainly alter the current of history because of its relationship to the problem of war or peace and conceivably could decide whether or not history shall continue to be written.

In my judgment, failure of the House to approve the resolution by an overwhelming majority will only serve to compound the dangers and difficulties which the resolution seeks to ameliorate. An almost certain consequence of such action by the House will be an expanded effort by the Communists to gain domination over the Middle East as well as other areas. The defeat of this resolution will be interpreted by Russian leaders as a sign of weakness or growing pacifism in the United States and will inspire them to undertake new and far-reaching adventures and the will of the free nations to resist Communist aggression may wither and die for they know that without our help their efforts offer no hope of success.

As the world's most powerful advocate of peace and an expanding freedom for mankind we find ourselves engaged in the most gigantic ideological struggle of all time, and with an adversary which will risk almost any means to achieve its objective of world domination.

Ethical, spiritual, and human values as we understand them are unknown to the leaders of international communism. And what makes these men even more dangerous and unpredictable is that they are really dedicated to the philosophy which dominates their thinking.

They do not see through a glass clearly. Almost completely their views are distorted in the light of Marxist doctrine and such an impairment of vision can persuade them to take steps which are fraught with peril, not only to themselves but to the world at large.

Like us they possess vast power which if used to maximum capacity in a nuclear war very likely would destroy civilization as we have known it and, perhaps, civilization itself.

Mr. Chairman, under existing conditions the best hope of world peace must be predicated on our ability to convince the leaders of international communism that while we cherish peace and human progress with an almost boundless fervor, we cherish freedom even more and, if there is no alternative, we shall not hesitate to use force to preserve it. And, Mr. Chairman, this is the primary purpose of the resolution now before us.

Thus far I have made no reference to the specifics of the resolution. As a matter of fact it does not deal in specifics. It is a model of ambiguity and by its very nature could not be drafted in precise terms without losing the full force of its psychological impact upon world opinion—particularly that which prevails in the Communist world. In other words, it is not the text of the resolution which is of major importance but its effect that is the paramount and overriding consideration.

Perhaps one way to dispel certain illusions in the minds of some is to use a negative approach and explain what the resolution does not do.

It does not require the authorization or appropriation of new funds to be expended under the mutual security program. It does, however, remove certain restrictions and limitations applicable to funds already appropriated and provides that these may be used to meet the conditions of today and tomorrow which were impossible to anticipate when the appropriations were approved last year.

The resolution has no effect whatsoever upon the powers vested in the President under the Constitution. The lawyers on the committee deliberated this question at considerable length. I do not have a legal background but it was my general understanding that the prerogatives of the President could be altered only by a constitutional amendment and the committee agreed unanimously that this was not a question at issue in the present instance.

Notwithstanding references to the United Nations, there is nothing in the resolution which requires us to surrender or delegate to that organization any responsibility for the development of American foreign policy. We shall work within and through the United Nations to the maximum degree possible but in no sense do we renounce our right to take action outside the U. N. should circumstances warrant such action.

Primarily in order to clarify this point the committee adopted an amendment which reads as follows:

> The authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations.

Obviously, the word "practicable" is the key to this question and permits wide latitude of action.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this resolution which suggests any basic change in American foreign policy. Actually, it is a reaffirmation of that policy with particular emphasis on the Middle East.

It stresses the fact, by inference at least, that if the nations in the Middle East fall under the yoke of Communist despotism and if the oil resources of the area are lost to the free world our national security will be jeopardized as never before—and that we do not intend to allow this situation to develop if we can prevent it.

The mantle of leadership of the free nations has been thrust upon our shoulders. The wisdom, the vitality—yes, and the courage with which we bear that awesome responsibility will project the future of mankind.

Let us not regard this as a purely magnanimous gesture through which we indicate a benevolent interest in the welfare of others. Our own survival is very much an issue and we would do well ever to be conscious of the fact that we need the cooperation and support of our friends and allies in the free world almost as much as they need ours—and for many and diverse reasons.

The rulers of Communist nations need not be concerned with public opinion or legal restrictions. They can take immediate action whenever it seems expedient. And because of the great and ruthless power which these rulers can exercise it seems incumbent upon the American people to join with the President in pointing out that we shall resist to the fullest any ill-considered adventures which they may undertake.

The purpose of this resolution is to prevent world war III by making our position very clear before it begins.

Mr. Chairman, if a recognition of the compelling need for the adoption of this resolution which so characterized the bipartisan effort to bring it before the House is reflected in the vote on final passage this will accentuate its purpose as a warning to potential aggressors.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD.]

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I think my record of 14 years here will place me on the side of those who oppose communism as much as any Member of this House.

I am opposed to this resolution. Certainly I cannot be accused of partisanship: You will recall that no man was more critical of the policies of the Democratic administration under Mr. Dean Acheson than I.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, indeed, that some would seek to convey the impression that opposition to this resolution is giving aid and comfort to the Communists. We, as elected representatives of the people, are charged with the responsibility of considering legislation on its merits, and it is unthinkable that we should be put in the position of being blackjacked into supporting any measure that we deem not in the best interests of our country. The House has been denied its right to work its will on this legislation, being forced to consider this resolution under a gag rule, and on a take it or leave it basis. No amendments are being permitted, and we are faced with the alternatives of taking the resolution as is, or rejecting it in toto. For the sake of America, I hope that the other body will act with better judgment.

It had been my hope that I could support this resolution in good conscience, I find, though, that I cannot go along and be true to my convictions.

For many years, it has been my privilege to hold membership on the great Committee on Armed Services. Many times, in the course of our work we have received testimony from top military officials in strictest confidence, cloaked in utmost secrecy and we have been cautioned against so-called leaks lest the enemy be appraised of our aims. Most of this information is, of course, of such a technical nature that even we, the members of the committee, cannot understand it, and if we told all we knew, we still would not be telling anything.

I have a feeling that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is in very much the same predicament: If they told all they knew, they still would not be telling anything the American people do not already know.

I can conceive of but one good reason that would justify support of this resolution. That is the fact that, heretofore, the Russians have apparently known every move we have made at the time we made it; they have known all our plans, but I say they do not know this one because nobody else does, not even President Eisenhower or Mr. John Foster Dulles, by their own admission.

An effort has been made to compare this resolution with that covering our dealings with Greece and Turkey. I supported that resolution because it was definite; we knew what we were doing. They were willing to fight. They have been strong allies, and the Turks proved to be one of our strongest allies in the Korean conflict.

I supported the Formosa resolution. We again knew what we were voting on. Chiang Kai-shek had a striking force of considerable size in Formosa, but we would not let him use that—even in Korea. Now they cannot afford to tell us what this Middle Eastern resolution is because such information will again aid the Communists. Remember, President Eisenhower, in the thick of the campaign, stated to the world that we would not send a man into the Middle East to fight under similar circumstances. I was in full accord with what he said at that time; but I thought he was out of order to announce it to the enemy.

I wonder if the committee members, or anyone who has the information, can inform me on 1 or 2 points. If I understand this resolution correctly: if some of the Middle Eastern countries should cooperate with the Russians for a while, and go along with the Communists against the will of their people, we could not go in unless we were invited. But suppose, later on, the Russians decided to overthrow that dictator and he got on a hot spot and called on America to come in, would we then go in to save him, and fight our original friends who were fighting to upset him?

Mr. Chairman, do we know where we are going in passing this resolution, or which side even, we will be on in case we have to fight?

I believe most of you will agree that the Russians already know from public statements of President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and other high Government officials, and even many out of Congress, that any attempt directly to use their military power in the Middle East would be promptly met by our full military might. Why, then, did the present administration request this proposed resolution from Congress? Is it possible that it might be a carefully planned propaganda move of the administration?

First. To smokescreen its past diplomatic blunders in our country's dealings with Israel and the Arab countries in the Middle East.

Second. To create an impression of imminence of war in the Middle East unless the Eisenhower doctrine is enacted into law; whereas, no convincing proof has been offered to show such a situation exists; this false impression being created, in my opinion, to enable the present administration at a later date, should a war not develop in the Middle East, to claim credit for another rescue of this country from the brink of war.

Third. To persuade the Congress to appropriate the millions requested for economic aid to the Middle East without the administration having to justify its expenditure as is normally required.

Secretary Dulles, while appearing before a joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, is quoted as saying that the Communist threat in the Middle East is "the most serious threat we've faced over the past 10 years." When Mr. Dulles was pressed for information which would justify this statement, he replied with evasive and general answers. Evasiveness, vagueness, and generalities characterize the testimony of Mr. Dulles and the high military officials at the public hearings held before our congressional committees.

I believe the Congress and the public are entitled to know the whole truth about the dangers to our security—if such dangers exist. The Congress and the public are being asked to "buy a pig in a poke."

The administration has failed to prove its case, certainly to my satisfaction. I have not been convinced that sufficient urgency exists or that there is a necessity for giving President Eisenhower discretionary power in that area.

The President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has authority under our Constitution to call out our military in event of a national emergency.

In the opinion of many leading students of constitutional law, the President, under our Constitution, would have the authority, without prior sanction or approval by the Congress, to order our troops to repel any penetration of the Middle East by Russia or one of her satellites. If this be so, is there any necessity for Congress to empower the President in advance to use our military to stop a possible Communist penetration of the Middle East? Should such a Communist penetration occur, the President could, under existing constitutional authority, immediately order our troops into action. He could obtain any necessary Congressional action later. If the Congress were not in session when such an attack occurred, it would take little time, thanks to our present-day fast means of transportation, for Congress to assemble in special session.

I believe this Nation can best establish lasting friendships with other governments by using more old-fashioned, garden variety diplomacy and fewer dollars. It is time we recognized the fact that no nation or person can buy friends with dollars.

Surely everyone here would take notice of my support of firm international policies. If I thought honestly this was a firm and definitive approach, I would be on the other side of this issue. I do not consider it such, and I cannot subscribe to it in its present form.

Whether this resolution passes or not will have little bearing on whether we become involved in a global war. In fact, there is even the possibility that this resolution may touch off the flames of global conflict. At best, either course must be resolved as a calculated risk, and I prefer to follow that course that I believe is most conducive to continued peace.

We cannot afford to continue a policy in foreign relations that has proved in practice time after time to be a complete and dismal failure.

Many questions have not been answered about this resolution. Linked as it is to the actions and will of the United Nations, can we reasonably assume that, in the event of hostilities, we would find our military strategists,

as they were in Korea, at the mercy of United Nations policies? Would there be another Yalu, beyond which our soldiers could not venture? Would there be limitations on our pursuit of the enemy, should we find it to our advantage, militarily? These questions are but a few which should be answered. We have not been given the answer, though American lives may be in the balance. Surely, I cannot obligate us to such an indefinite commitment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, in rising to the support of House Joint Resolution 117, I wish to state that I nevertheless have serious reservations regarding this legislation. These are briefly set forth in my supplemental views on page 13 of the committee report and I should like to elaborate on them at this time. I must add, however, that I regard the principle of this joint resolution as fully deserving of support and I intend to vote for the passage of the legislation.

First, this question of subversion is usually regarded as the most menacing one in the entire area of the Middle East. House Joint Resolution 117 recognizes this fact in the preamble but thereafter is unfortunately silent on this subject.

The matter was rather thoroughly discussed by Secretary Dulles during the first session of the committee hearings on pages 13 to 14. He stated categorically that we would not intervene militarily to overthrow any installed government in the area. He went on to say that we would combat Communist subversion by giving a nation assurance that it would not be attacked by open armed force, by helping to build up dependable and loyal security forces within that particular country, and by helping to improve their economic position. With such a plan of operation, I have no fault to find.

I do, however, consider the omission of such assurances from the legislation itself as a serious imperfection. Basically, it means that we recognize the menace of subversion in the preamble of this legislation but we ignore it in the listing of steps which the President is being authorized to undertake. To me, that is an open invitation to subversion itself. If the purpose of the resolution is to guard against Communist miscalculation, as the President himself said, should we not prevent the possibility of miscalculation in this direction as well? Surely language specifically stating that we were concerned about the threat of internal subversion and that, of course with the consent of the country concerned, we would authorize the President to use all of the power granted in sections 1 and 2 of the bill to combat this danger, surely such language would strengthen the bill. Surely it would have the aggressor under no misapprehension as to what our reaction would be if he resorted to subversion.

On page 11 of its report, the committee stated that it was recognized that the greatest danger of Soviet aggression lay in the direction of subversion, but that it was convinced that most nations of the Middle East would regard a formal commitment to oppose this menace as an assumption on our part to interfere in their internal affairs.

The Secretary himself admitted that this was a weakness in the resolution and that the greatest danger was from subversion. He stated, however, that he believed that even if a government were subverted from within, such a Communist satellite could not maintain itself without the backing of Soviet armed force. But suppose the newly formed satellite government officially invited Soviet force to enter the country. What then? We have already declared that we would not take action against a legally installed government and properly so.

In other words, you have the very real possibility that a government in this area could fall victim to so-called peaceful subversion, could, in effect, go Communist and could then invite in Soviet troops to help it maintain itself in power. And there is nothing contained in this resolution that would permit us to counteract such developments in any form.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the fact that a formal antisubversion commitment, if contained herein, might make some Middle Eastern governments suspicious that we might intervene in their internal affairs. But I personally regard the risk as one well worth taking in view of the real danger of subversion. I sincerely regret that this resolution tacitly admits the inability of this Government to take direct action against what is admitted everywhere to be the greatest danger of Soviet aggression that is likely to arise.

Now let me turn to the matter of a termination date. I am glad that the committee wrote in an amendment that provided for the authority contained herein to be ended by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. I would still prefer to have a fixed date set at which time the Congress would be required to review the entire question and, if necessary, extend the authority.

By their overwhelming popular mandate of last fall, the American people expressed their confidence in the Eisenhower foreign policy. That vote of confidence is one of the reasons that this resolution is expected to be approved, at least in this body. I am ready to reflect that vote of confidence in the President by my own vote here today. But I do not regard this as a vote of confidence that should automatically be inherited by a succeeding administration, whether Republican or Democratic. That is why I believe that the termination of the Eisenhower administration should also mark the termination of this authority. To avoid an unfortunate hiatus which might invite Communist aggression, I would suggest a terminal date of March 1, 1961, which would allow ample time for the new President to request an extension of this authority if he deemed it necessary at that time. It would also permit sufficient time for the 87th Congress to review the entire matter in the light of conditions then existing. The important thing to me is that there should be a stated time when the administration would have to ask for an extension or a reaffirmation of this authority and thereby automatically require the Congress itself to review the entire situation.

Now we come to what I regard as the most undesirable part of the entire legislation and that is section 3 which, in effect, removes nearly all restrictions on the use of $200 million in this area, restrictions which are contained in the Mutual Security Act and the Battle Act. Although no new appropriations are to be requested during the balance of this fiscal year, it is expected that authorizations and new appropriations will be requested during fiscal 1958 and 1959 for $200 million each year, subject to the same general flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to try and explain to the Committee where these funds are to come from except to refer the Members to page 76 of the printed hearings and the table contained therein. Nor could I explain to what use or uses the $200 million are to be put. In fact, I doubt that even the administration has a firm program along this line nor will have until the Richards mission returns from the Middle East and reports thereon.

My objection to section 3 is more basic. I simply object to giving this unlimited authority to expend funds which have already been authorized and appropriated under other legislation and with certain safeguards and restrictions contained at that time. If the Members want to know what these restrictions are, they are set forth on pages 11 and 12 of the committee report. These are the restrictions which we are being asked to remove on $200 million for the balance of the fiscal year.

If it is felt essential to remove these restrictions for special assistance to the Middle East, I would confine the removal to economic aid and leave military aid under such safeguards. Actually, I would prefer to see the whole question deferred until consideration of the new mutual security legislation later in the year. I frankly feel that I am not in possession of sufficient information to approve of section 3 and this new unlimited authority as it now stands. I think most members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will agree with me that such information as we do have was furnished at an exceedingly late date in the hearings and that little opportunity was given for detailed questioning of the administration witnesses concerned.

There, Mr. Chairman, are my objections to House Joint Resolution 117 in its present form. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for its passage in spite of my misgivings and I should now like to explain my reasons therefor.

Over the last fifty-odd years, the miscalculation on the part of world aggressors has involved this Nation in three terrible wars: World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. I am sure that the membership is familiar with the circumstances under which the miscalculation arose in each instance. The principle adopted earlier by the Congress in its passage of the so-called Formosa Resolution, the principle contained in House Joint Resolution 117, is an endeavor to prevent such miscalculation

from occurring in the future. It is a warning, couched in clear, simple, and unmistakable language and directed to a would-be aggressor, that if he takes certain action of an aggressive nature, this Government will react accordingly. To me, this concept is of such great importance that I support the pending legislation in spite of its imperfections and shortcomings which I have referred to above.

Many people have questioned this seeming delegation by the Congress to the Executive of its constitutional power to declare war. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer and certainly not a constitutional lawyer but it would appear to me that the Congress is granting no authority in sections 1 and 2 of this resolution that the President does not already possess by virtue of his position as commander in chief of the Armed Forces. But regardless of whether my interpretation is correct or not, the fact that the President is herein requesting the Congress to join and cooperate with him in this authority should obviate the constitutional aspect of the matter. Although the Members have heard it before, let me read the language to be found on page 7 of the committee report:

> This resolution does not detract from or enlarge the constitutional power and authority of the President of the United States as commander in chief, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.
>
> Likewise, the resolution does not delegate or diminish in any way the power and authority of the Congress of the United States to declare war, and the language used in the resolution does not do so.
>
> The committee does not in any way seek to interpret the Constitution of the United States with regard to the power of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

And I might add that even if this legislation were so intended, it could obviously have no power to do so.

I have heard that some people believe that we should only act through the United Nations in the Middle East, through, for example, an international police force. Well, I believe that it is clearly shown that the language of section 2 sets forth our desire and determination to cooperate with the U. N. at any and every opportunity. There is no authority for the use of armed force contained here that is not consonant with the Charter of the United Nations, specifically, article 51 which provides for the individual and collective right of self-defense.

But, in the tragic example of Hungary and earlier cases, we have seen how a Soviet veto in the Security Council can, in effect, nullify the power and authority of the United Nations itself. The President recognized this when he said:

"The United Nations can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved."

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would regard it as a source of grave danger if our Armed Forces were to be used in this area completely subject to the authority of the United Nations, of the Security Council, and thereby to a veto from the Soviet representative.

Others have raised the point that this resolution does not meet several outstanding problems of the Middle East, such as the Arab-Israeli dispute, the matter of the Suez Canal, and other matters. That is true enough. These questions are being dealt with elsewhere, principally through the United Nations, and we will continue to give our full support to their solution through that organization. I should point out, however, that these problems have been considerably aggravated by Communist influence and pressure in the Middle East. To the extent that the authority contained in this resolution will remove this influence and pressure, to that extent the passage of the resolution will, at least indirectly, contribute to solving these matters.

Of course, no one can declare with absolute certainty that the passage of this resolution will prevent the outbreak of war in the Middle East any more than it was possible to state that the Formosa Resolution absolutely removed the risk of war from that part of the world, but, if, in the face of stern and measured warnings as to what aggression would entail, the Communist enemy still persisted in its course, it would be because it was determined to initiate world war III, regardless of the consequences. And, obviously, the Communists have it in their power to do that at almost any time or opportunity of their choosing. I prefer to rely on Secretary Dulles' words to the effect that the passage of House Joint Resolution 117 would greatly decrease the chances of war in that part of the world while its adoption by the Congress would lessen the risk of such a calamity.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing grave and critical times in these days. The overwhelming desire of the American people is to continue at peace, provided that peace is to be one of justice for all men. President Eisenhower has shown himself to be dedicated to such a concept as well. Surely it is for us, the representatives of the American people, to approve of every step that will keep us on the path of a just and enduring peace. Likewise, it is our responsibility as leaders of the free world to extend our helping hand to those other peoples who also desire to maintain their own freedom and independence. House Joint Resolution 117 is designed to help accomplish these twin purposes and, therefore, I urge its adoption by an overwhelming vote of this body.

Consider if you will the consequences that would surely and inevitably follow the rejection of this resolution. Such a repudiation by the Congress of the wishes of our great President, coming shortly after his overwhelming popular mandate of last fall, on a matter of urgency in which he has demonstrably shown he holds this subject, such a repudiation, I say, would be nothing less than an open invitation to the Soviet Communists to walk into the Middle East. The loss of that great strategic area to international communism, with its invaluable natural resources of oil, with its location at the geographical crossroads of the world, would inevitably entail the fall of Western Europe, into which we have put so many billions of dollars to save it from falling to communism. Such a waste of our taxpayers' money would be unheard of. Furthermore, all Members will realize the position we ourselves would be placed in, with the Middle East and Western Europe both lost to the enemy. Would any Member of the House care to estimate the cost that we would have to bear, in such a contingency, to maintain even an insecure position of security in this world?

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that House Joint Resolution 117 will pass the House by an overwhelming majority, far larger than that by which the controversial closed rule was adopted. I am confident that the Congress will appreciate the desire of our Chief Executive to cooperate with him in measures which he believes will do most toward keeping this country from being embroiled in another horrible catastrophe of worldwide dimensions. I believe that the Congress is proud to be asked to share the responsibility which is ours at this solemn moment. I believe that our words and actions here today will not only serve as an inspiration to our own people but will send this message out to all other peoples, free and slave alike: "The American Government and the American people are united at this time. We seek a just peace for all but there is a limit to the price we will pay for it. We are determined that, so far as it lies within our power, other peoples shall be assisted to keep their freedom and independence likewise. And, although we seek nothing but friendship from other peoples, including the Russian people themselves, we warn international communism and the Soviet Government that aggression will be resisted by any and all means at our command." This message we send to the world with the passage of House Joint Resolution 117 and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be very blunt and outspoken about the President's resolution, now referred to as the Eisenhower Doctrine. It is no doctrine at all, but a loosely worded, ambiguous statement that any graduate student of international relations could improve upon. I am sure it could benefit from amendments offered on this floor. Learned commentators in hundreds of columns of newsprint have analyzed the resolution and dissected it and wondered what it all meant.

Well, it means this to me: The administration has outsmarted the Congress with a fine maneuver. Let's face the fact. Many of us in Congress do not like the resolution but apparently we dare not vote it down.

We dare not vote it down—less because we are moved by the President's popularity and persuasion than because we fear that some harm may be done to the national interest. If the Congress should reject the President's proposal to use American Armed Forces to meet aggression by international communism in the Middle East, this might be interpreted as an invitation to further mili-

tary adventures by local dictators and a testimony to the unwillingness of the United States to stop Soviet penetration into that area.

The Soviets are making inroads in the Middle East, as everyone knows. They are making inroads because their agents work directly with the downtrodden masses. They know how to exploit a deep-seated resentment against colonialism, how to exploit a surging demand for independence and for a share of the good things of life. They know how to capitalize upon misery and oppression. They know how to stir the dark waters of jealousy and unrest and national intrigue.

The Soviets are marching into the Middle East with ideas and money and techniques of subversion. They are not marching with troops and armor for territorial conquest. For that very reason the resolution before us lacks candor and honesty.

The resolution was wafted into the Halls of Congress on the big wind of a phony crisis. I say a "phony crisis" because this resolution was presented to us with an air of dire urgency, as if the Soviets were poised and ready to attack the Middle East. When the Congress appeared skeptical, and support for the resolution began to sag, the administration brought up its big guns—Admiral Radford, General Gruenther, and others—and made a determined effort to ram it through .

The Congress is asked—if I may be allowed another metaphor—to write a blank check without knowing how much money is in the bank. This is poor business. If we look at the fine print of the resolution, what do we find? The Congress is called upon to "authorize" the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States to meet Communist aggression in the Middle East for an indefinite period of time. The authorization—in the original resolution—is to be terminated by the President himself. The President is demanding a surrender by the Congress of its power to criticize American foreign policy and its right to participate in its enactment. The committee amendment would at least allow the Congress to terminate this authority by concurrent resolution.

I am not one of those who believe that the President should have his hands tied in dealing with national emergencies. I am ready to grant that the President already possesses the power, as Commander in Chief, to dispatch troops if the safety and security of the Nation demand such action. Therefore, this resolution is not really a Congressional authorization, but a Congressional approval in advance of such action by the President. It is thus related directly to the policies of a particular President in a particular crisis situation.

In the light of this fact, some have suggested that it would be advisable for the Congress to place a time limit on the requested "authorization." But what would we gain by that? A time limit would be tantamount to saying that the Congress gives advance approval to the actions only of President Eisenhower, whereas a future President would have to convince the Congress anew.

It is difficult to see why this administration should be singled out for such favored treatment. Its record of dealing with the Middle East is not one to which the Nation can point with pride. In 1954 the administration strongly urged the British to withdraw from the Suez Canal. That withdrawal set in motion the grievous events known as the Suez crisis, which the United States failed to anticipate and was not prepared to meet. In the end we wound up resisting and antagonizing our European allies, and comforting a petty dictator with an unrestrained appetite for domination of a large part of the world.

And what about the Israeli-Arab crisis? In 1950 the United States joined with Britain and France in issuing the tripartite declaration which declared they would "immediately take action" within and outside the United Nations to prevent frontier violations by any of the Arab States or Israel. But the United States never took steps to implement that declaration, and as a result it has become a dead letter. Our failure to prevent Soviet arms shipments to Egypt and our failure to prevent the Egyptian Fedayeen raids on Israel led ultimately to the Israeli attack on Sinai.

The President's proposal does not pretend to deal squarely with the threat to the Middle East posed by the continuing tension between Israel and her Arab neighbors. No United States policy has been enunciated in this regard beyond pressing for Israel's withdrawal to her borders existing before the recent military expedition and leaving the matter to the United Nations.

The very specific reference to "overt armed aggression from any nations controlled by international communism" clearly indicates the resolution would not come into operation in case of renewed fighting between Israel and the Arab countries unless one of them had become dominated by "international communism" in the meantime.

What does domination by "international communism" mean for the purposes of this resolution? How much Soviet domination of Syria, for example, would be necessary before the United States would move to ward off an attack by Syria on Israel? And suppose Soviet Russia dispatched volunteers, as it threatened to do in the recent fighting in Egypt? I understand Secretary of State Dulles has indicated the doctrine would be applied in case "organized volunteers" were sent by a Communist power, but the vague terms of the resolution do not decide this point.

Where does the resolution stand in relation to the Baghdad Pact? The Soviet Union, as a means of gaining its own ends, has allied itself with Arab nationalism in its attempt to drive the colonial powers from the Middle East. Egyptian and Soviet interests also are united in opposition to the Baghdad Pact. The pact threatens Nasser's hegemony in the area by giving prominence to Iraq as another Moslem center, while for Russia of course the pact represents the linking of NATO with the Middle East.

On November 29, 1956, the United States declared that any threat to the "territorial integrity or political independence" of the Baghdad Pact nations would be viewed by it with the "utmost gravity." It also referred to our readiness "to assist in measures to strengthen the security of those nations." The proposal in the resolution to aid "any nation or group of nations" in the "general area" of the Middle East, without specifying the nations or defining the area, seems to be a kind of backhanded way of joining the Baghdad Pact without actually doing so.

Are we thereby conveying the assurance of our support to Britain and the Middle Eastern members of the pact without becoming involved in the Arab divisions over the pact and without appearing to ally ourselves with Great Britain? Are we offering this support without appearing to take sides against Israel by joining a pact with some of Israel's Arab enemies? The resolution gives the President a free hand, but it does not serve to clarify our policies or make firm our intentions in the Middle East.

And what happens to our general alliance with Britain and France in NATO? The resolution appears to herald an independent United States policy in the Middle East, except as it may imply cooperation with the British in case of aggression against any of the Baghdad Pact members. The resolution marks another step away from close consultation and cooperation with our European allies, who until recently have been major powers in the Middle East, and for whom the area is still vital to continued security and economic well-being.

Unless real cooperation can take place in the Middle East, it is difficult to see how NATO can be given new life. For the essence of its problems today is that, as the direct military threat to their physical security in Europe lessens, the NATO allies have become deeply divided by national interests outside Europe. The Middle East is one of those areas where the NATO allies must cooperate and consult if the alliance is to have continued meaning. By emphasizing United States involvement in the Middle East through unilateral action and independence from our major allies, who also have vital interests in that area, we deal NATO another devastating blow.

In professing to adhere to the United Nations without mentioning our allies, the resolution, by indirection, scores further independence from Britain and France. It states that in responding to overt armed aggression by a nation dominated by international communism, we will act under the right of individual and collective self-defense set forth in article 51 of the U. N. Charter. The United States would be guided by the recommendations of the Security Council, or presumably by those of the General Assembly in case use of the veto blocked action in the Security Council.

Suppose the U. N. failed to recommend. In that case presumably we would continue to act under the provision for self-defense in article 51. Suppose, on the other hand, that the Security Council, or more likely the General Assembly, adopted a recommendation that the United States withdraw

its Armed Forces from participation in fighting in the Middle East. The United States would have no alternative but to comply.

The increase in so-called neutralist members of the U. N.—those that prefer not to aline themselves with either the Western alliance or the Soviet bloc—opens the possibility, at least, that United States action could be condemned. Certainly it would be extremely difficult to obtain passage of an Assembly resolution under which the United States could used armed force in the Middle East, except in the unlikely instance of overt aggression by the Soviet Union itself. The adherence to the U. N., in the President's resolution, is more a matter of form than of substance.

Since the danger of subversion and indirect aggression in the Middle East by a Communist power is real and present, why does the President present his case for the resolution largely on the unlikely circumstance of overt armed aggression? In his address to the Congress the President noted the great danger of indirect Communist aggression. However, he stated that this indirect aggression rarely succeeds "where there is reasonable security against direct aggression, where the Government possesses loyal security forces and where economic conditions are such as not to make communism seem an attractive alternative."

His argument seems to be that Communist influence and subversion in the Middle East will be thwarted if, first, we oppose Soviet armed aggression with American arms; second, if we help the countries of the Middle East to oppose Soviet armed aggression with their own arms supplied through our military-assistance programs; and third, if we embark on a large, flexible program of economic assistance to the Middle East countries.

I gathered from the President's address that he wanted the cooperation of Congress, in order to give the reassurance needed to deter aggression. He was not suggesting that he lacked authority as Commander in Chief to send American troops abroad in the event of a national emergency. Apparently he considers that congressional approval of the declaration would have an added psychological impact on friend and foe alike, removing any possibility that ambitious despots may miscalculate the reality of our defense in the Middle East. This, the President seemed to say, was the greatest risk now. It was, perhaps, in this light that the President said the very fact the United States had proclaimed its purpose in the resolution would serve to halt any contemplated aggression.

In other words, the President seems to assume, if I read his message correctly, that it will not be necessary to use the authority to send American Armed Forces to fight in the Middle East. The mere paper commitment of American Armed Forces will—the President argues—make their use unnecessary. Potential aggressors will be stopped by the mere threat of the use of force by the United States.

This calls to mind the general feeling about the North Atlantic Treaty when it was being considered in the United States. Then it was assumed the United States would not have to commit actual troops to Europe but merely indicate that our forces would be sent in case of Soviet aggression on a NATO ally. It soon became clear, however, that the defense of the NATO area could not be secured by a United States promise on paper. We had to send troops to Europe to give substance to our NATO commitment.

I, for one, do not believe that threats of force from a distance scare the Communists—particularly threats of force to be used in places and situations only vaguely defined. And what lies behind these threats? Do we propose—as the Soviets are pointedly suggesting in their propaganda—to use atomic bombs and atomic artillery fighting on the territory of Middle Eastern nations? Or is this just another veiled threat of massive retaliation against the heartland of Soviet Russia itself?

Some may say that the complex and delicate requirements of foreign policy permit no alternative to such vague and devious arrangements as this resolution suggests; that the United States must be free to respond over a wide area, leaving potential aggressors in doubt as to how far we will go or what we will do. This is not a foreign policy; this is a power play, a technique of psychological warfare. It may keep our potential enemies guessing, but it also keeps our friends guessing, and friendship built on continued ignorance of our next move cannot endure.

Let us recognize the so-called Eisenhower doctrine for what it is—a power play and not a Middle Eastern policy. Let us not pretend or be persuaded that the resolution before us will resolve the crucial conflicts of the Middle East. It takes more than words on paper; it takes far more wisdom and ability than this administration has demonstrated in 4 years, to begin to resolve those conflicts.

The context and terms of this resolution lead me to believe that the Congress, as much as anyone else, is the object of the President's psychological warfare. I hazard the statement that he was trying to dress up the economic aid program in a military cloak to scare the Congress into acceptance. Presented separately, the economic aid portion would be, and should be, debated by the Congress, and it might fare badly because of the conditions demanded. Riding on the coattails of a resolution against Soviet armed aggression, the economic proposal has a better chance to get through.

There are two parts to the President's plans for economic aid, which apparently is intermingled with military aid. The first is the authorization to transfer up to $200 million of appropriated funds to the Middle East from other areas. The second part is the request in the President's message for an additional $200 million in each of the fiscal years of 1958 and 1959. All of these funds would be for "discretionary" use and in addition to regular mutual-security funds.

It is reported that administration officials believe this discretionary power is important, in that the Mutual Security Act requirement that a part of the aid be given in the form of loans is not applicable everywhere in the Middle East, where poverty is widespread. Also, in this regard, these officials hold that Middle Eastern rulers have shown themselves extremely suspicious of the complex provisions of special aid agreements now required with each recipient country. This problem would be eliminated by the grant of discretionary authority to the President.

Finally, freedom from the restrictions of the Mutual Security Act would eliminate the provision in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act that only 20 percent of the aid funds may be spent in the last 2 months of the fiscal year. Since the fighting in the Middle East has held up the bulk of the aid programs there, most of this year's funds would have to be obligated between now and April 30.

In my humble judgment, this resolution is not the proper way to inaugurate and operate an economic-aid program for the Middle East. The enactment of foreign-aid programs is one of the major aspects of congressional participation in the making of United States foreign policy. The President proposes to do away with that. He wants to act as Commander in Chief, not only in ordering troops into battle but in dispensing economic assistance. No one in the administration has stated clearly and precisely, so fas as I know, why this discretionary authority is imperative for an effective aid program in the Middle East.

I believe that more congresional participation—not less—is needed in this respect. A recent report by a House Government Operations Subcommittee, under the direction of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], shows how much waste and misdirection there has been in the economic aid to Iran. The Congress needs to look closely and continuously at these programs.

More than that, we need a comprehensive reevaluation of the philosophy and operations of our foreign-aid programs before we embark in a greatly expanded program of aid to the Middle East. I have always supported these programs. I am quite willing to see more of my tax dollars go to the Middle East to help the poor and the underprivileged. But I am not willing to contribute tax dollars for the schemes of oil-rich potentates and reactionary rulers who live in vulgar display and splendor amidst the filth and disease and poverty of their downtrodden subjects.

Windy doctrines with empty words on paper and gifts of guns do not bring bread and rice to the tables of the undernourished or starving millions in the Middle East. We must learn to get down to the level of the people who need our help. These are hard lessons to learn, and, so far, I fear the Communists have learned them better than we. This I know—we will not learn them overnight by voting for quick scare resolutions and giving voice to wild alarms that Soviet

troops are about to encamp in the Arabian Desert.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND].

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning I upheld the purpose and even the text of the resolution when it was presented to the committee by the State Department. It was inevitable that after the President had asked for this resolution the Congress had no alternative except to grant it as such. I still believe that, after having listened to the testimony of many able witnesses for 2 weeks and to the debate here this afternoon, and knowing the thinking of the people in the Middle East, the only purpose and the sole purpose of this resolution is psychological. If, at this stage, we denied the President the authority which he asked, we would be inviting something in the Middle East countries which would be very injurious for our foreign policy. While I favor the passage of this resolution, I certainly do not agree with many meanings and interpretations that some of my friends have put upon it. For example, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has intimated that the election of the President meant an endorsement by everybody of his foreign policy. I do acknowledge the fact that the people of the United States gave our President an overwhelming vote of confidence, but I am also reminded of an incident which happened in the early thirties. A young, beautiful girl from Arizona was chosen as Miss America. When she was interviewed by newspapermen she said she was very fond of candy and liked to eat it at all times of the day. Arthur Brisbane in his newspaper column remarked:

> Let us remember that this girl might have won the beauty contest not because of her eating so much candy, but in spite of it.

The President might have won that overwhelming vote of confidence in spite of the recent moves of the Secretary of State in the Middle East.

Another colleague of mine on the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been greatly disturbed about the constitutionality of this resolution. My friends, it seems to me that some of the greatest and ablest constitutional lawyers in the country do not see that danger. Let us look at it in a simple manner. How can an act of Congress take away the constitutional powers which the President, as Commander in Chief, has by virtue of the Constitution of the United States? We are unnecessarily bothered and worried about that.

Another colleague of mine on the Committee on Foreign Affairs sees an invitation for internal subversion from the Communists. Let me make my position clear. I understand that the American people today recognize only one political enemy in this world and that is Communist dictatorship. In my opinion, there is no compromise on the part of any American citizen today on that score. There is no doubt in the minds of anybody in the outside world, considering the actions that we have taken and the amount of money that we have spent in all parts of the world to stop internal subversion, that the people of the United States or the Congress of the United States are not disturbed about internal subversion. But, let us face this fact. This resolution is being read by people all over the world and Communist enemies are placing wrong interpretations on it. How would it be if we gave ammunition to the Communists by inserting in this resolution that we will go with armed forces into a country if it is threatened with internal subversion? My friends, the people of the Middle East are eternally afraid of outside, armed intervention. They have just achieved their political freedom and no matter where it comes from—the United States or elsewhere—if we interfere with their internal affairs, we are going to lose the battle that we want to win. My friends, that battle today is to win the hearts and minds of the millions of people in Asia and Africa.

I recognize in this resolution nothing but a psychological meaning. Now that it has been presented to us by the President of the United States and it has been discussed all over the world and in the Halls of Congress, there is no other alternative for us except to vote "Yes" on this resolution.

Also let us not forget that this is not the first and last act of Congress that we are going to consider in the 85th Congress.

I was told when I was a young man, "Do not try to make the world over by one resolution." I do not think that just because we do not include in this resolution other aspects of the Middle East program that we are not going to discuss them or take action on them. I consider Israel the only oasis in that great desert of human corruption and governmental despotism. No one feels more strongly than I do that Israel is there to stay, and the people of the United States are pledged to come to her assistance when it is necessary. But when it comes to this resolution, the President has asked for it; and, for psychological reasons, it is imperative that we pass it by a unanimous vote, if possible.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, in the three terms that I have been a Member of this body I have never approached the well of the House with more reluctance than I do today. I find myself in opposition to the stated position of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the leadership of my own party, and the leadership of the President's party. That is not an enviable position to be in today.

I cannot speak in behalf of the position which they have recommended to this body. Instead, I find myself speaking on the side of the little people of America, like myself. Those little people in America to whom I refer are the ones who have caused this Nation to grow great and, under God, to become the greatest nation and the greatest way of life ever dreamed of in the history of mankind or human civilization. I feel that I speak for every American casualty who gave his life in World War II, from the youngest recruit, with about 3 weeks of basic training, who died on snow-covered ground near Bastogne to Lt. Gen. Leslie J. McNair, who was killed almost in visual range of the 6th Armored Division with which I served on the 25th day of July, 1944. I feel that I also speak for every marine, every armored cavalryman and infantryman who marched up Heartbreak Ridge, then was forced down again and then marched back up again. I feel that I also speak for those thousands of American men in arms who saw victory within their grasp across the Yalu River but were forced by another President, that time of my own party, who committed the Armed Forces of our country without authorization of Congress and who saw fit to deny them the peace and the victory that was within their grasp. They have had that within their grasp, and I feel that I speak for them because I believe that I am speaking against the stated cause of Communists in this country and against the stated cause of Communists throughout the world. Those in international communism want to be able to call the turn of events and to make the policy which we follow. If they can put this Nation in the untenable position of being forced to commit our troops in Formosa and the offshore islands and also simultaneously in the Mideast area they will either make fools of us militarily or they will make of us liars and cowards in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the international Communists calling the turn of events that your Nation and mine shall take.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution contains the most amazing request for absolute power ever asked for by a Chief Executive of the United States of America.

It asks the Congress of the United States to abdicate one of the few remaining powers originally fixed in Congress by the Constitution.

It asks the Congress to approve an undated declaration of war the date to be filled in later—not depending on future events—but rather depending on present day circumstances and one man's interpretation of future events. If it had been intended that one man or even the executive branch of Government should have that power the war power clause would appear in the executive article instead of the legislative article of our basic instrument of government.

Let me say here as I have many times said publicly and privately that I have the greatest respect for and confidence in both the President of the United States and in the office of the Presidency. But that is not to say that I trust either his individual judgment—or even the combined judgment of all personnel in the executive branch—one bit more or even as much as I trust the combined judgment of you my 434 colleagues in this House and of the 96 Members of the other body.

This resolution in effect denies that the Congress is collectively capable of analyzing world affairs. It denies that the Members of Congress are intelligent

enough to act in time of crisis—either positively when positive action is called for or negatively when negative action is called for.

I find myself in complete disagreement with both of those positions.

For that reason, if for no other, I would oppose this resolution. But there are many, many more valid grounds for my opposition.

Let us assume that the present occupant of the White House would never abuse the power granted to him by this resolution. He may or may not be there for any given period of time. Search your consciences and search your souls and determine if you would grant this power to his successor whether that successor should follow him on January 2, 1961, or some other date which is as of today incapable of that determination. There are many men who belong to my own Democratic Party whom I would not want to have that power—there are many men of the President's own party whom I would not want to have that power. There are many men who belong to parties now reasonably small in numerical strength who should not have such power.

Remember this, if need be engrave it on your hearts, we are not legislating only for today, tomorrow, this year, this administration, or even this century. We are legislating and we are determining a policy by which the future course of our Nation and our people will be set.

There is no time limit set in this resolution. There is no time limit in similar resolution affecting the area of Formosa and the offshore islands and there is no present indication that a time limit will ever be placed on either grant of authority to the executive branch.

If the emergency should arise which would call for a declaration of war by Congress, or the all-out commitment of American Armed Forces, then I should probably vote for it—and promptly leave this body and once again put on the uniform and insignia of the United States Army—and within a few short years my own boys would follow me into our Armed Forces.

But when your sons and mine enter such action, I for one want it to be with the direct sanction and approval of the Representatives and Senators who comprise the Congress at the time the declaration of war or commitment of troops is made.

That is reason number two for my opposition.

Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany never asked for such an absolute grant of power from the German Reichstag until he had broken its will and made it completely subservient to his will and his will alone.

For Congress to abdicate such a basic constitutional right to the executive branch might indeed be the final surrender by Congress of the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution.

That is my third reason.

To approve this resolution in its present form would be to fully endorse all mistakes heretofore made by Messrs. Dulles and Hoover, Jr., and to underwrite full approval of all mistakes which our State Department may make in the future.

The present Mideast crisis is the creature and child of their stupidity and inability to meet and face realities.

This crisis is nothing that developed overnight or without warning. Anyone willing to read and study could have foreseen it 8 to 10 months ago. As early as last July — 1956 — with my limited knowledge I foresaw it and so stated on the floor of this House. My remarks at that time appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 10, pages 14293–14294.

THE ASWAN HIGH DAM

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have witnessed the exposure of what is perhaps the most elaborate and most extensive extortion scheme in the entire history of nations.

I refer to the plan between Egypt and Russia to blackmail this country into financing the Aswan high dam which was scheduled to cost over $1¼ billion. I have continuously opposed American participation in this project and some similar projects. It never did make sense to me for this country to build a dam in Egypt for a dictator who is closely connected with Russia and who is actively fomenting strife in the Middle East and in North Africa.

The project was made doubly foolish by the fact that most of the 2 million acres of arable lands which would be reclaimed by this dam would be used for the production of cotton. American participation in building the Aswan high dam would put us in the position of telling our American cotton farmers to cut American production, and American income and the American standard of living, while at the same time financing in whole or in part increased production abroad, which production would further glut the world cotton market.

Despite all the commonsense arguments against this project, the State Department, in December 1955, announced plans to participate in the financing of this project. Let me point out one thing here. Once we committed ourselves to this thing, the brunt of costs would have fallen on the taxpayers of this country.

When I and others opposed the State Department's action, we were told that we must build the dam or the Soviet Union would build it as a part of their great new economic offensive. I have heard and read about this Soviet economic offensive, but I have yet to see any evidence of Russia giving away anything, except trouble. If anyone here has any evidence of a Soviet giveaway program, I would like to see it.

Well, General Nasser decided that our giveaway was not enough, so he decided to play both ends against the middle, in order to obtain more American dollars from the American taxpayer. In this extortion attempt, I believe he had the full cooperation and encouragement of the Kremlin, where the idea probably originated. There is nothing the Kremlin had rather see than for this country to weaken—or even destroy—itself by giving away our economic strength.

I remember reading in June 1956 that Russian Foreign Minister Shepilov was in Egypt talking with General Nasser. Following the conference between these two gentlemen, the press reported that Russia had made an offer to finance the entire cost of the project. No denial of this was forthcoming from either Shepilov or Nasser. The giveaway experts in this country began howling that we had better give away more or Russia was going to build the dam. Several days later, after giving the news that Russia would build the dam time to sink in, the Egyptian Government announced a willingness to resume negotiations with the West, and they assured us that they had not yet accepted the Russian offer.

This Russian offer has continuously been held over our heads in an effort to obtain more giveaway from the American taxpayers ever since the State Department announced plans to help build the dam.

In a way we were challenged to play Russian roulette. We accepted the challenge and found that the Russian gun was not loaded at all. The comment in withdrawing from the project called the Russians' hand and proved their bluff. Foreign Minister Shepilov, in a statement dated July 22, 1956, is reported to have stated that Russia was not considering any offers to help construct the dam. The action of the United States Department of State had in effect stated to them to "put up or shut up."

There is a possibility that the necessity of saving face in the world may require a genuine offer of assistance from Russia. In my opinion this might not be bad. The transfer of this much economic strength from the Soviet Union is certain not to be favorable with the people of Russia and the Russian satellite nations who are already very dissatisfied with their standard of living. There is expected to be a shortage of wheat in Russia and the satellite nations this winter. The people of these nations certainly will not understand why their governments give away their resources to Egypt while they go hungry. I and many others in this country cannot understand why we do it, even though most of our citizens are well fed and clothed.

So the great blackmail scheme has been exposed for just exactly what it was and is. It failed miserably, because for once during the 3½ years under Mr. Dulles the United States State Department subscribed to the principle that Americans have always been, are now, and will continue to be ready, willing, and able to help any nation which genuinely wants and needs our assistance, but shall not give 1 cent for tribute, blackmail, or extortion.

Mr. Chairman, the lack of policy by the State Department built up Nasser from a man of straw, a dictator about to fall of his own weight and weakness, to one who may become the recognized and accepted leader of the entire Arab world.

The United States has many friends among the Arabs and that friendship is founded on mutual trust and respect. The Chief of State of Saudi Arabia, King Ibn Saud, who will shortly visit here is now a friend and potentially a strong and loyal ally. On many occasions he has demonstrated his friendship and has rejected our proffers of foreign aid because he felt that to accept it would affect the sovereignty of his nation and his national and personal self-respect. He has granted us rights for bases, he has purchased and paid for equipment, he has welcomed military and technical advice and counsel but he has done so on the basis of one sovereign dealing with another sovereign. And I admire him for it. The indecision and lack of planning on the part of Dulles et al., are the very things which have precipitated the crisis in the Middle East and that very lack of decision and planning and commonsense is what we are today being asked to approve wholly and without reservation, and blindly.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot do it.

I oppose the $200 million blank check in economic aid because it is unnecessary and because I feel it would do more harm than good. This resolution takes away from Congress the right to specify who gets how much. To do this would be to say we can trust ICA, MSA, FOA, and

State Department without any reins or any checks. If we are to do this for ICA, MSA, FOA, and State Department, would not the next logical step be to delegate to the President the authority of Congress to appropriate funds and simply vote yes or no on the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget without study, without hearings, and without passing judgment.

I oppose the $200 million economic aid provision of this resolution because:

Our so-called foreign economic aid program has from the beginning been based on a mishmash of political confusions and economic fallacies. Politically, it has not promoted good will or gratitude or stopped the growth of communism. On the contrary, it has engendered suspicion of our motives precisely in the countries to which we have given most. Its effect has been actually to breed anti-American policies on the part of foreign governments eager to prove to their own people that their receipt of aid from us has not made them subservient.

We on our side no longer dare to ask for any political quid pro quo for our aid, or even to insist that the recipient governments follow sound economic policies. We are afraid of being accused of attaching "strings" or conditions—although without such conditions our aid must fail to achieve the only results that could justify it. In fact, by freeing foreign governments from making the internal economic reforms that would be necessary to assure and attract foreign private investment, our foreign aid has merely subsidized and prolonged inflation, socialism, and repressive controls in the countries receiving it. Our economic aid has probably on net balance actually retarded recovery in the countries to which it has gone.

The proposal for a still bigger economic-aid program merely serves to divert attention from the essential weakness of the rest of the Middle East proposals. Mr. Eisenhower declares boldly that we will now do in the face of every disadvantage what we did not have the foresight to do when we enjoyed every advantage. When Britain, France, and Israel only a couple of months ago were within a few days of controlling the Suez Canal, and protecting their treaty rights and the vital interests of the free world, we self-righteously joined Nasser and Soviet Russia to stigmatize them as "aggressors" and order them out. When the U. S. S. R. threatened to send "volunteers" to Egypt to enforce this edict, and when a hint from us that we would not tolerate this, and might even join forces with France and Britain to combat it, would have nullified the Russian threat, our administration spokesmen were strangely silent.

Now that the French and British are out, now that we no longer have allies in possession of the area, or even a clear idea of how we would get our own troops into the area, Mr. Eisenhower wants us to warn Russia how firm we are going to be the next time. Having rebuked Britain for a go-it-alone policy, we blandly propose a go-it-alone policy for ourselves, in the same theater and to accomplish essentially the same objectives. The only difference is that having spurned NATO and our proven allies we now promise, in compensation, to submit ourselves once more, as in Korea, to the trammels and frustrations of the United Nations, debate and consent. How great, by the way, is the alleged "moral force" of the United Nations? What did it accomplish in Hungary?

I have quoted from Mr. Henry Hazlett, an editor of Newsweek magazine, page 80, issue of January 28, 1957.

The Comptroller General of the United States is becoming increasingly alarmed about the futility of our foreign aid program and ICA.

In his annual report for 1956, on pages 116 to 119, his report contains severe criticism and stern warnings and reads:

As part of our continuing audit of the nonmilitary segment of the Mutual Security Program, we examined selected programs and activities carried on by the International Cooperation Administration. These examinations were made at the Washington office of the agency and supplemented by field visits to selected overseas offices. Because of the magnitude and complexity of the program, our examinations generally consist of an overall survey of program and administrative functions including the adequacy of financial and related policies and procedures, and a limited review of selected program activities.

During 1956 our efforts were directed in particular to economic and technical assistance activities in the Near and Middle East area. We submitted reports to the Congress on the assistance programs for Pakistan, Iran, Egypt, and Lebanon. We are now concentrating our survey work on assistance programs in the Far East area where the greater portion of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 mutual security funds is being expended.

In addition to ICA activities and individual aid-receiving countries, we examined certain multilateral and special programs authorized in the mutual security legislation, for example, that of financing the movement of migrants. On the latter, we reported our audit findings to the Secretary of State and the Director of ICA, pointing out duplication of functions by the two agencies which was subsequently removed by a reorganization effective in April 1956.

Another phase of our audit was concerned with the adequacy of fiscal procedures and the preparation of financial reports by the agency pursuant to statutory requirements and regulations. Close to $2 was deobligated by ICA as a result of our examination of the agency's report submitted pursuant to section 113 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

We also examined on a selective basis the accounts of all disbursing officers in Washington and the overseas offices as to proper documentation and compliance with applicable laws and agency regulations.

The nonmilitary assistance program operates in coordination with foreign governments and, as an integral segment of the foreign policy of the United States, is influenced in considerable degree by international political considerations. Furthermore, the character of the program and the organizational structure by which it is carried out have changed significantly over the past several years. Because of these conditions the program is complex and presents unusual problems of administration. Following are some of our principal audit findings.

One of our principal audit findings common to the administration of aid activities in the various countries examined by us was the considerable lag in carrying out the annual programs. Based on this and other factors we expressed the belief that the annual programs were in part beyond the capacity of the agency and the recipient countries to get under way during the year for which the funds were appropriated. We attributed this situation to (1) political considerations in determining the level of aid, (2) inadequate advance planning, and (3) insufficient recognition of the capabilities of recipient countries and of past experience in the time required to negotiate and undertake projects.

In a number of countries the agency has committed itself to a wide diversity of projects within various fields of activity. Because of limited availability of technicians and other factors, the missions have so dispersed their efforts as to be unable to administer the projects effectively. These and other conditions pointed up in our audits evidence a lack of sound planning. Regarding technical assistance, we stressed need for long-range planning in terms of ultimate goals of the recipient country advancement, and the development of annual programs within the framework of long-range plans designed to accomplish the ultimate goals.

The implementation of projects suffered from undue delays in the procurement of equipment and the contracting for technical services, caused to a large extent by poor coordination between the overseas missions, the Washington office of ICA, and the other participating Federal agencies.

Overseas missions did not have effective accountability for United States financed project equipment. Until recently they lacked required procurements records, unit property records, and physical inventories.

The ICA missions generally did not carry out an effective program of end-use inspections to ascertain that project equipment of salable commodities were being used effectively and in accordance with United States aid objectives.

Other findings covered matters related to programs in particular countries. Among these were (1) the relations with the American University of Beirut having to do with the regional training program, (2) the student assistance program in Iran, (3) the grain elevator project in Pakistan, (4) the agreement and subsequent cancellation of the loan project in Lebanon for public roads construction and the disposition of the funds resulting from the cancellations, and (5) the reprograming of funds among projects in Pakistan and Iran. These and other matters were discussed at length in our reports to the Congress on these countries.

During the year, we noted a growing recognition of the need for better administrative procedures. The Washington office of the agency and the missions visited by us demonstrated encouraging efforts to remedy certain of the deficiencies pointed out in our audits.

Our audit work was actively used by congressional committees during the second session of the Eighty-fourth Congress. We assisted the staff of the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee over a period of several months on the findings presented in certain of our reports, principally Iran, and subsequently gave testimony before the subcommittee on Iran and other aspects of ICA activities. We testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the fiscal practices relative to the mutual security program. In addition we furnished the committee at its request, our comments on certain legislative provisions contained in the proposed mutual security legislation for the fiscal year 1957. We also cooperated with representatives of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service while the committee was engaged in a survey of manpower and organizational arrangements in International Cooperation Administration.

For those reasons I shall oppose this resolution.

Now, let us see what the subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee—Hardy subcommittee—has to say about this very subject—and I quote certain paragraphs appearing on pages 3 and 4:

2. The so-called expanded technical-assistance program which began in January 1952 and resulted in United States obligations of over $100 million in a 5-year period,

was neither technical assistance nor economic development, but an ad hoc method of keeping the Iranian economy afloat during the years of the oil dispute.

* * * * *

7. Under the expanded operations begun in 1952, about $10 million in direct aid was furnished for a series of industrial, or capital improvement projects. Under statutory criteria the eligibility of the projects is questionable. United States officials sought to justify these expenditures on the grounds that the various plants involved were not badly needed for the economy of the country but would supply excellent demonstrations of the feasibility of such undertakings. However, the more important of these enterprises still are not fully operating after 4 years, due to poor planning and faulty engineering. Thus their value in terms of economic development has been almost nil, and as demonstrators they appear chiefly to be monuments to a fumbling aid program.

8. A major effort on the part of the United States mission in 1953 to promote the construction of a multi-million-dollar dam on the Karadj River has resulted in virtually nothing but the relocation, at a cost to the United States Government of nearly $3 million, of a road around the proposed site; while not only has there been no construction started on the dam, the Iranian Government has not even concluded a firm contract for its financing.

9. Among the programs undertaken was one of supplying nearly $5 million over a 4-year period to support Iranian students who were completing their college training abroad. Involved in the program was a $2 million subsidy, through a special exchange rate for dollars, to the well-to-do sponsors and parents of these students. The nature and scope of the program were not revealed to the Congress and the Comptroller General has ruled that the expenditure of technical-assistance funds for this purpose was not authorized.

* * * * *

11. United States control over what Iran did with this budget aid was practically nonexistent and the subcommittee notes that Iranian budget deficits increased rather than decreased during this period.

12. United States aid, alleged to be granted on the basis of austerity levels of Iranian Government expenditures, was utilized to pay for many extraordinary items, like the payroll of the National Iranian Oil Co. The fact that these items had not previously been considered appropriate charges against the Government budget casts doubt upon the propriety of treating them as budget items to be supported with United States aid dollars.

And I respectfully refer you to the full report.

I cannot approve and underwrite a continuation of such a policy and for those reasons I shall oppose it.

I wish I could support this legislation. I wish I could be given the opportunity to support an even stronger Declaration of Strength, Courage and Determination on the part of the United States of America because I know that the only language the Communists understand is the language of strength. But this resolution is not the way to do it.

If this resolution is approved by both Houses of Congress, it will only put us in a completely false and untenable position—a position where under express authority of the Congress the President would be obligated to commit armed forces to both the Formosan area and to the Middle East—against the combined forces of international communism.

Such a course of action would be going down the road to disaster and destruction and would pass the point of no return.

The Man of Galilee in His Sermon on the Mount, asked "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life?" in His Sermon on the Mount—St. Matthew 17: 26. If He were here today He might well ask a similar question to us concerning this resolution.

I do not believe the citizens of the Fourth District of Georgia elected me to abdicate one of the few remaining powers of Congress and to vest in one man those absolute powers which if vested in one man instead of 531 men and women shall surely destroy us. Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely. I don't want that to happen to your President and mine.

It may be that the only way we can save face in the Mideast is to adopt this resolution and thereby approve and endorse the tragic blunders of the recent months, but if that be true then so far as our Constitution, our basic framework of government and the expressed powers of the legislative branch of our Government—the Congress of the United States, all are concerned—

> Then nail to the mast her holy flag,
> Set every threadbare sail
> Give her to the god of storms,
> The lightning, and the gale.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this late hour with a sense of utter futility. Please do not misunderstand me; I am grateful to the distinguished chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the kindness and courtesy they extended to me when I appeared before them as a witness and for according me this time now to address the House. The futility I feel is because I know that nothing I will say will change a single vote.

That feeling is brought about by the fact that Member after Member has risen in the well of this House here today and after giving his views about what should be but is not in the resolution, or after finding fault with what is in the resolution, has concluded by saying "Nevertheless I will support it."

My views on this all-important subject are set forth beginning on page 286 of the printed record of the hearings conducted by the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee. They are set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 654. I appreciate the favorable comments that many Members on both sides of the aisle have made concerning that testimony. I regret that they have not been more effective in accomplishing the result that we all aim for.

There is not a doubt in the world that every man and woman who is a Member of this Congress, and I mean of both bodies of this Congress, is desirous of peace. Please do not overlook, however, that peace without honor is worth little, indeed; and there can be no peace with honor unless it is peace with freedom and liberty.

You cannot have peace with honor, freedom, and liberty unless you have a Department of State with a Secretary of State and subordinates who know the difference between an aggressor and an international brigand; who know the difference between aggression and self-defense; who know that a nation which disarms a potential killer is not an aggressor; who know that a nation which blockades international highways is an aggressor; who know that a nation which violates international law is an aggressor. You cannot have peace with honor when you have a State Department and its representatives who invoke sanctions against its friends and allies and who urge other nations to do the same. You cannot have peace with honor when you have a Secretary of State and aides and subordinates who, instead of addressing themselves forthrightly to the trouble at hand, turn their backs on that or urge delaying the solution of the immediate problems and instead of attempting to solve those problems, urge returning to the status quo ante, to the way things were before the trouble started.

You cannot have peace with honor by urging those who are defending themselves against armed threat, and worse, to retreat and retire until sometime in the future when we will talk about how we will protect them.

Such persons cannot be trusted with the welfare of this country or its security. Much less are they to be trusted with the peace of the world.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, no matter how much trust and confidence we may place in our great President, as long as he has a Secretary of State and men working under him, who mislead instead of leading in this great crisis, we cannot pass a resolution such as this.

You say in this resolution that it is intended for peace, and you say that in order to attain or maintain the peace you will give military and economic assistance to those countries in this area desiring and requesting such assistance.

Who is going to ask for it? They all desire it; who is going to ask for it? Israel has been asking for it for years and been turned down and is being turned down now. At this very time our Secretary of State is invoking sanctions, unilaterally, against the state of Israel.

Syria says she does not want any part of this resolution.

Egypt says through its great dictator, Mr. Nasser, it wants no part of this resolution.

Will not somebody please tell us who wants it? Who will ask for this assistance? Are you going to give this assistance to little Yemen while it attacks the British, while fulfilling its duty in the Protectorate of Aden, or are you going to pour it into Syria while it continues its infiltration across the Turkish border? Or maybe you will help Saudi Arabia and Jordan and Syria and Egypt destroy little Lebanon who wants nothing but to be left alone.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, this is not just a Jewish problem. This is not just a problem of Israel. This is a problem of all Christendom.

If you removed Israel from that part of the world, if as we all pray will not happen, by any chance every Israeli should either be annihilated or driven from that part of the world, this problem of keeping peace in the world would still be with us. These same Arab dictators and murderers would then turn their venom and their attacks on Christendom, aided and abetted by international Communists.

You are not going to keep the peace by saying to Communists anywhere that if and when somebody asks us for help then we will move in. You must do as we did in Formosa, you must do as we did in Guatemala. You must tell them without any ifs, ands or buts, this is it, you move and you must meet us on the field of battle.

Is that warmongering? If it is, it's the only language the Communists understand. But it is not. It is merely telling them that we are prepared to fight for our freedom, and the freedom of the world is our freedom as our freedom is the freedom of the world.

Peace cannot be won easily and if we are not ready to fight for our freedom and for peace we will have no peace. That is the only way you can talk to the Communists and anything less than that is sticking your head in the sand like the proverbial ostrich.

I was told there was on the President's desk in the White House a sign: "The buckpassing stops here." Somebody must have taken that sign away because the buck has been passed to us by the President.

Under the Constitution it is his duty and he has the power to make the foreign policy. He gave us the opportunity to do it for him. We are missing a golden opportunity.

We hear some Members say that maybe they will do a better job in the other body and that they will give us a good resolution.

But my sworn duty is to help write that resolution here in terms that nobody will misunderstand.

I do not contend that my amendments are the only way to improve this resolution. I do not contend that my amendments or those of any other Member must be adopted by you. I do urge that, as it is my sworn duty to give you my views, it is your sworn duty to listen to them and to weigh them and then bring to bear your best judgment in accordance with your own conscience to determine the issue. By adopting a closed rule, you have deprived me of the opportunity to perform my duty as I see it. I therefore cannot support this resolution.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, in his opening statement in support of this resolution, Mr. John Foster Dulles, before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, asked this question: Is there in fact doubt that the United States would, sooner or later, react with force if Communist-controlled governments used open force to conquer the Middle East?

What is his answer? It is, according to Mr. Dulles, that until Congress has actually spoken—by approving this administration resolution—there is doubt in the Middle East and there may be doubt in the Soviet Union.

What evidence does he submit to show that such doubt exists in the Middle East, or in the Soviet Union?

Do we in the House of Representatives need an administration-sponsored resolution to make us responsible or to dispel doubt, which Mr. Dulles asserts, concerning our position?

If such doubt does exist, are the leaders of the House of Representatives, the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, unaware of it? Or if aware of it, not aware of the value of a resolution such as is now proposed by the administration, as a device for making clear the determination of the House of Representatives, and so to dispel doubts?

When has the Congress, or the House of Representatives shown any hesitation, or unwillingness, to stand against Communist aggression in the Middle East or in any other part of the world?

If conditions in the Middle East are as bad as the administration has indicated, this resolution is quite inadequate. If they are not as bad as the administration claims, the resolution is unnecessary. No matter what the conditions may be the resolution is out of order and demonstrates, at least by implication, little respect for the House of Representatives and, fundamentally, little regard for the integrity of this body.

If the Senate improves this resolution, clarifies, and strengthens it, I will support that version, but in the House form I believe it better that the resolution be defeated.

It is taken for granted that the House will go along quietly and quickly. The Sunday Star, noting Senate questioning, observes that "things are going swimmingly in the House."

Why? Are we better informed than are the Senators?

Do we recognize the superior wisdom of John Foster Dulles?

Are we so in the habit of approving administration recommendations?

Is this new responsibility in foreign affairs, thrust upon us by this administration, so intoxicating, as to move us to approve anything, out of ready gratitude?

Are we intimidated by the risks of opposition?

Do we like to proceed with limited debate?

Do we enjoy the role, described for the House by the former respected chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Dick Richards, who on February 21 of last year issued a statement including these words "it appears from past performances that the executive department is still of the 19th century vintage opinion; that in the foreign affairs field, the House is an illegitimate member of the family and a weak-minded illegitimate son at that."

Our eagerness to rush, bound by a closed rule, to vote for this resolution, indicates to me that we do not have the high opinion of ourselves, or rather of this body, so often described as the people's branch of the Government—this body, intended by the Founding Fathers, in the words of James Madison, to "greatly predominate" in the Government of the United States, that we should hold.

This resolution would have come with better grace from the Congress, urging strength and firmness and some consistency on the part of the Secretary of State and of the administration.

Yet here the situation is reversed. The uncertain and the vacillating are urging strength on those who have not wavered.

The President has authority to use our military forces, under the conditions described in this resolution without the resolution.

He has according to the testimony of Mr. Dulles, sufficient funds to carry on for 60 days without further discretionary power. Certainly within 60 days the Congress can consider and grant, additional funds for discretionary use, if it wishes to do so.

Perhaps the passage of this resolution will strengthen the resolution of the administration. This argument has not been made by Members today who claim to know the mind of the administration.

The administration, according to David Lawrence, is very sensitive. In the Star of last night, Mr. Lawrence asks: "If Congress had been willing to let Mr. Dulles make a pledge of 130 million more back in February 1956 would there have been a crisis in the Middle East?"

Congress did not refuse, we find on further reading of Mr. Lawrence. No such authority was asked. Although Mr. Lawrence says President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles could not say so, they wanted broad power, so-called blank-check authority for long-range aid, and so forth.

It is my opinion that the passage of this resolution will certainly not achieve the great things claimed for it by administration spokesmen.

There is danger that its passage, if the administration really believes it to be as powerful as they say, will discourage Mr. Dulles and the administration from necessary efforts and hard decisions which may have to be made. Defeat of this resolution, as it now stands, unstrengthened, vague, and in some respects contradictory, will serve to call the administration to greater awareness of historical reality, and to an acceptance of the need for hard decisions in the face of difficult problems.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, sometime in the future, possibly about Easter, this resolution will be back before us for another vote by the House. It will be back after having had mature and complete discussion in the Senate. It very probably will have been substantially amended. Yet we here today find ourselves in the fourth week of the first session of the 85th Congress considering the first major legislation of the session and limited to 1 day of discussion. It may be another 4 weeks before other major legislation is considered. This most unusual procedure is taken under

a closed rule which will not permit free discussion or consideration of amendments. I am afraid this is not a day that we can be very proud of.

Now, I have great respect for the great Committee on Foreign Affairs and for its members. As a matter of fact, my first service in the Congress was on that committee. I know that it performs a very valuable function. When I first came to Congress, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we had before us legislation which marked a very striking departure from normal American policies. We brought to the Congress the lend-lease bill, but epochal as it was, that bill was debated for a week and many amendments were considered. No attempt was made to close debate, to shut off orderly consideration by the Congress of a very important subject. Yet a fully workable product was approved.

Consequently I am profoundly disturbed by what is proposed here. I have grave misgivings. It is, my colleagues, a blank check, a grant of authority which sets aside the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, although we have nothing but generalities on which to base this major grant of authority which is requested or, perhaps, demanded of us. This is blind trust in policies which a few months ago professed to see no problems of moment in the Mideast, which saw nothing but peace and prosperity on the horizon.

Mr. Chairman, I know the importance of the Middle East. I do not question the necessity for a statement of policy. I know that refusal to endorse a policy for the Middle East now at this stage would constitute an open invitation to communism.

So my vote, Mr. Chairman, will not be cast in opposition to a strong American policy to preserve the status of the Mideast. Such a policy is overdue. Had there been a positive policy for the Mideast heretofore, the Soviets would not now have a foothold there. My vote will be cast against the procedure by which a Mideast policy is offered; against its vagueness, against the weakness of our foreign policy generally, against this present insistence upon no other language without adequate debate even though we know no such haste will prevail in the Senate. This measure will not become law by Saturday night—nor for many Saturdays despite our haste. Please bear witness that I support and endorse the principle embodied in this proposal. But, I cannot subscribe to the procedure by which it is offered. When this measure comes back to us after consideration by the other body of the Congress—and I am sure that it will come back—I hope I can then in good conscience cast my vote for it. But, I deplore the fact that Congress, by the action which now sought, is denied a voice, is committed in advance, is led blindly down we know not what road and with us are led the American people. I say this procedure is unwarranted; it is a disservice to democratic processes of government, and to the constitutional processes, which we so proudly advocate for the world.

This action, Mr. Chairman, will not inspire mutual trust and confidence among ourselves for the long and the arduous session which we now begin.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my distinguished colleague for making such a forthright statement and I wish to associate myself with him in that statement. I, too, deplore the fact that we have come in here with a gag rule and are asked to take a proposition that will affect the people of the world and so many children yet unborn for years and years to come. I think that this resolution is presented here for only one reason and one alone. The military part of it is a subterfuge because the President as Commander in Chief already has the authority to use the Armed Forces, if necessary, for the defense of our country. The real objective of this resolution is to start another foreign-aid program to give away billions of our American taxpayers' dollars to unnamed, undesignated nations who have not asked for assistance and probably only want to be left alone.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this bill presents an extremely difficult decision. It is generally agreed that the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has the authority to deploy them in the best interests of America. He also has authority under the Mutual Security Act passed by the last Congress, to spend certain funds for economic assistance in the nations which comprise the Middle East. Yet, having this authority, the President and Mr. Dulles nevertheless insist upon passage of this legislation by Congress as evidence of solidarity and confidence in their proposals for the Middle East.

The President's request in asking for such a vote of confidence on a decision he proposes to take in connection with the Nation's foreign policy, is a most unusual procedure. Its impact is reflected throughout the world and a Member of Congress votes against the President's recommendation only when he feels he has no alternative. I am in that position. I have such grave reservations about this resolution that I cannot vote for it, reservations which have been created by the administration itself in refusing to divulge even the minimum amount of information needed to make an informed judgment upon this bill.

My dilemma and that of many of my colleagues who have expressed such profound doubts on the wisdom of this bill, derives essentially from the reasoning the President himself used in explaining to the Congress the purpose of this resolution. In his address to the joint meeting of the Congress on January 5, the President said:

> Nothing is more necessary to assure this than that our policy with respect to the defense of the area be promptly and clearly determined and declared. Thus the United Nations and all friendly governments, and indeed governments which are not friendly, will know where we stand.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the bill, I have read the hearings, and have listened to the entire debate. I must confess that if a vacuum exists in the Middle East, it also exists in the information that has been furnished to this House because if the Members of this House are not given the information from which they may know the basic fabric of the President's policy, how then can "the United Nations and all friendly governments, and indeed governments which are not friendly, know where we stand?" If we cannot be sure we understand the President's policy, will not the nations of the world—friendly and unfriendly alike—be confronted with the same difficulty and will not the purpose of the President's proposal thereby be lost?

Personally, I cannot escape the deep conviction that this resolution will not promote the peace of the Middle East. On the contrary, it may very well jeopardize the tenuous peace that now exists and may foster the renewed outbreak of hostilities. Confessedly, this is speculation, but we can only resort to speculation when our information must be derived from incomplete hearings, from an insufficiently detailed committee report, and from reports in the press.

Compounding this fundamental difficulty, are the procedural obstacles under which the resolution is presented under a closed rule which precludes amendments, and requires Members to accept it on a take it or leave it basis. To offset this deficit in information, we are urged to have confidence in the President and in his pronouncements, as though this in itself were sufficient reason for voting for the resolution.

Great as is the personal regard I have for the President, the fact remains that as Members of Congress we, too, have a responsibility to predicate our actions upon facts and knowledge, not faith in personalities. Otherwise, will we not be like the Members of Parliament so well described by the sentry in his song in the opening of the second act of Gilbert and Sullivan's Iolanthe, when he sings about the Members of Parliament:

> When in that house M. P.'s divide,
> If they've a brain and cerebellum too;
> They've got to leave that brain outside,
> And vote just as their leaders tell them to.

I suggest that our American system of parliamentary government differs from that of England. I suggest, too, that the President must know that in requesting that we share his responsibility in this area of foreign policy, he must share with us the facts and information which he possesses and which provoked his doctrine.

This resolution is allegedly for the purpose of deterring direct or overt Communist aggression in any nation in the Middle East. I suggest that it is crystal clear to the Communists that the United States by Executive declaration and by Congressional enactments, has already indicated that it will resist overt Communist aggression anywhere in the world. Certainly Korea taught them that lesson and

it has been apparent ever since that their conquests have been made not so much by direct military thrusts as by infiltration, subterfuge, and propaganda. In the Middle East the Russian advances have not been marked by direct invasion but rather by arms and economic deals which have served as the basis for the inflow of their technicians. Admittedly this resolution offers no remedy for such a Communist approach.

Does the President propose to compete with this type of Communist competition by offering arms to Egypt, to Syria, and to the other Arab nations? Does he propose to offer arms to Israel as well, so that it may defend itself against possible Arab aggression? There is little doubt that the Arab-Israeli dispute is the basic source of friction in the Middle East, and yet we do not know the manner in which this resolution will be used to deal with that problem, if it is so used.

I agree with General Gruenther who testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee that economic aid can have a much more salutary effect in building friendship with the United States than military programs. But one wonders whether the amendments to the economic-aid program which are encompassed by this resolution, being relatively minor changes in the current mutual assistance program, can achieve the purposes the President intends. The Hardy report shows particularly a history of defalcations and derelictions in the operation of the program in Iran. Certainly in other respects, the assistance programs have been ill conceived and poorly executed. What other result is to be expected, however, when its director is hostile to its purposes and has no vision or appreciation of the problems of meeting the conditions of poverty, despair, discrimination, and filth, which the programs were intended to eradicate? The Mideast offers a fertile field for the beneficent diplomacy which the technical assistance programs were designed to promulgate. But if the same personnel and the same slipshod approach are to be used to operate the programs as proposed by this resolution, can we not expect the same result of frustration we have experienced to date? Can one be sure when one gives assistance to certain Mideast nations that the people are its beneficiaries and that the money does not go to swell the overflowing coffers of the dictators who rule such countries?

It cannot be said that the House has worked its will on this resolution. We are voting on a proposal but we have had no opportunity to debate it or reason it through. It is hoped, it is expected that the resolution will be adequately considered in another body. Perhaps when it returns to this House, we may be furnished with sufficient facts and information upon which we, too, can act. Unfortunately, we do not have it at the present time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to that great former football player and present statesman, big in body, mind, and heart, whom we all love, although we may not always agree with him, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I took part in the last presidential campaign in good faith and supported the President in an area where he needed help at the start of the campaign. One of the things I praised the President for was the statement made by him and included in Republican literature was that no boys would be sent to the battle front unless the step was approved by Congress. He had kept us out of war and that was a powerful advantage he had. I did not dream that after election the President would ask Congress to give him authority to enter a war, without putting that specific question up to the representatives of the people. Under the Constitution this cannot be done. I do not believe Congress can delegate this power to the President or anybody else.

The constitutional provision is plain and obvious that Congress and only Congress can declare war. We have gotten around that by asserting that that entry into war against the North Koreans and Russia was a police action; we have gotten around it by approving the NATO agreement, for that agreement provides that when any nation attacks one of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization it is an attack against all members. In other words should an attack come against any member of that organization we are ipso facto in war and no declaration by Congress is necessary. When that NATO treaty was approved by the Senate it was unconstitutional for the reason that the Senate of Congress, is only one part of Congress. We can see what a precarious situation we are in by the approval of that treaty. Why go any further and extend the same doctrine in the Middle East?

The President is probably the worlds most competent general and I doubt if he would enter a conflict in opposition to Congress but when Congress grants that power now, some other President, less versed in war, might get us into a situation where the people acting through their representatives, would indignantly disapprove.

The argument is made that Congress acts too slowly, but the history of the past does not prove this statement. In the Japanese-German war, it took less than 2 hours to pass a resolution declaring war on Japan and Germany. That time, in a greater emergency, could be shortened.

I object to this resolution asked for by the President because I have held up my hand and swore to defend the Constitution of the United States, and because I believe it is a blunder on the part of a Republican administration. We all preached that there would be no more battlefronts unless by the approval of Congress, and to ask for a blank approval, long before any war is in sight, is not keeping faith with the American people. A party that does this will lay itself open to the charge that we, in the campaign, were merely indulging in campaign oratory; and I fear the people will lose faith, finally, in that party. After all, on these pledges by the party, I acted in good faith in the campaign; but now if I had known the intention was to grant a pocket declaration of war for the President to carry around in his hip pocket and use it under a set of circumstances, that have never been presented to Congress, I would not have supported that doctrine.

I am fully aware that this resolution will pass, because the Democratic leaders will vote with Republicans to pass it. That is no reason, however, that I must follow the crowd and violate the provisions of the Constitution. Anyone who is right is never, in the course of time, in the minority.

If Congress keeps on handing over its constitutional power it will soon have nothing to do but pass appropriations, and 90 percent of these appropriations will become necessary, because of a war which Congress knows nothing about. It seems to me I have heard Harry Truman, as President, criticized for a similar situation in Korea. He didn't have a blank declaration of war in his pocket but the result was the same as might happen again under this blanket authority. Speaking for myself, as one Republican occupying no high position in Congress but representing as best I can the people of a great State, I will vote against this resolution.

Do the Members of Congress realize what the Security Council of the United Nations is? Who controls it? Who directs its course? Who handled all equipment for troops? Who sends directions to commanders? Who receives reports from commanders?

Since 1946 a Russian Communist has held that position. At this very hour a Russian Communist is Secretary. Yet this resolution definitely keeps up this relation. Where do you think we will get in stopping Russia in aggression, with one of their Communists in control of the forces sent against them.

This resolution makes sure that any action by force shall be taken as now proscribed by the authority conferred on the Security Council by the United Nations, for here is what the resolution says:

> *Provided*, That the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations, and that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Notwithstanding our experiences in Korea, when the Russians were in control of the secretaryship of the Security Council, and had access to all information in regard to plans and troops and directions to military leaders, we here in this resolution again intend to engage in the same business. A Russian

is now Secretary of the Security Council, and if we take any action by force, a Russian again will be in control. I do not propose to further another defeat such as we suffered in Korea. We, nor any other nation, cannot win when a clash comes with Communist Russia when the secretary of the force to oppose Russia is himself a Russian Communist.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I agree with everything the gentleman has said. I think you have made an excellent speech today. I am glad that you brought out things that some of us do not know about. Anyway, I am with you 100 percent.

Mr. BURDICK. I am glad to have one friend. In 1 township in my district this year I got 1 vote. There were about 80 votes. So I wrote him a letter. I said—it was a general letter in the newspaper because I did not know who he was. I said, "If you will come down to my ranch some night after dark so the rest of your neighbors will not see you, I would like to congratulate you on voting for me, because in that vote you have taken off my shoulders a lot of responsibility."

I felt responsible for 90 voters and now only 1. So he came down at night. This has never been published. I congratulated him. He did not seem to accept it and I asked him: "Are you sick?"

He said, "No; I am not sick, but I came down here to confess something to you. I voted for you all right, but I did not intend to; I thought I was voting for your son."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply concerned about the future of our Republic since the President's request for congressional approval of the commitment of American men and money to the defense of the Middle East.

Let me say that I expect to vote to sustain his request in view of the fact that he already has that authority under our Constitution as Commander in Chief of the defenses. I hope that our expression of unity on this floor may convince the Kremlin of the wisdom of desisting from a policy of attempting to extend the Iron Curtain to the vital international crossroads that is the Suez Canal and the small nations adjacent thereto.

In so voting, I would remind the American people as well as the distinguished Members of the House that the implementation of the Eisenhower doctrine with its unpredictable complications can only come at the price of sacrifice here at home and the application of fundamental safeguards in its administration.

Involved in this tremendous undertaking is the national solvency of the United States. Once we have lost our fundamental economic soundness through ill-advised international largesse, we have lost our position as leader of the free world.

This House must sustain the desire of the President to implement with deeds the words of the State Department. But let each Member of this Body remember that our obligation to the general welfare of America and Americans is one of vigilant observation over each step of the way in making the Eisenhower doctrine a mighty instrument in the cause of world peace.

Hamlet, pushed to the brink of decision, soliloquized as follows:

To be, or not to be, that is the question:
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune;
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
And by opposing end them?

Like the tragic Hamlet, it has come about that this Nation is faced with a similar decision—a time when we must make up our collective mind whether we shall suffer longer the gradual erosion of our world position at the hands of a persistently serpentine Communist dictatorship, or, by adopting a Middle East declaration of purpose, keep the vital Suez Canal and oil-rich lands of the Eastern Mediterranean littoral from Communist control through a combination of words fortified by deeds.

From time to time in the history of our Republic we find ourselves at a crossroads, perplexed and beset by doubts as to our proper course. Such a time arose in the years of the late 1700's. We resolved our doubts, hardened our resolution, and, armed largely with courage and a great faith, gave the world the Declaration of Independence, implemented eventually by the vibrant provisions of a Constitution for free men and women who have lived by it now for exactly ninescore years.

Now, our mysterious destiny has brought us again to the challenge of another great decision. That decision presents itself, in simple terms, as the fundamental proposition whether Christian civilization, exemplified by the great nations of the West whose cultural foundations are based solidly in the Hellenic ideal of freedom of the individual is to survive against its great and mortal enemy—the doctrine of Communist imperialism whose product of atheistic materialism has resulted from the veneer of a pseudoscientific approach to history forcibly imposed upon a way of life and a culture oriental in concept.

The train of the past decade carries in it the sad and dolorous account of the death of nations, and the death of peoples. No literate person can fail to know of the steady encroachment of communism across the face of the world. As its handmaidens, this new and terrifying imperialism mirroring the worst atrocities of Ghengis Khan deals in death of individuals, deaths of entire races, extermination of classes, and the total subjugation of entire nations to its monolithic despotism.

In the free and clear atmosphere of this Republic, we naturally ask the apparent question: "Why has it been so? What mortal ailment brought on the pick and merciless death at the hands of the satrapy of Lenin?"

The answer is obvious. These nations that have died were, in the main, the small, the weak, the instable communities where Communist witcheries seized upon minor flaws in the body politic and, with all the savagery of burrowing shrews, quickly devoured that which they had penetrated.

We now have come to a point where we must consider the instant case of the Middle Eastern nations.

We must assume, at the outset, that those nations cannot, standing alone, resist either the economic blandishments of Communist Russia nor its military might. Thus the question faces us squarely, as it did Hamlet.

If Communist Russia is to be halted in its steady encroachment further upon the preserves of freedom, it must be stopped by, first, economic aid from this Nation as leader of the free world, and economic aid of such character and distribution to give the lie to totalitarian claims that we are but another in the long colonial history of oppression and class distinctions based upon color.

Our second choice, the companion piece of the first, is the definite commitment that our deeds in the fields, factories, and market places shall be bolstered with the solemn promise to reinforce the military might of the threatened weak with the ready strength of our Military Establishment.

A look at the harsh realities of the Middle East situation spells out a sinister pattern of future Communist expansion unless we strengthen Mr. Eisenhower's hand in countermeasures to further prevent depredations of the Communist spoilers.

Communist China craves the great food basket of the fertile, rice-rich southeast Asian area. Russia boldly desires, acting upon the taut and harried emotions of Nasser, to cut off the flow of vital Mideast oil to the free world and to strangle its artery of commerce through the Suez Canal.

The accomplishment of these two aims, actively sought at both ends of the Moscow-Peiping axis, would effectively seal the fate of the free portion of Western Europe through denial of fuel oil and Asian raw materials. By the same token, further expansion of Communist China would constitute a mortal peril to the United States and its increasing reliance upon rubber, tungsten, tin, and growing commerce with the nations of the vast Pacific Ocean area.

There is another aspect to the problem far beyond oil, raw materials, and the complexities of political fundaments.

This face of a dark mirror reflects itself to us in the features of underlying differences of race, religion, and culture in our resolve to extend the influence of American thought and assistance to disturbed and fearful peoples thousands of milies beyond our twin shores.

We shall encounter a full measure of spiritual opposition to our Christian doctrine, an opposition long ago encountered by our early missionaries and teachers who penetrated these lands.

There will be active resistance to our way of life, in a cultural sense, from peoples whose basic civilization differs

strangely and wonderfully from the truths we live by.

It is my sincere hope that the implementation of the Eisenhower doctrine will take into consideration this important aspect of extending our willing assistance to those whose freedom is threatened. Upon this one point I dare to venture the opinion that our entire structure of aid to the Mideast can collapse ignominiously if sensitivity and diplomacy are not employed in applying the broad principles laid down so ably by Mr. Eisenhower on January 5, 1957.

Let us now turn from the region of sand and oil and survey our situation here at home as it relates to Mr. Eisenhower's program and what he asks this Congress to give him.

With the approval of the Eisenhower doctrine by the Congress, three vital and reasonable questions arise:

First, will this declaration in itself serve sufficient warning to the Kremlin to deter overt aggression, economic or military?

Second, can our European and Middle Eastern allies be depended upon to shoulder the necessary effort to enable the Western World to secure and maintain the balance of power.

And, third, what can we expect to be the eventual cost to the American economy in resources, manpower, and free democratic government?

As to the first question, we have every reason to assume the President and his military advisers lean to the opinion that the doctrine will prevent any overt attempt by the Kremlin to initiate armed conflict, either direct or indirectly, through actions by any of her satellites, knowing as they must that unleashed atomic warfare, with its staggering chaos, will result.

Judging from Russia's recent actions in arming Egypt and Syria, we can only interpret her course as a means of activating and satisfying Communist sympathy and influence in areas where explosive local disturbances give promise of creating conditions of anarchy which favor her infiltration designs.

In relation to the second question, we find that the great and vital area of the world where the doctrine will apply is one where an appalling, prevailing poverty, an astounding general illiteracy, and greedy and opportunistic politicians all combine to afford communism a rich, though redolent, breeding ground.

Any tender of American economic aid, subject solely to the discretion and, I might say, capricious whims of local politicians cannot only defeat our end purpose of restoration of stability and freedom but may, in due course, be diverted to the advantage of our mortal and desperate enemy—the world Communist conspiracy.

We have no assurance at the moment that we can expect totally disunited national groups to resist their quisling elements who, for the sake of power expressed in terms of the hope of personal reward, will sell themselves and their whole peoples into the strands of a web woven upon Moscow's master pattern by Red agents and propagandists.

However, these are, as the military men put it, calculated risks. We must chart our course under the Eisenhower doctrine with these shoals and white water plainly marked for all to comprehend and thus to avoid.

When we look at the past record of aid in Western Europe, we must reluctantly concur with critics that high hopes and fervent aspirations upon our part to secure for the present and future a free world safe and peaceful have not met with the originally anticipated success we had planned for.

The great concourse of aid from this country to Europe which has flowed unceasingly since 1945 along military, economic, and cultural lines has not generated the abundant coordinated effort we had hoped for as a specific remedy for the disease of spreading Russian imperialism.

Thus, while our effort in NATO has not measured up to our hopes, I think we can still point with some satisfaction to an American airlift to Berlin that maintained the western line. American might and the upbuilding of our military strength across the Atlantic in close concert with our allies was sufficient to maintain a status quo against a rampant and surging Communist ambition coldly out to dominate the globe.

Taken in the light of our firm measures in Europe, I feel that the Mideast doctrine will work since in that area we deal primarily with simple economies and with populations where political force lines run clearly along religious and racial planes.

When we come to the third question which the Eisenhower doctrine poses, we find that history gives us no aid and comfort in assessing the future.

There is no yardstick of past experience, habit, or thought for use in measuring this undertaking. Its initial breadth and scope is, in the light of our post-World War II economic aid and succor to others, comparatively small. It is only when we view it in the light of budgets still to be drafted, appropriations yet unvoted, and permissive legislation to be submitted for approval of our successors in this House that we must wrestle truly with our consciences and search out the crannies of our intellects for sufficient justification to so commit the might of America.

The third question, thus, generates its own brood of questions.

Can we continue to indulge our economic production as at present if we give our solemn vow to stand up as the free world champion against tyranny on this vital battlefield?

Can our economy stand the possible future immense drain upon it if the extremity comes and we find that the Desert of Sinai, where there is a place called Armageddon, becomes our strong outer bastion for the defense of our North American cities?

Can we stand a little more inflation to pay for this great plan? Can our basic resources, financial stability, savings, pensions, private insurance, social security structure and the other great aspects of our complex national system stand this new and unpredictable burden?

Can our tax structure as presently constructed pay for this?

It will one day come home to Members of a future Congress that the shouting and tumult of foreign military and economic aid, while exciting, are, like the iceberg, only a bare one-sixth of the total menace.

The time may come, God forbid, when we shall be faced with an historic dilemma which came, as a classic European example, to the last Bourbon of France in 1789—whether we have repudiation of our public obligations or revolution in our streets by impoverished citizens who ultimately find themselves working solely for the all-powerful State.

These are the imponderables involved in the Mideast doctrine.

It is my conviction that the good sense of the American people who have but to know the truth to act upon it in times of emergency will solve these spontaneous issues born of the necessity of self-preservation through the preservation of the Middle East as an area friendly to the Western World, even though that friendship shall have been cemented with a generous proffered gift.

These are less evil and horrible than the twilight of the human race in the shadows of a nuclear war.

I am, in no sense, an isolationist. I detest the term in that as a communicant of a Christian church I believe that no man lives alone, nor is he, as the poet has put it, an "Island entire" in the sea of humanity.

What happens to others, in some measure affects me.

Our reluctant conclusion must be that destiny and the course of events has forced us to a declaration of policy in the torn and vexed Middle East.

We all know that there is a time and place in the affairs of men and nations when the time for indecision has passed. The hard choice is the only choice. The only alternative to reality is an eventual self-destruction.

Hamlet fell prey to the confused, tortured, and perplexing dilemma of failing to make his decision, preferring instead to dwell in the agonizing nightmare world of what might have been had he faced up to the realities at Elsinore. As a brutal consequence, he was doomed. Shakespeare's play gave us a great and immortal theatrical drama; it also provided an enduring parable of men, applicable also to nations, since men in the mass make up national entities.

I shall vote for the Eisenhower doctrine, knowing as I vote that it entails sacrifice and a great expression of national unity. It is my hope that the other distinguished Members of the House vote with me, knowing in advance of their vote, that we are standing now at the threshold of a decision as grave as any ever made by that handful of men in 1776 who pledged their individual all for the greater end of the welfare of the commonality.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to express first of all my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to the senior members of

the committee for extending the newcomers the courtesy and the consideration which they have throughout the days and nights of hearings spent in the consideration of the legislation now before us. I thank them also for their patience and the opportunity they have given to us to express our views. I have been asked to close general debate on this important resolution. I shall sum up briefly the arguments presented today and indicate why the committee almost unanimously supports the passage of this resolution.

If we do not believe that the Soviet camel has his nose in the Middle East tent we can stop discussing this whole problem right now.

There are some who have misgivings, and reservations about this resolution. There are imperfections in this bill and it has many shortcomings, they say.

There are those who have said that this legislation goes too far. Well, perhaps we could agree with that statement; I do not know. You can find opposition to any piece of legislation. All sorts of criticisms are and can be raised against legislative proposals. The committee has gone into this resolution very thoroughly and has tried to meet the objections as far as possible, and as far as deemed advisable.

It has been debated that this legislation goes too far in that it extends authority to the President which he does not now have and is an attempt to enlarge his constitutional powers. Others have argued that Congress is giving up its constitutional power to declare war; that this resolution is a delegation of that power to the President.

We all know that the Supreme Court of the United States is the sole and final judge of constitutional issues. It seems obvious, furthermore, that there is little likelihood that the United States Supreme Court will ever have an opportunity to pass judgment on the question.

Nevertheless, to resolve the fears and questions of many serious and well-intentioned colleagues who are gravely concerned about constitutional questions the committee spelled out in its report on page 7, very clearly and specifically that the resolution does not have constitutional implications and the committee intended that it should not so have. This declaration, disavowing any constitutional infringement or interpretation, could not be ignored by the judiciary, if called upon.

Further, it has been said that this resolution is excessive in dealing with the economic request. This fear does not appear well founded in view of the fact that the bill does not authorize new expenditures nor appropriate additional funds. It does remove certain restrictions of existing law on currently available funds to be used in what has been termed an economic emergency in the Middle East. However, this authority only operates until the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1957. Under the circumstances this request does not seem unreasonable or excessive.

There are those who say that the legislation does not go far enough, that we do not deal with the basic problems in the Middle East. The committee recognizes that. We do not settle the Arab-Israel dispute, we do not open the Suez Canal, we do not eliminate poverty, we do not stop the alleged mistreatment and persecution of Jews in Egypt. We do not attempt to legislate those things now. These problems must be settled, and as is pointed out on page 4 of the report, the United States must take the lead to do this. I am not convinced that the United States Congress should this afternoon attempt to legislate settlement of the underlying problems of the Middle East. Maybe we can do it after we have had an opportunity to study it more thoroughly. I do not think we can spell out in this legislation a long-range development or project program even though most of us admit it is badly needed and is the only way you can bring economic stability and political independence in that area. But we cannot talk yet or deal with such programs when the entire area is in a great state of unrest and tension. So the resolution does not attempt to deal with those things. It is said that we do not know what the funds are going to be used for. Well, let us review very quickly some of the things they could be used for, that they might be used for, that it might be desirable to use them for. Perhaps we will find out more in detail the specifics after our former colleague, the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has an opportunity to study the matter further; after the State Department has had an opportunity to study it further; and after the President of the United States has had an opportunity to react to their findings. But some things might have to be done immediately.

It might be budgetary assistance to some of those countries which are suffering from loss of revenues. It might be used to continue economic or development projects already authorized for the fiscal year 1957 but which were discontinued because of the trouble in that area and we had to pull out our working missions. It might be used for canal clearance or refugee relocation or for other emergency things. It might be used for special projects which are yet unspecified and not even in memo form in the project department of the Department of State. We might not find out about them until after they have had time to see exactly what the particular situation is and what is to be done about it.

So, then, we come down to this argument: What then are the reasons for this resolution? Let us be factual as far as it is possible to be under the circumstances and yet not violate any security information.

No. 1: There is no evidence of direct overt armed aggression by international communism. No. 2: Subversion? We do not expect any country in the Middle East to fold by February 1. That was the testimony before the committee. But the threat has been and is there for overt armed aggression; the threat of subversion is always present. We recognize all of these problems.

It has been argued that this resolution does not attack the problem of subversion. I will tell you quite frankly, and I do not have any hesitancy in telling you, that I am not going to vote yet for a change in the foreign policy of the United States which says that we will meet with armed force communist subversion in any country. I think I would want to debate that for a long time. So I think on that score we have gone far enough in this resolution when we recognize the problem of subversion. Everybody knows we are opposed to it, and we are going to try to meet that in every way possible. The President made that clear in his message sending this resolution to the Congress. Certainly I am not ready to express the policy that we will meet subversion by armed force, even though we may be forced to do it at any moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we then come down strictly to the question of economics. We are advised that an emergency exists. It is not particularly spelled out, it is not specified, with as much detail as many would like. In general terms we know what the present economic condition is and that an emergency exists. We are seeking authority in this resolution to remove restrictions of law on the use of currently authorized and appropriated funds until the end of this fiscal year. Anything beyond that is going to have to be presented to the Congress in the regular Mutual Assistance program. You can be critical of the President; you can argue that you ought to swat the camel on the nose—Some may say that we ought to yank him out by the tail. But the point is we ought to do something to get the Soviet camel's nose out of the tent; or, at least make an attempt to do so until such time as we are able to take stock of the situation and determine definitely and affirmatively a more detailed course of action dealing with the basic problems of that part of the world.

We have nothing new in the military situation. The President has announced on previous occasions the position of the United States regarding Communist overtures in this general area of the Middle East. The only new position is the announced economic emergency. The plain hard facts are that this is the primary problem with which we are dealing.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to say that the gentleman has made a real point when he said that there are a great many problems in the Middle East that cannot be settled by the Congress of the United States. If we agreed unanimously on what ought to be done about the Israeli-Arab dispute and set a border, we would be committing the most impertinent act that would properly be resented by a sovereign nation.

Mr. FASCELL. It would be extremely premature, because I think the majority of the committee feels that this resolution, at least, is the first step for estab-

lishing a basis upon which we can move from here. We recognize that the United States must take bold and affirmative leadership to prepare and implement policies, programs and projects which will lead to the solution of problems such as: recognition of the State of Israel by her Arab neighbors; unrestricted use of the Suez Canal; refugees; boundaries; economic and political stability and peace.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as debate of this very important resolution is brought to a close, let me take just a moment to remind you of what it is that we are preparing to vote on. Every Member of the House should have uppermost in his mind this question: Do you want to say to the Soviet leaders what this resolution says, or do you not? This is not going to be a vote of approval or disapproval on the past conduct of United States foreign policy. I will join with many who will vote for this resolution who believe that the handling of the Middle East situation under the present administration has not been satisfactory.

It is important for us to remember also that it will not be a vote on the meaning of the Constitution of the United States. All of us are fully aware that Congress cannot modify or infringe the Constitution and that the ultimate test of its meaning cannot be altered by congressional action alone.

These are the basic questions before the House:

Do we believe that it is of vital importance to the security of the United States to prevent the countries of the Middle East from falling under Soviet domination?

Do we believe that the Soviet Union will be more likely to march into any country of that area if they know we are ready to use our military forces to prevent such action than if they are in doubt as to our intentions?

I hope every Member of the House will put aside all other points that have been argued this afternoon for just a moment before voting and deliberate carefully on what a vote for or against this resolution will mean. Let each of us ask ourselves these questions. How will the action we take this afternoon be interpreted by the men in the Kremlin? What will be the reaction of the nations of the Middle East to what we are about to do? Finally, will approval of the pending resolution make our country more secure, or less secure? Will approval of this resolution increase or decrease the necessity of using our Armed Forces in the area?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for House Joint Resolution 117 because, of course, Congress stands behind the President under the circumstances. However, I wish to make it clear that my vote does not imply an endorsement of this administration's foreign policy.

I believe the President's request for this resolution was unnecessary and, as the second of its kind, poses grave constitutional questions related to self-stultification of executive power. Middle East problems in the main do not result from the policies of this or previous administrations although I believe the present administration has aggravated the situation and certainly cannot invoke the American people's confidence in view of the misrepresentations both the President and Mr. Dulles made during the recent campaign.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I read with interest the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] in the RECORD this morning.

In connection with these remarks, there were included the conclusions and recommendations of the Hardy subcommittee in its report on United States aid operations in Iran.

I was a member of this subcommittee. I closely followed the hearings. I regret to say I was in disagreement with the report, in form, substance, and timing. The report itself was hurriedly prepared during the holiday period. I was at home at the time, but Mr. HARDY was kind enough to send me a copy of the proposed report. After a careful study of it, I felt it my duty to write the chairman [Mr. HARDY] a letter which I asked to be included as a minority report if the report was filed substantially as proposed. After my letter was written, there were some minor changes made, but I do not consider them of a substantive nature.

I think my letter applies basically to the report from which the conclusions and recommendations are inserted in the RECORD, and for this reason I feel it appropriate that my letter to Mr. HARDY be submitted for the RECORD. I do not mean to say that I approve of everything that was done by our foreign-aid officials in Iran, but this operation was entered upon at a critical period in Iranian history, and the results achieved for Iran and the free world amply justified our operations and expenditures.

My minority report in the form of a letter is as follows:

JOHNSON CITY, TENN.,
December 29, 1956.

Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Operations, House Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PORTER: After reading the draft of the subcommittee's report, I find that I do not concur in several of its conclusions and recommendations. I believe it to be inaccurate and misleading in its presentation and in its analysis of the factual material. I also find that its general tone is biased and unfair.

Furthermore, in my opinion, the report taken as a whole, tends to cast reflections upon the intentions, character, and good faith of those who were responsible for the aid program during this most trying and difficult period of Iranian history. I do not believe that it is worthy of our committee to resort to indirection in order to convey impressions which cannot be factually supported by such evidence as has been adduced.

It has, of course, been impossible for me to analyze it in the light of the record, since I have not had access over the holidays either to the testimony or to the documents in the possession of the staff. I deplore the hasty manner in which the report has been drafted during the congressional recess and the failure to allow sufficient time properly to analyze it.

A study which has been some 9 months in the making surely merits more careful attention before publication. I firmly believe the committee should defer publication of the report until we have had a chance to study and discuss adequately the proposed conclusions, recommendations, and text.

Further, the nature of the proposed report is such that I think it is in the best interest of the United States that the Department of State be given an opportunity to examine it and to comment on the effects on United States foreign relations of its publication.

I consider that the publication of the proposed report, misleading and prejudicial as it now stands, could do grave damage to the conduct of United States foreign affairs at this critical time. The proposed report itself recognizes this in stating that "corrective action * * * in the conduct of aid operations cannot but severely wrench the whole fabric of our current concepts of foreign policy."

I take it that the "corrective action" referred to is the separation of economic aid from the accomplishment of immediate and urgent objectives of our foreign policy. Before this subcommittee, or any other committee of Congress, takes upon itself the responsibility of making such a statement, those who have the duty of carrying out the foreign policy of the United States should be given a full opportunity to discuss the proposed report with us before it is published. It seems to me that the attempts made in this report to discredit our responsible diplomatic and foreign aid officials are unjustified. Even if only partially successful, they could have an adverse effect upon the conduct of our foreign relations in every country where the mutual security program plays an important role. So far as Iran is concerned, even the historical notes in the report, quite apart from the more direct criticism—which fails to take into account the problems and difficulties encountered by Iran during recent years and the courage and tenacity displayed by the Iranian people in meeting them—can, in my opinion, have international repercussions harmful to the United States.

It should be noted that the report concentrates its criticism of administrative shortcomings almost wholly on the years 1951–53, when our program in Iran jumped from a small point 4 program of $1.6 million to $23 million during the most critical years of that country's history, so far as the Soviet threat is concerned. Obviously, no program could operate smoothly and efficiently under the circumstances. To be critical of its detailed operations without giving due credit to the success of the program in accomplishing its major objectives is more than nearsighted. As to waste, to which reference is made in several places in the report, this would surely have to be judged in the light of the objectives of the program and its real accomplishments.

There is almost a complete omission from the report of any reference to, or explanation of, the political emergency in which the expanded Iran program was undertaken. Nowhere does it sufficiently take into account the circumstances that attended our operations in Iran at any given period; consequently, it neglects to mention the evident success which marked the attainment of our major objectives. I do not believe that we are contributing to an intelligent understanding of the efficiency and economy of the means employed to achieve foreign policy goals (to borrow the introductory language

of the report) by eliminating meaningful references to these goals and the extent to which they were achieved. We cannot evade our obligation to evaluate the results of the program in the light of the security interests of the United States and the free world.

In the particular case of Iran, a bankrupt economy had opened the gates to communism. At the time of the emergency aid program, the conduct of which the proposed report so severely criticizes, there was rioting and bloodshed in the streets. The threat of the Soviets was very real. Disciplined Communist fifth columns terrorized the population. Communists had already penetrated many segments of Iranian life. The lives of our own Mission personnel were endangered. Point IV offices were attacked and pillaged. Yet the report makes no reference to the continuity of operations during this period of stress; operations, in fact, which contributed to the saving of Iran. Surely the work of American officials in Iran and in Washington at that time deserve recognition in the light of the results achieved. Even more important, there is no recognition of the successful efforts of the Iranian people themselves.

Again, I find nowhere an adequate discussion of Iran's internal problems, which constituted major obstacles to be overcome in the administration of United States aid programs. The political and administrative chaos in Iranian affairs which prevailed in the early years substantially accounts for some of the practices which the Mission found itself forced to tolerate in order to implement the program rapidly. As for the later period, to take another instance, Iranian budget deficits are treated in the proposed report without due reference to the expanded defense burden shouldered by Iran, an effort which was directly in the interest of the security of the Middle East.

Although the report correctly points out that an examination of the military end-item program was beyond the scope of the subcommittee, it is manifestly impossible to appraise the economic and budgetary problems of Iran without considering the heavy burdens placed on the Iranian economy by a substantially expanded defense buildup.

The accusation in the proposed report that high officials were reluctant to lay their cards on the table is unfair. On the contrary, I found these officials cooperative and frank. I realize, it is true, that they did not hesitate to disagree with opinions and conclusions expressed by the members of the subcommittee, many of which proved unfounded as the hearings went on. I do not believe that there was any attempt anywhere to make black white in the testimony of witnesses referred to in the draft report which you sent me. The Department of State and ICA gave the subcommittee's staff open access to the working papers in their files.

The report dwells on the administrative shortcomings of the early years in Iran, but places little emphasis on the development of better practices when it became possible to do so. I believe it was testified that, at one critical period, recruitment of American personnel for Iran had to be stopped, because of danger to American lives. The report seems to lead to the conclusion that the program in Iran should have been held up, or drastically curtailed, for lack of adequate personnel to guarantee in every respect good management and administrative practices.

The report appears to be misleading and inaccurate in many respects. For example, the report seems to accept Reeves' allegations in their entirety, with insufficient reference to contradicting testimony. There was abundant evidence regarding the shortcomings of Reeves. This evidence is brushed aside in the report.

Again, the report is misleading when it says that the technical assistance concept was "stretched" to cover the foreign exchange crisis and thus helped to prolong the Iranian "self-induced" oil crisis by some 3 years. In this respect, the report ignores the legislative history of the broadening of the Iran aid program to include economic aid as well as technical assistance. It also ignores the vital role which the aid program in fact played in keeping the oil negotiations alive until the final conclusion favorable to the West.

These examples are drawn at random to illustrate why I dissent from the proposed report. The list could be extended.

Therefore, I urge that publication of this report be postponed until it can be adequately reviewed and commented upon both by members of the committee and by the affected agencies.

Efforts to force through its premature publication are neither fair nor in the best interests of our Government.

However, in the event that this report is published despite my request, I ask that this letter be appended to it as an indication of my dissent.

Sincerely.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, one of the objections which has been expressed to the adoption of the resolution is that it amounts to a delegation to the President by Congress of the power to declare war. The objection is valid. We cannot very well send our Armed Forces abroad to combat armed aggression without waging war. If we give the President this power, we should not quibble over the loss of our constitutional power to declare war.

The Constitution does give us that power. However the records of history show that the power of Congress to declare war has been pretty well emasculated by the exercise by the executive branch of the powers granted to the President.

These powers are almost unlimited in foreign affairs. The Constitution says:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. * * *
>
> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls. * * *
>
> He shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers.

Although the Senate can consent to treaties or appointments of ambassadors, the Senate cannot initiate a treaty or appoint an ambassador.

In 1799 John Marshall, then a member of the House, said:

> The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations. Of consequence, the demand of the foreign nation can only be made through him. He possesses the whole executive power. He holds and directs the force of the Nation. Of consequence, any act performed by the force of the Nation is to be performed through him.

Almost a hundred years later a Senate Foreign Relations Committee affirmed this concept of Presidential power.

The right to receive and dispatch diplomatic agents gives the President the power to recognize new states and changes of government in existing states, to determine the status of belligerents, to decline recognition, to decline or terminate diplomatic relations. The matter of recognition can be of widespread importance to nations affected thereby. The severance of diplomatic relations with another nation can be a prelude to war.

The military power of the President is limited only by the forces which we have provided and the appropriations we have made for them under our constitutional powers. There is certainly no question of the right of the President to use our military forces in repelling an attack, without waiting for congressional action. He can use, and has in our country frequently used, our forces in protecting American lives and property. The President can also use his powers in foreign affairs and over the Armed Forces so as to make war difficult to avoid, if not inevitable.

William Howard Taft, in his book, "Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers," wrote:

> Under the Constitution only Congress has the power to declare war but with the Army and Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave no option but to declare it or recognize its existence.

We have treaties today which commit us to use our forces to protect the United States and other nations against aggression. To be effective, the use of our forces must be prompt and decisive. Therefore the President may be expected to act just as Presidents have acted in the past to protect American rights abroad. Such action could have the appearance of war, or could provoke a war.

In considering the power of Congress we should consider first—what is war? I think it is proper to view it as a contest of arms, or a struggle of violence between nations. Today it may even be a means of extermination. Then, also, what is meant by "declare"? Obviously "declaring" is not the same as "making," "waging," "precipitating," or "provoking" a war. The Constitutional Convention recognized this when it substituted the word "declare" for the word "make" which was in the first draft of the Constitution submitted to it. The scant record of debate on this change indicated a feeling that the word "make" was too extensive. "Declare" would have a narrower meaning and leave to the Executive the power to act to repel sudden attacks without prior action by Congress.

Declaring seems to be a matter of words. It is the same as proclaiming or announcing. It is not necessary for the commencement of a war. I have reviewed what I believe are the best known conflicts in our history and I find that several were carried on without a declaration by Congress. In no conflict had the Congress "declared war" in the sense of starting it. When a declaration was made it merely recognized the prior existence of the fact, after action or recommendation by the President.

For example, from 1798 to 1800 we were engaged in a naval war with France, although neither nation declared war. Congress did authorize the defense of merchant vessels against

French depredations and in other legislation referred to differences between the two nations and the possibility of war breaking out. The difficulties were ended by a treaty of peace.

In 1801 Tripoli declared war against the United States. Congress made no declaration of war but passed an act authorizing the President to employ armed vessels to protect commerce and authorized the seizing of public vessels belonging to the Bey of Tripoli.

On June 18, 1812, Congress declared that war existed between the United Kingdom and the United States. This was one instance where legislative processes were set in motion to the fullest with extensive debate. There had been difficulties with England for some time. Earlier in 1810 Congress by resolution had stated that certain letters and circulars issued by the Minister of Great Britain constituted direct and aggravated insults to the Nation and it would support the Executive in his refusal to receive any communications from the Minister, further authorizing the whole force of the Nation to be used to repel such insults and maintain the rights of the United States.

Algiers declared war on the United States in 1815 in the Second Barbary War but there was no response from Congress. The contest was of short duration.

The preamble of a joint resolution of May 13, 1846, recited that by the act of the Republic of Mexico a state of war existed between that government and the United States. There was no formal declaration but the President was authorized to employ the militia, naval and military forces to prosecute such war. We had trouble with the Mexican Government again in 1914 when by resolution the Congress stated that the President was justified in employing the Armed Forces of the United States to enforce his demand for amends of certain affronts and indignities committed against the United States. There was no declaration of war by either side. Again there was no declaration of war in 1916 when Pershing moved into Mexico. A court in Texas later said however that the trouble between the two countries brought about a condition of war, saying it was not what authorities may term a complete state of war, but rather in the nature of an incomplete state of war.

On April 20, 1898, Congress by resolution said that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right, ought to be free and independent, demanded that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces. The President was directed and empowered to use our forces to put the resolution into effect. Spain considered this as war and on April 21, 1898, sent our envoy home, recalling her representative. On April 25, 1898, Congress then declared that war had existed since April 21, 1898, between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain.

The resolutions of Congress in both World Wars were strikingly similar, both reciting that a state of war which had been thrust on the United States was thereby formally declared.

More recently our forces were committed to extensive action in Korea without any prior authorization of Congress.

The President has always taken the initiative. Congress responds but does not lead. The power to declare war is therefor actually a mechanical step, to be taken after hostilities are already underway and there is no other choice. Yet war must be recognized or declared now because it affects so many people. All the autocratic control of people by the Government in time of emergency must be set in motion. Legal rights are changed, treaties canceled, enemy persons are restrained or lose their rights, citizens are called to service. The House, Senate, and President must concur in these measures.

It has not been the practice for many years for the State Department to consult Congress in advance as to questions of foreign policy. When conferences were held by the executive department with congressional leaders it was usually to tell the Congress what had already been decided. This resolution has somewhat the same aspect in the manner in which its passage is demanded. Still we are given an unexpected privilege. We can go through the motions of considering the merits of a proposed foreign policy. So instead of worrying about the delegation of power we should seize the opportunity to express ourselves on the matter of policy.

Since the purpose of the resolution is to insure that the peace of the world and the security of the United States we may well ask—"Will it do so?"

Let us consider first the development of economic strength in what is termed the "area of the Middle East." We have already thrown over $800 million into that area and apparently accomplished nothing. What reason can there be to suppose that another $200 million, or even larger sums which will certainly be demanded of us, will now develop economic strength "dedicated to the maintenance of national independence" in the language of the resolution? The answer is obviously that someone is doing wishful thinking. Several nations have income from oil that would be ample to insure development of their economic strength, even the whole area, if used properly. This resolution writes a blank check on which Congress has no opportunity to designate the payee. We do not know who are the intended recipients of our bounty or how they may be expected to use our money. We are further placed in the unhappy and unfair position of having no choice in writing this blank check if we should be disposed to delegate to the President the power to employ our Armed Forces in the area, as authorized by section 2 of the resolution.

This section 2 is where Congress delegates its power to declare war to the President. Many questions immediately arise in reading this section with the preamble. Our enemy is "international communism" or the nations it controls. This calls for a definition of what we mean by "international communism." What sophistry to try to make distinctions between communism in one country and communism in another. Many of our citizens must still be puzzled as to why we give aid to Tito when they read this preamble.

What showing has been made that any nation or group of nations in the area is interested in the protection offered by us? If we are interested in maintaining peace in the area, should we not furnish aid to any nation attacked by another, whether controlled by international communism or not? Why have we not acceded to the Baghdad Pact and given it a chance to work? How are we going to use our forces to protect a nation against the internal subversion mentioned in the preamble?

It seems we never learn from experience. You must remember the disastrous effects of the restraints put on our forces in Korea by the United Nations. Yet this resolution provides that, if the President should use our Armed Forces, it must be consonant with the actions and recommendations of the United Nations. Is it not absurd to defer to the authority and responsibility of the Security Council of the United Nations when the foremost exponent of communism is a member of that Council with the power of veto?

These are some of the questions that have occurred to me and must have come to the minds of many of you. We might consider further just what we may accomplish by the adoption of this resolution as a declaration of policy. It is true, perhaps, that force or the threat of force has become as much a tool of diplomacy as negotiation. But we have apparently never accomplished very much with our threat of "massive retaliation" and other similar pronouncements in the past. Words and hundreds of millions in aid did not prevent the division of Vietnam. Our forces left Korea divided. If our words gave any encouragement to the revolt in Hungary, we should be ashamed of our failure to do more.

Now the Formosa resolution is pointed to as a precedent for the current resolution—a precedent for the delegation of our power—a precedent for the effectiveness of such a resolution. To me it is a precedent only as an expression of faith and confidence in our President. Otherwise there is no resemblance between the two resolutions. The Formosa resolution was definite and certain, particularly as to the aggressor and the area to be defended. The present resolution is broad, vague, and uncertain.

I would like very much to give the President all that he asks in this resolution. I have tried sincerely to find justification for an affirmative vote. This has been difficult. The only justification is hope—hope that the resolution will do what the State Department promises it will do.

The people of my district, certainly an overwhelming majority of them, are against more foreign aid. I have voted consistently against it. Now we have a request that $200 million which has already been appropriated for it, be spent in another area, at the will of the President. It is said that this is necessary to prevent internal subversion. Since the money is already available it seems reasonable that the President should be

permitted to make this effort. But sending this amount after what has already gone down the drain in this area will mean more than a billion spent to improve the economic strength of the Middle East. If that has not been effective, then we should quit throwing away our resources in this way.

The people of my district do not want war either. We are told that the adoption of this resolution will be a step in discouraging war. Our President is working toward peace, not war. I have no thought that he will use the powers given him by this resolution for any other purpose. Other Presidents have followed courses of action without consulting Congress that inevitably led to war. In asking the authority of this resolution the President has given us an opportunity to consider all the possible results of this resolution. I believe that if it should become necessary for the President to exercise the authority we here give him, to use our Armed Forces, it will still be for Congress to decide whether or not the resulting action is a war and whether a declaration of war is necessary.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, who are members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, who have preceded me, have covered most of the major details of this important resolution. However, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty and to the great constituency which I am honored to represent if I did not voice my own views with respect to the pending resolution—which is perhaps one of the most important of the many important issues which will confront this session of the Congress.

The United States is the undisputed leader of the free world today. Other nations of the world—those who are not caught in the Communist web—look to the United States for leadership in their endeavors for a just, lasting, and enduring peace. What we do here today and subsequent legislative and administrative actions which are to follow will, to a large degree, determine whether we are to preserve the peace or become engulfed in another war.

Our actions therefore should be nonpartisan and prompted only by the motive of doing what is best for the United States.

After considering the weight of the many arguments both pro and con, I can come to only the conclusion that our best interests—the chances of preserving the peace—are best promoted by adoption of the pending resolution. The alternative of this action is to draft and to thus permit the Communist forces to move in and fill the Middle East vacuum, strengthen their position, and ultimately overrun the forces of democracy and freedom. This alternative must not be permitted to occur.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I have been increasingly concerned over our drifting during the past several years—this Nation's drifting—in the matter of our relations with our allies and in the matter of foreign affairs. I have also been concerned, as have we all, regarding the continuing huge appropriations and foreign aid expenditures.

As many will recall the so-called Marshall plan—or foreign aid and mutual assistance program—was initiated in the 80th Congress during a period of European reconstruction after World War II. It was stated at the time that this program was of a temporary nature and would be discontinued. Notwithstanding these pledges and promises, appropriations have continued to increase and to mount and they unfortunately have not been discontinued. We could all with some degree of satisfaction accept this condition were we confidently assured that our programs were producing the results desired. However, as indicated, I have been increasingly concerned that our huge foreign aid expenditures have not been producing the results desired. We cannot purchase friendship with dollars. In many areas our aid and assistance programs are wasteful. Contrary to producing the desired results I fear they have produced in many areas enmity, resentment, and hostility to our own country.

I believe that we not only have been drifting in our foreign policy and losing friends and allies but that the huge appropriations made in the past cannot indefinitely be continued. Therefore, as indicated, I am concerned not only about the increasing huge appropriations but whether this resolution will produce the ultimate expectations and claims for it by the President and others, when adopted. Greater than the expenditure in dollars could be the possible ultimate expenditure of our manpower and the lives of our American citizens.

Certainly the President is highly respected as a military leader and in matters of foreign affairs. He has by a special appearance before the Congress called for the immediate adoption of this resolution. Supporting his views on this issue are the Secretary of State, our chief military leaders, the leaders of our Foreign Affairs Committees, and other recognized responsible authorities.

It has been pointed out that the authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States, as the President has requested, already exists—that the President has such authority—and therefore this resolution in this particular would only confirm the existing authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation. The President and the Secretary of State have both indicated that if the resolution is adopted the chances of having to use the Armed Forces in the Middle East will be much less than in case the resolution is not adopted. Therefore, on the basis of the weight of the authorities, the evidence and cogent arguments, I am giving my support to this resolution, although with reservations and some misgivings.

I shall support House Joint Resolution 117 because I am of the opinion that the good points outweigh its imperfections. I believe also that the resolution has been improved by the committee in several particulars, notably by the insertion of language that "the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent practical by the President through the United Nations"; and further by the provision that "this authority may be terminated at any time by a concurrent resolution by both Houses of the Congress."

I certainly believe, in view of our experience with the mutual-aid program and other foreign-aid expenditure programs, that some fixed termination date should be established. Congress also should insist upon a complete review of this program at frequent intervals. Due care must be exercised in the administration of the authority herein granted to protect against the wasteful expenditure of money and, of more importance, to protect the lives of American citizens. We who support this resolution do so with the fervent hope and prayer that it will assist in preventing war and in promoting peace.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I voted for House Resolution 123, the rule for consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, known as the Middle East Resolution, and I shall vote for the final passage of House Joint Resolution 117. My vote for House Resolution 123 was made despite the fact that I object to the closed rule in most cases of legislation. It seems only fair that the Members of Congress representing the people back home should be entitled to speak their opinions and vote for amendments if any were to be offered.

However, there is a distinction in this instance because affairs in that particular part of the world are in such a condition that unanimity of action and determination must be expressed. House Joint Resolution 117 would authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general areas of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The Foreign Affairs Committee with a membership that is known for its sincerity and integrity gave serious study to this very important issue. They inserted several amendments which I would have voted for on the floor if they had not been in the original resolution. For example, on page 2, section 1, the President is authorized to cooperate and assist any nation or group of nations in the Middle East only if they desire such assistance. In other words, the President cannot give this assistance unless it is requested by a nation or a group of nations.

Furthermore, the authorization for $200 million is not an increase in the foreign aid but merely uses some of the funds that presently have been authorized by the previous Congress.

For the sake of economy and efficiency, I have voted against foreign aid on previous occasions. However, since the money has been authorized and appropriated, it appears that there is no better place where it can be spent to our mutual advantage than in that particular area at the present time.

I do not believe that there are many Members in the House that have voted more consistently for economy than I have voted. Coupled with economy should be the word efficiency and, thus, since funds are appropriated and available, it should seem consistent that these funds be used in the area subjected to

Communist aggression, especially at the request of those nations that desire freedom and resist Communist activities.

I supported the Formosa resolution in a previous Congress and it is felt that the passage of that resolution was one of the factors that led to the abandonment of aggression in that area by the Communists. The free world must assert itself and, as many others have said, the greatest deterrent to war and the best guarantee of peace is the proper preparedness and the necessary display of strength and determination.

I join President Eisenhower and all others in the determination to work for peace. Our prayer is that this resolution is a declaration of peace instead of a declaration of war. It will display courage instead of fear. It will discard appeasement which brought two wars in our own time. I feel that the President will use this power only in the extreme instance. It is significant also to point out that the President has gone on record that he will not declare any war without the consent of the Congress and, also, section 5 of this resolution has a very specific amendment that makes it possible to terminate the provision of the resolution by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress. Thus, the authority still rests with the Congress and with the people.

We do not have a dictator in the White House, and we do not want one. If this course of action had been followed in the past, there would have been no Yalta, no Teheran, no Potsdam, and even before that time, no recognition of the Communist government that is the basis for our present concern.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this resolution would authorize the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Near East.

Ours being a constitutional government, the only powers that the President, Congress, and the Supreme Court have are the powers granted under the Constitution of the United States. The powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, do not give him the right to declare war. This is specifically reserved for the Congress and Congress alone.

If the authority asked by the President comes under his power as Commander in Chief of the Army, he needs no authority from Congress. In fact, Congress could not alter his power as Commander in Chief even if it desired to do so. On the other hand, if the power asked by the President comes under the power of Congress to declare war, the Congress certainly could not delegate that authority to the President no more than it could delegate it to the Supreme Court. On this basis, this resolution would be unnecessary or it would be illegal.

No one in Congress has greater respect for or confidence in President Eisenhower than I. It is most unfortunate that this resolution came before the Congress on a closed rule which is commonly called the gag rule whereby it is impossible for Members of Congress to introduce an amendment to it. More than 100 Members of this body in a rollcall vote attempted to block this gag rule and to allow Congress to debate amendments to this resolution. If this resolution were merely a statement of policy as to the United States' stand on the Near East, I doubt if one Member of Congress would vote against it. Notwithstanding my great confidence in the President and my great opposition to communism, I cannot legally or morally delegate responsibility placed in me under the Constitution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution.

I believe it should be adopted. I believe it should be adopted promptly. I hope and believe that it will be adopted by a powerful vote on both sides of the aisle.

I shall support the resolution because in the light of personal observation in the Middle East a year or so ago with six other Members of this House, and in the light of developments since that time, I am convinced that action by this country is necessary and that action is necessary now.

From a military standpoint it is clear that the Middle East area is of tremendous importance strategically. From the standpoint of oil resources the area has a tremendous importance to the defense and economic welfare of the free world.

It is perfectly evident that the forces of international communism desire to take over this area. With their insatiable desire for world domination they want control over this area just as they wanted control over Red China and over nation after nation in Eastern Europe and other parts of the world.

It is also clear that if this Communist objective should be attained it would not only destroy the independence of the nations in the Middle East but would create a situation of great danger to America and to the entire free world.

We all know of the great experience, outstanding ability, and judgment of General Gruenther. I wish every Member of this House would read his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee. To me it is unanswerable.

Let me call your attention to one sentence of his testimony, which I repeat for emphasis.

I would say—

He stated—

that the security of the United States and of the free world would be seriously endangered if the Middle East should fall under the domination of international communism.

Let me call your attention also to this statement by Secretary Dulles before the same committee which I also repeat for emphasis:

The vast sacrifices the United States has made for economic recovery of Europe and military defense of Europe—

He said—

would be virtually nullified if the Middle East fell under the control of international communism.

The nations of the Middle East, Mr. Chairman, cannot be expected to withstand alone the onslaught of Communist military aggression. They need effective power in support. The only effective power to assure the maintenance of their independence and to enable them to become strong in the military and in the economic sense of the word is the power to be found in America.

The policy contemplated by the resolution now before us, a policy in principle the same as that which we have heretofore adopted in respect to other portions of the world, should prove helpful in aiding the nations of the Middle East to develop and go forward as independent nations.

I shall support this resolution also, Mr. Chairman, because I believe that it will decrease rather than increase the danger of war. The best assurance against war in this part of the world, in my opinion, lies in making crystal clear the fact that we do not propose to stand idly by in the event of Communist military aggression. That, on the contrary, we are prepared, if necessary, to oppose that aggression with force.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution because I believe that its defeat at this time, under the conditions that confront us, could result in disastrous consequences and very possibly invite another war, just as I have always believed that we invited the war in Korea.

This is no time for uncertainty. Our position should be clear to the entire world.

We should leave no possible basis for miscalculation of our attitude such as was made by the German Kaiser prior to World War I; by Hitler prior to World War II; and by the Communist powers prior to the war in Korea.

Whether we like it or not, we are today in a position of leadership in the free world. We did not seek this position. We did not desire it—but we cannot escape its tremendous responsibilities.

We must measure up to those responsibilities in our own interest and in the interest of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the cause of world peace this resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are again at the crossroads of what well may be a most significant step in our unaltered course of attaining world peace and preserving our freedoms. The proposed resolution, outlined in the President's speech of January 5, concerning the Middle East situation and recommending certain actions, has my complete support. I believe it is deserving of the support of this entire body.

War, as a means of solving difficulties with other nations, has always been most repugnant to the peace-loving citizens of our country. In fact, there have been occasions when we seemingly have closed our eyes to the events of the world about us because we did not want to have any part of a war. At times we have come perilously close to disaster because it was thought the building up of armaments was considered a virtual declaration of war. We reverted to a position, so to speak, of letting other nations battle out their problems among themselves. But our lessons have been learned—the hard way sometimes—and we know that problems confronting nations halfway around the globe are our

problems, too. Isolation is not an answer in a world no longer measured in the distance of miles but rather in the differences of ideologies.

When World War II came to an end in 1945, the hope ran fervent in the hearts of men that at last civilized nations of the world recognized the folly of war and we would be blessed with a permanent peace. This great Nation of ours was prepared to lead the way to a firm and lasting peace, as it did in bringing to an end history's most bloody conflict.

Our fighting men put down their arms and returned to peaceful pursuits. Our mighty military machine was dismantled. Our people prepared to enjoy the sweetness of what we thought was a calm and tranquil world. History shows, and will continue to show, that this great free Nation has been constant and persevering in its course. It is a course for which we apparently were destined, of finding and keeping a peace that not only stilled the guns forever but quieted the souls of men throughout the world as they attained freedom.

But despotism's evil voice had not been silenced. I know we shall never forget the day in Fulton, Mo., so soon after World War II's battles had come to a close. We heard Winston Churchill warn us of the dangers that faced the free world. Churchill's definition of the world situation—as an Iron Curtain between the West and East—foretold of a future no longer bright and certain. As the echoes of Churchill's words died out, so did the freedoms of nations which are now satellites of the Soviet Union.

Clearly, then, a new struggle was looming on the horizon, a struggle which was not of our own doing, but one that had been chosen for us by a power-hungry conspiracy. The struggle soon became apparent in the minds of the people of other freedom-loving nations. We found ourselves in a contest of ideologies. And tragically, we found that once again we were faced with enemies, who if given the opportunity, would willingly sacrifice principles and peoples for material gain.

Full awakening to the new crisis which faced the free world came in 1948, when the Russians closed off the corridor to Berlin and attempted to starve this great city into submission to the Communist dictatorship. Our answer to the Soviets came in the famous Berlin Airlift. But at a tremendous cost in millions of dollars and some lives as freedom flights sped into the city to nourish and sustain this bastion of the free world.

The Berlin Airlift proved successful. The Soviets relaxed their restrictions on shipment and travel by land into Berlin. But could not the Berlin situation have been prevented by decisive, affirmative action before the blockade started? The Soviets were not certain of our position and assumed through our lack of being positive in our declarations and statements that we were weak and would bend to their pressure. Had a declaration concerning Berlin, similar to that which we are considering today, been announced stating we would take action, I am convinced the Soviets would not have attempted their economic blockade.

Two years later a similar situation confronted this Nation. Trouble was brewing in Korea.

We had warnings that hostilities could break out in this nation which was unnaturally divided through action at the conference table. But our policy was not clearcut, in fact, this Government virtually said it was not concerned with South Korea. We all know what happened.

In 1950 the fire of war burst once again on the world scene in Korea. The impact of Korea alone has left a deep imprint upon the minds of Americans as to what lies ahead should we fail to recognize that the ambitions of the international Communist conspiracy continually confront us.

Eventually, Korea, too, became only a memory of what happened. But we have not forgotten. We know, if there is nothing else but the American way of life that the Soviets respect, they do respect our capacity for being able to conceive the most powerful defense force in the history of the world. Some of this respect, needless to say, came to the Soviets 15 years ago when the United States became involved in World War II as a result of aggressions of the Axis powers. The Soviets know of our might—they witnessed it in our lend-lease program that gave the Russian Army and Soviet Air Force much of the tools with which to fight the common enemy. They saw it as we leveled Hitler's great industrial plant and drove his armies deep into what were the ruins of the Third Reich. And the Soviets witnessed our strength as we carried the tide of battle in the Pacific to the shores of Japan when the struggle came to a close.

This we know: The Soviets respect our Nation because of our strength. They understand power. And they also know that we are good keepers of the trust in that we will never use that power unless aggression is forced upon us. I am certain the Soviets recognize that clearly defined declarations by this Nation, concerning the world situation, mean exactly what they say. The Soviets will respect such declarations, not because they are words, but because they are backed with our full armed might.

Strength, not only ours, but that of the free world also, stands as the greatest deterrent to the aims of the Communist conspiracy. This strength comes in many ways—first, of course, in the moral fiber of our people, a people resolute in their spiritual beliefs; second, in our actual armed might; third, in our efforts to aid our allies in the free world's struggle against a conspiracy devoted to the subjugation of men's minds and hearts; and fourth, in our declarations outlining clearly what our aims are and what action we will take should there be aggression by the Communists.

Today we again stand on the threshold of a decision that affects the entire free world. I know it is with no happiness that any Member of Congress searches his soul to determine what is the right thing for us to do. Though this decision we make is not a happy one, I know that what we do today can result in preventing grief and unhappiness from spreading throughout our land in the wake of a war that could destroy civilization.

I do not pretend to be a specialist in foreign affairs, but I have spent considerable time studying and observing the world situation. I felt this was one of my important obligations, both as a citizen and as a Representative of the people. It has always been my position, based both on personal observation and deep conviction, that the best way to meet the Soviet threat is by maintaining a strong military force coupled with a policy that outlines to the free world and to the Soviets what position we take. This, I am convinced, draws the line in such a way that tells the Soviets beforehand what will happen if they commit aggression.

We live in a changing world, and as such, it is necessary to reaffirm not only our beliefs but the stands we are willing to take in times of distress.

Again, it is time for reaffirmation, to spell out in no uncertain terms to the free world, and to the Communist conspiracy, the steps we are prepared to take should aggression be employed in the Middle East by the Communists.

Frankly, it is unfortunate that in 1957, 40 years since we were first thrust into the arena of world conflict, the Congress of the United States should once again be making a decision that profoundly concerns war or peace.

But this circumstance, as in 1917, is not of our own making—we need only to look to the Kremlin to place the responsibility for the continuing threat to the peace and security of mankind.

I sincerely believe there is only one choice that faces this Congress. It is not a choice decided upon by our President. Rather, it is a choice that has been forced upon us by the tactics of the Soviet Union. We cannot abdicate from our duty and responsibility to the free world. We must give our unified support to the President because it is the right, not the expedient thing to do. The moral integrity of this Nation rests fully upon this decision. Through our affirmation of this resolution, we clearly show to our friends that the cause of freedom still burns brightly in the hearts of our people. And it spells out to those who would rule the world that their tyranny and aggression will not be tolerated.

Mr. Chairman, the actions taken here today may well determine the future course of world history. I do not, for one instant, believe our cause can be jeopardized by permitting the Soviet Union to think that we are not united, nor willing to defend the freedoms so dear to us and our allies. Failure to approve this resolution further declaring our policy in the Middle East could well be the first step to unleashing another catastrophe of war upon the world.

I deem an affirmative vote on this resolution not only support to our President, but support to our convictions that tyranny and power-mad dictatorships shall not enslave the rest of the world.

It has always been our Nation's policy to seek world peace, but as President

Eisenhower said, a world peace based on justice. We are not an aggressive nation, but we also are not a nation willing to sacrifice principle for peace at any price. This we affirm again today through this historical resolution outlining to the world our precious belief in freedom and our willingness to defend that freedom.

To do otherwise is to cast dishonor upon the many just causes of the past in which American blood has been so nobly given.

In conclusion, I want to make one thing clear in referring to a portion of this resolution. I am supporting the present resolution including economic aid because of the utmost confidence and faith I have in our President to carry out this program successfully. But I would be remiss in my duties if I failed to call attention to misgivings which I now have concerning some of our programs of economic assistance.

I have fully supported economic assistance in the past. It has been my belief that it was part of our solid contribution to the preservation of the peace through restoration of war-torn countries and to meet the new dangers posed by the Communist threat.

But a new question arises in reference to economic assistance—not one concerning the merits of the program—but that of the actual operation of such a program.

Last Thursday, January 24, the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, released a report of the International Operations Subcommittee concerning United States Aid Operations in Iran. The findings of the committee showed that this particular program was extremely wasteful, with funds being spent in a most careless manner.

I hope the report on Iran is not typical of the type of administration we are receiving from our Government personnel in foreign nations in operation of other economic assistance programs. The Iran situation certainly is a sad commentary on what can be termed gross misuse of the taxpayers' dollars.

It would seem as if some of our personnel administering these programs overseas were completely oblivious to the intent of the program. Such reports as this certainly make the Department of State's position questionable in refusing to completely outline for the Congress how and where it intends to spend money appropriated for economic assistance.

If our results of such spending can only be reflected in situations such as Iran, officials responsible for this type of administration have rendered a disservice. Certainly an immediate and careful reappraisal of the personnel administering these programs must be made and satisfactory adjustment accomplished.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deepest interest to the able debate on this resolution, and it seems to me that the more the objectives of this measure are discussed and explored, the more obvious it becomes that the membership of the House has imposed upon it at this moment a most crucial and, perhaps epoch-making, decision.

It is said that the measure is unconstitutional on the ground that it would permit the Executive to usurp the power of Congress to declare war. Candidly, I cannot read such a significance into this resolution. In view of the precedents, there is general agreement among constitutional lawyers and political scientists that the President already possesses under the Constitution and the law the power to act promptly to safeguard and protect the security of the United States. President Eisenhower has stated time and time again in substance that he would respect the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war, and I take him at his word. I am of the opinion that if it should be necessary in the future for the President to take action involving the use of armed force and war in or against any foreign nation that he will, in accordance with his previous statements, refer such a grave question to the Congress for its determination under the Constitution.

By this I do not mean to suggest that in event of an emergency presented by sudden attack upon the Nation, or its Armed Forces, that the hands of the President would be tied, because in that case very clearly he not only has the power to defend the country and its interests, but would be under a clear duty to exercise it. For these reasons, my friends, I am not impressed by the constitutional arguments against the resolution and I say this with full respect to those able colleagues who hold to a different opinion.

It is asserted by some that this resolution tends to bypass the United Nations. Of course, the very plain answer to this view lies in the language of the resolution itself wherein it is specifically provided that, and I quote, "the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations," and I am of the opinion that in every feasible, possible way, that provision will be respected and observed in letter and in spirit. In my judgment this resolution is, therefore, not inconsistent with any of our treaty obligations, or any agreements or commitments we may have as a member state of the United Nations.

But I am not desirous of taking my position on this historic and all-important issue solely on grounds of legal or technical considerations. This issue goes deeply into the security and welfare of our country and the free world—the cause of human freedom. It involves not only the question of war and peace. It may even determine the very physical existence and safety of this Nation as we know it today. It may decide whether freedom or slavery is to obtain in the world. It may determine whether this Nation will continue to be free, or will be attacked by ruthless, malignant Marxist terrorists who preach hate against their fellow men and aim to impress upon them a tyranny worse than death.

As one of the very first Members of this body, even back in the war and immediate postwar years, who early perceived, and openly and publicly exposed in and out of this body, the great threat posed for our way of life and freedom throughout the world, I have long been anxious to see this Government map out and carry through a bold, fearless policy to check and oppose and nullify the diabolical aims of the Communist conspiracy for world conquest.

As I have so often stated, the Communists have made tremendous gains in terms of acquisition of territory and control over the lives and destinies of hundreds of millions of helpless, freedom-loving people. They have accomplished these ends by open, unwarranted aggression and ruthless warfare conducted without regard for elementary principles of international justice. Many of their most valuable gains and victories came, unfortunately, through ill-fated and ill-advised diplomatic concessions by this Government and the governments of the free world. Again and again the forces of order, democracy, and freedom have made concessions to the Soviet that enabled the Communists to move a long way toward their goal of world domination. This type of thinking still affects us, and must be neutralized in our foreign policy.

There was, it seemed to me, no real, determined effort to insist upon general peace treaties following World War II. Instead we allowed inadequate, incomplete, and very dubious, questionable executive agreements to govern and determine the status of many great questions of war and peace. The result has been catastrophic to the cause of peace and representative government. Emboldened and encouraged, yes even strengthened, by our procrastination, appeasement, and vacillation, the Soviets intensified its nefarious campaigns of infiltration and subversion in every part of the world in violation of treaties, in mockery of the United Nations and in scornful defiance of the ideals and interests of this Nation. Thus we reaped the hideous fruits of the policies of delay and Fabianism which we for so long pursued.

I would not, for a moment, assert that this resolution is a complete solution, or that it will secure world peace by any magical, fast-developing formula. I think that it is most unfortunate that this measure is before us under a closed, gag rule. It was with great reluctance that I supported the rule and in the last analysis the feeling that I had little choice of alternatives unless I wanted to join in a delaying action was a governing consideration. I am sorry that, by the rule on the resolution, freedom of debate and amendment was denied Members of the House. If the issue were not so deep and grave I certainly would not support such a rule. This House should always be permitted to work its free and unfettered will upon all measures presented for its deliberation and determination.

Now, there is another phase of world policy of our Nation at this critical crossroads in the destiny of liberty which bears upon me with no inconsiderable force as we consider this resolution, and that is the great, paramount importance of this Nation to present a united front in our international relations. We must have strong, vigorous leadership acting

intelligently and swiftly to serve the interests of the American people, block the plots and schemes and plans for overt action of the designing Communist conspirators and strive for honesty, sincerity, good faith, and the spirit of mutual helpfulness and cooperation upon which our prospects for enduring peace with justice depend.

To bolster and reinforce the military and economic strength of those alined with us in the battle of freedom perhaps involves something more than calculated risks, but we must be prepared to assume them. The alternative of further drift and delay imports a hazard that in this day of peril we cannot afford to take.

There are uncertainties, imponderables, and incongruities in this situation which concern me greatly. But I believe that if we would best deter and check communism, protect our country, and work resolutely for a just peace, we must willingly accept and assume the risks.

I hope that some real prudence, economy, and efficiency will be incorporated into all our foreign aid programs called for by this and all other legislation. It is hard indeed to explain, let alone justify, many expenditures of huge sums of hard-earned money squeezed from the pocketbooks of the American people. But it is entirely impossible to tolerate waste, extravagance, improvidence, social obliquity, impracticality, and weird, uncharacteristic experiments in the various foreign aid activities. I hope that the administration will work wholeheartedly with the Congress to clean up the abuses and shortcomings of all the foreign relief programs and put them where they should be—on a sound, businesslike basis. Other nations of the free world must pull their full weight. The American people must be relieved of the heavy burdens arising from wasteful, improvident foreign programs.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the present state of the world calls for policies that were unheard of and would have been unthinkable prior to World War II. All of which stems from the desire for peace that is made uncertain because of the clash of two differing ideologies: namely, freedom in life and action, and, its opposite—communism—with emphasis upon its totalitarian form of government. The former recognizing the right of people to determine freely for themselves the kind and form of government under which they wish to live, and the latter an absolute denial of such individual freedom of choice; and in its place an absolute and harsh determination, using force and brutality, to impose the will of the few upon the many.

To meet this godless and atheistic force the free nations of the world, under the leadership of our own Nation, have assumed the task, and the sacrifice incident to it, of challenging the forces of evil to prevent their further encroachment upon the rights and liberties of free men and nations.

The task that has thus been assumed is no easy one. It calls for courage and sacrifice. It cannot be accomplished without constant endeavor and vigilance. Since World War II it has found expression in many varied ways. Realizing that in unity there is strength, an effort has been made to join the free nations of the world together. Thus, NATO, an organization of European nations, and similar organizations for like purpose in Southeastern Asia, in the Middle East under the Baghdad Pact, and the nations of the Western Hemisphere. In each instance the fundamental purpose has been to strengthen the cause of freedom and make certain that each of the nations, parties to such organizations, shall be protected in their desire to remain free, and not because of individual weakness succumb to a stronger foe that is both relentless and brutal.

The consequences that can result when an individual nation seeks, by individual effort, to free itself from the awful conditions that follow subjection by the forces of communism, is well illustrated in the recent atrocities that resulted in Hungary. The people of that nation fighting alone, although actuated by supreme courage, were unequal to the task of overcoming the overwhelming forces of Russia sustained and supported by machineguns and tanks of the latest design and effectiveness. The results in this unfortunate spectacle should go far in convincing every other nation that individual effort is far from adequate when the nation depends upon its own resources, and that it is necessary to join forces if ultimate victory is to be attained. And, this is true not only in the effort to prevent communism from making new inroads on presently free states, but is equally true when the effort is designed to throw off the shackles of communism.

The message that set forth what is termed "the Eisenhower policy for the Middle East" grows out of the conditions that presently exist in that trouble spot of the world. We are all aware that for many months the situation in the Middle East has been growing in importance, Instead of easing, it has been gradually growing more and more serious. During these months it has been no easy task for Secretary Dulles to keep things on an even keel and not develop into war. At several times it seemed as if the Israeli nation and certain of the Arab nations would become involved in actual war instead of mere border clashes. But, actual war has been averted time and again by the restraining hand and influence of the United States in a determined effort to maintain peace.

However, notwithstanding this all-out desire upon the part of our Nation to maintain peace, Great Britain and France assumed the initiative and in total disregard of our wishes, and, without our concurrence, proclaimed war on Egypt and sent their troops into the Suez portion of Egypt. This action upon their part was accompanied by similar action upon the part of Israel. Thus, it seemed that Great Britain, France, and Israel acting without, and in fact in opposition to, the United States, had precipitated a situation which some thought would compel the United States to cooperate with them, whether it wished to do so or not.

This naturally created a very serious decision for Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower to make as to what should be our national policy. With as much surprise to Great Britain and its associates, as their action had been to us, President Eisenhower spoke out in condemnation of this movement of troops into the trouble spot of the world as an act of incitement to war that could start a world conflagration. No one will doubt the extraordinary courage it took for the President to take this action in direct opposition to nations that had been our allies in recent years. But, as their act was in violation of our declared policy of suppressing such acts of force, initiated without the sanction of the United Nations, there was no other course for our Nation to pursue than condemn the action taken. While it was a hard decision to make because of the friendship that prevailed heretofore between ourselves and our known allies of long duration, yet it can be realized that in the long run it will be best for world peace to maintain adherence to the fundamental principles that are inherent to the creation and continued operation of the United Nations as an agency for peace.

It was out of this background of events that the President formulated a policy designed to maintain peace in this troubled area. The situation required firmness. No weak or vacillating policy would adequately meet the situation. It is to the credit of former President Truman that, sensing the danger that exists, he has endorsed and approved the action of President Eisenhower. The necessity for aid, of a material character, to the nations of the Middle East has not been seriously doubted, yet there is naturally a desire to know how the aid is to be administered, to whom and in what amount. As to the authorization for the President to use troops if and when necessary, there has naturally been some doubt, but the President, sensing this, has given assurance that except in case of the rarest emergency he would not utilize his authority to send troops into the area without first consulting with Congress. There is no doubt that he would keep his word in this respect.

Thus, the President's Middle East policy is designed and proclaimed for no other purpose than to maintain peace in that area of the world and thereby prevent a conflagration that could easily develop into world war III. It is not a declaration of war, but does serve notice that it is the intention of this Nation, if and when necessary, to resist any effort of communism to take over that part of the world. It was a bold stroke for the President to take. It took courage.

Any close and unbiased study of world history will show that there are times when it is necessary to take bold and courageous action if war is to be averted. In the past, war has been prevented on more than one occasion by such a display of courage, and it is equally true that war has resulted because of failure to speak out boldly with courage and sincerity.

Who will deny that the declaration of President Monroe, that has become known as the Monroe Doctrine, has been through all the years a deterrent to the

nations of the world and has prevented war and given peace to this Western Hemisphere? In this connection it will also be remembered that a stern warning from Teddy Roosevelt, when President, deterred Germany from sending its warships into the waters of one of our sister Republics in South America to take over the customs of that nation for an alleged debt. It is said that when this intention came to the attention of President Roosevelt he sent immediately for the German Ambassador to come to the White House. When he arrived Teddy told him what he had heard as to Germany's intention, and thereupon, without writing diplomatic notes to Germany, with emphatic words, warned the German representative that "if and when Germany sends its warships into that harbor American warships will be there to meet them." The result was that Germany desisted and no international incident or war resulted. This firm and courageous warning by President Roosevelt maintained peace.

And in more recent history there is much to encourage and justify the thought that World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict might have been avoided if there had been an early declaration of an American policy before these wars had been started and, before the nations responsible for such wars had been encouraged, as a result of our indecision, to believe that we would not participate under any conditions. It can be argued with force that if the Congress had granted the standby authority requested respectively by Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt there might have been a far different picture, and a situation that would not have required our entrance. And, it is equally true in the case of Korea, if Secretary of State Dean Acheson had not announced in January 1950 that America's defense perimeter did not include Korea, there would have been an entirely different situation. It is thought by many that this declaration of no intention to protect Korea was the real cause that gave encouragement to start the conflict against the Korean Republic that finally resulted in such tremendous casualties to our American boys after we entered into the defense of Korea.

The above reference to previous events, including those of comparatively recent instances, are only a few of those that could be given through different stages of world history that demonstrate the advantages to be gained by firmness in a cause that is just. It is my opinion that the warning given by President Eisenhower to nations less peacefully inclined than ourselves, in his declaration of a Middle East policy was not only proper, but necessary. It can, and, I hope and pray, will be a deterrent to Russia and restrain it from taking any action that might provoke war. I believe it will have that effect, and, that peace not war will be the result.

President Eisenhower has made his position known to the world, and, now it is necessary for the Congress to declare its willingness to support the President in what is true American doctrine, or repudiate him and in so doing relinquish our high ideals as a nation, and the moral leadership of the world. The President is sincere. We know he is. Will we be as sincere and courageous as he has shown himself to be? I believe we will do so. Already there has been evidence of wide approval not only in Congress from Democrats as well as Republicans, but also throughout the country, regardless of partisan affiliation.

The details of the resolution or bill now before us, although important and entitled to careful study and consideration, are not as important as the principle that underlies them and that gives rise to the necessity of the adoption of this declaration of purpose upon our part as a nation. The need for economic assistance to offset what otherwise would undoubtedly be offered by Russia in support of communism, is readily apparent. The amount to be offered, to whom and for what are, of course, important, but it would be useless to tie them down with conditions that would destroy their effectiveness. We have a right to trust the sincerity and the judgment of our President, Secretary Dulles and their associates who have, for upwards of 4 years, worked hard with zeal and with great ability in the cause of peace. They are each dedicated to the cause of peace, and, though there are instances as to which there may be some difference of opinion as to manner of dealing with such, yet no one will doubt or question the sincerity with which they each have striven, and, that as a final result it has been effective. The fact remains we are at peace and have reason to be encouraged that it will continue.

Although no man, high or low in Government, can prophesy with certainty as to whether there will or will not be war at any time in the future, yet we can be assured that President Eisenhower, dedicated as he is to the cause of promoting peace, will continue to use his great talents to maintain peace. And, as further assurance, he has unequivocally promised that in no case will he take this Nation into war without first having consulted Congress and gained its consent, unless the act of an enemy would be such as to require immediate action in our defense before Congress could be brought together, if not already in session. What further assurance could any reasonable person require? We have as President a man dedicated to peace, and giving an assurance that Congress, as representatives of the people, would be consulted preliminary to our entrance into war. Again, I repeat, what further assurance could any reasonable person expect?

In concluding my views on this important legislation, in addition to setting forth my confidence in the high ideals and purposes of our President in enunciating the important policy that is designated as the American policy for the Middle East, it is both appropriate and just that high tribute be paid to the ability and zealous spirit displayed by our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in carrying on the tremendous task of negotiating with other interested nations to obtain satisfactory agreement with each, so that there may be unanimity in effecting the objectives sought by the Middle East policy. The voices that have been raised against Secretary of State Dulles in his handling of the intricacies of peace in the Middle East will in the years to come be lost in oblivion as the weakness and impropriety of the views they have expressed become apparent when compared with the good accomplished by the labors of such a dedicated public servant as John Foster Dulles has shown himself to be. The voice of the critic is not always the voice of wisdom. Too frequently it is based upon little or no knowledge of the true facts, or for reasons that ignore the true facts and conditions.

It is in moments such as this that the duties and obligations of a Member of Congress weigh heavily. The desire of each is to do that which is right. Opinions may differ as to some details as to the course to be pursued, but the fundamental desire of each remains the same, namely to do what is best for our beloved country. We are proud of its past and its present allegiance to the principles of liberty and justice. We are proud of the moral leadership of the world that is our recognized and acknowledged position in world affairs. We are anxious to fulfill the duties and obligations of such leadership as God would have us do. May we have His guidance and may our response to His will be full and true.

For the reasons I have given I will support the proposed legislation to strengthen and make effective the policy declared by President Eisenhower as an American policy for the Middle East.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the motion for the previous question which is now pending on the resolution to adopt this rule. If the previous question is ordered, I shall vote against the rule, and if the rule is adopted, I shall vote against House Joint Resolution 117 when it comes to a vote.

I have listened carefully to the arguments of the able and influential Members of this House who are urging us to adopt this rule and to pass House Joint Resolution 117. Some of them have said that a vote against this resolution may be construed as a vote in favor of communism, or that such a vote may be construed as a vote of no confidence in the President.

I think it is stretching the blanket quite a bit to undertake to place any such construction on a vote against this rule or against the resolution.

There are a number of reasons why I shall vote against the resolution. For one thing it is vague and indefinite as to the territory involved. It does not designate any one country or group of countries to which this economic or military aid shall be given. It simply says "nations in the general area of the Middle East."

It does not place any time limitation on the powers granted to the President, although the resolution strips Congress completely of any jurisdiction over the subject matter of the resolution and grants authority to the President for an unlimited time to extend economic assistance and military assistance to any nation or group of nations, and to employ the Armed Forces of the United States when and if he deems it necessary

to do so in that vague area designated as the general area of the Middle East.

While the resolution strips Congress of its authority, it places the actions of the President under the authority of the United Nations, and the Security Council of the United Nations, in which body Russia may exercise the veto power any time it sees fit to do so.

In his message to the joint session of Congress the President asked that he be given unrestricted power to spend $400 million in this vague, undefined area. If the resolution passes, I expect he will spend many times that sum before the spending is stopped. Our Constitution and our form of government contemplates that Congress shall hold the purse strings of the Nation. It is to the best interest of the taxpayers and to the American people that Congress keep control over the funds spent by our Government. It is a complete abdication of responsibility for Congress to vote away this power over the purse. It does not belong to me as Representative from my district to give away this power. It is not mine to give away. This power belongs to the people I represent. No matter how much I may admire the President, that admiration does not justify my voting away my constituents' voice in this Government insofar as spending of money is concerned.

The Constitution provides that Congress has the power to declare war. Under that provision of the Constitution every congressional district in this country has a voice, through its Representative in the House, in deciding the serious question as to whether war will be declared or not. Each State, through its two Senators, has a voice in determining whether war will be declared. The people have that vested right to participate through their Representatives and Senators in deciding the question whether this country will go to war or not. If I should vote for this resolution, and place the decision of that vital question in the hands of the President alone, it would be an abdication of my responsibility as a Congressman.

Little by little Congress has voted away its powers and responsibilities. Time after time by its votes Congress has frittered away constitutional rights of the people and made itself a rubberstamp of the Executive. Some of its powers have been usurped both by the executive and judicial departments. With the passage of time, our Congress may become as much a rubberstamp as Hitler's Reichstag. In my judgment a vote for this resolution is another step in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if I should vote for this resolution, it would be a vote to evade my responsibility as a Member of this body; a vote to evade my responsibility for the spending of taxpayers' money, and a vote to evade my responsibility for a war which would, of course, involve the lives and limbs of American soldiers.

No facts have been made known to me why I should vote to abdicate my responsibility as a Representative to place the functions of the Congress in the hands of the President, and to vote blindly to give him unrestricted power to spend these huge sums of money and to send our soldiers into war when he decides to do so.

These are some of the reasons why I shall oppose this rule and the resolution.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, under leave granted Members of the House to extend their remarks in the RECORD relative to the joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East, I desire to make these observations on the questions involved.

I am convinced that the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with the Middle East countries is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace within the framework of the United Nations Organization. I am further convinced that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered by international communism.

I shall therefore support the resolution reported on favorably by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It is obvious that the authority sought by the President is in the general interest of the United States. It is not a partisanship matter. The general interest of the United States transcends every other interest of our national life.

This resolution represents affirmative action on the part of our leaders in the overall interest of peace. While it is a calculated risk, it is a calculated risk likewise to remain inactive.

Located within the area encompassed by the resolution is the cradle of civilization. To permit or to stand idly by while the hordes of communism and atheism trample upon the soil made holy by Him who came to save the world would be well-nigh intolerable.

Of course, it is with great reluctance that I think about supporting a move that might result in a world conflagration. However, the resolution has the support of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the leadership of the House of Representatives, both the majority and the minority, and the military authorities of the Nation.

It is the consensus by all who should know these matters that the security of the United States and of the free world would be seriously endangered if the Middle East should fall under the domination of international communism.

During the past decade, our people have made vast sacrifices for the recovery of Europe, both economic and military. Should the Middle East fall under the control of international communism, our efforts over the years would be nullified.

For these reasons, I shall support the resolution.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it appears that there has been no piece of legislation before the Congress in recent years that has caused the Members as much patriotic and conscientious reflection as this resolution requested by the President.

The resolution, as proposed by the administration, does not contain any factual plan or detailed program designed to solve the grave problems underlying the tension existing in the Middle East.

We are granted no information by the executive department as to the manner in which this resolution, or the implementation of it, might help to solve such basic diplomatic challenges as the Arab-Israel controversy, the resettlement of refugees, the reopening of the Suez Canal with adequate guaranties for the interest of its users. We are told that the primary reason for the withholding of such advice is "security," and the secondary reasons are to avoid embarrassment to ourselves and to our allies.

Under ordinary circumstances, most of us would be constrained, indeed, we would look upon it as our duty to suspend legislative judgment until full and complete revelation of evidence upon which to base an intelligent and justifiable legislative action had been made.

However, the President himself has assured us that the circumstances prompting his request of this resolution are not normal, and I think that most of us, as well as a great majority of the people of this country, are impelled, therefore, to fully rely on the President's experience, knowledge, and judgment, most particularly in military matters.

Furthermore, the endorsement of the Chief Executive to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary is, in the judgments of the best qualified experts, only congressional emphasis upon a power the President already possesses.

Blanket authorization for the Chief Executive to cooperate with any Middle East nation in the development of their economic strength, when they desire such cooperation, seems somewhat contradictory to the administration's virtual challenge to cut the budget wherever the Congress feels it can be done without hurting any essential interest or service.

In effect, this part of the resolution requests us to remove previously accepted restrictions on the spending of some $200 million that has already been appropriated. Certainly it is questionable as to whether any legislative body could sensibly recommend budget reductions if they are not provided with information as to how and for what specific purposes the taxpayer's money is to be spent.

However, on this phase of the matter, I understand that the Secretary of State has very recently agreed, before the Joint Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees current hearings, to accept a provision stipulating that none of the economic authorization could be actually used until 15 days after congressional committees have been informed of "the object of proposed expenditure and the country in which it is proposed to use such authority."

There is no doubt, of course, that the closest and most effective cooperation between this body and the executive department should be promoted in our common patriotic purpose of containing the spread of international communism and particularly in the Middle East area. Any unnecessary display of great difference or serious controversy on this matter between our two departments of government could very probably be most

effectively used by the devilish propaganda machines of the Kremlin.

Although some of us must conscientiously retain real doubts, in the absence of precise and detailed information, on the absolute necessity for this resolution, the Chief Executive implies by his request that the administration officials assume full and complete responsibility for their proposals.

Inasmuch as the substance of the resolution is an expression of trust and confidence in the Presidential judgment, and to avoid the danger of any vicious Communist distortion of disagreement, I feel that the resolution should be supported, and I earnestly hope the Chief Executive and administration officials will reveal their full justification of it at the earliest opportunity for the understanding of the American people.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that many of my colleagues feel, as I do, that this is one of the gravest moments of history in our lives. We are called upon to act upon the President's request for authority to defend the Middle East against Soviet aggression. We are called upon to negate the mumblings, fumblings, and stumblings of our administration, and more particularly, those of our Secretary of State in the vital field of foreign relations during the past 4 years. The world may little know or long remember what we do or say here in this time or crisis, because unless we abandon our present course of wishful thinking and our blindness to the real issues, there may be no world.

The President's plan has been termed many things—among them "a beginning" to end the difficulties in the Middle East. Now, to my mind, a beginning signifies a foundation, a strong basis upon which to rest future hopes and accomplishments. In view of existent facts, to me the President's proposal represents only a parchment canopy—with golden inscriptions of promises—with no true foundation or props to keep it earthbound or stable.

There can be no real peace in the world until the differences between Egypt and Israel are settled; until such problems as recognition of Israel by Egypt as a free state, resettlement of Arab refugees, reopening of the Suez Canal with the establishment of adequate safeguards for the interests of the users, are solved. The President's plan would leave these vital problems entirely up to the United Nations. Yet, at this point, there is a new deadlock between Egypt and Israel. The General Assembly, in disregard of Egypt's prior guerrilla and blockade war against Israel, waged in defiance of the armistice agreements, of international law, and of the United Nations' own decisions, calls on Israel for a complete and unconditional withdrawal of its forces to the armistice lines, without bringing Egypt to terms as well, or assuring Israel's national safety. In view of the fact that arms poured into Egypt from all sides and we denied Israel any arms assistance at all, and she was left defenseless and at the mercy of enemies who had sworn to destroy her, Israel refuses to accede to the demands until she receives firm assurance that its withdrawal from the stategic points in question will not place her in the same vulnerable position as before and permit Egypt to resume its warlike acts against her. Egypt's persistent harassing of Israel went unnoticed by the United Nations; Egypt has been emboldened by the unconditional support it has found in the General Assembly and rejects all the proposals for peace and for assurances of Israel's security. The United Nations tells Israel what to do, but it finds it impossible to negotiate with Nasser. So far, United Nations efforts have been ineffectual and have failed to better conditions in the explosive Middle East situation, the strife has continued for far too long.

It is evident that the United Nations must be prevailed upon by the United States to play a greater and more productive role than it has in the past. So far, the United Nations has been powerless to prevent the raids and acts of aggression against Israel, who has begged for peace; it has stood helpless when Egypt forbade transit through the Suez Canal to Israeli ships; it has made no headway with Nasser, who remains aggressive and uncompromising in his demands. Therefore, we must realize that when we say we stand behind the United Nations we are evading our responsibility, for the United Nations is only as strong as we make it. It is our duty to call upon our President and Secretary of State to pursue to the utmost and with all their powers, a definite and firm policy in the United Nations, to the end that that body will take immediate measures to bring about peace in the Middle East.

The resolution before us does not begin to touch or solve the real problems of the Middle East; it offers no help as to how we shall deal with Nasser or the pouring of Communist arms into the Middle East.

I wish to make it clear that I do not consider it necessary for the President to come to us for permission to exercise authority which is vested in him by the Constitution and which is already his.

It is apparent that the administration actually has no definite plan of action in the Middle East; that we do not know the geographical area in which it proposes to use the powers requested. So far, it has refused to specify the means, military or economic, which it proposes to use. Also, it is evident that the administration's request is not based upon specific appeals to our Government from the nations threatened, or from our Atlantic allies, for the kind of operations proposed in the resolution. This is, therefore, a different proposal from any with which we have ever been confronted. The vagueness which shrouds the proposal before us must be dispelled, its inferences clarified, and possible results studied and weighed.

It is maintained that the proposed resolution is primarily designed to deal with the possibility of overt Communist aggression. As former President Truman states, it does not face up to the other vital problems of the Middle East, such as Cyprus, Israel-Arab tensions, and the Suez Canal. Yet, these problems because of our own laxity in the past, led to warfare, jeopardized the western alliance and dealt Europe a deathblow in diplomatic and economic fields. The United Nations has neither the means nor power to solve these problems.

Our national policy is indefinite and incomplete. I have no wish to act as a rubber stamp on a blank check. Congress is being asked to give blanket authority to spend $400 million within 2 years for economic aid. I think it is imperative that we demand complete and detailed information as to just how, when, and where this money is to be spent. We must be assured that our money will go to the nations truly in need and will be used to the best advantage; we must make certain that huge sums will not find their way to the treasuries of nations who do not need or truly want our help and where no permanent good can be hoped for. We must not be scared into parting with $400 million when Dulles says that we either pay or lose the entire area, he admits complete failure as Secretary of State as well as having been derelict in his duties in the past when he should have safeguarded our interests and prevented the debacle we now witness. The payment of mere money now cannot perform the miracle he hopes for.

We have no assurance that Israel, pauperized by the constant threat of Egyptian military aggression, would receive any of our bounty. In order to defend the Middle East against Communist aggression it will take more than money. It means our taking the lead in solving the problems which invite Communist penetration and aggression. So far our score in this regard is zero.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended that positive and comprehensive measures for dealing with the fundamental problems of the Middle East should be prepared and presented by the Executive to the United Nations and to the Congress. The suggestion has also been made that we should go to the United Nations and encourage the formation of an adequate security force to handle overt aggression anywhere in the world, and specifically Communist aggression in the Middle East. I agree that a congressional expression of opinion would be of tremendous value in promoting such a force.

I repeat, it is the duty of this Congress to face its responsibility and to make recommendations governing our policies and actions in the Middle East. Most important is the necessity of ending the conflict between the Arab States and Israel, and this means preserving Israel's rights, her integrity as a free nation, her right to her own ports free of blockade and equal rights to use the canal with other nations.

In days past, nations went to war, thousands or millions of lives were lost, parent and loved ones bereaved, and finally those in power gathered about a peace table and came to terms. In this atomic age, this procedure cannot be risked. We must talk and achieve peace before the shooting begins in earnest. Recently, I suggested to the President that he request Nasser and Ben-Gurion to come to Washington to try to work

out a solution to their differences so that peace might be achieved and the threat of world conflagration dispelled. I was informed by the State Department that the moment was not propitious. In view of the ever mounting tensions, Soviet overtures and victories in the cold war, just when do the President and Secretary of State intend to act? When the Middle East is completely under Soviet domination? When Russia has brought off her greatest coup of all—when our economic life, at least, has been destroyed?

I call attention to suggestions made by Truman in his statement to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which I think are excellent and which I trust will have the earnest consideration of this body:

That we take into account the following factors: one, the adequacy of our military forces to act in the Middle East in such a way as to repel aggression without bringing about atomic war; two, the importance of acting in the Middle East not only through the United Nations but also in concert with our principal allies; three, the necessity of bringing about an increase in the productive economic power of free nations over a long period of time not only in the Middle East but elsewhere, in order to balance the mounting economic power of the Communist bloc; four, the desirability of bringing to an end the shipment of arms into the Middle East particularly by Russia, and eventually by all nations; five, the desirability of expending and strengthening the United Nations forces in the Middle East for the purpose of stopping the chronic state of guerrilla war on the borders of Israel and making the Suez Canal a guaranteed international waterway, open to all.

It is also necessary for the United States to let it be known that Israel is here to stay. No one here can doubt that Israel wants peace. She should be helped—not hindered—in her efforts to be allowed to exist as a free nation. Ever since she became a state she has been frustrated in all her attempts to achieve peace; she has been attacked, pushed to extremes of fear and anxiety over survival; aggression and constant fear of aggression have been her sad lot. She has been made to stand alone in her trials and tribulations. The time has come when we must see to it that justice and respect are given her. Unless we help preserve Israel's dignity as a free nation—we lose our own.

Before we can vote intelligently on a resolution such as this, Congress should demand to know the specific program and field of action anticipated by the President and Secretary of State. We should formulate and announce to the world such a clear and forthright foreign policy that our enemies will be estopped from questioning our motives and spreading false propaganda as to our real intentions, and so that all the nations of the world may know what our true aims are and that we wish to preserve freedom and peace. We should use our power in the United Nations to achieve practicable and effective results.

It is important that we face up to the dictators and the Communists and let them know that we will not be cowed by or tolerant of any future aggressive or vicious acts against defenseless and peace-loving nations; that we take stock of our terrible losses during the past 4 years in the field of foreign relations and diplomacy; that we take action to improve our status and to assure ourselves of a few victories in the cold war instead of being hoodwinked into complacency and then shocked by the inevitable loss.

Let us have intelligent and affirmative action and less mystery and deception. Let us resolve to win our battles in foreign relations not with money, but with astuteness, honor, and vision—strong in our belief that right must prevail.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, here I stand today as one who has always voted for foreign aid, mutual security, and general international cooperation with our friends. Today I voted against the motion for the previous question on the rule for discussion of the President's proposal for a Middle East program. Here we have one of the major issues of our time and it comes to us under a "gag rule," which limits and shortens debate and prohibits any Member offering an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand an amendment I was prepared to offer. All I can do now is submit it for the record and hope it may generate some thinking by our people as to where we are going and the extent to which we are resorting to expediency.

Here is the amendment I wished to offer:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY: On page 4, line 3, after "1957" strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That, no part of the money so available shall be used for the benefit of any nation or group of nations which permit human slavery, slave labor, peonage, or involuntary servitude within their borders."

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked by the administration to authorize economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed $200 million. It is extremely significant that we are also at the same time greeting a ruler from one of the most despotic and backward nations of the world. He arrives complete with retainers and retinue numbering 70 people. As a representative of one of the vital nations covered by this resolution, King Saud is in a position to gain aid and assistance from the United States.

The possibility that Saudi Arabia might receive economic aid disturbs me greatly and reminds me that there exists in that country a festering sore which should have been exterminated years ago. I refer to the practice of slavery and slave labor.

It is well known that slavery is openly practiced in Arabia and some reports indicate over 500,000 men, women, and children are in bondage at the present time. Now it seems to me that a nation that allows such inhuman and cruel practices to continue should not be eligible for economic aid from such a freedom-loving country as ours.

On top of the practice of slavery in Arabia, I would like to point out a few other facts about this nation. Although slave labor is legally recognized in Arabia, strikes and union organizations are not. In fact, according to a report from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, striking Arabian workers in the Aramco plant were subjected to horrible tortures and over 500 of these workers were imprisoned for daring to strike. These workers were imprisoned under a decree issued by Saud's government in June of 1956.

We also find that in this country our troops in the armed services are forbidden to attend Roman Catholic services in any form and Jewish members of the Armed Forces are not sent to Saudi Arabia because of possible embarrassment to the Government.

In the face of such conditions in Saudi Arabia and similar conditions existing in many other countries of the Middle East, are we now going to extend millions of dollars in economic aid and possibly send troops into these countries to fight when these countries still live in the Middle Ages and publicly proclaim their lack of faith in democracy and individual freedom? It is my plea that the administration look with searching examination into each of the many applications for funds they are about to receive and hold back money from any country that practices slavery, slave labor or any other form of involuntary servitude. Unless these funds are used among the people themselves and not by the rulers, the propaganda of international communism cannot be beaten.

Mr. Chairman, I have expressed myself on one phase of this resolution. It is my sincere hope that the other body will give it the open debate which it requires and add to it such corrections as are vitally necessary. To facilitate this result, I am voting for the resolution even though I did not have the opportunity to amend it on the floor of the House.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, under our form of constitutional government, the President of the United States is responsible for the practical application of our foreign policy. In fact, he is charged with initiating and carrying same into effect, as well as he is charged with being commander in chief of our Armed Forces. Most of us on this floor today are not members of our House Foreign Affairs Committee; but it seems to me from reading the report of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was this day furnished us, that said report clearly shows that distinguished committee has conscientiously and pretty thoroughly considered the presently all important subject matter constituted in the text of the resolution as submitted to Congress by the President.

The committee report of some 23 pages, in the hands of each of us, was approved by a vote of 24 to 2, which in my estimation is very worthy of being a clear finding that I should regard with utmost scrutiny and probable approval that committee's findings. I have also considered as much the text of the hearings before this important committee on the same resolution, House Joint Resolution 117.

While I recognize that there are a few factors involved in the content of this

resolution—or rather in the lack of some specific facts in this resolution—I, nevertheless, recognize that in the interest of our national security; in the interest of desiring to have reasonable flexibility; in the interest of making moves only when justified by actual conditions fully known, that the content of the resolution requested by the President, and amended by our Committee on Foreign Affairs, is no doubt the most reasonable program which can be reduced to writing at this time.

In preparing to vote in favor of this resolution, as amended by our own distinguished committee's diligent and thorough consideration, I, of course, know and recognize that the President of the United States and his advisers are charged with, and are expected to be, and no doubt are, very much more informed and acquainted with the problem of the Middle East than is even any person on this floor this day. Urgent insistence and representation to us that peace in the Middle East is more likely to endure if we pass this resolution is one factor entering into my decision to vote "aye." I cannot assume to know what they are talking about, but I believe the President of the United States is determined to do his dead level best in every way to find a basis of enduring world peace. This is another factor which has determined me to vote "aye" on the resolution.

Still another factor which makes me so declare is that as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee these several years, I have heard responsible oral testimony, and viewed documents galore, showing as clear as crystal that the condition which has already commenced to come about in the Middle East through the activity of Soviet Russia is but part and parcel of the Soviet conspiracy to gain economic and political control of the territories of the world as soon as it suits their avowed purposes and well-known objectives. I know of no renunciation by the Soviet dictatorship and international Communist conspiracy of its avowed and specific purpose of eventually eradicating from existence what we know as the free world. And we, of the United States of America, and our cordial neighbor, Canada, are two of their recognized targets of demolition and destruction.

Furthermore, my colleagues, may I urge to your attention that there still remains in the United States of America altogether too many allegedly patriotic American citizens who within their conscious attitudes toward our constitutional government would be quite willing to see international communism as presently emanating from the Kremlin conquer the world. We must be wide awake to this present danger in our own beloved Nation. The arrest just last week of three Soviet Communist spies by our own diligent FBI should be another warning signal to us.

In putting into effect the terms and assets of House Joint Resolution 117, I urge the President and his advisers to emphasize economic aid and cooperation with the nations in the general area of the Middle East. Having frequently said I do not believe that the military is the answer or solution ultimately, I, nevertheless, continue to recognize that we must always stay strong enough militarily to defend our own independence and to protect the declared desires of our allies in the world. I, therefore, sincerely hope that the President's program under this resolution will recognize that there is going on in Asia a revolution against feudalism, and that there exists over there a historic economic feudalism which I am informed is often combined with a political feudalism which controls much of the destiny of those parts of the world. No doubt the President and his advisers are well advised of the increasing and avowed desire for independence spreading over parts of the Middle East and Asia. And, likewise, a burning desire for equality.

I feel I have a willingness to trust this resolution in the hands of our President, but I would hope that he will continue in utmost ability to be ever present while the challenge of the Middle East continues. I am very happy that our own former Member, Congressman Richards, has been selected by the President to head a mission to the Middle East; this mission to report back to the President the best ways and means to make this resolution most effective so far as the economic aspect is concerned. I presently believe the effect of this resolution being overwhelmingly approved by this great legislative body will be to deter any aggressive military efforts by the Soviet conspiracy. This means therefore that we must be increasingly aware of the subversive infiltration which will normally increase when they are stopped in their tracks in their military plans. I regard this resolution as one in the interest of peace. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, had come to no resolution thereon.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The chair understands the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. MURRAY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CARTER VERSUS LECOMPTE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered printed:

JANUARY 29, 1957.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Clerk has received a petition signed by the attorney for the contestant in the contested election case of Steven V. Carter versus Karl M. LeCompte for a seat in the 85th Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Iowa.

This case appears to be developing under the laws governing contested-election cases in the House of Representatives. Since this petition requests permission to vary the requirements of the statute, and further, since the House itself only may grant such a departure from the provisions of the laws governing such cases, this petition is being transmitted to the House for its consideration.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill similar to the legislation I sponsored in the last Congress in the field of immigration.

My new bill contains the following provisions:

First. It would permit the entry of 5,000 minor war orphans adopted abroad by United States citizens or coming to the United States for such adoption.

In cases of war orphans adopted by United States citizens who are serving abroad in our Armed Forces or who remain abroad in the employment of the United States Government or an American organization, visas issued to orphans will be valid for 3 years, so that the adoptive parents will not be forced to return to the United States within the normal 4 months' period of validity of the visa.

Expeditious naturalization after admission to the United States is proposed for these children in order that they may accompany their adoptive parents abroad to foreign posts without undue hardship.

Second. Having been advised by the Department of State that about 19,000 visas allocated under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, have not been issued to three categories of immigrants for whom the visas were originally intended, my bill permits the issuance of this number of immigrant visas without time limitations.

On the expiration of the 1953 law, December 31, 1956, 16,338 allocated visas remained unissued to German expellees residing in West Germany and in Austria; 1,597 visas remained unissued to Dutch refugees and Dutch relatives of United States citizens residing in Holland; and 1,098 visas remained unissued to European refugees stranded in the Far East. My bill will permit the above specified number of visas to be issued to the immigrants as previously defined in the now expired law.

The Department of State will be charged with the issuance of those visas by consular officers so that there will be no perpetuation of the special organization set up for the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

Third. The Congress has been aware for some time of the fact that a considerable number of displaced persons and refugees born in Soviet Russia have misrepresented their place of birth in order to avoid forcible repatriation to Soviet Russia back in the years when this country practiced this unfortunate policy. Now many thousands of those people who have been in the United States for many years are faced with deportation proceedings on the ground that fraud was committed when they made applications for entry in the United States. Under the provisions of my bill, the Attorney General would be authorized to cancel deportation proceedings outstanding against this category of displaced persons and refugees if he finds that no fraud was committed for the purpose of evading quota restrictions of our immigration laws and that the misrepresentation was predicated solely upon the fact that the immigrant had grounds to fear repatriation which meant persecution, deportation to Siberia, or death.

Fourth. My bill will cancel the mortgage imposed upon several immigration quotas by legislation passed in 1948 under which displaced persons were brought to this country. Similarly, the mortgage imposed on the quota for Spain in connection with the importation of skilled sheepherders will be canceled. The effect of this provision of my bill would permit the full use of about 12 immigration quotas.

Fifth. My bill would admit under proper safeguards prescribed by the United States Public Health Service up to 1,200 immigrants afflicted with tuberculosis, provided such immigrants are spouses or children of United States citizens, or members of a family unit previously admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The purpose of this provision is to prevent the separation of families and curtail the number of private bills introduced in the Congress, mostly for the purpose of permitting our servicemen to bring their alien brides.

Sixth. My bill will clarify certain provisions of the immigration laws applicable to the exclusion of aliens who have committed crimes classifiable as misdemeanors and will authorize the use of the criminal code of the District of Columbia in order to determine whether such crimes, if committed in the United States, would be classified as minor offenses. This provision will also relieve the Congress of acting on a great number of private bills.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD INVESTIGATING RESOLUTION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker; today, I am introducing a resolution calling for an investigation of the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act, as well as its administration by the National Labor Relations Board.

It has been 10 years since the enactment of the Labor-Managements Relations Act of 1947—Taft-Hartley. We have had a great deal of experience. It is time to take stock.

We need to know which, if any, provisions promote injustice.

We need to know whether inequities may be corrected by amendment, or by repeal and the drafting of a new law.

We need to know whether the problem requires a break from the philosophy underlying the law. Taft-Hartley was written in 1947. Times have changed. Can a law written in 1947's climate meet the challenge of 1957?

It is pertinent to point out that within a few years of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, the late Senator Taft, a coauthor, himself proposed numerous changes. We need more than normal legislative hearings to determine whether more or fewer changes now are required.

Legislative hearings must be confined to specific proposals introduced. They may not necessarily be as broad as to cover the entire act. I believe a thorough and complete study is necessary.

A study into the operation of the act could not be complete unless it also included a study of the interpretation and administration by the National Labor Relations Board.

Our study should also determine the adequacy of NLRB's staff and procedures in order to speed up decisions. Action before NLRB today is frequently so long drawn out, that decisions on matters of certification, unfair practices, and the like, are often merely academic.

These matters are fundamental bread-and-butter issues to the men and women concerned. Action in such cases should be speedy, rather than prolonged. Delay can cause irreparable damage to labor's rights to organize and to bargain collectively.

I am proposing the investigation be conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor, or a subcommittee thereof. My resolution authorizes hearings outside Washington, and grants full powers of subpena. I am seeking $100,000 to conduct this study, so that it may be as thorough as possible.

THE CURRENT INFLATIONARY SPIRAL

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, I introduced a bill which, if approved, will direct a searching inquiry into the current inflationary spiral which threatens every segment of our national economy and the wellbeing of every American family.

This measure calls for a congressional investigation, conducted by the Joint Economic Committee, into the wage-price-profit relationships in our basic industries. It seeks to determine conclusively the real causes and to fix responsibility for the unsettling price increases which are extorting such an enormous inflationary toll from unprotected American consumers.

It has become unmistakably clear in recent times that a fair and equitable relationship between wages, prices, and profits, especially in such basic industries as automotive, steel, meatpacking, oil, and farm implements, is absolutely essential to the continued success of our economic system. This elusive relationship must be consciously promoted by labor and management working together for the general welfare. The primary responsibility, as the President recently pointed out, rests squarely with labor and management, it can neither be imposed nor assumed by the Federal Government.

But this does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that Congress must stand idly by when management or labor, or both, default in their responsibility. We are all aware that there has been such a default and that the ever-rising cost of living in America today is in large measure the result of an imbalance among wages, prices, and profits. The Federal Government has sought to cope with these inflationary pressures by raising interest and rediscount rates and by other tight money measures with which we are all familiar.

The very fact that these stringent remedial measures are necessary clearly suggests that congressional attention—and the attention of the American people—should be focused upon the underlying causes of the disability which we seek to correct. Only by prompt and decisive action on our part can the growing inflationary forces be checked before they snowball into even more serious proportions.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the benefit of the investigation I propose can be assured only if it is conducted in a thorough but impartial manner. The purpose of this inquiry would be frustrated if it were to fall short of producing all of the facts—regardless of how embarrassing they may prove for one party or another.

It may be charged, Mr. Speaker, that this inquiry goes rather far afield in that it cannot properly result in specific legislation. While I agree, as I have said before, that the basic responsibility rests with labor and management, it must also be recognized that the American public is entitled to factual information which can be arrived at only through the disinterested auspices of the Federal Government. And certainly there can be little question but that this same information would serve a most useful purpose to those of us here who in the months ahead will be charged with the responsibility of taking positive steps to combat the inflationary pressures which are posing such a serious threat to our overall economy.

Time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker. Unchecked inflation will not only continue to inflict serious economic hardship upon millions of American families, it will also weaken the American economy, which is freedom's greatest mate-

rial asset in the free world struggle to preserve peace and to meet the challenge of Communist tyranny. And the longer we delay checking inflation the more serious the problem becomes and the more tragic its cure.

I, therefore, urge that prompt action be given this resolution calling for a full and complete investigation and study into the price-profit-wage relationships in the automobile, steel, meatpacking, and other basic industries, whose policies exert a decisive influence on the American economy.

BIG OIL COMPANIES PRESSURING SERVICE STATION OPERATORS TO WIRE CONGRESSMEN AGAINST H. R. 11—RESTRAIN THE GREED OF THE CAPTAIN KIDDS IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received an interesting letter from the Texas Service Stations, Associated, Charles M. Wolfe, President, Greater Houston Unit, which outlines the views of the operators of service stations in our State and warns Members of Congress about the kind of opposition we face.

In Washington, D. C., today there are more people representing big business, including big oil companies, who are constantly in contact with every Member of Congress through some device or means than there are Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate. I do not charge that they are improperly contacting Members of Congress; neither do I charge that their activities are unlawful. I am merely reciting what I believe to be a fact in order to let our friends know the kind of opposition we have.

It will be noticed that the letter which I am inserting includes the following:

First. Endorsement of H. R. 11 and S. 11, which are the same as during the 84th Congress.

Second. Expression of gratification that the House passed the bill last session by a vote of 393 to 3.

Third. Information that 60,000 service station operators are forced out of business each year because of unfair practices that this bill will cure—this bill is desperately needed.

Fourth. Service-station operators are victims of price discrimination which destroys their businesses and savings and which causes the consumer to be gouged by monopoly prices.

Fifth. Big oil companies are propagandizing their captive lessee dealers who operate on short-term leases to wire Congress against the bill.

The letter is as follows:

TEXAS SERVICE STATIONS, ASSOCIATED,
Houston, Tex., January 26, 1957.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: During the last session of Congress our members strongly supported H. R. 11 and S. 11, the equality-of-opportunity bill, to close the good-faith loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act, created by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case. We were deeply gratified that the House passed this bill by vote of 393 to 3, and that it was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committeee even though it was not adopted before adjournment.

Events of the past few months have confirmed our need for adoption of this bill in the present session where it has been reintroduced with the same number, H. R. 11 and S. 11. Destructive price discrimination has been on the rise in our industry, and it is one of the principal factors causing an estimated 60,000 service-station operators to fail in business, quit, or be forced out of business each year.

This bill will close the loophole which permits this price discrimination, by preventing use of the good-faith defense to destroy competition. Service-station operators and other small-business groups desperately need this protection. Remembering the rate at which our businesses are being destroyed through price discrimination, we ask you to do everything in your power to see that this bill is passed early enough in this session to give us this vital protection against this monopolistic practice.

We make this request in our members' behalf because service-station operators are victims of price discrimination which destroys our businesses and savings, and we also make this request in the interest of preserving small-business opportunity in America and in the interest of consumers who are gouged by monopoly price fixing after small business is destroyed.

Inasmuch as this bill will prevent major oil companies from fighting independent brand competition with their dealers' money through price discrimination and will prevent cutting of dealers' margins through price discrimination, the major oil companies have opposed this bill. Now, however, they are going one step further. They are propagandizing their captive lessee dealers who operate on short-term leases to wire Congress opposing this bill.

Since these short-term dealers can be put out of their stations on a few days' notice if the company wants to discipline them, it is not surprising that considerable numbers of them might yield to supplier propaganda and send wires against their own self-interest. We think you should know of this practice as it is going on across the country, and be warned against it.

We are thankful that in a democracy we the people can appeal to you as our elected representatives to solve this grave problem through the adoption of wise legislation. We need your help and sincerely ask that you do everything possible for the success of this bill. Our members have a tremendous interest in what is happening in Congress on this bill and we will appreciate hearing from you as to progress which is being made.

Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. M. WOLFE,
President, Geater Houston Unit,
Texas Service Stations, Associated.

IDEAS—POSSIBLY THOUGHT PROVOKING

People interested in oil production, refining, and distribution have been dealt with fairly by Congress. They are well protected taxwise and otherwise. Many people believe that the very oil companies that are fighting the little man by opposing H. R. 11 have been granted special privileges.

It is difficult to understand why such big people who have enjoyed and are now enjoying so much security and benefits from our Government are determined to kill a bill intended to give equality of opportunity to the little man, a bill that does not propose special rights or benefits to the little businessman but only gives him an opportunity to enjoy fair competition, and if he works hard enough and is lucky, he can eke out a decent standard of living for himself and family.

PROTECTS HOMETOWN MERCHANT

Just in a few words, let me explain what H. R. 11 is intended to do. It is intended to guarantee, for instance, the hometown merchant the right to buy his goods, wares, and merchandise from General Motors, General Mills, General Electric, or General Foods under the same terms and conditions that the chainstore across the street is permitted to buy its goods, wares, and merchandise from the same seller. It makes it a violation of the law for the seller to discriminate against the hometown merchant, whether he is in the dry-goods business, grocery business, drug business, service station business, or any other kind of locally owned business.

COMPLETE MONOPOLY IN SIGHT

What could be fairer than that? Why should any concern, even the big ones, insist on having the right to discriminate against the hometown merchant? In other words, they are asking for the right to unfairly destroy any business. If something is not done within the next 2 decades, the corporations with assets of over $100 million each will own all manufacturing, processing, and distributing businesses in the United States.

RESTRAIN GREED

Small business is the backbone of our country and certainly should be encouraged to the extent that Congress will not permit the big concerns to unduly and unfairly destroy them. It is not asking too much of Congress to ask that the little man be protected against unfair, unjust, and racketeering tactics that some big concerns—not all of them—insist on engaging. Among the big people of America, most of them are big-hearted, generous, charitable, and believe in the Golden Rule, and actually practice the Golden Rule in their business, but there are some Captain Kidds in business and industry—some racketeers—who have no regard for the rights of the other man. It is the latter group that we are trying to deal with by restraining their greed and selfishness.

THE LATE JAMES J. LANZETTA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1956, in New York City there died one of the great public servants of our day, former Congressman James J. Lanzetta. He was 62 years of age.

He came to Washington in 1933 on the wings of a great victory over the irrepressible Fiorello H. LaGuardia. He came here in that year when that great American President Franklin D. Roosevelt commenced his campaign to drive fear from the hearts of the American people and started the long road back from depression to prosperity. Hope for continuous Democratic representation in

my congressional district, the old 20th Congressional District of New York, arose for the first time in many years. After 2 years of dedicated service and the enactment of great social advance in our country, James Lanzetta was defeated by the LaGuardia forces led by that fiery Congressman Vito Marcantonio. After a 2-year absence James Lanzetta defeated Vito Marcantonio and returned to these Halls for another 2 years.

These campaigns were fierce struggles between political giants who respected each other's abilities but gave no quarter. The verbal battle raged on the hustings, on the street corners and in the various clubs. The result was that the opposition with criss-crossing of various political and sundry groups brought down the Democratic giant. I am proud to represent the district which gave Jim Lanzetta to Congress.

Jim Lanzetta's life is an example of American tenacity and of devotion to America. He saw the bad with the good, the debased and decadent with the sound and vital. His goal was to cleanse, to reconsider, to restore, to correct the evil without impairing the good, to humanize every process of our everyday life without weakening or sentimentalizing it. He refused to engage in Machiavellian tactics to gain his immediate ends. He refused to compromise his principles for political gain. He stubbornly refused to permit anyone to endanger that principle which gives equality to all regardless of race, creed or national origin.

In those trying distant days his voice cried out against the evil forces which he saw rising in our midst. It was a voice in the wilderness unheeded for many years. Today we realize that his warnings, like Cassandra's prophecies, were real, although unbelieved.

Our country, these United States, was good to Jim Lanzetta and his wonderful family. He showed his appreciation for benefits received by service, sacrifice, and sincerity.

As a young man he marched off to war and served as a sergeant in World War I. His natural talents and knowledge of language easily led him to a position of interpreter of French and Italian. He sacrificed his adolescent years by working days while attending school at night.

He attended Columbia College, where he earned a degree in civil engineering. His keen mind was sharpened further by training in this field of endeavor. Jim loved people and turned to law, which deals with persons and the relations between men. His ability to speak, his courage to speak out, and his desire to advocate were helpful tools in this wondrous profession.

He studied law at Fordham Law School and soon thereafter set up the law firm of Lanzetta & Zemlock. His rise was rapid—inspector of markets, member of the Board of Aldermen of New York City, and Congressman.

When he left Congress, in 1938, he was appointed legal representative to Puerto Rico. He recognized the intensity of purpose of these Spanish-American citizens and their desire to improve their economic conditions and to gain recognition. Their political value to the Democratic Party came into full bloom in the past year's local elections.

After a period of practicing law, James Lanzetta was appointed a judge in the New York City magistrate's court, where he dispensed justice evenly to all. His attitude toward inexperienced lawyers was a joy to behold. A defendant was protected and was assured of a fair trial in his court, regardless of the ability or lack of ability of counsel.

After a few years, the appointing powers recognized his ability and appointed him as justice of the Domestic Relations Court which treats with family problems and children's peccadillos. The passage of years had turned this fiery speaker into a patient and considerate judge. His patience frequently appeased frustrated wives and irate husbands and sometimes brought about reconciliation. Neglected wives were assured of their just support from defaulting husbands in his court. His treatment of children was motivated by the thought that patience and understanding could straighten out the errant youth before he became a hardened criminal. His treatment was not soft or mushy, but firm and understanding.

Jim Lanzetta has left us. All that one takes from this world is character and a philosophy of life. His philosophy can be summed up in the words of an anonymous author who said:

> I shall pass through this world but once. Any good that I may do or any kindness that I may show, let me not defer it or neglect it, but let me do it now, for I shall not pass this way again.

James Lanzetta passed this way and has gone to the great beyond. Because on the way he touched me, I am richer in experience, I am wiser in judgment, I am happier in thought. All who met him on his journey through the corridor called life share this feeling and sentiment.

We mourn our loss. He lives in the hearts of his wife, his Kanawha Club, his pal Frank Rossetti, and his brothers and sisters, Dr. Lou, Pat, John, Angie, and Reggie, and his dear friends.

We extend to his family and those who loved him our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and character of the late Honorable James Joseph Lanzetta, who at the time of his death on October 27, 1956, served as a justice of the Domestic Relations Court of New York City.

Jimmy, as he was affectionately called by his friends, served as a Member of this body during the 73d and 75th Congresses. He and I were close friends before I came to the House of Representatives and I always admired him for his outstanding ability and character.

During the First World War Jimmy saw overseas service and after his honorable discharge received a law degree from Fordham University School of Law. He subsequently held several important positions with the city of New York including membership on the New York City Board of Aldermen. On July 2, 1947, he was named by former Mayor William O'Dwyer as a magistrate to fill a vacancy and later the same month was reappointed to a full 10-year term. He served with honor and distinction throughout his long and successful career in public life and was always kind, just, and humble in his dealings with his fellowmen.

I have lost a fine friend and I shall always have a very warm recollection of our friendship and association.

I wish to extend to his wife, brothers, and sisters my profound sympathy upon their great loss.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] in paying tribute to the memory of the late Judge James J. Lanzetta, whom I was privileged to know for many years. I was deeply saddened to learn of his passing on October 27, 1956.

Judge Lanzetta was a member of this body during the 73d and 75th Congresses, where he served with great distinction. Some of our senior colleagues who served with him here about 20 years ago will remember him as a fine debator and as one who pursued his points vigorously. Nevertheless, at all times he showed a high degree of fairness to the opposition and was responsive to reasonable argumentation.

This characteristic he took with him after he left Congress to assume a seat on the bench. He served with equally great distinction on the Domestic Relations Court of New York City and was highly respected by lawyers, as well as litigants, for his judicial temperament and sense of fairness.

I wish to extend my condolences and my deepest sympathy to his family in their hour of bereavement. Those of us who knew Judge Lanzetta intimately and were privileged to work with him closely will always cherish his memory. We shall remember him for his sincerity and friendship, and for his untiring efforts in behalf of the people whom he served in Congress and on the bench. May his family be consoled by the thought that he leaves behind an excellent record of service to the people of New York and a fine and honorable name of which his family and friends will always be proud.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks, at this point in the RECORD, on the life and character of the late Judge Lanzetta.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in honoring the memory of a distinguished public servant and former Member of the House, James J. Lanzetta, of New York City, who passed away on October 27, 1956. I served in the House with Jim-

my Lanzetta in the 75th Congress, and I well recall this hard-working, energetic gentleman who was devoted to his work and to the causes which he advocated. He was a friendly, pleasant man who loved people and these qualities were to be of great assistance to him when he became a member of the Domestic Relations Court of New York City. Jimmy Lanzetta brought with him to the bench the same patience, fairness, and kindness which he displayed throughout his public life. We who were fortunate enough to know him have been enriched by his friendship and will long cherish his memory. To the fine family which he left behind I extend my deep and heartfelt expression of sympathy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman James J. Lanzetta was a dear friend of mine. We served in the House together. He was a stanch friend and a loyal Democrat. We worked many long hours on matters concerning the New Deal during the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration.

Jim Lanzetta never forgot his humble origin and always sought to help those who were unable to help themselves. His was an exemplary character. A good character is like an acrostic—you read it up and down, from right to left and left to right—it always spells goodness of character.

He and I were frequently in the forefront to liberalize our immigration statutes. He believed that the national origins theory, which caused so much grief because of discrimination, should be taken out of the immigration fabric.

Jim Lanzetta had great courage and always fought for that which he thought was right, let the chips fall where they may. I can say of him what Webster said, "one man with courage is a majority." He has now gone to his reward. He has left a good name and a good name is the greatest legacy a man can leave. We offer his surviving dear ones our kindest sympathy.

OIL POLITICS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am not among those Americans who can rejoice at the current visit of King Saud to the United States. Although it is the President's privilege to negotiate with the head of any foreign state, Congress should be acutely concerned and has the right to know about any promises which are made obligating our Government.

If our Middle East policy is to concern itself with the development of stable conditions which prevent Communist aggression and which provide for the economic development of these underdeveloped areas of the world—how can our friends in the Middle East, such as Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Israel reconcile their friendship with our warm gestures to King Saud? Will it be our foreign policy to neutralize friendly nations and give powerful concessions to less friendly nations which find themselves in a position to make demands? Can we be assured that aid which this country gives to the Middle East will not find its way to our enemies? How do the people of Saudi Arabia feel about their king's visit to the United States—the 6 million people who do not own Cadillacs, private rail cars or private planes? How do the 90 percent of the people of a nation suffering from malnutrition feel and what great comfort can they derive from the gregarious hospitality of their king who very generously provided a dinner for all passengers and guests aboard the United States liner *Constitution* prior to its arrival in the United States? Was this hospitality a luxury that this underdeveloped nation could afford, and was it really King Saud's to give?

The King's visit to America may be to develop better Middle East understanding, but it will undoubtedly include a request for more American funds in some form or another. Most visitors from abroad have that same purpose. Does the King want some special concessions for the renewal of the lease on the American air base at Dhahran, or does he want to take it over himself? Does he want additional planes and arms from this Government to resist the threat of Communist aggression, or are they to be used to protect King Saud from internal revolts, from trouble which he may expect from his own people? Is our Government concerned with the welfare and the progress of the people of the Middle East and of Saudi Arabia, or are we more concerned with preserving and protecting the vital important contracts which American oil concessions have negotiated with King Saud?

On October 15, 1956, Mr. R. G. Follis, Chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Company of California, submitted a statement on the threat to the future of international agreements which requires examination at this time. This statement entitled, "The Right To 'Nationalize' " is as follows:

> Our company's shareholders and those of other American enterprises with investments abroad have a substantial personal interest in the recent happenings surrounding the Suez Canal. Not only must we be deeply concerned by the immediate threat to world peace implicit in these developments, but also their implications for the future of all international agreements.
>
> No one questions the right of any nation to nationalize private property in the public interest, assuming adequate and prompt compensation is provided to the owner. However, on certain occasions due to the risks involved or the magnitude of the project, governments make contracts with nationals of other countries which, in essence, surrender voluntarily the right to nationalize for a definite period of time. Based on this assurance, not only do those developing the project spend large sums in the country, but in many cases other businesses and even nations orient their economies to depend on the assurance of continuity implicit in the contract.
>
> If a nation can, with impunity, abrogate an agreement of this kind into which its government entered voluntarily and which has been faithfully carried out by the other party, then it would seem that we can no longer rely on international agreements as a foundation for cooperation in international business development.
>
> The concept that every nation has sovereign rights over its own territorial domain cannot be interpreted to mean that a nation has the right to repudiate a solemn contract whenever political or economic conditions make it appear expedient to do so. If every international agreement is to exist only so long as either party finds it convenient, without regard to contractual obligations, then there can be no such thing as trust between nations and the whole fabric of international agreements becomes meaningless.
>
> It is particularly unfortunate that unilateral actions leading to such a breakdown of international faith have occurred in recent times, in many cases in nations which are relatively new or underdeveloped. It is these nations that are in particular need of the technical, economic, and management assistance that is obtainable through investment from more highly developed areas. Such international investment is not likely to thrive under the cloud of doubt and insecurity raised by the abrogation of solemn agreements.
>
> Responsible governments throughout the world have a moral obligation to uphold the sanctity of international economic as well as political agreements, to the end that international development may again proceed as in the past. The abrogation of solemn agreements should never go unchallenged by responsible nations, nor should any nation enjoy the fruits of such an action.
>
> The responsible nations of the world and particularly the United States, as the leader of these, should affirm the integrity of contractual obligations of an international character through all established channels of relationship that exist between nations.

The Standard Oil Company of California, which in company with other companies in Aramco, the American oil consortium which has the Saudi Arabian concession, would like the whole might of the United States Government to enforce their private oil contracts with King Saud, which at their inception constituted a nefarious raid upon the rights of the Saudi Arabian people to the profits from the oil with which their country was endowed.

Contracts made by corporations and nationals of this country with governments, corporations, or individuals of other countries are made at the risk and peril of abandonment by either. The doctrine of caveat emptor prevails. The contracting party in America cannot expect our Government to rescue him from a foreign transaction which turns bad. A course of action by this Government to preserve and protect the integrity of unsound contracts between American nationals and foreign governments for foreign oil would be a certain course to war.

The American investors in foreign-oil development have received a good return on their investment. The calculated risk of nationalization and contractual abandonment has already been included in the sale price of the oil. The risk has already been paid for by the American oil consumer alone.

American blood and American arms must not be pledged to defend and protect the contract which Mr. R. G. Follis and his associates have made with King Saud.

DEFENSE SECRETARY WILSON AND THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson seems to have a talent for putting his feet in his mouth. His latest tirade charging that our National Guard men are "draft dodgers" is not only unfortunate, but, so far as the Oklahoma National Guard is concerned, it is simply not true. The famous 45th Division was repeatedly on the line in both World War II and Korea. Its members escaped neither military training nor actual battle. Many of them lost their lives. Secretary Wilson ought to apologize to them and their families.

Only a few days ago a former member of th 45th Division came by my office. He won the Medal of Honor in combat in World War II. He was a member of the Oklahoma National Guard. I ask the Secretary of Defense: Is this one of the men he had reference to when he charged that our National Guard men are draft dodgers?

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. FALLON), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS on tomorrow for 1 hour.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DEMPSEY and include a press release having to do with Secretary of Defense Wilson's statement and the National Guard of New Mexico.

Mr. HOFFMAN in two instances, in each to include relevant matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include relevant matter.

Mr. KEATING in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. VORYS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

383. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for corn base acreages and other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

384. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

385. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the Report on Borrowing Authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

386. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

388. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 44th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the act of February 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

389. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting the annual report on tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period January 1 through December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

391. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenue to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

392. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1956, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

393. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparable general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1956, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

394. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

395. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

396. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a petition with respect to the contested election case of Steven V. Carter against Karl M. Le Compte for a seat in the 85th Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Iowa (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AREND:

H. R. 3935. A bill to provide for corn base acreages, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3936. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3937. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3938. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 3939. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3940. A bill to grant certain lands to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3941. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 381); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3942. A bill to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 3943. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3944. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River channel-deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3945. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3946. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3947. A bill to facilitate the transmission of electric power by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3948. A bill to provide for the publication of advance notice of rules and regulations relating to lands and natural resources owned by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3949. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3950. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3951. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3952. A bill to authorize the construction of works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3953. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3954. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3955. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3956. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3957. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3958. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3959. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3960. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3962. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 3963. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3964. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3965. A bill to require conformance with State and Territorial fish and game laws and licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 3966. A bill to provide that the basic allowance for quarters shall not be paid to personnel of the uniformed services for their dependents when such dependents are serving jail sentences after conviction of a crime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 3967. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3968. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3969. A bill to repeal section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, relating to non-Communist affidavits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3970. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 3971. A bill to authorize service connection for certain serious disabilities incurred by persons in the active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3972. A bill to consider disabilities suffered by holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, or the Navy Cross, as having been incurred in service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3973. A bill to revise the basis for establishing wartime service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3974. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3975. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3976. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3977. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, for the purpose of restricting the use of billboards and other outdoor advertising displays along the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3978. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3979. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3980. A bill to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3981. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall purchase certain oil paintings of Nez Perce Indian leaders for display at the site of the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3982. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3983. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3984. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to include pasturelands in the soil bank program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 3985. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3986. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 3987. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 3988. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide more flexibility in refinancing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 3989. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place a maximum limitation on the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3991. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 3992. A bill to provide that the remarried widow of a veteran may be restored to the compensation, pension, or dependency and indemnity compensation rolls if her remarriage was to a veteran, and if her remarriage has terminated by reason of death of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 3993. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 3994. A bill to exempt from duty under paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 certain crawler-type diesel tractors imported into Puerto Rico for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 3995. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41) and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 3996. A bill to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Lake Texoma for the purpose of water supply for the city of Sherman, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 3997. A bill to amend sections 109 (a) and 109 (b) of the Soil Bank Act so as to require that contracts for the establishment of tree cover under the conservation reserve program shall extend for 15 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3998. A bill to provide for the construction of a fish and wildlife marine laboratory and experiment station in Naples, Fla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3999. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4000. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4001. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4002. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery, to provide for the international interchange of art and craft works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 4003. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4004. A bill to provide for decorative art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4005. A bill to repeal the act of Augst 9, 1946, providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 4006. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4007. A bill to amend section 208 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus property to publicly owned water districts and publicly owned sewer districts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4008. A bill for the relief of certain minor alien children adopted by United States citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 4009. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4010. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Education and Labor.

H. R. 4011. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4012. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4013. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4014. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4015. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4016. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized in 1883; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to establish an international university, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution designating the 3d day of February in each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution designating the 7th Day of December in each year as Preparedness Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieveing the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the price-profit-wage relationships in the automobile, steel, meatpacking and other basic industries whose policies exert a decisive influence on the American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 133. Resolution to require investigation of subversive list; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 134. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 135. Resolution providing funds for the investigations authorized by House Resolution 134; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging all efforts be put forth to secure favorable action on Senate bill 581, "because it will permit the continued research into new and improved uses of surplus grains for industrial uses"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4017. A bill for the relief of Kervok Sevag, Mrs. Virginia Sevag, and Sonia Sevag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Abdul Salam El Kadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Eva Ziccardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Kazimir Mikulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:
H. R. 4021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne Alice Grunow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:
H. R. 4022. A bill for the relief of Nellie Mary Trent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:
H. R. 4023. A bill for the relief of Oswald N. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Laibeck Teitelbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:
H. R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Annetta N. Thalassinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:
H. R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Alvin Uriah Wellington and wife, Daphne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:
H. R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Tak Wa Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:
H. R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Poulicos S. Loucacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Jesus Alvarina Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:
H. R. 4030. A bill for the relief of Michael Louloumaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H. R. 4031. A bill for the relief of Felipe Ollama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Maria de Jesus Alfaro de Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Vargas-Alamillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Anka Scirkovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Kata Genero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Inoue, Takako Inoue, and Yoshio Inoue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Gucho-Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Garlock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Elio Mezzetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Miho Sinko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Hans J. Bernick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Slobodan Galeb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:
H. R. 4043. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
H. R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Mirko J. Pitner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:
H. R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Yani Begakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of the estate of David Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. R. 4049. A bill for relief of Abraham Fye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:
H. R. 4050. A bill for the relief of T. W. Wheeler, doing business as Winton Truck Lines, and T. W. Wheeler, doing business as Robertson Auto Transport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:
H. R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Antonia Martignetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H. R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Mary Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Raul Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lucy Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:
H. R. 4056. A bill for the relief of the estate of Katharine Flower Runyon, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Edith B. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Costas George Vernadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:
H. R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Saida Barsam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):
H. R. 4061. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 866,306 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4062. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 886,541 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina:
H. R. 4063. A bill for the relief of John S. Adams (also known as Ivan T. Atanasoff); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:
H. R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Bajada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEWES:
H. R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toy Shee Moy (Choy Sen Yuet); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Natalija Djurovic Bogojevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Jungbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:
H. R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Louise Duesterhoft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:
H. R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Paolo Draper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Gassios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Ali Dawud Abu Ghannam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:
H. R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Gert Forsthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:
H. R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Peter James O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:
H. R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Ramon Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Raul Banuelos-Felix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. BROOMFIELD: Resolution of the Madison Heights City Council of Oakland County, Mich., urging that municipal governments be given preference in the acquisition of Federal surplus materials and supplies and on a par with school boards who now enjoy the right to acquire this property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

62. By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Resolution adopted at the regular monthly meeting of the Delaware River Port Authority on January 16, 1957, urging that the congressional delegations representing the Delaware River port area endeavor to have appropriate committees of Congress recommend such appropriations for deepening the Delaware from Trenton to Philadelphia as may be required by United States district engineer to continue the project at a maximum rate to completion; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in Lafayette Park here in the city of Washington there stands a monument which has particular significance to all of us today. The brief inscription below that statue speaks volumes. It reads:

Freedom shrieked when Kosciusko fell.

Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciusko was a man for the ages. The influence of his life will be reflected in generations yet unborn. His name, along with that of Abraham Lincoln, should always remain high on the honor roll of heroes of freedom. Curiously, both these great emancipators were born on February 12.

Just as every American schoolboy learns the saga of Abraham Lincoln, so every American child should know the story of this great Polish martyr. All Americans should know how he borrowed money to come from Poland to America to join in our Revolution; how he applied his engineering genius to the Colonists' cause and helped turn the Redcoat tide; and how he turned down the

material rewards offered by the grateful American people in order to return to his native land to join in the fight for Polish freedom.

Thomas Jefferson said of Kosciusko:

He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone.

The story of Thaddeus Kosciusko is a story of bravery, sacrifice, and courage. It is that same spirit which today enables the noble people of Poland to keep alive their love of liberty in the face of great odds. All men who love freedom rejoice that the greatness of Kosciusko is still the greatness of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Poland has given much to enrich and better the world. Great have been the contributions of men and women of Polish blood to the United States. Kosciusko was one of the brightest of those contributors. May we never forget his example and his courage as we strive to protect the peace and liberty to which he was so dedicated.

Senator McCarthy's Report to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to the people of Wisconsin No. 12.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REQUEST FOR BLANK CHECK TO USE AMERICAN TROOPS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

On Saturday, January 5, President Eisenhower appeared before a joint session of the Senate and House and made requests of the Congress concerning the Middle East. Perhaps the most important request he made was that Congress surrender to him its constitutional duty to decide if, where, and when American troops would be used—in other words, the power to declare war. He also stated that he would ask for $400 million to be used in such areas and for such purposes in the Middle East as he sees fit. This would be in addition to the other foreign-aid programs for this area.

I frankly can see no reason why the Congress should abdicate to the President its constitutional duty to determine if and when war should be declared—certainly, at least, not while the Congress is in session. The White House is less than 10 minutes from the Senate and House Chambers. The President can step into his limousine and appear before a joint session of the Senate and House with no more than 10 or 15 minutes' delay. It would certainly seem that committing American uniformed men to a new war could stand a 10- or 15-minute delay.

EFFECT OF STATUS OF FORCES TREATY ON GI'S

In connection with this question of giving the President the right to start a war if and when he sees fit, there is forcibly brought to mind the fact that President Eisenhower was the chief engineer of the Status of Forces Treaty, which provides that American uniformed men will be subject to trial in the courts of any nation in which they are stationed, rather than by Army court-martial as heretofore provided. I heartily disagreed with this at the time it was approved by the President and the Senate and still do. I feel that it is a strong argument against giving the President the right to send American young men to fight where he chooses without first getting congressional approval.

This is especially true with reference to the countries of the Middle East. At least one of those nations has a law, for example, to the effect that if anyone is convicted of stealing, the penalty is to cut off the right arm. Knowing of the extreme dislike which exists toward the United States in certain Arab countries, I certainly would not be a party to sending American boys to those areas, subject to local justice. Examples of what can be expected when American men are subject to foreign justice are already a part of the record. Take for example, in France a GI was found guilty in a French court of having borrowed a taxicab for several hours without permission of the owner, and was given 5 years' solitary confinement. A French national in the same week was found guilty of murder and was also given 5 years.

While I think the draft is necessary as long as the threat of world domination by the Communists exists, I frankly could not vote to draft or send American men to a foreign land while this iniquitous treaty remains in effect.

FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVEN AMERICAN UNIFORMED MEN IN RED CHINESE PRISONS

It should also be remembered that the President, who is commander in chief of the military forces, has taken no effective action to secure the release of the 467 uniformed Americans still held by the Chinese Communists and the 10 civilians held by them. This figure of 467 was received under oath from both Defense Department and State Department representatives.

I have urged that we cut off all aid to any of our allies who continue shipping goods or allowing their ships to be used to ship goods to Red China while they still imprison American men. This, in my opinion, would effect the release without firing a single shot. If it were not effective, then the next step would be to blockade the coast of China until our soldiers and civilians were released from Communist blood-stained dungeons. I feel very strongly that we cannot draft and send American men to fight in a foreign land unless we are determined to back them up to the full extent of our economic and military power. We, as a nation, owe those young men the same obligation that they owe their country. Unless and until this infamous Status of Forces Treaty is invalidated and unless and until we exert every power to secure the release of American prisoners in China, I could not and would not vote to send a single American man to a foreign land, much less give the President power to start a war where and when he sees fit.

OUR CONTRADICTORY POSITION

While I, of course, agree with the President's general statement that communism is the major threat to the world and that we should combat it wherever and whenever possible it is impossible to find any sense in the administration's contradictory position. For example, when Nasser, the Communist stooge dictator of Egypt, was about to be toppled from his throne and the Communist threat removed from that part of the world by British, French, and Israeli soldiers, we sprang to the defense of the Communist stooge and forced the British, French, and Israelis to withdraw. In this connection, it should be remembered that the Israelis captured fantastic amounts of the latest weapons of war sent by Russia to Egypt. According to every informed source, the Russian manufactured weapons captured from the Egyptians were far in excess of anything that could be used in the foreseeable future by the Egyptian army, and that the build-up in Russian war materials in Egypt was for the purpose of attempting a Communist conquest of the entire area, using, in the words of Khrushchev, Russian and Red Chinese volunteers. Thus on the one hand we witness the administration stepping in with lightning speed to save the Communist regime of Nasser, and on the other hand find the President urging that he be given power to use American troops to fight communism in the balance of the Middle East.

It should be remembered also that we have done nothing whatsoever insofar as the Hungarian blood bath is concerned. Our representative in the United Nations has not even suggested that we put into effect economic sanctions against Communist Russia unless and until they withdraw their troops from Hungary and return to Hungary the patriots who have been shipped to Siberian slave-labor camps. Insofar as Hungary is concerned we merely made some high-sounding speeches and passed a U. N. resolution condemning Russia, but took no affirmative steps to right the wrong. It would seem that instead of demanding that the Congress give the President the right to use American troops at some undefined place in the Middle East, action should be immediately taken to at least invoke economic sanctions and embargo of goods to Russia until the Hungarian situation is righted. Also, I believe the American people should be entitled to know by what conceivable line of reasoning the administration decides to protect the Communist stooge, Nasser, in Egypt and in the next breath proclaim that we will fight communism in other areas of the Middle East. At present the whole picture is without rhyme or reason.

ECONOMIC AID TO THE MIDDLE EAST

In connection with the request for $400 million to be spent in the Middle East at the administration's whim, it should be remembered that almost 2 years ago at the administration's request, we made an "area appropriation" of $100 million to be spent at the administration's discretion in southeast Asia. Only about $7 million have actually been spent simply because it has proven so difficult to find useful projects upon which to spend the money. It will certainly be as difficult to find useful new projects upon which to spend the $400 million requested by the President for use in the angry Middle East. Consider the countries at present involved in the Middle East crisis: both Iraq and Saudi Arabia have a surplus of dollars from their oil revenues; Syria, which is being supplied arms and technicians and guidance by Communist Russia, has already angrily denounced us and refused any dollar aid from the United States; and Nasser's press in Cairo has been denouncing the proposal as "imperialism" and "intervention." Keep in mind that the British and French regard Nasser as their mortal enemy and a tool of communism. Nevertheless we saved Nasser's skin and now propose to spend money to bolster his regime. Jordan is well on its way to following Syria and has given no indication that it would welcome American dollars or men.

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

In setting forth what had been previously advertised as "a bold new program" for the Middle East, in effect about all the President said was that something has to be done about fighting communism in the Middle East; I do not know what; I have no plans as yet, but give me unlimited money and the right to use American troops where and when I see fit and I may figure out what can be done at some time in the future, but I don't want to have to be bothered with getting Congressional approval before committing American troops and American dollars.

With this program I cannot go along.

Saving Nature Serves Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week during the annual convention of the Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., I had occasion to be in attendance at the meeting when the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, Senator from South Dakota, delivered an address, Saving Nature Serves Humanity, in which he made one of the most enlightening, and at the same time, most cogent cases for soil conservation that it has ever been my pleasure to hear.

Since the future of all humanity is governed by our stewardship of our natural resources, I heartily commend Senator MUNDT'S words of wisdom on this vital subject to all of my colleagues and ask that the address be printed in the RECORD.

The address follows:

SAVING NATURE SERVES HUMANITY

(Address by Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, a United States Senator from the State of South Dakota)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests at the head table, my colleagues of the Senate and the House, our constituents, whose taxes pay the salaries that make our services possible, and ladies and gentlemen all: I indeed deem it a real honor and a great privilege to have the opportunity to address this important audience of important people gathered here on this very important occasion to discuss the very important part that the limestone industry plays in our agricultural program.

The reason I have emphasized and repeated so often the word "important" is because, as those of us who live here realize, Washington is of course a most important city. It is important because it has become the center of world activities today. It has become the focal point where all foreign visitors ultimately come, It is the home of our President. It is the host city of our Vice President. Because of its important part in world affairs, it is certainly true that all of the bankers and merchants, the doctors and scientists and educators, even the taxicab drivers who live in Washington consider themselves a little bit more important than people in the similar category in their own hometown or in other States of the Union.

In fact, I believe, after having been here for some 18 years that if you want to get a direct answer to a specific question, and you want it fast, the best place to go for it is to a taxicab driver in Washington. He may be wrong but he is never in doubt and he can endow you with the greatest disorganized collection of misinformation of any individual that I know. He is important people. There is no question about that.

Certainly, these fine folks here gathered from the executive agencies are important people because legislate as carefully as we can, eventually what comes out at the administrative end is something that they concoct in the executive agencies. Sometimes it has just a slight resemblance to what we think we have passed at the legislative process.

So I know that I have this rare privilege of talking to a most important audience. I see a lot of Members of the House here. And, as a former Member of the House of Representatives, I know full well that they are important people. They are the ones who have the first say on the appropriations bills. They are the ones who, under the Constitution, have the first and initial action to take on tax matters. They go to the public every 2 years and feel that they represent the people and most of them aspire someday to become Members of the United States Senate; so undoubtedly they are important people.

As one who once cherished and achieved that aspiration, of course, I would like to discourage the practice and I warn them that the 450 feet from the House to the Senate Chamber comprises the most expensive and tortuous trail that a man can undertake. And Senator ELLENDER and the rest of you Senators—they are mighty important people—we are so important that we even have our own barbers in the barbershop because we are afraid to let anybody else shave us. We are so important that when we want to go any place on the Senate elevator we have the habit of punching a bell three times and the elevator comes immediately to the floor on which we are and takes us to the floor where we want to go.

A couple of weeks ago, GLENN BEALL, I met one of your Maryland constituents on the elevator who said he got on in the morning with a clean shave and he then had a 5 o'clock shadow; he was trying to get off on the second floor to see you, but Senators kept buzzing him up and down and he didn't get anywhere.

Then, of course, most Senators are candidates for the Presidency of the United States and those of them who are not are running for Vice President. Obviously, they are most important.

This is a distinction and an honor, therefore, for a country boy from South Dakota to talk to important folks like these—and, as I say, the taxpayers, the people, the constituents who make this great governmental process of ours possible.

Tonight, I want to discuss with you briefly an important subject, and that is the great function of conservation insofar as it applies to our land and to our soil and especially the part that the agricultural conservation program plays because so many of you in the audience, directly or indirectly, contribute to that, and play a significant part in the entire conservation program.

During recent years, most of us have been so very busy, insofar as agricultural problems are concerned, dealing with the temporary problems of agricultural surpluses, that we sometimes forget that man has seldom in world history had too much food. Our farmers have done a tremendous, a fabulous job of producing, especially in World War I and in World War II and the years immediately following.

I sometimes wonder what we would have done in our field of diplomacy in our modern attempts at foreign policy were it not for the fact that we do have these surplus foodstuffs and stocks of fiber to give away or to sell at discount. Perhaps it would be fair and perhaps we would have greater success with our farm programs if a way could be found for charging the costs of all this to international relations or to national defense or mutual assistance instead of charging so much of it strictly as an agricultural program.

In any case, I think that this surge of abundance, the result of applying new technology on new lands, has not yet run its course. And in fact, I doubt whether it has yet reached its peak. Even so, I think tonight we should devote our attention to a long-term aspect to our farm program that is a horse of a very different paint job and which is not related in any sense to agricultural surpluses.

All of us are somewhat familiar with the several books and the many articles that have been written on the problems of soil conservation in the United States and in other parts of the world. There have been a great many scholarly books written on this subject, some of them with terrifying titles, which cause men to ponder in perplexity about the future of mankind. About a generation ago we read one called Standing Room Only. Then there was one called Mankind at the Crossroads; another one, Our Plundered Planet, and The Rape of the Earth, and Land for Tomorrow. Books of that kind, in one way or another, deal with the problems of conservation, the conservation of man and his lands and his home.

Tonight, however, I do not choose to take you down the long road of a discussion of how much land there is in the world, or what sort of land it is, or how fast it is washing down to the sea or blowing into the air, or how poor it is getting to be. We will assume that tonight, not many, if any in this room, need any indoctrination as to the letter and the spirit of conservation. In fact, it is your interest in conservation that has brought you here.

Perhaps it will be enough to remind you of the very conservative words of the great conservationist, Paul Sears, who put it this way:

"The earth as a separate planet is 2,000 or perhaps 3,000 million years old. The species of mammal—to which we belong—has been present for only the last 30 seconds of the 24th hour of the earth's existence, while modern power technology based on fossil fuel compares with a very fast, instantaneous snapshot.

"For the first time in earth history, a single species has become dominant, and we are it. The power and intensity of our pressure upon the environment is without precedent. Our numbers increase at the net rate—conservatively—of 1 percent a year. That means a net gain of more than 50,000 a day, doubling in a generation. This also means increasing demand for space in which to live and move, and increasing demand for food and other necessities from the space that is left."

Inasmuch as a large part of the world's present agricultural surplus comes from the soil of our continent, we may well examine the local situation as the keystone to the arch of world problem. Incidentally, there are those experts such as Prof. L. Dudley Stamp who think that any large increases in the years ahead will come not from the largely unused tropical areas, or our oceans, but from America's own great Midwestern agricultural areas. The United States Department of Agriculture has made some projections on this. A good many of those projections have been pulled together in a recent paper "Future Needs for Agricultural Land Resources in the United States," by Dr. James R. Anderson.

A projection by the United States census indicates that we will have 210 million people in the United States by the year 1975 and that is accepted as a figure which is midway between the highest and the lowest estimates. A 10 percent increase in food consumption per capita by that date is also predicted. They find that consequently livestock production may need to increase by 45 percent and crop production by 25 percent over 1951–53 averages to serve our people in 1975.

They find that farm output will need to be increased nearly twice as fast in the 20 years following 1953 as in the 40 years preceding 1953. Then they start figuring on alternative ways of meeting those projected food needs.

One conclusion is that changes in technology that have taken place in agriculture in recent years will continue to account for a major part of the projected needed increase in farm output by 1975. Use of fertilizer and conservation and improvement in soils are judged to have accounted for about a fourth of the increase since 1940. But there is a land problem also. It is indicated that the acreage required for cropland in 1975 may be about 6 percent, or 30 million acres more than in 1950. And in that year, 1950, of the

total 1,904,000,000 acres of land in the United States, only 465 million acres or about a fourth of it, were classed as cropland. Of the present acreage of cropland, only about one-tenth is class I land which is level and easy to farm with little or no danger of erosion. About 70 percent can be used with moderate to severe limitations or risks of erosion. Another one-tenth can be used as cropland only with very severe limitations. And the remaining 10 percent of the acreage now used as cropland is not considered to be suited to such use.

I am well aware of the fact that by a series of statistics that way we could ultimately convince ourselves that we are on the verge of starvation, that we are about to run out of land. We get ourselves in about the same position as the Englishman in a London pub who was talking with one of his fraternizers one day about the great success that Britain had had in the major portion of its history as the greatest colonial empire of them all.

The first Englishman said to the second, "How is it, do you suppose, that our Majesty's Government has been so successful in dominating so much of the world and developing an empire upon which the sun never sets?"

One other one said, "It is a simple question to answer, you bloke: it is obvious that Great Britain's success in war and in peace and her capacity to develop a colonial empire is solely attributable to the old maids of England."

Said the first to the second, "The old maids of England? May I ask how you claim for them to be the basis of the great success of our Majesty's Government?"

And the second replied, "It is a simple thing if you just analyze it properly. After all, you have got to remember that England's great success in military affairs has depended in large part upon the cavalry; the cavalry required good horses; good horses have to have good fodder; clover provides good fodder; bees pollinate clover; field mice eat bees' nests; cats catch mice; old maids keep cats, and consequently Great Britain's success depends upon the old maids of Britain."

I don't propose to follow any such line of tenuous reasoning tonight to prove that liming is important, that soil conservation is important, but I do stress the fact that even the statistics of the situation indicate that as population expands faster, certainly, than we are building land, we have to learn to live intelligently and usefully with old mother earth.

Rough as any such general classification may be, there is a place, it seems to me, in that picture which indicates the importance of the members of the institute who are gathered with us here tonight. Most of that land must have a cover, or a better cover, part of the year, or during part of the rotation if we are to protect it and if it is not to suffer further major sources of erosion and deterioration. We must protect our land today if we are to retain the power to protect and provide for our people tomorrow.

An early goal of the agricultural conservation program was land-use adjustment and conservation. That is, with intensive cropping as a major problem, the program was developed initially to take land out of cultivated crops and small grains and to encourage diversion to grass and other soil- and water-conserving crops. Limestone was a major necessity on most land if a legume cover were to be established and maintained. Financial assistance was provided to establish proper pasture and range management and to control erosion. That meant, generally, strengthening the vegetative cover by applying minerals to sod crops and by seeding down additional lands not needed for crop production.

There have, of course, been some modifications in this program since its inception. Under the 1938 act the use of lime and phosphate was not limited to the control of erosion, but they might be used on sod crops to increase or maintain yields under intensive cropping. Still more recently, longer-lasting or so-called enduring types of practices have been stressed. There has been insistence on soil tests to determine the amount of minerals which must be supplied to obtain adequate erosion controlling cover; proper rotations are required. Package practices and followup applications of fertilizer are permitted, even required. It is thus a program for getting more conservation on individual farms in the public interest than would be possible were farmers to depend entirely on their own resources.

There is an upper limit on how much any individual farmer can be assisted. Participating farmers average about $100 per farmer per year; but not all of that is for limestone by any means. The latest statistics at hand indicate that more than 2,000 counties in 39 States include the practice of lime on cropland to permit the use and establishment of conserving crops. More than 300,000 farms participate in the practice in any 1 year, with nearly 5 million acres at an average rate of assistance of about $4 per acre.

One thing which I very much like about the program, which we are all so vitally interested in, is that it involves both a filter-up and a filter-down process. County groups submit their recommendations to their respective state groups, which in turn consolidate the county recommendations and submit recommendations for inclusion in the program developed annually by the Agriculture Conservation Program Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service, with approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. Program funds are allocated to the respective States on the basis of their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except for minimum allocations specified by law.

After the national program has been put together, each State group prepares its State programs subject to the approval of the administrator. In turn, each county group develops and prepares its county program, subject to the approval of the State committee.

A State program includes authorization for cost sharing in practices for which assistance is most needed in that particular State in order to achieve the purposes of the program. The State group also sets up the basic standards of performance that must be met as a condition to cost sharing. Essentially the same procedure is followed by the county group in preparing its county program. The program is flexible enough to meet local needs. The county may develop and recommend approval of special practices to meet emergency conservation problems in the area.

It may increase rates of cost-sharing, within prescribed limits, and develop practice specfications and operating methods in line with its own peculiar problems.

There is another aspect of the use of limestone on many soils which in the long run may prove to be fully as important as its contribution to erosion control. Prof. William A. Albrecht, of the University of Missouri, among others, has called our attention to the relation of the mineral content of the soil, especially the availability of calcium and magnesium, to the protein content of the food produced from the land. All of this, of course, is of basic importance in the dietary relationship to your good health and to the good health of your children.

Incidentally, that may very well be the basis for the high protein quality of the products of my own State and the longevity of our citizens of South Dakota. You will recall that the northern plains stand very high, comparatively, in length of life, vigor, and resistance to most diseases. Rejections for military service were exceptionally low. Life expectancy is exceptionally high.

A few years ago statistics prepared by the Associated Press indicated actually that the longevity of Americans was highest in the two Dakotas. As a loyal son of South Dakota, I wish I could tell you that longevity were highest in the State of Dakota but honesty compels me to report that the Associated Press survey showed that they live a little longer in North Dakota than they do in South Dakota.

That used to distress me for a great many years because I couldn't quite figure out why they should live longer up there than they do in South Dakota. I think I have the answer to it, though. After studying it as carefully as I could, I have concluded that the people of North Dakota hang on to live with a little bit more tenacity and refuse to die with greater reluctance in the hope that if they live long enough, some day they can move down into South Dakota. I believe that might be the reason.

I will not attempt to take you, even if I could, through all of the intricacies of this specialist's technology in this connection. However, I cannot refrain from relaying some of the very pertinent material. Caloric needs must of course be met for sustenance of life. Calcium and other elements usually present with it, are conducive to the conversion by the plant of carbohydrates into proteins. Plant bulk, largely carbohydrates can still be produced on soils that are exhausted of calcium and its protein-producing cohorts of fertility, but seed production and nutritive value declines or fails under such conditions. Disaster follows emphasis on crop volume and disregard of nutritional values.

It is imperative, I believe, and I know you believe, to our national success not only that our crops have good growth but also that our good crops are good for something. Good food, adequate nutrition, a balanced diet, these results are encouraged by proper and appropriate use of limestone and other supplements to our soil.

The agricultural conservation program, of course, is designed as a means by which the public through its Government shares the cost with farmers and ranchers of conservation practices that are needed and that would not be carried out to the desired extent by farmers themselves if they had to rely strictly on their own resources. That is another way, perhaps, of saying that we have come to recognize that the public has an interest in this matter. The public interest in the agricultural conservation program is based on improved conservation and more adequate nutrition and better food values, which may well outweigh any benefits accruing to the individual farmer. Not that the individual farmer doesn't benefit. Of course he does. His benefits are more immediate; the public may benefit for the next 1,000 years.

Participating farmers of course contribute part of the Government's share; and under the regular ACP they make direct payments to support a very substantial portion of the cost of the practices themselves. They also contribute their own labor and often use their own equipment. It is not a giveaway program that we are discussing here tonight.

In this day and age, we hear much of partnership programs between the Federal Government and the States—between the Federal Government and its citizens. In my opinion, our agricultural conservation program and the payments made available to farmers in the conservation and protection of our Nation's soil is a manifestation of the partnership principle at work at its illustrious best. In this program, the farmer, the landowner, the county and the State, together with the Federal Government, cooperating between the executive and legislative branches together as partners to plan practices for the present which will pass on into the future a fertile farmland and bountiful soil.

A prosperous farmer understands full well the sound economy involved in making the

proper applications to his soil. He understands the theories involved and he has the money to cooperate with the Federal Government in programs to this end.

One of the problems facing us is the fact that we have 1 million farm families in 1,000 low-income counties in America who get from the soil a bare sustenance. Perhaps there are many cases where the individual farmer does not fully understand the benefits he could accrue through good soil stewardship. In any event he just does not have the money to subscribe to such a program.

America is tackling the problem today of low-income families on several different fronts. In my opinion, providing adequate Federal assistance for our agricultural conservation program is one important method of helping low-income farm families.

One estimate is that only 30 percent of the production of major crops today results from fertility applied to the soil; 70 percent represents exploitation and a very small return of the food and feed creating capital removed from it. In the case of oil and certain minerals, the Government steps in to prevent the private owners from depleting with undue rapidity the resources of the earth. We don't do that from the standpoint of agriculture but it is just as devastating to the present and disastrous to our future where farmers become miners of the soil as it is where they unduly squander precious natural resources, such as oil hidden beneath the recesses of the earth.

Somebody has estimated that 80 million tons of limestone are required per year to provide what is now needed on land to provide for an optimum program. We have never been able to get up to half that mark, as a country. The best we have been able to do in the early postwar period is about 30 million tons. Actually, a great deal of that was done with the ACP program and all credit to it for the important part that it has played.

Farmers on their own have continued to apply about 5,500,000 tons per year. I don't mean by that, that none of them have learned to use limestone as a result of the program; they have. But some of them, especially in this era of the cost-price squeeze have not had the immediate wherewithal in order to continue private participation.

Such studies as have been made of what they are doing, or would do if the assistance were discontinued, show that in some areas 90 percent of those formerly participating continue to use limestone but perhaps not on quite the same level as before, but they do continue it out of their own pocket demonstrating that they realize the important part it plays, when, as, and if they have the finances with which to continue the practice.

The Congress has continued to appropriate fully as much money as the Executive wanted for these purposes. But, in my opinion, we have not done enough. A little less than one-fifth of the total commonly goes for limestone. Actually, you folks in the Limestone Institute and in the limestone industry have provided something over one-half billion tons of this finely pulverized calcarious rock since we first got the idea. Lime has been applied to nearly half as many acres as we cultivate annually. Obviously, there is duplication. Some of it has had several applications and much of it has had none.

It is a wonderful program and the public interest is well served. It would seem that with all of this, your own efforts, those of the agricultural colleges, plus those of the Federal Government under the ACP program, with the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture and the Congress, farmer usage of the benefits of liming might well have risen to a satisfactory level by today. However, statistics demonstrate clearly that this is not the case and perhaps we should spend a few moments wondering together, why not?

I think that each of us here in this room tonight must share his part of the responsibility for failure to develop an annual usage of liming more nearly compatible with the needs of our soil than is presently the case.

We in the Government should, I submit, extend the horizons of our vision and provide more adequately for partnership programs which will assist and encourage the utilization by farmers and the enrichment of the good earth of these United States by liming practices.

Those of you engaged in educational and scientific careers, those of you serving in the Department, should, I believe, step up your guidance programs and your pilot demonstrations to encourage more farm owners and more landowners, to do even more by their own initiative and with their own resources to cooperate with nature by appropriate treatment of the soil beyond the programs participated in by the Federal Government.

And you in the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, our hosts tonight—you who produce and distribute this important product with its constructive values which we all recognize—I think you should sharply extend and expand your salesmanship techniques by direct contacts with our farmers. The need and the potential demand for liming is always going to exceed the capacity and the appropriate functions of the Federal Government in supplying that demand.

By stepping up your advertising and publicity program, by educational programs designed to demonstrate the degree to which use of your product is in the self-interest of the farmer, by direct mail, by radio, by television, by informational data made available, through all the accepted media for contacting the people on the land, your organization can do much to stimulate the expanded and continuing use of limestone. Our Government should and must, in my opinion, assist with the program. Your organization has a collateral and corresponding responsibility to function vigorously in conformity with sound business and promotion practices in our great free economy by utilizing a portion of your resources in the expansion of your own markets.

Thus by working together as partners, working together as partners should, we can help protect for tomorrow what we have the responsibility of preserving here today. Saving nature serves humanity and history teaches the stern and lasting lesson that civilizations which fail to cooperate with nature ultimately succumb as victims of their own greed and shortsightedness.

Our friends in forestry have the impressive slogan which says: "If the people save the trees, the trees will save the people." May I suggest in conclusion, that I think we could agree here tonight that it can be said with equal validity and wisdom that if the people save the soil, the soil will save the people.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, 77 years ago last Saturday Gen. Douglas MacArthur was born in the city of Little Rock, which it is my honor to represent. The people of Arkansas have taken great pride in his achievements. They rejoice in his good health and wish him many more years of usefulness during a happy retirement. He has served the Nation and the cause of freedom well. We are all aware of his heroic and sacrificial services in the dark hours of 1942 and of his brilliant leadership in the military operations that enabled him to fulfill his promise that he would return to the scene of the first grim struggle. I am confident that even those who disagreed with General MacArthur's views with respect to policies in Korea appreciate his devotion to his country and would be glad to join in congratulations to one of the Nation's great generals.

Repudiating the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1776, our forefathers, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world, declared "These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Eight years of bitter war gave validity to that declaration. The Constitution was adopted. Became effective June 21, 1788. It created three departments of government. Gave to each separate and distinct, but coordinate, powers and functions.

Though the Constitution declared that the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the armed services "when called into the actual service of the United States," it limited to the Congress—gave to no one else—the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy.

Adherence to that document for 169 years has given us as individuals the greatest degree of freedom and prosperity enjoyed by any people anywhere at any time. Made our Nation the most powerful in today's world.

On January 5, 1957, House Joint Resolution 117 was submitted to the Congress at the President's request.

The purpose of that resolution was "to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence."

It authorized the President "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence" of any such nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring and requesting such assistance against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism. It also authorized the President to, until June 30, 1957, use not to exceed $200 million for the economic aid of such countries.

I was 1 of 61—the only one from Michigan—Members of the House who voted against this reolution—355 voted for it.

Before this resolution was voted upon, the President stated—and unequivocally—that, if given authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States to protect other countries, those forces would be used under the direction and command of the United Nations.

That means that our men sent to war under this resolution will fight, not under the Stars and Stripes, as in all previous wars, but under the flag of the United Nations, of which Red Russia is a member.

Moreover, they will serve under the command of an officer selected by United Nations—a polyglot group of 80 nations, none of whom wholly follows our way of life. Want your man fighting or dying under a foreign officer?

No one questions the ability, the sincerity, or the patriotism of the President.

But granting this power to the President establishes a precedent which cannot be ignored. Other Presidents will ask and presumably get the same authority. History shows that the granting of the power and means to carry on war creates a dictator, who, however beneficent, either becomes or is followed by a dictatorial tyrant.

Those who voted for the resolution were almost unanimous in apologizing for supporting it. No one questions their judgment—but.

I believe in the principles of government laid down in the Constitution. Adherence to those principles has given us what we have, made the Nation what it is. It holds promise for the future.

Much as I wished to join my colleagues in this vote, to comply with the President's request, my allegiance is not to the President, not to my party, but to my country.

I cannot, and I will not, shirk my responsibility.

Nor can I cast a vote which, in my judgment, does violence to my oath to support the Constitution, however expedient at the moment such action may seem to be.

Kansas Has 96th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, this is the 96th birthday of the great State of Kansas. The name had its origin with the Indians in whose language Kansas meant "People of the South Wind." The State motto "Ad Astra per Aspera"—"To the Stars Through Difficulties"—is well chosen for a people whose State was admitted to the Union on January 29, 1861 during the days of intense civil strife. In 96 years, the State has moved upward a long way toward the stars and certainly the progressive people of Kansas have learned that such advancements are accompanied by difficulty. But it has always been in the tradition of Kansas, as a heritage from their sturdy pioneer forebearers, to be undaunted by the obstacles which lie in the path of progress.

Kansas is proud of its location as the geographical center of the United States. From such a strategic location, its friendships and influence stretch out alike in every direction equally. We feel as akin to California as we do to Virginia, as a neighbor to North Dakota and to Texas. Neither the States of Washington or Florida are out of reach for us and we blend them both alike into our sphere of business and our choice of vacation lands. Every State is our neighbor and their inhabitants our friends.

Jayhawkers was the name given the daring bands of raiders and pillagers along the Kansas border during the days of the Civil War, giving rise to the Kansas nickname, according to some historians. Others declare the Jayhawker myth has its rise from other sources. But whatever the background, Kansans today are known as Jayhawkers and the Jayhawk myth has become a spirit of progress and power and there remains of the Civil War interpretation only the spirit of comradeship and the courageous fighting qualities to make and keep Kansas free.

The Secretary of Defense and Our National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Korean war began in June of 1950 and in September the 987th Field Artillery Battalion, Ohio National Guard, composed of men of Stark County, Ohio, was called to Federal service. In January 1951, after meager training at Camp Carson, Colo., the battalion was sent to Korea. From that time until the summer of 1952, these National Guardsmen of Canton, Ohio, were in the bitterest fighting in Korea, living in trenches and foxholes near or at the front, suffering the miseries and hardships of the Korean winter without sufficient clothing or equipment, bearing the brunt of what our former President chose to call a police action.

If this is dodging the draft, it is the first time that I have heard it described so.

I came to Congress while the 987th was in training at Camp Carson. I had stacks of mail from the families of these men who complained that the training they were receiving at Camp Carson was not adequate to fit them for immediate entry into combat. I believe they had something like 17 weeks between entering service and their date of embarkation.

Some months later the Army advised me that 6 to 9 months of training were required to put a Reserve or Guard unit into condition for combat, but the 987th had 17 weeks.

The unit contained veterans of World War II who were certainly not dodging the draft when they elected to serve their State and country as members of the National Guard.

It included also young men from the 1950 high school graduating classes, who certainly were not dodging the draft at a time when the monthly draft calls were inducting men in much higher age brackets.

This is my personal experience with the National Guard unit from my home town. I daresay that others can speak of other units who were federalized and rushed to the front under similar circumstances.

To call these patriotic volunteers "draft-dodgers" is the height or irresponsibility.

I hope there is no one in the United States who will accept such a statement, no matter how high the source, without consulting the record.

Fortunately, nothing can detract from the memory of those Guardsmen who never returned from Korea. Their bravery and patiotism, their devotion to their country even though many of them did not believe in the wisdom of the police action, will last forever.

Unfortunately, such reckless talk can have an effect on the prestige of today's Guard. It must be corrected at once. The Secretary of Defense is badly misinformed, perhaps by some of the same regular army brass who ran things from Tokyo and Washington while Guardsmen were fighting and dying in Korea 6 years ago.

Thirty-ninth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of those Congressmen who is interested in Ukrainian independence, I am arising to emphasize that this is the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, and we friends of the Ukrainian people should not forget that freedom is possible. We must continue our perseverance and work toward that fine day when we can celebrate January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in the present rather than as a much-wished-for hope of the future.

I have joined with Senator BUSH and Congressman CRETELLA of Connecticut in sponsoring the bill to designate January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day. I believe that this recognition will encourage our loyal friends and relatives in the Ukraine to continue and hope and work toward the day when this freedom will materialize. I earnestly believe that our work in this cause for the freedom of the Ukraine is a step toward the arrival of the kind of world where men

and women can be free and have the freedom from want and war which is so necessary to a happy and successful life.

In closing, may I say to my good Ukrainian friends and relatives, both in America and in the home country, that people of courage such as you will not give up this fight, as we know that in the end justice will triumph.

Address of Hon. A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri, at Laying of Cornerstone at Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent address delivered by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], at the ceremony in connection with the laying of the cornerstone of the new building for the Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church, in the city of Washington, on January 27, 1957:

In the 28th chapter of First Chronicles we find these words:

"And David assembled all the princes of Israel, the princes of the tribes, and the captains of the companies that ministered to the king by course, and the captains over the thousands, and captains over the hundreds, and the stewards over all substance and possession of the king, and of his sons, with the officers, and with the mighty men, and with all the valiant men, unto Jerusalem.

"Then David the king, stood up upon his feet, and said, Hear me, my brethren, and my people: As for me, I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God, and had made ready for the building:

"But God said unto me, Thou shalt not build an house for my name, because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood. * * *

"And He said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father."

"And thou, Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind; for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imginations of the thought; if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever.

"Take heed now; for the Lord hath chosen thee to build an house for the sanctuary: be strong, and do it."

The cornerstone of a new house of our God is soon to be laid. This is a joyous occasion for all of us of Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church. We welcome the friends who share this joy with us.

Our church is quite young—just a little over 2 years old—and, as the privilege of building the Temple in Jerusalem was passed on to a young king, Solomon, so the building of a Baptist Church on Pennsylvania Avenue has been passed on to a young church.

As plans for the temple were drawn even before the young King Solomon was born, so were plans for this church taking shape before Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church was born.

The idea of a church on this spot took form in our parent group, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church. Under the able leadership of their pastor, Frank Burress, part of this site was bought and paid for by Fountain Memorial. As the time for physical construction of the new church approached, numerous decisions had to be made.

The admonition of David to his son, Solomon, "Know thou the God of thy fathers and serve Him with—a willing mind," must have been a guiding spirit of the good folk of Fountain Memorial. After a lot of careful and prayerful planning, that group decided to form a new church.

On May 30, 1954, a small group of adventurers were duly constituted as the Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church. We were given title to the land here on the avenue and $1,000 in cash. We are truly grateful to the warm friends of Fountain Memorial. The new group called as their pastor, Rev. Walter Mitchell, who at that time was pastor of Fountain Memorial. With his encouragement, devotion, and constructive leadership, the young church secured a temporary meeting place and other physical properties at the Masonic Temple at 14th and U Streets SE. We extend sincere appreciation to Anacostia Lodge, No. 21 A. F. and A. M. for sharing their home with us.

Encouraged by the dynamic leadership of Pastor Mitchell, our membership responded generously in time, effort, and money. Not being a wealthy group, our accomplishments represent a response beyond the call of duty. In March 1956 Reverend Mitchell accepted a call to a pastorate in New Mexico and since that time we have continued our challenge under the leadership of Rev. Irvin Baldwin. Through his consecrated devotion and direction we are now at this inspiring house and at this consecrated spot to lay a cornerstone. During the 33 months of our short life as a church we have looked forward to this good time.

In just a few minutes now, Worshipful Brother R. Baker Harris, grand master of the Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of the District of Columbia, will lay the cornerstone of this planned magnificent structure. In the ceremony of placing this cornerstone, the grand master will use the gavel used by the father of our country, George Washington, in the ceremony of laying the cornerstone of the National Capitol Building on September 18, 1793. Our group is especially honored by the use of this historic instrument of freemasonry. This ceremony also directs attention to another instrument of Masonry—the trowel.

While the trowel is an instrument used by operative masons to spread the cement which unites a building into one common whole, we are also impressed with its speculative use of spreading the cement of brotherly love and mutual concern—that cement which unites all of us into a free democratic society dedicated to the service of God and all mankind.

In this great crusade of Christianity our church has an unusual opportunity to make certainly more than just an ordinary contribution. We are one of a very few churches on Pennsylvania Avenue—Pennsylvania Avenue, the most famous street in the whole world.

Nations and peoples around the globe are looking to the avenue for leadership, encouragement, and help. Groups seeking national independence and political freedom need to share our experience.

With those searching for release from ignorance we should share our eagerness and concern to understand ourselves and our problem.

With those striving for release from poverty we should share our ability to produce for abundance.

With those wanting release from the scourge of disease we should share our skills in the healing arts.

With those needing spiritual guidance we should share our faith in God.

As a Christian church on Pennsylvania Avenue we are accepting a commanding role in the drama of world Christian leadership. Geographic location alone, of course, will not play our part for us.

We must continue to work, and to share, and to grow in the unselfish spirit of Christian brotherhood.

As David admonished his son Solomon, we must "Take heed now: for the Lord hath chosen thee to build an house for the sanctuary: be strong, and do it." We must always seek God's will, and under His guidance, we must build not just a house but we must also build a great church here on the avenue.

Universal Peace Through the Use of the Dollar and the Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that, when Christ was born, expressing their joy and hope for the future, the angels sang:

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. (St. Luke, ch. 2, v. 14.)

Christ's life, His example, His teachings pointed toward the same goal. The people of the world have learned that war is destructive, contributes little if anything to man's progress toward contentment or happiness. Nevertheless, man, to preserve freedom and liberty and a degree of national security, has justified war.

In the President's objective of world peace, we can all join.

Reading the Bible, history, and current publications, it has been impossible for me to find where the use of weapons or financial aid has brought peace to the world.

In this progressive age, when so many heretofore unattainable objectives have been brought within reach, bold and foolish indeed would be the individual who soberly would characterize any endeavor as impossible of attainment.

So it may be that we, even those of us who disagree with the President's thesis that preparedness accompanied by threats of retaliation will promote world peace, are in error.

From my boyhood reading of the Stories of the Bible, I did learn that more than once the children of Israel, under the Lord's guidance, were sent into battle against the heathen. But it also seems to me that those wars followed intervals of the worshipping of false idols by God's chosen people.

Even before the coming of Christ, there was an apparent effort to unite all the peoples of the world into one world government by attempting to build a tower reaching unto heaven. Whether that effort failed because of the imperfection in its planning or the inability

of its builders, or because the Lord frowned upon it, we do not know. Reference is made to it only to show that the present effort to unite the people of the earth is not the first of its kind.

The recent resolution adopted by the House authorizes the President to use our military might, channeled through United Nations, and our financial ability, to protect the territorial integrity or the political independence—not the territorial integrity or the political independence of the United States—but of any nation in the general area of the Middle East which may request our aid.

So it is that, while we all join in the President's hope for the attainment of universal peace, we may be permitted as individuals in a free nation to disagree with his methods, to object to our participation in every war wherever in the world strife may occur and the President or his advisers think that our national security is involved. That our youth shall under the flag of the U. N. and its command, we under our flag or officers again march off to war to protect some other nation.

If world peace can be attained through the use of the sword or through threats of its use, we have delayed overlong, have too often assisted those now regarded as our enemies to add to their war strength.

If upon us rests the duty of maintaining the territorial integrity or the political independence of every nation, and if, as is argued, Eastern oil is necessary to the continued existence of our allies, France and Britain, then perhaps Mr. Dulles was wrong when he insisted that their forces be withdrawn from Suez and adjacent territory.

Just who were the aggressors in that affair? Undoubtedly those nations, with armed forces, invaded that territory, but, prior to that, Egypt had threatened to or had interfered with the flow of a vital commodity, a commodity which we realize those invading countries must have if they are to continue to exist.

An editorial in this week's Saturday Evening Post, which is attached hereto, calls attention to a few of the difficulties which may be encountered in attempting to make effective our present foreign policy if war comes as one of those results. Unscrupulous politicians in Russia or its satellite countries may use this threat against their expansion as their excuse to their people for aggression.

The editorial reads:

PROTECTING THE MIDDLE EAST COULD BE A MAJOR HEADACHE

The thesis behind President Eisenhower's request for more power than he now has to act in the event of Communist aggression in the Middle East appears to be that the European colonial powers can no longer control events in that critical area and that the United States is therefore the only remaining country capable of blocking Communist expansion in that direction. Inasmuch as the Eisenhower administration vetoed the Anglo-French attempt of last October to reassert some sort of authority in the Suez Canal area, the question of whether or not they could have done the job remains unsettled. Presumably, however, an Anglo-French triumph over Nasser would hardly have calmed the Middle East or done much to convince the various nations there that the West was their best friend and that they should have no truck with the Kremlin.

Curiously enough, President Eisenhower did not mention Great Britain or France in his address to Congress on January 5, except obliquely as nations which formerly "exercised much influence in the area," and by implication as members of the United Nations. And yet Great Britain and France still have important interests in the Middle East, interests which, as Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal made apparent, are vital to their survival. Surely the cooperation of these nations, beyond their status as members of the United Nations, would prove necessary to the success of any plan to stabilize the Middle East or defend it in the event of Soviet attack.

The assumption is that the President omitted this factor from the equation because of the feeling that his efforts to woo the peoples of the Middle East to our side would be embarrased by any mention of their former "colonial exploiters." That is doubtless one consideration, but there is at least one other consideration—namely, that the long-term result of what amounts to ditching our European allies in order to assume leadership of what Kipling contemptuously called "the lesser breeds without the law" poses problems which can be only dimly predicted.

The peoples of the Middle East have not managed on their own to establish viable political or economic systems. Arranging matters with them is often reminiscent of Theodore Roosevelt's exasperated remark during the Panama negotiations that making a deal with the Colombians was "like nailing currant jelly to the wall." We should have to expect delays, repudiations, evasions, and breaches of contract of which Colonel Nasser's activities remain a working sample. Unless we were prepared to go broke as a sort of good fairy of the bad lands, we would find ourselves forced to imitate the hated imperialists, at least in their efforts to establish respect for contracts and agreements as the basis of economic progress.

The President's plan can hardly be criticized as a demand for unrestricted power, although this criticism has been made. Mr. Eisenhower has emphasized his intention to consult Congress if it should be in session when the possible need for military action arose, and to call Congress in special session if that were necessary. He also pledged himself to take action "consonant with any action or recommendations of the United Nations." Indeed, this last stipulation might well restrict the possibility of prompt action. Prompt action in the event of a Soviet attack is essential; knowledge that there would be prompt action is equally so.

However, many important questions remain. What, for example, would happen should a Middle Eastern state, theoretically independent but actually under Communist tutelage, shut down the oil wells in its territory? There would be no request for help from the United States. No military aggression would have occurred. And yet another segment in the Soviet plan to starve Western Europe as a step toward world conquest would have been completed. The President's reply is that nations assured of military support are unlikely to act as tools of Soviet policy. Iran can be cited in support of that view; Egypt can be offered to support the other side of the argument. Or what happens if an "independent" Soviet satellite attacks a neighboring country? Unless the United States is prepared to police the internal affairs of Middle Eastern nations, it is difficult to see how these gaps can be plugged.

Only visionaries will expect any plan that could possibly be devised to guarantee perfect peace and tranquility in an area as historically turbulent as the Middle East. What we can do is to assure the countries there that their struggles toward a better life have our practical support, as indeed they have been having for some time, and that Soviet aggression against any of them will be opposed by this country. That is all the Eisenhower plan undertakes to do. The rest must be left to a kind providence and such wisdom and good sense as the leaders of the nations involved can bring to the solution of their difficulties.

Rev. Vernon Gallagher Expresses Views of Tito's Proposed Visit to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the RECORD the letter to me of one of the outstanding young men of America, the Reverend Vernon F. Gallagher, president of Duquesne University, in the city of Pittsburgh.

With the permission of the House, I would also like to insert my telegram in reply to Father Gallagher, whom we in Pittsburgh respect so much and whose opinions we value highly.

I strongly believe that the President should take into consideration the fact of Tito being a Communist dictator, dedicated to the overthrow of governments such as ours by force, in considering whether or not he should be brought to the United States as an official guest of our country. How is it possible to talk reasonably or plan future actions in cooperation with a Communist who believes that free peoples such as ourselves should not even exist? It is pretty hard to win an argument by logic or get a satisfactory agreement with a person who believes you should be dead because of your beliefs, or forcibly kept in a concentration camp when you disagree with him.

Let Tito first become the head of state according to democratic principles before he is considered for an invitation to the United States as the head of a state. It is my belief that no Communist dictator is head of state in the American or free world sense, and that we the American people have no obligation to treat him as such. It takes a long time for some of us to forget the kidnapping of the Greek war orphans, the shooting down and killing of American flyers without justification, and incidentally without apology, and the attempt to use force against our United States troops and the people of Trieste, and the threats to the good people of Italy, as well as the imprisonment, religious persecution and killing and placing in concentration camps of those who disagree with the ruthless dictatorship methods.

If Tito is really for freedom, let him declare himself and begin acting under the principles of the United Nations, and possibly the American people will take a second look. Mr. Tito should realize that he is not welcome every place as long as his principles and actions are so directly opposed to the liberties and freedoms

that we believe are basic and primary rights of every individual in this present suffering world of ours.

I am using this occasion quietly to reaffirm my position that I strongly oppose the visit of Tito to this country at this time, and wish to assure you, my many friends among the Yugoslav people, that we the American people will remain your strong and interested friends in the future.

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 22, 1957.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: My associates and I spend the greater part of our time and nearly all of our energies instilling the principles of ethical behavior in our students. We emphasize particularly that there is an objective basis to the moral fabric on which western civilization rests, that right is right and wrong is wrong irrespective of emotional bias or the seeming advantages of opportunism. We point out the dignity and prestige which great Americans achieved through their uncompromising stand on principles when expediency might have dictated an easier modus agendi. We condemn doing evil even when it is a means to a good end.

In the light of all this, news that Tito may be invited to visit this country fills all of us with dismay. Courtesies extended to one of the world's most notorious Communists could not but disillusion and discourage the more than 4,000 young men and women who form our student body. They join me in expressing the hope that rumors concerning the issuance of such an invitation are nothing more than an irresponsible attack on the integrity of our Government.

Yours very truly,
VERNON F. GALLAGHER, C. S. Sp.,
President.

CONGRESSMAN FULTON'S WIRE TO FATHER GALLAGHER

DEAR FATHER GALLAGHER: Am glad to advise that I agree with you thoroughly that an invitation to Communist dictator Tito for an official visit to the United States would be an American tragedy. Am placing your views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe they are so well stated that they should have further reading. As a friend of many Yugoslav people I have personally been one of Tito's strongest opponents in Congress because of his repression of civil and religious liberties, his imprisonment of religious leaders and his maintenance of concentration camps. Count on my continued active opposition. Thank you for your thoughtfulness in writing me.

Personal regards,
Congressman JIM FULTON.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in saluting the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of their 47th anniversary. I am proud to wear the pin presented to me last week by a Cub Scout visitor.

The qualities taught by the Boy Scouts are the qualities which make for fine leaders of tomorrow. Among them are self-reliance, patriotism, courage, hard work, cooperation, and belief in God.

One thing that always impresses me when I get reports of Boy Scout activities is the tremendous amount of hard work they do as a regular part of their Scout program. This is a wonderful lesson the Boy Scouts teach.

The ability to work is the foundation of good citizenship and the opportunity to work is an integral part of our American heritage. The men who built America were workers. So must be the men who will help build America in the years to come.

Strong in body, keen in mind, generous in spirit, and brave in heart, the Boy Scouts of America are the glory of the present and the hope of the future. With the future in hands such as these, we need have no fear.

Remarks of Hon. W. Pat Jennings, of Virginia, at Banquet of Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Supervisors, at Bristol, Va., January 16, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable W. PAT JENNINGS, who so ably represents the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia in this great body, delivered a very fine address to the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, at Bristol, Va., on January 16, 1957. This address contains much valuable information that I believe our colleagues and the people of this country should have.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include this fine address:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE W. PAT JENNINGS, NINTH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, AT THE BANQUET OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, HOTEL GENERAL SHELBY, BRISTOL, VA., JANUARY 16, 1957

It was with real pleasure and pride that I accepted the invitation of your chairman, T. G. Ragsdale, and Mr. I. H. Huff to participate in this annual meeting of the supervisors of the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts. I am happy that I was able to come down from Washington, where the 85th Congress has just started what expects to be an action-packed first session.

I want to discuss with you some of my thoughts on the soil conservation programs of the Nation, but I also want to make a request of you. I will be grateful for any recommendations you may have as a result of your work in the various programs and the experiences you have encountered in their operation. Any background information you can give me will be helpful, as I consider the legislative proposals pertaining to conservation programs during the 85th Congress.

During the 84th Congress, which made a dedicated effort to improve the farm programs of the Nation, I was privileged to represent the Ninth District of Virginia in the House. I served on the House Committee on Agriculture, which considers and reports all farm legislation of vital concern to Virginia farmers and our farm economy. The new committee assignments of the 85th Congress have just been announced, and I have retained my seat on the Agriculture Committee.

We have just concluded 4 days of extensive hearings on the soil-bank program. So tonight I want to devote a major portion of these remarks to that program and the need for expansion and improving it in many major respects.

Before getting into the soil bank, however, let's briefly look at some of the events connected with the new session of Congress. It opened in a serious—almost tense—mood. Indications are that a heavy legislative calendar is expected and many problems of national and international concern will undoubtedly be considered.

The Congress, I believe, has started with every indication that it will deal with the major issues as expeditiously and adequately as possible. Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, of Texas—"Mr. Sam" to thousands of Americans who regard him affectionately—set the tone of the Congress for the next few months in his remarks to the House when he was reelected Speaker for the eighth time:

"We must so act in the days to come that we will merit the confidence and the faith not only of our own people but of the people of the whole world. * * * This is a time of dedication for every human being that lives within the confines of the United States of America. Therefore I look forward to a session that will be fruitful, that will be serviceable not only to us but to the other people of the earth."

The proposals presented to the Congress to date bear out "Mr. Sam's" predictions.

Already the President has proposed a program of economic aid and military support, even to using American troops, to the nations of the Middle East to aid them in resisting any advances of Soviet Russia; the traditional state of the Union message, although rather general in nature, has brought forth many legislative proposals on which detailed messages will come from the administration later; major bills have been introduced in the two Chambers on Federal aid for school construction, civil rights, tax reductions, social-security amendments, bills to improve the future outlook for small business, farm-program changes, and many, many others. We can expect a great number of legislative actions to affect the daily lives of each of you and your neighbors; the national and international situation demands the best from both the administration and Congress.

The President's state of the Union message was overly optimistic on the farm picture. Despite his belief that there has been "heartening progress," I am inclined to expect major changes in our farm programs during this Congress, especially the soil bank. Farm income has not risen substantially from its dangerously low level as compared to the rest of our economy; farmers are still in the cost-price squeeze; farm surpluses have increased, not declined, their value going from $2.5 to $8.1 billion in the past 4 years; farm credit is up, in cost and in total amount; and general unrest still prevails. I will speak more of these circumstances in a few minutes.

I am particularly interested in the family-sized farm of this district and Virginia, which has received very little benefit from the soil bank. I expect the Family Farms Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee to be reestablished within the near future. I was a member of this subcommittee in the last Congress, and I hope to be in this one. I expect to ask that a continuing study of the family-sized farm problems be started and definite recommendations be made to the full committee for consideration and possible legislation.

My friends, turning to conservation in Virginia and the Nation, I think we can all

agree that soil and water conservation is basic to all land resource management and should be one of the most vital concerns of our time. Whether we live in town or country, we all have an obligation to participate in this vital endeavor. The President, in his state of the Union message, made special mention of the need to make the best uses of water, which he stated is "rapidly becoming our most precious natural resource." I am concerned that not enough people realize that the variety of programs and projects available in Virginia gives each of us a chance to do his share toward a clearly defined mutual goal.

Nothing is more important to our well-being than an ample supply of productive soil and clean water. Food and fiber to feed and clothe our people, forage and feed for livestock, and timber from our forests all come directly from the soil. Water in its many forms—whether as life giving supplies for farms and cities or as devastating floods—is regulated by the condition of the soil and its mantle of vegetation.

All of these things are so interrelated that no one can be dealt with alone. At the base of them all is the soil—with which you are directly concerned.

Soil conservation is basic not only to agriculture but to industrial and urban life as well. Our land and water resources are the foundation of our wealth. Our great cities, with all their complex activities, are dependent directly upon these resources. And as the President stated, "The domestic and industrial demands for water grow far more rapidly than does our population."

I want to state here that this concern of the Chief Executive over the water needs of the Nation, which, as stated, are interrelated with our soil conservation, is pleasing to me. Frankly, I have been disappointed in some respects in the attitude of the administration toward the Soil Conservation Service's funds. For example, the 84th Congress approved $62,942,759 for fiscal year 1956; the administration asked $59,488,959. We approved $67,500,000 for fiscal year 1957; the administration requested $62,215,000. These figures are exclusive of funds for the watershed and flood control program. I hope that we can expect a substantial fund request for both soil and water conservation in the 1958 fiscal budget; I expect to support an adequate appropriation to continue our work in these important areas. I have been and am still very much interested in the continuation of test demonstrations as practiced in the TVA watershed.

Soil and water conservation begin with the land itself. Although all our people depend upon these resources, only those who actually use and manage our farms and woodlands can take the necessary precautions to prevent their wastage and increase their productivity. The rest of us can help, but the first responsibility for conservation is with the landowners and users.

Soil conservation districts provide the mechanism for doing this job, and, of course, the key to each district's operation is its board of supervisors. Anywhere that you find these five landowners, who serve as board members without pay, you find public-spirited conservation leaders, who by the practice of conservation on their own farms set an example of good land husbandry.

Another strong force of leadership in the conservation movement is your own Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts. Your group serves as a guiding light to the local boards of Virginia's 29 districts. Your association represents their interests before the public, before the legislature, and in many other appropriate ways. As a leader among district supervisors, your chairman, T. G. Ragsdale, on his farm near Brandy, sets an example of conservation farming for the entire Commonwealth. I wish to commend every one of you here tonight for your efforts to improve and expand soil and water conservation in Virginia.

I might add, too, that I am participating in some of the programs on a small scale. During the recess of the last Congress, I had the local soil conservationist out to look over my family farm as a possible site for a water control dam. I am also planting trees on some of the hillsides, where in past years I have picked rock and during the depression days helped "grub."

The State of Virginia is well-prepared to use the mechanism of soil conservation districts to cope with its soil and water problems. Ninety-eight percent of the total land area of the Commonwealth is within organized districts. More than 38,000 farmers are cooperating in district activities. Nearly 29,000 of them have completed basic conservation plans on more than 5 million acres of farmland.

Now, having taken a quick look at the importance of soil conservation in the Nation, and the way in which we are equipped to practice it in Virginia, I want to discuss with you a supposedly "new" tool that came into being last year which can be used by soil conservation districts to put conservation plans into effect—the soil bank. Most of you are familiar with the manner in which it operates, but I want to review its objectives.

Also, I have 2 or 3 possible amendments to the basic act which I feel will improve the program for Virginia farmers especially.

The soil bank, as you know, has two parts—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve. The acreage reserve is a short-term program—available in the years of 1956–59 and supposedly designed to reduce surpluses, and at the same time, protect farm income by paying for crops that would have been produced on the acreage entering the program. The conservation reserve is a long-term program to divert land that is regularly used in crop production to conservation uses by assisting in establishing conservation practices by making annual payments for land placed under the program.

The principal intended objectives of the soil bank program—production adjustment, soil conservation, and reduction of commodity surplus—should clearly be among the vital agricultural objectives of 1957. These goals have not been reached. In addition, the hope has been repeatedly expressed that the soil bank will do something beneficial—sooner or later—for farm income. As I have stated, the need for a major improvement in the farm income of the Nation is definitely still with us.

As matters now stand, the soil bank has been assigned a tremendous task. We find ourselves relying heavily on the bank to produce real progress toward the objectives outlined. However, the load is larger than the bank, as now constructed, can carry.

The best example of soil bank failure is perhaps the corn crop. The Secretary of Agriculture spent $179 million of taxpayers' money, supposedly to retire 5 million acres. Nevertheless, the 1956 crop was 222 million bushels more than 1955, and 367 million more than the average crop for the last 10 years.

In all fairness, I must state that the soil bank is less than a year old and has not yet had a real trial under normal conditions. However, we should not let apparent weaknesses continue without improvement before the 1957 program is completed. Frankly, I have not found a widespread enthusiasm for the program or a prevailing belief on the part of the farmers that it will, in its present form, accomplish its intended purposes.

To bring about a sufficient amount of production adjustment, the soil bank must be handled in a way that will attract widespread participation on the part of the producers, who now question the wisdom of entering the program. One of the reasons for a lack of participation is that the incentive payments are not large enough to make the program attractive to the farmer from a business standpoint. The present program seems to be attractive primarily to those producers who are suffering from prolonged drought conditions, or who have encountered storms or floods or other setbacks.

Assuming that several thousand farmers take part in the soil bank this year, we can still reasonably expect that little net reduction in production will result. Chances are good that the least productive acres will be retired and additional fertilizer and more intensive management will be used on the remaining cultivated land. For example, we were told of a farmer with a base corn acreage allotment of 100 acres. He set aside 20 acres for the soil bank, but used his soil-bank payment to install an irrigation system on his remaining 80 acres, producing as much or more than he had produced previously on the 100 acres. Of course, we do not wish to penalize initiative and good farm practices, but this is just one of the problems that must be overcome.

I believe, therefore, to correct the need for a greater number of producers to place the land in soil bank, other than for the reasons of drought and other losses by weather, that we should increase incentive payments to a realistic level. A good example here is burley tobacco. Soil-bank payments have been set at 18 cents per pound; we cannot expect our burley farmers to place their tobacco acreage into the bank when burley has been selling at well above 60 cents per pound on this year's markets and with prospects good that the same will be true next year.

I have introduced 2 bills to bring about, I believe, an expansion of the soil bank in 3 respects. In addition to attracting more farmers by higher incentive payments, we can bring others in by legislative action to extend the coverage of the bank and correct its other weaknesses.

One of my bills would allow pastureland and grazing land to be brought into the acreage reserve. The Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to formulate and carry out during the period ending in 1960 a program that would allow farmers and ranchers to be compensated for reducing their acreage of grazing lands and making a corresponding reduction in livestock numbers. This addition to the soil bank would be set up, in conjunction with the conservation-reserve program, to make it possible to retire entire farming or ranching units from production.

The second bill I introduced only this week would direct that an acreage-reserve program for wheat and corn outside the commercial wheat- and corn-producing areas be established so as to give these producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the soil bank. This could be based on the historical production of the farm. To me, a bushel of corn produced in Virginia represents that much in the total supply of corn, which we are trying to reduce. Our Virginia producers should be eligible to receive payments from the soil bank the same as those in the commercial corn areas. It is apparent, also, that unless action is taken soon to prevent it, we are going to find farmers, who have practiced conservation on their land for many years, plowing it up to plant corn, wheat, or other feed grains, while at the same time Midwest producers are encouraged and paid for reducing their acreage. In other words, it is entirely possible that the major producing areas would be shifted to other parts of the Nation.

The two bills I have outlined—

1. To bring pasture and grazing lands into the acreage and conservation reserves; and

2. To set up a program to allow corn and wheat producers outside the commercial

producing areas of the Nation to participate in the acreage reserve;

plus higher incentive payments and a general tightening up of the overall administration of the soil bank, will do much to correct existing weaknesses.

I am also giving study to an amendment to require conservational treatment and preservation of reserved land designated for the acreage reserve as well as that placed in the conservation reserve. At present, acreage-reserve land may lie exposed to the elements without protective treatment and cover.

As far as soil conservation is concerned, I believe we all agree the soil bank has merit. Any time that we have a farmer taking land out of production and planting it in grass or trees, we automatically find a greater degree of protection for that land against erosion. However, some thought should also be given to increased payments under the conservation reserve; to encourage the removal of marginal and submarginal land from production. The more acres of this land placed to conservation uses, the better it will be for all concerned.

The Department of Agriculture has undertaken a national inventory of soil- and water-conservation needs, and I am sure the results will show that we need a greatly expanded conservation reserve. For example, the Soil Conservation Service, which is leading the inventory in cooperation with other agencies and conservation groups, has estimated on the basis of soil surveys that in Virginia alone there is something like a million acres of land now in cultivation that could better be devoted to other uses. This includes about one-third million of present cropland that is definitely unsuitable for cultivation under present conditions, and much of which needs to be covered with permanent vegetation to prevent its destruction by erosion. There is an additional half million acres or more of land poorly suited for cultivation that is better adapted to growing grass or trees.

This land is eligible for cost-sharing in the Conservation Reserve. With the proper program, this is an opportunity for Virginia farmers to take another step toward the goal of effective soil and water conservation.

Now, there are two or three other things I want to mention in connection with soil and water conservation and the soil bank.

The first of these is a need for public understanding of the programs, especially as to the cost. This is usually one of the objections to any farm program that it will cost the taxpayers money.

Recently a demand was made for a repeal or drastic reduction of the "rapid tax write-off" law. It was stated that since 1953 certificates have been granted to industry for rapid tax writeoffs, resulting in a "temporary loss in revenue of approximately $5 billion." From 1934 through 1952, the cost of the price supports for all crops under the Commodity Credit Corporation was approximately $1 billion. During this administration, the total cost was $2.7 billion. The total since 1934 is $3.8 billion, an average of a little over $100 million a year. Based on the above figures, it appears that the cost of the rapid tax writeoff program alone since 1953 is almost double the entire cost of the whole farm program on all crops in all parts of the Nation from 1934 through 1956.

I believe this example of the advantages that have gone to large corporations in the form of interest-free loans—or subsidies—in the tax write-off regulations should be pointed out to those who complain of the cost of the farm programs of the Nation.

Also, there is another fallacy of the soil bank which the public has accepted. That is the general belief that the soil bank will substantially boost farm income; that the millions of dollars going to farmers for placing land in the soil bank is an addition to farm income. Actually, the soil bank payments in most circumstances will partially replace income normally derived from the sale of crops rather than increasing it.

Soil conservation and the soil bank are not "new." The techniques and advantages of conservation were discovered and practiced in ancient times.

About 50 years after the birth of Christ, Pliny described in his work, Natural History, a field practice employed in Greece that was similar to the modern American type of land terraces. W. C. Lowdermilk found remnants of stonewalled terraces in "the cradle of the human race" extending from north Africa across the Euphrates—where now only skeletonized land remains. History might have been different had nations heeded the simple advice of Pliny to farmers, that they run their furrows across the slopes and provide channels "to draw off the water into drains." Seventeen hundred years after Pliny, Thomas Jefferson was preaching the same gospel to fellow Virginia farmers, as the New World was being put to plow.

But more than century passed before the soil became a matter of concern and national policy in America.

The United States took its first step toward the beginning of a program of soil and water conservation in 1928. An amendment was offered to an appropriations bill on the floor of the House to make money available for research in soil erosion on farmlands. Farm and watershed demonstration, and soil conservation work in cooperation with farmers followed, through the Soil Erosion Service in 1933 and subsequently the Soil Conservation Service, authorized by Congress in 1935. There has followed the steady growth of the soil and water conservation programs.

There is little doubt that sufficient legal authority to the executive branch to have fully established a conservation reserve, or soil bank, was already available under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (as amended). Additional funds could have been budgeted and requested of the Congress.

In making the public better acquainted with the fact that the soil bank is not a new, unheard of program, and to enlist their aid in promoting conservation, we should point out that the basic aims of the original soil conservation laws—that of developing and carrying out a permanent, national soil and water conservation program are similar to the aims of the conservation reserve of the soil bank—to divert more land from crop production to conservation uses.

We have much to be thankful for in the way of accomplishments, but we have much more to do if the program envisioned by all of us is to proceed on a well-oriented and permanent schedule. There is a real challenge for your association and for each of you supervisors; for each of us concerned with the need to preserve our natural resources. I am confident that the results obtained over the next few years will not only be proportionate to the funds expended, but to the enthusiasm and effort with which we proceed in the various programs and the extent to which everyone accepts his responsibility.

I am a strong advocate of and believer in our soil and water conservation programs, which are still a long way from realizing their full potentialties. I am concerned that these programs be improved and expanded to bring the full benefits to each of you and the other citizens of this Commonwealth and the Nation. I have outlined some of the actions that can be taken within the immediate future to bring about these improvements. It is my belief that every effort made, that every dollar spent, are investments in the future of America—an investment that will be returned many times.

Thank you again for the invitation to visit with you tonight.

Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February 15 marked the 137th anniversary of the birth of one of the great women of the world, Susan B. Anthony. On the occasion of this anniversary we would all do well to pause and consider her example of courage, devotion, and steadfastness of purpose.

Though born in Massachusetts, Miss Anthony spent most of her life in New York State, and my home city of Rochester proudly claims her as an adopted daughter.

Susan B. Anthony was born in Adams, Mass., in 1820. She spent her early career in teaching, and early became interested in the organization of the Daughters of Temperence. It was not until 1851, after she had met Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, that she recognized and became vitally interested in the need for woman's suffrage. To this crusade she devoted the remainder of her life.

The 55 years of her life that followed Miss Anthony dedicated with singleness of purpose and unbelievable persistance to the end that women should gain the franchise. She quickly became the driving force in the movement, assuming responsibility for arranging conventions and building up a strong women's rights organization. In 1869 she helped establish the Woman Suffrage Association, with Mrs. Stanton as president.

Impatient with the fruitlessness of her early efforts, Miss Anthony decided to take drastic steps in 1872. First she went with her sister and some other women to register to vote. Later they voted—thus testing the right of women to vote under the Constitution. Miss Anthony knew full well what the outcome would be. She was arrested for voting illegally, was tried, and fined $100 which she told the judge she would never pay.

Miss Anthony's work in behalf of her cause in the legislative halls of this land was prodigious. Largely through her efforts and those of Mrs. Stanton, woman suffrage was debated on the floor of the Senate in 1866 and a resolution was introduced in both Houses providing that citizenship be the basis of suffrage. Miss Anthony spoke before committees of every Congress beginning in 1869 and addressed the New York State Legislature scores of times.

The zeal and energy of this woman were incredible. In addition to directing local, State, and national campaigns for woman suffrage and attending widespread hearings on the subject, she never lost an opportunity to speak, write, and work for the advancement of women in education, in the professions, in business, and to win for them full civil rights. At the age of 74, when New York had a constitutional convention, she started a great campaign to secure an amendment allowing women to vote in the State.

She directed the work of sending out literature and petitions and went forth every week to speak all over the State.

Her work bore fruit, finally, but not until 14 years after her death. Senator Sargent introduced in the United States Senate the first woman-suffrage amendment in 1876 and it was introduced year after year through the tireless efforts of Miss Anthony. It was at last adopted in 1920.

I am happy to note that the memory of Susan B. Anthony lives on among us—not only in the more active role women play in our lives today and the regularity with which they exercise their franchise—but in various memorials that have been erected to her.

All of us here today are familiar with the Woman's Monument, by Adelaide Johnson, in the Capitol. Here enshrined in Italian marble are the great triumvirate in the woman's suffrage movement: Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony.

Other memorials to Miss Anthony dot the landscape of our Nation. No place honors her more than her adopted city of Rochester. This homage take many forms.

I am proud that the women of the party which gained her allegiance and loyalty have formed in my community a flourishing organization known as the Susan B. Anthony Republican Club, thus perpetuating her memory and furthering the principles of good government she espoused so strongly. The University of Rochester, which opened its doors to women at the instigation of Miss Anthony, honored her with a hall in her name. There is a bronze tablet to her and her sister in the First Unitarian Church, which they attended. Another bronze tablet to Miss Anthony graces the chapter house of the Irondequoit Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution of which she was a life member. A tree in Genesee Park was dedicated to her in 1935 and School No. 27 in Rochester is called the Susan B. Anthony School.

In 1945 the brick house at 17 Madison Street, where she had lived for 40 years, was purchased through voluntary gifts to serve as a museum. It has been restored in keeping with the times in which Miss Anthony lived. Furniture, books, pictures, and other mementos of an unforgettable life fill the house. The house at 17 Madison Street stands as a unique center to commemorate Miss Anthony and the crusade she led with such fidelity. All concerned with the Susan B. Anthony Memorial are to be congratulated for their work.

Though many years have elapsed since her death, Susan B. Anthony's example and influence still serve to encourage those who continue to strive for an improved status for women and for the furtherance of enlightened government.

Mr. Speaker, Susan B. Anthony truly belongs to the ages. Let us pause today to consider her works and the accomplishments of her life. Let us learn from the example she set for us. Let us follow her lead by adhering steadfastly to the ideals which conscience, rather than expediency, dictate.

I can think of no more fitting words to describe her than those uttered by one of her successors in the suffrage movement, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, at her funeral in 1906:

> This woman for a large part of a half a century was the chief inspiration, counselor and guide of our movement. There were women associated with her from time to time, women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, yet she was clearly the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century, perhaps the greatest of all time. We shall never see her like again.

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson's Statement Relative to National Guard Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 29, 1957

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the statement of Mr. Wilson is extremely regrettable. While I am not familiar with the efficiency of all the National Guard units in the respective States, I am thoroughly familiar with the National Guard in New Mexico.

Just prior to World War II, our National Guard was converted into a mechanized unit and sent to the Philippines. Shortly thereafter, the Philippines were bombed, and our National Guard found itself fighting at Corregidor under then Colonel Sage and General Wainwright. Approximately 50 percent of the National Guard that went to the Philippines did not come back. Colonel Sage and the remaining men spent 3½ years in Japanese prison camps.

It was my privilege to appoint General Sage, who attained that rank in 1945, head of the National Guard of the State of New Mexico. Today the National Guard of New Mexico is considered the most efficient in the United States.

I pray that the statement of the Secretary of Defense will in nowise disturb General Sage or his men in the magnificent job they are doing.

In my opinion the weakest link in our defense is the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, whom I regard as totally unfit for the position he now holds.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father—and not ours alone, but Father of all mankind—who art in heaven—and in the earth and in the temple of humble, contrite hearts—hallowed be Thy name.

Thy kingdom come. Thy will—not ours—be done—and not here alone, but throughout the whole wide world—as it is in heaven.

Give us this day—and not to us alone, but to all the millions who are hungry through the sin of human greed—our daily bread.

And forgive us our trespasses, as—if we dare to live such a test before Thee, our God—we forgive those who trespass against us.

And lead us not into temptation—in this time of fiery trial and testing of our faith and hope and love, without giving us the grace, the strength, and the power of Thy holy spirit—but deliver us from evil, that we may know and be sure, in the darkness as well as in the light, that Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 29, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 25, 1957, the following reports of a committee were submitted during the adjournment of the Senate, on January 28, 1957, and were omitted from the RECORD of Tuesday, January 29, 1957:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 26. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce; without additional amendment (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters and authorizing expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 59. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two temporary additional clerical assistants (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 60. Resolution amending S. Res. 162, 84th Congress, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs (Rept. No. 37);

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing a continuation of the Subcommittee on Disarmament and providing funds therefor (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products (Rept. No. 39); and

S. Res. 63. Resolution to print additional copies of the committee print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business," 84th Congress (Rept. No. 40).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 34. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to employ additional temporary clerical assistants and providing additional funds for the Committee (Rept. No. 42); and

S. Res. 46. Resolution authorizing certain investigations by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and providing funds therefor (Rept. No. 43).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the special Subcommittee To Investigate a Proposed Additional Airport for Washington, D. C., of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SALE OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Borrowing Authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Bertram D. Tallamy, of New York, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—AMBASSADOR TO ITALY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have a few brief comments to make regarding the nomination of Mr. Zellerbach to be our Ambassador to Italy. I do not plan to request a yea-and-nay vote; I merely wish to make my thoughts clear, insofar as this person is concerned, and to shed some light upon his record.

Mr. President, beginning in 1949, the California Department of the American Legion—this matter relates to one of the many facets of Mr. Zellerbach's career, I may say—attempted to secure the removal of what it described as un-American murals displayed in the Rincon Annex Post Office Building. The Legion charged that the murals were derogatory and cast an improper reflection upon the character of our pioneers. The artist who painted the murals had a very long record of affiliation with subversive groups. As a result of the Legion's activities, a hearing was held and there was introduced House Joint Resolution 211, which would have required the removal of the murals, which were described rather vividly by the American Legion.

The record also shows that Mr. Zellerbach was a trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The Chair will recall that the McCarran committee described—and rightly so—the institute as an umbrella for Soviet espionage. This matter was gone into in detail by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. I feel that nothing would be gained by my dealing with it in any great detail at this time.

However, Mr. President, I was rather shocked to find that although one Senator requested that a hearing be held on the Zellerbach nomination, the request was denied, and the Zellerbach nomination was approved by the committee without a hearing other than hearing Zellerbach.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know where the Senator from Wisconsin obtained the information to which he has just referred. So far as I can recall, before the Foreign Relations Committee there was only one Senator who requested a hearing, and the hearing was held for that Senator. Mr. Zellerbach appeared, and answered a number of statements which had been made, including the statement to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred.

It may be that some other Senator had requested a hearing; but to the best of my knowledge only one Senator made such a request, and he was heard.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that the names of other witnesses were submitted to the committee, but those witnesses were not called. In view of the nominee's unusual record, I believe those witnesses should have been called.

The nominee was also a member of the Committee for an Effective Congress. I need not describe that organization to the Senate; the Senate knows it is an extremely left-wing group, interested in electing those who will go far to the left of the old New Deal, and even far to the left of the "modern Republicans." [Laughter.]

The nominee was also a member of the board of directors of what has been known as the Fund for the Republic, which should be more correctly described as the Fund To Destroy the Republic. One of its activities has been to try to discredit any committee which attempts to disclose Communists. The members of the group say they are opposed to communism generally; but woe to anyone who attempts to pick up a single Communist by the scruff of his neck and expose him.

On November 19 of last year, Mr. President, the Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, announced that three antitrust judgments had been entered against firms of which Mr. Zellerbach was an officer. One was the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., of San Francisco. Another was the American Linen Supply Co. The third was the Chicago Towel Co.

On May 12, 1955, the American Linen Supply Co., of which Mr. Zellerbach was an important officer, was charged with violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 3 of the Clayton Act. It was charged that such violation had been committed by the defendant corporation and by unnamed conspirators. I believe the fine in that case was $2,000 for each defendant involved, plus a restraining order.

On May 18, 1955, the complaint was made and filed against the American Linen Supply Co. and the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., again charging them with violating section 1 of the Sherman Act. As I recall, Mr. President, there was a consent decree entered, again with a substantial fine and a restraining order.

I may say that I do not have all the documentation on this matter at hand. I thought the committee would go into this before approving the nomination. I do have material received from the American Legion; among other things, a release dated November 19, 1956, together with certain correspondence. A criminal complaint, not merely a civil action, was entered against Zellerbach's corporation. Again there was no defense to the complaint. I do not recall the penalty which was meted out.

So we have today before us the nomination of a man who was guilty of violating the Antitrust Act, and who, according to the criminal complaint filed by the Attorney General, has been involved with conspirators to commit such violation; a man who, according to the American Legion Department of California, was certainly guilty of activities which I would hate to find had been engaged in by an Ambassador who is to represent us in Italy, where the fight against communism has been touch and go for some time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the body of the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of Mr. James D. Zellerbach, who was named by the President to be Ambassador to Italy, and now awaits confirmation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield before he gives up the floor, may I ask him a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the biographical sketch set forth the criminal complaints made against his firm by the Attorney General, the disposition of such complaints, the fines, and the injunctions entered to discontinue unlawful acts which were being done?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The testimony——

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of the testimony; I am speaking of the biographical sketch.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The biographical sketch does not. The testimony before the committee did not indicate there were any criminal charges leveled against Mr. Zellerbach.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the very able Senator that a criminal complaint was filed against the members of the company, and that was disposed of, according to the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES DAVID ZELLERBACH

J. D. Zellerbach has had extensive and varied experience in business, in industrial leadership, and in international affairs.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Zellerbach is one of the American business leaders who has been active in international affairs over the past 10 years. From 1945 to 1948 he served as United States employer delegate and as vice chairman of the governing body of the International Labor Organization in Geneva. From 1948 to 1950 Mr. Zellerbach was Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration Special Mission to Italy where he instituted and supervised the Marshall plan program which contributed significantly to Italy's postwar economic recovery and to diminishing Communist influence in that strategic area of Western Europe. In 1953 he served as Alternate United States Delegate to the Eighth General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, representing the United States in the U. N.'s consideration of the problem of the economic development of underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Since 1954 Mr. Zellerbach has been a member of the United States delegation to the Bilderberg Conferences, a series of high-level private meetings with European leaders arranged by Prince Bernhardt of the Netherlands to facilitate better European-American understanding and cooperation.

Mr. Zellerbach has kept in close touch with the Italian situation in many ways. He has visited Italy, most recently last year, and he has had informal discussions with Italian leaders visiting the United States. Last March Mr. Zellerbach presided at the San Francisco dinner reception for Italian President Gronchi and his party. Mr. Zellerbach is chairman of the America-Italy Society of San Francisco and a director of the America-Italy Society of New York. He is a member of the advisory board of the Italian-American chamber of commerce on the Pacific coast. He supported the translation of the Federalist papers into Italian, and is also underwriting the translation of a leading American study of the United States Constitution—both for the University of Rome. In 1952 Mr. Zellerbach was awarded the Star of Italian Solidarity, first class, for his Marshall plan service in Italy. Last year he was awarded the title of Commendatore, Knightly Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs in Rome.

Mr. Zellerbach has also participated in foreign policy matters as a director of the Foreign Policy Association, a director and member of the executive committee of The Asia Foundation, a trustee of the Institute of International Education, a director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, and as a member of the Council of Foreign Relations.

INDUSTRIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. Zellerbach has also been active in promoting enlightened American business practices in the public interest. As chairman of the Committee for Economic Development over the past year, he has supervised the further strengthening of this organization of business leaders whose contributions to public policy over the past decade—from its work on postwar full employment to its recent studies on such problems as agriculture, highways, and taxation—have helped facilitate the continuing growth of the American economy. Mr. Zellerbach has also been chairman of the National Manpower Council at Columbia University since its inception in 1951, where he has guided comprehensive studies of America's skilled manpower problems and the development of programs to help the Nation meet these growing needs for more and more better educated and trained people.

Mr. Zellerbach was named "Business Statesman of the Year" for 1956 by the National Sales Executives last June. In accepting the award he spoke on the Challenge to Business Statesmanship and stressed the need for businessmen "to operate the economy as a public trust, for the benefit of all the people" in order to develop further "the broad public confidence which is essential to the continued vitality of our free enterprise system."

Mr. Zellerbach's other public-service activities include membership on the board of governors of the American Red Cross, on the national council of the United Negro College Fund, as director and national vice chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (North Pacific division), trustee of the National Fund for Medical Education, president of the San Francisco Symphony Association, director of the San Francisco Opera Association, Director of the San Francisco Museum of Art, director of Mt. Zion Hospital of San Francisco, and trustee of Mills College in Oakland, Calif.

BUSINESS

Mr. Zellerbach has been president of Crown-Zellerbach Corp. (San Francisco) since 1938. He has guided Crown-Zellerbach's development into the second largest paper company in the world. Crown-Zellerbach's net sales for 1956 are expected to approximate $450 million and net profits $50 million. This represents a 900 percent increase in sales and 833 percent in profits under Mr. Zellerbach's presidency. Crown-Zellerbach, formerly a Pacific Northwest operation, now has plants extending from Miami, Fla., to Ocean Falls, British Columbia. It produces a widely diversified range of more than 400 different forest products—from structural timber to facial tissue. It is a wholly integrated operation—controlling every phase of its operations from tree planting through logging, pulping paper and other manufacturing, converting, and wholesaling. In accordance with Mr. Zellerbach's guiding philosophy of being merchants of trees, Crown-Zellerbach seeks to use each tree it grows to the greatest economic advantage—whether for paper, plywood, lumber, or chemical products.

Mr. Zellerbach is a director of Crown-Zellerbach, of Rayonier Inc. (dissolving pulp, paper pulp and fine papers), of the Wells Fargo Bank of San Francisco, of the California Packing Corp., and of the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

PERSONAL

Mr. Zellerbach was born in San Francisco on January 17, 1892. He is married and has two sons. He received the bachelor of science degree at the University of California

in 1913, and was named alumnus of the year by the university in 1949. He has honorary degrees of doctor of laws from St. Mary's College and from Occidental College.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will whoever has the floor yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the Senator from New York get the floor in his own right, if he wants to discuss the nomination.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not think there is any Member of the Senate who knows Mr. Zellerbach better than I do. If there is, I should be very happy to know it. I have known Mr. Zellerbach for 25 years, personally and intimately. Up to 1941, before I went into the Army, I personally served as attorney in the East for his company, the Crown-Zellerbach Co. and the law firm with which I was connected up to the end of 1954 served them thereafter. So I know something about this matter, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Though I understand the traditions of this body, and though I had no intention of participating in debate until I could make some direct contribution on a measure based upon my own experience which could be effective and useful, I think it would be a dereliction of duty for me to sit silent when the Senate is considering a subject of which I know so much, and which involves sending to Italy an ambassador to represent our Government in one of the most critical areas of the world.

I should like to tell the Senator from Wisconsin that I am distinctly proud of any connection I have had with Ambassador Zellerbach. I believed the particular matter to which the Senator refers was a case in which I represented the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., and it occurred in the thirties. My recollection is it was about 20 years ago. I did not know that subject was coming up today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may correct him?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The information was filed, in one case, on May 17, 1955, and in another case on May 18, 1955. Another one was filed on May 12, 1955. So the Senator does stand corrected when he says 20 years ago. The informations were filed only a year and a half ago, or less.

Mr. JAVITS. I think I can clarify that for the Senator by making this firm, factual statement: At no time I know of has Mr. Zellerbach been found personally guilty in any antitrust proceeding with which he was personally connected, nor has he personally been fined. All the proceedings to which the Senator refers related to charges in connection with antitrust matters. The one complaint in May 1955, which involved the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., was not criminal but civil. Indeed, such antitrust cases have occurred with respect to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Radio Corporation of America, and many of the greatest corporations in our country. There are over 400 antitrust consent decrees outstanding. Indeed, the Justice Department engages in a measure of trade regulation in this way.

The particular matter to which the Senator has referred involved a highly complicated legal question of patents, in which there was a question of tie-in agreements. That is a complex legal question which arises with respect to many corporations. That was the question involved in the case of the American Linen Supply Co. to which the Senator referred. We could hardly find a great industrialist heading one of the large companies who has not been involved in some measure in proceedings growing out of the antitrust laws. If we are going to take that as the gage when persons are nominated to be Ambassadors, I think we are going to find our field of able men very limited.

Secondly, and what is most important, we are sending a man abroad to represent our country. Shall we send him abroad to do the job with our confidence and respect with the dignity which should surround the office and with the feeling among the people abroad that we are sending him as a representative of America of whom we are proud, or are we going to send him abroad under a cloud?

Mr. President, it would be easy to sit in the Senate today and say nothing, for the committee has unanimously reported Mr. Zellerbach's nomination, and probably the Senate will do the same today. The Senator from Wisconsin has already stated that no record vote is to be requested.

I think some facts should be spread on the record and made clear which were explained before the committee. They should be made clear in the eyes of the people of the country, and I shall attempt to do that.

First as to the matter of consent decrees, certainly the company with which Mr. Zellerbach was connected, in common with many other American corporations, has been involved in antitrust suits, but we have not considered such procedures as involving the moral integrity of the president of any one such corporation. I hope we shall not do so in this case.

Reference was made by our colleague to Mr. Zellerbach as being a trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is well known that is a Pacific coast organization which a great many people in that area joined years ago. But the dates during which Mr. Zellerbach was a member of that institute should be made very clear in the record. Those dates were 1947 to 1949, quite a number of years ago, and he served as trustee at the request of the president of Leland Stanford University, Dr. Sproul, at the same time that Dr. Sproul was a chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Dr. Sproul was president of the University of California.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. Dr. Sproul was succeeded as chairman by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, and formerly Secretary of the Interior, in President Hoover's Cabinet. It was under those auspices that Mr. Zellerbach served from February 18, 1947, to February 15, 1949.

Mr. President, I might say the list of the board of trustees when Mr. Zellerbach was elected, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, comprises some of the most distinguished names, both on the Pacific coast, and, in the land, names of people who are beyond question in their character and standing in the community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. B. Atherton, Walter F. Dillingham, Gregg M. Sinclair, Hawaii; George T. Cameron, Henry F. Grady, Louis Lapham, Donald B. Tresidder, Brayton Wilbur, San Francisco; Ray Lyman Wilbur, Stanford; Robert G. Sproul, San Francisco; Clarence A. Dykstra, Donald M. Nelson, Los Angeles; Abbott Low Moffat, Sumner Welles, Washington; John L. Curtis, Joseph P. Chamberlain, Arthur H. Dean, Charles K. Gamble, Huntington Gilchrist, William R. Herod, Brooks Emeny, New York; Rupert Emerson, Harvard; Knight Biggerstaff, Cornell University; Owen Lattimore, Baltimore; John R. Hersey, Connecticut; Louise Wright, Chicago; John K. Fairbank, Harvard; E. C. Auchter, Hawaii; Heaton Wrenn, Boyd A. Martin, Idaho; Edward W. Allen, Raymond B. Allen, Charles E. Martin, Seattle; O. C. Hansen, Daniel E. Koshland, Rene A. May, San Francisco; Arthur G. Coons, Los Angeles; Len deCaux, Mortimer Graves, Washington; Edward C. Carter, Frederick V. Field, Carrington Goodrich, Donald Teuksbury, Christian Arndt, New York; George B. Cressey, Syracuse; Lauchlin Currie, Washington; Benjamin H. Kizer, Spokane; Herbert S. Little, Seattle; William W. Lockwood, New York; David N. Rowe, Yale; Lynn White, Jr., San Francisco.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that one of the points made in the statement of the representatives of the American Legion was that the Fund for the Republic supported efforts to develop rules of procedure for congressional investigating committees.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In order that the record of Mr. Zellerbach may be complete, when I refer to his activities in the Institute of Pacific Relations, I say that he was active and voted against an investigation of Communist influence in the institute. It was proved very conclusively before the McCarran committee that there were such influences, and, as I say, the institute was referred to as an umbrella for Soviet espionage. Mr. Zellerbach was one of those within the institute who voted against exposing those Communist influences.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to state the facts as stated by Mr. Zellerbach before the Foreign Relations Committee. There is apparently some difference on the question to which the Senator has referred. Mr. Zellerbach states that, according to his records, he did not attend the trustees' meeting on April 22, 1947, when the vote referred to was taken. Mr. Zellerbach states that he was not a party to that matter at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I invite the Senator's attention to volume XIV, page 4944, of the hearings before the Eastland committee in 1952. There the Senator will find proof that Mr. Zellerbach did vote against investigating Communist influence within the institute, regardless of what Zellerbach may have said before the committee. It is only natural that he would deny that accusation, because of his past record.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to enter into any controversy with the Senator over that question. I merely wish to say this: Mr. Zellerbach states that the entire question of investigation was submitted to the membership of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and turned down by a very large vote. I shall look at the page to which the Senator refers. I am only referring to the facts as given to us by Mr. Zellerbach himself.

Finally, as to his membership on the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, he was joined by some very distinguished Americans, as I stated a moment ago. In August 1954 the American Bar Association saw fit to carry through with recommendations on the very subject matter which was referred to, namely, that of rules for congressional investigating committees.

As to Mr. Zellerbach's action in joining in a telegram from the Committee for an Effective Congress, I believe that, as a distinguished American joining with other distinguished Americans, it was very proper for him to make his views known to the Members of this body. Indeed, an overwhelming majority of the membership of this body agreed with those views. He was joined by some very distinguished Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the list of those signing the telegram to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Douglas M. Black (publisher); Cass Canfield (publisher, Harper's); Will Clayton (businessman, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs); John Cowles (newspaper publisher, Minneapolis Star and Tribune); L. W. Douglas (former Ambassador to United Kingdom); Samuel Goldwyn (movie producer); Erwin N. Griswold (dean, Harvard Law School); Albert J. Hayes (labor leader, National Association of Machinists); Paul Helms (corporation executive, Bakery Industry); Paul Hoffman (business executive and former ECA Administrator); Palmer Hoyt (Denver Post); Chester J. Laroche (advertising executive, former Chairman of War Advertising Council); Fred Lazarus, Jr. (Federated Department Stores); J. P. Marquand (author); Ralph McGill (editor, Atlanta Constitution); Reinhold Niebuhr (clergyman); J. R. Parten (president, Woodley Petroleum Co., Houston, Tex.); Frederick D. Patterson (educator, president and founder of United Negro College Fund, Inc.); Howard C. Petersen (president, Fidelity Trust Co. and former Assistant Secretary of War); Walter Reuther (labor leader, vice president AFL–CIO); Spyros P. Skouras (movie producer, president, 20th Century-Fox); Henry W. Wriston (president, Brown University); J. D. Zellerbach (president, Crown Zellerbach Corp.).

Mr. JAVITS. Finally, I think it is a rather good thing to air these matters completely, and I think it is very wise and necessary, in the interest of our country, to air them on the affirmative side, as well.

Who is this man Zellerbach, and why was he appointed to be Ambassador to Italy? It was not merely because he was an agreeable personality, but because he has talents and abilities which are necessary and useful in the interest of our country.

First, he is, and has been for a very long time, the president of one of the outstandingly successful corporations in our country, the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., the second largest paper company in the world. That corporation is successful not because it has made a great deal of money, but because it is literally an ornament of industry on the Pacific coast, because it has the most outstanding labor-management relations in that part of the world. It is credited with great developments in forest lands and urban areas in that part of the United States, because it is a business which operates in the public interest.

Second—and very important—here is a man who takes his civic responsibility very seriously. The reason why he became involved in the controversy over the murals was that he is probably the leading citizen of San Francisco in terms of art and music, which are so important. It is interesting to note that in connection with that particular controversy the House subcommittee, which held hearings on the resolution to which the Senator from Wisconsin referred, did not even report the resolution to the full committee. So Mr. Zellerbach takes his civic duty at home seriously; and he takes seriously his duty to the Nation as a whole.

Recently he has been the chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, a very important economic organization in our country. Last June he was named the business statesman of the year for 1956 by the National Sales Executives. That is hardly a Communist organization.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Let me complete this one thought.

Mr. Zellerbach is a member of the Board of Governors of the American Red Cross; the National Council of the United Negro College Fund; trustee of the National Fund for Medical Education; and also president of the San Francisco Symphony Association, director of the San Francisco Opera Association, director of the San Francisco Museum of Art, and so forth.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. In order that the record may be clear so far as the controversy with respect to the murals is concerned, let me say that I have never seen the murals in question. I am relying on the report of the California Department of the American Legion, in which the murals are described as "definitely subversive and designed to spread Communist propaganda, and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare. The artist who painted the murals had a voluminous record of affiliation with subversive groups."

Let me make it clear that I am relying on the American Legion. I have a great deal of respect for that organization. When it says that the murals are "definitely subversive and designed to spread Communist propaganda," I attach considerable weight to that report.

Again we find Mr. Zellerbach coming to the defense of those who wanted to keep those murals on display. That is only another small facet of his character.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a portion of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations with particular reference to the nomination of James David Zellerbach to be Ambassador to Italy. The portion to which I refer begins on page 148 and ends on page 169.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say to the Senator that I do not think I have ever objected to the insertion of anything in the RECORD, especially anything offered by the very able minority leader. However, I assume the Senator is attempting to insert the statements made by Mr. Zellerbach himself. There is no testimony by any other witnesses. Does the excerpt include any of the material furnished by the American Legion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is mistaken. I am including the questions raised by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who asked that the letter from the American Legion to which the Senator has referred be introduced into the record.

I am not in the habit of inserting self-serving statements. I am asking to have printed in the RECORD a certain portion of the hearings, which I could read to the Senate if I wished to take the time to do so. I am asking to have printed in the RECORD testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which a number of these questions were raised, to which answers were given. The testimony may or may not be satisfactory to the Senator from Wisconsin. However, I thought it was quite in order, as the Republican leader of the Senate and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to make this request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator tell us briefly what this excerpt contains?

First, as I understand, it contains the testimony of Mr. Zellerbach himself.

Second, I understand that it contains a letter from someone in the American Legion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. It contains the testimony of Mr. Zellerbach, who appeared before the committee. It begins with a statement by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in which he stated that he had received a complaint from the American Legion in California. That letter appears in

full in the record and was read in full by the clerk of the committee, so that all members of the committee who were present knew of the statements which had been made by that distinguished organization in my own State of California. So there was no attempt to hide the fact that opposition to Mr. Zellerbach was expressed. Certain questions were raised subsequently by various members of the committee.

I am not asking that the testimony be edited. I am asking that the entire testimony covering Mr. Zellerbach's nomination be made available for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATION OF JAMES DAVID ZELLERBACH TO BE AMBASSADOR TO ITALY

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Zellerbach?

Senator LANGER. I had a complaint from the American Legion out in California. Do you want to read this now, or after he comes in? What is your method of procedure here?

Senator MANSFIELD. Why don't you read it now?

Mr. MARCY. Mr. Zellerbach is here.

Senator LANGER. Would you be so kind as to read this out loud? Mr. MANSFIELD said he wants to hear it.

Mr. MARCY. This is a letter from the American Legion, dated December 17, 1956, to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senate:

"DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Many in the American Legion are seriously disturbed over the President's appointment of J. D. Zellerbach as Ambassador to Italy. The appointment appears somewhat surprising in view of a Department of Justice press release of November 19 relating to the antitrust difficulties of the Crown-Zellerbach Corp. of which Mr. Zellerbach served as president until the past few days. A consent antitrust judgment was entered by the Federal Court of Chicago on November 19, successfully terminating restraints of trade in the linen supply and towel business.

"It is believed the American public will view with a critical eye the appointment of an individual who has been the head of a firm involved with the Government in this type of litigation. The Department of Justice release is enclosed herewith.

"In 1954 Zellerbach became involved in the activities of the leftwing National Committee for an Effective Congress headed by Telford Taylor. He was the signer of a telegram dated July 23, 1954, based upon an appeal by the National Committee for an Effective Congress which was sent to all Members of the United States Senate, asking support of a measure which, if passed, would make any Senator unsafe and subject to censure whenever his activities met with disapproval of leftwing groups. For details see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 10, page 12741.

"Zellerbach, according to a brochure entitled 'Platform Policy of United States World Federalists, Inc., 1954–55,' was a member of the organization's national advisory board. According to recent newspaper articles, Zellerbach has resigned from a 3-year appointment as a member of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. This is the organization of which Robert M. Hutchins is president and which has $15 million to disburse for which we believe to be highly questionable causes. Included in their projects are attempts to discredit congressional committees in the field of security. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has recently been conducting inquiries concerning some of the fund's projects.

"According to an affidavit of Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, dated April 16, 1952, James D. Zellerbach as a member of the board of trustees of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1947, voted against Kohlberg's resolution calling for an investigation of Communist influence in the Institute of Pacific Relations. For more complete details see Internal Security Subcommittee hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, part 14, 1952, page 4944.

"Beginning in 1949, the California Department of the American Legion attempted to secure the removal of un-American murals displayed in Rincon Annex Post Office Building, San Francisco, Calif. The Legion charged that the murals did not truly depict the romance and glory of early California history, but did cast a most derogatory and improper reflection upon the character of the pioneers. The charge was also made that other murals are definitely subversive and designed to spread communistic propaganda and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare. The artist who painted the murals had a very voluminous record of affiliation with subversive groups.

"As a result of the controversy a hearing was held before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on May 1, 1955, under House Joint Resolution 211. Pages 78 and 79 of the hearing reflect the fact that J. D. Zellerbach was one of a committee which drafted and signed a statement opposing adoption of House Joint Resolution 211, which, if adopted, would have required the Administrator of General Services to remove the murals from the Post Office Annex.

"It is hoped that the above résumé will be of assistance to you in judging the qualifications of J. D. Zellerbach to represent the United States as Ambassador to Italy when the appointment is before the Senate for confirmation.

"Sincerely yours,

"LEE R. PENNINGTON,
"Assistant Director."

I should have identified this further by saying this was from the American Legion, on the letterhead stating "The American Legion, National Americanism Commission, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.," and this is from the Office of the National Director.

There is attached the Department of Justice press release of 1956.

Senator LANGER. The press release simply shows that the Zellerbach Corp. pleaded nolo contendere in the linen and towel matter.

The CHAIRMAN. When he comes before us I suppose you will ask him questions about this.

Senator LANGER. Well, I leave that to the committee. I do not know Mr. Zellerbach. I never met him. All I know is this was sent to me, and I want to file it with you as chairman of the committee and bring it to the attention of you gentlemen.

Mr. KNOWLAND ought to know Mr. Zellerbach. He comes from California, does he not?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes. I know him. I have approved his nomination.

Senator LANGER. So I know nothing about the matter, except it seems to me if we are appropriating $300,000 now in the next few days for the Antimonopoly Committee, to approve an ambassador who just pleaded guilty, nolo contendere, it does not make sense to me; and, as I say, I know nothing about the facts themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall we have him in? We are not going to act on him right away. Shall we have him in?

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask whether he has been found fully acceptable by the Italian Government or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Are you asking me?

Senator AIKEN. Yes. Do you know whether the Italian Government——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know.

Senator AIKEN. As I understand it, it is customarily asked of the Government to whom sent.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think he has.

Senator AIKEN. He has been approved by the Italian Government?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know. Do you know?

Mr. MARCY. That is true. They do not submit Ambassadors' names to the Senate for confirmation until they have received the——

The CHAIRMAN. They have been consulted?

Mr. MARCY. They have been consulted.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have no objection?

Mr. MARCY. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Zellerbach is here, and I think we ought to give him the courtesy of having him appear before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes. I think we ought to hear him, anyway.

Have him come in.

STATEMENT OF JAMES DAVID ZELLERBACH

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Zellerbach, you have been nominated Ambassador to Italy.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of us have not had the pleasure of knowing you, and we wanted to meet you in person, and it is for that reason we asked you to come before us. And no doubt you will be glad to answer any questions which any of the members may have to ask you.

I will ask Senator LANGER if he has any questions to ask.

Senator LANGER. Yes.

Mr. Zellerbach, you recently were or your company was a defendant in an antitrust suit in Chicago.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes.

Senator LANGER. How long had that case been pending?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Oh, I can't say. It's been going on for some time. It was a patent license case where the owners of the patent had licensed our company to operate under their patents, to supply them with part of the products which were dispensed from the containers, the towel containers they were.

So far as we were concerned, the matter was simply settled by an adjustment in the contract and a change in the license agreement. It is one of these technical patent cases. I do not know the details of it.

Senator LANGER. I notice by a press release of the Attorney General, he specifically accused you and some other concerns of "dividing the territory."

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, there was part of the license agreement under which we operated—we didn't own the patents, the other people did, and they licensed us to operate that way.

These contracts were all, so far as we were concerned, the contracts were all approved by our attorneys. We assumed they were legal.

Senator LANGER. From what Mr. Brownell says here, you agreed not to solicit other customers.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. As I say, this was part of our licensing agreement, the contract under which we operated, these contracts were approved by our counsel, and we entered into them, and I would assume that they knew what they were doing.

Senator LANGER. Who was your counsel?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Phillip Ehrlich in San Francisco.

Senator LANGER. How much were you fined?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Nothing at all. We weren't fined.

Senator LANGER. Who was fined? Who paid the $2,000?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. We were not involved in that case.

Senator LANGER. You were not?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. No. I think there were several, there was a criminal case against the people who owned the licenses and some other people, and we were not involved in this.

Ours was this—it was only one phase of this case in which we were licensed to operate under these patents, and we were licensed to operate and sell in certain territories. We were not fined.

Senator LANGER. You pleaded nolo contendere in the case.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. No.

Senator LANGER. The Attorney General says you did.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. No, I think not. We signed a consent decree in which we agreed to change our patent—we agreed that we would change our operating agreement.

Senator LANGER. Now, what about the Fund for the Republic, what was your connection with that?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I was a trustee for 3 years.

Senator LANGER. Three years?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes.

Senator LANGER. What is the purpose of that organization?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I think the purpose of the organization has been set forth in the documents which have been put out by the organization. It was set up primarily under—on the basis of a study made by a group of experts for the Ford Foundation when they decided on their program originally when the Foundation was set up, and the purpose of this particular phase of the operation was to, briefly, to protect the Bill of Rights.

I have the report put out by the Fund for the Republic, if you would like to see it, I have it out in my briefcase, in which it sets forth the purposes.

Senator LANGER. I think you ought to file that here.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes; I would be very glad to.

Senator LANGER. File it with the chairman.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. This is the report of all the activities of the foundation from its inception until last October when this report was issued, shows all the grants that were made, the purposes for which they were made, the purposes of the foundation itself, all clearly set forth.

Senator LANGER. You also belong, or was it part of—do you also belong to a different organization, or is this part of the work of the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, the Fund for the Republic actually makes grants to other organizations, and also makes grants for the purpose of making studies of various problems.

For instance, the Communist problem, a very substantial grant has been made there. Very substantial grants were made in the race-relations field. There have been grants made to the bar association to make certain studies.

These are all listed in this document, Senator, all of them.

Senator LANGER. There was one grant made, was there, to a Committee To Reform the Congress?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I don't think so. There was a study made by the American Bar Association which was financed from the Fund for the Republic, which went into the procedures of some of the congressional committees, I think. But the fund itself did not make the study.

Senator LANGER. In simple fairness to Mr. Zellerbach, I think we ought to have this letter read.

Will you read it again, and I would like to have your comments on it.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I guess I have heard about that.

Mr. MARCY. Should I read it again?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I don't think it is necessary. For me it isn't.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to have it read?

Mr. MARCY. I think Mr. Zellerbach has read it.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I have read it. I know about the letter.

Senator LANGER. I would like to have it read again since Senator MORSE came in. He would be interested.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been referred to, Senator MORSE. Would you like to ask some questions?

Senator MORSE. I haven't any questions to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you were introduced for that purpose.

Mr. MARCY. Do you want this letter read in the record again?

Senator LANGER. I would like to have it read again.

(The letter referred to was again read by Mr. Marcy.)

Senator LANGER. Have you any comments to make on that in addition to what you have already said?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, I can comment on each one of these points, if you would like.

I have already commented on the Fund for the Republic. I can give you the copy of this report of the fund, which lists all of the grants made by the fund up until last October. I think you will probably find most of the grants made were for very good purposes. One or two of them were not very good, and that is true.

So far as this other point, the censure resolution, this is true; I signed this telegram to the Senators. As a matter of fact, the Senate approved the resolution, so I suppose the Senate agreed with the position I had taken, or I agreed with the position the Senate had taken; let's put it that way.

The United World Federalists which is mentioned in there, I was on the advisory board of the United World Federalists, and I can give you their brochure or pamphlet that was issued at the time, which called for a strong support for the United Nations. That was the major activity.

The murals that are mentioned were painted in the Rincon Post Office in San Francisco. I happen to be a member of the board of trustees of the San Francisco Museum of Art. This is the modern art museum of art in San Francisco.

The people, the curator and others on the board, and particularly our artist members, felt that these, feel that these, are very good paintings. Most of the people on the board of trustees backed up the viewpoint of the experts on our staff and on our board, and opposed the destruction of these murals, which we considered good art.

Now, as a matter of fact, the committee which heard this, discussed this resolution, did not even report it out.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think at this point, perhaps, the biographical material on Mr. Zellerbach might go into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(The biographical sketch of James David Zellerbach is as follows:)

"JAMES DAVID ZELLERBACH

"Born: San Francisico, January 17, 1892.

"Education: B. S., University of California, 1913. LL. D., St. Mary's College, 1954.

"Marital status: Married, two children.

"Experience:

"Nongovernment: President, director, Crown-Zellerbach Corp.; chairman, director, Fibreboard Products Inc.; director, member executive committee, Rayonier, Inc.; director, Wells Fargo Bank & Trust Co.; Canadian Bank of Commerce; California Packing Corp.; trustee, National Fund for Medical Education; president, Crown-Zellerbach Foundation; director, Stanford Research Institute, American Korean Foundation, San Francisco Opera Association, San Francisco Mus. Art, San Francisco Federated Fund, Mt. Zion Hospital, National Jewish Hospital; president, San Francisco Symphony Association; chairman, National Manpower Council; director, National Industrial Conference Board, American Arbitration Association, and Fund for the Republic; trustee, Committee on Economic Development; governor, San Francisco Bay Area Council.

"Government: 1953, alternate delegate eighth General Assembly of U. N.; 1948–50, Chief, ECA Special Mission to Italy; 1945–48, United States employer delegate, vice chairman governing body, ILO;

"Memberships: National Conference of Christians and Jews; Foreign Policy Association; American Association for U. N.; International Chamber of Commerce; National Planning Association.

"Present position: President, director, Crown-Zellerbach Corp. Office: 343 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif. Home: 2790 Broadway, San Francisco. Legal residence: California."

Senator KNOWLAND. If I might ask just a few questions of Mr. Zellerbach.

You were in 1948 to 1950 the Chief of the ECA mission to Italy, to which you have now been appointed Ambassador. Would you very briefly give for the record just what your job was at that time, and how much traveling you did in Italy, and whether that was your first visit there, or if you had been there before, some of your background to qualify you to be American Ambassador?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, I can start from the beginning, that in effect I have not been there before I went down under the Marshall plan. I had visited Italy as a young man out of college a few weeks as a tourist. I did not go back again until I went down in July of 1948 as chief of the Marshall plan mission. I went to Italy. Then I set up the mission.

I was chief of the mission for 2 years. During this time I visited in every part of Italy, from the far north to the far south, Sicily, Sardinia. I think there is no part of Italy that I did not visit, that I did not discuss with the local people the problems, the economic problems, which were the problems I was dealing with.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you speak Italian fluently?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Not fluently. I speak enough to order my meals.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand it fluently?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I understand it much better than I can speak it. After all, it is 7 years, and I have forgotten a good deal that I knew, but I suspect I can pick it up again.

During this period I was responsible for recommending approval of the various projects, economic projects, both in the industrial and in the agricultural field, that I think are the basis for the present recovery of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Were your recommendations adopted?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. In most instances, yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. Have you been back to Italy since——

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes.

Senator KNOWLAND (continuing). Your assignment?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes, I have been back to Italy almost every year since I came home in July of 1950. I have never lost my interest in what is going on in Italy. I have kept my friendships going.

The present Prime Minister is a friend of mine. He was Minister of Agriculture when I was there. The present President of Italy, Mr. Gronchi, is an old friend of mine; the head of the Christian Democratic Party, the dominant party there is an old friend of mine, and they are and have been in correspondence with me.

Mr. Martino, the Foreign Minister, is a friend of mine. I would say that I have kept my contacts pretty thoroughly.

Senator KNOWLAND. You not only have a general knowledge and background of Italy from your own service there in the ECA Mission, but since that time you have gone back on several occasions, as you have said, almost every year, and you do have a wide acquaintance of people, both in the economic, cultural, and economic life?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Business leaders and labor leaders and the non-Communist labor leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. Both?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. No. Not the Communists.

Senator KNOWLAND. Let me ask this additional question. You partially answered it, and while I realize members of the committee may differ, I hope that you will pursue your picking up again, as fluently as possible, of a knowledge of the Italian language, because it has always seemed to me that an Ambassador would be under some handicap if he did not speak the language of a country to which he was accredited.

If we would just reverse the situation and consider what a handicap an Ambassador from another country to America would have if he did not speak English and therefore, as he got around the country, could not mix and mingle with people, who otherwise would have to operate through an interpreter, I think the importance of that is apparent.

I think, while there may be times when a country would be justified in sending someone because of other qualifications, I do think as a general rule it is highly desirable that the Ambassador speak the language of the country to which he is accredited.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I think you are right.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. Zellerbach a question or two?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Senator MORSE. First, the Senator from California may claim him as a citizen of California, which I am sure he is, but we claim him as sort of an adopted citizen in our State, because Mr. Zellerbach over the years has been one of the great citizens of the west coast, and has exercised great influence for good in my own State.

In fact, I have had a variety of associations with him. I want to testify as to his great ability to lose as well as win, because I was once an arbitrator in a major labor dispute on the west coast which involved his company, and he lost, I mean his company did. He personally was not involved. But he was perfectly willing to have me serve in a second case, which shows that at least he was willing to stand on the record, too.

I am interested in some of these charges which are made against him by the American Legion in their Americanism Committee, because I have had a little experience with some of those charges myself of recent date, and a couple of them were used against me not so many weeks ago, and I want to refer to them here by questioning Mr. Zellerbach for a moment.

This one about the Committee for the Election of a More Effective Congress, Mr. Zellerbach, it has supported and endorsed Republicans as well as Democrats, has it not?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. That is true, yes.

Senator MORSE. It has been completely bipartisan in its endorsements.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes.

Senator MORSE. It has supported me in two campaigns, to my knowledge, given me some financial contribution, I see on the books, although it was not given to me personally.

On the membership of the committee, it is composed of Republicans and Democrats, is that not true?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, I am not really too familiar with it, with the membership of the committee. I have had a long-distance relationship with it, really. But it is nonpartisan.

Senator MORSE. My understanding about it is that about the only association you have had has been a pocketbook association, in that you have contributed some funds to its activities.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. That is right.

Senator MORSE. Second, Mr. Zellerbach, this Institute of Pacific Relations, was Ray Lyman Wilbur a member of that organization?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes; he was a member of the association, but at the time I became a trustee, Bob Sproul, president of the University of California, was the president of it, and I think it was he who asked me to go on the board.

Ray Lyman Wilbur suggested me.

Senator MORSE. I asked about Ray Lyman Wilbur, because it was he who invited me to join the organization, which I did. I was in good company, and I still feel that way, although there was some evidence at a later date that some subversive elements tried to make use of the organization, at least there is some prima facie evidence to that effect, but I think it would be a sad thing if all the wonderful men and women who belonged to that organization are going to be smeared because of the fact that some people tried to creep into it, and were pretty well checked.

But is it not your understanding that some of the outstanding leaders of the west coast, in universities and professional life, were members of that institute?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Oh, yes. That is true. I have a list of the members of the board at that time. There were a few that turned out to be not so good later, but we didn't know it at the time.

Senator MORSE. My third question, and it is just a matter of form, but let's get it on the record: Is it not true, Mr. Zellerbach, that all through your business life you have taken a very active interest on the west coast in the work of organizations which have sought to improve the administration of Government, and have sought to bring the Government closer to the people of our country?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. That is true.

Senator MORSE. I want to say that I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the committee on Americanism of the American Legion does not know this man as well as I know him, because I know that from my own observations there is no basis in fact for any reflection upon his patriotism or his dedication to our system of constitutional government.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions to ask the witness?

Senator HUMPHREY. Only this, Mr. Chairman: I want to say I was very pleased when I read the President was going to nominate Mr. Zellerbach for this important post. I think it is a highly important post, and he has demonstrated already by his record of public service and his private attainments that he is more than qualified for it, and I think this bodes well for the future of our foreign policy in the area that you will serve.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions to be asked?

Senator MANSFIELD. May I make a statement, too. I think Mr. Zellerbach has done an outstanding job when he held the rank of Ambassador and was head of our ECA mission to Italy for some 3 years.

I realize, of course, that he is stepping into the shoes of an extraordinary woman who has performed an outstanding service in Italy, but I am quite sure that Mr. Zellerbach will not only relearn the Italian language, but revive as much as possible his old contacts with the present officials in the present government.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the occasion go by without endorsing those sentiments. I have known Mr. Zellerbach's career for a long time. I first met him in Italy, as a matter of fact, in 1948, too, and the success of our general program in Italy, I think, is certainly good testimony and very persuasive testimony as to the wisdom of his selection for the program of that country.

I think Italy has done better than any country in which we have had a program.

Senator WILEY. I think we can agree with all this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions to ask the witness, is what I am asking.

Senator HUMPHREY. I did not find out if he had ever been to Minnesota.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Yes; I have.

Senator HUMPHREY. I figured you had. You just had that countenance of fulfillment of some of the great purposes of life.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Zellerbach.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to complete the discussion on the question of the murals, I should like to state for the record that a hearing was held on May 1, 1953, before the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds of the other body, and that the resolution to which reference was made, relating to the murals, was not reported by the subcommittee.

To continue briefly with Mr. Zellerbach's affirmative record, he has been chairman of the National Manpower Council of Columbia University since its inception in 1951. Many of us have seen the reports of the council, which have been extremely valuable to our country in terms of availability of both civilian and military manpower.

As to the reason why Mr. Zellerbach is to be sent to Rome, this is not a businessman who was picked out of the air to be sent on an ambassadorial mission. Mr. Zellerbach has an outstanding record with respect to Italian-United States relations.

From 1948 to 1950, he was chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration special mission to Italy. Many Members of this body have been there. I myself was there during that time, and Members of the other body were there during that period. I believe that everyone who was there was deeply impressed by the outstanding efficiency of that operation, and by the popularity of Mr. Zellerbach with Italian officialdom and Italian people.

When he returned to this country at the end of his service he became chairman of the America-Italy Society of San Francisco, a director of the America-Italy Society of New York, and a member of the advisory board of the Italian-American Chamber of Commerce on the Pacific coast. In 1952 he was awarded a decoration for his Marshall plan service in Italy, and in 1955 was again awarded a decoration by the Italian Government for that service.

Finally, Mr. Zellerbach was an alternate United States delegate to the Eighth General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, and a very active participant in the conferences arranged by Prince Bernhardt of the Netherlands, which have had a great deal to do with the movement for economic unity in free Europe.

So long as I shall have the honor to belong to this body, I hope very much that I shall raise my voice, and I hope other Senators will raise their voices on the affirmative side with respect to such appointments, especially of high officials which our Government is sending abroad to represent us.

They carry with them the prestige, the dignity, and the majesty of the United States. Mr. Zellerbach deserves to carry that prestige and that dignity and that majesty. As is true in the life of any busy man who takes his public responsibilities seriously, there are some who disagree and some who agree with what he has done. However, the things he has done he has done as an American in the service of his country, with sincerity and with a desire to be a useful public citizen. By those standards, and weighing the affirmative against anything that may be said on the other side, I respectfully submit that Mr. Zellerbach is eminently qualified to serve as Ambassador of the people of the United States to Italy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James David Zellerbach to be United States Ambassador to Italy?

Without objection——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James David Zellerbach to be United States Ambassador to Italy?

All those in favor will signify by saying "aye"; opposed, "no." The "ayes" have it and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that when President Eisenhower's nomination of James D. Zellerbach to be Ambassador to Italy was before the Senate I voted by voice vote in favor of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. Zellerbach is the head of one of the largest forest products corporations in our State of Oregon, which has extensive timber, pulp, and paper operations. Some think it may even be too large, but that is not at issue here today.

What the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said about the fine labor-management relations of this corporation is entirely correct.

In his contacts in our State, Mr. James D. Zellerbach has made a favorable and outstanding impression. I have heard praise for Mr. Zellerbach both in organized labor and in business. Trade-union executive and business executives in Oregon have spoken well of their own relationships with Mr. Zellerbach. I wish the RECORD to show that I was pleased to support his nomination to be Ambassador to Italy.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the nominations under new reports.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James T. O'Connell to be Under Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lawrence Gridley Derthick to be Commissioner of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard William Habermeyer to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leroy E. Burney to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that Senators' statements be limited to 3 minutes. Normally, we have a 2-minute limitation. I am hopeful that Senators may not find it necessary to exceed a 3-minute limitation. I make this request because it is very important that the Senate consider some resolutions before 2:30 and because one or more Senators will have to leave the Chamber for important committee meetings. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Routine business is now in order.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF FALL RIVER, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Fall River, Mass., on January 8, 1957, and approved by John F. Kane, mayor, on January 11, 1957. The resolution points up the extremely serious situation facing the textile industry and the concern of the officials of Fall River, a textile center, in regard to it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF FALL RIVER, IN CITY COUNCIL,
January 8, 1957.

Ordered, That the city council go on record as favoring the subsidizing of the textile industry by the Federal Government until textile tariffs have been equalized; the method of subsidizing would be on the same basis as the farm plan, whereby the Federal Government would purchase at a reasonable profit products that cannot be sold to the general public because of unfair tariff laws and the Federal Government could then use this surplus in connection with European aid programs.

In city council, January 8, 1957. Adopted.

JAMES T. CAREY,
City Clerk.

Approved, January 11, 1957.

JOHN F. KANE,
Mayor.

A true copy.
Attest:

JAMES T. CAREY,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, CLOQUET, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Cloquet, Minn., has recently adopted a resolution urging Congress to set aside the first Sunday in February each year as Chaplains' Day in commemoration of the sacrifice of the four chaplains on the U. S. S. *Dorchester* during World War II. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including four chaplains of three great religious faiths: George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and

selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by No. 1163 Cloquet Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 16, 1957.

EDDIE A. HIURANGO,
Worthy President.
JAMES OLSON,
Secretary.

TAX REDUCTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, recently wrote an open letter to President Eisenhower on the issue of tax reduction for small business. Mr. Harder stresses the point that this whole area has been one of unfulfilled promises.

I believe the letter is self-explanatory, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., January 10, 1957.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We're calling on you to make good, this year, the promise of tax reduction which you made of your own free will last fall.

Let's look at the facts:

First, on May 31, 1956, you appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business to study the needs and recommend constructive Federal programs for independent businessmen. Our members heartily approved your action because it was in line with Federation membership vote and our efforts for more than 5 years.

Second, at invitation of Dr. Arthur Burns, then committee chairman, our vice president, Mr. George J. Burger, conferred with committee members at Washington, D. C., July 5. Mr. Burger made suggestions for action to improve the independent business picture just as we received them by ballot vote from our independent business and professional man membership which is 100,000 strong.

Third, your Committee on August 7 reported 14 recommendations, many of which were right in line with our suggestions. Among these the first was:

"With regard to Federal taxes the Committee recognizes the recent improvement in the budgetary outlook and, in the event the budgetary outlook remains favorable, recommends: That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 percent to 20 percent on income up to $25,000."

Fourth, in your acceptance speech at the Cow Palace at San Francisco, you indicated hearty endorsement of this 14 point program—not only of this or that point alone, but of all 14 points.

Mr. President, we polled our members on many of these 14 points. We can tell you their freely expressed, personally signed, individual opinions, which were forwarded by them to their Congressmen, were practically unanimous in favor of these points * * * particularly so on that referring to tax reductions.

More than this, our nationwide field force covering the congressional districts of the Nation personally contacted up to 1,000 business and professional people each day during the fall. In the course of these visits they informed one and all of the promises made by both parties and by you. Again they found practically unanimous approval of the 14 points you espoused.

But in face of all this enthusiasm and hope which your Committee's program and your promise helped engender, we and our members now read reports which indicate you are backing away from tax cuts this year because of spending necessitated in great part by heightened international tensions.

Frankly, Mr. President, we can tell you by virtue of our intimate contacts with independents just how their feeling is running, and it's running this way:

Right at this moment they, and other independents we have contacted, feel strongly that if it is possible for the administration and Congress to find the extra billions which you think are necessary for domestic and foreign programs without upsetting the budget, then it should be equally possible for the administration and Congress to find the relatively small $400 million or so which your own Cabinet Committee estimates this tax reduction would cost, without upsetting the budget.

Certainly we're not asking, nor are our members asking, you or the Congress to do anything to weaken our Nation or to cancel out humanitarian programs. All we are asking is that you do first things first.

In your May 31 letter to Dr. Burns you hit the nail on the head when you wrote of the "important contributions made by small business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy."

What we're asking is nothing more, and nothing less, than that you do something concrete this year to help ease the tax squeeze on independents' jugulars so that they may more freely flex their muscles in the job of building a greater and greater country by increased contributions to this progressive spirit and vitality—to the end that our Nation may be more easily able to bear the burdens it has undertaken, and will undertake, at home and abroad.

One final note: for years candidates for office have made great promises of worthy programs for independents. But each time a new crisis has arisen to make fulfillment fall far short, and independents have had to content themselves with a few crumbs brushed off the table, compared to the feasts set up for giant concerns, farmers, labor, foreign governments and others. Even on the most deeply etched faith this treatment is bound to exert some erosive action.

So, Mr. President, your opportunity is great—to strengthen the independent enterprise foundations of our Nation, and to rebuild stronger than ever the faith of independents in the political institutions of our country.

We ask you again: make good, this year, the promise of tax reduction which you made of your own free will last fall—even if it takes a personal message or appearance before the Congress to set the wheels in motion.

Yours respectfully,
C. W. HARDER, *President.*

RELIEF FOR DROUGHT-STRICKEN FARMERS—PETITION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday I presented to the Senate a petition from citizens of five Montana counties demanding that Farmers' Home Administration make available to drought-stricken farmers loans that the agency is already authorized to make in the area.

The petition has been printed in the RECORD without the names of those who signed it. The diversity of their occupations was an important aspect of the petition; it was not just a petition of farmers but of merchants, mechanics, public officials, doctors, bankers—people from all walks of life concerned by the acute farm problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition, together with the signatures, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request that the Farmers' Home Administration be required to—

(1) Act at once to perform its authorized credit functions for farmers in the counties of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone in northeastern Montana;

(2) Administer the program so that farmers in these counties to whom bank or other commercial or private credit is not available, may receive loans promptly and with a minimum of redtape;

(3) Secure qualified personnel sufficient in number to process applications for loans, so they may be acted upon speedily;

(4) Administer the disaster-loan program so that the needs of farmers in the area are served promptly and so that such loans are processed in substantial quantities rather than in the negligible numbers now being accepted for processing;

(5) If necessary, expeditiously review and revise its administrative policy and procedure to assure immediate, prompt, and effective credit service to the farmers of these counties.

We respectfully make this request because of the urgent need of many farmers in these agricultural counties for credit not otherwise available to them. This credit need arises from the generally poor crops in major areas of these counties in 1956. The lack of an efficiently functioning Farmers' Home Administration credit program is working severe hardships on many of the farmers and businessmen in these counties. Both Main Street and the farmers are at the crossroads of economic survival in the worst price squeeze since the 1930's. Without this program in active, constructive operation, many farmers and businessmen in these counties will suffer depression conditions. A policy of foreclosure and repossession is being urged by some commercial lenders, which means ruin to individual farmers and businessmen. Farmers' Home Administration credit could forestall this situation.

Your help in making the Farmers' Home Administration an effective, speedy, and efficient source of farm credit is needed and asked. Your help will benefit the people of Roosevelt, Valley, Sheridan, Daniels, and McCone Counties. We are confident that you can and will help us.

Larry McGowan, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Larry Mason, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Lawrence O'Connor, Poplar, Mont., farmer; William Murray, Poplar, Mont., farmer; George Dehner, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Robert Kelsey, Poplar, Mont., dray line; Nel Goedert, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Bradley Evenson, Brockton, Mont., farmer; W. Glenn Swank,

Poplar, Mont., farmer; Gerald C. Zuck, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Henry Lauridsen, Poplar, Mont., farmer; H. H. Brown, Poplar, Mont., farmer; C. J. Friedenbach, Brockton, Mont., farmer; V. R. Strommer, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Norbert Witschen, Poplar, Mont., petroleum salesman; Walter M. Burt, Poplar Mont., general merchandise; Howard C. Arnold, Richland, Mont., farmer and rancher; Arthur D. Laurence, Opheim, Mont., farmer; H. D. Flickinger, Opheim, Mont., farmer; E. N. Dohlen, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Richard H. Zimmer, Opheim, Mont., farmer; B. J. Oliver, Opheim, Mont., clerk; Raymond R. St. John, Opheim, Mont., merchant; Sammy Feezell, Opheim, Mont., farmer; O. A. Beck, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Arden L. Beck, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Alvin E. Risa, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Anard Biem, Opheim, Mont., merchant-farmer; Orris Ouren, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Leon Jones, Peerless, Mont., farmer and laborer; John S. Sletton, Peerless, Mont., farmer; J. E. Grandell, Peerless, Mont., farmer.

Harold Martin, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Gorden N. Crandell, Peerless, Mont., farmer and teacher; C. W. Oglesby, Peerless, Mont., farmer; William Hames, Peerless, Mont., laborer; Douglas V. Gilchrist, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Robert Chapman, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Clarke A. Hames, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Chet Baldry, Peerless, Mont., farmer; John J. Dighans, Peerless, Mont., farmer; William C. Kegel, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Chauncey A. Wyman, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Karnes Sundby, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Earl Kundson, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Clifford Rheardt, Peerless, Mont., farmer; William J. Quazkenbush, Peerless, Mont., laborer; Iver Nefstad, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Leonard Larsen, Peerless, Mont., farmer; F. U. Grain Co., Peerless, Mont., elevator; Clarence Sterett, Peerless, Mont., farmer; W. B. Haagenson, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Louis A. Winderl, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Waldo L. Fladager, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Nels Sundby, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Wyman Feltis, Peerless, Mont., farmer; R. J. Machart, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Alfred Kiser, Peerless, Mont., farmer; John Miller, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Bernard L. Lien Peerless, Mont., farmer; Albert G. Nelson, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Beulah Slaughter, Peerless, Mont., farmer; D. E. Hawbaker, Peerless, Mont., farmer; George Larson, Peerless, Mont., farmer and stock.

Roy Hawbaker, Peerless, Mont., merchant; Lester L. Estenson, Peerless, Mont., merchant; I. H. Halverson, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Julius Kasseth, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Phil Thievin, Richland, Mont., farmer; Peter Nieskens, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Ed Carney, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Arthur E. Machart, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Farmers Union Oil Co., Peerless, Mont., bulk plant; Albert G. Davidson, Jr., Froid, Mont., farmer; Theodore O. Thompson, Froid, Mont., farmer; Irwing Hove, Froid, Mont., farmer; Halles Waller, Froid, Mont., farmer; Victor Labatte, Froid, Mont., farmer; Arvade Priebe, Froid, Mont., farmer; David J. Arvidson, Froid, Mont., farmer; John Otterstetter, Froid, Mont., farmer; Duane Christofferson, Froid, Mont., farmer; Arthur Elvsaas, Froid, Mont., farmer; Gilford O. Erickson, Froid, Mont., farmer; D. J. Sorensen, McCabe, Mont., farmer; Steve Rudolph, Froid, Mont., implement dealer; Lawrence Bengtson, Froid, Mont., farmer; John D. Miller, Froid, Mont., farmer; Warren O. Christoffersen, Froid, Mont., farmer; Ray H. Thompson, Froid, Mont., farmer; Edgar Salvevold, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; August Eschenbacker, Froid, Mont., farmer; R. T. Nyquist, Froid, Mont., farmer; A. O. Erdahl, Froid, Mont., Farmer; C. M. Benson, Froid, Mont., farmer; Raymond N. Christoffersen, Froid, Mont., blacksmith and farmer; Marlin Hoye, Froid, Mont., farmer.

Joyce S. Luebke, Froid, Mont., contractor; James L. Moore, Froid, Mont., farmer; Clayton Kueseth, Froid, Mont., farmers oil union; Goodwin Bergh, Froid, Mont., farmer; William Luft, Froid, Mont., farmer; James M. Ostby, Froid, Mont., farmer; T. W. Danielson, Homestead, Mont., farmer; H. L. McNeil, Froid, Mont., farmer; James Christensen, Froid, Mont., farmer; Merton Pervis, Froid, Mont., farmer; Walter R. Scott, Froid, Mont., farmer; T. L. Cookson, Froid, Mont., farmer; T. A. Westberg, Froid, Mont., merchant; Ewald Christoffersen, Froid, Mont., farmer; Joe M. Knutson, Froid, Mont., traveler; Eli LaCount, Froid, Mont., farmer; Edithe LaCount, Froid, Mont., farmer; Robert Pervis, Froid, Mont., farmer; Svend Bertelsen, Froid, Mont., farmer; Ralph Rasmussen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Rodman E. Miller, Richland, Mont., farmer; Alfred N. Dighans, Richland, Mont., farmer; John Fuchs, Richland, Mont., farmer; Harold Bondy, Richland, Mont., farmer; George McKenzie, Richland, Mont., farmer; R. B. Curtis, Richland, Mont., farmer; W. J. Shuts, Richland, Mont., farmer; Kenneth Sanders, Richland, Mont., farmer; John Thorson, Richland, Mont., farmer; William Lawrence, Richland, Mont., farmer; Bjarne Loftsgaard, Richland, Mont., farmer; Earl G. Brackee, Richland, Mont., farmer.

Robert Squires, Richland, Mont., farmer; F. W. Miner, Richland, Mont., farmer; Emil Kravik, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Delbert H. Miller, Richland, Mont., farmer; Lawrence Poe, Richland, Mont., manager, F. U. Oil; Arnie M. Solheim, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mitchel Dereschuck, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Leslie K. Johnson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Arlo L. Neutgens, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; R. F. Hansen, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; C. M. Hansen, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; Vernon L. Hansen, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; Jack J. Turner, Wolf Point, Mont., farm and ranch; Cliff Saubak, Lustre, Mont., farm and ranch; Guy E. Madison, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; Gilbert J. Bruhn, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; H. J. Linderman, Glentana, Mont., farmer; Roger J. Lee, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Frank N. Triplett, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Charles H. Baker, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Dwight Baker, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; F. A. Whitmus, Jr., Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Robert W. Rusche, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Dewey C. Forsness, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer and rancher; Peter H. Wedel, Lustre, Mont., farmer; William Nykolayow, Vida, Mont., farmer; James LaRoque, Wolf Point, Mont., electrician; August H. Hayes, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Willie Woods, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Herman Anderson, Richland, Mont., farmer; Dean N. Olson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; A. L. Nelson, Wolf Point, Mont., oil dealer.

L. H. Dubbe, Oswego, Mont., rancher; Ben Anderson, Wolf Point, Mont., trucker; Glenn Engen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lee Willan, Poplar, Mont., farmer; John R. Andresen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Everett J. Davis, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Fred Marquardt, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Clyde R. Brookman, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Bert Slunaker, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; William Welzenbach, Wolf Point, Mont., manager oil company; Don W. Mueller, Wolf Point, Mont., station attendant; Leland Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Neil Hansen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lloyd L. Baker, Lustre, Mont., farmer; D. D. Nefzger, Vida, Mont., farmer; J. H. Geer, Vida, Mont., farmer; Richard Andersen, Wolf Point, Mont., station attendant; Harry A. Toavs, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Albert McClellan, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Charles Bawden, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Wilbur T. Johnson, Wolf Point., Mont., farmer; Dennis Hanks, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; C. G. Schuckman, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Arnold Mueller, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Andrew Solheim, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Adolph Meidinger, Wolf Point, Mont., blacksmith; Louis Dietrich, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman, insurance; Harold Bawden, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Martin Wittenberg, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Donald Heidner, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ray Nefzger, Vida, Mont., farmer; John Neubauer, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer.

Dan Nordstrom, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; Douglas F. Baker, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Henry Diedrich, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; John B. Johnson, Jr., Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Louis Green, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Darrel Iwen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Stanley Rensvold, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; George Good, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Harold Ruhd, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Don E. Nelson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Chas. E. Noren, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; A. J. Bauer, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Dwight S. Bridges, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Darwin L. Johannes, Wolf Point, Mont., refrigeration; R. K. Shrader, Wolf Point, Mont., bulk plant manager; Ralph Eggebrecht, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Otto Sletvold, Wolf Joint, Mont., farmer; Edw. Sletvold, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; V. E. Albert, Wolf Point, Mont., lumberman; D. E. Maltby, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Art Hubbard, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ted J. Manning, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Armand Richard, Vida, Mont., farmer; Odd Lunde, Vida, Mont., farmer; Delbert Blair, Wolf Point, Mont., partsman; John Tymofichuk, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; Alva Harris, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Steve Boysun, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; A. A. Toavs, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Albert Jansen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; George Meister, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Frank N. Toavs, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; E. W. Montgomery, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ellis Allman, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer.

H. W. Stone, Wolf Point, Mont., auto dealer; Paul Betz, Culbertson, Mont., auto dealer; Larry C. Jensen, Wolf Point, Mont., excavation; Charles E. Clemmer, Savage, Mont., farmer-rancher; Leonard K. Long, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Arthur E. Hall, Wolf Point, Mont., food merchant; Burk Taylor, Wolf Point, Mont., lumber dealer; Roy W. Fromdahl, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Glenn King, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; William Peters, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; M. L. Engles, Poplar, Mont., elevator operator; Nick Peters, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; Mrs. Nick Peters, Wolf Point, Mont., bookkeeper; M. G. Baker, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Lorrin Tiegen, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; J. E. Baldwin, Wolf Point, Mont., Montana State highway project engineer; Mrs. Norman Stai, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk-housewife; Roy M. Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Bob Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., city water department; Keith Sugden, Wolf Point, Mont., trucker; Lloyd L. Shumway, Wolf Point, Mont., service station; H. F. Gruefe, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ernest Bushman, Wolf Point, Mont., truck driver; Donald Wetsit, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Thomas D. Martin, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Eileen M. Bawden, Wolf Point, Mont., stenographer; Jack C. Seigle, Wolf Point, Mont., newspaper editor; Paul Vukelich, Wolf Point, Mont., office clerk; Harry N. Downs, Wolf Point, Mont., publisher; Lloyd Holen, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Thomas J. Christensen, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Norman H. Solheim, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Henry Braaten, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mabel Nasner, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer.

Ray I. Olson, Wolf Point, Mont., gas distributor; Mrs. C. C. Funk, Wolf Point, Mont., bookkeeper; Charles Loendorf, Wolf Point, Mont., Equity Oil manager; Leonard D. Gagne, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Donald Jensen, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Leo V. Newman, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Ronald C. Schultz, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Robert E. Wilkins, Wolf Point, Mont., chief of police; Addie E. Carpenter, Wolf Point, Mont., deputy clerk of court; E. Marie Sugden, Wolf Point, Mont., stenographer and housewife; Nels Lund, Wolf Point, Mont., justice of the peace; T. S. Dwyer, Wolf Point,

Mont., county assessor; Helen J. Heier, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk and housewife; Diane L. Landsrud, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Iris D. Heinrichs, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; H. M. Seiler, Wolf Point, Mont., deputy assessor; W. C. Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., county treasurer; Lelamae Chamberlain, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Loretta Gallagher, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Joan Redstone, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Rose Marie Beauchene, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Frank Delger, Wolf Point, Mont., under sheriff; Eleanor A. Schmeltzer, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk and recorder; Calvin L. Rogers, Wolf Point, Mont., abstractor; Baxter Larson, Wolf Point, Mont., lawyer; Dr. C. R. Growe, Wolf Point, Mont., chiropractor; A. C. Terpe, Wolf Point, Mont., contractor; Marvin Brookman, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; Chester Erickson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Chester Erickson, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Melvin S. Ferdina, Wolf Point, Mont., ranching; Douglas B. Parrott, Glasgow, Mont., automotive wholesaler; Oliver L. Moen, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic-farmer; Charles M. Walker, Glasgow, Mont., clerk.

Henry G. Rahn, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Carl E. Carlson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Henry H. Ortmann, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Gordon Lund, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; Herman Grotte, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Wilmar Reddig, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Elvin Olfert, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Willard Tieszen, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Robert Beery, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Paul G. Brown, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; Frank R. Hanel, Wolf Point, Mont., car dealer; Carl H. Deck, Wolf Point, Mont., grocer; Wilfred Greufe, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Herbert Houg, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; John L. Taylor, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Aldon E. Lee, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Martin Luenberger, Vida, Mont., farmer; Albert L. Ketner, Vida, Mont., farmer; John Overberg, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Alice Hanel, Wolf Point, Mont., homemaker; Rodell Mahlum, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Idan Camrud, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Raymond Poppa, Wolf Point, Mont., clergyman; William Hormek, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Clarence Lee, Wolf Point, Mont., parts man; K. K. Bondy, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; Arne Traeholt, Wolf Point, Mont., bookkeeper; Art Bates, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Wilbur Sugden, Wolf Point, Mont., service station; Carl R. Moe, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; W. C. Reichert, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; Max Fitzsimmons, Wolf Point, Mont., service station; Don Grimsrud, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Joseph Camrud, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Gordon M. Peabody, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer.

Arthur Garwood, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Edwin Jensen, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Rudolph E. Spitzer, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; Melvin C. Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., bookkeeper; John Nitschke, Wolf Point, Mont., ready-mix concrete; Leland Warmbrod, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Leo A. McLachlan, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; Lynn Nees, Wolf Point, Mont., wholesaler; Ray Kelberer, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant-farmer; L. R. Hovey, Wolf Point, Mont., car dealer; Kermit Smith, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Gordon Montgomery, Wolf Point, Mont., druggist; Robert H. Baaker, Wolf Point, Mont., druggist; J. L. Davey, Wolf Point, Mont., clothing merchant; Thos. Cook, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Elston Albert, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Jerry D. Cook, Wolf Point, Mont., student; M. E. Fitzgerald, Circle, Mont., F. I. F. representative; H. J. Rongstat, Glasgow, Mont., salesman; Ralph H. Hoversland, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer and rancher; R. E. Covvey, Wolf Point, Mont., insurance and real estate; K. K. Ulrich, Wolf Point, Mont., accountant; John Gribble, Frazer, Mont., rancher; K. E. Voss, Wolf Point, Mont., bank cashier; C. O. Wagnild, Wolf Point, Mont., bank cashier; Victor C. Carey, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Robert I. Penner, Wolf Point, Mont., banker; Mrs. Mable Frazier, Frazer, Mont., farm and ranch; A. J. Bailly, Vida, Mont., farmer; Arvid R. Moe, Wolf Point, Mont., partsman; Virginia Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Ed Sassen, Wolf Point, Mont., grain buyer; Minor E. McKnight, Wolf Point, Mont., Great Northern clerk and warehouse.

Ralph Watson, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; E. T. Fister, Glasgow, Mont., implement dealer; R. P. Rundle, Glasgow, Mont., appliance dealer; H. D. Magruder, Glasgow, Mont., auto dealer; D. L. Wertzberger, Glasgow, Mont., salesman; Art Tatak, Glasgow, Mont., cafe operator; Clarence Trimborn, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; Chester A. Glazier, Nashua, Mont., mechanic; Victor Garsjo, Nashua, Mont., mechanic; Milo Frazier, Frazer, Mont., farmer; L. W. Zimmerman, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Kenneth Parks, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Beulah Parks, Wolf Point, Mont., cafe; A. A. Werner, Poplar, Mont., car dealer; John Werner, Poplar, Mont., farmer; William H. Sand, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; O. M. Paulson, Wolf Point, Mont., creamery; Mrs. O. M. Paulson, Wolf Point, Mont., office help; Harley Evenson, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Leonard Rada, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; M. E. Howard, Circle, Mont., farmer; Albert Howard, Circle, Mont., farmer; Albert Reich, Wolf Point, Mont., meat cutter; Archie Graber, Wolf Point, Mont., teacher; Clarence Bartel, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; Allen Hendricksen, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; Don E. Marchwick, Culbertson, Mont., car dealer; Wm. Tlustozch, Culbertson, Mont., mechanic; E. C. LaCount, Froid, Mont., farmer; Einar A. Lund, Wolf Point, Mont., storekeeper; E. V. Marchwick, Culbertson, Mont., mechanic; Donald Forsyth, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Don W. Johnson, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Henry J. Frederickson, Wolf Point, Mont., janitor.

Peter A. Fast, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Emil E. Schmidt, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Rhoda M. Grosse, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lester R. Grosse, Wolf Point, Mont., machinist; Peter Berger, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Larry E. Grimsrud, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Robert Kowasaki, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Guy A. Miller, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk of court and farmer; Harold Kramlick, Glasgow, Mont., salesman; Abe A. Toews, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Morris Wright, Wolf Point, Mont., utilities; Paul G. Nygaard, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; James H. Larson, Wolf Point, Mont., jeweler; Joe Casey, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Michael V. Wolf, Wolf Point, Mont., implement dealer; Norven Langager, Wolf Point, Mont., appliance dealer; James Kurokawa, Wolf Point, Mont., cafe operator; William K. Remley, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; Don McMaster, Wolf Point, Mont., meat cutter; General Edwards, Wolf Point, Mont., neon signs; R. D. Neumiller, Vida, Mont., laborer; Andreas Hoversland, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Omar Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; E. A. Hinkle, Wolf Point, Mont., builder; Leeland F. Jones, Wolf Point, Mont., barber; Joseph Mossicotte, Wolf Point, Mont., barber; Neil G. Larsen, Wolf Point, Mont., cafe worker; Larry Persson, Wolf Point, Mont., attorney; Fred Folster, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; M. Berglee, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; P. M. Cantelon, Wolf Point, Mont., minister; Ralph L. Okland, Wolf Point, Mont., Lutheran minister; Louise Henkle, Wolf Point, Mont., parts manager; Robert Meister, Wolf Point, Mont., retired farmer.

Robert D. Fraser, Wolf Point, Mont., florist; Margaret Fraser, Wolf Point, Mont., florist; Norman Nedrud, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; P. B. Kamp, Wolf Point, Mont., hardware dealer; Byron H. Nelson, Wolf Point, Mont., hardware dealer; S. V. Nedrud, Wolf Point, Mont., merchant; Howard Turner, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Robert Ulrich, Wolf Point, Mont., ranch hand; Floyd T. DeWitt, Wolf Point, Mont., ranch hand; Dale Waters, Richey, Mont., farmer; Carl Carlson, Richey, Mont., carpenter and farmer; J. E. Wamsley, Wolf Point, Mont., retail lumber; E. R. Mair, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; H. E. Bergen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Andrew Nukolayow, Vida, Mont., farmer; W. E. Burnison, Wolf Point, Mont., real estate and insurance; Harvey Fehlhaber, Glasgow, Mont., lumber; John Stensland, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; LeRoy Vossler, Circle, Mont., farmer; Ole Olson, Circle, Mont., implement dealer; Al Sukut, Circle, Mont., farmer; Albert Moos, Brockway, Mont., farmer-stockman; Edward Elverud, Circle, Mont., garage; Edward Morlock, Circle, Mont., farmer; Edwin Moos, Circle, Mont., farmer; R. E. Miller, Circle, Mont., merchant; Edw. Towe, Circle, Mont., banker; Robert G. Yarger, Circle, Mont., farmer-stockman; Joe A. Sokolaski, Circle, Mont., lumberyard manager; Harold Wangen, Circle, Mont., merchant; Olaf Tu, Circle, Mont., farmer; George Hance, Circle, Mont., farmer; Avron A. Fritz, Circle, Mont., farmer.

August B. Wittkopp, Circle, Mont., farmer; Winfrid A. Fritz, Circle, Mont., farmer; Paul Habenshield, Circle, Mont., farmer; James Hendricks, Circle, Mont., farmer; Byron Dennis, Circle, Mont., farmer; John Twitchell, Circle, Mont., rancher; Louis Loudon, Circle, Mont., farmer; Harold Redmer, Circle, Mont., farmer; E. J. Hunsel, Circle, Mont., farmer; Lyle Berg, Circle, Mont., garage; Robert L. Brown, Circle, Mont., farmer; Lloyd O. Larson, Circle, Mont., farmer; Wayne A. Kleppelid, Circle, Mont., mechanic; Gottlieb Wagner, Circle, Mont., farmer; Arthur Rolandson, Circle, Mont., implement dealer; Soren P. Jensen, Jr., Circle, Mont., farmer; Gottlieb Maier, Circle, Mont., farmer; M. C. Rolandson, Circle, Mont., implement dealer; Fred E. Kalberg, Circle, Mont., farmer; Reuben Wagner, Circle, Mont., farmer; Floyd E. Quick, Circle, Mont., farmer; Pete Nickolie, Circle, Mont., farmer; Alex Lumsden, Circle, Mont., farmer; R. H. Schara, Circle, Mont., rancher; Donald G. Huseby, Circle, Mont., food merchant; John Micholio, Vida, Mont., farmer; Bernard Dinger, Circle, Mont., rancher; Lloyd Lemieux, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Frank H. Ueland, Brockway, Mont., rancher; Richard S. Jensen, Circle, Mont., farmer; Dale Powlowski, Circle, Mont., farmer; Gene Dribnenki, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Glenn Daly, Circle, Mont., farmer.

Arden Hudiburgh, Circle, Mont., farmer; Harold Maier, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Richard Rolandson, Circle, Mont., farmer; Joe L. Holik, Circle, Mont., farmer; Arthur L. Fitch, Circle, Mont., farmer; Emil Kondelik, Circle, Mont., farmer; Ingolf Losett, Circle, Mont., farmer; B. L. Zimmer, Circle, Mont., petroleum; Paul G. Paulson, Circle, Mont., cleaners; Keith Putnam, Circle, Mont., merchant; G. M. Gilbert, Circle, Mont., merchant; Olaf K. Olson, Circle, Mont., Gamble Store; Alden M. Bergland, Circle, Mont., drugs; J. R. Hansen, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Marvel Voegele, Circle, Mont., farmer; J. P. Jordon, Circle, Mont., farmer; Farmers Union Oil Co., Circle, Mont., petroleum; Robert W. Haggerty, Circle, Mont., well driller; Harold Meissner, Circle, Mont., farmer; M. L. Schaffer, Circle, Mont., farmer; Elmer Buell, Circle, Mont., farmer; M. J. Knutsen, Circle, Mont., farmer; Margaret H. Rorvik, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Carl J. Rorvik, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Arthur Waldbauer, Circle, Mont., farmer; Fred W. Massar, Circle, Mont., farmer; Harley Berry, Watkins, Mont., farmer; Jim Wilkee, Circle, Mont., lineman; Everett J. Hofland, Circle, Mont., farmer; J. W. Loomis, Brockway, Mont., service station; Wm. M. Steele, Brockway, Mont., farmer; LaVerne Logan, Brockway, Mont., merchant; Merlen J. Shennum, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Ed Bray, Brockway, Mont., farmer.

John Beaver, Watkins, Mont., farmer; Ben Langton, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Sam Borgan, Brockway, Mont., farmer; John D. Lavalley, Brockway, Mont., rancher; Ben H. Sowle, Brockway, Mont., service station; Oscar E. Gackle, Brockway, Mont., farmer; James N.

Moline, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Ervin Heitz, Watkins, Mont., farmer; Howard L. Koch, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Emil Schmidt, Watkins, Mont., farmer; Phillip Haglund, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Leo B. Larson, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Robert E. McCloy, Circle, Mont., farmer; Hebert E. Guldborg, Brockway, Mont., farmer; John F. Haglund, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Robert W. Berry, Watkins, Mont., farmer; Ted Kountz, Brockway, Mont., farmer; Ivar B. Lund, Circle, Mont., farmer; E. J. Peare, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; Roy Sansaver, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; C. E. Hanson, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Clarence W. Olson, Vida, Mont., farmer; Jewell Vaughan, Circle, Mont., farmer; Wilbur Long, Wolf Point, Mont., M. D. U. lineman; Howard Marquardt, Wolf Point, Mont., M. D. U. lineman; Eugene Baker, Wolf Point, Mont., elevator; Charles S. Peterbach, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Edwin A. Carlstad, Wolf Point, Mont., mechanic; Howard M. Long, Wolf Point, Mont., farm hand; Arlie L. Jensen, Wolf Point, Mont., contractor; Harry S. Johnson, Wolf Point, Mont., chief engineer; Robert R. Fromdahl, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; George Naasz, Oswego, Mont., farmer.

Gerhardt Buechler, Vida, Mont., farmer; Curtis W. Moe, Wolf Point, Mont,. laborer; Irwin Wall, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Wm. F. Winhofer, Poplar, Mont,. farmer; Francis W. McGowan, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Monte Martin, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Jacob D. Wall, Frazer, Mont., farmer; John L. Fuglsbo, Oswego, Mont., farmer; B. R. Stephens, Oswego, Mont., service station; Robert E. Sullivan, Wolf Point, Mont., partsman; John H. Derr, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Melvin Lingle, Wolf Point, Mont., contractor; Theo. Haber, Circle, Mont., farmer; Eddie Puckett, Wolf Point, Mont., laundry; Michael L. Kern, Sr., Wolf Point, Mont., service station; Harold Frazier, Frazer, Mont., rancher; Roy Sorley, Vida, Mont., farmer; Frank Shumway, Jr., Wolf Point, Mont, mechanic; Lester Eck, Wolf Point, Mont., meat cutter; Kenneth R. Walter, Wolf Point, Mont., meat cutter; R. D. Frederickson, Wolf Point, Mont., clerk; H. J. Neufeld, Wolf Point, Mont., produce man; Art Zervas, Wolf Point, Mont., grocery manager; Romeo Richard, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lee McCrea, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; John Hoversland, Wolf Point, Mont., sheepherder; Lester Dahl, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Harold Baglien, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Everett Rosenbaum, Oswego, Mont., farmer; Reuben V. Toavs, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lenox Pace, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; John Warmbrod, Sr., Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; John Warmbrod, Jr., Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Morris V. Tattoo, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; Howard Charleson, Poplar, Mont., farmer.

C. C. Funk, Wolf Point, Mont., garage; George H. Laumeyer, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Herb Dyck, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Math Heser, Vida, Mont., farmer; Harvey Karge, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Melvin Bogar, Vida, Mont., farmer; Leslie Dyck, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Harold Dyck, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Glenn Dyck, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Neville Berner, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Harry Friesen, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Kenneth R. Martin, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Tony Visser, Wolf Point, Mont., transportation; Lilburn C. Bahls, Richey, Mont., farmer; Roland Funk, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; J. McEneaney, Wolf Point, Mont., retired; Joe Watters, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Bertha Watters, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Marie T. Ferdina, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Will J. Kegel, Peerless, Mont., farmer; Torlief A. Sletten, Peerless, Mont., farmer; E. W. Montgomery, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Orin Shrader, Wolf Point, Mont., laborer; Roy M. Gunderson, Wolf Point, Mont., trucker; Herman Wiens, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Albert H. Wiens, Lustre, Mont., farmer; Clarence C. Brown, Vida, Mont., blacksmith shop; Bud Jensen, Scobey, Mont., contractor; James O. Nordwick, Wolf Point, Mont., rancher; Joseph Dolezilek, Jr., Frazer, Mont., farmer; Marvin Fast, Frazer, Mont., farmer; W. Hoversland, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; E. A. Kolden, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; John Herzberg, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; T. M. Rothe, Wolf Point, Mont., retired dairyman.

Dale K. Stennes, Wolf Point, Mont., bartender; George E. Dowse, Vida, Mont., farmer; August Wolff, Wolf Point, Mont., carpenter; Chester Arndt, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman; John C. McLachlan, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Jim Vick, Wolf Point, Mont., truckermechanic; T. A. Prewett, Peerless, Mont., agent telegrapher; Dean Swanson, Peerless, Mont., elevator man; George Canfield, Richey, Mont., rancher; Lucile Canfield, Richey, Mont., teacher; Albert Spitzer, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ed Marottek, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Eddie Travis, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Otto Zerbe, Lustre, Mont., farmer-businessman; H. P. Unrau, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Henry P. Unrau, Frazer, Mont., farmer's wife; Donald Kluth, Vida, Mont., farmer; Milton Siljenberg, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; George Rubin, Whitetail, Mont., farmer; Oliver W. Payne, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Henry E. Hanson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; George S. Puckett, Peerless, Mont., mail carrier; Harvey Wagar, Scobey, Mont., farmer and rancher; Arthur J. Bernard, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Chester Solberg, Scobey, Mont., implement dealer; Roy Killenbeck, Scobey, Mont., rancher; Tom W. Davis, Scobey, Mont., farmer; G. E. Melena, Scobey, Mont., implement dealer; Oliver M. Lien, Brockton, Mont., farmer and merchant; Elof Larson, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Sam Nygard, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Merland N. Iverson, Brockton, Mont., farmer; James Ruffatto, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Alvin O. Lien, Brockton, Mont., farmer.

Matt Ziolkowski, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Victor Samuelson, Brockton, Mont., farmer; George Shanks, Brockton, Mont., farmer; C. J. Samuelson, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Oscar Sturm, Brockton, Mont., farmer; George Bryd, Sturm, Brockton, Mont., farmer; George Byrd, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Ole O. Lien, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Geraldine Shanks, Brockton, Mont., housewife; Ludvig Loen, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Emert Bighorn, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Orphey A. Lien, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Orrie Vraa, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Mary Lien, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Ole H. Moen, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Charles Holte, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Robert Vaught, Brockton, Mont., merchant; Jay P. Olson, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Art Breitling, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; Ray A. Schneider, Tampico, Mont., farmer; Leland Keller, Glasgow, Mont., bookkeeper; Dewayne C. Haugile, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; N. Rishme, Glasgow, Mont., merchant and farmer; Wiley I. Farmer, Glasgow, Mont., insurance; Calvin D. Hill, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Peter Teichrow, Glasgow, Mont., library manager; Paul Weinmeister, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Homer Peters, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Walter Schneider, Tampico, Mont., farmer; Herman Hirchert, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Rex B. Robinson, Glasgow, Mont., insurance; Leonard Bult, Glasgow, Mont., dealer; Melvin C. Jensen, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer; Mardy Goodchild, Glasgow, Mont., truckdriver.

Glenn H. Allman, Nashua, Mont., farmer; James K. McGibney, Glasgow, Mont., insurance; James L. Keil, Glasgow, Mont., operator; H. Badger, Glasgow, Mont., merchandise; Amos A. Erickson, Larsland, Mont., farmer; Victor D. Weinmeister, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Charles E. Rogers, Hinsdale, Mont., stockgrower; Peter B. Quiring, Frazer, Mont., farmer-rancher; Harry Aitken, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Wilbert Fauth, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Virgil Everson, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; M. P. Buffington, Glasgow, Mont., bus; Donald Davenport, Opheim, Mont., stockman; Jerry Weinmeister, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Oscar Olson, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; James H. Fisher, Saco, Mont., farmer; C. W. Rasmussen, Glasgow, Mont., carpenter; W. D. Merriwether, Wolf Point, Mont., auto parts; M. E. Aspelund, Glasgow, Mont., oil dealer; Jalmer Larson, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Alton Wesen, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Cecil G. Satter, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; A. A. Wagner, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; L. J. Rasmussen, Glasgow, Mont., carpenter; Charles C. Heath, Glasgow, Mont., truckdriver; Gabin Wagner, Nashua, Mont., ranching; Stephen Wagner, Nashua, Mont., stockman; Sally Fister, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; Iris Anderson, Glasgow, Mont., bookkeeper; Evert Gustafson, Glasgow, Mont., minister; Calvin F. Bunk, Glasgow, Mont., body man; Wm. Wolden, Glasgow, Mont., machine shop; Kenneth Sonsteng, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Orval L. Schmidt, Nashua, Mont., grocery; Ole E. Askvig, Glasgow, Mont., grocery.

Fabian Nyquist, Glasgow, Mont., farmer-rancher; Donald A. Miller, Nashua, Mont., farmer-rancher; Muncie J. Taylor, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Harold K. Wilhelm, Opheim, Mont., farmer-stockman; C. H. Brocksmith, Glasgow, Mont., banker; Harris Smith, Glasgow, Mont., oil station; O. E. Markle, Glasgow, Mont., implements; Tom Hickok, Glasgow, Mont., office clerk; Palmer Pederson, Glasgow, Mont., driver; Arthur H. Fast, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Rose M. Miller, Nashua, Mont., housewife; Lawrence R. Larsen, Glasgow, Mont., parts man; James V. Kruzich, Glasgow, Mont., merchant; Glen Dix, Glasgow, Mont., merchant; Jean Markle, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; Lois Markle, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; Marion Goulet, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; C. D. Markle, Glasgow, Mont., farm store; Joseph Goulet, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Iver L. Vertz, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Ken Floyd, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Courtney Carlson, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Mitchel Etchart, Glasgow, Mont., rancher; Donna Lee Squires, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; Catherine Etchart, Tampico, Mont., housewife; T. H. Markle, Glasgow, Mont., retired merchant; Andrew Hellstern, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer-rancher; Mrs. T. H. Markle, Glasgow, Mont., housewife; Henry Bellon, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Chancey E. Long, Nashua, Mont., attendant, service station; Roy M. Keil, Nashua, Mont., station attendant; Barney Egosque, Nashua, Mont., farmer; B. Stenbakken, Nashua, Mont., insurance; Geo. W. Johnson, Nashua, Mont., station attendant.

Lewis M. Hill, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Joyce Charney, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Hartvik Garsjo, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Orvie Watters, Nashua, Mont., plant superintendent; Iner Hill, Nashua, Mont., farmer; John Yager, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Ivan W. Brandt, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Bert Floman, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; O. W. Kesler, Culbertson, Mont., superintendent of schools; Arnold Thomsen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; E. F. Garbe, Culbertson, Mont., accountant; W. R. Miller, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; J. E. Petersen, Culbertson, Mont., banking; Carsten Beck, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Gus Born, Culbertson, Mont., plumber; Amos S. Moore, Culbertson, Mont., wholesale petroleum; W. C. Redfield, Culbertson, Mont., lumber yard manager; Sylvan White, Culbertson, Mont., sheet metal work; L. W. Moen, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; Otis Nelson, Culbertson, Mont., elevator manager; H. A. McKinney, Culbertson, Mont., car and machinery dealer; R. W. Jensen, M. D., Culbertson, Mont., physician; F. B. McCann, Culbertson, Mont., rancher; Henry P. Hoffman, Culbertson, Mont., cafe; Willie Krueger, Culbertson, Mont., drayman; Marford Rasmussen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Ray Mattern, Culbertson, Mont., mechanic; Leonard Salvevold, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Paul Betz, Culbertson, Mont., bookkeeper; Louis L. Costin, Culbertson, Mont., service station operator; Carl M. Westby, Culbertson, Mont., oil station; Gerald E. Olsen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer;

Adam Brese, Jr., Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Pete Hekkel, Bainville, Mont., farmer.

Clifford Hobby, Bainville, Mont., mechanic; Segurd D. Moen, Culbertson, Mont., merchandise; Curtis G. Finnicum, Culbertson, Mont., oil distributor; Robert Gustafson, Culbertson, Mont., serviceman; Gordon Peterson, Culbertson, Mont., salesman; Edward Hekkel, McCabe, Mont., farmer; Ray Oelkers, Culbertson, Mont., station attendant; Dave H. Sehledewitz, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; B. L. Iverson, Culbertson, Mont., elevator manager; Fred F. Traeger, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; George Cooper, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; John Lab, Culbertson, Mont., rancher; Joe Christensen, Culbertson, Mont., laborer; John Bertino, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Jesse L. Hall, Culbertson, Mont., storekeeper; Irene Brasen, Culbertson, Mont., tavern; Mark E. Moore, Culbertson, Mont., dairy plant; Otto P. Waldow, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Dennis Blair, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Sid Blair, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Sterling McKinney, Culbertson, Mont., dealer; H. F. Weinrich, Culbertson, Mont., partsman; Jani Cholson, Culbertson, Mont., pharmacist; Duaine W. Miller, Culbertson, Mont., grocer; Warren H. Rumsy, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Louis L. Becker, Culbertson, Mont., partsman; Alfred Jensen, Culbertson, Mont., carpenter; Boyd W. Finnicum, Culbertson, Mont., motel operator; Svend Jensen, Culbertson, Mont., Carpenter; Chris Olsen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; C. R. Bradlhau, Culbertson, Mont., laborer; W. F. Manning, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; A. C. Petersen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Ted Damm, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Clarence Grovom, Froid, Mont., laborer.

Frank Schuetze, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Jack Martin, Culbertson, Mont., railroad; Whitman W. James, Culbertson, Mont., laborer; Richard Newton, Culbertson, Mont., highway department; Wilhelm Seegert, Culbertson, Mont., carpenters helper; Bernie Finnicum, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; Louise Tunison, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; Dan Schledewitz, Culbertson, Mont., blacksmith; Edwin T. Erickson, Culbertson, Mont., instrument man; A. D. Nay, Culbertson, Mont., railroad; Jacob M. Damm, Culbertson, Mont., railroad; S. G. Sowle, Culbertson, Mont., retired railroad; J. C. Gandrud, Culbertson, Mont., mechanic; Melvin D. Harris, Culbertson, Mont., gas station; A. Waldhausen, Culbertson, Mont., retired farmer; Lewis F. Kao, Culbertson, Mont., blacksmith; Earl Weeks, Culbertson, Mont., delivery; D. R. Morey, Culbertson, Mont., railroad operator; Immanuel Larsen, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Howard Rasmussen, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; Clarence Christianson, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Tom Lippert, Culbertson, Mont., vo-ag instructor; W. R. Miller, Culbertson, Mont., merchant; W. F. Lindsay, Culbertson, Mont., M. S. T. & T. company; Herman L. Jensen, Culbertson, Mont., barber; Gerald R. Tovdahl, Bainville, Mont., teacher; Marinus Lynggard, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Pete Penner, Culbertson, Mont., telephone company; Bernard Wolff, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Robert C. Anklam, Culbertson, Mont., National Guard employee; John R. Stanford, Culbertson, Mont., National Guard employee; E. J. Jaumotte, Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Marvin Oelkers, Culbertson, Mont., Monark lumber manager; Sam Tietz, Jr., Culbertson, Mont., farmer; Howard O. Iverson, Culbertson, Mont., bus driver.

Martin Damm, Culbertson, Mont., bus driver; Lyle V. Sorby, Culbertson, Mont., manager; E. V. Marchwick, Culbertson, Mont., mechanic; Alfie Nelsen, Culbertson, Mont., salesman; Art Erickson, Brockton, Mont., service station operator; Bill Bravard, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Leonard Kallevig, Brockton, Mont., elevator manager; Peder Moe, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Quinto Ruffatto, Brockton, Mont., farmer; Harry D. Fishell, Redstone, Mont., farmer; Western Implement, Plentywood, Mont., implement dealer; Plentywood Implement Co., Plentywood, Mont., implement dealer; Westland Service, Plentywood, Mont., service station; Holje Implement Co., Plentywood, Mont., implement dealer, Sheridan Oil Co., Plentywood, Mont., oil dealer; Red's Union Service, Plentywood, Mont., service station; Andrew L. Michels, Plentywood, Mont., farmer and auto dealer; W. C. Overgaard, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Victor Fishell, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Clarence Wagnild, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Arnold Boe, Outlook, Mont., farmer; Roy Johnson, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Arne H. Nielsen, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Melvin K. Kisler, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; J. C. Meyer, Westby, Mont., farmer; Clifford Jerde, Westby, Mont., farmer; Elmer Espen, Comertown, Mont., farmer; Farmers Union Oil Co. By: Oswald Klofstad, Plentywood, Mont., oil dealer; Albert Lindblom, Outlook, Mont., farmer; Leo E. Furst, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Eugene Mehl, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Curtis Stadstad, Plentywood, Mont., insurance agent, farmer.

Howard Tefre, Reserve, Mont., farmer; Lester Kanning, Plentywood, Mont., farmer; Ludwig Williams, Dooley, Mont., farmer; Jacob Pattison, Glasgow, Mont., farmer-stockman; Howard Solberg, Richland, Mont., farmer-stockman; Leo M. Pattison, Glasgow, Mont., farmer and merchant; L. J. Pattison, Glasgow, Mont., merchant and mechanic; Stanley Andersen, Opheim, Mont., Farmer and stockman; Harold N. Blair, Havre, Mont., block man-AC; Fred L. Amestoy, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer; Fred L. Sibley, Nashua, Mont., farmer and stockman; William R. Pattison, Glasgow, Mont., implement dealer; L. A. Henningson, Glasgow, Mont., farmer-stockman; A. H. Neubauer, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Thomas Zimmer, Glentana, farmer and stockman; Henry Bellon, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Joseph N. Stelliflug, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Walter Fuhrman, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Adolph Nybakken, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Glen Dix, Jr., Glasgow, Mont., farmer; M. F. Hammond, Saco, Mont., stockman; Jesse Lacock, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer; John Kline, Glasgow, Mont., lawyer; M. K. Bjorklund, Glasgow, Mont., insurance; F. M. Boehme, Glasgow, Mont., merchant; Arthur P. Sampson, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; DeLorne Barnes, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Harold A. Doebler, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; J. Day, Oswego, Mont., farmer; W. C. McKusick, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Melvin Fossum, Richland, Mont., farmer; Jake Peters, Larslan, Mont., farmer; William Uphaus, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; H. D. Flickenger, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Jasper DeDobbeleer, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Sidney S. Cotton, Glasgow, Mont., farmer.

Charles J. Miller, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Martin Schindler, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; John M. Birkoski, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Andrew Hellstern, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer-rancher; Marion Hellstern, Hinsdale, Mont., farmer-rancher; Alvin Eklund, Saco, Mont., farmer; P. L. Quiring, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Virgil Legare, Glasgow, Mont., implement dealer; Herman Wiens, Frazer, Mont., farmer; Everett Cabarett, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; James O. Jacobson, Glasgow, Mont., partsman; Jack H. Baker, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Robert E. Crowder, Glasgow, Mont., farm equipment mechanic; Lila K. Cornwell, Glasgow, Mont., bookkeeper; Alvin Wiebe, Glasgow, Mont., service man; Harold Diesen, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; Mervin Whitham, Glasgow, Mont., mechanic; Warren Camas, Glasgow, Mont., drayman; John Stuber, Hinsdale, Mont., cowboy; H. P. Penner, Larslan, Mont., farming; Thos. A. Wagner, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Mitchel J. Etchart, Tampico, Mont., rancher; Theo. Beck, Glasgow, Mont., rancher; Peter E. James, Richland, Mont., farmer; S. E. Ohlson, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Hubert Gundermann, Glentana, Mont., farmer; Dale A. Dascher, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Lloyd T. Elde, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Maynard Lystad, Nashua, Mont., farmer; Leslie L. Hanson, Glasgow, Mont., manager Ford garage; Galen Maas, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; F. J. Mersen, Glasgow, Mont., farm equipment dealer; Frank Ferrin, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; Arlen U. Lane, Glasgow, Mont., partsman; H. P. Penner, Larslan, Mont., farmer; Stephen Weber, Glasgow, Mont., bookkeeper.

E. L. Overland, Glasgow, Mont., salesman; Stanley G. Olsen, Larslan, Mont., farmer; Wm. L. Witt, Glasgow, Mont., parts manager; Ward L. Kellogg, Glasgow, Mont., auto body repair; C. A. Duncan, Hinsdale, Mont., rancher; Herman Potts, Glasgow, Mont., livestock dealer; Laurel Barnes, Nashua, Mont., mechanic; Chester E. Myxter, Glasgow, Mont., shop foreman; Frank Jensen, Hinsdale, Mont., contractor; Edmond Gerspacher, Saco, Mont., rancher; P. M. Lewis, Glasgow, Mont., farmer; H. M. Pearson, Richland, Mont., farmer; Jim Fohrman, Opheim, Mont., farmer; Eugene K. Henke, Scobey, Mont., petroleum; Emil Jackson, Scobey, Mont., petroleum; M. A. LaMotte, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Everett Barron, Flaxville, Mont., farmer; Richard Nelson, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Hugo Christianson, Scobey, Mont., petroleum; Ted A. Hauge, Whitetail, Mont., farmer; Lyle D. Knudson, Scobey, Mont., petroleum; Robert L. Wilson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Melvin J. Schow, Scobey, Mont., farmer; John Wang, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Wilbur Jones, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Fred Washik, Scobey, Mont., contractor; Ober E. Spear, Scobey, Mont., petroleum; Claude Hanrahan, Whitetail, Mont., farmer; Lucien Delagrave, Scobey, Mont., farmer; C. N. Murphy, Scobey, Mont., farmer; K. A. Furuli, Scobey, Mont., farmer; William E. Henderson, Modoc, Mont., farmer; C. K. Richardson, Scobey, Mont., farmer.

Herman Hanson, Scobey, Mont., stockman; Delbert Oglesby, Peerless, Mont., stockman; Otto Sorenson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Wilbur W. Riley, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Murray B. Lont, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Glenn Hanrahan, Whitetail, Mont., farmer; Rex Blevins, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Milton Shipstead, Scobey, Mont., farmer; W. D. Dickinson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Floyd Dickinson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Wesley Cromwell, Jr., Scobey, Mont., farmer and dairy; Henry E. Delagrave, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Clifton E. Jones, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Mike Halyk, Scobey, Mont., farmer; A. J. Wright, Scobey, Mont., well driller; Mickael Lamieu, Scobey, Mont., farmer; G. N. Crandell, Sr., Scobey, Mont., farmer; Ted Skornogoski, Scobey, Mont., farmer; R. Handy, Scobey, Mont., farmer; R. W. Susag, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Elias Paulsen, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Marius Paulsen, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Michael Hudyma, Scobey, Mont., farmer; John Suchy, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Charles Cassidy, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Edward Jensen, Scobey, Mont., farmer; L. K. McCann, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Adolph Springar, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Lyle Corey, Scobey, Mont., contractor; Ray Girard, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Don Hughes, Scobey, Mont., farmer-laborer; Harold Skerritt, Scobey, Mont., farmer.

Boyce Johnson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Leon Gendreau, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Don Gilmore, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Clarence W. Norveson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Eugene J. Wagner, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Donald Audet, Scobey, Mont., farmer; John L. Stentoft, Poplar, Mont., farmer; Louis Delagrave, Scobey, Mont., farmer; R. M. Ferguson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Alfred Kaul, Four Buttes, Mont., farmer; Peter Hauck, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Donald K. McCann, Scobey, Mont., farmer and laborer; Schuyler Hill, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Clifford Buer, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Jerry E. Bjarko, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Peter Tkachyk, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Roger C. LaPierre, Scobey, Mont., farmer;

James Tulf, Scobey, Mont., laborer; John ———, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Frank Jaski, Jr., Scobey, Mont., farmer; Roy V. William, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Edgar L. Richardson, Scobey, Mont., tavern owner; Richard N. Handy, Scobey, Mont., laborer; Stanley N. Richardson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; T. L. Babirachi, Scobey, Mont., seismologist; Fred W. Hanson, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Morris Paulson, Scobey, Mont., lumberman; Pete Vandenberg, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Homer Handy, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Gary J. Ocker, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Rex O. Opheim, Scobey, Mont., life insurance; Walter M. Tkachyk, Scobey, Mont., farmer; Otto Erstad, Scobey, Mont., farmer.

H. M. Smestad, Bainville, Mont., farmer; John Simard, Bainville, Mont., farmer; F. H. Shields, Bainville, Mont., farmer; George M. Shields, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Vernon Pacovsky, Bainville, Mont., farmer and VoAg Instr.; James Vandeberg, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Harold DeTienne, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Lawrence Crusch, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Eric Crusch, Bainville, Mont., farmer; M. A. Berwick, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Alex Tinenenko, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Oscar Romo, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Lavern Picard, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Earl LaCounte, Bainville, Mont., farmer; M. L. Berwick, Bainville, Mont., farmer; S. J. Christopherson, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Ernest Briske, Bainville, Mont., farmer; Leo Robinson, Bainville, Mont., farmer; William Harmon, Bainville, Mont., farmer-rancher; Albert Nelson, Bainville, Mont., farmer-rancher; Don Bolstad, Homestead, Mont., farmer; William A. Deem, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; George Simonean, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer and drayman; Louis Strode, Medicine Lake, Mont., cafe operator; Merlin P. Anderson, Reserve, Mont., farmer; G. A. Barr, Froid, Mont., farmer; Dale Murray, Reserve, Mont., farmer; Allen Murry, Reserve, Mont., farmer; Albin Erickson, Froid, Mont., farmer; Howard Johnson, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Eugene Parent, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Oscar Barnsness, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Alton Waller, Homestead, Mont., farmer.

LeRoy Larson, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Joseph G. Briere, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Dennis M. Stevens, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Norman Larson, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Melvin Tronson, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Wayne C. Tyler, Homestead, Mont., farmer; Howard Hove, Homestead, Mont., farmer; Harrison Umbrest, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Knut Twedt, Reserve, Mont., farmer; M. G. Schmitz, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Myrtle O. Lodahl, Medicine Lake, Mont., clerk; Anton J. Winther, Medicine Lake, Mont., clerk; Martin Holmgard, Dagmar, Mont., farmer; Fred R. Ray, Medicine Lake, Mont., merchant; Philip Reuter, Medicine Lake, Mont., insurance agent; Lee M. Euoehson, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Marlin A. Grandahl, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Carl A. Eid, Medicine Lake, Mont., merchant; Holger Groskurth, Medicine Lake, Mont., clerk; Dick French, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; George Blank, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Jerry Niederhauser, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Bob French, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Bernhard Eid, Medicine Lake, Mont., farm-laborer; D. H. Carpenter, Medicine Lake, Mont., grain buyer; Christian M. Jensen, Medicine Lake, Mont., painter; Frank Reuter, Medicine Lake, Mont., rancher; Lionel E. Borley, Medicine Lake, Mont., merchant; Julius Brien, Medicine Lake, Mont., trucker; Richard Hjort, Medicine Lake, Mont., farm laborer; D. R. Smith, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Ove J. Nielsen, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Edgar C. Granrud, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer.

D. Vern Adams, Reserve, Mont., farmer; B. E. Hancock, Medicine Lake, Mont., body man; Arnold Johnson, Dagmar, Mont., farmer; Vincent Gaffney, Medicine Lake, Mont., farmer; Wm. Keiper, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Wm. Keiper, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; William O. Keiper, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Joe Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Darrel Schipman, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Schipman, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Mrs. Frank Hanks, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Frank Hanks, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Wesley Spradley, Wolf Point, Mont., hotel manager; Mary Spradley, Wolf Point, Mont., hotel manager; Mrs. Joe Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Mrs. Leland Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Henry P. Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Maggie Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Nick O. Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Nick A. Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Mrs. Henry Braaten, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Markus Braaten, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Mrs. Markus Braaten, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Mrs. Olga Rhoads, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Mrs. Walter Mueller, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Walter J. Mueller, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Ray Jasinski, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer-laborer; Duane Onstad, Wolf Point, Mont., electrician; G. H. Bailey, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Margaret Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., telephone operator; Clarence Chamberlain, Wolf Point, Mont., stockman; Anthony Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer; Lawrence Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., farmer.

Ole L. Jensen, Richey, Mont., implement dealer; Lloyd L. Johnston, Richey, Mont., clerk; Harold Baery, Richey, Mont., farmer; Paul Sonnek, Richey, Mont., mechanic; J. L. Raisl, Richey, Mont., farmer; Norman Nelson, Richey, Mont., implement dealer; Dayton Lobdell, Richey, Mont., farmer; George Boese, Richey, Mont., farmer; Ralph O. Graber, Richey, Mont., city employee; Harold Goulding, Richey, Mont., theater; Dean Craig, Richey, Mont., filling station; George Strobel, Richey, Mont., farmer; Paul B. Jones, Richey, Mont., farmer; Julian Gibson, Richey, Mont., farmer; George J. Porter, Richey, Mont., farmer; Alfred Unrah, Richey, Mont., farmer; Vern A. Miller, Richey, Mont., mail carrier; Charles L. Miller, Richey, Mont., lumber dealer; George H. Boles, Richey, Mont., clerk; P. P. Daurence, Richey, Mont., store manager; Ben Holzworth, Richey, Mont., implement dealer; Eugene E. Michelson, Richey, Mont., farmer; William L. Colbert, Richey, Mont., farmer; William V. Zein, Richey, Mont., farmer; George J. Porter, Richey, Mont., farmer; Alfred Unrah, Richey, Mont., farmer; A. C. Williams, Richey, Mont., oil and gas dealer; Glen K. Coutts, Richey, Mont., F. U. oil manager; George Bahls, Richey, Mont., farmer; Edward Carpenter, Richey, Mont., farmer; G. B. Crockett, Richey, Mont., farmer; Ralph Levengood, Richey, Mont., rancher; Irving Bames, Poplar, Mont., farmer.

Harold Brown, Richey, Mont., farmer; Robert D. Richey, Richey, Mont., farmer; B. M. Whitman, Circle, Mont., well driller; Edward Zuroff, Richey, Mont., farmer; Newell Beery, Richey, Mont., farmer; Peter C. Abler, Richey, Mont., banker; Ruben Brown, Richey, Mont., business; Otis S. Waters, Richey, Mont., farmer; Ray Sampson, Richey, Mont., farmer; Harry Johnson, Richey, Mont., agent, Standard Oil; Joe F. Benes, Richey, Mont., farmer; Roland Grundmeyer, Richey, Mont., farmer; John Unruh, Richey, Mont., mechanic; Seymore Adsem, Wolf Point, Mont., lineman; Gunnar Jensen, Wolf Point Mont., body man; Stella Heser, Wolf Point, Mont., housewife; Dennis Morey, Wolf Point, Mont., salesman.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE—STATEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have received from Michael Pelinsky, chairman of the Erie branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which was unanimously adopted by that organization on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE, JANUARY 22, 1918, TO JANUARY 22, 1957

On January 22, 1918, at the close of World War I, the Ukrainian people reached another milestone in their historic development when they established a united, democratic, and independent republic. The event was of epochal significance not only for the Ukrainians, but for the whole of Eastern Europe as well. After almost two centuries of foreign domination by Russia and Austria, Ukraine finally attained its full freedom and independence.

The young republic, which was prompt to call an all-national parliament, the Ukrainian Central Rada, promulgated a series of liberal laws affecting the social and economic life of the population and assuring all minorities of equal rights as full-fledged citizens, but Ukraine could not enjoy for long peace and prosperity in freedom.

Although the Red leaders, Lenin and Trotsky, recognized the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine, Bolshevik Russia unleashed its newly organized Red army and in a series of invasions and large-scale battles, succeeded in destroying the young independent State of Ukraine, and impose upon the Ukrainian people—by force and terror so well demonstrated now in Hungary—the oppressive yoke of Russian communism. Even such a marked event as the union of all Ukrainian lands by an act of union on January 22, 1919, a year after the proclamation of independence, could not sustain the Ukrainian people in their effort to preserve their hardly won freedom in the face of the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia. By the end of 1920 the vast Ukrainian lands—with the exception of western Ukraine, Carpatho-Ukraine, and Bukovina, and Bessarabia—were subjected to the totalitarian domination of Moscow.

The martyrdom of the Ukrainian people under the Bolshevik regime has been measured by countless crimes committed against them by Moscow. But neither mass executions of Ukrainian patriots and deportations of millions of Ukrainians to Siberia, nor forcible Russification and outright genocide could ever break the determination of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom and independence.

During and after World War II, the vast Ukrainian underground forces, led by the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA), challenged Moscow's domination by stubborn and systematic resistance to Russia. Even in the Soviet slave labor camps of Vorkuta, Norilsk, Karaganda, Kingir, Mordovia and Verkhnoye-Umbatskoye, the Ukrainian political prisoners have been bold and recalcitrant defenders of freedom and human decency, and have staged bloody strikes and rebellions that have shaken the entire system of Soviet slave labor camps in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956.

It is the spirit of independence that keeps the Ukrainian underground forces alive even today and the Ukrainian people united against the alien rule of Moscow. In May 1956, the Ukrainian partisans attacked several Soviet military supply trains in Ukraine. During the Hungarian revolution in November 1956, Ukrainian freedom fighters blew up Soviet supply trains en route to Hungary at the railroad stations of Stanislaviv, Kolomeya, Nadvirna and Vorokhta in western Ukraine and in Carpatho-Ukraine. At the critical hour in Hungary, many Ukrainians from the Soviet Armies not only refused to fight against the Hungarians, but went over to the latter's side with tanks and am-

munition and joined the Hungarians in their struggle against the Russians.

Today, as Ukrainians the world over commemorate the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, the free world must take cognizance of the plight of the Ukrainian people under Russian tyranny. For all these long years, the Ukrainians were almost alone and unaided in their struggle against Moscow. Russian tyranny, as evidenced in Hungary, is by no means limited to Ukraine; it threatens to spread in Asia and in the Middle East, and indeed, to the Western Hemisphere.

Admiration alone for freedom fighters in Ukraine and Hungary and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain will not help these people to get rid of Russian domination. We must do more than that if we still believe in the principle that all nations, however great, however small, should be free and independent.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment.

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States (Rept. No. 45).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 970. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 971. A bill to abolish the death penalty in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 972. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Yun Wha Yoon Holsman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Melham Fayad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 975. A bill for the relief of Dionisios Vasiliou Tsiros; and

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) (by request):

S. 977. A bill to suspend and to modify the application of the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation laws to lands in the East Bench Unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 978. A bill for the relief of Satenik Damlama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 979. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 980. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare post-hospital treatment program for drug addiction and for other purposes; and

S. 981. A bill to create an Advisory Committee on Drug Addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 982. A bill to establish a hospital of the Public Health Service in one of the Pacific coast States especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 983. A bill for the relief of Dean Wing Chin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 984. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945, and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 985. A bill for the relief of Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (by request):

S. 986. A bill to amend section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to loss, damage, and overcharge claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 987. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Finelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 988. A bill for the relief of Satoe Yamakage Langley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 989. A bill for the relief of George A. J. Froberger; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 990. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to individuals at age 60; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the recognition of the Altar of the Nation as a national shrine.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. IVES:

S. Res. 81. Resolution favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolution printed in full which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO COSPONSORSHIP OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Senate Resolution 82

Resolved, That, beginning at the 2d session, 85th Congress, the paragraph No. 1 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall be amended by adding after the word "day", at the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."; so that, as amended, the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN ANNUITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note from a letter received from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission that a person who has served clerically in the legislative branch and is subsequently elected to Congress, for the first 5 years loses his right of survivorship under the retirement system.

This would appear to be patently unjust. There may be other injustices involved, but, in any event, I believe this situation ought to be cured.

To that end, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annnuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Chairman

of the Civil Service Commission, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 972) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 972

A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 6 (f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by striking out the words "or survivor of a Member."

(b) Section 10 (c) of such act is amended by striking out "If an employee dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service, or a Member dies after completing at least 5 years of Member service", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "If an employee or a Member dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service."

(c) Section 10 (d) of such act is amended by striking out "If an employee dies after completing 5 years of civilian service or a Member dies after completing 5 years of Member service" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "If an employee or a Member dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service."

The letter presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1957.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have your letter of December 14, 1956, submitting draft of proposed amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of certain Members of Congress.

Under existing law, when an employee dies after completing at least 5 years' civilian service, survivor annuity benefits become payable to his widow and children (who meet certain conditions not here material). Similarly, upon death of a Member of Congress with at least 5 years' Member service to his credit, his eligible widow and children are entitled to survivor annuity.

This statute does permit the existence of an anomalous situation in a very limited number of cases, which we are positive was never intended. This involves an employee who, upon election or appointment as Member of Congress, no longer has annuity protection for his survivors. Survivor protection will again attach (1) when he completes 5 years' service as Member or (2) when he returns to non-Member Federal employment before expiration of 5 years, but his death in the interim would support no annuity award to his widow or children.

The draft as written is in proper form to produce the result sought—that of continuing survivor protection in the few cases which will be involved. Since the Commission does not recommend as to enactment of legislation relating solely to Members of Congress, I have not reviewed the policy implications of this with my associate Commissioners.

Sincerely,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the 84th Congress, we passed legislation amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was then aware of the fact that if tax benefits were added to the benefits under the bill as written it would be possible for some large corporate claimants to receive more in total benefits than was actually lost abroad. At the same time, some of the smaller claimants would not receive anywhere near the amount of money they lost in foreign countries. To correct this patently unfair and unsought-for effect, the Senate committee adopted an amendment which I offered. The Senate saw fit to accept the amendment, and it went with the bill to conference.

During our meetings, the conference committee, of which I was a member, was informed by representatives of the Internal Revenue Service that the Senate's interpretation of the bill as it related to existing tax law was inaccurate. On the strength of that informaion, the conference commitee agreed to drop the Senate amendment.

Subsequent to the enactment of the law, I engaged in further consultation with the Treasury Department. In the course of this consultation the Department furnished me with a memorandum on the law, which in effect proved that the Senate had been correct and the representative of the Internal Revenue Service had been wrong. I therefore urged that a new bill be prepared to correct the defect of the present legislation.

I am happy to report that in these efforts I have had the fullest cooperation of the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service. I have now been furnished with a bill which, I understand, is acceptable to both agencies. This bill which I introduce would carry out the objective which the Senate tried to achieve when the legislation was first before us.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 979) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF DRUG ADDICTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills concerning the treatment of drug addiction. The overall purpose of these measures is to strengthen, expand and improve the Federal program for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts as well as to encourage the States to initiate constructive narcotic treatment programs of their own.

The first of these bills contains amendments to sections 341, 344, 345, 347, and 348 of the Public Health Service Act. This bill provides for the establishment by the Federal Government of aftercare treatment units for drug patients who have been released from the Federal hospitals that handle narcotic cases. Further, the bill authorizes the use of Federal funds by the States to assist them in developing their own narcotics treatment program. The bill also enables the acceptance of drug patients committed by State courts at the treatment facilities of the United States Public Health Service.

The second bill, which is an amendment to section 347 of the Public Health Service Act, provides for an advisory committee on drug addiction composed of experts in the field, which will make recommendations for the improvement of the Federal drug treatment program.

The third bill, an amendment to section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, authorizes the establishment of a United States Public Health Service hospital on the west coast of the United States for the treatment of drug addiction.

The battle against drug addiction and the illicit narcotics traffic can only be won by combining vigorous action by law-enforcement agencies directed against those engaged in the narcotics racket, and equally important on the positive side, an enlightened and effective treatment program aimed initially at giving the addict the kind of psychological and psychiatric guidance necessary to separate him permanently from the use of narcotic drugs. Both the Federal Government and the States have strong laws directed against the drug traffic which are being carried out conscientiously by the appropriate Federal and State law-enforcement agencies. Tragically, with the exception of the two Federal hospitals and one State hospital, we are without any effective overall drug treatment program in the United States. Simply serving time in a penal institution or confinement for several months in a State mental hospital with only the barest token psychiatric assistance are the typical methods of dealing with drug addiction at present. This approach only makes certain the return of the addicts to the use of narcotics shortly after their release from the institution. The existing absence of a well-rounded treatment program, either on the Federal or State level, insures a continuation of the disastrous narcotics traffic in the United States.

If, as has been sometimes thought, treatment of drug addiction were hopeless, if the statement "once an addict always an addict" were true, there would be no need to establish an intelligent overall treatment program. Permanent incarceration and isolation would be the only course to follow. Happily there is every indication that in a great percentage of cases of drug addiction a long-range intelligent treatment program will result in cure. In a recent New York

study, 80 percent of the patients treated remained free from the use of drugs. It is, therefore, vital to the national welfare that the present Federal program for the treatment of drug addiction be instilled with vitality and expanded and improved sufficiently as to be a useful and potent weapon in the war against drug addiction.

Essentially the treatment of drug addiction is the responsibility of the various States. Experience has demonstrated that often when the States are given some measure of assistance by the Federal Government they are better able to develop services and facilities in the social welfare field. The proposed bill, therefore, provides for a method by which the States will get financial help from the Federal Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The moneys are to be used for the development by the States of narcotic treatment facilities, a training program for the staff of these facilities, which would include psychology, psychiatry, doctors and social workers, and funds for research. This program would be administered through the Surgeon General's office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The allocation of these funds is left to the discretion of the Surgeon General.

Drug addiction exists primarily in and about the urban areas of the United States. A grant-in-aid program, using a rigid formula in distributing moneys to all States is therefore impractical. Under the proposed bill the States will have to assume their full share of financial responsibility before they will be entitled to receive the Federal money. Whatever expense is involved in this program will be repaid many times as a result of addicts who have been cured and who will no longer require the constant attention of the law-enforcement agencies and who no longer will spend the major portion of their lives in and out of penal institutions.

A second critical provision of the bill is the establishment of aftercare post hospital treatment units attached to and connected with the United States public health hospitals treating drug addiction. Numerically, two-thirds of the drug patients admitted to the hospital at Lexington—the largest of the two Federal hospitals treating drug addiction—come as volunteers. The remaining group are Federal prisoners. Of this two-thirds, 73 percent leave before they have stayed a 4½-month period—the minimum time prescribed by the hospital for treatment. In addition, neither of the hospitals have a formal aftercare treatment program. Consequently, the great bulk of these patients who have gone as volunteers, upon release immediately return to their former environment and old associates and very soon relapse to the use of drugs. A narcotics treatment program without aftercare is similar to the performance of surgery without sewing up the wound at the completion of the operation.

The bill provides for the care and treatment of State-committed patients to the United States Public Health Service hospitals treating drug addiction. This will enable addicts from many of the States which are unable, because of the heavy expense involved to develop their own treatment facilities, to utilize the Federal services.

Furthermore, under this bill, when a drug patient who has been repeatedly as a volunteer at one of the Federal hospitals treating drug addiction, always remaining but a few days, applies for readmission, he may be required to secure admission through commitment from a State court. Once in the hospital pursuant to commitment from a State court, the drug patient will be compelled to remain until he has materially benefited from the treatment program.

The second of the bills being introduced provides for an advisory committee on drug addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This committee is to be composed of experts in the field. The function of this committee will be to make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to improving the Federal narcotics program. The problem of the treatment of drug addicts is a dynamic and ever changing field and the Surgeon General can certainly benefit from the counsel and assistance that can be given to him by leaders in the field of drug treatment.

The third bill provides for the establishing of a Federal narcotics treatment center on the west coast and is the result of hearings held by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I was chairman. These hearings were the result of a year-long study of the treatment problems in the United States. It was learned that California has one of the most acute narcotics problems in the country. In fact, it is the only State in which the increase of the use of drugs by juveniles has been steadily maintained in the last 3 years. Testimony was given by responsible community leaders that despite the seriousness of this problem California does not have at present any program for the treatment of drug addiction.

The two Federal hospitals that treat drug addicts are located at a great distance from the west coast and it is necessary that a Federal treatment center be located in that area.

This bill embraces the framework for a comprehensive treatment program integrating the resources of the Federal and State Governments. When implemented by the States a procedure can be established under the bill for the gradual assimilation of the addict back into the community through the use of the proposed State developed facilities and the Federal outpatient units. States will be able to establish half-way houses where the addict, after release from the hospital, can live again in his home community, go to work, but still have the benefit of a small degree of supervision and professional guidance while readjusting himself to normal living. The State will also be able to utilize forestry camps for the same purpose.

We would not expect to effect a cure of any physical or mental disorder by simply confining a patient in an institution without any specific treatment for his illness. Yet, we often feel frustrated because the drug addict, who requires extended treatment for his specific problem emerges from a period of confinement and relapses to the use of drugs.

The plain facts are that a comprehensive treatment program for drug addiction does not exist in the United States. In penal institutions the addict simply does his time. In State mental hospitals where many addicts are sometimes committed for treatment the program normally consists of a period of sitting and waiting for release.

It was disclosed in the hearings of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee that the drug addict has his first contact with drugs normally at 17 or 18 years of age. Within a year, or even less, they have their first conflict with the law. The typical present approach of punishment, incarceration and reprimand by the patient's parents and community hardly represent an affirmative program to effect a cure which will permanently separate these unfortunate youngsters from the use of drugs. In the absence of the kind of program provided for in the proposed bill these young people are destined to continue their association with narcotics for the rest of their adult lives and to become involved in crime as a means of sustaining their habit. We must equip ourselves with adequate therapeutic tools to meet this problem, otherwise we will be abandoning these maturing human beings to the destructive forces of drug addiction due largely to our neglect.

Mr. President, I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 980. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare post-hospital-treatment program for drug addiction and for other purposes; and

S. 981. A bill to create an Advisory Committee on Drug Addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 982. A bill to establish a hospital of the Public Health Service in one of the Pacific coast States especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN URANIUM MINERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945, and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined.

A somewhat similar bill was introduced last year by Senator Millikin and me.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation which will be paid to certain independent ore producers who have equitable claims against the United States Government for ores supplied by them containing uranium used in experimental research and production of atomic energy.

If enacted, this measure would grant relief to certain small, independent producers, who, because of rigid security restrictions imposed by the Government in connection with the development of the atomic bomb program, were not paid for the uranium content of ores sold by them to agents or licensees of the Government during the period from May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945.

I appreciate the necessity for such secrecy which alone was responsible for the failure to pay the small producers at the time ore deliveries were made. Since the two largest ore producers were made agents of the Government, these companies were necessarily made aware of the use of such ore and payments for the uranium content were made to them at the time of delivery.

Under these circumstances it would seem that the Federal Government has an obligation to pay just compensation to these independent companies for property used in the successful prosecution of the war.

On May 4, 1956, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on this bill. As a result of these hearings, and to meet certain suggestions made by the subccmmittee, the bill has been redrafted to: First, exclude the large companies, processors and/or milling companies; second, revise the period of production for which equitable compensation should be granted to the independent ore producers from January 1, 1939–April 9, 1948, to May 1, 1943–August 5, 1945; and, third, change the price provision from $3.50 to $2.30 as the basis per ton for which the court cculd compensate these producers.

It is my opinion from the study I have made of this matter that this is not a special-interest bill. The bill would not reimburse selected members of a class, but rather would place all members of a class in a similar position.

Mr. President, the small miner is the backbone of the mining industry today, as he has always been. Without him we would not have made many of the basic discoveries that we have made.

I believe in the small miner, and I believe that this is a bill that will properly aid him in obtaining payment for ores containing uranium that was utilized by the Government for national-defense needs.

These small producers were deprived of valuable property without just compensation. They were deprived of an opportunity to sell this valuable material because they did not know its value or its end use. They did not know because of necessary security regulations.

It is inconceivable to me that these independent miners would have sold their ore at the price they received had they known its true value. At the time they were compensated only for the vanadium content of the ore.

With the wartime secrecy that precluded their knowing the ultimate use of the ore, they could not obtain the value of the uranium which their ore also contained. There were some rumors, and I have been told that some of these men attempted to recover from the processors the value of the uranium content. Naturally they did not succeed.

Mr. President, I feel that this bill will, if enacted, authorize compensation only for the meritorious claims, claims which the Government is justified in paying from both a moral and legal standpoint. I, therefore, strongly urge that it be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 984) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945, and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECOGNITION OF THE ALTAR OF THE NATION AS A NATIONAL SHRINE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution providing for the recognition of the Altar of the Nation, located in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine.

I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution may lie on the desk for 5 days to permit other Members of the Senate to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Altar of the Nation, located in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., which has been dedicated to the glory of God as a memorial to all American war dead, should be recognized as a national shrine.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PEOPLE OF CYPRUS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, one of the many explosive conditions in the world today involves the island of Cyprus. The residents of the island, predominantly Greek in origin, seek a union between Cyprus and Greece—or at least the opportunity for self-determination, which surely would result in union with Greece. The British Government, for complex political and military reasons, wants to retain the control which it has had over Cyprus for many years. The violence resulting from this situation has plagued the island for many years and is growing worse.

The effects of the dispute over Cyprus are felt far abroad. This conflict embitters the relationship between Britain and Greece, thereby weakening the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of which both are members. It strains the relations between Greece and Turkey, who are members of the Balkan Alliance. It provides the Communists with an opportunity to make propaganda about Britain's colonialism, thereby further damaging Britain's reputation among the anti-colonial nations of Asia and the Middle East.

Last year several Senators sponsored a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the British Government should proceed, in its relations with the people of Cyprus, upon the principle of self-determination.

As one of the sponsors of that resolution, I am submitting today substantially the same resolution. I believe its adoption would contribute to a constructive and peaceful solution of the difficult Cyprus question.

I submit the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask that it lie on the desk until the close of business at the first session of next week, so that other interested Senators may join me in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie at the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the people of the Island of Cyprus are struggling for their liberty and are demanding an end to their present colonial position in the British Empire; and

Whereas serious tension has arisen in the eastern Mediterranean area over Cyprus between our NATO ally, Great Britain, and our NATO ally, Greece, which has close ties of kinship and culture with the people of Cyprus; and

Whereas the United States is now recasting and remodeling its policy in the Middle East, of which Cyprus is an integral part, with a view to repairing the damage done to the free world's collective security system; and

Whereas the United States fought a great world war under the banner of the principle of self-determination of peoples: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that—

(a) the British Government should be urged by our Government to see the wisdom of seeking to maintain its influence in this area by the exercise of leadership in the cause of freedom rather than by the use of force and repression; and

(b) Free world collective security considerations should be given due weight but should not be used as an excuse for the frustration of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus; and

(c) The principle of self-determination, to which the United States has historically subscribed, be applied to the people of Cyprus.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF CONSTRUCTION ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. POTTER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 497) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 828) authorizing certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries, and it was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 478) to cede to the State of New Mexico concurrent jurisdiction over certain areas of land in the State of New Mexico now under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] may be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by me on behalf of myself and other Senators on January 17, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

METHOD OF COMPUTING INCOME OF FARMERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 670) to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958, the next time it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] may be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States, the next time the joint resolution is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF INCREASED PRICES OF FUEL OIL AND GASOLINE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 64), which calls for a special committee to investigate the recent increases in the prices of fuel oil and gasoline, which resolution I submitted on January 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Two addresses delivered by him, one on the steps of Federal Hall in New York City on January 11, 1957, and the other to the board of governors of the American Stock Exchange in New York City, on the same day.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement commemorating the 196th anniversary of the birth of Albert Gallatin.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States the following nominations:

The following-named Foreign Service officer for promotion from class 4 to class 3: William B. Kelly, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4: Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana; and Walter L. Nelson, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America: Charles W. Brown, of California; Joseph F. Christiano, of New York; Walter T. Kamprad, of California; and Abraham Vigil, of Colorado.

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation has been deeply concerned over the recent unjustified and unfair criticism of the National Guard made by the Secretary of Defense.

Even before the Secretary's unfortunate remark, however, there were indications that, unfortunately, there is not a genuine awareness in some high circles of the importance, of the honorable record, and the indispensable future role of a strong National Guard.

Having worked on legislative, armory, and other problems for many years with National Guard officers, and enlisted men of my State, having seen them in training at Camp McCoy, having noted their sacrifices in time of war and peace, I personally feel a sense of deep obligation to make sure that the Guard is neither slurred nor in any way devitalized.

I send to the desk the text of a further statement I have prepared on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have noted with deep interest the counterproposal which has just been made by the adjutants general of the States—a counterproposal to the administration's plan which would otherwise require all National Guard recruits to take 6 months of active-duty training.

I believe that the adjutants general's suggestion deserves the most sympathetic consideration. I am sure that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees will accord precisely such consideration to these and any other constructive viewpoints so that there can be a genuine meeting of the minds.

We are all, of course, interested in the very same objective, and that is, a strong, invincible America.

We cannot, however, have such a strong, invincible America unless the Guard is permitted to play its fullest and most effective role.

LETTER FROM GENERAL OLSON

Indicative of the position of a great many adjutants general is that of Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson, the able head of the Wisconsin National Guard, who had conveyed to me, as a matter of fact, prior to Secretary Wilson's regrettable remark, his own deep feelings on this subject.

There follows the text of Major General Olson's significant comments. As will be noted, incidentally, General Olson touches

briefly on the problem of adequate armory facilities as well:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, January 17, 1957.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * The mission of the National Guard is twofold. First, to provide a Reserve component of the Army, adequately organized, trained and equipped, available for mobilization in the event of national emergency or war and capable of participating in combat operations. Its additional mission is to provide the States with sufficient organizations so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strengths in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

We are particularly anxious to maintain and improve our state of training to keep us qualified for those missions. We believe that placing a mandatory restriction on our potential recruits which will require them to take 6 months active duty training in order to qualify them for membership in the National Guard will seriously affect the strength of the guard to a point which will eventually reduce it to an impotent force. I am sure you do not desire that to come to pass.

Young men of military age are either still in school or embarking on their vocations. For this reason, those individuals find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain 6 months leave to participate in the newly announced program. A training period of active duty should be designed so that it can be accepted by the citizen soldier.

We are also perturbed about the Bureau of the Budget withholding funds appropriated by the Congress for the Federal share for construction of armories for the National Guard. Without adequate training facilities our training program is greatly hampered and our efficiency materially reduced.

We appreciate this opportunity to acquaint you with the above facts * * *.

Sincerely,

RALPH J. OLSON,
Major General,
Wisconsin National Guard,
The Adjutant General.

PATRIOTIC RECORD OF THE GUARD

I should like to point out that there are over 400,000 officers and enlisted men in the National Guard throughout the country. In my own State, more than 12,000 Badgers, including enlisted men and officers, are participating in this fine program to give an ever-ready fighting force on the home front.

Their tradition as citizen-soldiers is a noble one. The patriotic combat record of national guardsmen who were called to duty for service on countless fields of battle and in the skies over enemy territory—that combat record dare not be discounted by any right-thinking person.

In this jet-atomic age, we need—more than ever—an effective force on the home front.

In the event of enemy attack—which, God grant, will never occur—the entire North American Continent might be a battle zone. Consequently, we need these minute-men of defense in tiptop shape and ready for mobilization throughout the country.

There follows a copy of the resolution by the executive council of the National Guard Association of the United States, as set forth on January 27, 1957, outlining a program the association feels would be more realistic and effective than the hard-and-fast administration ruling that would require 6-months active duty training period for all recruits:

"Resolved by the executive council of the National Guard Association of the United States, meeting in Washington, D. C., this 27th day of January 1957, That the following program of active duty training for the Army National Guard be recommended:

"1. That all men who have attained the age of 18½ years and who are members of the Army National Guard on March 31, 1957, be permitted to volunteer for a 6-months active-duty training program provided they have not already completed a prescribed basic training course.

"2. That all men who have attained the age of 18½ years who become members of the Army National Guard on or after April 1, 1957, be required to perform 6 months active-duty training provided they have not already completed a prescribed basic training course.

"3. That all men age 17 to 18½ years who are members of the Army National Guard on March 31, 1957, be permitted to volunteer for either 11 weeks active duty basic training or the 6 months active duty training program provided they have not already completed a prescribed basic training course.

"4. That all men age 17 to 18½ years who become members of the Army National Guard on or after April 1, 1957, be required to perform 11 weeks active duty basic training or volunteer for the 6 months active duty training program provided they have not already completed a prescribed basic training course."

ONE EXAMPLE OF THE IMPACT OF TODAY'S TAXES—WHY THE NATIONAL TAX COMMISSION IS NECESSARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 22, I introduced S. 769, for the purpose of establishing a Hoover style Commission on Federal Taxation.

I stated at that time—as recorded on page 822 of the RECORD—that the bill will be held in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, pending the addition of the names of numerous of my colleagues who are indicating that they will be glad to serve as cosponsors.

EIGHT ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

I am pleased to note that already the following Senators, my associates, have kindly indicated that they will be pleased to join with me on behalf of this proposed legislation: The distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], as well as the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

I believe that there will be additional cosponsors whose names I will be able shortly to give to the Senate. And I should like to renew my invitation to my other colleagues to join with us in this proposed legislation.

As I pointed out subsequently in the January 23 RECORD, on page 890, the response to my proposal has been uniformly enthusiastic.

WIDESPREAD APPROVAL

I have communicated with a number of leading figures of private enterprise throughout our country, and their initial reactions are all excellent.

From these famous people and from people who are unknown, from experts who have devoted a lifetime to exploring tax problems to laymen who may not be expert in taxes but who do know what the April 15 tax deadline means to them and to their families—from all of them, have come an almost unanimous chorus of approval.

TAXES ON WORKINGWOMEN

Let me cite one specific example of a phase of American taxes which should be studied. I refer to the problem of working wives in our country. I say that the National Tax Commission should take a look at the harsh impact of taxes on these workingwomen.

Let us remember that 20 million women are today in America's labor force. That means one-third of the entire labor force. Let us remember that more than one-half of all women workers are married. Moreover, more than 5 million women workers have children under the age of 18.

For the women who go out to work to supplement their husband's income, what is the impact of taxes? The answer is: A heavy impact, a very heavy impact.

NEW YORK TIMES' ARTICLE

As proof, let me cite an article in the financial section of the Sunday, January 20, New York Times. It reported expert evidence from the tax editor of the J. K. Lasser Tax Report. Included among the report's findings was the disturbing fact that if, let us say, a husband is earning $4,000 a year and his wife is earning $3,600 a year, the actual net income which is added as a result of the wife's work may prove to be only approximately $1,400 or so. I repeat, $1,400, based upon her own earned income of $3,600 a year.

Of course, the specific tax impact will vary from case to case. Of course, too, there are both intangible as well as tangible factors, affecting whether a wife will choose to continue to work and, in particular, whether a mother will work.

This is a tax phase which certainly requires careful study.

I send to the desk the text of the article from the New York Times. It illustrates the sort of new development on the American scene which should be carefully evaluated—the relatively new phenomenon of millions upon millions of workingwomen and the serious tax impact upon them. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES TOUGH ON WORKING WIFE—OFTEN MUST EARN $2 TO CLEAR $1

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

Working wives have become more and more numerous in American business. Their emotional problems have been discussed widely and the financial benefits are not neglected, but the tax angle often is skimmed over lightly.

Now John D. Cunnion, tax editor of the J. K. Lasser Tax Report, has compiled some revealing figures.

Once the wedding cake is eaten, young married couples face the question: Shall the bride continue to work and help bring home the bacon? Where the bridegroom is in the low- or medium-income groups, the answer generally seems to be yes.

Suppose the wife is a secretary who earns $3,600 a year. She probably has about $20 a week in expenses because of her work—$10 to cover carfare, lunches, newspapers, etc., and $10 for clothes she needs for the office. Here is the amount she will add to the family income, after Federal taxes:

Husband's Salary	Added income from wife's work
$4,000	$1,400
5,000	1,380
6,000	1,370
7,000	1,350
8,000	1,320

To a young couple, $100 a month additional income can mean a great deal. They may use it to buy new furniture, to save for the time babies arrive, to accumulate a downpayment for a house, to take a trip to Europe, to buy stock.

But the wife's contribution decreases as the husband's salary increases. If he makes $15,000 a year, his wife's $3,600 salary produces a mere $980 additional income after her $20 weekly expenses and Federal income taxes are deducted.

The aspect changes where incomes are more similar, such as in the case of the wife in a middle-income group—perhaps as assistant buyer for a department store, a magazine writer, an assistant professor, a department head, a chemist. She will need, say, $1,500 a year for lunches, apparel, a cleaning woman, etc.

Here is the tally:

Husband's salary	Family keeps when wife earns—		
	$6,000	$7,000	$8,000
$6,000	$3,140	$3,940	$4,670
$7,000	3,130	3,870	4,580
$8,000	3,070	3,780	4,480
$10,000	2,880	3,580	4,280

The additional "take home," ranging from $2,880 to $4,670, looks impressive and certainly allows ample savings and a higher standard of living than does the husband's salary alone.

THE WORKING MOTHER

Then there is the growing number of working wives with children. Here the complications—and the moralizing—begin. The young couple must weigh seriously the sacrifices as well as the financial benefits. With both parents working, the children will miss parental attention for 8 or more hours a day. However, some working mothers say an expert and kindly nurse can do a more objective job of child rearing than they could, and they can exhibit polite and self-reliant children in proof.

The cost of the child care runs from zero to about $60 a week for an experienced live-in nurse in big cities. The zero applies when a grandmother is willing and able to take over. However, most young couples find that the grandparent is either willing but physically unable, or able but unwilling, to take the job full time.

That means married couples must rely on regularly employed outsiders. Sometimes they may be lucky enough to find a retired nurse. But such women are as rare a find as a richly productive uranium mine.

There are some hidden expenses, too. If a wife stays home, she probably washes the children's clothes, from diapers to denims. If she works, she may be too busy. Since she can't go to the supermarket each day, perhaps she relies on home milk delivery, and that adds a dollar or two to the dairy bill. Nurses eat, and they add to the monthly food bill. The family may move to the suburbs to find larger living space, and that can mean commutation and other added costs. State income taxes may take a bite, too.

On the other side, there are some plus factors for the career mother. Her company probably covers her with an insurance policy. If she dies, she can count on leaving a substantial social-security benefit for the child until age 18. All the time she is building up social-security benefits for herself at age 62 or 65 and perhaps a company pension.

In balance, the monetary profits for the working mother may not seem large, but her career may still be very worth while. The couple may have extra financial obligations, ranging from a handicapped child to a dependent parent. They may be saving for a house. The husband may have a mercurial job, such as acting or free-lance writing, with an income that varies widely. The wife may be much happier at work, fulfilling lifetime ambitions, than she would be at home, struggling through what she considers brain-numbing housework. There is an added measure of security for the career mother in that she could carry on relatively well if anything happened to the husband.

In the war-threatened, inflation-wary world of today, there is no doubt more and more young couples ponder the advantages of a double working income. When they do, they should take a careful look at the tax angle—it's as basic as meat and potatoes.

OREGON WILL PARTICIPATE MORE ADEQUATELY IN AID TO SCHOOLS UNDER KELLEY BILL THAN UNDER THE PROGRAM OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my State of Oregon will participate far more fairly in Federal aid to school construction under the Kelley bill than under the program just announced by the Eisenhower administration.

Let me set forth as tersely as possible the contrast in Oregon's role under the two programs.

The administration proposal would allocate $325 million a year for each of the next 4 years in grants to States for new classrooms. This is a grand total of $1,300,000,000. The formula for distributing the funds would be largely predicated on need.

The Kelley bill would allocate $600 million a year for new classrooms for each of the next 5 years. This is a grand total of $3 billion. Distribution of the funds would be mainly based on school population.

Under the administration program, Oregon would receive $3,099,000 annually, and Oregon would be required to contribute $3,368,000 in matching funds in order to qualify for this Federal grant.

Under the Kelley bill, Oregon would receive $5,839,000 annually, and would be required to contribute exactly this same sum—$5,839,000 in matching funds—in order to qualify for the Federal grant.

The Kelley bill, let me add, is H. R. 1 in the House of Representatives; and I am sponsoring an identical companion measure in the Senate, where it is S. 777.

I hope to explain why I regard the Kelley bill as far better for Oregon and more fair to Oregon.

I am sponsoring a companion measure to the Kelley bill because Oregon is a State where the people have made a heroic and sacrificial effort to provide good schools and sound education. Our State has high local property taxes—in some areas, even staggering property taxes. I know farmers and homeowners who can barely finance these payments. Furthermore, Oregon today carries the heaviest State income tax in the Nation—without exception. The bulk of the tax burden goes to finance education.

Yet Oregon, which pays these burdensome taxes, has not kept pace with national prosperity during recent years. In 1952 per capita incomes in Oregon were running at a rate $97 above the national average; today they are $10 below the national average. While per capita incomes have been rising nationally about 11 percent since 1952, those in Oregon have risen only 4.5 percent—which is in no way comparable to the nationwide increase.

I cite these facts to indicate that Oregon is not a wealthy State, and that it is not enjoying any plush or gilt-edged prosperity. Its people are scrambling hard to make both ends meet, to pay the grocery bill and the rent. Yet, under the administration school proposal, Oregon qualifies for less in Federal aid than it must put forth in matching funds.

H. R. 1 AND S. 777 PROVIDE $5,839,000 FOR OREGON SCHOOLS ANNUALLY

Under the Kelley bill, however, Oregon must provide in matching funds only an amount identical to that which Oregon will receive for its schools. In addition, the Kelley bill program will last for 1 year longer than the administration plan, and President Eisenhower himself admits that the number of children in public schools will have increased by 12 million during the decade from 1952 to 1962. On top of all this, the Kelley bill will furnish Oregon with 86 percent more in Federal financial aid each year than will the administration scheme.

The administration formula is based on Department of Commerce per capita income figures. The State with the highest personal income will provide $2 for each $1 granted for school construction by the Federal Government. The State with the lowest personal income would provide $1 for each $2 in Federal funds. The remaining 46 States will provide matching funds on a sliding scale between these extremes. Thus Oregon, under the administration's measurement, would advance approximately $1.10 in matching revenues for each $1 collected in Federal aid. Under the Kelley bill, by comparison, Oregon would receive dollar for dollar, on an absolutely equal basis. It would be at par.

Mr. President, much can be said to justify the distribution of school-aid funds under the needs formula proposed by the administration. Yet such a formula would reward the South, where school financial resources often have been dissipated through the dual system which calls for separate school buildings for white and colored students. This is due to racial prejudice, and nothing more. In my opinion, the needs formula would send south of the Mason and Dixon line a disproportionate amount of Federal aid funds.

The basic question is not wealth but school children. A State may be relatively wealthy per capita, and yet have so many children of school age that its financial resources are strained to the utmost. Oregon is a State where numerous local districts are bonded to the hilt, and beyond. In addition, some neighborhoods and districts are so lacking in property of high assessment value that local property taxes simply cannot finance adequate schools. Such areas are often not in direct ratio to the per capita wealth of a State. I doubt if the administration's so-called needs formula is as wholly desirable as the measuring stick of school population which is called for under the Kelley bill.

I favor, instead, the population formula of the Kelley bill. It might be feasible and desirable to add to the Kelley bill a separate sum for equalization, which would be over and above the total amount available for national distribution in the form of aid to new school classrooms. This equalization fund would be wholly related to need. Under such an arrangement, the South would receive the lion's share of the equalization fund. But at least this proposal would separate equalization from the school funds totally available for the entire United States.

SCHOOL AID RANKS NEAR THE TOP OF LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Mr. President, I have studied this problem so attentively because I regard it as No. 1 among the challenges to the 85th Congress.

While we have been spending more than $40 billion annually on armaments of various kinds, we thus far have been unable to enact legislation for assisting in the construction of schoolrooms. Yet of what value is our defense if we neglect the welfare of the next generation of citizens? Furthermore, ignorance is a handmaiden of dictatorship, whether the dictatorship be of the Communist or Fascist variety. Benighted minds are the clay with which the tyrant molds his empire. Schools are the lanterns to light the way to progress and understanding. Surely the great Government of the United States can make a relatively small investment in better schools and in modern education generally. The Kelley bill, after all, proposes to invest each year in new school buildings a mere 1.5 percent of what the country spends annually for arms and defense; and the administration school program is even less than this—but eight-tenths of 1 percent of our yearly armament budget.

I think my colleagues know how close to my heart is the great hydroelectric project of Hells Canyon, on the Snake River. Denial of this project by the administration has cost the Pacific Northwest much in development and expansion. Yet I still would rank Federal aid to schools over Hells Canyon as a legislative goal which I seek in this session of Congress. For how much longer can our National Government continue its indifference to the educational needs of the children of the United States? That is the meat of the coconut in the issue involving Federal aid to schools.

Statistics will demonstrate how the distribution of funds under the administration's proposal would discriminate against States like Oregon and in favor of the States of the South. For example, Oregon would receive from the administration's bill $8.63 per census child for school construction purposes each year. But Arkansas and South Carolina each would receive $13.51 per child, Alabama would receive $13.48 per child, Mississippi would receive $12.95 per census child, and Georgia and West Virginia each would receive $12.63 per child. Yet, as we sit here in the Senate Chamber, Oregon is confronted this winter with the highest unemployment rate of any State in the Nation, and this certainly will have an adverse impact on the financial ability of Oregon's people to operate its school system, to say nothing of erecting needed new school buildings. The statistics presented by the administration show conclusively that a disproportionate share of the total fund available will go to the States of the South, if the White House program is enacted into law.

Many mistakes have been made in the past. The Hill oil-for-education bill was defeated, when it should have been adopted. The tidelands oil reserves, which should have been used for the support of schools in all 48 States, went instead to four favored States. In the 1952 campaign the Republican platform specifically renounced Federal aid to schools. The White House education conference of 1955 exposed the error of that renunciation, but precious time had been lost. Now the President himself has endorsed a Federal aid-to-schools program, I am happy to report. Although his program is not yet adequate, it represents an encouraging reversal of opinion on his part.

We must pass a program for Federal aid to schools. I hope it will be the Kelley bill, which is H. R. 1 in the House and S. 777 in the Senate.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS URGES ACTION ON EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to be a cosponsor of S. 11, a most important bill introduced on January 7 by a number of Senators for the purpose of amending and clarifying the Robinson-Patman Act, so as to strengthen genuine equality of opportunity.

It had been my hope that the 84th Congress would have enacted much-needed legislation of this type.

For this bill is designed to prevent destructive price discrimination practices which are now occurring because of the loophole created by the Supreme Court's decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case of 1951. This is the so-called good-faith loophole, which was never originally intended by the Congress.

I have heard from a great many small-business men of my State who vigorously support, as I do, the closing of this loophole through the medium of S. 11. This very morning, for example, I heard from the Appleton Automotive Service Association of my State along this line.

So, it is my earnest hope that this bill, S. 11, will be acted upon in the Senate Judiciary Committee shortly. I say this especially in view of the fact that after thorough hearings on both sides of the Hill, a bill similar to S. 11 passed the House overwhelmingly last year. The need for the bill is more imperative now than before.

Right-acting businessmen have nothing to fear from this bill. But many small-business men have a great deal to fear if this bill is not enacted.

We who believe in genuine competition, but in fair competition, we who believe in effective blows against monopoly, feel that S. 11 is part and parcel of preserving our free-enterprise system.

I send to the desk the text of a letter which I received from the President of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, endorsing action on this bill on behalf of the Nation's 200,000 service station operators. As a further indication of grassroots support—supplementing a great deal of similar evidence which I brought to the attention of the Senate last year—I append the text of the Appleton message.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *January 25, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: No practice has done so much to destroy free enterprise in the retail petroleum industry as price discrimination. Over the years it has put service station operators at the economic mercy of their major oil company suppliers who all too often have been able to crush independent brand competition, move surplus gasoline and reduce their own retailers' margins—by giving a discriminatory discount to one or a few dealers, and making others sell the product at a loss in order to compete.

As shown by the record, Congress intended to prevent such destructive price discrimination practices when it adopted the Robinson-Patman Act—but the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case in 1951, which opened up the "good faith" loophole, has destroyed the effectiveness of this protection by letting the good faith defense prevail even where competition is substantially lessened and monopoly fostered by the discrimination involved. As a result, price discrimination practices permitted by this decision are weakening and destroying small business across the country and fostering the growth of monopoly in industry after industry.

As the national trade association of service station operators, we believe the injury to small business in general and to the Nation's service station operators in particular caused by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case will continue to deepen and worsen until Congress acts to remedy this situation.

We were deeply hopeful of congressional action to correct this problem in the last session when the Equality of Opportunity bill passed the House by a vote of 398 to 3 and was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. While this bill failed of adoption at the last minute through lack of time, it has been re-introduced as HR-11 and S-11, the Equality of Opportunity bill,

and every single reason which supported its adoption in the last session applies with even greater force at the present time.

In behalf of the Nation's 200,000 service station operators, we earnestly request your help to secure the adoption of this desperately needed legislation as early as possible in the present session. The mounting rate of small business failures, the injury to consumers as (in industry after industry) they are forced to pay higher monopoly prices, the increasing injury to small business economic freedom and opportunity which we are witnessing—all cry out for congressional action against monopolistic price discrimination practices. Those who profit from these monopolistic practices have a right to be heard in their defense, but we ask you to weigh the interests of small business, consumers and the American system of opportunity against such pro-monopolistic interests—and to vigorously support our cause.

We also ask you to be alert to promonopoly propaganda in the guise of small business' communications. We are receiving reports that various major oil companies are propagandizing and pressuring their short-term lessee operators to wire Congress in opposition to this bill which is and has been strongly supported by service station operators through the years. Since these lessee retailers can be forced out of their stations on a few days notice, it is not surprising that some are yielding to company influence and pressure. This is occurring in spite of the fact that service station operators across the country are substantially unanimous in supporting the Equality of Opportunity bill and in spite of the fact that there are probably more complaints of price discrimination from service station operators than from any other business group in the country.

You have undoubtedly heard from members of one or more of our affiliated associations in 36 States in support of the Equality of Opportunity bill and asking your help in securing its adoption. In closing, we assure you of the united support of service station operators across America for this legislation and of the desperate need for its adoption at the earliest date.

We will appreciate hearing from you as to the progress of this vitally important measure.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS,
CASH B. HAWLEY, *President.*

APPLETON AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Appleton, Wis., January 29, 1957.

Sen. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This association of gasoline retail dealers of Appleton urgently solicit your support on the "Equality of Opportunity" bill S–11. The House passed this bill during the last session by a vote of 393 to 3 and it was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The bill has been re-introduced with the same number in this session.

We believe that the destructive practice of price discrimination practiced by the major oil companies is one of the major factors causing an estimated 60,000 services stations to fail in business each year.

The loophole of "good faith" in the Robinson-Patman Act must be closed. We need your help and sincerely ask that you do everything possible for the success of this bill. We would appreciate hearing from you as to the progress being made.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH F. VERNON,
President.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATERPOWER AT NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am sure that all supporters of the public-power preference clause will be interested in the article which appeared in the New York Times of January 29, describing the stand of our former distinguished colleague, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, with respect to proposed new legislation dealing with the development of potential waterpower at Niagara Falls.

Particularly those of us in the Senate from the States of the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley remember ex-Senator Lehman as one of the most staunch defenders of full development, in the public interest, of the hydroelectric resources of the great Columbia Basin and of the Tennessee River watershed. For those reasons, we should certainly consider carefully the warnings being voiced by ex-Senator Lehman concerning policies now prevailing at Niagara Falls.

The article from the New York Times, entitled "Lehman Opposes New Niagara Bill," is presented herewith for printing in the body of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1957]

LEHMAN OPPOSES NEW NIAGARA BILL—SAYS ABSENCE OF PREFERENCE CLAUSE IS "MOST UNFORTUNATE"—PREDICTS CONGRESS FIGHT

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman denounced here yesterday proposed Republican legislation for developing Niagara hydroelectric power.

He terms "most unfortunate" the failure to include the "preference clause," for which he has fought for 25 years. He said he expected public-power champions in Congress to fight the new measure.

The clause would give municipal and rural cooperative electric systems preference in the use of State-generated power. Its elimination presumably was part of a "compromise" to obtain the agreement of private utility interests to permit the State to develop Niagara power.

TERMED ESSENTIAL

The agreement was worked out by Robert A. Moses, chairman of the State power authority private utility officials and New York Republican leaders in Congress as a means of ending the long controversy over private versus public power development.

The issue has kept the United States from harnessing 1,800,000 kilowatts of water power available to it on the Niagara under a 1950 treaty with Canada.

"The preference clause, in my opinion, is essential to the distribution of the maximum benefits among the maximum number of people in New York State and neighboring States," Mr. Lehman said. "To eliminate the preference clause from the legislation would be most unfortunate."

Two Democrats on the power authority have approved the new proposal dropping the clause. They are former Gov. Charles Poletti and A. Thorne Hills, appointees of Governor Harriman.

They saw it as necessary to meet the damage caused by a rockslide last June to the Niagara-Mohawk Power Corporation's Schoellkopf plant on the river.

Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat of the Bronx and chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, has indicated his willingness to go along with the Republican proposal if municipal and cooperative electric systems were protected without the clause. He said he expected to start hearings within 2 weeks.

Mr. Lehman commented:

"While I want to see Niagara power resources developed without delay, I have some doubt whether the [Republican] formula reported in the New York Times would actually accomplish this purpose.

"I would guess that the Senators and Members of the House from the Northwest and Tennessee Valley area and from other public power areas would strongly oppose any Niagara legislation which lacks a preference clause regardless of what the New York Power Authority supports."

He disputed Mr. Hills' contention that State law adequately guaranteed preference in the use of State-generated power to domestic and rural users.

Asked if he would urge Governor Harriman to oppose the new legislation, Mr. Lehman replied that since he no longer was in the Senate he had "no vote and no authority." But he added: "Governor Harriman fully understands my feeling on this matter."

CALLED SHAM AND PHONY

WASHINGTON, January 28.—Spokesmen for two national public power groups attacked as sham and phony today the compromise in legislative proposals for the Niagara project.

Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Power Cooperative Association, and Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, issued the protest. They noted that Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat of Manhattan; Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., Democrat of Pennsylvania and other sponsors of the previous Niagara legislation had not been present at the meeting when the accord was set.

"Under this 'compromise' policy," they said, "the major share of the Niagara power project undoubtedly would be sold to a few big industries and private power companies, and the nonprofit public and cooperative agencies, which are so vital in providing the yardstick for power rates, would receive a mere pittance, if any."

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this month marks the 39th anniversary of the fight for independence by the people of the Ukraine. Seldom has history recorded a more persistent and devoted effort for freedom, yet one which to this day has been frustrated by the ruthless ambition of the Soviet Union.

It is sometimes forgotten that Ukraine is the largest separate nation enrolled in the empire of the Soviet Union. It is also the largest, both in area and population, of those nations behind the Iron Curtain. As such, it assumes great importance in the struggle for freedom being waged by many of those enslaved by Soviet leadership.

Ukrainians have never wavered in their determination to gain independence. In the 37 years since their republic was crushed under the Soviet heel, they have strengthened and increased their opposition.

Patriots have gathered in mass meetings demanding an end to Russian rule; they have destroyed Russian troop trains and equipment and they have aided the gallant revolt of the Hungarian people.

During this anniversary month of Ukrainian independence, it is appropriate to pay tribute to the courageous Ukrainians, both those behind the Iron Curtain and those in the free world, who will not admit defeat in their fight for true freedom in their homeland.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] upon his remarks of yesterday afternoon relating to the Middle East resolution and his comments on the statement of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] upon that resolution yesterday.

During the period the Middle East resolution has been under consideration by the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, the impression has been created that certain of our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle are attempting, for political reasons, to force the resignation of the Secretary of State. As one who has long held the conviction that partisan politics should be excluded from consideration of matters involving the national security of the United States, I regret that the actions and words of some of our Democratic friends have been susceptible of that implication.

An editorial entitled "Cold-War Casualty," which was published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, raises a number of questions which deserve the sober consideration of those Democratic Senators who have been sharply critical of Secretary Dulles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 29, 1957]

COLD-WAR CASUALTY

Senator HUMPHREY, one of the leaders of a band of Democratic Senators who have been trying to pull the rug from under Secretary Dulles, has made an interesting comment. He says "there is a growing feeling that Mr. Dulles may well be a casualty of the cold war, just as Mr. Eden was."

We have no doubt that Mr. Dulles will become a casualty if the Democratic Senators who have been gunning for him can get him in their sights. But we are at a loss to understand the analogy with Mr. Eden's case.

Sir Anthony became a casualty, not of the cold war, but of the ill-advised hot war which he launched against Egypt. Mr. Eden would be a popular hero in Britain today had that venture succeeded. He became a casualty because it turned out to be a dismal failure.

But what has this to do with Mr. Dulles? He warned against an attack on Egypt, predicting that it would lead precisely to the result which ensued. He tried to dissuade Mr. Eden from taking the disastrous step. When the then British Prime Minister, misleading the United States as to his intentions, plunged ahead, Mr. Dulles did the only thing he could do. That was to support the United Nations in its condemnation of this act of aggression and join in the demand that the attack be halted. Do the Democratic Senators think the United States should have supported, or perhaps joined in, the attack on Egypt? If not, what is the reason for equating Mr. Dulles' performance in the "cold war" with that of Mr. Eden?

Through a long week of harrowing cross-examination, we have not seen one fact developed which fixes Mr. Dulles with responsibility for what has happened in the Middle East. He has been challenged for canceling financial support of the Aswan Dam by Democratic Senators who ignore the fact that a Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee voted last July to bar aid for the dam project without prior approval of the committee. Democratic Senators who seem to hold Mr. Dulles personally responsible for our impaired relations with Britain and France are demanding that he produce the documents detailing our relations with those governments. How do they know that publication of this record would not further impair our relationship because of the disclosures which would be made as to the British-French performance?

We do not doubt that Mr. Dulles has made his share of mistakes. Nor do we think that he is entitled to any special immunity from senatorial heckling. We do feel, however, that this business is being carried to a dangerously irresponsible extreme. The tactics that are being employed, if carried to their logical conclusion, could gravely injure vital interests of the United States, and if that comes about we trust that the Democratic Senators will not try to evade responsibility for the consequences of their conduct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the editorial starts with this comment:

Senator HUMPHREY, one of the leaders of a band of Democratic Senators who have been trying to pull the rug from under Secretary Dulles, has made an interesting comment. He says "there is a growing feeling that Mr. Dulles may well be a casualty of the cold war, just as Mr. Eden was."

The editorial ends with this comment:

The tactics that are being employed, if carried to their logical conclusion, could gravely injure vital interests of the United States, and if that comes about we trust that the Democratic Senators will not try to evade responsibility for the consequences of their conduct.

Mr. President, the Senate has a grave constitutional responsibility to contribute to the formulation of a sound foreign policy which will safeguard our national security and our national interests.

It should not be a "rubber stamp," blindly endorsing whatever recommendations may be made by the executive branch. It has a duty to examine carefully recommendations made by the President and the Secretary of State. Senators are free, and should be free, to question and criticize, and point out what they consider to be errors of the past in order that such errors may be avoided in the future.

I may say, parenthetically, that so far in the great debate on the Middle East resolution I have failed to find any actual errors of the past pointed out clearly by those who have been so generally critical of the administration and its foreign policy.

I submit, Mr. President, that criticism, to serve a useful purpose, must be responsible and constructive. We are living today, and have lived since World War II, in a period of extraordinary world tension and danger which has been created by the menace of international communism, not by any foreign policy or activity of any kind on the part of the United States.

In such a period, the task of the President and Secretary of State in conducting the day-to-day operations of our foreign policy is surrounded by difficulties. Situations which endanger the national security of the United States may result from events over which we have absolutely no control.

Again speaking parenthetically, I may say that one can search his memory of our history and fail to find a period of so-called peace when we have been threatened constantly, year by year, almost day by day, with very grave danger, such as has been imposed by international communism during the years since World War II. Such a situation now confronts us as a result of events in the Middle East.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has made his recommendations for meeting that crisis. The House of Representatives is voting today on the joint resolution intended to give the President the authority he has requested, and to demonstrate to the world, and especially the Kremlin, that the United States stands united in its determination to safeguard our vital interests in the Middle East and to prevent the control of that area by international communism.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will come to grips with the resolution in the near future, and that debate on the grave issues involved will be conducted so as to unite the people of America rather than divide them. I urge my Democratic friends to abandon any attempt to make a scapegoat of the Secretary of State, and to heed the warning of the Star's editorial that the tactics they are employing "could gravely injure vital interests of the United States."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY TO OUR DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted by Mr. R. L. Adams to the Office of Defense Mobilization on January 7, 1957, citing the importance of the American watch industry to our defense program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF R. L. ADAMS TO THE OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION JANUARY 7, 1957

I graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1925 and served at sea in battleship and destroyer types from 1925 to 1932. My duties during this period dealt principally with ordnance and gunnery. From 1932 to 1935 I was a student at the United States Naval Postgraduate School at Annapolis, specializing in ordnance. The last half year of this period was spent as an observer at various naval stations and industrial firms engaged in production of naval ordnance items. From 1935 to 1938 I served at sea in a destroyer as gunnery officer. From 1938 to 1941 I was the field inspection officer for the Inspector of Naval Material, Pittsburgh district. During the period I had intimate contact with manufacturers of many items varying from armor, projectiles, wood prod-

ucts, aluminum products, knitting mill products, etc. From 1941 to 1944 I served at sea in cruiser and amphibian-type ships in various capacities. From 1944 to 1946 I was the Inspector of Naval Material, Bethlehem, Pa., which again required intimate contact with manufacturers of many items, both large and small, simple and complex. From 1946 to 1949 I served at sea in various capacities.

From 1949 until June 30, 1955, some 18 months ago, when I retired from the Navy and joined Lyon, Inc. of Detroit as head of their new products division, I was Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance for Material. In this position with the Bureau, I was in charge of procuring all munitions for the Navy, including naval ammunition of all types; aviation ordnance equipment; guided missiles; guns, gun mounts, and missile launchers; naval mines; torpedos, etc. The Navy also had responsibility, exercised through my office, for the procurement of material for other services, including procurement of rotating-type proximity fuses for the Army and Marines and air-to-air and air-to-ground rockets for the Air Force. In this assignment I had first-hand knowledge of the role of the jeweled watch and other industries as suppliers of Bureau of Ordnance requirements.

Historically, the watch industry has long been a prime source of supply for small, precision-built ordnance items and components. This is especially true of complex fuse mechanisms and safety and arming devices, of which many types and tremendous quantities were produced for the armed services during and since Korea. I believe it was just 7 months ago today that Commander Gichner testified before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on one facet of the Navy's experience in dealing with the jeweled watch companies, i. e., the procurement of proximity fuses from those companies and from others during the critical days of the Korean war. Mr. Gichner was my assistant, in charge of the VT-fuse program. I have read his testimony and have a copy here which I would request to have incorporated into the record. I might add that his recitation of the facts of this "crash" program accords in every detail with my own recollection, and I wholeheartedly endorse the conclusions he draws from those facts.

Why does the Navy turn to the watch industry for these and many other types of complex fuses and safety and arming devices? To anyone connected with the procurement of these items, the answer is at once so simple and obvious that one wonders why the question has not long ago been put to rest. Where very small, precise, accurate, compact, rugged, and reliable mechanisms are called for—in quantity and in the shortest possible time—we have found again and again that the jeweled-watch industry is uniquely suited for the job. It has the necessary combination of equipment, skills, and experience to attain quick production in both the quantity and quality required.

We have also found that the nonjeweled watch and clock industry is a necessary source, particularly because it has productive capacity to supply the necessary volume of many items. We have found that these industries have a type of equipment and a native skill which very definitely sets them apart from other industries as procurement sources for the type of material I have mentioned. This should surprise no one, since those equipped and trained in a special field normally excel in that line of activity. Other industries might produce the type of material if given the equipment and the time required. There is little if anything that American industry cannot produce, given sufficient time, proper equipment, and ample funds. The very nature of military procurement, however, is such—particularly in view of our everchanging weapons technology—that these are luxuries we cannot afford. And this, of course, is especially true of periods of rapid mobilization.

It is dangerous to generalize that the precision-instrument industry could supply the material traditionally obtained from the horological industry, because it has not proved so in practice. Even well-managed and eminently successful instrument companies have failed completely to meet the needs of the Navy in the watch industry's field. As one example, I recall that during the Korean war when the Navy was concerned with the adequacy of its fuse-production base, we furnished at Government expense a complete plant and the equipment necessary to produce a much-needed fuse to a reputable instrument manufacturer in the New York area. Despite that company's excellent background and performance in precision-instrument manufacture, it experienced the greatest of difficulties in converting to this new item, and was never able to produce.

I can say categorically, in fact, that as far as the fuses which we purchased are concerned, we could not have gotten along at all without a watch industry during Korea. Other companies were later brought into the program because watch-industry capacity was not sufficient to meet the services' requirements. It was the watch industry, however, that got our fuse program started, that worked the bugs out of the designs, that set up the production and processing procedures. Had we not had a watch industry to fall back on, we would have had to have fought this war without or with only token quantities of this critical item. And even when we were able to get other suppliers into production, in no instance that came to my attention was a jeweled-watch company outperformed in terms of quality by a company outside the jeweled-watch industry.

The performance of the watch companies in product engineering alone would render them indispensable. In times of pressure, it becomes necessary to get into production on new items which have not been fully engineered. In many instances we have supplied these companies with drawings (or in some cases rough prototypes) of complex, new ordnance items and asked them to produce prototypes or pilot-line quantities. More often than not, the designs are incomplete, and furnished prototypes sometimes do not conform to basic drawings. The watch companies can take these incomplete plans, make the necessary changes in the design of the mechanism to improve its performance and reliability, and cut its cost of manufacture. Frequently, the companies have simplified existing models to such an extent as to permit their ready manufacture by nonwatch companies. During the Korean war, for example, we had an almost overnight requirement for millions of fuses for 2.75-inch air-to-air rockets. No jeweled watch company had made this fuse, nor had they been scheduled to make it. Yet we called upon the watch industry to produce over 3 million of these fuses—again as a result of our experience in procuring similar items from the industry in the past and our knowledge of their present capacity and abilities to achieve rapid production of a complex quality item of this type. We have come to regard the jeweled watch industry as our best outside source for production engineering of miniature, dependable, and complex mechanisms.

I have talked so much of the watch industry's performance in the fuse program during the Korean emergency only to illustrate the need for the kind of job it can do during times of crisis. But no one should suppose for an instant that the changing nature of our armament has lessened this need. Quite the contrary. The capabilities of the jeweled watch industry are of extreme significance in our present-day weapons program. It is not by accident that the watch industry is so involved in practically all of our missile programs. Perhaps now, more than at any prior time in our history, we are going through a period of continuous refinement—of testing and retesting, evaluation and reevaluation—of new weapons and weapons types. This process has been accompanied by a concerted effort to make things both smaller and more reliable. With these dual objectives in mind, we have found it necessary to substitute mechanical and electro-mechanical devices for certain electronic gear in our missiles.

This constant technological evolution certainly illustrates the impracticality—if not the folly—of placing undue reliance upon a static concept of future M-day requirements. We will be required more and more frequently to procure new items in shorter periods of time and with less preliminary engineering. We just do not know today what will be the prime weapons in our arsenal a year or two from now.

I would like to add a word about capacity. Even if the watch industry were not unique in its performance capabilities, its productive capacity alone would be indispensable. During the height of our Korean fuse program, we found that there was a great shortage of certain horological machinery. The capacity of the watch companies to supply parts to other producers that had been pulled into the program was so inadequate that we had to purchase millions and millions of pinions from Switzerland. To remedy this, the Government has bought and has on hand several million dollars worth of new special-purpose machinery. But in my judgment it would be practically useless in time of need if there were no watch industry to operate it. What the services need is a larger watch industry. We should never be dependent upon European sources for this type of material.

In my judgment and because of the factors I have mentioned, we will come to place even greater reliance upon the watch industry for the supply of many of our most critical weapons components—both in the development and refinement of new types and for the volume production of types settled upon and selected to be operational. In view of this and of my personal familiarity with the vital contributions the industry made to our military preparedness during the Korean war, I cannot consider the present weakened condition of the jeweled watch industry in this country as anything less than an extremely dangerous threat to our national security.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I favorably report, with amendments, Senate Resolution 74, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], to establish a select committee on investigation of improper activities in labor-management relations, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 44) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Was the McClellan resolution ordered to be reported by the Senator's committee by a unanimous vote?

Mr. HENNINGS. The committee met this morning. I had to attend a meeting of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights at 10:30. I stayed with the Committee on Rules and Administration until half past 10 and heard the discussion on the resolution. I was compelled to leave the committee at 10:30 in order to attend a meeting of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, over which I presided. I have just come from that subcommittee meeting, and for that reason I do not know from personal knowledge what the ultimate result of the action was in the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have just been advised by Mr. Gordon Harrison, counsel of the committee, that the resolution was ordered to be reported this morning by a unanimous vote of the committee, after the adoption of several amendments which were agreed to at the outset.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the Senator from Missouri and his committee for their prompt action. My inquiry to elicit this information was made because the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has on the calendar some other resolutions which are reported by the committee over which the distinguished Senator from Missouri presides. He also has hearings scheduled during the afternoon and has asked me if I could arrange to have the Senate proceed before 2:30 o'clock to the consideration of the specific resolutions in which he is interested, and which are already on the calendar. I wonder if that would be agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HENNINGS. I desire to accommodate all Senators who have commitments. We all have commitments, but it is necessary that we meet here just the same.

I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and to have the resolutions taken up at any time that is agreeable to him and the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if unanimous consent could be obtained to proceed to the consideration of the resolution which was just reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would indeed be agreeable to me.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would be entirely agreeable to me, as I think I have said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 74 during the day on request of the majority leader. I have cleared the request with the distinguished minority leader, and I understand it is agreeable to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this a money resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This is Senator McCLELLAN'S——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I would not say it is Senator McCLELLAN'S resolution. While I joined in submitting it, it is a resolution to establish a select committee of eight to conduct a thorough investigation into labor practices and management-labor relations. It covers the general field which has been very much in the news lately, as a result of some action which was taken in the Subcommittee on Investigations and also some action which has been taken by leading officials in the labor movement.

It is hoped that such an investigation will, with the cooperation of many high officials in labor, result in a bit of housecleaning where it is needed in that area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a few questions of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Louisiana do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator's special committee not begin an investigation of labor rackets?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations did, yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the one I had in mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me advise the Senator from Louisiana that in the course of that subcommittee's work, primarily in the field of Government procurement of Army uniforms and clothing, we ran into the problem of labor racketeering. We found that, because of it, costs to the Government were greater, and also, by reason of such racketeering, the Government was receiving, at least in some instances, an inferior quality of goods. We found that bribery and other improper things were occurring.

When we encountered that situation, I instructed the staff—as I thought I had authority to do, as chairman—to pursue it further. We found such conditions existing in other areas of the country; and we went so far as to subpena some records and to subpena some of the top officials of the Teamsters' Union. We met with objection, obstruction, challenges of jurisdiction, and the pleading of the fifth amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was my next question. Is the Senator from Arkansas able to say, at this time, whether or not his subcommittee would have jurisdiction to undertake the investigation for which the creation of a new committee has been proposed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I contend that when we held public hearings a few days ago, and also when we held some executive hearings, we undertook to confine the hearings to the area in which I felt confident, beyond any doubt in my own mind, that the subcommittee had jurisdiction.

But at all times I have said that if this job is to be done completely and thoroughly, the Senate Investigating Subcommittee would have to have additional authority, which I requested in a resolution I submitted several days ago. At the same time the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] submitted a similar resolution, in which it was requested that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be given such additional authority.

As a result of the submission of the two resolutions, and in view of the fact that two regular committees have such jurisdiction in certain areas—although, in my opinion, neither has complete jurisdiction to do this job thoroughly—many discussions have been held. I may say they have not been held in a spirit of rivalry or antagonism at all; but the discussions have been held with the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and myself, and other members of the committee, and with the leadership, in an effort to ascertain the best approach and the best method of getting the job done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the resolution the Senator from Arkansas submitted, in behalf of his subcommittee, empower the subcommittee to make a thorough study of labor racketeering?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would. So would the resolution which has been submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with the additional power the Senator from Arkansas has requested for his subcommittee, was any further request made for additional funds?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the amount?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I asked for $250,000 at that time, in addition to the regular amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the resolution which is the subject of the pending unanimous-consent request, how much money is requested?

Mr. McCLELLAN. $350,000 for the full amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why has the amount been increased from $250,000?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Because when I submitted the resolution, I had not had time carefully to evaluate the extent of the job required and the amount of work which needed to be done. This morning, when I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I said very frankly that, in my opinion, funds in addition to this amount would be required in order finally to do the job. Let me say that I am basing that opinion largely upon the flood of letters I have received since the holding of the hearings. Most of the letters have come from labor union members, who have told about conditions in their areas, and have urged that the investigation be pursued.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator from Arkansas of the opinion that the amount being requested is the minimum amount required?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it is the minimum with which we should begin. I do not think the Senator from Louisiana doubts that if the proposed committee is established, it will be careful in the expenditures it makes. For instance, I can say to him that our former special subcommittee, now a special committee, was given $350,000. However, up to the 1st of January we have spent only $106,000; and we shall be able to conclude the work and return more than half the amount of money allowed us.

In the present instance I do not anticipate that very much of the money requested will be returned, because I

believe that whoever undertakes this job—if it is done in the way I think it should be done, and in the way I am sure the Senate will want it done—will find that this is the minimum amount with which the work should be begun.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for the work he has done in returning to the Treasury much of the money allowed the special committee—as he has just indicated. However, such a situation is not encountered in the case of all the committees, as the Senator from Arkansas knows. Generally we find that once so-called special subcommittees are organized, there is a tendency to permit them to grow and grow to perpetuate themselves. There are some of these temporary or special subcommittees that now are requesting additional amounts of money, although they have been in existence for many years. Unlike old soldiers, these committees neither die nor fade away.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will not judge them collectively. I think they have varying merits. I do not doubt that some may be of more importance than others.

But let me say this about the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee: Yesterday and today, particularly yesterday, we had before the subcommittee a man who is the president of at least 4 companies, doing contract business with the Government, in the amount of more than $9 million. In my opinion he has been robbing the Government. When we put him on the stand, he pled the fifth amendment, when asked whether he was the president of the company and when asked whether he had any interest in it. I take the position that such persons should not be allowed to contract with the Government; and I have called upon the Defense Department to declare that person ineligible hereafter. In that way we shall be saving the Government money.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, in my feeble efforts every year to try to keep these appropriations to a reasonable and realistic minimum, I have never objected to any legitimate investigation, as such. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas knows that to be so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; and I am sure the Senator from Louisiana supports this effort.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I do now, and I have heretofore. Again I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the noble work he has been doing in his committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Louisiana is very gracious and generous.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very hopeful that the Senator from Arkansas will be appointed chairman of the proposed special committee to investigate labor racketeering. Although I realize that the chairmanship of the committee will require a great deal of work, yet I also realize that some of the investigators of the Senator's own committee have already looked into the subject, in an effort to save money for the taxpayers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me say that if I were to leave the Senate tomorrow, and if this were to be my last official act, I would take pride in requesting that the proposed investigation be authorized, because I believe it will be a great service not only to the country, but also to honest organized labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 74, establishing a Select Committee on Investigation of Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wish to supplement what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has said. Certainly there is no rivalry whatever about this matter.

Last July, I proposed that such an investigation be undertaken, although I said that I would not request action on a resolution providing for it at that session, but that I would submit such a resolution in January; and that has been done. At the same time, the Senator from Arkansas has undertaken to do work in this field. It is one over which his committee has absolute jurisdiction; I have never questioned its jurisdiction. However, Mr. President, I think the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare also is involved in this matter, from the standpoint of proposed legislation. Therefore, I believe the way we are proposing to solve this problem is the proper way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not correct to say that the distinguished Senator from New York, who is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], are in complete agreement regarding the wording of the resolution and the manner in which the Senate is attempting to proceed?

Mr. IVES. Yes; I can answer definitely and affirmatively. But I wish to point out that we have been in consultation not only with the Senators named by the distinguished majority leader, but also with the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who also has been joining with us. All persons concerned have been in agreement as to the proper course of procedure in this matter. The importance of having fifty-fifty representation—4 Democratic Senators and 4 Republican Senators—is equally obvious; no politics should be involved in such an undertaking.

Mr. President, I hope very much indeed that we can proceed by unanimous consent, because that will make it much easier for the chairman, and also will make the committee's work much more effective; and that is the proper course to take in this matter, as I see it. If in this undertaking we proceed in such a spirit, it should go a long way toward resolving the matter of labor racketeering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the Chair whether the purpose of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is merely to avoid having the resolution lie over for 24 hours, until the next legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that in view of the way the Senator from Michigan has put his question, it is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that there is no desire to avoid anything. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has on the calendar two resolutions, and he has scheduled hearings. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported another resolution, one in which he is vitally interested. The resolution was reported unanimously, with amendments.

If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations asks the leadership on this side of the aisle, we shall attempt to arrange to have the resolution considered, before 2:30, possibly, so he can attend the hearings for which subpenas were issued, and at which certain witnesses are expected to be present. If we could have action on the resolution, we could accommodate the Senator.

It is immaterial to the Senator from Texas, and I think to the Senator from California, whether action is taken between now and 2:30, or whether we bring the Senate into session tomorrow to act on the resolution. If the consent is granted, then we can proceed to the consideration of the resolution. If any Senator should desire to refuse consent, it would be agreeable to the leadership to bring the Senate back in session tomorrow to act on the matter.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator has answered my question. The purpose is not to have the resolution lie over for 24 hours, but to consider it now, and I have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall withhold my request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have some bills to introduce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 74), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 3, after the word "chairman," to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "and adopt rules of procedures not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 7, after the numerals "1958," to insert "inclusive".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee desires recognition. I should like to have a certain Senator present on the floor, and I should like to have action on the amendments postponed until the Senator may be present.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withhold my request.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thought that by this time the request would have been disposed of. I tried to get the floor a little earlier, during the colloquy between the distinguished Senators. I desire especially to thank the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of that committee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], for their cooperation and helpfulness in expediting matters. I make that statement from my personal standpoint, as well as from the standpoint of the Senate and the country, because with the workload I have, I would really be burdened if I could not get cooperation such as we have been receiving. I feel that the Investigations Subcommittee is doing a job which is very important to the economy of our country, because its purpose is to save money which is being filched from the Treasury by fraudulent and improper practices. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the kind remarks expressed by the Senator from Arkansas.

HOWARD C. FOSTER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Howard C. Foster, a personal friend and fellow Delawarean, whose untimely and sudden passing on Friday, January 18, 1957, was not only a cause of deep sorrow and regret to me, but also to everyone who had been privileged to know him during his 34 years of service to those associated with the United States Senate.

Howard C. Foster came to the United States Senate on June 23, 1919, as assistant Journal clerk, serving continuously in various capacities until he resigned on May 31, 1953, while serving as assistant secretary for the majority.

During his long service he was noted for his kindliness, courtesy, integrity, and ability, which endeared him to all who knew him.

His sincerity of purpose and his faithful service in behalf of everyone who knew him will be an inspiration for all to follow.

We, in the Senate, who during the past years have had the privilege of associating with Mr. Foster will miss him, and we join in extending our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

MAJ. GEN. VERNE D. MUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas desire to proceed with further consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I have a brief statement I should like to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on yesterday, a man who was a great public servant in the truest sense of the word passed away.

He was Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge, World War II commander of the famous 1st Cavalry Division, and former head of the professional staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I feel a deep sense of personal loss over General Mudge's passing. Like every other member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I leaned heavily on him for advice and counsel. That advice and counsel was always, without any qualification, wise, prudent, and patriotic.

He had as much to do with shaping post-World War II military legislation as any Member of the Senate.

General Mudge was an unusual man—one who combined rare qualities of great courage, great judgment, and great knowledge.

He was a military man to the fingertips—a frontline, fighting general who bore on his body the scars of combat. He personally led his forces—in the first rank, which met the initial shock of combat—in the recapture of Manila.

But he understood the problems of legislation from a civilian viewpoint. He was deeply committed to the philosophy of civilian supremacy, and he knew how to apply that philosophy in a practical and very direct manner.

General Mudge was a modest, unassuming man, who would be deeply embarrassed by the thought that tributes were being paid to him. But the services of this remarkable man to his country must be noted.

My thoughts and prayers are with his grieving widow, but in her sorrow she has one consolation. Her late husband left his stamp on the structure of our country, and his services have left all of us a little closer to an age of security and freedom.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the distinguished majority leader regarding General Mudge. It was my privilege for a period of time, before going on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to have served on the Senate Armed Services Committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. During that period of time General Mudge was the chief staff officer of the committee.

He commanded the respect of not only the Democrats, but the Republicans on that committee, which is one of the great committees of the Senate. It is not divided along party lines. Both Democrats and Republicans alike have been vitally interested in the national-defense needs of the country. General Mudge gave loyal and devoted service to the committee and to the responsibilities of the Congress of the United States in dealing with the great problem of national defense.

In recent years, since his retirement from the committee, he had moved to my State of California, where I was proud to have him as a constituent and fellow citizen.

The news of his death has come as a great shock to all his friends. I join in expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the majority and minority leaders have spoken very movingly about the death of Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge. I should like to add my heartfelt words to what they have said.

At one time I was chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am now the ranking minority member of that committee. I was in close contact with Verne Mudge over a period of 6 years.

I know of no man who gave more impartial, intelligent, and faithful service to all the members of the committee than did Verne Mudge. His patriotic career as a general of the Army was brilliant. His bravery and leadership were unquestioned.

He followed up that work with the very fine and effective service he rendered to an important committee of the Congress.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining committee amendments will be stated.

The remaining amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 2, line 12, after "Sec. 4.", to strike out "(a)"; in line 13, after the word "authorized" to insert "as it may deem necessary and appropriate"; in line 22, after the word "consultants" to insert "and,"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "advisable," to strike out the comma and insert a semicolon, and in the same line, after the word "and," to strike out "(9)" and insert "further"; on page 3, after line 5, to strike out: "(b) For the purpose of taking testimony, the select committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 74), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organ-

izations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman, and adopt rules of procedures not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1958, inclusive, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

(b) Upon the filing of its final report the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $350,000, and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate Resolution 74, as amended, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, Senate Resolution 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 71) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for use of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 85th Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 100 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 400 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

STATUS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF HUNGARIAN WORKERS' COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the middle of last week it was my privilege to have as a guest in the Capitol Miss Anna Kethly, a member of the free Hungarian Government which existed in Hungary for about 4 days following the Hungarian revolution. Anna Kethly was Minister of State for Hungary, which is equivalent, in our vocabulary, to being Minister of Foreign Affairs or Secretary of State.

Miss Kethly recently testified at the United Nations relating to developments in the Hungarian revolution. She has had a record of years of dedication to human freedom and liberty. She has been personally associated with the free trade union movement in Hungary, and has been an active member of the Social Democratic Party.

She has sent me a letter which I should like to read. It is very pertinent, in the light of some of the observations which have been made with regard to Hungarian refugees. The letter is as follows:

NEW YORK, *January 25, 1957.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 24, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In connection with my visit to Washington on January 24, 1957, there arose the question of those Hungarian refugees who left their country, sought asylum in Austria, even though they were members of the Hungarian Workers' [Communist] Party. To answer this question I have to go back to the foundation of this party.

For several years after World War II it was the aim of the Communists to increase the membership of the party by all possible means. They tried to achieve this goal by propaganda methods but most of the time by fear and intimidation. Toward the end of 1947 the Communists succeeded in destroying the Social Democratic Party of Hungary and on June 12 they enforced the merger of this party with the Communists on a mock-congress.

By the fusion of the two parties several hundred thousand social democratic workers were forced into the newly founded Hungarian Workers' [Communist] Party. These workers were strongly anti-Communist in sentiment but they did not have any other choice if they did not want to lose their jobs. Toward the end of 1948 the party had nearly 1 million members. This number steadily decreased during the following years.

The fact that a refugee was a member of the Hungarian Workers' Party does not mean necessarily that he was or is a Communist, merely that he could not avoid being a member. By escaping Hungary and by freely admitting their pasts they show that they are against the present puppet Communist regime and according to my belief are entitled to asylum in the free democratic countries.

Please accept the assurance of my highest consideration.

ANNA KETHLY.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS AND FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 37, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 37) providing for additional temporary assistants and funds for the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether this amendment was approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

Mr. CURTIS. This amendment is offered to meet certain technical problems which confront the disbursing office. It carries out the intent of the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and it would replace the language of that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the proviso; and on page 1, line 10, after the word "advisable" it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the proposed amendment strike out the language of the committee amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. It would.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is in lieu of the committee amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement with respect to my amendment.

As I have said, this amendment would carry out the intent of the amendment approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration which it would replace, and would meet certain technical problems which would confront the disbursing office.

This amendment provides that whenever personnel are employed by a committee or subcommittee from the contingent funds of the Senate the minority shall as a matter of right select for appointment and control one employee in the upper salary bracket.

The pay of said minority employee shall be fixed in accord with existing law, but in no case shall he be paid an amount which is more than $1,200 less than the highest paid employee of the employing committee or subcommittee. In some cases he might be paid the same salary or a salary nearer than $1,200 to the salary of the highest paid employee.

At the present time many committees and subcommittees have employees who have been placed on the rolls of the committee or the subcommittee at the request of minority members. These arrangements have been worked out with the consent of the majority and the employees are actually appointed by the majority. It is not our intent to disturb those situations. The amendment does give to the minority the selection of one employee for appointment as a matter of right, should they so choose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no particular objection to the amendment. I merely wish to advise the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and also the Senate that what the Senator is seeking to do by his amendment is being done and has been done under the rules of my committee. The minority selects its counsel. In that regard we have observed the rules, because whomever the majority selects as counsel must be approved by a majority vote of the committee; and the same condition applies to the minority counsel under the existing rules of the committee.

What the Senator is seeking to do is being done already. I merely wanted the Senator to know that in the committee and in the particular subcommittee under discussion the minority has counsel of its own choosing, approved by the full committee. So long as I serve as chairman of the committee every member of the staff will continue to have instructions to serve each member of the committee upon his request whether such member is a Republican or a Democratic member. We try to operate in that way.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am aware of the facts which he has stated. I assure him that the amendment is being offered to all resolutions pertaining to committees in similar situations, and that his committee is not being singled out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand. I merely wished to advise him that our committee has been doing what his amendment seeks to have the committee do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to say in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I recall when he initiated the practice to which he refers. It was quite some time ago. It happened when I was still a member of the Committee on Government Operations. The practice has worked out in a very satisfactory manner. He is to be commended for initiating that rule in the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska. As I understand the amendment which is now being considered, it is in lieu of the amendment which was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. It is in lieu of the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the same amendment the Senator seeks to have attached to all other resolutions. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Not quite to all of them. We did not offer it to resolutions pertaining to a committee which is about to expire or will expire in a matter of months. We did not offer it to Senate Resolution 74, which concerns a committee on which there is no majority and minority. Otherwise, the amendment is being offered to all other resolutions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the Senator did not offer it to the resolution pertaining to the Special Committee Investigating Lobbying. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. That committee is about to expire, and we have no desire to make any change there.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to advise the Senator from Nebraska that the minority members of that committee were permitted to select an assistant chief counsel of their own.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to state to the Senator from Arkansas that the very fair manner in which he approached that problem, as well as all other problems, was the reason the Senate has so many times called upon the Senator from Arkansas in connection with important assignments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a general statement with respect to the so-called special money resolutions now on the Senate calendar. As Senators know, every year when these resolutions come before the Senate I have exerted considerable effort and spent much time in trying either to have the appropriations they provide reduced or to compel proponents of the resolutions to justify the necessity for the resolutions.

As I said a moment ago, I have never opposed any investigations when I felt there was a genuine need for them. Particularly is that true with respect to the resolution which is now pending. As I said, it is my judgment that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has done noble work. I should say that it is work beyond the call of duty. He has spent much of his time on the committee. If he is selected for the committee to investigate labor racketeering it will again add to his burdens. I wish once more to compliment him for the fine work which he has done in the past.

As some Senators undoubtedly know, I have tried from time to time to save our taxpayers a little money, not only by having the scope of some of the investigations curtailed and the amount asked for in the resolutions reduced, but also in connection with foreign aid and in other fields.

If the Senate is to make any attempt in the future to reduce the expenditures of the executive branch of our Government, it strikes me that we ought to set an example in the Senate. As I have pointed out from time to time, our expenditures have been increasing from year to year. During the last year before the passage of the Reorganization Act—that is, fiscal year 1946—the total expenditures of the Senate were $6,360,385. That was the entire cost of the Senate to our citizens, including the salaries of Senators, the cost of operating all committees, and also the cost of special investigations such as those we are considering now. Since that time, there has been a gradual but steady increase in the Senate's expenditures.

In 1947 the expenditure of the Senate increased to $8,443,402. In 1957, that is, for this fiscal year, the total amount of money which has thus far been appropriated to operate the Senate—including funds proposed to be spent by the standing committees, salaries of all Senators, and the operation of special committees—is $21,226,615. That is an increase over 1946 of $14,866,230, or 233.7 percent.

I realize that we have a great deal of work to do in the Senate. However, I find that much of the work that has been done by special committees could very well have been done by the standing committees of the Senate, at less cost.

For example, in the case of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I have been chairman for 4 years, I do not know of any investigations during that period which have not been conducted within the committee and by the use of the committee staff. As a matter of fact, the committee is authorized the employment of four experts. We have employed only two. We are authorized the employment of six clerical assistants, and we have six of those employees. During the last session of Congress, I am glad to say that of the $110,000 which could have been spent by the committee for salaries and expenses, only a little over $66,000 was actually spent—we returned to the Treasury almost 50 percent of the maximum available to the committee.

With respect to investigations by so-called special subcommittees, as well as investigations by standing committees, the Senate has been increasing the cost of such committees every year since 1940. In 1940 expenditures for these purposes totaled $170,268.

Last year—that is, fiscal year 1956—$3,007,428.20 was spent for the same purpose. The year before that, which was 1955, $2,118,331.19 was spent, an increase of almost a million dollars in 1956 over 1955.

If the resolutions now before the Senate are adopted, together with other resolutions which are in the offing, I predict that the amount of money which will have to be drawn from the contingent fund of the Senate in order to pay for various investigations will exceed the amount spent in 1956 by more than $500,000—or a total of more than $3,500,000.

During the course of the consideration of all the resolutions to be taken up today, I plan to offer comments and to seek justification for the proposed expenditures. With that understanding, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that in the resolution under consideration there is no increase over the amount of the appropriation of last year. I had asked for a slight increase, because under a law enacted last year, it is necessary to pay some $5,000 or $6,000 for retirement pay, which it was not necessary to pay heretofore. But the Committee on Rules and Administration did not grant the increase, and I am not making any complaint about it.

Fortunately for the Senate, certainly fortunately for me, as chairman of the committee, and I think fortunately for the country, over the course of the years, the committee has assembled one of the finest staffs I know of anywhere. I am not taking all the credit for that, because similarly able assistants were obtained under the chairmanship of my predecessor, and even before that. They are not clock watchers; they are workers. Every night there is someone in the office until 9 o'clock. Every Saturday members of the staff are at work. Many of them stay until 7 or 8 o'clock at night. It is a working committee. It is doing a job which is essential. Every dollar spent by this committee saves $100 in return. I say that without any reservation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a notation opposite the order number to the effect that the amount requested is the same as the amount granted last year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I indicated to my good friend from Arkansas a while ago, it is not my intention to oppose this resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. I stated to the Senator from Arkansas that I thought both he and this subcommittee were doing outstanding work. I am not opposed to legitimate investigation, as the Senator well knows. I am only opposed to perpetuating so-called temporary or special investigations for apparently no valid reason, at great cost to our taxpayers.

What I have been contending is that more of the work—work which it is proposed to shift to these special subcommittees—should be done by staffs of the standing committees. As I shall point out in a few minutes, the Committee on the Judiciary, which, in my opinion, abuses its privilege of seeking additional money for special purposes, intends to spend this year for special committees alone almost a million dollars, when much of the work these special subcommittees would perform could no doubt be done by the regular staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator. I simply wanted to take the occasion to tell the Senate this much about the staff we have, how hard they work, and how faithful and conscientious they are. They are performing a real service for the country, and are saving the money of the taxpayers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have a little clarification from our distinguished friend from Louisiana as to whether he is making some distinction which is not readily apparent to me between select committees and special committees and standing committees. Every one of the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, of course, consists of members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Under the rule, certain standing subcommittees are maintained, which are either permanent or semipermanent in character.

As new situations and new challenges arise, the chairman can suggest to the committee that perhaps a special committee should be appointed, because special problems and special circumstances develop from one session of Congress to another. But the fact of the matter is that such decisions are all within the jurisdiction and orbit of the Committee on the Judiciary. Every Senator who serves on a select or a special committee under that committee is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. So this is, after all, auxiliary work. To be sure, it could be referred to any 1 of the 7 or 8 standing subcommittees but workwise or moneywise I doubt that would make any difference.

I observe on the floor, listening to the colloquy, our distinguished friend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has done notable work in the field. I think he will bear out the observations I have made about how the Committee on the Judiciary has functioned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also know something about how committees function. I have been in the Senate for 20 years. Before the passage of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Claims, of which I was the chairman, handled all claims against the Government, claims which are now being handled by the Committee on the Judiciary. Those claims were referred to the standing committee of which I was chairman. The committee, with one clerk, handled all the claims, which were then, as now, plentiful. As a matter of fact, my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], was a member of that committee. He is the only Senator on the floor at this time whom I recall having been a member of that committee.

In those days, Senators themselves made studies of the various claims against the Government. We obtained reports from the department of the Government where the claim originated. We obtained from the respective departments the full facts as to all the cases. The committee itself did the work. The Senators themselves studied the cases in detail.

But today, I understand that work has been moved into the Committee on the Judiciary, and, from the full committee, to a special subcommittee with a separate staff. As a result of the transfer, 4 or 5 lawyers are paid to do all that work themselves. I doubt that any Senator ever studies the claims, as did the Senators who served on the old Committee on Claims.

Furthermore, it has become necessary to add several lawyers to the legal staff handling claims in the Department of Justice. So, the cost in that field alone has gone up perhaps 2,000 percent, compared with the cost prior to 1946. By the same token, expenses have increased in connection with work in the other committees, but particularly in the Committee on the Judiciary.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois is correct when he says that subcommittees are appointed by the chairmen of the respective committees. In the case of the Judiciary Committee, the subcommittees form a part of the Committee on the Judiciary, and, as the record shows, most of these have substantial staffs, separate and distinct from the full committee's staff. What the Senator has said in that respect is true; I agree with it.

The point is that each standing committee has allotted to it, as I recall, $110,000 a year in order to pay for the services of four professional staff members, and from six to eight clerical employees. In addition, many of the committees have prevailed upon the Senate to adopt special resolutions which increase the number of experts and clericals which these committees may hire. The Committee on the Judiciary has done that with alarming consistency. In addition to the $110,000 of which I spoke, and the additional special experts who have been authorized and employed by the Committee on the Judiciary, we are now confronted with resolutions which have come from that committee in which the amount requested, up to date, is more than $900,000—almost a million dollars—for more special investigating staffs.

I believe that much of the work which is performed by the special committees could be done by the regularly employed staffs of the committees—at least by the experts provided for under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has on the calendar two resolutions in which he is interested. As I previously announced, he has a committee hearing set for this afternoon. I wonder if action can be taken on the pending resolution, so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the other resolution in which the Senator from Arkansas is interested before his committee meets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The question is

on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining committee amendment.

The remaining amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$210,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 37), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $210,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES AND LOBBYING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, Senate Resolution 47, authorizing the Special Committee on Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions to investigate attempts of persons to influence improperly Senators or officers and employees of the executive departments through campaign contributions or other practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 47) authorizing the Special Committee on Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions to investigate attempts of persons to influence improperly Senators or officers and employees of the executive departments through campaign contributions or other practices, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "before," to strike out "May 31," and insert "April 30,"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "exist," to strike out "on May 31," and insert "at the close of business on April 30,"; in line 11, after the word "on," to strike out "May 31" and insert "April 30"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$60,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the special committee established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress (approved February 22, 1956), is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate on or before April 30, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) The special committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on April 30, 1957.

SEC. 3 (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized, during the period beginning February 1, 1957, and ending on April 30, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 4. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $60,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. Last year $350,000 was appropriated for this committee and the committee spent only $106,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; up to January 1 of this year. Up to the present time, I would say we have spent a total of approximately $119,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The remainder will be returned to the Treasury, will it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now the committee is requesting $60,000 to complete its work; is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; and that is what the Committee on Rules and Administration allowed. I am satisfied with that amount. I would ask for more only if a contingency were to arise; but I do not think one will, although it is never possible to be certain.

We shall undertake to complete our work by the 30th of June, and we anticipate that we shall have spent only about half the amount the Senate has allowed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even including the $60,000?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 47), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader and the other Senators for cooperating, so that I may now pursue some committee duties.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 61, authorizing a consideration of the Subcommittee on Disarmament and providing funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

THE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, three vital segments of our economy are concerned with what I have to say today.

The recently announced rise in the price of newsprint carries an already expensive commodity to a level which victimizes everyone. In three areas, however, the burden falls most heavily.

I refer to a great American institution, the free press, which over the years has waged a losing battle with the rising costs of publishing.

I refer to the small-business man whose livelihood is geared to his advertising.

And I refer to the individual American who, morning and evening, reaches into his pocket for the price of his daily newspaper.

Noisy trucks, loaded with bulky white rolls of paper, rumbling down our city streets, are a familiar sight to us all. As we watch the heavy rolls of newsprint disappear down a ramp into the cellars of the local newspaper, few of us realize that we are watching our society's lifeblood.

Newsprint is the measure of how civilized we are. In times of peace the consumption of paper products—from books to pictures to food containers—is a barometer of modern achievement. In times of war, pulp and paper are prime elements in the national defense. Explosives, rayon, and paperboard containers require vast amounts of paper and pulp. As a war propaganda weapon, newsprint ranks in importance with men and munitions.

Mr. President, 75 percent of the newsprint used in this country comes from

Canada. On December 31 of last year, a Canadian newsprint producer, the Abitibi Sales Co., of Toronto, notified its customers that its price for newsprint would go up $4 a ton on March 1, 1957. One week later, Consolidated Paper Sales, of Montreal, followed suit. Since then, five others, including a newsprint mill in the United States, have joined the move, bringing the present cost of newsprint to an alltime peak of $134 a ton.

On January 11, I wrote the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, calling his attention to the hardship situation this created for all users of newsprint. I urged an immediate investigation into the reasons for the increase. Recognizing the wisdom of quick action, the chairman has scheduled public hearings by the full committee, to begin February 26.

It is my purpose today to acquaint the Senate with the urgency of what we propose to do. I should like also to suggest certain avenues which our investigations might pursue, so that once and for all we shall get to the bottom of a situation which has placed a cruel burden on newsprint users.

To visualize the newsprint supply situation, one must think of a colossal spider web spanning the whole of Canada, extending across the United States border and down into our own Southern States. Lurking somewhere within that web is the spider himself. Government antitrust officials have been trying to capture him for years. From 1933 to the present day, he has devoured the profit margin of publishers by sending the price of newsprint up 325 percent. Like helpless flies, the smaller publishers are squeezed to death. Larger publishers fight for their lives. Between 1932 and 1952, 749 daily newspapers in the United States disappeared either through merger, consolidation, or failure.

Some say the spider lurks in Canadian territory. Some say he lives on our side of the border. There is evidence that he operates like a cartel, and the years have produced strong traces of his price-fixing and restraint-of-trade activity Despite the attention given to newsprint by Federal agencies and congressional committees, he has evaded positive identification.

It is apparent, however, to any serious observer that a group of individuals or companies in the newsprint industry will one day stand revealed as the spider. This is the group which over the years has conspired to kill fair competition in the industry, fix prices, and to cash in for itself. Once and for all, these individuals must be identified and prosecuted.

Mr. President, large metropolitan dailies, small weeklies in rural communities, and a vast number of magazines and trade and technical publications in this country are dependent upon Canadian imports to keep their presses rolling. In 1956, we imported from Canada almost 7 million tons of newsprint. Our own domestic production ran in the neighborhood of 1½ million tons for the year.

According to the historic pattern of newsprint prices, one newsprint mill is the bellwether. After the first price increase has been announced, all the others—both Canadian and American—follow suit. Thus, it will be only a matter of time before the recently announced $4-per-ton increase will become universal. Interestingly enough, newsprint price increases are always uniform. I call this to the attention of the Senate as another indicator of possible price fixing. If the market were completely free, surely some variation and play in price levels would appear.

In a nutshell, the newsprint situation is embodied in the events of the postwar period:

The price of a ton of newsprint stood at $67 in 1946. Ten years later, in 1956, it was $130.

To be sure, manufacturing costs rose during that time. I am told that a typical mill's manufacturing cost moved from $44 a ton in 1946 to $76 a ton in 1957; and freight rates increased by roughly $9.

In other words, before the latest $4 increase was announced, newsprint prices rose $63 a ton, while manufacturing and freight costs rose only about $41 a ton in a 10-year period.

Mr. President, newsprint represents from one-fourth to one-third of the total cost of newspaper production. Today, the cost of putting out a paper is at an all-time peak. When the $4 increase becomes uniform, United States publishers will be picking up a 1957 tab $23 million bigger than the one they picked up last year.

What justification do the newsprint mills offer for zooming prices? They are still playing the same old record; they are still mouthing the same old tune of rising costs. In the meantime, their profits show the following extraordinary jumps:

The St. Lawrence Corporation's profits in 1955 showed a 58.7 percent increase over that for the preceding year. For the first 6 months of 1956, it zoomed 54.9 percent over the profit for the comparable 1955 period.

Donnacona's 1955 profits were up 45.5 percent over those in 1954.

Abitibi chalked up a 31.2 percent increase in a comparable period.

I shall not cite figures for all of the mills; but I shall offer for inclusion in the RECORD the complete roster of profits in the newsprint industry. Skyrocketing profits are shown for almost all Canadian mills. In the United States Crown Zellerbach and Great Northern Paper companies showed 20 percent larger profits in 1955 than in 1954.

Certainly we want to see our Canadian neighbors prosper. But an attitude of "all the traffic will bear" should not be expected to be well received on this side of the border.

The newsprint industry, like the famous heroine of Forever Amber, has a colorful past. May I point to a few highlights:

Newsprint has engaged the attention of the antitrust agencies and Congressional committees over a long period.

In 1917, after an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, certain newsprint manufacturers were indicted for practices in restraint of trade. The matter was terminated the same year by entry of a civil consent decree.

A 1927 investigation by the Federal Trade Commission produced no evidence of violation of law, and another attempt in 1938 was unsuccessful.

However, in 1939 4 American and 3 Canadian corporations and 11 American and 4 Canadian individuals were indicted. In 1941, in this case, 6 defendants pleaded nolo contendere, or "no contest," and were fined a total of $30,000. The case was dismissed as to the remaining defendants.

In 1947 the Department of Justice impaneled a grand jury in New York to inquire into trade restraining activities in the newsprint industry, both in the United States and Canada. As a result, the Province of Ontario passed a statute making it a criminal offense for any records to be taken out of the Province. No formal action was taken as a result of the grand jury proceedings, quite possibly because of the difficulties encountered through operation of the Ontario statute.

Official sources have indicated over and over again that there have apparently been illegal activities in restraint of trade.

In 1951, the Celler Subcommittee on Monopoly of the House Judiciary Committee reported that mills representing nearly 70 percent of the total North American newsprint capacity east of the Rocky Mountains were controlled by 7 groups—the International Paper group and its 6 largest competitors. In the period between 1935 and 1939, 4 companies, Crown Zellerbach, including its subsidiary, Pacific Mills, Ltd., Hawley Pulp & Paper Co., Inland Empire Paper Co., and Power River, Ltd., were the only North American manufacturers regularly selling newsprint paper in the States of California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington. These 4 manufacturers together controlled, manufactured, shipped, and sold not less than 75 percent and at certain times all of the newsprint paper available in those States.

The Celler subcommittee found that Canadian newsprint producers, doing business in some 50 or 60 countries throughout the world, set up agreements in many of them, if not all, fixing prices, allocating tonnages, and making other arrangements which eliminated competition among North American producers in these markets.

It has been my hope that the Canadian Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, a body similar to our Federal Trade Commission, and the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice would be concerned enough to seek out offenders on the Canadian side of the border, as we on this side are now attempting to do.

Our two nations, I believe, should work together on this problem, as we do, for example, on tax questions. I believe it would be possible to develop an international convention, along the lines of United States-Canadian tax conventions, which would facilitate a joint effort by both countries to eliminate illegal practices in newsprint. I am sure both nations desire to clean house in this matter.

It was disappointing, therefore, to read that Mr. Stuart Garson, the Canadian Minister of Justice, recently declared in the House of Commons that the advance in the price of newsprint could be explained as ordinary market behavior. Mr. Garson stated that the Chairman of the Canadian Restrictive Trade Practices Commission also believed there was no justification at this time for an inquiry, and that he had no intention of initiating a probe of newsprint price fixing. Mr. Garson also remarked that no formal representations on newsprint had been received from the United States Government.

I believe we should continue our efforts for joint United States-Canadian action, supplementing them with a vigorous search for the offenders in our own country. I have written to the Department of State suggesting that conversations on a diplomatic level be initiated with a view to developing a bilateral investigation.

In the meantime, we must move swiftly in the United States.

We must find answers to the following questions:

Are Canadian newsprint millowners deliberately milking the United States publisher dry?

Is a Canadian-United States cartel in operation, fixing prices and restricting trade on both sides of the border?

Are these price rises and exorbitant profits instigated by United States investors in Canadian firms?

At the present time American interests control more than 30 percent of total Canadian newsprint capacity and more than 40 percent of all newsprint capacity on the North American Continent. Other stock interests and securities of Canadian firms traded over the counter in this country bring the current estimate of United States capital in the Canadian paper industry to something like half the total investment.

I shall propose to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that American holders of these interests be brought before our committee so that we may study company operations exhaustively. I shall further propose that the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, and representatives of the American publishing industry present their views and recommendations.

It is my hope that the committee will see the need for a crash research program into means of developing our own sources of newsprint. Complete dependence on Canadian sources is unhealthy and should be eliminated. We must capitalize on our great timber resources in Alaska, a potential which at present is going to waste. We must encourage new enterprise to employ methods of making newsprint from agricultural products, hardwoods, wheat, straw, and inked newsprint. If it is necessary to give accelerated depreciation and tax privileges to developers of newsprint mills in the South, that should be done.

Mr. President, the retailer, the small manufacturer, the filling-station operator—all those who must advertise to live—are waiting for us to act on skyrocketing newsprint costs. Many of them will be forced to curtail or discontinue their advertising, and some will be wiped out. If we stand by and let this happen, if we call it merely another card in the deck stacked against small business, surely we are not worthy to occupy our seats here and serve in this Chamber.

Beyond that, we have a responsibility to preserve one of our greatest democratic institutions, the American press, whose vitality is being sapped by newsprint costs. Through the genius of the publishing community, each one of us is able, by dropping a few pennies on the counter, to buy that miracle of enterprise and production, the daily newspaper.

Let us keep it that way. To do so we shall have to take quick action on the newsprint situation now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Michigan has made a great contribution to the consideration of this very important question. As he knows, we intend to start hearings on the subject, I think, within 2 weeks. I do not have the exact date in mind, but it was announced. We hope to be able to answer some of the questions posed by the Senator from Michigan. We also hope we may be able to give some encouragement to the American pulp and paper industry to enlarge domestic production, and to investigate the possibility of including Alaska in such plans.

I am glad the Senator from Michigan has posed these questions, because there is much food for thought embraced in them. After all, there may be a monopoly in Canada over which we have no control. There are American investors involved. It may be that the committee will have to go into that question, as suggested by the Senator, in an attempt to have the two countries cooperate in some way.

If there ever was a universal commodity which is needed by everyone, it is newsprint.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his great interest in this question. Even before my letter to him, I knew that the staff of the committee had been working on it.

I wish to commend him also for the expedition with which the hearings are being called. I am sure the Senator agrees with me that our publishers are in practically a captive market. As I understand, a day or so ago a new company raised its prices, making 8 in all that have raised their prices an extra $4. We know that many small publishers are going out of business. The skyrocketing cost of production in the newspaper business today, and the cost of paper, are very critical factors. I commend the Senator for his great sympathy and his interest in this problem.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I commend the Senator from Michigan for bringing up this very important question. Also I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] for proceeding in this direction. I, too, believe that this is a vital program. We have a very difficult and delicate situation to meet, because of the large production of newsprint in a country which is not our own. Certainly, the entire subject should be explored.

I do not see any basis for the extreme successive price increases which have taken place. I think we should be informed on the subject, and I commend the chairman of the committee for proceeding, and the Senator from Michigan for outlining the problem here today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As Senators know, this has been a continuing problem. It started back in the OPA days, when we established an OPA price for newsprint.

An effort was made to arrive at a gentleman's agreement with Canadian newsprint producers that they would not go above our OPA prices. They kept the agreement for a while. Then suddenly one company broke the line, and the others followed like sheep. As a result there were two prices in the two countries, both for the producer and the consumer.

This is a continuing problem. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has been worried over the problem.

Mr. POTTER. There has been a great deal of congressional interest, and a great deal of action by agencies of the Government. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have looked into the problem time and again. I know that the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will go into this subject very diligently, so that we may possibly reach a solution to the problem.

I am greatly interested in trying to develop new newsprint sources in the United States and in Alaska. I understand that in Alaska one of the problems is power.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In my section of the country newspaper publishers, in an effort to avoid being wholly dependent upon the Canadian supply, started what virtually amounted to a cooperative pulp and paper mill in the city of Tacoma. However, they have run out of logs. For many years the Department of the Interior, under all administrations, has enforced a ban against taking logs from Alaska and bringing them to this country to be processed, I suppose on the theory that if the logs were kept in Alaska, industry might be attracted there, which is a good idea.

Many problems are posed. What has been done has had some effect. I think there are some sympathetic ears in Canada. Only a few weeks ago the president of the Powell River Lumber Co., one of the largest producers, made the statement that before his company

raised its price he wanted to hear what we thought on the subject. I hope he will keep his promise.

Mr. POTTER. I hope the interest shown by the Congress will result in sympathetic ears across the border.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from Michigan has made a fine presentation of this problem, in which all Members of Congress and the public are vitally interested.

I had the opportunity of talking with the Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, today. I am certain that the investigation by his committee will be thorough, and will reach the bottom of many aspects of the problem. I know that his committee will be constructive in approaching a solution.

We have received complaints from some of the representatives of newspaper interests in connection with the antitrust and antimonopoly features of this problem, and our staff has done some work on the subject. In consultation with the Senator from Washington it has been agreed that we shall have a representative present at his committee hearing, and that there will be full cooperation between his committee and our monopoly subcommittee, so that the question can be gone into very thoroughly.

Any features of the situation which affect the antitrust laws or involve the question of monopoly will also be considered in possible committee hearings before our committee.

By an attack on a broad front, with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce taking the lead, and others following it in their respective jurisdictions, it certainly should be possible to reach some permanent and satisfactory solution to the problem, which has been arising year after year since about 1926.

I think the Senator from Michigan has made a fine contribution to the discussion today.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

THE FBI STORY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to a recent book entitled "The FBI Story," by Mr. Don Whitehead.

The demands on the time of the Members of the Senate preclude much of the reading which we would like to accomplish. However, in this instance, it is my opinion that the information to be gained from this book will more than compensate for the time which is devoted to its reading.

It has disturbed me that until the appearance of this volume there was no documented, well-balanced story of the FBI. In fact, the most voluminous account of the activities of this agency was contained in a slanted and distorted version which appeared a few years ago under the authorship of one who seemed to be trying to discredit the agency.

The FBI Story, by Mr. Whitehead, sets the record straight. It presents a résumé of the beginning of the FBI and its activities against criminals, saboteurs and the Communist conspiracy.

In essence, the book is a biography of the 30 years of leadership of John Edgar Hoover. The organization, as we see it today, is a tribute to his integrity, high ideals, and devotion to duty.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I have had frequent contacts with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and have observed the extremely close cooperation between that organization and the local county and State law enforcement agencies.

In the various accounts of specific cases contained in this book, the lie is given to those who have tried to maintain that the FBI is a national police force similar to the secret police of other nations.

I, personally, found this to be an extremely worthwhile book. The author, Mr. Whitehead, has won two Pulitzer prizes for distinguished reporting on domestic and foreign affairs. His account of the FBI is factual and exciting and should be required reading for all those who desire to understand the responsibilities and the conduct of this superb and devoted organization.

It is my understanding that Warner Bros. have purchased the motion-picture rights to this fine book and, with the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, plan to make a dramatic, visual portrayal of the important message which Mr. Whitehead has conveyed.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing a continuation of the Subcommittee on Disarmament and providing funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota why the subject matter of the resolution cannot be handled by the Committee on Armed Services. As I understand, a resolution on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services will be under consideration this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution will provide for about $90,000 for that committee. I am wondering why that committee could not handle this matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to my good friend that his question is a very appropriate one indeed, because it goes to the very heart of the purpose of the subcommittee. The Subcommittee on Disarmament consists of 6 members from the Committee on Foreign Relations, 4 members from the Committee on Armed Services, and 2 members from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It is an entirely bipartisan committee, consisting of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats.

Inasmuch as the problems with which this subcommittee deals cut across all jurisdictional lines of the three committees I have mentioned, namely, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Foreign Relations Committee, we feel that the nature of the problems justifies the establishment of this kind of subcommittee, consisting of representatives from the various committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this in connection with the work being done by former Governor Stassen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It deals solely with disarmament. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It relates to the disarmament field, and to the foreign policy and security policies as they are affected by disarmament. We are not only concerned with the problems of disarmament, but must also make sure that the proposals which are made are foolproof and that they are examined very carefully by responsible representatives of the Senate, because every one of the proposals will in some way affect basic statutory law.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, last year the amount requested was $35,000. This year the request is for $30,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. We hope that we may be able to return a substantial portion of that amount.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, this would provide a sufficient amount to complete the remaining five studies, and to carry them to a conclusion. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It represents a 5-month budget. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a subcommittee that will fade out, is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 61) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the subcommittee (as authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 93, of the 84th Congress, 1st session, agreed to July 25, 1955; as amended by Senate Resolution 185, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 8, 1956; and as amended by Senate Resolution 286, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to July 13, 1956), of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the international control and reduction of armaments, as further described in Senate Resolution 93, 84th Congress.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to June 30, 1957, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any

of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 4, Senate Resolution 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 72), as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; and Mr. Javits, of New York.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; Mr. Talmadge, of Georgia; Mr. Curtis, of Nebraska; and Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the resolution provides for members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR WOFFORD

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 5, Senate Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Wofford, of South Carolina, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, by way of explanation, let me say that this is the usual resolution, in accordance with the practice of the Senate, designed to pay compensation to employees of a former Senator. It covers the period of 1 month, during which time former Senator Wofford's office and other matters were being disposed of. It is a purely routine resolution, and it follows the usual practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM R. LAIRD III

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, Senate Resolution 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator William R. Laird III, of West Virginia, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this again is a purely routine resolution, in accordance with the established practices of the Senate with respect to employees of former Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR ROBERT HUMPHREYS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 7, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert Humphreys, of Kentucky, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 6, 1956, salary for services in his office for the period November 7, 1956, through December 6, 1956, or for so much of that time through December 6, 1956, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 6, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. This is another routine resolution. It follows the policy established by the Senate and followed for many years with respect to employees of former Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO MRS. JANE BROWN

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 8, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mrs. Jane Brown, sister of Thomas M. Greenwood, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HENNINGS. This again is a resolution in accordance with the established practice of the Senate. It concerns the sister and heir at law of the former assistant to the Sergeant at Arms. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO PATRICIA M. CLEMENTS AND MARY VIRGINIA MITCHELL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 9, Senate Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patricia M. Clements and Mary Virginia Mitchell, daughters of Hal Mitchell, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be

considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. This is another routine resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO MARY MARGARET HARTIGAN

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10, Senate Resolution 69.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret Hartigan, widow of James S. Hartigan, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. This is another routine resolution, to pay a gratuity to the widow of a former employee of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 12, Senate Resolution 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. This resolution would merely increase the staff of the committee by one, and would maintain it at the same size as last year, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. We have had this employee for the past 8 years. She is necessary because of the great amount of correspondence the committee must handle.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many additional clerks does the committee have?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have only this one for the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] must leave the city this afternoon. Therefore, out of order, I should like to call up Calendar Nos. 15, 35, and 34. First I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, created by Senate Resolution 285, agreed to July 11, 1956, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1957, through June 30, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. The chairman may designate one or more members who may act for him for the purpose of this resolution.

SEC. 3. The committee shall transmit to the Senate not later than June 30, 1957, the results of the study herein and previously authorized together with such recommendations as may at the time be found desirable. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on June 30, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I believe the amount provided last year for this subcommittee was $300,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that amount has been spent by the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amount which has been spent is $218,000. There is remaining approximately $82,000 which has not been obligated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that amount be reappropriated, or would the difference be sent to the Treasury?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are still proceeding under the amount authorized. The amount requested is still within the $300,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount called for in the resolution is $75,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a reappropriation; that is what it amounts to.

Mr. ELLENDER. The $75,000 is a new appropriation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a reappropriation. That is what it amounts to. It is a reappropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the $75,000 is not in addition to the $300,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It is still within the original authorization of $300,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the committee hope to make its report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee hopes to make its report not later than June 30, although I believe it will have to be made a little earlier, because the mutual-security authorization bill will be before the committee prior to that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I express the hope that it will be long before May 30, indeed I believe that all of these studies should be before the Committee on Foreign Relations before that time. I express the further hope that the mutual-security bill will be considered by the committee earlier this year than it was last year, so that we can have a complete understanding of what is going on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall later suggest, because of the questions raised by the Senator from Louisiana, that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the study of the foreign-aid program be printed in the RECORD, because it answers the question which the Senator has raised. It will be noted that the reports relating to every country are already coming in. They are in the hands of the committee members, and we are already studying them. We are looking forward to having all the work done in a very short time. The amount of money sought does not go beyond the original authorization.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I assume the remaining $82,000, of which $75,000 is placed in the budget, would be enough to enable the committee to continue its work through this session of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is my understanding. I am handling this matter for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], but I understand this amount is adequate for all our needs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice the report is headed "Study of Foreign Aid in Its Relation to Foreign Policy." I am wondering whether there is to be a continuation of this type of committee after the present session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that this committee is, in fact, the Committee on Foreign Relations itself, together with the representatives of the Committee on Armed Services. The study was authorized by Congress in order that a check might be made into the manner in which the programs are operating in the different countries.

There is also a committee appointed by the President which is making a

study for the executive branch. However, a continuation of the Senate committee is not contemplated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was an amendment to be offered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the resolution is without amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HENNINGS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 34, Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 59) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two temporary additional clerical assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask a question of my distinguished friend from Minnesota? I assume the resolution has been cleared with the minority members of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The information I have is that it has been cleared. The member of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who has been with me on the floor, so assures me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the two additional clerical employees have been employed in the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is within the authorization.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations, in typing the resolution, made a mistake in denominating it as Senate Resolution 50. The clerk has correctly stated it as Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to employ two additional clerical assistants from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958.

STUDY OF FOREIGN TECHNICAL-ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. HENNINGS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 60) amending Senate Resolution 162, 84th Congress, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand this resolution, it would provide no new money but would merely enable the subcommittee to make a report and close out the investigation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The resolution merely extends the date of the deadline for transmitting to the Senate the final report of the subcommittee on the technical-assistance program from January 31 to February 28. No additional money is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1957."

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HENNINGS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate Resolution 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) to investigate the administration of the Civil Service System and the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 3, line 4, after the word "committee," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think there is an amendment at the desk. If not, I raise a point of order on the amendment which is in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina state his point of order again?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I raise a point of order so far as the amendment reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina state the ground of his point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, the committee, as a committee does not have a right to propose such an amendment. I think the amendment can be made on the floor of the Senate, but I do not think the committee can make it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is my purpose to offer an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment. I also expect to offer that amendment to a number of other resolutions, just as was done in respect to Senate Resolution 37. It may develop that we can consider this amendment by unanimous consent, and not have to take it up in the case of each individual resolution.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina would object if Senate Resolution 25 were to be passed over for the present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senate, let me say that the resolution provides additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We already have on the committee a man appointed by the minority whose pay comes within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member. But I am raising the point of order because I think this committee amendment is the wrong procedure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Committee on Rules and Administration does not have jurisdiction to insert this kind of language in the resolution before it comes to the floor, the whole section can be offered with the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]

proposed to the first resolution considered this afternoon.

In the interest of expedition, I simply suggest that the Senator from Nebraska offer section 4, on page 3, with the language that was agreed to earlier today as an amendment to the other resolution. That will cure the situation, and we can move on to the next resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was about to make a suggestion in the interest of expedition. I do not know whether the point of order has been ruled upon. I assume that takes precedence over any other suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to have the point of order ruled upon. I think I am within my rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from South Carolina insists on his point of order, the Chair will rule.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That will not prevent other Senators from offering amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer an amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nebraska withhold his amendment until the Chair rules on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have asked for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). The Chair rules that under the uniform practice of the Senate, when a question was raised as to the jurisdiction of the former Standing Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the functions of which were vested in the Committee on Rules and Administration under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it was held by the Presiding Officer that the committee had no jurisdiction or authority to deal with substantive matters in any resolution providing for the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, but that its jurisdiction was limited to the matter of the payment of funds, and that it had only a perfunctory duty to perform.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was about to ask for further clarification, although I think it is clear to most Senators that "perfunctory" means with relation only to the contingent fund of the Senate. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. It does not relate to moneys appropriated for the several committees and subcommittees thereof, which do fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that assumption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought that I was.

For the purpose of expediting the procedure, I think that as to such matters as apply to appropriations other than those from the contingent fund of the Senate, we may subscribe to a unanimous consent agreement, if the Senator would care to propose it, and have that agreement apply to all the resolutions which are being considered today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was about to agree to the suggestion in the case of this one resolution, but I cannot agree to it in the case of some of the other resolutions. I cite an illustration. The funds of my committee for an investigation of the Trading With the Enemy Act have been reduced from $60,000 to $35,000. Yet the committee is being asked to appoint one minority employee at a substantially high salary. There will not be enough money in the fund to employ two stenographers, much less to hold any hearings or to make any investigations whatsoever.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has served on that committee and has been chairman of it. In 1954, the committee had $108,500. The following year I asked that the amount be cut by $50,000 to $58,500.

This year we are including the claims acts in the investigation. We need $60,000, but, in all fairness, I may say we did not explain that to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I thought I might propound my unanimous-consent request, but not include in it Senate Resolution 50.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Sometimes the extra employee is not needed throughout the entire year.

Mr. CURTIS. We can let Senate Resolution 50 go until it is reached on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That will be all right, but I did not want the same amendment applied to other resolutions of a similar nature, for to do so would create a situation which would seriously hamper investigations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is some validity to the point which has been made. After all, an investigation requires a certain amount of money for the necessary operations. The proposed investigation has been pending a long time, and considerable work must be done in connection with it.

I know that many persons come to the committee's office and request an investigation of the entire alien property field.

It was my personal opinion, at least, that proposed cut was a little sharp, all things considered, and especially in the light of the amendment proposed for a minority clerk and for the necessary compensation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not objecting to that amendment to the pending resolution, but I did not want to agree to a unanimous-consent request that the same amendment be made in all similar resolutions.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Missouri permit me to propound the request?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know what the Senator from Nebraska wishes to propound, but I know what I wish to propound, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, my inquiry is this: Has such a unanimous-consent agreement been requested? I understand that it has not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No unanimous-consent request is now before the Chair.

Mr. HENNINGS. A little while ago the distinguished Senator from Nebraska spoke to me, and suggested that he would like to propound a unanimous-consent request. After consultation with the majority leader and the acting minority leader, it was agreed between us that there would be no objection on our part to the proposed request, although, of course, we cannot speak for the Senate as a whole.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the same language which I moved be stricken from Senate Resolution 37, on page 2, in line 9, and the amending language in Senate Resolution 37, on page 1, in line 10, as inserted therein, be applied similarly to the following resolutions, when taken up for consideration: Senate Resolution 25, Senate Resolution 42——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska have before him the calendar numbers of these resolutions?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not have them now, but I shall be glad to supply them later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that such amendments be made in the following resolutions: Senate Resolution 25, Senate Resolution 42, Senate Resolution 44, Senate Resolution 48, Senate Resolution 49, Senate Resolution 51, Senate Resolution 52, Senate Resolution 53, Senate Resolution 54, Senate Resolution 55, Senate Resolution 57, and Senate Resolution 58.

I also ask unanimous consent that the same amending language which appears in Senate Resolution 37, on page 1, in line 10, be inserted in the following resolutions, when they are taken up for consideration: Senate Resolution 26, Senate Resolution 34, Senate Resolution 45, Senate Resolution 46, Senate Resolution 62, Senate Resolution 73, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I make the inquiry merely for clarification: Is it in order for a Senator to propose, even by unanimous consent, the amending of a resolution not then before the Senate for consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from

Nebraska has requested that such amendments be made in the resolution, when taken up by the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska simply that such an amendment may now be offered? In other words, final action would not be taken on the amendment, as a result of agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that final action on the amendment would be taken only as and when the resolutions referred to were taken up for consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As each resolution is taken up, the amendment will still be open to further consideration; will it?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me state that it is my understanding that if the proposed unanimous consent were given at this time, it would have no force or effect whatever as to the other resolutions, until they were taken up. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that as the resolutions are called up, they could then be further amended.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is to say, severally and individually?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "consultants", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the subcommittee is a standing subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I further understand that last year it spent $75,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Last year we had two subcommittees, and this year we have only one. Last year we did not spend all the money; instead, we returned about $18,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the two subcommittees were performing separate functions, were they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. As the Senator from Louisiana will recall, one of the subcommittees dealt with security and subversives.

Mr. ELLENDER. The present request is for what purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is in regard to the group life insurance fund. We propose to investigate the rates changed and the way the program is being administered.

Mr. ELLENDER The amount requested is $50,000, I understand.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, $50,000, to cover all investigations pending before the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. When is it proposed that the work of the subcommittee be ended? Will the subcommittee fade out soon, or is it to be a continuing subcommittee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Inasmuch as over 98 percent of all Government employees are insured, an investigation of that subject is a large undertaking. The same can be said of the retirement fund, which already has approximately $6 billion in it. In connection with those matters, with so much of the employees' money involved, we must keep a close watch on the administration of such funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the regular staff do that work?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That would be almost impossible; with so much proposed legislation and over 3,000 appointments each year, the staff must be ably supported by experts to conduct the investigations that are demanded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it proposed that experts in that field be obtained?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, and we shall employ them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee"; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 14, Senate Resolution 48, authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 3, line 4, after the word "committee," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants

and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel 1 employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 20, after the word "consultants" it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

On page 3, in line 4, after the word "committee", insert a period, and disagree to the committee amendment inserting the words:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska whether this is the same amendment as the one he offered to the resolution on which we acted just a moment ago.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this resolution will finance the operations of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The appropriation called for is in line with the appropriations made for the subcommittee since 1950. Last year we were able to return a substantial part of the fund, and we hope to be able to do the same this year. However, it was the feeling of the members of the Armed Services Committee, and was concurred in by the Committee on Rules and Administration, that we should have the amount called for by the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the amount returned to the Treasury, from last year's appropriation, was $90,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not reduce to that extent the amount called for by the resolution, so that it will provide for $100,000, instead of $190,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We do not think we should be penalized for having been provident last year. The subcommittee had a considerable volume of work, but was able to combine the counsel's job with the assignments of other staff members, and to use them for that work. We expect that this year our volume of work will be somewhat greater.

We consider it to be the better part of wisdom to provide the amount we believe we need, and then perhaps be able to return some of it, rather than to have need for more than we are allowed.

I may say that in the past 3 years the subcommittee has returned approximately $270,000. So the subcommittee has not been a wasteful one, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas and the ex officio members who constitute some of the most economy-minded Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 48), as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matter pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee, and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 16, Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 2, after the word "printed", to insert "as a Senate document"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "status" and insert "statue"; in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "Louisiana," and insert "Louisiana; and that"; in line 10, after the word "thousand", where it appears the first time, to strike out "Copies" and insert "copies be printed"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "the House, and for the use"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "and", to strike out "the remaining"; and in line 5, after the word "Public", to strike out "Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings" and insert "Printer"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, presented by the State of Louisiana; and that 3,000 copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Representatives in Congress from Louisiana; and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Senators from the State of Louisiana.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 18, Senate Resolution 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 42) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate problems of American small and independent business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 42), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 1, after the word "Small," to strike out "Business is authorized under the authority of Senate Resolutions 58 and 272 of the Eighty-first Congress" and insert "Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$85,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, the committee proposes to insert the following:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, and to insert on page 2, line 4, after the word "consultants," the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question for clarification. This particular resolution relates to the Select Committee on Small Business. The Senator will remember that the question about minority employees arose. I pointed out that we had always conducted that committee, since 1950, on a completely nonpartisan basis. As a matter of fact, the staff director was put on the committee by the minority, and is at the present time employed by the committee, as are other employees of the staff. Since our top-level man is a member of the minority, is there anything in the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska that would in any way interfere with an agreement as between the majority and the minority of a committee to let the staff stand just as it is now, even though it does not conform strictly with the provision the Senator offered, but goes beyond it?

Mr. CURTIS. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I wish to answer that I believe the question he raises is a matter for internal determination of the Small Business Committee. Our purpose is making available one employee to the minority as a matter of right does not go to the point of the politics of the employee involved. It is a question of the minority parties having the right to select and appoint an individual. We are aware that at the present time there are on many of the committees employees who have been appointed at the request of the minority, but it is done only by the grace of the majority. It is done where the majority actually makes the appointment. We have no desire to disturb those arrangements. The amendment gives the minority the selection and appointment of one employee without the concurrence of the majority, as a matter of right, if the minority so chooses him. They do not have to choose him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator. I think he placed on the record what I thought was his intention. It is a matter to be worked out largely between the majority and the minority.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield, as I recall, the $85,000 requested is about the same as was provided last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is $5,000 less than last year, but we are turning back approximately $8,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in addition to the $110,000 made available?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a permanent committee, that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 42), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, 81st Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultant: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $85,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 19, Senate Resolution 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 44) further authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a study of public and private housing, and providing additional funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 44), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 2, line 16, to insert the following:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the second committee amendment, and to insert on page 2, line 16, after the word "consultants" the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditure as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee"; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report all its findings, together with its recommendation for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the resolution, as amended, provides the sum of $90,000 for the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The amount provided is approximately $10,000 less than the committee had last year. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the subcommittee, is present, and he may desire to make a further presentation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the subcommittee is a standing subcommittee. Is the study of housing a continuous process? It is my understanding that the subcommittee has been in the process of studying housing for some time. How many years has this study been in progress?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, in the 83d Congress the Banking and Currency Committee obtained additional funds to make a special study of certain housing scandals, particularly those in the section 608 program. Early in the 84th Congress the present subcommittee was set up to make a continuing study of housing. It is not a permanent standing subcommittee, but I will say to the distinguished Senator that I feel that so long as the Federal Government is going into the housing program to the extent it is now doing—there is a Federal involvement during 1956 of some $18 billion—the expenditure of $100,000 a year, which I think the subcommittee should have had, represents a very small investment for the purpose of making this continuing study.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the nature of the study? Does the committee go behind the scenes to determine whether or not the Government spends too much money on its housing programs, or whether the houses are built properly—just what does it do?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Louisiana, I will say that the subcommittee studies and checks into about every problem one can think of in connection with our multisided housing program. For instance, I happen to recall that during the past year a question was raised as to the letting of contracts in the construction of military housing at Abilene Air Force Base in Texas. It was the first contract being let under the new program.

We immediately dispatched two men to that area to check into everything that had been done. The men returned and made a report. We got officials from the Defense Department, the Air Force, and the Housing Agency, and brought them together and went over the report. I think we straightened out some matters that might otherwise have led to some of the problems we had under the section 608 program. We made studies in different parts of the country. We check into problems as they arise. We check into new housing programs to ascertain the progress that is being made. We try to improve on the programs from time to time.

In addition to that, the subcommittee handles legislation pertaining to housing for the Banking and Currency Committee. Conferences will be held during the year with representatives from different segments of our economy that are concerned with housing, representatives of banking, investment companies, insurance companies, home builders, mortgage bankers associations, and so on. The subcommittee brings those persons before it and holds conferences to try to ascertain whether there may be a better system of handling mortgages which will result in an advantage to the Government.

I could go on indefinitely, but I will merely say what I have said previously: I think $100,000 invested for the purpose of keeping an eye on this tremendous program, in which the Government involvement may be as much as $18 billion this year, is money well spent.

My only suggestion is that in this particular case I think a mistake was made in cutting us back about $10,000. It is true that we turned in some $11,000 which was appropriated last year, out of $100,000; but it so happened that it was not necessary for the committee to hold hearings in other parts of the country. I think we should not be penalized for having saved that $11,000. It is not at all improbable, if Members of the Senate place upon us additional loads, that we may have to come back and ask for more money before the end of the year.

I rest with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the subcommittee have anything to do with the so-called scandals which took place recently in the housing industry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator mean about 3 years ago?

Mr. ELLENDER. About 3 years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That subject was handled by a special staff when the Banking and Currency Committee was headed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The investigation came to an end when the committee submitted its final report. However, the present subcommittee was immediately set up for the purpose of making a continuing study of just such problems as the special staff of the Senator from Indiana had investigated.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is a subcommittee which was organized after the Capehart subcommittee went out of existence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I believe that so long as the Government remains in the housing program to the extent to which it is now engaged in it, we badly need some such a committee as this.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to call up Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, has not been acted upon because the Senator from Florida desires to be present when it is considered. He is unable to be present now. We have agreed to withhold action on it until he can be present.

Mr. GREEN. Was he sent for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We shall notify him, and request his presence as soon as possible.

THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE DRAFT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from Maj. Gen. John M. McGreevy, adjutant general of the National Guard of Rhode Island. The telegram is self-explanatory, and I believe it will be of interest to Members of the Senate. I heartily concur in what General McGreevy has to say regarding the statement of the Secretary of Defense in reference to the National Guard, its officers, and enlisted men. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read the telegram, as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *January 29, 1957.*

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the 2,246 officers and enlisted men of the Rhode Island National Guard who were recalled to active duty during the Korean emergency and many of whom fought in Korea, I resent the statement of the Secretary of Defense referring to the National Guard as a draft-dodging business. This statement seems to be part of the plan to downgrade and discredit the National Guard. I hope that you will use your good offices to place the National Guard in its true light.

JOHN M. MCGREEVY,
Major General,
The Adjutant General of Rhode Island.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) designating the 3d day of February 1957 as a day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DORCHESTER DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 90, which has passed the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90), as follows:

Whereas the Army transport *Dorchester* was sunk by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on February 3, 1943; and

Whereas four Army chaplains of different religious faiths—George L. Fox, of Gilman, Vt., Methodist; Alexander D. Goode, of York, Pa., Jewish; Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N. Y., Reformed Church in America; and John P. Washington, of Newark, N. J., Roman Catholic—lost their lives in the sinking of such vessel while heroically serving their comrades and their country; and

Whereas each of these men was awarded posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross for services rendered to his country above and beyond his prescribed duty; and

Whereas the conduct of these heroic chaplains and other brave men who died on the *Dorchester* will forever be an inspiring example of courageous and unselfish devotion to God and to country; and

Whereas Sunday, February 3, 1957, is the 14th anniversary of this great tragedy of World War II and will be observed by the American Legion as a day dedicated "to God and country": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the third day of February 1957 be observed as a day dedicated to the memory of the heroic conduct of George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington, the Army chaplains and other brave men who lost their lives in the sinking of the Army transport *Dorchester* on February 3, 1943.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on the 3d day of February 1957, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies, in commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of the four chaplains, and other brave men who lost their lives on the *Dorchester*.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure has the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Judiciary Committee.

The concurrent resolution designates February 3, 1957—this coming Sunday—as Dorchester Day.

February 3, 1957, has already been designated by the American Legion as Dorchester Day and the resolution would request the President to issue a proclamation in this connection.

On February 3, 1943, the Army Transport *Dorchester* was sunk by enemy action off the coast of Greenland. Aboard this transport were a minister of the Methodist Church, a minister of the Reformed Church, a rabbi and a Catholic priest. These four clergymen led the members aboard in prayer and gave up their own lifejackets to others aboard.

February 3, 1957, is to be dedicated to these four chaplains and other brave men who died as the result of this enemy action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 21, Senate Resolution 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing an investigation of matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$115,000" and insert "$100,000", and in line 13, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in line 13 on page 2.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that this committee amendment be rejected. I have an amendment to offer.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 12, after the word "consultants" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so elected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other member of such staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] could tell us what the subcommittee did last year, and what were the results of hearings which were held.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to undertake to advise the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

According to information supplied by the subcommittee, in addition to examining the areas to which security measures have been extended, beyond necessities to protect national security interests, the subcommittee has been concerned over the increased tendency of executive departments and agencies to refuse information to the Congress and the public—where no legitimate national security secrets are involved. Senate committees have informed the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of many instances where they felt the denial of information was unjustified; moreover, they felt generally powerless to compel the production of the desired information which they considered vital to intelligent functioning of the legislative process. Some liberalization of rigid Government censorship rules has resulted from the work of the subcommittee but this work is far from being completed. The subcommittee intends to propose a few legislative measures early in this session which, it believes, will help to clarify general confusion concerning executive department regulation of information; nevertheless, statutory amendments are only one method of dealing with the problem; the subcommittee intends to continue an examination of the complaints about "secrecy in Government," and report its findings to the Congress and the public.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this report based upon evidence developed last year by the subcommittee?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I may say to the Senator that last year the subcommittee completed its hearings on the security program. I sat here for 3 months during the recess, holding those hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did any legislation result from those hearings?

Mr. HENNINGS. There was no legislation, except to this extent——

Mr. ELLENDER. What benefits will flow from the hearings, except by way of exposing certain conditions? What is the purpose of holding the hearings, and consuming the time of the Senator from Missouri and many other Senators?

Mr. HENNINGS. They consumed the time of no other Senators, because no other Senators were present.

The purpose was to call before the committee, as we did, members of the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and others, and to look into the general question of the so-called security regulations. The result has been a change in such regulations, so that persons who have been charged with having been security risks have been given an opportunity to be reinstated; and in many cases they were.

I recall the case of one young man who was not given a commission in the Coast Guard because his mother had at one time been a member of an organization condemned in California by the so-called California Un-American Activities Committee, or whatever the name of the committee is. There were any number of such cases.

I may say also to the Senator from Louisiana that there were a number of cases relating to prisoners of war, many of whom returned to this country and were denied veterans' benefits. We went into those cases one by one and undertook to make adjustments. We demonstrated in virtually all such cases that there was no evidence to warrant the Defense Department denying to those persons veterans' benefits or honorable discharges.

We also went into the proposition that if a man is taken into the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, and has a good record in any of the several divisions of the armed services, his conduct while a member of the armed services should be the criterion, and not something that may have happened some time ago with respect to a relative.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee has completed that phase of the study, has it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. The subcommittee has finished that phase of the study.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it now proposes to enter into another phase. What is that phase?

Mr. HENNINGS. We propose to continue a general study of the extent to which the guaranties to the American people under the Bill of Rights are being protected or are being infringed, and to make a preliminary study of activities in the field of administrative law. The Senator is a very able lawyer and knows something about the encroachments of the administrative agencies upon the courts and tribunals where there is the right of appeal and where an opportunity is presented for a proper hearing. We feel that some of the fields of administrative law are highly complex and difficult, and some of us believe, too, that the original intent of Congress in setting up the administrative agencies has not been completely followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the purpose of the subcommittee to investigate these matters to the end that some corrective legislation may be submitted to the Senate?

Mr. HENNINGS. Oh, yes; the Senator is correct. The purpose of the subcommittee is also to make a preliminary study of activities in the field of administrative law, in terms of protection, or lack of protection, now being provided for the rights of American citizens, including corporations and other business entities. This study may lead to the recommendation that the Senate establish a committee for continuing legislative oversight of administrative law procedures and practices, and delegated authority, as well as the possible approval of changes in the structure for appeals from administrative tribunal rulings. The subcommittee cannot predict its conclusions until it has made a careful preliminary study of the nature of the problems and the degree to which constitutional rights are involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator hope to complete the work of the subcommittee during the first session of this Congress, so that this subcommittee will end next year?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that this subcommittee will not fade out, I hope, because I also hope the Bill of Rights will never fade out.

Mr. ELLENDER. This subcommittee has not been in existence for long. The Senate never had such a subcommittee before or if it did, it functioned without the necessity for such large extra appropriations.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the Senator that this is a standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. If the Senator wishes the Committee on the Judiciary to abandon a standing subcommittee which has been in existence for many years, that is another proposition entirely.

Mr. ELLENDER. This study is a new study, which was started last year. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; this study has been conducted for the past several months.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it was only last year that the subcommittee was organized with a separate staff; it is a new subcommittee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. 1955 was the first year that money was specially appropriated to the subcommittee.

Mr. HENNINGS. 1955, the year before last.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the Senator that formerly the subcommittee was known as the Subcommittee on Civil Rights. I moved that the designation of the subcommittee be changed from "civil rights" to "constitutional rights."

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee has been in existence for only 2 years, then; first it was known as the Subcommittee on Civil Rights, and now it is known as the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is a matter of terminology. The Subcommittee on Civil Rights was a standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Because of the semantics involved, and because of a general misunderstanding of what constituted civil rights, it being generally understood that civil rights relate to race relations, I moved that the name be changed to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights; and the committee agreed with me. It was done because many matters coming within the purview of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution would be considered by the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent does the work of the subcommittee duplicate or supplement the functions of the civil-rights division of the Department of Justice?

Mr. HENNINGS. There is no civil-rights division in the Department of Justice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, the Senator knows better than that, I hope.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know it because there is no such division.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may not be called the division on civil rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. This morning the committee met and drew up a bill providing that the section on civil rights in the Department of Justice be changed to the division on civil rights. Such a division does not now exist in the Department of Justice. There is no such division in the Department of Justice. The committee has tried many times to enlist the cooperation and indeed the attendance of the distinguished Attorney General of the United States before the committee. We have had a great deal of trouble in getting that gentleman to come to the Hill to tell us things and to be of assistance to us, although he has on several occasions sent others.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to argue that point with the Senator. I do know that there is a Civil Rights Section in the Department of Justice.

Mr. HENNINGS. A section, yes; not a division. The Senator said a division.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the difference, except a difference in terminology?

Mr. HENNINGS. There is a difference. There is a great deal of difference between a section and a division.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will not argue that point. The Senator is technically correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. A division is headed by an Assistant Attorney General. A section need not be headed by an Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point is that there is a special group in the Department of Justice which has jurisdiction over violation of Federal civil rights of our citizens. Again I wish to ask the Senator, to what extent will the subcommittee cooperate with the civil-rights section of the Department of Justice?

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to say to the Senator that we will cooperate to the fullest extent. Our problem has been to enlist the cooperation of the Attorney General. It is our hope that what the Senator has designated as a section on civil rights will be designated a division on civil rights. We believe that Congress has certain responsibilities which

transcend those of the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY AND WAR CLAIMS ACTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 50) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy and War Claims Acts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$35,000", and in line 14, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel 1 employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committe on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I hope the committee will agree to accept the amendment. If so, I would be inclined to agree to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment would strike out $35,000 and insert in lieu thereof $50,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must disclaim any area of agreement. I believe we had something of an understanding as to what the realities and the equities and the merits of the situation were. The Senator from South Carolina recognizes, of course, the necessity for asserting as a matter of law the minority interest and their right to a minority employee. Speaking for myself, as the former chairman of the subcommittee dealing with alien property, but certainly not for my distinguished compatriots on the Committee on Rules and Administration. I recognize that this is one of the most complicated and most abstruse subjects which has ever engaged the attention of any committee of the Senate. It means going back to World War I and World War II, and through all the amendments that have been added to the so-called Alien Property Act and bringing them up to date and, of course, charting a new policy.

I quite agree with the Senator from South Carolina that some additional funds over and above those requested by the Committee on Rules and Administration are necessary in order to conduct efficient operations in this field.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should explain that if we do not agree to give the subcommittee the additional amount that I requested in my amendment, we will not have enough money in the committee account with which to employ the additional minority employee.

I believe the subcommittee needs at least $50,000. Anyone who will look into the record of the subcommittee, both under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and under my chairmanship, will note that the subcommittee returned some money every year. That proves that we do not use any more than is absolutely necessary. I sincerely believe that we need $50,000 for the contemplated investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] were not agreed to, the subcommittee could get along with only $35,000. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That would be about in keeping with the——

Mr. ELLENDER. Engaging a minority employee will cost an additional $15,000. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have discussed this matter also with the ranking minority member. He will bear me out when I say that we may not spend all the money that will be given to the subcommittee. We may not need all the money.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Curtis amendment should not be agreed to, the subcommittee could get along with $35,000. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe we probably could.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been disturbed by the ever-increasing amount of these requests. Some years ago, in the 80th Congress, the Senate spent, for extra committees, out of the contingent fund about $1,600,000. In the next Congress the figure went to $1,900,000. In the 82d Congress it reached $3 million. Then it went to $3,100,000. In the last Congress we spent $5½ million out of the contingent fund for extra committees. Some of the money appropriated was turned back.

The subcommittee we are talking about deals with the Trading With the Enemy Act. That subject has been investigated over and over again. What ought to be done is to establish a legislative policy. To do that, some proposed legislation should be brought before the Senate.

I believe the cut to $35,000 is merited. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I shall not resist the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. But I hope the committee will not spend the money to investigate the same things over and over again, and that a legislative policy may be arrived at.

Mr. ELLENDER. In this instance at least $15,000 could be saved. The chairman of the subcommittee states unequivocally, as I understand him, that the work could be done for $35,000; but in order to provide a job for the minority, an additional $15,000 is included. I say that is unconscionable. I hope that both amendments will be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; that is not precisely correct. If Senators will study the work of the subcommittee, they will find that year after year we have been able to return over $15,000, but in those years the appropriations were larger than what I am now asking for. The money was appropriated to us, but the committee did not use it because we did not want to spend the money. I promise the Senators that we shall spend only what is actually necessary. We will spend only what we actually need. We are now greatly understaffed and overworked.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose, in offering the amendment to provide for a minority employee on this committee or any other committee, to create any additional expense. It is my position that if there are matters which require investigation, and if a staff

is required to investigate, then a staff composed of both minority and majority employees is required. Either the work should not be undertaken, or else both parties should be represented in the selection and the control of the staff members.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. It is not my purpose to create any new or additional position on the committee.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. How many staff members now serve on the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the present time there is 1 man who is an attorney, and there are 2 stenographers.

Mr. THYE. Do they comprise the entire staff of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the present time, they do. The committee has had a larger staff than that. At times, when there have been more investigations, the committee has had more employees temporarily, but not permanently. In prior years there were 14 under Senator Smith of North Carolina and 9 under the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I think the Senator from Minnesota heard the Senator from Illinois say a moment ago that if someone were needed, he would have to be employed.

Mr. THYE. How many persons were employed at the height or the peak of the work in the past year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There were never more than 6, but in past years the subcommittee has had as many as 14. We will try to get along on an average of four.

Mr. THYE. How many of those were attorneys on the committee staff?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Two.

Mr. THYE. Were the others secretarial employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They were secretarial employees at smaller salaries.

Mr. THYE. The Senator now is asking for funds which would enable the committee to have, in the future, a staff comparable in size if the workload called for it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is all.

Mr. THYE. Was not the Senator straining the fact slightly when he asked for $15,000 for a minority employee on the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not ask for that amount at all. Our original budget was for $60,000 and a grant of $50,000 is actually a reduction of $10,000 from what we need.

Mr. THYE. That was the inference I drew from listening to the colloquy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amount of $15,000 was provided in an amendment. I want to be fair. The Senator from Illinois explained on the floor that probably the minority will not ask for a person be employed unless it becomes necessary when we get into hearings and investigations when we shall require more employees. We always operate at a minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely trying to make this point: I gained the impression from my good friend from South Carolina that he would raise no objection to the amount of $35,000 unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska were adopted. So I concluded that the purpose was to provide—perhaps not tomorrow, but eventually—for an additional employee from the minority to serve on the subcommittee. The chairman of the subcommittee tells us that he can do the work with $35,000.

To increase the amount to $50,000, so as to conform with the amendment which will be submitted, is, I think, unconscionable. It should not be done. Although the amount is very small—it is only $15,000—let us at least try to save that sum, if possible.

Mr. CURTIS. That is not the situation at all. We are not proposing the creation of a new position. We are merely providing for the selection of the number of persons necessary to do the work.

Mr. President, I ask that we vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which amendment is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that an amendment to increase the amount?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the status of the Curtis amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other amendment has not been offered. The Chair presumes that it will be offered later.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to add a word in support of what the Senator from South Carolina is seeking to do. I am certain that the Senate as a whole does not understand that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary handles more legislative business than does any other committee. There is not a single committee of the Senate which comes anywhere near handling the amount of business which comes to the Committee on the Judiciary, save only the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The latter committee has a geographical jurisdiction which extends from the very easternmost boundaries of the Virgin Islands to the westernmost boundaries of the Hawaiian Islands and to the end of the Aleutian Islands in Alaska.

These two committees do more work than do any other committees in the Senate. Perhaps the Committee on Appropriations performs more arduous service, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry perhaps has the most difficult problems of any committees of the Senate.

The clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary came upon the floor a moment ago, and I asked him to give me a record of what the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has done during the last Congress. Of 2,825 written reports filed on proposed legislation in the Senate by all committees, the Committee on the Judiciary filed 1,422. This represents 50.3 percent of all the work of the Senate. I shall not burden Senators at this time with the full text of the report, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objecion, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE THOUSAND AND TWENTY-EIGHT PRIVATE LAWS—SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORKLOAD AS OF JULY 27, 1956, 84TH CONGRESS

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the two sessions of the 84th Congress, as of July 27, 1956, comprised 40.68 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced, 50.92 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 43.33 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate, it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 2,825 written reports filed on legislation in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,422, which represents 50.3 percent.

The total of reports filed with the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 1,601 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, 833 cases involving adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act, and 3,165 cases involving adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

As of July 27, 1956, the Judiciary Committee had received 2,006 Senate bills and resolutions and 877 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,883 bills and resolutions.

As of July 27, 1956, the committee had disposed of 1,383 Senate bills and resolutions and 786 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 2,169 bills and resolutions, which includes 9 bills from which the committee was discharged.

Of the bills thus disposed of 212 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 490 were private relief bills, 1,450 were private immigration bills, 13 were general claims bills, 4 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 767 Senate bills and resolutions and 678 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,445 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 23 of the 1,445 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably, 139 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 270 were private relief bills, 1,025 were private immigration bills, 9 were general claim bills, and 2 were general immigration bills.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 608 Senate bills and resolutions, 107 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 715 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably, 69 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 215 were private relief bills, 425 were private immigration bills, 4 were general claim bills, and 2 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee as of July 27, 1956, included 623 Senate bills and resolutions and 91 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 714 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 270 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 150 are private

relief bills, 264 are private immigration bills, 6 are general claims bills, and 24 are general immigration bills.

It will be noted the Committee has disposed of 786 House bills and resolutions, out of 877 such measures referred to it, leaving 91 House bills and resolutions pending as of July 27, 1956.

This means the committee took action on 89.6 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 2,006 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 1,383, leaving 623 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to start from scratch by requesting Departmental reports in most such cases, action was taken on 68.9 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, and under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, under authority delegated by the Congress, are reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending in the committee 537 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 2,029 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 2,566 cases, of which 1,550 were approved, 12 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 39 were not approved, leaving 965 cases in process as of the close of the 84th Congress.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 474 cases of adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, to which were added 407 additional cases submitted during the Congress, making a total of 881 cases, of which 766 were approved, 3 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 10 were held for further information and 54 were not approved leaving 48 cases in process as of July 27, 1956.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 41 cases of adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to which were added 4,767 additional cases submitted during the Congress, making a total of 4,808 cases, of which 2,740 were approved, and 34 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 360 were not approved, and 31 were held for further information, leaving 1,643 cases in process as of the close of the 84th Congress.

During the 84th Congress, the committee received 111 executive nominations, of which 1 was Associate Justice of the United States, 60 were Federal judges, 3 were Assistant Attorneys' General, 15 were United States attorneys, 21 were United States marshals, 1 was First Assistant Commissioner of Patents, 1 was Examiner in Chief, Patent Office, 4 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and 4 were members of the Parole Board.

As of July 27, 1956, nominations pending totaled 6.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire the Members of the Senate to accept my statement, which cannot be challenged, that the Committee on the Judiciary is the most arduously worked committee of the Senate. It handles, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out a little while ago, the claims bills, which formerly were handled by the committee of which he was the chairman. There is not a resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary asking for a penny for the handling of claims. The claims bills which are referred to our committee are handled by the individual members of the committee, just as they were when the Senator from Louisiana was chairman of the independent committee.

Then we have various nominations which are made to the judiciary and to the Department of Justice. I do not know how many hours and days were spent last year in personal hearings on judicial nominations. I handled at least six separate nominations which had been submitted by the President and which were subject to controversy. They required many hours and, in one instance, weeks of labor by the chairman of that subcommittee.

So I ask Senators to consider the burden which has been placed upon the Committee on the Judiciary. I have never served with a committee in which there was more cooperation among the members, regardless of party, than there is on this committee.

I observe the Senator from Illinois sitting in the Chamber. I am certain the Senator will agree with what I say. The Senator nods his very handsome head in approval.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is true, is it not, that whatever the good results of the Legislative Reorganization Act have been, that act has placed an undue burden upon the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has.

Mr. HENNINGS. For example, at the last session I served on 9 subcommittees of that committee and was chairman of 2 subcommittees. At this session I am a member of 7 subcommittees and the chairman of 3, all of them active.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am a member of 8 subcommittees and the chairman of 3.

Mr. HENNINGS. These activities do not contemplate the confirmation of the several nominations of Justices of the Supreme Court and district judges, for which separate subcommittees are appointed in each instance, or the confirmation of the nominations of United States attorneys, or the consideration of literally hundreds of private claims and immigration bills.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Lastly, I would say to my smiling friends on the Republican side of the aisle that I hope we can proceed rapidly with the disposition of these resolutions, because I am certain none of the Senators on the other side of the aisle would want to change the majority of the Senate by overworking any member on the Democratic side of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the statement made by my good friend from Wyoming and also the information he has placed in the RECORD. There is no doubt that the Committee on the Judiciary does much work. It is one of the busiest committees in the Senate. What I am contending is that we should set the example in reducing unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the point for which the Senator is contending.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairman of the subcommittee says he is satisfied that he can handle the work of the subcommittee with $35,000.

In order to provide an employee for the minority, to conform to the amendment to be submitted by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, it is proposed to make the amount $50,000, so as to create a new position for the minority. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that. Of course I merely pointed out that the amendment was offered—as I have told the Senator from Louisiana in private conversation—out of misunderstanding of the work of the various committees.

I was acting chairman all last year of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I never raised a question about the political affiliation of any staff member. I sought only to have staff members who were competent professionally to do the technical work which had to be done in connection with the matters before us. Then, when the time came to consider the resolution, I found my memory electrified by realizing that to the senior members on the minority side of the subcommittee we had accorded the right to select the minority members of the staff.

There has been no violation of the principle on the basis of which the amendment has been offered.

But what is the use of quibbling over it? We do not care about Democratic or Republican partisanship, when we are handling the business of the United States which comes under the courts, the enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice, and the important legislation, such as the Trading With the Enemy Act. What are we going to do with such matters? That is a very important and delicate question.

Mr. President, since the majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration has agreed to go along with the amendment, I hope we may go along with it, and then be able to return to our work, and read and sign the mail which still must go out today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Rules and Administration has approved $35,000, which is the amount I believe should be the maximum provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, Mr. President, let the Senate decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 1, after the word "consultants", it is proposed to insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than

$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

On page 2 in line 14, after the word "committee," it is proposed to insert a period and strike out the colon and the words:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this is the same amendment which previously has been submitted. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 50), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION MATTERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 51, authorizing an investigation of immigration and naturalization matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$102,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 14, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 11, after the word "consultants" it is proposed to insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

On page 2, in line 14, after the word "committee", it is proposed to insert a period and strike out the colon and the words:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this is the same as the amendment I have previously offered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 51), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by adopting the amendment, the committee has to reduce its expenditures from $102,000 provided last year, to $90,000.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, acting for the chairman of the committee, I have authority from him to agree to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS, CORRUPT PRACTICES AND OTHER MATTERS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 39, Senate Resolution 73, authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to investigate certain matters pertaining to Federal elections, corrupt practices, and other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is the same amendment previously offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 8, after the word consultants, it is proposed to insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is this the amendment the majority leader has been accepting all along?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the resolution relate to the regular subcommittee which investigates elections?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since there is no election this year, why is it necessary to provide so much money?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that over a period of years it has been customary to make appropriations for this standing subcommittee. The resolution authorizes $60,000 for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The resolution provides for the usual small staff

carried by the subcommittee in a nonelection year, and it would provide sufficient funds with which to handle the many inquiries concerning election laws, inasmuch as such inquiries are referred to the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was spent last year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last year the amount spent was $150,000, which was the amount appropriated; $44,200 will be returned.

Let me point out that just this afternoon, according to the United Press, there came to the subcommittee a request in regard to the Texas senatorial election. So I am sure there will be plenty of work to do, and it may well be that later in the year we shall have to request additional funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 73), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally;

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employees; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS PERTAINING TO CERTAIN EUROPEAN AND ASIATIC COUNTRIES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 53, authorizing an investigation of problems pertaining to certain European and Asiatic countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 1, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "March" and insert "February."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$47,500" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 15, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel 1 employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 2, after the word "consultants", it is proposed to insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

On page 2, in line 15, after the word "committee", it is proposed to insert a period and to strike out the colon and the words:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withhold his amendment? I am chairman of the subcommittee. I may add that it is the only subcommittee of which a Republican Senator is the chairman or head. By tradition, the outgoing chairman of the Judiciary Committee is named the chairman of this subcommittee.

I think the amendment of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, would not help any, for there are only two members of the subcommittee staff. One is a Republican, and the other is a Democrat. The total appropriation is $45.000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President. I am the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, and I wish to say that everything the Senator from North Dakota has said is correct. We work together on the subcommittee, and there is no partisanship about it. We get along fine.

Mr. LANGER. There are only two staff members.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, there is no intention of setting aside any arrangement which may have been worked out. The amendment would provide for a matter of right, if the minority wished to exercise it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe in this case it would be the majority; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is making the appointments, and we are thus in the minority, insofar as this particular subcommittee is concerned.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think the Republican Party has made an outstanding record in the case of this subcommittee. Each year we have returned approximately 40 percent of the fund appropriated for this purpose. On the subcommittee staff we have only 1 lawyer and 1 stenographer, and they are all we need.

I am very proud of the fact that at the time when the first Hungarian refugee entered Austria, we had there a representative of the subcommittee, a lawyer, Mr. Louis Marhoefer, to welcome that refugee. We have had that lawyer, that one member of our staff, there continuously to see to it that the refugees were thoroughly examined in every way we possibly could have them examined. The staff has also been at Camp Kilmer, and there has investigated the existing conditions. I am not altogether satisfied with the internal security situation, but we do the best we can.

Personally, I have no objection if there is a desire to increase the amount and to employ another lawyer. Certainly we need the $45,000, in view of the hearings we have to hold. For instance, we have to consider the bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and, I believe, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who wish to have an additional 100,000 refugees admitted to the United States next year. Hearings must be held on that measure. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] have introduced a bill calling for the admission immediately of an additional 20,000 refugees. The subcommittee consideration of those bills will require extensive hearings and considerable expense.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to say that our distinguished friend, the senior Senator [Mr. LANGER] has been chairman of the subcommittee, and I was the one who made the motion that he be made chairman of the subcommittee. I made that motion some 3 years ago. He has conducted the business of the subcommittee efficiently, effectively, and with dispatch. As one of the minority members of the subcommittee, although I am a member of the majority party, I assure the Senator from North Dakota that I shall do all I can to see to it that we do not demand that an additional lawyer

be employed, just to give someone a job at a salary within $1,200 of the top salary.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly the point.

Mr. HENNINGS. I agree that we must be reasonable and fair about these matters. We always work together on that basis.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the distinguished Senator. It would be a waste of money to have another lawyer. We might as well throw the money out the window.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a point of order. Has not the decision of the Chair been announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it is too late to ask for a division. The decision of the Chair has been announced. The only course that would be available to the Senator would be a motion to reconsider.

The question before the Senate now is on agreeing to the last committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 53), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior comment of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 52.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 52) authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 23, after the word "committee," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a short statement in connection with the resolution. It was adopted unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary and approved unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution provides for $50,000 for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. Last year the subcommittee received $80,000, of which practically all has been expended.

The chairman of the subcommittee last year, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is present, and I understand he desires to make a statement in this connection in support of the resolution.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the last year we had very good cooperation in the committee, on a purely nonpartisan basis. We had an excellent staff. More than 30 hearings were held by the committee during the last year. The committee has filed 13 reports on various subjects of great importance. They are in great demand by persons who are interested in the problems of youth and juvenile delinquency. Two bills of great importance which were before the subcommittee, were passed. One was designed to stop the interstate traffic in pornography, and to enable the Postmaster General to seize certain indecent literature in the mails. The other deals with the care of youthful delinquents after they have been released from the charge of the courts. The Senate passed a bill in which the Senator from Minneosta [Mr. THYE] and other Senators were greatly interested. It had to do with stopping the black market in baby sales. That bill was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. Several other bills passed the Senate which did not pass the House. For instance, the Delinquent Children's Act of 1956 passed the Senate, but did not secure final action in the House.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] has in mind investigating a very wide field of subject matters. I told the chairman of the committee that I wanted to devote as much time to the monopoly and antitrust subcommittee as I could. I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] has been very cooperative in agreeing to push for the passage of bills and to finish the work of this committee during the next year.

There are now 25 bills pending, on which some hearings will be required before the bills can be reported to the Senate.

Frankly, my idea about the continuation of this work is that it would be possible and appropriate to have it handled by the staff of the full committee. However, in consultation with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the full commitee, he said that every member of the staff was fully occupied with other matters. There simply was not a staff available to handle the hearings and certain other inquiries that are of importance.

So, under the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] I know the bills to which I have adverted will be properly presented to the Senate. There will be testimony. Important hearings will be held. I am sure the work of the committee will more than justify the small amount that has been requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. I have an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the first inquiry into the subject matter embraced by the pending resolution was authorized during the 83d Congress, first session. I can well remember the former distinguished Senator from New Jersey Mr. Hendrickson, who took the position that if the Senate provided the $44,000 he was asking, he could complete a study of the problem of juvenile delinquency. That statement is in the record. Later on, during the second session of the 83d Congress, a request by Senator Hendrickson was made to provide, not $44,000, but $175,000, for additional investigations into the problem of juvenile delinquency. At that time it was stated that the problem not only could be thoroughly studied during 1954, but that sufficient evidence could be gathered to justify the presentation to the Senate of legislation to cure the evils which were being complained about.

Since 1954 the Senate has adopted each year resolutions providing various sums in order to continue this study, with the result that up to the present time, the study that was supposed to cost from $44,000 to $75,000, has actually cost $425,000. If the amount of $50,000 authorized in the pending resolution is provided, it will mean a total expenditure of almost a half million dollars to make a study of juvenile delinquency. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, how many laws have resulted from the studies by the so-called Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I pointed out earlier, legislation stopping the carrying of pornography from State to State and in automobiles, Public Law 95, is one of the laws that has resulted from these studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that a bill which was before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; that was before our subcommittee. Then there was a bill passed to enable the Postmaster General to seize certain literature. There was a bill for after-care treatment of juvenile delinquents after their release from court, the Youth Correction Act. Then three bills were passed by the Senate and went to the House of Representatives, but failed of passage there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it would seem to me that the subcommittee has already gathered all the evidence it needs. Surely after 4 years of hearings and other studies on the subject of juvenile delinquency, the problems and apparent solutions are known to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary. By now they should have sufficient knowledge of the facts. If any legislation is necessary to correct the evils complained of, let it be submitted.

Last year, as I remember, some of this money was to be used in order to employ special attorneys to draft legislation. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was then chairman of that subcommittee. The amount in the resolution was reduced from $80,000 to $55,000, and later he presented a supplemental resolution and obtained approval of $25,000 more. I understood from him then—in fact, I think the RECORD shows it—that so far as he was concerned, that sum would be satisfactory, and would provide sufficient funds for the subcommittee to complete all the required studies.

Yet here we are again, in the process of providing $50,000 more to continue these studies. I repeat that we have enough evidence on hand now to justify the passage of such other legislation as may be necessary in order to correct the evils complained of.

As I pointed out last year, we are spending close to $150,000 to maintain the office of the Senate legislative counsel. We have on that staff some very eminent lawyers, whose sole duty is to prepare legislation for the committee and for individual Senators. Why cannot those lawyers be used to draft such legislation as the juvenile delinquency subcommittee considers desirable, and thus eliminate the necessity of providing additional funds to employ more lawyers to prepare such legislation.

It is my belief that this subcommittee should fade out of the legislative picture. There is no further need or justification for it. Such legislation as may be appropriate to correct the evils brought to light in previous hearings could be easily prepared by our legislative counsel.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, every time the question of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency arises, we encounter opposition. Our opponents will vote for appropriations for hogs, horses, cows, and sheep; but when it comes to our little children they rise in opposition and say that such legislation ought to be wiped out, and that we ought not to have any juvenile-delinquency subcommittee.

I say to Senators, go down to El Paso, Tex., and cross the line into Mexico. There are 2,000 acres of land claimed by both Old Mexico and the United States. For nearly 100 years they fought over the ownership of those 2,000 acres. At one time the question was submitted to the Chief Justice of Canada, who decided, as an arbiter, that the land belonged to Mexico. However, the United States paid no attention to that award. If one goes down there and looks around, he finds a post here and a post there, and little strands of barbed wire. That is all that separates those 2,000 acres from the city of El Paso. I ask Senators to go there and look at the situation, as I did as a member of the subcommittee. It is the most horrible sight I have seen in years. The area is filled with opium joints, liquor joints, gambling places, and other like places, and the authorities are helpless, because no one knows who has jurisdiction.

Let those who oppose this appropriation look at the literature which the sheriff of San Diego picked up in California, and which teen-agers brought back from Tijuana. It is the most horrible looking literature I have ever seen in my life.

In Baltimore one little corporation was making more than $1 million a year sending out pornographic literature. In the old days if a man hauled liquor in a car he could be stopped. Yet, until we made our investigation in Baltimore, there was no law covering that field.

What did we find? We found lines of distribution of pornographic literature extending into Louisiana, North Dakota, and every other State of the Union. One of the agents was arrested in Houston. We obtained evidence on a man in North Dakota, who was sent to the penitentiary. Moreover, the legislature enacted a model law on the subject.

I wish my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana had been with us on some of the investigations into juvenile delinquency among the Indians.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that what my distinguished friend is saying is true, but I am contending that the evidence has been discovered. It has been made known to the Congress. As my good friend from Tennessee pointed out, laws have been enacted pursuant to those hearings, and some of the evils have already been corrected. Additionally, we have enough evidence before us perhaps to support the enactment of further legislation to correct the situations that my good friend is complaining about.

Mr. LANGER. Consider legislation in another field. Suppose the Senator's sister were married to some scoundrel, and after they had had two or three children he deserted his wife and went from Louisiana to California. How would he be brought back? According to the testimony of the District Attorney in Denver, Colo., the law with respect to runaway fathers should have been enacted years ago. But it is necessary to hold hearings on proposed legislation every time. In my opinion it would be criminal not to enact legislation enabling us to bring witnesses here to testify under the runaway fathers' law.

Consider the situation in connection with the black market in babies. Women who have served terms in the penitentiary advertise in newspapers that they have babies for adoption. Federal Judge Donohue of Minnesota was the first to bring that situation to the attention of the committee, when he learned of the transportation of babies across State lines, with no laws governing the traffic.

One of the best committees in the Senate is the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope not a penny will be taken away from that subcommittee, but that, on the contrary, that subcommittee will be permitted to continue to do as good a job as was done under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The Senator from Tennessee devoted days and nights to the work as chairman of that subcommittee, going from one end of the country to the other. He did a job for which the people of the United States ought to be very thankful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be rejected, following which I wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, after the word "consultants," it is proposed to strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this is the same amendment which has been offered in connection with previous resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CRITICISM OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a telegram dated January 29, 1957, addressed to me and signed by Raymond F. Hufft, major general and Adjutant of the Louisiana National Guard, pertaining to criticism of the National Guard by Secretary of Defense Wilson.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 29, 1957.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Louisiana National Guard resents the accusation and insults by the Secretary of Defense toward the National Guard. The Louisiana National Guard has served gallantly with honor and dignity in every war from the Revolutionary War through the Korean conflict. It is proud of its historical background and traditions achieved during the period. During the Korean conflict the Louisiana National Guard furnished the 773d Tank Battalion, the 122d Bomb Squadron, and the 135th Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron. The 10,000 guardsmen of this State recommend that Congress demand the resignation of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense.

RAYMOND F. HUFFT,
Major General, The Adjutant.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, Senate Resolution 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 56) authorizing an investigation of national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no amendment to offer to this resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me say, as chairman of tihs subcommittee, having served on it for 4 years, that we visit regularly the penitentiaries and reformatories of the country, spending a day in each institution. Sometimes it requires 3 or 4 days for the trip. The amount requested, $5,000, is a very modest sum. It was authorized last year. Usually the subcommittee spends less than $2,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota said many fine things about the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I wish to take a moment or two to say some fine things about the Senator from North Dakota in connection with this activity.

I am glad that finally $5,000 is being provided for this little subcommittee. I used to be chairman of it. The Senator from North Dakota was a member of the subcommittee. He made all the trips and did all the work, and the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee would not sign the vouchers. So, so far as I know, he paid for the trips mostly out of his own pocket. The cost did not amount to much, but it was something.

I hope the work of this subcommittee will continue. It is doing a fine job.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I most emphatically endorse all that the distinguished Senator from Washington has said about our good friend from North Dakota, who has been a faithful member of the subcommittee.

I have visited approximately 20 penal institutions in the United States and have spent over a month and a half of my time, during recess periods of the Senate, for the most part, in doing that work. Many of us have made a study of penology over a long period of years because of our interest in the subject as district attorneys, and otherwise, as well as from our interest in youth work. I do not believe that there should be any objection to the amount involved.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no objection to the resolution, so far as I am concerned, or to the amount involved.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is no staff involved.

Mr. CURTIS. No staff is involved. I believe the committee amendment as shown in the print of the resolution should be rejected.

Mr. HENNINGS. I so move, Mr. President, that the committee amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Having been chairman of the subcommittee for the past 2 years, I do not believe the committee amendment should be added to the resolution. It would be out of place on the resolution. We may not use all the money. I am not chairman of the subcommittee now, but I was for the past 2 years, and in that time we returned about $4,000 of the $5,000 the subcommittee received. We had to investigate various penitentiaries. I am glad to report, incidentally, that there has not been one uprising in any of the penitentiaries we have visited.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is not very popular or pleasant work that the subcommittee must do.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was agreed to.

STRENGTHENING OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 27, Senate Resolution 54.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the strengthening of the Federal criminal code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 2, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$43,000" and insert "$40,000," and in line 17, after the word "committee," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct a full and complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement through changes and additions in existing laws and enforcement procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $40,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee: *Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what was the nature of the amendment with respect to the amount involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amount was changed from $43,000 to $40,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With respect to this subject, I have had several conversations with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. This subcommittee was formerly under the chairmanship of former Senator Price Daniel, of Texas. It did very extensive work in attempting to improve criminal procedures in the United States. However, a great deal of this work remains to be done. Small committees such as this one, with small appropriations, suffer when a reduction like this is made.

Although I am willing enough to accept the reduction which was made by the committee, I do so only because if the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will offer, with respect to the employment of a minority member, is adopted, it will probably increase the amount of the expenditure.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is the senior minority member on the subcommittee. He and I have had no difficulty whatever in working together on the committee, and I believe that if the Senator from Nebraska would be willing to withdraw his amendment it would serve the purpose he is seeking to effect. However, I shall not press the Senator on that point. I see the Senator from Maryland in the Chamber. However, I did not want the resolution to be adopted without the RECORD showing what the facts are. Does the Senator from Maryland desire to make a statement?

Mr. BUTLER. I should like first to find out what the disposition of the Senator from Nebraska is with regard to his amendment. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to press his amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. At the appropriate time I do expect to offer the same amendment that has been offered by me to the previous resolutions. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maryland the fact that my amendment would give the minority on the subcommittee the right to select an employee if it chose to do so.

To that extent, it is a permissive provision. I am offering the amendment at the direction of my leadership and the majority of the members on the minority side. It will be my purpose to offer the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I will not oppose the amendment. The Senator from Wyoming and I, it is true, have been able to work out any staff difficulties that have arisen. I am certain that we can do so in the future. I do not wish to be in opposition at this time to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I believe it is a good amendment and should be adopted. Its purpose should be carried out in the work of our subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment, which is the same amendment I have offered previously, and ask unanimous consent that it be not read, but that its text be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "consultants", insert: "*Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming. I understand that the Senator is chairman of the subcommittee. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is the same committee which was headed by former Senator Price Daniel in its investigation of narcotics, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the subcommittee propose to investigate this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to give the Senator a list. Among the subjects which have been suggested to the committee for study by the Department of Justice over past years, and by the present Department of Justice, but which studies have not been carried out because the staff of the subcommittee was not sufficient to enable the subcommittee to do the work, are the following: A Federal habitual criminal statute. A Federal conspiracy statute, aimed at illegal interstate operations. That means criminal operations, of course. A revision of the obstruction of justice statute. A revision of the perjury statute. A statute aimed at prohibiting interstate transmission of gambling information.

Mr. ELLENDER. When did the Department of Justice ask that these studies be made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These requests were made in years past. I do not have the details on the requests at this time. Bills were presented, but no action was taken in the past because it was impossible, with the staff available, to do the work that had to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean that the staff was too small to conduct hearings?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct; also to meet the complex problem involved in trying to improve the Federal criminal code, to meet modern situations.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Department of Justice makes such requests, does it not give the committee the facts relating to the situation involved?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that the Department of Justice, of course, cooperates with the subcommittee in various ways. However, the subcommittee cannot in justice to itself be dependent entirely upon the facts that come to it from the executive branch.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not correct to say that the Department of Justice gives us assistance, but it is done on a reimbursable basis? In other words, we must pay the people the Department sends to us. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Last year we held 38 days of hearings and took more than 9,000 pages of testimony. We filed four major reports. We passed the most comprehensive bill on the subject of the illicit narcotics traffic that has ever been before Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only in the Federal field, but also for the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUTLER. We passed a code for the District of Columbia. We adopted four major resolutions dealing with the international traffic in narcotics and narcotic derivatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. The subcommittee has done a magnificent job with very little money. It has done that job over a period of 19 months. The budget we are asking for is a minimum. As a matter of fact, I do not believe we will be able to live within that budget if we are to do the job the Senate resolution requires of us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that this subcommittee could be classified as one of the temporary-but-perpetual, special-but-continuing subcommittees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator realizes of course——

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, it will always have something to do. Unlike an old soldier, it will not fade away. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. There is nothing more pressing today than the problems of interstate crime. We must find some way in which to combat interstate crime. That is one of the main subjects we will study. We must revise the perjury statutes. We must go over the whole criminal code.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When we build Federal-aid highways and our manufacturers build high speed automobiles, equipped with safety belts, in order to protect passengers in the cars, we create an opportunity for criminals to escape local jurisdictions. We likewise increase the burden of the Federal courts, because the prosecution of crime is obstructed by the fact that the present statutes are not adjusted to the modern age in which we live.

Mr. BUTLER. That is perfectly true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 54), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct a full and complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement through changes and additions in existing laws and enforcement procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $40,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Pursant to provisions of Senate Resolution 74, agreed to today,

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] as members of the Select Committee on Investigation of Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT announced the appointment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

EXAMINATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE AND PATENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, Senate Resolution 55.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 55) to examine the administration of the Patent Office and statutes relating to patents, copyrights, and trademarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 13, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$80,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the second committee amendment, and to insert on page 2 line 2 after the word "consultants" the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the subcommittee was authorized to spend $110,000 last year and is asking for $80,000 this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Last year the committee had, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, $108,233.34 under 2 resolutions. Of this amount, $7,400 was appropriated for the month of February 1956, and of this amount $1,355.74 was not expended. Out of the balance, some $27,000 remains unexpended and is being returned to the contingent fund.

We have asked for $100,000 because we are carrying on the most thorough study of the patent system that has ever been

undertaken. I am glad to be able to say that the committee has secured the cooperation of experts like Vannevar Bush, who has written a paper on the subject. Papers have been written also by other patent law experts.

In the most recent issue of the magazine Business Week, for January 26, 1957, I find, much to my surprise, an article which is printed on parts of three pages, entitled "Patent Law Reforms Take Shape." The subheadings read:

New studies point up many of the flaws that have existed ever since the Patent Office came into being. Many of the proposed solutions, too, are rewordings of old recommendations. This time, however, the proposed changes have a better than even chance of going through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATENT LAW REFORMS TAKE SHAPE

New studies point up many of the flaws that have existed ever since the Patent Office came into being.

Many of the proposed solutions, too, are rewordings of old recommendations.

This time, however, the proposed changes have a better than even chance of going through.

Armed with reports from three experts in the field, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights—headed by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming—is about ready to press for major changes in patent laws. And it looks now as though the organized patent bar, which has successfully resisted legislative tinkering in its preserves for much of the past century and a half, will go along with some of the proposed remedies.

The new ammunition comes from recommendations of Dr. Vannevar Bush, Chicago attorney George E. Frost, and from an exhaustive statistical analysis by the Patent Office. Frost's report reflects the dominant view of the patent bar, and in general defends the present system. The Patent Office includes an analysis of patents issued since 1939, and shows that between then and 1955, corporations received 6 out of every 10 issued, with one-third of these going to 50 companies. Hartford National Bank & Trust Co.—the one financial company listed—holds patents in trust for N. V. Philips Gloeilampenfabrieken (Holland) and other companies.

OLD BATTLE

The debate over America's patent system—whether it spurs or hinders industrial growth—has been going on for years, and demands for reform have burgeoned. In recent years alone, more than a dozen reports on the patent system have been filed by Presidential commissions, congressional committees, and industrial groups. With repetitious unanimity, they have warned of the growing jeopardy to the patent system and to industrial progress itself, stemming from "archaic" tools and methods available to an overburdened Patent Office.

NEW APPROACH

The three latest reports spotlight many of the same old flaws, and many of the solutions have a familiar ring. To a large extent, they will be measured by O'MAHONEY's committee against this current situation:

The increased delay between the time an inventor files for a patent and the final ruling on his application. Some of the delay can be traced to a slowdown imposed by patent lawyers and their clients, but for the most part, the holdup is the result of Patent Office practices.

The Patent Office with two-hundred-and-eight-thousand-odd applications held over from prior years, won't be able to process 1958 applications until 1960—and some won't be processed and issued until mid-1960's.

The shortage of staff required to screen and classify patents has produced the backlog. But an 8-year modernization program started last year, along with the first substantial appropriations hike in many years, is beginning to show results. By mid-1958, the backlog should be down to about 188,000 applications.

The Patent Office has asked for $19.2 million for fiscal 1958, and will get that much at least. Congress, a step ahead of the administration in facing up to the problem, appropriated $17 million last year—$3 million more than the White House requested. This year, the Patent Office is installing new business machines to speed up processing of applications. In addition, there will be proposals to beef up pay of top officers and scientists, in an attempt to keep trained technicians from defecting to higher paid industrial jobs.

UNDER CONSIDERATION

While the O'Mahoney committee hasn't announced its recommendations, here are some of the proposals—new and old—that it is considering:

The 20-year bill, under which patents would expire in 20 years (instead of the current 17 years) from the date an application is filed, with optional extension for Patent Office delays. The plan is aimed at halting delaying tactics, such as a stream of application amendments by applicant to put off the start of the 17-year life of the patent. The patent's life would be reduced to the extent the period between application and issuance exceeds 3 years. The patent bar is evenly divided on the proposal.

Elimination of delays caused by interference proceedings when two applications covering the same development are pending action at the same time. The examiner must consider a number of factors to establish which of the two had prior invention. One solution would be to issue patents to both applicants immediately, and leave it to the courts to settle priority. The other would limit to 1 year the period in which references to support priority of invention may be cited before the application is filed.

Allowing an applicant for a "defensive" patent merely to list his application on a special register, without carrying through to final issuance of patent. For example, corporations file "defensive" applications on many inventions they have no intention of utilizing. They are filed only to fend off future infringement suits or demands for royalty payment.

Strengthening patent validity: Now disclosure of invention comes when a final patent is issued. One proposal would allow 6 months after disclosure for submittal of evidence of prior invention overlooked by patent examiner. Another proposal, strongly urged by Dr. Bush, would make more available the literature on prior art.

MOOT QUESTION

The historic resistance to change in patent law is explained largely by the nature of the debaters and their subject. A patent is a monopoly—giving its owner the exclusive right to an invention to use pretty much as he sees fit, or not use at all. Since the days of the signing of the Constitution, there has been continual argument as to whether the patent monopoly furthers or hinders its avowed purpose: to stimulate invention.

Despite the impressive record of industrial growth, the question has never been settled. The individual inventor, that rare genius who comes up with solutions that had eluded or were never probed by his corporate counterparts, is fast disappearing from the scene. Critics of the patent system hold that his enterprise has been thwarted by harassing legal tactics—of the patent law.

Other critics point to cases where the patent monopoly has played the key role in the creation of small businesses to exploit new products, which in turn, spark the research efforts of competing companies to meet the new challenge. This sets off a chain reaction, which results in the higher cost—including research—of launching a new product. The individual inventor, who lacks the money to go ahead on his own, now combines his talents with those of others. He joins the corporate research team.

NEW FUEL

The debate over the pros and cons of the present patent system has been fired since 1939 by the shift of the Justice Department from a position of relative neutrality to one of active criticism of the patent system. And the Federal courts, backing Justice Department's position with compulsory patent licensing edicts, also stiffened their attitude toward patents outside the antitrust field. This has shown in court-imposed restrictions on the sweep of invention claimed by a patent owner suing for "infringement" and in the harsher language used by the courts when they invalidate patents.

Quite understandably, these recent attacks and the unrelenting challenge to the basic philosophy of the patent system have made patent attorneys more sensitive to criticism.

DAMPER

The fact that the patent bar will go along with at least some of the proposed remedies indicates that O'MAHONEY to some extent has been successful in allaying its fears of drastic upsets in the system. In the hearings late in 1955 and in public statements since, O'MAHONEY has been careful to stress the fact that his objective—to be pressed at a more exhaustive series of public inquiries this year—is to strengthen weakened joints, to scrape off the rust, rather than to insist on a radical overhaul.

WHO GETS PATENTS

These 50 companies have been the leaders in taking out patents over the past 17 years. Together they received 19.5 percent of all patents issued in that time.

General Electric Co	10,757
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	8,539
Radio Corp. of America	7,894
Westinghouse Electric Corp	7,567
Du Pont de Nemours, E. I., & Co	6,338
Esso Standard Oil Co	4,899
General Motors Corp	4,041
Eastman Kodak Co	3,784
Bendix Aviation Corp	3,113
American Cyanamid Co	2,872
United Shoe Machinery Corp	2,461
Phillips Petroleum Co	2,424
Shell Oil Co	2,374
Westinghouse Air Brake Co	2,108
Sperry Rand Corp	2,066
General Aniline & Film Corp	1,919
Dow Chemical Co	1,884
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co	1,813
Monsanto Chemical Co	1,747
Socony Mobil Oil Co	1,697
Universal Oil Products Co	1,665
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	1,645
B. F. Goodrich Co	1,559
United States Rubber Co	1,469
Hartford National Bank & Trust Co	1,419
International Business Machines Corp	1,410
International Standard Electric Corp	1,406
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	1,393
International Harvester Co	1,391
United States Steel Corp	1,374

Celanese Corp. of America	1,354
Deere & Co	1,233
Texas Co	1,151
Hercules Powder Co	1,107
International Telephone & Telegraph Corp	1,101
Chrysler Corp	1,089
Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd. (Great Britain)	1,030
Associated Telephone & Telegraph Co	1,017
Curtiss-Wright Corp	964
Raytheon Manufacturing Co	948
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	935
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	914
Wingfoot Corp	887
American Viscose Corp	871
American Can Co	845
United Aircraft Corp	821
Borg-Warner Corp	813
Philco Corp	788
Rohm & Haas Co	788
Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp	779

(Data: "Distribution of Patents Issued to Corporations (1939–55)," Senate Committee of the Judiciary, 1956.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much more study does the Senator from Wyoming think will be devoted to the subject?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will be necessary to hold hearings, and without question this money will be needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator believe that with this amount the studies can be completed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I certainly hope the studies will be completed this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 55), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN DATA ON THE ARKANSAS, WHITE-RED RIVER BASINS AND THE NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK REGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate Document No. 13 is a comprehensive report on the conservation and development of the water and related land resources of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins. This report was prepared by the Arkansas-White-Red Basins Interagency Committee, composed of representatives of the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Power Commission, with the participation of representatives of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. The preparation of the report was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950. It was submitted in 23 volumes, including many maps, charts, and photographs. It is believed that only 7 volumes should be printed. The total cost of preparing this report was about $7 million.

Senate Document No. 13 presents a general inventory of possible future developments in the area involved. This inventory and the voluminous information presented on all aspects of the resource problems will permit further planning and coordination to assure that the programs and projects which may be undertaken in the future are fully integrated and consistent with the objective of achieving optimum development of the region's resources, and will provide a general framework within which the States, the Federal agencies, and the Congress may consider future recommendations for specific program developments in the light of future conditions, information, and needs.

These additional copies of the report are needed because of the large number of States and other agencies involved and the large interest that has been shown in the result of the studies made. The number requested is believed sufficient to satisfy the needs of the congressional committees, the Senate and House document rooms, and others interested.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Public Works that since the Federal Government has expended such large sums in preparation of these reports, they should be made available for public use and distribution. The Committee on Public Works therefore recommends the favorable consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

This concurrent resolution would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Works 3,000 copies each of reports transmitted by the Secretary of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins—Senate Document No. 13, 85th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Works the amounts stated of the following reports transmitted by the Secretary of the Army from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins, Senate Document No. 13, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, and report on water resources of the New England-New York region, Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, which reports were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950.

REPRINT OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "TAX GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 63.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. 63) to print additional copies of the committee print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business," 84th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate 10,700 additional copies of the committee print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business" prepared during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND ANTIMONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 57.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, line 2, after the word "committee", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it had been hoped that we could have the Senate recess at about 5 o'clock. If there is any likelihood of deferring some of the colloquy and of agreeing to the remaining resolutions on the calendar, I should be glad to have the Senate remain in session. But if it becomes necessary to have the Senate come back tomorrow anyway for that purpose, I think the Senate should recess soon.

I hope Senators will keep their speeches brief; and if there is an opportunity to have the resolutions agreed to, we can continue in session a little beyond 5 o'clock, even though our arrangements had been to stop about 5 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, on page 3, line 2, and after the word "consultants" on page 2, line 12 to insert:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment makes no change whatsoever in the practice of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. The subcommittee has been under my acting chairmanship ever since the death of Senator Kilgore. During Senator Kilgore's lifetime, the chief counsel was selected by the vote of the full committee, and the staff was appointed upon the theory that it should be a professional staff of competent, efficient persons. There are on the staff representatives nominated by the minority as well as by the majority. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska makes no change whatsoever, because there is minority representation upon the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I understand correctly that this subcommittee intends to investigate the hiking of oil prices in the past 2 or 3 months?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I may make a preliminary statement, I will then yield further to the Senator from Wyoming.

This subcommittee during the past year, under the acting chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], has done notable work in the investigation of the automobile industry and the meat industry and in the recommendation of certain laws pertinent thereto. It has begun an overall study which will be consummated in hearings concerning the necessity of amending the antitrust laws, especially with reference to the conglomerate mergers which seem to be the new style of bringing about concentrations of economic production.

The Senator from Wyoming will preside at and will direct the further hearings in connection with the meat industry and the automobile industry. He has made plans to start an investigation in connection with the Attorney General's committee concerning the exempting of certain oil companies from the operations of the antitrust laws, growing out of the Middle East situation. That, of course, includes the matter of the price increase.

I understand the Senator from Wyoming has developed a method of operation in conjunction with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

If the Senator from Wyoming wishes to make a further statement, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to add a few words.

This subcommittee began its work under the late Senator Kilgore, after the Department of Justice had appointed a committee of 60 persons, I think, consisting of lawyers, college professors, and economists, who were invited by the Attorney General to examine all the antitrust laws, including the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Sherman Act.

When the report was completed, after 2 years of work, and at a cost, I understand, of approximately $400,000, or perhaps it was $500,000, it was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, which was called upon to make an examination of it.

Following that, a number of bills were introduced. One of them had the approval of the Department of Justice. For example, there was the so-called prenotification and merger bill. Hearings were held on the bill, under my acting chairmanship.

A study of the automobile dealers' problem was conducted by both the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under a subcommittee headed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. In that work, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] played a very important part. The two committees worked together, because, of course, the shipping of automobiles from one State to another involves interstate commerce; and the practices adopted in the distribution of automobiles come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and also under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, particularly when violations of the law are involved. The hearings on the automobile industry required much time and much study, but they resulted in the passage by Congress of a measure, which was signed by the President, known as the bill to give good-faith automobile dealers their day in court.

In the meantime, complaints came to us from livestock men and from consumers of meat products, with respect to the operation of the chain stores. It seemed to me to be a very interesting fact that in 1921, when Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming, and Senator Kenyon, of Iowa—one a Democrat and the other a Republican—joined together to sponsor a bill known as the packers and stockyard-control bill, the bill failed of passage during the administration of President Wilson, because the work of Congress then was concentrated on the war. But the bill was enacted during the administration of President Harding, who signed the bill. That bill was intended to prohibit the concentrated control of stockyards and retail operations by the five large packers.

Now we have come to see the time when the packers themselves have been encountering competition from the chainstores, which likewise have been doing what the packers originally had done. The chainstores have been operating feed lots and have been doing some slaughtering of cattle and sheep, and all in all that situation brought on an investigation which we were conducting. We held several hearings. A great deal of interest was expressed in that matter. Then the election came on, and it was impossible to secure the attention the problem needed. So we had to abandon the investigation. It should be revived, and that should be done under this committee.

By virtue of an appropriation bill, we have asked the Department of Commerce to make a new census of manufactures and a study of the concentration of the production of certain manufactured goods. The Bureau of the Census has been working on that matter, in cooperation with the committee; and the appropriation bill authorizing that study was passed by the Senate, with the support of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who made the statement showing the legislative intent regarding the proposed legislation. The study relates to a phase of the production and processing and distribution of food, and the study has long been overdue. The conditions which prompted Congress to act in 1921, 36 years ago, are now existing with respect to another phase of this industry. Naturally, only the very ablest and most expert lawyers, statisticians, and economists can be employed to do such work.

Immediately after the election last year, when I returned to the city of Washington, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction over petroleum matters, I became interested in the Executive order creating an improved plan of action to be carried out by what is known as the Middle East Emergency Committee, to supply oil for Western Europe, as a substitute for the oil that area was deprived of by the blocking of the Suez Canal. In my office I have had numerous conferences with the committee staff, with representatives of the State Department, with representatives of the Interior Department, with representatives of the Department of Justice, and with representatives of the Office of

Defense Mobilization. At the request of the National Petroleum Council, I attended their meeting, at which Secretary Seaton, the Administrator, made an address.

Of course, this question involves the antitrust laws, because the committee which was established to carry on the distribution of oil—known as the Middle East Emergency Committee—was made up of representatives of the 15 giant petroleum corporations which operate in foreign countries; and many of them operate in the Middle East, and many of them have refineries in Western Europe. That situation raises a very, very difficult problem.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, and his assistant, Mr. Wormser, have welcomed the study we have been making, and have expressed their willingness to testify before the congressional committees.

Shortly after the first conferences were held the Humble Oil Co., one of the subsidiaries of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, announced a price increase for crude oil. That announcement set forth a chain reaction from the users of fuel oil, the users of gasoline, and others, in all parts of the country; and many Senators have heard the protests.

Now that that work has been begun by the committee, and in fact has been carried to the point where the date for the first hearing has been set, we were happy that the Committee on Rules and Administration granted us our appropriation. It is not as much as we requested; and we feel that probably we may have to request more, because this is one of the most complex fields in which a Congressional committee could operate.

Of course, I am ready to recognize the concurrent jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I think would deal much more with the direct problem of increases in the prices to consumers, than we would in dealing with interlocking operations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say that I have discussed this matter, and we realize that because of the nature of the problem there is some overlapping.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But there are two distinct fields. Our committee has apparent jurisdiction over pipelines and the Federal Power Commission and the setting of prices. But the matter could also involve antitrust laws and policies and other matters dealt with by the committee on which the Senator from Wyoming serves.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has discussed it with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and it is agreed that their staff may sit with our staff at any time, and it is agreed between us that the information we gather will be available to both committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shoud like to ask this question: I notice that Calendar 32, Senate Resolution 26, would provide $250,000 for an investigation of certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce. Another resolution on the calendar calls for a study of the antitrust laws and antimonopoly laws; another resolution on the calendar would authorize a study and investigation of certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products. There is yet another resolution—one submitted, I understand, by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]—which calls for the appointment of a special committee to investigate petroleum and petroleum products. Would not there be duplication among those studies? Would not the jurisdictions of these subcommittees overlap or even conflict if they were all permitted to act in connection with those matters and to receive sizable appropriations for purposes which apparently overlap?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Personally, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that when there are two standing committees—the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—dealing with this subject, special committees are not needed, from my point of view.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly what I was about to suggest. Therefore, when the time comes for the Senate to consider Calendar 37, Senate Resolution 62, which would authorize the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products, I think we should deny funds for that proposed investigation, because the Senator's subcommittee certainly has jurisdiction, and so has the subcommittee which would act under authority of Senate Resolution 26, concerning the investigation of certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce. That subcommittee certainly would also have jurisdiction to make the study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think I can clarify the matter; the Senator has this matter a little mixed up.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who has?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Louisiana has.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have asked a question of the Senator from Wyoming. He has said that his committee has jurisdiction over the matter. The Senator from Washington says his committee has jurisdiction over it. Why create a special committee to consider the same problem, inasmuch as both of two standing committees can now study it? As a matter of fact, why should two standing committees indulge in the same study? Certainly one should be enough. Three is obviously too many, as is two. I fear there will be gross duplication.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 26, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, has no relationship whatsoever to the proposal which merely calls for an appropriation for the normal work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. But what problems would that group study?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It studies all matters pertaining to merchant marine, fisheries, railroads, trucks, bus lines, airplanes——

Mr. ELLENDER. And also oil transportation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And television, radio, the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission; in fact, I can present a long list of subjects.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the committee also investigate problems relating to the interstate transportation of petroleum and petroleum products? Of course it could.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to say to the Senator from Louisiana that Order No. 37, Senate Resolution 62, calling for $50,000, is a special resolution, dealing only with the subject of petroleum and the price rise. It has nothing to do with the regular work of the committee. This is a special resolution for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. We are going to work together on the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may make a statement, I think it will help our understanding of the issue. Last week I was invited to New York to talk before the Antitrust Committee of the New York State Bar Association. The meeting was very well attended. Leading antitrust lawyers of New York City were there. I was talking with one of them. Speaking to him of the national impact of companies that are fearful of the antitrust laws, I said to him, "You who defend these big companies must find yourselves obliged to expend huge sums."

He said, "Why, Senator, do you realize in my office alone last year we distributed $1 million to pay attorneys in the several States to defend one company we operate?"

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly is asking for an appropriation of $300,000. We asked for that amount. It was cut down $75,000. We are bowing amicably—the Senator does not like the word; I like the word "amicably"—to the adjudication.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not the point at issue. The point at issue is that there is bound to be duplication when subcommittees of two standing committees cover the same ground.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point at issue is the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I am making is that the Commerce Committee would be given additional funds to study the oil problem under Senate Resolution 62. That same committee could also handle the study under Senate Resolution 26. In view of this, and since some work has already been done, why should the Senate now authorize a new expenditure under Senate Resolution 62?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That could be done if the appropriation were authorized for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but I do not apprehend that will be done. The job is here to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a request for $225,000 for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study interstate problems; the shipment of oil is such a problem. I am sure that problem, which is part and parcel of interstate commerce, could well be considered by the committee without additional money being provided. Work could be started by that committee. That is all I have in mind. I am not objecting to

an appropriation for an antitrust study. I am only objecting to what appears to be rank duplication with respect to a study of petroleum. Why does the Commerce Committee need two resolutions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We had our regular appropriation reduced from $250,000 to $225,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the Senator to look at Order No. 37 on the calendar, Senate Resolution 62.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amount was reduced. This is a special resolution because the question of pipeline and interstate shipment of gas, due to the rise in price, is something that came up recently, and was not within the general purview of the committee. If the Senator wants to reduce the amount in this resolution I suggest that he add $50,000 to the regular committee appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am saying that the committee could do the work with the money it regularly receives plus the special funds authorized in Senate Resolution 26.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could not under the regular appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not some money returned this year by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The committee will probably return money next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 57), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expense of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 30, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$289,291.45" and insert "$260,000."

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in connection with the committee amendments. When Senate Resolution 58, providing funds for the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, was reported by me from the Committee on Rules and Administration, it was amended to reduce the amount authorized from $289,291.45 to $260,000.

Following the reporting of the resolution, the Committee on Rules and Administration reconsidered Senate Resolution 58, and I am now authorized, in behalf of that committee, to ask that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration in order that the amount originally requested, that is to say, $289,291.45, be restored and that the amount originally requested may be authorized at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, speaking for the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to insert in the RECORD the statement that at the time the resolution was reported, the committee was unanimously for the full amount requested. We certainly appreciate the chairman of the committee restoring the full amount.

Mr. HENNINGS. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to say that all of the requests of the Judiciary Committee were unanimous. I think the Senator will agree with that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 22, to insert the following:

Provided, That out of the amounts authorized herein as compensation for staff personnel one employee shall be selected by the minority and his compensation shall be set within $600 per annum of the highest gross salary paid to a majority staff member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, and to insert on page 2, line 13, after the word "consultants", the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Senate Resolution 58

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed, and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $289,291.45, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS AFFECTING INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 32, Senate Resolution 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 26) to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was on page 3, line 1, after the word "resolution", to strike out "which shall not exceed $250,000," and insert "which shall not exceed $225,000,"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics; and
(10) fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistance and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk. It is similar to the amendment previously offered, except that there is no language to be stricken. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and the reading of it be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 14, after the world "consultants", insert *"Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say, for about a half a minute, I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. However, I wish to point out that the staff of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is pretty well divided as between Democrats and Republicans, or as between the minority and the majority. As a matter of fact, pretty nearly every member of the committee has an appointee on the staff. I do not think the amendment tends to create a very good precedent, but practically it will not affect us, so I shall not object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 26), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics; and
(10) fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistance and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF BANKING AND CURRENCY MATTERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 33, Senate Resolution 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 45) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters and authorizing expenditures therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. It is similar to the previous amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be waived, and that it be printed, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

On page 2, line 11, after the word "consultants" to insert *"Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;
(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
(3) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
(4) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
(5) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
(6) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
(7) securities and exchange regulation; and
(8) disaster insurance or indemnity.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants

and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 37, Senate Resolution 62.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment similar to the last amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be waived, and that it be printed in the RECORD, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the amendment of Mr. CURTIS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "consultants", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I tried to point out a while ago, Senate Resolution 57 was up for consideration, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming stated that a start had been made in a study of petroleum prices due to the Middle East problem.

I also pointed out that under Senate Resolution 26, the special committee selected to investigate problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce had jurisdiction over the same subject matter as that involved in the pending resolution.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that both those committees can do the work which would be involved in the pending resolution, it is only a waste of funds to create a special committee.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee created under Senate Resolution 26 will have $225,000 to spend in making studies involving interstate and foreign commerce. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under Senate Resolution 57 has been given $225,000. So here we have a total of $450,000 being made available to these two subcommittees, both of which have authority to make the same study as is proposed under the pending resolution.

Mr. President, there can be no excuse for such gross duplication of efforts by Senate committees. I earnestly ask that the sum of $50,000 be saved the taxpayers, by our defeating the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the production for sale or use in interstate commerce, the delivery to pipelines and other interstate transportation facilities, and the transportation, distribution, and sale or use in such commerce, of petroleum products, in order that all possible steps may be taken by the Congress to—

(1) prevent serious economic dislocation with respect to such products;

(2) provide for the proper conservation and most effective use in the national interest of the petroleum resources in the United States;

(3) properly protect commerce among the several States in petroleum products; and

(4) to protect the consumers of petroleum products from the burdens and harmful effects that may be brought about, as a result of the operations and activities of any individual, partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the production, refining, transportation, distribution, or marketing in interstate commerce of petroleum products, or any combination of such activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants—*Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 40, Senate Resolution 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 34) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to employ additional temporary clerical assistants and providing additional funds for the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works without amendment, and subsequently had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert the following:

That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is the same as the amendment offered previously to other resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after the word "consultants", it is proposed to strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid any other employee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 34) as amended was agreed to, as follows:

That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clearical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 46, Calendar No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 46) authorizing certain investigations by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and providing funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consideration, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$193,000" and insert "$180,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Indian affairs;
(2) irrigation and reclamation;
(3) minerals, materials, and fuels;
(4) public lands; and
(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "consultants," it is proposed to strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the amount involved is the same as the Senate provided last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand it is the same as the amount provided last year.

Mr. MALONE. It is less than last year's budget.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have a statement to make in that connection.

This resolution provides $180,000 for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This is approximately $15,000 less than the committee had last year. The resolution relates to certain studies which the committee contemplates, under its general jurisdiction. I may say for the information of Senators that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is chairman of this subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 46), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Indian affairs;
(2) irrigation and reclamation;
(3) minerals, materials, and fuels;
(4) public lands; and
(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF QUESTIONS AFFECTING THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senate proceed to act upon Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Calendar 11, tonight, but I should like to have it made the unfinished business.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 17 I introduced jointly with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] two antitrust bills. A provision of one of those bills was designed to give the Federal Trade Commission clear authority to seek temporary injunctions when the Commission has reason to believe that a proposed merger is in violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act.

The urgent necessity for such a provision was vividly illustrated again last week when the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled against the FTC in its suit to obtain an injunction against International Paper Co. As a result of the decision, International Paper Co. is free to proceed at this point with its plans to acquire two lumber companies Although the Commission believes the proposed mergers to be against the public interest, it is virtually powerless to prevent them.

The January 29 issue of Law Week, a Bureau of National Affairs publication,

summarizes the International Paper case as follows:

FTC CANNOT HALT MERGER PENDING DETERMINATION OF MONOPOLY CHARGE

A weakness in the Federal Trade Commission's power to prevent unlawful mergers under the Antimerger Act, section 7 of the Clayton Act, is revealed by a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. The Federal Trade Commission is not authorized to seek a court of appeals injunction against a corporate merger pending FTC determination whether such merger violates the act (*FTC* v. *International Paper Co.*, January 24, 1957).

The FTC argued that if it, after a hearing, should find that the act had been violated and should order the acquiring corporation to divest itself of stock and assets acquired, it would be impossible to restore the status quo.

However, the opinion explains that the Clayton Act contains a scheme of dual enforcement. Section 7 may be enforced by FTC cease and desist orders or by suits in equity instituted by the Attorney General. Individuals may also have injunctive relief.

These specific provisions as to who may seek injunctions, and in what courts, imply that the Commission itself is not authorized to do so.

The Court of Appeals decision indicates clearly that the FTC should be given the power to seek antitrust injunctions. The Congress has authorized the Commission to spend substantial sums for antitrust enforcement. To insure that these funds are used effectively for the protection of the American people against illegal mergers, the Congress must, in my considered opinion, give the Commission adequate legal means to restrain such mergers.

For the reason that the two antitrust bills were omitted from the RECORD when I introduced them for myself and Senator THYE, I ask unanimous consent that S. 721 and S. 722 be printed in the RECORD now.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 721) to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes; and the bill (S. 722) to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first and second paragraphs of section 11 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 735, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 21) are hereby redesignated as subsection (a) and (b) of such section, respectively.

(b) The third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh paragraphs of such section are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any person required by such order of the commission or board to cease and desist from any such violation may obtain a review of such order in the court of appeals of the United States for any circuit within which such violation occurred or within which such person resides or carries on business, by filing in the court, within 60 days after the date of the service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the commission or board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the commission or board, and thereupon the commission or board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the commission or board. Upon such filing of the petition and transcript the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree affirming, modifying, or setting aside the order of the commission or board, and enforcing the same to the extent that such order is affirmed, and to issue such writs as are ancillary to its jurisdiction or are necessary in its judgment to prevent injury to the public or to competitors pendente lite. The findings of the commission or board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. To the extent that the order of the commission or board is affirmed, the court shall issue its own order commanding obedience to the terms of such order of the commission or board. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the commission or board, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the commission or board, and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The commission or board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order, with the return of such additional evidence. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(d) The jurisdiction of the court of appeals to affirm, enforce, modify, or set aside orders of the commission or board shall be exclusive.

"(e) Such proceedings in the court of appeals shall be given precedence over other cases pending therein, and shall be in every way expedited. No order of the commission or board or judgment of court to enforce the same shall in anywise relieve or absolve any person from any liability under the antitrust laws.

"(f) Complaints, orders, and other processes of the commission or board under this section may be served by anyone duly authorized by the commission or board, either (1) by delivering a copy thereof to the person to be served, or to a member of the partnership to be served, or to the president, secretary, or other executive officer or a director of the corporation to be served; or (2) by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or the principal office or place of business of such person; or (3) by registering and mailing a copy thereof addressed to such person at his or its residence or principal office or place of business. The verified return by the person so serving said complaint, order, or other process setting forth the manner of said service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt for said complaint, order, or other process registered and mailed as aforesaid shall be proof of the service of the same.

"(g) Any order issued under subsection (b) shall become final—

"(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

"(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the commission or board has been affirmed, or the petition for review has been dismissed by the court of appeals, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

"(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the commission or board has been affirmed or the petition for review has been dismissed by the court of appeals; or

"(4) upon the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the commission or board be affirmed or the petition for review be dismissed.

"(h) If the Supreme Court directs that the order of the commission or board be modified or set aside, the order of the commission or board rendered in accordance with the mandate of the Supreme Court shall become final upon the expiration of 30 days from the time it was rendered, unless within such 30 days either party has instituted proceedings to have such order corrected to accord with the mandate, in which event the order of the commission or board shall become final when so corrected.

"(i) If the order of the commission or board is modified or set aside by the court of appeals, and if (1) the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari has expired and no such petition has been duly filed, or (2) the petition for certiorari has been denied, or (3) the decision of the court has been affirmed by the Supreme Court, then the order of the commission or board rendered in accordance with the mandate of the court of appeals shall become final on the expiration of 30 days from the time such order of the commission or board was rendered, unless within such 30 days either party has instituted proceedings to have such order corrected so that it will accord with the mandate, in which event the order of the commission or board shall become final when so corrected.

"(j) If the Supreme Court orders a rehearing; or if the case is remanded by the court of appeals to the commission or board for a rehearing, and if (1) the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari has expired, and no such petition has been duly filed, or (2) the petition for certiorari has been denied, or (3) the decision of the court has bene affirmed by the Supreme Court, then the order of the commission or board rendered upon such rehearing shall become final in the same manner as though no prior order of the commission or board had been rendered.

"(k) As used in this section the term 'mandate,' in case a mandate has been recalled prior to the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance thereof, means the final mandate.

"(l) Any person who violates any order issued by the commission or board under subsection (b) after such order has become final, and while such order is in effect, shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. Each separate violation of any such order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the commission or board each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 shall have no application to any proceeding initiated before the date of enactment of this act under the third or fourth paragraph of section 11 of the act entitled "An act to

supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 735, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 21). Each such proceeding shall be governed by the provisions of such section as they existed on the day preceding the date of enactment of this act.

A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers and provide for more effective enforcement thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 15 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731 and 736, as amended, 15 U. S. C. 18 and 25) are amended as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 7 of said act is amended by striking the first, second, and third paragraphs, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"No corporation shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital, and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, and no bank, banking association, or trust company, shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the assets of another corporation if (1) either the acquiring corporation, or the corporation from which such stock, share capital or assets are acquired, is engaged in commerce, and (2) the effect of such acquisition of such stock, share capital or assets, or the use of such stock or share capital by voting, the granting of proxies or otherwise, may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, in any line of commerce in any section of the country.

"No corporation, bank, banking association, or trust company subject to the provisions of this act may acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock, share capital, or assets of any other corporation, bank, banking association, or trust company where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the acquiring and the acquired corporations are in excess of $10 million until 60 days after delivery to the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under the first paragraph of section 11 of this act and to the Attorney General of notice of the proposed acquisition. Such notice shall set forth the names and addresses, nature of business, products or services sold or distributed, total assets, net sales, and trading areas of both the acquiring and the acquired corporations. The parties shall furnish within 30 days after request therefor, such additional relevant information within their knowledge or control as may be requested within 60 days after delivery of notice of the proposed acquisition by the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act or by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That the Commission or Board or Attorney General may extend the time for furnishing such additional relevant information. Any corporation willfully failing to give the notice or to furnish the required information shall be subject to a penalty of not less than $5,000 or more than $50,000, which may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Attorney General. Failure by the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General or other appropriate agency to request additional relevant information pursuant to this paragraph or to interpose objection to such acquisition within the 60 day period shall not bar the institution at any time of any action or proceeding with respect to such acquisition under any provision of law. The Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act, after consultation with and upon approval of the Attorney General, shall establish procedures for the waiver by the appropriate Commission or Board and the Attorney General of all or part of the notification and waiting requirements in appropriate cases and in categories of cases where notification and a waiting period is deemed unnecessary to effectuate enforcement of this section of this act: *Provided*, however, that such procedures may be amended from time to time as the Commissioner or Board, upon the approval of the Attorney General, considers appropriate.

"The notification and waiting period provisions of the preceding paragraph shall not apply to the following:

"(1) any acquisition of stock when the stock acquired or held does not exceed 10 percent of the voting rights, as represented by the voting stock or other voting share capital, of the corporation in which the stock is acquired;

"(2) any acquisition of stock, in a single transaction or series of related transactions, unless the fair market value of the consideration paid for such stock in such transaction or transactions exceeds $2 million;

"(3) any acquisition of stock which does not increase, directly or indirectly, the acquiring corporation's share of voting rights in any other corporation;

"(4) any acquisition, in a single transaction or series of related transactions, by one corporation of assets of any other corporation if the fair market value of the consideration paid for such assets in such transaction or transactions (after deducting the portion thereof comprising stock in trade used in the ordinary course of the transferring corporation's business, and transferred by such acquisition) does not exceed $2 million;

"(5) acquisition by any corporation of bonds or other obligations without voting rights of any other corporation, securities issued by the United States, or by any State, Territory, or insular possession thereof, or by any political subdivision or public agency or instrumentality of one or more of any of the foregoing;

"(6) any acquisition of real property, solely for office space or residential use;

"(7) any acquisition by any corporation from the Government of the United States;

"(8) acquisition, solely for the purpose of investment of assets, other than voting stock or other voting share capital, by any bank, banking association, trust company or insurance company, in the ordinary course of its business;

"(9) acquisition of stock, other share capital, or assets of any corporation, if the acquiring corporation, prior to such acquisition, owned directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the corporation whose stock, other share capital, or assets are acquired, or if more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the acquiring corporation is owned, directly or indirectly, by a corporation which, prior to such acquisition, owned, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the corporation whose stock, other share capital, or assets are acquired;

"(10) any acquisition of stock or assets which, under any specific provision of law, requires the approval in advance of a commission or board or other agency of the United States, and when so approved is exempt under any specific provision of law from the provisions of this section: *Provided, however*, That any commission, board or agency of the United States which is authorized by law to approve the acquisition by one corporation of the stock or assets of another corporation where by virtue of such approval such acquisition is exempted from the provisions of this section shall promptly notify the Attorney General of any application or request for such approval.

"Except for the provisions of the two preceding paragraphs this section shall not apply to corporations purchasing stock solely for investment and not using the same by voting or otherwise to bring about, or in attempting to bring about, the substantial lessening of competition. Nor shall anything contained in this section prevent a corporation engaged in commerce from causing the formation of subsidiary corporations for the actual carrying on of their legitimate branches or extensions thereof, or from owning and holding all or a part of the stock of such subsidiary corporations, when the effect of such formation is not to substantially lessen competition."

SEC. 3. The second and third paragraphs of section 2 of this act shall take effect 120 days after their enactment. The procedures for the waiver by the appropriate Commission or Board and the Attorney General of all or part of the notification and waiting requirements in appropriate cases and categories of cases required by the second paragraph of section 2 of this act shall be established within 120 days after enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. That section 15 of said act is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following paragraph:

"Whenever the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe—

"(1) that any corporation subject to its jurisdiction is acquiring or has acquired stock or assets of another corporation in violation of the provisions of section 7 of this act; and

"(2) that the enjoining of such acquisition or the maintenance of the status quo after acquisition pending the issuance of a complaint or the completion of proceedings pursuant to a complaint by the Commission under this section and until such complaint is dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, would be to the interest of the public,

the Commission, by any of its attorneys designated by it for such purpose, may bring suit in a district court of the United States to prevent and restrain violation of section 7 of this act or to require maintenance of the status quo. Any such suit may be brought in any district in which the acquiring or the acquired corporation resides or transacts business. Such proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violation shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited, and the court may make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises. In any case where injunction or restraining order is granted under this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall proceed as soon as may be to the issuance of the complaint and to the hearing and determination of the case."

SEC. 5. Section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after the word "association", a comma and the words: "or to any report made by any person, firm, partnership, corporation, or association in compliance with the third paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 18)."

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are meeting today on the 75th anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest Americans—the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

To our generation, he will always be with us—the man who led us out of the bleak days of the depression and brought us safely through the greatest war in history.

He was a controversial figure—a man who lived in the midst of strong arguments and great debates. But our people will remember him not for the controversies but for the fact that through his leadership, life became better and more secure for all of us.

Because of his administration, people who used to read by candlelight and kerosene lamps now have the blessings of electricity.

Because of his administration, people who once lived under the constant threat of losing their life's savings now have deposit insurance.

Because of his administration, people who once had to watch their topsoil blow away now have soil conservation.

A whole way of life has been changed—and those who lived through the depression before his administration will testify that the change has been for the better.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States, our country was at one of the lowest ebbs in its history. Banks were folding like houses of cards, factories were closing, people drifted aimlessly in search of jobs that were as elusive as the will-o'-the-wisp.

He acted, and the fresh, keen winds of hope swept away the mood of deep despair.

He brought the same qualities of bold imagination and forceful leadership to an even greater job—the defeat of the Axis Powers. He died before that task was accomplished, but he had wrought so well that the end of the Fascists was but months away.

We have many memories of this great man and they are all memories which will remain fresh and green so long as there is an America. Take him as you will, he was a leader of daring and courage who wrote one of the greatest chapters of our history.

Mr. President, it is with great pride and pleasure that I tell the Senate that one of his most helpful public servants during his term as Governor of New York and during the entire period he served our country as President—one who was by his side when he breathed his last—is today a faithful employee of the majority policy committee of the Senate. She now sits in the gallery above us.

I should like to ask Miss Grace Tully to stand.

[Miss Tully rose in the gallery and was greeted with applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express my deep gratitude to the very able Senator from Wyoming for his many courtesies to the majority leader.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be impossible to be less than courteous to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I should like to turn my attention to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

PROPOSED 6 MONTHS' ACTIVE DUTY TRAINING OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a dozen or more telegrams from citizens of my State, protesting against the adoption of the proposed 6 months' training period for the National Guard. These telegrams are so obviously sincere—and I may say emphatic—that I feel they should be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I make that unanimous-consent request.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWCASTLE, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Proposed directive imposing 6 months' active duty training on all 17 to 18½ age bracket National Guard enlistees is unjust, and unworkable—will crush the fine organizations we now have—earnestly request you exert effort to have same withdrawn—not only would enlistments be stopped, education would be jeopardized and family life of 17-year-old boys destroyed. Proposal of adjutant generals conference of 11 weeks compulsory training of this age bracket enlistees to be consumated during summer vacation time is acceptable and will strengthen rather than destroy the National Guard, sincerely.

GERALD D. BOYER,
Colonel, Artillery, Wyoming National Guard, Commanding.

CHEYENNE, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Request support in defeating 6-month active duty training bill for National Guard recruits, main reasons, decrease in enlistments in age group 17 to 18½ plus will interfere with their education at that age request instead 11 week mandatory period after which recruits can still volunteer for the 6-month training period.

JAMES R. HAWK,
Wyoming National Guard.

CASPER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Sen. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Proposed law of 6-month active duty training for enlisters of National Guard will destroy Guard. Secretary Wilson's statement is belittling, asinine lackadaisical and discriminating to every member of Guard. I have over 6 years service and no military obligation and proud to belong to Guard now. What kind of service record has Mr. Wilson got?

HARMON L. O'NEAL,
Casper, Wyo.

RAWLINS, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Speaking from the ground level the National Guard, the Nation's second line of defense, will crumble and fall due to the lack of recruits tough enough at least at best if the new proposed 6 Armed Forces Act is allowed to be passed.

CAPT. KENNETH T. MCGINNESS.

NEWCASTLE, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Urge you to vote against bill, now pending, to require 6 months' active duty training for National Guard enlistees. This measure would badly curtail all National Guard enlistments, be a killing blow to a college education, and in general would destroy aggressive potential of a 17-year-old boy. Would recommend your support of Adjutant General's conference of 11 weeks' compusory training of this age bracket, as this would correlate with Guard recruitment and training programs.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD R. THOMPSON,
Wyoming National Guard.

CASPER, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Proposed 6-month active duty for new enlistments will be the ruin of the National Guard. Please don't let them put an end to the oldest military organization. National Guard history speaks for itself. Wilson statement has shaken our faith for a man in his high position. I have never been a draft dodger. I have been shot at more times than Wilson has made trips at taxpayers' expense. He should apologize or resign.

JACOB M. PUTMAN.

CASPER, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

As member of National Guard, without military obligation, strongly recommend disapproval Department of Defense proposed 6 months' training program for National Guard man, and approval of National Guard proposal of 11-week program.

PAUL E. ELLENBERG.

CASPER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Proposed law of 6 months' active duty training of enlistees of National Guard will be the death of National Guard. The statement of Secretary Wilson is the most discriminating to every member present, and future of the Guard. I have over 14 years' service, and have always been proud of it. How much service does Mr. Wilson have?

CHARLES M. BAUER.

WHEATLAND, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference the 6 months' active duty for all individuals effective April 1, 1957, or within 120 days after enlistment. Reasons against the 6-month training program.

1. It would decrease and discourage enlistments for individuals from 17 to 18½ years of age.

2. It would interfere with the education of that group.

3. We consider that group too young to be away from home for that period.

4. Parents are not in favor of the 6-month training program.

The AGE Association have proposed a 11-week mandatory training program instead of the 6 months. Eleven-week training program is much more favorable for everyone concerned inasmuch as it would not interfere with an individual's education, he would still receive his basic training, it would be less expense to the Government and still accomplish the same.

The 6-month training program would certainly cut the National Guard's throat; which is the backbone of the Nation's Reserve forces.

Therefore urge you to support the 11-week mandatory training.

FRED C. PATTERSON,
Wyoming National Guard.

GILLETTE, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you oppose the policy of the Defense Department requiring 6 months' active duty training for all enlistees in the National Guard, without prior service, for the following reasons:

1. The 17–18½-year-old age group is generally too immature to be away from their families and community environment for 6 months.

2. It would definitely interfere with their education, since it could not be completed during summer vacations.

3. It would decrease enlistments in the National Guard, since the 6 months' training would be a certainty whereas active duty under selective service is presently almost nonexistent.

I recommend your support for the 11-week period proposed by the National Guard Association in lieu of the compulsory 6 months' training proposed by the Department of Defense.

DORIE J. BARBE,
Wyoming National Guard.

CASPER, WYO., *January 29, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 325 officers and enlisted men of my battalion and as an individual I strongly urge the deepest consideration be given to the position of the National Guard in proposed training requirement change. As county attorney I haved worked with hundreds of young people who get into trouble because of their immaturity during absence of parents. Observing National Guard men of tender years for a 2-week period away from home confirms my belief that their best interests and the country's best interests will not be served by 6 months of enforced training between 17 and 18½ years. The contemplated program would have additional effect of destroying the National Guard in Wyoming. The program has been tried by the Reserves locally in Casper, Lander, and Riverton and has failed miserably. I respectfully ask that you do everything within your power to see that the National Guard which would be among the first lines of defense against aggression is not emaciated under the guise of adding to national defense.

Maj. RAYMOND B. WHITAKER,
Wyoming National Guard.

THE WEST IN DISARRAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a former Governor of my State, the Honorable Leslie A. Miller, who has also been associated with the Hoover Commission, recently called my attention to an article which was published in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs magazine. The article is entitled "The West In Disarray." It was written by Paul-Henri Spaak, one of the great statesmen of Europe. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is well worthy of close study, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST IN DISARRAY

(By Paul-Henri Spaak)

Only yesterday we were living more or less at ease in an atmosphere of relaxed international tension, enthusiastically practising the principle of peaceful coexistence set forth by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party. This happy state of affairs had lasted for some months. As a result, even the most skeptical among us had gained a certain degree of confidence. The prevailing tone was one of optimism.

On July 26, in defiance of international obligations, Colonel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal Company, thereby setting off a whole chain of reactions. Just when the crisis was most acute, a revolution broke out in Hungary and the Soviet Union stepped in with unparalleled brutality to repress it. Within a few weeks the international horizon was darkened by heavier clouds than at any other time in the last 10 years. The effect was that of falling from a high place. Illusions faded as we found ourselves face to face with stark reality.

As I write these lines, nothing is settled. There is a general strike in Budapest, and the Russian tanks are still there. In Egypt, an international contingent is about to relieve the Anglo-French forces, but we wonder anxiously how the two related conflicts can be resolved, one concerning the Canal, the other between Israel and the Arab nations.

Yet although nothing is settled, it is possible to measure some of the consequences of these events. All international institutions have been shaken by this double crisis. It has directly affected the United Nations, NATO and the whole attempt to achieve unity in Europe. In this welter of events, resolutions and decisions, not to mention feelings, we find food for somber thought. Already we can reach certain conclusions.

First of all, let us look at the United Nations. I note, with mingled surprise and satisfaction, that in world opinion its prestige still is high. I say with surprise, because from the start I had excessively great hopes for this organization. Too often they have been dashed. Those who do not know the inner workings of the United Nations, its ponderousness, the time it wastes, the hypocrisy which frequently marks its debates, its oft-demonstrated inefficiency—in short, those who are acquainted with it only from the outside and hark back to its generous principles and noble ideals—all these have held fast to their original confidence and faith.

There is something profoundly touching about this widespread reaction. Facing any case of international injustice or threat of war, people in large numbers turn to the United Nations for redress. I only wish that I could still number myself among the faithful. And yet I honestly cannot. On the contrary, it seems to me that never before has the insufficiency of the United Nations as at present constituted stood out so clearly. In spite of its apparent success, I believe that it has never come so near to the brink of failure—that is, unless it proceeds promptly to reestablish its strength.

It looks as if the United Nations had been able to prevent the extension of the war in Egypt but were powerless to block or end the Soviet aggression against Hungary. This difference fosters the fear that in an organization where impartiality was supposed to be the rule, power or cynicism actually has carried the day. This is a fundamental fault, but there is another still worse. The charter signed at San Francisco aspired to be all-embracing. Of course the main aim was to outlaw war, to condemn and prevent recourse to violence. But there was also the constructive idea of establishing law and assumirg the triumph of justice. Although the United Nations has, to a certain extent, prevented war, I fear—much as I should like to be mistaken—that it is quite incapable of making the right prevail.

The San Francisco Charter seems to me dangerously incomplete and so ineffectual that I do not see how, in its present form, it can long endure. To eliminate war as a political weapon is certainly a great moral step forward. But if no alternative recourse is provided, then the system is handicapped from the start and can lead only to chaos.

Let me put it in a different way. In the present United Nations setup, which is not what its founders wished and hoped it would be, everything short of war is allowed. Treaties may be violated, promises can be broken, a nation is licensed to menace its neighbor or to perpetrate any sort of trick on it, just as long as there is no actual war. The attitude of Egypt during the last few months is a case in point. While Egypt denied transit through the Suez Canal to Israeli ships, sent death commandos onto Israeli soil, violated the Treaty of Constantinople, sent arms to be used against the French in Algeria and made preparations to attack its neighbor, the United Nations was powerless to intervene. Such intervention would not come within the scope of the Charter as at present interpreted. But let Israel in desperation send troops into the Sinai peninsula and let Anglo-French forces land at Port Said, and they are sure to be condemned. Meanwhile, those who were looking on impassively at the brutal repression of the revolt in Hungary could not find words harsh enough to damn them.

This brand of justice, I repeat, is nothing but a caricature. Such an interpretation of principles amounts to rewarding any nation which is audacious enough to accomplish the most reprehensible act but which very cleverly stops short, not of violence, but of open war. This state of things cannot endure. It is high time to modify the Charter, to abolish the veto, to make for responsible voting, to decree that violators of international law shall be excluded, ipso facto, from the organization, and to set up a real international army.

Obviously, all this is very difficult to bring about. That the veto has rendered the Security Council powerless does not need to be demonstrated further. Thus, as was foreseen at San Francisco by a good many delegations, the system established there has proved to be inapplicable. Yet there is hope, perhaps, in the fact that the General Assembly seems to be more and more aware of its possibilities and anxious to make up for the too-evident bankruptcy of the Security Council. Is the Assembly strong enough to set up an order of things which could, to a certain extent, compensate for these shortcomings? In any event the question is being asked.

My optimism, I admit, is limited, principally because of the attitude of Soviet Russia and the satellite countries. The spectacle which they have presented in the course of debate in the present Assembly is indeed profoundly shocking. They become passionate defenders of the General Assembly's recommendations every time that Egypt is in question, but they treat all resolutions concerning Hungary like dead letters. This attitude is so immoral that the very authority of the Assembly becomes deeply affected by it. Under such conditions it is impossible to believe that peace can be maintained and international justice assured.

But perhaps the very depth of the evil will force people to open their eyes. During the early days of the United Nations reform of the Charter was often discussed, but these efforts came up against fierce opposition from the Soviet Union, and they have been progressively abandoned. Today the subject is again the order of the day; those who believe in the need for the United Nations are once more demanding its adaptation to new circumstances. If this trend could grow and assert itself, it would undoubtedly represent the best hope of the moment.

Secondly, let us look at the Atlantic Alliance. In this moment of major crisis it failed to function. Ironically enough, just when at the instance of all the partner nations three "wise men" were studying ways of strengthening NATO, particularly by means of periodic consultations, the great

Western Powers suddenly revealed their fundamental disagreement. Let us not inquire who is to blame. Are not all the Great Powers equally guilty for letting themselves get into this situation?

Today when the aims of Soviet policy are again dangerously clear the Atlantic Alliance is more necessary than ever. It is urgent to repair the damage done to it, and this requires an effort of will. First, all the parties must arrive at the same interpretation of the facts, and then they must consent, once for all, to sacrifice the unimportant to the essential. And what may the essential be? The essential is this: that although both before and after the 20th Communist Party Congress there were changes in the Soviet Union's domestic policy, its foreign policy has remained exactly the same. Its aim is still what it was under Stalin: to weaken the Western nations, to create difficulties for them my complicating and poisoning the problems with which they are faced, and yet to refrain from overstepping certain limits beyond which they inevitably would find themselves involved in a world war.

This policy is determined by two imperatives. The Soviet Union remains completely Communist, it seeks the victory of communism, but at the same time it wishes to avoid a war. For even if it were victorious, its economic and social ideals would be retarded and perhaps the achievement of them would be jeopardized. Strange to say, the real face and the essential nature of communism are still little known and badly understood, particularly, perhaps in the United States.

Too many people continue to think of communism as an extreme leftwing movement, opposed to capitalism and favoring collective ownership. But communism is much more than this. It is a new form of civilization trying to impose itself from the top, and its fundamental principles are diametrically opposed to those from which the moral, political, economic and social evolution of both Europe and America has proceeded and on which it today is based. Our civilization is shaped to the measure of man. Its chief characteristic is respect for the human person. From that, all the rest stems, Communism, on the other hand, denies and ignores man, takes no interest in him as an individual and certainly does not respect him.

With such different points of departure, no purpose common to the two systems can be found. One of the two must triumph over the other, and if it is to be ours we must stick together. Europe can no longer do without the United States; that is a fact which calls for no further demonstration. And the United States would be deeply mistaken to imagine that it can get along without Europe. In spite of the difficulties which sometimes make the coordination of policy difficult, in spite of the regrettable events of these last months, where are America's best friends? In Asia or Africa? No; in Europe.

In what parts of the globe are the misery of the people and inexperienced leadership opening the way to Communist infiltration? Where, on the contrary, is communism held in check or forced to recede? The answer to these questions is not difficult to find. The essential thing is the defense of our civilization. All the rest, no matter how important it may seem, is secondary.

So little is needed to make the Atlantic alliance what it should be. The principal partners need only to have a little more trust in one another, to be more deeply aware of their fundamental unity. As I write, the three "wise men" are about to turn in the report which was requested of them. Its general content is not hard to guess. It will call for more frequent and regular consultations among the signatories of the Atlantic pact; it will ask each to abstain from any single-handed action capable of disrupting the policy of the others; and it will suggest fuller exchange of information regarding each one's aims and objectives.

Everyone is going to agree with these recommendations. But this does not reassure me completely. What is needed is an active will to press forward along these lines rather than a mere verbal acquiescence in them. Have the perils through which we have recently passed and are still passing opened our eyes?

Fortunately, the Soviet Union committed a serious diplomatic error by asking the United States to join it in opposing the Anglo-French enterprise in Egypt. This was too much. It pointed up unmistakably the low estate into which the Atlantic alliance had fallen. It will be, I believe, the indirect cause of an effort to rebuild it. This alliance is the tool for making a joint policy. It is inconceivable that we shall not employ it.

Although the present crisis presents dangers for both the United Nations and NATO, it may well be beneficial to the cause of European unity. Ever since the nationalization of the Suez Canal there has ben a strong current of opinion in that direction. Colonel Nasser's bold move showed what a definite lack of esteem for the great European nations exists in certain quarters. And the failure of the United States to support the Anglo-French cause has underlined the same theme. The European nations are somewhat like scattered chicks. When they see a hawk hovering above them—whether in the form of Stalin or Nasser—they tend to come together.

Chancellor Adenauer and Premier Guy Mollet have restated forcefully their desire to pursue European unity. They have done even more. They have devised constructive solutions for various technical problems, proving once again that when a political will exists technicalities can easily be swept away. In this field things are evolving favorably, and there is a chance that within a few weeks we shall see agreement on a common European market and on Euratom, the European project for atomic-energy development. Once again the goal seems within reach. But this was equally true in the period of the European Defense Community; and having lived through this experience, I cannot allow myself to be carried away by premature enthusiasm. Those of us who work for European unity are fated to be constantly on the verge of either triumph or disaster. It is an incontrovertible fact, however, that the idea of a third force, a united Europe, has made great progress in the course of recent months. For the United States this should be a cause of rejoicing. The third force is not an attempt to neutralize Europe and place her at an equal distance between America and Russia. On the contrary, it expresses the European will to cease being a deadweight upon America and to become a genuine ally, ready to assume a full share of responsibilities.

I have said—and there is no use trying to hide it—that things seem to me to have been going badly. I am not entirely pessimistic; I do not look for a third world war. But I do fear (I must admit) that a more and more confused situation is developing in which the Western World risks losing much. It can gain only by showing unexpected courage and unity.

A sense of fatality seems to smother us. We know what must be done. We even succeed in expressing it quite clearly. But for one reason or another we are not able to translate our will into action. We were right to create the United Nations, we were right to make the Atlantic Alliance, we are right to dream of a united Europe. But once the policy has been agreed upon and the instruments forged we are not able to make them operate efficiently. Little by little the instrumentalities lose their force and scope and hopes dissolve in disillusionment. Where are the men of clear mind and resolute will that the West needs desperately to save its precious inheritance?

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate stand in adjournment until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Friday, February 1, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert Dechert, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, vice Mansfield D. Sprague.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Hyde Gillette, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Albert J. Robertson.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officer for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

William B. Kelly, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
Walter L. Nelson, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles W. Brown, of California.
Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.
Walter T. Kamprad, of California.
Abraham Vigil, of Colorado.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James David Zellerbach, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James T. O'Connell, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Lawrence Gridley Derthick, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of Education.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1957.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leroy E. Burney, of Indiana, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

CANDIDATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS

For appointment

Surgeon

Stanley J. Sarnoff

Assistant Surgeon

Walter R. Stahl

For permanent promotion

Dental Surgeon

Lawrence J. Stanwich

Sanitary Engineer

Robert L. Stenburg

Confirmation of recess appointment

Senior Surgeons

Bruce Underwood
Marvin S. Cashion
Harry A. Sauberli
John D. Porterfield

Surgeons

Paul G. Becker
Wilfred D. David
LeRoy Garbe
Stephen Hajdu
G. Donald Whedon
Milton Zises

Senior Assistant Surgeons

Robert M. Allman, Jr.
Roger W. Grummel
Richard P. Reinertson
Bruce B. Bellomy
James A. Kemp
Louis Levy
Richard J. Bouchard
K. Lemone Yielding
Marcus M. Key
Frank E. Lundin, Jr.
John L. Fahey
William P. Johnson
John E. Manire
Montague Lane
Thomas F. Dutcher
Tom D. Y. Chin
Alfred D. Weiss
W. K. Long, Jr.
William S. Richards, Jr.
Ernest Epstein
Donald A. Henderson
John E. Applen
Edward J. Waits
William S. Dunford, Jr.
Carl L. Davis
Leonard Brown
Richard E. Zellmer
Reuben J. Burkman
Heyman Tetewsky
Harald S. Frederiksen
Robert T. Scholes
Donald S. Frederickson
Donald L. Fry
Winthrop E. Hoyle
Samuel Baron
Benjamin M. Primer, Jr.
Lowell R. Hughes
William Richard King
John D. Davidson
Carlton E. Swett
Robert S. Gordon, Jr.
John W. Severinghaus
Robert W. Prichard
Emil Frei III
Joaquin Martinez-Oramas
David P. Rall
Leonard J. Duhl
Richard H. Thurm
Franz W. Rosa
Charles A. Monroe
Horatio C. Wood IV
David J. Sencer
Frederick Dykstra
Peter Hamile
Howard W. Kopping
John H. Cooper
Kenneth H. Hyatt
Michael Potter
David C. Poskanzer
Kopel Burk
Louis A. Gaul
Randolph A. Frank
Donald P. Tschudy
John M. Lynch
Orlando L. Clark
John L. Stephenson
Charles H. Boettner
Richard C. Reynolds
Ted L. Welton
James W. Mosley
Charles A. Petersen
Donald E. Kayhoe
Homer L. Twigg, Jr.
John R. McKenna
William C. Brown
Robert C. Bullers
Thomas F. Flynn
Richard N. Matzen

Assistant Surgeons

William B. Furguson, Jr.
James A. Richardson, Jr.
George C. Hottinger
Emery A. Johnson
Elbert E. Hines
Gilbert G. Tobler
L. Bruce Bachman
Anthony J. Federico
Robert R. Fletcher
Edward J. Hinman
Waldo Cook
Jerry W. Crabtree
Paul A. Asper
Arnold R. Haugen
Donald C. Reifel
Herschel C. Gore, Jr.
Stephen R. Dunphy
George E. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. McGandy
George G. Meyer
Richard J. Eliason
Maurice F. Goldman
Robert C. Geiger
Donald E. Poage
Conrad E. Herr
John F. Kelly, Jr.

Dental Surgeons

Harry W. Bruce, Jr.
William J. Putnam

Senior Assistant Dental Surgeon

Kenneth C. Potter

Assistant Dental Surgeons

Clair L. Gardner
Arnold K. Webster
Robert G. Hansen
George A. Galiber
Russell O. Glauser

Sanitary Engineer

Alfred E. Williamson, Jr.

Senior Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Joseph M. Dennis
William H. Megonnell
Bernd Kahn
Ralph I. Larsen
Charles C. Johnson, Jr.

Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Paul E. Langdon, Jr.
Gene B. Welsh

Junior Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Norman J. Petersen
George I. Johnston
Archie E. Becher, Jr.

Senior Assistant Pharmacist

Felix A. Conte

Assistant Pharmacist

James E. Bleadingheiser

Junior Assistant Pharmacists

William H. Briner
Paul O. Fehnel, Jr.
Robert E. McKay

Senior Scientist

Arthur L. Schade

Scientists

Richard A. Ormsbee
Sanford M. Birnbaum
William H. Ewing

Senior Assistant Scientists

John F. Sherman
Frank P. Brancato
Myron J. Willis
John W. McDowell
Aubrey P. Altshuller
Louis A. Cohen
James B. Longley

Assistant Scientists

George P. Kubica
Kenneth W. Walls

Veterinarian

Francis R. Abinanti

Assistant Veterinarians

Douglas M. Hawkins
Robert L. Watson
Anton M. Allen

Nurse Officers

Elinor D. Stanford
Elsie E. Richardson
Maria B. Rementeria

Senior Assistant Nurse Officers

Marie M. Ceglarek
Violet C. Ryb
Mabel N. Hay
Helen M. Hanlon
Janet L. Fitzwater
M. Argenta Geist

Assistant Nurse Officer

Arthur R. Barth

Senior Assistant Dietitian

Marjorie A. Emidy

For confirmation of recess permanent promotion

Senior Surgeons

Richard H. Linn
Clark W. Mangun, Jr.
Louis C. Floyd
Ardell B. Colyar
Warfield Garson
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
R. Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Rikli
C. Dudley Miller

Surgeon

Leon Levintow

Senior Assistant Surgeons

Joseph A. Rapaport
Inez L. Ice

Senior Assistant Dental Surgeons

Lawrence E. Van Kirk, Jr.
John H. Duffy

Senior Sanitary Engineer

Paul W. Reed

Senior Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Richard D. Vaughan
Herbert A. Bevis
John E. McLean

Senior Assistant Nurse Officer

B. Octavia Heistad

Assistant Therapist

John L. Echternach

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

For appointment

To Be Surgeon

Stanley J. Sarnoff

To Be Assistant Surgeon

Walter R. Stahl

For permanent promotion

To Be Dental Surgeon

Lawrence J. Stanwich

To Be Sanitary Engineer

Robert L. Stenburg

For confirmation of recess appointment

To Be Senior Surgeons

Bruce Underwood
Marvin S. Cashion
Harry A. Sauberli
John D. Porterfield

To Be Surgeons

Paul G. Becker
Wilfred D. David
LeRoy Garbe
Stephen Hajdu
G. Donald Whedon
Milton Zises

To Be Senior Assistant Surgeons

Robert M. Allman, Jr.
Roger W. Grummel
Richard P. Reinertson
Bruce B. Bellomy
James A. Kemp
Louis Levy
Richard J. Bouchard
K. Lemone Yielding
Marcus M. Key
Frank E. Lundin, Jr.
John L. Fahey
William P. Johnson
John E. Manire
Montague Lane
Thomas F. Dutcher
Tom D. Y. Chin
Alfred D. Weiss
W. K. Long, Jr.
William S. Richards, Jr.
Ernest Epstein
Donald A. Henderson
John E. Applen
Edward J. Waits
William S. Dunford, Jr.
Carl L. Davis
Leonard Brown
Richard E. Zellmer
Reuben J. Burkman
Heyman Tetewsky
Harald S. Frederiksen
Robert T. Scholes
Donald S. Frederickson
Donald L. Fry
Winthrop E. Hoyle
Samuel Baron
Benjamin M. Primer, Jr.
Lowell R. Hughes
William Richard King
John D. Davidson
Carlton E. Swett
Robert S. Gordon, Jr.
John W. Severinghaus
Robert W. Prichard
Emil Frei III
Joaquin Martinez-Oramas
David P. Rall
Leonard J. Duhl
Richard H. Thurm
Franz W. Rosa
Charles A. Monroe
Horatio C. Wood IV
David J. Sencer
Frederick Dykstra
Peter Hamill
Howard W. Kopping
John H. Cooper
Kenneth H. Hyatt
Michael Potter
David C. Poskanzer
Kopel Burk
Louis A. Gaul
Randolph A. Frank
Donald P. Tschudy
John M. Lynch
Orlando L. Clark
John L. Stephenson
Charles H. Boettner
Richard C. Reynolds
Ted L. Welton
James W. Mosley
Charles A. Petersen
Donald E. Kayhoe
Homer L. Twigg, Jr.
John R. McKenna
William C. Brown
Robert C. Bullers
Thomas F. Flynn
Richard N. Matzen

To Be Assistant Surgeons

William B. Furguson, Jr.
James A. Richardson, Jr.
George C. Hottinger
Emery A. Johnson
Elbert E. Hines
Gilbert G. Tobler
L. Bruce Bachman
Anthony J. Federico
Robert R. Fletcher
Edward J. Hinman
Waldo Cook
Jerry W. Crabtree
Paul A. Asper
Arnold R. Haugen
Donald C. Reifel
Herschel C. Gore, Jr.
Stephen R. Dunphy
George E. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. McGandy
George G. Meyer
Richard J. Eliason
Maurice F. Goldman
Robert C. Geiger
Donald E. Poage
Conrad E. Herr
John F. Kelly, Jr.

To Be Dental Surgeons

Harry W. Bruce, Jr.
William J. Putnam

To Be Senior Assistant Dental Surgeon

Kenneth C. Potter

To Be Assistant Dental Surgeons

Clair L. Gardner — George A. Galiber
Arnold K. Webster — Russell O. Glauser
Robert G. Hansen

To Be Sanitary Engineer

Afred E. Williamson, Jr.

To Be Senior Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Joseph M. Dennis — Ralph I. Larsen
William H. Megonnell — Charles C. Johnson, Jr.
Bernd Kahn

To Be Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Paul E. Langdon, Jr.
Gene B. Welsh

To Be Junior Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Norman J. Petersen
George I. Johnston
Archie E. Becher, Jr.

To Be Senior Assistant Pharmacist

Felix A. Conte

To Be Assistant Pharmacist

James E. Bleadingheiser

To Be Junior Assistant Pharmacists

William H. Briner
Paul O. Fehnel, Jr.
Robert E. McKay

To Be Senior Scientist

Arthur L. Schade

To Be Scientists

Richard A. Ormsbee
Sanford M. Birnbaum
William H. Ewing

To Be Senior Assistant Scientists

John F. Sherman — Aubrey P. Altshuller
Frank P. Brancato — Louis A. Cohen
Myron J. Willis — James B. Longley
John W. McDowell

To Be Assistant Scientists

George P. Kubica
Kenneth W. Walls

To Be Veterinarian

Francis R. Abinanti

To Be Assistant Veterinarians

Douglas M. Hawkins
Robert L. Watson
Anton M. Allen

To Be Nurse Officers

Elinor D. Stanford
Elsie E. Richardson
Maria B. Rementeria

To be Senior Assistant Nurse Officers

Marie M. Ceglarek — Helen M. Hanlon
Violet C. Ryb — Janet L. Fitzwater
Mabel N. Hay — M. Argenta Geist

To Be Assistant Nurse Officer

Arthur R. Barth

To Be Senior Assistant Dietitian

Marjorie A. Emidy

For confirmation of recess permanent promotion

To Be Senior Surgeons

Richard H. Linn — William P. Ramey
Clark W. Mangun, Jr. — Leo J. Gehrig
Louis O. Floyd — R. Leslie Smith
Ardell B. Colyar — Arthur E. Rikli
Warfield Garson — C. Dudley Miller

To Be Surgeon

Leon Levintow

To Be Senior Assistant Surgeons

Joseph A. Rapaport
Inez L. Ice

To Be Senior Assistant Dental Surgeons

Lawrence E. Van Kirk, Jr.
John H. Duffy

To Be Senior Sanitary Engineer

Paul W. Reed

To Be Assistant Sanitary Engineers

Richard D. Vaughan
Herbert A. Bevis.
John E. McLean

To Be Senior Assistant Nurse Officer

B. Octavia Heistad

To Be Assistant Therapist

John L. Echternach

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, on this day of decision, as we face wistfully a future that none can forecast or foresee, may it fortify our souls to know that Thou wert the God of our forefathers.

Inspire us with the glorious conviction that as Thou didst support them in their times of trial and tribulation, of fear and foreboding, so Thou wilt also strengthen and sustain us.

Help us to realize that there is nothing we need so urgently and supremely as a profounder sense of the moral and spiritual resources available unto us by prayer and faith and by a unity of spirit.

Give us a clearer vision of the might and majesty of democracy and may we long to make its spirit more comprehensive and catholic, more fruitful and progressive.

Grant that our democracy may not merely be a beautiful doctrine containing lofty ideals and principles, but a dynamic one that manifests itself in deeds of concern and cooperation and seeks to minister sacrificially to a world struggling for freedom.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 637. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

The message also announced that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had appointed Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PURTELL as Members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The chairman also appointed Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LAUSCHE as Members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

NATURAL PARADISE IN MICHIGAN: ISLE ROYALE

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the new budget for the executive departments, there is included $1,214,563 for the enhancement of Isle Royale National Park, Mich., one of the most beautiful and unspoiled areas on the North American Continent.

Isle Royale, in northern Lake Superior, is 45 miles long and 9 miles wide and comprises an area of approximately 210 square miles. This national park, located 600 miles from Detroit and 450 miles from Chicago, is the second largest island in the United States. A uniquely situated park, Isle Royale is accessible to 35 million people. Yet, in 1955, as a result of lack of transportation to the island and inadequate housing facilities in the park, only 5,000 tourists availed themselves of the privilege of visiting this natural playground.

It is most gratifying to learn that the Bureau of the Budget now recommends an allocation in excess of $1 million to be spent for Isle Royale in the following manner:

Management	$76,673
Maintenance	97,090
Construction	1,040,800

If the money recommended by the Executive is approved by Congress, and I sincerely hope it will be, thousands of tourists will be able to view sights found nowhere else in the Midwest. On Isle Royale, a herd of 300 moose roam the island as they did hundreds of years ago; wolves and coyotes that cross 50 miles of ice to forage in the park are heard after the moon comes up. Fishing in virgin lakes and streams is a caster's delight.

I hope that Congress will give sympathetic attention to the Budget recommendations and allow the American tourist to take advantage of one of the few remaining wilderness areas of the United States.

MIDDLE EAST ECONOMIC AND MILITARY COOPERATION

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday all time for general debate on the joint resolution had ex-

pired. Under the rule, the joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment as printed in the reported joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 5, after the word "East", insert "desiring such assistance."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as will be observed by the Members, adds the three words "desiring such assistance" on line 5 of page 2. This section applies to economic aid. Those words were added by the majority of the committee for, I think, two principal reasons. In the first place, it was desired to make somewhat uniform the language concerning economic aid with the language relating to military assistance. Secondly, some of us felt that it tightened the wording of the resolution without detracting from its effectiveness. I, for one, also hoped that it might result in a saving of American tax dollars. Those who are interested, by referring to pages 149 and 150 of the hearings, will discover that neither Secretary of State Dulles nor Mr. John Hollister has any objection to this amendment. In fact, they both approved it. The Secretary of State took the general attitude that it was hardly necessary, but that if the committee felt it wise he saw no objection whatsoever to such an addition.

If the Members of the House would read on down, on lines 10 and 11, on page 2, they will find that the words "desiring such assistance" with respect to military assistance programs, are used. A little further down, in lines 13 and 14, the words "requesting such aid" are used with respect to the employment of the Armed Forces.

So I repeat it was felt by a majority of the committee that, with respect to economic assistance, it was appropriate to add some such words to make uniform and at the same time somewhat limit the resolution.

A number of different wordings were suggested by the committee, and those which were finally used were suggested, I think, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. In my opinion the amendment does improve the resolution, and should result in some savings of money. It tends to tighten the operation with respect to economic aid, and therefore I believe that the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe we were both troubled about the phrasing, and both felt that the wording of the amendment finally adopted would improve the resolution.

Mr. ADAIR. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. HAYS of Ohio rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is entitled to recognition, as a member of the committee.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am not only opposed to the amendment, but I am opposed to the entire resolution, especially the section dealing with economic support for the Middle East. I was unable to be here yesterday during general debate to state my reasons for opposing it, but I think anyone who votes for this resolution should keep in mind that you are voting to take your constituents' money—and this was testified to before the Foreign Affairs Committee—and give much of it in direct budgetary support to other nations. What does that mean? That means the State Department will give it as the Hardy report showed, in cash, to these Arab dictators. As you know, I have stood on the floor of this House year in and year out for mutual security. I will go down the line still for mutual security for the Near East if I have some assurance that it is going to raise the standards of living of the people out there. Take the case of the distinguished visitor who is here in Washington today, seeking money. He had an income last year of $360 million, the equivalent of $180 for every man, woman, and child in his kingdom. Yet the Saudi Arabians get along on a $40 per person net yearly income. The King's income for himself and family was $360 million. If any of you have ever been in Saudi Arabia, you will remember the condition of those people. They live in a situation that the writers of the Arabian Nights never dreamed of. Oh, the King has a thousand Cadillacs, air-conditioned and gold-plated. Twenty-eight air-conditioned palaces. He has 90 brothers on the public payroll drawing from $30,000 to $350,000 a year. We are told we cannot afford any tax reduction in this country; that the budget is too high. But we can afford to give money to King Saud because he has overdrawn his oil royalties. If any of you have had the occasion to read the Hardy report—and I read every word of it yesterday—it said that the quarter of a billion dollars which has been spent for mutual security in Iran has been spent in a cavalier fashion, it has been wasted, and much of it cannot even be accounted for; yet the State Department comes in before the Foreign Affairs Committee year in and year out and tried to justify that kind of expenditure.

I am for mutual security when it is mutual security, but I am not for bribing any Arab dictator, and I will tell you why. First, it is immoral; but, more practical than that, if the experience of the British in the Near East proves anything it proves that you cannot rent Arab dictators, that you cannot bribe them because they are always bidding to somebody else for more money, and they will not stay bribed. I suppose we are going to give $35 million to Jordan to keep that state free.

I was up at the United Nations and heard the Jordan representative talking about the illegitimacy of governments in the Near East. If there is an illegitimate government in the Near East it is Jordan. It has no father or no mother and no reason to exist; it is a geographical monstrosity created by the British so they could reward an Arab chieftain who had aided them in World War I, and the British have kept it there with $35 million a year, a source of trouble and conflict out there.

Our Secretary of State talked about a bold new policy. His bold new policy is trying to pick up the mistakes of others and spend the American taxpayers' money to keep those mistakes going.

I am going to vote against the resolution and I am not a bit worried that I can justify my vote.

I asked Mr. Dulles the question when he came before the committee if he could give us any reason to think that his remarks about the crisis out there were any more factual than they were just before the election when he said everything was so fine. His answer was: "The President received a mandate and he wants me to be his Secretary of State, and I think that is the reason."

I said: "Now, just a minute. The President carried my district by ten thousand or twelve thousand votes; I carried it by 26,000 votes, and my campaign, Mr. Secretary, was based upon the mess you have made of foreign policy in the Middle East. In my district I got a mandate to try to see that my constituents' money is not thrown away."

I have heard a lot of talk about throwing money down ratholes. This is a real one.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules adopted by the House all debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 16, after the word "that", insert "the authority herein granted shall be carried out to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President through the United Nations, and that."

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment does three things:

First, it reaffirms our devotion to international principle and to the rule of law.

Second, by indicating that, to the extent the President finds it practicable to work through the United Nations, we renounce any thought of going it alone or dominating the area that is involved in this resolution. It seems to me that for these two reasons there is no doubt in

the world about the validity of the statement that we should work through the United Nations.

Third, it deprives the Soviet of a propaganda weapon that they would otherwise have, because it makes clear that we are not going into this area with any thought of dominating it but only to provide some stability through our leadership. We need to deprive the Communists of the opportunity of running the whole show. I think that is an important argument. And all of this with complete reservation of the independence of our own country.

I want to emphasize the phrase "to the greatest extent deemed practicable by the President" and to say that this phrase is designed to give him all of the latitude that the Chief Executive seeks and should have.

The committee heard me very patiently yesterday in my statement on this resolution and I do not wish at this time to impose upon the committee; however, if there are any questions about this amendment I will be glad to yield and to respond to such questions. It seems that the amendment speaks for itself and I trust it will be supported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will recollect that when the amendment was in different form and had considerably more language in it, there was some criticism in the committee. This is an agreed amendment. I concur in what the gentleman said in two ways: One, it emphasizes our desire to work through the United Nations where practicable and it also spells out that the extent to which we do that is to be within the sound discretion of our Executive and that our cooperation is not automatic.

I think one more thing should be said and that is that the Security Council in the case of any military operation does not itself direct those operations but, as in the case of Korea, the United States was designated to head up the Unified Command and nothing except communiques and administrative reports which were public property were made to the Security Council.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. I recall agreeing with the criticism he made of the language that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and I presented. I think that the amendment has been improved.

I might say in commenting upon the previous amendment, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that this resolution was not a rubberstamp action. We had an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] working together, which we approved a moment ago. This amendment initiated by the gentleman from Florida and myself, and concurred in, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] indicates, proved that the committee in good faith tried to improve this resolution. To take any of these committee amendments out would undo much of the hard work that the Committee on Foreign Affairs did in the consideration of this matter.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I would say to the Members of the House that this amendment was approved by almost unanimous action of the whole Committee on Foreign Affairs. When it was all whittled down our committee members of both parties succeeded in getting a very closely worded amendment, that was well received.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but respect the gentleman who has introduced the amendment, my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]. I have great respect for him, and I know that he offered the amendment in committee with every good intention. But, it seems to me that there is no place for the amendment in this resolution. The subject matter relates to military matters of importance to our country. It is not a proper matter for United Nations action.

Now, when one gets to talking about the United Nations, we know that that is a very touchy subject with some people, but I think that it is important enough to realize that it has certain limitations, and I think that this amendment points out the limitations.

A very distinguished Britisher said this about the United Nations, and I think it is pertinent at this point, and I would like to refer to it. He said:

> Though, like everyone else, I wish the United Nations could work, I have come reluctantly to the view that in its present form it cannot.
>
> It is composed, of course, of men full of the best intentions, and its admirers are equally well meaning. But I cannot help feeling that people tend to overestimate its power for good and to underrate its potentialities for evil.
>
> We know all too well nowadays how easy it is for people to fall victim to phrases, to be hypnotized by slogans, and I am afraid that that is what is happening in the case of U. N.
>
> "Send it to U. N." is becoming a sort of incantation. In many quarters it seems to be treated as a shibboleth. You have only to mouth the words and go through the ceremonial and all will be well.
>
> Somehow, the proponents of the U. N.'s infallibility have managed to persuade themselves that anyone who does not put his complete faith in the organization is not anxious to maintain peace—in fact is almost a warmonger.

That statement by Lord Cherwell, in the House of Lords, appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too, read with interest Lord Cherwell's article, which was based on a speech in the House of Lords. I can see how the British would be a little unhappy about the U. N., right now, but the fact remains that the U. N. Assembly's resolution was effective to get the British out of the unfortunate Egyptian venture they had launched, so that it is not quite as impotent as the article would tend to make it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That may be true, but I think it was rather the big stick of your Uncle Sam.

Now, take a look at section 2, if you will. This provision is the meat of the resolution, the heart of it. And, what does it deal with? It deals with the authority in the President to handle military assistance and, further, to prevent aggression militarily in the district. Now, I would just like to know how in the world the President of the United States could refer these matters of military assistance or military aggression to the United Nations for action. I think the amendment is pure surplusage. It should not be in this resolution. It serves no real purpose because I am sure the gentleman who offered the amendment would admit that it would be very serious business if the President were to refer these two very important military matters to the United Nations for action. It is a preposterous suggestion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves the Committee now rise and report the resolution to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. VORYS. It is my understanding that under the rule this motion is not in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on that point of order, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

This is a preferential motion. It is not an amendment which is prohibited under the rule adopted by the House, but a preferential motion. It is in order. The point of order is overruled and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support House Joint Resolution 117 for I am convinced that it does violence to the Constitution of the United States.

If the Constitution is to be amended let it be done properly and legally with the consent and approval of the governed.

So that the record may be clear, let me say that I am opposed to the Communist police state and all its works, no matter where it is to be found. I am also opposed to aggression whether by Communists or so-called freedom-loving nations.

Let me further state at the outset that this is not alone a question of delegating power to President Eisenhower for he, no more than any other human, has a fixed tenure upon life.

Passage of this resolution will be the longest single step yet taken toward centralization of government and rule of the Republic by executive decree.

It is contended that a President, as Commander in Chief, already has the

powers provided in this resolution and in his recent appearance before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary of State Dulles pointed to the fact that neither the British Parliament nor the French Chamber of Deputies were called upon to give approval to their invasion of, and acts of, aggression upon Egypt.

And it may well be recalled that on September 29, 1954, this same Secretary of State Dulles, speaking at the London Conference in an effort to breathe life into the European Defense Community, said this:

> I should explain perhaps that under our constitutional system the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States and, as such, has the right to determine their disposition.

And then this:

> That is a right which cannot be impaired by action of the Congress.

In other words, whether in peace or war, says Mr. Dulles, a President has vast and unconditional power to use the military as he sees fit, and Congress can in nowise impair that power. This would be a strange and new concept of the authority to govern this Republic were it not for the presense of this resolution and the well-known moves of the State Department to subordinate to its lust for power every department and agency of Government, including Congress.

Perhaps it would be well to remind ourselves, as well as Mr. Dulles, on this occasion that in our Declaration of Independence one of the principal charges against a tyrannical British King was that he had made "the military independent of and superior to the civil power."

But perhaps the Declaration of Independence, the precious Bill of Rights, and the Constitution have become old fashioned in this day of modernism, which finds a Secretary of State trying to buy friends throughout the world and a well-paid Secretary of Peace and Disarmament apparently spending much of his time erecting political lightning rods for himself and handpicked friends.

If it be true that a President already has the untrammeled power to dispose military forces and embark this Nation upon a war anywhere in the world, and I contend Mr. Dulles' statement to the London Conference is both fallacious and pernicious, then why is there not before us today a simple but forceful statement of our determination to meet and resist Communist or any other aggression in any form?

As the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] and others have so well stated, such a resolution would undoubtedly be approved unanimously by this House. Certainly I would vote for such a statement of policy.

The provisions of the pending resolution, dealing with the United Nations, are a dangerous attempt at sugar coating. The U. N., under its present charter, is neither capable nor competent to halt aggression.

Those who formulated the United Nations Charter, and the present Secretary of State admits in his recent testimony that he was one of them, failed utterly to profit by the paramount reason for failure of the League of Nations: that nations allied in war might well be poles apart in peace.

Section 3 of this resolution is also wholly unacceptable. It is unnecessary and it is a further surrender of the constitutional power of Congress to control the purse strings.

I reiterate that I cannot support this resolution, which has the full effect of law, because it provides delegations and surrenders of power that are unthinkable if this Republic is to be perpetuated with the consent of the governed.

I cannot support this legislation because no one is willing to define "the general area of the Middle East" and the "perimeter" countries into which American troops may be sent to war and millions of American tax dollars may be spent without further approval or consultation with Congress.

I cannot support this proposal because there is no evidence on the record that a new emergency exists. Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee during hearings on this proposal, said this:

> I do not expect, and I am sure the President and Secretary do not expect, there will be an outbreak of war right away.

Congress will be in constant session for several months and any emergency can be met almost instantly.

For these and other reasons my vote will be cast in opposition.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. Chairman, this motion possibly is not meant to have very great effect, but certainly I am opposed to striking out the enacting clause after we have worked so long on this joint resolution.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is certainly a controversial issue and one on which many of us require a lot of advice. Pending the consideration of it and the announcement of the President that this matter was coming to us, I sought the advice and counsel of the people of my district by questionnaire. I asked the people of my district the following question: Do you favor United States military intervention in the Middle East by military force, if Russia attacks? The answers from 945 were 648 yes, 147 no, 84 no opinion.

I have not tabulated all of the returns from the people of my district, but with replies from nearly 1,000 running nearly 5 to 1 in favor of this resolution, I have no doubt that the people of my district have faith in President Eisenhower's request for this authority.

When the Formosa resolution was before the House I supported it, believing that we could trust the President of the United States on that very difficult and controversial question. In this instance I think we can put enough faith in the President to use his wisdom in exercising these powers to prevent war or be ready to strike if war should come.

It is about time that we serve notice on Russia that we are vigorously opposed to any further expansion of Communist imperialism.

The firm resolution taken by Congress at the request of President Eisenhower to protect Formosa against Red China has had a sobering effect on Red China and has not caused war in the Far East.

I believe this is more calculated to prevent war than to cause war, and I shall support the resolution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to inquire as to the legislative program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy that my friend has asked that question so that the membership of the House may be advised as to the program.

The Committee on Rules reported out several resolutions today. Tomorrow, there is H. R. 3109, a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available for business loans. There is a reasonable necessity for quick action because, as I understand it, the present lending capacity of the administration will have been exhausted in the early part of February.

There are several resolutions, which come up at the beginning of each session, in relation to committees. They are as follows:

House Resolution 56, to create the Select Committee on Small Business.

House Resolution 64, to authorize the investigation of the Veterans' Administration.

House Resolution 67, for the investigative authority for the Armed Services Committee.

House Resolution 86, to authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to make an investigation of housing.

House Resolution 94, the investigative authority for Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

House Resolution 99, the investigative authority for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 104, the investigative authority for the Ways and Means Committee.

House Resolution 107, the investigative authority for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment as it appears in the printed copy of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 3, line 8, strike out all of line 5 down to and including all of line 16 and insert:
>
> "SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957

for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed $200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That, whenever the President determines it to be important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority of section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and without regard to the provisions of section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. SELDEN. The original language of section 3, as I understand it, contains no limitations on the amount of the $200 million that can be spent in any one country. Also, the termination date of the authority granted in the original section 3 is uncertain. Will the gentleman from Missouri tell me if I am correct in stating that the amendment which is now under consideration makes it clear that the authority granted the President in section 3 is only for the balance of the present fiscal year?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. SELDEN. Am I correct in stating further that the committee amendment now under consideration limits to $30 million the amount that can be spent in any one country?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the committee amendment now under consideration greatly improves section 3 of the resolution, and I join with the gentleman from Missouri in urging its adoption.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I join in the support of this amendment. Is it not a fact that while this amendment was offered in committee by our distinguished chairman, it is the result of a bipartisan effort of our committee to trim down and put limitations on the rather broader authority which was requested in the original resolution?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes; the committee worked out this amendment to clarify some of the questions and ambiguities which existed in the original version of the resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I join in sponsoring the amendment and say that many of us felt these matters should be limited in these respects, and this was an overall amendment which combined many of the factors which many of us had been considering.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I might say further that the amendment prevents the use of funds for the support of United States Armed Forces in the area. It exempts expenditures from the requirements of section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1957, which provides that not more than 20 percent of the funds may be allocated or set aside within the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DOES THE ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION DISREGARD THE CONSTITUTION?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the procedure of today of offering preferential motions seems a little unusual, the necessity for it is because it is the only method left to the opponents of this resolution. The Committee is so large, and so many of its Members desired to speak at such length during general debate that those in opposition have not had any opportunity to give their views.

Yesterday, our very able, sincere, and patriotic colleague from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], clearly, concisely, and eloquently gave the House some of the reasons which caused 146 Members to vote against the rule.

No one should question the sincerity or the patriotism of a vote cast on this occasion.

This resolution authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to protect the territorial integrity and the political independence of any nation in the general area of the Middle East—not the territorial integrity or the political independence of the United States—which may request his aid. Inasmuch as we condemn war by an aggressor, when we become the military ally of another nation in order to protect its territorial integrity and its political independence, do we not automatically become an aggressor—come under our own condemnation?

It authorizes the President, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1957, to spend any sum he may desire, not exceeding $200 million, from any funds now available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

In the considered opinion of many patriotic citizens, the resolution is in direct conflict with the terms of the Constitution which vest the power to declare and carry on war in the Congress of the United States.

The resolution is a blank check, permitting the President to expend any sum not exceeding $200 million of the taxpayers' dollars in any manner which he may deem to be important to the security of the United States, and, in addition, to any other existing authorizations with respect to such fund.

The resolution has accurately been characterized as a blank check authorizing and directing the President to declare and carry on a war whenever he deems it necessary—not to protect this Nation—but the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East—a delegation of a power given to the Congress, and only to the Congress, to declare war.

It is another step toward the repudiation of the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, which, for more than 150 years, have protected the freedom of our citizens, given us national security.

It is another step toward the surrender of our national sovereignty.

It is a move to further subject us to the control of United Nations, toward depriving the citizen of his opportunity and his freedom, toward the destruction of the United States of America.

It establishes a precedent which cannot be ignored when future Presidents demand like authority.

Delegate this power to the President—it cannot be denied a future President. Control of the military makes dictatorship easy.

It is difficult to understand why we should disregard the clear terms of the Constitution, make this delegation of constitutional power. Cannot the President trust us? We have been hearing a great deal about how small this world has grown, just a little bit of a marble, we are told. Very well. But we are never more than 2 or 3 hours from Washington. We are here at present. Cannot the President trust us?

There are 435 of us when we are all here. Is there any reason why there cannot be a little reciprocity in the administration? Is there?

Is the President the only one who knows it all? I am not speaking of him personally. I am speaking of him as President. Is he or more accurately his anonymous advisers the only ones who can tell our people when war shall be declared?

CONSISTENCY

A campaign promise, direct or implied, should be something more than campaign oratory a highway to office.

The election of President Wilson to a second term was aided by the statement that he kept us out of war, and the implication that, if reelected, we would remain at peace.

His reelection was followed by World War I.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt won reelection as President largely because on his way to Boston to make a political speech—on October 30, 1940, and when it was apparent that he was losing in the campaign—he was advised to and did consent to make the speech in which he said:

> I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Reelected, that solemn promise, which undoubtedly secured him tremendous political support, he quickly threw in the ash can, disregarded.

An appreciable number of the votes cast for Dwight D. Eisenhower were influenced by his statement that if elected he would go to Korea and by the implication that the war would end, our men come home.

The last campaign was won on the assertion that the Republican administration, notwithstanding the fact that we had a Legislative branch controlled by the Democratic Party, had brought to this country peace, prosperity, and progress.

Notwithstanding the expenditure of more than $110 billion, the victories of World War II and the Korean war, we are now, in substance, told by the President and the Secretary of State that the world situation which confronts us is more dangerous than at any time in the past.

Assuming that assertion to be true, it is proof abundant that the expenditures which the citizens of this country have been required to make, the suffering and loss of life, the diplomatic efforts which have been put forward by this Government of ours, have been in vain, have not been effective.

If I had been taking a doctor's medicine for 20 years and was worse at the end than I had ever been before I would not want any more of that dope.

If it be true that the liberty of our citizens, the security of our Nation, is now threatened, is now in immediate danger because of the intentions and the military might of that part of the world which is under Communist domination, then this is not the time to forewarn those nations, to give them opportunity to increase their military power, nor to impoverish ourselves, weaken ourselves by future military or financial aid.

It is the time to make effective our own economic and military strength.

Throughout the country, there is wide complaint that the United States Supreme Court disregards the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Not so many years ago, the Congress, in the Reorganization Act, surrendered to the President a part of the legislative authority exclusively granted to it by the Constitution.

This reference is to the act, several times amended, but which, today, authorizes the President to send down a reorganization proposal which, notwithstanding constitutional provisions, and in violation thereof, becomes the law of the land unless within 60 days vetoed by either the Senate or the House.

That legislation was a surrender of a degree of the legislative authority granted exclusively to the Congress.

Through the making of executive agreements, our membership in the United Nations, and the decisions rendered by the Supreme Court, we have surrendered a part of our national sovereignty—to a degree, placed our citizens, and their liberty, under laws or regulations enacted by a group of other nations.

The Supreme Court has, through its decisions, taken from the States a portion of the sovereign authority retained by them and by the people, by the Constitution.

THIS RESOLUTION

The Congress is in session. We have frequently been told that in time and distance the world in recent years has shrunk.

If that be true, the Congress is never more than an hour or two from Washington and its legislative Halls.

Ever in our ears is the admonition that today we are living in a very, very small world, where we cannot ignore the actions of other people, other nations.

If we have as a nation moved into the city, into the apartment house, from our village or country home, then more important than ever is it that we watch our daily conduct, avoid offending or coming in contact with the rights of our next-door or down-the-corridor neighbor.

A foreshortened, a contracted world renders more necessary than ever the minding of our own business, both as individuals, communities, and nations.

At the opening of the session, as on previous sessions, my oath as Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan was to abide by the Constitution of the United States. My duty, my allegiance, is not to the President of the United States, to the leaders of my party, but to the people of my district, my State, and my country.

I will not, because I cannot, vote to delegate to the President of the United States the authority, shirk the responsibility, imposed upon me by the people of my district, by the solemn oath of office to which, in good faith, I subscribed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 6, strike out the word "month" and insert the word "months."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 7, after "January", insert "and July."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. The author of the amendment was on his feet seeking to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. All right; I am willing to let him speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine desire recognition in support of the amendment?

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think a great deal need be said on this particular amendment. The debate yesterday and today reveals the concern of many of the Members over the amount of money to be made available under this resolution. They are concerned, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has said this morning, over how it is going to be spent.

This amendment is not a partisan amendment. It received the unanimous support of the committee and I think it stemmed from a realization that although it might be perfectly sensible to plunge into this particular resolution realizing that we cannot ahead of time know precisely what funds we will need and how they should be spent, nevertheless we should have information, complete information, more often than once a year.

The way this provision would work is that when the Richards Mission concludes its efforts, the administration will be possessed of far greater detail as far as the program is concerned. The first report would, therefore, be made to the Congress in July rather than next January. In short, we are being asked in a sense to buy a pig in a poke. All we are requesting is a look into the poke a little bit earlier than otherwise might be the case. In other words, we are shortening the tether of this particular horse. We do not think it is realistic, in this twilight zone we are operating in, to expect in advance to know exactly how much is going to be spent and for what purpose. This may not be a cold war but it is a pretty sizzling peace. The committee felt this amount of authority should be allowed under the resolution, but that we should shorten the tether and maintain as close supervision as possible of the action conducted by the President under this resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the two amendments are aimed to having the President report to the Congress in January of each year and likewise at the end of each fiscal year, which is June 30. I was one of those who joined with the gentleman on this amendment and I favor it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I subscribe to having 2 reports instead of 1, but I would like to have some expression as to whether or not it is anticipated that these reports will be in detail and give us some actual information, or will they be based on this so-called illustrative proposition? If they are illustrative I would rather not have them at all.

Mr. COFFIN. I think the committee hopes that the reports will be as informative as it is possible for the administration to prepare them. We surely hope they will be informative reports.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman go a little bit further than to share a hope that they will be informative and insist that they be indeed informative?

Mr. COFFIN. I cannot speak for the rest of the committee.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit the chairman of the committee to express himself on that point?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I think we shall insist that the reports be clear and in such detail as may be possible.

Mr. HARDY. In specific detail as to what was actually done with the money?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes. We welcome the best reports that the Executive can make to us and we hope he is going to

give us something that we may understand.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman assure the House that unless the reports are so specific the committee will seek to secure informative information?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Well, I am not in position to go that far.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. From what source will the funds come? Is this unobligated or unreserved money or what is it?

Mr. COFFIN. The moneys included under section 3 are moneys authorized and appropriated under existing legislation. Some of the projects have been held up because of what has happened in the Middle East; therefore, there is money that could be available for different purposes the administration recognizes as of greatest priority.

Mr. GROSS. Last year we apparently were overgenerous. These moneys were not obligated or earmarked in any way. We were overgenerous with the appropriations?

Mr. COFFIN. The committee was concerned with that very point and asked a great many questions of the witnesses as to whether they had inflated their request. We were assured, I think to our satisfaction, that there had been no inflation, that it was a question of what is recognized as being of greatest priority now in this new situation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to insert their own remarks during the course of the debate this morning. My reason for that is that a number of Members who did not have the opportunity to present their views yesterday in this forum are seeking the opportunity to do it today. If such request is in order, I now make it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the House that it is my intention to ask in the House also that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter, if they wish.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to oppose the amendment, because the distinguished gentleman from Maine has every good intention in mind in proposing it. If I thought the State Department would give any kind of a real audit of what they are doing with these funds, I would be heartily for it, but it would be just another report, which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], pointed out would not mean very much.

I do not want anyone to think I have anything personal against the King of Saudi Arabia. I did not say anything against him personally. I did not say anything about some of the customs in his country—and I will not mention them—that are repugnant, to Americans. But, I was talking about whether or not we, as taxpayers, ought to give him a hundred or so million dollars. And, I was discussing what he did with the $360 million that he had last year. To assure the House that I was trying to observe all the proprieties that are customary and due, I called the Secretary of State last week and told him on the telephone that I thought it might be embarrassing to have to discuss some of these things with the king in the country and perhaps it would be better to either postpone his visit or postpone the consideration of this bill for a couple of days. He said, well, he was not going to postpone his visit, and he thought I ought not to say anything about how he spent his money. I happen to disagree with him. I think it is pertinent. When you have a situation, as the situation is outlined in the Hardy report—and I know that people are going to say I am straining at a gnat when I am talking about a mere quarter of a billion dollars being thrown away—I am shocked at some of the things in it. I am shocked to know that when they could not justify the expenditure of money in Iran any longer, that the TCA covered up. They deliberately misled the Congress, and they just said to the Iran officials, "Come up every month. We will give you $5 million in cash, and you do not even need to tell us what you did with it." Now, that is what happened. There is no need of anybody getting up to deny that. And, if you think that bookkeeping is bad out in Iran, all I can say to you is wait until you see some of the bookkeeping that is going to happen in some of these other countries in the Near East. They will make criticisms of the Hardy report look like their auditing was done by the best board of auditors in the United States, compared to some you are going to see, because the Secretary admitted that he is going to hand these dictators chunks of money up to 50 or 60 million dollars and they can do with it what they like. And, if you think they are going to tell you what they will do with it, well, you do not know them as well as I do. And this is just the beginning. Mind you, they will come in later and ask for another 5 or 10 billion dollars; and, in fact, they said they will in the mutual security bill. I have stood in this well for 8 years and supported mutual security and fought as recently as the last session of the Congress many of the people of Mr. Dulles' party. But, I submit to you, if you had a man in charge of an estate of a quarter of a billion dollars and he came into court and said, "I cannot account for any of it. It is all gone. I do not know what I did with it," I do not know what you would do in some of your States, but instead of putting him in charge of another few billion dollars, we in Ohio would at least bring him in for probation before we gave him any more money.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would really like to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman mentioned mutual security.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I have not yielded yet. I said I would like to yield, but I am afraid if I did, that he would bring up that Formosa proposition. Then I would be forced to do to him what Mr. Acheson did to him the other day when, after all the interchange was over Mr. Acheson said, "Well, if anybody invited the Communists to attack South Korea it was the House of Representatives when they failed by one vote to pass my request for more military aid and more economic aid for Korea." My colleague from Ohio said, "I dug up your Korean speech for the Republican committee in the campaign," and Mr. Acheson said, "And that vote was cast, that motion to recommit was made by one JOHN VORYS, of Ohio." I would yield to the gentleman, but I would not want to do anything like that to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, after "otherwise", insert "except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is obviously simple in language and in intent. However, I think it does have a fundamental significance. Particularly does it have a significance in view of the fact that numerous suggestions have been made that a specific date be included in the resolution for the termination of it. Someone suggested that it should be terminated at the end of this administration. That did not seem practical. Other interim dates were proposed. Finally the committee unanimously approved the insertion of this language which is the same language used in the Greek-Turkey Aid Act and also the Mutual Security Act.

It permits the Congress to bring to an end the authority granted in the resolution by a simple majority of the House and the Senate. And it is fundamental in this respect, that many have objection to giving this broad authority, as the resolution necessarily does, to the administration; and we felt that it would hold at least the power to terminate in the Congress of the United States. I think that is all that is necessary to say, Mr. Chairman, directly to the amendment. Let me say this further. This is the first time I have been in the well of this House during the debate on this resolution. But all through yesterday and today I have listened to the numerous arguments made on this measure and I think without exception every one had some merit in the argument, whether for or against. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with all of the criticism and with all of the misgivings we have about this resolution—and I have some and I think everyone has some—at the same time, in all reason, it seems to me that all the objections we have, become academic when we stand here today and start to vote on this measure. That is, the President of the United States is my President, he is your President. This is my Nation, it is your Nation. What can we do from this moment on but hold

up the hand of our President before the world and say to him and say to the world, that we are in great unanimity in purpose in this vast and important area of the Middle East?

Mr. Chairman, that is my attitude. I have some criticism of things which have occurred in the past but it seems to me that all we can do here today, with little choice—and I do not say that apologetically in any sense, is to support this resolution.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to say that I, too, agree with the gentleman, that we should hold up the hand of the President. But I would like the gentleman to tell me, with the gentleman's misgivings on this matter if he thinks it was absolutely necessary for the President to stick his hand out to be held up?

Mr. BURLESON. I will say to the gentleman that those are the things that, as of this moment, are academic. If we try to go back and ferret out all these matters on which we do not agree, then we are not going to act in what I think is the best interest of our Nation at this time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I commend the gentleman for his attitude in reference to the President. What I was going to attempt to observe when my colleague from Ohio refused to yield to me was this: Our former colleague, Dick Richards, is not going to go out there and recommend squandering money, unless he has completely changed from the courageous, independent soul that we served with so long. I think when we vote for this, we are voting not only confidence in our President but also confidence in our former colleague, Mr. Richards.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say. The situation as to some of these things which the gentleman has just mentioned, regarding the future operation of this program, may, too, become in a sense academic when we think of what the effect on the world will be by our action here, whether it is positive, but more seriously, as to whether it is negative.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman made an excellent point on reporting to Congress twice a year under this resolution, that in no event shall it be illustrative, it must be informative and must have the facts and figures as to what the program is at that time.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this matter is important enough to require its review regularly by the Congress. We ought not to postpone its review by the Congress until a concurrent resolution comes in or the President may see fit to issue a proclamation. I think the provision in this joint resolution should require that it expire not more than 1 year from the date of enactment, so that the Congress will be compelled to review this entire program much sooner than otherwise.

Some things have been said today about the visit of the King of Saudi Arabia to our country. To those who might wish to condemn him for what happens in his native land, let me suggest to you that maybe things are going to change in Saudi Arabia. Apparently the ghost writer, who is writing the speeches for King Saud is plagiarizing our great President. Let me quote to you what this great King said only yesterday to the United Nations:

> We stand on moral principles, on the freedom and dignity of human beings, on cooperation among the freedom-loving peoples.

Does not that reflect the words of our own President? But bear in mind it was this same President who supported the convocation of a conference in Geneva on antislavery under the auspices of the United Nations, and then had his delegate tell that conference, "Don't let the United States be committed to what you are doing there, because that will offend some people like the King of Saudi Arabia." He is one of the greatest slave masters the world has ever known. It is he who legalizes the slave trade within his own country. His is the only country that refused to answer the questionnaire of the United Nations on slavery.

But those are the internal affairs of his country—or so we are told.

Let us not be carried away by the King's espousal of these moral principles involving the freedom and dignity of human beings until we see how he implements them upon his return home. Let us also tell him that while we will not meddle in his internal affairs we will give him no money with which to enslave his own or any other people.

A nation's morals are the morals of its people. There is an international moral code, too, which is as good or as bad as that of the nations that participate in the international community. We can take ourselves down to the immoral principles of the worst of these countries or we can rise up and insist on living by the principles that we look upon as the highest and the best. The conduct of our nation, in and out of the United Nations, is far from moral, far from just. That it is followed by many other nations makes it the more pitiful, not the more just.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. I wonder if the gentleman read a column by Victor Riesel in today's New York Daily Mirror in which Victor Riesel points out that Ibn Saud is so moral that because a handful of workers decided to strike for better conditions, he threw them into a pit filled with scorpions where some 80 people died of poisoning as a result of being bitten by these scorpions. This is the kind of man for whom we depart from tradition and personally welcome at the airport.

Mr. MULTER. I think Victor Riesel overlooked the fact that these were not workers, these were slaves. There is a difference in Saudi Arabia between slaves and people. Apparently we will be asked to approve that distinction. I know that neither you nor I will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BASS of Tennessee moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I sat here all day yesterday and listened to debate on this resolution, and I never heard so many people come before the Congress and apologize for supporting a piece of legislation. I could not find a single person who did not have some reservation about this resolution. Yet, due to the rule we were not allowed to amend it.

Now, I can frankly say to you I have studied about this since the press broke the story sometime in the early part of the year and, until this moment, and we are going to vote in just about 10 minutes or so, I have no decided whether I can support the legislation or not.

I think this House ought to be told the reasons why this resolution was brought before the Congress and what made it necessary. Here is the exact reason this was brought up. Last year, we witnessed the lowest form of political demagoguery going on in the Nation where one party was made a party of war and another party was made a party of peace, reducing patriotism to a cheap form of political chattel. We saw a candidate for high office in America, and also the second highest office, go all over the country saying that in no case and under no circumstances would American boys be committed to action in the battlefield. Yes; they did it time after time, and they were so successful in convincing the American public that they meant what they said that after it was all over, they feared that the rest of the world, and particularly the Communists, may have believed they were telling the truth, thereby making the Middle East fair game.

Therefore, in order to protect the freedom-loving peoples of the world and in order to let Russia know that we did not mean what was said, that we do have an interest in world freedom and will fight to protect it, the President now has put the Members of this House directly over the proverbial barrel in order to rectify one of his political campaign mistakes. I am firmly convinced that is the only and the single reason for the necessity for this resolution today.

I am presently inclined to oppose this resolution for three reasons:

First. I do not believe in giving the power to declare war to one man, regardless of who he may be.

Second. It opens up new fields of foreign aid spending which have already reached objectionable proportions.

Third. When I vote to declare war, I want to know exactly where and when

American boys will fight. This resolution does not contain that information.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution, far from being a repudiation of Presidential statements made during the campaign, represents prompt action to carry out the assurance that our forces will not become involved in the Middle East. Our President and our Secretary of State have recommended this as a measure to keep American boys from Middle East battlefields in wars brought on by Soviet miscalculation of our intent. Our Secretary of State has described this as a "declaration of peace." That is the reason it has had such overwhelming bipartisan support in our committee and that is the reason why it will have the overwhelming bipartisan support of the Congress. I quote the statement of Secretary Dulles from our hearings on page 6:

> The purpose of the proposed resolution is not war. It is peace. The purpose, as in the other cases where the President and the Congress have acted together to oppose international communism, is to stop world war III before it starts.

If you are in favor of that purpose, then I hope that you will vote for this resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I say this, that my comment previously about the gentleman from Ohio is not a chastisement, it was rather a hope that there would be no remarks of a personal nature when we had an official visitor in this country from the floor of this House. If other speakers disagree, that is a mater of their own choice, and it is perfectly open for that kind of comment. But I think there is a limit of courtesy when we do have an official visitor here.

On the question of my vote on 1 or 2 amendments which I offered, I believe I have the privilege of answering that. Last year this House adopted, through the Foreign Affairs Committee, an amendment of mine, making a billion-dollar cut in the mutual security program. It became a committee amendment. Mr. RICHARDS handled it on the floor and I supported him. That amendment was passed, and the House stood by that amendment by a vote of 172 to 112. So this is more than casual participation. I hope I do it seriously. On the other hand, I am defeated many times. May I say for Mr. RICHARDS and myself that it was very pleasing to hear the Secretary of State say before our committee that they had gotten along on the $900 million cut and they had $200 million left over for this resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is before the House of Representatives at the request of the President. No one is in better position to evaluate the situation in the Middle East than the President of the United States. He has a right to submit this proposition to us. On the basis of his evaluation it is before us. Whether or not we agree with his evaluation, we should vote on the proposition basically in the form in which he requested it. We can vote it up or we can vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the committee, if there are any further committee amendments to be offered to the pending resolution?

Mr. GORDON. There are no further committee amendments to be offered.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of extending my remarks. I will vote in favor of making funds and methods available to the President to carry out our world responsibilities, both in the military and economic spheres. I believe it is imperative that we take a strong and united stand as a nation in the face of present world conditions. However, it is with great reluctance that I cast an affirmative vote for such a sweeping program without more thorough knowledge being made available to Members of Congress of how and where the money is to be spent. I vote for this measure only out of a knowledge that dynamic action is needed, and a hope that our foreign policy will become a stable force of constant direction which can be understood by ourselves and the rest of the world.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the Mideast resolution, House Resolution 117, presents one overriding dilemna to me—is it constitutional or not for me to vote for it? I think it is not. If it is not a declaration of war, I cannot transfer to the President this power which constitutionally rests in Congress, the representatives of the people—the right to declare war. If it is a declaration of war, though predated, it should be so called—and if it is, I would expect more facts and information than the Congress has yet been supplied. But since it is not, there is no choice. The President is asking for authority which Congress cannot so give. If the President already has the authority, as some say, then why come to Congress for this particularly worded resolution? And, if he has, I lament the fact because it is the result of treaty law, abridging our Constitution which would not have ever been possible had a Bricker amendment or constitutional safeguard been then in effect. In my position, recalling my oath, swearing to uphold and defend the Constitution, there is no question of lack of confidence, respect or faith in the leadership of the President whom I greatly admire. I simply recognize ours to be a government of law, not men. Therefore, I cannot, as many have passionately declared on the floor, be against it and vote for it.

Nor do I think the world or Russia will misunderstand our disunity in this vote if such there be. There is no lack of solidarity in the United States opposition to communism and Russia—but there continues to be a confusion of the end justifying the means, so that Congressmen are moved to plead: "Let's vote for it, but we're against it." We should try to make the resolution say what we mean. Our aim is the same.

Since, however, the people of this Nation, through their Representatives, were not heard nor amendments permitted, as the result of the closed rule, no one should be surprised at a lack of unanimity. "Gagging" the Congressmen because of haste and producing this questionable resolution does not fool the Communists. It seems to me we only fool ourselves and weaken our form of government.

I heartily agree that the United States position should be made clear, so no miscalculation by others might result in war; also, that Russia only understands firmness and force; that we should steady our friends and serve notice on our enemies; that we must not vacillate or show weakness. Firm and determined we must be.

Is debating our problems in parliamentary procedure on the floor of the House vacillating or showing weakness? I think not. Is unanimous consent to be expected or required in free government by free men when such a momentous step as this is presented in haste—leaving our questions unanswered? No. In fact, therein lies our difference from communism and dictatorship.

Further, why should foreign aid be linked to this resolution. Many of us conscientiously cannot alter our previous stands, disapproving foreign aid without facts, and without the further study and evaluation we have requested as a result of the waste in preceding programs. What are the economic facts? Where is the money needed? For what projects? The waste of haste won't win friends.

Is the placement of our troops under the U. N. Security Council and its Russian secretary, suggesting possible Russian influence or control, the solution? The resolution states our policy will be "consonant with the treaty obligations and with the Charter of the United Nations." Surely we Congressmen representing our constituents and the future shock troops of this program have the right to hear this matter discussed.

Does this resolution, aimed against overt armed aggression, protect us against the time-tested successful Russian techniques of subversion and infiltration? Will the nations "request" us to intercede as the resolution states, or will they be fearful of Russian retaliation in not knowing what the United States will do. Do these nations want military protection? Do they want economic aid? Will economic aid help or upset and inflate their immature and primitive economies? Are we indeed to assume unlimited responsibility for these nations and those on the "perimeter" of these nations and so on ad infinitum?—referring to Mr. Dulles' testimony.

We are warned that "security" prevents our having the facts. Must we Congressmen vote solely on "faith"? I think not. It is the job of a Member of Congress to represent his people responsibly. While I respect "security," surely

we should know more of this carte blanche plan before giving our approval, as responsible representatives of the people. And there are other questions quite unresolved for me, which in good conscience I must propose, and I am not endeavoring to quibble. I feel I have a right to know and until I know cannot give my approval.

I simply do not believe that our Constitution and the free speech of floor debate must break down and be shunted aside when confronted with the stark threat of Communist aggression—overt or subversive. Rather—that's when our form of Government must shine forth most brightly to light the way for our troubled neighbors, struggling to achieve our kind of life and freedom. I begrudge the Communists having achieved such hurried procedure on our part. We well know that the Senate will deliberate and will be influenced by our action—as in benefitting from our amendments, if such had been permitted. Perhaps therein lies our hope—that the Senate, witnessing our haste, will now deliberate more fully and without political expediency to work out a firm, forceful resolution without constitutional abridgement, ambiguity, or foreign aid without further study. Then when the conference outcome is brought back to us for the vote it is my hope that I can vote for it, my objections having been satisfied.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this resolution only after the most earnest soul searching; after consultation with many individuals of the highest standing in the Nation and in my own confidence, in Congress and out and including both supporters and opponents; after weighing the sharply divided sentiment within my district; and after careful study of committee hearings and close attention to debate in this House.

I cast this vote despite definite misgivings and reservations and, in part, because my misgivings with respect to an opposing vote are even more serious.

I would be less than frank if I failed to say that in many particulars sponsors of this resolution, in both the executive and legislative branches, have added to the difficulties of my affirmative vote.

For example, I regret that they did not see fit to propose a simple resolution asserting the vital interest of the United States in the independence and territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East area and the purpose of this Nation, if necessary and under authority of Congress exercised at the time, to use force to prevent or resist Communist aggression.

Such a resolution, it seems to me, would have avoided raising complex and highly controversial constitutional issues as to the relative roles of the President and the Congress in committing American forces to combat or the Nation to war.

I regret, also, inclusion in a resolution designed to express the united determination of the Congress and the Nation to resist such aggression, of legislation in the field of military and economic assistance. Such legislation, it seems to me, could have better and more properly been presented and considered subsequently and apart from this resolution, particularly since the proposed aid is as yet of undesignated type and amounts, for undesignated nations in the area, and for specific purposes as yet only vaguely defined.

Most of all, I regret that in an action dedicated to the cause of freedom, it has been deemed expedient by both the executive branch and this House, to deny Members of this House the freedom to consider and act upon amendments to this proposed resolution. This is a privilege retained by the other body and one which, it is my sincere hope, will be exercised by the other body to the improvement of the resolution and the benefit of our national interests.

Notwithstanding these and other reservations and misgivings, I am voting for this resolution.

I do so because of the clear design and goal of international communism for world conquest and the unquestioned purpose of Soviet Russia to exploit the tensions and situation of this troubled area for its evil ends.

I do so because I believe a firm and clear notice of American intentions, as the best possible deterrent to such designs, is an overriding consideration.

I do so because of my confidence in the knowledge and judgment, on this score, of President Eisenhower and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in particular.

I am also voting for this resolution because I am completely unwilling, by a negative vote, to give even the faintest suggestion that, as a staunch believer in the American system of the separation of powers and checks and balances within the Government, my misgivings with respect to the executive branch and its powers compare, even remotely, with my concern over the evil designs and ominous power of international communism.

I do so also because I am convinced that President Eisenhower has demonstrated both a firm adherence to constitutional principles and complete devotion to the cause of national security and a just peace. Let me add that I emphatically reject the superficial thinking which seems to argue for blind acceptance by Congress of any or all recommendations of the President, even in the area of foreign policy.

In witness of this adherence and dedication on the part of the President of the United States, I cite his termination of the treadmill war in Korea; his sponsorship of the Formosa resolution which—with the constitutional concurrence and support of the Congress—has averted thus far a Communist attack on that Pacific bastion; his prompt and firm decision last October that there would be no American involvement in the Middle East conflict precipitated by Britain, France and Israel; and, finally, his assurance in his special message of January 5 that, in event of the necessity of military action under this resolution he would "maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session" and "if Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, would at once call the Congress into session." I do not know how a President could more fully demonstrate his respect for the constitutional obligations and responsibilities of the Congress while, at the same time, meeting his own constitutional obligations and responsibilities in a situation which may require speedy action.

I am voting for this resolution because I am unwilling to identify myself with those who, by their own part in blunders, ineptitude and miscalculations have in past years and previous administrations contributed, however unintentionally, to the successes of communism, yet today offer little but sanctimonious criticism of those who have inherited the mess.

I am voting for this resolution despite serious misgivings and concern with respect to the pledge of adherence which it gives to future "actions and recommendations" of the United Nations, pledges which I wish this House might have had an opportunity to debate and modify through amendments. The fact remains—however much some of us may question the wisdom of the commitment—that by due legislative process, we are members of the United Nations. And the fact likewise remains that we are in duty bound to adhere faithfully to the commitments we have given until or unless experience gives proof of the folly or peril of those commitments sufficient to cause our modification or repudiation of the commitments, likewise by due legislative process.

In a word, all misgivings and reservations to the contrary notwithstanding, I am voting for this resolution because I want the Congress to join in giving firm notice of our intentions to an enemy who would conquer the world, and us with it, and thereby render our Constitution and our very liberties a nullity, and because I want the Congress to sustain and strengthen the hand and voice of the President of the United States as the agent of the Nation in firm opposition to the enemy.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone will doubt the sincerity of the request of our President for the authority provided for in House Joint Resolution 117. The people of America have grave concern for the plight of those in the Russian satellite nations and they would do all that may practicably be necessary to help them free themselves from their bonds of enslavement and see that they have the opportunity for self-determination and a return of their sovereign governments. All Americans want to set up a solid roadblock against further enslavement of nations and their peoples by Russia, but, Mr. Chairman, is this the way?

I have carefully studied the hearings and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in order to answer to my own satisfaction several important problems which arise. I believe the greatest of these is the question of the abdication by Congress of its constitutional powers as prescribed in article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that this is just another thrusting of a legislative obligation and duty into the hands of the Executive. I cannot in good conscience believe that we who have been elected to represent the people would rather pass constitutional authority to the Executive than assume

our full responsibility as, if, and when the occasion should arise. I cannot in all the record find ground for such action insofar as I am concerned, even if, as some would have us believe, the action is a precautionary measure in the never-ending battle against communism.

The further concern I have with respect to the authority herein sought by the Executive resolves around section 2 of the resolution. It is quite clear, at least in my opinion, that even if given the authority under this resolution, the United States cannot act unilaterally in halting Communist aggression. This section makes it definitely an action carried out through the United Nations. It seems at last those who would have it that way have found the military potential necessary to enforce United Nations resolutions or edicts. Yet, on the other hand, also subject such action in the Security Council of the United Nations to the Russian veto, and they have never hesitated to use it.

It has been said that these standby authorities are necessary since time would be of the essence in the event of an emergency and action by Congress in accordance with its constitutional powers would entail possible dangerous consequences through delay. But, from our past experiences in the United Nations, can it be successfully argued that it would take longer to act through Congress than to work through the United Nations? I cannot and will not in good conscience abdicate constitutional authority of the United States to the United Nations.

Finally, I have great concern over the precedent established in this resolution with regard to waivers of certain restrictive provisions in the use of heretofore granted appropriations for economic and military assistance.

It has been reported in one of our leading newspapers that there is but one action which we can take—Congressional approval of a project too far advanced by the White House to be rejected in the face of world opinion. I cannot agree with this reasoning. I am convinced that the best interest of my beloved country comes before world opinion.

In view of the foregoing, Mr. Chairman, I find myself constrained, in good conscience, to vote against this resolution.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, since President Eisenhower delivered his Middle East policy address to Congress on January 5, I have given the text of his message many hours of study and thought. I have also given the report of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 117 conscientious and careful deliberation.

As a new Member of Congress, I am fully aware of the gravity of the situation at hand and appreciate that this issue may well demand the most important decision I shall be called upon to make during the 85th Congress. I therefore offer my remarks in the deepest sincerity of my judgment and in the face of being in disagreement with the majority of my colleagues in this great legislative assembly.

Let me first say without equivocation that I recognize the comparative positions of the Soviet Union and the free nations of the world in the potentially explosive area of the Middle East. I share with the majority of my colleagues in Congress a knowledge of the changes that have taken place both in the political and the economic structures of the several small nations in this area.

Particularly disturbing to me, however, is the inconsistency of reports relating to the positions and relationships of the United States with the Middle East countries. If developments in the Middle East have suddenly reached the emergency status during the past few weeks thus prompting this resolution, then we have not been offered such evidence as would justify this conclusion. On the other hand, if such an emergency exists which necessitates the need for the adoption of this policy, it is my sincere belief that the President already has such power. In either event, I offer that the Members of Congress are available daily and except in rare instances within a few minutes' call should they be summoned to a special session to act upon specific measures that may be demanded. The economic aid which is so vital a part of this resolution might conceivably be required as an emergency measure; but it is my humble and sincere belief that a definition and the direction of such aid be offered before any Member of this body can decide upon such a mammoth expenditure if he is to properly perform those duties which the people in his district might expect of him.

I am confident that my colleagues in this legislative body and particularly the elder statesmen of both parties are aware of the many ramifications of "blank-check" powers provided in this resolution. This awareness has already been repeatedly expressed upon the floor of the House. It naturally follows that those who vote to approve this resolution must have resolved that it is at best a calculated risk. Only history will write the success or failure of this risk if and when this resolution is put into full force and effect.

I should like at this point to call attention to the historic occasions in the past when both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S Truman exercised such broad powers as are now sought through passage of House Joint Resolution 117. Congress later approved by majority vote the actions taken but only after such decisions had been made by Executive order.

If a state of emergency does not exist or at least has not been so declared, approval of this resolution by the Congress would in substance amount to the surrendering of such powers as are provided us under the Constitution. It is to me of primary necessity that we preserve the provisions of the Constitution in protection of the very things which bring us to headlong opposition with the men of the Kremlin. In view of the thoughts expressed in the foregoing statements, I cannot conscientiously bring myself to voting in favor of a foreign policy as established in the resolution offered to the Congress on January 30, 1957.

In summary of my objections to the basic form of House Joint Resolution 117 I offer: First, that the program is admittedly without limitation as to time or area; secondly, that it has phrased in a manner which provides too fluid an interpretation of the demands of both economic aid and employment of the military; and third, that in the absence of a declared emergency that Congress is being asked to abdicate its powers specifically provided under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to record my objection to this resolution and the inability of the House membership to offer amendments to improve House Joint Resolution 117.

I object to the gag rule which prohibits Members of this House to offer amendments to improve House Joint Resolution 117. Although we are denied the right of full discussion and the offering of amendments to the proposed resolution, it is my hope that the other body will have free debate and discussion on this important measure in the separation of the economic aid from the authorization for the President to employ troops in the Middle East.

I am forever cognizant of the problems in the Middle East and have full faith in President Eisenhower's statement as of last October, when he publicly stated, "The best way to win world war III is to prevent it."

The great need of unity on the part of the executive and legislative branches of Government to show the strength of this Nation in combating any Communist movement in the Middle East should deter war.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the resolution and hope and pray that the other body will be able to set aside the economic aid that prevails in this resolution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot find it in my heart to vote for this resolution giving the President authority to send our American youth across the seas to fight and die in what history records as a never-ending quarrel between neighbors thousands of miles from our shores.

Such broad, far-reaching authority is plainly a delegation of power by the Congress not authorized by the Constitution. Such broad warmaking powers vests more power in the hands of one American than any good man such as our present President should want, or a bad one should have.

Let us not forget that with the rapid air travel now available, even if Congress were not in session, should the need occur for emergency action, the Congress could be called into session and in operation within 24 hours after the call of the President.

The President already has the authority to mobilize our troops in the event of an invasion of our shores by land, sea, or air.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I have given very careful thought to the matter of sending troops to the Middle East and the allotment of $400 million in foreign aid to this area. I am sure that every thinking person in America has also carefully deliberated these issues.

The authority to use troops in the Middle East is in my opinion a matter already within the President's jurisdiction. I believe that this is understood although, of course, by having congressional backing of this issue will make for unanimity.

My position with respect to the foreign aid giveaway program is well known to my constituents. This program which has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars first began as a relief measure in the days immediatley following World War II, but has continued as an outright dole in the subsequent years. But for the fact that the proposal dealing with the important Middle East situation will come to the floor of the House under a closed rule, I would surely offer an amendment to strike out the $400 million foreign-aid section. Under the circumstances there is no alternative to vote either for or against the entire measure without amendment and I can do nothing except to vote for it. The situation is highly sensitive and demands immediate action, and the President has made the request of the Congress.

I want it specifically understood that by voting for the Middle East measure I am not in any way endorsing the administration's foreign policy, because I do not agree with many of its features especially as it pertains to foreign aid. In my opinion it would be wise as well as economical to have very thorough studies made of the administration's foreign policy before additional billions of the taxpayers' dollars are expended in the haphazard and unprofitable manner that has been the pattern through the years of the foreign-aid program.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, the resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, before this distinguished body today has as its announced purpose the preservation of peace, but it must be realized that failing in achieving that peace, this resolution would then become the means whereby Congress will have delegated its express authority to declare war. It is because of that delegation to declare war that I oppose the favorable consideration of this resolution.

At the outset of my remarks I would like to pay tribute to our great President and to his principal cabinet officer responsible for the conduct of our foreign affairs, the Honorable John Foster Dulles. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that President Eisenhower with his humility as a man, with his foresight and wisdom as a leader, and with his experience of great and outstanding service to his country would pursue every honorable avenue in the quest of peace before he would commit one American soldier to combat against an enemy. I am also convinced that Secretary Dulles shares with the President an abiding abhorrence of war and has worked selflessly and effectively with integrity and ability to achieve peace and to sustain it on an enduring basis once it was achieved.

It has recently become popular political sport among certain of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to lay charges against our great Secretary of State. These charges are without foundation, they are politically motivated, and they accomplish no purpose but to erroneously impress our enemies in the world with the misapprehension that we are weak and divided within our own house.

Mr. Chairman, such attacks on our national leaders create an uncertainty that is inconsistent with support of this resolution, which is intended to create certainty. Such inconsistency is a matter that must be explained by those who engage in the irresponsible act of unfounded destructive criticism on the one hand, and who, on the other hand, undertake to support an unconstitutional delegation of authority on the pretext that they are attempting to create certainty of retaliation in the minds of any would-be communistic predator.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to make a speech in defense of our great President and his Secretary of State. Their outstanding achievements in international affairs, as evidenced by the record, constitute more than sufficient refutal to their detractors. What I am endeavoring to make clear is that I have the utmost confidence in the ability and patriotism of each of these outstanding Americans. I have served with no other President and with no other Secretary of State in my long service in the Congress of the United States with whom I would be willing to go as far in entrusting complete discretion in the conduct of our international relations.

Mr. Chairman, despite this confidence in our present President's greatness, I must decline to support the resolution that is before the distinguished membership of this great committee. My opposition stems from the conviction that this resolution embodies an unconstitutional delegation of authority expressly vested in the Congress by article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States. My opposition stems from my grave concern over the serious precedent that enactment of the resolution would create. My opposition stems from the fact that this resolution would become a precedent for a later delegation that would be subject to arbitrary abuse and individual caprice by another President. My opposition stems from the fact that this resolution does not represent the only solution to what is admittedly a very grave and serious international problem.

An unconstitutional act establishes a precedent that tends to grow, and when such unconstitutional act embodies an abdication of the responsibilities of the Congress by a delegation to the Chief Executive, such act threatens our liberty as indivduals and jeopardizes our vitality as a Republic. If this resolution is adopted, the Congress will have delegated to the Chief Executive the authority to commit our Nation's youth to combat—combat that will be just as real and just as terrible even though it has not been formally labeled a declared war.

Mr. Chairman, in no instance was the wisdom of our Founding Fathers better evidenced than in the establishment of three coequal branches of our Federal Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. An unconstitutional delegation to the Chief Executive implies the conveying to the executive an opportunity to perform arbitrarily, and perhaps secretly, acts which the Congress should do publicly and according to the legislative procedures established for such action.

Mr. Chairman, our American history is fraught with instances of perilous crises. We have in the past successfully emerged from these crises a greater and stronger nation without abandoning our governmental institutions and without vitiating our Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that a declaration of intent expressed at this time on the part of the Congress to tolerate no Communist intervention in the Middle East would be as an effective deterrent to Communist aggression as the proposed delegation of Congressional responsibility to the Chief Executive. Such a declaration of intent would not have the disadvantage of creating an unconstitutional precedent. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the adoption of House Joint Resolution 117.

Let us be reminded of responsibility by a few words from a distinguished member of the United States Supreme Court, Justice Joseph Story, who served on the United States Supreme Court early in the 19th century. From his Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, first published in 1833, Justice Joseph Story had this to say:

> Let the American youth never forget that they possess a noble inheritance, bought by the toils and sufferings and blood of their ancestors; and capable, if wisely improved and faithfully guarded, of transmitting to their latest posterity all the substantial blessings of life, the peaceful enjoyment of liberty, property, religion, and independence. The structure has been erected by architects of consummate skill and fidelity; its foundations are solid; its compartments are beautiful as well as useful; its arrangements are full of wisdom and order; and its defenses are impregnable from without. It has been reared for immortality if the work of man may justly aspire to such a title. It may, nevertheless, perish in an hour by the folly or corruption or negligence of its only keepers—the people. Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit, and intelligence of the citizens. They fall when the wise are banished from the public councils, because they dare to be honest; and the profligate are rewarded, because they flatter the people in order to betray them.

Mr. Chairman, this noble inheritance must be protected and preserved for future generations.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I voted against the gag or closed rule which prevented any amendments being offered to the House joint resolution. This resolution authorized the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East. It gave authority to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, as well as for our own protection and freedom.

This rule—gag—prevents amendments by any Member of Congress. It means we must accept the word—every line—of one committee of Congress. I have the highest regard for the Foreign Affairs Committee, but they are human and possibly subject to errors. I refuse to believe they have drafted a perfect bill.

It is the right of each and every one of us to be able to present the views of our constituents. If these opinions incorporated in amendments are not in accord with a majority of the Members of this body, let the amendments be defeated, but we should have our views considered and debated and voted upon, "Yes" or "No."

Now, Mr. Chairman, relative to the resolution granting certain powers to the President, the big question is, will the passing of this resolution be a deterrent to war and be of assistance in assuring world peace? I have sincerely tried to be of assistance to our President and to find justification for an affirmative vote. The only justification is hope, hope that the resolution will do that which the State Department promises will be done. An overwhelming majority of the people of my district are against more foreign aid, nor do they want war. We are told by those who have the facts that the adoption of the resolution will be a step in discouraging war. Our President is working toward peace, not war. I believe that if it should become necessary for the President to exercise the authority we have given him to use our Armed Forces, it will still be for Congress to decide whether or not the resulting action is war or whether or not a declaration of war is necessary.

I shall support this resolution because after listening many hours to the debate, both pro and con, I believe that it will decrease rather than increase the danger of war.

The best assurance against war, in my opinion, lies in making crystal clear the fact that we do not propose to stand idly by in the event of Communist military aggression. On the contrary, we are prepared, if necessary, to oppose such aggression with force.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution because I believe that it would be difficult at this time under these conditions to do otherwise in that any other action could result in disastrous consequences and very possibly invite war. This is no time for uncertainty, our position should be clear to the entire world.

We are today in a position of leadership in the free world. We did not seek this position, nor did we desire it but we cannot escape its tremendous responsibilities. We must measure up to those responsibilities in our own interest, as well as the interest of the free world. Let us hope and pray that that which we do will be right.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, like a great many Members of this House, I have serious misgivings and concern about the Middle East resolution which I support today only because of the exigencies of these times, exigencies created principally by mistakes of our Department of State.

How did our present dilemma develop? In June 1956 we forced England to abandon her Suez bases in order to appease Colonel Nasser and restrain him from his threat to fall in with the Kremlin. Colonel Nasser won that round; 6 weeks later he took control of the British bases and moved closer to the Kremlin.

On August 31, 1956, at a news conference, the President renounced the use of force to protect the rights of canal users declaring that the United States was committed to a peaceful settlement of this dispute. With this clarifying information, Colonel Nasser promptly decided it was quite safe for him to reject all proposals to restore the Suez to international control. Colonel Nasser won round two.

Under the pressure of critical oil shortages, the British and French made an effort to take the Suez by force and accomplished their objective. Our Government forced the withdrawal of the British and the French and Colonel Nasser won round three. In displaying the humiliating withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli forces, Colonel Nasser rose higher than ever in the esteem of his people.

We bought peace for a time in the Middle East, but the bill has not yet been tallied. We are so thoroughly bogged down in our Middle East policy that no other course remains but to support the President's declaration in the hope that a just peace will be the result.

It is my sincere hope that economic and military aid will flow to friendly nations in the Middle East, to Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Israel. Turkey and Iran have a common frontier with Russia and block the overland routes between Russia and Turkey. If Communist aggression comes, they are best situated to offer resistance. As the eastern outpost of NATO, Turkey would provide the strongest deterrent to Russian aggression. It is regrettable that economic and military support for Turkey should redound to the personal advantage of Tom Dewey, the hard-working lawyer with a well-heeled client.

Our basic troubles with Egypt result in part from the dangerous ambitions of Colonel Nasser but also because, unlike Russia, we have little basis for trade and commerce with Egypt. The strength of our foreign policy is definitely related to our trade policies—the supreme test of which may come next year when the Reciprocal Trade Act will face its rendezvous with destiny.

It is my hope that the resolution which we provide today will result in free and equal use of the Suez by all nations of the world and that America and the United Nations will insure equality of treatment to Israel and to any other nation which may be disliked by Egypt. Israel must be accorded the right of unrestrained shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba. The United Nations forces halted the combat between the British, the French, the Israeli and the Egyptians; they must remain to assure peaceful use of the Gulf of Aqaba and to insure that shooting does not begin again.

It is my hope that the Middle East aid which we pledge today will not find its way to King Saud for the specific purpose of consolidating his control over his subjugated people. Nor should this aid be given to protect the contractual interests of American investors in Saudi Arabian oil. They collected for the risks they took on "risk" capital, let them take some risks.

Furthermore, we should leave it considerably more up to King Saud to protect his own position, by spending more of his own money for developing Saudi Arabia. We pay him for his oil—let him spend more of his profits on his people and less on himself. Soviet Russia has neither the need nor the money to buy Saud's oil and he has no better customers than Western Europe and America.

It is also my hope that the administration will not pledge our Nation to building the Aswan Dam for Colonel Nasser. At some future time, our Government may well consider economic aid to Egypt as an underdeveloped area, but this aid must come to the Egyptian people and not through Colonel Nasser.
forcing the Soviets into a costly foreign aid program to build the Aswan Dam or other projects, it may be very wise to permit the Soviet entry into our kind of diplomacy. In the final analysis, there may be no better way to weaken Russia and deter Russian aggression than by forcing the Soviets into a costly foreign aid program such as we have carried on during the past generation. There are serious doubts that the Soviet economy could stand that burden very long.

In any event, our foreign aid in the Middle East should be directed to the strengthening of friendly nations about whom we are positively certain—who seek and respect our friendship and who respect the right of our people to determine when and where and to whom we shall provide aid. We must make it clear that our people do not respond to forceful demands based on threats.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I view this resolution without any enthusiasm whatsoever. The reason is that this is too little, much too little, too late, and only vaguely affects the troubles of the area. What the administration has done is to borrow and water down the Truman program of 1948 for comprehensive economic development of the Middle Eastern nations and the Tri-Partite declaration of 1950, which by failure of the present administration's foreign policy, has lapsed. What is needed is much more.

We are told that American foreign policy demands a declaration of solidarity between the Congress and the President. That is true at this time. Ordinarily such would be presumed. Foreign policy is constitutionally almost the exclusive province of the Executive.

The reason for the truth of that statement is less than pleasant to contemplate. Part of it is that Mr. Dulles got himself entangled in another one of his very unfortunate background conferences with some of his newspaper cronies. The result was that the Middle East became a new subject for congressional action. As in his earlier remarks on the subject of the "brinkmanship," Mr. Dulles brought forth, for want of something more original, a new policy which included the old Truman proposals and a warning to the Kremlin that the United States would fight if there were Soviet aggression in the area. Congress was to pass this whole mish-mash under the leadership of the President, with appropriate flights of oratory. The blare of

press agentry was to round out the whole operation into something which everyone would praise down to the tenth generation.

This has been likened to the Monroe Doctrine and other equally important pages of our history. The trouble is that Mr. Dulles disregards the well-known fact of constitutional law that the conduct of foreign policy and the powers of the Commander in Chief reside in the President regardless of prior congressional approval. He disregards existing mutual security treaties in the area. He ignores the obligation which we incurred to act under the United Nations Charter in the event of aggression by any nation at the request of the United Nations. It was known even in the days of President Monroe, when the powers of the President and the Federal Government were regarded to be much more circumscribed than they are today that the President had such constitutional power. The Monroe Doctrine was a manifestation of belief in such powers.

It has been reported that Mr. Dulles did not even consult with the President and the appropriate section in his own department before he released this startling new doctrine. He certainly did not consult the Congress. I first read of the doctrine in the New York Times, which has been the recipient of so many editorial tidbits from our headline-hungry Secretary of State. Certainly in the light of the treatment which was accorded the Congress, which is supposed to vote on this constitutional monstrosity, such a report is not unlikely.

We are told that the Congress must vote out this resolution, post haste, or countries throughout the world, including the Soviet, will regard it as indecision and lack of a firm united foreign policy. To this last proposition there is just enough truth that I must hope this resolution preserves what shreds of American foreign policy remain.

Another fact presents itself for consideration, one still less palatable. It appears that such a declaration will help our friends and allies to recover faith in our foreign policy. I refer to Britain and France who had so little faith in American policy that they decided to go it alone in Suez after decades of close cooperation.

The Suez fiasco is only one example why such a resolution is necessary. In that regrettable affair we caused the humiliation and degradation of our principal allies Britain and France, and for all intents and purposes, removed them from the area. A vacuum was created which America must now fill. We found ourselves supporting Mr. Dulles' friend, Dictator Nasser, and in open alinement with the Soviet Union against our traditional friends and sister democracies, Britain, France, and Israel. By our actions in the area we saved Nasser at a time when he was cowering in fear in a Cairo celler. We restored him to power and prestige, not only in Egypt, but in the Arab world. I hope all note how Mr. Nasser has repaid us for this. He has deliberately stalled opening of the canal, stepped up his hate broadcasts against the West, including America, and has begun dickering for more Soviet arms.

The result of this whole affair, conducted by Mr. Dulles, has been that Britain has had to ask waiver of some $100 million in interest due us on her loans. European industry has shut down or is on reduced output because of oil shortage. Workers are laid off. Britain must reduce defense expenditures, recall her troops from overseas bases, and retrench generally. The obligations which our ally, Britain formerly carried out must be assumed by the United States at a time when we have a record peacetime budget. Of course, the American taxpayer will get the bill for this bungling in the form either of increased taxes or maintenance of the same high level of taxation. In addition the setback to the economies of the free world will have its impact on the American worker and manufacturer.

Mr. Dulles' own testimony reveals the weakness of this resolution.

By his own admission this resolution will have no effect on internal subversion, which is the most likely way of conquest by the Soviet in this day of intercontinental rockets and atomic bombs. Mr. Dulles is so quoted several times in the hearings.

This resolution ignores the real causes of the trouble in the Middle East. The problems of the Gaza Strip and resettlement of 900,000 Arab refugees are disregarded. It does nothing to guarantee free passage through the Straits of Tiran or the Suez Canal. Nothing is proposed to make the states of Syria, Jordan and Egypt live in peace with our sister democracy, Israel. It is silent on a guaranty of borders in the area. According to Mr. Dulles, these matters are reserved for consideration at some future time and place. This is a very grave defect in an already imperfect plan. Worse, according to Mr. Dulles, the resolution does not protect our sister democracy, Israel, from Arab attack.

An added weakness of this resolution is that we in Congress grandly settle upon the President powers which he already possesses. We establish a precedent which will delight the backers of constitutional amendments limiting the power of the President to make treaties and to conduct foreign affairs. In a worse fashion, we abdicate the power of the Congress to declare war, if the contention of the Secretary and the others who have so forcefully pushed this proposal, is correct. Thus in one cut we are striking at the powers of both the Presidency and the Congress.

My vote on this matter is not a vote of confidence in the administration or its conduct of American foreign policy. Nor in any sense is my vote a ratification of the ineffective foreign policy which has characterized this administration.

Quite the contrary, it is a scathing indictment of the administration's foreign policy that the Congress should have to pass a resolution giving the administration power it already has, to rescue that administration from a position into which it has fallen by its own ineptness.

This is not a real foreign policy as many have contended. It is only a first tottering step in that direction. My hope is that it will some day soon blossom into such a foreign policy. Indeed, I join my colleagues in demanding that the administration form an intelligent foreign policy, with a sincere and discerning approach to all of the problems of the area which the administration has so long overlooked.

I might comment briefly on the exultant remarks of the President and the Secretary of State on the peaceful character of the Middle East. I would be uncharitable to say that the remarks which I quote below were deliberate falsehoods, calculated to deceive the American voter. Still they give me genuine cause to wonder how the situation has changed in such a short time to demand such extraordinary action as the House is asked to take today. I wonder how many Americans feel the same reaction.

On August 19, 1954, at Springfield, Ill., the President gave the American people this gem of candor:

> The long and dreary quarrels in the Suez region have been composed with the greatest possible promise for the security and prosperity of the West, including the United States of America.

On September 23, 1954, at the Hollywood Bowl, the President made another appraisal of the Middle East situation:

> At Suez ancient enmities and quarrels involving two of our friends have been resolved. Peace has been preserved. Progress has been assured in an area vital to Western civilization.

On October 11, 1956, the President was asked the following question at a press conference:

> Mr. President, dispatches from both London and Paris reflect the rising feeling of anti-Americanism among our allies, apparently feeling that the administration's foreign policy is being inhibited by election-year conditions. My question is: Do you think there is any basis for such a feeling abroad?

He answered in the following language:

> No, I do not * * * we must be talking about the Suez Canal affair because that is the one that has been alleged to be creating this difficulty. Now, I must tell you this: I asked the Secretary of State this morning—he came in to see me—whether he had any intimation from anyone in British officialdom whom he met that they were dissatisfied with our stand in this thing or thought that we had been vacillating and not carrying forward as we stated * * * he hasn't and I assure you I haven't.

On October 21, Secretary Dulles said in a television interview that the "Big Three have developed common policy to an amazing degree in the Near East."

The last quotation from the President appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of October 13, 1956. It is characteristic of careless election-time remarks fed the American people:

> I have an announcement. I have got the best announcement that I could possibly make to America tonight.
>
> The progress made in the settlement of the Suez dispute this afternoon at the United Nations is most gratifying. Egypt, Britain, and France have met through their Foreign Ministers and agreed on a set of principles on which to negotiate, and it looks like here is a very great crisis that is behind us.

Rather absurd aspects of the proposal are the assurances of Secretary Dulles and the President that the power for the use of American troops granted in the resolution will not be used without consulting Congress first if that branch of Government is in session. If the Congress is not in session, we are informed that the Congress will be called into session to consider the problem, either before or after the troops are used. Under such circumstances the real need for such a resolution becomes much less clear.

Another manifestation of the futility of the whole Middle East program on which we are asked to vote is well outlined by the editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News of January 27, 1957, which shows that the President and Secretary of State very frankly do not know how this money is to be expended. We have reason to believe that with the aid of former Representative Richards, who is going to make a study of the needs in the area, some intelligent program will be reached. Certainly the Secretary's testimony shows that he has no idea of how these funds will be spent. This is a terrible way to legislate: To ask for money without the vaguest idea of how it is to be spent; to make threats against a danger which according to Secretary Dulles is not very real at this time; and to threaten to defend an area with weapons which conceivably could turn the whole region into radioactive wasteland. Following is the editorial:

MIDDLE EAST MYSTERY

While the administration intensifies its efforts to get quick congressional endorsement of the Middle East doctrine it appears to be trying also to make United States commitments under that doctrine as ambiguous as possible.

The President told reporters that if Congress refuses him the authority to spend $200 million on economic aid in the Middle East, "it would destroy what we are really trying to do." At the same time he not only declined to say what the money might be spent on but asserted that he would not know until after a mission headed by former Representative Richards had made a study of needs in the area.

Before a Senate committee, Secretary of State Dulles was more mysterious. Implying that there were plans for spending the money, Mr. Dulles told Senators that to disclose them now would "telegraph our punch" and so nullify the effect of the program.

On the military side, those trying to discover how, where and with what we might possibly intervene in the Middle East were twice rebuffed. The President quite properly refused to guess about hypothetical situations but he did indicate that military action by us might necessarily involve the use of "small" atomic weapons. These weapons, he said, are "an almost routine part of our equipment nowadays and you would almost have to use them, the way our forces are organized in that area."

This is no secret, yet it is the first time the administration has publicly related its military undertakings under the Eisenhower Doctrine to the available military means. The implications may well prove shocking in Congress and among the Arab States. It is impossible to believe that any nation forewarned of our intention to use atomic weapons to save it would invite our assistance. Under the doctrine we are pledged to give no help unless asked.

Congressional questioning so far has pinned nothing down. The doctrine is not reduced to bluff but it is exhibited increasingly as a statement of what we would like the world to believe we will do rather than as a program for action even in outline. How useful that may be will depend entirely on whether the administration now follows its own logic and puts us in position to make good on the obligations it accepts. A minimum need would seem to be an armed force that could operate as police rather than as nuclear destroyers.

Equally discouraging to one who supports the administration on this resolution is the present conduct of our foreign affairs under the direction, we suppose, of Mr. Dulles. To show how vacillating and generally discouraging that policy has been, I am inserting another editorial from the Detroit (Mich.) News of January 14, 1957, which shows precisely how we have alienated first one side and then another in the area.

LOST IN WONDERLAND

A chart in Newsweek magazine throws more light on the current debate over Middle East policy than anything we have seen. It tries to show graphically the ups and downs of our relations with the Arabs and with our allies as the result of our successive diplomatic moves. The picture is of two aimless zigzags leading nowhere.

In 1954 we pressed the British to get out of Suez, gaining slight favor with the Arabs, losing it with the British. We then pushed the Baghdad Pact, alienating Arabs, encouraging our allies. Both trends were promptly reversed when we refused to join the pact ourselves.

In quick succession, we then agreed to finance the Aswan Dam for Egypt, stalled on the agreement while Nasser bought arms from Russia, refused to sell arms to Israel, and cancelled the Aswan agreement.

When Nasser seized the Suez Canal we supported our European allies with Secretary Dulles' strong proposal for a users' association. But from this high point of decision we steadily retreated. When Mr. Dulles would not stand firmly by his own proposal, the British and French took things into their own hands and the United States found itself joining Russia and Egypt in censuring the invaders. We reached there the peak of popularity in the Arab world and the nadir of our relations with Europe.

As we start now on another zag with the Eisenhower doctrine, the record can be searched in vain for any guiding purpose. We have succeeded demonstrably in currying favor alternatively with first one side and then the other. The net result, one suspects, is that neither side likes us much or trusts us at all.

The record is clear on another point: That none of the basic troubles in the Middle East has been due to Communist intervention. All have resulted directly from the removal of European power and the consequent scramble of the newly independent states to mark out their own spheres of influence. United States intervention has intensified the anarchy by encouraging all the contestants to believe that under unspecified conditions they might enjoy American support.

The trouble is we have no defined national interest. A passion for peace, a hatred for communism and principles of abstract justice are simply not enough to shape a consistent diplomacy. What, for instance, is the peaceful, anti-Communist, just way to determine Israel's borders and guarantee her integrity, or restrain Nasser's ambitions, or stabilize Jordan?

These problems will never yield to moral generalization. To solve them we have to take sides and we have to take risks, far beyond those the new policy contemplates.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who support this measure do so only because we realize that the situation, due to the administration's muddling, has reached such a point that we must do so, not because of any belief that this will in any way help the situation.

In conclusion, I want to say that if the administration is given the power in this resolution which it so earnestly seeks, I hope Mr. Dulles will get down to serious business. The patience of our people with him is growing short. I hope that he will begin to try to restore peace to the Middle East area by attacking the real causes of trouble. I expect him to stay home in America and tend to this important business and forget his background conferences and traipsing around the world. If he does not, the President should dispense with his services in favor of someone who understands the responsibility of the high office of Secretary of State.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am casting an affirmative vote on this resolution because I feel that it is the course that will best insure peace. I do not by this vote condone the past failures in foreign policy of this administration, nor do I believe that the present resolution can be a proper foundation for a lasting solution to the problems inherent in the Middle East. Yet, Congress has been asked for this authority and to refuse the request would be viewed by the free world as a refusal by this country to shoulder its responsibilities.

I can only express the hope that wise use of the authority granted by this resolution will be used by the administration to achieve the objectives which we all seek.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, before I came to the House on January 3 last I realized that on many votes the question before us would not be black and white. I knew that often the choice would be hard. It is my hope that not many votes will cause me the regrets invoked by this one.

I voted for the resolution because, of course, I am behind the President as our Commander in Chief. He is in the best position to know about the dangers confronting our Nation. It is his duty to use our Armed Forces where necessary in the national interest. We have long decided that Western Europe had to be sustained and defended. The oil from the Middle East is an essential if Western Europe is to survive. A breakdown in the economy in Western Europe would make those nations ripe for Communist subversion.

The President in asking the Congress for this resolution was asking us to do an unnecessary thing. He was compromising the constitutional flexibility of his great office. It is as though a squad leader in combat turned to one of his men, and asked, "Are you with me?" The question was uncalled for, but, once asked, has to be answered affirmatively.

The great danger of the resolution's passage is that the administration may try to represent that it now has a foreign policy for the Middle East. Permission to use troops, with the due safeguards of keeping in close touch with Congress and

the United Nations, is nothing the President did not have before under the conditions stated.

As for the $200 million already appropriated and from which certain strings were detached, I have no objections, assuming we spend it as is intended. I know we need money to be spent at home. But, most of all, we need peace. Despite examples of flagrant waste and stupidity in previous expenditures, it is generally agreed that America has used its great wealth on the whole effectively in the interests of peace. I have no difficulty choosing between dollars, on the one hand, and the lives of our boys and the safety of our country, on the other.

True, much of this money may be spent so that it winds up in hands of persons who neither need or deserve it under our moral code. I am in sympathy with the masses in those countries who need help in rising from their squalor and misery. But even if we had the money we cannot effect social changes that interfere with sovereign governments, at least not directly. Moreover, the chief and only justification for our spending the taxpayer's dollars is that our national welfare is helped accordingly. The test is whether our position of strength for peace in the world is helped or hindered, not whether the social and economic conditions of a particular country are or are not assisted.

The most galling aspect of this resolution goes back to the campaign. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, how the President, the Vice President and many others in the Republican Party set themselves up as the great peacemakers, assuring the voters that we were strong and that our foreign policy had brought peace. We were specifically informed that the situation in the Middle East was excellent. Now we know different.

It is error for anyone to interpret my vote for the resolution as any kind of endorsement for the kind of policies Mr. Dulles has sought to establish. There can no longer be confidence in Mr. Dulles in the United States or elsewhere.

This is not the occasion to weigh Mr. Dulles. Our colleagues in the other body are arranging for that overdue operation. My sole purpose today was to make it clear that my vote for the resolution was a reluctant regretful vote and that I am full of apprehensions about the ultimate results of this resolution both in the Middle East and in connection with the constitutional powers of the President.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, for many reasons I am voting against the passage of House Joint Resolution 117, a resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East.

In so voting, I am not motivated by petty, partisan, political motives. Rather, Mr. Chairman, I am moved by a constant and earnest desire for peace.

I am voting against this resolution only after long and careful deliberation of every facet of every implication of the President's request for this authority. Such a request—especially in these troubled times—cannot and should not be lightly refused. But it must be refused when it becomes evident that the authority requested already resides in the Office of the President of the United States and that the passage of this resolution, as it is presently worded, might lead to confusion and to an ultimate weakening of the powers of that great office.

It is greatly to be regretted that the Members of the House were deprived, by the closed rule on debate and amendment, from perfecting this resolution and from clarifying it in such a way that its meaning would be clear, unmistakable and consonant with the adoption of a bold, unequivocal and constructive foreign policy by the United States in the Middle East. I hope that this resolution will be so perfected in the Senate through full debate and amendment that, when it comes back to this House for final action, it will be in such a form that I can support it and vote for it.

But in its present form this resolution is not clear. Testimony as to what it means—how far it goes—what action it would authorize that is not already authorized—whether and in what manner it will be implemented—these are all questions which the present form of the resolution does not answer. The testimony presented before committee and the discussions I have heard on the floor of this House have only served to emphasize how confusing and how subject to misunderstanding the present wording of this resolution is.

I am firmly convinced that the President of the United States already possesses the military powers he seeks through House Joint Resolution 117. If this were not so, then we would be in the position of admitting to ourselves and to the world that the Office of the President of the United States is not endowed with sufficient powers to act swiftly and decisively in emergency situations to protect by military action the vital security interests of our Nation. If this resolution seeks to do more—if it seeks to delegate to the President the powers vested in the Congress to declare war—then obviously I, for one, cannot vote to strip the Congress of so vital a power which, by the explicit terms of the Constitution, is vested in the Congress, and in the Congress alone.

It must be remembered that this resolution is not phrased in terms of acknowledging the existence of the power in the President to take military action in emergencies to protect the vital interests of the United States. The resolution, instead, is phrased as though new powers are to be vested in the President upon the passage of this resolution. Such a phraseology may well come back to plague us in the years to come when it will be argued that, without such a resolution, the President is powerless to act.

I am concerned also with the basis upon which this resolution has been requested from the Congress, and the unseemly haste with which it is sought to pressure this resolution through to adoption by the Congress.

The facts controvert the need for such ill-advised haste.

The resolution is aimed at the use of the military might of the United States against "overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism." And yet, every scintilla of evidence brought before the House in support of this resolution and of its hasty adoption points unmistakably to the fact that international communism is not seeking to take over the nations of the Middle East by means of "armed aggression."

The present and even greater danger of subjugation of these nations by Communist-inspired subversion is not even covered by this resolution. There is still another area of possible aggression that this resolution does not even seek to comprehend within its terms. I refer to aggression by one nation in the Middle East area against another nation in that area where neither nation is controlled by international communism. It is in this latter situation that there appears to be the greatest present danger of armed aggression. And yet this proposed resolution ignores this danger as though, ostrich-like, by ignoring it, it will cease to exist. By the very admission of the proponents of this resolution, the danger of armed aggression by a nation controlled by international communism does not today exist. Why, then, the rush for the adoption of this resolution?

A lack of coherence in purpose and objective pervades this entire resolution and the reasons that have been advanced for its passage.

The confusion is exhibited in more ways than the President seeking the grant from Congress of military powers which he already has in order to meet a danger from armed aggression which the Secretary of State says is not imminent.

By the adoption of this resolution we are asked to give to the President a blank check in the use of military powers of undetermined size and strength against nations to be determined at some future time by the President under criteria so vague as to permit of any interpretation.

We are also asked to authorize an additional blank check for the expenditure of up to $200 million for the purposes of the resolution without any legal restraint whatsoever.

We who have been asked to vote in favor of this resolution have not been given the slightest idea of how these sums are to be expended. Are these sums to be used to continue the arms build-up in the Middle East? Are they to be used to eradicate some of the evils of poverty, hunger, and disease that make many of these nations of the Middle East such fertile breeding grounds for Communist infiltration? Are these sums to be used to replenish the private funds of feudal dictatorships in the Middle East so that their personal retinues may continue to function undiminished by loss of oil revenue? Are the funds to be used to strengthen the economic and social status of the peoples under the sway of these dictatorships?

We have been given neither the answers to these questions nor any inkling of the directions which any new policy which may be formulated will take. Indeed, we have no assurance that a policy

will be evolved, or whether we will continue to stumble from crisis to crisis.

We are all aware—painfully aware—of the troubling issues of this troubled crossroads of the world. Equitable and statesmanlike solutions must be evolved with respect to the Suez crisis, the Arab-Israel tensions, and the refugee problems. This resolution—and the testimony presented in its support—offer no program for the solution of these issues. But more than that, there is not exhibited an awareness that the problems of the Middle East are part and parcel of the problems the United States confronts throughout the world. We cannot continue to subdivide the world into segments and treat them as unrelated to the other. We cannot continue to ignore the true role of the United Nations when it suits our purposes—and then pay pious lip service to its existence when we believe we can gain some temporary advantage thereby.

I must point out, Mr. Chairman, that the policy enunciated by the proposed resolution is so close to a policy of the unilateral use of force which we so recently condemned—and rightly condemned—when adopted by our Allies—France, Great Britain, and Israel—as to make the two almost undistinguishable.

If we are to condemn the use and threat of force—if we are to condemn the "go-it-alone" philosophy that our allies used just a few short months ago, let us not ourselves propose such a course of action for ourselves.

What must be formulated is a foreign policy for the United States that is based on the high moral principles by which America must be motivated. We must put our trust in those principles and adhere to them vigorously, judging any proposed course of action in their light. The hopes of the peoples of the world for peace do not lie in the use of force. They never have and they never will.

These, then, are but a few of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I am voting against House Joint Resolution 117. My vote cannot and should not be interpreted as meaning that I will not support a properly phrased resolution expressing the will of the Congress in this matter, or that I will not give full and enthusiastic support to all measures needed to carry out a realistic leadership role for the United States in world affairs.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that quick and emphatic endorsement by the House of Representatives of President Eisenhower's Middle East resolution should serve to strengthen the policies on which the best interests and the future welfare of the United States and the entire free world are based.

It was difficult for me, as a mother and as a lawmaker, to make a decision on a matter upon which may well rest the question of war or peace. I am casting my vote only after giving deep study and thought to all of the enormous implications of the Middle East crisis. My vote is for the resolution because I am convinced this is the only course left to follow in this strife-torn area of the world.

In doing so, I realize many serious questions are involved in this momentous foreign policy decision. I know there are those, both in Congress and throughout our land, who have had misgivings about certain aspects of this resolution. I can understand such views, for this is a grave decision affecting the lives and the future welfare of every American.

The American people, however, have shown their deep faith in President Eisenhower's leadership. That faith has been based, in large measure, upon the President's unquestioned and determined seeking of world peace, and on his leadership which has maintained an honorable peace in an explosive world.

I am certain that all of us in this Chamber today know that it is not the authority of Congress to make foreign policy. That power is vested, by the Constitution, in the President, and to infringe upon it is to invite chaos in affairs of state.

President Eisenhower already has announced to the world this policy regarding the Middle East. It is frightening to contemplate the worldwide repercussions if we in the House of Representatives today rebuke the President in his announced policy. Such an action would be tantamount to a vote of no confidence—and it would mean an open invitation to the Communist masters in the Kremlin to move further, and with bolder steps, into this area of the world.

On the other hand, by emphatic passage of this resolution today, Members of the House, who are, indeed, representatives of all the people of America, can give strength and solidarity to a declaration of purpose and courage which no potential aggressor can ever miscalculate or fail to understand.

This resolution is a positive notice of our intention and our will to the Soviet Union—the one nation which unquestionably has ideas of aggression and conquest—that the United States will give the full weight of its support to the little nations that want to be free.

These small nations, if they are to remain a part of the free world, must have such assurance that they will not be abandoned, to face Soviet aggression helpless and alone.

This resolution gives such assurance. It will, in my estimation, help strengthen the hands of the administration in its efforts to bring peace and stability to the Middle East.

During the past weeks, I have listened to much of the testimony on the resolution before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have studied all of the testimony at length. I believe one of the most clearly defined statements in all this testimony was made by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when he outlined three basic objectives of our policy in the Middle East.

I believe it worth while to briefly review these objectives.

First, Admiral Radford said, the nations of the Middle East must be kept independent of Communist domination.

Second, the strategic positions and transit rights in this area must be available to the free world.

Third, the resources, strategic positions and transit rights must be kept from slipping behind the Iron Curtain.

The resolution upon which we are acting today is a genuine, bold, and positive effort to make certain that these objectives are maintained, and that the spread of Communist aggression be checked.

We cannot follow a defensive course of appeasement in our foreign policy and win our fight against Communist ideologies. This has been proven in the past by the very fact that every time we have taken a positive policy position, such as in the Formosa declaration, the Kremlin leaders have backed down.

President Eisenhower has sought this resolution because of his firm belief that it will be a deterrent to war. I am certain the prayers and faith of the American people are with him in this decision.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make known my position as one in favor of House Joint Resolution 117, authorizing the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East.

From the debate we have had on this measure and based upon my own attendance at the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee and its executive sessions, it is clear that the measure does not deal with the basic tensions in the area. For that reason I felt compelled, as did many of our colleagues, to oppose the adoption by this House of a gag rule forbidding the consideration of any amendments to the measure as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the forces of international communism are equipped and ready to capitalize on existing tensions, to foster new ones and to use force whenever it suits their policy. It is essential, therefore, that the evil forces of communism be confronted with a declaration by the President and the Congress of the United States which we hope will have the effect of deterring the Kremlin and any nation controlled by it in that area from aggression.

I hope that this measure will have a psychological effect not only upon the Kremlin and those nations in the area which are falling under the domination and control of communism, but also on the Eisenhower administration and on the Congress itself. The deliberations and the action by this House should convince the administration that this is only a first step and that further action by our Government must be taken.

For that reason many of us on the committee felt that the committee report should contain language making this clear. Although language which I suggested for inclusion in the report was stronger and more far reaching in this respect, I was pleased with the decision which we made to incorporate the following language on page 4 of the report:

> The broad purpose and policy of the resolution is set forth in the preamble. The resolution does not set forth a detailed plan or program for dealing with all the major problems in the Middle East. It deals with courses of action relating to immediate military and economic threats. Other basic problems causing tension in the area are not dealt with in the resolution. The solution of the Arab-Israel controversy, the resettlement of refugees, the reopening of the Suez Canal with

the establishment of adequate safeguards for the interests of its users, and other problems, are of grave importance and should be given continued attention by the Executive.

Positive and comprehensive measures for dealing with the fundamental problems of the Middle East should be prepared and presented by the Executive to the United Nations and to the Congress. Sufficient legislative authority already exists for the settlement of many phases of these problems. Our country should lead in boldly pursuing and implementing policies and programs to bring peace, security, and economic stability to the Middle East.

While I favor the resolution for the reasons which I have stated, I deplore the fact that it does not deal with the causes of tension enumerated in our committee report. It seems to me that, if there were contained in the resclution and made evident therein that we act solely on the basis of principle as it applies to all nations rather than to any nation or group of nations, it would be very salutary.

I believe if this Nation insisted that Israel be permitted the use of the Suez Canal, if this Nation insisted that those countries preventing Israel from using the Straits of Tiran be condemned, if this Nation insisted that those nations that endanger peace by provoking its neighbors into retaliation be condemned, if this Nation insisted that those nations who refuse to admit citizens of all nations of the world into their countries because of religion also be condemned our standing would be on firmer ground than it is today. Unless we insist upon such action, we dishonor ourselves.

Were these thoughts in some manner incorporated in this resolution, it is my firm belief that there would be unanimity in the Congress in its favor. I sincerely hope that the other body will cover this situation somehow. It is my belief that were a firm position taken to the effect that aid would not be granted to those countries surrounding Israel, the center of tension, unless a negotiated peace between the Arab States and Israel were consummated, those Arab countries who refuse to admit the existence of Israel would realize that this country truly fosters a peaceful solution of all controversies and thereby seeks to remove a threat to world peace.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 117 omits much which I would like to see included in it. Since it is clear, however, that we recognize this as only a beginning, I feel it is better than nothing in view of the precarious state of affairs throughout the area. I have, therefore, no alternative but to support the measure.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with no firsthand knowledge of the Middle East, I would not presume to speak as an authority, nor do I harbor any illusions that, as a freshman Member of this distinguished body, I could influence any of my good colleagues in the House to join with me in supporting House Joint Resolution 117.

I rise only to outline very briefly my own position on this grave question. I cannot say that I am in full accord with all the provisions of this resolution. As a matter of fact, I am very much opposed to section 3, which grants the administration unlimited authority to use funds already appropriated up to the extent of $200 million in this area. I believe that my opposition to this section can best be reflected, however, in my negative votes on future appropriation bills where I will have a voice.

The resolution could have been strengthened with a specific statement that, upon request of the nation concerned, all authority vested in sections 1 and 2 would be employed to combat the danger and threat of internal subversion.

Notwithstanding these objections, I support the resolution because I feel the good points far outweigh the bad. It is imperative that the Congress join with the President in a firm military declaration of our position in the area so as to preclude the chance of the Kremlin miscalculating it. I am convinced that passage of the so-called Formosan resolution, at a time when the Chinese Reds were poised to launch an all-out attack against the island fortress, was the sole factor in an easing of tension in that area. Had there been a similar declaration of our military position with respect to South Korea in 1950, I dare say the Reds would never have risked the invasion of South Korea.

To those who object to the resolution on constitutional grounds that "Congress shall declare war," I say that when the Constitution was written better than 150 years ago, transportation was such and scientific development at a stage where many weeks could be spent debating a proposal to declare war without endangering the security of the country. Today, the Congress could be obliterated and the entire country devastated in just the amount of time it takes to call the roll of the House of Representatives.

It is a terrible thing to talk about, gentlemen, but I believe it points up the need for a forward look—some real vision, if you please—and I, for one, support the President in this declaration as a means of deterring that which we might anticipate happening without its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, and pursuant to House Resolution 123, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin moves that House Joint Resolution 117 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 45, noes 191.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were: Yeas, 355; nays, 61; answering "present," 2; not voting, 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—355

Abbitt	Chenoweth	Frelinghuysen
Adair	Chiperfield	Friedel
Addonizio	Christopher	Fulton
Albert	Clark	Garmatz
Alexander	Coad	Gary
Allen, Calif.	Coffin	Gathings
Allen, Ill.	Cole	Gavin
Andrews	Colmer	George
Anfuso	Cooley	Gordon
Arends	Cooper	Granahan
Ashley	Corbett	Grant
Aspinall	Coudert	Gray
Auchincloss	Cramer	Green, Pa.
Avery	Cretella	Gregory
Ayres	Cunningham, Iowa	Griffin
Bailey	Cunningham, Nebr.	Griffiths
Baker	Curtin	Gubser
Baldwin	Curtis, Mass.	Gwinn
Baring	Curtis, Mo.	Hagen
Barrett	Dague	Hale
Bass, N. H.	Davis, Tenn.	Halleck
Bates	Dawson, Ill.	Harden
Baumhart	Dawson, Utah	Hardy
Beamer	Delaney	Harris
Becker	Dellay	Harrison, Nebr.
Beckworth	Dempsey	Harrison, Va.
Belcher	Dennison	Harvey
Bennett, Fla.	Denton	Haskell
Bennett, Mich.	Derounian	Hays, Ark.
Bentley	Devereux	Healey
Berry	Dies	Hébert
Betts	Diggs	Henderson
Blitch	Dingell	Herlong
Boggs	Dixon	Heselton
Boland	Dollinger	Hess
Bolling	Donohue	Hiestand
Bolton	Dooley	Hill
Bonner	Dorn, N. Y.	Hillings
Bow	Dowdy	Hoeven
Boykin	Doyle	Holland
Boyle	Durham	Holmes
Breeding	Dwyer	Holt
Brooks, La.	Eberharter	Holtzman
Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson	Horan
Broomfield	Elliott	Hosmer
Brown, Ga.	Engle	Huddleston
Brown, Mo.	Evins	Hull
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Hyde
Broyhill	Farbstein	Ikard
Budge	Fascell	Jackson
Burleson	Feighan	James
Bush	Fenton	Jarman
Byrd	Fino	Jenkins
Byrne, Pa.	Fisher	Jennings
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Johansen
Canfield	Fogarty	Johnson
Cannon	Forand	Jonas
Carnahan	Forrester	Jones, Ala.
Carrigg	Fountain	Jones, Mo.
Cederberg	Frazier	Karsten
Celler		Kean
Chamberlain		Kearney

Kearns	Moulder	Scrivner
Keating	Mumma	Scudder
Kee	Murray	Seely-Brown
Kelly, N. Y.	Natcher	Selden
Keogh	Neal	Shelley
Kilburn	Nimtz	Sheppard
Kilday	Norblad	Shuford
Kilgore	Norrell	Sieminski
King	O'Brien, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Kirwan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Kitchin	O'Hara, Ill.	Sisk
Kluczynski	O'Neill	Smith, Calif.
Knox	Osmers	Smith, Miss.
Laird	Ostertag	Smith, Va.
Landrum	Patman	Spence
Lane	Patterson	Springer
Lanham	Pelly	Staggers
Lankford	Perkin	Stauffer
Latham	Pfost	Sullivan
LeCompte	Philbin	Taber
Lesinski	Pilcher	Talle
Lipscomb	Pillion	Taylor
Long	Poage	Teague, Calif.
Loser	Poff	Teller
McConnell	Porter	Tewes
McCormack	Powell	Thompson, N. J.
McCulloch	Preston	Thompson, Tex.
McDonough	Price	Thomson, Wyo.
McFall	Prouty	Thornberry
McGregor	Rabaut	Tollefson
McIntire	Radwan	Trimble
McIntosh	Rains	Tuck
McMillan	Ray	Udall
Macdonald	Rees, Kans.	Ullman
Machrowicz	Reuss	Vanik
Mack, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Pelt
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Pa.	Van Zandt
Madden	Riehlman	Vinson
Magnuson	Riley	Vorys
Mahon	Roberts	Vursell
Mailliard	Robsion, Ky.	Wainwright
Marshall	Rodino	Walter
Martin	Rogers, Colo.	Watts
Matthews	Rogers, Fla.	Weaver
May	Rogers, Mass.	Westland
Meader	Rooney	Wharton
Merrow	Roosevelt	Whitener
Michel	Sadlak	Widnall
Miller, Calif.	Santangelo	Wigglesworth
Miller, Md.	St. George	Willis
Miller, N. Y.	Saund	Wilson, Calif.
Mills	Saylor	Withrow
Minshall	Schenck	Wolverton
Moore	Scherer	Wright
Morano	Schwengel	Young
Morgan	Scott, N. C.	Younger
Moss	Scott, Pa.	Zelenko

NAYS—61

Abernethy	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Minn.
Alger	Gross	Polk
Andersen, H. Carl	Haley	Reed
	Hays, Ohio	Robeson, Va.
Anderson, Mont.	Hemphill	Rogers, Tex.
	Hoffman	Rutherford
Ashmore	Holifield	Sheehan
Barden	Jensen	Sikes
Bass, Tenn.	Keeney	Siler
Blatnik	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Bosch	Krueger	Smith, Wis.
Bray	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Brownson	McCarthy	Thomas
Burdick	McGovern	Utt
Byrne, Ill.	McVey	Whitten
Chudoff	Mason	Wier
Church	Metcalf	Williams, Miss.
Collier	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Ga.	Morris	Winstead
Dorn, S. C.	Multer	Yates
Flynt	Nicholson	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Clevenger O'Konski

NOT VOTING—14

Andresen, August H.	Ford	Reece, Tenn.
	Judd	Rivers
Bowler	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Buckley	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Chelf	Passman	Williams, N. Y.

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Clevenger against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Passman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. BURLESON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on House Joint Resolution 117.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight February 1 to file a report on the urgent deficiency appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to reserve all points of order on the bill?

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR THE DEMOCRATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to have been chosen to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a proposed program for the Democrats in the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress. This program has been endorsed by 80 of my colleagues.

This program was first announced on January 8, prior to the state of the Union and budget messages.

The program covers foreign policy and national defense, immigration, civil rights, improved civil service, education, health and housing, taxes, labor, business and industry, agriculture, public works, resources, atomic energy, veterans benefits, and government operations.

The President's state of the Union and budget messages recommended the passage of a number of the proposals contained in the program we are recommending. Among the President's recommendations, for instance, were revision of the immigration laws, civil rights legislation, aid to school construction, revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act, atomic energy, and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

The proposed program for Democrats in the House of Representatives in this Congress goes beyond the administration's recommendations in a number of areas including the treatment and compensation of Government employees, revision of the labor relations law, housing, revision of the tax laws, tax relief for small business, an improved unemployment program, assistance to industry in depressed areas, and the revision of farm legislation. The program also calls for a repudiation of the administration's partnership approach to the development of natural resources, and its replacement by what the signers of the proposed program describe as a return to the historic resources development partnership, including farmer cooperatives, public power districts, private enterprise, and the Federal Government.

The program also calls for congressional action to provide for greater responsibility in the executive offices and action to make clearer the administration's accountability to Congress and the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the signers of this proposed program are convinced that if a sufficient number of the so-called modern Republicans join in support of the program there will be no difficulty in securing passage of legislation to carry it out.

Signers of the proposed program for the Democrats in the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress are STEWART L. UDALL; JOHN E. MOSS; JOHN F. SHELLEY; JOHN J. MCFALL; B. F. SISK; JAMES ROOSEVELT; CECIL R. KING; CHET HOLIFIELD; CLYDE DOYLE; D. S. SAUND; BYRON G. ROGERS; WAYNE N. ASPINALL; GEORGE P. MILLER; GRACIE PFOST; WILLIAM L. DAWSON; BARRATT O'HARA; JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN; JAMES B. BOWLER; THOMAS S. GORDON; SIDNEY R. YATES; CHARLES A. BOYLE; RAY J. MADDEN; WINFIELD K. DENTON; J. FLOYD BREEDING; CARL D. PERKINS; EDWARD P. BOLAND; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.; LOUIS C. RABAUT; JOHN D. DINGELL; JOHN LESINSKI, JR.; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY; JOHN A. BLATNIK; ROY W. WIER; COYA KNUTSON; FRANK M. KARSTEN; LEONOR K. SULLIVAN; A. S. J. CARNAHAN; GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER; LEE METCALF; LEROY H. ANDERSON; PETER W. RODINO, JR.; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO; FRANK

THOMPSON, JR.; LESTER HOLTZMAN; VICTOR L. ANFUSO; EUGENE J. KEOGH; EDNA F. KELLY; EMANUEL CELLER; ABRAHAM J. MULTER; JOHN J. ROONEY; ALFRED E. SANTANGELO; LEONARD FARBSTEIN; LUDWIG TELLER; HERBERT ZELENKO; JAMES C. HEALEY; ISIDORE DOLLINGER; LEO W. O'BRIEN; WAYNE L. HAYS; CHARLES A. VANIK; THOMAS L. ASHLEY; AL ULLMAN; EDITH GREEN; CHARLES O. PORTER; WILLIAM A. BARRETT; KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN; JAMES A. BYRNE; EARL CHUDOFF; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER; GEORGE M. RHODES; ELMER J. HOLLAND; GEORGE S. MCGOVERN; DON MAGNUSON; HENRY S. REUSS; LESTER R. JOHNSON; CLAIR ENGLE.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR THE DEMOCRATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 85TH CONGRESS

For the first time since 1848, when party designation was vague and ill-defined, the voters of the United States have not given the President-elect a Congress of his own party. This situation is especially significant so far as the House of Representatives—the people's branch of the Government of the United States—is concerned. It indicates approval of the record of the 84th Congress, controlled by Democrats, and approval of the program projected by the Democratic candidates in the campaign of 1956.

We believe it important that the projected program of the majority of the party in control of the House of Representatives be publicly stated at the beginning of the first session of this Congress. The statement which follows contains proposals which are within the range of authority and of the responsibilities of the House of Representatives. It presents a program which is, we believe, supported by a majority of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives and also by a majority of those voters among the citizens of the United States who in the last election voted to elect this Democratic majority.

FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

We favor the maintenance of adequate defense forces and believe that this can best be accomplished by maintaining balance among the three branches of the armed services. We believe, also, that unless the world situation improves significantly, there should be no reduction of the personnel in the armed services. We will support legislation and appropriations necessary to accomplish these purposes.

We will continue to give strong and consistent support to the United Nations. We urge the administration to work through this agency whenever feasible, not only in the military and diplomatic fields, but also in economic and cultural areas.

We believe that our friendship with the countries of Western Europe need not be sacrificed and that these nations need not be humiliated in the eyes of the world in order to win for the United States the friendship of the uncommitted peoples of the rest of the world. We therefore favor the continuance of an adequate aid program to meet the needs of our Western European and other allies, especially those needs which result from the loss of Near Eastern oil supplies.

We propose that instead of indiscriminate condemnation of colonialism, the Eisenhower administration offer positive aid to countries holding colonial possessions, so that the economic shock of abandoning such possessions can be cushioned and, at the same time, protection given to persons and property in the colonial areas during the transition to independence. We will give our support to such efforts.

We favor an expanded point 4 program, and we are hopeful that the Eisenhower administration, after 4 years of hesitation and contradiction, will develop and present such a program to the Congress.

We favor the passage of legislation necessary to encourage and facilitate world trade, and we will propose legislation to meet the special problems of United States industries and workers affected by liberalization of trade policy.

We are for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii.

IMMIGRATION

We will propose legislation and work for the revision of immigration and naturalization laws to eliminate the national origins rule and to provide flexibility in the admission of displaced persons, refugees, and other deserving cases.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL SERVICE

We will propose measures and work for the enactment of legislation designed to eliminate illegal and unconstitutional discrimination affecting the right to vote and the right to engage in gainful occupation, and designed, also, to insure full protection of the law of the enjoyment of the security of person and of the rights of citizenship.

We favor legislation to protect the national security and, at the same time, in keeping with recent Supreme Court decisions, to protect Government employees and other citizens from the violation of rights and from the abusive practices of the Eisenhower administration.

We favor an increase in the compensation of Government employees to meet the increased cost of living and to compare with the compensation paid to persons performing similar work in nongovernmental employment.

We favor the recognition of the right of employee organizations to represent their members and the granting to Government employees of the right to full participation in the political life of the nation.

EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HOUSING

We favor the enactment of legislation to assist States and local communities in building schools and providing essential health and safety facilities to all school children. This legislation should be similar to that proposed in the last Congress. It should not include the unsound financial provisions recommended in the first Eisenhower education bill in the 84th Congress or the unworkable proposal for the distribution of funds incorporated in what was described by the Republican candidate as the "one clear call to action" on education.

We favor an expanded program of Federal aid for medical education, hospital construction, and health services.

We shall support increased benefits under the social security program, the extension of coverage, and the raising of the wage base upon which benefits depend.

We will propose and support an expanded and improved Federal housing program designed to meet the special needs of low-income and middle-income families, and senior citizens. We will also support an expanded urban redevelopment program.

We will oppose efforts to destroy the effectiveness of laws designed to protect consumers and businessmen from exploitation and unfair practices.

TAXES

We favor revision of the tax law to close the loopholes in the 1954 act, to eliminate unwarranted privileges, and to provide tax adjustment for small businesses.

We favor the elimination of the most burdensome and inequitable excise taxes.

As the budget and general economic conditions indicate, the income tax should be reduced.

BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

We will undertake to assist small independent businesses by strengthening the Small Business Administration, and by inquiry with a view to the improvement of the antitrust laws and of their administration, as well as the administration of various Government commissions and agencies affecting small businesses.

We will propose and seek to enact legislation to assist in promoting industry and creating jobs in depressed areas of the United States and in areas of underdevelopment and unemployment.

We propose to strengthen the unemployment-compensation system, to extend its coverage and improve its benefits, and to adjust it to meet the problems of automation and industrial change.

We favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and its replacement by labor-relations legislation that is favorable to labor, to management, and to the public.

We favor the extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, together with an increase in the minimum wage to conform with increased productivity and the rising cost of living.

AGRICULTURE

We will propose and support the enactment of legislation to improve the farm program so as to assist the farmers of the United States to secure parity of income.

We favor legislation to improve the water- and soil-conservation program, to insure that the soil bank be used for the purposes for which it was designed, rather than an instrument of political expediency.

The problems of drought relief and crop insurance would be met by the expansion, the improvement, and the effective administration of the existing drought-relief and crop-insurance programs.

We favor an expanded school-lunch program and other programs for the disposal of agricultural surpluses.

PUBLIC WORKS

We will work for a stepped-up, sound program of public-works projects in rivers and harbors, hydroelectric, flood control, and public buildings to better utilize existing resources and provide better and more adequate facilities and services to meet the needs of an ever-increasing population in an expanding economy.

We will continue work to build up momentum for an effective, long-range, expanded, and accelerated Federal-aided highway and public-roads program.

RESOURCES

We propose to abandon this administration's limited partnership with the commercial utilities and return to the historic resources-development partnership between farmer cooperatives, public-power districts, private enterprise, and the Federal Government.

We believe in the principle of multiple-purpose use of the land and water resources of our river basins, with special emphasis on the protection of our watersheds for domestic, agricultural, recreational, and industrial uses, and in the comprehensive development and management of these resources to get maximum flood control, irrigation and reclamation, power, forest production, grazing, mining, and fish and wildlife conservation and recreation.

We will continue to work for the adoption of a generous Federal program to assist Indian tribes in the full development of their human and natural resources and prompt settlement of Indian claims against the United States, including negotiations and compromise in the best interests of both parties.

We will again oppose altering treaty or other Federal-Indian contractural relationships without the free consent of the tribes concerned and will oppose programs similar to those supported by the Eisenhower administration to weaken Federal control over public grazing lands, national forests, and

other resources now held for the people of the United States by the United States Government.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In addition to the continued development of a balanced and flexible stockpile of nuclear weapons, we will propose legislation to accelerate the domestic civilian atomic-energy program by the construction of prototype reactors, to increase the production of fissionable material for further nuclear experimentation, and to bring about greater cooperation in this entire field, in domestic operations and in cooperation with our allies. We will also seek a comprehensive survey of radiation hazards from bomb tests and reactor operations.

VETERANS

We will continue to press for legislation to compensate veterans and their dependents for the physical, economic, and the other losses which they have suffered as a consequence of military service.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

We will propose legislation to make the Congress more effective and to provide for greater efficiency, economy, and responsibility in the executive offices, and to make clear the administration's accountability to the Congress and to the people of the United States.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILSON AND THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to three telegrams that I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today relating to the Secretary of Defense referring to members of the National Guard as "draft dodgers." I think it is a deplorable state in America when the head of the Defense Department, who has jurisdiction and authority over the armed services and the citizen soldiers of America, refers to that great arm of the service as "draft dodgers."

I am inserting a telegram from the Governor of the State of Tennessee, from the adjutant general of Tennessee, and from a general in the National Guard of the great Volunteer State, setting out reasons why the Secretary of Defense should either resign or retract his statement about the National Guard, our first arm of defense of America. I concur completely with these telegrams.

RESERVING POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may now reserve all points of order against an appropriation bill to be filed by midnight February 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT, AND THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the 84th Congress we passed an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act which became Public Law 1013 and provided for a 10 percent increase in benefits, generally speaking. This increase was admittedly insufficient, but we passed the legislation as an emergency relief measure with the understanding that this matter would be considered again during the 85th Congress.

Already there are numerous bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce proposing many changes to liberalize the retirement program. We have had constant appeal for changes in the program. All of these bills deserve consideration.

In my report on last year's legislation—House Report No. 2418, 84th Congress, 2d session—I stated that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in its consideration of the numerous bills pending before it to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, has placed great emphasis on the effect of the proposed amendments on the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account. The committee is unanimously of the opinion that no amendments to the law should be made which would jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement system. We have grave responsibilities toward the currently active railroad workers and those who will follow, and who will retire in the future. We must make certain that when they retire from the railroad industry, the reserves in the retirement account plus the income into the system will be adequate to pay the benefits due them.

In order to meet this problem, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I, as chairman of the committee, have, today, introduced identical bills on this subject—H. R. 4102 and H. R. 4101, respectively. A great deal of thought and consideration has gone into the preparation of these bills. They are the result of various conferences, including conferences among the standard railway labor organizations, and it is believed that this is an approach to the problem that we all recognize exists.

The bills the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and I have introduced provide principally for, one, an increase in practically all retirement and survivor annuities by 10 percent; two, the payment of an insurance lump sum even though there are survivors immediately entitled to survivor annuities; three, the permissive retirement of a female employee, at a reduced annuity, if she has attained age 62 but has less than 30 years of service; four, the payment of a spouse's annuity at age 62 on a reduced basis, if the spouse elects to take such a reduced annuity; five, a change in the earnings limitation on disability annuitants, who would be permitted to earn up to $1,200 a year in employment outside of the railroad industry without losing their monthly disability annuity, and so forth.

To finance this program, as well as to make up the deficits in the Railroad Retirement System incurred previously, including the deficit incurred last year by the enactment of Public Law No. 1013, 84th Congress, which granted a 10 percent increase in benefits, generally, these bills propose, one, to increase the maximum creditable and taxable compensation from the present $350 a month to $400 a month for service after June 30, 1957; and two, to increase the retirement tax rate from 6¼ percent to 7½ percent. The bills would exclude employee retirement taxes from gross income and from wages for Federal income-tax purposes.

Unemployment insurance benefits would be increased, under the provisions of these bills, from the present 50 percent of the employee's compensation on his last job to 60 percent of such compensation. The maximum daily rate would be increased from $8.50 to $10.20 per day. The amount of annual compensation needed to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits would be raised from $400 to $500. These bills also provide for extended benefits to an unemployed worker who has had 5 years or more of railroad service, who did not voluntarily retire or leave work without good cause, and who has exhausted his presently allowable unemployment benefit privileges.

FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal our antiquated Federal Corrupt Practices Act, a law which in theory—and in theory only—governs the conduct of Federal elections, and to replace it with a workable statute geared to modern conditions.

The old law, enacted in 1925, is hopelessly outmoded. For example, it contains the absurd provision that a candidate for United States Representative may not spend more than $5,000 in a campaign. Is it any wonder that candidates resort to the special committee device to legally evade this ridiculous requirement? Or that public confidence in politicians and our American political system falters at times?

I am convinced that both of our political parties stand to gain from legislation guaranteeing open and fair elections.

This is a time in our history when holders of public office need a maximum of public respect, and nothing would better serve this cause and bring new integrity to our political life than laws designed to make our election campaigning responsible and thoroughly honest.

The bill which I introduced today is only slightly changed from the one I

sponsored in the House during the 84th Congress, and has the same general features of the bill (S. 636) reported out by the Committee on Rules of the Senate during the 84th Congress.

It raises the limits on expenditures by candidates to realistic levels and at the same time provides reasonable controls which will make the limits effective.

I hope that the Congress will act this year on a clean elections bill so that the 1958 election will be conducted in a manner which will bring credit to our politicians and our political system.

VISIT OF PRESIDENT TITO OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who have not had an opportunity to sign the petition protesting the invitation to Tito, the petition is in the lobby and available for you to sign. I make this statement in view of the fact that a news release was read by me in the House yesterday stating that Tito had said he would not accept the invitation from the United States. The reason given was because of anti-Yugoslavia remarks made in the United States. No one has made any anti-Yugoslavia remarks that I know of. The remarks heretofore have been anti-Tito remarks. The petition will be picked up tonight after the House adjourns but those who have not signed it by now will have an opportunity to sign it.

WNAC–TV'S OPERATION AUSTRIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of this body a very outstanding piece of public service which has been provided the people of eastern Massachusetts by television station WNAC–TV, of Boston. Through Mr. Norman Knight, executive vice president and general manager of this station—and I might add a friend of mine and a farsighted and public-spirited man—this station, which is owned by RKO-Teleradio Pictures, Inc., recently sent a team of three men to Austria to conduct a study of the refugee situation there, to make pictures, to entertain refugee youngsters, and to bring back for their great audience a true and authentic picture of the conditions of these unfortunate people.

This team consisted of Producer-Director H. Jeff Forbes, Cinematographer Edward Gilman, and Songwriter Frank Luther. Working in cooperation with CARE these men shot over 10,000 feet of film before they returned to the United States, and on January 17 they projected over the facilities of WNAC–TV a 30-minute film spectacular entitled "Suffer Little Children." This film was widely received. It depicted the true facts about these children and their parents and was a wonderful thing. Any American who had the privilege of viewing this picture must have been proud of the fact that he was one, and it gave those who saw it a full opportunity to understand and appreciate the values of the freedoms which we in this country enjoy.

It has also come to my attention that on February 18 another spectacular film lasting for 1 full hour will be telecast from the film taken on this trip to Austria. This film will be entitled "Weltschmerz," which translated means World Sorrow, and again will focus public attention on the situation in Hungary and the conditions surrounding the people forced to flee from this unfortunate land. Again it is the purpose of this film, Norman Knight, and station WNAC–TV to show, by contrast, those blessings which are enjoyed by Americans.

I would like to mention that the script for this film was written by Kenneth MacGaskill, and that the executive producer was James Pike, of the WNAC–TV staff, all Boston people.

I bring this to the attention of this House because of the outstanding public service involved. At great cost these films were produced for the one purpose of giving Americans in our part of the country the privilege of seeing conditions and the results of government as it is operated behind the Iron Curtain. On several occasions I have sat with Norman Knight, with George Steffy, another vice president of WNAC–TV and the Yankee Network, and with Leland Bickford, the news director of these organizations. The interest displayed by these men in our foreign situation and the results of our foreign policies upon the people which is served by their organization is a refreshing thing.

In conclusion let me state that I feel outstanding accomplishment should be recognized. And when it involves the welfare of one's country and its people it it doubly valuable. I feel that we owe a debt of thanks to RKO-Teleradio Pictures, Inc., to its young and outstanding president, Thomas F. O'Neil, and to Norman Knight, its vice president, one of the most brilliant and forward-looking persons I have ever met, for making these films possible. It is the type of service that does much to exalt, embellish, and strengthen our civilized life.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, without desiring to be officious, I must insist that in the future, chairmen asking to transact business go to a microphone or take some position on the floor of the House other than in the line of Members asking for routine unanimous-consent requests, and thereby make their business known to the House.

A few moments ago the chairman of a committee asked unanimous consent to file a certain report. I believe that was his request. I could not hear him because of the confusion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], had to obtain unanimous consent later to reserve points of order. I must insist that in the future, chairmen of committees, or those speaking for them, seeking unanimous consent to transact business of general interest, make such requests from a position where the membership of the House can hear them. I would also hope that such requests had been properly screened by the House leadership.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a proper insistence.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointments to boards and commissions:

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Monument Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. JONES, of Alabama; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. SMITH, of Wisconsin; Mr. WESTLAND, of Washington.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; Mr. O'HARA, of Minnesota; Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055, 1056, and 1854, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS, of Colorado; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; Mr. SCRIVNER, of Kansas; Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BECKWORTH, of Texas; Mr. DOOLEY, of New York.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. STAGGERS, of West Virginia; Mr. MILLER, of Maryland.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 8, section 1106 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio; Mr. KEATING, of New York; Mr. HILLINGS, of California.

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa.

HONORING THE CHAPLAINS AND MEN WHO DIED ON THE U. S. S. "DORCHESTER"

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 90.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Army transport *Dorchester* was sunk by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on February 3, 1943; and

Whereas four Army chaplains of different religious faiths—George L. Fox, of Gilman, Vt., Methodist; Alexander D. Goode, of York, Pa., Jewish; Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N. Y., Reformed Church in America; and John P. Washington, of Newark, N. J., Roman Catholic—lost their lives in the sinking of such vessel while heroically serving their comrades and their country; and

Whereas each of these men was awarded posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross for services rendered to his country above and beyond his prescribed duty; and

Whereas the conduct of these heroic Chaplains and other brave men who died on the *Dorchester* will forever be an inspiring example of courageous and unselfish devotion to God and to country; and

Whereas Sunday, February 3, 1957, is the 14th anniversary of this great tragedy of World War II and will be observed by the American Legion as a day dedicated "To God and country": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the third day of February 1957 be observed as a day dedicated to the memory of the heroic conduct of George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington, the Army chaplains and other brave men who lost their lives in the sinking of the Army transport *Dorchester* on February 3, 1943.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on the third day of February 1957, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies, in commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of the four chaplains and other brave men who lost their lives on the *Dorchester*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a fitting tribute to these heroic men who lost their lives on the troopship *Dorchester* that we dedicate February 3, 1957, as a day of observance.

It was on February 3, 1943, that 4 Army chaplains of different religious beliefs, with their arms linked in prayer as they sank into the deadly waters off the coast of Greenland, gave a demonstration of faith, courage, and brotherhood such as the world has seldom seen. These brave men of God—George Fox, Methodist; Alexander Goode, Jewish; Clark Poling, Reformed Church in America; and John Washington, Roman Catholic—will ever arouse in the minds of men a heroic story of the sea, which has earned its right to be forever memorialized in the history of our country.

It is a story valuable to the American tradition because it is a lesson in the essential unity of our people and their separate faiths—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish. It is a story of sublime sacrifice which has inspired and strengthened men everywhere.

We should endeavor to establish and perpetuate in the minds of men everywhere a knowledge of the sacrifice made by these four Army chaplains and its meaning. We shall be doing so when we dedicate this February 3 to the memory of these heroic men of God and the other brave men who lost their lives on the troopship *Dorchester* on February 3, 1943.

FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $627,000, including employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$627,000" and insert "$575,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the House has had presented to it a budget which can run, if certain supplementary items are presented, as high as $71 to $72 billion. It seems to me we should get our own house in order before we come to the main job of meeting our responsibilities with reference to that budget.

This amount of $575,000, if agreed to, will be 2½ to 2¾ times the amount allocated for similar purposes for a similar committee in the other body. We all know that that body has not been the least bit niggardly in spending money for investigations. For my own part, I cannot vote for the pending resolution, either providing $620,000 or $575,000. I hope the House will reject it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I agree entirely with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. As you will recall we spent 3 days with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget before the full Appropriations Committee. The picture that they painted for us really was not very encouraging from the standpoint of maintaining fiscal responsibilities so far as the affairs of our Nation are concerned. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has well stated the situation when he said that we must do everything right from the beginning in this Congress if we are to hope to make any economies whatsoever in the appropriations for the running of our Government.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to disagree with my colleague from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, but may I say that the resolution now before the House concerns an appropriation for investigations by the Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member.

I should like to suggest that the best way to attack the huge budget of $72 billion is to look into the details of the budget. This should be done by the Appropriations Committee; it should be done by the legislative committees, and it should also be done by the investigating committee of the House, the Government Operations Committee.

It is easy for the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Budget Director all to admit that the budget is too large, but when they say they do not know where it can be cut it seems to me it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to inform itself sufficiently about the detailed items in the budget and those items which can be eliminated or reduced without harming our national programs to do an intelligent job of reducing the budget. That cannot be done unless the committees of the Con-

gress equip themselves with investigative staffs to go below the broad generalities and the huge lump-sum appropriations requested and find out which items can be eliminated without harm.

It is precisely to save money that the committees of the Congress should be equipped with staffs to ferret out those items which are wasteful and then see that they are eliminated.

The report of the Hardy Committee on Aid Expenditures in Iran cost the House of Representatives very little, but it did call attention to many poor procedures and unbusinesslike practices in connection with the expenditure of foreign-aid funds.

I think it is incumbent upon the House to follow expenditures, broad grants of authority and great flexibility in the administration of public funds to see that items involving wasteful expenditure of money such as in the case of Iran, for instance, do not occur again.

I think this resolution, which carries a low enough sum, in my judgment, to operate the Government Operations Committee and all of its subcommittees for a year, should be adopted by the House. We need investigators if we are going to find out the facts and learn where we can cut intelligently.

May 15, 1952, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD facts and figures showing the value in savings to the taxpayers of one thoroughgoing congressional investigation. I would urge those who seek to cut the funds allotted to committees for investigations to consider such facts before urging that we economize first on ourselves. That discussion appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 4, pages 5278–5279.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. How long has this committee been operating?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Government Operations Committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Since the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman point to specific cases or specific incidents in which the working of this committee has pointed to savings and cuts that should be made of any consequence?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I know of one instance where the Government Operations Committee saved the Government, it is reported, anywhere from $50 million to $75 million in the case of jet planes that were never tested. Through the investigation of the Government Operations Committee they stopped the further contracts on these jet planes.

Mr. JENSEN. When and where was that accomplished?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I will yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, to answer that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The investigation of the jet plane fiasco occurred last year. The planes were built at the McDonnell Aircraft Company in East St. Louis. The engines were built by Westinghouse. It resulted in failure and the killing of several very fine test pilots, as the result of them putting into production defense contracts on jet engines and planes before they had been proven out. The process of procurement of items which have not yet been proven to be usable is a procedure of the procurement of the Defense Department which has been under attack by this committee for many years. We feel that now we have got them to adopt a program of proof before they buy.

But, I would like to pass on to something very specific. One of our subcommittees investigated a so-called wash transaction on cheese by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JENSEN. What sort of a transaction?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A wash transaction.

Mr. JENSEN. Wash?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of buying and selling cheese, which has resulted in the Department of Justice instituting suits to recover $2.5 million which was illegally spent, according to the General Accounting Office. As the result of an investigation by another subcommittee we secured the cancellation of $12 million worth of civil defense studies which were proven to be duplicative of other studies of the same type throughout the Nation.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said another subcommittee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Another subcommittee of the full Committee on Government Operations. Only modesty prevents my giving the name.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I also call attention that in the sale of surplus material by the Defense Department, they declared an excess for stock-fund purposes in order to get around the Donable Property Act for colleges and schools and hospitals. We closed that gap, but in the sale of surplus material one year of over $2 billion of acquisition value sales, the Defense Department got a little over 5 cents on the dollar, or between 5 and 6 cents, and the next year a little over $2 billion on acquisition cost, between 6 and 7 cents. As the result of action by the subcommittee and the full committee, the full Committee on Appropriations last year appropriated $1 million more for the General Services to have supervisory authority, and we strengthened their hands, and on the sales now, the last report I got, it is up to 16 percent. You remember the SAGE contract that I played a little part in. There was a saving in the 10-year period of $830 million, $83 million a year on the SAGE contracts alone as to what they are now and what was originally proposed. That was all done by reason of one of the subcommittees of which the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], are members and of which I happen to be the chairman. Now, those are some illustrations that I know about because the two matters I previously referred to developed out of the subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman. Those are facts. The gentleman will remember the debate on the floor—the subject was part of a report of the Committee on Armed Services—on the military construction bill last year. They had to get authority of law to make the contracts. The result was that those contracts are now $83 million a year less than the original contracts contemplated where they had no authority in law to make them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it would be only fair to give just a little bit of credit, a "teenie" bit of credit to the Committee on Rules with which committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] cooperated in bringing about this saving.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true. I do not claim exclusive credit. I was confining my discussion to the work of the Committee on Government Operations. But the Committee on Rules, with the gentleman from Ohio playing a very important part in it, cooperated to that end. I conferred with the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it was on the basis of the action originally taken by the gentleman's subcommittee that the Committee on Rules acted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this House who has been here for at least a few years knows that I have been very active in insisting that the Committee on Appropriations have a larger investigating staff. We did have a large investigating staff when the party of which I am a member was in power. We did go into the books of every department of government and we did make some great savings. I would not want to have anyone believe that I am opposed to investigations where investigations are needed. And certainly they are needed in almost every Department of the Government. What I wanted to ascertain was the very thing that I have learned, specific cases where the gentleman's committee has been effective in making savings.

May I ask the gentleman, how much did the committee have for investigations for the current fiscal year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. They received $995,000 for the 84th Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. That is, for the 2 years.

Mr. FRIEDEL. For the 2 years, yes. There was a great deal of work contemplated for last year but, because it was an election year, some of that work was not completed. There is still a great deal of work to be done, and it is their intention to do it this session.

The Government Operations Committee has shown us where they saved the Government millions of dollars.

The House Administration Committee realizes the importance of saving money. The Federal Budget this year is tremendous—and it should be reduced wherever possible. We have found that it is good

business to spend $1 million in order to save several millions. The Government Operations Committee has many subcommittees, which are needed to handle the many types of investigations in various fields, and they work very hard. We had members of the committee of both parties, appear before us and we are convinced that they are saving the Government many millions of dollars. For this reason, we feel that this request for funds is justified.

Mr. JENSEN. There are Republicans on this committee, are there not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Of course.

Mr. JENSEN. And do they cooperate fully?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I had not heard a word about any member of that body.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Did not the gentleman hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] when he spoke?

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentleman from Michigan on that committee?

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman will yield, I am a member of the Committee on Government Operations but not of the Committee on House Administration. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] is the ranking Republican on the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. JENSEN. I know that.

Mr. MEADER. But I should like to say inasmuch as the gentleman asked me the question, that in 1951, the Bonner committee investigated the efforts of the Air Force to set up its own supply system for common-use items and saved millions and millions of dollars by blocking that effort on the part of the Air Force, Of course, the work of the committee cannot always be evaluated in dollars and cents because sometimes it results only in an improvement of the service with the amount of money that the agency has.

Mr. McCORMACK. The cataloging is now commencing to show effect. Remember the cataloging program that has taken about 4 years to catalog the common items in the Defense Department. Other committees have played an important part in it, but the Committee on Government Operations has been following it very closely.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] is chairman has gone very carefully into the requests of the various committees for funds for investigation. He has insisted, as have the other members of the committee, that these requests be accompanied with a budget showing just what sort of an organization they propose to set up and what they propose to do with the money.

While I am not a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Maryland is chairman, I do know that they have been conscientious in trying to get an estimate before they have approved any of these requests. They have had the chairman and the ranking member of each of these committees before them for hearings before they have ever reported approval of the requests. They are probably having many more requests. This is only the second one this year, I think. They really have reduced the requests by some $50,000.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. The Committee on House Administration did reduce the request from $627,000 to $575,000. I would have to have a pencil and paper to figure out the percentage reduction, but it is somewhere around 8 percent. I hope the Committee on Appropriations can do as well with the President's request for $71 or $72 billion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER, Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In the time which has been allotted to observe this date, I shall speak only briefly and then will gladly yield to as many Members of the House as desire to speak on this commemorative occasion.

When we think of Franklin Roosevelt, we think first of all of courage. His was not only the personal courage which enabled him to overcome the crippling handicap of infantile paralysis, but the even deeper courage with which he was able to inspire a nation and a world. From the famous words he spoke in his first inaugural address—"the only thing we have to fear is fear itself"—to the last words he wrote just before his death—"the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today"—Franklin Roosevelt gave to the people of our country a confidence in a better destiny which they themselves could bring about.

Roosevelt was a great leader of a kind which only a democracy could produce. He believed intensely in the individual—in his rights, in his freedoms, above all, in his capacity to create for the benefit of his fellow men. His administrations, with him at the helm, were all enormously productive ones, as Americans put forward their best efforts to meet corrosive social problems, to build new institutions to meet changing needs, to win a war against the forces of tyranny.

But the excitement which Roosevelt generated in whatever he did was not a revitalizing force for American statesmanship alone, but for American politics as well. F. D. R. himself was a master politician, and he brought a contagious zest of skilled craftsmanship to the art of persuasion and organization which builds the machinery of effective democracy.

We often think of Franklin Roosevelt primarily as an innovator. This he certainly was, although looking around us today, only a quarter of a century since he became President, it is sometimes difficult to realize how much he did initiate, so much has his legacy become a part of our everyday life. And, indeed, in the final analysis, Roosevelt was less an innovator than a man who led a nation out of a great depression and through a great war and left it more solidly dedicated than ever to the deepest traditions of American democracy.

As Franklin Roosevelt himself said in one of his final messages in 1945:

> The creed of our democracy is that liberty is acquired and kept by men and women who are strong and self-reliant, and possessed of such a wisdom as God gives to mankind—men and women who are just and understanding and generous to others—men and women who are capable of disciplining themselves—for they are the rulers and they must rule themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the subject of the 75th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of our greatest Presidents of all time, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, the 31st President of the United States.

Today marks the 75th anniversary of his birth. It is nearly 12 years now since he died. And yet his memory is still very fresh in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans, as well as many millions of people throughout the world who recognized him as a great world leader and statesman.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's great belief in humanity and his efforts to improve the lot of all people have earned everlasting respect and admiration for him during his lifetime. Since his death this admiration has turned into reverence. His name and his deeds grow with the years, and the glorious chapters he has written into American history and world history will remain for all times and generations.

The courage with which he steered this Nation into a new and brighter day will long be remembered. In these crucial days for our Nation and for all free nations, the spirit and memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt live on to inspire us and to guide us in the days ahead. America was truly blessed to have at its helm a leader of such qualities in critical times of peace and war.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the name and the memory and the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will live on forever in the minds of people. With a family background going back to the early colonial days, with substantial wealth and his social status secure, a

graduate of Groton and Harvard, by his leadership he endeared himself to the backbone of America, the average American. His name and reputation went to all corners of the world, a symbol of hope to the underprivileged and the exploited. As Governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt made a record that quickly spread beyond State lines and became nationwide. I remember well when I first met Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was in Boston in the election of 1928 during the campaign of Al Smith for President. I can see him now as he spoke that evening when he extended his arm and his fingers and his hand and said, and I quote:

If any person votes against Alfred E. Smith because of his religion, may God have mercy on his miserable soul.

In 1933, in the depth of the great depression, he assumed office. Despair was everywhere. There were many who doubted that our institutions of Government could survive. It is unnecessary for me, on this occasion, to recount in detail his leadership and his many recommendations which became law under which hope and confidence were restored to our people, and under which our country was rebuilt. His first act was to save the existing financial structure of our country by his bank holiday action. He acted quickly to bring relief to millions of starving Americans. He moved quickly to save farms and homes and he moved against monopoly and exploitation. He removed the corrupt holding company corporate device that was sapping, for the benefit of a few, the economic strength of our Nation. He moved to protect our investors against the stock market thieves. Under his leadership the country received social-security legislation, minimum-wage legislation, the elimination of child labor, labor its Magna Carta, our banking system strengthened by the passage of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and so many other constructive laws, and invariably against great and powerful opposition. And all of these laws are now accepted as fundamental in our philosophy of government. Even our Republican friends have reluctantly accepted the Fair Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt. President Eisenhower has embraced it.

Then came Hitler and World War II, waged under the sterling and courageous leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I can remember while in his office one day, when everything looked black and Hitler's armies under Rommel were winning battle after battle, when Hitler's forces were winning battles elsewhere, Franklin D. Roosevelt grimly said to me: "It looks dark, John, but Hitler can win every battle until he wins the battle of the Atlantic, and he has not won the war." The deep confidence a majority of the people of the country had in him, as well as their strong devotion, was evidenced by their electing him, the first man in our history, as President for a third term and again for a fourth term.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was a builder, bringing by his leadership hope and confidence back to our people. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a warrior, for under his leadership, vision, and personality World War II was conducted to a successful conclusion.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great humanitarian, as evidenced by his leadership of love of the average citizen. The sentiment in which countless millions of persons held Franklin D. Roosevelt may well be expressed by a statement a lady made upon hearing of his death: "He must have been a great man, because I cried when I heard of his death."

The spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt will always live as long as mankind exists. Franklin D. Roosevelt was not only one of the great Presidents of our country, but he takes his place in history of one of the great constructive figures of all time.

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th anniversary of the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the giant of the 20th century.

I doubt if there is anything I could possibly say that would add to his stature. His unique position in history is most firmly established. He ranks along with Washington and Lincoln as the man of the hour sent to save a country teetering on the brink of disaster. No President ever faced a more gruelling task than that presented to F. D. R. on that grim morning in 1933. The Nation was in despair and chaos and the dissident element of our society which feeds on discord and misery was becoming increasingly more active. In short, unless a firm and far-sighted leadership was provided to the American people, anarchy would prevail. The first 6 months of his first term turned the tide—the bank holiday, the WPA, the programs for farm families, the CCC, assistance to small business—at last people started to feel there was some hope, after all.

Mark Anthony's speech is apropos on the birthday of this great man: "the good that men do is oft interred with their bones" and, to paraphrase, the shortcomings of 20 years of leadership are kept very much alive for use in any and all political harangues. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not perfect—I never met a man that was. But he tried to be perfect. He had a keen awareness of the problems of his fellow Americans and did everything in his power to help them. Many a family throughout this Nation still owns their own home or farm or business because F. D. R. cared.

I could go on, but I think that my feeling could best be summed up by telling this Chamber that the night President Roosevelt died, my family and I knelt down and, mingled with our grief, thanked an all-knowing Creator for sending our country this man when he was so desperately needed.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the great depression all, including hope, was washed away, all that men and women had accumulated by hard years of toil to prepare for their age was gone, all that youth and prime had built for security and advancement was in the winds. In the wilderness of their despair came Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was faith in him that lifted them up. Their eyes turned from the frozen and barren grounds to the heavens and their shoulders bent backward with confidence and faith, as in their faith in this reborn Isaiah, they followed Franklin Delano Roosevelt out of the wilderness.

No man in history ever gave to a distressed people the spiritual lift that Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave to the American people at that period. He was one of the great men of all times, one of the great spiritual forces, the like of whom passes in human scrutiny but seldom, and passing leaves forever all mankind his debtor.

When the word came that his spirit had passed on I saw men and women in the streets of Chicago sobbing.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt had left the earth and gone to the realms of immortality.

But today I am thinking how happy he would be, and I think that he does have the consciousness of what we now are doing and saying, happy to know that in this Chamber his son is carrying on in the same spirit. I wish the son to know how much we in the House notice his industry, his devotion, the great job that he is doing in this House carrying on in his father's footsteps.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we observe today the 75th anniversary of one of this Nation's truly great Presidents. The distinguished majority leader has described at length Franklin Delano Roosevelt's great contributions to the prosperous and economically healthy America we enjoy today. Other Members, more versed in these matters than I, can discuss more fully his epoch-making work in the creation of a truly creative world order—one in which America is living up to her responsibilities and the full potential of her power and wealth.

I would mention something quieter, something perhaps not so earth shaking in its immediate results, but nonetheless something of which Franklin Roosevelt himself would, I am sure, be deeply proud had he lived to see its fruition.

F. D. R., we sometimes forget, was struck down in his prime by polio. A strong, vigorous man, already having been honored by his party with the proffer of the second highest position this Nation affords, Roosevelt was brought nearly to death's door by this little-understood malady. Only through his own inner strength and the courage of his wife, herself a woman of true greatness, did he regain his health and again enter the service of his country.

He never forgot his affliction. But in the greatness of Roosevelt's soul there was no defeat, only defiance. He founded the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The President's birthday was dedicated by a generous nation to this great charity, rather than to pointless celebrations. The birthday balls, and later the March of Dimes, owed their inspiration to this profound humanitarian.

It is most appropriate this year, now that the long work of the foundation has produced a vaccine, that we pause and pay tribute to the man whose spirit helped as much as the dimes of a generous nation and the science of a Jonas Salk to curb polio.

I think also that it is especially appropriate that President Roosevelt's crusade against physical paralysis should have come to fruition, since as a President he was perhaps more than any of great and near-great men who had held that office a symbol of a fight against paralysis in Government.

The President, who took his first oath in March 1933, stepped in to lead a nation paralyzed by fear, by a lack of confidence, by a lack of imagination and vision. He led this land from the shadow of this fear to the sun-lit years in which our prosperity was firmly established, our world leadership made manifest, and our self-confidence restored.

The great foe of public paralysis and the compassionate fighter against physical paralysis, this is the Roosevelt we remember today.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance recently to review an article that appeared in Life magazine several years ago, but I am sure that I can recall from memory the salient features of it. Some 35 or 40 modern historians who approached the matter in a nonpartisan way and from a historical standpoint set out a list of the Presidents of the United States, listing them in certain categories: The greats, the near greats, averages, and failures as Presidents.

As to the greats I am certain that they were listed in the following order:

No. 1, Abraham Lincoln.
No. 2, George Washington.
No. 3, Franklin D. Roosevelt.
No. 4, Thomas Jefferson.
No. 5, Woodrow Wilson.
No. 6, Andrew Jackson.

I make this point: You will note that even though Franklin D. Roosevelt has passed from the scene of action so recently compared to the other greats I have mentioned, he is now listed as one of them and as No. 3. It could well be that in years to come he will stand as No. 1. But whether he does or not he will always stand, in my judgment, among those few immortals who were supremely great as Presidents of the United States.

All of those that I have mentioned had at least two things in common. They were men of almost unbelievable moral and political courage and they were men of the very highest visions in life. I would say to the gentleman that, in my judgment, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, very probably at least, saved this great and beloved Nation of ours from if not disintegrating at least going backward for many, many years. I believe that he was a genius of the very first order as an administrator and leader. I believe sincerely that he loved people, that he loved our American way of life and that he contributed to the welfare of our people as much as, if not more than, any man who has ever lived in the history of our Nation.

May God rest his soul in peace. I am sure that we, the American people, will always hold him in our hearts as one of the true heroes of American history.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this tribute to a great President and a great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I am not personally acquainted with the Life magazine article of which my good friend and colleague from Oklahoma spoke, but I have long felt in my own mind that when the history books of this country are some day written, several hundred years from now, the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt will stand first among the Presidents of this century and very probably of our country's first 300 years of existence.

Unlike Washington and unlike Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt had to deal with more than one great crisis in our country. He not only had to lead our country out of the depths of despair and depression but he also had to lead us back from the brink of a disastrous defeat when freedom was under attack by the Axis Powers on two different world fronts.

Today, in our own time, millions of American citizens on farms know the blessings of electricity, electric power and light in their homes because of the leadership and vision of Franklin D. Roosevelt during his presidency. Today millions of other American citizens who are wage earners in our midst enjoy a decent standard of living and a decent working wage because of the leadership which he gave in the field of collective bargaining and minimum wages for American working men and women. Today, millions of American people know security when they put their money on deposit in a bank because of the leadership he gave in the field of deposit insurance. Today millions of American people know some security when they invest their money in the stock of a great corporation because of the leadership which he gave in establishing closer supervision over the securities of corporations in this country. There are so many ways in which so many millions of American citizens today are the beneficiaries of his vision and of his willingness to fight for the things in which he believed that it is almost impossible to list them in the time allotted for this tribute this afternoon. But, certainly it is a privilege to join in this tribute. I hope that those of us in the Congress and those of us particularly who sit on the Democratic side of this House will take renewed inspiration from the great causes for which Franklin Roosevelt fought and from the leadership which he gave to us in that fight, because there are still battles to be won, there are still important laws to be passed in all of these fields involving the security and welfare of our American people. Franklin Roosevelt set a standard for courage and for diligent pursuit of these great purposes for which all of us will long be indebted to him in future years.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my many colleagues in commemorating the 75th anniversary of the birthday of a truly great American and former President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I was stationed at Wright Field in Dayton, Ohio, in the Army of the United States when this great man passed away. Like many others, men and women in civilian clothes and in uniform, rich and poor, high and low, educated and uneducated alike, I felt as though I had lost one of the dearest members of my family. I know of no public figure in my lifetime whose passing caused the shedding of so many tears. Mr. Roosevelt was close to the people of this country, especially the little people—the salt of the earth.

When I think of him and the splendid contributions he made, not only to America but to civilization, I am convinced that of his many fine qualities, his greatest was a quality for which King Solomon once so earnestly prayed. It was also a quality which Ezekiel, the prophet, was able to acquire by putting himself in the shoes of his fellowmen—the quality of an understanding heart.

In this hour while the world is in a turmoil and the redemption for both commerce and mankind is being worked out in so many mysterious ways, I know of no quality more desperately needed by mankind than the quality of an understanding heart.

The memory of the life and the works of this great man is something which I personally will always cherish and hold near and dear to my heart. I believe that this same memory lingers, and will continue to linger, in the hearts and minds of millions upon millions of people all over the world.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. As one who comes from labor I feel I would be remiss if I did not join my colleagues in paying their respect to a man whom labor owes so much, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I represent one of the largest industrial districts in the United States. Before the coming of Mr. Roosevelt, men worked long hours in the mills, and received very little pay for those hours of work. Their families did not enjoy the little niceties of life.

We worked alongside of men who, forced by desperation, spoke up and tried to better not only their earnings but the conditions under which they worked. In most cases they were rebuked by the boss, and in many instances were discharged and placed on the blacklist which meant they could not work in any other mill or factory. We saw the results of the great depression, in these towns, where families were in want of food, and where the future looked very drab. When Franklin D. Roosevelt came into office, economic conditions had reached a status quo, and

could go no lower, for work was not to be found anywhere.

People of other countries were following false leaders who promised them food.

In Russia we saw the rise of Lenin and Stalin and communism. In Germany we saw the rise of Hitler and nazism. Italy saw the rise of Mussolini and fascism.

Franklin Roosevelt realized that to save the American system the economic life of the Nation should be so widened that all people would share in the benefits of a better life.

One of his first steps was to give the working people of America the right to organize, and to negotiate collectively for their share of the profits which they created by their labor. He knew that the greatest tool to be used against the spread of the foreign isms was to raise the standards of living of the millions of toilers in our country, so that we could create a purchasing power to buy the necessities of life produced in our factories and on our farms.

The accomplishments of Franklin Roosevelt can be seen in the many things that labor has secured for their families at the negotiation table.

Today, we see a family getting into the family car with their children, taking a vacation and visiting parts of America they had never seen, and being paid while on that vacation.

We see the mothers going to the hospitals to have their babies, and receiving the best of medical care, due to the health insurance negotiated under their husbands' contract.

The older workers, retired, and living on a pension instead of going to the poorhouse as they did in the old days, enjoy their old age, free from want. The security of employment is enjoyed by the worker in our mills, mines and factories.

All these things came about due to the foresight of Franklin Roosevelt.

He proved to the world by making every strata of society a living part of our capitalistic system, that our system would work.

I feel that as a member of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, that I speak for every member when I say he brought joy and happiness to millions of homes in America, and that every member of our organization joins with me to honor his memory on the day he was born.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in these days when our nation seems becalmed midstream in the swirl of world events, many must think of the Roosevelt years. In his day there were many people who disputed the course on which the ship of state was moving, but no one could dispute that the ship was on a steady course and moving fast.

I am pleased to join in this tribute today to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The world was made better through his efforts.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to all the Members of the House and to the gentleman from Wisconsin for the sentiments which they have expressed here this afternoon. I know how much it will mean to and how deeply it will be appreciated by my mother and all of my family.

I think it would be appropriate for me to say that if there is perhaps one thing which I remember from my father and which I hope I will always carry with me it is his great faith in people and in the fundamentals of democracy. I remember so well the time when I was present when someone suggested in 1943 that it would be dangerous to have a national election during the great struggle in which we were then involved. I remember his saying that the American people could survive not only a national election but could take full part in all of the processes of democracy no mater how great a crisis they might be passing through. I hope and pray that all the leaders of our country in the years to come may have this great faith in the people of their country.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in the Congress all of the years that Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States. I had many, many contacts with him, of course. It fell to my lot to carry out as chairman of a great committee many of his recommendations. They were highly controversial. They included the Railroad Holding Company Act, the National Securities Act, stock exchange regulation, the Federal Communications Act, the Rural Electrification Act, and the Utility Holding Company Act. These six major measures were put through my committee and through the Congress in 4 years while I was chairman of that great committee.

I want to say one thing about Franklin Roosevelt: When he engaged with you in a fight he never turned his back on you. He stood up and fought with you when he gave an indication that he was going to stand by you.

I think one of the most fortunate things that ever happened to us throughout our history was the coming of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he did. Many, even of the Members of Congress, are not old enough to remember the great depression that was upon us when he became President of the United States in 1933. He was a man of vision, he was a planner, and against all enemies he had the courage to stand up and fight for what he thought was the best interest of the American people.

Remembering those days, I wonder many times what would have happened if a man of little vision and slight courage had come along as our leader, or our so-called leader, at that time.

History must record that Franklin D. Roosevelt was one of our great imaginative statesmen of our times. He always had by his side a woman who I think is one of the great if not the greatest woman in the world today, that is, his widow, Eleanor Roosevelt. Her great strength of character, her great strength of mind, her great patriotism, are a challenge to me at all times and every time it is my high privilege to meet and converse with her. So the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the things that were done in it will live throughout the ages.

A remarkable thing to me is that many of the enactments that came along during his administration were by some called highly socialistic.

The charge was made that he and others of us working with him had carried the country into socialism. Well, if we were socialistic in putting these things on the statute books, then our opponents are just as socialistic as they claim we were for putting them on the books because they have left them on the statute books. Nobody in a position of responsibility in the opposite party has even proposed the repeal of a single law that we passed in the 20 years that we held the helm in the executive department and in the legislative department. So, that is a tribute to our actions then—and an additional tribute to his great, his far-reaching, and his lasting leadership.

Mr. REUSS. I thank our distinguished and beloved Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in retrospect a number of basic observations recur to me that I should like to make on the occasion of the 75th birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt: My observation is that no other statesman in the span of the lifetime of this 32d President of the United States did so much to implement both in his domestic and his foreign policies the moral principles that form the foundation of Western civilization and society. I leave it to the historians to determine whether the body of moral law under which we live ever received anywhere or at any time the fullness of concrete expression they were given by the force and the influence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. For me the exciting fact is that this implementation of religious or moral idealism has been proven practical and workable because we have the demonstrated fact that the Roosevelt legislative and political creations were never as enduring as they are at this hour. We have, outstandingly, Federal responsibility for supporting the needy jobless, regulation of security markets, protection of collective bargaining rights. And what is social security but one of the laterly formed foundation stones of the sound American sense of the rightness of mutual human responsibility?

Is there today anywhere any vestigial remains of the opposition to these measures?

We all remember how these measures I have just enumerated were consolidated in the second Roosevelt administration. Added was the minimum wage law of 1938, another milestone in lifting man's face to the sun. The Roosevelt impact on the American mind was clear when he was reelected for the third term by an electoral vote of 449 to 82. What stands out now is Roosevelt's international leadership in cementing to us, with hoops of steel, the friendship and

the fighting spirit of our allies. With our Latin American neighbors he transformed the Monroe Doctrine into a pact for mutual defense, and he made this country the "arsenal of democracies."

It cannot be doubted that in the arrangements that followed among the nations of the world he upheld the honor and the prestige of the United States at the many international conferences and kept in focus the moral position of the allies before the threat of the totalitarian powers and even the impending threat of the Soviet Union. His utterances in depression or in war united the Nation and galvanized its public opinion on the side that I am emphasizing as moral principle. When he spoke and when he acted, the idealism usually associated with dreams and vague hopes became dynamic realities.

It is these dynamic realities that explain so much of our strength, our prosperity, our fortification against depression and against war, that makes us the happy people that we are.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 75th anniversary of the birth of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we pause for a few moments each January 30 to pay tribute to this great American, who will always symbolize the Democratic Party's dedication to the welfare of the common man.

On this occasion one cannot help but wonder what the world might be like today if somehow the life of Franklin Roosevelt had been spared. Had he lived, he would certainly be hailed today as the elder statesman of the world. We can only speculate what effect his wisdom, courage, and statesmanship would have had on the course of world history in the crucial post-World War II period.

We can, however, clearly appreciate the impact of Franklin Roosevelt's great contribution to the social and economic well-being of all our citizens. The reform legislation enacted by Congress during the dark days of the depression will forever stand as monuments to his leadership and understanding of the needs and aspirations of our people.

In commemorating the 75th anniversary of his birth, let us rededicate ourselves to carry on his fight against poverty, ignorance, prejudice, and injustice in the world. Let us resolve to go forward toward the full realization of the humanitarian goals which he so clearly established.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today being the 75th anniversary of the birth of one of our Nation's greatest men who rose to the Presidency, it is altogether proper that we should pause from our labors to pay him tribute. We should do this, not so much because he became the Chief Executive of our beloved country, but because of his indefatigable efforts and genuine accomplishments on behalf of our land, which at the time of his inaugural was suffering intensely from a most severe economic depression; we should honor him for his outstanding contributions for the benefit of all Americans. For this his memory will live forever in the hearts of men.

I sincerely feel that President Franklin D. Roosevelt must have been divinely inspired in his endeavors, for we see the results to the present day. Not only did he save our country from the disastrous calamity of the 1930's, but he made it a far better place than before, by assisting those least able to help themselves, through social security, bank and deposit insurance, et cetera.

We are indeed grateful that in the hour of our greatest need, a kindly providence gave us this man whose brilliant intellect was coupled with an understanding heart and feeling for suffering humanity. Under his leadership, human and spiritual values were accorded the recognition they rightfully merit. Franklin D. Roosevelt became a true world leader whose work and words of wisdom shall live forever. One of his most famous utterances which we will long remember, is surely applicable today—"We have nothing to fear, but fear itself."

ECONOMIC STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am now in my 17th consecutive year of membership in this great legislative body. My tenure, which began before Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, has covered what are perhaps the most fateful years in the history of this country. I suppose I would be classified as a veteran Congressman. That is a label of which I am proud—not only because of the accomplishments of the eight Congresses in which I have served, but because the people of my district in Indiana have so consistently felt that I am best qualified to speak for them in the making of laws which shape the destiny of America.

Situated as we are in the very heart of our country, in the area which produced Abraham Lincoln and other great Americans, we Hoosiers regard ourselves as the sons and daughters of rugged American pioneers. We are grassrooters, if you please. We are practical, hard-working people who operate on the principle that a man earns his living by the sweat of his brow and that you cannot get something for nothing. Such was the thinking of our forefathers who made this Nation the greatest the world has ever known.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the people of Indiana are worried, greatly worried, about the economic state of our Union. They note our continued trend toward oppressive, if not destructive, taxation; of loose and unnecessary spending; of Federal encroachment into the domains of State responsibilities; of seemingly perpetual foreign giveaways of our declining dollars. They feel the killing squeeze of rising prices, their life savings losing value, and their hopes for the future of their children growing darker.

Ours are brave people. They are willing—yes, anxious—to tighten their belts and make valiant sacrifices to preserve the land they love so devoutly. That is exactly what they have been doing since the beginning of the Roosevelt era back in 1932. They have patiently accepted and sought to make work the policy of "spend and tax, tax and spend" which ran rampant for 20 years during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

That 20 years saw the beginning, development or encouragement of conditions and practices which were carryovers for the Eisenhower administration. Like cancerous growths, they have been difficult to wipe out or halt. However, considerable progress has been made. We have had two balanced budgets and a tax decrease under Mr. Eisenhower and we have avoided shooting wars.

Nevertheless, our slide toward cheaper dollars, higher Federal expenditures and higher prices for all our people has persisted—though in lesser degree. Today we have a 50-cent dollar, as compared to the dollar value of 1939. When Mr. Eisenhower took over, it was a 53-cent dollar, which means a 3-cent decline in 4 years. That certainly is better than the dizzying plunge of previous years—yet, we have to do better.

How to right our economic ship of state and give our people a glimmer of encouragement is a job for this Congress, and future Congresses. We have the authority, here on historic Capitol Hill, to take the necessary steps. The question is: Do we have the brains and the guts to do it?

As the Congress considers ways in which to meet these challenges, let us remember these burning facts:

First. If the increase in Government costs is not stopped, we will have a national depression of staggering proportions.

Second. We are now taxing American businesses, industries, and capitalism so severely that much incentive for growth and home ownership is dying.

Third. The individual American wage earner is giving back, to the tax octopus, almost half of every deflated dollar that he earns.

Fourth. These conditions all add up to precisely what Lenin frankly said, not so many years ago, was his formula for conquest of world capitalism. We are following that plan, taking the bait—hook, line, and sinker.

There are numerous steps Congress should consider in the effort to bring our economy back on the beam of commonsense. As a longtime member of our Appropriations Committee, some ideas have occurred to me as I have participated in considerations of so many budget requests. I do not recommend any of them as solutions of our problem, yet I do think they are worthy of thought. I offer these suggestions:

First. An overall congressional study of our national fiscal structure, looking toward a workable policy which would make it possible for individual Americans to save a fair portion of their earnings.

Second. A ceiling on Federal expenditures, with stipulated amounts ear-

marked for retirement of the national debt and interest payments on that debt.

Third. A drastic downward revision of our foreign-aid program. The scandalous American programs now effective in some countries are disgraceful. The situation in Iran is one of the latest to come to light. We can approach this problem with the realization that a certain amount of foreign aid on America's part still is good business, but for the most part it is ineffective and a costly illusion.

Fourth. A drastic cut in Federal meddling in responsibilities rightfully belonging to our 48 States. At this point, I am thinking particularly of proposals to set up a multi-billion-dollar Federal-aid program for schools. Most States do not want this meddling. Rather, they want Uncle Sam to take his hand out of their tax pockets and let them build and maintain their own schools. That certainly is the case in my own State of Indiana. One of the most insidious developments since 1932 has been that of increasing Federal bureaucratic usurpation of States rights.

Fifth. A reappraisal of the individual income-tax structure now stifling our people. We now have reached the point in this country where workers do not ask what their wages or salaries will be—rather, they are interested only in the amount of take-home pay. If they fully realized the amount the Federal octopus is taking from their pay envelopes, the demand for reform would be overwhelming. Let us remember that 83 percent of all money collected by the Government from personal income taxes is taken from people who make less than $6,000 a year.

There are many more suggestions I could make, Mr. Speaker, as to possible ways we can correct conditions, but the ones I have set forth here will do as a starter.

The most important point I would like to make is that our economic state of the Union is in dire trouble and we, as Congressmen sent here to represent a patient and long-suffering people, owe it to them to make every effort to do something about it.

VISITS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the important duty and obligation of the President to conduct the foreign affairs of the country, the matter of inviting representatives of foreign governments to visit the United States is his personal privilege. The President must represent all of us with all the nations of the world.

One of his responsibilities is to promote a better understanding between our Government and foreign governments. If it is his judgment that this obligation can best be discharged by inviting the heads of other governments to visit this country, he should do so. That does not mean that either the President or the rest of us may share the philosophy or may approve the conduct of the governments which they represent.

I am afraid that any lack of courtesy we may show to the head of any state is likely to be regarded by the people of that nation as an affront to their national prestige.

Surely no harm can come from encouraging friendly cooperation in the struggle for national independence, security, abundance and peace.

Any approach to decency requires that heads of friendly governments visiting in this country as guests of the President should be accorded courteous consideration. We would expect no less for our President should he visit abroad.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT on tomorrow for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for 30 minutes on February 5, in memory of the late George Holden Tinkham, formerly a Representative from the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Mr. PRICE, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MASON, on the subject of President Eisenhower's New Republicanism.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. PRICE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 31, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

397. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

398. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

399. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, transmitting a report and recommendations by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, pursuant to Public Law 128 (as amended by Public Law 491), 84th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

400. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of General Services for the year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

401. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 21st Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

402. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report by the Department of Agriculture covering positions placed in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

403. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report by the General Accounting Office on its positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 24. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 11). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 56. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; with amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 64. Resolution to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 67. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of

funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries, relating to housing; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 94. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 99. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3109, a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2528, a bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4076. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4077. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945, and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 4078. A bill to repeal section 335 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4079. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes", approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4080. A bill to permit a resident of Alaska employed by the Federal Government in Alaska to accumulate a maximum of 45 days a year annual leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4081. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4082. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-treatment plant to serve the St. Joseph's Indian School, Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4083. A bill to provide increases in annuities granted under the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4084. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4085. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4086. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4087. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 4088. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4089. A bill to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4090. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 4091. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 4092. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4093. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4094. A bill to permit certain repatriated citizens of the United States to obtain certified proof or documentation of their repatriation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4095. A bill relating to agency contributions under the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of employees engaged in the operation or maintenance of irrigation projects; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 4096. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4097. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4098. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of California a portion of the property known as Veterans' Administration Center Reservation, Los Angeles, Calif., to be used for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4099. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Church grounds as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4100. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4101. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4102. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 4103. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to extend the act for 2 years; and to authorize barter transactions with satellite countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4104. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 4105. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4106. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4107. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations, volunteer reserve services, squads, and first aid crews; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4108. A bill to amend the acreage-allotment and price-support provisions for corn and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4109. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4110. A bill to amend section 204 (b) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 4111. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4112. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1938, to increase the amount of liability insurance or other security required for the operation in the District of Columbia of certain passenger motor vehicles for hire; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4114. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in United States courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4115. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Shiloh National Military Park to the State of Tennessee for the relocation of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 4116. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4117. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4118. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4119. A bill to amend section 602 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4120. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters, United States marshals, and collectors of customs through written competitive examination in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4121. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the civil rights statutes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4122. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4123. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 4124. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4125. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4126. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4127. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4128. A bill relating to the computation of the retirement income credit and certain other items where joint income tax returns are filed by husband and wife; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4129. A bill to amend section 1401 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide that individuals retired for disability shall receive retired pay based upon the highest basic pay of any grade satisfactorily held by them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4130. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent brothers and sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4131. A bill relating to the Federal estate and gift tax treatment of bequests and gifts to certain hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from the corporate income tax even though employers and their dependents are eligible for benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4133. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, 78th Congress, with respect to the computation of disability payments in the case of certain seamen and other persons; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4134. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4135. A bill to promote and preserve local management of savings and loan associations by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4136. A bill to extend the period within which Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4137. A bill to create a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4138. A bill to provide for the construction of a superhighway between Frederick, Md., and Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4139. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4140. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4141. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4142. A bill to amend the act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill., in order to make certain changes in the authority of such commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4143. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4144. A bill to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4145. A bill to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4146. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 4147. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Buttes Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 4148. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4149. A bill to make it unlawful for a salesman of real estate to represent that a dwelling or other structure is guaranteed by the United States as to its quality or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4150. A bill to amend section 801 of the Housing Act of 1954 to provide, in the case of certain residential housing loans, that a portion of each such loan must be withheld and set aside for a specified period in order to insure that the construction is in accordance with the plans and specifications; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4151. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide that no claim for loss on a loan insured thereunder shall be paid unless the work for which the loan was made was actually completed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the Altar of the Nation, located in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that a civilian physical fitness and training program should be established in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 136. Resolution to provide funds for necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Lydia Troiano Di Gaetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert D'Annibale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 4154. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Thomas Brainard, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 4156. A bill for the relief of Renee Schinazi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4157. A bill for the relief of Pietro Catalano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4158. A bill for the relief of Livia Pierucci Simoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 4160. A bill for the relief of Ester Piccini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4161. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zermeno-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of Bruno Maurovich and Jerry Claudio Maurovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Miguel Arreola-Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Enrique Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4165. A bill for the relief of Szmul Golomb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4166. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eve Mae Hardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 4167. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Mardessich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4168. A bill for the relief of Susi Eberl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4169. A bill for the relief of Jan Feldman Wolsky (Wolski) and Waclawa Wolsky (Wolski), his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4170. A bill for the relief of Ezra Gindi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucia Bianca Rognoni Maggia-Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4172. A bill for the relief of Joao Inacio and his wife, Manuela Inacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 4173. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ciolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4174. A bill for the relief of Filomena and Emil Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 4175. A bill for the relief of Francesca Compello Rivera, also known as Francisca Compillo Pachecho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Pulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

63. Mr. BROWNSON presented a petition of Alexander Bernard and 100 other citizens of the Greater St. Mark Baptist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., urging the early enactment of civil rights legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Birthday of Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement commemorating the 196th anniversary of the birth of Albert Gallatin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT COMMEMORATING THE 196TH BIRTHDAY ON JANUARY 29 OF ALBERT GALLATIN

Among those who came from other lands and made substantial contributions to the growth and strength of our country, the name of Albert Gallatin, a Swiss, stands high. A great American who helped shape the future of our country, it is to our benefit that on his birthday, January 29, we should reaffirm the principles for which he fought and from which this country gained so much.

As our second Secretary of the Treasury, who formulated and practiced the concept of economy in government, he was a symbol of financial wisdom and integrity. As a leading Senator and Congressman, and contemporary and coworker of Jefferson and Madison, his zeal for liberty and democracy burned very brightly. As our Ambassador to England and France he was an internationalist who fought for low tariffs and friendly commercial relations with other lands. In the words of Jefferson, he was a man "of pure integrity, and as zealously devoted to the liberties and interests of our country as its most affectionate native citizen."

Gallatin emigrated to his adopted land at the age of 19 from Geneva, where he distinguished himself as a scholar. Among his contributions to our democracy was his aid in rewriting the constitution of Pennsylvania to give due recognition to the newly arrived immigrants. His championing of the people's right to be informed about government operations, in opposition to the Hamilton theory of secrecy, is a basic tenet of our democracy today.

But it is in the wider field of international relations, of foreign trade, that I wish to speak about Albert Gallatin. As a representative of the United States, Gallatin served on the commission that negotiated the Treaty of Ghent with England, which concluded the War of 1812. In 1818, his expert knowledge of trade and finance proved invaluable to our Minister to England, Richard Rush, in concluding a commercial convention. In his deep conviction that our country must establish mutual and friendly trade relations with foreign countries, Gallatin made many profound contributions to our young republic.

Gallatin established the basic doctrine that sound commercial relations, not commercial war, was the key to America's prosperity, and indeed to the whole world. Since Gallatin's time this basic concept has been enlarged upon and adapted by the policies of Cordell Hull, and others, and since has become a strong touchstone in our foreign policy relations with other nations.

Today, however, these farsighted and proven policies are under fierce attack by narrow protectionist forces. While constantly paying lipservice to the principle of reciprocal trade they seek to undermine its practical application many times with the acquiescence of the administration.

In the light of Gallatin's precepts, we would do well to return to commercial and mutually profitable relations with our friends overseas. That would be the best way that America can profit from the profound contributions made by one of our great Founding Fathers.

Bicentennial of the Birth of Alexander Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on the steps of Federal Hall in New York City on January 11, 1957, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; and also the text of a short address which I delivered to the board of governors of the American Stock Exchange in New York City on the same day.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS IN NEW YORK ON BIRTH DATE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON, JANUARY 11, 1957, CEREMONIES ON STEPS OF FEDERAL HALL, NEW YORK CITY

Thank you very much indeed, Chairman Osbourne, for that delightful introduction, distinguished platform guests, gallant members of B Battery, ladies and gentlemen of the great city of New York, and those listening to us in the radio audience.

It certainly is a wonderful opportunity for a country boy from South Dakota to stand here at the financial center of the world on the front steps of Federal Hall on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, and I am happy to see so many of you standing there enjoying this typically fine warm South Dakota day, which if we had it back home we would say to one another, we are having a January thaw. Thank you all for coming here today.

During this year of 1957 all of us I am sure are going to be looking into our history books, going to be reading a lot of magazine articles, listening to radio and television programs dedicated to the tremendous contributions that Alexander Hamilton made to the way of life you and I and all of us enjoy.

I think I will touch this morning just on two aspects of the great contributions of Alexander Hamilton. The one we certainly could not omit referring to as we stand here at the intersection of Wall Street, Nassau, and Broad Streets and what I have said and what actually is the financial center of the world. We should pay recognition here to the fact that Alexander Hamilton was the first great American to recognize the importance of establishing on this continent and in this new Government a sound national currency. Because a sound dollar means as much to the poorest man among us as to the richest. A sound dollar is an essentiality for the success of anybody's economic future or economic venture and we today are the proud possessors of the soundest monetary system in the world and we are that in large part because as a fledgling Republic, Alexander Hamilton had the wisdom and good sense and the capacity to establish a basis for a sound Federal currency which we have maintained from that day to this. He refused to permit any of the Old World practices of that day and age to infiltrate into the monetary policies of this country whereby those in Government would weaken the currency or inflate it to the disadvantage and the disaster of the average citizen.

I refer to one other contribution of Alexander Hamilton because he indeed was the man who gave the breath of youth to the American Revolution, the American Constitution, to its adoption, and to the first formative years of this young Republic. Alexander Hamilton, as we all know, met an untimely death, still a very young man, but in those few years which he was permitted to live, he made contributions which 200 years from the date of his birth, we who have met here today recognize and pay tribute to. He gave this country that spirit of youth which from that day to now has dominated this great institution called America. I think it is symbolic of his youth when we look back to the early days of America and realize that you and I today are citizens of the youngest of the great powers in the world and that the youngest of these great powers in the world today has become the strongest of the great powers in the world and all that has been accomplished in an exceedingly short period of years insofar as the calendar of mountains is concerned.

Alexander Hamilton recognized the essence of orderly Government and the function of the individual citizen and the necessity of protecting his rights as an individual. And in these days of ideological cleavages when so many unhappy people in so many far distant lands are suffering from the tyrannies and the totalitarianisms of dictatorships, are suffering from the godless aggressive tyrannies of communism, it is good to know that you and I can enjoy as fellow citizens the blessings of an institution of Government that Alexander Hamilton did so much to achieve.

May I say finally to the good people of the city of New York, this greatest city in the world, that you have here in your environs the home of Alexander Hamilton, the Hamilton Grange which unfortunately has fallen into a sad state of disrepair but which happily is now coming under the protective guidance and inspiration of public-spirited citizens seeking to relocate and to reconstruct the Hamilton Grange. There are those among you who plan to make it a historic shrine and I am sure the generous people of the city of New York are going to contribute enough to provide for that restoration and reconstruction of a tremendous American shrine, the home of Alexander Hamilton and that when it is done I am equally confident your Federal Government is going to cooperate by making it a national monument and carry on to keep it open so that all those coming to our shores and all those privileged to live here and be citizens can have an opportunity to get inspiration by visiting that home.

May I say in conclusion that I appreciate the cooperation of the officials of the city of New York in what they have done to help commemorate the name and the contributions of Alexander Hamilton; we appreciate this visitation of this fine part of our national defense that came up here by air to participate in the program; we appreciate President Eisenhower's proclamation; the activities of the Defense Department; and the activities of the Department of the Post Office which today is issuing a commemorative 3-cent stamp, a fine stamp that all of you who listen here will want to purchase to remember your part today in this patriotic program dedicated to a great American—Alexander Hamilton.

Thank you very much indeed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN FROM SOUTH DAKOTA, AT THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL CEREMONIES, AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 11, 1957

May I first congratulate the American Stock Exchange on being the first organized group in America on the 200th anniversary of the birthday of Alexander Hamilton to arrange and conduct ceremonies appropriate for that occasion. Starting early in the morning as all good New Yorkers always do, you have gotten the jump, sir, on a great series of commemorative events taking place throughout our country today and in Great Britain as well and so I want to pay you my respects for starting what we know is going to be a year long dedication to the memory and the program and the services of that great American, Alexander Hamilton.

Alexander Hamilton certainly is close to anybody in this country who is acquainted with or interested in the financial activities of our great land because more than any of the other early constitutional forefathers, Alexander Hamilton was a man who understood the purpose and the value of sound currency and the function of a wise system of economic enterprise. As our first Secretary of the Treasury, he was the man who steered through Congress the first Funding Act of our young Republic in the not altogether startling amount of $75 million. We are about to get the details soon of the last or the latest Funding Act in this country which is going to run in the neighborhood of $75 billion and during the lifetime of this Republic in the interim from which we started out with $75 million as an appropriations act to a Federal budget of nearly $75 billion there have been, of course, a great many changes in the size and in the economy and in the procedures and population of this country of ours. We have changed as a country. We have changed in our position of world leadership but, to the eternal memory of Alexander Hamilton, let it be said that we have remained consistent to the purposes and the program established by the constitutional forefathers and by men of the era and of the type of Alexander Hamilton, despite the tremendous changes which are somewhat typified by the size of the new budget compared to the size of the first one. Despite all that, we remained pretty steadfast to what the constitutional forefathers wrote at Philadelphia at the time they were writing the preamble to the Constitution in which they proclaimed for all to read, the fact that on this continent we were establishing a new nation for the purpose of providing the national defense and promoting the general welfare.

I think this year of 1957, being the bicentennial year of Alexander Hamilton, is a good occasion for all of us to ponder just a little bit about the fact that in connection with all their other attributes of greatness the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States had a tremendous capacity for precise prose. Nothing written in the English language has said so much with so few words, and it was not likely that the constitutional forefathers in the preamble chose the words that they associated with the business of national defense and that they associated with the functions of the general welfare. They chose deliberately the word "provide" the national defense because that was, and is, legitimately a function of the Government and they failed deliberately to use the word "provide" in connection with the general welfare because they believed then, as I believe now, that it is the function of the Federal Government only to promote an atmosphere and condition which are conducive to the general welfare rather than to accept the paternalistic pattern of the countries of Europe from which our constitutional forefathers came where they tried awkwardly and unsuccessfully to provide, along with the national defense, also the general welfare of the people. And I think it is interesting to note that at this late hour America has remained steadfast to that ideal as to the differentiation of the functions of the Federal Government from the standpoint of its business and the standpoint of its economic and industrial institutions and from the standpoint of its general welfare

as contrasted with the functions of the parent Government and from the standpoint of the national defense.

So as we all sort of revise and revitalize our understanding of what America stands for—of the basic ingredients of freedom as we have accomplished them in our Constitution and in our history—I think that this 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton provides an excellent chance for all of us to realize once again why Americans are so lucky; why we are the most fortunate people in the world. In part, but only in small part, because we have perpetuated fairly well a formula and a program which the constitutional forefathers wrote out for us with eternal clarity. And I think as we perpetuate that, as we rededicate ourselves to the basic concepts of freedom in this country, we will do honor in that way more than any other way to the memory of these great Americans.

May I say in conclusion, just a suggestion off the cuff, that there is in the city of New York a movement under way which seeks to reestablish and to rebuild the Hamilton Grange, the old home of Alexander Hamilton in your city, for which I understand the Oxford has found a suitable new site and for which it is looking for associates to help them finance the reestablishment and rebuilding of the Grange with the very probable outcome that once it is established the Federal Government will be happy to maintain it in custody and to perpetuate it as one of our Federal monuments. I toss out as a gratuitous suggestion—I think it would be wonderful if the financial fraternity of New York City, with its great leadership and with its almost unlimited capacity, would undertake, as a project, the reestablishment or assistance with the reestablishment of a monument in New York City which in the years to come, I believe, will bring tourists to it and will do much to help to commemorate the genuinely great contributions of Alexander Hamilton to the way of life which we enjoy.

Thank you very much, sir, for being permitted to participate with you in this initial ceremony in memory of a great American, Alexander Hamilton.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter I sent some weeks ago to the New York Times relative to the contribution the National Broadcasting Co. and Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, president of that company, are making to the area of educational television. This good work continues and I am pleased to mark it. The letter follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1956.

RADIO AND TELEVISION EDITOR, SUNDAY NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to have read the excellent article by Mr. Jack Gould relative to educational television which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 16. It is an able exposition of the problem.

The plans for educational television set forth by Robert W. Sarnoff, president of the National Broadcasting Co., is indeed a welcome step.

National Broadcasting Co., in cooperation with the Educational Television and Radio Center, of Ann Arbor, Mich., will broaden the television horizon and in so doing invest in television's maturity and more fully serve the public which is, in final analysis, television's main support.

That the National Broadcasting Co. will make an appropriation of $300,000 for this project is highly commendable.

As Mr. Gould points out, the area of educational television is a wide one and if wisely used can propel forward hitherto untapped sources of imaginative broadcasting. NBC's plan is a gratifying step and I hasten to note, one of the most significant advances made by the television industry in the past 5 years.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee.

A Cruiser Named "Brooklyn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill, H. R. 2386, which provides that the next cruiser to be commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named U. S. S. *Brooklyn*.

For many years it has been the custom of the United States Navy to name its cruisers after cities. During the past 100 years 3 ships proudly bore the name *Brooklyn*, and each of these ships had a wonderful record of service for our country.

The first of the ships bearing the name *Brooklyn* was launched back in 1858. It participated in Commodore Farragut's capture of New Orleans, Galveston, and Mobile, as well as in other naval actions of the Civil War period.

The second ship named *Brooklyn* was launched in 1895 and served as the flagship of Commodore Winfield Scott Schley. This cruiser was engaged in the famous victory during the Battle of Santiago, in the Spanish-American War.

The third of these ships named *Brooklyn* was a light cruiser which was launched in 1936 in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Like its predecessors, it played a heroic and distinguished role in World War II when it saw 15 months of combat service in European waters, including 4 landings and 4 major engagements. It also served as the flagship for the United States naval forces in north African waters. This ship returned unscathed after the war.

In July 1951, for some unknown reason, this ship was sold to the South American Republic of Chile. Since then the United States Navy has had no cruiser named *Brooklyn*. The people of the Borough of Brooklyn, including many veterans' organizations and civic groups, are keenly aware of this fact and are disappointed that the Defense Department has not seen fit to continue the glorious tradition of the past 100 years to bestow the name *Brooklyn* on another cruiser.

For this reason I have introduced my bill to name the next cruiser U. S. S. *Brooklyn* in honor of the Borough of Brooklyn and its 3 million inhabitants.

Atomic Energy's Peacetime Application Promises a Revolution in Food Preservation and Handling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article was written by me for the September 1956 issue of the Pennsylvania Restaurant Bulletin, the official publication of the Pennsylvania Restaurant Association, and was in response to an invitation by the editor that I give my observations of the "atomic" lunch served last year by the Office of the Quartermaster General to some of us who are members of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The article follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY'S PEACETIME APPLICATION PROMISES A REVOLUTION IN FOOD PRESERVATION AND HANDLING

(By JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, U. S. House of Representatives)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: We asked Congressman VAN ZANDT to write this article for the Bulletin after hearing he has earned somewhat of a reputation as an "atomic gourmet," based on his sampling of foods treated with atomic rays.)

During the closing days of the 84th Congress, I joined some of my colleagues of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for lunch in a House of Representatives dining room in the Capitol.

Upon entering the Speaker's dining room we were met with the sight of a table tastefully set with crisp white linen, sparkling glassware, shining silver, floral centerpiece, and appetizingly prepared food.

SPECIAL LUNCH

This was no ordinary lunch, however, which the Office of the Quartermaster General had prepared for us. Every item of food on the table, except the butter and cream, had been treated by radiation, one of the numerous byproducts of our atomic-energy program.

Come with me into the Speaker's dining room and be my guest at this luncheon and sample the wide selection of foods. Here is our menu:

Fresh shrimp cocktail
Roast pork Roast beef Roast chicken
Green beans Baked Idaho potatoes
Bread and rolls
Lemonade Fresh strawberries

You will note that all of the foods retain their natural color and texture and if they deviate from their natural taste, it is so slight that only the most experienced gourmet can detect it. All of these foods have been processed and stored at about room temperature for periods ranging from 10 days up to several months.

All of these appetizing foods have been subjected to either a sterilizing or pasteurizing dose of radiation, packaged in moisture

and airtight plastic film or conventional metal containers.

RADIATION PROCESSING

The radiation, either gamma rays or particles called electrons, used to process this food are obtained from used nuclear reactor fuel elements or from a machine called an atomic particle accelerator.

Now that much successful research work has been done, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense are combining their efforts to design and construct a special nuclear reactor and associated facilities which will permit irradiation of up to 30 tons of food per month.

CONSUMPTION EXPERIMENTS

The Army Surgeon General has conducted extensive experiments on volunteer Army personnel which to date prove there are no deleterious dietary, medical, or psychological effects as a result of prolonged consumption of irradiated food.

Some fresh vegetables, such as lettuce, celery and tomatoes, develop an undesirable texture after being sterilized by irradiation. Further research may solve this problem.

Fresh milk, butter, and cream do not lend themselves to irradiation since they develop a serious off-taste and odor. Progress is being made in solving this problem.

THREE TREATMENT CATEGORIES

It is obvious that preserving food by irradiation holds a good promise of revolutionizing the food processing, distribution, and handling industry. It will probably be accomplished by three categories of treatment: (1) heavy and complete irradiation; (2) medium irradiation; (3) light or pasteurization treatment.

The first two categories are pretty well dictated by the foods themselves. Some foods inherently will stand higher dosages of radiation without changes in texture or taste. Food so processed will remain edible for long periods of time. Potatoes, for example, will remain at room temperature storage virtually free of sprouting and withering for 6 to 9 months or longer.

Other foods such as processed meats, firmer vegetables, bread, and rolls can tolerate the higher dosages and will store for protracted periods.

The second category includes fresh meat, poultry, seafood, and somewhat softer vegetables. These uncooked foods store well at room temperatures for periods of several weeks up to several months.

BACTERIA DESTROYED

The third category of foods are those which undergo adverse effects in taste and texture from heavy irradiation. A light dosage of radiation will destroy surface bacteria and with a small amount of refrigeration will have greatly extended shelf life.

Lemons can be stored for longer periods without being attacked by blue mold. Likewise, fresh strawberries will store for many days longer while remaining plump and retaining their color.

It should be emphasized that in every case, foods preserved by irradiation need to be packaged in an airtight container of some kind to prevent recontamination from airborne bacteria and molds.

It appears that processing costs for irradiated foods will be competitive with existing techniques once full-scale facilities become available. This is particularly true if the cost of refrigeration is eliminated in part or altogether.

FLAVOR CHANGES STUDIED

I might add that our Pennsylvania State University has done considerable research work on solving the problems of odor and flavor changes in foods processed with radiation. This institution's work in this and other energy problems has been invaluable.

Irradiation of food is but one of the multitude of peacetime applications of atomic energy which will benefit mankind in innumerable ways and will save millions of dollars each year.

The National Guard Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing and regretful that the loyal, effective, and hard-fighting National Guard men would become the object of abusive charges by an official of Government. Especially is it deplorable when such statement was made by the Secretary of Defense—a man who you would think would be extolling the virtues of all such units of defense. The Nation needs unanimity of action now in this time of nervous tension and unsettled state of international unrest. For the outburst of Secretary Wilson to be made at all is distressing but when the country is involved in making far-reaching decisions on foreign policy makes the timing of such an utterance even more inappropriate.

My people, both members of the National Guard and those who are not members of this great organization, deplore and resent Secretary Wilson's assertion that the National Guard was used as a refuge from the draft. The National Guard needs no defense. Its indelible record has been written throughout its history—it is outstanding, it is superb.

I am proud, indeed, of the men—patriotic men—who make up the personnel of one of the oldest military units in our Nation. The citizen-soldier stands ready in war and peace as a defender of our institutions.

The late Robert P. Patterson, as Secretary of War during World War II, has stated the case of the National Guard in that war:

In World War II, the National Guard took to the field 18 infantry divisions, 9 of those divisions crossed the Atlantic to Europe and Africa, and 9 went to the far reaches of the Pacific. The soldiers of the guard fought in every action from Bataan to Okinawa. They made a brilliant record on every fighting front. They proved once more the value of the trained citizen-soldier.

When the Korean war occurred in 1950 we called on the National Guard to supply the urgently needed manpower and equipment. The first call came in June of that year and by early 1952 more than 150,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen had been ordered to active service. During one period of the war over 80 percent of the air guard was mobilized.

Many guardsmen fought in Korea. Other divisions were rushed to Europe against the threat of Communist penetration in that area. Thousands of individual guard specialists were moved to critical military posts throughout the world. The record of the National Guard during the Korean conflict is one for all America to recall with pride and appreciation.

The Army National Guard today consists of 21 infantry divisions, 6 armored divisions, and numerous nondivisional units, including 12 antiaircraft artillery brigades, 5 corps artillery, 13 regimental combat teams, 9 armored cavalry regiments, and many other types of units. There are more than 5,300 units with an organized strength of over 403,000 officers and men.

The Air National Guard is organized into 27 combat wings with 87 combat squadrons and supporting elements. In all there are over 650 units with a strength of 63,000 men and officers.

At this very moment units of the National Guard of Kentucky are working valiantly to protect the lives and property of citizens and to preserve the peace, order, and public safety in that State threatened with floods.

This is the enviable record of the National Guard. This is the history that refutes any disparaging statement to the American concept of the citizen-soldier. We hold to the wishes of those who founded this great democracy that the National Guard shall be a well-trained, excellently equipped militia under control of the various States and with State-appointed officers.

Situation in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, because I consider the existing situation in the Middle East of such vast importance, I have today sent a communication to the President of the United States concerning Secretary of State Dulles' remarks at his recent news conference with regard to possible sanctions against Israel. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the letter addressed to the President:

FEBRUARY 7, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read in a transcript of the remarks made by Secretary Dulles, at his recent news conference, that this great Nation would give very serious consideration to action by the United Nations calling for sanctions against Israel, that small beleaguered democracy in the Middle East.

I firmly believe that if this Nation not alone partakes in sanctions but even if it votes for sanctions against Israel it would be tantamount to endorsing the action of Egypt in refusing to abide by United Nations action in calling upon Egypt to permit use of the Suez by Israel; in preventing the use of the Straits of Tiran by Israel for innocent passage of ships or of cargo going to that nation, without Egypt's consent; and of the

murderous Fedayeen raids which caused Israel to react for its protection and safety.

Let us not forget that Egypt still considers itself at war with Israel and refuses to make peace.

It has been stated that the stature of this Nation has been enhanced in the eyes of the Afro-Asian countries by our vote in the United Nations demanding that France, England, and Israel withdraw from Egypt because we acted on the basis of principle rather than realism. Should it not enhance this Nation's stature further if we stood by principle rather than realism by insisting that Israel receive guarantees against further violations of its borders; by insisting that all nations of the world have free passage through the Straits of Tiran; that Egypt permit use of the Suez by all nations? Are only strong and powerful nations to be permitted to flout what is considered to be justice and equity while small nations struggling to improve their lot and to live at peace are to be condemned?

For the United States to vote for or apply sactions against Israel, the state we helped create and whose preservation our Government has repeatedly announced as United States policy—sanctions against this one state in the area which takes seriously its obligations to improve the standard of living of its inhabitants as a model for the whole area to follow—would not be adhering to principle however that term might be stretched.

As a new Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of that body, I would appreciate your views in connection with the foregoing.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

A Chaplains' Day Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, coincident with the timing of the American Legion's 1957 Back to God program on February 3 is the anniversary of the sinking of the Army transport, the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, which carried with it 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths, namely, George L. Fox, John P. Washington, Alexander D. Goode, and Clark V. Poling.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a Chaplains' Day resolution, adopted by Baltimore Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Baltimore, Md., and my reply thereto.

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Where on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic during World War II with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths, George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander D. Goode, Jewish rabbi, and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these 4 chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of inter-faith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

JANUARY 29, 1957.

Mr. HOWARD G. DRESSEL,
Worthy president, Baltimore Aerie No. 59, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. DRESSEL: I have read with appreciation the Chaplains' Day resolution adopted by the Baltimore Aerie No. 59, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 22, 1957, urging the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader, as you may know, introduced a resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) for this purpose on January 22. You may be certain the resolution is receiving my wholehearted support and vote. It is my sincere hope it will meet with congressional approval before February 3.

Your resolution dedicated to the heroic conduct of these four proponents of true faith and sacrifice should have, in my opinion, as wide a distribution as possible, and for this reason, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you for making a copy available to me and with kindest regards to you and the members of your order, I am

Sincerely yours.

Noteworthy Statement in Interparliamentary Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a splendid address recently delivered by our esteemed colleague, Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING, of the United States Delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that during his service as delegate, Congressman KEATING made two addresses, which were generally hailed as being among the most important and most effective that were made at the Bangkok meeting of this international conference. It is gratifying to note that one of our colleagues made such marked contributions to the proceedings of this conference. Congressman KEATING ably set forth what I believe to be the proper American viewpoint regarding the Secretary General's astonishing remarks.

We have had altogether to many inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and obvious propaganda in reports of international bodies that are supposed to be working harmoniously and impartially for common objectives of the civilized world. Obviously, the allusions by the Secretary General to the present Chinese Government represented in the United Nations constitutes a slur and a reflection upon that Government. As Congressman KEATING so well points out, these derogatory references may well be resented by the some forty nations that presently conduct legally accredited diplomatic relations with that Government.

The long continued imprisonment of American citizens by the Chinese Reds, including ministers of the gospel and military personnel, and the failure to permit the repatriation of our fellow citizens, not to speak of the excesses and repeated breaches of international law perpetrated by the Chinese Communists, has aroused the deepest resentment of the United States and other free nations.

It was also most appropriate that Congressman KEATING should repudiate that portion of the Secretary General's report containing patronizing and disparaging references to the South Korean Government.

The Members of this body know the history of Korea and are cognizant of the gallant struggles of the Korean people to protect their nation against the brutal, unwarranted aggression of the Chinese Reds. The history of Korea since World War II makes it very clear indeed that the Chinese Reds and their masters, the Soviet Union, have scorned and rejected every effort made by the United Nations to conduct free elections in that afflicted nation. An Iron Curtain has been drawn by the Communists preventing Korean unification. Every effort in the direction of that unification has been thwarted and blocked by the Chinese Communists and their Kremlin dictators.

If we tolerate further this type of international ridicule and contempt on the part of the spokesmen of any nation without affirmative and positive remonstrance and protest, we should not be surprised if certain nations continue their slurs, insults, and derision.

The address follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE KENNETH B. KEATING, OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION, CRITICIZING CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. President and fellow delegates, I should like to address my remarks to the report of the Secretary General. I believe we are all impressed with the amazing scope of these annual reports which range over governmental developments throughout the entire world. We all realize how impossible it must be to comment upon developments in so many countries without some errors of fact, without raising some controversial issue, without provoking in one quarter or another some accusations of unfairness and injustice. Yet the Interparliamentay Union

must, because of its very nature, maintain the highest standards of objectivity and fairness if its prestige and influence are to be maintained and increased.

I am, therefore, seriously concerned to find in certain sections of the Secretary General's report a very distinct bias. This bias is very apparent in the sections dealing with the Republic of China, the Republic of Vietnam, and the Republic of Korea. The nature of this bias is similar throughout all these sections and I think it can best be made evident by a brief review of that section dealing with the Republic of China, which, indeed, the report even refuses to call by its proper name and refers to it as "the government of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek in Taipei." It later refers to "Chiang Kai-shek and his collaborators."

In fact, the entire section of the Secretary General's report on China not only is inaccurate in a number of respects but it is cast in such a way as to derogate the position of the Government of the Republic of China and to enhance that of the Chinese Communist regime.

It should be noted in this connection that the Government of the Republic of China is recognized by the United States and 39 other nations as the sole and legal Chinese Government. It has represented China in the United Nations General Assembly and in the Security Council since the founding of the United Nations and continues to do so. Consequently, the description of the Chinese Government, as outlined in this report, is not in keeping with the facts and cannot but be offensive to those governments recognizing the Republic of China.

Turning to the question of the talks between Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson and Wang Ping-nan, perhaps the one major fact which was presented correctly is that the United States does not recognize the Chinese Communist regime. Insofar as other matters are concerned, it is a matter of record that on September 10, 1955, Wang Ping-nan pledged on behalf of the Chinese Communists that measures would be taken so that Americans in China could expeditiously exercise their right to return to the United States. Despite this pledge, given more than a year ago, 10 Americans are still held in Chinese Communist jails. In contrast, the United States has freely permitted Chinese nationals to return to the China mainland and, despite Chinese Communist allegations of obstruction, the Indian Embassy has not brought to our attention even one case of a Chinese national having been hindered in or prevented from departure since the date of the agreed announcement. It is suggested that the Secretary General's report might be more accurate if these facts were included.

With respect to the renunciation of force, it should be noted that the basic United States position is that we do not ask the Chinese Communists to renounce their objectives but that we only ask that they renounce the use of force in trying to achieve them. The Chinese Communists have refused to agree to such a renunciation of force, and consequently we must conclude that they intend to use force whenever it suits their convenience.

Also in connection with these talks at Geneva, it should be stated categorically that no United States official, neither Ambassador Johnson nor anyone else, has declared that "useful work had been accomplished in opening the way to further talks at a higher level." On the contrary, the United States has maintained the position that the Chinese Communists' refusal to honor the pledge of September 10, 1955, on the repatriation of Americans now in Chinese Communist jails and Peiping's unwillingness to renounce force do not encourage us to discuss other matters with them.

In commenting on the international policies of the Chinese Communists, it is curious that the Secretary General did not mention that they still maintain large numbers of troops in North Korea. This fact would have placed Chinese Communist international policies in a somewhat different and more enlightened perspective.

With reference to the section on the Government of the Republic of China, comment has already been made with reference to the national and international position of that government. The implication that the Chinese Communists would be agreeable to peaceful coexistence with the Republic of China is not borne out by the facts. They have consistently taken the position that they will take over Taiwan, by force, if necessary.

I should now like to turn for a moment to the section of the Secretary General's report dealing with the Republic of Korea. The report refers with an air of disparagement to the South Korean Government. I should like to point out that the United Nations General Assembly, in a resolution adopted in December 1948, declared that the Government of the Republic of Korea is a lawfully established government, "based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate * * * and that this is the only such government of Korea." I feel that in the interests of accuracy the report should have referred to the Government of the Republic of Korea in terminology used by the United Nations.

In its very brief mention of a Chinese Communist proposal for another conference on Korean unification, the report implies that Chinese Communist efforts to achieve unification have been rebuffed. I would remind you that the governments of the United Nations Command have long sought effective means of reunifying Korea. Their efforts to this end have continually been frustrated by Communist refusal to agree to two fundamental and entirely reasonable principles: (1) recognition of the right of the United Nations to deal with Korea, and (2) national elections under United Nations supervision. Their position on this problem was set forth at Geneva in 1954, and was subsequently, in two sessions of the General Assembly, endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations.

The British note to Communist China, which is the refusal of the Chinese Communists initiative referred to in the Secretary General's report, stated: "the governments of the United Nations command believe that no evidence has been shown of the good faith which alone could enable any new conference to serve a useful purpose."

The report refers to the "aggressive designs" of the Republic of Korea. Although the Korean Government has vigorously opposed an armistice which leaves the country politically divided, it has, nevertheless, scrupulously observed the provisions of the armistice agreement which it refused to sign, while the Communists, who profess adherence to it, have repeatedly violated it.

In free elections on May 15, 1956, which were observed by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, Dr. Syngman Rhee was reelected President of the Republic, and Chang Myon, of the opposition party, was elected Vice President. The report's erroneous reference to the election of Chang Myon 4 days later gives the false impression that his election was, in some way, a subsequent reaction to the reelection of President Rhee.

Speaking of elections, it is worth noting that the North Korean regime has held no national elections, free or otherwise, since 1948—a situation in marked contrast to that in the Republic of Korea, where in the same period the Korean people have, in free, democratic elections, observed by the U. N. commission and reported to the U. N. General Assembly, twice elected their President and Vice President, and three times elected their representatives in the National Assembly. Under these circumstances, it seems inappropriate for the report to criticize the Government of the Republic of Korea, and say nothing about the notorious practices of the North Korean regime.

The Republic of Vietnam shares with the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China the obviously unsympathetic attitude which this report seems to apply automatically to any anti-Communist government. Much is made of the "intransigence" of Ngo Dinh Diem, but nothing is said about the notorious persecuion of refugees in the north, the terrorizing of churches, and the slaughter of all opponents of the dictatorial regime of Ho Chi Minh at the hands of irresponsible peoples' courts. Even the Ho Chi Minh regime itself publicly confesses to such atrocities.

On November 1, 1956, a communique from its Council of Ministers stated, and I quote: "Those who were wrongly arrested or punished by the peoples' courts will obtain their freedom. As for the cadres who were wrongly judged, their civil rights will be restored to them, suitable missions will be assigned to them, compensation for their lost properties will be made. Those who were unjustly persecuted will be cleared of charges and their families compensated and provided for."

I suppose the last sentence states that compensation will go to families because the victims were executed and can no longer benefit by this belated admission of large-scale error. President Ngo Dinh Diem has always made it clear that it would participate in nationwide elections when conditions for genuine free elections could be assured in the north. It is difficult to see how any fair-minded person could conceive of free and fair elections taking place in north Vietnam under the conditions thus far known to have existed there any more than one could hope for free elections in Hungary in the light of what all the world has seen occur there in these recent tragic days. Yet, the best that the Secretary General's report can say for the Government of south Vietnam which has just promulgated an excellent constitution assuring freedom, parliamentary rule, and civil rights is that "it took shelter in the pretext that it had not signed the said agreements and did not find itself bound by them."

At page 78 in the French text and page 283 in the English text begins a lengthy eulogy of Soviet diplomacy, Soviet party policies and Marxian communism, the detailed activities of the Supreme Soviet, and the so-called people's democracies that makes me think only of the aggressive verbalizing which characterizes the output of our American advertising industry. Then when the report comes to the Western Community of Nations, we are given the impression that everything is crumbling and falling apart. I do not agree—and I am sure that many of the other delegates here cannot agree—with the opening line of this part of the report, namely, "For almost 10 years, the Western Powers have stood on the defensive." (See p. 296 of the English text.)

Finally, we come to a section (at p. 193 in the French text and p. 391 in the English text) entitled "In America." And what does the report say about my country? Why it is noted that our foreign policy "extends to all parts of the world and that we have come to realize that isolationism is a thing of the past. Beyond that, the Secretary General notes that this is an election year and that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon are candidates against Mr. Adlai Stevenson and Mr. Estes Kefauver. I hope my fellow delegates will not be misled by this treatment, to believe that our participation in the affairs of the world has been either so limited or so insignificant or so unworthy of note.

I regret that I have been so critical of a report into which obviously so much labor and learning have gone. However, nothing could be more important than that this organization be on guard lest it become a source of partisanship, injustice, and propaganda based upon the political prejudices of individuals or factions. Our task, like that of great poets and philosophers, is to see truth steadily and to see it whole.

Whom Should We Invite?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent statements by Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York, and others, concerning King Saud and Marshal Tito, it might be well to examine the meaning and significance of invitations to foreign dignitaries. Personally I feel that much of this criticism has been extreme, and unnecessarily embarrassing for the President in his handling of our foreign policy.

What does it mean when the President of the United States invites the Chief of State of another nation to visit Washington? Does our Government thereby endorse all of the policies of the prospective guest? Does it mean that we fully approve of the form of government existing in the country and the guest represents?

The answers to the last two questions are obviously "No." Were such an invitation to imply that the United States completely endorsed the policies of the foreign dignitary concerned, his government, and its policies, few indeed would be the chiefs of state who could qualify for an invitation. As a matter of fact it would be difficult to find a government with which the United States agrees on every major policy question.

We have disagreed with Prime Minister Nehru on a number of issues, yet his recent visit here was generally considered worth while. It undoubtedly contributed to a better understanding between India and the United States.

We have recently had fundamental disagreements with Great Britain and France over their military action in Egypt, but few would say the leaders of these countries should be prevented from visiting America.

Should United States officials meet only with representatives of those governments with which we are in full accord? If so, what is to be the purpose of international negotiation? How then are we to settle our differences with foreign nations—through war?

President Eisenhower is dedicated to pursuing every honorable means of establishing a firm peace. Under the best of circumstances, his task is extremely difficult. It involves the balancing of numerous diverse forces and the carrying out of many delicate international negotiations. His efforts to prevent our annihilation in an atomic war will be made far more difficult, perhaps impossible, if his freedom to negotiate is narrowed by emotionalism and unreasonable political pressures.

Under the Constitution, the development and implementation of foreign policy is primarily an Executive responsibility. In deciding on a particular policy the President can call upon experts and sources of information unavailable to Congress and the general public. If President Eisenhower, after studying the relevant material and weighing all the factors, decides that it is in the national interest to invite a chief of state to visit this country, I believe Congress and the public should support him. The President's decision in such a case would certainly be based upon a conviction that an invitation, on balance, would strengthen the United States in its crucial contest with the Soviet Union.

Actually the administration should not have been forced to change its policy because of the alleged weight of popular opinion. Understandably there have been some flurries of criticism, but these could have been expected. It is to be hoped that the President will continue to encourage further visits by various foreign dignitaries. If such visits are unnecessarily curtailed, and if because of undue political pressures, direct conversations are not held between heads of states, the strength of the entire free world may be adversely affected.

President Eisenhower's New Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, what is the "New Republicanism" that President Eisenhower talks about? According to his own description of it—judging from his messages to the Congress—it is a program that will bring into being a welfare state with unlimited spending, centralized power in Washington, taking more and more of the taxpayers' earnings through taxation, and building up a vast bureaucracy to do for the people what they should be doing for themselves.

What is this New Republicanism if it is not the old Harry Hopkins-Franklin Delano Roosevelt philosophy of "Tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect"? It so closely resembles Roosevelt's New Deal and Truman's Fair Deal that I cannot tell them apart.

Essentially Ike's New Republicanism is a form of bribery, a program to buy votes with the voters' own money. It is based upon the theory that a bureaucracy can better spend the taxpayer's money than he can himself.

Ike's $72 billion budget is an excellent example of what his New Republicanism adds up to. It indicates what the cost to the already overburdened taxpayer is going to be when his New Republicanism—another name for the welfare state—becomes the order of the day.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republican Party needs today is a rededication to the principles of its founder, Abraham Lincoln, a regeneration at the local and State level, a revitalizing at the grassroots. This will not take place so long as the National Committee spends 90 percent of its campaign funds to elect the two candidates at the head of the ticket and forgets about the candidates below the top. This will not take place if our precinct-level workers are not recognized and rewarded for excellent work done. This will not take place if elected representatives of the people are snubbed and cold-shouldered by an "appointed" palace guard whose chief function seems to be to insulate the Chief Executive so he cannot learn what is going on outside his regular carefully guarded beaten track.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the American people are still at heart conservative; they still believe in private initiative, private ownership, property rights as well as personal rights; private operation of business on a profit basis; they still believe in our Constitution and the principles of government it outlines and defines; and they want it preserved for future generations. They do not want a welfare state—with all that the name means—established in the place of the form of government our Revolutionary Fathers set up and under which we have prospered so greatly. I predict that the New Republicanism when fully understood by the American people will be repudiated overwhelmingly.

Argentina Sponsors Ben Franklin Anniversary Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the people of Argentina in sponsoring the stamp commemorating the 250th birthday of Ben Franklin.

Of course, we Pennsylvanians are doubly proud of the fact that Ben Franklin was a Pennsylvanian, but he was essentially a prototype of the modern Atlantic Basin man where we all live. As a man of inquiring spirit, and friendly disposition, with the art of phrasing basic thoughts in pithy and homely words, Ben Franklin continues to live today in spirit among all of us in the Western Hemisphere.

As a Congressman who took part in the program for the celebration of the 250th birthday of Ben Franklin in Philadelphia recently, I wish to particularly congratulate our good Argentine friends for this recognition of the brotherhood of all people of spirit such as Ben Franklin, whose scientific approach and friendly spirit in troublous times are a current inspiration to all of us in the difficult time in which we of this present generation are living.

First National City Bank Holding Company Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1957

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by me before the examiner designated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board in re applications of First New York Corp. and others to become holding companies under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956—First National City Bank-County Trust Co. proposal—Thursday, January 31, 1957:

TESTIMONY BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE EXAMINER DESIGNATED BY BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, IN RE APPLICATIONS OF FIRST NEW YORK CORP. ET AL. TO BECOME HOLDING COMPANIES UNDER THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK-COUNTY TRUST CO. PROPOSAL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the first proceeding before the Federal Reserve Board under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.[1] For that reason alone, the decision rendered in this case will have the greatest significance in future interpretation and administration of this vital new legislation. Equally important, the plan presented to the Board is one which could have the most far-reaching consequences on the future banking structure not only of New York State but of the entire Nation. In these circumstances, it is of transcendental importance that the examiner and the Board give this matter the most searching and extensive scrutiny before rendering final decision.

What is involved here is an application under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act, seeking, in essence, Federal Reserve Board approval for the First New York Corp. (a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware) to become a bank holding company which would acquire 100-percent stock control of (1) the First National City Bank of New York, (2) its trust affiliate, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., a New York State-chartered bank owned by the same shareholders, and (3) the County Trust Co. of White Plains, N. Y., also a State bank. The proposal, in addition, contemplates the chartering of three new national banks into which would be consolidated the First National City Bank, the City Bank Farmers Trust, and the County Trust Co., although, as of the present date, no formal application for the chartering of these new banks has been filed with the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States.

Principal purpose of the plan, it is clear, is to circumvent New York State statutory limitations preventing banks in New York City from establishing branches outside the boundaries of the city.[2] These limitations, which are applicable to national banks under the Banking Acts of 1927 and 1933,[3] were designed to safeguard against banking monopoly in the State by protecting independent banks in areas beyond New York City from encroachment by the giant city banking institutions. Here, through the simple expedient of forming a holding company, the same management which is restricted in its operation under a bank charter seeks to acquire a unit bank, operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated, and flout the expressed will of the legislative body of New York State regarding the establishment of branches. Indeed, the applicants themselves admit that circumvention of statutory district lines is the underlying reason for the proposal. In their application they state that "the boundaries of New York City have come to represent an increasingly arbitrary and unnatural division of a trade area and a correspondingly arbitrary and unnatural limitation upon the extension of service of New York banks."[4] To forestall the threat to the State banking structure implied in this plan, the New York Legislature adopted on January 29, 1957, stopgap legislation, effective until May 1, 1957, to prohibit any holding company from acquiring any bank located outside of the district prescribed for branch banks. As I will discuss later in my testimony, adoption of this measure makes the present proceeding moot at least until May 1, 1957.

I turn at this point to consideration of the nature of the banking institutions involved in the present proceeding.

The First National City Bank of New York is the second-largest commercial bank in the city in terms of assets, deposits, loans, and number of banking offices. Created in March 1955 as a result of a merger of the National City Bank and the First National Bank of New York approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, the First National City Bank and its affiliate, City Bank Farmers Trust Co., have aggregate assets of approximately $7.1 billion, which comprise over 19 percent of the total commercial banking assets in this city.[5] In comparison, Chase-Manhattan Bank, the largest bank in New York City from the standpoint of assets, has about 21.7 percent of total assets of all commercial banks in the city. Next in size to First National City Bank are the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank, with each having assets of about 9 percent of total commercial banking assets in New York. In contrast, 44 of New York City's 60 banks have in the aggregate 10 percent of the total commercial banking assets of New York City. In brief, total assets of the First National City Bank are twice as large as 44 banks in New York City and exceed the combined assets of the third- and fourth-ranking banks in the city.[6]

The County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y., the other major bank involved in the application, is by far the largest bank in Westchester County having total assets of approximately $375 million which comprise 48 percent of all banking assets in Westchester County. Its nearest competitor, by way of comparison, has assets aproximating $138 million which represent 18.6 percent of the commercial bank assets of Westchester County.[7]

II. STATUTES INVOLVED

Several statutory provisions are directly involved in the substantive phase of this proceeding. Among these is section 3 (c) of the Bank Holding Company Act which specifies:

"In determining whether or not to approve any acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section, the Board shall take into consideration the following factors: (1) the financial history and condition of the company or companies and the banks concerned; (2) their prospects; (3) the character of their management; (4) the convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities and the area concerned; and (5) whether or not the effect of such acquisition or merger or consolidation would be to expand the size or extent of the bank holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking."

Explaining the purpose of the provision, the Senate report on the bank holding bill pointed out that: "It is upon the basis of these factors that the Federal Reserve Board is to measure whether each application should be granted or denied in the public interest. It will be noted that these factors extend beyond the nature of those primary in importance to bank supervisory authorities in the exercise of their supervisory powers. In most instances, safety of the depositor's funds and adequate banking service to the public in the area where the bank operates are uppermost in the consideration of such bank supervisory authorities.

"The factors required to be taken into consideration by the Federal Reserve Board under this bill also require contemplation of the prevention of undue concentration of control in the banking field to the detriment of public interest and the encouragement of competition in banking. It is the lack of any effective requirements of this nature in present Federal laws which has led your committee to the conviction that legislation such as that contained in this bill is needed. Under its provisions, the expansion of bank holding companies in the banking field would not be prohibited, but would be regulated in the public interest."[8]

Equally important in the present proceeding is section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act which provides that "nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct."

So that there can be no doubt about the meaning of this section, I quote again from the Senate report:

"The bill provides that none of its provisions are to be construed as approving any act, action or conduct in violation of existing law. It also provides that nothing in the bill shall constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or later instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action or conduct. In the opinion of your committee, approvals granted and action permitted under the provisions of this bill are not to supersede the provisions of other Federal laws, particularly those designed to control monopoly or break up trusts. For example, the Clayton Act has been judicially determined to apply to banks. Under the provisions of that act, the Federal Reserve Board has an administrative role to play in determining whether banks comply with the requirements of the Clayton Act. Under the provisions of this bill, any action taken by the Federal Reserve Board in accordance with its terms is not to interfere in any manner with the performance by the Board of

[1] Public Law 511 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).
[2] Sec. 105, New York Banking Law.
[3] 12 U. S. C. section 36.

[4] See application First New York Corp. before Federal Reserve Bank (November 5, 1956), exhibit D, p. 4.
[5] First National City Bank operates 74 domestic branch offices in New York City and 65 foreign branches located in 22 foreign countries.
[6] See statement, Superintendent of Banks of State of New York, pt. III hearings, House Antitrust Subcommittee on Current Antitrust Problems (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 1993–96.
[7] County Trust Co. has 38 branch offices or about 47 percent of all commercial bank offices in Westchester County.
[8] S. Rept. 1095 (84th Cong., 1st sess), p. 10.

such functions as may be assigned to it under the Clayton Act." [9]

Against this background, it is clear that the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act adopted in 1950, is fully applicable to the present transaction. That amendment provides in part as follows:

"No corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission shall acquire the whole or any part of the assets of another corporation engaged also in commerce, where in any line of commerce in any section of the country, the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly." [10]

Jurisdiction to enforce new section 7 insofar as it applies to banks, banking associations, and trust companies, is vested concurrently in the Federal Reserve Board [11] and in the Attorney General.[12]

By virtue of the foregoing, I was more than a little surprised that the Federal Reserve Board in formulating the issues to be resolved by the examiner in this proceeding, did not include the question as to whether or not the effect of the First National City Bank plan may be substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly in any section of the country, within the meaning of the Celler-Kefauver amendment. For that reason, on January 9, 1957, I wrote Mr. C. Canby Balderston, Vice Chairman of the Board, regarding this apparent omission. In reply I received a letter from Governor Balderston explaining that the Board "in its consideration of this matter will take into account all pertinent factors, including whether the proposed transaction might involve a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act or other statutes."

I am attaching as appendix A to my testimony relevant correspondence I have had with Governor Balderston concerning this matter.

III. THE CONGRESSIONAL INTENT UNDERLYING THE CELLER-KEFAUVER AMENDMENT TO SECTION 7

In light of these considerations, full understanding of the purpose of the Celler-Kefauver amendment is essential for proper disposition of the pending application. Basically, this act strengthened provisions of existing antitrust legislation in order to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers and acquisitions. For one thing, the coverage of old section 7 was extended to cover nonbank corporation mergers accomplished by asset as well as stock acquisitions. Bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions remained unaffected by this new legislation. That, however, has no relevance to this proceeding, since the proposal before the Board involves, in effect, a bank merger accomplished by a stock acquisition—a transaction fully covered by the Celler-Kefauver amendment.[13]

Beyond that, the Celler-Kefauver amendment established a new standard of illegality. It eliminated the old section 7 test which required that the effect of an acquisition may be to substantially "lessen competition between the acquiring and acquired corporation in any section or community." In lieu of the effect on competition between the acquiring and acquired firms, the amendment adopted a less restrictive test which predicated illegality on whether the effect of the acquisition "may be substantially to lessen competition * * * in any section of the country." One reason for the change was to make it clear that mergers which enabled small competitors to compete more effectively with giant corporations were in the public interest. The change was not, however, intended to legalize mergers between competitors which were illegal under old section 7.[14]

A second and equally important reason for the change was to enlarge the coverage of section 7 "to make it clear that the bill applies to all types of mergers and acquisitions, vertical and conglomerate as well as horizontal, which have the specified effects of substantially lessening competition * * * or tending to create a monopoly." [15]

The House report added that "acquisitions of stock or assets have a cumulative effect, and control of the market sufficient to constitute a violation of the Sherman Act may be achieved not in a single acquisition but as the result of a series of acquisitions. The bill is intended to permit intervention in such a cumulative process when the effect of an acquisition may be a significant reduction in the vigor of competition, even though this effect may not be so far reaching as to amount to a combination in restraint of trade, create a monopoly, or constitute an attempt to monopolize. Such an effect may arise in various ways, such as elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition, increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises, or establishment of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete. * * *

"It would be unnecessary for the Government to speculate as to what is in the "back of the minds" of those who promote a merger; or to prove that the acquiring firm had engaged in actions which are considered to be unethical or predatory; or to show that as a result of a merger the acquiring firm had already obtained such a degree of control that it possessed the power to destroy or exclude competitors or fix prices.

"The test of substantial lessening of competition or tending to create a monopoly is not intended to be applicable only where the specified effect may appear on a nationwide or industry-wide scale. The purpose of the bill is to protect competition in each line of commerce in each section of the country." [16]

The Senate report commented that "the type of problem to which this bill is addressed was described by the Federal Trade Commission in these words:

" 'Under the Sherman Act, an acquisition is unlawful if it creates a monopoly or constitutes an atempt to monopolize. Imminent monopoly may appear when one large concern acquires another, but it is unlikely to be perceived in a small acquisition by a large enterprise. As a large concern grows through a series of such small acquisitions, its accretions of power are individually so minute as to make it difficult to use the Sherman Act test against them. * * *

" 'Where several large enterprises are extending their power by successive small acquisitions, the cumulative effect of their purchases may be to convert an industry from one of intense competition among many enterprises to one in which 3 or 4 large concerns produce the entire supply. This latter pattern (which economists call oligopoly) is likely to be characterized by avoidance of price competition and by respect on the part of each concern for the vested interest of its rival.' * * * (The Merger Movement, A Summary Report, pp. 6–7." [17]

The legislative intent is also clear that the prohibitions of new section 7 are intended to be far more stringent than those of the Sherman Act; that it is enough to show that the future competitive effect may be adverse even though the actual anticompetitive results cannot be demonstrated. Indeed, section 7 of the Clayton Act was originally adopted to supplement the Sherman Act's prohibitions against mergers and to ban those where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition. Section 7's test of illegality, therefore, was based upon probable future anticompetitive consequences unlike the Sherman Act which requires proof that injury to competition has already resulted. Thus mergers were proscribed under section 7 that were well beyond the reach of the Sherman Act.

However, section 7 soon became a dead letter so far as preventing mergers was concerned due primarily to the fact that the courts held that the Sherman Act's rule of reason (requiring extensive inquiry into economic factors to show actual effects) was applicable.[18] This obliterated for all prac-

---

[9] Id., p. 19.

[10] 15 U. S. C. 18. Sec. 7, as amended, exempts mergers approved by a number of Federal regulatory agencies, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, etc. However, it does not exempt mergers, such as the one proposed here, approved by the Federal Reserve Board. Hence, from a technical standpoint, Board approval would not insulate from antitrust prosecution an acquisition under the Bank Holding Company Act.

[11] 15 U. S. C. 21.

[12] 15 U. S. C. 25.

[13] There is no question that present sec. 1 covers a holding company's acquisition of stock in other corporations. Indeed, the primary reason for originally enacting sec. 7 was to deal with such transactions. This is demonstrated by the following language of a House Committee on the Judiciary report, dated May 6, 1914, which recommended passage of the Clayton Act (H. Rept. 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess.):

"Sec. 8 (now sec. 7 of the Clayton Act) deals with what is commonly known as the holding company, which is a common favorite method of promoting monopoly. Holding company is a term generally understood to mean a company that holds the stock of another company or companies, but as we understand the term a holding company is a company whose primary object is to hold stocks of other companies. It has usually issued its own shares in exchange for these stocks and is a means of holding under one control the competing companies whose stocks are thus acquired. As thus defined a holding company is an abomination, and in our judgment is a mere incorporated form for the old-fashioned trust."

[14] H. Rept. 1191 (81st Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 6–8.

[15] Id., p. 8. In view of this new test of illegality, no longer apposite is *Transamerica* v. *Board of Governors of Federal Reserve Board* (206 F. (2d) 163 (CA 3, 1953)); certiorari denied (346 U. S. 901 (1953)). In that case Transamerica had acquired control of 48 banks with 645 offices in 5 Western States. The Board found—and its finding was not challenged in the court—that the area of competition was largely the local community. The Board made no effort to prove the existence of competition between any of the acquired banks in any local community, and, in fact, rejected evidence on that issue. Furthermore, of the 48 acquired banks, 38 were located in communities where there were no other acquired banks. The court held that since there was no competition between acquiring and acquired corporations to begin with, the Board's finding of a sec. 7 violation must be rejected.

[16] Id., p. 8.

[17] S. Rept. 1775 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), p. 5.

[18] See *International Shoe Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (280 U. S. 291 (1930));

tical purposes the distinction between section 7 and the Sherman Act and thwarted the congressional intent that monopolistic tendencies resulting from corporate mergers were to be nipped in the bud.

In this setting, a major purpose of the Celler-Kefauver Act, as the Senate report pointed out, was "to make it clear that the (act) is not intended to revert to the Sherman Act test" but "to cope with monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency and well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding * * *. (The) various additions and deletions—some strengthening and other weakening the bill—are not conflicting in purpose or effect. They merely are different steps toward the same objective, namely, that of framing a bill which, though dropping portions of the so-called Clayton Act test that have no economic significance, reaches far beyond the Sherman Act. * * * The concept of reasonable probability * * * is a necessary element in any statute which seeks to arrest restraints of trade in their incipiency and before they develop into full-fledged restraints violative of the Sherman Act. A requirement of certainty and actuality of injury to competition is incompatible with any effort to supplement the Sherman Act by reaching incipient restraints." [19]

IV. THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION IS CONTRARY TO THE CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT—IT IS ALSO CONTRARY TO PROVISIONS OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT BARRING BOARD APPROVAL WHERE THE EFFECT WOULD BE TO EXPAND THE SIZE OR EXTENT OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY SYSTEM INVOLVED BEYOND LIMITS CONSISTENT WITH ADEQUATE AND SOUND BANKING, THE PUBLIC INTEREST, AND THE PRESERVATION OF COMPETITION IN THE FIELD OF BANKING

Before discussing the applicability of these statutory standards, I must emphasize that the record before the Examiner is lacking in essential market data necessary to determine the probable competitive consequences reasonably to be anticipated from the First National City plan. Thus the record is lacking in market analysis with respect to the probable effect the merger would have on competing banks in Westchester County. It is lacking in market analysis with respect to the probable effect the merger would have on competing banks in New York City. It is lacking in market analysis in respect of the amount of present and potential competition between the First National City Bank and the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., on the one hand, and the County Trust Co. on the other.[20]

Furthermore, the record is barren of evidence as to how the plan may affect incentive for the formation of new banks in New York City and Westchester County; how it may affect present and future customers in their ability to shop freely for banking services; and how it may affect opportunity for present and potential banks to operate in the relevant markets.[21]

Because of these considerations, coupled with the fact that serious antitrust questions are presented, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has instituted full-scale investigation of the plan to obtain relevant market data, as well as other information.

I am attaching as appendix B copies of correspondence between the Antitrust Division and the Federal Reserve Board relating to this investigation which is now being conducted.

Later in my testimony I shall again advert to this matter. I would merely add at this juncture, that without the benefit of the information the Antitrust Division is now seeking to obtain, it would be inconceivable for the Federal Reserve Board to make determination of the issues presented.

Competitive effects on Westchester County

Even on the basis of the present incomplete record, reasonable probability exists of an increase in the combination's market power in Westchester County to such a point that, in the words of the House Judiciary Committee report, "Its advantages over its competitors threatens to be decisive." [22]

Relevant in this connection is concentration of commercial bank assets in Westchester County as demonstrated by the following table:

Concentration of commercial bank assets, Westchester County, June 30, 1956

	Total assets (millions)	Percent of total
County Trust Co	$355	48.0
National Bank of Westchester	138	18.6
2 largest banks	493	66.6
First National Bank of Yonkers	56	7.6
3 largest banks	549	74.2
First Westchester National Bank	45	6.1
4 largest banks	594	80.3
8 remaining banks	146	19.7
Total, all banks	740	100.0

The present degree of banking concentration in Westchester County is such, with County Trust Co. controlling about one-half of all banking resources, and with the National Bank of Westchester as much as two-thirds, that there is considerable doubt as to whether smaller competing banks in the county will have long-range opportunity to do business profitably; whether they will have unfettered opportunity for growth and expansion; whether new banks will be able to enter into business without undue handicap; and whether new capital will find such new banks an attactive investment.

The short of the matter is that present concentration in Westchester County is serious enough; to combine the resources of the dominant banking institution in Westchester County with the gigantic resources of the First National City Bank of New York, may well compound that situation to an enormous extent. If smaller banks in Westechester now labor under a competitive disadvantage with the County Trust Co., that disadvantage would pale into insignificance by adoption of the pending proposal. It now takes considerable courage for small-business men to pool their resources and charter a new commercial bank in Westchester County. The obstacles to new charters, now especially serious because of concentration of banking assets, could well become infinitely greater once County Trust Co. had behind it the weight of the First National City Bank resources. Integration such as proposed, that "links together competitive areas with others in which competition is already seriously defective accomplishes by finacial consolidation something very much like what is accomplished by the tie-in prohibited by section 3 of the Clayton Act; it permits the use of market power in one area to create competitive advantages unrelated to efficiency in others." [23]

It follows that the acquisition would introduce into Westchester County an institution of such power that the banking community would be transformed into one overwhelmingly dominated by a single company, with a reasonable probability of price leadership and a general absence of price rivalry. Smaller banks in Westchester County could not be expected to be unaware of the financial power with which they would be confronted by virtue of this consolidation but their means of competition would be hardly comparable to those available to the First National City-County Trust combination. To suppose that entry by First National City Bank in Westchester County might have no adverse competitive effect on the other 11 banks in that area is like supposing that chickens can dance with an elephant and come out unharmed.

Indeed the inference can be drawn that the pattern of acquisition behavior that has characterized the operation of the County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank in the past, would continue in the future, so that ultimately, much, if not all remaining effective competition in Westchester County would be destroyed, via the same route. This is in accordance with the principle that probable future effects of a consolidation cannot be looked upon in isolation but only in the framework of the merger history of the participants to the transaction.

In respect of First National City, it has taken an active part in the recent series of large mergers that reduced the number of more sizable banks in New York City, those with assets of about $500 million, from 16 to 12. By its merger with the First National Bank, the National City Bank increased its assets by $713 million or over 12 percent.

The following tables show the result of these mergers on banking concentration.

Concentration ratios, New York City, five largest October 1954 and September 1956

Before the recent wave of mergers initiated with the chemical-corn merger of October 15, 1954, concentration ratios in New York City for the five largest banks stood as follows:

Institution	Resources (billions)	Percent of total
National City	$5.43	16.5
Chase	5.36	16.3
Total		32.8
Guaranty Trust	3.10	9.4
Manufacturers Trust	2.96	9.0
Bankers Trust	2.16	6.5
Top 5	19.01	57.7
New York City total	32.95	

United States v. *Republic Steel Corp.* (11 F. Supp. 177 (N. D. Ohio, 1935)). Old sec. 7 made illegal stock acquisitions where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition between "the corporation whose stock is * * * acquired and the corporation making the acquisition." A literal reading of this provision could prohibit virtually all stock acquisitions of competing concerns even those which had but minimal economic significance. In all probability the courts reverted to the Sherman Act test of looking at actual and immediate effects so as to avoid the literal sweep of this provision.

[19] S. Rept. 1775 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), pp. 4–6.

[20] It is fundamental that the antitrust laws are designed to protect not only existing competition but potential competition as well. As the Circuit Court stated in *United States* v. *Patterson* (59 F. 280, 283 (1893)), "Neither the letter of the statute nor its purpose distinguishes between strangling a commerce which has been born and preventing the birth of a commerce which does not exist."

[21] In determining what market factors may be relevant in ascertaining the probable competitive consequences of any particular merger, see Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws (March 31, 1955), pp. 125–127.

[22] Cited supra, note 14.

[23] Joel B. Dirlam and Alfred E. Kahn, Fair Competition: The Law and Economics of Antitrust Policy, Cornell University Press, 1954, p. 1943.

At the most recent date (September 1956) the ratios stood as follows:

Institution	Resources (billions)	Percent of total
Chase	$7.24	22.0
First National City	6.35	19.0
Total		41.0
Manufacturers Trust	3.0	8.9
Chemical Corn	2.9	8.7
Guaranty Trust	2.77	8.3
Top 5	22.26	66.9
New York City total	33.42	

The other principal participant, the County Trust Co., completed 12 mergers in the postwar period. In fact, its activity rose to such a pitch that during 1955 its acquisitions numbered seven institutions. When it attempted to cross the Hudson, however, to acquire the Ramapo Trust Co., of Spring Valley, the superintendent of banks vetoed this merger. A primary purpose was to keep the merger ambitions of County Trust from spreading into Rockland County.

The following tables show the merger of First National City Bank and County Trust Co.:

Merger history: First National City

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
		Millions
International Banking Corp	1915	$41
National City Co. (City Co., of New York)	1916	
Commercial Exchange National Bank, New York	1921	11
Second National Bank, New York	1921	30
Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn	1926	76
Farmers Loan & Trust Co., New York	1929	205
Long Island National Bank, Long Island City	1931	4
Bank of America N. A.	1931	500
First National Bank, New York	1955	713
Total		1,580

Sources: (1) Rand McNally, (2) Polk's Bankers Encyclopedia, (3) Moody's Bank and Finance Manual.

Merger history: County Trust

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
		Millions
First National Bank, White Plains	1920	$2
Caleb Heathcote Trust Co., Scarsdale	1936	4
Hartsdale National Bank	1940	3
Mount Pleasant Bank & Trust Co.	1940	3
First National Bank, Hastings-on-Hudson	1941	3
First National Bank, Pleasantville	1943	2
Ossining Trust Co	1946	4
Fleetwood Bank of Mount Vernon	1946	11
Washington Irving Trust Co., Portchester	1947	29
Citizens Bank of White Plains	1950	18
First National Bank, Croton-on-Hudson	1952	3
Northern Westchester Bank, Katonah	1955	5
First National Bank, Ardsley	1955	3
Central National Bank, Yonkers	1955	30
Dobbs Ferry Bank	1955	4
Peekskill National Bank & Trust Co	1955	7
Irvington National Bank & Trust Co	1955	4
First National Bank of Elmsford	1955	4
Total		139

Sources: (1) Rand McNally, (2), Polk's Bankers Encyclopedia, (3) Moody's Bank and Finance Manual.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present holding-company plan appears as but another step toward larger size, greater dominance in the market area, and a possibly destructive dominance in Westchester County. Thus, there is presented the very type of situation to which the Celler-Kefauver bill was addressed. As the Senate report on that bill stated:

"Imminent monopoly may appear when one large concern acquires another, but it is unlikely to be perceived in a small acquisition by a large enterprise. As a large concern grows through a series of such small acquisitions, its accretions of power are individually so minute as to make it difficult to use the Sherman Act test against them. * * *

"Where several large enterprises are extending their power by successive small acquisitions, the cumulative effect of their purchases may be to convert an industry from one of intense competition among many enterprises to one in which 3 or 4 large concerns produce the entire supply. This latter pattern (which economists call oligopoly) is likely to be characterized by avoidance of price competition and by respect on the part of each concern for the vested interest of its rival * * *." [24]

Senator ROBERTSON, cosponsor of the bank holding bill, was aware of the danger to competition from a transaction such as this. Presenting the bill on the Senate floor, he stated:

"Recently there has been much discussion, in and out of Congress, of bank mergers. I believe there is substantially greater danger of abuse through the bank holding company device than through the process of bank mergers. Imagine what a New York City bank with deposits of $7 billion could do in the way of competition with other banks if it also controlled a vast industrial empire worth $1 billion, and had unlimited ability to establish banks throughout New York State and in any other State.

"It is inconceivable to me that any Member of this distinguished body would say that the time has not come to put a curb on such possible expansion. The pending bill not only would divorce the bank holding companies from their industrial empires, but also would put any future expansion under the control of the Federal Reserve Board, which would have the advice and assistance of the Comptroller of the Currency and State bank-regulating agencies—the agencies which are charged with responsibility for maintaining the strength and the integrity of our monetary system." [25]

Similarly Governor Robertson, member of the Federal Reserve Board, in a speech on October 22 of last year to the Independent Bankers Association, pointed to the problem at issue in the following terms:

"We are required to pass upon applications by holding companies for permission to acquire additional bank stocks. In doing so, we must be guided by certain standards which Congress has prescribed in the law itself. These standards relate to financial conditions, future prospects, character of management, needs of the community, and restriction of holding company growth within limits consistent with sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition. These are not rule-of-thumb standards. In applying them, the Board must carefully consider all the circumstances of each case that comes before it, weighing one factor against another, and—needless to say—no factor will always weigh the same and no two cases will ever be exactly alike.

"Whether you fully appreciate it or not, there are some differences between a great metropolitan area—for example, New York City—and my home town, Broken Bow, Nebr. One can imagine a multimillion dollar holding company acquiring a bank in New York City without unduly upsetting competition there. But if such a corporation acquired one of the three small banks in Broken Bow, the other two might fear that their life expectancy had been shortened. Even a Solomon might have to ponder a while in applying the statute in such different situations."

Apart from this, there is a further dimension—a possible chain reaction. The success of the applicant in establishing this holding company would undoubtedly spur it to further efforts elsewhere in the State of New York. It is common knowledge that other large city banks, such as Chase Manhattan, Bankers Trust, Chemical Corn and Manufacturers would have to establish similar bank holding companies to keep abreast. Once First National City had gained approval, it would be useless, and in fact inequitable, to disapprove the rest. These considerations make it plain that this one decision involves not one but 4 or 5 bank holding companies.[26]

It is certain, however, that there are not enough of these regional branch banks to go around or satisfy every city bank. The expectation would be for a general scramble to buy up the independent banks in Rockland, Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties. In the end, local competition in these areas would be trampled and replaced by the Big Five of New York City. As far as the sizable commuter traffic between New York City and the suburbs is concerned, competition between the suburban banks and the city banks at the retail and small-business level would be annihilated, as will be pointed out below.

Competitive effects on metropolitan New York City

Among the most important competitive forces in banking in metropolitan New York—particularly to people in the suburban areas—are the sizable regional branch banks that have sprung up in the rapidly growing counties surrounding the five burroughs. These suburban institutions have actually grown in three ways: through the influx of population, through new branches, and through mergers with existing smaller banks. Some of these banks, in fact, have acquired control of so large a portion of the banking resources of their counties as almost to raise questions of undue concentration. An important mitigating fact, however, is that commuter traffic, the automobile, and banking by mail bring these institutions into close competition with the banks in New York City. To an important degree, residents of the suburbs have a free choice as borrowers or depositors between their local institutions and city banks.

Regardless of the actual exercise of this choice, this proves nothing about the presence or absence of real competition. On the contrary, it may indicate that competition is extremely effective, and that this causes the suburban branch banks to offer equally good service at comparable rates to banks in the city. A mere trickle—in fact the mere threat—of a shifting of accounts is as important a competitive element in banking as might be wished for. No more eloquent evidence of the truth of this statement could be adduced than the competition for savings in metropolitan New York.

Relationship between population and deposits in New York City

One of the major points made by First National City is that since New York City population increase has been lagging behind the growth of the suburbs, it is necessary for a bank which desires to maintain its growth to go into these suburban areas.

[24] Cited supra, Note 17.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 5, page 6755.

[26] Note that recent mergers in New York City showed the chain effect. In 6 months, the 5 largest banks raised their share from 58 percent to 67 percent of New York City's total.

In the words of the First New York Corp. application:

"The First National City Bank of New York management also believes that due prudence and proper exercise of its responsibilities to First National City Bank shareholders make it desirable to protect First National City Bank against the consequences of business and population shifts from the city to Westchester County, which may create a relatively rapid growth of banking opportunities in the county, while at the same time limiting the growth potential within the five boroughs." [27]

This argument takes the rather simple view that a close relationship exists between population and bank deposits. Unlike most communities, however, the New York City banks are not dependent upon the single factor. Because of their countrywide money market and corporate activities, their correspondent banking and their position in international finance, any such claim is fallacious.

On the contrary, when one takes the long view of the period since 1900, population in New York City has grown from less than 3½ million in 1900 to over 8 million today. Thus the present population is 2⅓ times that at the turn of the century. By contrast, over the same period the deposits of the downtown commercial banks in the city increased from $1.7 billion to $29.4 billion. After adjusting for changes in the price level, their deposits today are over 5 times the level in 1900 as shown in the following table:

Population growth and commercial bank deposits, New York City, 1900–1955

June 30	Population (millions)	Index	Total deposits [1] (billions)	Index	Total deposits deflated [2] (billions)	Index
1900	3.44	100	$1.64	100	$4.46	100
1955	8.05	234	27.79	1,684	22.93	514

[1] Data for 1900 include all commercial banks in Manhattan. In 1955, only central reserve city member banks (banks with offices below Canal St.).

[2] 1955 figures deflated by implicit price deflator for gross national product; for 1900, the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index used.

Inadequacy of First National City Bank statistics

The ratios advanced by First National City are highly misleading. For example, exhibit F, page 5 cites that the "percentage of domestic business * * * originating in Westchester, based on amount of deposits * * *, is estimated to be less than 1 percent." Similarly it is stated, on page 7, that "the group to be formed by these proposals will have deposits and resources less than 6 percent larger than those of the First National City Bank of New York. * * *."

The main fallacy involved in these ratios lies in the fact that the First National City Bank is both a money-market bank as well as a retail institution. The County Trust Co., by contrast, does mostly a retail business.

To show how preposterous this comparison is, New York City banks could acquire the assets of all commercial banks in upstate New York and increase their size by only 23 percent. An analogy might be an acquisition by the Ford Motor Co., which manufactures charcoal, of various charcoal producing competitors and justifying the acquisitions by putting into the ratios the entire operations of the Ford empire.

First National City produces no data breaking down their banking activities into wholesale and retail components, and showing the effects on size, concentration, etc., on such a detailed basis. An attempt has been made here to estimate, for example, the direct consumer lending business of First National City. It would appear that this bank's share is almost one-half of the New York City total. A grave question is raised, therefore, whether the First National City Bank's present dominance in this field can safely be increased further through its holding company activities.

Further, First National City controls approximately one-third of both the number and dollar amounts of thrift deposits of commercial banks in New York City. The County Trust's 120,000 thrift accounts constitute roughly one-fifth of the 600,000 such accounts now at First National City. Clearly this kind of ratio is considerably higher than the 1 percent variety cited in the application.

Still another interesting question is how many people are involved in the various ratios cited by First National City. The 1 percent of dollar deposits emanating from Westchester, for example, may represent a large number of persons. For example, the number of individuals with thrift accounts at County Trust is approximately 120,000 while the number with demand accounts is 119,000. Moreover, the number of persons with direct consumer loans is above 15,000 and the number of personal trust accounts is about 550.

Most of these individuals will be directly affected by the acquisition of County Trust by the First National City Bank. Most of them (or a member of their family) undoubtedly commute to the city. Thus they have a choice as to where they may deposit their savings, where they may place their funds for use in regular or special checking accounts, and where they may obtain loans for personal needs. This acquisition will eliminate for these many thousands of individuals a substantial portion of their freedom of choice as to whether they prefer to bank near their homes or near their place of work. Facts such as these are glossed over by lumping the large national corporate and international deposits with special checking accounts so as to render the ratios negligible.

In general, the First National City's application is completely deficient as a piece of market research relevant for this application. In the absence of a competent study of the market for the various services provided by the First National City Bank and County Trust Co., many important aspects of this bank holding company plan remain in obscurity or hidden from view.

Although the many previous considerations adduced raise a presumption that this bank holding company plan is anticompetitive in effect, and hence against the public interest, the omission of valid market data takes on an unmistakable significance.

Ease of raising capital

One of the points made in the First National City application is that through the holding company device it is easier to raise capital and that County Trust will therefore benefit in this regard. Thus, in the First New York Corporation application (exhibit F, p. 3), the following statement is made:

"The association would likewise facilitate the raising of additional capital for the County Trust Co. to support its present position and future growth. Because of the great expansion in its deposits, its need for additional capital funds has been continuous; they have been provided in part by the sale of subordinated debentures. It is clear that its future capital requirements will be equally great if it is to meet adequately the needs of the communities which it serves. If the proposal is approved, the problem of raising this additional capital would fall upon the holding company which, through the broader market which may be expected for its own stock, would be able to accomplish this task more readily."

However, an examination of the premium now existing for County Trust stock indicates that it is actually in an extremely favorable position as regards the raising of additional capital. During 1956, as shown by the table that follows, its market value was about two times its book value per share. By contrast First National City Bank stock was selling at only slightly higher than its book value. Thus the market has already taken into account the future growth and earnings potential of County Trust and this is reflected in the market value of its shares. It can therefore be inferred that County Trust would have no difficulty in raising the capital needed to margin its future deposit growth, and does not need a holding company organization to accomplish this.

Comparative book and market values, First National City Bank and County Trust Co., 1956

First National City Bank:
Book value per share $60.22
Range: Market price per share, 60¼–73¼.
County Trust Co.:
Book value per share $14.18
Range: Market price per share, 25¼–33⅓.

V. THE APPLICANT FAILS TO MEET ANY OF THE OTHER FACTORS OF SECTION 3 (C) OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT

From the background of the act, it is clear that a bank holding company application, to win approval, has to meet squarely every single test prescribed by section 3 (c). Failing in that, the application must be disapproved.

It must be observed that the Bank Holding Company Act is a restrictive measure—not one designed to place the stamp of approval upon indiscriminate creation of new bank holding companies. This is demonstrated by the history of the legislation as well as by the provisions of the act itself.

Bank holding companies first caught the public's attention in the late 1920's when their organizational activity reached a peak. Many such ventures were mainly speculative in nature, with the result that the stock market crash caused much distress. By 1930, the Congress became so concerned over bank holding companies that it held extensive hearings culminating in specific regulatory provisions in the Banking Act of 1933.[28] Such regulation proved inadequate, however, not only because of loopholes in the act itself, by which bank holding companies might evade the reach of the Federal Reserve System, but also because of the failure of the act to deal with one of the principal problems involved—concentration. In a special message to Congress on April 29, 1938, President Roosevelt made these comments:

"It is hardly necessary to point out that the great economic power that might be wielded by a group which may succeed in acquiring domination over banking resources in any considerable area of the country. That power becomes particularly dangerous when it is exercised from a distance, and notably so when effective control is maintained without the responsibilities of complete ownership.

"We have seen the multiplied evils which have arisen from the holding-company system in the case of public utilities, where a small minority ownership has been able to dominate a far-flung system.

"We do not want those evils repeated in the banking field, and we should take steps now to see that they are not.

"It is not a sufficient assurance against the future to say that no great evil has yet resulted from holding-company operations in this field. The possibilities of great harm are inherent in the situation.

"I recommend that the Congress enact at this session legislation that will effectively control the operation of bank-holding companies." * * * [29]

[27] Exhibit D, p. 4.

[28] 12 U. S. C., sec. 1 et seq.

[29] S. Doc. 173 (75th Cong., 3d sess.).

Bills subsequently introduced in the Congress failed to make headway so that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System felt moved to renew a plea for legislation in its annual report for 1943. This report stated in part as follows:

"There is now no effective control over the expansion of bank holding companies either in banking or in any other field in which they may choose to expand. Moreover, the device lends itself readily to the amassing of vast resources obtained largely from the public which can be controlled and used by a few people and which give to them, when they choose to use them, an unfair and overwhelming advantage in acquiring additional properties and in carrying out an unlimited program of expansion. In the exceptional case, these resources have been used to acquire independent banks by measures which leave the local management and minority shareholders little with which to defend themselves except their own strenuous protests. Likewise, these resources have been used to support the market for their own stocks and thus to facilitate the acquisition of independent banks by the exchange of stocks, as well as to create trading profits for favored participants.

"The Board believes, therefore, that it is necessary in the public interest and in keeping with sound banking principles that the activities of bank holding companies be restricted solely to the banking business and that their activities be regulated, as are the activities of the banks themselves.

"Such legislation should be so designed as to prevent any such company from using the corporate device to circumvent and evade sound banking principles, regulatory statutes, and declared legislative policy."

In 1944 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation added its voice to the call for legislation. It stated in its annual report for that year:

"The business of lending money is well suited to private initiative and is best performed under competitive conditions. Monopoly in banking is a threat to American traditions, both because it limits the opportunities to engage in the business of banking, and because it provides an opportunity for favoritism in the extension of credit which may foster monopolies in other industries. The growing tendencies toward monopoly in the banking business are serious, and prompt action should be taken to curb them. * * *

"A partial monopoly which develops when one bank obtains a disproportionate percentage of the total banking resources of an area may have a serious effect on the economic life of the district. * * *

"Holding companies not only tend to become monopolistic, but increase the problem of supervision. * * *"

In the meantime, and continuing through the early postwar years, the large bank holding companies continued to expand without hindrance. Finally, in 1948, a point was reached when the Federal Reserve Board decided to grasp the initiative under powers conferred by the Clayton Act. Without repeating here the voluminous proceedings against the Transamerica Corp. in any detail, the following section of the Board's brief seems relevant in stating the bank holding company problem in general terms:

"The Clayton Act is a prophylactic statute, designed to arrest monopoly 'in its incipiency and before consummation,' as Congress itself said when it passed the law. Section 7 was specifically aimed at holding companies which buy up the stocks of companies in actual or potential competition and bring those companies under common ownership and control. The holding company which follows this practice was denounced by Congress as 'an abomination.' Here we have a case where just such a situation as Congress specifically visualized has come to pass. Transamerica and its predecessors have for over 40 years been acquiring the stocks of small, medium and large sized commercial banks in an ever-expanding area on the west coast. To date, they have acquired almost 700 separate banking offices in 5 States. As fast as these banks were acquired, they were merged into or became branches of one or another of the rapidly growing branch banks in the controlled group. The cumulative effect of these acquisitions has been to bring the Transamerica controlled group of banks to a point where they now comprise 40 percent of all commercial banking offices in the 5-State area, having 39 percent of all commercial bank deposits and 50 percent of all commercial bank loans in those States. Furthermore, the evidence clearly indicates that, unless restrained, Transamerica intends to acquire more banks and thus to increase further its growing monopoly power in that area. The net 'effect' of these acquisitions, we contend, 'may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly' of commercial banking offices, deposits and loans in the 5-State area, contrary to the provisions of section 7. The nub of our contention springs from the conviction that the only proper legal test for determining the 'effect' of such a continuous series of acquisitions is to consider their cumulative effect upon both existing and potential competition in commercial banking in the area." [30]

Perhaps nothing sparked renewed agitation for effective restrictions against bank holding companies more than the Board's inability to stop the acquisitions of the Transamerica Corp., due to the apparent impotence of old section 7 of the Clayton Act as interpreted in that case by the Circuit Court of Appeals.[31] Finally, by 1955 the Congress had accumulated sufficient testimony, and Members of both Houses had become sufficiently familiar with the issues, to bring bills within sight of enactment. The main line of argument, familiar from many long-drawn-out proceedings, did not falter from its main objective—greater restriction. Thus, Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, testified at hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee as follows:

"These provisions of existing law regulate the activities of a bank holding company only if it happens to control a member bank and only if it desires to vote the stock of that bank. In effect, therefore, regulation is largely voluntary on the part of the holding company. Even if a voting permit is obtained, the regulation to which a holding company is subject is aimed mostly at protecting the soundness of the member banks in the group.

"These provisions, therefore, do not deal at all with two apparent problems in the banking holding company field. In the first place, there is nothing in present law which restricts the ability of a bank holding company to add to the number of its controlled banks. Consequently, there can well be situations in which a large part of the commercial banking facilities in a large area of the country may be concentrated under the management and control of a single corporation." [32]

When the House Committee on Banking and Currency issued its report to accompany its proposed bill, H. R. 6227, the problem was stated again in this form:

"Evidence developed during the hearings has convinced your committee that bank holding companies are not in accord with the very precepts upon which our banking system rests. The United States early in its history, it should be recalled, adopted a democratic ideal of banking. Other countries, for the most part, have preferred to rely on a few large banks controlled by a banking elite. There has developed in this country, on the other hand, a conception of the independent unit bank as an institution having its ownership and origin in the local community and deriving its business chiefly from the community's industrial and commercial activities and from the farming population within its vicinity or trade area. Its activities are usually fully integrated with the local economic and social organization. The bank holding company device threatens to destroy this democratic grassroots institution.

"Your committee believes that the destruction of the American unit banking system, resulting in the further concentration of credit facilities, would have revolutionary effects upon our free-enterprise system. Ultimately, monopolistic control of credit could entirely remold our fundamental political and social institutions.

"The time for action is now. We dare wait no longer, for already we are rapidly following the example of England whose many banks became the big five. She finally passed a law against further concentration. The Bank of England has been nationalized. France has nationalized its few banks. The same will inevitably come to pass here unless we forestall it by legislation.

"There is no question about what the reaction of the American people would be to such a condition. A nation that would not allow a monopoly over tobacco certainly will not condone one over the lifeblood of its economy, money, and credit. Through their Representatives in Congress and the State legislatures they have at various periods erected legal barriers against centralization of credit. Some of these have fallen, some have corroded. It is urgently necessary that we stop the remaining laws from being evaded. H. R. 6227 would do this. Its adoption by the Congress is necessary if we are to preserve our free-enterprise banking system, the economic counterpart of our political system. Each is essential to the other." [33]

From the foregoing it is abundantly clear that the act is restrictive and that by no means was it intended to provide ambitious bank holding companies a hunting license to wage war on the country's independent unit and regional banks.

In addition to its history, provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 make it clear that it would be a perversion of congressional intent to depict this act as a harmless ordinance designed to legitimatize or even foster and encourage bank holding companies. The following points are significant:

1. Acquisition of bank stock or assets. Procedures are set forth whereby the Board of Governors cannot render a decision without first consulting the appropriate State authority or the Comptroller of the Currency. Specific provisions of the act, previously discussed, establish that the Congress was deeply concerned about the harmful effects of these acquisitions on competition and the public interest.

2. Banning acquisitions across State lines: Acquisition of a bank located in a State other than where the holding company's principal

[30] Reply brief of counsel for the Board of Governors, November 9, 1951, in the Transamerica proceedings.

[31] Cited supra, note 15.

[32] Hearings before House Committee on Banking and Currency on H. R. 2764 to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 13–14.

[33] H. Rept. No. 609 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 1–2.

operations are conducted is expressly forbidden, unless specifically authorized by State law.

3. Divestment of nonbanking organizations: The act, recognizing the great potential abuses inherent in combining banking with nonbanking enterprises, requires divestment within a specified time period.

4. Registration of existing holding companies: The act requires registration with the Board of Governors of all information regarding the financial condition and operations, management, and intercompany relationship of all existing bank holding companies and their subsidiaries. This closed a previously existing loophole in the Banking Act of 1933.

5. General powers given to Board of Governors: The Board of Governors is empowered to issue any regulations or orders, to require reports under oath and to examine holding companies and their affiliates whenever necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act.

6. Forbidding intercompany borrowing: The act recognizes the possibility of abuses through financial manipulations within the holding company setup. It therefore forbids a subsidiary bank from investing in the securities of the parent company, from making loans collateraled by such securities, or from extending credit to any subsidiary of the holding company.

7. Responsibility of holding company officers: The act specifies that officers, directors or employees of a holding company are subject to the same severe penalties for falsification of records as would be the personnel of member banks.

It is in this setting that the facts of section 3 of the Banking Holding Company Act must be applied.

Factor 1, the financial history and condition of the banks concerned: As the applicant amply demonstrates, the financial history and condition of the 2 banks involved are sound. Apart from the merger histories of these 2 institutions, which has previously been described, there is little to be added to the facts presented by First National City Bank. Since both institutions are in a strong and profitable condition, the public interest does not require in the least that their proposed alliance through the holding company device be approved.

Factor 2, prospects of the 2 banks: From all appearances, the prosects of First National City Bank and County Trust Co., of White Plains, are excellent. Again, the applicant has shown that its own growth and earnings—as well as those of its proposed subsidiary—are good. Both institutions may be expected to benefit from the continued growth of population and income in New York State, with a resultant gain in the volume of business done by these 2 banks. The prospects of these institutions, therefore, are bright and offer no grounds whatever why this application should be approved.

Factor 3, character of management:

Both First National City Bank and County Trust Co. are generally considered adequately managed banks, headed by experienced officers and guided by active boards of directors. Indeed, the successful operation of both banks as separate entities raises a question whether the imposition of yet another layer of management might not result in diseconomies, in a blunting of initiative, and in the creation of a superbureaucracy that might stifle the creative talents of top personnel. Indications that undue size produce such effects—as evidenced by time-consuming and inefficient lending procedures—were given to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee To Revise the Banking Law during its hearings.

In sum, not only does present character of management fail to supply grounds why this application should be approved, but a presumption that management might suffer calls for disapproval.

Factor 4, convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities:

The convenience, needs and welfare of the communities in the areas in which First National City Bank and County Trust Co. operate appear presently well served by banking institutions, including the applicant and its intended subsidiary. Both these institutions offer a full and apparently adequate range of services to their customers even though their specialties differ. By volume of business, First National City Bank is not so much a retail as far more importantly a wholesale bank which serves the national and international markets. The County Trust Co. of White Plains, by contrast, puts its major emphasis on retail banking.

It is recognized that certain services, such as facilities for international transactions, are more available at the First National City Bank than at the County Trust Co. But any such lack cannot be construed to prove an inconvenience to the residents of Westchester under the meaning of this act. There is no reason why such new services could not be added equally well—if a large enough demand existed in Westchester—without the proposed combination.

Second, residents of Westchester are now within easy commuting distance of banks in New York City, including the First National City Bank, apart from the fact that they have access to any of the more specialized services of city banks through the unique correspondent banking system. No compelling reason exists, therefore, why the convenience of residents of the area involved would demand the proposed holding company plan. In the absence of such a positive showing, disapproval would have to follow.

There is no evidence showing benefits from the consolidation

As for arguments in the application purporting to show resultant benefits of the merger, let me make these observations. There is not a shred of evidence that the First National City Bank made a preliminary market research study or survey in order to learn where, how, and in what particulars the proposed merger would afford increased facilities to the borrowers and savers of Westchester County.

Not a single type of borrower was shown as being unable to get credit or as being unable to obtain it in whatever amounts needed for growth and development.

Not a single business, industry, or enterprise was cited as being stunted in diversification or growth for lack of adequate banking facilities.

Not a single fact of any kind is adduced to show that anyone in Westchester County needs the personal and small-business services which in its application the First National City Bank states it would be in a position to render.

Not a whit of evidence is presented to show that the banking facilities of Westchester County, and specifically of the County Trust Co., have refused or been unable to grow as needed. On the contrary the actual growth is shown to be extraordinarily rapid, fully as rapid as the rate of suburbanization of population and business.

Nor is there an iota of detail as to how the proposed merger would bring about "more economic and efficient operation." On the contrary it is stated that "no change in management is contemplated." The application speaks of "continuity of able management" presumably facilitated by "access to personnel and the training programs of the First National City Bank" without any evidence that a management survey had been made by the County Trust Co. resulting in a finding that after more than 40 years of rapid growth, it was experiencing such additional difficulty in recruiting management personnel as to necessitate recourse to supposedly extra supplies of such talent in the First National City Bank. The application nowhere indicates why and wherein the free-enterprise method failed of bidding for personnel from not only the graduates of dozens of banking and business schools but from the ranks of all the managerial personnel in all the banks of the country.

Nor is there any proof given that "because of the great growth in deposits * * * the relationship of its [County Trust Co.] capital funds to its deposits is not so strong as that of the First National Bank." The ratio is different, as one might expect in a rapidly growing bank. But the application itself calls County Trust Co.'s financial condition sound.

In short, one looks in vain for facts to show how the proposed merger will add strength, service, adequacy, diversification, or growth to the banking facilities that are forcefully demonstrated to be completely adequate in Westchester County.

VI. FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME IS PREMATURE

1. Determination should await completion of the Department of Justice investigation. As I have pointed out previously, the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, in view of its responsibilities under the antitrust laws, is now conducting a full-scale investigation of the proposed transaction designed, among other things, to ascertain all the essential competitive facts.[34]

This means, in effect, that the Department of Justice, which has important antitrust responsibility here, is not satisfied with the status of the present record in respect to essential competitive facts. In this light, present Board determination would necessarily be premature and inappropriate.

There is another important consideration. Should the Board approve the application on the basis of the present record, difficult, if not impossible, would be subsequent antitrust prosecution by the Department of Justice in the event it concluded the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act had been transgressed. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the Federal Reserve Board has concurrent enforcement jurisdiction with the Attorney General under that act, so far as bank merger consolidations are concerned. Consequently, Justice Department suit challenging legality of the merger under the antitrust laws would undoubtedly be met with the contention that a coordinate enforcement agency had previously considered the transaction in light of the antitrust laws and had granted approval. True, amended section 7 of the Clayton Act does not exempt Federal Reserve Board approval from the reach of the antitrust laws. Yet, from a practical standpoint, the court would unquestionably place great emphasis on the fact that the Federal Reserve Board—an agency having enforcement authority over bank consolidations similar to that of the Attorney General—had registered approval. Therefore, irrespective of the inadequacy of the present record, there is very real danger that Board approval might well immunize this transaction from subsequent antitrust prosecution.[35]

---

[34] See letter, Victor R. Hansen, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, to Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, January 11, 1957, appendix B–5.

[35] This situation is unlike *United States of America* v. *Radio Corporation of America* and *National Broadcasting Co.* (Civil No. 21743,

The conclusion is inescapable, in sum, that in order to avoid the possibility of vitiating Department of Justice investigation into this matter, it is incumbent for the Board to defer consideration until such time as the Department has completed its inquiry and has made definite recommendations to the Board as to the proposal's legality or illegality.

2. In view of New York State legislative action the matter is not ripe for determination: On January 29, 1957, the Legislature of the State of New York adopted legislation amending the banking laws of that State so as to prohibit any bank holding company from acquiring any bank located across the district prescribed for branch banks or, stated otherwise, to permit bank holding company expansion within the State only in accordance with the branch banking laws of State. This measure, which was signed by the Governor of New York on the same date, is effective until May 1, 1957.

Under these circumstances, the present proceeding is moot owing to the fact that Board approval between now and May 1 at least, can have no binding effect. This is because the transaction is barred under State law.

Against this background, proper procedure dictates that the Board conduct hearings in this case only at such time as its mandate can be meaningful—not when favorable Board decision is a futile gesture. Unless such procedure is followed, the proceeding here becomes one to explore issues that are beyond the Board's ability to resolve definitively, rather than a quasi-judicial proceeding to decide a case or controversy.

APPENDIX A–1

JANUARY 9, 1957.

Mr. C. CANBY BALDERSTON,
Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BALDERSTON: I appreciate very much your letter of January 7 concerning my testifying in the course of hearings before the Board regarding the First National City Bank of New York proposal to create a holding company which would in turn acquire the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. of New York and County Trust Co. of White Plains, N. Y. The arrangements you have indicated are quite satisfactory.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of a statement I have presented before the New York State Joint Legislative Committee to revise the banking law which bears in part on this proposal and I direct your attention particularly to pages 10 and 11 dealing with the applicability of section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950.

In light of the express requirements of section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, I was more than a little surprised that the Board in formulating the issues to be resolved by the examiner did not include as one of the questions whether or not the effect of the First National City plan may be substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly in any section.

Parenthetically, I am sure that the Board is familiar with the fact that the 1950 Celler-Kefauver Act changed the standards of Clayton Act section 7. Previously that section predicated illegality on whether the effect of such acquisition may be to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is so acquired and the corporation making the acquisition. In contrast the Celler-Kefauver amendment established a less restrictive test and based illegality on whether the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition in any section of the country.

In light of these considerations, I would appreciate your advising me as to whether the Board contemplates a direction to the examiner in the First National City Bank case that he determine whether or not the effect of transaction may be such as to be proscribed by the Celler-Kefauver Act.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A–2

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, January 18, 1957.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: This is in reply to your letter of January 9, 1957, with reference to the hearing regarding the formation of a bank holding company involving the First National City Bank of New York, City Bank Farmers Trust Co. of New York, and County Trust Co., of White Plains, New York, and enclosing a copy of your statement on January 7, 1957, before the Joint Legislative Committee To Revise the Banking Law of New York. We are pleased that the arrangements outlined in our letter of January 7 with respect to the time of your testifying at the hearing are satisfactory.

Section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 provides that nothing therein shall be interpreted as approving any action which may be in violation of the existing law, nor is anything herein to constitute a defense to any action or proceeding on account of any prohibited antitrust action or conduct. Also, as you indicate, under the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act the test is whether the effect of the acquisiton may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

Section 3 (c) of the Bank Holding Company Act requires the Board, in passing upon each application by a bank holding company for approval of its acquisition of bank stock, to consider certain specific factors, including whether or not the effect of the proposed acquisition would be to expand the size or extent of the holding-company system beyond limits consistent with the public interest and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. The concept involved in this factor is a broad one, and in the Board's opinion adequate consideration of the facts in this regard necessarily involves consideration of the standards mentioned in section 7 of the Clayton Act—that is, whether in any line of commerce in any section of the country the effect of such acquisition might be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly.

In the circumstances, it has not been considered necessary to refer specifically in the order for hearing to the standards of the Clayton Act or to give specific instructions to the hearing examiner on the subject. You may be assured that the Board in its consideration of this matter will take into account all pertinent factors, including whether the proposed transactions might involve a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act or other statutes.

Sincerely,

C. CANBY BALDERSTON,
Vice Chairman.

APPENDIX B–1

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, November 21, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN MARTIN: The Division's attention has recently been directed to the proposed formation of a bank holding company by the First National City Bank of New York and the County Trust Co. of White Plains, N. Y. In connection with the Division's responsibility to enforce the antitrust laws, this matter is of some interest to us.

Our understanding of the responsibilities of the Board of Governors under the recently enacted Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as well as the Clayton Act, prompts us to defer our consideration of this matter until some determination is made by your agency. We would of course appreciate being advised of any contemplated action which the Board of Governors intends to take on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division.

APPENDIX B–2

NOVEMBER 29, 1956.

Mr. VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 21, 1956, with reference to the application to the Board of Governors for the formation of a bank-holding company involving the First National City Bank of New York, the City Bank Farmers Trust Company of New York, and the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y.

On November 14, 1956, the Board asked the Comptroller of the Currency and the superintendent of banks of the State of New York to submit within 30 days any advice and recommendations that they may wish to offer with respect to this matter. Thereafter the Board will determine whether a hearing will be held on this application. If so, we will be pleased to advise you and notice of the hearing will be published in the Federal Register.

Very truly yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

APPENDIX B–3

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, December 11, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This acknowledges your letter of November 29, 1956, concerning the application of the First National City Bank of New York, the City Bank Farmers Trust Company of New York, and the County Trust Company of White Plains, New York, to form a bank holding company.

We appreciate your advice that, should the Board of Governors determine to hold a hearing on this matter, you will give us notice. In the event the Board determines not to hold a hearing, we would also appreciate being advised in advance of the Board's ultimate decision to approve or disapprove the application.

As you know, our responsibilities under the antitrust laws require us to remain conversant with this matter. It would be helpful, therefore, and might avoid a duplication of work by two different agencies on the same matter, if you would be able to furnish us with any basic competitive information you have collected or compiled

---

ED Penn.) filed December 4, 1956. In that case the Department of Justice challenged as in violation of the antitrust laws an exchange of television stations previously approved by the Federal Communications Commission. The distinction between that situation and the one involved here is that the Federal Communications Commission, in contrast to the Federal Reserve Board, has no antitrust enforcement responsibility.

relating to these banks and to the competitive aspects generally of this proposed consolidation.

If you believe it would be desirable to discuss any of the problems arising from our respective responsibilities on this matter, we would be happy to confer with you.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

APPENDIX B–4

DECEMBER 26, 1956.

Mr. VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: This refers to your letter of December 11, 1956, with further reference to the applications under the Bank Holding Company Act for the formation of certain bank holding companies involving the First National City Bank, of New York, City Bank Farmers Trust Co., of New York, and County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y.

The Board has now ordered a public hearing in this matter, and there is enclosed for your information a copy of the order for such hearing, as it will appear in the Federal Register in due course. I enclose copies of letters received from the Comptroller of the Currency and the Superintendent of Banks of New York, dated, respectively, December 13, 1956, and December 12, 1956, expressing their views with reference to these applications.

In response to your request for any basic competitive information we have relating to this matter, I am enclosing a copy of the applications filed with the Board and of the attachments thereto.

The Board or its staff would be glad to discuss any phase of this matter with you at any time that you should wish to do so. Also, in the event that you should wish to have a representative of the Department of Justice submit testimony at the hearing, it will be appreciated if you will advise the Board in order that a convenient time may be arranged for such testimony.

Sincerely yours,

C. CANBY BALDERSTON,
Vice Chairman.

APPENDIX B–5

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, January 11, 1957.

Hon. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of December 26, 1956, concerning the application of the National City Bank of New York, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., of New York, and the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y., to form a bank holding company. We note that a hearing on this matter has been scheduled for January 24, 1957.

The basic competitive information submitted with your letter indicates that both First National City Bank, of New York, and County Trust Co., of White Plains, are banking institutions of considerable size and importance. First National City Bank of New York is the largest commercial bank in New York City in terms of resources, and the second largest in terms of deposits, loans, and number of banking offices. County Trust Co., of White Plains, is the largest in Westchester County on the basis of the same factors, and in all important respects appears to be at least two times as large as its next competitor. On the basis of these facts, it is our view that our responsibilities in the enforcement of the antitrust laws require this Department to investigate the matter fully in an effort to ascertain all the essential competitive facts. In this connection we think it significant that section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 specifically preserves the applicability of the antitrust laws.

We would be glad to discuss the matter further with you. It is our intention, however, to institute an immediate investigation of this matter. The Department cannot say at this time that it desires to submit testimony in your hearing since our full investigation has not as yet been undertaken. If possible, however, we would like to reserve the right at least to file a brief or other statement at a later date.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

APPENDIX B–6

JANUARY 18, 1957.

The Honorable VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 11, 1957, with regard to the forthcoming hearing involving the application of the First National City Bank, of New York, and others to form a bank holding company. You advise that it is your view that your responsibilities in the enforcement of the antitrust laws require the Department of Justice to investigate this matter fully in an effort to ascertain all the essential competitive facts and that it is your intention to institute an immediate investigation. We note that the Department cannot say at this time that it desires to submit testimony in the hearing but, if possible, would like to reserve the right to file a brief or other statement at a later date. We will be very glad to have you submit a statement or file a brief at the appropriate time if you should decide to do so. In the meantime, the Board or its staff will be glad to be of any assistance it can to the Department in connection with any aspects of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

APPENDIX B–7

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, January 29, 1957.

Hon. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by this Department to Mr. James S. Rockefeller, president of the First National City Bank of New York, on January 25, 1957.

This communication is being forwarded to you so that you may have some idea of the nature and scope of our investigation of the proposal for the formation of a bank holding company by the First National City Bank of New York, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., and the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

APPENDIX B–8

JANUARY 25, 1957.

Mr. JAMES S. ROCKEFELLER,
President, First National City Bank of New York, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ROCKEFELLER: In connection with our responsibilities to enforce the antitrust laws, we have taken note of the proposal for the formation of a bank holding company by the First National City Bank of New York, City Bank Farmers Trust Co., and County Trust Co., of White Plains, N. Y. To properly evaluate the effect of the formation of this bank holding company in light of the antitrust laws, we would appreciate your supplying us with the following information:

1. Copies of the minutes of the meetings of the boards of directors of the First National City Bank, City Bank Farmers Trust Co., and County Trust Co. regarding the contemplated formation of the holding company.

2. Extent of activity of the three banking institutions in such nonbanking functions as pensions and personal trusts, corporate trusts, and bond transactions, specifying the nature or type of service rendered, operating income received from each type of service, the amount or percent each itemized operating income represents in the total operating income for each bank, and clients or customers of each of these services common to County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank and/or City Bank Farmers Trust Co.

3. Extent of activity of the three banking institutions in lending operations, either alone or in participation with other banks so designated and identified, giving the category (brokers', construction, installment, commercial, and other personal or business loans) and type or purpose of the loans, the number and general location of respective borrowers for each type of loan, the amount loaned by category and type or purpose, the number of borrowers in common between County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank and/or City Bank Farmers Trust Co.

4. Extent of activity of the three banking institutions in deposit operations, giving the amount of each category of deposit (domestic and foreign correspondent bank demand and time deposits), the number and general location of depositors under each category, the charge for servicing deposit accounts and interest paid on savings deposits, the number of depositors in common between County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank and/or City Bank Farmers Trust Co.

5. Extent of activity of the three banking institutions in such nonbanking fields as real estate, insurance, mutual investment funds, etc., specifying the nature or type of business transacted in each category, the amount of operating income received from each category, and the amount or percent of operating income each of these nonbanking activities represents in the total operating income of each bank, and clients or customers of these nonbanking activities in common between County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank and/or City Bank Farmers Trust Co.

6. Indicate the nature and extent of services the proposed holding company will furnish to its constituent banks.

7. Indicate for each of the three banking institutions its legal or equitable stock or asset interest or ownership in other banks, financial institutions or commercial enterprises, specifying as to the amount and type of interest and the nature of such businesses.

If, in certain instances, exact details or amounts requested are not readily available, estimates, so indicated, will be satisfactory for our purposes.

Should you or your counsel desire to submit this information personally here in Washington rather than by mail, please feel free to contact Mr. Ephraim Jacobs, Chief, Legislation and Clearance Section, to arrange a mutually convenient time.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are daily praying that Thou wilt give us strength and fortitude in our times of weakness and worry and make us equal to every crisis and calamity.

We penitently confess that again and again it seems as if the world in which we live is only made up of a discordant and struggling mass of human beings with nothing to unite and hold them together but force and fear.

Grant that we may have a greater faith in the cohesive power of love and never lose heart in the high adventure of building a better world.

Inspire us with that divine love which casts out fear and always goes out in service and good will to all mankind.

Bless us above all with such a love of Thy truth that we shall come to know the truth of Thy love.

Hear us in the name of our gracious Lord whose life was one of love and sacrifice, of compassion and sympathy. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On January 25, 1957:

H. R. 20. An act to amend Public Law 954, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked, to say the least, to read in the papers the last few days remarks attributed to our Secretary of Defense, casting grievous slurs upon one of the finest defense organizations of the United States, namely, the National Guard.

If anyone were to investigate the glorious history of our National Guard, he could not help but come to the conclusion that they have, on many occasions, been our first line of defense. The men who have all through the years, during peace and war, given of their time and lives in the service of their country in our National Guard, deserve far better treatment.

I am thoroughly familiar with our National Guard organization, not only in the State of New York, but throughout the United States. I had the honor of serving as chairman of a joint legislative committee of the New York State Legislature, rewriting the military law of the State of New York. I am aware of the great sacrifice of officers and men, of their intensive training programs, and their readiness in time of war to serve their country. Some of the greatest fighting divisions of World Wars I and II and the Korean war were made up of men from the National Guard. I do not speak of the National Guard as a mere tradition, but as a ready fighting organization.

I do not know of any expenditure made by our Federal or State Governments that is more wisely spent than in the maintenance and expansion of the National Guard of the United States, including naval militia, air wings, and in some cases, such as in New York, marine units. It is always easy to criticize and find fault, but I think it would be much better to point up any specific instances of defects and correct them.

My cheers go up to the National Guard and express the hope they will never lose heart in serving their country through this means. I will continue to do everything I can to help continue their untiring efforts on behalf of our country.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing hazards from radiation fallout, I am today reintroducing my bill to permit the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure and distribute fallout detection devices to the States for education, training, and operational purposes.

I am certain I need not labor the need for this legislation. The recent nuclear bomb tests by the Soviets, the development of long-range missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and the increase in world tensions, make it imperative that this Nation be fully prepared for any emergency. Especially do we need radiation detection devices in the hands of our civil defense personnel, so that they can determine and give adequate warning to civilians of danger from radiation fallout.

At this time, the Nation's Civil Defense organization is without the basic authority to secure and distribute these vitally important instruments. Members of this House will recall that we approved my bill providing such authority to FCDA, last year, but the other body adjourned without acting on the bill, and this legislation did not become law.

Fortunately, the Civil Defense Administration has been able, for the past 2 years, to proceed with this urgent education and training program through an amendment to its annual appropriation bill. Acting under that temporary authority, FCDC has encouraged industry to mass-produce detection devices, and today 238,533 survey instruments and 611,000 dosimeters are on hand. FCDA estimates, however, that at least a million and a half survey instruments should be in the hands of trained personnel to provide the country with adequate protection.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have called attention to this pressing need—and serious oversight—in our Civil Defense program and have sponsored an amendment to the appropriation bill through which a start has been made. Now, surely, the time has come to provide such authority in the basic law on a permanent basis.

The total cost of this protective program thus far has been less than $5 millions. An additional $8 millions have been budgeted for the next fiscal year. These are minor sums indeed for protection against radiation hazards. We know that our Civil Defense personnel, if trained and equipped, could save millions of lives in the event of a fallout emergency. By the same token, we know that a lack of detection devices in the hands of trained personnel could result in untold casualties.

To delay the action called for in this legislation, therefore, is to dally with disaster. I hope and trust that it will be promptly enacted into law.

THE NEW REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate the President upon his success in remaking the Republican Party. Also to comment on the statement that there is nothing to be gained by debate in the House of Representatives. Perhaps there is. That thought grows out of the fact that the other day 146 voted against any consideration being given to the resolution which we later adopted. Then, though 146 had voted against the adoption of the rule to consider the joint resolution, when it came to a vote on the resolution itself, there were only 61—85 apparently having changed their minds who voted

against its adoption. It must have been the debate or something of like nature. Perhaps the more intelligent saw the error of their ways.

I am not criticizing any of the 60—I was the 61st.

It may be that some day after the President has tried out the New Deal, the Democratic theories were not subscribed to by all Democrats, Mr. Speaker, this idea of deficit spending, we may some day get back to where a President can go along with the conservatives and every man will be required to earn at least part of what he receives from the Federal Government.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 2367.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The eyes of the free world have been fixed on Hungary over the past 2½ months. Thousands of men, women, and children have fled their homes to escape Communist oppression. They seek asylum in countries that are free. Their opposition to Communist tyranny is evidence of a growing resistance throughout the world. Our position of world leadership demands that, in partnership with the other nations of the free world, we be in a position to grant that asylum.

Moreover, in the 4½ years that have elapsed since the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the practical application of that law has demonstrated certain provisions which operate inequitably and others which are outmoded in the world of today.

Prompt action by the Congress is needed looking toward the revision and improvement of that law.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Last October the people of Hungary, spontaneously and against tremendous odds, rose in revolt against Communist domination. When it became apparent that they would be faced with ruthless deportation or extinction, a mass exodus into Austria began. Fleeing for their lives, tens of thousands crossed the border into Austria seeking asylum. Austria, despite its own substantial economic problems, unselfishly and without hesitation received these destitute refugees. More than 20 nations have expressed their willingness to accept large numbers of them.

On November 8, I directed that extraordinary measures be taken to expedite the processing of 5,000 Hungarian visa applications under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. On November 19, the first of this group departed from Vienna for the United States. By November 29, it had become clear that the flight of Hungarian men, women, and children to gain freedom was assuming major proportions.

On December 1, I directed that above and beyond the available visas under the Refugee Relief Act—approximately 6,500 in all—emergency admission should be granted to 15,000 additional Hungarians through the exercise by the Attorney General of his discretionary authority under section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and that when these numbers had been exhausted, the situation be reexamined.

On December 12, I requested the Vice President to go to Austria so that he might inspect, firsthand, the tragic situation which faced the refugees. I also appointed a President's Committee for Hungarian Refugee Relief to assure full coordination of the work of the voluntary agencies with each other and with the various Government agencies involved.

On January 1, 1957, following his return to the United States, the Vice President made a personal inspection of our reception center at Camp Kilmer and then reported to me his findings and recommendations. He reported that the people who had fled from Hungary were largely those who had been in the forefront of the fight for freedom. He concluded that "the countries which accept these refugees will find that, rather than having assumed a liability, they have acquired a valuable national asset."

Most of the refugees who have come to the United States have been admitted only temporarily on an emergency basis. Some may ultimately decide that they should settle abroad. But many will wish to remain in the United States permanently. Their admission to the United States as parolees, however, does not permit permanent residence or the acquisition of citizenship. I believe they should be given that opportunity under a law which deals both with the current escapee problem and with any other like emergency which may hereafter face the free world.

First, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation giving the President power to authorize the Attorney General to parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe, escapees selected by the Secretary of State, who have fled or in the future flee from Communist persecution and tyranny. The number to whom such parole may be granted should not exceed in any one year the average number of aliens who over the past 8 years have been permitted to enter the United States by special acts of Congress outside the basic immigration system.

Second, I urge the Congress promptly to enact legislation giving the necessary discretionary power to the Attorney General to permit aliens paroled into the United States who intend to stay here to remain as permanent residents. Consistent with existing procedures, provision should be made for submission of the cases to Congress so that no alien will become a permanent resident if it appears to the Congress that permanent residence in his case is inappropriate. Legislation of this type would effectively solve the problem of the Hungarian escapees who have already arrived and, furthermore, would provide a means for coping with the cases of certain Korean orphans, adopted children, and other aliens who have been granted emergency admission to this country and now remain here in an indefinite status. This should be permanent legislation so that administrative authorities are in a position to act promptly and with assurance in facing emergencies which may arise in the future.

QUOTA SYSTEM

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, essentially a codification of the existing law, retained the national-origins quota system established in 1924. In the more than a quarter of a century since that time experience has demonstrated a need to reexamine the method laid down in the law for the admission of aliens. I know that Congress will continue to make its own study of the problems presented, taking into consideration the needs and responsibilities of the United States. There are, however, certain interim measures which should be immediately taken to remove obvious defects in the present quota system.

First, the quota should be based on the 1950 census of population in place of the 1920 census. An annual maximum of 154,857 quota immigrants is now provided, using the 1920 census. I believe that the economic growth over the past 30 years and present economic conditions justify an increase of approximately 65,000 in quota numbers.

Second, an equitable distribution of the additional quota numbers should be made. Under the present system, a number of countries have large unused quota numbers while other countries have quotas regularly oversubscribed. I recommend that the additional quota numbers be distributed among the various countries in proportion to the actual immigration into the United States since the establishment of the quota system in 1924 and up to July 1, 1955.

Third, quota numbers unused in 1 year should be available for use in the following year. Under existing law, if a quota number is not used during the year, it becomes void. In my view, Congress should pool the unused quota numbers for Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Oceanic area. Those numbers should be distributed during a 12-month period on a first-come, first-served basis without regard to country of birth within the area. However, I recommend that these unused quota numbers be available only to aliens who qualify for preference status under existing law—persons having needed skills or close relatives in the United States.

Fourth, the so-called mortgage on quotas resulting from the issuance of visas under the Displaced Persons Act and other special acts should be eliminated. Visas issued under these acts were required to be charged against the regular immigration quota with the result that quotas in some instances are mortgaged far into the future. I recommend that the mortgages so created be eliminated, consistent with the action of Congress when it enacted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which provided for special nonquota visas.

Fifth, the Congress should make provisions in our basic immigration laws for the annual admission of orphans adopted or to be adopted by American citizens. Experience has demonstrated that orphans admitted under earlier special legislation have been successfully adjusted to American family life. It also has revealed that there are many Americans eager to adopt children from abroad.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF FOR HARDSHIP CASES

The large and ever-increasing mass of immigration bills for the relief of aliens continues to place an unnecessary burden upon the Congress and the President. Private immigration laws in recent years have accounted for more than one-third of all enactments, both public and private. Like any other enactment, each case must be separately examined and studied as to its merits by the Congress and the President. The problem presented is usually a determination whether hardships and other factors in the particular case justify an exception from the ordinary provisions of the immigration laws. These determinations could be effected without resort to legislation if the necessary administrative authority is provided. I recommend that the Attorney General be granted authority, subject to such safeguards as Congress may prescribe, to grant relief from exclusion and expulsion to aliens having close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations. Generally these are the classes of cases which have been favorably regarded by Congress because of the hardship involved.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

In addition to the quota revisions, experience under existing immigration law has made it clear that a number of changes should be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Some provisions create unnecessary restrictions and limitations upon travel to the United States while others inflict harships upon aliens affected. I have made a number of proposals for amendments; with some minor modifications, I renew those recommendations and call attention here to certain of them.

One of the obstacles to travel, and a hindrance to the free exchange of ideas and commerce, is the requirement in the present law that every alien who applies for a visa or who comes to the United States without a visa but remains for as much as 30 days be fingerprinted. In some foreign countries fingerprinting is regarded with disfavor. Lacking any significant contribution to our national safety and security, the law should be amended to eliminate the requirement of fingerprinting for aliens coming to the United States for temporary periods.

I further recommend an amendment to the law to permit aliens traveling from one foreign country to another, passing merely in transit through the United States, to go through this country without undergoing inspection and examination, and without complying with all the standards for admission. This would eliminate hardships to the traveler, loss of good will, and much expense to the transportation companies.

The law should be amended to eliminate the necessity for immigration officers to inspect and apply all grounds of exclusion to aliens seeking admission to the mainland of the United States from Alaska and Hawaii. These Territories are part of the United States and aliens who have entered or are present in them are subject to all the provisions of the law. If any were deportable before arriving on the mainland their deportable status continues.

I recommend the repeal of that provision in the law which requires aliens to specify their race and ethnic classification in visa applications.

A large number of refugees, possibly thousands, misrepresented their identities when obtaining visas some years ago in order to avoid forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain. Such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation, and in respect to these unfortunate people, some relief should be granted by the Congress.

Inequitable provisions relating to the status under the immigration laws of Asian spouses, and of adopted and other children should be rectified.

Alien members and veterans of our Armed Forces who have completed at least 3 years of service are unable to apply for naturalization without proof of admission for permanent residence. I recommend that this requirement be eliminated in such cases, and that the naturalization law applicable to such persons be completely overhauled.

While the present law permits adjustment of status to permanent residence in the cases of certain alien, it is unnecessarily restrictive as to aliens married to United States citizens. Adjustment is forbidden if the alien has been in the United States less than 1 year prior to his marriage. This results in the disruption of the family and causes unnecessary expense to the alien who is forced to go abroad to obtain a nonquota visa. It is my recommendation that the requirement of 1 year's presence in the United States before marriage be repealed.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

I have previously called the attention of the Congress to the necessity for a strengthening of our laws in respect to the aliens who resort to repeated judicial reviews and appeals for the sole purpose of delaying their justified expulsion from this country. Whatever the ground for deportation, any alien has the right to challenge the Government's findings of deportability through judicial process. This is as it should be. But the growing frequency of such cases brought for purposes of delay, particularly those involving aliens found to be criminals and traffickers in narcotics and subversion, makes imperative the need for legislation limiting and carefully defining the judicial process.

I have asked the Attorney General to submit to the Congress legislative proposals which will carry into effect these recommendations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1957.*

INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOAN AUTHORITY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 137 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3109) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on the bill (H. R. 3109) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

The Small Business Administration was originally set up in 1953 and has functioned since that time. In the judgment of this supporter of that legislation it has served a good purpose.

There has been considerable criticism of the Small Business Administration, largely, I think, stemming from the fact that all the loans have not been approved. Of course, it must be borne in mind that this is a banking institution and it is not a charitable institution. Therefore, there must be some ground, some substance for making these loans. I think they are made upon a more generous basis than possibly private banking loans. Generally speaking, also, it is the policy of the Small Business Administration to only make those loans which cannot be obtained from local banking institutions. In other words, where private capital is available, it is not the purpose of the Small Business Administration to make these loans.

Originally, the authority was limited to $150 million. The Small Business Administration has made so many loans, let us put it that way, that it has been necessary to ask for this increase. So, this bill is a very simple one. It provides first for the increase from $150 million to $230 million. The bill as originally introduced by the committee provided for only $215 million. But, after further hearings, and after hearing the testimony of the head of this institution, it was found necessary to increase its capacity by another $15 million, bringing it up to $230 million.

The other provision in the bill simply increases the revolving fund from $375 million to $455 million.

I do not apprehend that there is going to be a great deal of opposition to this legislation. I think we all look with favor upon the continuation of this most worthwhile administrative agency.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this organization on the whole, I think, has been a good one. As I said a moment ago, there has been considerable criticism of the administration because they did not grant all of the loans. I can only say, from personal experience, that out of 3 loan applications that I know of, which were made from my own congressional district, 2 of them were approved. The third one was turned down on the ground that the applicants presented such a good financial statement, it was thought by the Small Business Administration that they could obtain the financial assistance elsewhere—and subsequently, they did.

I might add further that one of the two that were approved turned out to be a bad one and had to be liquidated. So, all in all, I think the administrators have made a very good administration of a rather difficult problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, one of the guardians of the Treasury, and I say that in no facetious spirit. I have great admiration for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but I did not rise to talk about the Treasury at this time. Do I understand this is an open rule?

Mr. COLMER. Yes; it is.

Mr. GROSS. This bill evidently does not come from the State Department through the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. COLMER. Apparently, if I read it correctly, it comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency. Had it been a closed rule, I might say to my friend I would have opposed it.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my last comment immediately preceding the question by the gentleman from Iowa, I was commenting upon the business administration of this administrative agency.

I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include a statement showing the loss experience of the Small Business Administration, as of December 31, 1956, which was furnished my Committee on Rules by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statement follows:)

Loss experience on SBA business loans (as of Dec. 31, 1956)

	Number	Total amount	SBA share
Total loans approved	5,160	$235,749,662	$195,702,420
Net loans approved (net after deducting cancellations)	4,373	199,888,383	165,616,334
Laons disbursed	3,606	153,154,798	126,302,270
Amount disbursed by SBA	------	(88,236,132)	----------
Amount disbursed by banks	------	(64,918,666)	----------
		Total amount disbursed	Unpaid principal balance
Loans delinquent in excess of 60 days	64	$2,609,316	$2,092,090
Loans in liquidation	78	3,527,408	[1] 2,480,575
			SBA amount
Loans charged off: Principal amount	3	----------	$70,224
Interest and other receivables	------	----------	4,688
Total	------	----------	74,912

[1] It is anticipated that existing collateral will permit recovery of the greater portion of this unpaid principal balance.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, there is no opposition to this legislation and the reason for it has been fully stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. The statutory limitation on business loans by the Small Business Administration is $150 million. That statutory limitation has been approached to the extent of all but $12,936,252. For the period through June 30, 1957, it was felt necessary to add an additional $65 million, which will require an appropriation to the revolving fund. But the Administrator pointed out that the current expiration date of the Small Business Administration is July 31, 1957, and suggested an additional $15 million for that month, which would mean a total of $80 million to be added to the revolving fund. Of course this is the fund from which loans are made and repaid and is a continuation of the authority contemplated by Congress in creating and continuing the Small Business Administration.

I am in favor of the rule.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the steps taken today in behalf of small business. In assisting this segment of our economy, we are recognizing and strengthening the very sinews of free enterprise and the American way of life.

One of the outstanding examples of small-business enterprise is in my own district, where the Small Business Association of Rochester, Inc., organized 3 years ago, has become 1 of only 3 such associations in the entire country to affiliate as an entire group with the National Small Business Men's Association.

Among the objectives of this group which will have the commendation and support of all thoughtful Americans are the following:

To encourage small-business men in the Rochester nine-county region to enable them to grow and become as big as their individual initiative, ability, and energy will permit.

To take action directed to the preservation of individual initiative in American business; and

To promote the organization of all small businesses and professional services in the Rochester nine-county region by providing information and services directed to the unique and specific problems of small business.

These and the other laudable objectives which the association has set for itself will win the respect of all who want to see opportunity protected at the grassroots. I am confident that the legislation under consideration here today will assist in the attainment of these objectives, and lead to a strengthening of small-business enterprise, not only in my district but throughout the country.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to speak on this rule may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to vote for this rule and to vote for H. R. 3109 to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount to be used thereunder for small-business loans. In view of their excellent record and the tremendous help they have been to small business all over the country, I believe the Small Business Administration could use more funds than are provided in this measure. My experience is that the Small Business Administration has made every effort to be helpful to small business everywhere in the country and has remarkably succeeded in its efforts.

As is the case in the districts of many Members, the Small Business Administration has assisted and been very helpful to small business in my district in Massachusetts. Indeed, I am very grateful to the Administrator, Mr. Stewart, and his very able staff at Boston, for all they have done for small business in my district. I am grateful, too, to Mr. Barnes and his fine staff here in Washington for all they have accomplished.

The Small Business Administration is worthy of the support of Congress. It is doing an excellent job in the area of our national economic life where help is

needed. In many cases the Small Business Administration has actually thrown lifelines out to various small industries and saved them on many occasions. In addition to loans in many, many cases, the Small Business Administration is very helpful and generous with its advice to business concerns that have no other dependable sources available.

In closing, I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank and congratulate the distinguished chairman and members of the Banking and Currency Committee for their wisdom in bringing out this bill to the floor of the House for action at this time. I trust this measure will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday there is 1 suspension, H. R. 2367, that has relation to the drought situation in certain parts of the country. It has been reported out of the committee unanimously and I believe there is no opposition to it.

On Tuesday we will take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957.

We carry over all of the resolutions that were programed for today in relation to investigatory powers by the committees I mentioned yesterday, with the exception of the resolution to create the Select Committee on Small Business. That will be the next order of business today.

The reason for putting the other resolution over until next week is because of a desire to amend certain language.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As the majority leader has just stated, these resolutions we hope will be brought up on Tuesday. In the meantime, we would like to have some discussions with the chairmen of the committees interested in these resolutions. I am therefore asking the members of the Rules Committee and the chairmen of these other committees to meet in the Rules Committee room this afternoon as soon as the business of the day is concluded and we take up the special orders.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I understand these resolutions will be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Until a later date, and I am asking the members of the Rules Committee and the chairmen of the various committees involved in these resolutions to meet upstairs as soon as we go into special orders.

Mr. McCORMACK. The leadership, of course, cooperates with the chairmen of the legislative committee so far as possible, and we hope to program these resolutions for next Tuesday.

Then there will be a bill from the Armed Services Committee, H. R. 2528, authorizing the sale of the alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky.

I know of no other legislation for next week. Should any be programed I will make the announcement as soon as possible in order that the membership may have as much advance notice as possible.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I may state to the leadership and to the Members of the House that this bill from the Armed Services Committee is the same as those dealing with the disposal of other butadiene plants. After free and frank debate has been had I do not intend to ask for a rollcall unless somebody requests it.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the majority leader if it is his intention to ask that we go over from today until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was just going to submit that request together with another one.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOAN AUTHORITY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE AND TITO'S VISIT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the press reports were very misleading regarding the President's comments on distinguished visits during his press conference yesterday morning.

The inference from these reports would lead one to believe that the President was referring to Marshal Tito's visit to the White House. The President's remarks were confined solely to the visit of King Saud.

The No. 1 enemy of world freedom and the primary cause for our troubles throughout the world is Communist aggression as maneuvered by the Communist tyrants, which includes Tito along with the Soviet leaders. President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, Anthony Eden, and other leaders of the free world had one unfortunate experience in meeting with Khrushchev and Bulganin at Geneva. This meeting magnified the prestige of these Communist leaders and strengthened their position among the enslaved people in their captive nations along with elevating them as legitimate world leaders in the eyes of millions throughout the free world. Nothing valuable or effective toward world peace resulted from the Geneva gathering.

Immediately after Geneva, Khrushchev and Bulganin took a highly publicized and effective tour throughout the Middle East and Asia, capitalizing on their newly won prestige which they gained at the Geneva Conference, and proceeded to sow seeds of dissension and hate against the United States and the West.

The Geneva meeting contributed a great deal to our present difficulties in the Middle East and Asia, and especially the Suez Canal problem. Secretary Dulles and the President should realize now that meetings with Tito and other Communist tyrants lead to nothing but the strengthening of their cause and aiding their long-term strategy for world-wide conquest.

It is interesting to read the following verbatim quotation from ex-President Herbert Hoover on Saturday, December 5, 1953, in the United States Courthouse, New York City, while testifying before the congressional Select Committee on Communist Aggression—volume 2, page 221:

> No one can read the directions and speeches of Lenin and Stalin and Molotov and ever believe that agreement with Russia has more than purely temporary value.
>
> There are occasions when I think agreements could be made which would be to their interest or to the mutual interest, but those are pretty rare occasions. Such agreements would last only just so long as it suited the Russians.
>
> You have to bear in mind that during the interval between the First World War and the Second World War, it suited the Russians to have a peaceful front. During that time they made 36 different nonaggression pacts or treaties guaranteeing nonaggression activities.
>
> Every one of those went by the board the day they made the agreement with Hitler in August 1939.
>
> That ought to indicate the sacredness of an agreement in the mind of the Russian when it doesn't suit him.

This is the end of the quote from ex-President Hoover's testimony.

Here is a verbatim quotation from Gen. Wladyslaw Anders in London, England, Friday, June 18, 1954, while testifying before the congressional Select Committee on Communist Aggression.

> Conferences are regarded necessary by the Bolsheviks only for two reasons: One is to spread their propaganda across the world, the other to gain time. Ever since Lenin and Stalin, the Bolsheviks have always said the same thing: Their aim is to dominate the world. If necessary, they will use blackmail. If necessary, they will momentarily retreat—if such is the decision of the Communist hierarchy, they will go ahead again with double force.

Former leaders of other captive nations testified in almost identical language that conferences with Communist

tyrants lead to nothing but advantage for their Communist aggression.

The U. S. News & World Report magazine over a year ago stated in an article that Communist leaders made 52 agreements with free nations in the last 25 years and broke 50 when it suited their convenience. The two agreements which they kept were to enter the Japanese war and grant a corridor into Berlin. They violated the Berlin corridor agreement and entered the war with Japan for the last 2 weeks of the conflict.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman from Indiana is certainly well informed on the subject matter he is speaking about, having been chairman of the committee investigating the Katyn massacre. He was over there and met these leaders that had to deal with the situation through personal contact and experience.

In reference to the Associated Press dispatch from Yugoslavia concerning the refusal on the part of Tito to accept an invitation to the United States, he uses the excuse that there have been remarks made in this country that were anti-Yugoslavia. That is not true because the committee sponsoring the petition had no such thought and no remarks were made which were anti-Yugoslavia. The remarks were anti-Tito. If the report reflects his statement to the press it is not a correct appraisal of the situation. So I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana if that is his impression of the report from Yugoslavia?

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with the gentleman from California in his statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I also have had letters from Yugoslavian people in this country who agreed with the Members of Congress who signed the protest petition.

Mr. MADDEN. I may state further that President Hoover's testimony and that of these leaders, was borne out at Geneva. Immediately after Geneva with the prestige that was built up when President Eisenhower and Mr. Eden flew across there to sit down with Khrushchev and Bulganin nothing was accomplished; but they immediately used their newly won prestige to parade through the Middle East and Asia to build up sentiment and the disorder which brought on the Suez Canal difficulty. They used the Geneva Conference in the same way that ex-President Hoover and these other leaders testified before our committee 4 years ago when they stated that the Communist leaders would use any kind of a conference in order to extend and to build up their own prestige.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House that February 2 is Groundhog Day.

It is regrettable that February 2 falls on Saturday this year; therefore, Congress will not be in session to receive the pronouncement of this great meteorologist, this great prognosticator of the weather, who at that time from his "weather works' den" on Gobbler's Knob in the foothills of the Alleghenies, will make his annual forecast as to weather conditions for the following 6 weeks. Millions of people are anxiously waiting the word of the world's foremost prophet—the Punxsutawney groundhog.

Several years ago the "chuck's" message was interrupted by a state of the Union message; last year an international misunderstanding scheduled the appearance of the former British Prime Minister, whose address to both Houses of Congress precluded your hearing the message from Gobbler's Knob.

The grave question is whether or not he will see his shadow. From what I can learn from the scouts in the vicinity of the windy, snow-covered knoll, where the snow for months has been deep and the cold subzero, the followers of the prophet expect he will quietly emerge from his den, take a quick look, see his shadow, back into his hole, slam the door on the outside world, and we will be in for 6 more weeks of wintry weather. However, no one can tell what the prediction may be. The chuck and the chuck alone knows the answer.

I might call to the attention of the House that since the Punxsutawney groundhog ascended the weather throne at Gobbler's Knob nearly a century ago, petty, prevaricating pretenders have pecked peevishly at his position as the preeminent prognosticator; however, little or no attention is paid to the petulant pretensions of these piebald pilgrims parading as progenies of Punxsutawney's peerless prophet.

This year it will be a relief to the Members of the House to know that we will not hear from the gentleman from Wisconsin who annually rose to the defense of the Sun Prairie quack, that publicity-seeking opportunist who regularly sounded off from that wide-open-space-in-the-road at Sun Prairie, Wis.

It may be that the boys up at the "slumbering lumber lodge" at Quarryville, Pa., will bring out that nature faker of a low degree in an attempt to intrude upon the sacred tradition of the one and only Punxsutawney groundhog in the same objectionable manner as in the past.

And it may be that my good and able friend, BROOKS HAYS, will again make a scurrilous attack on the "seer of seers" in defense of his hound dog, who, he claims, is a weather forecaster of no mean ability.

So, I feel it is my patriotic duty, not alone to the citizens of the 23d District of Pennsylvania, which I am proud to represent, but to the people of the whole Nation, to alert them to these plagiarizing pseudo-chucks who will want to intrude upon the amazing and almost incredible predictions of this foreteller of the weather.

After the Punxsutawney chuck's announcement on February 2, I trust there will be no brash attempts—which I deeply resent—by the run-of-the-mine fabricators and deceivers to usurp the distinguished and honored position in the weather world occupied by the "chuck," the originator of this unique and remarkable weather service, the one and only Punxsutawney groundhog.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 56 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1957, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 12 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 7 from the majority party and 5 from the minority party, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of the potentialities of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; (4) whether priorities and preferences established and allocations made by the Federal Government with respect to scarce materials adequately serve the needs of small business; and (5) methods of solving the special problems of small business arising by reason of national emergency: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated

chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."
Page 1, line 2, strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen."
Page 1, line 5, strike out "five" and insert "six."
Page 1, line 9, strike out "and directed."
Page 2, line 24, after "places", insert "within the United States."
Page 2, line 25, after "House", strike out "is sitting."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we know of no objection to the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this resolution broad enough for this committee to investigate the 1-cent increase in gasoline prices?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I will state to the gentleman that this is the usual resolution which we have passed in every Congress creating a Committee on Small Business to investigate the problems of small business.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this is broad enough to cover an investigation of the 1-cent increase in gasoline prices?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield to the author of the resolution to see what he thinks about it.

Mr. PATMAN. It covers anything that affects small business. Any problem that comes up affecting small business caused by an increase in gasoline prices will be investigated by this committee.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman says that he does have authority to go into the question of the increase in the price of gasoline?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman is in favor of going into that?

Mr. PATMAN. If we are convinced that the committee should go into it, we will go into it. We shall leave questions like that to the committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOAN AUTHORITY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3109) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth sentence of section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $215,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (a)."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out "$375,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$440,000,000."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$215,000,000" and insert "$230,000,000."
Line 10, strike out "$440,000,000" and insert "$455,000,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth sentence of section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $215,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (a)."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out "$375,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$440,000,000."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3109 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 3109) was passed were vacated and said bill was laid on the table.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time to review briefly the origin and history of the Small Business Administration. This agency is distinctive in that it is the first peacetime lending agency established by the Congress for the sole purpose of assisting small business.

The act which made this agency possible was approved on July 30, 1953. Prior to that time small-business loans were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but more money was lent to large business than to small. When the RFC was allowed to expire, the 83d Congress established the Small Business Administration so that small business firms might not only enjoy the advantages to which they were accustomed under RFC, but also the superior advantages to be had from an agency devoted exclusively to their interests.

Mr. Speaker, it seems also appropriate that something should be said about the principles governing the operations of the SBA and that facts should be supplied to show how well this agency has conducted its affairs in the light of those principles.

The small-business lending operations of SBA were soundly conceived. Insofar as one can judge the record of an agency that started its work only 3½ years ago, the lending operations have been and are being carried on in a sound manner. The act in section 207 (a) (1) requires that "all loans made shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment." The act also wisely provides that SBA shall not provide financial assistance "unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms." The act also contemplates that SBA not circumvent private lending to small business concerns, for it is provided that no loan may be made by SBA unless it is shown that a participation with a private lending agency is not available. The record shows that SBA is carrying out this intent of the Congress. As of December 31, 1956, SBA had approved 5,160 business loans. Of this total 3,598 loans were made by SBA in participation with private lending agencies. The remaining 1,562 of the loans approved represent direct loans by the SBA. Remember that in each of these 5,160 small-business loans, approvals were only granted after the small-business applicant had been denied financial assistance in whole or in part by private lending agencies.

As I indicated above, this agency has been in operation only since mid-1953 and too little time has perhaps elapsed for sure judgment as to the soundness of loan operations. However, as of the close of last year the record shows that disbursements had been made on 3,606 loans in a total amount of $153,154,798. As of that date the agency had charged off as losses 3 loans involving an unpaid principal amount of $70,224. The loss ratio for these actual chargeoffs was approximately one-twentieth of 1 percent of the amount disbursed. As of the close of last year 78 additional loans were in process of liquidation. The total amount disbursed on these loans was $3,527,408 and the remaining unpaid balance was $2,480,575. The unpaid principal balance of these loans in liquidation amounts only to a little over 1½ percent of total loan disbursements. Furthermore, it should be noted that the agency anticipates that the collateral securing these loans will permit recovery of the greater part of the unpaid principal balances. Also, as of the end of last December, there were 64 loans in a de-

linquent status for more than 60 days. The $2,609,316 amount disbursed on these loans compares with a delinquent principal balance outstanding of $2,092,090. Results to date, therefore, indicate that the agency is doing a pretty good job in its lending operations.

There is another fact that may be considered as indicative of the soundness of the lending operations of SBA. At the close of last year 55 loans had been sold, refinanced, or participation agreements terminated. Disbursements on these loans amounted to $2,900,000 and the balance outstanding at the time of disposition amounted to $2,200,000. All of these loans initially were loans which private lenders either would not make or would not make without Government participation. Now, private lenders are assuming the sole responsibility for these loans without the Government being in the picture at all. This is evidence that these loans must have been made on a basis very close to standards that are acceptable to private lenders.

Mr. Speaker, this brief review of SBA operations during its short life reveals evidence of good management, adherance to the principles embodied in the act and presumption in favor of the continuance of the agency.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in support of H. R. 3109 which increases the business loan authorization of SBA by $80 million.

The reason for such an increase of funds is well stated by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration. I wish to include as part of my remarks the testimony of Mr. Barnes before the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 23, 1957:

STATEMENT OF WENDELL B. BARNES, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

My name is Wendell B. Barnes, and I am Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

In order to permit the Small Business Administration to continue approving loans to worthy small-business concerns, we are requesting an increase in the legislative limitation on business loans outstanding from the present limit of $150 million to $215 million.

The demand for SBA financial assistance has continued to increase to the point where, once again, this agency has loaned nearly all the money the Congress has granted it for loans. Through December 31, 1956, SBA has approved 5,160 business loans for a total of $235,750,000.

When I appeared before this committee a year ago to request an increase in the agency's disaster loan limitation, the $150 million limitation on business loans appeared to be adequate through June 30, 1957.

This estimate was based largely on experience during the first 2 years of the SBA's lending program. In each of those years, the volume of business loan applications rose in the spring, but then returned to a normal level in the summer and fall months.

However, in 1956 this patern did not hold true—the spring increase was followed not by a decline but by an almost steady rise in number of applications. In October, applications reached an alltime high of 692, followed by 685 in November and 603 in December.

This volume of business loan requests is almost double the 350 applications per month we had anticipated, and had provided for in the agency's budget for the current fiscal year.

The rise in applications apparently is due to several factors:

1. The present high level of business activity with higher prices for inventories and higher wages, along with a record-breaking capital-goods expansion, has resulted in an enormous demand for credit. Bank credit has expanded in order to meet the demand, but the volume of loan applications coming to Small Business Administration continues at a higher level.

2. The popularity of the Small Business Administration's limited loan participation plan, under which we will join with a bank in a loan to a small firm up to a maximum of $15,000 in Government funds, or 75 percent of the loan, whichever is smaller. This plan was begun a little more than a year ago, and is especially designed to meet the credit needs of small retail, wholesale, and service firms. Currently, about 22 percent of the business loan applications filed with the agency are for loans of this type.

3. Within recent months the Small Business Administration's Loan Policy Board has extended loan eligibility to certain types of firms which previously were excluded from the loan program, such as privately owned hospitals and nursing homes which are operated for profit and motion-picture theaters.

4. Another tremendously important factor in the heightened loan activity is the fact that the banks are steadily growing better acquainted with the SBA's programs and services and are calling upon it to help with the credit needs of the small firms they serve.

On a cumulative basis through last June 30, banks had participated in 68.6 percent of the loans approved by the agency. During the first half of this fiscal year their participation has been even greater—they have shared in more than 72 percent of our approved loans.

In this connection I might point out two changes in the participation loan program resulting from the present credit situation. First, the number of banks asking the agency to participate in loans on an immediate basis rather than on a deferred basis is increasing, and, second, there has been a slight increase in requests from banks for the agency to purchase its share of disbursed deferred participation loans.

Although these trends do not affect the balance of our legislative loan limitation, they do mean a quickened demand upon the agency's loan revolving fund.

As of December 31, 1956, the balance of the SBA's business-loan limitation has been reduced to $12.9 million. At the present rate of loan approvals, this amount will be fully committed early in February.

If, as seems likely, the normal spring increase in business-loan applications occurs, and the present credit situation remains unchanged, we estimate that business-loan applications to the agency will average at least 700 per month for the remainder of the fiscal year.

At the present approval rate, these will result in about 350 loan approvals per month, averaging $36,000 per loan, or approximately $12.6 million in loan approvals each month.

We therefore recommend to the Congress that the present legislative limitation of SBA business loans outstanding be increased by $65 million to a total of $215 million. This amount should be sufficient for business-loan approvals through June 30, 1957. We have made no recommendations concerning agency needs beyond that date, since Congress undoubtedly will study the legislative limitation on loans when considering extension of the agency.

Of the $125 million legislative limitation on SBA disaster loans outstanding, about $83 million remained available as of December 31, 1956. This amount should be adequate for the remainder of this fiscal year.

In conjunction with the request for an increase in the business-loan limitation, we also have asked the Congress for a supplemental appropriation for the agency's loan revolving fund, and authority to transfer additional sums from the revolving fund to the appropriation for salaries and expenses, in order to provide additional staff for the increased loan-application workload.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee and I will be glad to answer questions or supply any additional information the members may desire.

I might point out that the method by which we have arrived at this estimate has been furnished, and although the apparant increase in the limitation is $65 million, the estimated requirements is a larger figure, $82.8 million.

However, due to the fact there are repayments each month, it will not be necessary to have the limitation raised to the full amount of our requirements.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 3109 which we have had under consideration is really a very simple bill and does only one thing. That is, it provides for a $80 million increase in the small business lending authority of the Small Business Administration.

I must confess that anyone looking at the bill and unfamiliar with the basic act would undoubtedly be at a loss to know just what was happening. It may be helpful if I would go into this for a moment.

The Small Business Administration, under its basic act, is authorized to provide three types of financial assistance. These are, first, the making of small business loans for which $150 million is authorized; second, the making of disaster and drought loans for which $125 million is authorized; and third, the providing of assistance to small business concerns in financing Government contracts for which $100 million is authorized. These three amounts are then accumulated into an overall total which also appears in the Small Business Act as a limitation on overall financial assistance. Therefore, if we want to change the small business loan authorization, as this bill does, and increase it by $80 million we must add $80 million to the existing small business loan authorization of $150 million making the new authorization $230 million and we must also add $80 million to the overall total limitation appearing in the act, namely we must increase the present overall limitation from $375 million to $455 million.

Now if we may confine our attention for the moment to the specific subject of loans to small business I think it might be helpful to have a quick review of these operations. The Small Business Administration may make a direct loan to a small business concern in an amount not exceeding $250,000 and for a term not exceeding 10 years. The proceeds of the loan may be used to build or buy a plant, install or acquire equipment and fixtures, or finance inventory and other current items. The Small Business Administration also has authority to enter into participation agreements either on an immediate or deferred basis under which the Small Business Administration and a private lending institution extend the loan to the small business

concern. Under an immediate participation agreement the private lender and the Small Business Administration each immediately provide their agreed-upon portions of the funds for the loan made to the small business concern. When the Small Business Administration enters into a deferred participation agreement with a private lending institution the private lender advances all of the funds loaned to the small business concern but the Small Business Administration will stand ready on any subsequent demand from the private lender to buy up the portion of the loan covered by the deferred participation agreement. The only limitation on the deferred participation agreement authority is that such an agreement may not be made for more than 90 percent of a loan. In other words, under a deferred participation agreement the private lender is always going to have a stake in the financial soundness of the loan until it is repaid. From the standpoint of dollar amount approximately one-third of the Small Business Administration's loan assistance has been carried out through direct loans made by the agency. Of the remaining two-thirds of loan assistance provided, approximately 60 percent has been provided on an immediate participation basis and the remaining 40 percent on a deferred participation basis.

At the end of last December the Small Business Administration had committed $137 million of its then $150 million business loan authorization. That left only about $13 million of commitment authority as we entered 1957. That is only about 1 month's operation, as recently loan commitments have been made at the rate of $12 million to $15 million a month. Politically it is probably open season whenever legislation affecting this agency is on the floor but I am sure none of us want to see this agency run out of authority to provide needed financial assistance to small-business concerns. The agency may have been a little slow in getting its loan programs underway but by and large I think they have done a pretty good job. Quite naturally they have to say no to loan requests at times but if they did not do so I think we could all be properly suspicious that they were not properly protecting the taxpayer, who in the final analysis is providing the funds.

I realize, since the Agency has only been in existence since 1953, it is too short a period to form much of a judgment as to the soundness of the loan operations. However, for what it is worth here is the experience to December 31 of last year. Three loans have been charged off in a total amount of $70,000. Seventy-eight loans are in liquidation—the total amount of these loans was $3½ million and the unpaid principal amount is $2½ million. The Agency estimates that colateral securing these loans will permit a recovery of most of the unpaid balance. Another 60 loans with unpaid principal balances totaling $2 million are delinquent in excess of 60 days. It is, of course, too early to guess what will happen to these delinquents but I mention them to complete the picture of the troubles to date in SBA lending. Considering the nature of SBA lending I think this is a pretty good record to date.

I mentioned earlier that the Agency is empowered to make disaster loans to victims of such natural disasters as floods, hurricanes, drought, and so forth. Although this bill is not concerned with that phase of the Agency's operation I do want to say just a word about it because I think in that field the Agency has done some particularly good work. These disaster loans can be made to small-business concerns and also to individuals who have suffered major natural-disaster losses. The Agency had made 4,830 disaster loans as of the close of last year. While these loans may also be made on a direct or participation basis most of the assistance has been made on a direct-loan basis. As of the end of last December disaster loans approved totaled $55.6 million, of which the Small Business Administration's share was $53.5 million. No one can guess as to what the loss experience will be on this type of loan and I think we should always bear in mind that they are being made to our fellow citizens to alleviate acute distress. Even so, I would anticipate that on this type of loan we will even experience a pretty good collection ratio because the American citizen is honest and pays his debts and with a little assistance is ingenious in working out of his troubles.

Again I repeat on the whole I think this Agency is doing a good job and I am glad the House passed this legislation promptly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, from all of the evidence I have been able to accumulate, it appears that H. R. 3109, to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, is justified. The hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency appear to bear this out.

The Small Business Administration was established pursuant to the Small Business Act of 1953. It is the first peacetime agency devoted wholly to small-business problems and is an independent agency under the general direction and supervision of the President. The management is vested in an Administrator who is appointed by the President, together with three Deputy Administrators appointed by the Administrator. A Loan Policy Board, consisting of the Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Commerce, establishes general policies for the granting or denial of financial assistance.

The Small Business Administration makes loans to small business in amounts up to $250,000, for terms up to 10 years. It also helps small businesses in procuring contracts with the Federal Government, provides technical and managerial aids to small business, and consults with other Government agencies to insure fair and reasonable treatment for small-business concerns.

The Small Business Administration makes three types of business loans: direct loans, immediate participation loans, and deferred participation loans. About 30 percent of its loans are direct loans. Such a loan is made by itself without participation by any other lender. The balance of its loans are made in cooperation with banks or other lenders and are about evenly divided between immediate participation loans and deferred participation loans. In an immediate participation loan, Small Business Administration pays out part of the loan and the bank pays out the rest. In a deferred participation loan the bank makes the loan, but Small Business Administration agrees to take over part of the loan—up to 90 percent—if the bank requests it to do so. The necessity of the enactment of H. R. 3109 was brought about by the following situation: At the end of 1956 the amount Small Business Administration had outstanding in business loans, plus the commitments it had made, totaled $137 million, leaving only $13 million for new loans.

Before Small Business Administration can make additional loans provided for in the bill, it will be necessary for the Congress to make appropriations to a revolving fund established for that purpose in the Treasury. Accordingly, the bill increases by $80 million the amount of appropriation authorized to the revolving fund. The new total of $455 million authorized for this revolving fund includes the $125 million already authorized for disaster loans and the $100 million already authorized for procurement functions, as well as the expanded authorization of $230 million for business loans.

In my estimation this increased amount made available under this bill for small business is highly justified by all of our past experience in this field. The Small Business Administration has not lost money. In spite of the fact that Small Business Administration accepts loans which cannot be readily handled by a bank, its business experience has been excellent. The number of defaults have been at a minimum. The result is that, in addition to performing a very worthwhile service for the small business of this country, the Small Business Administration has made a modest profit.

I believe it could be admitted by all who have carefully followed the Small Business Administration that it has applied the principles of good business in addition to rendering a much-needed service to a segment of our economy which has no other recourse for credit.

I am happy to say in support of this bill that the Small Business Administration has made some needed loans in my own particular area.

I notice from the testimony of the hearings on this bill that the business-loan applications are now averaging about 700 per month. The present approval rate is approximately 350 per month, averaging $36,000 per loan for SBA's share. The figure in this bill of an additional $80 million is based on need through June 30, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill should be passed today without any qualifying amendments. This money is one of the best investments we can make in the business life of smaller communities throughout the country.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us this afternoon H. R. 3109, a measure providing an increase in the legislative limitation on business loans that have been executed for the welfare of small-business institutions. Section 202 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, constitutes a philosophic preamble setting forth the principles which motivated this legislation. This subject is stated as follows:

The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed. It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as is possible the interests of small-buisness concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

The Small Business Administration has rendered financial assistance to small business since its original status was determined by the Congress, and through December 31, 1956, it had approved 5,160 business loans in the amount of $235,750,000. In each of the years following the passage of the original legislation the volume of business-loan applications rose in the spring, but then returned to a normal level in the summer and fall months. However, in 1956 this pattern did not hold true. The spring increase was followed by a steady rise in the number of applications through the fall months. In October, applications reached an alltime high of 692, followed by 685 in November and 603 in December.

The demands upon the financial assistance of the Small Business Administration have increased to the point where it seems advisable to extend additional loaning facilities to that organization. Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives to speak upon this subject. He recommended that the legislative limitation on business loans outstanding be increased. Accordingly the Banking and Currency Committee in H. R. 3109 wishes to amend section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 as follows: Not to exceed an aggregate of $230 million shall be outstanding at any one time; and this resolution further states that section 204 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out $375 million each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof $455 million. In order that the Small Business Administration may continue loans to worthy small-business concerns, it seems no more than right that the Congress should approve the recommendation of the Administrator of this agency, and it is my pleasure to support H. R. 3109.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, those of us whose special concern has been small business are gratified and pleased by the action here today on H. R. 3109, increasing the lending authority of the Small Business Administration.

The request by the administration, together with the expeditious action by the Banking and Currency Committee, and the apparent unanimous support from both sides of the aisle, are extremely significant. They indicate and reflect the need to assist the small business community. They indicate that, despite the optimism of the President's Economic Report and earlier State of the Union Message, the small business community is not sharing in whatever present prosperity may exist. To the contrary, they indicate quite clearly the hard times experienced by small-business men from coast to coast.

We have recognized that a need exists and the degree of urgency in granting relief. I sincerely hope that SBA is equipped to process applications expeditiously, otherwise the benefits we provide shall vanish into thin air. I respectfully urge the Appropriations Committee to look into SBA's budget to make sure sufficient personnel is allotted to handle the workload without delay, especially in the field offices where all applications originate.

I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that SBA officials follow through to obtain greatest value from the program. This additional lending authority will produce few results unless SBA is less rigid in its loan requirements than it ordinarily might be. I hope that SBA, now that the existence of near-depression conditions has been recognized, will adjust its lending policies to rely to a lesser degree on current balance sheets and to a somewhat greater degree on the long-range prospects of an applicant.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the House in approving H. R. 3109, to increase the loan authorization of the Small Business Administration, is a very significant and major action. The fact that the House and the Senate have both approved this measure early in this session of the Congress is indicative of the fact that the small-business economy of the Nation is in need of immediate assistance.

With tight credit policies and increased interest rates, the squeeze on business is particularly felt in the small-business economy. Time has been running out for assistance to small-business men of the Nation and certainly it is appropriate that Congress should act speedily in this instance. The increasing of the loan authorization authority by $80 million to the existing capital loan authorization of the Small Business Administration will increase the total authorization to $230 million. There was much testimony in both the House and the Senate and considerable feeling by others that the new authorization should have been increased to a minimum of $250 million.

The Small Business Administration is authorized to provide financial assistance in the way of loans in 3 different categories: First, the making of small business loans for which $150 million has previously been authorized; second, the making of disaster and drought loans for which $125 million has previously been authorized, and third, the providing of assistance to small business concerns in financing business contracts for which $100 million is authorized.

The total overall authorization when this legislation is approved by the President will amount to $455 million. However, because of the various categories of loan authorization and restrictions imposed by legislation, the overall total for loans to small business enterprises, with the new increase authorization, amounts to only $230 million.

The President has indicated that drought assistance loans in the Midwest drought area should be made and also the recent flood conditions in Tennessee and Kentucky area represent a situation where flood disaster loans should be immediately made.

So, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, in view of the tight squeeze of the small business economy and because of the drought situation prevailing in the West and flood situations in the South and elsewhere, the overall loan authorization for the Small Business Administration should be significantly increased. Certainly, adequate appropriations to implement these authorizations should be made.

Mr. Speaker, the small-business men of the Nation employ a wide section of the citizenship of our country. They pay taxes and represent the warp and woof of our economy. The small business economy of our Nation should be strengthened and encouraged into an expanding dynamic capitalism.

The President in his recent economic report has boasted of our healthy economy. However, we all know and recognize that the small-business section of our economy represents that area in which prosperity is the least felt and in which immediate assistance is most needed.

The Congress should act further to provide the proper climate for independent businessmen of this Nation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have repeated at this point the 14 recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business. These recommendations follow:

First. That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 percent to 20 percent on incomes up to $25,000.

Second. That business be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any one year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Third. That corporations with, say, 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Fourth. That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

Fifth. That the President arrange for a comprehensive review of procurement

policies and procedures of all departments and agencies, including the legislation pertaining thereto, with a view to facilitating and extending the participation of small businesses in work on Government contracts.

Sixth. That the President direct departments and agencies engaged in extensive procurement to adopt procedures which would insure that a need for advance or progress payments by a bidder will not be treated as a handicap in awarding a contract, and which would facilitate and accelerate the making of such progress payments as may be requested by small suppliers under Government contracts.

Seventh. That the Renegotiation Board clarify the fact that, although a contractor who subcontracts work may not reasonably expect to be allowed as large a profit thereon as if he had done the work himself, the practice of subcontracting—especially the extent to which subcontracts are placed with small businesses—is encouraged by giving it favorable consideration in determining allowable profits.

Eighth. That the life of the Small Business Administration, which is now scheduled to expire in mid 1957, be extended at the earliest opportunity.

Ninth. That the maximum amount of an issue of corporate securities which the Securities and Exchange Commission may exempt from registration be increased from $300,000 to $500,000.

Tenth. That the President call a conference on technical research, development, and distribution, for the benefit of small business.

Eleventh. That legislation be enacted to enable closer Federal security of mergers.

Twelfth. That procedural changes be made in the antitrust laws to facilitate their enforcement.

Thirteenth. That wage reporting by employers for purposes of social-security records and income-tax withholding be simplified.

Fourteenth. That the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget undertake a comprehensive review of the reports and statistics required of small businesses.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on House Resolution 56.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ALIEN ORPHAN ADOPTION LEGISLATION

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide for the admission of 5,000 additional alien orphans adopted or to be adopted by American citizens.

In introducing this bill, I recognize that it would implement only a small portion of the President's recommendations for changes in our immigration and naturalization laws.

However, the recommendation it would implement is one that, as far as I have been able to determine, is least likely to be opposed by individuals and groups otherwise hostile to any change in present immigration quotas.

Here in our wonderful land, we have thousands of childless couples living lonely lives in prosperous surroundings who will wait and have waited months and years for the chance to adopt into their homes one of the very limited number of American babies available for adoption.

Elsewhere in the world, we have little children living lonely lives in abject poverty, sentenced by circumstances to a life short, sickly, and sad. We cannot relieve the vast misery of the world, rich and powerful as we are. We can, however, do our best to alieviate the most innocent of the world's suffering multitudes and who is more innocent and deserving than a child left parentless in a part of the world where even the strong, organized and able bodied must toil ceaselessly for the bare essentials of existence.

We must not let the more complex controversies surrounding major amendments to our immigration laws strangle a simple extension of our program to bring lonely children to lonely parents, to the joy of both. I urge the members, whatever their position on more major amendments to present immigration restrictions, to join me in pressing for early passage of an increase in the number of orphans under 10 years of age who may come to the United States for adoption by American citizens.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ELECTRIC POWER PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks Members of Congress will again be confronted with demands for legislation designed to accelerate civilian application of atomic energy.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I feel that a brief review of some of the problems in this field should be presented to the House.

You will remember that, despite a unanimous inclination to encourage development of fissionable material for peacetime uses, we were unable to agree on a definite program at the last session of Congress. I believe that our decision to recommit the Gore bill was both judicious and fortunate.

Even many of the House Members who voted against recommittal were skeptical of its potential; I feel that we who have objected to it would have found far more supporters had the issue not come to the floor shortly before adjournment.

A number of Members felt that legislation, whether or not it was palatable in all respects, should be enacted for the sake of expediency.

They had come to the conclusion that congressional action was necessary if only to notify the world that the United States was determined to remain in the vanguard of electric-power generation through the medium of the atom.

It was fortunate that no such legislative proposal was accepted, if only because a law of this kind would have impeded the Atomic Energy Commission from proceeding with the most logical and workable program.

I want to say that, while I have on frequent occasions differed with recommendations of some of my colleagues on the committee, I am honored to be among a group of such highly conscientious and dedicated statesmen.

Some of my colleagues were obviously discourage at the failure of the House to reach a compromise, yet in retrospect they must surely agree with the wisdom of our decision. I would say that our efforts were highly productive.

The committee accumulated volumes of necessary information in our hearings, in deliberations with Atomic Energy Commissioners and their subordinates, in meeting with scientists and engineers from private industry, and in discussions on the floor of Congress. I am sure that the full membership of the House profited by the debate inspired by introduction of the Gore bill.

As we approach the subject half a year later, we realize that no new law is necessary. The AEC, under the direction of Admiral Strauss, has already presented its overall blueprint for accelerating the reactor project.

Neither the Gore bill nor a related proposal is necessary or desirable from the standpoint of national security and the general welfare. You can be sure that the joint committee will continue to work closely with the AEC and that we will keep our colleagues informed at all times on whatever matters are of concern or interest to the Congress.

Perhaps one of the most important items to keep in mind in considering commercial atomic power is the general fuels situation.

Now, I come from a coal district.

I am appreciative of coal's bright possibilities—assuming, of course, that this Congress will join in helping to eliminate some of the roadblocks created by inequitable Governmental policies.

When I go back into my district in a period of vigorous mining activitly, I cannot help but be enthusiastic about the coal industry's contributions to national defense and the national welfare.

While today there are many miners whose jobs have not been revived since

they were first destroyed by the admission of excessive imports of residual fuel oil, it is nonetheless a deep satisfaction to find a majority of our mines again in operation.

When miners have steady employment, the whole economy of our community is stimulated.

Similarly, a rise in demand for coal brings with it a simultaneous increase in freight traffic on our railroads.

Without a thriving coal business, unemployment among railroad workers in Pennsylvania alone extends into the thousands.

Mr. Speaker, last year Pennsylvania produced approximately 89 million tons of bituminous coal—or 17.8 percent of the national output.

Multiply Pennsylvania's business gains through coal production by 5.5 and you get an idea as to the value of this industry to the Nation as a whole. You understand immediately why it is vital to all our people that the coal industry continue to progress.

What are the opportunities in this direction? I would say that the answer to this question lies largely in the decisions that are to be made by this legislative body in the months ahead.

One premise on which there is no difference of opinion is the fact that rising standards of living and increasing population will continue actuation of the skyrocketing demand for more and more electrical and mechanical energy.

A school of thought head prominently during hearings of the joint committee foresees such a great need for fossil fuels as to threaten depletion of these resources before the end of the 20th century.

This opinion was expressed by men of great learning who approached the subject with complete objectivity; I shall, therefore, not hastily imply that these estimates are in error.

I merely submit that the vast storehouses of coal which underlie more than half of our States and are considered recoverable by the United States Geological Survey amount to almost 30 times the total tonnage that has been removed throughout the history of America's coal industry to date.

If, as has been predicted by various authorities, the demand for coal in this country reaches the billion-ton mark in the next 2 or 3 decades, our reserve cupboard could sustain this annual rate of production at least through the year 2800.

As custodian of 92 percent of all the known mineral fuel reserves in this country, the coal industry must have every opportunity to operate in an atmosphere conducive to its growth and development.

These conditions are, of course, a requisite to the economic progress—yes, to the very survival—of the congressional district and the State which I represent.

Since coal supplies industries which provide necessaries of life to every man, woman, and child in the 48 States, its availability is equally important to you, to your children, and to those generations whom God selects to guide the destiny of our great Nation long after we have departed this life.

Let me offer some suggestions that we in the 85th Congress can adopt as a means of assuring a wholesome environment in which the coal industry can thrive.

Today, as for some years past, the oil and natural-gas industries are enjoying a depletion allowance rate of 27½ percent.

In my opinion, this concession is reasonable, for without it those industries would lack much of the wherewithal necessary to carry on the exploration and developmental work necessary to keep supply in step with upswings in demand.

At the same time I am convinced that the 10-percent rate available to the coal industry is unfair and inadequate.

I wish that this Congress would accept as one of its immediate responsibilities the business of increasing that rate to a point where the coal industry will have a greater opportunity to invest in the new mining properties that will be required for fulfilling needs of the coming years.

Unfair competition invading United States markets from abroad is of like concern to us who recognize that the coal industry must be loosened from injurious economic shackles that retard growth and discourage our fellow citizens whose means of subsistence are irrevocably attached to coal's success.

I need not undertake a long explanation of the problems attendant to that bridge of ships extending from the oil refineries of the Dutch West Indies into the electric utilities and industrial plants on our eastern seaboard.

I have discussed this issue on the floor of this House many times in the past. I warned this deliberate body during the two previous Congresses that only a legislative barrier would protect the domestic fuel industries of the United States from the continued onslaught of foreign oil flooding our east coast.

I need not recite figures or produce tables as testimony for the substantiation of my past remarks. It is sufficient to say that in 1956 more foreign residual oil entered our industrial markets than in any time in the history of this Nation.

I beg that you take action on this proposal without delay. The ability of our mines and miners to supply the fuel for tomorrow's requirements may well depend upon your action on this and other issues which I bring before you today.

What is decided in the matter of atomic energy legislation is of profound concern to the coal industry and its more than 200,000 working men, as well as to management and labor in our railroad industry.

If the atomic power program were subsidized by the Federal Government to an insignificant amount, it is reasonable to assume that the reactors could be made to produce electricity which could be sold cheaper than the unsubsidized electricity which comes from coal.

When you build a plant and provide fuel at Government expense, output could logically be expected to market at very low rates.

Under those circumstances, the coal industry would be placed in an untenable competitive position. The example has been set by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As for the type of program proposed by the AEC, the coal industry has entered no objection.

Coal management and labor recognize that there will be room in the market of the future for electricity produced by reactors.

With generating capacity expected to double in 10 years and quadruple in 20, traditional fuels can conveniently concede a percentage of their utility markets to atomic power and still enjoy tremendous increases in demand.

The one fear that has persisted in the minds of coal operators and mine workers is that the Government will go overboard in its cooperative venture with private industry, to the point of subsidizing the long-term commercial production of power on a broad scale.

I, too, would oppose attempts by public-power groups at injecting the Government so deeply in commercial atomic energy as to endanger the structure on which our private utilities system has been founded. Members of Congress must stand firm against any such invasion.

The coal industry has also, and I think, justifiably, requested that costs involved in the production of power through the atom be made public.

The theory is that only when the complete ledger of Federal expenses in the reactor program is divulged will the general public be able to appraise accurately the competitive advantages of the atom as a fuel.

If electricity thus produced is to cost 4 or 5 or 10 times as much as electricity generated in traditional plants, those records must be made available to the public.

If, on the other hand, it is ultimately possible for atomic plants to supply electric power below the cost of all competing systems, we shall welcome this development even though it may mean that reactors will take a far greater share of the market than is anticipated. There is no place for a coverup of cost in our program.

The one other major consideration that comes to mind is that it would be folly for the Government to construct or subsidize duplicate experimental plants.

We cannot afford to engage in such mischievous undertaking; what is more, the number of available scientists and engineers is all too limited to disperse them as would be required in such cases.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should give the AEC an opportunity to pursue the course which it has outlined.

I am confident that it will achieve maximum accomplishment without violating the limits which I have set forth.

From time to time the committee will propose legislation to carry out and supplement the Commission's plans.

With the knowledge that this country is in the midst of an effective research and development program, the House and Senate will be able to proceed with

these legislative proposals unhampered by any doubts as to the feasibility of the overall objectives or procedures.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last spring I was privileged to be the chairman of a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which held extensive public hearings on a problem of greatest concern to the future well-being of our country: The shortage of scientists and engineers. This shortage has serious implications for our atomic energy and defense programs and has gained increasing urgency in view of the threat posed by the virtual crash program which the Russians have adopted to train their young men and women in the scientific and engineering fields. In view of the need for prompt action to correct this situation, I am today introducing legislation which I believe will provide an important step toward insuring an adequate supply of scientists and engineers and at the same time bolster our overall strength. I am pleased to advise my colleagues that the Honorable JOHN PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island, will introduce a similar bill in the other body.

I think all of us on the subcommittee began the hearings on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower with the objective of developing legislation to remedy an admittedly serious situation in the special areas under discussion. But the more we looked at the problem the more we came to realize that the shortage of scientists and engineers is only part of a larger national problem of shortages of specialized talent in all fields of endeavor and that any remedial action, to be effective, must take this fundamental fact into account.

It is always tempting, when faced with a serious problem in a specialized area which cries for immediate solution, to adopt special-purpose legislation to remedy problems in that particular area. The trouble is that unless this legislation is developed in the context of our overall national problems and policy objectives we may find that we are creating serious imbalances in our society and economy which in the long run will only undermine the very strengths we are attempting to build up.

With this in mind, my colleagues and I on the subcommittee concluded that the best way of maintaining an adequate supply of scientists and engineers over the long run was to concentrate on the basic problems underlying present and anticipated future shortages of specialized talent in all fields. Through isolating these basic problems and developing measures to deal with them, we will be able to produce more scientists and engineers and at the same time avoid overemphasis in any one area, to the detriment of others.

Fundamental to any consideration of this matter is the adequacy of instruction in our schools, both at the secondary and college level. How well are we preparing our young men and women to face the challenges of this complex technological age in which we live? Most important, are we giving them a well-rounded, well-balanced education in the high school and early college years so that they will have firm ground on which to stand when they seek higher education and careers in specialized fields?

Almost without exception the expert witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee answered this question in the negative. They pointed out that there is one great deficiency in the basic curriculum which must be remedied. This deficiency is in the field of mathematics instruction which has suffered a rapid deterioration in recent years in our high schools. Many schools are not even offering mathematics in their course of instruction any more. Now, mathematics is not a specialized subject. It is a fundamental part of any well-balanced curriculum. But it is also an indispensable element in preparation for college-level studies in science and engineering. There is no telling how many thousands of young men and women of potential talent are lost each year because of poor preparation, which makes it impossible for them to pursue higher education. It is certain that the loss is substantial in terms of our intellectual resources which are so necessary to the future strength of our Nation.

Given this situation, Mr. Speaker, and the urgent need for improving mathematics instruction in our high schools as a fundamental part of the curriculum, I am today introducing a bill to provide a $500 Federal scholarship for every high-school senior who has successfully passed an examination in the traditional fundamental subjects of mathematics, such as algebra, plane and solid geometry and trigonometry. The examination would be at a level of difficulty equivalent to the usual college entrance requirements.

The bill also provides, in the case of those who go on to college, for another $500 scholarship for all students who have taken and successfully completed a course in calculus, another traditional subject which is a basic part of any well-balanced curriculum and an essential foundation for those going on to careers in science and engineering.

The proposals contained in this bill were first made by Prof. I. I. Rabi, of Columbia, in testimony before the subcommittee last spring. Professor Rabi is a world-renowned authority in the field of nuclear physics and is esteemed by his colleagues for his breadth of knowledge, not only in the academic sphere but in major areas affecting our whole society and economy. With his many years of experience in a wide range of fields, he is eminently qualified to make recommendations for improvements in our educational system and society.

The benefits to be derived from the scholarship program outlined by Dr. Rabi are many. For one thing, this program would not only encourage students to take more mathematics and calculus in high school and college but would serve indirectly as a strong stimulus at the community level for improvement of these courses in local schools. It would particularly appeal to parents in terms of offsetting tuition payments, and the scholarship money would, of course, be tax exempt.

Another advantage, and an important one, is that this system of scholarships would not discriminate and would not lay undue emphasis on any one area of specialization to the detriment of the others. Mathematics has been described as a subject which is essential, fundamental, and neutral. It is a basic pillar of support for any well-educated person, whether he goes on to a career in engineering or specializes in the liberal arts. At the same time, it is indispensable for anyone who wishes to pursue a scientific or engineering career.

A third advantage of the program is that it will achieve practical results in terms of strengthening our Nation's intellectual resources without the risk of Federal interference with local school systems or of pushing people in one direction or another. The program would be purely voluntary in nature. The proposed awards would be made to all students who could pass the examination, irrespective of their backgrounds or financial status. There would be no strings attached, no compulsion to take any prescribed courses of study after accepting the award. Thus, a high-school senior would be perfectly free to accept the $500 and go on to major in liberal arts in college or not go to college, as he chooses. If he does go to college and passes freshman-year calculus, he is then entitled to another $500. Once again, there are no strings attached. As Dr. Rabi so aptly pointed out, this program opens the door to people going into science and engineering without closing any other doors.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate well that the problem posed by the shortage of scientists and engineers in this country is not a simple one. We are just now beginning to come to grips with some of its more complex aspects, and it will take coordinated and vigorous efforts on all sides if we are to developed effective remedial measures. Above all, we must not take hasty and ill-considered action to meet short-term needs which will, in the long run, only weaken us rather than strengthen us.

I believe the proposals which I have just outlined fit well within this frame of reference and provide an opportunity to take effective action now to relieve a situation which in a very real sense threatens the future strength and well-being of this country. To this end, I urge that these proposals receive prompt consideration by the appropriate committee of this Chamber.

ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT ASKS "WHY NOT A FOOD-STAMP PLAN?"

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I again introduced a bill which I prepared 3 years ago for the distribution of up to $1 billion worth of surplus

food each year to needy Americans—to Americans in actual need, not now getting enough to eat. This food would be distributed under a food-stamp plan. In this Congress, the number of my bill is H. R. 949.

On Monday of this week, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, published by Mr. Richard M. Amberg, asked in its lead editorial "Why Not a Food-Stamp Plan?" and stated its support for my bill in the following words:

WHY NOT A FOOD-STAMP PLAN?

The inhumane paradox of a nation bulging with food surpluses while millions of needy haven't enough to eat doesn't make sense to a lot of folk. It makes no sense to Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, St. Louis Congresswoman, who has been trying more than 2 years to have Congress pass a food-stamp plan.

The idea of distributing idle farm products to American families, hungry in the shadow of wasting food surpluses, has appealed to others on Capitol Hill. It intrigued the Democratic Party, which plumped for such a program in its platform. The last Congress asked the Department of Agriculture to investigate and come up with a report.

Now the lawmakers have that report, and it's a humdinger. The Department has never liked food-stamp proposals. This report makes suggestions that could go a long way toward smothering all hope for distribution of extra foods to the country's undernourished.

The Agriculture survey figures a food-stamp program, to assure adequate national diet, would embrace about 25 million Americans and would cost as much as $2,500,000,000 a year. Further, it probably would do little to cut farm surpluses.

Whether so designed by the Department or not, this report could tear food-stamp plans to smithereens. It would be tagged a do-gooders' fantasy, a plunder of the tax till, when worried fiscal experts already are whetting knives for a distended peacetime budget.

But the food-stamp idea will not die. Nor are we convinced it cannot work, at least in a limited way. And Mrs. SULLIVAN'S relatively simple proposal seems a practical plan.

She was one of the original food-stamp proponents, introducing her first such bill in 1954. She had another in 1955, which she has reintroduced this year.

Outline of her plan is this: The program would be set up by the Federal Government, with eligibility requirements limited to persons getting some kind of public assistance. That means generally old-age pensioners, those on relief, those receiving unemployment compensation, aid to dependent children, and the like.

Distribution only from surplus foods would be made through State or other established welfare agencies. Instead of 25 million, her proposal would affect only about 5 million or 6 million. It presumably would not cost the Federal Government anything like $2,500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000, and it would go to the most deserving.

Her's nor any other food-surplus scheme would do much toward whittling down major surpluses, which exist, of course, in wheat, corn, and cotton. But it would siphon off some of the piling, spoiling excess of cheese, butter, dry milk, shortening, cottonseed oil, dry beans, and beef.

The Agriculture Department's blueprint for a food-stamp plan is preposterous and self-defeating. Congresswoman SULLIVAN'S bill packs a great deal of commonsense and deserves more serious study by Congress.

A careful estimate of its cost should be made. If the tax is not great, her bill should be passed and the program put on trial.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention particularly to the comment in this editorial about the analyses which have been sent to Congress by the Department of Agriculture on the possible operation of a food-stamp plan. As the Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, the soil-bank bill which we passed here last year had in it a provision, inserted at my suggestion, requiring the Department of Agriculture to report to us on how a food-stamp plan could be used to avoid future excessive surpluses. A preliminary report was sent up here last fall and a follow-up analysis was submitted earlier this month.

As the Globe-Democrat points out in the above editorial, the Department of Agriculture seemed bent on outlining a possible food-stamp plan of such scope and magnitude, involving some 25 millions persons, as to make the whole idea seem ridiculous and tear food-stamp plans to smithereens.

H. R. 949 was devised 3 years ago to channel this surplus food—or a portion of it—to some 5 million Americans we know are in want—in actual need—actually not getting enough to eat. It is hard for us to realize that among us in this rich land, with record-breaking economic levels, we have some 5 million fellow citizens going to bed with a feeling of not having enough to eat. These are the unfortunates who must exist on pitifully small relief grants—general assistance, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and so on.

I am sorry the Department of Agriculture has resisted so strongly so continuously, so cruelly, the idea of channeling some of the mountain of surplus commodities to these really poor Americans. True there is in existence a surplus food-distribution program, but to characterize that program in a word, I would say it is wretched. It is woefully inadequate. It reaches only a small proportion of the needy—the people on welfare. It has been used to help many people through temporary periods of distress caused by flood or drought or temporary unemployment, but it has not been devised to help the really poor who are dependent on welfare assistance year-in and year-out. These have not been getting the surplus food. They should be the first to get it—not the last.

My bill, H. R. 949, is as follows:

[85th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. R. 949

(In the House of Representatives, January 3, 1957; Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture)

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health, and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation, as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy persons is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health,

Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SPENDING OF MILITARY AND ECONOMIC AID FUNDS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear my reasons for opposing the administration's request for a free hand in the expenditure of military and economic aid funds in the Middle East and for advance authorization from the Congress to commit American troops to that area.

Certainly, no Member of the Congress would deliberately wish to hamper the administration in its efforts to check the spread of Communist tyranny in the Middle East or in any other quarter of the globe. Likewise, thoughtful Americans are deeply concerned with the explosive crisis that exists in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that administration policy-makers are only now alerting the American public to this crisis, which has confronted us for several years.

I voted against the administration's current Middle East proposal because it represents a dangerous illusion of policy where there is no policy. It is the shadow, not the substance, of true strength. It gives the President no authority to meet a military emergency that he does not already have. It seeks no real answers to the fundamental political problems that threaten the peace and stability of the Middle East. It provides no intelligent, practical plan to use American aid dollars to eradicate the swamplands of poverty and disease that open the way for Communist inroads in the Middle East. There is no safeguard against the dissipation of our tax dollars in the wild extravagance and vice that characterizes the life of ruling monarchs in the Middle East.

It has been argued that the administration needs a free hand on an emergency basis to save freedom in the Middle East. But what is the nature of the threat to freedom and stability in this part of the world?

There is first of all an incendiary political problem stemming from the bitter Arab-Israeli dispute. There is the related Arab refugee problem, and the unsettled question of the Suez Canal. From all indications, it is more likely that one of these trouble spots might erupt in a shooting war between one or more of the Arab States and the State of Israel than that the Russians will be so stupid as to launch a military attack in the Middle East.

As a nation that has played a key role in the creation of the State of Israel, the only real democracy in the Middle East, America may be ill-advised in strengthening the hand of those Arab chieftains who insist that they will not rest until Israel is destroyed. It would hardly be a victory for democracy if democracy's showcase in the Middle East were destroyed by feudal despots with the help of American arms and material.

No one but the Communist or the Fascist could rejoice over this prospect. That is why I believe we should accelerate our efforts through the United Nations for a solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute before we pursue further the arming of the Arab States.

Likewise, the lack of any real domestic reform program within the Arab States will render our proposed Middle East economic-aid program largely ineffective in stopping the internal threat of communism. Is there any reason to believe that American dollars will be used to improve the economic lot of the people of that area? All past experience points to the contrary.

The current visit of the king of Saudi Arabia highlights the difficulty that confronts us. Here is a ruling monarch, who lavishes $54 million a year on his own personal household, while his people live on a yearly per capita income of $42. With a population of 99.5 percent illiterate, King Saud has, to date, established 2 high schools and 10 elementary schools. A vast array of air-conditioned Cadillacs, luxurious palaces, slaves, concubines, and revelry beyond imagination, provide for the amusement of the royal household while the populace languishes in poverty.

Do we build strength against communism by contributing American tax dollars to perpetuate this kind of feudal despotism? I cannot believe that it is either good politics or good diplomacy to waste our economic resources and our moral strength trying to prop up rulers who embody everything that is alien to our tradition of liberty and equality.

Instead of removing restrictions on the use of American-aid funds in the Middle East, I would suggest that we further restrict and curtail such expenditures until such time as the States of the Arab world work out, with the cooperation of the proper United Nations agencies, a series of constructive, well-defined projects that will build for true strength against Communist subversion, by a full-scale attack on those ancient evils—poverty, ignorance, and disease.

I include at this point a letter to the editor of the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, by Mr. Herman Pickus, and an article by Mr. George Barnes appearing in the Reporter magazine:

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of January 20, 1957]

KING IBN SAUD

To the EDITOR: The red carpet is to be rolled out in Washington at the last of January for King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia. This tyrannical despot of a feudal country will be here to get a line on how many millions of dollars he will get from the foreign-aid program being pushed through Congress for the Middle East.

Under ordinary circumstances Ibn Saud would be condemned in this country for what he is—a feudalistic ruler of one of the few countries left in the world in which slave traffic is a government business. It is estimated by the United Nations that there are over 50,000 African slaves in Saudi Arabia and that between 35 and 45 thousand slaves are put on the auction block in Saudi Arabia each year.

The people over whom Ibn Saud rules lives in indescribable poverty and disease, but the great wealth produced from oil of the country is used, not to help them, but to keep Ibn Saud and those around him living in fabulous luxury.

After all, a king with a harem and a retinue numbering 10,000 persons can use up a lot of money if they are to live in lavish luxury as Ibn Saud and his favorites do.

Ibn Saud is coming to Washington at the invitation of this Government which will enable him to get his bid in early for a healthy slice of the foreign aid for the Middle East.

He will get it, too. No one dares antagonize Ibn Saud. The United Nations doesn't even dare raise a question of slave traffic in this country.

It is strange that an administration that has refused to invite Anthony Eden when he was head of a friendly ally feels that it must invite a ruler whose hands drip with blood just because there is oil on those same hands. Why not let Ibn Saud expend part of the $250 million he receives every year from oil which is paid to him by American controlled oil companies to raise the standard of living in his country?

HERMAN PICKUS.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

[From the Reporter magazine of February 7, 1957]

TWO FUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS FOR WHAT?

(By George Barnes)

So far as the economic aspect of the administration's historic gamble for the Middle East is concerned, the Secretary of State apparently means to hold his hand pretty close to the vest. Hours of questioning on Capitol Hill have failed to evoke from Mr. Dulles any real explanation of how he is going to use the $200-million-a-year fund the administration wants from Congress.

No one who knows the desperate poverty of the region and understands the irrepressible surge of its peoples toward something better will challenge the premise that the United States must respond to their need if we hope to dissuade them from further adventures with communism. The question to which Mr. Dulles' reticence gives rise, however, is whether the administration's new economic program can actually produce the results we look for in the present crisis.

It may be, of course, that the Secretary of State has excellent reasons for his reluctance to expose his hand at this stage of the game. It is well known that money can work wonders in the Middle East if you are not too finicky about how you use it; and it is at least possible that Mr. Dulles does not intend to be finicky. If this is the case, his noncommittal attitude at this stage is understandable.

On the other hand, if the administration intends to pursue a major development program in the Middle East on the crash basis suggested by the President, Mr. Dulles' reticence may derive from the plain fact that he doesn't know what the money is going to be used for. We have been trying for 5½ years to get an effective economic-development program going in the Middle East, and we haven't had much luck at it.

WE CAN'T GET RID OF THE MONEY

The fuzziness of the administration's new program makes comparisons with this past effort hazardous. We do not know, for example, what countries or what kind of projects are to be included in the new program. The general impression is that it is to embrace a wide area extending from Libya to Pakistan and from Turkey to Ethiopia.

From all that has been said, however, it may be assumed that the main focus will be on the Arab States at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, where the greatest pressure of Communist penetration is being felt. A look at our previous efforts at economic development in these countries may serve to illustrate certain problems Mr. Dulles apparently prefers to ignore.

Between July 1, 1951, and June 30, 1956, the United States allotted a total of $136,295,000 to 5 Arab States—Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. Of this allotment, which means money earmarked for a particular country, $129,627,000 was obligated, which means earmarked for specific purposes, development assistance and technical cooperation, within a particular country. But of the obligated funds, only $73,054,000 has actually been spent. In other words, over a 5-year period, it has been impossible to spend 45 percent of the money we had planned to spend in the 5 Arab States.

Eliminate the technical-assistance funds from the totals, and the picture is even less promising. For development projects alone—presumably the kind of aid contemplated by the administration's new program—we obligated $84,134,000 for 3 Arab countries—Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt—in the 5 years between 1951 and 1956. Of this amount, only $36,487,000 has actually been expended, which is to say that 56 percent of the money we planned to spend for economic development in Arab countries over a 5-year period is still in the Treasury.

Two Arab States—Iraq and Saudi Arabia—have received no development aid at all, preferring, presumably, to rely on their own oil royalties. One Arab country has refused assistance of any kind. This is Syria, ingrown, suspicious, unstable, and now deeply penetrated by Soviet influence and heavily endowed with Soviet arms.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that for Israel, the United States development aid funds obligated during the same 5-year period totaled $252 million, of which $234 million, or 92 percent, has actually been put to work. If the amount allocated to Israel exceeds by many times the amount allotted to individual Arab States—a fact Arab leaders are fond of pointing out—the reason may be that the Israelis have had the political stability, the will, and the skill to plan and carry out development programs as rapidly as financial assistance becomes available. Washington has long wished for similar competence and initiative on the part of Israel's neighbors.

In short, there is little or nothing in our past Middle East experience to justify the contention that the administration can get real economic development underway in the region if Congress will only put up several hundred million dollars with no strings attached. There is even less to suggest that such an expenditure will deter Soviet penetration or win for us the abiding friendship of the Arab peoples. Certainly the $136 million of economic and technical aid we have allotted to them in the last 5 years has done neither.

The basic fallacy in the economic aspect of the administration's new proposal, so far as one may judge from Mr. Dulles' generalities, is that it appears to treat only the symptoms and disregards the causes of the illness that plagues the Arab world. Despite our past experience, the administration seems ready to go right on putting money ahead of the Arabs' fundamental needs—peace, stability, and regional cooperation. It should be clear by now that just spending money won't work any miracles.

DOUBLECROSSING OVER JORDAN

The Jordan Valley project is a case in point. This was a plan initiated by the United States to conserve and harness the waters of the Jordan for irrigation and power. The plan was a "natural" both from the engineering standpoint and as sound economic development, offering more than 200,000 people—about a fourth of the Arab refugees—a decent livelihood from irrigated agriculture in what is now an all but barren valley. But there was a joker—the project required the agreement of 4 Middle Eastern states, all of which had legitimate claim to a share of the river and 3 of which were bitterly hostile toward the fourth. The countries were Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel.

In October 1953 President Eisenhower asked Eric Johnston to go to the Middle East as his personal ambassador to try to persuade the four Jordan Valley states to agree on the project. Johnston set out with no illusions as to the difficulty of the assignment, but with a firm conviction that such a plan, if carried out, would help to resolve the urgent refugee problem, establish a pattern for intraregional development, and perhaps open the way for a general relaxation of Arab-Israel tensions.

No man ever worked harder at a job than Johnston worked at this one. On the four separate visits to the Middle East over a span of 3 years on which I accompanied him as an adviser I watched him argue and cajole his way through hundreds of weary hours of the most detailed and harassing negotiations it is possible to imagine. He burned the midnight oil in every United States Embassy in the area preparing argumentation and counterproposals for the next meeting with one side or the other. American Ambassadors winced at his tough talk to Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Kings, watched him shatter all the rules of diplomatic exchange, and ended up with a considerable amount of admiration for what several of them now call the Johnston technique.

In the end his persistence and persuasiveness brought the three Arab States and Israel into agreement on the economic and engineering aspects of a plan for developing the Jordan Valley for the benefit of all four states. He had accomplished the unprecedented feat of working out a project that was acceptable to both sides.

In late September 1955 a special committee of Arab engineers reported to the Arab League that the Johnston plan, revised and refined through negotiation, was equitable, workable, and compatible with Arab interests. This put it squarely up to the political leaders of the Arab States—whether or not to assent to a project involving the expenditure of some $200 million in their countries over a 10-year period, the creation of a major new agricultural area, the development of power for industrial expansion, and the permanent settlement of several hundred thousand of their people on the land.

On the night of October 11, 1955, in the Cairo office of the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Johnston was handed a brief statement that had just been adopted by the Arab League. It requested more time to consider the technical details of the project. This was diplomatic double talk; rejection of the plan had nothing to do with technical matters. The league's action was motivated wholly by political considerations. It was a clear reflection of the obsessive hatred of Israel that pervades the Arab world. The effect of the league's action was to kill any immediate possibility of going ahead with a major undertaking that offered indisputable benefit to the Arab States themselves.

The negative vote that killed the project under the Arab League's unanimity rule was cast by Saïd el-Ghazzi, then Premier of Syria, who feared the possible political consequences of acceptance. Both Lebanon and Jordan, the other principal beneficiaries, were in favor of acceptance. On the following morning an exceptionally well-informed Egyptian newspaperman told me that el-Ghazzi had acted under instructions from Nasser, of Egypt, who had repeatedly assured Johnston that he would support the plan.

A PAIR OF PREREQUISITES

This case history of what happened to a sound and desperately needed large-scale Middle Eastern development project is cited to illustrate several of the realities that Mr. Dulles appears to disregard in his projections of the administration's economic plan.

One is that economic progress in the area which is of greatest concern to us in the Middle East cannot be achieved until there is peace and a reasonable political rapprochement between the Arab world and Israel. Continued military tension imposes a staggering economic burden on the economy of every state in the area, diverts the energies of the people from constructive to destructive ends, strengthens the hand of Nasser and lesser Arab demogogs, and invites further Communist intrusion. So long as Arab leaders feel it necessary to pursue the politically popular line of vengeance against Israel, United States offers of economic aid are going to run a poor second to Soviet offers of planes and tanks.

The second reality is that the Middle East can move forward economically only as a region. Its progress depends on regional integration and cooperation between the various states that make it up.

This becomes abundantly clear from even a cursory exploration of major development possibilities.

The Jordan River project, as has been pointed out, requires assent and cooperation by four governments. Development of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley would call for agreement among Iraq, Syria, and Turkey. The Nile—in spite of Nasser's emphasis on the Aswan High Dam—can only be harnessed for maximum benefit through agreement and cooperation among Egypt, the Sudan, Ethiopia, and the territorial governments of Kenya, Tanganyika, and the Belgian Congo.

An expansion of tourist travel to the Holy Land would produce immediate new revenues for the hard-pressed states of Jordan and Israel, with ancillary benefits to their neighbors. It would, in addition, stimulate the construction of new hotel and resort facilities, new transport lines, new highways. Yet, here again, a regional approach is necessary if the traveler is to have free access to all that he wants to see.

One of the region's most urgent needs is a modern highway system linking the Mediterranean seaboard with inland cities and the Persian Gulf. One imaginative and practicable project would involve the construction of a modern toll road, with feeder highways, from Lebanese and Syrian seaport cities across the desert to Iraq and Saudi Arabia. Such a project would be feasible only as a joint undertaking.

The regional approach in the present state of Middle Eastern affairs is admittedly not an easy one. Not only are the Arabs still actively at war with Israel; tensions within the Arab world itself are acute. Nasser's ambitions to weld the Arab nations into an Egyptian-dominated federation have, in fact, produced precisely the opposite effect. To the south, the Sudan and Ethiopia are increasingly apprehensive of Nasser's machinations, suspicious of his intentions regarding the Nile, angry at his constant propaganda aimed at

their minorities. Any constructive effort to start the region along the road to greater economic well-being must begin by dealing with these pressures and conflicts which continue to plague the Middle East.

There is not the slightest doubt that a carefully planned economic attack, carried out on a regional basis under conditions of real peace, could contribute immeasurably to the progress and emancipation of the area. But the mere expenditure of a few hundred million dollars in a crash operation designed to halt Communist penetration by paying for a project here and there won't get us anywhere at all.

If this is all Mr. Dulles has in mind, he might as well save our money.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

COAL IN THE OIL CRISIS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion concerning effects of the Middle East crisis and the shutdown of oil supplies, little attention has been given to the availability in the United States of large supplies of coal which could be used to good advantage in fueling the furnaces of European industry.

In recent weeks we have seen the difficulties of trying to replace from the Western Hemisphere the oil Europe customarily receives from the Arab States. There is every indication that the current crisis will be prolonged. There is no reason to believe that this will be the last crisis or that the people of Europe will ever be able to rely on an uninterrupted supply of petroleum from Arabian sources.

It seems to me that the authorities responsible on both sides of the Atlantic will be well-advised to take into consideration the availability of coal as a primary source of energy, and to lay plans to provide for increasing shipments to Europe.

INVESTIGATION OF THE AL SARENA MINING CLAIM CASE

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1956, the Committee on Government Operations, in House Report No. 2408, reported to the House the result of the investigation into the well-known Al Sarena Mining Claim case. On July 6, 1956, the chairman of the committee, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, sent a copy of the record and of the report to the Attorney General for action to protect the interests of the Government.

I understand that since that time, the Justice Department has been actively studying and investigating the matter. I certainly hope that this study and investigation will be translated into action at an early date.

It is very interesting to note that in the meantime, the Interior Department, under its new Secretary, has concurred in the committee's conclusion that the Administrative Procedure Act does govern contests in mining claim cases. The violation of the provisions of that act was one of the major findings of the committee in its report on the Al Sarena case.

The Interior Department's concurrence on this point of law occurred in the case of *United States* v. *Keith V. O'Leary et al.*, decided on September 28, 1956, and reported in volume 63 of the Interior Department decisions at page 341.

On September 28, 1956, the Department also amended its regulations to conform to the Administrative Procedure Act. The changes were published in the Federal Register for October 4, 1956, volume 21, at page 7623.

An interesting commentary on these developments by the eminent correspondent, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, appears in the Des Moines Register for January 10, 1957. This was followed by an editorial on January 12, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that these two items be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 10, 1957]

ALTER RULES, BAR GRAB OF UNITED STATES TIMBER

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Eisenhower administration has quietly written its own condemnation of the way the Al Sarena Mining Co. was given 454 acres of timber land in the Rogue River National Forest.

Decisions and changes in regulation made by Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton will bar such action as that by which former Undersecretary Clarence Davis awarded 23 mining patents to the Al Sarena firm.

A joint Senate-House Investigation Committee criticized the Al Sarena case as a give-away of more than $300,000 of timber on a questionable claim that a special assay ordered by Davis showed sufficient mineral possibilities.

The company obtained the patents from Davis under a mining claim and immediately went to work to harvest the timber.

DAVIS QUITS QUIETLY

Davis resigned quietly a few weeks ago.

While the department has been careful to avoid direct criticism of Davis, Seaton has been busy changing regulations so that there will be no more Al Sarena cases to plague the administration.

The case, involving forest land in southern Oregon, is considered a big factor in the defeat of former Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, in the November Senate race.

Seaton has ruled in the case of United States versus O'Leary that mining patent cases like Al Serena's must be handled under the administrative procedures act.

LIKE SENATE OPINION

A Senate Interior Committee report had stated that the administrative procedures act should have been followed in the Al Sarena case and that the irregular operations comprised a violation of that act.

The act provides that cases before administrative agencies must be handled by a method similar to that of courts—on the record and documents before the court on appeals, and with the right of notice to all parties so protests can be filed.

Davis granted the 23 patents as Acting Secretary of Interior in the absence of McKay.

NEW EVIDENCE

In granting the patents, Davis went outside of the hearing record, appealed to his office and introduced new evidence by asking for new assays on the mines without remanding the case to the original hearing body.

The administrative procedures act requires notice to all parties. Davis did not notify the Forest Service, which was a party to the dispute and which had protested the granting of 15 of the 23 patents.

The new samplings were acquired by persons acceptable to the McDonald family of Birmingham, Ala., owners of the Al Sarena mines, and the assays from the Oregon area made at a firm in Alabama— a firm that had done much work for the McDonalds.

NO CHANCE FOR REBUTTAL

The joint Senate-House Committee in its report said:

"Obviously when Dr. Davis secretly procured and accepted without notice to the Forest Service the Mobile company's report of assays, the United States, represented by the Forest Service and its counsel, had no opportunity to submit rebuttal evidence or conduct any cross-examination.

"It is equally obvious that Mr. Davis went outside the record to obtain this evidence when he arranged for the special procedure."

The Office of the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior stated that the Administrative Procedures Act would positively bar the introduction of new evidence at the appeals level.

That office also stated that the procedures followed by Davis would be considered improper in the light of Seaton's decision in the O'Leary case and subsequent regulation changes.

MANY OTHERS

The Seaton decision in the O'Leary case actually states that even at the time of the Davis decision for the Al Sarena firm there was a requirement that the Administrative Procedures Act be followed in mining-claim cases.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Hatfield Chilson, a Colorado lawyer who has recently been appointed, declared that the cutting of timber under allegations of a mining claim was an abuse that showed up not only in the Al Sarena case but in many others.

Chilson stated that the Congress has tightened the law to make it somewhat easier for the Department to prevent this type of timber grab in the future.

SOME LOOPHOLES

However, he stated that there are still loopholes in the law under which a mining firm could get patents to rather valuable timber lands on a minimum showing of mineralization.

Laws passed by the last Congress allow the Interior Department to move into a mining claim and harvest timber prior to the time patents are granted.

Chilson explained that good timber harvesting practices are required, and that selective cutting might make it impossible for the Department to get any more than a minor part of the timber harvested be-

tween the time a patent was applied for and the time it is granted.

He explained that if the Government overharvested the law provides that the firm obtaining the mining patents could go into adjoining Government timber to cut what was needed in normal mining operations.

ALLOWED SOME TIMBER

The law provides that the person obtaining the mining patent shall receive a normal amount of timber for use in working the mine.

Chilson stated that although the law had been changed and the decisions and regulations revamped in the past few months that there is need for continued vigilance to prevent abuses of the mining law.

He explained, however, that it is necessary to make prospecting attractive so the natural resources will be developed.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 12, 1957]

SEATON BARS TIMBER GRABS

The handling of the Al Sarena mining claim case by the United States Department of the Interior 2 years ago was a smear on the record of the Eisenhower administration that could have been, and should have been, avoided.

Clarence A. Davis, general counsel and former Under Secretary of the Department who was largely responsible for the manner in which the case was handled, has now resigned.

Fred Seaton, the new Secretary of Interior, has taken steps to make certain that the Nation's timber resources will be more adequately protected in the future.

In ruling on another mining claim application, Secretary Seaton made it clear that courtlike procedures must be followed in the granting of such applications. Records must be made. Hearings must be held. Interests of other agencies of the Federal Government must be considered. And if there is opposition to the granting of an application, parties on both sides of the dispute must be notified with respect to all evidence and action.

The procedure is not new. It was provided for in the Government Procedures Act. But it was partly ignored and in a manner that cast a heavy film of suspicion over the Al Sarena affair.

Secretary Seaton's ruling cannot guarantee that every safeguard of the Nation's interest will be observed in the future. It will, however, provide a precedent that will make it more difficult for others to be profligate or careless with respect to valuable natural riches that belong to the public.

What stirred up the fires under Davis and his superior, former Interior Secretary Douglas McKay, was not just the fact that the Al Sarena Mining Co., of Birmingham, Ala., was given the right to do some mining in Oregon.

But with the mining claim went the privilege of stripping the 454-acre plot in the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon of precious timber. The company was said to have harvested more than $300,000 worth of timber from the land.

Secretary Seaton has taken steps to discourage that sort of looting in the future. He has performed a valuable service and the public can be assured that so long as he heads the Department of the Interior, that looting will not knowingly be permitted.

But this assurance is not enough. Both Congress and the Department of the Interior should reexamine the laws and procedures dealing with the protection of our natural resources and plug every leak that may still exist.

PUNISHMENT FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced another bill dealing with the power of courts of the United States to punish for contempt. It is a companion bill to H. R. 3006, which I introduced on Wednesday, January 16, 1957.

In simple language, the purpose of the bill introduced today is to provide that: First, no person can be punished for contempt of court by a Federal judge unless such person was given notice by personal service of the proceeding out of which the injunction issued and was granted an opportunity to be heard on the question of whether or not the injunction should be issued; second, any person accused of contempt because of disobedience or resistance to an injunction not committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice shall be entitled to a trial by jury upon demand therefor.

It seems to me that the principles here involved are so fundamental to American jurisprudence that the mere citing of them is sufficient in itself to demonstrate the necessity of their enactment into law. I am sure that the great mass of our people were confident that such rights existed in this great, liberty-loving Nation. We have been holding up our country as a model republican form of government where the people are all-powerful and the Government is the servant of the people.

In the recent past we have had demonstrated that apparently the judiciary could take over the functions of the States and localities in the policing of law and order in the States and localities; that a citizen of this country could be hailed into court, charged with disobeying an order of some Federal judge, notice of which had never been served upon such citizen nor was he even a party to the litigation, and then summarily tried by the judge, who refused to grant the accused the time-honored right of trial by jury. Until recently, I was of the opinion that everyone charged with a crime was entitled to the right of trial by jury before being subjected to a fine and imprisonment. To me, this is a sacred right. It is a right that all English-speaking people have had since the signing of the Magna Charta. At least I so thought, and I believe the vast majority of the people of this great Nation were of the same opinion.

It has been demonstrated, however, that certain segments of the Federal judiciary have determined to police their areas; to compel the citizens therein to adjust themselves to the philosophy of this jurist; and to enforce upon the people these philosophies by simply enjoining entire communities from doing anything that might be obnoxious to the judiciary and without giving any actual notice to the individuals therein of such injunctions. When the provisions of the all-embracing injunction are violated, hordes of marshals are sent out to round up the people accused of violating the provisions of the injunction and they are thrown in jail to be there held until some date convenient to the judiciary, to be tried.

Apparently, the same segment of the judiciary is unwilling that the people they accuse of disobeying their order should have a jury trial. In view of all this, it is necessary that the Congress do something to protect the rights, privileges, and freedoms of the citizens of this country.

In the recent past, we have seen some of the judiciary arrogate unto themselves authority that they never had. They have usurped power never given them by the Constitution or the law of the land. They are attempting to take over the police powers of the States and localities. They have endeavored to browbeat whole communities into accepting philosophies foreign to such communities.

This bill is not an attempt to change any fundamental law or precept or even the philosophy of the court. It is simply designed to guarantee to the American people that they will not be haled into court without due notice and once in court be tried by an arrogant, tyrannical, power-crazed, dictatorial judge instead of by a jury of their vicinage.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that other Members of this great body will realize the critical situation our people are facing today and act before it is too late.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LANHAM for 45 minutes on Monday next.

Mrs. SULLIVAN for 10 minutes today.

Mr. PRICE in lieu of the special order he has for today that he may insert his remarks at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. MCGOVERN for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HOFFMAN for 10 minutes on Monday, February 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY in four instances, in two to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MORANO) and to include a transcript of the program Meet the Press.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee).

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 4, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

404. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1956, filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, pursuant to paragraph 14, section 8, act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 974); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

405. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 70th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

406. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the act, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

407. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

408. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on positions compensated under the authority of Public Law 623, 84th Congress during the calendar year 1956, pursuant to section 503, title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1056. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; with amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2367. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule 22, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4177. A bill to amend section 401 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the power of courts of the United States to punish for contempt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4178. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4179. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4180. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 4181. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4182. A bill to provide travel pay and compensatory time off with respect to certain time in travel status for certain civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4183. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the refunding of the bonds of municipal corporations and public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska, to validate bonds which have heretofore been issued by a municipal corporation or any public-utility district in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes" (54 Stat. 14), approved January 17, 1940; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 4184. A bill to extend rural delivery mail service to persons desiring such service and residing on or near improved roads; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4185: A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4186. A bill to amend section 4197 of the Revised Statutes to provide that the master of a vessel may correct an outward foreign manifest by post entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4187. A bill to amend section 3 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the minimum amount of the annuity payable to any individual thereunder will not be affected by the retirement of such individual (or any other individual) to social-security benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK (by request):

H. R. 4188. A bill to clarify section 283 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to conflict of interests, with respect to certain actions of Federal officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4189. A bill for the adoption of 10,000 eligible orphans, under 12 years of age, and to grant permanent residence to orphans admitted to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4190. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River channel-deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4191. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4192. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4193. A bill to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538-540); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4194. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to eliminate all restrictions upon the right of an individual to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts or to receive more than one annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4195. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to reduce from 60 to 50 the age at which certain permanently disabled individuals become entitled to receive their annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4196. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" with 40 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4197. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that certain articles containing synthetic rubber shall be so labeled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4198. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 relating to the number of refugee orphans to be admitted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4199. A bill to extend the unemployment compensation program to employers of one or more employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4200. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for public schoolroom construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4201. A bill to provide direct aid to States and Territories for public schoolroom construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4202. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4203. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE (by request):

H. R. 4204. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian claims fund to settle claims of cer-

tain United States nationals against Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4205. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4206. A bill to amend section 391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 4207. A bill to provide hospital care and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4208. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of certain governmental obligations and of the interest on such obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4210. A bill to establish workmen's compensation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4211. A bill to provide for further research and technical assistance required for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable of adversely affecting the health and welfare of man; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4212. A bill to provide for the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4213. A bill to provide for the appointment of 2 circuit judges for the Second Judicial Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 4214. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4215. A bill amending sections 22, and 24, of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4216. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 4217. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4218. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide scholarships; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4219. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4220. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4221. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4222. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide education and training thereunder to persons whose pursuit of education has been interrupted after January 31, 1955, by military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4223. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) from $600 to $800 for 1957 and to $1,000 for 1958 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4224. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4225. A bill to provide a scholarship loan program to afford an opportunity to Americans to attain an educational level to which they aspire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4226. A bill to provide an appropriation for the enlargement of the United States courthouse at Philadelphia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of all Spanish-American War Veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the A. A. Sprague Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Seattle, Wash., as the George E. Flood Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fresno, Calif., as the B. W. Gearhart Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution providing for a complete investigation of mental health legislative programs which are being currently promoted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con Res. 99. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Res. 139. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 140. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 139; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the recent increases in the prices of fuel oil; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to study the naval defense of the Pacific coast areas of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 64; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4227. A bill for the relief of Vartanouche Kalfayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4228. A bill for the relief of Eileen Mary McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4229. A bill for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N. C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4230. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 4231. A bill for the relief of Helen Lillian Deutsch Lowi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4232. A bill for the relief of Lambert Kwok, Nancy Li Kwok, and Evelyn Chi Ngan Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4233. A bill for the relief of Ennio O. Cappelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4234. A bill for the relief of Miss Irene Varverakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 4235. A bill for the relief of Parania Mykycej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 4236. A bill for the relief of Eithaniahu (Eton) Yellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4237. A bill for the relief of Gerard Phillip Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4238. A bill for the relief of Hebbani Krishnamurthi Jairaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 4239. A bill for the relief of Sewell W. Dixon, William E. Welch, Roland Scott, Edward Deale, Warren M. Crandell, William H. Crandell, R. E. Lee, and Louis E. Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4241. A bill for the relief of Lucille Josephine Mathilda Snell nee Copeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Louis F. Cremers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Arman Giritlian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Melham Fayad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Michael Branch (Kazuo Yamamoto) and Mark Branch (Hideo Kuramochi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Gino Raffello Moretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Miguel Rios-Nieves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Arnold Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

64. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of Home Builders Association of Howard County, Ind., with reference to interest rates on VA and FHA mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

65. By Mr. BETTS: Petition of Fostoria Aerie No. 430, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Fostoria, Ohio, asking that the first Sunday in February of each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the Wahpeton, N. Dak., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the Congress of the United States set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplain's Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

67. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harvey Wesley Love, Burns, Tenn., relative to asking $50,000 for personal injuries, tortures, and grievances to Harvey Wesley Love by a brutal United States Veterans' Administration hospital attendant, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Increase in Oil and Gas Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has the responsibility of investigating and reporting on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States. In the Pacific Northwest the situation has changed greatly in the last few years, which I think bears looking into. For example, we have added to the supply by an oil pipeline from Canada, and in this connection have a new refinery at Ferndale, Wash. Also there is a new refinery at Anacortes, and a third one in the process of construction. Other companies have announced that they are putting in refineries in the near future. But the point is that the supply of oil from Canada should have increased the overall supply, and accordingly reduced the cost of petroleum products in the area.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, natural gas has just been brought into this area by the completion of a new pipeline which was connected with Seattle and other large cities very recently. Natural gas will be now used far more extensively for heating homes and should be competitive with and reduce the buying pressure for oil.

In the face of these new developments do we find that the consumer is benefited and the cost has been reduced? On the contrary, I have just received a strong protest regarding the enormous increase in fuel oil prices by the major oil companies and their subsidiaries in this area. In this connection I am told that fuel oil—Pacific specifications 300 and 400—prices have been raised from $3 per barrel to $4.24 per barrel within the last year. The last raise, according to my information, was 17 cents per barrel effective January 19, 1957, which is included in the total price raise shown for the past year. Stove and diesel oil have been raised proportionately.

The seriousness of this situation to the consumer is indicated by the fact that PS–300 and PS–400 are the principal fuels used for heat and hot water supply in the area, so that there exists a critical situation as far as heat cost is concerned.

All in all, it makes me wonder if the law of supply and demand is being interfered with, and certainly I think that an investigation is in order. Accordingly I am writing to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, urging that he include the Pacific Northwest in any investigation of the oil industry which the committee contemplates. I imagine that the committee will want to investigate charges that the closing of the Suez Canal has been used as a pretext to raise oil and gas prices. The Pacific Northwest should be included in any such investigation.

Transcript of Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey on Meet the Press, National Broadcasting System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a transcript of the January 27 television and radio program Meet the Press at which time Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey was guest:

Meet the Press, America's press conference of the air, has interviewed and will continue to interview those who play a vital role in national and international affairs.

Our guest, ladies and gentlemen, is the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey. In just a moment Secretary Humphrey will meet the press.

Now, Meet the Press, the prize-winning program produced by Lawrence E. Spivak. Ready for this spontaneous, unrehearsed conference are four of America's top reporters. Please remember their questions do not necessarily reflect their point of view. It's their way of getting a story for you.

Here's the moderator of Meet the Press, Mr. Ned Brooks.

NED BROOKS. And welcome once again to Meet the Press.

Our guest is the Secretary of the Treasury Mr. George Humphrey. His concern over the rising cost of Government has developed into one of the big news stories here in Washington. In discussing the new $72 billion Federal budget, Secretary Humphrey used a phrase that has been widely quoted. He said, "Unless a way is found to reduce the spending in the future, we will have a depression that will make your hair curl."

Mr. Humphrey's strongly worded warning against big spending provided the central theme for President Eisenhower's most recent news conference. Since the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Humphrey has been one of the President's closest advisors. His Department is responsible for financial policies and, of course, these policies affect the fortunes of all of us.

The new budget is about $2 billion larger than the last one and it sets a new peacetime record. It does meet one of Secretary Humphrey's objectives—it will not cause a Treasury deficit but the surplus is so small that it allows no room for a reduction in taxes.

And now seated around the press table ready to interview Secretary Humphrey are Marquis Childs, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Richard Wilson, of the Cowles Publications; Edwin Dale, of the New York Times; and Martin Hayden, of the Detroit News. Our regular panel member, Mr. Lawrence Spivak, is not with us today. He will be back next week.

And now, Mr. Secretary, if you're ready we'll start the questions with Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS. The President said at his press conference that he would use any constitutional means to cure a depression whereas you said that you would resign probably if there were a tax cut in the face of deficit spending. Doesn't this open up a pretty wide difference between you and the President?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I don't think so, Mr. Childs. I think that we both have the same objective. We both would do anything that we thought would be effective to prevent a depression. The only question is, What and when are various things effective?

Mr. CHILDS. Well, do you reject the theory of so many of the professional economists that you must use Government spending when business falls off? Do you think that's an unsound theory?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It all depends upon what happens to income at the same time. I think that the time—the real time—to prevent a depression is before it starts. The old adage of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure is a very good thing to remember.

Mr. CHILDS. Well, would it be fair to say that your disagreement is with the Council of Economic Advisers and perhaps with Gabriel Hauge, the President's economic righthand in the White House, because they

suggest, or at least the President suggested in his economic report, that there would be—there'd have to be—very flexible policies to—in relation to the economy.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I don't think that necessarily there's any disagreement anywhere. Flexible policies can be used but as I say the various things that you would and might do should be used at various times, and I think when you attempt to answer hypothetical questions and haven't all the facts before you, it's very difficult to pick out the timing of when one method would be appropriate or another would be appropriate.

Mr. CHILDS. But you don't anticipate this hair curling depression anyway, do you?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't anticipate it and I think, Mr. Childs, there's no reason why we should have it if we do the proper things as we go along. My warning was a warning that things might happen at some future time if we didn't do the things that we should do as we go along, principal one of which is to reduce our spending at the present time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Hayden.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, Mr. Secretary, right in that connection, the Eisenhower administration has now been in for 4 years. Now, of course, you coupled your hair-curling expression with the other comment that you thought that this record peacetime budget was probably the best that could be conceived at this time. Well, after 4 years you've been working at it, what is going to happen next year or the year after that is going to give you a chance to make a material reduction?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think, and I hope, Mr. Hayden, that maybe it'll happen this year. Ah, my whole point in this thing is this, that we have worked hard for several months to prepare a budget which is the consensus of opinion is as good an estimate and a budget you know is only an estimate. It's as good an estimate as we can now make of what we would propose to do over the following 18 months. Now, the thing that I am urging is this: That we do not just accept that estimate and say that's all over; we'll just go ahead and spend that amount and do more—do no further work on it. The thing that I'm urging—the thing that I'm trying to impress on people—is the necessity of working during all of that 18 months, the ensuing 18 months, days, nights, holidays, and Sundays, to reduce those expenditures as we go along, and I can't see why we shouldn't make some progress in doing it. It doesn't seem to me that we need to necessarily just say we accept those estimates and forget it. I think we ought to work at it, and I believe if we work intelligently and hard enough that we will make some progress and that there should be some room to make some reductions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but, Mr. Secretary, you've been working hard for 4 years, and I'm sure intelligently, but thinking back a little into our history that business community of which you were then a member used to say in Franklin Roosevelt's day that he was spending us to ruin. Well, I just looked up the figures, and in 1941, the last year before the war, even though defense was on, the Roosevelt administration was taking $59.28 per citizen in taxes. The Eisenhower administration last year took $461.64. Well, that's getting way beyond the Roosevelt ruin. How do you tie it together?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, you have a great many factors that happened in between, you see. Your dollar is only half as much as it was then. The last end of the Truman administration the dollar depreciated very, very rapidly, as you'll remember. So that accounts for a good deal of it.

Another important point is that since that time you've had a very great increase in your population and in addition to that you've had an increase in productivity and our total annual product is much greater now than it was then. Now all those things have to be taken into consideration in comparing two periods.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Secretary, I believe when you first came into office you felt quite certain that it would be possible to reduce Federal spending to about $60 billion a year.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's what I hoped.

Mr. WILSON. Now it's up to $72 billion and probably actually near $100 billion and that's at least 20 percent higher than when you first came into office. What's happened to all these dreams about a so-called sound economy?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I don't know where you get your 20 percent. The budget we found when we came here exceeded $70 billion. Now, we cut that budget in a period of about 18 months by nearly $10 billion. The budget has crept back on us. Various new devices, various new things have arisen to increase expenditures pretty well all along the line, and we haven't felt that sufficient cuts could be made, we haven't seen, haven't been able to work out places where sufficient cuts could be made to offset these increases as we've gone in.

Mr. WILSON. Well——

Secretary HUMPHREY. I have the hope, Mr. Wilson, and I believe that we are spending too much money. I believe we're taking too much out of this economy over a long period of time. Now, I'm not concerned, as I said to Mr. Childs, about a depression, an immediate depression. That isn't the point. The point is that if we continue to take as much money out of this economy as we have been taking, as we are now taking, I don't believe we are going to have the capital to supply the necessary tools, the machinery, and all the things that are required to make the jobs that we need for our growing population.

Mr. WISON. Yes, sir; but the other day you placed your main emphasis in the statement you issued on a reduction in individual income taxes.

Secretary HUMPHREY. If we can reduce taxes, yes.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; if you can reduce taxes. Well, I understand this is what you're getting at—the accumulation of capital is impeded by high corporate taxes, is that right?

Secretary HUMPHREY. By high corporate taxes and by high individual taxes.

Mr. WILSON. Why by high individual taxes.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, the individuals then have less money to save, to invest. We must have the great amount of investment that's used to buy tools to make plants, to provide transportation, to do all the things that are required to provide the jobs for our increasing population, for the young men and women, and there are a million and a half of them a year almost coming in and wanting new jobs. Now that means a lot of new expenditure and a lot of new capital and most of that capital comes from savings of the people.

Mr. WILSON. You said you wanted to reduce taxes a year hence, as I recall.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That's what I hope. If we can make a sufficient reduction—if we can make a sufficient reduction now in the expenditures then we would be in position to reduce taxes a year from now.

Mr. WILSON. Well, now I thought your main concern was inflation. Wouldn't reducing taxes be inflationary?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think reducing our expenditures is the greatest break on inflation we could possibly have, and the reason I think it is simply this. If we reduce expenditures, it means that the Government—I'm talking about Government expenditures—it means that the Government will employ less people and will buy fewer goods. If the Government buys fewer goods and if it employs less people, it means that those people are released to make more goods for things that the people can buy. In other words, we will release people from making guns and planes and various things or doing various things in the Government that the people can't buy to go into industry and make things that the people can buy. Now, as more goods are available you will stabilize your prices. The greatest thing that can happen to the stabilization of prices and of costs of goods is to have more people working at it to make more goods to have more goods available and that relieves the pressure on prices, and that will prevent inflation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Dale.

Mr. DALE. I'd like to return for a moment, Mr. Secretary, to this possible recession or depression problem. First, would you concede that there ever could be a time when deliberate budget deficits would be a good weapon to fight a depression with—there could be?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It's very hard to say—to answer a hypothetical question like that and have it accurate. I can say this: I think it is hard for me to see just the circumstances that would prevail when you would want to do that. Now, this is the reason, Mr. Dale: The Government is spending about $1 when, at the same time, the people of this country are spending $8 or $10. Now, when you're in a declining volume of business—when you're in what we refer to as a depression—the real cause of that is lack of confidence in the people. The people become fearful; they do not buy; they curtail their own expenditures. The thing that will end that is to restore confidence. Now, if the Government in such situation does something that will injure confidence, it will just compound the difficulties. What the Government must do is to do something that will restore confidence; and if the Government by reducing—by increasing its deficit by $1 so scares people that the people withdraw from some of their expansion, they can shut off $8 or $10 for every dollar that the Government spends, and I think that in most cases you would find that confidence would be more shaken by a deliberate big deficit spending than you would by having the Government do more constructive things and restore confidence so that the people themselves would begin to spend.

Mr. DALE. Then further on to your prediction of a depression that would curl your hair if the tax burden on the people could not be reduced at some time, how do you account for the fact that with the given levels of high taxes last year saw an alltime record by a big margin in capital investment and new creation of jobs in the face of the present taxes?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I personally think that you have to take things over a little period of time.

Mr. DALE. But they've been rising every year now for 3 or 4.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, what happened? Now let's just go back and review this for just a minute. We came in and we had a budget of some seventy-odd-billion dollars and there was a great feeling throughout the country that we were spending too much money and we by various means and lot of hard work—the same kind of hard work I want to see us indulge in again—cut that budget and we reduced those expenditures by about $10 million, and then we gave a tax cut—a $7 billion tax cut—which was the biggest tax cut in history, and the combination of what we did and the feeling that the people got, restored a confidence in the people—built a confidence in the people—and we've been going up on that confidence ever since.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned a moment ago the rising number of employees in the Government. Now, a lot of people seem to understand why the cost of goods has gone up, but they find it harder to understand why the Government continually has

to keep adding to its payroll and the number of employees. Could you explain that?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I find it pretty hard to understand, myself. Of course, there is always the alibi that we have a growing population and that with a growing population we must continually go up. But the thing that makes America is that we get more production per man—that we do more per hour per man all of the time, and if we can do that in industry, I don't know why we can't and shouldn't do it in Government.

Mr. DALE. We have about two and a half million employees or somewhere around that number. Would you care to suggest any number that you think might be cut off of that two and a half million?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I can't specifically go through the Government and state to you tonight just where I think people should be cut off. I'll tell you this—that so far as the Treasury is concerned, we have teams that are out studying every function that we have. We are finding places every day where we're reducing forces and where we're making progress and we're going to make some reduction in Treasury budget.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS. I noticed in the papers today, Mr. Secretary, you propose that all foreign economic aid should be on the basis of repayable loans but wouldn't that keep it out of the—wouldn't that keep it away—economic aid—away from the countries of southeastern Asia where it is most needed for building their economies and resisting communism?

Secretary HUMPHREY. You know, I'm often quite interested to read in the paper what I do think. Sometimes it's quite a novel experience. This particular thing you refer to is this. When the Fairless Committee was appointed to study the foreign-aid situation—you recall we have the Fairless Committee and the congressional committees and all?—I was the first witness to testify before that Committee and they rather experimented with me and when I finished testifying, they asked me if I would just put my ideas in a letter and send it to the Chairman. I did that and the letter that I sent went to Mr. Fairless. Now, that's my letter to Mr. Fairless. Mr. Fairless is the head of this Committee that is studying the subject. The letter some way, some part of the letter, leaked. The whole letter has not been published and until Mr. Fairless releases the letter, I don't think that I want to discuss it and I don't think it's proper for me to do so.

Mr. CHILDS. Well, you don't care to say how you feel about repayable loans in terms of economics?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will just say that the information that was in the paper—that I read in the paper this morning—I read with great interest and it isn't accurate.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Hayden.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Secretary, getting back to the inflation question, both you and the President have more or less indirectly laid it on businesses and labor as the ones who must now take the ball on controlling inflation, calling on them to moderate their pay demands in the case of the unions and to minimize their profits, you might say, in case of business. Now, isn't it basic in our system that business is entitled to the profits that the market will provide and that labor is entitled to anything it can negotiate in fair negotiation with management.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Over a long-term period. I don't think that anyone feels that it's good business—I don't think that any business feels that it's good business to just look at things from a short-run point of view. You try to look at things over a long period and to run your business for the best interests over that long period. Now, I don't think that it is up to just management and labor. I think that this involves everybody. One of the reasons I'm glad to be on this program today is because I think that the—all the public in America are interested in this thing. I think it's greatly to their advantage to try to help—to try to help us—to reduce these expenditures and the public can be of great assistance in this matter. These things—these requests for expenditures—all arise with the public in the first place. It's public pressure for this service or that service or this help or that help that starts these things. That has a reaction on the Congress because the public are demanding things and the Congress go forward with programs and plans that cost money. The executive can't do it all, the Congress can't do it all, the public can't do it all, but all together—if we all turn in and if we all desire to get these expenses down—I think we can make some progress doing so and I think we ought to start with the public and then go to the Congress and go to the executive and have the executive carry it through.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Well, Mr. Secretary, that's very persuasive what you've just said, but aren't you actually just about a one man—making about a one-man campaign on this subject. I've heard it said that the—in a Cabinet meeting the other day there was a showing of hands of some indication of what the sentiment was and that you and the President were the only ones who thought this budget was too high. Is that about right?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I don't recall that incident. That's another one of those interesting things that you—that you hear about afterward, but I will say this. Contrary to the newspaper stories that I read that the President and I are at odds on this matter, the President—I've never seen any man work harder or more intently to reduce this budget—to bring this budget into proper shape than the President himself, and the President and I are just as much in accord as we can possibly be in trying to do this thing that we think is for the benefit of all of the American people if it can be accomplished.

Mr. WILSON. Well, now you've appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and you've been talking on this line for several weeks. What is the outlook for actually bringing this figure down within a more reasonable range?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it's a hard job. I don't expect any miracles. I don't believe you can have any miracles, but if you don't try, I'm sure you won't get it done. You say that most people are in favor of this big spending. I don't think so. I think when you go out through the country, you'll find hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people who are as concerned as I am about this——

Mr. WILSON. I merely——

Secretary HUMPHREY. And those are the people I want to incite into action and get them to help in their communities to lessen the pressures on the Congress to do things that cost money.

Mr. WILSON. I was only referring to people in the administration when I said that most people in the administration appear to be in favor of this.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think if you took the Cabinet and went right straight through it, you'd find almost unanimous belief that we have to do more than we have done—that we have to improve our situation in reducing expenditures.

Mr. WILSON. Are you getting a big public response—are a lot of people coming in to support you on this?

Secretary HUMPHREY. There's a very large public response.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Dale.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Secretary, you blamed the public for this and pressures arising—don't you blame the Russians?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, you can hardly say you blame the Russians. The fact that the Russians are there——

Mr. DALE. A threat——

Secretary HUMPHREY. And are a threat and a continuing and great threat is, of course, one of the big elements of this.

Mr. DALE. Also, you—you've spoken frequently about working every day to reduce this between now and the 18 months when it's all over with but the last 3 years, if I'm not mistaken, the final figure turned out to be higher, not lower, than the original figure. Is that not the case—or at least 2 of the 3?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think that is more accurate. I think in 2 of the 3, that is correct.

Mr. DALE. And that's because——

Secretary HUMPHREY. We just didn't do as well as I think we should, that's all, and because we haven't done as well, that's no reason why we shouldn't try and try our best and keep trying to do better.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Hayden.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Secretary, as a businessman 4 or 5 years ago you used to be a very bitter critic of Government financial officers. After 4 years, have you got a little more sympathy for your predecessors?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I think I know—I've seen a lot of things I haven't seen before.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Secretary——

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. If you were—if this Government went into——

Secretary HUMPHREY. Just to finish your question, I'm critical of myself. I don't blame just the public—I don't blame just the Congress—I blame everybody, including myself. I think we all ought to do a better job.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Secretary, on that note, I think we'll have to bring this to a close. I'm sorry to interrupt, but I see that our time is up. Thank you very much, Secretary Humphrey, for being with us.

Federal Employees Entitled to Pay Adjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a salary increase for Federal employees whose positions are subject to the Classification Act is amply justified. I am proposing a formula for such an increase in H. R. 5243, which I introduced on February 22.

Congress has provided pay raises for these employees in recent years, but at no time were they sufficient to restore their salaries to their prewar level of purchasing power. They have to wait too long for each increase for the raise to give them any lasting benefit. For that reason there should be no delay in taking action on this matter as soon as possible.

The bill I have introduced would increase the first $2,500 of salary by 10 percent. That part of total salary which exceeds $2,500 would be increased by 24½ percent. In the case of a salary now in excess of $7,500 that portion above $7,500 would be increased by 27 percent. Thus the employee now receiving $3,415, the entrance rate for grade GS–4, would receive $250 as 10 percent of the first

$2,500 of his total salary and an additional $224 as 24½ percent of the $915 by which his salary exceeds $2,500. His total raise would be $474.

In the first four grades the proposed increases would be well substantiated by the increased cost of living and the overall advance of productivity. Raises in the middle grades would be brought up to approximate equality with the cost-of-living level of salaries for the same grades in 1939. However, even at the rates of increase I am proposing, the salaries provided would not be sufficient to withstand even a further small increase in living costs.

The entrance salary for grade GS–7 would be increased by only $71 a year above the amount needed to restore the rate for that grade to its purchasing power in 1939. In grade GS–9 the proposed rate would be only $10 above the 1939 cost-of-living level.

The salary problem is a very real and pressing problem. For the Government it is a matter of attracting and holding employees who are qualified and reliable. The Government has been fortunate in being able to recruit many unusually capable employees. They are in fact dedicated to the public service. But the Government should not exploit this attraction which the public service may have over and above the remuneration which it offers.

For the employees it is a matter of simple justice. Workers outside the Government service have received increases well above those in the Federal service. We cannot match industry in paying the salaries offered persons in the higher administrative and professional positions, but there is not the slightest reason we cannot do as well or better than industry in paying employees in the first few grades of the Classification Act salary schedule.

In searching for a solution to the immediate pay problem, we should keep clearly in mind that the maintenance of buying power is common to all who earn a livelihood. Prices of commodities and services which people generally need for ordinary comfort have risen considerably since the end of World War II. The trend upward has not ended. This fact has only one meaning—a pay increase is needed now and it should be large enough to prevent Federal employees from continuing to lose a sizable portion of the purchasing power of their salaries in earlier years.

Permanent Residence to Orphans Admitted to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide for the adoption of eligible orphans under 12 years of age and grant permanent residence to orphans admitted to the United States.

The able and distinguished gentleman of Oregon, Mr. CHARLES PORTER, is the original author of this bill and he has graciously consented to my joining him in the introduction of the same bill.

There is an element of moral responsibility involved in the purpose of the bill. Americans are known far and wide for their charity and real generosity. Passage of this bill will give that charity expression and will contribute immeasurably to amity and understanding between Americans and the peoples of many foreign lands.

The objective of this bill is something the American people have indicated they want to do. It meets a need and contributes to a solution of the problem.

America has a degree of responsibility. Hawaii feels very close to this problem.

"The Ultimate Aim in the Middle East: Peace"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a number of Republican Members of the House, finding themselves in agreement with the statement of the Secretary of State last November that something better must come out of the Middle East than a return to the status quo, have appended their approval to a telegram addressed to Secretary of State Dulles on January 25, 1957.

We express our belief that peace in the area may depend on United States leadership and that it is essential to peaceful conditions in the area that the belligerents should be kept apart from each other. A return to the status quo would not accomplish this. Unless the security of frontiers and the right of passage through international waterways be spelled out, the instability of the international situation continues, to the detriment of the interests of the United States.

The telegram and the signatures of those expressing their approval of its contents follows:

JANUARY 25, 1957.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

We have addressed you in the past, Mr. Secretary, as a committee speaking for a group of more than 50 Republican Members who are concerned about the lack of an Arab-Israel peace and growing Communist influence in the Middle East.

We believe that many Members of Congress who support your program to resist Communist aggression in the Middle East are firmly convinced that the United States must now assert strong leadership in the United Nations to arrest a tragic train of events which will inevitably lead to new hostilities and to the strengthening of Communist power in the region.

We share your views expressed in the General Assembly on November 1, 1956, that it would be a mistake to restore the conditions which existed last October and which led to the outbreak at that time.

Consistent with your expressed purposes we urge:

One. That our U. N. delegation support strong measures to assure that the UNEF will be deployed in the Sinai Peninsula to prevent Communist-armed Egyptian forces from reoccupying their former bases in Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip, from resuming their border raids and sea blockades on the Gulf of Aqaba, and from carrying on other warlike acts aimed at Israel's destruction.

Two. That the U. N. and the United States now formally address the Government of Egypt to ascertain whether that Government is ready to renounce its declared state of war against the State of Israel and to enter into negotiations looking to settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict and arrangements guaranteeing international shipping both through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Three. That until arrangements have been completed for the effective disposition of U. N. forces and until Egypt has begun to negotiate disputed issues in good faith, we oppose any further one-sided U. N. action calling upon Israel to make further unconditional withdrawals of her forces which may prejudice her national survival.

We are convinced that the security of the United States will be served by the foregoing program which will prevent further aggressions and promote peaceful settlements.

HUGH SCOTT, 6th District of Pennsylvania; KENNETH B. KEATING, 38th District of New York; ALBERT P. MORANO, 4th District of Connecticut; JAMES G. FULTON, 27th District of Pennsylvania; EDMUND P. RADWAN, 41st District of New York; EDWIN H. MAY, Jr., 1st District of Connecticut; JAMES T. PATTERSON, 5th District of Connecticut; FRANK J. BECKER, 3d District of New York; ROBERT HALE, 1st District of Maine; ALVIN M. BENTLEY, 8th District of Michigan; ROBERT W. KEAN, 12th District of New Jersey; ROBERT J. CORBETT, 29th District of Pennsylvania; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, 15th District of California; JOHN P. SAYLOR, 22d District of Pennsylvania; STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, 2d District of New York; HENRY J. LATHAM, 4th District of New York; GORDON CANFIELD, 8th District of New Jersey; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., 2d District of Connecticut; LAURENCE CURTIS, 10th District of Massachusetts; EDWIN B. DOOLEY, 26th District of New York; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, 35th District of New York; WILLIAM E. MILLER, 40th District of New York; GLENN CUNNINGHAM, 2d District of Nebraska; WILLARD S. CURTIN, 8th District of Pennsylvania; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 39th District of New York; R. D. HARRISON, 3d District of Nebraska; J. ERNEST WHARTON, 29th District of New York; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, 1st District of New Jersey; WILLIAM E. MCVEY, 4th District of Illinois; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, 32d District of New York; ALBERT W. CRETELLA, 3d District of Connecticut; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, 5th District of Massachusetts; VINCENT J. DELLAY, 14th District of New Jersey; PAUL A. FINO, 25th District of New York; JOE HOLT, 22d District of California; FRANCIS E. DORN, 12th District of New York; FLORENCE P. DWYER, 6th District of New Jersey; ALBERT H. BOSCH, 5th District of New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, 6th District of Washington; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th District of Michigan; CHESTER E. MERROW, 1st District of New Hampshire; WINSTON L. PROUTY, at large, Vermont.

Is a Second Pearl Harbor Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution calling for a study of west coast defense. It is self-evident that an enemy of the United States in possession of the atom bomb, and more so the hydrogen bomb, increases a thousandfold the danger of a second Pearl Harbor. So the risk of a sneak attack hangs over our heads—and is greatly increased if we allow an undue concentration of defense planes and combat vessels in any one naval base.

Last year, our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised this issue on the floor of the House when he referred to a photograph he had seen of five of our active modern aircraft carriers side by side in their southern California home port. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, will recall that he agreed it was unwise not to limit the number of such combat units located in any one spot. During that same colloquy I mentioned my effort to persuade the Navy to base some of their ships in the Pacific Northwest on account of the vast coastline, including, of course, Alaska, which lies north of southern California.

There are many factors which I will not mention at this time, but always I come back to the firm conviction that certain combat units of the Pacific Fleet should be permanently based in the Pacific Northwest. After all, the shore facilities and docks are already available in Puget Sound. To a large degree it is a matter of where the families of the ships' crews are billeted and how the ships are scheduled. And as I say the length of supply lines, more than 1,400 miles shorter to the Orient from Puget Sound, and 1,100 miles shorter to Alaska, eloquently bespeak for a home port closer than southern California. And when you disperse you cut the risk of a second Pearl Harbor in half.

Interestingly enough during the recent outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East and while the Suez crisis was hot, what did our Navy do on the Pacific coast? In mid-November 23 units of the Pacific Fleet, according to a subsequent newspaper article, were redeployed from California. Then when the international crisis subsided, back they went. At least the December 7, 1956—a significant day of the year—issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer noted that seven destroyers in Seattle for the emergency were quietly returning. The way the world is, Mr. Speaker, it would seem our armed services should treat 365 days of the year—not just during periods of localized hot wars—as a crisis. Our naval vessels and their crews should never be based so that for morale purposes of families and crews all maneuvers must be operated from one location—and only for overhauls or short vacation public relations purposes the ships visit in other ports.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have thought it desirable for the House Armed Services Committee to look into the matter. Accordingly I have introduced a resolution calling for a study of our west coast defenses, with particular reference to avoiding a second Pearl Harbor by designating more than one home port for the Pacific Coast Fleet.

I trust in the interest of national security, this resolution will have early consideration. It might be well, also, for the Committee on Armed Services to study the desirability of keeping one *Forrestal* type aircraft carrier and also one nuclear-powered submarine on the west coast. It seems to me on account of Hawaii and Alaska and our Far East commitments more importance to the Pacific would be in order.

The Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I recently expressed concern over what I regard as a serious error in judgment on the part of the Federal Reserve Board which may well jeopardize the Government's entire housing program. I objected strenuously to the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board which permits commercial banks to pay higher interest rates on savings and time deposits. Shortly following this action, I prophesied that it would set off a chain reaction which would start a competitive rate war among lending institutions, would tend to divert funds from the home mortgage field, and would tend to drive mortgage interest rates on FHA and GI loans so high that the average home buyer would be barred from the home market. I am including a press release dated January 7 which expresses my criticism in detail.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my prophesy is being confirmed by events. I have received a flood of correspondence indicating that mortgage lending institutions in various parts of the country have been forced to raise their dividend or savings rate, which will inevitably put further upward pressure upon mortgage interest rates, and may well negate the recent increase in the FHA rate to 5 percent.

One of the communications which I received was particularly thorough and comprehensive and I would, therefore, like to include in my remarks a letter on the subject from Mr. Thurman Lee, president of Dry Dock Savings Bank of New York City, one of the largest savings banks in the country:

The Federal Reserve Board was accused today of a serious error in judgment which jeopardizes the Government's entire housing program.

Congressman ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee during the last Congress, said he was referring to the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board which permits commerical bankers to pay higher interest rates on savings and time deposits.

"Frankly I regard the action as a policy blunder of the highest order. It has set off a chain reaction which may well drive mortgage interest rates on FHA and GI home loans so high that the average home buyer will be barred from the market," RAINS said.

"Normally we can expect the Federal Reserve Board to act in the public interest. In this case I am afraid they were sold a bill of goods by the big commercial banks, which ironically are already enjoying peak profits.

"It should have taken no special genius to see that the Fed's action will put strong pressure upon other mortgage lenders, such as savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, to pay higher rates to retain their savings deposits. This will mean that lenders will have to charge higher interest rates to mortgage borrowers," RAINS said.

"And the worse part is that the harmful impact will be heaviest upon the lower-priced segment of the housing market which is financed largely by FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed home-mortgage loans. As a matter of fact the action may well negate the recent increase in the FHA interest rate to 5 percent, thereby forcing the FHA rate up still another notch," RAINS said.

"About the only justification I have seen offered for the Fed's action is that somehow it will increase the total of savings and thereby reduce inflationary pressures. This argument will just not hold water. I cannot believe that the average family will suddenly start reducing its consumption merely because it would receive 2 or 3 dollars more a year in interest on the family savings account," the Alabama legislator said.

"The blunt truth of the matter is that the action was designed solely to shift existing savings from one lender class to another, but as I pointed out earlier other lenders in self-defense will naturally increase the rates they pay for savings in order to maintain their previous competitive advantage," RAINS said.

"Not only do I think that the Fed's action was ill conceived, but unfortunately it could not have been timed worse. At a period when the home-building industry is already approaching a state of severe crisis it is incomprehensible to me how an agency—presumably dedicated to promoting economic stability—could have taken an action which will prove so unsettling upon a mortgage market already in a state of near shock. I can only hope that the Federal Reserve Board will review its policy, confess its error, and rescind its recent action," RAINS said.

The congressional housing leader stressed that in his view the situation has become so serious that a severe crisis looming before the mortgage market can only be prevented by prompt legislative action.

"The administration's tight-money policy, with its inevitable upward spiral in interest rates, is threatening a drastic fall-off in home construction. This not only will deny our people the housing they need, but also could put a damper upon the prosperity of our entire economy," RAINS said.

"Clearly something must be done and done soon. I am today introducing two measures in the Congress which in my judgment will provide the tools essential to a solution.

"The first is an emergency measure which would make more than $1 billion of the World War II veterans' insurance reserves immediately available to support the GI-loan program. That program, which in recent years has financed about one new house for every four houses built, has been tor-

pedoed by the recent action of the administration increasing the interest rate on FHA-insured loans to 5 percent.

"The GI loan, with its interest rate limited by law to 4½ percent, obviously cannot compete in the private-mortgage market in such a situation," the Alabama Congressman said.

"Frankly I would hate to predict whether or not the Congress will vote to increase the GI-loan interest rate to 5 percent. Accordingly, I think it is imperative to give an immediate shot in the arm to the GI-loan program by using a substantial portion of the national service life insurance reserves to make GI loans available," RAINS said.

The congressional housing expert stressed that the proposal was not new. "I have proposed the use of NSLI reserves to support the GI-loan program for several years now and I am proud to say that the proposal was included in the housing bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee last year, although unfortunately it didn't get into the housing legislation which finally passed," RAINS pointed out.

"I should emphasize, however, that the use of NSLI reserves cannot be regarded as a cure-all. The Congress will have to consider a whole series of complex questions such as whether to increase the interest rate on GI loans, whether as an alternative to liberalize the downpayment requirements on FHA-insured loans, the question whether to give additional funds to the Federal National Mortgage Association, whose resources to support the FHA and GI mortgage market are fast approaching exhaustion, and the question of providing additional funds to support the title VIII military-housing program," RAINS said.

"It so happens that all of these matters have come to a head at once, a fact which will dictate timely action on the part of the Congress. In order to solve these problems as quickly as possible, I am today introducing a resolution which will extend the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, a subcommittee which I have been proud to head over the past 2 years. Our subcommittee has already given considerable thought and attention to the problems involved and I am convinced that the experience we have gained will greatly help the Banking and Currency Committee to formulate early legislative recommendations which will enable us to have a stable and sound home-building industry instead of an industry which up to now has been a chronic victim of successive crises," RAINS concluded.

DRY DOCK SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., January 21, 1957.

Hon. ALBERT RAINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAINS: I read with great interest your statement published on the financial page of the New York Times, January 7, 1957, in respect to "the policy blunder of the highest order" committed by the Federal Reserve Board when it recently authorized commercial banks to pay 3 percent interest on savings and time deposits. I must say that I thoroughly agree with you, particularly as, although the Board expressed the hope its action would stimulate savings, it did nothing whatever to insure the stimulated savings were invested in long-term home loan and capital market they should be. The higher rate which commercial banks pay on savings may help to persuade the public to save rather than spend. That is good. But it is not enough. The chief value the savings might have is that they would go to satisfy the demand for long-term capital. Commercial banks do little long-term investing. A savings dollar with them is a dollar lost to the long-term capital market.

The chain reaction you refer to has certainly already started in New York City. The Chase Manhattan Bank, the largest one in our city, immediately commenced, on December 6, an intense campaign to obtain savings and strongly featuring their 3-percent interest rate. As a result of the campaign, the Chase Manhattan has picked up a very substantial amount of savings deposits, apparently nearly $70 million, from December 6 to date. While Chase Manhattan was experiencing this gain, the savings banks had substantial losses from December 26 to December 31. The report from the 15 largest savings banks in New York City from January 1 to January 15, 1957, shows a gain of $4,159,000 against $25,297,000 in the same period of 1956 and $45,393,000 for the same period of 1955. At the same time, the other large commercial banks with savings deposits in these 15 days have about held their own and experienced none of their usual January gain. I do not believe by any means that all this $70 million came out of savings banks, for, of course, a lot of it could have been switches from the Chase Manhattan's own demand deposits, but it has crippled, temporarily at least, our ability to purchase home loans. This has happened in spite of the fact that all of the savings banks here pay 3 percent, the same as Chase, and savings and loan associations pay 3 percent or more. The Chase Manhattan has succeeded in this campaign largely because of the convenience of its 93 offices in the city, whereas the savings banks are restricted to 3 for each bank, and few of them have been able to open all they are entitled to. One result in respect to your comments on FHA and GI home-loan rates is that 5-percent FHA's have dropped from par to 95 here in the last few weeks or so.

I understand the principal problem of the large New York commercial banks was the constant loss of large time deposits from foreign governments and banks. I was told by Mr. Shepard, chairman of the First National City Bank, and Mr. McCloy, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, the two largest commercial banks here and, I believe, the second and third in the country, that this was their real problem and that they had requested the Federal Reserve to raise the rate on those deposits rather than savings deposits. Dissatisfied with the interest paid them on their time deposits, the foreign depositors were drawing down their balances and buying Treasury bills, whose yield was more attractive. Any deposit so withdrawn was often soon lost to the New York market through transfers to other cities in this country and almost invariably lost to the bank concerned. A certain amount of the deposits was also being transferred to Canada and Switzerland, where the short-term rates were higher. The two largest New York City commercial banks, therefore, appealed to the Federal Reserve Board to raise the ceiling on these time deposits, the so-called certificate-of-deposit accounts, but not on the deposits of small savers evidenced by passbooks. They were somewhat surprised to see the savings deposit ceiling rate raised also.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that I am not writing you because this means increased competition for my bank or savings banks generally. We can quite well take care of ourselves with any competition that develops. I write you because I believe that for many years to come this country will greatly need savings deposits for long-term capital investment. The only instrument not being used to the fullest extent to accomplish this purpose which I see is the commercial banking system. I hope it embarks on such a course, but unless its savings accounts are invested in the forms they should be their activities will be a hindrance rather than a help to the economy.

The point that troubles me is the use to which the commercial banks put the savings deposits they are now competing for so aggressively. Even though the Federal Reserve has succeeded in making the money market tight and short-term commercial-bank loans are more difficult to obtain, they are still obtainable. However, one of the great problems which has developed in this country, and which even more deeply affects its economy, is the lack of savings for long-term investment.

I am sure to highlight this problem I need not mention more than the road and school programs which are going to require billions, the long-term bond and mortgage loans which must be constantly provided for expanding industry, and the home mortgage financing which you mention. Unfortunately, the commercial banks do not invest their savings accounts in long-term bonds and mortgages such as savings banks, life insurance companies, pension trusts, and savings and loan associations do. In addition to avoiding their duty of using savings money for long-term capital investments, as their savings deposits only require 5 percent reserves as against 12 to 20 percent on demand deposits, this enables them to build up additional free reserves on which they can expand their loans and further inflate the economy. This fact is quite clear if one reads Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr.'s, testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, on December 10 and 11, 1956. I quote from Mr. Martin's testimony:

"WHO INCREASES MONEY SUPPLY AND THE TRAGIC RESULT IS INFLATION

"Mr. MARTIN. It is often forgotten that, when the commercial banking system expands its loans and investments, it generates new money. When, as has been the case this year, aggregate demands for credit have exceeded savings, the only way to finance them all would be by an even greater expansion of bank credit—that is, by generating still more money.

"And, as I have emphasized, creating more money will not create more goods. It can only intensify demands for the current supply of labor and materials. That is outright inflation.

"SHORTAGE OF SAVINGS

"Now, when the demand became so much in excess of the supply of savings, there were obviously pressures on interest rates. I would like to see interest rates as low as it is possible to have them at all times. I am not in favor of high interest rates. I want interest rates as low as it is possible to have them without producing inflationary pressures.

"RETAINING VALUE OF DOLLAR

"Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, then, let me give you this question: When this Administration began, the Treasury Department issued the new 30-year bond, at 3.25 percent interest.

"In short time it was selling at a big premium. Now it is selling below par. * * *

"When bonds of the United States are selling below par, isn't that a danger signal?

"Mr. MARTIN. Senator, I hope that the United States issues can always in the open market sell at par and above.

"But you have the finest security in the world when you have the United States security today. You know now—wait a second—you know when the interest comes——

"Senator O'MAHONEY. I am glad to know that your answer is on the record.

"Mr. MARTIN. When the interest comes due it will be paid. You know that. When the principal comes due it will be paid. You have no worry about that.

"The only worry you have is depreciation of the dollar. We have a responsibility to people. It is unfortunate if they have to liquidate early, but we have a responsibility

to see that they are paid off in their interest and in their principal in terms of the dollar they put into it.

"NECESSITY OF INCREASING SAVINGS

"But I will say that so far as making the blanket charge that because there have been increases in prices the policy has failed, let us never forget that there are budgetary and fiscal problems also. But the real test is how much higher would those prices have risen if the law of supply and demand in the money market had not been permitted to operate to dampen down somewhat the rate of spending and proceed to move in the direction of increasing savings?

"That gap between savings and investment has to be met by some process.

"UNDESIRABILITY OF INCREASING MONEY SUPPLY AT PRESENT

"Representative PATMAN. You do not depend on savings entirely, do you, Mr. Martin; don't you depend on created money?

"Mr. MARTIN. If we create money when the demand for money—when people are trying not only to spend more money than they have, but to buy more goods than the aggregate there is—if we create money at that juncture in the economy, then all we do is add upward pressures on prices."

I think you will find every responsible economist will agree with Mr. Martin's statements. Yet the action of the Federal Reserve Board in respect to encouraging aggressive growth of savings accounts in commercial banks, which would be put to the wrong purposes unless it saw they were not, which would widen instead of narrow the savings-investment gap, seems to me entirely inconsistent.

It is obvious that the saver above all is most interested in knowing that his savings dollar, when withdrawn, will have as nearly as is possible the purchasing power it had when he saved and deposited it. I doubt if any of them realize that until commercial banks either invest savings deposits properly or are compelled by law to do so, that every dollar they deposit in commercial banks will further distort the economy by piling up short-term at the expense of long-term funds.

Let me give you an example of the uses to which the public's deposits and savings are put when in the hands of different types of institutions.

Mortgage debt held by financial institutions in September 1956 amounted to $108,600,000,000. At that time all commercial banks with $207 billion of assets held $22,500,000,000 of mortgage loans. Their holdings were 10.8 percent of their assets.

Their holdings of residential mortgages were $16,800,000,000—equal to 8 percent of their assets.

New York State's commercial banks (State and national) had on June 30, 1956, $41,248,000,000 of assets, of which $2,106,000,000 or 5.1 percent were real estate loans.

The weekly reporting New York City banks, on January 16, 1957, has $19,523,000,000 of deposits and $601,000,000 of real estate loans, equal to about 3 percent of deposits.

Mutual savings banks, on the other hand, with $33 billion of assets held $19,200,000,000 of mortgage loans. The percentage here was nearly 60.

Savings and loan associations had $41,600,000,000 of assets last September and $34,900,000,000 of mortgages.

The two types of mutuals, with one-third of the commercial bank assets, have 2½ times as many mortgages in their portfolios as commercial banks do.

Life companies last September reported $94,400,000,000 of assets and $32,100,000,000 of mortgages.

The State of Connecticut has recognized this problem for some time. Its banking laws require that commercial banks must segregate their savings accounts and must invest them in the same media in which savings banks invest theirs. Unless the Federal Reserve Board takes an equally sound position, or Congress and the States enact legislation requiring them to do so, I do not think there is the slightest chance that the commercial banks will voluntarily invest their savings deposits where they are really needed—for the good of the country and the good of the savings depositor himself. I say this for a number of reasons, a few of which I shall cite. During times of high interest rates, as we have today, commercial banks aggressively pursue savings accounts to make short-term commercial, consumer credit, and personal loans. As money eases off and it is not profitable to bid for savings money, they drop interest rates to their savings depositors. I think a most striking example of this is an announcement on the financial page of the New York Times of July 1, 1939, which I quote:

"BANK TO END PAYMENT OF COMPOUND INTEREST

"The Chase National Bank announced yesterday that it will discontinue on August 1 the payment of interest on compound interest accounts. It stated that, although it had maintained a compound interest department in many of its branch offices for the convenience of customers, it had not sought to compete with savings banks for thrift funds generally. Such deposits aggregate less than 1 percent of its total deposits.

"Since November 1, 1938, the Chase has paid 1 percent on compound interest account balances between $50 and $1,000, one-half of 1 percent on balances from $1,000 to $2,500, and no interest on balances over $2,500. The maximum interest paid by savings banks in this State is 2 percent."

I attach hereto a photostat of the same bank's savings account advertising today and an appraisal of it, which was sent to me, entirely unsolicited, by the president of the New York Subways Advertising Co. Incidentally, it is the second largest bank in the country and the largest in New York.

The action of the Pennsylvania bank authorities as reported on January 3, 1957, in the American Banker, which rejects the action of the Federal Reserve Board is in sharp contrast to the action of Chase Manhattan. I quote it:

"PENNSYLVANIA HOLDS SAVINGS RATE AT 2.5 PERCENT

"HARRISBURG, PA.—Robert J. Myers, Jr., Pennsylvania banking secretary, has decided against increasing the present 2½ percent interest ceiling State banks may pay on savings accounts.

"Mr. Myers said there have been some requests from banks that the banking department follow the action of the Federal Reserve System and boost the ceiling to 3 percent.

"He said a survey by the Pennsylvania Bankers Association on the issue recently showed that 378 banks were against the 3-percent rate, while only 130 favored it. Both State and national banks were included in the survey. He added that relatively few State banks are now paying the maximum 2½ percent.

" 'The Department,' he continued, 'has not found any general sentiment in favor of increasing interest rates. We don't deem it advisable at this time to make any change.' "

No one appreciates more than I do the necessity for the most careful consideration of any proposals which effect changes in our banking structure and the delicacy in which they must be put into operation. I do believe, however, the time is fast approaching when the Federal Reserve, the Congress, and the States themselves, probably all three of them, must give some attention to the manner in which savings deposits are invested by commercial banks and the problem their action creates. If the Congress adopts the President's suggestion in one form or another contained in his state of the Union message, that a thorough study be made of our entire financial system, that would seem the appropriate place and body to initially deal with this question.

I am sure that any permanent legislation, such as the Connecticut legislation on savings accounts, which separates savings from short term funds and insists that the savings be invested by commercial banks not in short-term commercial loans but only in the ways open to savings banks, must await a study such as the President has proposed or Congress itself may conduct.

However, in view of the great gap between savings and available capital funds, Mr. Martin's views on the seriousness of this situation and your own comments in respect to its effect on the home loan market, it does seem to me that some temporary and emergency action might well be contemplated. I would think it highly desirable for Congress and the Federal Reserve to remind commercial banks of their duty to use the savings they are now so aggressively seeking in the long-term capital market where they would be of maximum benefit to the economy. If the banks would do this until either the capital funds shortage is alleviated or the studies the President or Mr. PATMAN have now proposed are completed and result in permanent legislation on this point, your home loan problem will be substantially lessened.

I regret writing you at such length and hope that what I have said you may find of some value. I enclose our January 1, 1957, statement so you can see I can speak with considerable experience on this subject.

With all good wishes.

Faithfully yours,

THURMAN LEE.

The Trinity River Development in Northern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the next few months, Congress will be called upon to make a decision regarding the proposed partnership agreement between the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Federal Government with respect to the Trinity River development in northern California.

Recently, I have noted that the first two contracts for the Trinity project have exceeded the Bureau of Reclamation's estimates by more than 30 percent. I am sure my colleagues will be interested in this fact since it indicates that an even greater economy to the Federal Government can result from the partnership agreement which Secretary Seaton recently approved.

It appears to me that the issue involved in this proposed agreement is the fundamental one of public ownership as opposed to the free enterprise system. Admittedly, power is a commodity which is consumed by all of the people in our Nation. If public power were to serve all the people, perhaps I could find some merit to the public-ownership argument.

But our power needs are so tremendous that even the wildest advocate of public power cannot hope for 100 percent ownership by the Government.

In the absence of Government monopoly, we find a situation where a selected group of power users receives low rates which are made possible by subsidies and tax exemptions at the expense of other taxpayers across the country. Though areas in my district would benefit from preferential rates, I do not feel that it is fair to taxpayers in areas who pay their own way. Public power for all may be a desirable objective, but public power for some at the expense of others is not fair.

Support of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 31, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has an opportunity to make permanent its achievements toward temporary peace in the Middle East. In this connection I am sending the following wire to Ambassador Lodge, supporting the position of Israel:

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR LODGE: I understand the General Assembly is scheduled on Friday and Saturday of this week to consider resolution on Israeli withdrawal and United Nations occupation of Gulf of Aqaba and Gaza strip. I urge United States' support of Israel's demand that United Nations assure Israel protection from shipping blockades and against return to pre-invasion border raids by deployment of U. N. troops in disputed areas immediately following Israel's evacuation. Israel's neighbors must accept the fact that this little nation is there to stay and work out a permanent peace.

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, again we turn unfilled to Thee, asking for the things that only Thy grace can give. In these days of turmoil, grant that we may never lose faith in the ultimate victory of Thy power over everything that for the hour worketh destruction on the earth. In the midst of the tasks committed to our hands, we pray—

For strength to leave unsaid the bitter word,
The power to say the kind one and forgive
All that is said or done by thoughtless men,
The courage to go on, and try again,
When hopes have failed. The patience, Lord, to wait
And the wisdom to see clearly and to cling
To simple truths, though fame and glory dim,
The faith to make a dream a living thing,
A gentleness of soul, a spirit meek,
A nobler life—These are the things we seek,
So that, in the ministry of public affairs,
We fail not man nor Thee.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 30, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General; and

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calender will be stated.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bertram D. Tallamy, of New York, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, anounced that the House had passed the bill (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. CELLER, of New York, Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, of New York, and Mr. HILLINGS, of California, as members on the part of the House of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. GARY, of Virginia, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, as members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. BECKWORTH, of Texas, and Mr. DOOLEY, of New York, as members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MAGNUSON of Washington, Mr. SCRIVNER of Kansas, and Mr. CHENOWETH of Colorado, as members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. RILEY of South Carolina, Mr. LANKFORD of Maryland, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, and Mr. OSTERTAG of New York, as members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, and Mr. LECOMPTE of Iowa, as members on the part of the House of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia and Mr. MILLER of Maryland, as members on the part of the House of the Federal Records Council.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr.

JONES of Alabama, Mr. ASPINALL of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, and Mr. WESTLAND of Washington, as members on the part of the House of the National Monument Commission.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to three minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF TOWNSITES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that Bureau, dated January, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM, NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), Washington, D. C. reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress in that Department of the flight-training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet of that company, as of December 31, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 843, RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmiting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress and accomplishments of the anthracite mine drainage program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, giving the final valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated November 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 372, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16 and 18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled, and to the Oregon Members of These Legislative Bodies:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas under Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress, it is provided for termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas as a part of said legislation it is further provided that an appraisal shall be made of the assets of said tribe, to be completed in February 1957, after which the members of said tribe shall have the opportunity to elect to withdraw from said tribe and convert their interest into money, immediately upon completion of said appraisal; and

"Whereas said policy may lead to a forced liquidation of a fine stand of pine timber, does not provide for sustained yield, and is opposed by the management specialists employed to put said act into effect; and

"Whereas said bill does not provide for a period of rehabilitation wherein the Indians on said reservation will be prepared intellectually and emotionally to become full-fledged members of our society; and

"Whereas said law does not provide for a guaranteed fair market value of said resources, does not reserve to the members of the tribe the right to bid on the assets of the reservation, and does not make any provision regarding hunting and fishing rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, That the Congress of the United States hereby is urged to provide stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587 is to become effective; be it further

"Resolved, That the Oregon Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; be it further

"Resolved, That a substitute comprehensive law be enacted, providing for liquidation of the assets of the Klamath Tribe over an extended period of time, for protection of the timber resources on a sustained yield basis, for education and rehabilitation of the members of the tribe at the cost of the Federal Government, and for continued consultation with the members of the tribe regarding promulgation and carrying out of the proposed legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Frederick A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by House January 25, 1957.

"[SEAL] EDITH BYNON LOW,
"Chief Clerk.

"PAT DOOLEY,
"Speaker of House."

The petition of Thomas Coleman, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Harvey Wesley, of Burns, Tenn., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Legislative Resolution 6

"Whereas there is pending in the Senate of the United States, a bill designated as Senate bill 581; and

"Whereas the bill provides for transfer to the Department of Agriculture, the Government-owned alcohol-producing facility at Omaha, Nebr.; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill will be of a great benefit to people living in the grain States of which Nebraska is one, because it will permit the continued research into new and improved uses of surplus grains for industrial uses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled—

"1. That the Members of Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be urged to use their efforts to secure favorable action on Senate bill 581.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
"President of the Legislature."

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of legislative resolution 6, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 68th regular session on the 23d day of January 1957.

HUGO F. SRB.
Clerk of the Legislature.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently there was introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day.

A letter from my friend, Myroslaw Kalba, of Omaha, Nebr., urges that approval of this joint resolution be expedited. He also sent me a resolution adopted in a recent meeting of the Omaha branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a celebration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the free, sovereign, independent, and democratic Ukrainian National Republic, by act of its parliament and government, on January 22, 1918, hereby appeal to the conscience of the free world and to all free and freedom-loving nations to help the people of Ukraine enslaved by the colonial empire of Communist Russia, to reassert their independence and once again join the proud ranks of free nations.

We protest on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence against the employment by Communist Rusisa of Ukrainian nationals in the ranks of the Soviet armed forces to crush the liberation movements of other nations and to be ordered to slaughter people rising and bidding for freedom. We also wish to call the attention of the people of these United States to the fact that the fate of Ukrainians living in the so-called satellite countries, or people's democracies, is no better than within the Soviet Union. Most recent reports assert that about a quarter of a million Ukrainians in Poland are being subjected to persecution along with Jews, Byelorussians, and others. This fact has been editorially reported in the New York Times of January 10, 1957, and should serve as a warning to the free world that in spite of ostensible ideological differences, the dictators of the satellite countries are dedicated partners of the Kremlin in the crimes of oppression, extermination, and genocide committed upon people seeking freedom and constituting a threat to the colonial empire run by Moscow.

Ukrainians in the enslaved homeland and their blood brothers scattered throughout the free world will never give up the fight until Ukraine is once again united, free, and sovereign, just like during the time of proclamation of the acts of independence and unity in Kiev on January 22, 1918 and 1919.

This community of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the city of Omaha hereby goes on record as being of one heart and purpose with the freedom-seeking people of Ukraine until the day of final liberation.

RUSSIA'S TREATMENT OF HUNGARIAN PEOPLE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COURT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire. The concurrent resolution properly denounces the atrocities inflicted on the Hungarian people by the Communist government of Russia.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the people of the State of New Hampshire are well aware of the tremendous struggle put forth by the courageous and freedom-living citizens of Hungary against the communistic tyranny and aggression of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas they look with horror and revulsion upon the bloodletting and massacre of Hungarians and inasmuch as frustration for the most part marks our inability to help these liberty-loving people; and

Whereas by public report, this general court understands that the new Hungarian regime of the Kadar government has been appointed by the Government of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas such government, according to public report, has been totally against the wishes of the Hungarian people; and

Whereas the said government is reported to completely disregard humanitarian principles: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we, the members of the New Hampshire General Court do hereby denounce and protest the atrocities inflicted upon the Hungarians by the Communist government of Soviet Russia and by the said Kadar government and offer moral condemnation of such inhuman acts; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of our congressional delegation in Washington and to the clerk of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

Passed January 24, 1957.
Attest:
[SEAL] ROBERT L. STARK,
Deputy Secretary of State.

PROPOSED VISIT BY TITO TO THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Association Canado-Americaine, of Manchester, N. H., on January 24, 1957. The resolution of this organization of 25,000 Americans in New England expresses their protest against inviting Tito to visit this country.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Josip Broz, alias Tito, Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, has, through his utterances during his recent visit to the Kremlin and his inhuman treatment of certain Hungarian patriots last fall, again proven himself to be one of the world's most cruel and cynical Communist leaders, a dangerous enemy of liberty loving people everywhere, and a bloody accomplice of the butchers of Budapest; and

Whereas our distinguished Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, asserted last December that a high level meeting between the President of the United States and Marshall Tito might be useful and that an invitation to him for that purpose is therefore deserving of sympathetic consideration; and

Whereas it now seems to be accepted as a fact in authoritative circles that such an invitation has already been secretly extended to Tito and accepted by him, although the time and place of the proposed visit do not appear to have as yet been definitely fixed: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the executive council of the Association Canado-Americaine, in meeting assembled at Manchester, N. H., unanimously protest against Tito's visit to the United States, feeling as we do that such a visit could only serve interests inimical to those of our beloved country; that, in the light of our past experience with Communist leaders whose appalling record of broken pledges is unprecedented in the annals of civilized governments, any information exchanged or understanding reached with Tito would at best be meaningless, if not actually misleading; and that the presence here in this country of this Red revolutionary, whose bloodstained record of religious persecution is notorious in Yugoslavia, would constitute an affront to all God-fearing and liberty loving Americans; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to every New England Member of the United States Senate.

Dated at Manchester, N. H., this 24th day of January A. D. 1957.

Executive council, A. C. A.
By EMILE LEMELIN,
President General.

CITIZEN SOLDIERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution adopted by both houses of the General Assembly of Georgia condemning and refuting the recent statements of Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson reflecting upon the patriotism of the citizen soldiers of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution of the Georgia State Senate

Whereas Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson on January 28 made the statement that the National Guard was "a sort of scandal" and a "draft-dodging business"; and

Whereas such utter stupidity indicates a complete lack of knowledge of the service of the National Guard to this country; and

Whereas such irresponsible talk and action by a man charged with maintaining the defenses of this Nation indicates that he is utterly unqualified to serve in that office; and

Whereas the National Guard has had a long and illustrious record of service to the United States both in peace and in times of war; and

Whereas the Georgia Air National Guard was the first unit in the United States to be called to active duty during the Korean conflict; and

Whereas two Georgia National Guard antiaircraft battalions and one antiaircraft brigade were called to active duty; and

Whereas the 48th Infantry Division of the Georgia National Guard was ready and willing at all times to serve this Nation; and

Whereas such statements by the Secretary of Defense reflected discredit and dishonor upon those who served and upon those who gave their lives as members of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia (the House concurring), That immediate demands be made on the President of the United States to the end that such an unqualified individual be removed from office; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from the State of Georgia and to the President of the United States.

In the senate, read and adopted January 29, 1957.

In the house, read and adopted January 29, 1957.

S. ERNEST VANDIVER,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.
MARVIN E. MOATE,
Speaker of the House.
JOE BOONE,
Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTION OF UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation noted with deep interest and respect the splendid tributes which were paid to the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine and their kinsmen throughout the world on the occasion, last week, of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1918.

As in previous years, men of good will throughout the world paid tribute to the unquenchable spirit of freedom in the hearts of the oppressed Ukrainian people inside the borders of the Soviet empire.

The legitimate aspirations of the Ukrainian people, like the aspirations of other freedom-loving ethnic, national, racial and religious groups, caught behind the Iron Curtain, cannot forever be denied.

All history has proven that, although a people's aspirations may be crushed by brute tyranny, people will rise again and again until justice has been done.

I present a letter which I have received from Konstantine Mandzenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Milwaukee branch, together with an appended resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Milwaukee, January 27, 1957.

The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are privileged to communicate to you, as a friend of long standing of groups and peoples fighting for freedom and against the threat of Communist conquest of the world, that this community has held a solemn celebration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence in Kiev on the 22d day of January 1918.

In connection with our celebrations in this community which went on simultaneously with the dignified marking of Ukrainian Independence Day in the Nation's Capital by prayers being read by members of Ukrainian Church hierarchy in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives, we have unanimously adopted a statement of unity of purpose in the fight for liberation of our Ukrainian brothers enslaved within the Communist empire, the text of which we submit herewith for your possible utilization in your legislative activities.

Respectfully,
KONSTANTINE MANDZENKO, *Chairman.*

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a celebration of 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the free, sovereign, independent and democratic Ukrainian National Republic by act of its Parliament and Government on January 22, 1918, hereby appeal to the conscience of the free world and to all free and freedom-loving nations to help the people of Ukraine enslaved by the colonial empire of Communist Russia to reassert their independence and once again join the proud ranks of free nations.

We protest on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence against the employment by Communist Russia of Ukrainian nationals in the ranks of the Soviet armed forces to crush the liberation movements of other nations and to be ordered to slaughter people rising and bidding for freedom. We also wish to call the attention of the people of these United States to the fact that the fate of Ukrainians living in so-called satellite countries or people's democracies is no better than within the Soviet Union. Most recent reports assert that about a quarter of a million Ukrainians in Poland are being subjected to persecution along with Jews, Byelorussians and others. This fact has been editorially reported in the New York Times of January 10, 1957, and should serve as a warning to the free world that in spite of ostensible ideological differences, the dictators of the satellite countries are dedicated partners of the Kremlin in the crimes of oppression, extermination, and genocide committed upon people seeking freedom and constituting a threat to the colonial empire run by Moscow.

Ukrainians in their enslaved homeland and their blood-brothers scattered throughout the free world will never give up the fight until Ukraine is once again united, free and sovereign just like during the time of proclamation of the acts of independence and unity in Kiev on January 22, 1918, and 1919.

This community of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the city of Milwaukee hereby goes on record as being of one heart and purpose with the freedom-seeking people of Ukraine until the day of final liberation.

RESOLUTION FROM COMMON COUNCIL OF MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's news of the tragic airplane accident in the Los Angeles area in which dozens of school youngsters were injured by the tragic collision of two planes, underlines the importance of a resolution which I have received this morning from A. W. Bareis, city clerk of Madison, acting on behalf of the common council of Wisconsin's capital city. The resolution calls for immediate action for the construction of a northwest-southeast runway at the municipal airport.

I present the resolution as an indication of a type of problem which is being encountered in that community and in other communities throughout the land. It is my intention to continue to take up this matter with the Corps of Engineers and with the Air Force.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the north-south runway at the municipal airport at Traux Field is the principal runway at said airport; and

Whereas the approach to said runway from the south necessitates flying over heavily populated areas of the city of Madison, which constitutes a serious hazard to the property and person of the citizens of Madison residing in this area of the city; and

Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers and Air Force have planned for the extension of the northwest-southeast runway so as to make the newly enlarged runway the principal runway in order to avoid this hazard; and

Whereas the plans for the extension of this runway have been postponed for at least 1 year, if not indefinitely, which delay has caused great concern due to the necessarily continued use of the north-south runway at Truax Field as the principal runway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayor be and he hereby is directed to take such action as he finds necessary to obtain from the United States Corps of Engineers and Air Force immediate action in extending the northwest-southeast runway at Truax Field and to inform them of the need for immediate action; further be it

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the elected Representatives to the United States Congress who represent this city to inform them of the need for action on this proposal and to enlist their assistance in support of immediate action on the construction of the northwest-southeast runway so as to avoid the current hazard to person and property of the city of Madison.

This is to certify that the foregoing ordinance was adopted by the common council of the city of Madison, Wis., at a meeting held on the 24th day of January 1957.

A. W. BAREIS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, ELIZABETH, N. J.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last October when the Senate was not in session I received from the Secretary of Council No. 47, Polish National Alliance of Elizabeth, N. J., a resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the council on Sunday, September 30, 1956. Because of the distressing situation in Poland and the other satellite countries, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the entire civilized world has been greatly shocked by the massacre at Poznan, Poland, of peoples whose only effort was a cry for bread to sustain their life which is subject to great privations; and

Whereas often promised free elections, Poland is not free; and

Whereas Poland is a land of misery, hunger, violence and terrorism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Council No. 47 of the Polish National Alliance of North America, comprised of numerous organizations, deplore the brutal massacre at Poznan, Poland; we extend our deepest sympathy to the relatives of the massacred; and

We hereby ask the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Senator of the United States, to raise his voice in behalf of the forgotten people of Poland—our allies—who to this day are really a true symbol of a freedom loving people; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of our Council and that a copy be forwarded to the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Senator of the United States.

Dated at Elizabeth, N. J., October 2, 1956.

COUNCIL NO. 47 OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF NORTH AMERICA,
ANDREW A. ZIEMAN, *President.*
AUGUST DZIEDZIC,
JOSEPH MISIUR,
HAZIMIEN PRINCE,
Resolution Committee.

Attest:

HELEN C. SOCHA, *Secretary.*

DESIGNATION OF CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, 2 resolutions; one adopted by the Olathe Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles; and the other, adopted by the Topeka Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles. They urge that the Congress set aside the first Sunday in February of each year as Chaplains' Day.

It was on February 3, 1943, that the steamship *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with a loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths: George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister.

In view of the splendid service rendered by the chaplains of all of our military services, I recommend favorable action on the part of Congress on a resolution of this type.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTIONS

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the steamship *Dorchester*, was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths: George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the steamship *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by Olathe Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 22, 1957.

RAYMOND H. JAMESON,
Worthy President.
ELWOOD SHIELDS,
Secretary.

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the steamship *Dorchester*, was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi, and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister, and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the steamship *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding, and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by Topeka Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles on January 21, 1957.

JOE BOWERS,
Worthy President.
JOHN M. KENNEDY,
Secretary.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Isadore Shulman, president of the Jewish Federation of Southern Illinois, embodying a resolution adopted by the board of directors of 11 Jewish community councils throughout southern Illinois, relating to peace in the Middle East.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH FEDERATION OF
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS,
East St. Louis, Ill., January 23, 1957.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It is my privilege to transmit to you the following resolution adopted unanimously by our board of directors, representing 11 Jewish community councils throughout southern Illinois:

"PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

"With the question of permanent peace in the Middle East now on the agenda of the United Nations, the nations of the world have the sacred obligation to help achieve a just and lasting peace in that crucial part of the world, which we fervently pray will be attained by mutual agreement of the parties involved. Such a "peace with justice, and justice with peace" will be of momentous and enduring value to all peoples of the area and to all mankind.

"It would be a tragedy of catastrophic proportions if the situation in the Middle East were permitted to return to the conditions which led to the outbreak of hostilities, and which again would bring about war. The fuse to the powder keg is still aflame; it must be put out.

"The leadership of our country in the United Nations is indispensable in order to assure that the causes of war are removed. While the United Nations force still polices the critical areas, it is imperative that the United Nations itself, with our initiative, will take action to guarantee that there will be free passage through the Suez Canal for all nations, including Israel, as required by the international convention governing the use of the canal and as specifically called for by the Security Council but disregarded by Egypt to date; that all ships will have access through the Red Sea and Gulf of Aqaba, universally recognized as an international waterway, and that the possibility of Egypt's blockade of that waterway will not be restored; that the Gaza strip and the Sinai Desert will no longer be used to launch Fedayeen raids.

"The Middle East, seething with strife and continuing to feed the causes of war, is a cauldron of catastrophe. May I urge you to give the full weight of your great prestige and leadership to bring about the initiative and action by our country now, while we have this momentous opportunity, to help achieve clear and permanent settlement for the security of the United States and the benefit of all mankind.

"Another resolution passed by our board of directors is related to the threat of annihilation faced by Egyptian Jewry:

"*Resolved*, That our Government facilitate the immigration to the United States of those Egyptian Jews who desire to find haven here under the emergency parolee status made available to the unfortunate refugees from Soviet terror in Hungary.

"Evidence published in our press, reports that a reign of terror is directed toward Jews in Egypt: Thousands are incarcerated, innocent of any wrongdoing, thousands are deported and their property confiscated, and the barbarous practice of holding hostages from every family deported has been instituted.

"Our country has always been a haven of refuge to unfortunate victims of persecution. I urge you to act now and help salvage one of the oldest religious Jewish communities from annihilation."

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. ISADORE SHULMAN,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 607. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 47).

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 46)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Small Business I submit a report.

I call attention to the fact that this is the seventh annual report of the Committee on Small Business and that it, as was true of the six reports which have preceded it, represents the unanimous findings of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 992. A bill for the relief of George H. Beard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Gambini and Tomazo Gambini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 994. A bill to ratify and confirm conveyances of allotted land on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota by fullblood Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 995. A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended;

S. 996. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes; and

S. 997. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 998. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 999. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1000. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of Sun Fo (also known as C. S. Sun) and his wife, Mrs. Sun Fo (also known as Sukying C. Sun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1002. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1003. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Mining Claims Rights Restoration Act of 1955, to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for reclamation reservoir sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1005. A bill to assist recipients of public assistance and other needy persons in improving their nutritional standards; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing additional outlets for surplus agricultural commodities; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1006. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER

S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman;

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; and

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1010. A bill to amend the Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers to provide a method for the promotion of substitute rural carriers to the position of regular rural carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1011. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1012. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Saugatuck River to the Byram River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1013. A bill to provide for corn base acreages and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for a corn base acreage of 51 million acres for any year in which an acreage-reserve program is in effect for corn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1015. A bill to apportion more equitably between the State of South Dakota and the Federal Government the cost of providing aid and assistance under titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to Indians residing in such State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1016. A bill to stimulate industrial development near Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 1017. A bill to authorize the performance of active duty for training of 11 weeks in each of two consecutive years for certain persons enlisted under the provisions of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1018. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for review by the Secretary of Labor of the minimum wage recommendations of industry committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1019. A bill to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1020. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1021. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act to authorize the award of certain scholarships; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution relating to the observance of National Hospital Week; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HILL, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION, REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 819 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 819) entitled "A bill for the relief of Mary A. Ford," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the Court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

AID TO RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the issuance of food and fiber certificates worth $10 monthly to the recipients of public assistance, and others who are in need but who are not eligible for assistance for one reason or another under State or Federal welfare regulations.

I conceive of this plan as a major way to improve the dietary standards of America's families. It is irresponsible and inconsistent with our ideals, and the capacity of our Nation to produce, to tolerate undernourishment among any of our citizens. The plan I propose will provide a way for them to improve their nutritional standards, and thereby the health of our Nation.

Second only in importance to the purpose I have stated, a food-stamp plan will reduce the agricultural surpluses which are mounting in the storehouses of the Nation, and assist in maintaining fair prices and income to farmers by providing additional outlets for surplus agricultural commodities. The present administration regards the surpluses as a national liability. I regard them as a national asset. The problem we face is one of improving the avenues of distribution, not cutting down our capacity to produce food.

This bill has one great virtue as compared to the Federal Government's present inadequate method of distributing surplus food from the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses to States or municipalities. It takes the distribution and processing out of the hands of Government and returns it to private enterprise, where it belongs. I believe the commercial processors and local merchants can do a better job than local governments can. Furthermore, the plan will help local storekeepers, because it adds to the purchasing power of their poorest customers.

In summary, I find that a food and fiber stamp system of distributing food is more in keeping with American ideals than the Government's present program of trying to dump or store surpluses. Ours is a land of plenty. Yet in our country millions of aged, jobless, dependent children, and disabled people suffer from dietary insufficiencies. I know that the concept of a food-stamp plan has great support in the Senate, and I am hopeful that we shall be able to enact such a measure during the present session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1005) to assist recipients of public assistance and other needy persons in improving their nutritional standards; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing additional outlets for surplus agricultural commodities; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF TITLES I, II, AND III OF IMMIGRATION AND NATONALITY ACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BEALL, BENNETT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, FLANDERS, IVES, JAVITS, MARTIN of Iowa, PAYNE, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SMITH of New Jersey, and WILEY, I introduce a bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

I request that the bill lie on the desk for 2 legislative days in order that other Senators desiring to join might be able to do so.

Companion measures were introduced in the House by Representative HILLINGS, of California, H. R. 4201; and by Representative KEATING, of New York, H. R. 4205.

This bill is a comprehensive measure containing 37 sections, and I shall not impose upon the time of my colleagues to explain all 37 sections. Rather, I refer Senators to remarks made by me on January 7 when I introduced four bills to carry out the President's recommendations of a year ago. Those bills are S. 343, 344, 345, and 346.

The bill which I now introduce embodies the content of those four bills and my remarks of the 7th will explain the provisions of the new bill. There are, however, 5 sections in the new measure which were not included in previous proposed legislation, and I call the attention of my colleagues specifically to sections 4, 5, 6, 36, and 37.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement dealing with the sections of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1006) to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF SECTIONS 4, 5, AND 6

These provisions of the bill would revise and clarify existing parole authority covering the emergency admissions of aliens into the United States. Also procedures would be provided under which a designated number of aliens who have been paroled into the United States might adjust their immigration status to that of a lawful permanent resident. Aliens paroled into the United States and who are presently here in an indefinite status include escapees from Hungary, certain Korean orphans, adopted children, split families, and other aliens admitted for emergency reasons or for reasons of public interest.

Section 4 grants the President power to authorize the parole by the Attorney General into the United States of escapees from Communist tyranny, selected by the Secretary of State, who have fled from their homelands and are in other, non-Communist countries. The number of escapees who could be so paroled annually may not, under the proposal, exceed the average number of aliens who have been permitted to come to the United States each year since June 25, 1948, by special acts of Congress (approximately 68,000). Parole could be granted under such proclamation to escapees from Communist persecution who have fled to any non-Communist area, including Hungarian refugees who have migrated not to Austria but to some other non-Communist country.

Section 5 sets up a procedure whereby the immigration status of parolees may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident. The Attorney General could grant such adjustment of status in his discretion after the alien has been in the United States for 2 years and if the applicant is of good character and if the adjustment would not be contrary to the national interest. A report of the Attorney General's action if favorable would be submitted to the Congress. Unless the Congress disapproved, the alien's entry would be recorded as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. If the Congress did not approve the administrative action, the Attorney General is to require the departure of the alien from the United States.

Section 6 provides that the number of aliens whose status may be adjusted under section 5 shall not exceed in any fiscal year the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year since June 25, 1948, by any special acts of Congress, enacted on or after that date.

SECTION 35

Under existing law there is no available method whereby American citizens who wish

to adopt alien children can bring them to this country without encountering the delays which follow if the child was born in a quota area the quota of which is exhausted. It has been established under previous legislation which permitted the admission of orphans that these children were well suited for adjustment to the American form of life and that they made worthy additions to our population. This section would authorize the issuance of not more than 2,500 nonquota immigrant visas annually to certain alien orphans, under the age of 10 years, who are adopted or are to be adopted by a United States citizen. Special provision is made for the filing of assurances that the proposed adoption will be completed, that the child shall be actually an orphan, and that the natural parent shall derive no benefit under the immigration laws by virtue of the admission of the orphan to the United States.

SECTION 37

This section repeals those provisions of existing law relating to naturalization of soldiers and veterans, made necessary by the restatement and codification of that naturalization law as contained in this bill.

PERFORMANCE OF ACTIVE DUTY IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill concerning the National Guard, and about which I desire to speak briefly.

The bill would give enlistees in the National Guard and the Reserve components a choice of two 11-week training periods in 2 consecutive years or 1 consecutive 6-month period.

The bill if enacted would become effective on April 1, 1957, and would, I believe, eliminate the objections which the National Guard now has to the proposed 6-month consecutive period of service proposed by the Department of Defense to become effective April 1. The measure would allow an enlistee a choice of whichever period would best fit into his educational plans.

I myself believe this proposal would strengthen the guard by providing 6 months of training service, and would coordinate better with the school plans of a good many who become members.

While I am on the subject of the National Guard, I would like to make a few remarks about the outstanding contribution to the national defense by our own National Guard:

The present strength of the South Dakota National Guard is 3,858. During the Korean emergency 1,900 men and officers were ordered to active duty and many more volunteered who were not called.

At the present time, South Dakota is drafting men in the 22-year age bracket. Yet 70 percent of the enlistees in the guard are 20 years old. Obviously they are not interested in evading service, because they cannot be called until they are 22.

Our South Dakota National Guard has always been among the first to be called in any conflict and has always served with distinction, and will again if necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1017) to authorize the performance of active duty for training of 11 weeks in each of 2 consecutive years for certain persons enlisted under the provisions of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT RELATING TO REVIEW OF MINIMUM WAGE RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDUSTRY COMMITTEES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for review by the Secretary of Labor of the minimum wage recommendations of industry committees, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the Secretary of Labor may review the minimum wage determinations of industry committees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, rather than have the recommendations of such committees mandatorily binding after 15 days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill, prepared by the Labor Department, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1018) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for review by the Secretary of Labor of the minimum wage recommendations of industry committees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanation presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS INDUSTRY COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS OF 1957

The attached bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to, among other things, provide for review by the Secretary of Labor of the minimum-wage recommendations of the industry committees. It is designed to carry out a recommendation made by the President when he signed the enrolled enactment of the "American Samoa labor standards amendments of 1956." The proposal embodied in the bill is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

EFFECT OF THE 1955 AND 1956 AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT

Prior to the 1955 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act the wage-rate recommendations of the tripartite industry committees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were subject to review by the Secretary of Labor. After affording interested persons an opportunity to be heard, he was directed by the statute to accept these recommendations, provided they were in accordance with law and supported by the evidence. If the Secretary disapproved the recommendations, he was directed to refer the matter back to the industry committee, or another industry committee for such industry, for further consideration. The 1955 amendments to the act abolished these safeguards. They required the Secretary to provide by order that the industry committees' recommendations shall take effect 15 days after they are published in the Federal Register, with no authority in the Secretary to review the recommendations. They also required that the minimum rates of wages established in accordance with this procedure be reviewed by the committees at least once each fiscal year. The 1956 amendments to the act provided procedures for adjusting minimum wage and overtime pay standards in American Samoa, by adopting the special industry committee procedures for establishing minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

NEED FOR REVISING THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

The present industry committee provisions of the act run counter to good principles of Government administration. They place authority to determine minimum-wage rates in temporarily constituted bodies consisting in major part of interested private parties representing employers and employees with no provision for check or review of their actions by any responsible official of the executive branch.

If the committee's actions are contrary to the statutory standards or cause hardship, aggrieved persons have no official to whom they can complain and obtain a remedy. Their only recourse is through appeal to the courts, in which event the Secretary of Labor must defend the wage order recommended by the committee and promulgated by him under a statutory provision requiring him, without review, to rubberstamp their action through a formal order.

The constitutionality of the present Puerto Rican provisions has already been attacked in the courts and may well be raised in future litigation. Defenses against these attacks will present major problems for the Department of Labor attorneys in view of Supreme Court decisions which, it has been urged, show that the present Puerto Rican provisions are invalid as an unconstitutional delegation of a legislative power to private persons.

Another problem in connection with this procedure concerns the requirement of an annual review by the industry committees of wage rates established. The requirement for reviewing these rates on an annual basis is not only administratively burdensome, but such frequent review is not justified by the probable change in economic conditions over so short a period of time. In addition, the present statute appears to require a review of all rates established by these committees, including those rates which are equal to the general statutory minimum of $1 an hour prescribed in section 6 (a) (1).

Since, under the proposed amendments, the Secretary will review the industry committees' recommendations and, at the time of judicial review, the committee may no longer exist, it will also be necessary to amend the judicial review provisions of the act to require that the Secretary, rather than the industry committee, file with the court the new or modified findings in connection with a second hearing. It is also desirable to amend this provision so that the court has the benefit of the same review of the second recommendation as of the first.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF THE ACT

Section 5 (c) of the act would be amended by the bill to require the Secretary of Labor

to prescribe, by rules and regulations, the procedures to be followed by him in reviewing the minimum wage determinations of the industry committees. Under this provision the Secretary could provide orderly procedures for review.

Section 8 (a) would be amended to provide for biennial rather than annual review of industry committee wage rates. In addition, only those minimum rates of wages established in accordance with section 8 which are not equal to the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6 (a) (1) would have to be reviewed by the industry committee, thus eliminating the necessity for review of $1 rates.

Section 8 (d) would be amended to give the Secretary of Labor 30 days from receipt of the transcript of the record upon which the industry committee's report was made in which to issue the wage order carrying the committee's recommendations into effect or in which to disapprove the recommendations. If the wage order is issued, the recommendations would take effect upon the expiration of 15 days after the date of issuance, as at the present time. The Secretary would be required to approve the recommendations unless he finds that they were not made in accordance with law, are not supported by the evidence in the record of the industry committee or, taking into consideration the same factors as are required to be considered by the industry committee, will not carry out the purposes of this section.

If he disapproves the recommendations, he would be directed to refer the matter back to the industry committee which made them or to another industry committee for such industry for further consideration and recommendation. The tests of disapproval and the disposition of the matter when he disapproves follow the pre-1955 language of the act.

Section 10 (a) of the act would be amended to require the Secretary, rather than the industry committee, to file with the court the modified or new findings made by the committee in connection with matters referred back to the committee by the court for the purpose of adducing additional evidence. The Secretary would also be required to file the committee's recommendation, if any, for modifying or setting aside the original order and any findings of the Secretary on review which would require his disapproval of such recommendations under section 8 (d).

Section 5 of the bill provides that the term "Secretary" as used in the act means the Secretary of Labor.

Section 6 of the bill provides that the amendments made by sections 3 and 4 shall be applicable with respect to any committee findings or recommendations under the Fair Labor Standards Act pending before the Secretary, and any actions under that act pending before such committee, on or after the effective date of this act.

COMMISSION ON CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE OF RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources.

Events of recent decades have focused the attention of thinking Americans on the problems arising from the utilization of our natural resources. There is no doubt that progress in understanding these problems and in working out their solutions lags far behind the social and technological advances achieved in many other areas of public concern.

Our lands, our waters, our forests, and our other natural resources are the basic resources upon which depend the continued growth, development, and economic prosperity of our Nation.

The geography of the United States subjects this Nation to several difficult problems in our overall development policy. These problems have become more acute, as the population of the United States has doubled since 1900. During the next two decades the population is expected to increase by about 40 million. Therefore, it is essential that we protect and preserve these resources in order that we may assure continued prosperity, and provide for the increasing demand for products of the soil, to take care of the rapidly increasing population.

Water and soil are our most valuable natural resources. President Eisenhower recently took a personal firsthand look at Kansas and other areas where the ravages of prolonged drought have brought enormous distress and suffering.

No problem is more vital to this area of drought than the decreasing water supply, and wind erosion of our soil.

The President has asked the States and local communities to take action along with the Federal Government in joint endeavor to conquer this grave problem which is endangering the livelihood of literally millions of our people.

The creation of a committee as proposed in my bill would work toward the solution of the problem, based on joint cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies.

Many experts agree that in 25 years our demand for water will double from its present level. In my own State of Kansas we have some very definite water problems. It is my firm conviction that the future growth and development of Kansas will be largely determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes.

It is estimated that the runoff in our State, which is now completely wasted, is between 10 and 15 million acre-feet annually. That seems a huge amount, but, actually, about six times that amount of water is already needed to fill our present demand in Kansas. If our demand doubles in 25 years, we must have a solution to this problem.

It is my contention that this is not just a short-range program. It must be a program looking to the future.

It has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all sources of water supply in cooperation with a sound soil-conservation program.

Presently, the Federal Government has many programs dealing with the problems of our natural resources, but I believe it is important that we effectuate a policy of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and the various subdivisions of government for a greatly expanded cooperative program. This is certainly in line with President Eisenhower's proposed plans.

The Commission proposed by my bill would be appointed by the President, and composed of 1 member each from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Army, 3 members representing the States, 3 members representing local subdivisions of the Government, and 3 members representing the public at large.

They would be directed to study and investigate the present conditions of the renewable natural resources of the United States, the probable future demands on such resources, and formulate a practical program for carrying out their remedial recommendations.

Under the bill introduced by me the Commission would submit a report to the President for transmittal to Congress, including proposals for legislative enactment and administrative action, as, in its judgment, are necessary to carry out its recommendations on or before March 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1019) to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1019

A bill to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the land, waters, forests, and related natural resources of the United States constitute an essential basis for the national security and the physical, social, and economic welfare of the American people; that the conservation, orderly development, and sustained use of the renewable natural resources of the United States is the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the States, the various subdivisions of government, and the people thereof; and that this policy shall be effectuated through cooperation of the Federal Government, the States and their various subdivisions, the owners and users of these resources, and private groups and organizations serving as a medium for public participation.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of studying and recommending means of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Renewable Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President

as follows: 1 member each from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army; 3 members representing the States, 3 members representing local subdivisions of government; and 3 members representing the public at large. All members of the Commission shall be qualified by expert knowledge of or experience with the problems and management of the lands, waters, forests, and related renewable natural resources of the United States. One member of the Commission shall be designated by the President as Chairman and another as Vice Chairman.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present condition of the renewable natural resources of the United States, the probable future demands upon such resources, and shall formulate a program for the practical carrying out of the policy established in section 1.

(b) The Commission shall submit a report to the President for transmittal to the Congress, including proposals for such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations, on or before March 1, 1958, and shall submit its final report not later than June 30, 1958, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The Commission may, from time to time, submit such interim reports as it deems desirable or as the President may request.

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT, RELATING TO THE AWARD OF CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have been impressed, astonished, and sometimes frightened by the repetitious but vitally important testimony of well-qualified persons who point out the dangers to the security of our country due to the shortage of scientists and engineers.

Last year the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, conducted hearings on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower. Throughout all the testimony given, we were constantly admonished on the importance of properly training scientists and engineers if we are not to lose the race for the development of the atom.

President Eisenhower, in 1956, made reference to the scarcity of scientists, a fact which has been of grave concern to well-informed and capable persons in the field of education who have been aware of this problem for a long time.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 by authorizing the foundation to award scholarships of $500 each for successful completion of a specified examination in high-school mathematics. The examination is to be prepared and given by the National Science Foundation on procedures and standards formulated by the foundation, and will test the general knowledge of mathematics of those about to matriculate in college. In addition to this, the foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose, further scholarships of $500 to those students who, having received a scholarship under this subsection at the time of matriculation in college, successfully complete an examination in calculus at the end of the first year of college.

Obviously, the reason for this is to encourage pursuit in mathematics beyond high-school graduation, without the element of compulsion.

My purpose in introducing this bill is to follow through on one of the major recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Research and Development in its interim report on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower. A similar bill was introduced yesterday in the House of Representatives by Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development. Both of these bills are predicated upon a proposal made before the committee by Prof. I. I. Rabi, of Columbia University. The bill will provide the needed stimulus to our high school students to study mathematics.

It is unfortunate that in this atomic age mathematics is not taught in all high schools in the Nation. The proposed $500 scholarship will stimulate interest, and will emphasize the need and the justification for mathematics in our high school and college curriculum.

The Soviet Union is turning out scientists much faster than we are, and the time has come when we must do something about this situation. I feel very strongly about this problem, and I believe that the awarding of scholarships to high school students and first-year college students will encourage them to apply themselves diligently to the study of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, which are the fundamentals in the training of engineers and scientists.

Mr. President, I do not mean to convey the impression that there has been any laxity or dereliction on the part of our school systems to meet this responsibility. Much of the cause lies in the fact that we live in an atomic age into which we have moved rather rapidly in the past 10 years—an evolution which requires us to reappraise some of our shortcomings and to do something about them. There was a time when we did not have such an urgent need for the development of scientists and engineers in large numbers, but today there is a keen sense of competition and rivalry in the atomic field—particularly as regards the peaceful development of the atom. The nation that wins this contest will be the one that develops the talents of its people in the field of mathematics.

The bill I am introducing will not be discriminatory in any manner. All students will be eligible, regardless of their family background or financial status. The bill does not propose special purpose legislation, because if a student receives one of the $500 scholarships he will not necessarily have to enter the scientific field. However, I would be less than honest if I did not state here and now that it is my fervent hope that students who demonstrated their ability in mathematics to the point of being awarded such scholarships would continue into the scientific and engineering fields.

One of the other byproducts of the bill will be an increase in the caliber and quality of our teachers of mathematics. I am sure that each school will strive to have its students receive these scholarship awards, and thus will concentrate on maintaining on its faculty only the most desirable type of instructors.

Mr. President, I must frankly admit that the bill does not constitute the sole solution of this great problem. Many

other worthwhile proposals have been advanced.

Only recently the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] introduced a bill, referred to as the Veterans' Children's Scholarship Act, which would set up, out of alien property funds, scholarships for children of veterans, in order to develop more engineers and scientists. To me, his proposal is an excellent one, and should be encouraged in every way possible.

The bill I now introduce is much broader in scope, insofar as eligibility is concerned; and in my opinion, my bill strikes at the very root of the problem, namely, the subject of mathematics.

I trust that the appropriate committee will give my bill its immediate attention, and will hold hearings on it at the earliest date possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1021) to amend the National Science Foundation Act to authorize the award of certain scholarships, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the observance of National Hospital Week, May 12 through the 18th, sponsored by the American Hospital Association. This week can serve a valuable purpose in acquainting the American people with the services performed by our Nation's hospitals and in familiarizing them with the men and women who serve our country's health needs so faithfully and so unselfishly.

The chosen theme of this year's National Hospital Week is Careers That Count. During this week our Nation's hospitals will emphasize the importance of encouraging young people to enter the variety of challenging careers offered in today's community hospital. As our national health services are expanding with our increasing population, so are health career opportunities.

It is vital to our Nation's health to establish in the eyes of the American people the importance of attracting able and dedicated young men and women to expanding opportunities for work in our Nation's hospitals. Our hospitals have grown in number since 1658 from 1 to over 7,000. This in itself is remarkable. Yet we must not overlook the fact that a modern hospital of today is, to the people it serves, worth 7,000 of the hospitals which might have existed 300 years ago. If our country's hospitals are to continue to improve and expand in facilities and functions, they must be able to attract qualified men and women.

Mr. President, too few of us realize the important role that hospitals in thousands of communities across the land have played in maintaining and advancing the health of our citizens. In such times as this, when we all recognize the grave threat to all free peoples in the present world situation, it is essential that every American citizen maintain the best health possible.

No nation can be strong unless its people be strong and healthy. Health gives the individual possessing it the maximum capability to enjoy his personal liberties. It fosters material benefits which abound in this country to a degree not found anywhere else in the world. But no nation can ever be complacent about the standards of health it has achieved. Humanity and expedience alike require that the burden of sickness and disease shall be lifted from the shoulders of mankind, that we may, step by step, reach new plateaus of achievement and well-being.

One of the key agents in advancing our country's health is the American hospital. It is fitting that our Nation grant recognition and express its gratitude to our hospitals and to the men and women who serve in them. I am, therefore, today submitting, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a concurrent resolution whereby the Congress asks the people of the Nation to observe National Hospital Week by joining in proclaiming the importance of hospitals as a career for our country's youth and in commemorating our hospitals' tradition of devoted service to our people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) submitted by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. THYE) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas American hospitals are the centers of community health services to our citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American community has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are vital to civil defense and natural disaster planning and efforts at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 12, and ending May 18, will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

INCREASED CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1957,

The name of Mr. FLANDERS was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 889) to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. POTTER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THYE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BEALL), on January 29, 1957.

PREVENTION OF BORDER RAIDS AND BLOCKADES OF INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS IN MIDDLE EAST—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has submitted Senate Resolution 77, stating it to be the sense of the Senate that our Government should support effective action, both inside and outside the United Nations, to guarantee that there will not be a resumption of border raids in the general vicinity of Israel. The resolution has gone to print. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the resolution the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON WESTFIELD RIVER, MASS. (S. DOC. NO. 17)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Westfield River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, adopted September 14, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON PARITY FORMULA (S. DOC. NO. 18)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture was directed to make a thorough study of the parity formula. The report of the Secretary was filed with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday.

I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with reference to having the report printed as a Senate document. I know there will

be many requests for this study. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him at the National Aircraft Conference, held in Washington, D. C., on Friday, February 1, 1957.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him to Kansas Republican Veterans, at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1957.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF C. BURKE ELBRICK, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Livingston T. Merchant.

Notice is given that the nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Oregon, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring August 9, 1961;

Eva Kelly Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1958;

M. Hepburn Many, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana for a term of 4 years;

Albert M. Morgan, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years; and

Chester A. Weidenburner, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey, for a term of 4 years.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, before Monday, February 11, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

TRIBUTE TO THE NATION'S VETERINARIANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine group of professional men who, largely unknown and unheralded, are making a great contribution to the health and welfare of our country. They are the veterinarians of America.

Too often, unfortunately, in this mechanical, jet-atomic age our vast resources in animal life, in which the "vets"—as we familiarly know them—perform their tasks, are relegated to the background in the thinking of some people. This is unfortunate; for, as we should know, both milk from our cows and meat from animals and fowl represent indispensable items in the American diet.

As we know, too, the "vets" are fighters in the front ranks of our battles to eliminate disease from animal and fowl life. Guardians of our health, not only have they been busy in eliminating diseases from our domestic herds and flocks, but they have contributed greatly toward keeping some of the world's worst diseases from our shores.

In Wisconsin, America's Dairyland, we are justly proud that—due largely to our hard-working veterinarians and the outstanding cooperation of our agriculturalists—our Badger State has been declared modified certified brucellosis free. In addition, we have made great strides in the conquering of mastitis, and other diseases of animal life. Recently a State veterinarians' conference at Madison emphasized the accomplishments of this fine group of servants on behalf of the public health. Moreover, tribute was paid to a great Wisconsinite, Dr. Harry J. O'Connell, our State veterinarian. He was named "veterinarian of the year" by the Wisconsin Veterinarian Medical Association.

To give my colleagues the benefit of a résumé of accomplishments not only by the veterinarians, as a group, but of Dr. O'Connell's fine personal contribution, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles from the Milwaukee Journal of January 10 and January 11, stressing the achievement of veterinarians on behalf of the public health.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 11, 1957]

VETERINARIAN OF YEAR IS DR. H. J. O'CONNELL—STATE ASSOCIATION MAKES ITS CHOICE AT ANNUAL DINNER AT CONVENTION

Dr. Harry J. O'Connell, State veterinarian for more than 6 years, Thursday night was named veterinarian of the year by the Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association at its annual convention dinner at the Schroeder hotel. He was the third recipient of the annual award.

Dr. O'Connell, whose Irish good humor and graying red hair are as widely known as his work in veterinary fields, was cited for leading Wisconsin's fight against tuberculosis and brucellosis in State cattle. He is credited with creating good will between the veterinary profession and the agriculture department and never has cooperation between the two been better, according to D. N. McDowell, agriculture director. He will be 65 next Thursday.

BORN IN TOMAHAWK

Born in Tomahawk, Wis., Dr. O'Connell was the son of a pioneer businessman of that area who shipped oxen to the north woods and also operated a butcher shop. The future veterinarian showed an early interest in horses, such as those used in the logging industry, and after high school enrolled in the McKillip Veterinary College, Chicago, from which he was graduated in 1918.

The young veterinarian immediately enlisted in the Army as a second lieutenant in the veterinary corps. He treated the Army's cavalry and artillery horses. After he was discharged he set up a practice at Cashton, Monroe County. In 1924 he took his first job for the State, as a field veterinarian in the tuberculosis eradication program. In early 1927 he took charge of the program, which he has directed since. * * *

* * * * *

VISITED MANY FARMS

"Since Dr. O'Connell took over this work he probably has had the distinction of having been on more farms and tested more cattle in the State than any other single veterinarian," said the association's citation.

In 1939 Dr. O'Connell became assistant State veterinarian under Dr. V. S. Larson, a post he held for 3½ years. He then did field supervision but returned in 1949 to be assistant to Dr. J. T. Schwab, then State veterinarian.

With the combination, in 1953, of the State and Federal veterinary services, Dr. O'Connell's staff was increased and now comprises about 50 persons in headquarters, 40 in the laboratory, and 25 field veterinarians in addition to working with local private practitioners.

STATE IN FRONT RANKS

Under Dr. O'Connell's direction Wisconsin has been in the front ranks in cattle disease control. The State was accredited "modified free" of bovine tuberculosis in July 1932, the first dairy State with such a rating. It also was the first dairy State to get the rating in brucellosis eradication.

Dr. O'Connell, who lives with his wife in Madison, will leave his job as State veterinarian at the end of January, as required by the State retirement law. However, he will continue active as a Federal employee doing liaison work between the agriculture department and the division of animal health. Dr. A. A. Erdmann, administrative veterinarian of the department, is expected to be named the new State veterinarian by the board of agriculture, which meets January 23.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 10, 1957]

FIGHT UNITED STATES LIVESTOCK ILLS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES—SYSTEM OF INSPECTION AT PORTS OF DEPARTURE IS OUTLINED AT VETERINARIANS' CONVENTION

Some of the world's worst livestock diseases are being kept from American shores by a thorough system of inspection at foreign ports of departure and quarantine at United States ports, according to an expert from the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

Lt. Col. F. D. Maurer, head of the Institute's Virology Section at Washington, D. C., described some of the dread animal maladies

in talks Wednesday and Thursday before the Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association. Its convention will continue through Friday at the Schroeder Hotel.

Colonel Maurer headed a 2½-year project of foreign disease study in Kenya and other parts of Africa. He noted that such disease as scrapie, from Europe, and blue tongue, from Africa, already have invaded American sheep flocks. The difficulty is that some of the foreign diseases are similar to those found in America, he said.

CALLED WORST PLAGUE

Rinderpest, which Colonel Maurer described as the "world's worst plague of cattle" has not reached here, although similar diseases are encountered. Rinderpest is worse than foot-and-mouth disease, he said. It is a virus disease, resulting in sore mouth and digestive tract and a 70 to 80 percent mortality.

Colonel Maurer's group also encountered African swine fever, similar but much worse than the hog cholera found here. There is no vaccine for swine fever and its prevalence makes buildup of large herds of hogs impossible. West Africa, where it is found, has only isolated swine production, Colonel Maurer said. Since the country has a large proportion of Moslems, pork is not a big item in the national diet.

INTENSIFIED BY TRAVEL

Greater world travel, especially by air, has intensified the foreign disease-control problem, Colonel Maurer declared. In former years when cattle and other livestock were moved by ship there was time for disease to appear during the trip and for the animals to be disposed of. Since animals now can be flown in in a matter of hours, the inspection before departure must not fail. One of the preventive methods is prohibition of carrier animals, Colonel Maurer said.

Dr. S. H. McNutt, head of the veterinary science department at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, said that veterinarians and medical doctors had been cooperating to detect the spread to humans of the pomona type of leptospirosis, found in livestock. So far the only human case was of the rat type, he said.

Dr. McNutt recalled that sleeping sickness of horses had spread to humans, after it had been thought that the virus was extremely safe for students to work with. In the Red River Valley of Minnesota-North Dakota, there was such an outbreak among humans 20 years ago that there were not enough well persons to take care of the sick, he said.

MIGHT ADD POULTRY

Pomona leptospirosis first appeared in hogs near Madison in 1948, Dr. McNutt said. It appears in both cattle and swine. In other countries—France, Switzerland, western Europe, and Australia—there also have been human cases, he said. Animals apparently build up an immunity which is fairly permanent, he added.

Dr. A. C. Kelman, of Waterloo, Wis., told the group that some veterinarians might consider adding poultry to their practice. He noted that larger flocks of chickens are appearing, calling for better veterinary methods. Some young veterinarians will have to go into poultry practice as the large animal field becomes saturated, Dr. Kelman said.

Dr. Harry J. O'Connell, Madison, State veterinarian, told the association that 1956 had been a year of great progress in Wisconsin livestock health, highlighted by the declaration of the State as "modified certified brucellosis free" on June 6.

MASTITIS IS COSTLY

"This historic event places Wisconsin among the five States in the Nation so certified," Dr. O'Connell said. "It marks a milestone in the complete eradication of this disease. It is the intention that our present brucellosis program will continue until this disease is completely wiped out."

Last year, said Dr. O'Connell, 25,233 brucellosis (Bang's disease or contagious abortion) reactors were disclosed and $704,000 was paid farmers in indemnities for slaughter. Nearly half a million calves were vaccinated.

Dr. O'Connell said 8 States now had banned the sale of live hog cholera virus and 4 more were taking steps in that direction. However, only 26 cases in the State were reported last year, the fewest since 1952, he said.

He called bovine mastitis, a disease of the udder, the most costly animal disease in the State and Nation, with at least 20 infectious causes.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS IN NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PURPOSES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on Public Works the bill (S. 512) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power, and for other purposes. I have received the following telegram from the Governor of New York:

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In response to your inquiry regarding my position on Niagara power legislation, I want you to know that I strongly supported the Lehman-Buckley bill last year, and I similarly support the identical bill that you introduced this year.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

COURTESY TO REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in my opinion, our No. 1 problem as a Nation is to learn how to live with other people. I commend President Eisenhower for the splendid statement he made at his press conference on Wednesday in regard to representatives of foreign governments who are here as guests and visitors.

As a Christian Nation, we pride ourselves on the fact that we believe in the golden rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It is my opinion that only on this basis and this attitude are we going to be able to work out a program of international and lasting peace.

The President made it definitely clear that he deplores any discourtesy shown to the visitors who come to the United States representing foreign governments, but at the same time he also stated that this did not imply any approval of internal actions in those countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all, let's get this clear in our minds. You don't promote the cause of peace by talking only to people with whom you agree. That is merely yes-man performance. You have got to meet face to face the people with whom you disagree at times, to determine whether or not there is a way of working out the differences and reaching a better understanding.

Now, the visits between heads of states are dictated by such considerations as eliminating misunderstandings and determining whether or not there are practical steps to take in the promotion of peace, and today the diminution of armaments—certainly worthy causes—and should be pursued with all the strength and all the wisdom we have.

In this light I am always obliged to any man, any head of state, who will come and talk to me when we think we have problems that might be advanced, solutions might be advanced by this kind of meeting, and they don't demand that if I want to talk I have to come and see them. Most of them recognize the difficulties that I have in my peculiar constitutional position.

I, therefore, deplore any discourtesy shown to a visitor who comes to us, representative of a government or of a people, and whose purpose is to see whether he can assist in ameliorating any of these difficulties.

Now, this does not necessarily imply any approval of any internal actions in such countries. It means simply that the promotion and the development of peaceful programs today is the most important work of statesmen, and that is what we ought to be about.

TRAGIC AIR CRASH OVER CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday in California there occurred a tragic, sickening, and horrible disaster. Flying at some 17,000 feet, near the city of Los Angeles, two aircraft, still owned by the respective manufacturers, and apparently engaged in testing operations, one a Douglas DC–7 and the other a Northrop jet fighter, collided. A part of the fuselage of the larger airliner hurtled into a schoolyard. Two schoolchildren were killed. Others were maimed. One youngster had his leg amputated. Several dozen people were injured. All in all, seven died.

The news I have today is to the effect that the appropriate Senate committee will commence an investigation, and I assume that representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board likewise will conduct their investigations.

My attention was called sometime ago to a statement by one who is presumed to know that the air traffic control situation in America is one horrible mess and is going to get worse before it gets better.

Mr. President, I do not know whether a testing operation was taking place over the air in California yesterday or not. I do know that the mayor of the city of Los Angeles has requested the National Government to take immediate steps to provide that in the future all testing operations by aircraft shall be confined to areas below which there is no population. I endorse that urgent recommendation. Essentially, that would mean, for my State, and particularly the southern part of my State, the ocean or the desert.

I wish to suggest to the Senate, and to others who may care to listen, that the time is now long past for the American Government to take appropriate

steps to protect the American people in their cities and towns and centers of population where protection can, by law or by regulation, be given. I am sure the Congress of the United States overwhelmingly would approve legislation, with teeth in it, providing, for example, that in the field of testing operations, the tests be confined to remote areas where a repetition of yesterday's tragedy in California could not take place.

Mr. President, I have no proposed legislation which I desire speedily to draft and to introduce, but I urge upon the Members of the Senate who will inquire into this question to take positive and swift steps to determine the fullest extent to which legislation with teeth in it can be adopted, and which will provide for clearly designated flight test areas, which, generally, will assure air traffic order instead of air traffic chaos and tragedy, and will provide penalties, civil and criminal, against all those who break the law in their flights above the cities and the populated areas of our country. We need to provide effective Federal controls, enforceable and enforced, in all air traffic in order to bring some measure of security to our people across the Nation.

Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a Civil Aeronautics Administration Directive, sent today from Washington to its regional administrators, as a result of yesterday's tragedy in California.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the directive was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF FLIGHT OPERATIONS
AND AIRWORTHINESS,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1957.

REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS, 1 TO 6:

Request you take immediate action to establish voluntary local flying areas for all test flights where such areas not already effective. Test flying means all flights conducted for the purpose of observing or measuring the performance of an aircraft or its components following manufacture, alteration, major repair, etc. These areas should be in sparsely populated geographical locations and in light air-traffic areas. Suggest you designate a safety inspector for each area to work with appropriate chief controllers, manufacturers, air carriers, and military to establish areas and procedures on voluntary cooperative basis as soon as possible pending taking more formal action by appropriate agencies. In addition to establishment of local test areas, suggest you consider establishment of additional local procedures governing use including coordination devices between various groups using same areas, observers in aircraft, and any other safety ideas applicable. Suggest you call conference of industry and military representatives to discuss problem. We will welcome your suggestions.

JAMES T. PYLE, *W–1 011800Z.*

HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, very recently the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Vice President of the United States, visited Austria for the purpose of studying the Hungarian refugee problem. When the distinguished Vice President returned to this country he made a statement to the people of the United States as to the obvious general quality of the Hungarian refugees. Mr. President, I, and I presume all of my colleagues, have had many inquiries from our respective States regarding questions which I felt the Vice President adequately answered when he returned from Austria recently; but to satisfy myself, I took advantage of a short period of active duty during the past week to fly into Germany and Austria for a visit to the border and some refugee camps at the assembly points. I concur wholeheartedly with the statement made by the distinguished Vice President when he said that few, if any, Communists are among the Hungarian refugees, and that they are people of obviously high quality. After my visit there, and after reading the remarks of the Vice President, I became convinced that the screening being conducted is making it virtually impossible for Communists to come in with the refugee groups. I am not standing here saying there are no Communists coming with them, because that would be an impossible statement to make, but I am convinced that the course being followed by the Government is resulting in a minimum of Communists coming here.

Mr. President, I was impressed by the youth of the refugees. I understand the average age of the Hungarian refugees is about 24; that some 6,000 college students have come into this country, among them, I understand, some doctors of philosophy. I have not seen in the camps any people whom Americans usually associate with refugee groups. I did not see old, tired people. I saw the youth of Hungary, eager to leave the tyranny of the Communists, and anxious to get to a country whose freedom they recognize as coming from God. In the eyes of the young people and in their words, as I talked to them through interpreters, I could see and hear the deep, intense hatred of the people of Hungary for the Communists who dominate the lives of the Hungarians.

After having returned from my visit abroad—and the United States is not being overburdened; Switzerland is taking half the number of Hungarian refugees we are taking into this country; France, Germany, and Austria are assuming a load they are ill equipped to bear—I am convinced we are making the correct move, and that President Eisenhower's request that those who could come here, under the immigration rules, should be permitted to enter this country is a wise one, and will result to the advantage of the United States, and add to our prestige among the other nations of the world. It gives me pleasure because the Vice President of the United States is presently presiding over the Senate, to make the statement I have made and to concur in his remarks, and to thank the President of the United States for having made his suggestion.

Mr. President, I have another subject I wish to speak on, under the 3-minute rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CONCERNING THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the longstanding failure of the leadership of our Military Establishment to recognize the always proven fact that the National Guard is the backbone of our defense was never so aptly demonstrated as by the unfortunate remarks made by Secretary Wilson during the past week. As a former member of the Air National Guard and one of its organizers, I thoroughly resent his statement, and I suggest that the Secretary survey with the open mind for which he is noted the failure of the Reserve program which he so ardently supports.

Mr. President, the Reserve Act of 1955 cannot produce trained men of the quality of those who comprise the National Guard. In fact, to assume that 6 months training can produce a soldier is obviously ridiculous. Based on my 26 years of association with the Reserve force and the National Guard I can state that the Reserves, as such, have never been treated in a way that would assure adequate reserve forces in times of need; and that because of the continuance of this shortsightedness, today, with the exception of isolated instances, the Reserve program is not functioning.

I may state that included in this shortsightedness is the fact that the heads of our Military Establishment do not request sufficient funds for the proper conduct of the Reserve program; and when they have funds available, they evidently do not desire to provide sufficient new equipment, armories, and so forth, for the organized reserves.

I suggest to Secretary Wilson he would do well to study the success of the National Guard concept and the constantly high quality of leadership and soldiers it has produced for the Army and the Air Force in times of war.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the controversy over the question of the training of the National Guard is most unfortunate.

In my opinion, it has hurt the morale of this historic and important part of the American plan of defense.

I have a high regard for Secretary Wilson as an outstanding executive, but I feel that his slurring remark about the National Guard has damaged the effort for more widespread military training.

The United States is a peace-loving Nation. The American people have always hated the idea of war. Military preparedness has always been a controversial subject. We have suffered tragic losses because of our tendency to postpone preparations until we have been forced into armed conflict.

For that reason no part of our defense organization, including the Regular

Army, has ever been adequately prepared for action at the beginning of war. The outbreak of hostilities has always found our Regular Army units reduced to their minimum strength. They were widely scattered and much of their equipment was obsolete.

The vast changes which have taken place in military science—the development of swift communications and nuclear weapons—have not altered the basic principle that properly trained personnel, ably led and directed, is the major factor between victory and defeat.

Therefore, for our proper defense, we must have the best-trained, the best-equipped, the best-organized, and the most mobile Regular Army in the world, ready to take the field on short notice. It should be backed up by a well-trained and strongly officered citizen reserve.

In my humble judgment, after a half century of study, the best method by which we can build a great reservoir of trained personnel for our armed services is universal military training.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if my good friend from Pennsylvania will yield to me for a moment in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am happy to yield if I have the time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will give the Senator some of my time. I intend to discuss the same subject matter which the Senator from Pennsylvania is discussing.

In the first place, I wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania for resenting the unfortunate utterance of one who knows, or should know, the facts better than his statement indicates. The National Guard has been in every war. I do not know whether the former head of General Motors has ever been in battle or not, but I do know that members of the National Guard from Pennsylvania and from practically every other State in the Union were in the Philippines during the hostilities there. They were with Wainwright at Bataan. They went through the death marches. They learned how to grow and eat rice. Many of them did not come back.

New Mexico's entire National Guard was in the Philippines. Practically 40 percent of them died there. The others came back, but many of them are dying as the result of their service in that area.

Whatever the Secretary of Defense may do, I am sure he will live to regret his unfortunate utterance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair must invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate is proceeding under the 3-minute rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that such time as may be consumed be charged against the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason I am being so emphatic is that I know the record of my good friend from Pennsylvania in the National Guard. Through the kindness of the people of the State of New Mexico and the Senate of the United States, I happen to handle the Defense Department appropriation bill. That includes every cent of money appropriated for the Department of Defense, including the salary of the Secretary and what is appropriated for the National Guard. I hope the Secretary will not in any way interfere with the fine work which the National Guard is doing.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I very greatly appreciate the fine remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I think the people of America ought to realize that the citizen soldiery of the United States, which means the National Guard and the Reserve, came into being when the embattled farmers fought the British forces at Lexington and Concord, before the Declaration of Independence.

I believe that every American, regardless of his station in life, should be ready to defend his country and should be prepared to do a good job. It is my firm belief that basic military training for every young man is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of our Republic.

The work of training should be performed by the ablest Regular Army officers and well-qualified National Guard and Reserve officers. To achieve its highest purpose the trainee should not only be well schooled in military work but also be taught the meaning of our form of government and the American way of life under the God-given right to live in freedom.

When his basic training is completed, the trainee could elect service for a fixed period in the Regular Establishment or a longer period in the National Guard or Reserve. Thus we would be able at all times to muster a citizen army, ready, trained, and prepared to meet any threat to our national security.

As a part of the training plan I would suggest that officers of the Regular Army be given rank and command in the Guard and Reserve units. Large-scale maneuvers should be held in the Regular Army; National Guard and the Reserve would participate. This would give high-ranking officers an opportunity to handle troops in position commensurate with their rank.

Mr. President, no words of mine are needed to glorify the brilliant record of the National Guard in all our Nation's wars. In that connection I made the following statement soon after I heard of Secretary Wilson's unfortunate remark:

The National Guard and the Army Reserve of the United States are our great defense institutions. During war after war our guardsmen and reservists have followed in the heroic footsteps of the embattled farmers at Lexington and Concord.

In any great emergency, America has always depended upon citizen-soldiers. Any suggestion or intimation that guardsmen entered that organization to avoid the draft is most unfair.

Quite the reverse is true. For example, the National Guard of California and Oklahoma went directly to Korea, and our own National Guard of Pennsylvania went to Germany at the same time.

Personally, I have always urged universal military training which would, to my mind, take care of our defense training and mobilization problems.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "In Defense of the Guard," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of February 1, 1957; also an editorial entitled "Unfair Slur on the National Guard," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of February 1, 1957]

IN DEFENSE OF THE GUARD

At his press conference Wednesday, President Eisenhower put into proper perspective the National Guard ruckus stirred up by Defense Secretary Wilson.

Mr. Wilson angered guardsmen when, with characteristic bluntness, he told the House Armed Services Committee that National Guard enlistments were "sort of a scandal during the Korean war, a draft-dodging business."

Guardsmen naturally inferred that the Defense Secretary was accusing the National Guard itself of scandalous behavior. But, as the President pointed out, the guard's recruitment was done "in accordance with the law."

In other words, Congress itself made the law governing military recruitment and the guard could hardly be blamed if the law permitted youths to enlist in the guard rather than be drafted to fight in Korea. As it was, guard units did fight in that war.

Anything that tends to discredit or damage the National Guard is exceedingly unfortunate. The guard is one of the most important elements in the Nation's defense. As the militia of the various States, it performs State and local military functions which no other force is prepared to handle. In any local emergency, the National Guard is called out to restore and preserve the peace. And in time of national peril, it provides a trained nucleus which can immediately be called into regular service.

The guard's training and efficiency is, in fact, the crux of the issue on which Mr. Wilson was testifying when he made his inept statement about draft dodging.

If the guard is to serve with maximum efficiency and to provide a ready backlog of trained military manpower, then its recruits should undergo the 6 months of active duty training advocated by the Defense Department and endorsed by the President. That would strengthen the guard and make it all the more valuable. It is too bad that the ill-advised talk about draft dodging obscured this important issue. The President is to be commended for getting the discussion back on the track. Let's hope it gets good results.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

UNFAIR SLUR ON NATIONAL GUARD

By his attempt to pin a draft-dodging label on the National Guard during the Korean conflict Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson has regrettably lived up to a reputation of saying wrong things at wrong times.

The timing of Mr. Wilson's remark, which he insisted on repeating yesterday, is particularly unfortunate. His suggestion beclouds the highly important question of extended initial training—for 6 months—for men entering both the Organized Reserve or the National Guard.

Guard officials have taken an uncompromising stand of opposition to this proposal. In that we think they are dead wrong. In his draft-dodging suggestion the Defense Secretary is dead wrong, also. There have been examples of draft evasion, of course. But Mr. Wilson's attack was too generalized; in fact, aimed in a direction—at the guard—where the facts demonstrate he is in error.

Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, points out that 37 percent of the Army National Guard and 84 percent of the Air National Guard were mobilized during the Korean struggle; that 2 of these divisions and many other Army and Air units served in combat in Korea. Others augmented the Regular Army and Air Force in Europe and elsewhere.

When Mr. Wilson made his charge before the House Armed Services Committee on Monday he said that "A boy 17 to 18½ could enlist in the National Guard and not be drafted to fight in Korea." General Walsh said yesterday that at the time Selective Service was taking no one under 19. But on their enlistment youths below that age were, as General Walsh said, immediately subject to go anywhere the Government ordered.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of this State, who served from private to major general in the National Guard in three wars, declares that "any suggestion * * * that guardsmen entered that organization to avoid the draft is most unfair. Quite the reverse is true."

Congress should not permit Mr. Wilson's latest remark to delay or prevent sound action on the 6 months' training plan. The Nation needs trained reserves. It doesn't have them and won't get them under existing methods. The new plan offers at least partially to correct this. It deserves and should have the earnest attention of Congress on its merits, regardless of Mr. Wilson's slur on the National Guard.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on January 23 the Adjutants General and other general officers of the Army National Guard met in Washington. They set forth a plan of training. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF BASIC TRAINING FOR THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD—RECOMMENDED UNANIMOUSLY BY ADJUTANTS GENERAL AND OTHER GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

One. That all men age 18½ to 25 years now in (as members before April 1, 1957) be permitted to take 6 months' active duty for training on a voluntary basis, provided they have not already had active duty for training.

Two. All men age 18½ to 25 years who are enlisted on or after April 1, 1957, be required to take 6 months' active duty for training as a mandatory condition to their enlistment.

Three. All men age 17 to 18½ years who are enlisted on or after April 1, 1957, be required to take 11 weeks of active duty for training as a mandatory condition to their enlistment. These men may volunteer for 6 months' active duty training.

Four. All men age 17 to 18½ years now in (as members before April 1, 1957) be permitted to choose either 11 weeks' active duty training or 6 months' active duty training, on a voluntary basis.

Five. That there would be no ratio imposed upon the component to the number of men to participate in either the 11-week program or the 6-month program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the past few days I have received a large number of communications from the people of my State expressing resentment at the disparaging remarks made by the Secretary of Defense relative to the National Guard. Those letters point out the remarkable record which has been made by the National Guard of Vermont, going back to the time of the Solomon Islands campaign, and activities in other theaters of war.

They also point out that the National Guard units of other States have also acquitted themselves well. They point out further the high standard of the National Guard of my State at the present time.

I believe the writers of these communications are justified in expressing resentment at the remarks of the Secretary, which may be characterized moderately as unwise, unfair, and untrue.

I do not know what action President Eisenhower intends to take in this matter. I was glad to note that he expressed himself clearly at a press conference the other day. But regardless of what he does, it appears that the remarks of the Secretary of Defense have greatly impaired any future usefulness which he might otherwise have had as the administrator of the Department of Defense. In order to be effective, an administrator must have the confidence of those with whom he has to deal. It appears that the Secretary has lost a great deal of such confidence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] a group of telegrams and letters which I have received concerning the National Guard, and that these communications be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were referred to the Armed Services Committee, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANDER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We protest Secretary Wilson's statements regarding National Guard as indicating a definite lack of knowledge of this subject by him. A check of National Guard Bureau records will show that Wyoming units made as enviable a record as any other unit sent to Korea.

H. A. CARSON, *Mayor.*

LANDER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Notwithstanding Secretary Wilson's statement to contrary the town of Lander apologizes to no one for any member of its National Guard. We are proud of them individually and collectively.

MARK DUNCAN,
President, Lander Chamber of Commerce.

LANDER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

About 75 percent of the Wyoming guard was called to Korea in 1950. Check history of 300th Antiaircraft Field Artillery Battalion. Check citations awarded by general orders to this battalion. Tell Secretary Wilson we are proud of our guard.

C. E. BELL,
Executive Vice President,
Lander State Bank.

THERMOPOLIS, WYO., *January 31, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Re Department of Defense mandatory 6-month active-duty training plan for new National Guard enlistees. I am very strongly against this plan as it will interfere with future educational requirements of new members of this unit in addition to drastically reducing number of new enlistments. I urge that you do everything possible to amend this plan by substituting the 11-week active-duty training plan as adopted by the Adjutants General Association for new enlistees. I also recommend that you vigorously protest Wilson's remark concerning the National Guard. As you know, this unit compiled an enviable record in Korea while on active duty, and members of this unit, both present and former, who served with this unit in Korea are very indignant over the slur cast on the National Guard by Secretary Wilson.

EUGENE R. SMITH,
Wyoming National Guard.

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., *February 1, 1957.*
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As a unit faced with problems of recruiting members in National Guard, we are opposed to 6-month compulsory training program. Do favor 13 weeks, as suggested by National Guard. Six months would be finish of units in Wyoming. This unit is only 50 percent now, and that is hard to maintain.

1st Lt. JOHN R. SCHMIDT,
Commanding B Battery.

CASPER, WYO., *February 1, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As an officer and member of Wyoming National Guard, I, for one, do not like comments of Wilson calling us slackers and draft dodgers. Members of Wyoming's 300th Field Artillery did not receive Presidential citation for being draft dodgers in Korea, nor were nine Cheyenne pilots killed in action by being slackers. Am confident that Department of the Army is going to ruin the National Guard by forcing 6 months' training on new recruits. As resident of Wyoming, I urge you investigate these comments and stop Army in their move. Thank you.

KAYE A. LORD.

TORRINGTON, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request that you vote "No" to Defense Department's proposal requiring young men between ages 17 and 18½ who enlist in the National Guard on or after April 1, 1957, to take 6 months' active duty training because (1) it will interfere with their education; (2) we feel men of this age group are too young to be away from home during peacetime; and (3) we feel that it would very materially decrease enlistments in this age group. Comments that we have heard from the general public in regard to above matter have been very unfavorable. We would favor 11 weeks' active duty training, with the op-

tion to take 6 months' active duty, as proposed by the Adjutants General Association, because it will not only keep enlistments up, but we feel will increase them, will not interfere with their education, and will be looked upon a great deal more favorably by parents and the public in general.

1st Lt. ROBERT E. LATTA,
Wyoming National Guard.

HEADQUARTERS, 1022D ENGINEER BATTALION COMBAT,
Laramie, Wyo., January 30, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I would like to request your support of the recommendations of the National Guard Bureau favoring 11 weeks active duty training for National Guard enlisted men without prior service. There are numerous reasons in favor of this program over the change effective the 1st of April, requiring these men to complete 6 months active duty. Primarily, from an educational standpoint, so that the active-duty training can be completed during the summer and not interfere with a young man's best opportunity of completing his education without interruption.

It may be of interest to you to know that my unit in Laramie is composed of 80 percent prior-service men, the majority having served in either World War II or Korea, with several of them having served in both conflicts.

Your support of the National Guard Bureau recommendations favoring 11 weeks active duty will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Maj. JOHN M. ADAMS,
Commanding.

SHERIDAN, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On the hearings starting Monday, I wish you to know that I, as a voter and a member of the National Guard of Wyoming, do not favor the 6 months compulsory training program for enlistees in the National Guard. It would kill our enlistments of the future.

I believe the summer training program of 11 weeks would be much better as that program would not interfere with a young man's education.

Also, you may inform Mr. Wilson that our unit was a bunch of "dodgers" during the Korean conflict, but it was bullets in Korea, not the draft at home.

Yours truly,
TUDOR EDWARDS,
Wyoming National Guard.

HEADQUARTERS BATTERY,
300TH ARMORED FIELD ARTILLERY BATTALION,
Sheridan, Wyo., January 29, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As battery commander of Headquarters, Battery 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion, Wyoming National Guard, I would like to express my opinion on the proposed Army policy requiring all men who enlist in the National Guard after April 1, 1957, to participate in 6 months' active duty training.

I feel that this proposal is unsatisfactory in that it would be more difficult to recruit men to enlist in the Wyoming National Guard, that a young man between ages 17 and 18½ is not mature enough, on the average, to leave home for an extended period, that the proposed policy is nothing more than universal military training, and that it would greatly interfere with a young man's civilian education and desire for higher learning.

It would be much better to have an 11 weeks' training period available to enlisted men which could be very easily accomplished during the summer vacation months, therefore not interfering with the civilian-education program.

Secretary of Defense Wilson claims the National Guard is untrained. Does he know? Combat is the supreme test to see how well-trained an individual or unit is. Our battalion, when in Korea, was as good or better than any similar unit in the 8th Army area. We as a battery, Wyoming National Guard, very much resent the Secretary's remarks.

As to the statement that the National Guard was for draft dodgers this battery alone had better than 10 enlistments after the unit was alerted for active duty.

Sincerely yours,
THEODORE R. HARKER,
First Lieutenant, Artillery, Commanding.

CASPER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am writing to express my opinion concerning a matter vital to the preservation of our first line of defense, the National Guard.

I believe I can speak with a modicum of knowledge, having served over 18 years in the National Guard, including 5 years of active service during World War II, and under no military obligation.

For over 180 years the National Guard has been the epitome of the citizen soldier, both in war and peace. In times of national emergency, our National Guard has provided the only large trained group of soldiers available at a moment's notice for defense of our country, as evidenced by Wyoming's own 300th Field Artillery, 141st Tank Battalion, and the Air National Guard, during the Korean war. Our own units composed only a small portion of the many National Guard units of the 48 States who saw service during this war. Were the members of these National Guard units draft dodgers, and an untrained bunch?

The thing that concerns me most is that recent proposals concerning the National Guard strike at the very heart of our democratic freedom and way of life. To my mind, it is un-American for one Government group to usurp the power to legislate, given only to the Congress by the citizens of the United States.

Recent utterances by Secretary of Defense Wilson have placed a stigma on the National Guard which will be difficult to overcome, therefore, I strongly urge you to carefully and thoughtfully hear and consider the recommendations made by the National Guard concerning an 11-week training program. I further urge you to disapprove the efforts by the Defense Secretary to undermine and destroy our first line of defense.

I would appreciate very much knowing your views concerning the best group of trained citizen soldiers in the world.

Respectfully yours,
PAUL E. ELLENBERG.

CASPER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As a member of the Wyoming National Guard who has no military obligation I wish to express my opinion to Secretary Wilson's remark about the National Guard being a haven for draft dodgers.

During the Second World War, I was classified as 4–F by the draft board for having a ruptured eardrum. This was in 1944. There was nothing I could do then and believe me I was disappointed at not being able to serve my country. However, 2 years later in 1946, I had my classification changed to 1–A so that I could enlist in the Army. I passed my physical this time and served for 3 years honorably as records in Washington will verify. I spent 26 months with the occupation forces in Germany, and I wouldn't trade all that experience for all the money in the world.

My enlistment expired in 1949, and in 1953 I joined this guard unit. I now work full time for the guard, and as one who makes up the enlistment records for new recruits, I can vouch for the fact that they are not of draft age, and need their parents' consent, so how can they be classified as draft dodgers?

I have sent approximately 7 enlisted men from this unit into active duty for 2 years, and if they joined the guard to get out of the draft, why did they volunteer for this 2-year period of active duty?

In my opinion, a youth does not join the guard to "beat the draft" but to complete his high-school education and serve his country at the same time.

I can only conclude that Secretary Wilson is an awful loudmouth and should get his facts straight before making such derogatory statements. I myself can't see how a person expects to "beat the draft" by joining a guard unit during a crisis like the Korean situation when, during an emergency, the guards of the States are the first to be called up for such emergencies. Surely if I were going to "beat the draft" I wouldn't head for the nearest guard unit. That would be the quickest way into the fracas. If I wanted to "beat the draft," I would head for the hills, and hibernate.

If there is any way that I could call Secretary Wilson a liar to his face, I would certainly do it. It will be a crime unpunished to let this man keep his high office in the Government without making him retract his statement.

If this is the type of men we have to run our Armed Forces, I am all for quitting right now. Please, if at all possible, see that this man is made to pay for his outrageous remark.

Sincerely yours,
M. Sgt. WILLIAM J. COLLINS.

CASPER, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'MAHONEY: In regard to the 6 months active-duty requirement being forced upon the National Guard, effective first of April 1957, I am writing you to express my views.

Enlistment in the National Guard by men 17–18½ years in particular will be cut to the bone. Men will feel that their chances of being drafted are remote (which they are at present), and take their chances outside.

Six months' active duty will greatly interfere with high-school students completing their education. Six months taken out of their schooling at any time will throw them out of phase in their school year, and in some cases they will never finish high school. Since high-school students are one major source of enlistments, it will result in a serious reduction in National Guard recruits.

As you know the National Guard is, and has been since the Declaration of Independence, the only Reserve force with any semblance of readiness to be called immediately in case of a national emergency. If the National Guard is to have this 6 months active-duty requirement thrust upon its new members, and take the consequent reduction in personnel, it will be a much less effective force.

If the National Guard members must take the 6 months active duty, then the same should be true for all physically qualified men in the same age group. This apparently won't happen unless U. M. T. or something similar becomes law. The National Guard should not be discriminated against in this manner.

Further, I would like to take exception to the remarks in today's paper by Secretary Wilson in regard to "scandal and draft dodging in the National Guard during the Korean war." I personally know of numerous National Guard men, including myself, who joined the organization shortly after the Korean action began. It appeared at that time that an individual's chances of being called in the guard was much greater than it would have been by remaining in a Reserve unit or in a civilian status. General Walsh already has given figures on percentages of National Guard units called. It is my belief that the above remarks were very ill-conceived.

It appears that the failure of the Army's 6-month program is trying to be salvaged by forcing it upon the National Guard without regard to the consequences to the latter.

Any assistance you can give in preventing the enforcement of the 6-months plan upon the National Guard will be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. SIMS,
Wyoming National Guard.

HEADQUARTERS, 300TH ARMORED FIELD ARTILLERY BATTALION,
Sheridan, Wyo., January 29, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As a citizen voter, taxpayer, and a member of the Wyoming National Guard, your favorable support and reaction is requested in regard to the proposal that men in the 17-18½ year age group, who enlist in the National Guard, after April 1, 1957, serve 11 weeks active duty training during the summer months. It is felt that the 11 weeks would meet basic training requirements, and would not interfere with the civilian school program for the enlistee.

The Army's proposal that all enlistees in the National Guard must take 6 months' active duty training is not satisfactory as it would decrease enlistment in the Wyoming National Guard, interfere with the educational program of the man, and in many cases a 17-year-old is too young to leave home for that length of time.

The record of the 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion with headquarters and headquarters battery at Sheridan and battery-sized units at Cody, Worland, Lovell, and Thermopolis is open for your inspection as to training, particularly its record in Korea and, if chance presents, inform the Secretary of Defense that we, the 300th, spent time in Korea and we were not dodging the draft. We had many men, patriotic, who enlisted in order to accompany the 300th to Korea.

Sincerely yours,

Maj. RALPH N. CLOYD,
Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS 351ST ARMORED FIELD ARTILLERY BATTALION,
WYOMING NATIONAL GUARD,
Laramie, Wyo., January 30, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As a battalion commander in the Wyoming National Guard, and directly concerned with the recruiting problems of the National Guard, I strongly urge your support of the 11-week basic training course in lieu of the 6-month program for National Guard men.

As the main strength of the National Guard consists of prior-service men and young men mostly of school age, it is my opinion the 11 weeks would give a basically trained man and still not interrupt his plan for schooling or entering the business world.

I further wish to state that neither I nor a large percentage of my men are so-called draft dodgers as we served during the police action called Korea with the 141st Tank Battalion, Wyoming National Guard.

Sincerely yours,

Maj. THERON F. STIMSON,
Commanding.

RAWLINS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Rawlins, Wyo., January 29, 1957.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I realize that the matter I am going to discuss is completely out of your hands, but as a former member of the Wyoming National Guard, I feel that Mr. Charles E. Wilson's remarks on Monday, January 28, 1957, were wholly unwarranted and in my opinion completely asinine.

I am sure that you are aware that of the four National Guard units in the State of Wyoming in 1950, three of them were called to active duty and one of them served in Korea as a battalion and 90 percent of the men in the other two units went to Korea as replacements. If this is "draft dodging business," I would certainly like to know what a "nondraft dodging business" is.

I served 10 months in the Korean war and feel that I know what I am talking about. During the time I was in Korea I remembered that there were two National Guard divisions that were engaged in active combat at that time, these divisions being the 40th from the State of California and the 45th from the State of Oklahoma and two Regular Army divisions who were sent back to Japan supposedly to protect the country of Japan. I believe that Mr. Wilson should be made to make a public apology and that the administration should publicly reprimand this man for his remarks.

In my personal opinion, I think that it is a shame that a man who goes around making statements such as Mr. Wilson does, is no person to have in the position of Defense Secretary of the United States. I am sure that if the chips were down, Mr. Wilson would not know what to do or which way to turn.

Sincerely yours,

QUINN JOHNSON, *Manager.*

67TH ARMY BAND MODIFICATION CENTER,
Cheyenne, Wyo., January 29, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I should like to write in regard to the action coming before the Legislature, for the National Guard. I have long been a member of the guard; have fought with the units of the State of Wyoming and creditably I believe my record will show. In looking over past records of guard units I am sure that they have all participated with more than creditable service in wartime, which means that training and discipline were sufficient.

The reason of this letter being, it is my opinion that 6 months training for age groups 17½ to 18 years of age would be too long a period. This would disrupt all forms of education of which the individual had planned. Eleven weeks would be acceptable from the standpoint that the individuals might take this training during the summer.

I have listened pro and con to this argument. If we are to recruit young men into this program for reasons of loyalty to their country and at the same time keep faith with them we must believe in them enough to trust they will be good loyal soldiers when and if their call to duty arrives.

To this date I have served in World War II and the Korean conflict with guard units from this State, I would hate to tell the relatives of many dead friends of mine lost in these battles that they had served in a service that now was considered a form of evading the draft.

If any form of active service is required, please for the sake of the National Guard make it a shorter period of 11 weeks.

KENNETH B. LAVERENTS, *Bandmaster.*

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, as Senator from and a resident of Connecticut, I am proud of our Connecticut National Guard. It has a glorious record of distinguished service which dates from 1711. In every one of this Nation's wars the men of the Connecticut National Guard have fought and died valiantly to preserve this country's liberty. I therefore feel that I must take issue with the recent remarks of the Secretary of Defense in regard to the National Guard. I think these remarks were unfair and unfortunate and have cast a reflection upon a valiant, dedicated, and most valuable Reserve component of our Armed Forces.

Our Connecticut National Guard has a proud record of service which is second to none. The 102d and 169th Infantry Regiments trace their origins to militia units organized in 1711. These units proudly display battle pennants signifying their participation in every major conflict involving our military forces. In World War I, the 1st and 2d Connecticut Infantry Regiments became the 102d United States Infantry in the 26th or Yankee Division. The performance of this division is a matter of glorious record. In addition, a coast artillery regiment and a field hospital of the Connecticut National Guard were also federalized and served with distinction.

In World War II, the 43d Division—the Connecticut National Guard—fought brilliantly all through the South Pacific to the Philippines. That division comprised the 102d and 169th Infantry Regiment, the 192d Field Artillery Regiment, and the 118th Medical Regiment.

I should like also to note here that the 208th AAA Regiment, also of the Connecticut National Guard, saw combat service in the Pacific theater.

At the time of the Korean conflict, Mr. President, the 43d Division, two AA group headquarters units, two AAA battalions, and the entire Connecticut Air National Guard were mobilized. Our State was left with only two AAA battalions, and it became necessary to reactivate the State guard to comply with Connecticut statutes that the State have a military strength of 2,500.

Mr. President, the 43d Division was first stationed at Camp Pickett, Va., and was then sent to Germany to take over on the NATO line so that other American NATO troops could be sent to Korean duty. One of the AA battalions was sent

to the Kuriles. Officers and men of the 43d were taken from the division while it was still at Camp Pickett and sent to Korea as replacements. The fighter pilots from the Connecticut Air National Guard also saw combat service in Korea.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that from the end of World War II until 1953 Selective Service in Connecticut was not drafting anybody under 21 years of age. The young boys who joined the guard during that time were voluntarily making themselves available for military service.

In view of the brilliant and inspiring records of these Connecticut National Guard units, it is most unfair to associate them with any implication of draft-dodging. All of us in Connecticut are proud of our National Guard men. We are grateful to them for their military service and for their heroic exploits in our behalf in times of other emergencies, such as the floods of 1955.

Mr. President, the Connecticut National Guard never has dodged and never will dodge its responsibility. The Congressional Medal of Honor winners in its ranks, its battle flags from colonial to modern days, and the white crosses which mark the final resting places of some of its members in far corners of the world, are convincing proof of the caliber of the Connecticut National Guard and of its officers and men.

Mr. President, the service and high sense of duty of Connecticut's National Guard men are demonstratedly deserving of tribute, not aspersion, from the officials of our Defense Department.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received many protests from members of the Arkansas National Guard concerning Secretary Wilson's charge that the National Guard was a haven for draft dodgers during the Korean war.

Units of the Arkansas National Guard established an enviable combat record in Korea, and rightfully resent the Secretary's slur on their patriotism.

I ask unanimous consent to have these telegrams and letters printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., *January 30, 1957.*

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Records of the 142d Field Artillery group in Fayetteville reflect a most enviable record of valiant service. Charges by Mr. Wilson indicate that those charged with leadership in our Nation's defense are apparently irresponsible or are not appreciative of the sacrifices and service performed. Secretary Dulles doesn't want French or English, Army doesn't want National Guard men. Can they do it alone? Demand apologies at least to families of deceased guardsmen in Korea.

Col. MAUPIN CUMMINGS,
Arkansas National Guard.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., *January 31, 1957.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As veteran National Guard men who have served with National Guard units in World War II and Korea, we were shocked by Secretary of Defense Wilson's unwarranted and untrue attack on the National Guard. Having served in Korea with the 936th Field Artillery Battalion, Arkansas National Guard, where the battalion established an excellent combat record, and being presently engaged in training the same unit to fill its rightful place among the first called in the event of a national emergency, we fail to see how a young man can be called a draft dodger who places himself in military jeopardy many years before he would be called under the present Selective Service System.

Lt. Col. WILLIAM BUSH,
Commander, 936th Field Artillery Battalion.
Maj. CARMEN L. LIERLY,
Executive Officer.
Maj. JACKSON G. BYRD,
Training Officer.

HARRISON, ARK., *January 30, 1957.*

Hon. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the Harrison National Guard, I believe Defense Wilson has served more than his time. Suggest you take a look into his present policy toward National Guard. Because he is working toward the final elimination of Arkansas National Guard.

Maj. DONALD R. RANEY.

HARRISON, ARK., *January 30, 1957.*

J. W. FULBRIGHT
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We concur with General Walsh on his reply to Secretary Wilson.

C. W. O. DON G. RICHESIN,
M. Sgt. DAVE SCOTT,
Sgt. RAY L. MCANEAR,
M. Sgt. REX S. BRAZELL,
Sfc. EUGENE T. HUCKABAY,
Sgt. JAMES L. BLACKWELL,
Arkansas National Guard.

HARRISON, ARK., *January 30, 1957.*

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers and men of organization stunned in high Government official reference to National Guard draft dodging during Korean conflict. Northwest Arkansas, including Harrison, furnished National Guard battalion that fought in Korea. Draft dodging accusations tend to mock those who volunteered through National Guard to protect Nation and principals.

LEE BRAZELL.

FORT SMITH, ARK., *January 30, 1957.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers, men, 937th Field Artillery Battalion, and 39th Military Police Company, Arkansas National Guard, would appreciate your support of General Walsh on National Guard policies.

937TH FIELD ARTILLERY BATTALION AND
39TH MILITARY POLICE COMPANY,
Arkansas National Guard.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I know that you are aware of the derogatory statement uttered by Secretary of Defense Wilson, pertaining to the shameful way draft dodgers flocked into the National Guard during the Korean war.

Sir, as a private citizen and more especially as an officer in the Arkansas National Guard I take exception to this purely stupid remark—I can think of no other printable adjective to use in describing it—and entreat you as a constituent to register a strong protest to the Department of Defense and anything else that is in your power to prevent like situations in the future.

Mr. Senator, I make this request to you because I have the greatest respect for your judgment and ability. You realize, of course, that I am not alone in this respect, but am voicing the opinion of the vast majority of the intelligent people of Arkansas as was evidenced in both the Democratic primaries and the general election of 1956.

If it is facts and figures you are interested in, I am sure Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh would be glad to inform you that in the Korean war 84.4 percent of these "draft-dodging" Air National Guard men were called to active duty along with 37 percent of their comrades in the "shameful" Army National Guard. These citizen soldiers, Mr. FULBRIGHT, were in many cases veterans of World War II and would not have been required to serve, had they not volunteered for service in the National Guard.

In our home State of Arkansas, the fine combat record of the 936th and 937th Field Artillery Battalions merited several commendations from superior commanders concerned in the Eighth Army in Korea. The 332d Tank Battalion and 125th Medical Battalion, 154th Tactical Squadron, and elements of the 136th Fighter-Bomber Wing, members of the Arkansas National Guard, also carried on their "shameful draft-dodging" actions while giving a commendable account of themselves while on active duty during the Korean conflict. Mr. Senator, these were not the only Arkansas units to be activated. These are units I am familiar with and know whereof I speak. I differ from Mr. Wilson by getting the facts before I speak, and would keep quiet rather than tell a lie.

At the present time, the National Guard is as it always has been, our first line of defense. Our periodic inspections by teams of Regular Army men will bear me out in saying that the National Guard is the biggest bargain in our defense budget. In addition to this, space does not permit me to enumerate the numerous times National Guard units have been called out to quell civil disturbances and assist the various States during times of disaster.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, rather than leave you with the impression that I'm merely tooting my own horn, let me say that we are proud to serve in the National Guard and expect no one to bend over backward for us. You realize, of course, how such public statements as the one uttered by Mr. Wilson can hurt us individually and collectively. Down here in Hope, 87 percent of the members of Company A, 153d Infantry have not missed a drill during the last calendar year. These men were very disturbed by this remark. I have informed them that I would write to you, requesting that you protest this and insure that it doesn't happen in the future.

Trusting that my confidence in you will not be shaken, I am,

Respectfully,

1st Lt. LOUIS E. LACHOWSKY,
Arkansas National Guard.

JANUARY 29, 1957.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Rather than write you when I return home, I am taking the liberty of asking you to make a public statement as to your views on the statement by our Secretary of Defense Wilson—on the members of the National Guard being "draft dodgers" during the Korean war.

I am commander of the 327th AAA Battalion at Arkansas State College in Jonesboro—and will be glad to come to Washington to testify at any time that no guard unit

I know of took in any draft dodger—I think it is about time some of our representatives in Washington should speak up in behalf of an issue such as this. I am sure that you will find that the sentiment of the people does not agree with Mr. Wilson, and would appreciate having your views on the matter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK M. ANGELO,
Angelo Products Co., A. & P. Co-op Co.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the criticism of the National Guard by the Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Secretary of Defense owes a profound apology to the courageous officers and men of the National Guard of the United States, due to the unfortunate inference of the statement that he has made about that great organization.

During the Korean war, many elements of the National Guard of the United States served our Nation patriotically and effectively on the field of battle. The National Guard contributed 8 complete divisions, 3 separate regimental combat teams, as well as scores of group headquarters, separate battalions, and separate companies. The National Guard's contribution numbered over 1,700 Army-type units.

As National Guard units were called to the colors, the National Guard of the United States undertook to replace these units by recruiting additional manpower. For this reason, some persons gained the impression that they were not as likely to be called into combat if they joined one of these replacement units as they would be if they had been drafted into the Army. This was not the fault of the National Guard. It is a situation that could easily have been corrected by the Department of Defense. The Department could have called these replacement units into active duty and sent them overseas with the units that had preceded them.

When Mr. Wilson referred to this situation as a "scandal," he should have explained that the fault was that of the Department of Defense in permitting such a result to occur. Having been a member of the Armed Services Committee during the period in question, I am positive that the committee, as well as the Congress, would have cooperated 100 percent in supplying any legislative authorization that might have been needed to assure that replacement units of the National Guard were subject to combat to the same degree as other military units training for the defense of the country.

Practically all of the young men who joined the National Guard during the period in question volunteered for the purpose of fighting in defense of their country. If a few joined the guard because they thought their chances of combat duty were thereby diminished, such a feeling was not shared by the courageous officers and the other spirited men of the guard units.

The great majority of the men who were recruited into the replacement units were not subject to the draft because of age or other circumstances. Many of the young men in the guard were below the draft age of 19; substantial numbers over the age of 19 were exempt for a variety of reasons. Obviously, the vast majority of men could have been members of the guard for no other purpose than a sincere and patriotic desire to preserve this country against its enemies.

If the war in Korea had developed into an atomic war with Russia, every member of the guard would have been urgently needed for immediate service in the defense of this country and in maintaining order. Under these circumstances, it is extremely unfortunate that Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson should have cast a slur upon the patriotic record and fine tradition of the National Guard of the United States. The National Guard has served creditably in every American war, commencing with the War for American Independence and continuing through the Korean conflict.

In this connection, I would particularly want to make reference to the proud record of the Louisiana National Guard. During the Korean conflict, the Louisiana National Guard contributed the 773d Tank Battalion, the 122d Bombardment Squadron, and the 135th Air Control and Warning Squadron. The Louisiana National Guard stood trained, ready, and eager to furnish every one of its units at a moment's notice.

In referring to the magnificent service of the Louisiana National Guard, I would like to commend the present Adjutant General of the State of Louisiana, Maj. Gen. Raymond Hufft, one of the great fighting men of our time. Ray Hufft is one of the most decorated fighting men in the world, practically every decoration having been won upon the field of battle. His decorations include two purple hearts. The fact that he lost a lung in the fighting overseas during World War II did not diminish his zeal to serve his Nation in time of danger.

I know that every Louisianian is proud of the Louisiana National Guard just as the other States of this Union are proud of the splendid record and the courageous men who today compose the National Guard units of the United States.

FREE CHEST X-RAYS FOR SENATORS AND MEMBERS OF SENATE STAFFS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one of the major concerns of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Senate is the health of our Nation. Each year funds are appropriated to the Public Health Service for the grant-in-aid program to the States. A substantial portion of these funds are used to further the control of tuberculosis, which still remains our major communicable disease.

Tuberculosis continues to be a serious public health problem because, among other reasons, there are few early symptoms. A person may appear and feel healthy, yet have active tuberculosis. The best single diagnostic procedure in the early stages of tuberculosis is the chest X-ray. In a city where tuberculosis is especially prevalent, as it is in Washington, it is important that every person over 15 years of age have a chest X-ray at least once a year.

Free chest X-rays will be available to the Members of the Senate, to their staff members, and to their families, beginning on Monday, February 4, and continuing through Friday, February 8 in the Senate Office Building.

This service is provided as a cooperative undertaking of the Public Health Service, the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, and the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association, and it is under the supervision of Dr. George W. Calver, our Director of Medical Services.

RETIREMENT AND OTHER PRIVILEGES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, favorably reported by me on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I ask the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to this matter.

The bill provides clerical assistants and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

It is my understanding that there are only two living former Presidents of the United States, former President Hoover, and former President Truman. The bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and was passed unanimously by the Senate last year.

I have discussed the bill with the distinguished minority leader, and I am now reporting it to the calendar. It is our plan to proceed to its consideration on Monday next, if that is agreeable to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader. It is agreeable to us that it lie on the table, and that we take it up on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The proposed legislation is noncontroversial, as I understand, and there was no controversy about it in committee. It is the same bill that was reported unanimously last year and passed by the Senate last year.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by Jacob H. Gichner before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, June 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JACOB H. GICHNER BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY, JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC REPORT, JUNE 7, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Jacob Gichner. I am a mechanical engineer by profession, having received my bachelor of science degree from Lafayette College in 1924 and my master's degree in mechanical engineering from the same school in 1926. I was engaged in the metals and later the mining business during the period preceding World War II. In 1942 I was commissioned by the United

States Navy and assigned to the Bureau of Ordnance as assistant to the head of their ammunition program. I left the Navy with the rank of commander in 1946 and worked for private industry as a mechanical engineer until 1949 when, at the request of Admiral Noble, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, I put in a temporary 6-month tour as acting head of the Navy's ammunition program. As a part of this assignment, I was asked to review, evaluate, and prepare a report on the Navy's ammunition program in the years following World War II.

In December 1950 I was recalled to active duty in the rank of commander and placed in charge of the proximity (VT) fuze program, a position I held until July 1952 when I reverted to Reserve status. From then until June 1953, I was employed by the Ronson Corp., in Newark, as head of their engineering and research department. In June 1953 I left Ronson to establish my present machine tool and equipment retail business here in Washington.

I appreciate the committee's invitation to appear before it and the opportunity it affords me to relate something of the experience of the military in the procurement of the proximity fuse during the Korean conflict. I accepted the committee's invitation because I feel that much has been publicly said in the past with respect to the relative role of the watch companies and others in fuse production that simply does not accord with the facts as I know them. I have no personal stake or interest whatsoever in this question. I do feel sincerely that the record, at least as to Korea, needs be made straight, and I assure you, gentlemen, that is my sole purpose in appearing before you today.

I might explain at the outset that, according to the then-existing division of responsibility between the services, the Navy was charged with the procurement of rotating fuses of all types for the Army and Marines, as well as for its own forces. The Army, in turn, had responsibility for procuring nonrotating fuses for each of the services. In the rotating fuse family, the proximity fuse was by all odds the most important and was, and still is, one of the prime tactical weapons in our arsenal of ammunition types. During the Korean war, the Navy procured for the Armed Forces billions of these fuses at a cost of over $1½ billion.

In December 1950, when I was given responsibility for coordinating and expediting the rotating proximity fuse program for the Navy, the safety and arming devices for these fuses were being obtained exclusively from the Naval Ordnance plant in Rochester, N. Y., which was operated by Eastman Kodak under a long-standing management contract with the Navy. It was on November 26, you will recall, that the Communist forces launched a powerful counterattack from the Yalu. By the end of December they had forced the evacuation of 105,000 United Nations troops from Hungnam. These were bleak days. The decision was made almost immediately—in January 1951—to expand fuse production and broaden our source base. At that time, there were on the mobilization list of planned producers of safety and arming devices for rotating proximity fuses 12 companies—the 4 jeweled-watch manufacturers and 8 other firms outside the jeweled-watch industry, which firms are well known to this committee.

Based upon the record of past performance of these companies, comparative prices, and upon the estimates of our engineers as to their respective abilities to deliver, we selected 5 companies—Hamilton, Elgin, and Bulova and 2 outside the jeweled-watch industry—and in February awarded letters of intent to each. Each company was given almost identical orders in terms of quantities and was supplied with plans, models, and parts. From that point on, the record, I believe, is revealing.

First as to delivery performance. The first deliveries received under this crash program were received from the Elgin National Watch Co. in October or November 1951. The next company to deliver acceptable lots was the Hamilton Watch Co. in January 1952. Hamilton was followed by the Bulova Watch Co. in February. When I left the Navy in July of 1952, some 17 months after orders were placed, neither of the other two companies had been able to deliver a single lot of acceptable safety and arming devices for proximity fuses to the Armed Forces. On at least two occasions I visited the plant of one of these latter companies in an effort to assist them into production, and at one point, I recommended canceling the company's contract outright because of its apparent inability to overcome production difficulties. Several months after the contracts were awarded, the other of these two companies found it necessary to completely reengineer its production facilities from scratch.

At the beginning of the program, it was found that in many cases drawings had to be changed and deviations allowed because the plans and drawings received from Rochester had not been brought up to date at the time they were transferred to the other companies. When these changes were authorized, they were issued by means of change orders to all of the companies in the program so as to insure standardization of product. Once the original lots were accepted from each of the jeweled watch companies, requests for deviations and waivers from those companies were kept to a minimum.

Next, as to quality. Under procedures then in effect, 12 fuses from each lot of 3,000 produced were subjected to firing tests at the Army Proving Ground at Dahlgren, Va. If a single round out of these 12 failed, 36 more rounds from the same lot were tested. If there were any failures in this group, the lot was rejected. And, incidentally, since each of these rounds alone cost the Government approximately $50, not to mention the other costs of firing, refiring was an extremely costly process. In addition to the firing tests, each lot was put through what we call a jolt and jumble test. Based on the reports received by me, the reject rate on fuses containing safety and arming devices produced by the jeweled watch companies was lower than that on fuses containing devices produced by the other two companies. Actually, the first several lots received from the two companies outside the jeweled-watch industry were found unacceptable by these tests. In my judgment, both of these companies were more production conscious than quality conscious—and this no doubt accounts in no small part for their inability to deliver initial lots that were acceptable to the military. At one point, I recall, we tested over a hundred consecutive lots from the jeweled-watch companies without a single fuse failure.

Finally, as to price. The lowest prices paid by the Government for fuses under this program were charged by the Elgin National Watch Co. Elgin was followed, in order of costliness, by Bulova, Hamilton, and finally by the other two companies. It is interesting to note that while the aggregate of the costs going into the manufacture of proximity fuses had almost doubled since World War II, the military was able to obtain these fuses during the Korean war at considerably less than World War II prices. Furthermore, as the program got under way, the companies were able to reduce somewhat their prices to the Government.

I would prefer not to draw any conclusions from the foregoing. I think the experience speaks for itself. I do feel, however, that the achievement of the jeweled watch manufacturers during the Korean war is undoubtedly attributable to their continual commercial concentration on the production of close tolerance, precision-made, high-quality parts. Others can and have produced parts for proximity fuses and equivalent military instruments. The Korean experience certainly indicates to me, however, that where mass production of new military items of the proximity fuse type are urgently in need, the jeweled watch industry is likely (1) to require much less lead time, (2) to turn out a superior product, (3) at equivalent or less cost.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR IRREGULARITIES—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 13, to investigate the penetration of criminal elements into, and their influence on, organized labor in the United States, and Senate Resolution 14, to investigate the impact of labor irregularities on Government operations, including so-called racketeering practices, and whether there have been violations of Federal statutes, and the efficient enforcement thereof, which resolutions now lie on the table, be indefinitely postponed.

I have cleared my request with the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the distinguished minority leader.

In view of the fact that the Senate has created a select committee for the purpose covered in the resolutions, I believe the action I propose is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, later in the day I shall move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 637, a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, which was reported to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I shall make that motion at the conclusion of statements Senators wish to make today.

RESIGNATION OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE STANLEY F. REED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of us note with regret the determination of Associate Justice Stanley F. Reed to retire from the Supreme Court of the United States on February 25. Justice Reed, upon his retirement at the end of this month, will have completed a fine public service, both as Solicitor General of the United States and as a member of the Supreme Court.

Justice Reed is an able jurist. He is courageous. He never hesitated to dissent when his conviction caused him to come to that determination. He is a kindly man. He is alert mentally and

vigorous physically. We certainly hope that in other ways he will continue to render active public service and give to his friends and associates the benefit of his counsel.

I am happy to pay tribute to the work and public service of this outstanding American.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN DAILY DIGEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Members of the Senate, I should like to announce a change in the procedure for preparing the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to the announcements made periodically on the Senate's advance legislative program. Some Senators and their staffs have experienced difficulty in locating in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the pages on which the announcements of the Senate's program are made.

In order to eliminate that problem, we have arranged with the men who prepare the Daily Digest and the Government Printing Office to carry each day in the Daily Digest the specific page references upon which the program announcements appear. Thus, it will be possible to get the program information by glancing at the Daily Digest to determine exactly where in the RECORD such announcements appear. I hope this will save time and facilitate the efforts of each Member's office to keep informed on the schedule of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, with respect to the majority leader's announcement dealing with the Daily Digest, which is printed at the end of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to say, as one who helped organize the Digest in its present form, that I was very much pleased by what the majority leader said a few moments ago about the Daily Digest. If I understood him correctly, there will be reference in the Digest to statements with respect to the legislative program which appear in the body of the RECORD.

I ask, in the way of a humble suggestion, whether it would not be possible to print at the top of the back page of the RECORD, where reference is made to committee meetings of the next day, an announcement as to when the Senate will next meet, and also when the House will next meet. If that were done, we would have the information before us without referring to the body of the RECORD. Perhaps that is what the Senator intended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that that would be the practical effect of the announcement I have made. I will explore the Senator's suggestion as it relates to the House.

However, the question I have referred to was raised by several Senators. For example, it is now approximately 12:45, and I am making an announcement as to what will take place on Monday next. I am announcing that we will have a session on Monday next and that it is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock on that day. We have now made an arrangement whereby in the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—whether it will come under the heading "Committee Meetings" or elsewhere, although it is my impression that it will come under that heading—there will be an announcement that the Senate will meet at a certain time on a certain day, and reference will also be made to the page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where the detailed announcement concerning the legislative program appears.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that would be extremely helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

PRESENTATION OF 1957 GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the people of South Dakota have long known that in KARL MUNDT, my distinguished senior colleague, they have had a persistent worker for good government. We are pleased to note now that the American Good Government Society has decided that he is an outstanding worker for good government, and that on the 22d of February the society will present to Senator MUNDT, at the society's annual Washington's Birthday dinner, the 1957 George Washington award.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by Mr. J. Harvie Williams, executive vice president of the American Good Government Society, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, have been chosen by the American Good Government Society for its 1957 George Washington awards, to be presented at the society's annual Washington's Birthday dinner, February 22.

Trustees of the society, headed by former Nebraska Senator Edward R. Burke, have received formal acceptance from both Senator MUNDT and Representative COLMER of invitations to attend the dinner, in the Presidential Room of Hotel Statler, and to receive the awards "for outstanding contribution to good government."

Dr. John A. Krout, vice president and provost of Columbia University, will deliver the principal address of the dinner program, theme of which will be "George Washington and his close relationship to and long association with Alexander Hamilton." This is in conformance with the society's plan to build a program each year around some important activity in the career of the "Father of Our Country."

The Hamilton theme was chosen for the society's participation in the Alexander Hamilton bicentennial celebration, now underway.

Senator MUNDT and Representative COLMER will receive illuminated scrolls, bearing texts to appropriately describe briefly the contributions to good government made by each.

Presentation to MUNDT will be made by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina. COLMER will receive his scroll from Representative CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee.

Recipients of the American Good Government Society's awards during recent years include:

Former Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia, and Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, 1956; Gen. Robert E. Wood, and Representative Howard Smith, Democrat, of Virginia, 1955; former President Herbert Hoover, and recently retired Texas Gov. Allan Shivers, 1954; the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, and Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, 1953.

AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY.
J. HARVIE WILLIAMS,
Executive Vice President.

EDITORIAL COMMENT CONCERNING THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday of this week President Eisenhower sent a special message to the Congress urging that emergency action be taken to stimulate and assist the States and localities with urgently needed school construction. The President's proposals have since received wide recognition and applause on the part of the Nation's press, and I ask unanimous consent that five leading editorials, commenting upon the President's message, be printed at this point in the RECORD. The editorials are entitled as follows: "For Schools and Children" from the New York Times of January 29, 1957; "Federal Aid for Schools Needed," from the New York Herald Tribune of January 29, 1957; "School Aid: Round Two," from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 29, 1957; "The Need Must Be Met," from the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1957; and "That Children May Be First," from the Christian Science Monitor of January 29, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1957]

FOR SCHOOLS AND CHILDREN

President Eisenhower returned yesterday to a subject whose importance is generally underestimated—and this for the simple reason that it is hard to dramatize. This subject is education. It is schools and teachers. It is what happens to the rising generation. It is an integral part of the national defense, the national wealth, the national dream and hope.

The President proposes, as he did a year ago, to use Federal grants and loans to meet an educational emergency. As he promised to do during last fall's campaign, he has compressed what last year was a 5-year program into a 4-year program. The actual amounts asked are not great. Indeed, they are small change compared with what we feel obliged to put into defensive weapons and into various kinds of foreign aid. Congress is asked to grant $1.3 billion to help build new schools, to purchase up to $750 million of local school bonds if these cannot otherwise be sold at reasonable interest rates, and to put a few million dollars into studying and planning school construction programs.

The emergency exists partly because all kinds of construction were slowed down by war and partly because the increase of popu-

lation and of demands for trained individuals requires the greatest expansion of educational opportunity in our history." As the President points out, the number of pupils in the Nation's public schools has increased by 5.5 million during the past 5 years and is expected to increase by 6 million more during the next 5 years. At the same time the colleges have reached an all-time high, yet may double or even triple their enrollments during the coming 10 or 15 years.

Education, even on the highest level, has ceased to be a luxury. It has become a right for those who can qualify for it. More significant still, it has become a national necessity, for we are entering into an age of experts and specialists, without whose skilled hands and brains our infinitely complicated material civilization will not run.

True to his basic philosophy, President Eisenhower wishes to leave as much of the educational process under State and local control as is possible; shrinks from Federal interference in the kind or quality of education; would distribute grants with emphasis on need and on local cooperation rather than by a count of young noses, and would terminate extensive aid as soon as the emergency is over. He does not contemplate a nation of interchangeable robots, each reading the same page of the same textbook at the same hour.

Last year's school program perished in the House of Representatives because Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York found support for an amendment barring aid to segregated schools. This move did no good to the good cause of integration but did effectively chloroform the good cause of Federal emergency aid to education.

The President asks that this mistake not be repeated. Let us hope it won't be.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 29, 1957]

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS NEEDED

President Eisenhower, in a special message to Congress yesterday, again asked that the Federal Government grant $1.3 billions to help States build new public schools over a period of 4 years. Last year he recommended that Congress appropriate that amount for 5 years, but the bill was killed by the House of Representatives. In the meantime, a year has been lost.

The facts are that today there are some 2 million school children enrolled in public schools over and above the normal capacity of the buildings in use, and this surplus is expected to increase in the coming years. Split sessions, overcrowded classes and less teacher attention to the individual are only a few of the evils of this lack of schools. The President's plan would allocate the funds to those States with the greatest financial need, rather than on the basis of school population, and would stimulate greater State and community contributions by providing that Federal grants be matched by local appropriations after the first year. Funds would also be used to purchase some school bond issues.

There can be no doubt that the present generation of school children will not receive the education to which they are presumed to be entitled—as American citizens unless more schools are built. A teacher with more than 25 pupils in each class—considered the maximum for best instruction—cannot give each pupil the attention he deserves in the elementary grades. Double shifts in each building inevitably mean cutting corners in the amount of time devoted to each class, to study periods, to library sessions, and other correlated activities, again to the detriment of the pupils.

If communities and States simply cannot afford to increase school facilities to accommodate the growing population, the Federal Government should help out, according to President Eisenhower. And this does not in any sense mean Federal control of any kind over the teaching program. As the President pointed out in his message, the money would provide only "the bricks and mortar for school buildings, and there will be no Federal interference with local control of education." He has asked Congress to "act quickly" on this program. It should certainly do so if it expects the next generation of citizens to have an education worthy of this Nation's traditions.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 29, 1957]

SCHOOL AID: ROUND 2

President Eisenhower's proposals for Federal loans and grants to help the States erase the classroom shortage are in all essential respects the same as those he made to Congress a year ago. The House doomed aid to education last year by adopting the Powell amendment to forbid assistance to States which have segregated schools. The President recognizes that a repetition of this maneuver is threatened and hopes that this time Congress will consider school aid on its own merit, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration.

This newspaper is in wholehearted accord with that view. Even if an aid program with the restriction could be enacted—which of course it cannot—the cause of desegregation would not be advanced thereby, and many of the States that need Federal help the most would be denied it.

Mr. Eisenhower sticks to his view that Federal aid should be allocated on the basis of need as well as in proportion to school-age population. This approach was rejected by the House last year in favor of the Kelley bill which would have allotted the funds on a simple school-census basis. As the President notes, that measure "would tend to concentrate Federal aid in wealthy States most able to provide for their own needs."

We hope Congress this time will see that the Kelley formula's simplicity really amounts to extravagance and would, if adopted, be likely to increase the total Federal cost, extend the period of assistance, or both. Surely a program based upon relative need is the fairest—and most economical—device for focusing drastically needed school-construction aid.

There is room for debate, of course, over the size and pace of the program. The announced objective is to help States and localities erase a construction backlog of 159,000 classrooms in 4 years and then rely again on local revenues to keep further construction in step with rising school enrollments. The estimate of the backlog probably is conservative, and the assumption that the schools can keep apace of new needs on their own is precarious unless more is done locally in the way of raising debt limits and increasing State contributions.

But, as a beginning, the program is as much as it is realistic to ask or expect. Those who may worry that even an emergency Federal program, once begun, can never be ended would do better to worry about what will happen to the thousands of children on half-time schedules or in overcrowded classes if some assistance is not quickly made available. For youngsters grow up but once, and in the hands of those now in school the destiny of this Nation will very soon be placed.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1957]

THE NEED MUST BE MET

Congress is facing a serious obligation this year to enact a Federal aid to education bill. Repeatedly during his first administration President Eisenhower directed special appeals to the legislators to recognize—and to do something about—a nationwide need that has been steadily increasing, and will continue to increase in the near future. In Congress itself the need has been widely acknowledged, but an unusual combination of partisan and regional differences has served to defeat every legislative effort.

In his message to the 85th Congress, the President has urged again that the legislative branch authorize "a comprehensive program of Federal assistance," with greatest emphasis on financing construction to meet the critical shortage of classrooms. Referring specifically to the year already lost through failure of Congress to resolve its differences in 1956, the President has recommended a program to accomplish in 4 years what he previously estimated might safely be stretched over 5 years. In brief, his plan calls for a total of $1.3 billion in Federal construction grants to States, for Federal purchase of $750 million in local construction bonds when school districts may be unable to market them at reasonable interest rates, for $20 million in matching grants to States, and for advances to help provide reserves for local bonds.

The President also met head on three questions which have figured largely in past defeats for education legislation. First, was reaffirmation of the principle that education is basically a local responsibility, that Federal aid should be extended as an emergency measure only and without any shadow of Federal control over school systems. Fears of Federal control, or of surrender of responsibility by local communities, were believed to have been factors in defeat of a bill in the House last year. Second, was his repeated recommendation that funds be allocated on a combined formula of school-age population, local ability to meet needs and total effort within the States. Last year's bill would have distributed funds on a basis of school-age population only—a formula that would tend to concentrate aid in the larger and more wealthy States. And finally, he expressed the hope that the legislation would be enacted on its own merits, "uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problem of integration." By motion of Representative POWELL, New York Democrat, last year's bill would have barred Federal aid to prosegregation States—an amendment that prompted a heavy adverse southern vote on the ballot on which the legislation was defeated.

There is little doubt that all of these issues will be fought out again this year. But the President has made a persuasive case for action in the national interest. Congress should not fail to meet its responsibility.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 29, 1957]

THAT CHILDREN MAY BE FIRST

When Federal aid to public schools last came before Congress it was killed by a combination of those who feared it as an additional leverage toward desegregation, of those who oppose further extension of Federal functions, and of those who are for Federal economy at almost any price.

Few care to appear hostile to improved education for American youth. So there was less point-blank than oblique opposition to the bill. For instance, Congressmen who favored desegration voted for the POWELL antisegregation rider, the passage of which had been foreseen as guaranteed to kill the aid bill.

It is unlikely these assorted motivations back of opposition have been removed. The hope for Federal aid, therefore, depended

upon a marshaling of the generally pro-school American sentiments behind it into a public opinion strong enough to override any combination against it.

Into such a political weather pattern President Eisenhower has sent up another message urging national concern with the needs of public schools.

Several cautions have been in the thoughts even of people who would like to keep the segregation issue separate, who would not be doctrinaire about big government where good schooling for the Nation's children is at stake, and who would rather that Federal economy be not too severe on education. These, all together, may have damped somewhat the support required to enact school aid. The President's message takes account of these cautions.

As to keeping the segregation issue separate, Mr. Eisenhower says: "I hope this school-construction legislation can be enacted on its own merits. * * *"

Another valid cause for reluctance has been the fear lest Federal aid might mean Federal control at the cost of home rule. The President lays down as basic principles: (1) That the aid he advocates is emergency aid only—until States and communities can again take over all the burden; (2) that it "must not infringe upon the American precept" of local responsibility and control; and (3) that Federal aid must stimulate more local support—this by the device of Federal-State matching funds.

The form in which the school-aid bill finally reached the floor of Congress last year somewhat justified the widespread impression that this would be another form of Federal dole to the States: grants were to be distributed simply on the basis of the number of school-age children in each State. This, the President says, "would tend to concentrate Federal aid in wealthy States most able to provide for their own needs."

His message reemphasizes the approach he set forth a year ago: that aid should be given in proportion to local need, in inverse proportion to local resources and in recognition of local effort.

These proposals blueprint a foundation for the sound bill this newspaper called for just after Congress killed the effort last summer. Such a bill was described as "one freed from political leverages and cleansed of political sops behind which the many could unite who put children first."

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Moen, of North Dakota, concerning the price of eggs. I again call the attention of the Senate to the very low price of eggs which farmers all over the country receive compared with the prices which the consumers have to pay.

Three years ago the farmers were getting 6 cents a dozen for eggs. At that time I placed in the RECORD a letter concerning that situation. Many Senators came to me and said that that simply could not be true. So I then secured a receipt issued by the foreman of the county hatchery, which I placed in the RECORD, showing that that was the current price of eggs at that time.

At present, the price of eggs is much higher, but it is still far too low, when a comparison is made between what the farmer receives and the amount the consumer has to pay.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The farmers that have chickens surely are getting a rough deal. The egg prices are depression prices right now. We took in a few cases to produce in Grand Forks yesterday. Prices are 24 cents No. 1. Mediums are 18 cents, and pullet eggs, 15 cents per dozen. It hardly pays for feed besides all the work. The farmers would appreciate very much if you could help some along the egg prices.

Very truly,
Mr. and Mrs. OSCAR MOEN.

GILBY, N. DAK.

OBSERVANCE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1ST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be included among the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 35, and I sincerely hope that the House will expedite passage of the proposed legislation in order that the anniversary provided for may be observed with some timeliness.

The Senate passed a similar joint resolution during the last session without opposition, so I do not feel there is any necessity for bolstering arguments as to its merits.

Suffice it to say that the measure provides for greatly merited bipartisan recognition of the historic contributions made to the modern conservation movement by President Theodore Roosevelt and his Forest Chief, Gifford Pinchot.

To me, it is especially gratifying that Teddy Roosevelt, a native of the East, developed such a comprehensive and sound appreciation for the needs of the West, and the Nation as a whole, in the orderly use and conservation of the natural resources of the West. It is also significant to me that in launching the modern conservation movement at the Governors' Conference, President Theodore Roosevelt gave adequate evidence of his interest in and respect for the rights of the various States and of the people living in or near and using the public lands involved. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that the historic Governors' Conference not only was an outgrowth of a water-resource development meeting, but also directed an extreme amount of attention to problems of protecting our watersheds and developing water for the semiarid West.

For those who love and admire Teddy Roosevelt and the conservation movement, I hereby request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two summary statements on this subject which I think quite effectively underscore the importance of this legislative proposal. The first is a research paper prepared, at my request, in the fall of 1955, by Harris Collingwood, analyst in conservation and natural resources for the Library of Congress. It is entitled "Theodore Roosevelt's Conservation Program." The second item is a statement I offered in testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last June, when this proposal was under consideration by the 84th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask that these two items be published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S CONSERVATION PROGRAM

I. HISTORY

The conservation movement, as defined by Theodore Roosevelt in his autobiography, "was a direct outgrowth of the forest movement. It was nothing more than the application to our other natural resources of the principles worked out in connection with the forests. Without the basis of public sentiment which had been built up for the protection of the forests, and without the example of public foresight in the protection of this, one of the great natural resources, the conservation movement would have been impossible."

This conception was already in his mind while Governor of New York State. Some of it, no doubt, stems back to his ranch experiences in North Dakota, during the early 1880's. Twenty years later he was eager to discuss them with men of comparable vision. One such occasion occurred during the winter of 1899, when the then chief of the Bureau of Foerstry in the Department of Agriculture, Gifford Pinchot, stopped at the executive mansion in Albany, on his way to prepare a working plan for the forests of the Adirondack League Club at Tahawus, N. Y. This led to other significant conversations with Pinchot and with Frederick H. Newall, then hydrographer with the United States Geological Survey.

On the basis of this acquaintance, these men lost no time in calling on the new President immediately following his arrival in Washington after the assassination of President McKinley. This was their opportunity to outline their plans for the consolidation of the forestry work of the Government in the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Forestry, and for a national program of irrigation of the arid lands of the West.

Recalling this incident, Roosevelt later wrote: "I was a firm believer in reclamation and forestry, and after listening to my two guests, I asked them to prepare material on the subject for me to use in my first message to Congress, of December 3, 1901. This message laid the foundation for the development of irrigation and forestry during the next 7½ years. It set forth the new attitude toward the natural resources in the words: 'The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal problems of the United States'."

During the remainder of his period as President, Mr. Roosevelt repeated and developed his ideas in messages to Congress, in correspondence, and in an address to the American Forest Congress, held in Washington on January 2, 1905.

II. THE CONSERVATION PROGRAM SUMMARIZED

The conservation program was essentially a land-use program, designed for the development of the forest, grazing, and water resources of the country through effective use. It was unique in that the idea of trying to hoard or save the resource was replaced with a recognition that its capacity to produce

wealth can best be developed under programs of management which provide for effective use and continual restoration. A first step in accomplishing this was to bring the publicly owned forests and the scientifically trained foresters together. The fact that Gifford Pinchot had assembled the nucleus of such a staff in the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture, where they were associated with other similarly trained people dedicated to public service, no doubt influenced President Roosevelt's decision to get the forest reserves transferred into that Department.

In their administration these lands were to receive protection that they might be restored and the forests permitted to grow while being used. This led to the enunciation of plans to set aside areas in the reserves more suitable for growing farm crops than for growing trees or grass, for the harvesting of the trees and grass, and eventually for the development of recreation, hunting, and fishing facilities so as to be available to the public.

Most of the forest reserves consisted of lands in the high mountains, so inaccessible as to be left to public ownership. For this reason, more than any other, the Government held possession of the headwaters of most of the streams of that part of the country. Seeing the close relation of forests and water, and the latter's function as essential to the economy of the lower lands, Mr. Roosevelt was quick to see the possibility of managing the forests for water production. With that in mind, a natural step was to consider the possibility of impounding water in the mountains and adjoining country, for use during the growing season. Thus was conceived the reclamation program and the attendant governmental development of water for irrigation.

Quotations from some of Theodore Roosevelt's public statements, bearing upon the conservation program, follow. Coupled with each are references to subsequent actions by Congress, and to some of the interpretations of earlier laws, which gave life to the dream which Theodore Roosevelt called conservation.

III. CONSERVATION POLICIES AND THEIR ENACTACTMENT INTO LAW BY CONGRESS

Consolidation of Government forest activities policy: Protection of the forest reserves for which the General Land Office was responsible, mapping and description of their timber by the United States Geological Survey, preparation of plans for their conservative use, and the general advancement of practicable forestry by the Bureau of Forestry, "should be united in the Bureau of Forestry, to which they belong. * * *

"The President should have by law the power of transferring lands for use as forest reserves to the Department of Agriculture."

* * * * * *

"The scientific bureaus generally should be put under the Department of Agriculture." First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.

"One word as to the creation of a national forest service * * * which I have recommended repeatedly to Congress, and especially in my last. I wish to see all the forest work of the Government concentrated in the Department of Agriculture. It is folly to scatter such work, * * * and the policy which this administration is trying to carry out through the creation of such a service is that of making the national forests more actively and more permanently useful to the people of the West." Address to the American Forest Congress, January 2, 1905.

Legal action: Act of February 1, 1905, providing for the transfer of the forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture (33 Stat. 628; 16 U. S. C. 472).

Extension of national forests, policy: "The forest reserves will inevitably be of still greater use in the future than in the past. Additions should be made to them whenever practicable, and their usefulness should be increased by a thoroughly businesslike management." First annual mesage to Congress, December 3, 1901.

Legal action: Acquisition by purchase: The Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, with amendments).

Acquisition by donation: Clarke-McNary Act of June 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 654; 16 U. S. C. 569).

Acquisition by exchange: Act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465, as amended by act of February 28, 1925, 43 Stat. 1090; 16 U. S. C. 485, 486).

Wildlife reservation and wilderness areas, policy: "Certain of the forest reserves should also be made preserves for the wild forest creatures * * *. The increase in deer, elk, and other animals * * * may be expected when * * * forests are properly protected by law and properly guarded." First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.

Legal action: Under basic legislation pertaining to the administration of the national forests included in the act of June 4, 1897, the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to make rules and regulations and establish such services as will insure the objects of such reservations; namely, to regulate their occupancy and use and to preserve the forests thereon from destruction. Accordingly, wilderness areas of several types have been set aside within many of the national forests. Under departmental regulations U–1 and U–2, such areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture upon the recommendation of the Chief of the Forest Service. As of January 1, 1951, a total of 78 wilderness and wild areas had been set aside, covering 14 million acres.

Use of the national forests as places of recreation, policy: "* * * hundreds of persons * * * come each summer to enjoy the privilege of camping. * * * Some at least of the forest reserves should afford perpetual protection to the native fauna and flora, safe havens of refuge to our diminishing wild animals of the larger kinds, and free camping grounds for * * * ever-increasing numbers of men and women. * * * The forest reserves should be set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole and not sacrificed to the shortsighted greed of a few." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.)

Legal action: Under authority of the act of June 4, 1897, and subsequent legislation, provision for public recreation is a recognized function of national forest administration.

As of January 1, 1951, the Forest Service was maintaining 4,398 camp and picnic areas, 191 swimming areas, 208 areas for winter sports. In addition to 71 organization camps owned by the United States there were 404 privately owned organization camps on national forests. Together, these had a daily capacity of nearly 44,000 campers, and over 30 million found recreation on the national forest in 1951. The forests also claim to have 81,000 miles of fishing streams, over 2 million acres of fishing lakes and reservoirs, and an estimated 2,600,000 big-game animals.

Protection from fire, policy: "All the reserves should be better protected from fires." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.)

"The Forest Service has proved that forest fires can be controlled." (Letter from Theodore Roosevelt to Gifford Pinchot, from Oyster Bay, August 24, 1906.)

Legal action: Acting under authority of the basic act of June 4, 1897, and subsequent acts of Congress, protection of the national forests has been steadily improving, it remains, however, a major activity of the forest force. In 1950, the fires that burned a total of 330,531 acres of national forest land, consumed less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the area protected.

The Forest Service also takes the lead in encouraging organized protection against fires by the several States and by owners of forest land. Efforts in this direction were started under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961; title 16, U. S. C.), and the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 564–570, 471, 515).

Windbreaks and shelterbelts, policy: "The use of forests as windbreaks out on the plains, where the tree does not grow unless men help it, is of enormous importance." Address to the American Forest Congress, January 2, 1905.

Legal action: Action in response to this recommendation has been largely outside of the national forests. It has been encouraged by section 5, of the Clarke-McNary Act of June 24, 1924, and by legislation creating and maintaining the Soil Conservation Service. It remained, however, for President Franklin D. Roosevelt to launch the Forest Service on a large scale shelterbelt planting program by an executive order issued in 1934.

Extending the application of forestry to privately owned lands, policy: "Henceforth the movement for the conservative use of the forest is to come mainly from within; from the men who are actively interested in the use of the forest in one way or another, even more than from those whose interest is philanthropic and general." Address to the American Forest Congress, January 2, 1905.

Legal action: Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 564–570, 471 and 515); Sustained Yield Forest Management Act of March 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 132; 16 U. S. C. 583–583i); and Cooperative Forest Management Act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 473), supported by industry activities such as were initiated by the Lumber Code Authority, under the NRA of 1934, and this by a forestry division in the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, the American Forest Products Industries, Inc., the Forest Industries Council, Forest Farmers, Inc., Trees for Tomorrow, and others.

Forest reserves to be put to their highest use, policy: "Wise forest protection does not mean the withdrawal of forest resources, whether of wood, water, or grass, from contributing their full share to the welfare of the people but on the contrary, gives the assurance of larger and more certain supplies. The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use." First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.

Legal action, land settlement: Forest Homestead Act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat. 233, as amended; 16 U. S. C. 506). By March 4, 1909, the Forest Service later reported the opening of nearly half a million acres of agricultural land in the national forests to settlement under this act.

Legal action, sale of timber: Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 35); March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132; 16 U. S. C. 476). Sale of timber at cost. Act of August 10, 1912 (37 Stat. 287; 16 U. S. C. 489).

Legal action, grazing: Early in 1906, the Forest Service obtained a decision from the Attorney General stating that it was legal to require payment for the grazing of sheep and cattle on the national forests. Charges were first made in the summer of 1906. They have continued and are now an important source of revenue.

Use of national forests for grazing, policy: "I cordially approve of * * * your effort

* * * to keep the grazing lands in the forest reserves for the use of the stockman, and especially the small stockman, who actually live in the neighborhood of the reserves. * * * To keep them [the forest reserves] so they can be permanently used by the stockmen no less than by the public, you have to spend a certain amount of money. Part of this is to be obtained by charging a small fee for each head of stock pastured on the reserve. * * * It is, of course, perfectly obvious that the man who pastures his stock should pay something for the preservation of the pasture. * * * In granting grazing permits you give preference to the small nearby owners; after that, to all regular occupants of the reserve range; and finally to the owners of transient stock. * * * This system prevents the grass from being eaten out by the great herds or flocks of nonresidents, for only enough cattle and sheep are admitted upon the reserves to fatten upon the pasturage without damaging it. In other words, * * * the forest reserves are to be used * * * in favor of the actual homemaker, of the man with a few dozen or a few score head of cattle, which he has gathered by his own industry and is himself caring for. This is the kind of man upon whom the foundations of our citizenship rests, and it is eminently proper to favor him in every way." Letter to James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, following transfer of the forest reserves, December 21, 1905. * * *

"Recent investigations have demonstrated the destructive character of the free-range system in the past. * * * The grazing value of much of these lands is not now more than half what it once was. It therefore becomes the duty of the Government to see to it that in the future these lands are used in a way that will preserve their grazing value and give them the greatest usefulness to the people. * * *

"The future welfare of almost the entire West depends upon the preservation of the water supply, and this in turn upon the wise use of the forest and the range. * * *

"The forest reserves belong to all the people, but the grazing privilege can be used by only a few. It is therefore only just and right that those who enjoy the special advantages of a protected range should contribute toward the expense of handling the reserves." Letter from President Theodore Roosevelt to Gifford Pinchot, November 27, 1905.

Legal action: Rules and regulations for grazing on the forests were first developed under authority of the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 35; 16 U. S. C. 551). Thereafter, on the basis of accumulated experience, they were considerably expanded and perfected under the act of April 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 82). This act permits the election of local grazing advisory boards, and authorizes issuance of grazing permits for periods not to exceed 10 years.

Reclamation and irrigation policy: "The wise administration of the forest reserves will be not less helpful to the interests which depend on water than to those which depend on wood and grass. The water supply itself depends upon the forest. In the arid region it is water, not land, which measures production. The western half of the United States would sustain a population greater than that of our whole country today if the waters that now run to waste were saved and used for irrigation. The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal questions of the United States.

* * * * *

"Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the flood waters. * * * The storing of the floods in reservoirs at the headwaters of our streams is but an enlargement of our present policy of river control. * * *

"The Government should construct and maintain these reservoirs as it does other public works.

* * * * *

"Irrigation works should be built by the Government * * * and the cost of construction should, so far as possible, be repaid by the land reclaimed. The distribution of the water * * * should be left to the settlers themselves in conformity with State laws and without interference with those laws or with vested rights. The policy of the National Government should be to aid irrigation in the several States and Territories in such manner as will enable the people in the local communities to help themselves, and as will stimulate needed reforms in the State laws and regulations governing irrigation.

* * * * *

"A careful study should be made, both by the Nation and the States, of the irrigation laws and conditions here and abroad. Ultimately it will probably be necessary for the Nation to cooperate with the several arid States in proportion as these States by their legislation and administration show themselves fit to receive it." First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.

Legal action: Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388). The law applied to 16 Western States. On March 14, 1903, six major projects were approved, and on August 28, 1903, construction was started on the Truckee-Carson project in Nevada.

The 160-acre limitation as written into the Reclamation Act of 1902, limits to 160 acres of irrigable land, the amount of water that can be supplied to any one landowner from a Federal project. This may be increased to 320 acres in the case of a man and wife. Designed to give the largest possible number of farmers and farms an opportunity to use water from such projects, the provision has proved difficult to enforce and has been bitterly opposed in parts of the West.

After 4 years, Theodore Roosevelt in a letter to Gifford Pinchot, commented on the rapid progress made by the reclamation program, and pointed out some of the dangers and difficulties still ahead. "There remains," he wrote, "the critical question of how best to utilize the reclaimed lands by putting them into the hands of actual cultivators and homemakers, who will return the original outlay in annual installments paid back into the reclamation fund; the question of seeing that the lands are used for homes, and not for purposes of speculation or for the building up of large fortunes.

"The requirement of the Reclamation Act that the size of the farm unit shall be limited in each region to the area which will comfortably support one family must be enforced in letter and spirit. * * *

"You should * * * give * * * support to the officers of the Government * * * in getting back the original investment, so that the money may be used again and again in the completion of other projects and thus in the general extension of prosperity in the West. * * *"

At this point he recognized the interest which had bound the two men together during much of his entire life. "By the side of the reclamation service there has grown up," he wrote, "the Forest Service, which was created when the charge of the forest reserves was transferred from the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture. The forest policy of the administration, which the Forest Service is engaged in carrying out, is based * * * on the vigorous purpose to make every resource of the forest reserves contribute in the highest degree to the permanent prosperity of the people who depend upon them. If ever the time should come when the western forests are destroyed, there will disappear with them the prosperity of the stockman, the miner, the lumberman and the railroads, and most important of all, the small ranchman who cultivates his own land. I know that you are with me in the intention to preserve the timber, the water, and the grass by using them fully, but wisely and conservatively. We propose to do this through the freest [sic] and most cordial cooperation between the Government and every man who is in sympathy with the policy, the wisdom of which no man who knows the facts can for a moment doubt." Letter to Gifford Pinchot, from Oyster Bay, August 24, 1906.

SOURCES

American Forestry Association. Proceedings of the American Forest Congress. January 2 to 6, 1905. Washington, D. C., H. M. Suter (SD 118 .A5 1905).

Irion, Harry, The principal laws relating to the establishment of the national forests and to other Forest Service activities. Washington, U. S. D. A., Agricultural Handbook, No. 20, May 1951.

Morison, Elting E. (selected and edited by), The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, vols. 5 and 6, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1952 (E 757 .R 7958).

Pinchot, Gifford, Breaking New Ground, New York, Harcourt-Brace, 1947 (E 664 .P62 A3).

Richardson's Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. XIII. New York, Bureau of National Literature, Inc. (J. 81 .B 97).

Roosevelt, Theodore, Theodore Roosevelt—An Autobiography, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913 (E 757 .R 791).

HARRIS COLLINGWOOD,
Analyst in Conservation and Natural Resources, Economics Division, Library of Congress.

OCTOBER 6, 1955.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS, OF UTAH, RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139, PROVIDING FOR OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity provided for me to appear before this committee to endorse the proposal to establish a commission to plan and direct a nationwide observance of the 50th aniversary of the conservation movement.

However, my purpose in appearing before you is not only to endorse the suggestion, but also to point out the comprehensive scope of the conservation movement set in motion by the Conference of Governors convened in 1908 by that great President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Conservation, as "Teddy" Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot visualized it, was not confined merely to the preservation of scenery. It involved the conservation and wise use of all our natural resources. It was a bipartisan program, involving the active participation of the States, as evidenced by the convening of the 1908 Conference of Governors, a historic event which this legislation will memorialize.

I not only believe that we should commemorate this occasion, which marked the real origin of the conservation movement, but also that we, as conservationists, should utilize this golden aniversary for some soul-searching and stock-taking to assure ourselves that our efforts in this direction are holding to the objectives and principles as laid down by the movement's founding fathers half a century ago.

To that end, I request you to review with me the origins and recommendations of that historic Conference of Governors of 1908.

In a preface to the official Proceedings of the Conference of Governors, Secretary W. J. McGee makes this summation of the movement's origins:

"The idea of conserving the Nation's resources arose partly from the recent forestry movement, partly from the still more recent waterway movement."

In short, the conservation movement originated in part from the national forest program, established by Teddy Roosevelt and the Congress primarily to preserve the Nation's watersheds, and the waterway movement, another great water resource program to develop the country's rivers and navigable lakes.

This disclosure may come as a distinct surprise to some modern-day conservationists, who apparently have become obsessed with the idea that the conservation and development of water resources is inimical to the aims of conservation. Actually, as the record shows, the water development program was responsible for the very genesis of this great natural resources conservation movement.

President Roosevelt is very specific on this subject in a quotation presented by Mr. McGee in that same preface. The germ of the idea for the Conference of Governors, he said, "took form in an address by President Roosevelt before the Society of American Foresters (of which he was, and is, an associate member), March 26, 1903. In expressions indicating perhaps more clearly than any of the earlier date, the interdependence of our resources, he said to the forest students:

"'Your attention must be directed to the preservation of the forests, not as an end in itself, but as a means of preserving the prosperity of the Nation. * * * In the arid region of the West agriculture depends first of all upon the available water supply. In such a region forest protection alone can maintain the streamflow necessary for irrigation and can prevent the great and destructive floods so ruinous to communities farther down the same streams. * * * The relation between forests and the whole mineral industry is an extremely intimate one. The very existence of lumbering * * * depends upon the success of our work as a nation in putting practical forestry into effective operation. As it is with mining and lumbering, so it is in only a less degree with transportation, manufactures, and commerce in general. The relation of all these industries to forestry is of the most intimate and dependent kind.'"

Later, in appointing the Inland Waterways Commission, an event of historic importance in the development of our great national waterways system, President Teddy Roosevelt made this comment, further attesting to the interdependence of our natural resources:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. * * * The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. * * * It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan * * * without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Therefore, I ask that the Inland Waterways Commission shall consider the relations of the streams to the use of all the great permanent natural resources and their conservation for the making and maintenance of prosperous homes."

In announcing his plans to convene the Conference of Governors, President Roosevelt made this comment in the course of an address before the Lakes-to-Gulf Deep Waterway Association meeting at Memphis on October 4, 1907:

"As I have said elsewhere, the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. To solve it, the whole Nation must undertake the task through their organizations and associations, through the men whom they have made specially responsible for the welfare of the several States, and finally through Congress and the Executive. As a preliminary step, the Inland Waterways Commission has asked me to call a conference on the conservation of natural resources, including, of course, the streams, to meet in Washington during the coming winter. I shall accordingly call such a conference. It ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

When the historic Governors' Conference convened in 1908, it included not only the Governors of the respective States, but also representatives or organizations concerned with preservation and wise use of our forest watersheds and timber, our streams, and our minerals. It was truly a conservation conference, in every sense of the word.

The comprehensive nature of this first national conservation conference was reflected in the declaration of views and recommendations which was submitted and approved at the fifth session of the 3-day Washington conference. The proceedings of this session, in respect to these recommendations, are so significant, that I hereby request that an extract of the proceedings of this session be introduced into the record as a part of my remarks. But, in summary, I present herewith some extracts from the declaration which emphasize the interdependence of natural resources in this movement:

"The great prosperity of our country rests upon the abundant resources of the land.

"We look upon these resources as a heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the comfort, prosperity, and happiness of the American people. * * *

"We declare our firm conviction that this conservation of our natural resources is a subject of transcendent importance which should engage unremittingly the attention of the Nation, the States, and the people in earnest cooperation. These natural resources include the land on which we live and which yields our food; the living waters which fertilize the soil, supply power, and form great avenues of commerce; the forests which yield the materials for our homes, prevent erosion of the soil, and conserve the navigation and other uses of our streams; and the minerals which form the basis of our industrial life, and supply us with heat, light, and power.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease; that there should be reclamation of arid and semiarid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the people; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries, and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness, and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.

"We urge the continuation and extension of forest policies.

"We recognize in our waters a most valuable asset of the people of the United States.

"Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity."

That declaration of 1908 stamped that Conference of Governors as a real meeting of conservationists, vitally interested in all the natural resources of this great country.

As a part of the program for commemorating this half century of conservation, I recommend the convening of a similar conference of governors and representatives of all natural resource organizations for the purpose of taking stock of our progress and reevaluating our problems in terms of successes and failures during the past 50 years. Perhaps the convocation of such an assembly will serve to remind all who express interest in such a movement that all our natural resources are worthy of the attention of conservationists of the stature of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

Out of such a second governors' conference at the halfway point in the first century of organized conservation may come renewed cooperation and interest in the overall problems of conserving and utilizing our natural resources. Problems in this field are destined to get worse before they get better, and our success in conserving and wisely using our natural resources in the face of increasing pressures and increasing population will call for cooperative, farsighted statesmanship of the type displayed by those eminent founders of the century's great bipartisan conservation movement.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yesterday the President transmitted to the House of Representatives a message recommending certain changes in the immigration laws, which message was printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. Today the Senate received an identical message, and if there is no objection, it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No objection being heard, the message is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF QUESTIONS AFFECTING ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have been witnessing the rapid disintegration of the bipartisan foreign policy of this Nation. It is time someone called a halt to action so damaging to our national security.

During the perilous war years and the years of reconstruction the American people demanded that partisan politics be laid aside while this Nation struggled with the forces that sought to destroy free men. Great leaders in the Democratic and Republican Parties

worked constantly to see that the Nation put partisanship aside, as it looked abroad. President Roosevelt brought Republicans like Secretary of War Stimson into his Cabinet. The Department of State made use of the brains and ability of such Republican men as John J. McCloy, Robert Lovett, and John Foster Dulles, and hundreds of others who could be named.

Today, President Eisenhower, in the face of ominous threats from abroad, has sought the counsel and advice of such eminent Democrats as Walter George and Dick Richards. He has appointed men like Ambassador Bunker and Mr. Zellerbach to responsible diplomatic posts.

In short, Mr. President, it seems to me that the men to whom this Nation has looked for leadership in the office of President have soon found their responsibilities in protecting this Nation have demanded that they pursue our foreign policy goals without partisanship.

I believe this idea was implicit in the Constitution. When this Nation was formed the Founding Fathers decreed that no treaty could go into effect unless approved by two-thirds of the Senate. In 1789 the only intercourse this Nation had which involved the Congress directly was by the treaty device. But today, much of our foreign policy revolves around foreign-aid bills and resolutions of the Formosa or Middle East type. If we are to speak with the firm voice the Founding Fathers required in matters of foreign relations, our congressional acts today must reflect strong bipartisan support.

If we are to be true to the standards set forth by the Founding Fathers, and if this Nation is to deal with other sovereign and powerful nations on a plane of full power and equality, we must do our utmost to bring about unity within the Nation before we assert leadership abroad.

It is a joint responsibility, Mr. President, of the Executive and the Members of this body to search constantly for positions of mutual accommodation so that our external enemies may not profit by divisions within our own country.

As rational men we know that we can be wrong. We know that intelligent, loyal, and conscientious men may judge facts in different lights and prescribe differing policies. In recent weeks there have been frequent critical references to Mr. Dulles, to President Eisenhower, and to our policy in the Middle East, just as in recent years there were critical references to Democratic leaders.

I might devote some time to criticism of the pre-Eisenhower mistakes. But I ask, would that advance the security of this Nation? Would it advance our security to recall the years when Democratic Members of this body answered Republican critics of the loss of China by asserting there was nothing the United States might have done which would have altered the tragic series of events in China?

Does it advance the national security today for some of the critics of what is being done in the serious situation in the Middle East to urge that somehow our Nation pushed the wrong button in the Middle East or failed to snap its fingers at the right time, and thus somehow failed to bring order out of Middle East tension?

My point is, Mr. President, that there is blame enough to go around. Man is not infallible; and we must not forget that Presidents and Secretaries of State are men, and may make mistakes. They may do so, whether they are Republicans or Democrats. The same may be said of the Members of the Senate of the United States.

I believe the American people realize it is much easier to destroy than to build. Millions of our citizens recently witnessed on television the inauguration of President Eisenhower. One thing they may not have realized was that the construction of the inaugural stands was commenced last fall before the election. Yet, today, as I look out on that Capitol Plaza—only some 10 days after the inaugural ceremonies—I see that the inaugural stands have been dismantled. In 10 days a handful of workmen have dismantled a structure that an army of men took 90 days to build.

Are we now in the process of dismantling in a few short days a structure of bipartisan foreign-policy statesmanship that has been built over the past decade by such men as Cordell Hull and Arthur Vandenberg? I hope not, Mr. President. But I suggest that it behooves each Senator to examine his actions and to make sure that what he says and what he does will build, instead of destroy.

Mr. President, I realize that the big issue is whether the Kremlin is to take over the Near East, which has 70 percent of the oil of the world, and whether the Kremlin is to find a passageway to Africa, in which continent so many of the vital strategic materials of the world are to be found. I also realize that last year the Congress appropriated $750 million for this area. I know that the President is not asking for one penny of additional appropriations. All he is requesting is that he be given additional time in which to handle approximately $200 million of that appropriation. In substance, that is the situation. However, we also know that, not for one year or for decades, but for centuries, it has been the hope of the Russians to obtain this gateway to Africa. Now that oil has become so important in the life of the world, if the Kremlin were permitted to take over that area, that would mean that the free world would be given a most serious stab in the back, one from which it might not recover. So it is, Mr. President, that the resolution simply calls a spade a spade.

My remarks should not be construed as an attempt to stifle criticism of our President or of our Secretary of State, although I must say that we seem somehow to contrive to make a Secretary of State, regardless of party, the Nation's scapegoat for anything that goes wrong outside our borders.

Constructive criticism is a legitimate device, however, for the government of freemen.

It has often been said that the President proposes foreign policy and the Congress disposes of foreign policy. However, this is not what happens. Instead, the President proposes a course of action which he, with the advice of thousands of loyal Americans, believes will best serve the interests of the Nation. The Congress measures that expert advice against the vast knowledge and tremendous strength of the American people. The Congress must seek to shape the President's proposals in such a way as to command the widest possible support of the people, to whom the Members of Congress are most immediately and directly responsible.

Here lies our strength, for it is only as our policy has the wide support of Americans that it can be strong.

Mr. President, having practiced law for 30 years before I came to this august body, let me say that long ago I was taught not to permit myself to be led up blind alleys, but in each case to ascertain the real issue.

In this case, the issue is whether the preservation of the United States and the rest of the free world requires that the proposed step be taken. I believe that we should take it. When the resolution was first introduced in the Senate, I asked four questions, and then sat down. Later on, when the resolution is reported to the Senate, I shall answer the questions in accordance with the facts which have been developed in the committee. However, I have just answered in the affirmative one of those questions.

My good friend, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] a few days ago made on this floor some remarks which he entitled "Foreign Policy and the Democratic Majority." I do not agree with some of his remarks and conclusions, but it was his right to engage in criticism of the foreign policy of the Nation. At the conclusion of his remarks, however, he made some comments with which I can agree. He said, for example:

> There is a need to return not only the formulation of foreign policy, but its conduct, to where they belong—to the President and his Secretary of State.

Mr. President, those were the important words of a Democratic Senator. He urged that the formulation and the conduct of our foreign policy be returned where they belong, namely, to the President and the Secretary of State. The Senator from Montana and I seem to agree that the people of the Nation have delegated to the President of the United States the immense task of formulating our foreign-policy proposals. Our President has at his command thousands of experts. He is in the best position to judge the needs of the national security.

Mr. President, that is the issue. Today, when the fallout from a hydrogen bomb can cover an area 300 miles wide and 1,400 miles long; when American ingenuity has developed airplanes which

can travel at speeds of between 1,000 and 1,900 miles an hour; and when, as the Army has said, a third world war would cost the lives of 70 million Americans, it is well and wise for us to stop, look, and listen, and to ask what preservation measures we can take.

Mr. President, in the interest of the promotion of our national security, President Eisenhower has proposed a course of action for this Nation in the Middle East. His proposals deserve our most careful consideration. The presumption should be that he is right in his prescription. Those who believe his proposal to be in error have the burden of proving him wrong. I do not question their right—or, indeed, their duty—to question this proposal most carefully. But I do insist that the motive of the critics must be above suspicion. They must not seek political gain for themselves or for party. The security and safety of the Nation are at stake. They must constructively help in the formulation of a policy which will advance the security interests of the American people and the safety of the United States and of the other free peoples of the world.

The Senator from Montana also stated—

and beyond all else there is a need for clear, continuous, and constructive leadership from the President of the United States—leadership which will point the way toward peace in a world where there is no peace.

These are statements, Mr. President, with which few of us would disagree.

It is my belief that the President is providing constructive leadership toward the permanent peace we all so greatly desire and need. His mandate from the American people is fresh, clear, and strong. This Nation is at the peak of its economic and military strength. On that point I could speak at length. Today the United States has an economic product amounting to $430 billion annually, and a national income amounting to approximately $340 billion. Furthermore our Nation stands on moral principles recognized throughout the world. We cannot lie down on the job.

If the downtrodden people of this earth are to find hope, it is in the United States. If the enslaved peoples of earth are to find hope for freedom, it is in the United States. If the war-weary people of earth are to find hope for permanent peace, they look to this Nation for leadership.

But to believe these things is not enough. There is need that our actions in Congress—the right arm of the President in the conduct of foreign policy—show the world at large that our foreign policy is unified, strong, and based on universal principles acceptable to all free people.

I have great confidence, Mr. President, in the ability of the American people to distinguish between constructive criticism and blatant, befuddled badgering.

I respectfully suggest that transient headlines are no substitute for statesmanship.

The time has come for the Senate of the United States to buckle down to the job and to consider the President's proposal on its merits, amend it as the majority of Senators find necessary, and present the results to the world with the resounding unanimity of which a free people are capable when they see their vital free interests in danger.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that it is our plan, when we conclude business today, to adjourn until Monday and, unless something unforeseen develops, to adjourn from Monday until Thursday.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE BY SENATOR ELLENDER OF HIS INTENTION TO ADDRESS THE SENATE ON THURSDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to announce, if it is agreeable to the majority and the minority, that I intend to make my report on my recent world trip on next Thursday, February 7. I was abroad 3 months and I visited 32 countries. I have been in the process of preparing my report for over 2 months. I shall be ready to make it on Thursday. I should like to ask my good friend the majority leader whether Thursday would be suitable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Thursday is entirely agreeable to the majority leader. I appreciate the consideration the senior Senator from Louisiana always shows for the leadership in matters of this kind. The senior Senator from Louisiana knows the majority leader has a very high regard for his opinions, and is looking forward anxiously to his report. There is no Member of the Senate who is more thorough or who is more comprehensive in his reports to this body. I know that every Member of the Senate will be interested in the observations and in the recommendations of the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the Senator from Texas for his kind remarks.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate bill 637, a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, passed this body, and is one of the first substantial pieces of legislation to be passed by the Senate. It went to the House. The House adopted an amendment involving some $30 million additional. The amendment is now at the desk. I desire to have it laid before the Senate, in order that I may move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the fifth sentence of section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $230,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (a)."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out "$375,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$455,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished able junior Senator from Pennsylvania and ask him to explain, for the benefit of the Members of the Senate, the effect of the House amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when the bill came before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency it was our thought that if we provided the additional lending authority which the Small Business Administration asked for, namely, $65 million, it would be adequate to carry the Administration's lending facilities through the end of the current fiscal year. There had been some doubt in the Senate committee as to whether the amount requested was in fact sufficient, but we concurred in the view that what the agency wanted would be adequate.

When the bill went to the House it was pointed out that the authority of the Small Business Administration to make loans may well continue to July 31, or an additional month, and that if the Congress should be so involved in its business as to be unable to enact permanent legislation with respect to the Small Business Administration by the end of June, it would be desirable to have the 30-day leeway in order to give additional time for permanent legislation to be enacted. Because of that situation it was thought that this additional lending authority would be needed.

It is therefore the view of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I have been authorized to represent at this time, that the additional authorization of $15 million provided by the House amendment is desirable, and I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate bill 637.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement before the motion is acted upon.

It is a source of deep satisfaction that one of the earliest actions of this Congress should be on a measure affecting small business.

This, of course, is not a bill which purports to solve the problems of small business. It simply adds to the lending authority of the Small Business Administration so that small businesses may acquire some of the capital they need in order to survive.

This body, in its wisdom, has created a Select Committee on Small Business, headed by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

On Monday it is my intention to submit to the Senate for its consideration the new membership of that Select Committee. I expect it to be extremely active in this session, because I think there was never a time in the history of the Nation when the problems of small business needed our attention more than it is needed now.

It is my belief that before this session has ended we will have to act in more basic fields of the problem—unless we are willing to see small business become smaller until it reaches the vanishing point. The facts and figures that are available indicate that the situation is becoming desperate.

Sylvia Porter, an unusually acute observer of the financial scene, estimated recently that between 240 and 250 business firms will go bankrupt every week of this year. I ask unanimous consent that her column on this subject be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my statement as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the cause of this disturbing trend in failures is not altogether clear. But certain things are readily apparent.

The tight money policy hits the small-business man much harder than it hits the big fellow.

The continual trend toward mergers of big companies leave a smaller share of the market for the average businessman.

Rising costs all along the line add to the difficulties of a small firm in meeting expenses.

And, of those increasing costs, one of the most important is the increasing cost of money. This is something that is felt all along the line—by business, by government, and by the average citizen.

Mr. President, I am told that if the interest rates applicable to the Federal debt in 1952 had held at those lower levels, and been applicable to the 1956 debt, our taxpayers would have been saved approximately $717 million.

We must also realize that the problems of financing are complicated in every field as the cost of money constantly rises. Because of the constant rise in interest rates, municipalities are assuming excessively heavy interest obligations in order to sell their bonds.

Mr. President, this is a situation that can change our whole economy. The rising cost of money and other necessities represents a constant squeeze on small business—and the squeeze will eliminate many as time goes on.

I have never been opposed to big business as such, as it plays a vital role in our whole economy. But we face the problem of maintaining the free-enterprise system, and that is something we cannot do unless we help small business remain vital and flourishing.

This is a problem which must be tackled from many standpoints. The Congress has the committees. They are ably led and I think ably manned with most efficient staffs. I believe they can, and I hope they will, during this session face up to this challenge and do the job as it ought to be done.

Again, Mr. President, let me express my deep satisfaction that one of the first acts of this Congress is designed to meet one of the immediate needs of small business.

I wish again to pay tribute to and to commend the very able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the initiative he took in this measure and for the efficiency and the capacity which he has demonstrated in handling this piece of legislation. It is now ready to go to the President for appropriate action, and we are grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the members of his committee on both sides of the aisle for the help that they have given to the small-business men of this country. I have no doubt that the small-business men will always remember this action.

EXHIBIT 1

SMALL FIRMS IN CRISIS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Every week this year, between 240 and 250 business firms will fail—and most of them will be small companies. Most of the bankruptcies will wipe out the owners and their families.

By the end of 1957 about 13,000 business firms will have died.

This will be a year of crisis for small business and the crisis is likely to get worse.

This is the grim picture at a time when the chief concern of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board is that the overall economy will become too "exuberant." This is the situation at a time when the President is emphasizing that prosperity—not depression—is the major problem facing the country.

I'm not guessing about the trend of business failures. I'm simply making a conservative projection of the statistics on business failures released each week by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Already, 1957 has exceeded the same periods of 1956, 1955, as far as business bankruptcies go. The average is about 240 a week against 222 in 1956 and 199 in 1955. And while the failures are concentrated in retailing, small manufacturing and homebuilding, the casualties cross all industry and trade groups, crop up in all areas of the country.

It's a certainty that the plight of the small-business man will intensify, unless the administration and Congress act quickly and boldly to give small business essential relief.

Competition in every line of industry and commerce is getting fiercer. Big companies are merging with big companies; medium-size firms are merging with medium-size firms. The small independent in retailing, wholesaling, and manufacturing is at an increasing disadvantage.

Tight money is hitting the smaller business borrower much harder than the big. In a period when the demand for money exceeds the supply of money, it's understandable that lenders will prefer the safer, more established firm over the little fellow. It's understandable, but that doesn't lessen the impact on the small borrower.

RISING COSTS CITED

The rising emphasis in our land on research, new and improved inventions, etc., obviously favors the big corporation. Add rising costs of manpower and materials as well as money, and you have the basic factors in the stark trend.

Before the election, a lot of pious words were said by the Republicans and the Democrats about helping the small-business man, and since Congress convened a lot more pious words have been said. The bright hopes of speedy action are dimming, though.

President Eisenhower is on record with a pledge of tax relief to small corporations. But the Treasury is arguing it can't afford to lose any revenue. In Congress, Democratic leaders are quarreling about how the relief should be granted and Republicans are dragging their feet.

That small business should be in this crisis after the most prolonged period of unparalleled prosperity in history is terrifying. The small-business man is the heart and backbone of our economic system. If he dies, private enterprise dies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like the RECORD to show the appreciation of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania for the fine cooperation which the leadership on both sides of the aisle rendered in making possible the expeditious passage of this quite important piece of legislation. I thank both the majority leader and the minority leader for their cooperation in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under rule XIII be dispensed with on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say in explanation that I hope the committees will get some bills on the calendar. As soon as they do, we shall be prepared to consider them.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 117, relating to the Middle East situation, which was received from the House today. It is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 19, which was, by unanimous consent, referred to the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees jointly.

Without objection, House Joint Resolution 117 will be referred to the same committees jointly.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and de-

fense of their independence was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services jointly.

PROVISION OF RETIREMENT AND OTHER PRIVILEGES TO FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier today there was reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a bill relating to former Presidents of the United States, namely, Senate bill 607. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the question of the ultimate disposition of the Straits of Tiran which control the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, the policing of the Gaza strip, and of the border between Egypt and Israel.

I preface my remarks by saying that in his press conference on Wednesday the President of the United States complained about the criticisms which were being made of his foreign policy by certain Democratic Senators. In the main, he took the position that such criticisms were frivolous and generalized, that they were lacking in documentation, and that they were based upon hindsight and devoid of any constructive alternatives.

Were I to discuss this remark of the President of the United States in detail I should find myself compelled to disagree with him. I think the comments of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] have been in good taste and extremely constructive, and that it does not contribute to a unified attitude on the part of our Nation to brand these remarks in the fashion in which it was done by the President of the United States. But I do not intend to speak on that subject today. Instead, I wish to discuss a very concrete question upon which a decision must be made by our State Department and by the United Nations, possibly within the next day, and certainly within a few days. This is not hindsight but rather foresight.

There is now pending before the United Nations, meeting in New York, a resolution requiring the Israeli troops to withdraw from the positions which they have taken at the Straits of Tiran controlling the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, and compelling them to withdraw from the Gaza strip, which runs up from Egypt along the seacoast into what used to be known as Palestine. Furthermore, no provision is made for a neutralized zone between that section of the Sinai Desert under the control of Egypt and the State of Israel.

It is well known that the American delegate to the United Nations, and the entire American delegation to that body, operate under instructions which are given them by our State Department. Therefore the policy which they support in the lobbies of the United Nations and on the floor of the United Nations is the policy of our Government.

Tomorrow, in all probability, a vote will be taken on this crucial question; and while the information we get from the press dispatches is incomplete, there is good ground to believe that the policy which our Government has adopted hitherto is very dangerous to the peace of the world and the ultimate security of this region, and that if persisted in, it may result in disaster.

Therefore, it seems to me highly appropriate that on the floors of Congress, while there is yet time in these concluding hours, the issue be analyzed, so that no complaint can be made afterward that it is hindsight and lack of constructive suggestions which have been presented.

With the forebearance of Senators, I should like to analyze the importance of these areas. I have placed two maps behind me. One is a large map of the entire Middle Eastern area, and the other is a smaller map dealing with the immediate sections of Arabia and the Middle East.

Virtually all of the oil of the Middle East comes from the middle and northern sections of the Persian Gulf, and, in the case of Iraq, also from the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. Those rivers empty into the Persian Gulf.

This oil from the Persian Gulf area, which comprises three-fourths of the known oil resources of the world, and which furnishes more than two-thirds of the oil which Western Europe consumes daily—namely, 2 million out of 3 million barrels—can be taken to Western Europe in 2 different ways.

Approximately 1,200,000 barrels can come around the Arabian Peninsula, up the Red Sea, and through the Suez Canal by tanker; then the tankers continue their course through the Mediterranean and in some cases into the Atlantic.

There were also three pipelines from Saudi Arabia and Iraq which led to ports in Lebanon. Now, as we all know, the Suez Canal has been blocked by the sinking of ships on the part of Egypt, and 2 of the 3 pipelines have been blown up by Syrian troops. Therefore, there is only one pipeline taking oil from Saudi Arabia to the Mediterranean port of Sidon.

So, the direct connections formerly relied upon for the shipping of 2 million barrels of oil have been cut down probably to not more than three or four hundred thousand barrels a day through the one pipeline which remains.

If we look at the maps in detail, we find that there is a possible supplementary or alternative route to the Suez Canal, and one also which can be supplementary or an alternative to the pipelines which have been blown up. That would be a pipeline from the Israeli port of Elath, at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba at the southernmost point of Israel, across Israel and to a port such as Haifa or Jaffa. There is no reason why this pipeline route should be confined to one pipeline. There could be two or more pipelines. Under those conditions the oil would move entirely through the State of Israel, and would not be subject to the difficulties which come from pipelines running through Syria. I wish to emphasize again that two of those pipelines have been blown up.

Furthermore, such a pipeline would not be under the control of Egypt.

Prior to October 29, 1956, the entire Sinai Peninsula, including the area controlling the Straits of Tiran was entirely in the possession of Egypt. Egypt had erected shore batteries at the Straits of Tiran and had occupied the islands which lie in those straits, and had prevented the passage of any ships in or out of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israeli ships did present themselves and were fired upon by the shore batteries and were compelled to turn back.

This, I believe, was a violation of all the rules of neutrality, although the Egyptians justified it on the ground that the war of 1948 between Egypt and Israel had not been terminated.

It was largely to prevent the Gulf of Aqaba from being closed that the Israelis invaded the Sinai Peninsula. That was not the sole reason. There were also border raids coming from the Sinai Peninsula. However, one the major purposes of the military movement by Israel was to get control of the Straits of Tiran to dismantle the shore batteries, and to make it possible for tankers and other ships to come into that gulf. They were successful in that operation. I shall not go into the military campaign, except to say that the forces of Israel won a quick and overwhelming victory.

Arrangements were made with French financial interests to construct the pipeline from Elath, at the head of the gulf, through to Haifa, entirely within Israeli territory.

It is my information that this work has begun.

The resolution proposed in the United Nations by the Arab-Asian bloc calls for the withdrawal of Israel troops, and for nothing but the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai Peninsula and from Gaza. The Israeli troops are to get out of the Sinai Peninsula, and then nothing is said as to what is to happen when the Israeli troops do get out.

We know quite well, from the experience in Egypt, that if that is all that is done, when the Israeli troops do get out, the Egyptian troops will move in.

While I am discussing this I should like to say that while I approve in general

of the position which our Government took before the United Nations in disapproving the attack by Britain and France upon Egypt, I believe I can say that in the heat and speed of decision, a very crucial mistake was made, in that the situation along the Suez Canal was permitted to return to what lawyers call the status quo ante.

As the British and French forces moved out, the Egyptian forces moved in. The U. N. troops were performing an important function in merely serving to prevent open hostilities between the Egyptian troops and the British and French troops once a cease-fire is agreed upon. In any event, the Suez Canal is now in the military control of Egypt, and it will be very difficult, indeed, to replace it with any real international control. Time has moved on. The Egyptian troops are there. It will be almost impossible to oust them. Colonel Nasser and his government, therefore, will control the movement of oil ships through the canal in the future. Since his troops are there, passage will exist at the sufferance of Egypt. Even though traffic may be resumed after the canal is physically cleared, it can be closed down again at any moment that it pleases the national interest of Egypt to do so. Therefore, the situation in the Suez Canal is a very tenuous one. I think that it is correct to say that our policy was gravely defective. It did not provide for some more permanent guaranty of free passage through the Suez Canal for all ships, including the ships of Israel, which have been barred from the canal ever since 1951.

If the Arab-Asian resolution is adopted, virtually the same thing will happen at the Straits of Tiran, the Gulf of Aqaba, and in the Gaza strip. Once again the Egyptian troops will move in at the Straits of Tiron. The shore batteries will be erected once more, and we can be quite certain that passage in and out of the Gulf of Aqaba will be prohibited. It will not be possible to use the additional pipeline; in fact, there will be no purpose in constructing it. The entire passage of oil from the Persian Gulf into Western Europe will be under the control of Egypt and Syria. Those countries will have the Western World in a position where they can seize it by the throat, and will have a strategic weapon of great importance.

I was greatly pleased to read in the New York Times for Tuesday that the delegate from Canada to the United Nations, Mr. Pearson—a very able man—had proposed an alternative resolution to the resolution of the Arab-Asian bloc. The so-called Pearson proposal was that there should be a simultaneous movement of the United Nations police force into these disputed areas at the very time that the Israeli troops moved out; in other words, that no vacuum would be left in those areas. As the Israeli troops moved out, in conformity with the directions of the United Nations, the U. N. police force would move in. The Straits of Tiran would be neutralized and the Gaza strip also would be neutralized.

I believe the Pearson proposal was a very statesmanlike proposal. It has been somewhat difficult, on the other hand, to follow the American position, because it has been clouded with excellent language which has not always been lived up to by the concrete proposals of the American delegate who, as I said, is operating under directions of the State Department.

The American delegate, our former colleague, Mr. Lodge, said that there should be U. N. policing of those two areas. However, he proposed two resolutions; one resolution would order the Israelis out, and then, when that was accomplished, he would propose another resolution providing that the U. N. force would move in. On the surface, that would seem to be a fair proposal, but it leaves a tremendous loophole, which can be disastrous. Suppose the first resolution of Mr. Lodge is passed, and suppose that the Israelis, in conformity with international law, move out, but the U. N. has not adopted its second resolution, namely, that the international police force occupy the Straits of Tiran, and there is a vacuum along the Gulf of Aqaba and the straits, and in the Gaza strip.

Does anyone doubt for a moment what will happen? Into that vacuum Colonel Nasser will move Egyptian troops; and while the debate is going on at the United Nations—and there are filibusters there as well as here—Egypt will present the world with an accomplished fact. She will be in possession of the Straits of Tiran at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba; she will be in possession of the Gaza strip; and possession is 9 points of the law—9 points of international law, in any event.

Once again the Straits of Tiran will be closed; once again the conditions which existed in Gaza will reoccur. In other words, the proposal of Mr. Lodge and of the American delegation, as it has been advanced thus far, is one which, in my judgment, would restore the status quo ante and would continue the stranglehold which Egypt and Syria have over the passage of oil to the West.

Let me say a word about the Gaza strip. It is a narrow strip, 6 miles wide and 25 miles long. In it are about 60,000 Palestinian Arabs and about 200,000 Arab refugees. The Arab refugees live in great misery, half starved, idle, and resentful. They, together with 600,000 Arab refugees in Jordan, constitute one of the most terrible and pressing problems in the world today, one which the Western countries, Israel and the Arab States all must do something to solve, and solve quickly.

I shall not go into a discussion of the comparative blame for the border raids between Jordan and Israel, on the one hand, and Egypt and Israel, upon the other. There has been some provocation from both sides. But in the period from March 1955 to October 1956, there was a series of raids both from Jordan and Gaza into Israel itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator's thought if I were to ask him to yield at this point I was looking for something in the RECORD, because the question I desire to address to the Senator has to do with the suggestion he has made as to what the United Nations should do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would it be courteous if I yielded for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course; I desired to ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in understanding the Senator from Illinois to have said to us in his discussion of the proposal of Delegate Pearson, of Canada, that if that proposal were adopted, there would be no hiatus; there would be no loss of time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And there would be no loophole?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the United Nations would immediately take the place vacated by the Israeli troops and, therefore, place the United Nations in the position of preventing any outbreak of war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has brought up that point. I wish to ask if he has taken note of the fact that the President, in his message of January 5, in discussing this matter, made certain statements which bear directly upon what the Senator is now saying to the Senate. On page 225 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 5, 1957, in sections 3 and 4 of the President's message on this subject, the President said, after having outlined the simple and indisputable facts as he raised them with respect to the Middle East situation:

> Our thoughts naturally turn to the United Nations as a protector of small nations. Its charter gives it responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I think we all agree with that statement. That is why we approved the establishment of the United Nations. We wanted an international force representing all peace-loving countries so as to prevent aggression and to avoid war.

However, at the conclusion of the paragraph from which I have been reading, the President used these words:

> The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved.

Then in section 4 of his speech, in the first sentence, the President said:

> Under all the circumstances I have laid before you, a greater responsibility now devolves upon the United States.

Does not this seem to imply that in presenting to the Senate for consideration the resolution which is now Senate Joint Resolution 19 the Department of State is laying the groundwork whereby the United States, with its Armed Forces,

shall be obliged to step into the vacuum which the Senator just now so lucidly described will be created if the Pearson policy is not adopted, and if the policy presented by Ambassador Lodge under the direction of the State Department is followed, namely, that the Israelis must go out first, and the United Nations shall not go in until after the Israelis leave, making it impossible, therefore, for the United Nations to prevent the Egyptians from moving in, and thereby making it necessary for the United States to exercise the power we are asked to give to the President to send troops at the request of any nation in this area?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Wyoming that if the Egyptians are allowed to enter the area after the Israelis withdraw, I think it will be quite impossible for United Nations forces to be used to oust them, any more than the United Nations forces will be used to oust them along the Suez Canal; and that if they are ousted, it will have to be done by American troops, which would, as the Senator has said, involve us in a war with Egypt, and probably some of the Arab States, and might precipitate a world war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator agree that it would be much more likely to prevent war if we now took steps to fortify the United Nations and to make certain that the international force shall move in before the United States is called upon to act as a substitute for the United Nations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming has anticipated the kernel of my speech; namely, that if we want to reach a peaceful solution, one of the first steps must be to make certain that the United Nations will neutralize these areas. There was, I think, a weakness in the President's speech of January 5 when he said, in effect, that these functions are, of course, to be performed by the United Nations. But the United Nations is not a force in itself; it is merely a legislative body, in which various countries are represented, the United States being, perhaps, the most powerful.

Unless the United States takes a constructive attitude within the United Nations, we can be quite certain that the United Nations will not have a constructive attitude itself, because it does not operate by itself.

What I am pleading for is that in these remaining hours before the final vote is taken in the U. N., the State Department may change the policy which was forced upon Ambassador Lodge; and that instead of compelling Canada and Mr. Pearson to come to us and to agree to our policy, as the dispatches yesterday seemed to indicate, we will join with Canada in the proposal that there be a simultaneous entry of United Nations troops into the shore positions commanding the Straits of Tiran and into the Gaza strip, as the Israeli troops move out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for having yielded to me so that I might ask a few questions. I think that my perception of what his argument was to be has not at all weakened his argument, but has served only to emphasize it. I wish to associate myself completely with the plea which the Senator is making.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I find inner reinforcement in the fact that he comes to the same conclusion to which I have come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Illinois for giving a very clear and able presentation of this perplexing problem. I also wish to join in the proposal just offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I think it makes good sense.

Is it not true that for a number of years there has been on record a resolution of the United Nations to the effect that the Suez Canal shall be operated without discrimination against any nation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; that has been true ever since 1951.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But has not the resolution been violated ever since that time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and I regret to say that no country has protested against such violation. We ourselves have not protested against it. In all fairness, let me point out that no protest was made under the previous Democratic administration, and none has been made under the Republican administration. There was 2 years of sin under the Democrats and 4 under the Republicans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not it seem logical that Israel—in fact, all nations that are interested in the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the Near East—should insist that steps be taken to insure that such violation shall not continue in the future?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is an absolute requirement, insofar as the Suez Canal is concerned. But the difficulty is that since Egypt is in military control of the canal, and since it is extremely dubious that the United Nations will go so far as to internationalize the operations of the canal, and since it is extremely dubious that any individual country will do so, in practice the operation of the canal is dependent upon the will of Egypt; and I am not at all sure that Egypt will be amenable to reason in this respect.

So I am pleading that the same mistake be not made in connection with the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza strip. I point out that the Gulf of Aqaba would permit both a supplement and an alternative to both the Suez Canal and the pipelines, and thus would make the West more independent of Egypt and the Arab States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I referred to the Suez Canal simply as one phase of the problem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, if operation of the Suez Canal were stopped, and if the movement of shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba were blocked, the result would really be to effect an almost complete embargo on shipments by Israel, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At this time I should like to ask 1 or 2 other questions, if I may do so with the permission of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator from Illinois feel that even though these several questions relate to difficulties between the Arab countries and Israel; and even though the President, in his speech, and our State Department, by the pronouncement of its policy, have left those problems to the United Nations, certainly there is a very definite leadership that we can exercise in doing our best to see to it that the United Nations takes steps to solve these problems?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree. I would say that our Government cannot divorce itself from responsibility for the policies which our delegates to the United Nations assume in that body. The able Senator from Alabama was once a United States delegate to the United Nations. Let me ask him if it is correct that when he served in that capacity, virtually every day he received from the State Department his instructions regarding what was to be done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was in 1950; and while it is true that we did receive suggestions from the State Department, I may say that the delegation met every morning around a conference table, and discussed the various matters; and if we differed with the State Department, we let the State Department know it; and in many instances the State Department changed or modified its policy.

I think it might be interesting to note at this point that one of the delegates at that time, with whom I had the pleasure of serving, was Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons between the instructions given to the United States delegation in 1950 and those given today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought it was pertinent to mention the date.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But from conversations with Senators who in recent years have been delegates to the United Nations, it is my understanding that, in practice, the United States policy there is now dictated by the State Department, and therefore is an administration policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the same is true in the case of all the other countries represented at the United Nations. It has to be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Because, as the Senator from Illinois has so well pointed out, the United Nations does not constitute a lawmaking and law-enforcing body. Instead, the United Nations seeks to lead.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask another question about a matter which has greatly disturbed me in connection

with the President's proposal for a Middle East program. In his message the President admitted that it does not strike at the basic problems.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, ever since I had the privilege of visiting in the Middle East several years ago I have said that I felt the No. 1 problem there was the resettlement of the Arabs, and that I did not believe there could ever be stability in that area until the resettlement was accomplished.

The Senator from Illinois has recently visited that area. I wonder whether he agrees with that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly do not pretend to be an expert on the Middle East; after all, my stay there was brief. Nevertheless, there is no substitute for the eye; and as one studies the situation, certain conclusions become clear.

I quite agree with the Senator from Alabama. The resettlement of the Arab refugees is fundamental to peace in that area. That will require the cooperation of Israel, the Arab States, and the Western World, including ourselves. There are many transitional steps which can be taken. In my opinion, there can be no adequate solution until there is a concerted plan for better use of the water in the area, including the development of the Jordan project, which would absorb approximately 75,000 of the Arab refugees within Israel and 125,000 of those within Jordan; and also the full development of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, which in the days of the Babylonian Empire gave a comfortable standard of living to 15 million people, whereas there are now only 5 million people there. The Government of Iraq is the only government which is using its oil revenues for the benefit of the people; and it is devoting 70 percent of its oil revenues to the development of that canal system and to other projects. In that connection, Iraq deserves to receive technical assistance, the services of engineers, and so forth. If the project could be fully developed, there would be sufficient work and sufficient land for the remainder of the Arab refugees now in the State of Jordan.

There are complex problems in regard to the political relationship between Jordan, Iraq, and so forth. But the problem is soluble, provided there is a will and leadership.

While I did not intend to discuss today the President's program, but, instead, intended to confine my remarks today to the specific question which probably will come up tomorrow in the United Nations, namely, what will happen to the Gaza strip, the Straits of Iran, and the border, nevertheless I will say that the Eisenhower doctrine does not address itself to the real issues; it does not deal with the problem of the relationship between the Arab States and Israel or to the problem of the Arab refugees or to the problem of possible attacks by one Arab State against another Arab State or, as I have said, possible attacks by several Arab States against Israel. Furthermore, it does not deal with the problem of internal subversion in these countries.

Presumably all it does is to address itself to the question of overt aggression. If we examine the map, we see there is a northern screen of countries, Turkey and Iran, which lie to the north of these States of the Middle East. Russian infantry would have to move across this protecting screen and if it did, then under the Baghdad Pact Britain, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan would spring to arms. The danger of overt Russian aggression in the countries to the south is therefore relatively slight. I believe the Secretary of State has testified that he does not accuse any of these countries of being at present Communist dominated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Might it be well to point out that we already have military commitments to the countries in the northern tier?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We were instrumental in getting Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan to form the Baghdad Pact. We were instrumental in getting Great Britain to help underwrite the Baghdad Pact. But then we stepped out, and refused to underwrite it ourselves. This helped to disillusion Great Britain with Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower.

But I do not wish to get into a general criticism of the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration in the Middle East. Perhaps I shall do so on another occasion.

Today, I wish merely to emphasize that the sands of time are running out; perhaps the United Nations will vote tomorrow on this question. The action taken by the United States delegation will be decisive, and its attitude will be dictated by the State Department.

As of yesterday, the program of the Eisenhower-Dulles administration and of Mr. Lodge provided a wide loophole and vacuum between the time when the Israeli troops are supposed to move out and the conjectural time, if any, when the United Nations' troops will move in. In fact, there is no provision for United Nations' troops to move in. In that vacuum, Egypt could face the world with an accomplished fact, and then we would revert to the same conditions which existed before, namely, with the Gulf of Aqaba closed and with border raids along the Gaza Strip and into Israel.

It is not my intention to indict the Egyptian Government or to apportion the blame in the case of the violations of the border between Egypt and Israel. However, it is a fact that when the Israeli troops conquered the Gaza strip—which they did in 2 days, with only five casualties—they found a list of 600 ununiformed guerrillas in the pay of the Egyptian Government, and they were used for raids out of Gaza into Israel. Some of those men were taken into custody, although probably most of them escaped into Jordan. If the Gaza strip goes back to Egypt, we can be quite certain that those guerrilla troops will be organized again, and there will be more border raids, and there will be a great temptation on Israel for reprisals, as there was before.

In addition to the neutralization of the Straits of Tiran and the Gaza strip, I think there should be at least a narrow band of territory in the Sinai Desert, next to Israel, 25 or 50 miles in width, which should be patrolled by United Nations forces. In fact, it could be patrolled by helicopter most of the time.

There could be an insulated zone across which border raids would not be tolerated, in return for which I think Israel should consent to permitting at least inspection teams on her side of the border to see that elements of her country did not get out of hand as well.

Mr. President, there are press dispatches today from the United Nations which are somewhat cloudy in nature. It is hard to tell from them just what the attitude of the American Government will be. I hope very much that there has been a change in the attitude of yesterday. It is in the belief that constructive criticism in advance, whenever that is possible, is a function of the legislative body that I offer these comments and observations today for whatever they are worth.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope my question to the Senator will be germane to the discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure they will be.

Mr. BUTLER. Assuming Egypt is a sovereign power and conceding that we adopt the Pearson philosophy, what would be the position of the Government of the United States if England and France and other nations requested the United Nations to patrol Egypt or the portions of Egypt bordering on the canal to assure to them their vital interests?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say that the Egyptian troops are already at the canal.

Mr. BUTLER. But they are there only because we forced other troops to get out, and the remaining force is, of course, Israel's. Israel did not get out; the British and French did get out. If we accede to the views of Israel and adopt the Pearson philosophy, do we not have to go back to the situation which existed at the time England and France pulled out at our request and give them the same protection we give Israel for their vital rights and interests in that area?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is much easier to protect the future than to reverse the past. I hope my good friend will not hold it against me if I quote from Omar Khayyam:

> The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on: nor all your piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

While I think it was right to get the British out of Port Said, I think we made a mistake in not having the U. N. troops fill the vacuum and take over the policing of the canal. I think it would have been much better for the international force to have been put in control of the canal, but that was not done. I think a mistake was made by not doing it.

Mr. BUTLER. If the situation had been reversed, and the troops of Britain

and France had remained in the area, would the Senator be making the same speech?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be highly desirable to have an international force along the Suez Canal, but that was not done.

Mr. BUTLER. How desirable would it be to occupy a vital area of a sovereign nation simply because that nation had a resource we wanted or had control over a resource we wanted? We are dealing with a sovereign nation. Our country may have within its borders all the uranium it wants. It may be, however, that another nation wants some of it. Suppose the United Nations should tell us we could not operate our country as a sovereign nation because by doing so we would be interfering with the free flow of uranium?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not want to get into a discussion of the question of sovereignty with my friend from Maryland. The facts are that the Israelis have withdrawn from all points except two, namely, the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip.

Mr. BUTLER. I could recite some pungent phrases on the floor. A country does not have merely a touch of sovereignty; it either has complete sovereignty or does not have it. Egypt has it, and I think she has a right to it. I am not espousing the cause of Egypt. I am talking about a factual situation, divorcing from my discussion the parties involved. I hold no brief for the actions of Egypt. I certainly hold no brief for the actions which have occurred in that area of the world. But when the Senator criticizes the President's policy in that area, I say he had better take a look at the results of what the Pearson policy would be if they were adopted by the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say to my good friend from Maryland I think the oil resources of the Persian Gulf area have world significance?

Mr. BUTLER. I think the uranium deposits of some nation may have world significance, but we do not walk in and take them away. We have never done that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one is proposing that the oil resources be taken away from the states of that area. As a matter of fact, the American companies have been most liberal in their division of profits with those states. Aided by the depletion allowances and other tax benefits which we have extended to those companies, which have stimulated their generosity, they divide their profits 50–50, so that Saudi Arabia is getting about $250 million a year, Iraq about $200 million a year, Iran about $150 million a year, and she will get more, and the little Sheikdom of Kuwait, with half a million people, is getting about $250 million a year, and the disposition of that latter amount would be most interesting if it could be ascertained.

I do not propose that we should make the terms less favorable to those countries or to those people, but I do say it is extraordinary when the international situation is such that Egypt can close the canal and where Syria can blow up the pipelines. Is there not some world responsibility to see to it that there is a continuous flow of so vital a resource? It is all very well for Egypt to get larger fees for use of the Canal. It is proper for Syria and Lebanon to get larger transit fees for the right-of-way of the pipelines. But are we going to say that they have the right to stop the flow of oil to the Western World when such stoppage would lead, if not to disaster, to great suffering because of pure, unadulterated, 100 percent, blown-in-the-bottle national sovereignty?

Mr. BUTLER. As I have said, and I do not intend to labor the point, I think a nation's sovereignty is something that should nct be tampered with. I do not think the territory of our Nation should be used for the transportation of oil or any other product if the Congress of the United States should see fit to prohibit it. If the sovereign nation of Egypt wants to prevent ships from passing through its land, if there is no violation of a treaty, Egypt has a perfect right to do that. Even if she is in violation of a treaty, she has the right to stop such passage if she wants to pay the consequences of a violation of the treaty. I am not willing to see established the violation of the sovereignty of any country, and I do not think the United Nations was established for that purpose.

The United Nations was established not to participate in a violation of the rights of sovereign nations; it was established to preserve the rights of nations, and in that way preserve peace.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not approve of the action taken by the British and French on the 30th of last October, but I do say unless there is a solution, as soon as possible, to the problem of the shipment of oil to Western Europe, and unless there is found a solution to the problem of Arab refugees, there will be another outbreak of hostilities. Next time we may not be able to insulate it; it may develop into a world war.

Mr. BUTLER. Suppose we were told, "You cannot even come into our country to drill for oil." What would we do about it? Would we send a United Nations team in there to drill for oil under the supervision of the United Nations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. BUTLER. What would be done?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We should take steps to insure the free and nondiscriminatory passage of oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea. That is what I am saying. Further, it is wrong to allow one country—whether that country be Britain, France, Israel, Egypt, or anyone else—to extend its influence in the name of national sovereignty by force and violence in a situation which could bring on a world war. That is the point.

Mr. President, unless there are further comments to be made on this subject, I yield the floor.

REFINANCING OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on Monday, January 31, the New York Times, from the statistics available in the Department of the Treasury, published a story setting forth that during the calendar year beginning January 17, 1957, the maturities of the securities of the United States which would have to be refinanced amounted to $78,740,402,074. The entire list is then given.

It appears from this statement that a week ago, that is, a week before the 31st of January, the amount to be refinanced in the succeeding calendar year was $77,141,000,000, and that a year before the amount to be refinanced was $69,788,000,000.

I refer to this table because yesterday the Treasury Department issued a statement announcing that the Treasury was offering 3⅜ percent, 1-year Treasury certificates of indebtedness, maturing February 14, 1958, and 3½ percent, 3-year-3-months Treasury notes maturing May 15, 1960, open to holders of $7,219,000,000 2⅝ percent certificates now outstanding, and the holders of $2,997,000,000 of 2⅞ percent notes maturing March 15.

This means, of course, that with respect to indebtedness now bearing a rate of interest amounting to 2⅝ percent, for $7,200,000,000, and a rate of interest of 2⅞ percent on securities worth, at the face value, $2,997,000,000 two new series of certificates will be issued, one of which will be at 3⅜ percent for 1 year, and the other at 3½ percent for 3 years and 3 months. This indicates that there is a very striking inflation in the rate of interest which the Government of the United States must pay for the money it borrows to carry out its programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the table to which I have referred and the statement issued by the Treasury Department as of yesterday.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1957]

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $78,740,402,074

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $78,740,402,074. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills and notes as follows:

Jan. 17: Discount bills	$1,600,740,000
Jan. 24: Discount bills	1,600,142,000
Jan. 31: Discount bills	1,601,624,000
Feb. 1:	
Series E saving bonds [1]	2,223,334,663
Series F saving bonds [1]	451,548,938
Series G saving bonds [1]	1,667,765,300
Feb. 7: Discount bills	1,600,725,000
Feb. 14: Discount bills	1,601,029,000
Feb. 15: 2⅝-percent certificates of indebtedness	7,219,479,000
Feb. 15: Discount bills	1,749,900,000
Feb. 21: Discount bills	1,599,827,000
Feb. 28: Discount bills	1,600,093,000
Mar. 7: Discount bills	1,600,005,000
Mar. 14: Discount bills	1,599,968,000
Mar. 15: 2⅞-percent Treasury notes	2,996,574,000
Mar. 21: Discount bills	1,600,310,000
Mar. 22:	
Tax anticipation certificates	3,220,612,000
Tax anticipation bills	1,005,647,000

[1] Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

Mar. 23: Discount bills	$1,614,593,000
Apr. 1: 1½-percent Treasury notes	531,296,000
Apr. 4: Discount bills	1,600,348,000
Apr. 11: Discount bills	1,600,105,000
Apr. 18: Discount bills	1,601,086,000
May 15: 1⅝-percent Treasury notes	4,154,930,000
June 24:	
3¼-percent tax anticipation certificates	1,311,980,000
Discount bills	1,600,616,000
Aug. 1: 2¾-percent Treasury notes	12,056,091,000
Aug. 15: 2-percent Treasury notes	3,792,028,000
Oct. 1:	
1½-percent Treasury notes	824,196,000
3¼-percent certificates of indebtedness	7,270,942,000
Jan. 1, 1958:	
Series E saving bonds	2,341,864,249
Series F saving bonds	211,157,624
Series G saving bonds	1,689,845,300
Total	78,740,402,074
Week ago	77,141,448,074
Year ago	69,786,385,215

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

The Treasury Department announced today an optional exchange offering of 3⅜ percent 1-year Treasury certificates of indebtedness maturing February 14, 1958, and 3½-percent 3-year and 3-month Treasury notes maturing May 15, 1960, open to the holders of $7,219 million 2⅝-percent certificates maturing February 15 and $2,997 million 2⅞-percent notes maturing March 15. The new certificate offering will also be open to holders of the $531 million 1½-percent notes maturing April 1. Cash subscriptions will not be received.

The new certificates and the new notes will be dated February 15, 1957, and exchanges will be made at par, with an adjustment of interest in all cases as of that date. In the case of the notes maturing March 15, accrued interest from September 15 to February 15 will be paid to subscribers following acceptance of the notes. In the case of the notes maturing April 1, accrued interest from October 1 to February 15 will be paid to subscribers following acceptance of these notes. In all cases the final coupon should be attached to the notes when surrendered.

Interest on the new certificates will be payable August 15, 1957, and at maturity on February 14, 1958. Interest on the new notes will be payable on November 15, 1957, and semiannually thereafter.

The subscription books will open on Monday, February 4, and will remain open only for 2 days for this exchange offering. Any subscription for either issue addressed to a Federal Reserve bank or branch, or to the Treasurer of the United States, and placed in the mail before midnight, Tuesday, February 5, will be considered as timely.

The Treasury also announced that it will invite tenders for $1,750 million, or thereabouts, of 129-day Treasury bills for cash and in exchange for the special Treasury bills maturing February 15. The full terms of the offering will be contained in a statement to be released Monday morning, February 4. Tenders will be opened at 1:30 p. m., eastern standard time, on Thursday, February 7.

The new bills will be dated February 15 and will mature June 24, 1957. These will be tax-anticipation bills, acceptable at face value in payment of income and profits taxes due June 15, 1957. Settlement for accepted tenders must be made in cash or other immediately available funds or in a like face amount of Treasury bills maturing February 15.

PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY MARSHAL TITO

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the question that has been raised about Americans showing "discourtesy" to Marshal Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia.

As you know, Mr. President, I, along with other Members of Congress, have expressed vigorous opposition to the idea of inviting Tito to the United States. Many patriotic American organizations have done likewise. And this for the very simple reason that we object to bestowing the Nation's honors on a man who is an enemy of the United States, who is a member of an international conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of our way of life.

I now call attention to an article datelined Belgrade, January 29, which appeared in the New York Times the day before yesterday. The article states that Tito is thinking of rejecting what was apparently an invitation to visit the United States, in the light of opposition to the visit expressed in Congress and in the press. I now quote from the New York Times article:

> In general, Borba complained of "slanderous and irresponsible writings" in some United States newspapers, as well as "indecent and insulting language" used by some politicians.
>
> Yugoslavia public opinion expects the Eisenhower Administration "not only to dissociate itself from the anti-Yugoslav campaign but also to condemn it," Borba said.
>
> There could be no doubt that the Yugoslavian Government took a serious view of the congressional petition and that it would not go through with the visit unless the Washington administration made some conciliatory gesture.
>
> Stressing that the initiative for the visit had come from the United States, Borba complained that up to now the administration had not reacted firmly against the "inciters" of the anti-Yugoslav campaign.

In passing, Mr. President, I ask Senators to note that the first official information that Tito has been invited to visit the United States comes, not from the United States Government, but from the official Communist Party newspaper of Yugoslavia. For many weeks now Congress has been trying to find out whether the invitation has been officially extended. We have been denied that information. In fact, when Secretary Dulles was asked whether the invitation had been extended, he denied that it had. Now we finally have confirmed what we had suspected—and the confirmation comes from the Communists. I ask Senators how can we expect to discharge our responsibilities when we have to depend for our information upon Communist Party newspapers.

I now quote from the President's press conference of Wednesday, January 30. Let us keep in mind that on the day previous, the official Communist newspaper of Yugoslavia said that Tito would be unable to come to the United States unless the Eisenhower administration would "dissociate itself from the anti-Yugoslav campaign" and "condemn it." The very first question—obviously a planted one—asked the President at his news conference was this:

> Mr. President, could you give us your views, sir, on the situation today when Washington visits by world leaders, who are obviously important to our foreign policy, are under critical attack in this country, and particularly in Congress.
>
> I refer specifically to the visit today of King Saud, and the reported plans for Marshall Tito to visit the United States.

The President began his answer by saying that "you don't promote the cause of peace by talking only to people with whom you agree" and that, by implication, Tito had been invited to the United States to promote the cause of peace. He then said:

> • • • I therefore deplore any discourtesy shown to a visitor who comes to us, representative of a government or of a people, and whose purpose is to see whether he can assist in ameliorating any of these difficulties.

Before I comment on that statement, let me call to the attention of Senators the reaction in Yugoslavia. I now quote from the New York Times of yesterday, January 31:

> Marshal Tito's proposed visit to the United States "may be on again, thanks to President Eisenhower. Until late this afternoon Belgrade was gloomy • • •. The official mood changed as soon as the first reports arrived on today's news conference at the White House. The President's criticism of discourtesy to foreign chiefs of state took the Yugoslav capital by surprise • • • [It may] cause them to reconsider [the question of Tito's visit].

I have two things to say about these events:

First, it seems to me that we have reached a sorry state of affairs when a Communist dictatorship can lay down and obtain compliance with an ultimatum to the Government of the United States.

Tito said he would not come to the United States unless the administration disavowed and condemned what the Yugoslavs call the "indecent and insulting language" of Members of Congress; and within 24 hours the President did precisely that. It is just as though Tito had snapped his fingers, and the United States Government began to dance. Now the Yugoslavs very generously say that they are willing to reconsider their decision not to accept our invitation.

Secondly, I should like to take up the question of whether, indeed, we ought to be "discourteous" to the likes of Marshal Tito. The President is quite right in saying that we must not limit our international talks to people with whom we agree. But the President—or perhaps I should say the "palace guard," which I am sure was responsible for this invitation in the first place—is quite well aware that there is more involved here than a mere talk between Marshal Tito and President Eisenhower. Whatever we have to say to Tito, and Tito to us, can be said just as well through our Ambassadors. What is involved here is a formal state visit during which this Nation,

in effect, honors Marshal Tito. The diplomatic implications of a state visit are well known. Invitations for state visits are not extended unless the host country, in one degree or another, means to express its friendship for the regime represented by the invited guest.

The palace guard evidently believes that our national interests will be advanced by playing host to Tito and honoring him. I disagree. I believe that to invite a man who, after the breach between Yugoslavia and Russia had been healed, said, "Nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries"—meaning Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Russia—"marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin," a man who has applauded the Soviet blood bath in Hungary, and who is supporting the vicious Kadar regime in Hungary—I believe that to invite such a man to the United States is to promote Communist slavery, or war, or both. That being the case, I have no other choice, under my oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States as best I can, but to vigorously oppose the Tito visit.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand the Senator to say that he has knowledge that an invitation has been extended to Tito to come to the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. That information came from the Belgrade newspaper.

Mr. LONG. If I understand the Senator correctly, the press of Yugoslavia in Belgrade has made the statement that the invitation had been extended. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Not in so many words. They said the initiative for the visit came from Washington. That is the same as saying that Tito had been invited by us. We learned that only from Yugoslav newspapers. Many of us had suspected it. The Secretary of State was asked whether such an invitation had been issued. He denied it. We found it out from the Yugoslav newspapers.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assure Senators that, although my views may be wrong, they will not be subjected to censorship by the White House.

Not only that: It is now clear that we who believe the Tito visit is bad for our country cannot hope to prevail upon the executive department to change its mind about the invitation; so our only hope, it seems, is to raise such a fuss that Tito will decide not to come.

Therefore, since discourtesy is our only weapon, I urge that all of us in the Senate, and every other American who feels as I do, be as discourteous to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, as God gives us ingenuity to think up gestures of discourtesy. Since it is only through an expression of popular opposition to the Tito visit that Tito will be prevailed upon to stay at home, let us take note of our rights and duties as free citizens and start shouting from the rooftops.

Since I prepared these remarks, I have read a United Press dispatch from Yugoslavia, which I quote:

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, February 1.—The Yugoslav Foreign Office said today "the time is not yet ripe" for President Tito to visit the United States, but the trip still is being considered.

Spokesman Banko Draskovic told newsmen the United States and Yugoslav Governments "have considered that the visit of President Tito to the United States would be mutually useful."

"This visit, however, for which the date has not yet been fixed, will not be carried into effect for the time being," he said.

He explained: "The conditions and atmosphere which have been created in this connection in the United States of America have shown that the time for such a visit is not yet ripe."

Mr. President, I, for one, serve notice that I will do everything in my power—and I hope the other Members of the Senate and every other American will do likewise—to make sure that the time will never be ripe to bring this Communist dictator to this country to pollute our air and desecrate our land.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 4, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Norman R. Abrams.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Leon H. A. Pierson, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland for a term of 4 years, vice George Cochran Doub, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 2, 1955.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 1 year in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5141.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1957:

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

Bertram D. Tallamy, of New York, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Kefauver at the National Aircraft Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 1, 1957

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I made this morning before the National Aircraft Conference, consisting of members of UAW-CIO, and also the International Machinists Union.

In the speech I pointed out the shortage of skilled technicians and workers, and suggested steps which could be taken by industry and union organizations and the Government to help us get more skilled workers and technicians.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL AIRCRAFT CONFERENCE AT THE STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 1, 1957

It is a great pleasure for me to meet today with you members of the UAW-CIO Aircraft Department. Your director, Leonard Woodcock, is an old and dear friend of mine. I understand also that there are representatives present of the International Association of Machinists, the other large union in the aircraft-missiles field. Your two unions, working together, are a great national asset—because among your members are the great bulk of trained and skilled manpower in this vitally important industry.

During recent years, some of us have become increasingly concerned that our Nation may be facing a serious crisis in this very field—the field of trained workers, trained engineers, scientists and skilled technicians.

Since World War II, defense activities have been oriented more and more toward research and development. These efforts consume probably a hundred times the engineering

manpower used by production. Their results open the doors for still more and more demand for skilled manpower.

No one seriously expects any significant letup in this struggle. The fact is that the character of industry and, for that matter, of our daily lives is changing at a breathless pace. About half the current sales of the chemical industry are of products that were not in existence barely 20 years ago. The Radio Corporation of America expects that 10 years from now 80 percent of its products will probably be items not heard of today.

Scientists, engineers, and skilled manpower such as that represented by these unions, working in fields of jet engines, guided missiles, mechanical and electronic controlling devices are keys to these advances.

We think of these advantages frequently in connection with military matters but they also mean great civilian advantages. For instance we are now beginning to have jet airliners which resulted from progress made in jet military planes.

I was interested in reading only Wednesday of this week the testimony of various witnesses before the Special Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The testimony warned of the growing shortage of engineers and scientists, and emphasized that the Soviets are now far outdistancing this country in both categories.

Admiral Carney testified quite bluntly. He said that it has been reported that the output of technical people in the Soviet today almost doubles ours.

"This is very hard for an American to swallow," Admiral Carney said, "but there undoubtedly is truth in the report."

Of course, Admiral Carney and all other witnesses, all of whom agreed with this state of affairs, testified that one of the big reasons is that people are not free in the Soviet Union. A young man, who shows talent, can be ordered to become a scientist or an engineer, a skilled mechanic, or electronic worker.

That, however, does not detract from the problem. Our free-enterprise system, if it is to remain free, must meet and beat the challenge.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I know that the Armed Forces themselves are suffering seriously from a lack of technically skilled personnel.

General LeMay, Commander of the Strategic Air Force, says there is one deficiency which pertains not only to Strategic Air Command but to the military services as a whole, and that is a deficiency in skilled manpower.

"We will never be able to maintain the kind of force in being, capable of striking against the enemy on a moment's notice, or of assuming an alert posture which will in any way approach what we ought to be able to do with the money which has been expended against our equipment and facilities unless we have skilled professional manpower required to maintain and operate a modern weapons system," General LeMay says.

"I consider the lack of skilled manpower to be my most critical deficiency," he continues.

When you analyze this statement, the general has called attention to a very serious situation. He has said that we are not capable, because of the lack of skilled manpower, of maintaining an "alert posture." This is confirmed by other ranking military officials.

As far as the military is concerned, part of the reasons for this lack of skilled manpower undoubtedly is due to the lack of any plan within the military system to recognize and reward particular skills. A sergeant with the same length of service gets the same pay whether he is driving a truck or working with electronic equipment.

This is not true, I understand, in the Soviet Army. In many ways, despite their generally lower standard of living, members of the Soviet Army, considering all their prerequisites, are on a higher pay scale than our Army. And special skills are recognized with special pay scales.

In order to continue in the competitive race for survival, we have got to revise our own thinking with regard to pay for the military. I know that there has been considerable work done on plans to modernize the pay scale of the Armed Forces. I hope that such a bill passes this year. We have no time to waste.

The military, however, is only one-half the problem. The other half of the problem is concerned with people like you. There we have witnessed the same shortsightedness which has let our military pay scale lag so far behind for technically trained people.

It is interesting to note that the minimum-wage rate under Walsh-Healey determination for the aircraft industry was established at $1.05 an hour in July 1950, and that there has been no increase in this minimum rate since that date. I agree with the UAW that this is far too low. I join with you in believing that the Department of Labor should make a complete review and survey of the current wage rate situation in the aircraft industry, including engine plants, parts plants, and accessory plants—and including also the guided missile industry—in order to establish a new minimum more consistent with present-day facts.

Maintaining the skilled employees now in the industry, however, is again only half the story. There is today a shortage of skilled manpower, particularly in the aircraft industry, just as there is for the Armed Forces.

A study by the United States Bureau of Apprenticeship recently came to my attention which shows the continuing increase in the demands for skilled manpower. Census figures show that in 1910 the number of skilled workers, craftsmen, and foremen represented 11.7 percent of the labor force. By 1950 this figure rose to 13.8 percent, despite the trend to mass-production methods. Currently, as the second industrial revolution gains momentum, with the application of automation, electronics and nuclear energy in industry, there obviously will be an ever-increasing percentage of the work force requiring training. Some economists and manpower authorities estimate that somewhere between a third and a half of our future work force will have to be skilled.

I hate to make this comparison, but once again, as in the case of scientists and engineers, the facts show apprenticeship training in the Soviet Union is growing at a far faster pace than here in the United States. A study, Industrial Training in the Soviet Union, by Walter Galenson, of the University of California, shows that apprentices in industry nationwide increased from 133,300 in 1928 to 269,200 in 1937. Since that time, the data is not available, but in 1940 the State labor reserve system was adopted. This program is based on the totalitarian concept of drafted youth, and provides for both short and long term training as well as advanced formal technical and engineering schooling. We know therefore that training has been accelerated substantially since then in the Soviet Union.

The necessity for stepped-up training and education therefore exists all along the line. It is a job for government, industry and the unions, working together. Certainly industry can do much more on its own to help train adequately skilled technicians. Unions, as I know the UAW and the machinists would be the first to admit, can do more. I think it is a problem which should be discussed across the collective-bargaining tables.

The Government, for its part, has got to recognize the necessity for such training. Just as the Government is going to have to develop an imaginative program for the training of more scientists and engineers, so also is it going to have to take a hand in assisting with the establishment of adequate apprenticeship programs.

This can be done both in a financial way and by the proper development of programs within the Labor Department. It is a legitimate part of our overall educational system.

I would like to suggest that as one step that might be considered would be for the Air Force to place in each contract let for Air Force planes and missiles a provision requiring the contractor to have an approved personnel-training program within his own plant. This would have the advantage of giving some assurance of maintaining a continuing skilled force.

Furthermore, industry must make better use of the trained manpower it has. I know that all of you are familiar with the advertisements in the daily newspapers in which industry is desperately trying to pirate scientists and engineers from other industries, offering everything including life in Florida.

At the same time, I would wager that most of those industries so advertising are overlooking, right under their noses, skilled technicians in their own plants who could step up into some of the engineering jobs if they were upgraded, thereby relieving the trained engineer for some more technical and delicate operation in the same plant. I know that the National Science Foundation is making a study of this very proper utilization of manpower, and finds it to be a great waste of this precious resource. I am sure that there are men right in this room with the technical skills to go through such an upgrading process.

I have been one of those who has been critical of the cutbacks in the Air Force itself. I am still critical of such cutbacks. The new budget, while we don't yet have the breakdowns, quite obviously is too low to provide enough new planes even to take care of replacing those lost through obsolescence and attrition. Apparently there will continue to be an increase in the production of missiles, but from my point of view the program which the new budget apparently contemplates is not adequate. Many military people think that if we should unfortunately become involved in a war under modern conditions, we would have to fight it with the equipment then in being. Industrial targets would be destroyed.

But serious as this situation is, even more serious is the continuing lag in the training of scientists, engineers and skilled manpower. For unless that deficiency is corrected, this Nation won't have to wait for a war to lose it. Until a better world order than we now have is worked out, the nation which makes the mistake of lagging in developing the industrial potential necessary to compete, may lose out to the totalitarian nation which throws all its manpower into the field which it believes most important.

I think we are ahead now in industrial capacity and in engineering and technical know-how. But just as the gap has closed in quantity of planes, and just as it is closing in quality of planes, so is it closing in science, engineering, and technical skills.

We must not let this happen. But to prevent it we've got to have the determination we once had when we explored new frontiers in our western movement. Now we've got to explore and crack these frontiers of industrial and engineering achievement.

Kansas Republican Veterans, a Militant Force for Better Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 1, 1957

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered at the Kansas Republican Veterans luncheon at Topeka, Kans., on January 29.

January 29, in addition to being the birthday of the State of Kansas, has also been recognized as the day for the gathering of Kansas Republicans at an annual meeting.

For several decades the Republican Veterans have been meeting on that same date, and it was my pleasure to address them this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I assure you it is a genuine pleasure to have this privilege of addressing the Kansas Republican Veterans Club.

On this Kansas Day occasion I bring you the greetings and good wishes of your Kansas Republican delegation members in Washington—Senator SCHOEPPEL, Congressmen REES, SCRIVNER, SMITH, GEORGE, and AVERY. Some of them are here—others could not be with us because of the pressure of duties in the Congress. All of them have asked that I express their appreciation for the support and efforts which this organization has accorded us who represent Kansas in the National Senate and House of Representatives.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you in my own behalf for your help and cooperation toward my reelection as United States Senator in the campaign last fall.

The Kansas Republican Veterans Club is truly a potent and militant force dedicated to the cause of better government. Its membership is composed of men and women who have served in the Armed Forces of our country and who have chosen the Republican Party as their vehicle of political expression. Thus, in effect, there is a double bond of unity—unique to this group—among all political organizations.

Service in our country's Armed Forces is not necessarily a qualification for public office, nor a requirement for activity in the field of politics and government. But military service certainly contributes an awareness and a realization of the vital need for good citizenship and good government, and the obligation of each individual citizen to do his or her part toward the public good.

It is easily understandable, therefore, why such a preponderance of our governmental leadership comes from this very organization—the Kansas Republican Veterans Club.

Today, I want to talk to you, not as veterans, but as Republicans. I want to talk to you as members of the great Republican Party, which has just won an overwhelming victory nationwide in the reelection of our own fellow-Kansan, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our esteemed Vice President, RICHARD NIXON.

Never has there been a clearer example of the people's confidence and trust in their Nation's leadership than was displayed by the largest number of voters in our country's history in returning our beloved President to this high office. And never has there been a time when we needed more the sound, skillful, honest leadership of President Eisenhower.

The threat of Soviet aggression and infiltration is growing daily in the small countries of the Middle East and elsewhere. These countries are seeking freedom and self-government. If they are allowed to become subject to Communist domination they soon will suffer the same fate as Hungary, where wholesale murder, brutality, and savage ruthlessness are the order of the day, as the Kremlin crushes a people whose only desire is to be free.

President Eisenhower has placed before the Congress a request for the necessary powers to aid these small countries of the world who are struggling for free existence. He has asked that America be in position to heed their pleas if aggression occurs, so that we may help them with both military and economic assistance.

By approving the President's request, I believe we will have served a resounding notice upon international communism which will deter their aggression and bring us a long stride toward our goal of world peace.

We shall also have brought renewed faith and hope to those small, struggling countries whose desires are the same as our own—freedom and self-government.

In 1823 our Nation approved the Monroe Doctrine. We served notice on the nations of the world that our interests would not be confined to actions limited within our own shores and we would view with concern actions taken by other nations that might be inimical to our interests in the Western Hemisphere.

Today President Eisenhower expands this program to other areas of the globe. We are closer today through transportation and communications to the Near East and Far East than we were to Panama and Rio in 1823. Personally, I expect to support the program that the President has submitted.

Here at home, just 2 weeks ago, President Eisenhower took a personal, first-hand look at our own State and others where the ravages of prolonged drought have brought enormous distress and suffering. Already he has recommended measures to alleviate this critical situation and, I am sure, other measures will follow.

No problem is more vital to us in Kansas and this great area of drought than our decreasing water supply and wind erosion of our soil.

The President has asked the States and local communities to take action along with the Federal Government in joint endeavor to conquer this grave problem which is endangering the livelihood of literally millions of our people.

The President's trip was of great value, in that it helped to dramatize the need of Federal assistance in this area, but the regrettable part of the trip was the President did not have an opportunity to get the personal touch of the human privation and suffering of our people.

I am sure our State legislature will devote its best efforts to help in this great drought program.

These are two examples out of many, of Republican national leadership, facing a dangerous world crisis, and doing its utmost to remedy a grave situation at home. I think it is our duty, not just as Republicans, but as good citizens to give our support and backing to President Eisenhower and his efforts.

This meeting of the Kansas Republican Veterans Club is a part of the 1957 Kansas Day where Kansas Republicans of our party's organizations and membership gather together to plan for the future, to exchange ideas, to achieve a unified party program.

I want to take this opportunity to urge each of you to attend the Kansas Day banquet tonight and hear the Honorable George Murphy, who, from Hollywood and the stage, has taken a more and more important part in the direction and activity of the Republican Party.

A great speaker, George Murphy, has also displayed vast ingenuity and fine administrative ability in his endeavors for the Republican Party, especially in the last two campaigns. He has just completed a highly successful task at the inauguration, where he secured and produced the galaxy of talent present from the entertainment world. Let me repeat, don't miss George Murphy tonight at the Kansas Day banquet.

As we work together this Kansas Day toward the election of 1958, I think we Kansas Republicans must look at reality. Staring us in the face is the cold, hard fact that the Republican Party has lost the governorship, the lieutenant governorship, and the Congressman from the fifth district.

Kansas Republicans are not alone in their losses in the 1956 campaign. West of the Mississippi River the opposition has made inroads in many States in congressional seats and in the governorships.

These results occurred in the face of a great Eisenhower sweep in these very States. I suggest that our national Republican leadership—together with our State and county Republican leadership from this area—get together often for a long, new look at basic policy, mutual interests and mutual problems, as well as attitudes and action, if we are to reverse this trend and give the President the Republican backing and support he needs in the Congress and the statehouses.

Now, in looking at our situation in Kansas I do not want to assume the mantle of an oracle—because I am certainly not one. Neither am I here to preach or to wear any robes of office. My only objective is that I feel very keenly there is a duty incumbent upon both you and me and every member of the Republican Party. That duty is to help restore our State government to the administration and leadership of good Republicanism.

To achieve that goal the Republican Party in Kansas must deserve it. A political party is worth its salt only if it serves as the means for better government for the people. Before we can expect to reassume the reins of government we must reestablish the confidence and trust of the people of Kansas in our party.

Mere partisanship is certainly not the answer nor the road to follow. The declaration of policy by the Republican legislature to cooperate with the executive, to support his proposals if they are for the public good and the best interests of Kansas, is a long stride in the right direction and in keeping with Republican tradition at its best.

I commend our Republican legislature for this attitude of striving for the welfare of Kansas above party considerations. Before this session is ended I am confident the people of Kansas will see a demonstration of real leadership and better government initiated and carried out by a Republican legislature.

Our State of Kansas has a Republican heritage. It was born, has grown, and become great and prosperous under Republican direction throughout almost all of its years of statehood. Kansas again will be Republican—but only if we face the facts, admit, and rectify our mistakes, and adhere to the high principles and policies which have made the Republican Party the guiding star of Kansas destiny.

Kansas has been under Republican State administration for the past 18 years successively. In 1936 our State went to the opposition party both as to the governorship and the lieutenant-governorship. Yet 2 years later in the 1938 campaign, Kansas

again elected a Republican governor and lieutenant governor and has done so at each election until last November.

During that long era of Republican administration our State enjoyed a great and valuable growth in many directions.

Through its Republican State administrations Kansas made giant strides in many fields, such as education, mental health, public health, rural health, highways, teachers' retirement, social welfare, institutional care, institutional and educational building, industrial development, and many others.

This great advancement represents the kind of government Kansas needs and approves. Yet, in a relatively short time the Republican Party fell from grace—and we must recognize that fact.

The Republican Party in Kansas needs the sound and sober thinking of every member of this organization and the entire party structure.

We must remember that when the great majority political party of our State falls into division, disunity, and downright plain feuding, the people of the State, including our own party membership, will rightfully become disgusted.

We must remember that when the leadership of our party fails to follow those high principles for which our party has become known—and begins to think of personal gain, rather than the welfare of all of our people—our entire party is bound to suffer.

The Republiean Party in Kansas needs a constructive, progressive, forward-looking program in line with our traditional pattern, and the will to carry it out.

We must abhor and throw out the methods of destruction, of maligning our fellow party members, of name-calling the Republicans who disagree with us.

To seek self-advancement by unjust criticism of progressive and honest Republican administrations is a sure way to political suicide—and what is more important—a sure way of destroying the Republican Party.

Kansas Republicans do not object to constructive criticism, but they do object to unjust and carping criticism within our own party.

Kansas people have demonstrated that they will not tolerate such tactics for long. The sooner we recognize these facts, the sooner we will regain the confidence of the people of Kansas.

We have experienced a period of accusation, misrepresentation, and vindictiveness unparalleled in Kansas history. This kind of political savagery has sprung out of our own party, egged on and maintained by disseminators of both public and private word, to a point that the Republican Party in Kansas must either clean up its own house and start afresh for 1958, or slide downward toward more defeats and further loss of public esteem.

During the past campaign and since, and in the short time I have had here on this occasion, countless Republicans have visited with me—they are unanimous in their thinking that we must rebuild the Republican Party in Kansas.

This does not mean destroying what we have, merely to achieve a change. Instead, it means strengthening our present Republican Party with new ideas and new blood, adhering to the soundest and highest principles of party conduct and program, to be carried out by all party members—old and new alike. What we need is more oil and less vinegar.

One of the greatest myths—a strawman created by those who set it up and then knock it down and about with great fervor—is that of the appellation "Old Guard" to any part of the Republican Party of over 2 or 3 years vintage.

In the same mythology is the tag of liberal to another part of the same party. Who constitutes the Old Guard and who constitutes the liberals is never quite defined. It is meant to be divisive, and it has been picked up by the opposition for that very purpose.

This attempt to separate the Republican Party in Kansas into the sheep and the goats is one of the first things I think should be resisted and eliminated. The labels of liberal, conservative, progressive and so on, I believe were well taken care of by President Eisenhower when he said in effect—let the Republican Party be liberal in human relationships and human rights, be conservative with the taxpayers' money, and progressive in all things.

The Republican Party needs the thinking, the views and the efforts of all its members, from 18 to 80 and beyond.

The next time you hear some self-styled political expert labeling some individual or group as Old Guard, as a meaning sinister, and some other expert hailing other individuals or groups as great liberals, as a meaning commendatory—just remember a little of it may be true, but for the most part it is nonsense.

What the Republican Party in Kansas needs is not a division or battle over strawmen or straw labels, but a united party membership devoted to traditional Republican progress, to high principles and ideals—a party of workers, young and old, conservative or liberal as they please, men and women, all dedicated to the best interests of Kansas.

On such a foundation, I believe the Republican Party can be rebuilt, so that the people of our great State will reaffirm their faith and confidence in Kansas Republicanism in 1958.

